UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 97—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1951, TO FEBRUARY 21, 1951
(PAGES 1 TO 1456)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

J
11
.R
v.97
pt.1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
11-21-51

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1951

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Eighty-second Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose approval we seek above the hollow applause of men, with the unwritten record of a new session open before us we would make the first entry "In the beginning God," as with contrite hearts we offer the prayer that all the deliberations of this historic Chamber may be begun, continued and ended in Thee. In a world where the very foundations seem to be shaken and the mad fury of battle this very day assails our senses and tears our hearts, we cherish this hushed and hallowed moment which so long ago the founding fathers set apart as an altar of prayer at the day's beginning.

Grant that those who by the people's choice have been called to high places of state in this fateful day, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand, assuming responsibilities as heavy as the servants of the Commonwealth have ever borne, may be filled with Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Thee. On this significant day of beginnings like the sound of a great amen may there ascend from every Member of this legislative body, upon which are the eyes of the world, the solemn prayer: "So help me, God!" We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first order of business is the administration of the oath of office to the newly elected Senators. Their names will be called in alphabetical order in groups of four and as their names are called they will proceed to the rostrum where the oath will be administered.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the names of Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. CAPEHART.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the oath required by the Constitution and prescribed by law is administered to Mr. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER as a Senator from the State of Maryland for the term beginning January 3, 1951, such action shall be deemed to be without prejudice either to him or to the constitutional right or power of the Senate to take any action it may subsequently deem proper, pending the outcome of the investigation now being made by the Committee on Rules and Administration through a subcommittee into the 1950 election in said State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senators whose names have been called will come forward and take the oath of office.

Mr. AIKEN, escorted by Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BENNETT, escorted by Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, escorted by Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. CAPEHART, escorted by Mr. JENNER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. DIRKSEN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. DOUGLAS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. DUFF, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. HENNINGS.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. DUFF), escorted by Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. KEM, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, and Mr. MAYBANK, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MCCARRAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. IVES, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MALONE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. MORSE.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BENTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KERR, and Mr. CORDON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. NIXON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. TOBEY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. LANGER, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—William F. Knowland and Richard M. Nixon.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Brien McMahon and William Benton.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear, Jr.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Herman Welker.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—Virgil M. Chapman and Earle C. Clements.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender, Sr., and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Owen Brewster and Margaret Chase Smith.

Maryland.—Herbert R. O'Conor and John Marshall Butler.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—James P. Kem and Thomas C. Hennings, Jr.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and Willis Smith.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Edward Martin and James H. Duff.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Estes Kefauver.

Texas.—Tom Connally and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Utah.—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt.

RESUMPTION OF SENATE SESSIONS IN SENATE CHAMBER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks this is not an inappropriate time to invite the attention of Senators and their guests to what the Chair regards as an important historic event, namely, the return of the Senate to this Chamber.

Ninety-two years ago this month the United States Senate moved from the Chamber which it had previously occupied into this new wing of the Capitol, and the House of Representatives moved from what is now Statuary Hall into its new Chamber.

Twice within the life of the Eighty-first Congress the Senate, because of repairs which were being made to this Chamber, has had to move out of this Chamber into its old Chamber, which for many years had been occupied by the Supreme Court.

The Chair would like to congratulate the Architect of the Capitol and all his associates, as well as the committees of the Senate and of the House for the magnificent work they have done in the remodeling of this Chamber of the United States Senate.

Here also in connection with the old Chamber were hammered out the patterns of our institutions, our liberties, and our constitutional rights. Here many historic debates took place from 1859 until the present time. Debates in this Chamber and in the corresponding Chamber at the other end of the Capitol made American history.

It seems to me that now when we return to this Chamber, which has been occupied for nearly a century by the Senate of the United States, we can very well be imbued with a new spirit typified and symbolized by the new appearance and the new conveniences not only on the floor, but in the galleries for the benefit of our friends and guests.

The Chair may be pardoned, he hopes, if he expresses the conviction and the belief that from this new atmosphere here we may take new courage and a new spirit of cooperation, and the determination that, without regard to differences which must exist among strong men with deep convictions, which differences must be expressed here if we are to maintain the freedom of debate, we may conduct ourselves as should the greatest legislative body in the world, the last forum of free debate and free consideration among legislative bodies; that in this critical time in our history and in the history of the world, we may here highly resolve, in the language of Lincoln at Gettysburg, that liberty shall not perish from the earth, that we shall continue to be a nation "of the people, by the people, for the people," and that through our cooperation and our unselfish services here in behalf of our people we may set for all the world an example which may bring peace and happiness and contentment to all mankind. [Applause.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ecton	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	Ellender	Kefauver
Bennett	Ferguson	Kem
Benton	Flanders	Kerr
Brewster	Frear	Kilgore
Bricker	Fulbright	Knowland
Bridges	George	Langer
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Lehman
Butler, Nebr.	Green	Long
Byrd	Hayden	McCarran
Capehart	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Carlson	Hennings	McClellan
Case	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Chapman	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Hoey	McMahon
Clements	Holland	Magnuson
Connally	Humphrey	Malone
Cordon	Hunt	Martin
Dirksen	Ives	Maybank
Douglas	Jenner	Millikin
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Mundt	Saltonstall	Thye
Murray	Schoeppel	Tobey
Neely	Smathers	Watkins
Nixon	Smith, Maine	Welker
O'Conor	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Pastore	Sparkman	Williams
Robertson	Stennis	Young
Russell	Taft	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. WHERRY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent that until further notice my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate, because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also wish to ask such unanimous consent. I wish to make the same request today that I made yesterday, in behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], namely, that he be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate until January 22.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it has been the custom and the uniform practice for many years that the Senate not transact any business prior to the delivery by the President of the United States of his address on the state of the Union. I therefore move that the Sen-

ate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator by unanimous consent permit me to address a question to him before the motion is put?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the motion mean that, if it is agreed to, no business of any kind—such as speeches, the introduction of bills, or anything of that sort—will be transacted on Friday, either?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think, as a courtesy to the President, we should not transact any business whatsoever, on Friday as well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that is necessary, when the President has postponed his speech for an entire week? Formerly we always had the President's address the day after the Senate met.

As a matter of fact, no courtesy is involved, because in the House of Representatives there has always been the introduction of bills on the very first day they met.

Does the Senator think it is necessary to delay the business of the Senate for an entire week because the President is not able or willing at this time to deliver his state of the Union message?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I certainly believe it is desirable to follow the usual custom which has been uniformly practiced in the past. It is clear, I think, that no legislative time will be gained by the introduction of bills and resolutions today or Friday since the committees are not yet organized and will not be able to transact any legislative business prior to next Monday. While the interval is somewhat longer than on former occasions, there is nothing to be gained by breaking precedents now. I hope we will continue to follow precedents.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator realize that the President will then have delayed the whole action of this body by nearly a week by his failure to deliver his state of the Union message immediately, as he always has done heretofore, and as has been the custom? Furthermore, apparently the budget message, upon which much of the action of Congress must be based, is to be postponed until January 15, whereas we have often had urged upon us that we had to come back to special sessions and had to rush through many bills almost the day after they were introduced. Now we are asked to delay action by the Senate for almost 2 weeks, not only on legislative proposals, but also in the way of expressions of opinion by Members of the Senate on questions that are before the Senate of the United States and before the people of the country.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the fact that the Senate was in session yesterday, and as a result there is legislation which is on the President's desk, awaiting his consideration. Moreover, the duties of the President in these times of crisis are great, and require a great deal of his time.

Equally important, I already have pointed out that the Senate committee memberships have not yet been appointed, and it is obvious the Senate cannot transact any legislative business until the respective committees have been manned and are able to function. Under these circumstances it seems clear that the introduction of bills and resolutions prior to next Monday does not in any way affect the timetable of Senate operations.

I certainly think this is a courtesy which should be extended to the President of the United States. We should not break the custom which has prevailed for many years, since no time will be lost.

Mr. President, I shall renew my motion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Arizona that heretofore it has not been customary to make a motion or to ask unanimous consent for that purpose. The Chair has usually assumed that Senators would accord to the President the courtesy of not introducing bills until after the President had delivered his message to the joint session of the two Houses.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my motion was that the Senate stand in recess until Friday, but I have withheld the motion temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Senator from Arizona withheld his motion. Does he now renew it?

Mr. McFARLAND. First, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask the Senator to yield to me, only to permit me to ask a brief question: Can the Senator from Arizona tell the Senate now whether by next Monday or Tuesday the committees will have been appointed so that legislative matters can be taken up after the President delivers his annual message?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall act with due diligence in seeing that the committees are appointed, so that there will not be any more delay than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator feel that the question of having discussions on the floor of the Senate comes under the heading of the transaction of business?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would answer the distinguished Senator in this way: I think it would be most discourteous to the President of the United States for the Senate to engage in debate prior to the delivery of the President's message.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would not the Senator feel that, in view of the delay, no custom is involved, and that possibly if we were to follow the Senator's suggestion, a precedent would be established as a consequence of which future Presidents might delay even more indefinitely the delivery of their State of the Union message? Should we not consider the matter carefully before establishing the precedent of extending the time?

Mr. McFARLAND. My answer to the Senator's question is that none of us should regard this as an unusual delay in view of the circumstances. I have said before that the problems confronting the President are great. We were in session yesterday. The President has important proposed legislation upon his desk. I do not regard waiting until Monday as an unusual delay.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is not true, however, that this is not a question of courtesy, because the House of Representatives has never engaged in the custom to which reference has been made. The House of Representatives has always acted on the first day of the session; Members of the House have introduced bills on the first day of the session, and have gone ahead with business, without waiting for the delivery of the President's message.

So it seems to me to be merely a matter of custom.

I suggest to the Senator that the President is the one who has changed the custom, by postponing his state of the Union message to a time which will keep the Senate inactive in the interval, and, regardless of what is said, will delay the ultimate action of the Senate on many measures because of his delay.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is entitled to his opinion, and I respect it. He is correct in alluding to the proposed procedure as a custom, and I am merely suggesting that we follow precedent. I hope, therefore, he will not insist upon objecting to the first request which is being made on the opening day of the new Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not object at all to having the Senate take a recess to Friday, but on Friday I propose to raise the question again.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to permit an insertion to be made in the RECORD?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate will meet on Friday, and the Senator from Ohio has stated that he again will raise the question on Friday.

Therefore, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1951

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress met in their Hall, and

at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

The Chaplain of the Eighty-first Congress, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, in this first meeting of our Eighty-second Congress, we are again reverently approaching Thy throne of grace and mercy, of majesty and power, through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We thank Thee for our beloved country, conceived in sacrifice, dedicated to Thy glory, and consecrated to the service of all mankind. May we now prize our Nation more highly as we think of our fellow citizens out on the fields of battle defending our liberties to the utmost.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body, who have been entrusted with the high vocation of leadership in the affairs of government, may be guided by Thy divine spirit in all their deliberations and decisions as they seek to lead struggling humanity out of the night of darkness into the radiant light of a better day.

Grant that daily we may enter into counsel with the God of all wisdom, holding our own desires and wishes in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will and performing our duties with a pure and steadfast devotion.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to magnify Thy great and holy name and to hasten the coming of that blessed day when peace shall be the glorious possession of all the members of the human family and they shall walk together in the spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Wilt Thou hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of our Lord and Saviour:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

ROLL CALL BY STATES

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by the Constitution for the meeting of the Eighty-second Congress. Certificates of election covering 434 seats in the Eighty-second Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin	Roberts	Elliott
Grant	Rains	Jones
Andrews	DeGraffenried	Battle

ARIZONA

Murdock Patten

ARKANSAS

Gathings	Tackett	Harris
Mills	Hays	
Trimble	Norrell	

CALIFORNIA

Scudder	Anderson	Jackson
Engle	Hunter	King
Johnson	Werdel	Doyle
Havenner	Bramblett	Holifield
Shelley	Hillings	Hinshaw
Miller	Poulson	Phillips
Allen	Yorty	McKinnon

COLORADO

Rogers	Chenoweth	Aspinall
Hill		

CONNECTICUT

Ribicoff	McGuire	Patterson
Seely-Brown	Morano	Sadlak

DELAWARE

Boggs

FLORIDA

McMullen	Sikes	Herlong
Bennett	Lantaff	Rogers

GEORGIA

Preston	Davis	Wood
Cox	Vinson	Brown
Forrester	Lanham	
Camp	Wheeler	

IDAHO

Wood Budge

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Hoffman	Chiperfield
Vail	Sheehan	Simpson
Busbey	Jonas	Mack
McVey	Church	Springer
Kluczynski	Reed	Jenison
O'Brien	Mason	Vursell
Sabath	Allen	Price
Gordon	Arends	Bishop
Yates	Velde	

INDIANA

Madden	Beamer	Wilson
Halleck	Harden	Harvey
Crumpacker	Bray	Brownson
Adair	Denton	

IOWA

Martin	LeCompte	Jensen
Talle	Cunningham	Hoeven
Gross	Dolliver	

KANSAS

Cole	George	Hope
Scrivner	Rees	Smith

KENTUCKY

Gregory	Chelf	Perkins
Whitaker	Spence	Bates
Morton	Underwood	Golden

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Brooks	Larcade
Boggs	Passman	Allen
Willis	Morrison	

MAINE

Hale	Nelson	Fellows

MARYLAND

Miller	Garmatz	Sasscer
Devereux	Fallon	Beall

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton	Bates	Kennedy
Furcolo	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Goodwin	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Nicholson	Martin
Rogers	Herter	

MICHIGAN

Machrowicz	Wolcott	O'Brien
Meader	Crawford	Rabaut
Shafer	Thompson	Dingell
Hoffman	Woodruff	Lesinski
Ford	Potter	Dondero
Blackney	Bennett	

MINNESOTA

Andresen	McCarthy	Andersen
O'Hara	Judd	Blatnik
Wier	Marshall	Hagen

MISSISSIPPI

Rankin	Abernethy	Williams
Whitten	Winstead	
Smith	Colmer	

MISSOURI

Magee	Armstrong	Sullivan
Moulder	Short	Curtis
Welch	Carnahan	Karsten
Irving	Cannon	
Bolling	Jones	

MONTANA

D'Ewart

NEBRASKA

Curtis	Stefan	Miller
Buffett		

NEVADA

Baring

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow Cotton

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton	Case	Addonizio
Hand	Widnall	Kean
Auchincloss	Canfield	Sieminski
Howell	Towe	Hart
Eaton	Rodino	

NEW MEXICO

Fernandez Dempsey

NEW YORK

Hall, Leonard W.	Coudert	Taylor
Latham	Donovan	Kilburn
Clemente	Klein	Williams
Quinn	Roosevelt	Riehlman
Delaney	Javits	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Heller	Powell	Taber
Anfuso	Fine	Cole
Keogh	Dollinger	Keating
Kelly	Buckley	Ostertag
Heffernan	McGrath	Miller
Rooney	Gwinn	Radwan
O'Toole	Gamble	Butler
Multer	St. George	Reed
Celler	Wharton	
Murphy	Kearney	
	Byrne	

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Carlyle	Jones, Woodrow W.
Kerr	Deane	Redden
Barden	Doughton	
Cooley	Jones, Hamilton C.	
Chatham		
Durham		

NORTH DAKOTA

Aandahl Burdick

OHIO

Elston	Reams	McGregor
Hess	Jenkins	Hays
Breen	Brehm	Kirwan
McCulloch	Vorys	Feighan
Clevenger	Weichel	Bolton
Polk	Ayres	Bender
Brown	Secrest	
Betts	Bow	

OKLAHOMA

Schwabe	Steed	Wickersham
Stigler	Jarman	Belcher
Albert	Morris	

OREGON

Norblad	Stockman	Ellsworth

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Flood	Sittler
Granahan	Fenton	Morgan
Scott, Hardie	Rhodes	Graham
Chudoff	Bush	Saylor
Green	McConnell	Kelley
Scott, Hugh D.	Simpson	Kearns
James	Mumma	Denny
Vaughn	Gavin	Corbett
Dague	Walter	Fulton
O'Neill	Lind	Eberharter
	Van Zandt	Buchanan

RHODE ISLAND

Forand Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Dorn	Richards
Riley	Bryson	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lovre Berry

	TENNESSEE	
Reece	Gore	Sutton
Baker	Evins	Cooper
Frazier	Priest	Davis
	TEXAS	
Patman	Thomas	Bentsen
Combs	Thompson	Regan
Beckworth	Thornberry	Burleson
Rayburn	Poage	Rogers
Wilson	Lucas	Mahon
Teague	Gossett	Kilday
Pickett	Lyle	Fisher
	UTAH	
	Granger	Bosone
	VERMONT	
	Prouty	
	VIRGINIA	
Robeson	Abbitt	Harrison
Hardy	Stanley	Smith
Gary	Burton	Fugate
	WASHINGTON	
Mitchell	Mack	Tollefson
Jackson	Holmes	
	WEST VIRGINIA	
Ramsay	Bailey	Kee
Staggers	Burnside	Hedrick
	WISCONSIN	
Smith	Kersten	Hull
Davis	Van Pelt	O'Konski
Withrow	Murray	
Zablocki	Byrnes	
	WYOMING	
	Harrison	

The CLERK. The roll call discloses that 426 Members-elect have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been received showing the election of EDWARD L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska, and of JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress the name of Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Clerk, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference representing the minority of this House, I have the honor to nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Eighty-second Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—231

Abbitt	Furcolo	Murray, Tenn.
Abernethy	Garmatz	Norrell
Addonizio	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Gordon	O'Neill
Andrews	Gore	O'Toole
Anfuso	Gossett	Passman
Aspinall	Granahan	Patman
Bailey	Granger	Patten
Barden	Grant	Perkins
Baring	Green	Philbin
Barrett	Gregory	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Hardy	Poage
Battle	Harris	Polk
Beckworth	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Preston
Bentsen	Havenner	Price
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	Priest
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ohio	Quinn
Bolling	Hébert	Rabaut
Bonner	Hedrick	Rains
Bosone	Heffernan	Ramsay
Boykin	Heller	Rankin
Breen	Herlong	Redden
Brooks	Holifield	Regan
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Rhodes
Bryson	Irving	Ribicoff
Buchanan	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Buckley	Jarman	Riley
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Burnside	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Burton	Jones, Hamilton C.	Robeson
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Rodino
Camp	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rooney
Celler	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Chatham	Keogh	Sabath
Chelf	Kerr	Sasscer
Chudoff	Kilday	Secrest
Clemente	King	Shelley
Colmer	Kirwan	Sheppard
Combs	Klein	Sieminski
Cooley	Kluczynski	Sikes
Cooper	Lane	Smith, Miss.
Cox	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Lantaff	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Larcade	Staggers
Dawson	Lesinski	Stanley
Deane	Lind	Steed
DeGraffenried	Lucas	Stigler
Delaney	Lyle	Sullivan
Dempsey	McCarthy	Sutton
Denton	McCormack	Tackett
Dingell	McGrath	Teague
Dollinger	McGuire	Thomas
Donohue	McKinnon	Thompson, Tex.
Donovan	McMillan	Thornberry
Dorn	McMullen	Trimble
Doughton	Machrowicz	Underwood
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Durham	Madden	Walter
Eberharter	Magee	Welch
Elliott	Mahon	Wheeler
Engle	Marshall	Whitaker
Evins	Miller, Calif.	Whitten
Fallon	Mills	Wickersham
Feighan	Mitchell	Wier
Fernandez	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Fine	Morris	Willis
Fisher	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Flood	Moulder	Winstead
Fogarty	Muiter	Wood, Ga.
Forand	Murdock	Yates
Forrester	Murphy	Yorty
Frazier		Zablocki
Fugate		

MARTIN—192

Aandahl	Ayres	Boggs, Del.
Adair	Baker	Bolton
Allen, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Bow
Allen, Ill.	Beall	Bramblett
Andersen, H. Carl	Beamer	Bray
Anderson, Calif.	Belcher	Brehm
Andresen, August H.	Bender	Brown, Ohio
Arends	Bennett, Mich.	Brownson
Armstrong	Berry	Budge
Auchincloss	Betts	Buffett
	Bishop	Burdick
	Blackney	Busbey
Bush	Hess	Radwan
Butler	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillings	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Case	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Holmes	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Hope	Sadlak
Clevenger	Hull	St. George
Cole, Kans.	Hunter	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Schwabe
Corbett	James	Scott, Hardie
Cotton	Javits	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Jenison	Scrivner
Crawford	Jenkins	Scudder
Crumpacker	Jensen	Seely-Brown
Cunningham	Johnson	Shafer
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas	Sheehan
Curtis, Nebr.	Judd	Short
Dague	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Denny	Kearns	Sittler
Devereux	Keating	Smith, Kans.
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Springer
Dondero	Latham	Stefan
Eaton	LeCompte	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lovre	Taber
Elston	McConnell	Talle
Fellows	McCulloch	Taylor
Fenton	McGregor	Thompson, Mich.
Ford	McVey	Tollefson
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Towe
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	Vail
Gavin	Mason	Van Pelt
George	Meader	Van Zandt
Golden	Merrow	Vaughn
Goodwin	Miller, Md.	Velde
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	Vorys
Gross	Miller, N. Y.	Vursell
Gwinn	Morano	Weichel
Hagen	Morton	Werdel
Hale	Mumma	Wharton
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	Widnall
Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson	Wigglesworth
Halleck	Nicholson	Williams, N. Y.
Hand	Norblad	Wilson, Ind.
Harden	O'Hara	Withrow
Harrison, Wyo.	Ostertag	Wolcott
Harvey	Patterson	Wolverton
Herter	Phillips	Wood, Idaho
Heselton	Potter	Woodruff
	Poulson	
	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Martin, Mass.	Rayburn	Reams

NOT VOTING—8

Angell	Hoffman, Mich.	Mansfield
Crosser	Horan	O'Konski
Gillette	McDonough	

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 426, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, received 231, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, received 192; present, 3.

Therefore, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-second Congress.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My colleagues, it is a privilege for me to stand on this exalted platform even if it is only for a few moments. It is one of the compensations of a defeated candidate; he is permitted to share in the reflected glory of the victor. I admit that several months ago I had ideas I might occupy this position a little longer than I am going to today; the decision has

been otherwise, however, and I have no regrets. But, seriously, it is a happy place assigned to me.

Ten years ago the Members of this House elected a Speaker. He has served with one interruption, which I might say with the indulgence of the Speaker, was a happy interlude. He has now been chosen for a sixth term. On January 30 of this year he will have served as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in American history. The record previously was held by that able, distinguished, and most notable son of Kentucky, Henry Clay. On January 30 our Speaker will have exceeded his tenure of office.

One cannot be elected Speaker for all that period of time without being a fine character, a man of extraordinary ability, great fairness, and a parliamentarian par excellence. Those are virtues which we have in our Speaker. In this hour of confusion, this hour of uncertainty when none of us knows what the future has ahead, we have a man who has the courage; we have a man who has the firmness to do that which is right, to the end that our country may emerge a better country. We are sometimes misunderstood by our friends in other countries. We fight, we debate, we vote, and then we settle the question. They cannot understand that these are the practical principles that make for a democracy, a republic. They cannot see either that when our fight is over, that when we reach a decision, we are all united, we are all Americans with but one thought: To make America a better land for all our people.

So, ladies and gentlemen, without further ado, it gives me great pleasure to present to you your Speaker and my Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. MARTIN, my beloved colleague and predecessor in this position for a time, and Members of the United States House of Representatives: I should be less than human if the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts did not touch me deeply, or if your action here today renewing your confidence in me did not sink deeply into an appreciative soul. I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory the favor of my colleagues on the Democratic side and the courtesy, the kindness, and the helpfulness of my colleagues on the Republican side in the trying days in which I have occupied this position, sometimes of terrible responsibility.

I come back to you today to renew the pledge that I have made to you many times before: That I will do my best to conduct the affairs of this office in the way that may be pleasing to you and pleasing to my countrymen.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested, we live in troubled days. In my deliberate opinion, looking around the earth, everyone now living in any democracy, where freedom and liberty still exist, live in the most dangerous time they ever lived in or anyone ever lived in since the foundation of this Republic. So it behooves us to lay aside little differences, lay aside all criticism that is not constructive, that is not helpful, and all of us join and pledge ourselves that this, the greatest, the freest and the finest government that ever existed upon the face of the earth shall be strong enough to maintain its liberty and its security.

I trust in these times that there will not be too many domestic issues that will divide us and take our minds and our effort away from the great problems that face us in the world today. We live in a world where people live closer together than they ever lived before. Distances amount to little. There was a time when we boasted that we had two great friends, the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. During our last war they became hazardous things. And let me say to you it matters not where other counsel may come from, I feel that I know the United States of America cannot wrap two oceans around it and stay secure, safe, and free.

We are a part of this world and we must remain that. This great democracy, challenged with the leadership of the world that we have accepted and that we must have accepted, is the leader of the democracies of the world, the pattern for free peoples the earth around, and unless we perform our duties and our mission in the days to come I fear we will have a world that will not be a fit place for men and women and children to live in.

So my efforts shall be to join with all patriotic men and women in this House, and they are all patriotic men and women, devoted to the high purposes and to the great principles upon which this democracy was founded, to do the things that will make us so strong that international desperados and despots will fear to get in our path. This we must do if civilization itself is to survive.

During the months ahead I shall work with you, every one of you, to make this come true so that one day again we may return to an enduring peace that men and women will know what tomorrow will bring. From the bottom of a grateful heart I again thank you.

I am now ready to take the oath of office and I will ask my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], dean of the House, to administer the oath.

Mr. SABATH then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to a custom that was established a few years ago, I will now ask all the Members to rise and take the oath of office.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTER OATH TO ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, Whereas ROBERT CROSSER, a Representative-elect from Ohio, from the Twenty-first District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said ROBERT CROSSER at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said ROBERT CROSSER.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTER OATH TO WILSON D. GILLETTE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, Whereas WILSON D. GILLETTE, a Representative-elect from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Fourteenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said WILSON D. GILLETTE at Towanda, Pa., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said WILSON D. GILLETTE.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 2, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints Capt. James L. Fisher, United States Navy, retired, justice of the peace of Standing Stone Township, Bradford County, Wysox, Pa., to administer the oath of office to the Honorable WILSON D. GILLETTE.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, pursuant to unanimous vote of that caucus, it is my happy privilege to announce the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as majority leader of the House for the Eighty-second Congress.

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House, I am directed by that conference to officially notify the House that the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, has been selected as minority floor leader of the House.

ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph H. Callahan, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Ser-

geant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be divided and that the vote on the election of the Chaplain be taken separately.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of Rev. Bernard Braskamp as Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken; and Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., was elected Chaplain.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution.

The Clerk read the substitute resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Irving W. Swanson, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Tom J. Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Beecher Hess, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints, as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the following Members: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

CLERK DIRECTED TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT AS TO THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have just presented to the House for its consideration extends the rules under which the business of the House was conducted in the last Congress to the present one. It insures and protects every Member's right and privilege to go on record and vote for or against vital legislation.

I am of the opinion that the rules which prevailed in the Eighty-first Congress have worked well, have safeguarded the rights and interests of the several committees and their members, and have been for the best interests of our Nation. Some gentlemen who were opposed to the adoption of the rules in the Eighty-first Congress were under the impression that the Committee on Rules, of which I have the honor to be chairman, would be deprived of some of its rights and privileges.

May I state, having been a member of the Committee on Rules for 20 years, as well as chairman for 12 years, of what is claimed to be the most powerful committee of the House, that that committee functioned fairly well during the Eighty-first Congress notwithstanding the effectiveness of the 21-day discharge amendment to the rules, and there is no justification for reverting to the rules in effect during the Eightieth Congress.

The Committee on Rules, during the last Congress, reported a total of 240 bills, rules, and resolutions. For the information of the membership, here is what the Committee on Rules accomplished in the Eighty-first Congress:

During the first session 116 bills and resolutions were considered by the committee. Eighty-two rules were granted on general legislation. Nine House joint resolutions and Senate joint resolutions were granted rules. Fourteen resolutions providing investigatory power to standing committees of the House were reported favorably. Two resolutions providing for special investigating committees were reported favorably. One resolution creating a small-business committee was favorably reported. Two resolutions providing for recess and suspension of the rules were reported favorably. Four House concurrent resolutions were reported favorably. One resolution assigning delegates to various committees of the House was reported favorably. Only one rule was denied, that on the rivers and harbors flood-control bill.

During the second session, 99 House and Senate bills and resolutions were considered by the committee. Eighty-seven rules were granted on general legislation. Nine House resolutions were reported favorably. Three House joint resolutions were granted rules.

As stated previously, the grand total of bills and resolutions granted rules or were favorably reported is 214.

At the same time I wish to say that under the rules, as amended by the Eighty-first Congress, providing for the 21-day discharge rule the House had the privilege and the opportunity of voting on eight important bills reported favorably by legislative committees on which the Committee on Rules failed to act or denied rules thereon, namely, the rivers and harbors flood-control bill, the joint resolution providing for United States participation in international organizations, the bills providing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, the National Science Foundation bill, the mining bill, the veterans' hospital bill, and the poll-tax bill.

Under leave granted me yesterday, I shall file with the House at a later date, a separate and complete report on the

rules granted and the resolutions favorably reported by the Committee on Rules during the last Congress. The foregoing shows that under the rules of the Eighty-first Congress, which my resolution now seeks to continue in the Eighty-second Congress, when the Rules Committee failed to act, the committee chairman had the opportunity, the privilege, and the right to offer his own rule, under which rule these bills were acted upon by the House. Otherwise none of them could have been considered.

Consequently, I feel that the rules in effect during the Eighty-first Congress should be adopted, and that this resolution I have offered is proper, and in the best interests of legislative procedure.

I am of the opinion, in view of the fact that the Rules Committee was created as a policy committee, that it is the duty of the committee to seek to carry out the mandates of the House and to expedite legislation. It gives each and every chairman of a legislative committee, if he sees that the Rules Committee has failed to act on his bill, after considering it for weeks and months, the right to file his own rule for the course of the legislation. So, in the interest of the Members, in the interest of all legislative committees, I think the resolution before us should be adopted so we can continue to have orderly procedure and advance legislation that is recommended by the President and favorably reported to the House by the various committees. After all, Mr. Speaker, the President has certain duties to perform under the Constitution, namely, to recommend legislation to the Congress. Who is in a better position to recommend legislation than the President? I feel it is the duty of those of us in the majority to carry out the recommendation of the President as far as possible. The Rules Committee should carry out the wishes and desires of the majority, but unfortunately, as it is today, somehow or other, some of the gentlemen who belong to the Democratic Party, whose responsibility it is to carry out the program of the majority in power, do not work with their leaders, and, although we have a so-called majority on the Rules Committee here, it is only a paper majority. Unfortunately, frequently I have found myself in the minority on my committee. You may ask why? I answer that by saying because three of the Democratic members do not cooperate with the majority of the members but prefer to cooperate and deal with the Republican minority. In fact, only yesterday, or the day before, I am informed these three Democratic members of the Committee on Rules, elected by the Democrats as Democrats, were in conference with Republican leaders for the purpose of arranging for the defeat of the resolution I have presented here today, which provides for the continuance of the 21-day-discharge rule.

To what extent the Republicans have gone is, indeed, amazing, because I have it on good authority that some of the Republican liberal Members and new Members were clubbed into agreeing to vote against my resolution under the peril of not being considered for appointment to committees of their choice or for which they were best qualified. By this sort of action they are digging their own political graves.

History will repeat itself. Well do I recall the fight of the 25 progressive Republicans who joined with the Democratic forces in overthrowing "Cannonism" and in changing the rules of the House which permitted the consideration of legislation in the interest of the common people. They were derided and ridiculed by their Republican colleagues who legislated for the vested interests, yet in the ensuing election all of the 25 progressive Republicans were reelected and so many of their regular Republican colleagues who voted against the changing of the rules were defeated in such numbers as to bring about the election of a Democratic House.

Ever since I entered Congress I have fought for liberal rules providing for the conduct of business before this House. In fact, it was due to my resolution that Speaker Cannon, known as the czar, was shorn of his power to name all of the committees, which gave him absolute control of the House. Ever since, I have continued in my fight to safeguard the rights and privileges of Members to vote on bills that properly came before the House. The 21-day-discharge rule is in that direction because, as I have stated, when the Committee on Rules fails to act or acts adversely on a rule providing for the consideration of a bill, then the chairman of a legislative committee is empowered to file his own rule, thereby making it possible for the Members of the House to express themselves and to vote on legislation.

Being aware of the cooperation on the part of three Democratic members of the Committee on Rules with the Republican minority on the committee, and the prolonged fight to deny Members the right to vote on measures bottled up by the Committee on Rules, I fear that my resolution may not be adopted. However, I am satisfied that if that should occur, not only those who have entered into this unholy alliance but also those Members who will vote against my resolution will in the future regret their action, because the country and the press have approved of the 21-day discharge rule. The repeal of this liberalized rule will, as I have stated, tear down the rights of every Member.

It is to be regretted that this coalition uses its power to defeat liberal and progressive legislation, and that it invariably supports and votes for all legislation advocated by the vested interests, such as the infamous natural-gas bill, the tidelands oil bill, and the freight-rate basing-point bill.

This is proof, regardless of what the Republican leaders may say, that instead of having the interests of the people at heart, the special interests seem to be uppermost in their minds.

I shall not detain the House longer. There are quite a few others who wish to be heard on this resolution. However, I cannot conclude before I wish each and every one of you a Happy New Year. In addition to that, I want to congratulate the Speaker upon his reelection, and congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] upon his reelection as minority leader. I hope that both of them will be reelected often and many times to the same positions to which they have been elected today.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and I do not yield to anyone to offer amendments. Under the rules I have 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has an hour under his control. How much time does he yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SABATH. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, how about the minority? We still have certain privileges.

Mr. SABATH. I have assured the gentleman that he will receive a reasonable length of time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What is a reasonable length of time? Thirty minutes? Is not that the usual procedure in the House?

Mr. SABATH. I have explained to the gentleman, although I know that gentlemen on that side seem to be—and I regret it for they should not be—opposed to this legislation.

My time will be equally divided, evenly between those for and those against. So the gentleman will get sufficient time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Under this division how much time is the gentleman going to let the minority have?

Mr. SABATH. Thirty minutes, divided, 15 minutes on the Democratic side and 15 minutes on the Republican side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman means that the minority will have only 15 minutes?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, if the gentleman needs a little more time I may be able to find a little for him; he knows I am always fair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is stating that he will yield the opposition 30 minutes; that is what he is stating, but some of the opposition seems to be over on the right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Under whose control?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has control of the time.

Mr. SABATH. May I say that I had a conference with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] yesterday. I presume that is the opposition. So to you gentlemen combined I will grant and yield the 30 minutes; and the majority, those that are for the resolution, will also have only 30 minutes, no more; therefore, it will be evenly divided, honestly, fairly, squarely divided.

Mr. COX. Am I recognized, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes for debate.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia was recognized for debate only.

Mr. COX. Then, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish recognition at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not in order for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] or some other Member to offer a substitute for this resolution?

The SPEAKER. Not in the time of the gentleman from Illinois unless he yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. He is taking all the time; he is getting the entire hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is the mover of the resolution and has control of the time. The gentleman from Illinois, as is usual, has offered the resolution, and he was recognized for an hour, and that hour is under his control. He yielded for debate only.

Mr. COX. If I may be permitted, then, to speak for the contenders for change, the gentleman from Illinois may have the entire hour and we will use our time on the substitute resolution that I will offer in the event that the previous question is voted down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to understand the parliamentary situation at the moment.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will use his time——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts desires to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the legislative situation, it is that any Member who has a resolution, either the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else, may not offer the resolution until the previous question is voted down.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is moved and is voted down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit that in 1945, at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, we had this issue here when I offered my amendment creating the Committee on Un-American Activities; it was ruled in order. I think the gentleman from Georgia has the right to offer an amendment or a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so unless the gentleman from Illinois yields for an amendment or the previous question is voted down.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] for debate only.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes for debate.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Just a moment ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] told me 15 minutes. Is he going to yield me any time that I may yield in my own right?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] does not have any time except what has been yielded to him.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] 30 minutes, if he desires to yield time, but to be used for debate only.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will accept it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago I took the oath of office as a Member of this House for the tenth time. During most of those years I served as a member of the Rules Committee—14 years to be exact. I can truthfully say that during the past 2 years under rules adopted by the Eighty-first Congress there has been much more confusion in the Rules Committee than ever before. I think and believe this body will change them.

I want to mention briefly to the new Members here today the action of the Eightieth Congress and preceding Congresses as compared to the action of the Eighty-first Congress. During the Eightieth Congress I was chairman of the Rules Committee. I invited the attention of the members of the Rules Committee in session to the standing committees of the House which approved bills appropriating at least $20,000,000,000 more than the revenue estimated to be received by the Government in those 2 years.

We felt that something should be done about it, that the budget must be balanced even though it was necessary to hold up several bills with considerable merit. As a result of the rules adopted by the Eightieth Congress that Congress saved the taxpayers considerable money and for the first time in 18 years the income of the Federal Government was larger than its outgo. In other words, since 1933 it was the first Congress that balanced the budget. So I say to you that if you are interested in cutting down nondefense spending you should vote down the previous question.

Under the rule adopted by the Eighty-first Congress what happened? A few moments ago we heard our beloved Speaker mention the great responsibilities that have been his. We all admit that. What has happened under this rule? Many more great responsibilities have been added to the Speaker's burden. There is no question but what the Speaker of this House has taken unto himself the responsibilities of the Rules Committee. During the Eighty-first Congress he had more responsibilities and power than Uncle Joe Cannon had during a half century of work in this Congress.

You will be told that the Rules Committee will try to bottle up legislation. During the Eighty-first Congress there was considerable confusion in the Rules Committee. There were very few meetings of the Rules Committee in which it was not necessary to go out and put additional responsibilities on the Speaker. Now to you new Members I will say this: There are two ways that the membership of this House can get bills to the floor for final determination. It will be stated that we are trying to take away from you the right to act on meritorious bills. You have the right to sign the discharge petition, which takes effect when 218 names appear thereon, and on Calendar Wednesday you also have the right to be recognized, so the Rules Committee does not have absolute power on any bills. The majority of the membership can bring any bill on the floor of the House for action.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the previous question is moved, that it is voted down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yielded 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. He has now addressed the House. Is it in order now for me to ask him to yield to me in order that I may speak in the 30 minutes granted to him by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think so.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the granting of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], is it possible for him to grant time of the 30 minutes that has not been used by him?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say so.

Mr. SABATH. May I say this: I have promised three different gentlemen on your side some time, and I promised four gentlemen on this side some time. I hope that there will be no misunderstanding and that you will have sufficient time as well as those Members that have sought to obtain time heretofore.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has promised to yield some time to those who are against the change. I, as one of those, should prefer to get it from the Republican side. Since the gentleman has yielded 30 minutes of his time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], I understand from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] that I may get such time as I think reasonable from him on that score.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Let me ask the gentleman from Illinois this question. I am not going to yield half of my time to people over here in sympathy with the resolution, unless the gentleman gives some of his time to those on our side.

Mr. SABATH. That is what I am going to do.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman may then go ahead, and I will act accordingly.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think that this House, on the first day of the session, is being called upon to make what will be a historic decision. That

being true I think it appropriate to remind this House that in the early days of the Republic we did not need a Committee on Rules. There were fewer Members, less business, and the then Speaker was able to control the legislation for the good of the country. It was found, as we expanded, that we needed a Committee on Rules, and it was set up, Mr. Speaker, only for the purpose of regulating the traffic and the business of the House so we could have orderly and regular procedure. To legislative committees of the House were given the authority to pass on the merits of any legislation submitted by the President or by any Members of the House. The legislative committees took time to study it, and then it was referred to the Committee on Rules so that we could have orderly consideration on the floor of the House. But, as time developed, the Committee on Rules wandered away from its original purpose. It started not to regulate the flow of legislation to the floor of the House; it started to block legislation. But, that is not the worst thing that the Committee on Rules developed into the habit of doing.

It developed a habit of studying legislation that had been studied for maybe weeks or months by the legislative committees. The committee began to dissect that legislation and make up their own minds as to whether or not it was good legislation. Many a chairman of a legislative committee which had considered legislation for months and months was ordered by the Committee on Rules to change the provisions of legislation before a rule would be granted. That was a denial of the purposes of setting up legislative committees. It was a denial of the purpose for which the Committee on Rules was set up. It was a denial of the right of the Members to vote upon legislation.

Many, many chairmen of committees in order to get legislation which their committees had approved unanimously felt compelled to strike out or change provisions in order to satisfy the whim of two or three Members of Congress who happened to be on the Committee on Rules.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, we have made some progress in the last 2 years. If we go back to the old rules, we are simply turning over, Mr. Speaker, not to seven members of the Committee on Rules but to a majority of seven members, four members, the power to say what legislation this House shall consider. If seven members of the Committee on Rules sit on the question of granting a rule for a piece of legislation, and four of those members are against it, that legislation will not be reported out. The House will be stymied and its will will be denied, the will of the people will be denied, and the House will not even be allowed to debate that legislation.

I submit that the country will resent any action taken by this House today which seeks to rescind the rule which was adopted 2 years ago and which has been approved by the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. I think it would be a crime to abrogate our right at least to debate legislation which has been approved by legislative committees.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in my 16 years here I have heard the Committee on Rules condemned for its failure to report rules on some measures reported by legislative committees. On the other hand, I have heard the great Committee on Rules very often commended in the highest terms for what many said was a noble, patriotic, and high-minded action in preventing certain measures from coming to the floor.

I served on the Committee on Rules for a number of years. I served under the chairmanship of the very genial gentleman from Illinois, Judge SABATH. I also served in one Congress as majority leader. I think I am qualified to speak about the position of the Committee on Rules and its responsibility to the House of Representatives, yes, and to the country, and to speak of the great, overall, end good, that has been accomplished by the Committee on Rules through the years and prior to the advent of the so-called 21-day rule.

Let me say further: To try to adjust the rules of the House of Representatives to meet an immediate or a particular situation existing today which may not exist tomorrow is, in my opinion, a mistake. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] rather indicated that such is the reason this move is being made, in view of his statement that all of the President's suggestions should be enacted into law.

Let us get this matter out in the open. Let us quit shadow boxing about it. Let us talk about it as a matter of principle. The reason the proponents of the 21-day rule are so vigorous and so active is that they think they see in the Committee on Rules something of a balance wheel in the way of unwise, unsound, and ill-timed, spendthrift, socialistic measures which, in my opinion and the opinion of many others, should not be enacted into law. Again let me refer to the remarks of my very good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. He says he is for all of the President's program. I take it that would include socialized medicine, the socialistic Brannan farm program, and all of the other things we have heard about.

The gentleman from Illinois says he occasionally finds himself in the minority on the Committee on Rules. I take it that what he is saying to us quite frankly is that he is afraid if he did get a socialized-medicine bill out of a legislative committee the Committee on Rules would not report it to the floor.

Let me say, for my part, that if such a bill did come out of a legislative committee I would want the Committee on Rules to block it.

Through the years the Committee on Rules has been the strong right arm of responsible leadership. That is the reason the committee is made up of eight members of the majority party and four members of the minority party. It has always been that way. It was that way when there were only 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] says that the only purpose of the Committee on Rules is to regulate the flow of traffic. Once in a while, if responsible leadership decrees otherwise, the regulation could mean stopping the flow of traffic. In my opinion, that is in the best interests of the Nation.

If the Committee on Rules is to grant a rule on every bill which is reported, regardless of what the position of the leadership may be and regardless of what the chances of enactment of such legislation on the floor of the House might be, then I ask, "Why have the Committee on Rules at all?" Except, I might remind you, that every once in a while the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others of the Committee on Ways and Means are not averse to asking the Committee on Rules to give them a gag rule or a closed rule so that measures which they bring to the floor will not be subject to amendment.

It ought to be clear to everyone, there are a great many bills reported out by legislative committees which should not come to the floor of the House for action. Probably I am treading on dangerous ground, but I am going to say this: Legislative committees very frequently tend to draw to their ranks people whose interests are those of the committee, and very often it happens that in the work of the committee through the years the members of the committee tend to become special pleaders for that particular interest. Many times they report legislation which is out of line with what the leadership wants and which is out of line with what the overall majority of the membership of the House wants. What sense does it make to bring measures like that to the floor of the House?

May I say—and this is in the nature of a confession we might as well make and be frank with ourselves—that occasionally legislative committees report measures which they think are good. Meanwhile, responsible leaders, concerned about the state of the Treasury and the impact generally on the economy of the country, decide the measure should not be enacted into law. The majority of the Members deep down in their hearts many times think it should not be enacted into law. But let us just admit now, my colleagues, that every now and then you get a measure like that. And you know as well as I do, if it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives it is going to be passed. Our beloved Speaker told us he hoped not too many domestic issues would be acted on in this Congress. Apparently the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] have their wires crossed because the gentleman from Illinois thinks we should have all these measures on the floor of the House.

As far as the war effort is concerned, and as far as our national defense effort is concerned, the Committee on Rules will not under any circumstances stand in the way of any action needed to be

taken. I well recall that in the Eightieth Congress we had the matter of selective service presented to us. I think it is fair to say that a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules, as that committee was then constituted, were not in favor of the enactment of the Selective Service Act.

But when the Republican leadership said to them, "This measure must be brought on for action," the Rules Committee voted out a rule.

As far as I have been able to discover in my 16 years here, by and large the Rules Committee has responded when the leadership very definitely said a measure must come to the floor for action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and we who have been here are well acquainted with his reasoning and his arguments, because he is sincere in his position, and he is very sincere in a status quo state of mind. My friend is very hesitant to look into the future; to try to travel in the future in the best way possible to meet the problems that the reasonably near future presents to us.

He has made the same stereotyped argument that we have heard in the past. Two years ago, when this rule was overwhelmingly adopted, and then later when they had a coalition, which is functioning now—the country is not deceived, they know what is going on today. The Republican Party is the tail of the kite of certain Democratic Members. From a political angle it is the Republican Party that is on trial, in my opinion, because the Eightieth Congress, which was a very powerful factor in the election of President Truman, made a record, and that record was made by the Republican members of the Rules Committee, with that coalition. But they had a majority then. Six Members in the Eightieth Congress on the Republican side made the record of the Eightieth Congress upon which President Truman made his campaign. They tied up the low-cost housing bill. They would not let it come to the floor of the House. Countless Members on the Republican side tried to get it up for consideration. The Rules Committee, in a dictatorial manner, refused absolutely, despite the pleading of Republican Members, to let the bill come up for consideration, to let the House consider that bill. There were several other important bills that they bottled up in the committee arbitrarily. Six men arrogated to themselves complete authority of this House, to prevent the will of the majority from being expressed.

Only the other day we had the union-shop bill under consideration. It passed the House by an overwhelming majority. An overwhelming majority of the House was in favor of that bill. Only about 52 Members of the House, as I remember it, voted against it a few days ago. Yet that bill was tied up in the Rules Committee for months. They never did grant a rule on it.

I remember last year when they brought up this matter the second time, when they talk about the Rules Committee economizing, that same committee reported out a bonus bill that would have cost the Government billions of dollars, and we had to recommit it by one or two votes. That is the very committee that tries to present the argument that we are going to save money.

Only a few days after, in the last Congress, we defeated the attempt to repeal this rule, the Rules Committee reported out a bill that would have meant billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money if it had been passed. So, the argument of economy falls to the ground. So, what is the real issue? The real issue is whether you and I, elected as Members of this House, in our own right, are going to permit six men to prevent bills which have been reported out of standing committees, bills of a general nature, of interest to the people of the country, from being considered by this House. We are not taking any rights away from the Rules Committee. We give them a reasonable period within which to report a rule. If they do not report a rule, then the chairman of the standing committee can file a resolution under the 21-day discharge rule and if the Committee on Rules does not report a rule out within 21 days, the chairman of the standing committee may call up the bill on 2 days a month. If there are a number of such 21-day discharge resolutions outstanding, the question of recognition rests with the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This rule was brought about to unshackle the House from the dictatorial control of six members of the Committee on Rules.

The first vote will come on ordering the previous question. If the previous question is ordered, that is the end; if the previous question is voted down, a motion will be offered to strike from the rules the 21-day discharge provision. That will be considered and then there will be a straight vote on the amendment. I hope the previous question will be adopted. If so, that will close all debate for the day on that and settle the question. On the other hand, if it is not adopted I hope that the substitute to be proposed will be defeated, because if adopted it will bring back the dictatorial control of this great body by six members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, when the change of rules was adopted it was supposed to take the shackles of the dictatorial power of the Rules Committee off of the membership. The change was adopted under peculiar circumstances. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] moved that the rules of the House of the previous session be adopted with an amendment; that amendment was not in type; it was not printed; nobody had a chance to read it. Then the gentleman from Illinois moved the previous question so there could be no debate on the subject. Today, at least, we have a chance to talk about the issue that is involved. The only phase I want to talk about is this question of the House having no appeal from the dictatorial action of the Committee on Rules.

It so happens that I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for the past 4 years. It is very probable that I shall not be a member of that committee in this session; hence, I am not talking to you wanting any personal power.

We have had in the rules of the House for many, many years a provision known as Calendar Wednesday, under which on every second Wednesday during the entire session, unless two-thirds of the membership signify their willingness to waive the rule, the chairmen of committees may bring up legislation which has been voted out of their committees and which is on either the Union or the Consent Calendar, without any reference whatever to the Rules Committee. That particular proviso has been in the rules since time immemorial and has been used here on occasion.

I am amazed when I hear the majority leader and the gentleman who has been chairman of the Committee on Rules for so many years say that the Committee on Rules is in a position to block anything it sees fit to block. I have heard the majority leader here day after day after day move to suspend the rules with regard to Calendar Wednesday. He knows as well as I do that last year one of the most controversial measures brought before the House came before the House under operation of the Calendar Wednesday rule and not because of the 21-day rule.

Why not return to what was an orderly method of procedure?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The Rules Committee was set up by a group of the broadest-minded men who ever served in the Congress, for the very purpose the gentleman is talking about. I want to call attention to one thing the gentleman has left out. We can petition a bill out by the signatures of half the membership. It takes half the membership to do that.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct. The majority of the House at any time can express its will. In other words, the House can override what has been referred to as the dictatorial powers of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add one other thing. In any orderly procedure you have got to have some clearing body whether you call it a policy committee or a rules committee in the operations of the House. The majority party has been given double the number of members of the minority party in exercising its function in the Rules Committee. Years ago the power was taken away from the Speaker of the House to

appoint committee members in the House when that power was abused and there has been in the past an altering of the rules because of the actions of single individuals. This change in the rules came about because certain Members, particularly on the majority side, on account of the seniority rule which was adopted many years ago, were distrustful of their own membership in steering their own party policy. That is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that should not be remedied by a change of rules. That is a situation that ought to be changed by the majority party in selecting its own members of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that an attempt was made on the part of the majority to make it appear that they alone were opposed to this change in the rules. There are a number of Members on this side of the aisle who are opposed to eliminating the 21-day rule and who have been all along. I am one of them.

It seems to me very clear that the rules as they now stand are better than they would be if the proposed change were made for the reason that now the majority leadership has, as it should have, the responsibility for determining what the legislative program will be. That responsibility is much clearer than it would be if the rules were changed back.

I do not say that the 21-day rule is perfect or that it always works. It is not perfect. But under it the responsibility of the majority is clearer than it would otherwise be. As a matter of fact, it has not always worked. In the case of the FEPC bill it did not work. But in the case of the FEPC bill we were able under the rule to determine squarely where the responsibility lay. It was impossible in that instance for the majority leadership to avoid the responsibility.

It should never be possible for the House to escape or avoid declaring its position on any important issue. And if protection is necessary against hasty action or the pressure of selfish groups, the responsibility for it should not be in a two-headed bipartisan operation as it is under the Rules Committee. It ought to be in the majority leadership. That responsibility should be clear, and the power should go with it.

I am confident that many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle will adhere to the position they have taken in the past and continue to support the 21-day rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to identify myself with those on my side of the aisle who feel that the rule for bringing up bills under the 21-day rule should be retained in its present form.

I would like to say that I do not think this is either a Republican or a Democrat question. It is an American question. I have a deep and abiding belief in the principle that the private economy of the United States is the fundamental basis of our free institutions and I belong where I am on the Republican side of the aisle for that reason. But that tradition is exactly what compels me to oppose this proposed rules' change.

We are trying to influence the whole world on the side of freedom. The question before us in this 21-day rule is one of whether the people shall have more direct expression in the House than they had before when bills had to go through the Rules Committee. On that issue I think if we want to make the example to the world of the democratic process that we are preaching we must stand for the proposition that the people shall have the most direct access possible, which means keeping this 21-day rule exactly as it is.

The proof of the validity of this position is in the fact that despite Calendar Wednesday and the discharge petition, bills did get bottled up in the Rules Committee before the 21-day rule was put into effect—desirable bills that the country wanted. An outstanding example of how the 21-day rule can work in the very interests of the freedoms we are fighting for was the bringing up of the statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska under the 21-day rule.

To repeal the 21-day rule is a step backward—this is not a time to move backward. I hope the House will vote down any change in this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in this Republic of ours it is very important that we proceed under an established system of laws. The respect that the House of Representatives will have throughout the country and the good that it will do will depend upon the system of procedure we have here and the fixing of definite responsibilities. I believe that the power of the Committee on Rules as it was exercised up until the recent change ought to be continued. I think we ought to have a right to vote for the rules as they existed prior to the change of 2 years ago. The test of liberalism in this body will be the vote on the previous question. Unless the previous question is voted down, the opponents of this particular rule will not get a chance to offer a substitute. So, let it be said if anyone here is contending for a liberal position, that gives all the parties a right to present their plans, they must vote down the previous question so that the alternative question can be submitted to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I take this position because I believe it is good for the country. I take this position because I am convinced that it will prevent the advancement for consideration and the passage of much legislation that will be very costly, legislation that we can do without. It will prevent the passage of much legislation that will enlarge this Government; that will put more burdens upon our citizens. It will retard the passage of legislation that will create more rules and regulations and restrictions for our citizens. I wonder how many Members in the campaign of last year promised their people that they were going to come down here and vote for a system to speed up the passage of legislation for the enlargement of our Government, of legislation that will cost more, of legislation that will establish more boards, bureaus, and agencies. Our survival depends upon the solvency of our country. This Congress must not miss a single chance to eliminate or reduce expenditures. These huge expenditures are causing the cost of living to soar and are destroying all values.

Now, a word to those new Members here. Under the rule that operated so successfully for many years, after a legislative committee reported out a bill, with the exception of certain privileged measures, it is sent to the Committee on Rules. It is a chance for a second look; a second consideration. What is wrong with that? The gentleman from Pennsylvania objected because the Committee on Rules studied the legislation and looked into its merits. Why should not legislation be studied at all stages?

My most impelling reason for taking the position I do is that I believe it will save the taxpayers of the country millions and millions of dollars. Thoughtful citizens over the country are very much concerned for the solvency of our Government. They are alert to the huge expenditures being made by this Congress.

Perhaps not enough attention is given to authorization measures. It is the authorization measures that set up new boards and bureaus and that call for new Government activities and services. These bills come from the legislative committees. We will grant that the legislative committees give thorough consideration to these proposals. They are usually unaware, however, of the proposals that are being advanced by other legislative committees. It is necessary and important that there be one committee that reviews all of these proposals. This way the sum total of the cost of these many proposals can be appraised. To have the Rules Committee exercise its traditional power retards the enactment of laws, it slows up the process of enlarging our Government.

If any proposal advanced by a legislative committee is extremely meritorious, if it is necessary and in the interest of our entire country, the Rules Committee will recognize that fact and permit the measure to come to the floor for consideration. The notion that the Rules Committee can thwart the will of the majority is without foundation of fact. A petition signed by a bare majority of 218 Members can take a bill away from the Rules Committee, or any other committee and bring it to the floor for consideration. In addition to the petition method, we have Calendar Wednesday whereby all the committees will have an opportunity to present legislation not otherwise reached in the legislative program. A vote against the Sabath proposal and in favor of the Cox proposal is not a vote to give absolute and dictatorial powers to the Rules Committee. It is a vote for orderly procedure, thorough study, and for an appraisal of the total cost of the proposed acts of the

House. In providing these safeguards it will not only mean less Government, but better Government, and it will retard the great increase in the cost of our Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, these are critical times when totalitarian arms and ideas threaten democracy.

Democratic rights and ideas, however, can only be protected through full use thereof. Otherwise we surrender to totalitarian technique.

Formidable tasks ahead will challenge all the wisdom of all of us, not only a part of us.

All intelligence cannot reside in the members of the Rules Committee.

I urge no arbitrary limitation on our ability as Congressmen to decide democratically the momentous issues before us.

Abrogation of the 21-day rule means dangerous restraint upon our effectiveness.

Abrogation means road block to progress.

Abrogation means retreat from democratic process.

Some Rules Committee members have set their judgment athwart many worthy bills. Take, that is, H. R. 2734, the so-called Celler antimonopoly bill. The Rules Committee disregarded my request for a rule, held up the request for months, and finally drove me to ask the Speaker to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Speaker granted my request. The bill passed overwhelmingly. The Senate accepted it and it is now law. If the Rules members had had their way, the monopolists would have had a field day. See the trouble the Rules Committee put me to, to get the bill passed.

During the Eighty-first Congress eight measures were brought up through resort to the 21-day rule. All passed the House. Furthermore availability of the rule forces the Rules Committee to clear any number of good bills.

Of course orderly procedure requires some supervision of House agenda, but it is absurd to allow ironclad, uninhibited control to a few.

I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] we need no wet nurse. We are able to take care of ourselves in the rank and file of Members. We need no protection. If what the gentleman said were sound, then let us all abdicate and let the Rules Committee rule completely as dictators.

I shall not surrender to any oligopoly to determine what shall or shall not come before the House.

Remember in an oligopoly "power is the only measure of right."

Congress, like any Nation, could not flourish if it does not march on. The proponents of abrogation of rule 21 would have us remain static—would have us maintain the status quo. To stand still is to move backward.

"Rules Committee-ism" is a canker in our body politic, if the 21-day rule is consigned to limbo. It means an all-powerful Rules Committee. We might as well, then, abdicate.

I warn, a canker has the habit of spreading. It would not end with the negation of the 21-day rule. Power begets power.

The Rules Committee would again become a giant of power. Shakespeare said in Measure for Measure, "It is excellent to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant."

"Rules Committee-ism" will be as bad as "Thaddeus Stevens-ism." Stevens caused great wrong.

"Rules Committee-ism" is as bad as "Cannon-ism." Cannon caused great evil.

If the rule goes out the window then the Rules Committee would become virtual dictators. "Dictatorship is like a great beach tree—nice to look at but nothing grows under it."

Do not shirk responsibility, gentlemen.

Do not transfer your rights to a select coterie of Members. Amendments have been offered by members of the committee, what right has the Rules Committee to gainsay us and put up a road-block and say "No; the House shall have no opportunity to pass upon these bills"? If that is so, let all of us abdicate. Let us all resign here and now and say that the Rules Committee shall run the affairs of the House.

If the Rules Committee could have their way and this rule were abrogated they would be for the maintenance of the status quo. I say that to remain still is to go backwards. I do not want the country to go backward.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am chairman of a legislative committee, just as is the gentleman from New York. I do not appreciate the gentleman's criticism of the Committee on Rules. I believe in the Committee on Rules and I am in favor of changing the rules.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, within the time allotted to me, I may in my humble way contribute something toward clarifying this issue and making it better understood. May I begin by saying you have seen here today only that which you could expect. You have heard those who have been the handmaidens of a certain political philosophy attempting to retain as a part of the rules of the House the particular section pertaining to the 21-day procedure which has been mentioned here. You have heard others of us, who believe in a more realistic political philosophy, oppose that rule. It is only natural that the majority leader, who is very sincere in his position, should challenge and question the position of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] because the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] occupies an official party position. As majority leader of the House he is charged with the duty, and has always been very zealous in his efforts to put through every piece of legislation sponsored by the Truman administration, which he has served so ably and so well.

The first vote which will be taken will be on ordering the previous question, for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will undoubtedly move the previous question. If a majority of the House votes in favor of ordering the previous question, then the only remaining question which can be voted upon will be the resolution itself.

However, if the previous question is voted down—in other words, if the majority of the House votes "no" on ordering the previous question—then it will be in order to introduce the amendment which will strike out the 21-day rule, which was adopted by the last Congress under a very peculiar parliamentary operation which shut off all debate. If the previous question is voted down, we can then fully discuss this amendment on its merits and decide what the rules should be. We can then decide whether we wish to keep the 21-day rule, which was adopted in the last session, or whether we should go back to the old rules which prevailed for 40 years.

I say there is nothing liberal about shutting off debate. There is nothing liberal in saying to the House, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who professes to be a great liberal, proposes, that the House should not be permitted to consider an amendment to his resolution. There is nothing liberal about that. He says he is a great liberal. But he wants to shut off debate and to keep this body from discussing or voting on any amendment, or deciding whether or not the 21-day rule should be continued.

Let us stop and see what has happened in the past. How did the Committee on Rules receive the power which has been discussed here? It came about as the result of one of the most gallant legislative fights ever made by any Member of the House of Representatives—by George W. Norris, of Nebraska. That happened back in 1910. George W. Norris is known in history as the great liberal. In fact, a book has been written about him as a great liberal. It was the great liberal movement he led that established the power of the Committee on Rules. Prior to that time the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed all legislative committees, including the Committee on Rules. He was also chairman of the Committee on Rules, so that unless the Speaker himself wanted a piece of legislation to come before the House, the House did not even have a chance to vote on it one way or the other.

So it was Norris, the great liberal, the great liberal of all time, who established this rule which the present-day so-called liberals in the House here today are objecting to, who took away from one man, the Speaker of the House, the power to autocratically control the flow of legislation to the floor, and placed that power in the hands of a committee of 12 members.

Some other things were also done at that time. In order that the Committee on Rules should not become arbitrary, a provision was put in the rules so that a majority of the House could always work

its will. Under this provision whenever 218 Members of the House decide they wanted to bring a bill to the floor, they could do so by signing a request or a petition at the Clerk's desk that the bill should be brought up.

So remember, my friends, if this rule is amended, if we do go back to the old rule as we should, the Rules Committee cannot block the consideration of any bill on the floor of the House that a majority of this House wants to consider.

In addition to that, there was and is a provision in the rules establishing Calendar Wednesday twice a month, on which day the roll of the legislative committees are called and, if a majority of any committee, wants to bring up any bill, it can do so when that committee is called. So there are two ways that the House can always work its will.

Now what is the proposal of these present-day so-called liberals who boast of their liberalism? They are objecting to adopting a rule that may in any way prevent them from continuing their great liberality with the people's liberties and the people's finances. Instead of permitting the House to function under a duly established Rules Committee, elected by the House itself, they want to place the entire power to decide what bills shall be called up for consideration under certain circumstances in the hands and will of one man—the Speaker of the House. Is this a liberal action? I insist not. Instead, it is the most reactionary proposal which has been before the House in many years—one that would do away with the progressive action of the truly great liberal, George W. Norris, back in 1910.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, this is not just a question which fits any definition as to liberal and conservative. This issue is beyond party lines as it cuts across each party as well.

The question is, Do you Representatives each individually want to take the responsibility in public and be recorded for your votes on vital issues that come before this Congress? If that is the case, you will want no road block or so-called graveyard Rules Committee to kill bills before you get a chance to vote on them on the open floor of this House. Your own people want you to stand up here and be counted. Your constituents are entitled to know how you stand on the major issues.

As you know, the Rules Committee operates by secret vote. There is never a record vote that comes out in public from that committee. The legislation is blocked in secret. No one can tell who blocked any measure and there is no responsibility on any identifiable person. The members of the Rules Committee are generally from so-called safe districts that are carried regularly by large margins, so there is no danger of defeat and public opinion is successfully isolated and ignored. The will of the majority cannot be expressed and can be successfully overruled by a majority of seven Representatives. As this majority is across party lines, there is no party responsibility and the carrying out of the party platform pledges becomes meaningless.

On May 20, 1948, I asked this question: "Why was the naval civil-functions bill, H. R. 6341, with 80 items of defense, including the guided-missiles testing range at Mugu, Calif., held up for a year by the Rules Committee without action when it had been unanimously reported out by the Armed Services Committee over a year previously?" Not one of the Rules Committee answered. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee said, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 5, page 6226, that committee had made application for a rule but the action of the Rules Committee had precluded action on the floor, as follows: "The gentleman—myself—is substantially correct in the remarks he made about the date of reporting the bill and what is in it. We made application to the Committee on Rules a while ago for a rule, but the action of the Committee on Rules has precluded action upon the bill until the present time."

In addition to that, there was much pressure to revive the selective-service law in 1948. The Rules Committee held back consideration of that most important issue. The Armed Services Committee had held hearings, reported the bill by the great margin of 28 to 5, and the Rules Committee arbitrarily refused to act and would not fix a time for debate in the House for weeks. The Rules Committee then held hearings of its own on the legislative questions which were the province of the Armed Services Committee. Great public indignation and National Defense Department warnings of peril to the national safety finally broke the filibuster. Why should such a small group of men have the negative power to even shut off debate on the floor of Congress on such a critical issue?

On H. R. 5965 of the Eighty-first Congress, the 16,000-hospital-bed reinstatement program for servicemen and veterans, action was held up for months by this Rules Committee last year. The bill was reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on August 24, 1949. I went up to the Rules Committee just now to check up. Do you know what is on the Rules Committee records right now as to the hospital-bed reinstatement program—16,000 additional beds for the boys from Korea and the veterans? It says on the records, "Pending—no rule granted." As far as the Rules Committee is concerned, it is still "pending and no action."

If you are interested in national defense and veterans' legislation, if you are interested in getting moderate social legislation even debated publicly in this House without being knifed in secret vote by unknown hands, if you are interested in party responsibilty, so that the people who have party responsibility take that responsibility in public vote, then you do not want across the hall a secret majority in the Rules Committee that does to the death everything they, and they alone, believe in their superior wisdom, might get out of hand on the floor. I have confidence in you, in your good intentions. I hope and believe you will each take your own responsibility and vote to meet the issues in public and on record on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, democratic processes of legislative bodies throughout the world are on trial today before the various peoples of the world. So it is today in the United States. The democratic process of allowing a majority of the Congress of the United States to consider a piece of legislation which has been considered vital by the chairman of one of the 19 standing committees and a majority of that committee, which has been considered vital for the best interests of the people, the right to bring that legislation to the floor and let each and every Member of this body rise and take his own responsibility here for that measure is on trial today. Do you know what happened in the Eighty-first Congress?

Eight measures were brought to the floor of the House and passed by great majorities because of the 21-day rule. What were they? The anti-poll-tax bill. How did the majority on the Democratic side vote on that? And how did the majority vote on the Republican side? But you could not get it to the floor from the Rules Committee because seven men said you could not consider it and pass it.

The rivers and harbors flood-control bill was brought to the floor by the Congressman from Mississippi, Mr. Whittington, was considered and passed by a great majority. The Alaska statehood bill and the Hawaii statehood bill were brought to the floor under the 21-day rule and passed by great majorities. The National Science Foundation Act, which had to do with the national defense, was passed under the 21-day rule. The National Minerals Act to subsidize vital minerals was passed on this floor because of the 21-day rule. And the Veterans' Administration hospital bill was brought to this floor by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] under the 21-day rule and passed by a majority of this House. That is part of the legislation passed because of the 21-day rule.

A bill contributing funds to United Nations agencies was also passed.

In addition to the legislation actually passed under the 21-day rule, other important legislation was reluctantly given rules by the Rules Committee. Among these were the bills to broaden and improve social security coverage and benefits, the bill to increase the national minimum wage rate from 40 cents per hour to 75 cents per hour, and the housing bill from the Banking and Currency Committee.

The 21-day rule has proven its worth. I, therefore, request that the Members preserve it by voting aye on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. In order to offer an amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois the previous question will have to be voted down.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is ordered there will be no amendment, of course.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 247, not voting 2, not sworn in 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—179

Addonizio	Gore	Murphy
Albert	Granahan	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Granger	Norblad
	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Aspinall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Ayres		O'Neill
Bailey	Hand	O'Toole
Baring	Hart	Patman
Barrett	Havenner	Patten
Beckworth	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bender	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	Polk
Bentsen	Heffernan	Powell
Blatnik	Heller	Price
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bolton	Holifield	Prouty
Bosone	Holmes	Quinn
Breen	Howell	Rabaut
Brooks	Hull	Ramsay
Buchanan	Irving	Reams
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Burdick	Jarman	Ribicoff
Burnside	Javits	Rodino
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Canfield	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Kean	Rooney
Carnahan	Kearney	Roosevelt
Case	Keating	Sabath
Celler	Kee	Sasscer
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Secrest
Combs	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Cooper	Keogh	Shelley
Corbett	King	Sheppard
Dawson	Kirwan	Sieminski
Deane	Klein	Spence
Delaney	Kluczynski	Staggers
Denton	Lane	Stigler
Dingell	Lanham	Sullivan
Dollinger	Lesinski	Sutton
Donohue	Lind	Taylor
Donovan	McCarthy	Thomas
Doyle	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Eberharter	McGrath	Thornberry
Engle	McGregor	Tollefson
Evins	McGuire	Trimble
Fallon	McKinnon	Underwood
Feighan	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Flood	Madden	Welch
Fogarty	Magee	Whitaker
Forand	Marshall	Wickersham
Ford	Merrow	Wier
Frazier	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Fugate	Mitchell	Wolverton
Fulton	Morgan	Yates
Furcolo	Morris	Yorty
Garmatz	Moulder	Zablocki
Golden	Multer	
Gordon	Murdock	

NAYS—247

Aandahl	Baker	Boggs, La.
Abbitt	Barden	Bonner
Abernethy	Bates, Ky.	Bow
Adair	Bates, Mass.	Boykin
Allen, Calif.	Battle	Bramblett
Allen, Ill.	Beall	Bray
Allen, La.	Beamer	Brehm
Anderson, Calif.	Belcher	Brown, Ga.
Andresen, August H.	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ohio
	Berry	Brownson
Andrews	Betts	Bryson
Arends	Bishop	Budge
Armstrong	Blackney	Buffett
Auchincloss	Boggs, Del.	Burleson
Burton	Herter	Redden
Busbey	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bush	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Hillings	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Hoeven	Regan
Carlyle	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Chatham	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Chelf	Hope	Riley
Chenoweth	Hunter	Rivers
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Roberts
Church	James	Robeson
Clevenger	Jenison	Rogers, Fla.
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Rogers, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Sadlak
Colmer	Jonas	St. George
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Schwabe
Cotton	Jones, Mo.	Scott, Hardie
Coudert	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Cox		
Crawford	Jones, Woodrow W.	Scrivner
Crumpacker		Scudder
Cunningham	Judd	Shafer
Curtis, Mo.	Kearns	Sheehan
Curtis, Nebr.	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Dague	Kilburn	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Lantaff	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Larcade	Sittler
DeGraffenried	Latham	Smith, Kans.
Dempsey	LeCompte	Smith, Miss.
Denny	Lovre	Smith, Va.
Devereux	Lucas	Smith, Wis.
D'Ewart	Lyle	Springer
Dolliver	McConnell	Stanley
Dondero	McCulloch	Steed
Dorn	McDonough	Stefan
Doughton	McMillan	Stockman
Durham	McMullen	Taber
Elliott	McVey	Tackett
Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.	Talle
Elston	Mahon	Teague
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Thompson, Mich.
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	
Fernandez	Mason	Towe
Fisher	Meader	Vail
Forrester	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	Vaughn
Gary	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Gathings	Mills	Vinson
Gavin	Morano	Vorys
George	Morrison	Vursell
Goodwin	Morton	Weichel
Gossett	Mumma	Werdel
Graham	Murray, Tenn.	Wharton
Grant	Nelson	Wheeler
Gregory	Nicholson	Whitten
Gwinn	Norrell	Widnall
Hagen	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Hale	Ostertag	Williams, Miss.
Hall, Leonard W.	Passman	Williams, N. Y.
	Patterson	Willis
Halleck	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Harden	Pickett	Wilson, Tex.
Hardy	Poage	Winstead
Harris	Potter	Wolcott
Harrison, Va.	Poulson	Wood, Ga.
Harrison, Wyo.	Preston	Wood, Idaho
Harvey	Radwan	Woodruff
Hébert	Rains	
Herlong	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—2

Eaton	Kerr

NOT SWORN IN—5

Angell	Gillette	Mansfield
Crosser	Horan	

So the previous question was not ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the resolution, which I send to the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. Cox: Strike out all after the *Resolved* and insert "That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress, with the following amendment included therein as a part thereof, to wit:

"Paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.'"

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman please state whether or not the amendment as he submitted it is in the exact language as it appeared in the rules before the change was made?

Mr. COX. Exactly so, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman means with the exception of the additions that he added? As amended it is not the exact rule that we had during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. COX. It is the same rule we had in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. With your amendments in there?

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And for years previous.

Mr. COX. And for years previous.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman advise what he might be disposed to do on time for those opposed to the rule?

Mr. COX. I have made no decision.

Mr. Speaker, when I went on the Rules Committee many years ago I was told that it was a difficult place to fill and was admonished that it would not be permissible at any time that I should consult my own personal political welfare, but that I should ever make decision on questions coming before the committee upon the basis of what I conceived to be for the best interests of the country. Mr. Speaker, I have sought to keep that charge. If I know my heart and mind, I speak the truth when I say that there has never been a time when I submerged what I conceived to be the good of my country to party regularity. And, Mr. Speaker, I should like it to be remembered that I am a member of the Rules Committee because of the interest taken by the occupant of the chair, and I wish here to bear testimony to the fact

that at no time have I ever been free of deep solicitude for his peace of mind, his happiness, and his official success. At no time in all my life have I given a deeper and a more consistent affection to any man other than members of my immediate family than I have to this distinguished citizen of whom I speak.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when we assembled here 2 years ago, fresh as we were from a great victory, there was demand for the scalps of people who had stood in the way of reform measures advocated by many prominent figures in this House and the country. The Rules Committee had incurred the displeasure of many because it had, in keeping with what it believed to be the good of the country, refused to stampede under the lash of the whip applied by strong unofficial minority groups.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee has not been unmindful of the wishes of the leadership; they were not so during the Speakership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; and at no time have they been so under the Speakership of the gentleman from Texas, or the leadership of my long-time and devoted friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

I know, Mr. Speaker, the idea prevails that the Committee on Rules has fought with the leadership, that it has been unbending to the wishes of the leadership; but I want to make a revelation, one that will be a surprise to the country: There has never been a time during my membership on the Committee on Rules that the Speaker of this House made a request that action be taken that I did not respond affirmatively to it. I should say, however, that the Speaker would never make a request that involved the sacrifice of principle. The present Speaker and his predecessor never on a single occasion sought to high-pressure the Rules Committee, and as much can be said of the majority and minority leaders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we propose to go back to the old rule, the rule that was adopted in 1924, I believe, and liberalized in 1931 under a fight conducted by the gentleman from Georgia, the lamented Charles Crisp. I submit that what is proposed is in the interest of orderly procedure and that it is a step which this House, in my judgment, should take.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to offer his amendment.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Add to the end of the amendment offered by Mr. Cox the following:

"Amend clause 7 of rule 24 by adding thereto the following: *'Provided further*, That, pending action on the previous question, no motion for adjournment or other motion which in the opinion of the Chair is frivolous or has for its purpose delaying consideration of a motion on the previous question shall be entertained by the Chair'."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour, but the Chair hopes he will explain his amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is not an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman has offered it as such and, therefore, it being before the House he may debate it for 1 hour if he wishes. The Chair would like for the gentleman from Massachusetts to take time to explain what he means by this amendment because the Chair does not understand it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if the point of order might be delayed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under the parliamentary situation as now exists, the previous question having been voted down on the original resolution, could the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] be offered as a separate amendment rather than as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered it as an amendment to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a further inquiry as to the parliamentary situation. If the gentleman from Massachusetts should withdraw the offering of his amendment as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] might he subsequently offer it as a separate amendment?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman mean after disposition of the other matter?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; after acting upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. A substitute cannot be amended after it is agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair should sustain the point of order raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then, of course, that would dispose of the question without the hour's debate, would it not?

The SPEAKER. It would, but the Chair wants to know what this is all about and trusts that the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he is going to insist on his amendment, will explain it. The Chair does not understand it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am still reserving my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not ruled on the point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time is a substitute amendment in order to either the amendment now pending offered by the gentleman from Georgia or to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]?

The SPEAKER. A substitute would not be in order to a substitute.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact I am advised that the Rules Committee is willing to consider this matter at an early date as a separate proposition, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can withdraw it as a matter of right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 180, not voting 5, not sworn in 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—243

Asndahl	Chiperfield	Hall,
Abbitt	Church	Leonard W.
Abernethy	Clevenger	Halleck
Adair	Cole, Kans.	Harden
Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hardy
Allen, Ill.	Colmer	Harris
Allen, La.	Cooley	Harrison, Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Cotton	Harrison, Wyo.
Andresen,	Coudert	Harvey
August H.	Cox	Hébert
Andrews	Crawford	Herlong
Arends	Crumpacker	Herter
Armstrong	Cunningham	Hess
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mo.	Hill
Baker	Curtis, Nebr.	Hillings
Barden	Dague	Hinshaw
Bates, Ky.	Davis, Ga.	Hoeven
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.
Battle	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.
Beall	DeGraffenried	Hope
Beamer	Dempsey	Hunter
Belcher	Denny	Jackson, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Devereux	James
Berry	D'Ewart	Jenison
Betts	Dolliver	Jenkins
Blackney	Dondero	Jensen
Boggs, Del.	Dorn	Jonas
Boggs, La.	Doughton	Jones, Ala.
Bonner	Durham	Jones, Mo.
Bow	Eaton	Jones,
Boykin	Elliott	Hamilton C.
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Jones,
Bray	Elston	Woodrow W.
Brehm	Fellows	Kearns
Brown, Ga.	Fenton	Kersten, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Fernandez	Kilburn
Brownson	Fisher	Kilday
Bryson	Forrester	Lantaff
Budge	Gamble	Larcade
Buffett	Gary	Latham
Burleson	Gathings	LeCompte
Burton	Gavin	Lovre
Busbey	George	Lucas
Bush	Goodwin	Lyle
Butler	Gossett	McConnell
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	McCulloch
Camp	Grant	McDonough
Carlyle	Gregory	McMillan
Chatham	Gwinn	McMullen
Chelf	Hagen	McVey
Chenoweth	Hale	Mack, Wash.

Mahon	Reed, N. Y.	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Rees, Kans.	Stockman
Martin, Mass.	Regan	Taber
Mason	Richards	Tackett
Meader	Riley	Talle
Miller, Md.	Rivers	Teague
Miller, Nebr.	Roberts	Thompson,
Miller, N. Y.	Robeson	Mich.
Mills	Rogers, Fla.	Towe
Morrison	Rogers, Tex.	Underwood
Morton	Sadlak	Van Pelt
Mumma	St. George	Vaughn
Murray, Tenn.	Schwabe	Velde
Nicholson	Scott, Hardie	Vinson
Norrell	Scott,	Vorys
O'Hara	Hugh D., Jr.	Vursell
O'Konski	Scrivner	Weichel
Ostertag	Scudder	Werdel
Passman	Shafer	Wheeler
Patterson	Sheehan	Whitaker
Phillips	Short	Whitten
Pickett	Sikes	Wigglesworth
Poage	Simpson, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Potter	Simpson, Pa.	Williams, N. Y.
Poulson	Sittler	Willis
Preston	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Radwan	Smith, Miss.	Wilson, Tex.
Rains	Smith, Va.	Winstead
Rankin	Smith, Wis.	Wolcott
Redden	Springer	Wood, Ga.
Reece, Tenn.	Stanley	Wood, Idaho
Reed, Ill.	Steed	Woodruff

NAYS—180

Addonizio	Gordon	Murdock
Albert	Gore	Murphy
Andersen,	Granahan	Murray, Wis.
H. Carl	Granger	Nelson
Anfuso	Green	Norblad
Aspinall	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Edwin Arthur	O'Neill
Baring	Hand	O'Toole
Barrett	Hart	Patman
Beckworth	Havenner	Patten
Bender	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bentsen	Hedrick	Polk
Bishop	Heffernan	Powell
Blatnik	Heller	Price
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bolton	Holifield	Prouty
Bosone	Holmes	Quinn
Breen	Howell	Rabaut
Brooks	Hull	Ramsay
Buchanan	Irving	Reams
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Burdick	Jarman	Ribicoff
Burnside	Javits	Riehlman
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Rodino
Canfield	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Carnahan	Kean	Rooney
Case	Kearney	Roosevelt
Celler	Keating	Sabath
Chudoff	Kee	Sasscer
Clemente	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Combs	Kelly, N. Y.	Secrest
Cooper	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Corbett	Keogh	Shelley
Dawson	King	Sheppard
Deane	Kirwan	Sieminski
Delaney	Klein	Spence
Denton	Kluczynski	Staggers
Dingell	Lane	Stigler
Dollinger	Lanham	Sullivan
Donohue	Lesinski	Sutton
Donovan	Lind	Taylor
Doyle	McCarthy	Thomas
Eberharter	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Engle	McGrath	Thornberry
Evins	McGregor	Tollefson
Fallon	McGuire	Trimble
Feighan	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Flood	Madden	Welch
Fogarty	Magee	Wickersham
Forand	Marshall	Widnall
Ford	Merrow	Wier
Frazier	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Fugate	Morano	Wolverton
Fulton	Morgan	Yates
Furcolo	Morris	Yorty
Garmatz	Moulder	Zablocki
Golden	Multer	

NOT VOTING—5

Kerr	Mitchell	Wharton
McKinnon	Vail	

NOT SWORN IN—5

Angell	Gillette	Mansfield
Crosser	Horan	

So the substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed may have five legislative days in which to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 3, 1951, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Irving W. Swanson and William F. Russell, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum, respectively; James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk) to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum; Tom J. Kennamer and Beecher Hess, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum, respectively; John McCabe to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,300 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 1 o'clock p. m., January 8, 1951, at a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON JANUARY 8, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 8th day of January 1951, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 9) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Christopher C. McGrath, New York; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Foster Furcolo, Massachusetts.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Franck R. Havenner, California; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; Edward deGraffenried, Alabama; L. Gary Clemente, New York; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on House Administration: Thomas B. Stanley (chairman), Virginia; Omar Burleson, Texas; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Ken Regan, Texas; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Edna F. Kelly, New York.

Committee on Rules: Adolph J. Sabath (chairman), Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; John E. Lyle, Jr., Texas; James J. Delaney, New York.

Committee on Ways and Means: Robert L. Doughton (chairman), North Carolina; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; A. Sidney Camp, Georgia; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; J. M. Combs, Texas; Hale Boggs, Louisiana; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Walter K. Granger, Utah; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 10) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be

authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-second Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESS ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess at any time on January 8, 1951, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible, but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the daily RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

OUTBREAK OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a minute to report to the House the facts concerning the new outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico which was mentioned briefly in this morning's papers. As the Members are aware, foot-and-mouth disease was first discovered in Mexico a little more than 4 years ago. Since that time the United States has spent more than $120,000,000 in an effort to fight and eradicate that disease in Mexico to prevent it spreading across the border into the cattle ranches, dairy farms, and hog farms of this country.

Thus far that effort appears to have been successful. The disease has been prevented from spreading northward into northern Mexico and the United States. A campaign of slaughter and burial of diseased and exposed animals, plus vaccination of all susceptible animals in the infected area, has stopped the disease in its tracks and this outbreak which has just been reported is the first active case of the disease that has been found in Mexico since December 26, 1949—just a little more than a year ago.

Since the first outbreak of the disease in Mexico, the Livestock Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture has kept a close watch on the situation. It has reported to the House from time to time and has taken the lead in initiating whatever legislative action was necessary and in establishing congressional policy toward the campaign. That subcommittee has been headed by three very able chairmen: Dr. George Gillie in the Eightieth Congress, and Representatives Eugene Worley, of Texas, and Walter K. Granger, of Utah, in the Eighty-first Congress. With the assignment of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] to the Ways and Means Committee, I have been designated as chairman of that subcommittee in the Eighty-second Congress.

As the new chairman of the subcommittee I met with officials of the Department of Agriculture yesterday to discuss with them this latest news from Mexico. As the result of that conference I want to assure Members of the House that this new outbreak of the disease—while it is discouraging—is not alarming and does not mean any change in the eradication campaign in Mexico.

The outbreak occurred in the State of Veracruz, Mexico. That is one of the States on the Gulf of Mexico. The municipality of Espinal, where the disease was found, is about 50 miles from the Gulf and about 100 miles south of the northern quarantine line. This means it is about 300 miles south of the border.

The disease was found in a herd of 56 cattle on a small ranch where they were being pastured for slaughter. The first sick animals were discovered by the rancher last Wednesday. By last Friday more of the animals were sick and the situation was reported to the authorities. Field and laboratory diagnosis was made immediately by veterinary technicians, and on Sunday the entire herd was appraised, slaughtered, and buried.

There are now 16 veterinary inspection teams combing the area of the outbreak for any further signs of the disease and none have been discovered as yet. We hope, of course, that they will not be able to find any. But we will not be too much discouraged if they do, and we will deal with any active disease promptly.

Never before in history has there been an effort to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease on the scale which has been undertaken jointly by the Governments of Mexico and the United States in Mexico. There were many who predicted that it could not be done—that the disease would continue forever in Mexico and we here in the United States would have to live forever in the constant dread of it spreading across the border.

No one was willing to predict that the fight would be as successful as it has been thus far. I personally consider it amazing that we have had only this one active outbreak of the disease in the past 12 months. Our hope, of course, is that this is merely a localized flare-up and that the virus of the disease is actually dying out in most of the infected area.

Only time and constant effort and vigilance can determine the outcome, but in this period when all the food production resources of this country are being called upon again for their greatest output, we must conquer this disease in Mexico and prevent the disaster that would result from its entry into this country.

I want to assure the House that the livestock subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture will seek to continue, as it has in the past, to work closely and constantly with the officials of our Department of Agriculture and State Department with representatives of the livestock industry and with Mexican officials in the campaign against this disease. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has today introduced a resolution to authorize and provide for the continuation of the work of the Livestock Subcommittee. If so authorized we will keep a constant watch on the situation and will report promptly to you any developments of consequence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and was not here to respond on the last roll call. Had I been here, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during the last roll call. I should like to have the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "nay."

HON. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pekin and the county of Tazewell, Ill., have been signally honored today by the inauguration of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN as junior Senator from the State of Illinois.

I heard Mr. DIRKSEN make a speech last night on a program called the Capitol Cloakroom. He said that he was not ashamed to admit that he was a reexaminationist, that he believed we should examine our foreign policy, and that we should reexamine some of the

gifts that have gone to foreign lands for which we have had no expression of appreciation whatsoever, and for which no fighting men have been sent from these foreign countries.

I believe that his colleagues in the Senate as well as his old friends here in the House will go along with Senator DIRKSEN in a further policy of reexamination of this foreign policy and our spending of funds in foreign lands.

EIGHT TIPS TO FOLLOW IN 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur cabled me on December 26: "No matter against what odds, we will do the best we can." Today I believe every loyal American in the United States thinks every minute of the day about our men fighting and dying for us in Korea.

Every one of us is thanking them and praying for them. Every one is supremely grateful to them for their sacrifices. I know these men in Korea want us to keep sane and well in this terrible time in the history of America. Hence I am giving eight tips for a jittery America. They were suggested by State Health Commissioner Vlado A. Getting. The eighth tip which he gives is: "Strengthen your own personal weapon of faith." I would put that first and I would spell Faith with a capital "F."

The article is as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of January 2, 1951]

EIGHT TIPS TO FOLLOW IN JITTERY 1951

Laughter and relaxation, good food and exercise are more important than ever in these times of war jitters, State Health Commissioner Vlado A. Getting pointed out in a New Year message today.

The commissioner issued eight tips for remaining healthy and happy despite the current tensions. The tips:

1. Keep in top shape physically. Eat plenty of varied and nourishing food. Sleep 8 hours each night and avoid overfatigue.

2. Invest wisely in a regular check-up by your family doctor and dentist.

3. Look for laughter and relaxation. Take time out now and then for a good joke, the movies, theater, your favorite sport, or radio humorist.

4. Keep busy. Find more things to do. Develop new interests and hobbies.

5. If your physical condition permits, try brisk exercise outdoors, if possible, every day. Play golf, tennis, baseball, or other active sports. Leave your worrying habits behind.

6. Don't let the war jitters get you down. Curb your imagination. Find out how to protect yourself and your family against enemy attack. Join civil-defense activities. Decide what you can best contribute to your community and do it.

7. Do things promptly. Don't shirk responsibility. Putting off decisions, problems, and jobs only makes them more difficult.

8. Strengthen your own personal weapon of faith.

FLAGG SPRINGS CITIZEN OF FANNIN COUNTY, TEX., PAYS WONDERFUL TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter and also a poem in tribute to the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from H. E. Perry, of Honey Grove, Tex., route 1, a letter, the excerpts from which are as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: I take this opportunity to write you as I am a 49-year-old tenant farmer in Fannin County, Tex., living in the Flagg Springs community where my beloved friend, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, House Speaker, and his most gracious father and mother lived for 27 years before he moved to Bonham where he now resides. This little quiet farm community has been given national recognition by reason of our beloved Speaker living here, and as a young man got his first schooling at Flagg Springs.

I have composed and written some poems of tribute to this great statesman. I gave him a copy through my local Honey Grove Signal newspaper and I don't have a typewriter or a printed copy, so I will write it in longhand by pencil for you. Also you are such a close friend to the Speaker, I am sure you, along with other friends, will honor Mr. RAYBURN on January 6, 1951, at his birthday dinner. I wish you would read this on this occasion and also if possible put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I surely will thank you so kindly as an humble farm tenant with only a ninth-grade education in my feeble but sincere effort tried to pay my heart's honest tribute to this great American. Oh, for his eloquence to pay him his just desert. * * *

Sincerely yours,

H. E. PERRY.

HONEY GROVE, TEX.

A TRIBUTE

We love our dear SAM RAYBURN,
  Speaker of the Nation's House.
He is a refined, cultured gentleman,
  He is a son of the native South.

He is a Texan by choice and adoption,
  But Tennessee is the State of his birth.
As a fighter for freedom and justice,
  There is no equal of him on earth.

In 1912 he was elected to Congress
  On March 4, 1913, he took his seat
He has made such a faithful servant
  In no campaign was he ever beat.

His tribute to womanhood,
  Was a life of devotion to his mother,
His tribute to mankind
  Was a living tribute faithful as a brother.

It was in the Flagg Springs community
  As a youth he grew brave and strong,
His love for truth and justice
  Made a man who will do no wrong.

In spite of fame and honor
  He never lost the common touch.
His devotion to the Democratic ideals
  Inspires us all so much.

We Americans live with confidence
  When his hand guides the ship of state.
He is so sincere and consistent,
  His true heart never harbors hate.

Mr. RAYBURN is a great fighter
  For freedom, for peace and right,
We pray as we support him
  For the world he wins this fight.

His noble father and sainted mother
  Gave him an untarnished name.
He has written it in imperishable letters
  In his country's Hall of Fame.

—*H. E. Perry.*

HONEY GROVE, TEX.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial and a letter to the editor.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer

or department to make to Congress, in compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 27); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, both inclusive, in compliance with the provisions of paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

3. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a typewritten copy of a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, pursuant to the provisions of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1950, approved June 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 324), the Purnell Act, approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 972), and the Adams Act, approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 64); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, in accordance with section 7 of the Agricultural Extension Work Act of May 8, 1914; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by Public Law No. 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1950, together with a copy of the officers' reports to the Fifty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, pursuant to Public Law No. 630, Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 548, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1950, for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund, pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, in compliance with the requirements of section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

12. A letter from the Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of Operations Under the Federal Airport Act, in accordance with the provisions of section 18 of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

13. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report describing the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

14. A letter from the Executive Secretary, the American National Theatre and Academy, transmitting its yearly report of accomplishments and finances as of June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

15. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1950 under the act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1231); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting its third report in compliance with Public Law No. 377, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

18. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1950, in compliance with the provisions of section 143 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4. A bill to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5. A bill to create a National Cemetery Commission for the consolidation of national cemetery activities within one civilian commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 7. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 8. A bill to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 10. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the rebroadcasting of radio programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 11. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those employees engaged in operating civilian-manned vessels of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 13. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 14. A bill to increase the amount of the deduction allowed for income-tax purposes with respect to medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 16. A bill to establish a Tax Settlement Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 17. A bill to allow widows and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 18. A bill to authorize payment of death gratuity on account of death in active or training service of personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, including the Reserve components of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide for equalization of flight pay for Navy and Marine Corps officers and former officers who did not receive flight pay equal to that paid to Army officers engaged in regular and frequent aerial flights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 20. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the Armed Forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 21. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make an allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 22. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 23. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special Korean Campaign Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 24. A bill to provide for the evacuation of dependents of Armed Forces personnel from occupation zones or areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 25. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 26. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 27. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public health program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 28. A bill to provide protection of persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 29. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 30. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 31. A bill for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 32. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit the rendering of free telephone service to certain hospitalized members, and former members, of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 33. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 34. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 35. A bill to establish in the Department of Labor an Agency for the Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 36. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 37. A bill to amend section 1073, title 18, United States Code, with respect to indecent molestation of minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 38. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 39. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 40. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 41. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 42. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 43. A bill to relieve taxpayers from the payment of interest on deferred payments under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 44. A bill to provide for review by courts of the United States of determinations under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 45. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Beatrice, Nebr., and for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 46. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Hubbell, Nebr., and for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 47. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 48. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 50. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 51. A bill to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 52. A bill to provide for refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline, where the gasoline is destroyed by fire or other casualty while held for resale by a jobber, wholesaler, or retail dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 53. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 54. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 55. A bill relating to the tax on alcohol used in the manufacture of nonbeverage products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 56. A bill to increase the relief benefits of widows and children of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the White House police force and other persons entitled to benefits under the act of September 1, 1916, who lose their lives in line of duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 57. A bill to provide for the extension of economic aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 58. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable water within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 59. A bill to extend certain benefits now provided by law for veterans of World War II to personnel on active service with the Armed Forces of the United States of America during the military, naval, and air operations in Korea or other places while serving under the flag of the United States of America and the United Nations, or under the flag of the United States of America alone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 60. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 61. A bill to cancel interest on certain indebtedness against the United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 62. A bill providing that gain realized on the sale or exchange of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 63. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities at half salary or wages, based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who shall have completed 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 64. A bill to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to Virginia Electric & Power Co. of a perpetual easement of right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes across lands of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, Va., such easement to be granted in exchange for, and in consideration of, the donation for park purposes of approximately 6 acres of land adjoining the park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 65. A bill to create a commission to study the feasibility of Federal participation in the American Negro Progress Exposition; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 66. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 67. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 68. A bill to add certain veterans' organizations to the list of veterans' organizations whose proceedings are printed annually for Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 69. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to lend certain property to national veterans' organizations, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1949, so as to include property of the Coast Guard, and by defining "recognized national veterans' organization"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 70. A bill to amend chapter 85, title 28, United States Code, by adding a new section 1360 relating to jurisdiction of district courts over certain military-preference cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 71. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 72. A bill to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 73. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to its application to radio network organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 74. A bill to exempt the personal property of certain veterans' organizations from the District of Columbia personal-property tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 75. A bill to amend section 705 of title 18, United States Code (relating to badges or medals of veterans' organizations), to make it applicable to certain additional veterans' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 76. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 77. A bill to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions when admission is free of charge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 78. A bill to limit the removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 79. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of devices for protection of property from storms, floods or erosion; to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

H. R. 80. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 81. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 82. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 83. A bill to provide for observing certain legal public holidays on Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 84. A bill to provide that the tax on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 85. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that espionage and advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence shall be capital offenses at all times; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 86. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 87. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purpose of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 88. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 89. A bill to provide annuities to the widows of justices, judges, or former justices or judges of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 90. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Hocking Valley coal region in the State of Ohio for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal and oil shale; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 91. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 92. A bill terminating issuance of immigration visas to natives of certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 93. A bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 94. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 95. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased retirement benefits for immigrant inspectors, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 96. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 97. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 98. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 99. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester;* to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 100. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 101. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 102. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 103. A bill to increase the opportunities of blind persons for employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 104. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 105. A bill to extend the benefits provided by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain persons who served as technical advisers to the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 106. A bill to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examination; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 107. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to resignation and retirement of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 108. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 with respect to the naturalization of alien spouses of American citizens employed by certain international organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 109. A bill to permit the United States, as well as private persons, to commence treble-damage actions under section 7 of the Sherman Act and section 4 of the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 110. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide that United States commissioners shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 112. A bill to require departments and agencies of the Government to furnish certain information and papers when called upon to do so by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 113. A bill to increase the salary of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 114. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 115. A bill to provide that certain loans secured by realty taken for a public use shall not be counted in computing the aggregate amount of loans that may be guaranteed for any veteran under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 116. A bill relating to the status quo of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 117. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 118. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General to finance the construction or acquisition of post offices, in certain cases, to borrowing from local lending institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 119. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 120. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 121. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 122. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 123. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for United States marshals and deputy marshals of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 124. A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 125. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 126. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 127. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 128. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 129. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 130. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 131. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 132. A bill to exempt persons who served as cadets in the United States Merchant Marine Academy in excess of 90 days at sea beyond the continental limits of the United States between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 133. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 134. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to study the need for smog control in the vicinity of airports in order to promote safety in air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 135. A bill to extend medical benefits to dependents of Coast Guard personnel and to widows of deceased Coast Guard personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 136. A bill allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 138. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building in the Los Angeles Harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 139. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building in the Los Angeles harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 140. A bill to amend chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow exporters a refund of taxes paid on tires shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 141. A bill to provide that the gain realized on sale of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 142. A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators, receivers, and other fiduciary officers to take charge of the affairs of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 143. A bill to reestablish the original eleventh and twelfth Federal home-loan bank districts and to reestablish the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 144. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 215, relating to acceptance or solicitation to obtain appointive public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 145. A bill to allow for income-tax purposes a deduction for depreciation and repairs on the residence of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 146. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 147. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 148. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with certain organizations to carry out the functions of the poundmaster of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 149. A bill relating to amounts made available for grants for hospital construction for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 150. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 151. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 152. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the States and their political subdivisions for the loss of tax revenue with respect to certain real property, and improvements thereon, acquired by the United States and used by the Armed Forces for recreational and welfare purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 153. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 154. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 155. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 38, Eighty-first Congress, concerning loans by the Secretary of Agriculture to bona fide fur farmers in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 156. A bill to repeal the Alaska railroads tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 157. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 158. A bill to provide that judges of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 159. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 160. A bill to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 161. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 162. A bill relating to the exemption from payment of income tax of certain compensation payable to Federal employees stationed in the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 163. A bill to provide for an additional district judge for the third division of the District Court for the District of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 164. A bill to amend the Army Organization Act of 1950 to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 165. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 166. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 167. A bill to amend section 111 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for the immediate availability, in event of an emergency declared either by the Congress or the President, of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 168. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to certain suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 169. A bill to grant annual and sick leave to certain temporary rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 170. A bill to provide that the absence of any individual for 20 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 171. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 172. A bill to provide for the continuance of family benefits to civil-service employees separated after 5 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 173. A bill to amend section 2042 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 174. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 175. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 176. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 177. A bill to increase the allowance for equipment maintenance of rural carriers by 2 cents per mile per day for each scheduled mile or major fraction thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 178. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 179. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 180. A bill to provide for the display of the American flag on every post office in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 181. A bill to amend section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 182. A bill to exempt from income-tax compensation and benefits paid to seamen on account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 183. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1945, by changing the basis of award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System from 2 years of service to 1 year of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 184. A bill to amend section 1342 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to action by State agencies affecting public utilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 185. A bill to provide that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulation eliminate the requirement that certain tax and information returns shall be made under oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 186. A bill to provide for the lease of the Belasco Theater to the American National Theater and Academy for the presentation of theatrical and musical productions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 187. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed on South Huntington Avenue in Boston, Mass., as the General George S. Patton Memorial Hospital in honor of the late Gen. George S. Patton; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 188. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 189. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 190. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 191. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 192. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study the agriculture situation and to recommend adequate farm legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 193. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 194. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 195. A bill to provide for the acquisition of McCormack General Hospital, Pasadena, Calif., by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 196. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 197. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 198. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 199. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 200. A bill authorizing flood-control works on the Yakima River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 201. A bill to change the names of Ice Harbor Dam, Lower Monumental Dam, Little Goose Dam, and Lower Granite Dam on the Snake River to the Whitman Lock and Dam, Lewis Lock and Dam, Clark Lock and Dam, and the Spalding Lock and Dam, respectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 202. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klickitat unit of the Wapato project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 203. A bill to provide for the relief of individuals entitled to monetary proceeds from estates settled in foreign countries where such countries prohibit the transfer of such proceeds to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 204. A bill to authorize members and certain former members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear certain decorations tendered them by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 205. A bill to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 206. A bill to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 207. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to require the preparation of passenger lists for all flights of commercial airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 208. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 209. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 210. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 211. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 212. A bill to amend section 200, title II, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, as amended by Public Law 316, Eightieth Congress, approved August 1, 1947; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 213. A bill to include certain additional veterans' organizations whose accredited representatives and claim agents may assist veterans and their dependents under section 616, National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and section 500, World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 214. A bill to amend section 200, chapter II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 3, Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 215. A bill to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to income taxes of members of the Armed Forces dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 216. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 217. A bill to provide for the erection of a World War II memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 218. A bill to provide that veterans pursuing educational and training courses in public institutions shall receive the books, supplies, and other equipment they would receive if they pursued similar courses in private institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 219. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to persons who served in the Merchant Marine of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 220. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, relating to actions for civil liabilities for violation of the Emergency Price Control Act;

to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 222. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1948 to provide for reports by the Chief of Engineers with respect to national defense values of river, harbor, and waterway improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 223. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected blindness in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 224. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to certain veterans with wartime service-connected disability involving the loss or loss of use of certain extremities in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 225. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in southwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the Armed Forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 226. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize delivery of surplus potatoes and eggs to the States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 227. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for war-veteran patients in United States veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 228. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 229. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to remove from the free list patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 230. A bill to repeal paragraph 1752 (relating to patna rice) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 231. A bill to impose a duty of 2½ cents per pound on patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups and for other purposes, rice meal, and broken rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 232. A bill to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 233. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense production plants in such area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 235. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 236. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for the payment of insurance benefits to certain persons not within a class of permitted beneficiaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 237. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 238. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 239. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 240. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 241. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 242. A bill to eliminate the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 243. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 244. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 245. A bill to authorize payment after June 30, 1951, for unused annual leave accumulated by employees of the Federal and District of Columbia Governments during the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 246. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 247. A bill relating to appointments, promotions, and transfers in the Federal civil service during the existence of the present national emergency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 248. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial to Army Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington, who perished with the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and sacrificed their lives for their fellow men; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 249. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for making loans to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies for the construction of treatment works and for the preparation of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 250. A bill to provide for the purchase from the State of New York of buildings and land now occupied by Halloran General Hospital at Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 251. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to authorize care of graves of deceased patients buried at the expense of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 252. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 253. A bill to regulate the hours of employment of persons employed in marine hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 254. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 255. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the blind"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 256. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 257. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 258. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in commemoration of the Serpent Mound, Adams County, Ohio; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 259. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Rankin House at Ripley, Brown County, Ohio; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 260. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 261. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, so as to provide additional compensation for certain members of the uniformed services during periods of actual contact with hostile ground forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 262. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept voluntary conveyances of lands owned by Waccamaw Indians in North Carolina and to issue trust patents for such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 263. A bill to amend Public Law 622, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 777, second session, an act to provide for the payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons for the period they were residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 264. A bill to remove the discrimination against Indians in the enforcement of Federal and State laws concerned with the use and sale of intoxicating beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 265. A bill for the relief of certain persons occupying lands of the United States within the drainage of the Arroyo Seco, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 266. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 267. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 268. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the

welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 269. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 270. A bill to amend section 1404 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the transfer of certain civil actions from one district to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 271. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Cumberland Dam and Reservoir on the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 272. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 273. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 274. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, particularly in national defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 275. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 276. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 277. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 278. A bill to provide additional punishment for violations of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 279. A bill to promote the national defense, and to insure against shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production and stockpiling of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 280. A bill to amend and reenact sections 4F, 4G, of title 30, United States Code, act of May 7, 1941 (ch. 87, secs. 1 and 2, 55 Stat. 178), relative to the appointment of coal-mine inspectors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 281. A bill to facilitate the exercise of the franchise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 282. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain articles and products containing raw materials with respect to which priorities have been established or allocations made under the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 283. A bill to equalize the purchasing power of the American dollar and currencies of the United States, when the same come into competition with foreign moneys in the purchase of goods and merchandise, of all kinds not on the free list, that are bought for transportation and importation into the United States of America from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 284. A bill to encourage increased production of coal, to promote the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 285. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 286. A bill to amend title 18, section 61, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America in force January 3, 1949, by adding thereto sections 61 (1), 61 (2), and 61 (3) relating to offenses in elections and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 287. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district courts of the continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 288. A bill to protect the rights and privileges of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 289. A bill to provide for the compensation of personal services on Sunday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 290. A bill to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 291. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 292. A bill to provide equal treatment for all employees in the civilian service of the Government with respect to payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the service in the case of persons improperly removed or suspended from such service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 293. A bill to amend and reenact sections 1861 and 1862 of title 28, United States Code (act of March 3, 1911, ch. 231, sec. 275, 36 Stat. 1164; and act of February 3, 1917, ch. 27, 39 Stat. 873), to authorize the judges of the district courts to appoint two jury commissioners, who shall meet on or before July 1 of each year to make a list of persons competent to act as jurors in the Federal courts; defining the qualification of such jurors; prescribing the oath to be taken by such commissioners, the records to be kept, and providing for their compensation; the method such commissioners shall use in the drawing of such jurors from the prepared ballots, required to be kept in a locked jury box, until withdrawn by said commissioners in the presence of the clerk of said court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 294. A bill to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 295. A bill to amend the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, to mature United States Government life insurance when the insured becomes 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of titles II, III, and IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 297. A bill to extend the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 298. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of certain veterans who died while serving in the Armed Forces during World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 299. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 300. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 301. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 302. A bill to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 303. A bill to establish parity in the rates of disability and death compensation payable for disability or death resulting from service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 304. A bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical sequelae of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 305. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Mound Bayou, Miss.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 306. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 307. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Tupelo, Miss.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 308. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 309. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and children the provisions of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 310. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 311. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 312. A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 313. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 314. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 315. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 316. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a minimum rate of compensation for World War II veterans who have arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 317. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in the national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 318. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 319. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 320. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 321. A bill to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 322. A bill to provide reimbursement of emergency medical expenses incurred by certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 323. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 324. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 325. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of military personnel who were taken as prisoners of war while serving in Korea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 326. A bill to provide for the erection of appropriate memorial stones in certain cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces in World War II who are missing, missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 327. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the enforcement of certain provisions thereof prohibiting importation of products of forced labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 328. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 329. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a), so as to extend the period during which applications for review on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be filed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 330. A bill granting additional time for filing claims for refunds of overpayments of income tax by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 331. A bill to authorize payment of benefits for injuries or death incurred by veterans as a result of training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 332. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 333. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 334. A bill to exempt from admission tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 335. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 336. A bill to increase the allowance for equipment maintenance of rural carriers by 2 cents per mile per day for each scheduled mile or major fraction thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 337. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 338. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 339. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 340. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 341. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to establish the hours of work for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 342. A bill to provide hospitalization and medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 343. A bill to authorize the long-term chartering of tankers for the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend the Army Organization Act of 1950 to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 345. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 346. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to provide further relief for persons in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 347. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 348. A bill to provide for the coverage of barbiturates under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 349. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of the rivers of the New England States to further the program for the generation of electric energy in such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 350. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the enlisted men of the Medical Department of the Army who served in World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 351. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 352. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 353. A bill to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against the forces of the Government of North Korea certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 354. A bill to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against the forces of North Korea certain insurance benefits provided by law for certain veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 355. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 356. A bill to authorize restoration of a remarried widow to the rolls upon termination of her remarried status; to the Committe on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 357. A bill to amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, to equalize pensions payable to dependents of World War I and World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 358. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to provide assistance to certain veterans with paralysis resulting from brain injury in acquiring specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 359. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 360. A bill to provide for an Administrator's advisory group in the Veterans' Administration to insure review by the Administrator of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 361. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 362. A bill to amend subparagraph (K) of paragraph II, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize increased compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 363. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 364. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to permit the veteran to select his prosthetic appliance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 365. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 366. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 367. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 368. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 369. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 370. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 371. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide expeditious naturalization for persons serving in the present hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 372. A bill relating to the classification of registration officers in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 373. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, to provide additional preference, in retention, reemployment, and reinstatement, for veterans having a disability of 10 percent or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 374. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide for the naturalization of certain noncitizen parents of persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine, in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill to grant free postage to members of the Armed Forces who have been inducted into the service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law No. 759, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 376. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide retirement benefits for certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 378. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 379. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 380. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the naval ammunition depot at Iona Island, N. Y., to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission for use as a public park; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 381. A bill to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 382. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 383. A bill to provide for a preliminary survey of the mouth of the Sparkill Creek and the immediate area of the Hudson River thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 384. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, under certain conditions, shall be deemed to have been in the active military service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 385. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 386. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 387. A bill to exempt from tax the transportation of persons on boats used for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 388. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 389. A bill for the relief of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 390. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 391. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 392. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones in family cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces missing, missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 393. A bill to provide for the operation of a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital at the Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility, Clinton, Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 394. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's becoming President of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 395. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 396. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 397. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the diamond jubilee of the American Chemical Society; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 398. A bill to authorize the construction of a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 399. A bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 400. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 401. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 402. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 403. A bill providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 404. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 405. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 406. A bill authorizing acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 407. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to make it a Federal offense to make certain loans at rates in excess of 3 percent per month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 408. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 409. A bill to authorize and direct the Attorney General separately to itemize the budget estimates for the salaries and expenses for the United States attorney for the District of Columbia and his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 410. A bill to amend section 508, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 411. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War No. II, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 412. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 413. A bill to provide for the protection of the water rights of water users of the Kings River, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 414. A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, and to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps in relation to that of the other Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 415. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 416. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 417. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 418. A bill to insure the periodic election by secret ballot of officers of labor organizations representing employees in industries affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 419. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grand papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 420. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 421. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 422. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 423. A bill to increase the special pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services for sea and foreign duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 424. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in southwestern Oklahoma; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 425. A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 426. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, to provide reimbursement for fines paid and for lost pay and other benefits upon correction of military and naval records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 427. A bill to repeal certain restrictions on cotton acreage reports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 428. A bill to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 429. A bill to establish within the Civil Service Commission a Board of Appeals on Efficiency Ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 430. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government required by law or regulation to wear them; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 431. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 432. A bill to provide automatic annual pay increases for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 433. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 434. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 435. A bill to grant credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for annual leave accumulated in excess of 60 days; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 436. A bill to provide for competitive bidding on oil and gas leases issued on acquired lands where a competitive interest in leasing is evident; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 437. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 438. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 439. A bill to amend paragraph 2 (C) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 440. A bill excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 441. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to widows of veterans and to wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 442. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for forest-fire prevention and suppression in States in the southern region; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 443. A bill to provide a pension for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 444. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 445. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy substandard quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr BURDICK:

H. R. 446. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 447. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas, to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 448. A bill to grant civil-service employees a retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 449. A bill to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 450. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 451. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 452. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 453. A bill providing for the right of hearing and appeal by classified civil-service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 454. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 455. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation or half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 457. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 458. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 459. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians within Indian country; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 460. A bill to provide for Government guaranty of loans made to Indians for the purchase or improvement of farms and farm equipment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 461. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 462. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 463. A bill to incorporate the Reserve Officers Association of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 464. A bill to provide for the appointment to regular classified positions in the postal field service of certain former war service indefinite regular carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 465. A bill relating to the manufacturers' excise tax on trailers used in connection with passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 466. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 467. A bill to provide that students away from home while attending college shall be enumerated for census purposes as residents of the enumeration district in which their home is located; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 468. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party with respect to candidacy for Federal or State elective offices; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 469. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the

amortization deduction for emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 470. A bill to amend the Census Act of June 18, 1929, so as to prohibit inquiries as to income of individuals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 471. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 472. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 473. A bill to provide pensions for non-service-connected permanent and total disability for persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 474. A bill to grant certain educational, loan, employment, and other benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 475. A bill to provide that persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities shall be entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care on the same basis as veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 476. A bill to provide that the widows and children of persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities shall be entitled to pensions for non-service-connected death on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 477. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 478. A bill to provide for the review of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 479. A bill to authorize acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 480. A bill to grant the benefits of section 217 of the Social Security Act, as added by the act of August 28, 1950 (Public Law 734, 81st Cong.), to veterans of the Korean War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 481. A bill to permit Civil War veterans to receive hospital treatment in hospitals of their choice if Veterans' Administration facilities are not available in their locality; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 482. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure), so as to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity in the case of Government officers and employees convicted of a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 483. A bill to prohibit the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 484. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 485. A bill to require persons who obtain commissions for rendering assistance in the obtaining of Government contracts to register with the Congress, and to establish in the General Services Administration an Office of Contract Information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 486. A bill to prohibit justices of the United States from testifying as to the character or reputation of any person or matters of opinion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide a correctional system for juvenile delinquents proceeded against in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 488. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the Armed Forces buried outside the United States, lost at sea, or reported missing in the performance of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 489. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 490. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 491. A bill to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 492. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1942 (U. S. C., title 1, ch. 2, sec. 25), relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 493. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 494. A bill to amend Public Law 368, Eightieth Congress, so as to provide for allowances for private interment of repatriated war dead, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 495. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C., sec. 23), as amended, to provide for deductions from gross income of the fair value of relief parcels sent to persons in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 496. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 497. A bill to provide for the application and enforcement of provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations and to assure the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 498. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 499. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 500. A bill to make retroactive section 6 (b) (2) of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended, dealing with the restoration to Government service of persons improperly discharged, suspended, or furloughed without pay under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 502. A bill to pay certain substitute postal employees time and one-half overtime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 503. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 504. A bill to provide books and sound-reproduction records for certain physically incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 505. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 506. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 507. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 508. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 509. A bill authorizing the erection of a shrine on the U. S. S. *Arizona*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 510. A bill relating to the compensation of certain laundry employees at United States naval hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 511. A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 512. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 513. A bill to provide better promotion opportunities for Federal employees in the executive department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 514. A bill designating building guards employed in public buildings in the departmental and field service as United States Building Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 515. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 516. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the Armed Forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and defense industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 517. A bill to provide for the storage in New England of at least 150,000 bales of cotton owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 518. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility at West Roxbury, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 519. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 520. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 521. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building at Lawrence, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 522. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at North Andover, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 523. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of freedom of the press, with a likeness of Heywood Broun on said stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 524. A bill to amend Public Law 441, Eighty-first Congress, so as to provide for the annual proclamation of National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 525. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 526. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 527. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, so as to equalize the legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to permit labor organizations to bar Communists from membership; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 528. A bill to provide aid in stabilizing agriculture prices by providing an equalizing fee on imported fats and oils, an offset on exports of fats and oils, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 529. A bill to increase the benefits granted certain World War I veterans with service-connected disability ratings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 530. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the Armed Forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 531. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 532. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 533. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 534. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 535. A bill to prohibit the transfer of strategic commodities to countries whose armed forces are in conflict with armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 536. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide that assessments due from insured banks shall not be reduced for the 5 years after 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 537. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 538. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 539. A bill relating to the performance by Federal judges of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 540. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 541. A bill to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 542. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to exemption from the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 543. A bill to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 544. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 545. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 546. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 547. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 548. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 549. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 550. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 551. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 552. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 553. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 554. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 555. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 556. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 557. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased retirement benefits for immigrant inspectors, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 558. A bill to authorize the President to permit certain persons from the Republic of Korea to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 559. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 560. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 561. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 562. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 563. A bill for the relief of persons discharged from the draft in World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 564. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands acquired by the United States in connection with the construction of the Narrows and Blakely Mountain Dams in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 565. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 566. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 567. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 568. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, so as to provide additional compensation for certain members of the uniformed services during periods of actual contact with hostile ground forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 569. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 570. A bill for the relief of the city of Hazelhurst, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 571. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress, in admitting any new State, to limit its representation in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution requesting the President to answer questions relating to our foreign policy, and for the creation of a Select Joint Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress to impose income taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States of America and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution to schools of a million copies of the Constitution of the United States as it is; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee on aviation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution relating to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress to regulate the use and ownership of trade-marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to grant free postage to members of the Armed Forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend section 402 of the Defense Production Act so as to require that if price or wage controls are exercised under that section they be exercised for prices and wages generally and ceilings be set at the levels prevailing from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize delivery of surplus farm commodities to the States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to provide for research into the health hazards of air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to authorize a sum, not to exceed $80,000,000, to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Minnesota River in the Minnesota River Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and for the reissuance of new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the disabled veterans of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to make it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students and leaders in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Motor Vehicle Commission for the purpose of making uniform laws pertaining to operation, ownership, and control of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the review of Federal criminal procedure for the purpose of studying and investigating the existing statutes and rules of criminal procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and investigate cloud nucleation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim January 30 of each year Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thirty-first President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution providing for rescinding all tariff agreements negotiated with any foreign country controlled by a Communist Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President exercise now powers granted him by section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to suspend diplomatic and commercial relations with the Republic of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution recommending a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to deal with disarmament and calling for a crusade for world peace and freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the disposition of certain Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should emphasize to the nations and peoples of the world that the United States is not an aggressor nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 12. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of a national retirement system; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 13. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 12; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 14. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 15. Resoluion to continue the authority of the Committee on Agriculture to investigate matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 16. Resolution creating a Select Committee on International Economic Relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 17. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 18. Resolution to continue the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Res. 19. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of articles, equipment, and facilities in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 20. Resolution to speed up America's defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 21. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Ways and Means to make a study of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in all fields, with special reference to the field of taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. Res. 22. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of Communist activities among merchant seamen and their unions and Communist infiltrations into transportation industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 23. Resolution directing full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement of export policies and control regulations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 24. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to committee reports on bills and joint resolutions authorizing new programs of grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 25. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relative to the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 26. Resolution to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and United Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 27. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Res. 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 29. Resolution providing an increase in salary for an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 30. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to create a special committee to provide for operation of the House of Representatives in the event that that body is unable by reason of the hostile action of a foreign power to perform the duties prescribed by the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 32. Resolution providing for a committee to consider removal of the United States Capitol or providing a supplemental Capitol; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. Res. 34. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the importation of convict-made goods; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 35. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 34; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 36. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine means by which the national interest may best be served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 37. Resolution authorizing additional clerical assistants; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 38. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct through studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 39. Resolution creating a Select Committee on International Economic and Defense Relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. Res. 40. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of the Government of organizations dealing with labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 41. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the farm machinery and equipment industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. Res. 42. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 43. Resolution authorizing the creation of a select committee to investigate and evaluate the education and training program of World War II veterans under Public Laws 16 and 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 572. A bill for the relief of Emanuele Lo Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 573. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 577. A bill for the relief of Maia Andre and her mother, Mrs. Juliane Altenbrun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Ettl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 579. A bill for the relief of Hendryk Kempski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 580. A bill for the relief of Miss Kwangnyeng Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 581. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tabit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 582. A bill for the relief of Davina Teh-hsing Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosie Lu Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 584. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Kenneth B. Laughlin, of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 585. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Slavic Gospel Association, Inc., for use as a church site; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 586. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 587. A bill for the relief of Marvin L. Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 588. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 589. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 590. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jessie K. Eyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 591. A bill for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 592. A bill to restore certain land in Alaska to the public domain and to authorize its sale to George Gilbertson and Arthur Anderson, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 595. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Aspegren Sorngaard (formerly Mrs. Esther Aspegren Bloom); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 596. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 597. A bill to provide that the former owners of land acquired by the United States shall, in certain cases, have the right to reacquire the mineral rights in such land when it is sold by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 598. A bill for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 599. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 600. A bill for the relief of Dr. C. A. Schenck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 601. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kostas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 602. A bill for the relief of Christos Haralmos Marasaglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 603. A bill to provide for the admission of Dr. Karl Schaefer to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 604. A bill for the relief of Hans Lenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of Albert Beraha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 606. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Omana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Ronald Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 608. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 611. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Martratt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 612. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 613. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 614. A bill for the relief of George H. Zwick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of Samuel David Fried; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Zafiriadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of the alien Gheorge Ion Dimian; the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 619. A bill for the relief of Yingnan Hoe, Mesum Hoe, and Meguen Hoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gianna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 621. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Foods Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 623. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 624. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chisako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 625. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 626. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 628. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee to Eugene Fisher; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 629. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mabel Monroe Bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 630. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 631. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk; to the Committee on Public Lands.

My Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 632. A bill to grant Janina Wojcicka, and her two minor sons, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki and Stanislaw Wojcicki, permanent residence in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 634. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Constance Winslow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of Earl M. Winslow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Heliodoro Figueroa-Mesa, Tomasa Figueroa (Hernandez-Saldate), Maria Luisa Figueroa (Hernandez), and Sabina Figueroa (Hernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 638. A bill for the relief of Warren Thomas and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 639. A bill for the relief of Leland C. Barnard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Aubrey Edington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 641. A bill for the relief of Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spytihnev Karlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Novak Zuber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 644. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 645. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 647. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 648. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of aliens Max Mayer Hirsch Winzelberg and Mrs. Jenty Fusa De Winzelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 649. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of Harry Fung Kang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 651. A bill to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 653. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Chiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 654. A bill for the relief of Ivo Cerne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 655. A bill for the relief of Nicolas T. Theodorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 656. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 657. A bill for the relief of Tony Marchiondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Britton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 659. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to permit Andre Caradec to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Eldridge Waranch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of William O. Stevens; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of Clara Bogar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 665. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 666. A bill for the relief of Fumie Kawamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 667. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Chryssoula Dimitrious Halatsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Macomber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angiolina Bertorelli Zanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 672. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Manuel M. Leonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 674. A bill to authorize the appointment of John F. Rand as a permanent lieutenant colonel in the Regular Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 675. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Spyridon V. Karavitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 676. A bill to amend Private Law No. 814 of the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Mapa, his wife, and eight children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill for the relief of the estates of William A. Miller and Harold P. Stites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 680. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of Zanis A. Valdmanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 682. A bill for the relief of Dr. I-Kua Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of Mary Zelveian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Charles Kokinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Norwegians, and Polish persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 686. A bill for the relief of Dan Camil Manuila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of May Hosken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of Nicholas George Strangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 689. A bill for the relief of Ihor Sevcenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 690. A bill for the relief of Jan Krizik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of Chi-Cheng Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 692. A bill for the relief of Jerome M. Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 693. A bill for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 694. A bill for the relief of John Yansak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 695. A bill for the relief of George Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 696. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Roscoe Turner; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 698. A bill for the relief of John Keene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Teresa Florence Shimizu and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 702. A bill for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 703. A bill for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 704. A bill to repay income and estate taxes to the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, erroneously collected on basis

of American citizenship subsequently determined by Supreme Court not to have been acquired by taxpayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 705. A bill to require delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, seized by the Alien Property Custodian, and to confirm the original restoration thereof by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 706. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 707. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 708. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 709. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of George Lukes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 712. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 713. A bill for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Aenny Blank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pipola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of George Sarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of Edna Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eustadio D. Papavasilopulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria V. Yosco and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Carlo de Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 724. A bill to authorize the appointment of Nathaniel M. Havenick as a permanent major in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 725. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 726. A bill for the relief of Wesley Amell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 727. A bill for the relief of Julia Busch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 729. A bill for the relief of Christakis Modinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 730. A bill for the relief of Josue Sandoval Paco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 733. A bill for the relief of Emily Gannagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 734. A bill to grant Wilburn Eugene Counts the rating of chief barber, United States Navy (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Constantine N. Perkins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 736. A bill for the relief of Mary Arnovick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 737. A bill for the relief of Judith Leone Banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 738. A bill to provide for payment by the Maritime Commission for the use and reconditioning of the vessel *Retreat*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of William Curtis Wong Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of John Reginald Leat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 741. A bill for the relief of David Mark Sterling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 742. A bill for the relief of Slavko Nikola Bjelajac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 743. A bill for the relief of Jerry Wang Van Meter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster at Inglewood, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Harris A. Bakken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 747. A bill for the relief of Panagoitis Demetrios Zeras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of William B. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of Wong Doo Moy and Wong Ngon Thill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 751. A bill for the relief of Loretta Chong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 752. A bill for the relief of Leonard Emanuel Irving; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill for the relief of Velio Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 754. A bill for the relief of Josef Stuchal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Giulia Pontrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Felice Ricciardello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 758. A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 759. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of Joseph Urban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Vincent or Vincenzo Tripoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Mario Tiberi; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of John George Papailias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nancy Belle Norton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine V. Mycue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 768. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 769. A bill for the relief of Poulikis S. Loukakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Seyid Ali Oglu Hussein, alias Seyid Ali Ebish Hussein, alias Ismail Ebish Hussein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 771. A bill for the relief of Antranik Hovsepian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of Yi Fu Chen and his wife, Betty Yi Fu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Mering Bichara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 774. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 775. A bill for the relief of Rivers Fontenot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 776. A bill for the relief of Hiroichi Hamasaki and Shizu Hamasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 777. A bill for the relief of Dr. Coloman S. Perjessy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 778. A bill for the relief of Maurice C. Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 779. A bill for the relief of Masako Hachisuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tin-Yu-Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 781. A bill for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 782. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 784. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Commander Nicholas T. Gansa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 785. A bill for the relief of Wataru Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 786. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Cavanaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 787. A bill for the relief of Camillo James Albano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of Jan Karszo-Siedlewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 789. A bill for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 790. A bill for the relief of Marie Kristine Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 791. A bill for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 792. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Indutries of the State

of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 793. A bill for the relief of the Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 794. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Peres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 796. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 797. A bill for the relief of James Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 798. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 799. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 800. A bill for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 801. A bill for the relief of Miss Dorothea Reifler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 802. A bill for the relief of Vernon Crudge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 803. A bill for the relief of Andi Bryne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 805. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of T. G. Egan Refractory Engineering Co., Inc., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 806. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 808. A bill for the relief of Emilio Cecca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 809. A bill for the relief of Chaskel Roth, his wife and two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 810. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of Frank J. La Barbera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of Antonio Porco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 815. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Ernest (Anastasios) Aslanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of C. & S. Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 818. A bill granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in Fort Brady Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of F. E. Thibodo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Luis Eduardo Equizabal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Rickards Mandelbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Luisa Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriella Buia, and Daniela Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bernice de Tuneq; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 829. A bill for the relief of Satoko Uchiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 830. A bill for the relief of Emilio Bellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tin-Yu-Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 832. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shuifong Lee Kwong, Kai-pond Kwong, and Kai-Lai Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Orans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 835. A bill for the relief of Erich Von Stroheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 837. A bill for the relief of Ayako Kuroda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Miyako Matsuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 839. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,596,994, issued August 14, 1926, relating to shoe button-snaps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Delbert Henson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 841. A bill for the relief of the Interstate Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 842. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Ciro Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of Ben Lipscher, Mrs. Ben Lipscher, and Mike Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 845. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Hornbeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Krueger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of Frank Healy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Mary Izumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Efstatheos Gasparis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 854. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna DiGiorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 855. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Herlihy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 856. A bill for the relief of Dr. James F. Spindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 858. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Ninteau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 859. A bill for the admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 860. A bill for the relief of Eleni Katsalakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 861. A bill for the relief of Anton Wen-tah Wei and Mrs. Helen A. Wei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 862. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 863. A bill for the relief of Stanley Trela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 864. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 865. A bill for the relief of Hemming Adolf Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 866. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 867. A bill for the relief of Man Kwi Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 868. A bill to provide for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of Julian Kania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 871. A bill for the relief of Samuel T. Poness, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of Boris Batchbaroff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Adelchi Colecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of Inger Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Moszko Wendrovnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of Ewa K. Sudol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 878. A bill for the relief of Eva Enevoldsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 879. A bill for the relief of Alfred Herbert Vondran, midshipman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Biolzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Anna Leonard, an American citizen, covering damages by American troops to her property located in Salzburg, Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 882. A bill for the relief of Mieko Miyazaki Malloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Bowie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 884. A bill for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Athena Mary Onasses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Francisco Cozzolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 893. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of James Veidelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 895. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Peter V. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 899. A bill for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 900. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. R. 901. A bill to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 902. A bill for the relief of Marcus M. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie Katherine Reese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 904. A bill for the relief of William McGraw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 905. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of L. Shelby Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 907. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Charlie Joe Starnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of Ludmilla Jungbauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Yotsu Yusawa Heim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer.

O Thou who art the supreme intelligence and the only source of all wisdom and strength for life's many strange and difficult adventures, make us daily more conscious of Thy greatness and goodness. We rejoice that with this assurance we need not be afraid to enter upon any new day, however freighted it may be with heavy burdens.

Grant that we may have a clear perception and understanding of that which is right and necessary and helpful and worth while.

May we be wise and strong and courageous enough to do faithfully and well whatever any occasion or circumstance or duty may demand.

Inspire and sustain us with the confident conviction that righteousness and truth shall prevail and that Thy divine will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MINORITY WHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LESLIE C. ARENDS, has been elected Republican whip.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 44) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire.

Committee on Armed Services: Lewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Jack Z. Anderson, California; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Leroy Johnson, California; Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed, New York; Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that I have reappointed as the majority whip the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLEVELAND DEAR

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my painful duty to announce to the House the death of my predecessor in this body, the Honorable Cleveland Dear, of Alexandria, La., who passed away at his home in Alexandria, La., on December 30.

Mr. Dear served as a Member of this body in the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses and rendered great service to the Nation. He did not run for reelection but returned home and was elected to the local bench where he served with honor and distinction as the judge of the ninth judicial district, Rapides Parish, La.

I have known Cleveland Dear for nearly 40 years. He and I were schoolmates at the Louisiana State University. He was a good student and when he got out of school, he engaged in the active practice of law. For some years he was district attorney of the ninth judicial district of Louisiana and served ably in that capacity. He has been an able jurist for a good many years.

He leaves a wife and two children. I know his fine wife quite well. She is a wonderful woman. I know that Mr. Dear's family will greatly miss him. I know that he will be missed by a great host of friends and I know also that the bench and bar of his judicial district and the entire State will miss him. To his family and friends I extend my deepest sympathy and pray that God will sustain them in this hour of their great loss.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of sorrow that I weigh the loss to Louisiana and to the Nation of one of its most distinguished sons, former Representative Cleveland Dear of Alexandria, La.

Cleveland Dear was an unselfish and devoted servant of his fellow man in every facet of his career. When the Kaiser's armies marched against democracy, Cleveland Dear left his law practice and served as a courageous young officer of the United States Field Artillery. For 13 years after World War I, he served ably and conscientiously as district attorney of the ninth judicial district of Louisiana.

In the lean years of the 1930's—when the people of our great Nation were cry-

ing out for inspired and unselfish leadership—he offered himself to the voters of Louisiana's Eighth Congressional District as a candidate for the Congress. Upon his election to the Congress for two consecutive terms, he dedicated himself to wise and responsible legislation, winning the respect and confidence of those who knew him.

Some 9 years ago, he took his place on the bench of the judicial district which he had served as district attorney. A champion of justice, his tenure as a district judge was marked with fairness, impartiality, and a rare devotion to duty.

Louisiana is filled with sadness as it takes stock of the loss of this faithful and devoted servant.

Although much time has elapsed since he gave up his membership in the House of Representatives, Judge Dear left many admiring friends in the House and throughout the Nation.

Our special sympathy and prayers go to his widow and two children.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

AN OVERLOADED MIND

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter I received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from one of my constituents which is as follows:

I do hope you will have backbone enough to read this letter in Congress before you throw it in the waste basket.

It is signed by Mr. Alvin D. Snyder, Paynesville, Minn., and the letter he speaks of is as follows:

AN OVERLOADED MIND

The Honorable FRED MARSHALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Will you please read this letter when you have a good attendance in Congress?

I am so filled, and there are many others like me, that I want you to know how a lot of us fathers' hearts feel. We ordinary people go to the polls to select the man we feel will be capable of doing his duty.

It is our opinion a bunch of 18-year-olds could do just as good a job. We consider frankly you are not fit to handle people's lives. You, each and everyone of you, are only our hired men. You should honor us for setting you in Washington with a nice suit and white collar.

We are not sending you to Washington to constantly argue. Just because you think you are safe for 2 years, some of you would have a different smile if we voters would use an old-time horse whip. Our Government has now got the young people to the stage where they no longer care.

Now let's change this thing around. Let's draft all the men from 35 to 60. There surely would be a lot of you fellows in that line. Also myself. Why this group's first answer would be, oh, no. What would become of my business and my family. All right. These young people want a business also. Their heart is in just the same place as yours, and when a sweet young man of 21 has to give his life in battle the old saying is, "He died for his country." Like h——; he is dying to save the hide of you hired men.

I am nearly 60 years old. We have raised seven children, four boys and three girls. I have two boys home, running my farm. They are both single, ready to take over, but uncertain as to the Government plans.

I can no longer carry on. I have farmed for 34 years, and seldom had a white collar on except for Sunday.

We have 60 feeder steers, a fine bunch of high-grade Holstein cows and calves, also have 24 sows bred for spring farrowing, and 700 laying hens.

Now, are you, Congressmen, going to ruin this farm economy by taking such boys and let the draft boards tell us fathers. We should worry; we have a large surplus.

Let me tell you on these draft boards you have made sure that you haven't many farmers on them. We are, Your Honor, entitled to one farmer seat on that board, and you Congressmen should make this clear.

We are against you Congressmen raising money from our United States by the millions nearly every week and sending it to another country. We don't think our Congress knows the difference between $1 or a million. I don't think we have a man in Congress that has set himself behind a milk pail and milked cows for 34 years, but it seems very easy for you to raise our taxes and shove a wad of our money under other countries' noses, and all we get back is bullets at our boys. I believe I could run Congress all alone and do a better job than all of you together.

If anyone thinks I am wrong in my opinion, please answer me back.

ALVIN D. SNYDER,
PAYNESVILLE, MINN.

SPEEDING UP AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy as I see the apparent lack of speed on the part of those in authority in Washington handling our all-important defense program.

As a Member of this House during preparations for our defense before Pearl Harbor, I recall there was a feverish enthusiasm which spurred everybody in high places to get things moving.

By the time we were called on to fight Hitler and the Japs, Washington was a beehive of activity, with elaborate and gigantic plans to build the greatest Army and Navy the world had ever seen.

Today, although they are drafting men back home with absolutely no regard for family circumstances and calling everybody to the colors with scarcely a deferment, uprooting homes, business and jobs, there is little but apathy here in the Nation's Capital.

We are moving too slowly in building the weapons and equipment which our servicemen must have to defend the country against more terrible foes than we ever had to reckon with.

While Germany and her satellites had powerful armies at their command, they were insignificant compared with the might of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Reds.

There are today ready to march against us at the raising of a Communist finger armed forces 20 times larger than the Nazis could ever muster. Most of these hordes are well equipped, not a few with American arms and material.

Such a dangerous situation, therefore, ought to galvanize the appointed heads of our defense effort into immediate action. In spite of repeated urging by Congress there is still little evidence on the surface that anything is being done which will remotely approach the all-out preparations for our defense of 1941.

For this reason, and also because I am certain the folks back home are far ahead of official Washington in their thinking and their anxiety over our plight, I am introducing the following resolution, and I hope the Secretary of Defense will call his helpers to action as the result of it:

RESOLUTION TO SPEED UP AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM

Whereas the state of preparedness in the United States is not what it should be; and

Whereas there is evidence that many industries are not receiving defense orders from the Government for which they are waiting; and

Whereas there is a pronounced contrast between the lack of speed in preparing for today's serious exigency and our previous outstanding program of rearming for World War II; and

Whereas the American people are ahead of many Government officials in realizing the gravity of our present situation and how slow is the current rate of defense production: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to make an immediate investigation of—

(1) How many airplanes, tanks, guns, and ships are coming off the assembly line each day;

(2) What is holding up the awarding of defense contracts and subcontracts by the Government to business concerns, large, medium, and small;

(3) Why so many industries, particularly smaller ones, are not yet being utilized in our rearmament program in spite of the fact that our planners have been aware of the danger of delay for over a year; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to issue an immediate order for full steam ahead in all departments of Government dealing with rearmament problems, said order to speed up our all-out effort in defense production.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no oojection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is not a Member of this House who is not familiar with the fact that we not only have a shortage of nurses today but that the situation will grow steadily worse with the years ahead.

Today we have but 322,000 trained nurses—the need is for 381,000 nurses. These figures exclude military needs. The military hospitals today have 3,000 nurse vacancies, and if our military

forces are increased to the suggested figure we will need an additional 20,000.

The need will be constantly growing as the years pass. The increasing birth rate and longevity of our people alone will call for an ever-increasing group of this trained personnel. We must also consider seriously the tragic aftermath of war, and the urgent need for adequate nursing care for those members of the Armed Forces whose cases are chronic.

Thirty-two years after the termination of World War I, we know that we are providing much-needed nursing care to more than 53,000 veterans of that conflict.

Future wars may very well create an ever larger number of war casualties amongst our Armed Forces—and may even number thousands and thousands of civilians as well.

I have long considered the serious crisis that could occur in the immediate future. I have, therefore, undertaken surveys and consultations with some of our leading private and Government authorities on this important matter. As a result of these many conferences I bring you a comprehensive, long-range program that will improve the health of all segments of our population.

The bill which I am introducing will provide aid for those schools of nursing training which are unable to increase present enrollment because of limited facilities and the high cost of training in the latest modern medical techniques. We also find that there are many worthy and eager applicants for nurse training who cannot pay for that training.

This bill provides for supplemental assistance to nonprofit nursing schools. These funds may be used to cover partially the cost of instruction, expansion of facilities, and the improvement of curricula and equipment. The measure also provides scholarships for student candidates who meet the school-entrance requirements but who are unable to defray the cost of such training. To summarize—this bill should solve the need for additional nurses for the Armed Forces, for our industrial health services, for our civil-defense activities, for our constantly increasing population, and will provide for the rehabilitation of persons who could be restored to the labor force. It will provide a healthier tomorrow for the people of the United States.

There is no substitute for the care that an adequately trained nurse can give. We can and we must plan now for the future in this most important field. We must not leave the health and safety of our people to chance. Ours is the responsibility to act and to act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I shall see that the membership has copies of the bill, and shall be happy to answer whatever questions come to mind as and when they have opportunity to read it.

PENSIONS FOR CIVIL WAR VETERANS' WIDOWS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration dated December 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that some of my colleagues who were present on December 15, 1950, will recall my speaking of the very sweet old Civil War widow who received about $1,000 in back pension payments that were due her because the Veterans' Administration had not increased her award when she attained the age of 70 years.

I was gratified that the error was found and that payment could be made just before Christmas, for it meant so much to this elderly pensioner. Upon further inquiry, I found that this case was not an exceptional one but it seems to be a routine matter to have such claims for back payment presented.

As I expressed in my previous statement, I felt that the Veterans' Administration should correct this condition and review all Civil War $36 awards to ascertain whether or not the pensioners were receiving all that they were entitled to under existing law.

I telegraphed General Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, suggesting that such a review be made, and I am delighted to present his reply, in which he promises such a review as soon as possible. His letter follows:

DECEMBER 26, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in reply to your teletype dated December 18, 1950, in which you have referred to those cases in which pension is being paid to Civil War widows who may be entitled to a higher rate by reason of having reached the age of 70 years.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated, and I am directing that a review be instituted immediately of those cases in which pension is being paid to Civil War widows at the rate of $36 monthly. If it is determined in such cases that there may be entitlement to a higher rate under existing laws, action will be taken to authorize the increased pension or to request any additional evidence which may be required. The review will be completed as expeditiously as possible with the personnel available in the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material, also that my remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the other day I noted in the press that it is the intention of the Department of Agriculture very shortly to permit the entry into this country of meat from Mexico. I think that would be a very foolish thing for the Department to do in view of the fact that just the other day there was a fresh outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease down in the Veracruz region. I certainly urge, Mr. Speaker, upon the Department of Agriculture that it take into consideration the enormous cost to this great country of ours if that dreadful disease ever enters into our country. We cannot afford to take even a minute chance of this happening.

I surely hope, Mr. Speaker, that a careful study of this entire situation will be made, and if Mexican beef should be permitted entry into the United States, regardless of what form it may be in, the Congress of the United States should make the decision.

DISTORTED FIGURES ON THE WALLS OF THE HOUSE CHAMBER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in looking around the walls of this House, or, I should say at the ceiling, a stranger might think we were meeting in the Pyramids of Egypt, from the appearance of these antiquated figures.

The distorted imitation of the American eagle that has been placed overhead looks as if it might have been stepped upon by Joe Stalin. It does not even resemble the American eagle as it appears on the Seal of the United States, which that figure is supposed to represent.

It is my intention to introduce a resolution to remove those ghastly placards, which I understand are composed of plaster of paris, and put the figures of great Americans in their places—those great patriots who helped to establish and build this Republic.

I would like to remove the figure of Napoleon and put that of glorious old Benjamin Franklin in its place.

That so-called likeness of Crotius might be replaced by John Adams, or Alexander Hamilton. Innocent III might be replaced by Charles Carroll of Carrollton, one of the great signers of the Declaration of Independence.

That supposed likeness of Suleiman might be replaced by James Monroe.

Then, there is the figure of Caius, it is a wonder they had not put "Confusion" right after it. We might put Andrew Jackson in his place; and replace that figure of Papinian up yonder with that of Martin Van Buren; and that figure of Solon which you see yonder might very appropriately be replaced with that of John Marshall.

And other great American leaders including ex-Presidents, might take the places now occupied by the picture of Hammurabi, Alfonso X, Edward I, Pothier, Colbert, Lycurgus, and all the other representatives of the pre-Christian era—with the exception of Moses. I would let Moses stay, because he is the man who brought down from Sinai the Ten Commandments that are being so ruthlessly ignored or violated by the enemies of this Government—at home and abroad.

Then, if I could reach a compromise with our Republican colleagues, in addition to the other figures, I would place the figures of Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis, as well as that of Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee in conspicuous places and follow them up with other American presidents, at least down to the turn of the century.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is one great American's name up there.

Mr. RANKIN Two—Jefferson and Mason.

Mr. MASON. And that one is Mason, and the one over there is Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, the only two they have from Virginia—or from America. But I will take care of all the States, and the American Republic, if the rest of you will go along with me.

Remember this is the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and not a sanctuary of antiquity, or the tomb of King Tut.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday and Tuesday next for 10 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. HORAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I know the majority leader can give me a helpful answer to a question which has to do with our work. We came down here on November 27 and ever since have been pushed hard with the legislative program which was submitted and which the administration seemed determined to get that through the Eighty-first Congress. We even met on January 1, a legal holiday. Bills were put through when no printed copies were available to the Members. Now why is it we are not working tomorrow or Saturday, and how much loafing are we to do next and subsequent weeks? I suppose the answer will be that the standing committees have not been set up, but that is not at least in my opinion the real answer to the haste in putting through legislation the last few weeks and on the first.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman pleases.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is so wise that he is possessed of all the wisdom in the world, in his own opinion. The gentleman knows that at the outset of a new Congress it requires some period to organize.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the answer. I thank the gentleman for his answer and for his courtesy. Of course, the real reason is that the administration wanted the Eighty-first Congress rather than the Congress elected in November to put that legislation over. The gentleman knew he could not get it over in the new Congress in the same form it passed the Eighty-first Congress. That is the reason.

Mr. McCORMACK. The effort of the gentleman from Michigan does not represent the views of his Republican colleagues, I know that. My remarks are confined to him. It is nothing but a small, cheap effort to get some publicity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At least I never attempted to represent my colleagues, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. His remarks show his willingness to cooperate.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Monday, January 8, the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House on that day who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Further, on account of suggestions that have been made, there will be no seats in the aisles of the gallery. This is done for reasons that are not necessary to explain. Also, no children will be allowed on the floor, because they do not have the privilege of the floor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, published in the the Tax Review for December 1950, with an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent concerning price controls on meat.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times relating to his former colleague, Mrs. Norton.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances and include an article appearing in the Lowell Sun.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARTLETT, for 10 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

19. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of November 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "International Cartels in the Alkali Industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

21. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report

of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The Divergence Between Plant and Company Concentration, 1947"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

22. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting reports of the regular annual meeting and a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States held at Washington, D. C., September 25–27, 1950, and March 9, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the Administrator of Veteran's Affairs, transmitting the annual report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1950, pursuant to provisions of section 6 (c) of the act of July 3, 1930 (Public Law No. 536, 71st Cong.), and section 1504 of the act of June 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 346, 78th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 910. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 911. A bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 912. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide expeditious naturalization for persons serving in the present hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, particularly in national defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 914. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 915. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the national security and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 916. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, to provide for the making payments in lieu of State and local taxation of certain property transferred to service departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 917. A bill to furnish members of the Armed Forces with free transportation to and from home during furlough; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 918. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to women members of the military or naval forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 919. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States naval hospital at the naval shipyard at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 920. A bill to refund certain interest payments made by World War I veterans on loans secured by adjusted service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 921. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 922. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 923. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. P. 924. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 925. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to exempt from induction for service the sole surviving sons of certain fathers who died in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 926. A bill to authorize United States participation in the creation and maintenance of a United Nations armed police force to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to suppress acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 927. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 928. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 929. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments to States and agencies thereof for certain farming operations in compliance with the conservation program under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 930. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 931. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. R. 932. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, who was honorably discharged from the enlistment in which such service occurred, and the surviving unremarried widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 933. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 934. A bill relating to the use for Federal tax purposes of the last-in, first-out, inventory method; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 935. A bill to require that one member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be from the New England States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 936. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 937. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction for income-tax purposes, of certain capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 938. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 939. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 940. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John James Audubon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 941. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 942. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 943. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 944. A bill to provide for certain tax-exempt purchases for hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 945. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated after September 8, 1939, by a member of the Armed Forces who was

separated from service by death before September 1, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 946. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles to amputees whose injury was incurred while on active service before World War II and who were not discharged until after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 947. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 948. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 949. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion of military or naval service in the computation of the 5 years of service necessary for entitlement to annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 950. A bill to provide that Federal judges shall not be compelled to appear as character witnesses or to appear as witnesses where the testimony could be obtained from other sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 951. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 with reference to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 952. A bill to increase revenues by raising the national income, creating new jobs and new wealth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to designate payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed, and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to clarify responsibility for acts of aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution looking toward the complete elimination of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CATHINGS:

H. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing Members of the House of Representatives to have inserted in the Washington telephone directory, as their business telephone number, the number of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 46. Resolution opposing all plans, programs, and proposals tending toward the development of any form of world government which would limit the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of Adele Vandan Busch Oosterwyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 956. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Jacob Clue, also known as Jacob Klueh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Kurt Emil Walter Hannemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of Avram, Malvina, and Arthur Schonbrun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 960. A bill for the relief of Ciro Panariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Frederick Joseph Reeve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Chu Bud Yick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 964. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Poeschel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of Charlie Bodady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Walter Klem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 969. A bill for the lawful admission of August Soo and Hilda Valkjärv Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 970. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga Danuta Kantor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Luciana Caratella Bianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of John E. Franklin and Martha Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Sarah A. Davies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michi Masaoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 979. A bill for the relief of George Akira Nagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 980. A bill for the relief of Kikue Uchida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 981. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 982. A bill for the relief of Willem Smits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 983. A bill for the relief of Haralson County Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Southern States Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 985. A bill for the relief of Harvey Bishop and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 986. A bill for the relief of U. S. Homes, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of William F. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Juanita Molina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Michael Chirco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 990. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 991. A bill for the relief of Stephan Karpatjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 992. A bill for the relief of Mario Figlioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 993. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 994. A bill for the relief of Aaron, Shifra, and Ahud Sternberg to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 995. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Faustino Justaniano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 996. A bill to provide for the recognition of the veterinary school of Middlesex University, Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of William J. Drinkwine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 998. A bill for the relief of Esa Matuk Zacharia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Shafeec Abdallah Mansour and his wife, Eleanor Mansour, and their two children, Nabeel Mansour and Erika Randa Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1000. A bill for the relief of Wang Chi-Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the sand, gravel, and clay deposits in and on a certain tract or parcel of land in

Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a civilian Medal of Honor to Joseph Leib; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By Mr. POLK: Resolution of Matthews-Carter Post, No. 325, American Legion, Manchester, Ohio, signed by W. R. Pownall, commander, and George Wisecup, adjutant, urging that Congress increase compensation, pensions, and allotments for dependents to compensate for the high cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the executive council of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress assembled in session at Stevens Point, Wis., December 9, 1950, opposing importation of furs from Russia and its satellites into United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 3, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, as we rejoice at the gift of another day may its hours be made luminous by Thy presence, who art the light of all our seeing. In everything we are called to do may we be at our best, and so be worthy of our high calling.

Grant us the spirit of kindliness, of thoughtfulness, and of fair play in all our relationships. Deliver us from all malice and contempt, lest we hurt others and sour our own souls. May the tyranny of partisanship and expediency never bend our conscience to low aims which betray high principles.

Hear Thou our prayer as out of the depths we cry as we climb the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, had been elected Clerk of the House of the Eighty-second Congress.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session of the two Houses at 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, January 8, 1951, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. WHERRY advanced in the middle aisle, and Mr. MCFARLAND said: Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House, has waited upon the President of the United States and informed him that the Congress is now in session and ready to proceed to business. The President sends his felicitations, and requests the committee to inform the Senate that he desires to address a joint meeting of the Congress on Monday next at 1 o'clock.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 8th day of January 1951, at 1 o'clock post-meridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today because of illness.

TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS PRIOR TO THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the last meeting of the Senate, a discussion was had with regard to the transaction of business prior to the delivery by the President of the United States of his annual message. I do not regard the placing of matters in the RECORD and speeches as the transaction of business. For that reason I am perfectly willing that matters be inserted in the RECORD and that speeches be made.

When the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] informed me that he wanted to address the Senate I told him I thought he ought to be entitled to tell the President what he ought to say in his message next Monday, and I did not want to deprive the Senator from Ohio of that privilege. So I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to place matters in the RECORD, and we will then, of course, be happy to hear the Senator from Ohio with regard to what he thinks the President should place in his message to the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. And any other Senators, I hope.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; any other Senators. I do not want to confine it to my good friend from Ohio because we are a democratic body and any other Senator who wants to address the Senate should have the opportunity.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Arizona in his request include the introduction of bills?

Mr. McFARLAND. As I stated yesterday, the committees have not as yet been appointed and the Senate is not organized; so it would be useless to introduce bills at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to clarify the parliamentary situation in that regard. The Senate met today following a recess. Therefore there is no morning hour. Under those conditions matters may not be inserted in the RECORD except by unanimous consent. Bills or resolutions may not be introduced, and no business may be transacted without unanimous consent. Of course, if a Senator wished to make the point, he could object even to the insertion of routine matters in the RECORD, which are regarded as transaction of business in the sense that after such business has been transacted a quorum call would be in order.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is asking for unanimous consent that all Senators be permitted to insert matters in the RECORD, including petitions and memorials, which by unanimous consent, would be in order under that category if we were in the morning hour. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I did not intend to include petitions and memorials. I referred merely to the insertion of matters in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was merely commenting on the fact that under the heading of petitions and memorials insertions in the RECORD are usually the order of business. However, the Chair will limit the request to insertions in the RECORD, not including petitions and memorials. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to the request. However,

I should like to point out to the distinguished Vice President that speeches are not considered as business, and speeches are included in the unanimous-consent request, if Senators should wish to take advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I take it that it is not necessary to ask for unanimous consent to make a speech. I was merely announcing that I thought the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should be entitled to advise the President. I do not think there will be any objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Ohio advises the President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair wishes to add the comment that under the parliamentary rules and precedents speeches are not regarded as the transaction of business. In other words, if no business has been transacted after a quorum call, except the delivery of speeches, another quorum call could not be immediately requested in order to transact business.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF MOBILIZATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in complete accord with the observations of the distinguished Vice President. I now ask unanimous consent to call attention to and also to insert in the RECORD as part of my statement an editorial published in the Omaha World-Herald. First I should like to make some observations about the editorial.

The people of the great agricultural Midwest, like all loyal Americans, are gravely concerned by and earnestly seeking solutions for the crisis which confronts the United States.

They are prepared to carry their full share of the burden, however great may be the job of preserving freedom and security.

On the international front they are vigorously expressing their opinions and, quite rightfully, I believe, they are demanding new policies more constructive than those that have led us into military danger and diplomatic disadvantage.

At the same time, they are measuring the problems of national emergency, as they affect our domestic economy, and are girding themselves to contribute to the safety and expansion of our economy as conditions require.

One of the most provocative suggestions to come out of this midwestern thinking on the economic problems of mobilization is a suggestion for the suspension of the farm price support program during the period of emergency.

This is a most serious question, with so many ramifications that it cannot be accepted or rejected without thorough study and mature consideration. But, certainly, it speaks well for the sincerity and honesty of the agricultural sections of the Nation, that such a suggestion should come from those most directly affected.

The proposal for suspension of the Federal farm price program was given voice in an editorial in the Wednesday editions of the Omaha World-Herald. So that it can be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and be available for their consideration, I ask unanimous consent that it be included as part of my remarks and printed in full as a statement at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO FARM CONGRESSMEN: A CHANCE TO LEAD

The men who represent the Farm Belt in the Eighty-second Congress have a chance to perform a great service for the Republic, one which will cause their names to be blessed.

This is it:

They should take the lead in demanding that the price-support program of the Department of Agriculture be suspended for the duration of the national emergency.

If such a move were to originate with the men who represent the corn country, and the wheat country and the butter-and-egg country, it would go through a whooping.

We recommend the idea to Senators WHERRY and BUTLER of Nebraska, and HICKENLOOPER and GILLETTE of Iowa. We commend it also to the Representatives of those two States. Here is a chance to show the world that in at least one area of this country there are men who put patriotism ahead of hand-outs.

It should be abundantly clear to everybody that the need for these clumsy give-away schemes has passed.

Low prices and surpluses are no longer a problem. Instead, the planners are talking about shortages—about the need for vastly greater production, and the twin problem of keeping prices down.

Perhaps the greatest shortage of all will be in manpower.

So why should the Government, through hand-out programs, hire men to grow things which aren't wanted?

Why waste manpower and acres in producing stuff which will be stored away in caves until it rots?

Why hire one bunch of bureaucrats to keep prices high, and another bunch to bring prices down?

It doesn't make sense.

Actually this reform would not require an extraordinary amount of political courage. A number of leading farm organizations already are on record against price supports.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, at its convention last month, said:

"In the year ahead * * * farm prices will be supported by the firm demand of a mobilizing economy. Under such conditions, the need for price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on certain commodities is greatly reduced. We believe that such programs should be suspended, as the law provides and as conditions permit."

The National Grange at its autumn convention reiterated its belief that the price-support system is a faulty method of dealing with surpluses of both the so-called basic crops and the perishables.

Not only these leading farm organizations, but a number of lesser ones, including organizations of potato growers, have taken the same stand.

If they are willing to dispense with hand-outs, what is Congress waiting for?

How much money could be saved by wiping out price supports?

Nobody knows for sure. The bookkeeping is so complicated (perhaps by design) that the loss can't be figured exactly.

However, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, who is better informed than most on this matter, once opined that the whole support program cost $1,000,000,000 in 1949. The 1950 cost may have been even higher.

Whatever the amount, it should be saved in 1951.

The wasted dollars should be put in the defense program.

The manpower that has been used to process and store surplus crops should be released for war duty.

The PMA and CCC bureaucrats should be taken off the farmers' backs and allowed to find useful jobs.

The Congressmen from the black-soil States, we repeat, have a chance to perform a great service for their country.

OUR MILITARY AND DEFENSE NEEDS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert three newspaper articles in the body of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in connection with the articles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on numerous occasions in the Eighty-first Congress, particularly subsequent to the new war in Asia, I said that it was imperative that we reduce all expenditures not related to our military and defense needs.

Although every Member of the Senate knows full well the crying need for action which will attain essential economies so necessary to meet the impact of the new war, it is fitting and proper that we be reminded again and again that we have yet to act on an over-all program to conserve Federal payrolls and to cut nondefense spending.

I shall have much more to say on this whole subject as this session progresses, but rather than trespass at any length on the Senate's time in these opening days, I will speak only through three newspaper articles. The first one is an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Thursday, December 28, 1950, entitled "Nondefense Spending Must Be Cut." The second is an article from the Washington Star of Tuesday, January 2, 1951, by Joseph Young, entitled "United States Staff Called Too Large for Peak Efficiency," and the third is an editorial from the Washington Star of Wednesday, January 3, 1951.

Mr. President, I am convinced that these articles express the sentiment of the American people in this hour of crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks in the hope that they will be carefully read by every Member of the Senate of the United States.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 28, 1950]

NONDEFENSE SPENDING MUST BE CUT

President Truman's intimation that there will be still higher taxes in store for the American people once more points up the glaring necessity for a rigid program of efficiency and economy in the Government which will leave no room for vast spending unrelated to the defense effort.

It is clear that heavier taxes will be required to pay for the rebuilding of our military strength. The $7,700,000,000 expected to be levied by this Congress may be only the

beginning; it is evident that even the administration does not know at this time how much more will be required.

But there should no longer be any question that these new and burdensome taxes must be accompanied by firm measures to insure that the taxpayers are getting their money's worth, and to provide unmistakable assurance that the additional taxes are not merely paying for continued waste and inefficiency in the Government.

In recent weeks there have been encouraging reports showing that the Government can save substantial sums of money if officials are willing—or are forced—to make the effort.

Various reorganization plans recommended by the Hoover Commission have been made into law in the past 2 years. The resulting economies from these moves will approach, according to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, $2,000,000,000 a year.

Another aspect of this reorganization program was emphasized by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. On improved management procedures alone Government agencies already have saved $5,000,000 a year. That is a drop in the bucket, considering the huge expenses of the Government, but it shows what can be done.

It not only can be done, but it must be done. Now, with spending necessary to strengthen our country increasing every day, it is imperative for our economic stability and for the welfare of the taxpayers that every item of nonessential spending be eliminated.

Only about half of the reforms recommended by the Hoover Commission have been put into effect. With the Nation bending every effort toward defense, there is a tendency to forget the remaining half.

Yet efficiency is more vital than ever. It is needed to provide guaranties that the money appropriated for defense is not wasted. It is needed to get rid of the duplication and waste that slow down nondefense arms of the Government. The way to instill efficiency where it is needed is to enact the rest of the Hoover Commission program.

There is still a tremendous amount of waste in the Agriculture Department, which has not applied any of the suggestions made by the Hoover group. The post office, furnishing poorer service than before, still has not been modernized or freed from politics, as the Commission recommended. Other departments, either because their heads refused to act, or because Congress blocked reorganization plans, have a long way to go to root out costly waste.

But Congress can do more than pass the rest of the Hoover Commission recommendations. There are many large items in the budget which would be desirable enough in peacetime, but should be postponed when the country is saddled with vast burdens stemming from the defense program.

There has been a great deal of talk, in Congress and the executive branch, about cutting down on nondefense spending. In his speech to the Nation recently, President Truman said that he was ordering all department heads to reduce nondefense items.

It is time that order was carried out to the letter. With defense requirements placing unprecedented burdens on all Americans, the new Congress and the President should furnish ironclad proof that ruthless pruning of nonessential spending will precede any action on higher taxes.

[From the Washington Star of January 2, 1951]

UNITED STATES STAFF CALLED TOO LARGE FOR PEAK EFFICIENCY—HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT IS MILDER THAN EARLIER ONES

(By Joseph Young)

The Government, in general, could do a better job with fewer employees, a House Civil Service Subcommittee declared today in issuing its final report on its investigation of Government personnel practices.

The report, however, was milder in comparison with findings of similar congressional studies of past years, and also had some words of praise for Federal officials and employees.

Committee members believe this more restrained type of report can do more good in the long run by enlisting the friendly cooperation of Federal departments and agencies in following the subcommittee's recommendations for improving the situation.

AGENCY HEADS CRITICIZED

The report did criticize sharply the Government's Cabinet officials and agency heads for failing to take enough of an active part in their departments' and agencies' personnel operations.

The group recommended that—

1. The heads of all departments and agencies make a thorough study of the personnel activities under their direction, with a view to eliminating overlapping and duplicating functions. Organizaton structure should be simplified.

2. All functions not directly related to the defense effort should be reappraised with a view toward reduction or complete elimination.

3. Agency and department heads should exercise strong central control over their personnel and administrative operations.

They should devote a lot more time to active supervision of the subordinate operations within their respective assignments.

CONTINUING STUDY URGED

4. Excess personnel should be transferred to defense agencies which need them.

5. Congress should set up a continuing committee to follow up on the subcommittee's recommendations and determine whether the Government's executive branch is following them.

In its general findings of Federal personnel in nondefense agencies, the subcommittee declared:

"The subcommittee finds that, in general, executive agencies could do a better job with fewer employees. In many respects they have not fully recovered from the ill effects of the World War II period. Elaborate staffing requirements still exist. Work habits are relaxed from the all-out effort which formerly prevailed."

DUPLICATION POINTED OUT

"Although some new nondefense activities have been added to the normal prewar workload, they are not sufficient to take up the slack. Functional duties have not been altered in conformance with postwar conditions. Improved methods and labor-saving techniques have not been placed in general practice.

"Reorganization to eliminate duplicate and overlapping activities has not been completed. Overhead administrative costs have increased sharply. The retrenchment from a peak period of wartime employment has not been fully carried out. The cost consciousness which prevailed in the prewar period has not been restored. The full capacity and myriad talents of the Federal work force are not properly utilized."

The subcommittee, which did not investigate the defense agencies, declared that the "need for vigilance in the practice of economy and efficiency in Government becomes increasingly self-evident in periods of national emergency." Recent events make it essential the Government make optimum use of all available manpower, especially in the nondefense operations, the group added.

COOPERATION PRAISED

The subcommittee made full-scale investigations in the Treasury, Interior, and Labor Departments, and the Federal Security Agency and the General Services Administration. It also received data from the Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and State Departments and the Veterans' Administration.

The group praised the "wholehearted cooperation" that Federal employees gave them in connection with the investigation, even when in many instances "this entailed the submission of self-damaging information in spite of the possibility of reprisal."

"The subcommittee wishes to acknowledge and express its sincere appreciation for this assistance," the report declared. It has not only increased the accuracy of these reports, but it has also enhanced the subcommittee's belief that the vast majority of thoughtful Federal employees are increasingly anxious to support any effort which holds promise of improvement.

[From the Washington Star of January 3, 1951]

SPOTLIGHT ON OVERSTAFFING

Evidence of overstaffing in the Government uncovered by a House Civil Service subcommittee indicates the need for a continuing scrutiny of what the subcommittee calls "employee utilization" in the Federal departments and independent agencies. Chairman WILLIAMS and his group state bluntly "that, in general, executive agencies could do a better job with fewer employees." They were supported in this conclusion by frank admissions from within the agencies themselves that there has been waste of personnel and money. Promises to correct some of the conditions complained of by subcommittee investigators have been obtained, but promises have not always produced results in the past. The promises need to be followed up by some such congressional group as that which has started the ball rolling.

The subcommittee believes that present overstaffing practices in nondefense agencies are an aftermath of World War II, when offices only remotely related to the war effort expanded without regard to cost or efficiency of operation. When the letdown came there was a tendency to hold on to activities and personnel not really needed. Despite criticisms in the past by congressional committees and by the Hoover Commission, there was still a lot of surplus fat to be trimmed from the departments as the new national emergency developed. The possibility exists that some nondefense agencies will use the emergency as an excuse to retain employees that could be used to better advantage in defense jobs.

The President, as the head of the executive establishment, can help to arrest this tendency by supporting the subcommittee's proposal for a comprehensive reappraisal of all activities not connected directly with the remobilization program. The Williams subcommittee dug deep enough to convince it that such a review would turn up plenty of places for retrenchment, with consequent savings in personnel, and funds. These improperly utilized employees and dollars are urgently needed elsewhere in the Government—specifically in the Defense Department and the agencies collaterally assisting in the defense effort. It is an inexcusable extravagance to take on new employees when there are experienced workers already on the Federal payroll with not enough to do.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a bill which I propose to introduce on behalf of myself and other members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as soon as the introduction of bills may be in order.

I ask also that there be printed immediately following the text of the bill an explanation of it.

There being no objection, the bill and accompanying explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 203) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. During the time that this title is in force, and for any of the following purposes, but only in matters related to the national security or defense, namely, any of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) hereof; the promotion of the national security or defense; the support and maintenance of the Armed Forces, the better utilization of resources and industries; the more effective exercise and the more efficient administration by the President of his functions as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; or the better coordination of agencies and their functions; the President is hereby authorized to transmit to the Congress, under this title, reorganization plans which shall, except as provided in this title, be governed by the provisions of titles I and II of this act.

"SEC. 302. Each reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress under this title shall—

"(a) be certified by the President as submitted under this title;

"(b) be identified as being temporary;

"(c) become effective in accordance with the provisions of section 6 hereof, except that a period of 15 days prior to taking effect shall obtain in lieu of the 60 days specified in the said section 6; and

"(d) remain in force only until the termination of this title or until otherwise made inapplicable by or pursuant to law.

"SEC. 303. (a) In addition to the matters specified in titles I and II hereof, any reorganization plan under this title may provide for either or both of the following, which shall for the purposes of this title be deemed to be reorganizations:

"(1) The extension of any function of any agency to any other agency; and

"(2) The utilization of the facilities, services, or personnel of any agency.

"(b) The President may include in any reorganization plan transmitted under this title provisions for the appointment of officers and other personnel in such manner as the President shall specify.

"(c) There may be omitted from the message of the President transmitting any reorganization plan under this title reference to the probable reduction of expenditures to be brought about by the plan (provided in section 3 of this act).

"(d) No reorganization plan under this title shall provide for, and no reorganization under this title shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all of the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or

"(3) abolishing, transferring, or consolidating the whole or any part of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

"SEC. 304. Upon the termination of this title all functions, agencies, property, personnel, records, and funds affected by any reorganization plan then in force under the provisions of this title shall have such organizational status as may heretofore or hereafter be provided by law or by reorganization plan under titles I and II hereof.

"SEC. 305. This title shall terminate on June 30, 1952, or on the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or on a termination date designated by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever date is the earliest.

"SEC. 306. This title may be cited as the 'Defense Organization Act of 1951'."

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED TITLE III OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

In general, this bill, which adds a new title III to the Reorganization Act of 1949, authorizes the President to transmit to the Congress temporary reorganization plans. These reorganization plans would be along the lines of reorganization plans authorized by the present Reorganization Act of 1949 except for certain differences specified in the proposed title III. These differences are brought out in the following review of the various sections of the proposed title III.

SECTION 301

This section prescribes the purposes for which a reorganization plan may be submitted under the proposed title III. Those purposes include the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and also include—with adaptations appropriate to an emergency situation as contrasted with a state of war—the purposes covered by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Section 301 also requires that reorganization plans submitted under the proposed title III shall be governed by the provisions of titles I and II of the Reorganization Act of 1949 except as otherwise provided in the proposed title III.

SECTION 302

This section requires that each reorganization plan transmitted by the President to the Congress under title III shall be identified as being temporary.

The section further prescribes that the period available to the Congress to reject a reorganization plan transmitted by the President under title III shall be 15 days in lieu of the 60-day period specified in section 6 of the Reorganization Act of 1949. The purpose of this provision is to meet the need for rapid action during the emergency period.

The section also limits the effective period of a reorganization plan becoming effective under title III to the period ending with the termination of the title. The section recognizes that a reorganization plan may become inoperative at an earlier date by or pursuant to law.

SECTION 303

The Reorganization Act of 1949 now provides for specified forms of reorganization, namely, transfer, consolidation, coordination, delegation, and abolition. Section 303 would provide for two additional forms of reorganization.

Section 303 (a)(1) would permit the inclusion in a reorganization plan under title III of a reorganization which would extend any function of any agency to any other agency. While this is in some respects comparable to a transfer of function, it differs in that the agency having the function in the first place is not divested thereof but the function in question is, in effect, shared with one or more other agencies. While this was accomplished a number of times under title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, it is not apparent that it could be done under the Reorganization Act of 1949 unless suitable provision be made therefor by law.

An example of a transaction of this nature may be found in connection with the duty-free entry of materials under the authority of 34 U. S. C. 568. That provision of law authorizes the Navy Department to bring in materials free of duty and without customs inspection. Such authority was extended as follows under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941: To various agencies by Executive Order 9177; to the United States Maritime Commission by Executive Order 9495; to the Department of Commerce by Executive Order 9768; to the Atomic Energy Commission by Executive Order 9829 (still in effect). The ability to avoid customs inspection is probably the primary consideration, and the duty-free entry secondary.

A further example of the extension of a function from one agency to another may be found in Executive Order No. 9440, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to place orders with other agencies for materials or services to be obtained by contract or otherwise.

Section 303 (a) (2) would permit the inclusion in a reorganization plan under title III of a reorganization consisting of the utilization of the facilities, services, or personnel of any agency. This form of reorganization would not appear to be covered by title I of the Reorganization Act of 1949. However, section 2 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, authorized the President "to utilize * * * any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices or officers now existing by law." The intent of section 303 (a) (2) is the same as that of the quoted language (and it is possible that revision of the text of 303 (a) (2) to accord more nearly with the quoted words would be advantageous).

It is believed desirable that the President have the authority to utilize facilities of the Government in connection with the defense effort and that, accordingly, provision along the lines of section 303 (a) (2) is necessary. Further, that this provision is important can be illustrated by reference to a case involving the Office of Temporary Controls which was decided by the Supreme Court. The Government's position was upheld partly on the ground that the President had utilized an officer of the Government (the Federal Works Administrator) and that such utilization was provided for in title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Section 303 (b) would authorize the President to include in a reorganization plan under title III provisions for the appointment of an official without Senate confirmation. While it is expected that a number of officials conducting the defense program would be confirmed by the Senate—as is the Director of Mobilization (Mr. Wilson)—there may also be expected to be numerous other officials, particularly those of a lesser status, with respect to whom confirmation by the Senate would not seem necessary. In any event, the President was not limited in this respect during World War II, and numerous officials were provided for by the President, in whole or in part pursuant to title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, without provision for confirmation by the Senate.

Section 3 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 requires, in substance, that the President include in the message transmitting any reorganization plan an estimate of the reduction of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganization plan. Section 303 (c) of the proposed title III would make this requirement inapplicable to temporary reorganization plans made under title III. It is believed that it will in most instances scarcely be feasible to make an estimate of any value with respect to the reduction of expenditures to be brought about by reorganization plan under title III. Indeed, it is more likely that title III would be utilized in connection with an expanding defense program, at least initially, and that the expenditures would be on the rise instead of decreasing. It does not appear that any useful purpose is served by requiring the President either to attempt to make a rather unrealistic estimate or to

make a declaration that the making of such an estimate is not feasible, in connection with the transmittal of each reorganization plan.

Section 303 (d) provides that no reorganization plan may be submitted under this title which would abolish or transfer the functions of any executive department or create any new executive department, or which would abolish, transfer, or consolidate the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers.

SECTION 304

Consonant with the temporary character of title III, section 304, provides for the reversion to the prior status of the functions, agencies, and other matters effected by reorganization plan under title III upon the termination of such title. The section recognizes that an intervening change may have been made by or pursuant to law, and that any such change shall prevail upon the termination of title III.

SECTION 305

This section provides that title III will terminate on June 30, 1952, or on the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President, or on such other termination date as may be designated by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President. The Reorganization Act of 1949 terminates automatically on April 1, 1953, and this section will require the reexamination by the Congress before the extension of the powers granted herein.

SECTION 306

This section provides a short title for the proposed title III, namely, "Defense Organization Act of 1951."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill is designed to give to the President certain powers which he has requested, I believe, in his message of December 16 or 18, with reference to restoring the powers under title I of the War Powers Act of 1941.

We approach that problem in this bill by adding another title, title III, to the Reorganization Act. Title III permits organizations to be made on a temporary basis during the period of this emergency, but it retains in the Congress the same opportunity to scrutinize and pass upon proposed reorganizations during the period of the emergency.

I am asking that this be done in order that Senators who are interested may have an opportunity to study the bill and give to me or to other members of my committee any suggestions they may have with reference to it. This is a subject which we should consider early in the session. As soon as it is in order to introduce bills, I shall introduce this bill and call hearings on it immediately.

GOVERNOR OF TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD the contents of a bill which I intend to introduce in the next few days with reference to amendments of the organic act relating to Alaska, permitting a change which would enable the people of Alaska to elect their own Governor, together with an article headed "Error found in proposed '51–52 budget," published in the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chronicle of December 22, 1950; an article headed "Grins and groans—Why not election of Governor?", published in the Ketchikan (Alaska) News; an article headed "First things first," published in the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, January 2, 1951; an article headed "Why not elect our own Governor?", published in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, December 26, 1950; as well as a statement prepared by me bearing on the subject.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, is amended by inserting after section 2 thereof two new sections as follows:

"SEC. 2A. (a) At the general election in 1952 and at each quadrennial general election thereafter, the governor of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the qualified voters of Alaska and shall hold office for a term of 4 years commencing on the second day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible for the office of governor unless at the time of his taking office he is at least 30 years of age, is a citizen of the Territory of Alaska, and has resided therein for at least 3 years next preceding the date of his taking office. The election of the Governor shall be held in the same manner provided by law for the election of the Delegate from the Territory of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States.

"(b) The governor (other than a governor appointed by the President) shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all of the members of the house of representatives. The Senate of Alaska shall have the sole power to try all impeachments and when sitting for that purpose, the members of the senate shall be on oath or affirmation. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the senate. Judgment in the cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the government of the Territory. Any person convicted shall, nevertheless, be subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law.

"SEC. 2B. (a) The governor shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Alaska, appoint the secretary of the Territory of Alaska, who shall hold office for 4 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Alaska.

"(b) In case of a vacancy in the office of governor, the person holding the position of secretary of the Territory of Alaska at the time the vacancy occurs shall succeed to the office of governor and to all duties and emoluments for the remainder of the term. If for any reason the governor is temporarily absent from Alaska, or unable to perform his duties, the secretary shall act as governor, with all the powers and duties of the office during such absence or disability. In the event that the secretary is unable to succeed to the office of governor or to act as governor, or in the event that the office of secretary is also vacant, such other person as may be provided by the laws of the Territory shall succeed to the office of governor or shall act as governor, as the case may be. In the event that a newly elected governor is unable to take office, a temporary successor shall be elected by a majority vote of all members of the legislature of the Territory meeting in joint session at the next succeeding term thereof, who shall hold office until a successor is elected and qualified at a special election to be held within 120 days from the date of adjournment of such session."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 2 of such act of June 6, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 61), is amended to read as follows: "The governor of the Territory shall be charged with the interests of the United States Government within the Territory."

(b) The first paragraph of section 10 of such act of June 6, 1900 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 62) is amended by striking out "governor, surveyor-general."

(c) The second paragraph of section 10 of such act of June 6, 1900, is amended by striking out "The officers so appointed" and inserting in lieu thereof "The officers provided for in this act."

(d) The last paragraph of section 10 of such act of June 6, 1900, is repealed.

(e) The act entitled "An act to further prescribe the duties of the secretary of the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1905 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 42, 65, 66), is amended by striking out the words "the Secretary of the Interior" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof "the governor of the Territory."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the day on which the first governor elected pursuant to section 2A of the act of June 6, 1900, takes office.

[From the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chronicle of December 22, 1950]

ERROR FOUND IN PROPOSED 1951–52 BUDGET

JUNEAU.—A $3,000,000 error in Alaska's expected deficit for the 1951–53 biennium was pointed out yesterday by Republican Senator-Elect Elton E. Engstrom, of Juneau.

Tax Commissioner M. P. Mullaney later admitted the error and said he would submit a statement with a revised total revenue figure shortly.

The original report from the budget board listed an anticipated deficit of $567,561.28.

Then Engstrom, a fish broker who is familiar with the earnings of fish processors, double-checked—and found a double listing of $3,000,000 by the department of taxation as expected revenue from both fish processors and the salmon cannery license tax.

He brought it to Mullaney's attention, saying the deficit would be closer to $3,500,000.

The total budget requested was $20,128,311.28. Engstrom said the revised revenue figure would be approximately $16,500,000.

[From the Ketchikan (Alaska) News]

GRINS AND GROANS—WHY NOT ELECTION OF GOVERNOR?

We understand that Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has announced his intention of opposing any bill which would give Alaskans the right to elect their own Governor on the grounds that it would interfere with Alaska's chances for immediate statehood.

Try as we will we cannot go along with this line of reasoning. In the first place our Delegate over 2 years ago pledged his unqualified support to such a bill only to pull strings to have it shelved at the first opportunity. If that bill had been acted on at that time Alaska today would have been working with a Governor elected by the people of the Territory and one who had their absolute trust and support. We do not believe that Delegate BARTLETT was working for the best interests of the people who elected him when he sabotaged the bill.

Now with the proposed statehood bill failing by its own weight and the bungling of those who claimed to be all out for it we find our duly elected Delegate again going all out

to attempt to scuttle a bill giving us a chance to elect our own Governor on the grounds that such a measure would "hurt" our chances for statehood. We feel that Delegate BARTLETT is deliberately abandoning his obligation to the people of the Territory in order to keep Federal Appointee Ernest Gruening on the job. The results of the last election bear out the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated Governor Gruening for working against the best interests of Alaska and we predict that they will eventually repudiate BARTLETT for the same reasons if he continues on his present course.

In the first place the bill giving us the right to elect our Governor would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a State constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished.

In the meantime if the chance were given us to elect our own Governor this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him—but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill.

Federally appointed Gov. Ernest Gruening in his long tenure in office has failed to lead Alaska forward to the position she should hold today. He has proven himself an adept politician and has created a powerful political machine at the expense of the taxpayers but his attitudes and actions have strangled the industrial development of the Territory and divided its people.

There are men here in Alaska who have been here many years and who understand the problems of the country and have the ability to meet them in a forthright manner. Such men have the faith and confidence of the people and the voters should have the absolute right to choose one of them as governor.

BOB BARTLETT is aware of this fact for he has told us so. We sympathize with his present position for he is at the cross roads where he must choose between his loyalty to Gruening or his obligations to the people who voted him into office. We are sure that Alaskans will be watching his choice with interest for they have a great deal at stake.

This much is certain: If BOB BARTLETT has legitimate reasons for opposing a bill granting Alaska the right to elect its own governor the people will give him a close and a fair hearing. On the other hand they are not in the mood to accept the weak-kneed reasoning which was shown in the professional lobbying deal. We sincerely hope that Mr. BARTLETT continues to place the welfare of the people of Alaska above all other interests.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner of January 2, 1951]

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The stage is set in Washington for the introduction into the Eighty-second Congress of legislation to grant Alaskans the right to elect their own governor.

This is a right already enjoyed by all other Americans and by the people of Puerto Rico—it is a right that has been long in coming to Alaskans and one which is needed now as never before.

Never in her 83 years under the American flag has Alaska so required the wise and understanding leadership of a governor whose primary interest is exercising the will of Alaskans in the administration of Territorial affairs. In the years ahead the Territory will be faced with difficult decisions and knotty problems, and the solution of these problems must come only through the expressed will of the people if Alaskans are to take their rightful place as full-fledged members of the American Republic.

It is unthinkable that the Territory and its people should be deemed incapable of producing and electing their own chief executive, thereby taking a first and wholly logical step toward mastery of their own governmental affairs.

No valid arguments have yet been presented by opponents of this move, but a number of flimsy smoke screens have been set up to becloud the issue.

Principal opponent of legislation providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska is, strangely enough, a man who is himself elected by the people.

Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has refused to endorse or lend his support to the proposed legislation, taking the stand that he will settle for nothing short of statehood. BARTLETT'S affection for federally appointed Ernest Gruening has long been known, but it has never been suspected that this friendship runs so deep as to blind BARTLETT to the desires of the people he represents.

Ernest Gruening would naturally find a gubernatorial election extremely distasteful, and he can be counted upon to exercise all of the power and influence of his political machine to defeat the bill which would bring to an end his Juneau gravy train. Gruening is no doubt very aware of the fact that if his name ever appeared on a ballot he would be laughed out of the Territory by the citizens over whom he has ridden roughshod during his tenure of federally appointed office.

BARTLETT'S action in refusing to support legislation permitting Alaskans the right to rid themselves once and for all of this man is totally unexplainable even to those who voted him into the office of Delegate.

His sole defense for his action is based on his statement:

"I regret that I cannot agree with you that Alaska is only entitled to an elective governor. * * * I stand for an elective governor plus many other things. Some of those changes would be far, far more important than the privilege of electing our own governor."

In other words, having placed the cart before the horse by urging statehood before we have proven we can govern ourselves, BARTLETT refused to permit the horse to be returned to its rightful place. Like a petulant child tutored only to sing one tune, he cries, "I want statehood immediately or nothing at all."

The plain fact of the matter is that the bill to elect our governor would in no way hinder or retard the Senate action on statehood. Even the most ardent proponents of "statehood now" agree that there would be a lapse of years between the time the enabling bill is passed by Congress and the time actual statehood is achieved.

This lapse would be due to the necessity of electing delegates to a constitutional convention who would draft a State constitution, after which this constitution would have to be approved or amended by the Congress of the United States.

Alaskans agree that the major need for statehood lies in the desire of the Territory to be freed from the bureaucratic system of Federal controls by which Alaskan development is now hamstrung. And in the drafting of both, the statehood enabling act and the State constitution, special care must be given to see that this primary aim is accomplished, for without a complete divorcement from present Federal controls statehood would be an empty achievement indeed.

In view of this, does it not seem illogical that the drafting of the statehood enabling act and of the State constitution should be carried out under the direction and supervision of a federally appointed governor? Where is the guaranty or safeguard against perpetuation of the Federal bureaucracy?

Does it not seem more logical and more in the best interests of the Territory that this work be completed under a man elected by the citizens of Alaska—a man who Alaskans know will carry out their expressed desires and wishes?

Alaskans should now—this year—begin laying the solid groundwork of self-government that will lead to statehood by proving themselves capable of maintaining their own house in good order. They must not be misled by job-conscious politicians who attempt to confuse the issue so as to remain securely in office.

The first move in achieving self-government is to urge Congress to pass immediately the bill granting us the right to elect an Alaskan governor.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News of December 26, 1950]

WHY NOT ELECT OUR OWN GOVERNOR?

Delegate BARTLETT is only practicing heroics when he says in effect that nothing constructive for Alaska must be done until statehood is granted.

That was the stand he took recently when he was asked to support a bill calling for the election of a governor of Alaska.

Such a move was recently proposed by Senator HUGH BUTLER, the Republican Senator who led the opposition fight against H. R. 331, the Alaska statehood bill.

It might have been expected that Delegate BARTLETT would not feel kindly toward any measure proposed by the Nebraskan Senator, but in denouncing support of BUTLER'S proposed bill Delegate BARTLETT put himself squarely on record as opposing one basic principal of free democracy so far as Alaskans are concerned. He has said in effect that he will block any move allowing Alaskans to use their right of franchise until statehood is granted.

"I regret that I cannot agree with you that Alaska is only entitled to an elective governor," Delegate BARTLETT replied to Senator BUTLER when asked if he would support an elective governor bill in the next session of Congress. "It seems to me that the first step toward statehood was taken a long time ago and the final step preceding statehood occurred on August 12, 1912, when Alaska's Organic Act was signed. In urging statehood now I stand for an elective governor plus many other things. Some of those changes would be far, far more important than the privilege of electing our own governor."

Delegate BARTLETT and the others who made such a valiant and commendable effort for their cause should come down to earth again, forget the grandstand and play the game for the people in the bleachers. Moaning a lost cause now is a pitiful waste of time.

Delegate BARTLETT'S stand is especially puzzling now when 2 years ago he himself pledged unqualified support to an elective governor bill. It was later shelved at his insistence with the reason given that it might harm the cause of statehood.

Clear-thinking people fail to see how a measure to elect our own governor could possibly harm statehood. Statehood will come when the time is ripe and in the meantime a governor, elected by the people, a governor in whom the people of Alaska had faith and confidence, a governor who had Alaska at heart, could do more to aid the cause of statehood than any other form of strategy that could be adopted.

The Ketchikan Daily News has some similar thinking along this line. It said recently:

"In the first place the bill giving us the right to elect our governor would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in

any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January, it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a State constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished. In the meantime if the chance were given us to elect our own governor, this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him—but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill."

After all it is silly to say that one group is for statehood and another group is against statehood. Statehood is the ultimate goal for which all right-thinking Alaskans are striving.

But statehood is not the only goal of Alaskans. It has been lost in this first attempt, not because of the Senate filibuster, but because many persons in the Congress of the United States hadn't faith that Alaska was yet ready for statehood.

So let's do away with the rabble-rousing, "statehood-or-else" tactics. Let's turn our energies to constructive things that can be obtained now. There is so much to do before statehood comes.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

If the question of granting statehood to Alaska is to be brought up again this year, I believe new hearings should be held on the spot in Alaska itself.

Last year the only hearings held were here in Washington, and that made it impossible for most of the opponents of Alaska statehood to appear. Those favoring statehood were able to come all the way to Washington through the good offices of the Alaska Statehood Committee and upon payment of a nominal rate for their transportation by air, but no such opportunity was given to those opposed. Before we pass on Alaska statehood we should investigate conditions on the spot.

At the time such hearings are held I believe we should also study the proposal to give Alaska the right to elect its own governor. I expect to introduce a bill along that line very shortly. My bill would give Alaska all the real advantages of statehood without, at the same time, inflicting an unbearable burden of taxation on the people of the Territory. Since Alaska cannot balance its budget even now under a Territorial status, it is difficult to see how it can hope to do so under statehood.

If a subcommittee should visit Alaska in connection with this matter, I hope it will also go into the question of canceling some of the Federal reservations and opening up those resources for development. I am afraid Alaska will never be able to support statehood unless some steps are taken first toward bringing Alaska's potential resources into productive use. In my judgment that is a far more important problem than the statehood question.

LAUNCHING OF THE KFAR TRUMAN PROJECT IN BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on January 4, 1951, Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States, and Mrs. Barkley were guests of honor at a dinner marking the golden jubilee of the national Jewish fund and the launching of the Kfar Truman project in Baltimore, Md.

The project will provide a haven for 250 Jewish families with land and other necessities to establish themselves in Israel. A notable feature of the evening preceding the address by the Vice President was the presentation of a certificate stating that 1,000 trees have been planted in Israel in a group named for the late Rabbi Adolph Coblenz, of the Chizuk Amuno congregation, one of Maryland's most respected citizens.

Speaking of Israel, Mr. BARKLEY told of plans to reclaim the Negeb Desert by means of vast, costly irrigation systems, and he praised Israel as "Jewish democracy in action." As a result of several visits to Israel the Vice President is convinced that Israel is once again to become a great nation of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that an item published in the Baltimore News Post may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARKLEY SPEAKS HERE AT JEWISH FUND DINNER

(By Edgar Williams)

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY and Mrs. Barkley were guests of honor at a dinner marking the golden jubilee of the national Jewish fund and the launching here of the Kfar Truman project last night at the Lord Baltimore Hotel.

The project will provide a haven for 250 Jewish families with land and other necessaries to establish themselves in Israel and will cost $50,000. Of this total, $30,000 already has been pledged and $1,800 was collected by children.

Notable features of the evening preceding the address by the Vice President included the presentation of a certificate stating that 1,000 trees have been planted in Israel in a group named for the late Rabbi Adolph Coblenz, of Chizuk Amuno Congregation, by Mendel N. Fisher, executive director of the NJF. It was received for the congregation by Milton Fleischer.

CHORUS HEARD

The presentation was followed by several selections by the 42-voice Beth Tfiloh choral group led by Cantor Max Kotlowitz.

Introduced by Alvin Chesiock, general chairman and toastmaster, Mr. BARKLEY started in a light vein with references to his saltless diet prescribed after flying 125,000 miles making political speeches. He added:

"My wife out of loyalty to me has followed the diet. I have lost 25 pounds, but I don't want her to lose anything that I contracted for when we were married."

Becoming more serious, the Vice President said:

"There may be some in this country who want us to withdraw into a cellar whenever the winds start to blow. They seem to think we can come out when the storm has passed and find things as they were."

NOT HIS VIEW

"I'm not one who believes this.

"We can't withdraw ourselves from the world's disturbances and retain leadership."

Speaking of Israel, Mr. BARKLEY told of plans to reclaim the Negeb Desert by means of vast, costly irrigation systems and he praised Israel as "Jewish democracy in action." He declared:

"As the result of several visits, I'm convinced that Israel is once again to become a 'land flowing with milk and honey.'"

There were 700 guests at the dinner.

FOREIGN POLICY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], regarding foreign policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

During the last week of 1950 the press and radio of the Nation has offered a cloudy, contradictory, and gloomy picture of things to come. The Senator from Washington wishes to briefly quote and reflect on a small handful of recent press and radio dispatches.

On Saturday, December 30, Arthur (Bugs) Baer said:

"Just a year ago, we wrote 1950 was a brand-new mysterious year and there was frost on the crystal ball.

"If 1951 is the year we worried about in 1950 then we were as correct as white tie and tails. That one candle burned us on both ends.

"We're starting a new year. Don't let the other guy finish it."

On December 28 from Tokyo, the Associated Press stated:

"Nearly half a million Chinese and Korean Reds massed along the thirty-eighth parallel today for a big blow that may fall at any hour.

"However, the outnumbered but alert United Nations army is likely to deal the enemy a punishing blow when the Communists unleash this second invasion of South Korea.

"General MacArthur estimated the total Red at 1,350,000 men in Korea or in reserve in Manchuria.

"The United Press said Chinese troops crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in force for the first time and occupies Kaesong, 2 miles northwest of Seoul."

On the same date the same source had this to say:

"Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, new commander of the United States Eighth Army, toured part of the nervous, 150 mile allied front by jeep, as evidence mounted that the Communists, first expected to strike Christmas eve, were ready now.

"Ridgway took over the Allied ground Army Wednesday, after a brief visit with President Rhee, of the Republic of Korea, at the Presidential palace.

"'I aim to stay in Korea,' the new commander told Rhee."

From Ottawa under date of December 29 the Associated Press said this:

"Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent indicated today the Canadian Government is planning to send several fighter squadrons to Europe and said the Army's special force still may go to Korea."

This information is carried in a Daily News editorial on December 28 under the heading "The war Lie can't see."

"American casualties as of December 14 totaled 33,878. That was higher than the combined total of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the War with Mexico.

"Deaths alone numbered 5,870. By the next report that figure probably will exceed Norway's total losses in World War II.

"If these figures do not spell war to Mr. Lie, what would?"

In his speech of last Friday, John Foster Dulles was quoted in the Washington Post as concluding his statement with this:

"The United Nations if it shows that it has the requisite moral courage, should be given the right to determine the fact of aggression so as to insure the Charter goal of armed forces is being used save in the common interest. In such ways the idea of collective security can be given sensible and effective content."

From Belgrade under date of December 29 the Associated Press said this:

"Foreign Minister Edward Kardelj told the Yugoslav Parliament tonight that the world is heading for a third world war.

"He denounced Red China's intervention in Korea as 'bringing the world a step nearer to a new world war' and added:

"'Crossing the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea by Chinese troops places upon the Government of China and all those who support it a mighty responsibility before history.'

"He offered a four-point proposal for peace in Korea:

"1. A cease-fire and maintenance of the thirty-eighth parallel as dividing line between North and South Korea.

"2. Establishment of a UN commission to supervise elections for a government of a united Korea.

"3. Gradual withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the lifting of the 'blockade' of Formosa.

"4. Admission of Red China to the UN."

From Paris under date of December 29 the United Press stated:

"The National Assembly tonight approved a record 740,000,000,000 franc ($2,114,000,000) military budget for next year, including 355,000,000,000 francs ($1,014,000,000) to be spent on France's contribution to the Atlantic Pact Army. * * *

"France has barely started to build the 20-division army she promised her allies as her share in the Atlantic army and, observers feared, it will not be ready in time.

"Supported by United States arms, equipment, and credits next year totaling up to $2,400,000,000, the Government pledged to have divisions trained and equipped by the end of 1951 and the other 10 by the end of 1953.

"But so far French rearmament is mostly on paper. Aside from the budget approved today, all that France has to show in the way of concrete achievements is an increase in the length of military service, from 12 to 18 months.

"Equipment of France's existing five divisions, four of them with American arms, is going forward slowly."

From Oslo, Norway, on December 26 the Associated Press carried this story:

"Secretary General Trygve Lie declared tonight that the United Nations must not give up in Korea even though this determined stand risks involvement in a war with Communist China.

"If the UN is forced into war with China, he said, the blame will rest 'upon those who have been pulling the strings and perhaps hoping for advantages through aggression.'

"Lie, on vacation, spoke over the Norwegian State radio network. He said he had not given up hope for a peaceful solution in Korea, but added that failure of the UN to stop the attack on South Korea would mean an end to UN hopes for achieving its aims in Korea or any other place.

"He said the goal of the UN in Korea is to promote a unified free community governed by the people and to make it possible for Korea to live in peace with her neighbors."

I can give only my own interpretation and judgment of the several dispatches. From my point of view the statement by Secretary General Trygve Lie of the United Nations is deserving of the greatest emphasis and concern.

If Mr. Lie was speaking authoritatively for the United Nations I think he ought to answer some questions which are uppermost in the mind of every thoughtful American.

On the assumption that Mr. Lie knows what he is talking about and that the United Nations forces are to remain in Korea until the blood-drenched and suffering area becomes a unified free community I for one want to ask Mr. Lie this question: From what sources will armed forces be committed in Korea to carry out Mr. Lie's stated objective of forcing the aggressor out of Korea?

General MacArthur has estimated the total Red force at 1,350,000 men in Korea or in reserve in Manchuria. The best information I have concerning our United Nations strength in Korea is that it consists of about 250,000 troops. Of these about 100,000 are South Koreans and 30,000 or less have been provided by free nations other than the United States.

Unless additional troops are provided by the United Nations it is difficult to believe that our forces can drive the aggressor out of Korea. If the present United Nations forces strength remains about as it is there is reason to believe that the aggressor will continue to force the United Nations to retire if the aggressor intends to fully commit his strength.

If Mr. Lie is not able to state that additional troops will soon be provided by member states of the United Nations will he tell America and the world how he expects the free nations to drive the aggressor out of Korea?

The General Assembly is the only principal organ of the United Nations on which all 59 members are represented. In June 53 of these members voted to support a resolution which stated that the Korean aggressor must be defeated and punished. The six members who voted against this resolution were:

1. Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.
2. Czechoslovakia.
3. Poland.
4. Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.
5. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
6. Yugoslavia.

Obviously, no one expected any assistance from these nations which by their negative votes expressed some sympathy or approval for the aggressor's conduct in Korea.

Of the 53 member nations who voted to oppose the Korean aggressor only 13 members, so far as I have been able to determine, have contributed ground forces since the Korean war began in late June 1950.

All of us are familiar with the contribution which has been made to the Korean War by the United States. As of December 14, 1950, 33,878 American casualties had been suffered. As of that date 5,870 Americans had been killed in action.

I shall list the member nations which have contributed troops to the Korean War, together with the total ground forces which I have been informed each has contributed. It stands to reason that every member nation has suffered losses and the stated figures will therefore represent a larger number of allied forces than are presently available for combat.

The member nations and their contingents are as follows:

British	16,573
Australian	1,887
Philippine	1,349
Turkish	5,051
Thailand	1,521
Netherlands	873
Canadian	1,176
French	914
South African	210
New Zealand	273
Swedish	168
Indian	332

A total of these figures stands at 30,327. A resulting fact is that the number of American casualties is greater than the total ground forces contributions made by 52 member states of the United Nations.

Without much comment I wish to list the 40 nations which have thus far made no ground force contributions to the war in Korea: Afganistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel (admitted 1949), Lebanon, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

What these 40 nations have in being or available as armed forces I do not know. Perhaps Mr. Trygve Lie knows. Certainly he ought to tell us what he knows. If the United States can anticipate ground force contributions from these nations that is one thing and we could plan accordingly. If no help is to be expected from them, or if no additional contributions are to be anticipated from those 12 nations which have already committed some ground forces that is quite another thing and America ought to be advised of what the future situation is actually to be.

Mr. Trygve Lie has publicly stated that the United Nations must remain to be eventually successful in driving the aggressor from Korea. This can only be done by securing larger numbers of troops than are presently committed and no one in authority, including Mr. Lie, has given any tangible evidence of where the fighting forces are to come from.

My last assumption for the moment is that free fighting forces will somehow be found and committed in Korea and that these forces will eventually be strong enough to defeat and drive the aggressor out of Korea. I must therefore ask Mr. Lie another question. Has it been decided by the United Nations that authority will be given to the United Nations commander in chief in the field to destroy the enemy's supply sources and lines of communication even though this demands that bombings take place north of the Yalu River?

As the United Nations forces are successful and move north the problem of defeating the aggressor will become more difficult because the enemy's sources of supply will draw ever closer to his areas of combat.

Unless authority is provided to destroy the enemy's sources of supply the future problem before the United Nations forces will be no different than it was in late November 1950 when our forces were only a few short miles south of the Yalu River and the Manchurian border. Our forces were badly mangled and were required to retreat in great haste during that period because the United Nations policymakers would not authorize General MacArthur to attack the enemy's sources of supply.

If Mr. Trygve Lie, in his broadcast to the world from Oslo, Norway, on December 26, meant that additional United Nations forces would soon be committed in Korea and that the field commander in chief would be permitted and encouraged to use every military weapon and to go anywhere to destroy the enemy, one could logically assume that the possibility for a complete Korean victory would be present.

If, however, Mr. Trygve Lie meant that we shall be required to continue to fight with inadequate forces and without authority to try to destroy the enemy anywhere and everywhere, there is no possibility that the war in Korea can be won. Under these latter circumstances we can only look forward to a series of holding actions and further withdrawals, as a result of which more blood will be shed, more needlessly in a futile effort to accomplish the impossible.

A humorist is often the best qualified to define an impending tragedy. Bugs Baer certainly told us what was up when he said:

"We're starting a new year. Don't let the other guy finish it."

POSSESSION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS BY RUSSIA—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR McMAHON AND KARL T. COMPTON

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between Karl T. Compton and myself regarding the possession by Russia of atomic weapons.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1950.

Dr. KARL T. COMPTON,
Chairman of the Board, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR DOCTOR COMPTON: I understand a recent newspaper story quotes you as denying a statement made on the floor of the Senate and to the effect that you have grave doubts of Russian possession of atomic weapons.

To clear the matter up, I'd certainly be grateful for any letter which you may care to write me on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN MCMAHON,
Chairman.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
December 21, 1950.

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: This is in reply to your letter of December 14 regarding a newspaper story about my alleged grave doubts as to Russian possession of atomic weapons.

I may have made some such statement shortly after the war and perhaps in connection with some testimony before a congressional committee. In that period I certainly did not believe that Russia had yet achieved an atomic bomb. However, I have no recollection as to whether I said it at all, and, if so, where.

I certainly have made no such statement since the time when the President announced an atomic explosion in Russia. This announcement was based on evidence too definite to be disregarded.

In summary, therefore, I can only say that if I have made such a statement it was made quite a bit earlier, and any implication that such a statement applies at the present time is improper and incorrect.

Very sincerely yours,

KARL T. COMPTON,
Chairman.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY, OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, at the inauguration ceremonies held in the assembly chamber, State capitol, Albany, N. Y., on January 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN AND ARTICLE BY MIRIAM ZELLAR GROSS

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator CAIN and an article by Miriam Zellar Gross with reference to multiple sclerosis, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXCESS PROFITS TAX—DISCUSSION ON THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion on the subject Excess Profits Tax, held on the American Forum of the Air, December 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FOREIGN COMMITMENTS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Foreign Policy Debate Is Clarifying the Issue," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of December 31, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN BRAND OF DEMOCRACY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Paul F. Watkins, editor of the Herald Progress of Ashland, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE—LETTER FROM ROBERT P. PATTERSON

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Robert P. Patterson regarding the defense of Western Europe, which was published in the New York Times December 31, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION IN KOREA—EDITORIAL FROM TOPEKA (KANS.) DAILY CAPITAL

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Speak Up, America!" written by Henry A. Bubb, president of the National Savings and Loan Association, and published in the Topeka Daily Capital of December 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DO WE ABANDON ROME?—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON HOOVER SPEECH

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Do We Abandon Rome?" published in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., issue of December 30, 1950, as a reprint from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ON ORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a recent editorial published in the New York Times dealing with the recommendations of the Hoover Report on organization of Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUED ADVANCE OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORKER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the New Yorker of December 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR IN KOREA

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a soldier in Korea, contained in an editorial published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of January 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENT OF RUBBER TO RUSSIA BY GREAT BRITAIN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an International News Service Dispatch dated London, December 21, 1950, entitled "Britain Will Ship Russia $10,000,000 Worth of Rubber," which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FUNERAL DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the convention of the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association held at Bismarck, N. Dak., on May 26, 1950, on the subject of compulsory health insurance, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL WALKER NEVER DIED—POEM BY CHARLES W. LOVELAND

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "General Walker Never Died," written by Charles W. Loveland, and published in the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA'S PLAN FOR WORLD CONQUEST—ARTICLE FROM CORONET MAGAZINE

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Russia's Plan for World Conquest," written by Joseph Stalin and published in the January 1951 issue of Coronet magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to Disaster," published in the Washington Sunday Star of December 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EX-PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. SPRAGUE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It Seems to Me" written by Charles A. Sprague, and published in a recent issue of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF NICKEL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Too Much Complacency," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KOREAN SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE COOS BAY TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Moral Issue," from the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAMS REGARDING CHRISTMAS OBSERVANCE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a State Department release regarding Voice of America programs to the world on the subject of Christmas observance throughout the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM OF FOREIGN POLICY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE SAFETY OF THE NATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further requests for insertions in the RECORD or for submission of other routine matters, the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader for his action in opening the floor of the Senate for debate before the President's State of the Union message. In view of the crisis in which we find ourselves today, the President may well take longer for the preparation of his message, but certainly that should not prevent discussion of vital national issues on the floor of the Senate.

During recent years a theory has developed that there shall be no criticism of the foreign policy of the administration, that any such criticism is an attack on the unity of the Nation, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and that it sabotages any idea of a bipartisan foreign policy for the national benefit. I venture to state that this proposition is a fallacy and a very dangerous fallacy threatening the very existence of the Nation.

In very recent days we have heard appeals for unity from the administration and from its supporters. I suggest that these appeals are an attempt to cover up the past faults and failures of the administration and enable it to maintain the secrecy which has largely enveloped our foreign policy since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was a distinguished Democrat, President Woodrow Wilson, who denounced secret diplomacy and demanded open covenant openly arrived at. The administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman have repudiated that wise democratic doctrine and assumed complete authority to make in secret the most vital decisions and commit this country to the most important and dangerous obligations. As I see it, Members of Congress, and particularly Members of the Senate, have a constitutional obligation to reexamine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States. If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of the country, but even its future existence.

I may say that I hope the debate will occur on the floor of the Senate. I was invited to speak over the radio tonight following the speeches by former President Hoover and Mr. Dulles, and I declined because I felt that a statement of foreign policy by a Senator ought to be made on the floor of the Senate. I think there ought to be a continuous discussion of that policy during this session of the Senate.

Certainly when policies have been determined, unity in execution is highly desirable, and in the preparation for and the conduct of war it is essential. During recent months, the Republican minority has joined in granting to the President those powers which may be necessary to deal with the situation. We have not hesitated to pass a draft law, a law granting extensive powers of economic control, and almost unlimited appropriations for the Armed Forces. No action of the minority can be pointed to as in any way blocking or delaying the mobilization of our resources and our Armed Forces. If there has been any delay in the rearming, it has been in the administrative branch of the Government.

But it is part of our American system that basic elements of foreign policy shall be openly debated. It is said that such debate and the differences that may occur give aid and comfort to our possible enemies. I think that the value of such aid and comfort is grossly exaggerated. The only thing that can give real aid and comfort to the enemy is the adoption of a policy which plays into their hands as has our policy in the Far East. Such aid and comfort can only be prevented by frank criticism before such a policy is adopted.

Whatever the value of unity, it is also true that unity carried to unreasonable extremes can destroy a country. The Kaiser achieved unity in Germany. Hitler again achieved the same unity at the cost of freedom many years later. Mussolini achieved unity in Italy. The leaders of Japan through a method of so-called thought control achieved unity in Japan. In every case, policies adopted by these enforcers of unity led to the destruction of their own country. We have regarded ourselves as safe and a probable victor in every war. Today it is just as easy for us to adopt a false foreign policy leading to the destruction of our people as for any other nation to do so. The best safeguard against fatal error lies in continuous criticism and discussion to bring out the truth and develop the best program.

I have referred to the general tendency toward secrecy on the part of recent administrations. At Tehran and Yalta we secretly agreed to a zone of influence for Soviet Russia in Europe extending through the Baltic states and the Balkans and into the eastern zones of Austria and Germany. The result was to establish Russia in a position of power in central Europe which today threatens the liberty of Western Europe and of the United States itself. Our leaders secretly agreed to turn over control of Manchuria to Russia, and later hampered the operations of the Nationalist Government in combat against the Communists without consultation of any kind with Congress. In Germany our leaders adopted the Morgenthau plan while constantly denying that they were doing anything of the kind, and without submitting the questions in any way to Congress for discussion. The President without authority, as I pointed out in my speech on June 28, 1950, committed American troops to Korea without any consultation whatever with Congress and, in my opinion, without authority of law. He did not even tell Congress there was a war for 2 weeks after we were engaged. The President claims the right without consultation with Congress to decide whether or not we should use the atomic bomb.

We see now the beginning of an agreement to send a specified number of American troops to Europe without that question ever having been discussed in the Congress of the United States. The Atlantic Pact may have committed us to send arms to the other members of the pact, but no one ever maintained that it committed us to send many American troops to Europe. A new policy is being formulated without consulting the Congress or the people.

In other cases policies have been developed to a point where the honor of this country is committed before any serious debate by the public is permitted. Thus in the case of the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact, the programs were broached in the most general terms, then substantially advanced by the State Department through secret briefing conferences with many friendly groups and thorough indoctrination of friendly editors, columnists and commentators before they were submitted to the public or to Congress. After that if anyone dared to suggest criticisms or even a thorough debate, he was at once branded as an isolationist and a saboteur of unity and the bipartisan foreign policy.

More and more it has become customary to make agreements instead of treaties thus bypassing the power intended to be conferred on the Senate to pass on the wisdom of important principles of foreign policy. It is still fashionable to meet any criticism by cries of isolationism just as Mr. Hoover's recent speech has been treated. Criticisms are met by the calling of names rather than by intelligent debate.

I do not intend to say that a bipartisan foreign policy could not be adopted, but there has been no real bipartisan policy, at any rate since the 1948 election. It is a proper ideal and the minority will always be ready to answer any appeal for advice and cooperation. Only there cannot be a bipartisan foreign policy unless it is a policy on which both parties agree, and it is unlikely that there can be such agreement unless the administration is more inclined to give consideration to the views of the minority and to modify its own views than it has done in recent months. We certainly would be prepared to make concessions, but certainly the policy of concessions should not be a one-way street. I quite realize the difficulty of any President in consulting the minority in advance on every question of foreign policy, and I do not blame him for his failure to urge or adopt a bipartisan policy. But certainly the Republican minority cannot be attacked for failure to agree on policies on which they have not even been consulted or on policies which they may regard as detrimental to the welfare of the Nation.

The result of a general practice of secrecy in all the initial steps of foreign policy has been to deprive the Senate and Congress of the substance of the powers conferred on them by the Constitution.

We would be lacking in the fulfillment of our obligations and false to our oaths if we did not criticize policies which may lead to unnecessary war, policies which may wreck the internal economy of this country and vastly weaken our economic abilities through unsound taxation or inflation, policies which may commit us to obligations we are utterly unable to perform, and thus discredit us in the eyes of the world. Criticism and debate are essential if we are to maintain the constitutional liberties of this country and its democratic heritage. Under the present administration, at any rate, criticism and debate I think are essential to avoid danger and possible destruction of our Nation.

LIBERTY AND PEACE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD BE THE BASIC AIMS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The principal purpose of the foreign policy of the United States is to maintain the liberty of our people. Its purpose is not to reform the entire world or spread sweetness and light and economic prosperity to peoples who have lived and worked out their own salvation for centuries, according to their customs, and to the best of their ability. We do have an interest, of course, in the economic welfare of other nations and in the military strength of other nations, but only to the extent to which our assistance may reduce the probability of an attack on the freedom of our own people.

After liberty, peace must be the goal of our policy and of our leaders—more than it has been in recent years. In order to assure progress and happiness for our people, we must avoid war like poison, except when it is absolutely essential to protect our liberty. War not only produces pitiful human suffering and utter destruction of things worth while, but it actually may end our own liberty, certainly for the time being. From our experience in the last two world wars, it actually promotes dictatorship and totalitarian government throughout the world. It is almost as disastrous for the victor as for the vanquished. War is to be preferred only to the destruction of our liberty.

It seems to me most unwise ever to admit that war is inevitable until it has occurred, and it seems to me that today our policy and the thinking of too many Americans are based too much on the premise that war is inevitable. It is a possibility which we must face, and for which we must prepare, but the theory of a preventive war, so closely related to the acceptance of that thesis, is contrary to every American principle and every moral principle.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

The present situation arises out of the menace of communism and the military strength of Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia has broken every treaty. It has suppressed liberty everywhere within its zone of influence. It engineered a forcible seizure of the Government in Czechoslovakia. It promoted the military aggression of the North Koreans. It promoted the military aggression of the Chinese Communists. Those diplomats and soldiers who have had to deal with the Russians find them always unreasonable, uncompromising, and truculent. There is sufficient evidence of a determined plan to communize the entire world, which can be clearly envisioned from the writings of Lenin and Stalin, just as Hitler's intention could be found in Mein Kampf. Such a plan is evidenced by the formation of Communist organizations throughout the entire world, acting as agents for the Russian Government, and promoting the communizing of every country by propaganda and infiltration into labor unions, organizations of all kinds, and the government itself. We have seen how successful that effort has been in this country.

Does this Russian plan include a military conquest of the world, where infiltration is unsuccessful? It is now clear that it does include the use of satellite troops to attack neighboring countries in cases where such military aggression may not necessarily lead to a third world war. Up to this time, apparently, the Russians have not been willing to use their own armies in deliberate military aggression, for fear of precipitating such a war, but it is pointed out that that may be because they are not yet ready.

I myself do not see any conclusive evidence that they expect to start a war with the United States. Certainly I see no reason for a general panic on the assumption that they will do so. We have clearly notified them that any attack in Europe upon the members of the Atlantic Pact means a third world war, and we are obligated to enter such a war under the terms of the Atlantic Pact. Look at it from any point of view—and, I think, particularly from the Russian point of view—and it is difficult to see how the Russians today could reasonably entertain the hope that they can conquer the world by military action. It must seem to their thinkers an extremely difficult undertaking. I believe they are still thinking in terms of a slow but steady advance by the methods which they have used up to this time. Those methods are dangerous enough.

Since there is a greater possibility, however, of a destructive war against our liberty than we have ever faced in the past, at least since the Revolutionary War, there is no doubt that we should go just as far toward preparing for war as we can go in time of peace without weakening ourselves in the long run and destroying forever the very liberty which war is designed to protect.

The questions which our Government must decide and in which decisions the Congress and the people should have a determined and decisive voice are:

First. How far can we rely on the United Nations to maintain and restore peace?

Second. What should be our military policy in preparation for a possible attack by Russia on ourselves and our allies?

Third. Is such a policy possible for a long period of years without inflation and the loss of all liberty at home?

Fourth. How shall we convince the people of the world that liberty is a better way of life than communism can ever be?

How can we best maintain peace? The United Nations was established as the great organization to maintain peace. It has failed to do so because of fundamental defects in the Charter, defects which I have frequently pointed out. Certainly I would not advocate a withdrawal from the United Nations at this time. It does give a forum in which matters of differences can be discussed and brought out in the open. If we know what those differences are, there is some better chance for adjusting them than if grievances are built up under the surface and break out suddenly in unforeseen conflict. I supported the Charter when it was first adopted, largely on the ground that it would provide such a forum for discussion. When the Charter was before the Senate, I said:

I believe that an international organization, devoted to the maintenance of peace, to the study of possible threats to peace, and to a constant effort to solve the differences which lead to war, is an essential feature of any peace hope or peace policy. The United Nations Charter has many faults, some of which I shall discuss, but it provides without question a continuing council table at which are represented all the nations of the world, meeting constantly to solve those problems which in their opinion may endanger international peace. If the men who participate in this continuing conference are men of ability and good faith, I believe that this organization can go far toward preventing war.

But in the present crisis, where the entire world is threatened by the Communist menace, the United Nations has proved that it is not only an utterly ineffective weapon to check military aggression, but that it is actually a trap for those nations which rely upon it as an organization to secure action against aggressors.

But the defect of the United Nations lies in the fact that it was never based on law and justice to be interpreted by an impartial tribunal, but was based on a control of the world by the power of five great nations. Those who wrote the first draft of the Charter at Dumbarton Oaks did not even mention the word "justice"; and in the Charter as finally drafted, the Security Council, in deciding on means to preserve the peace, is guided solely by considerations of policy, not of justice. Obviously in such an organization, there must be a veto power; and that veto power nullifies any effective action by the United Nations. I pointed out in the debate on the Charter that the veto power changed the whole nature of the organization and reduced the United Nations organization to a consulting body. I said at that time:

All the discussion about force is of minor importance because it can never be used to solve any major crisis. * * * If the Charter had been in effect, Japan would have vetoed any action against itself on the invasion of Manchuria and of China. Italy would have vetoed any action against itself on the invasion of Ethiopia. In some ways the organization would have been less effective even than the League of Nations. The Charter could not use force if Russia were to invade Poland or seize the Dardanelles from Turkey. * * * Even attacks by satellite nations of one of the great powers might be engaged in safely if a great power had agreed in advance to exercise the veto power.

That is the end of the quotation from my speech at that time.

This prediction is borne out today by the Russian use of the veto power to prevent action against Communist China. I then said:

If one of the five great powers violates the Charter and vetoes action against its own violation, the Charter is for all practical purposes dissolved in failure.

When the North Koreans attacked it happened that Russia was boycotting the Security Council, and the resolution

calling for action against the North Korean aggression was therefore passed without dissent.

On June 28, 1950, I questioned the legality of the United Nations action, because article 27 of the Charter clearly provides that decisions of the Security Council on all matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members. There was no concurring vote by Russia, but we overrode this objection without considering how it might be raised against us in the future. Furthermore, we took this action without considering the fact that, if the Chinese Communists attacked and the Russian representative returned to the Security Council, the United Nations could not follow up its action against the Korean Communists by similar action against Chinese Communists. If the Russians had planned it that way, they could not have done better. Did they perhaps arrange the North Korean attack when they were boycotting the United Nations, so that the United Nations might take an abortive action? Did they deliberately ignore the point I have just made relating to affirmative votes, knowing that they could later block action against China? We were sucked into the Korean War, as a representative of the United Nations, by a delusion as to a power which never has existed under the Charter.

We have vainly tried to bypass the limitations on the power of the Security Council by asking for action by the General Assembly. Under the Charter, this body was never intended to have any power to call on governments for action, or do more than recommend. It would be most unwise for us to build up any such power in the General Assembly. No nation has contracted to abide by any decision of the General Assembly. There is no obligation to comply with its recommendations. Furthermore, we would only have one vote among 60, which sometime in the future, even in the very near future, may be inconvenient for us. Certainly this does not excuse the failure of the Assembly to denounce the Chinese Communists as aggressors. Their failure repudiates the very basic theory of the Charter. But action taken by them today would have only moral effect.

Those who are blaming the United Nations should much more blame the limitations of the Charter and our own Government for forcing United Nations action beyond its permanent power to perform.

May I point out again, also, that the President incorrectly assumed that the United Nations was an operating organization, with power to call on us for troops which we could supply. As a matter of fact, he had no authority whatever to commit American troops to Korea without consulting Congress and without congressional approval. He could not commit our Armed Forces to support the United Nations under the very terms and provisions of the act which was passed by Congress to implement the United Nations Charter, for that act only recognized the commitment of troops in the event of the negotiation of a special military agreement with the Security Council "which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by an appropriate act or joint resolution." The Russians have prevented the conclusion of any such agreement. Congress has therefore never acted. The President simply usurped authority, in violation of the laws and the Constitution, when he sent troops to Korea to carry out the resolution of the United Nations in an undeclared war. It may now be argued, of course, that Congress by appropriating money for additional Korean action has ratified the act, but the war was on, and we had no choice but to back up wholeheartedly the boys who were fighting in Korea. The calamity into which we have been drawn, and which has resulted in almost as many American casualties as the First World War, arose out of the unwarranted assumption that the United Nations was an operating organization, as we would have liked to see it, when as a matter of fact it was a hopeless weapon against aggression from the beginning.

I have suggested that we ought to formulate the amendments which would create an ideal organization, insist upon a full discussion of those amendments, and, if they are finally blocked by Soviet Russia, bring about the dissolution of the United Nations and the formation of a new organization which could be an effective weapon for peace. But for the present we can only make use of the United Nations as best we may, as a diplomatic weapon, and through it we may hope perhaps that more friendly relations can be established with Russia. But as far as military policy is concerned, I see no choice except to disregard the United Nations and to develop our own military policy and our own policy of alliances without regard to the nonexistent power of the United Nations to prevent aggression.

What then should be our military policy in preparation for a possible attack by Russia on ourselves or on our allies? Our first consideration must be the defense of America. Whatever one may feel about the action of the United States in other parts of the world, no matter how much of an internationalist a man may be, he must recognize that this country is the citadel of the free world. The defense of the United States itself is, of course, the first goal of our own people, essential to protect our liberty; but it is just as important to the rest of the world that this country be not destroyed, for its destruction would mean an end to liberty everywhere and to the hope of restoring liberty where it has been lost. It seems obvious that the immediate problem of defending this country depends upon control of the sea and control of the air.

There is no question that we have the largest Navy in the world, and certainly, while the British are our allies, complete control of the sea throughout the world, except as it may be hampered by Russian submarines. We have a powerful Air Force, but it seems to me vitally necessary that that Air Force be increased until we have control of the air over this country and over the oceans which surround our continent. It should be capable of expansion in time of war to secure as great control as possible over the rest of the world and over the enemy country. With our resources and with Great Britain as an ally, that is not impossible. By the end of the last war, we had practically complete control of the air over Germany and Japan, and it was the decisive factor in the winning of the war. Not only is the Air Force necessary for defense of America, but it is the one weapon which can damage the enemy bases from which air attacks upon us can be made, and which can drop atom bombs where they may be decisive.

Whether war can be ended by air power alone may be open to question, but certainly sea and air power can achieve a complete protection while other forces are being developed to meet whatever goals may seem to be desirable in a third world war. Of course, an army of reasonable size has a place in the defense of the American Continent. A land army is also necessary for the defense of air bases, further defense of islands near the continental shores, and for such occasional extensions of action into Europe or Asia as promise success in selected areas. But it need not be anything like as large an army as would be necessary for a land war on the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia.

The fact that the Air Force has deteriorated is due solely to the shortsightedness of this administration and the Pentagon policy which in substance refused any increase in Air Force unless corresponding increases occurred in the Army and Navy. The Eightieth Congress in 1947 set up a congressional Aviation Policy Board. This Board reported to the Congress on March 4, 1948, recommending a 70-group Air Force as a prerequisite for national security. A Citizens Advisory Commission set up by the President under Mr. Finletter also recommended a 70-group Air Force. The Eightieth Congress in the supplemental defense appropriation bill of 1948 provided for such a force and the Air Force increased from 55 groups in June 1948 to 59 groups in December 1948. On December 31, 1948, however, a Presidential directive required the Air Force to be cut to 48 groups. In 1949 the Eighty-first Congress provided for a build-up of the Air Force to 58 groups again, 10 more than recommended by the President, but the President when he signed the fiscal 1950 Military Appropriation Act directed the Secretary of Defense to place in reserve the amounts provided by the Congress for increasing the structure of the Air Force. The amount impounded by direction of the President totaled $775,450,000.

On October 5, 1949, I wrote:

> The possession of the bomb by Russia emphasizes above everything else the necessity of building up an all-powerful air force. The only possible defense is a complete control of the air. If there is ever a third world war, it will be won by the nation who can most completely dominate the air. We should build up our own Air Force again to 70 groups. We must constantly improve our Air Force and our air defense.

But until the Korean War, the President still insisted on holding the Air Force to 48 groups. Now the increase is to be balanced by an even larger increase in the land forces.

Not only is an all-powerful air force the best possible defense for the United States, but it is also the greatest deterrent to war. Winston Churchill has said that the American possession of the atomic bomb and the possibility of using it in an attack on Russia is the greatest possible deterrent to Russian aggression. It seems to me this must be true. The Russians are not going to be deterred by land armies until they are built up to a point threatening aggression against Russia or its satellites, and they can always attack before that point is reached. They know that the destruction of their principal industrial developments by atomic bombs may make it infinitely more difficult for them to succeed in any war. Every consideration, therefore, of American defense, and also of the insurance of peace, depends upon the development of an air force more efficient and more effective than the world has ever seen.

A superiority in air and sea forces throughout the world can achieve other purposes than mere defense. It can furnish effective assistance to all those nations which desire to maintain their freedom on the continent. It can achieve a balance of power under which more peaceful relations throughout the world can constantly be developed.

While defense of this country is our first consideration, I do not agree with those who think we can completely abandon the rest of the world and rely solely upon the defense of this continent. In fact, the very thesis of an effective control of sea and air by the free nations requires that we do interest ourselves in Europe and the Near East and India and the Far East, so that Communist influence may not extend to areas from which it is still possible to exclude it by many methods other than land armies. Of course, Mr. Hoover's recent speech was completely misrepresented by the administration press in this regard. He did not advocate retirement to the American continent. He only urged that emphasis be placed on our defense of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, as it should be, particularly if all of our allies should abandon us.

It seems to me that our battle against communism is in fact a world-wide battle and must be fought on the world stage. What I object to is undertaking to fight that battle primarily on the vast land areas of the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia where we are at the greatest possible disadvantage in a war with Russia. The first principle of military strategy is not to fight on the enemy's chosen battleground where he has his greatest strength. We could not have a better lesson than has been taught us in Korea. We cannot possibly transport enough men and equipment to overcome the vast manpower supplied by the teeming millions of Russia and of China. Where there is complete disregard for human life, even the best weapons and equipment will fail to overcome that disadvantage in manpower.

Our position is not greatly unlike that of Great Britain, which dominated much of the world for a period of 200 years, and brought about the balanced peace of the last half of the nineteenth century. The British had control of the seas and met every challenge to that control. There was no question of air power. They seldom committed any considerable number of British land troops to continental warfare, and when they did so they were by no means successful. Marlborough fought very largely with mercenary troops and the troops of his allies. Napoleon was finally defeated by a combination of many nations which did not contain more than 20 percent of British troops. Yet, control of the seas enabled the British in many places to develop power on the land, as in India. They supported one group in such countries against others, and gave strong support to their friends. They established garrisons at strategic points where sea power could protect them. It was the sea power of Britain which gave Britain a powerful influence on the Continent of Europe itself. It seems to me that by reasonable alliance with Britain, France, Holland, Australia, and Canada the control of sea and air can establish a power which never can be challenged by Russia and which can protect Europe as it has been protected now for 5 years through fear of what sea and air power can accomplish against Russia. There is no need for a specific line of defense, but we can exercise a power for peace over a vast area. If the Russians realize that that power cannot be challenged, and can do real damage to their own nation with the atomic bomb and otherwise, their purpose of military aggression may well wither, and gradually peaceful relations in Europe may grow again. The desire of human beings for peace and comfort and normal human relations is a powerful force which will constantly reassert itself.

I do not believe that this sea and air power should be used for aggressive purposes, but I do believe it should be available to assist those nations which ask for assistance to defend themselves against Communist aggression, to the extent that such power can be successfully and effectively used. We must not undertake anything beyond our power, as we have in Korea. We must not assume obligations by treaty or otherwise which require any extensive use of American land forces. In the first place, we should be willing to assist with sea and air forces any island nations which desire our help. Among those islands are Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand; on the Atlantic side, Great Britain, of course.

Japan is a special case. It seems to me we should at once make a treaty with Japan and then declare peace with Japan by joint resolution. Such a treaty should provide for assistance from the United States in the air and on the sea, with proper bases, and temporarily perhaps with a few divisions on land until the Japanese can create their own land army for defensive purposes.

I believe the policy would also involve the support of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and the providing of arms and other assistance which might enable him to defend himself and contest with the Chinese Communists in China itself at least until peace is made with them. It is ridiculous to talk about avoiding a war with Communist China when such a war already exists. When American boys are being killed by Chinese armies, and Peiping announces that they are fighting the United States and trying to destroy American forces, we might as well have a declared war. It would untie the hands of our military commanders, and force the return of some of their army to China. The operations of Chiang's army and the free Chinese on the mainland should be a real hindrance to the occupation of southeast Asia by Communist armies. In fact, it would seem to be the only hope. Such a war certainly need not involve the invasion of China by American armies, or cost us one more man, or one more dollar, than the present war in Korea. In fact, it would cost us much less.

I do not know enough about the military situation to know whether we can maintain our position in Korea, but certainly we should not jeopardize our Army there to the extent of risking its destruction. It is far better to fall back to a defensible position in Japan and Formosa than to maintain a Korean position which would surely be indefensible in any third world war.

There may be some question as to the ability of a sea and air power to defend islands in reasonably close proximity to the coast as are Formosa and Japan. Sea power there is seriously limited by submarines and mines, but we should make every possible effort to establish the ability of our Navy and Air Force to prevent any landing across 100 miles of salt water.

The power of great sea and air forces is not necessarily limited to island nations. The policy I suggest certainly would not abandon to Communist conquest the continental nations. In the first place, we may give economic assistance to many such nations providing they really want that assistance. We can give arms as we are bound to do under the Atlantic Pact, and as we are now doing in Indochina, in Greece, and in Turkey.

There are some places where it may even be wise to commit some land troops if we can see a reasonable chance of success. Korea does not seem to be such an area, but the entire continent of Africa is connected with Asia, and certainly we should assist in defending the Suez Canal as a means of maintaining our connections by sea, and northern Africa where we hold valuable air bases. It may be possible to assist Spain. I should suppose that Singapore and the Malay peninsula could be defended by land troops if sea and air power is available on both sides of the peninsula. The extension of such aid by land troops, however, is a dangerous experiment as we found in Korea. I doubt if we should enter into any commitments in advance, or undertake the job at all unless we are sure it is well within our capacity, and almost certain of success.

The greatest question of policy before the country and before this Congress, however, relates to our undertakings in Europe. Under the general principles I have laid down, I would say that we had better commit no American troops to the European continent at this time. Some modification is required in that theory because, first, we are now occupying Germany with the obligations growing out of the Second World War, and second we have made certain promises under the Atlantic Pact, which we are bound to carry out.

It might be well first to consider just what our obligations are under the Atlantic Pact. One thing seems certain. There is no legal obligation to send American land soldiers to Europe.

Article 5 of the treaty reads:

> The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

By its terms this article clearly leaves us free to determine what action we deem necessary. In other words, we are obligated to go to war with Russia if it attacks any of the Atlantic Pact nations, but we certainly are free to determine how we shall fight that war. A council is set up by article 9 which is to recommend measures for the implementation of article 5, but we are certainly not bound to accept any such recommendations.

In July 1949, on the floor of the Senate, it was even argued that the pact did not obligate us to provide arms and equipment for the parties to the pact. It seemed to me, however, that if we ratified the pact we were morally obligated to provide such equipment—and that is why I voted against it—in view of the promises made by the State Department in connection with the signing of the pact. The amount of this equipment, however, was not to be extensive and certainly it was based on a very large contribution by the other parties to their defense. On the bill implementing the pact the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said:

> So I am sure the Senator from Maryland agrees that, in the final analysis, the great strength and authority of the North Atlantic Pact is, not in article 3, but in article 5, which is a general notification to any potential aggressor that if he does aggress upon the North Atlantic community, he will confront all the resources of 300,000,000 people to guarantee his defeat.
>
> Mr. TYDINGS. I agree thoroughly with the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan severely limited even our contributions for arms. He explained in the debate on the bill implementing the pact that the over-all assistance was only $1,100,000,000, to be paid out at the rate of $500,000,000 a year. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made it clear that the pact did not obligate us to send a land army to Europe. He said:

> This bill does not provide, as has been said by some persons, that we are rearming Western Europe. Western Europe will spend $5 or $6 for each dollar contributed by the United States. Let me point out that we are not increasing by this aid the number of armed men in the armies of the North Atlantic Pact nations. We are simply undertaking to modernize their existing armies which they themselves raise by aiding them in obtaining equipment, munitions, and supplies. But we are not sending a single soldier to any of those countries for combat purposes, nor are we insisting that they increase the size of their armed forces.

So it can be seen that what is being talked about today is something entirely different from what was being considered when we adopted the Atlantic Pact.

In his appearances before the Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Acheson denied that we were obligated to send troops or even extensive aid in equipment. He said:

> It is not proposed to increase the establishments beyond what is already provided in their budgets.

Now we are urging that they triple and quadruple their budgets. I quote further:

> This assistance has to do with the provision of more effective and better rounded equipment for those forces. The European nations will do the great bulk of this equipping themselves. They will enter into—in fact they already have devised the basis of—agreements by which they will help one another get equipment.
>
> So far as the pact countries are concerned, United States assistance will be somewhere between one-sixth and one-seventh of the total effort which will go into military efforts in Europe. We will provide, as is stated in the statement, approximately $1,130,000,000 for the pact countries.

Now we are talking about providing, in addition, 25 percent of all the foot soldiers involved in the European defense army.

In committee Secretary Acheson was asked the direct question by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]:

> I believe you said earlier in your testimony today that it was contemplated that a great portion of the armament, or the developed armament, of Western Europe, in the nations of this pact, would be carried under their own weight. I presume that that refers also to the manpower in their armies. I am interested in getting the answers as to whether or not we are expected to supply substantial numbers—by that, I do not mean a thousand or two, or 500, or anything of that kind, but very substantial numbers—of troops and troop organizations, of American troops, to implement the land power of Western Europe prior to aggression.
>
> Is that contemplated under article 3, where we agree to maintain and develop the collective capacity to resist? In other words, are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?
>
> Secretary ACHESON. The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "No."

Since the sponsors of the treaty backed by the State Department took this position, they can hardly contend now that we have any obligation under the Atlantic Pact to send American soldiers to Europe. We did have warning at the time of the Atlantic Pact that the military authorities in the Pentagon regarded the pact as leading toward a land war with Russia and American troops in Europe. I pointed out in opposing the pact that we were headed in this direction. I said:

> It is one thing to agree to go to war with Russia if it attacks Western Europe. It is another to send American ground troops to defend Norway or Denmark or Holland or Italy, or even France and England. I cannot assert positively that we are committing ourselves to a particular type of war, but I am inclined to think that we are. Thus General Bradley testified before the committee:
>
> "Finally, after studied appraisal of the future security provisions for our country, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in unanimous agreement that our strategy, in case we are attacked must rely on sufficient integrated forces of land, sea, and air power to carry the war back to the aggressor, ultimately subjugating the sources of his military and industrial power. Plans for the common defense of the existing free world must provide for the security of Western Europe without abandoning these countries to the terrors of another enemy occupation. Only upon that premise can nations closest to the frontiers be expected to stake their fortunes with ours in the common defense."

This appears to contemplate a land war with Russia on the continent of Europe. It appears to contemplate later an invasion along the lines which Napoleon and Hitler found to be impossible. It implies that the nations which signed this pact expect us to send American troops to defend their frontiers.

But it was only our military planners who discussed sending American land troops to Europe. Responsible officials of the Government absolutely repudiated any idea that the Atlantic Pact contemplated any such aid. If the President in his conference with Mr. Attlee, or Secretary Acheson at Brussels, has undertaken to commit the United States to any such assistance before or during a war they are usurping the authority given by law and their program should be submitted to Congress for consideration before we become obligated. The President has no power to agree to send American troops to fight in Europe in a war between the members of the Atlantic Pact and Soviet Russia. Without authority he involved us in the Korean War. Without authority he apparently is now attempting to adopt a similar policy in Europe. This matter must be debated and determined by Congress and by the people of this country if we are to maintain any of our constitutional freedoms. I note that, at his press conference yesterday, the President asserted that he had the right to send additional troops to Europe. Technically, of course, he can send troops to occupied Germany as long as the war status is in effect. But, in fact, no more troops are needed for the occupation of Germany. In fact those already there are a heavy burden on the German people. Also we hope that soon the war status may be ended by resolution. If the President has any technical right to send American troops to Europe, certainly Congress by resolution, such as the Coudert resolution, or

by restriction in the appropriation bill providing the divisions required, may finally determine the policy to be pursued.

My own views on the general policy of the Atlantic Pact were clearly stated in a speech which I made on the Senate floor on July 11, 1949, in opposing the ratification of that treaty. It has now become an obligation of this country and the situation is therefore somewhat changed. We have two divisions in Germany. If Russia attacks, we will be in the war. We would be obligated to be in the war if Russia attacked any member of the Atlantic Pact. But I do not think we should force our assistance on nations which do not wish to arm themselves. I do not think we should insist or even urge that the European nations form a great international army unless they request us to help them in that project. I do not think we should assume the leadership in the formation of a great international army by the appointment of an American commander in chief. General Eisenhower is going to Europe to look into the wisdom of this project, and I hope he explores every aspect of such a commitment. If we do so, we will be called upon constantly to increase our contributions to this army, and it will be very embarrassing to decline, because we shall be the sponsor of the entire project. On the other hand, if these nations really do desire to build up their own arms, and do so with our assistance, which we are obligated to give, and if the time comes when they see the need of and demand a coordinated defense, and if it appears at that time that that defense has a reasonable chance of success, I should not object to committing some limited number of American divisions to work with them in the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact. Such a program, however, never ought to be a key point in our over-all military strategy. And the initiative should be theirs and not ours.

The course which we are pursuing will make war more likely. If this great international force which we envision is gradually built up, the Russians for a while will gradually increase their strength, but it seems obvious that if they think the Allies are gaining on them too rapidly, they can always begin the war. However defensive and pacific our intentions, to them the building up of this force must look like aggression when it is completed. Someone has invented the theory that the Russians have a particular timetable under which they were at one time looking to attack in 1955. Then the makers of timetables moved the time up to 1952, and now they have moved it up to 1951.

I know of no evidence for any such conclusion. If they have an intention to attack, they will obviously attack before the Atlantic Pact forces are built up, and it will take at least 3 years to build them up. Why should they wait? If they have no intention to attack, then we do not need the armed forces, at least in such coordinated form and in such close proximity to Russia as to seem to threaten an attack on them.

Furthermore, I am most concerned about the danger and difficulty of committing our greatest efforts to a great land war on the continent of Europe against Russia. Neither Napoleon nor Hitler was ever able finally to defeat Russia on land, although they had more men than we are now planning, certainly in comparison to the number of Russians then available. If we send to Europe or promise to send within a few weeks of the beginning of the war, say a million and a half men, there is at least a reasonable chance that that army may be destroyed and may never return to this country. They will certainly be outnumbered, as they are in Korea. Their defense against Russian hordes apparently depends on the development of new weapons which are still untested. Even then a modern war cannot be won by remaining on the defensive, even behind a Maginot line of bazookas.

Furthermore, do we not risk the loss of every man we send to Europe? If we have to spend $3,000,000,000 building air shelters in this country to protect our people and cities against Russian atom bombs, then surely there is danger that the Russians can destroy all of the ports of the Continent which we may be using. They may prevent the landing of our troops, and the furnishing of adequate supplies. They may make even a Dunkerque impossible. One atom bomb at Hungnam might have destroyed the entire American force which escaped from there. The entire facilities of escape, as well as the men themselves, might well have been destroyed by a single such bomb.

Is such a military policy possible for any period of years without inflation and the loss of liberty at home?

I believe that it is possible for us to maintain our economy if we pursue the air and sea strategy I have outlined. Apparently, 700,000 men apiece for the Navy and Air Force would provide a most powerful sea and air defense. I must admit I am guessing as to the figures because they have been presented most indefinitely to the Armed Services Committee, but it is at least suggested in the hearings that $10,000,000,000 a year would take care of the current operations of these two forces plus about $10,000,000,000 a year in new equipment. This equipment bill might decrease after several years when the forces reach their full strength. To this $20,000,000,000 must be added another $20,000,000,000 for the Army even if we hold that Army to approximately a million and a half men. The total expense of $40,000,000,000 a year for military purposes plus domestic expenditures and aid to foreign nations might hold the entire expenditures of the Federal Government within $65,000,000,000. It is possible, in my opinion, to develop taxes which will ultimately meet that bill.

However, those who are thinking of our policy in terms of an American Army in Europe and a war there with Russia propose a much larger increase in the Army. The program is entirely indefinite at this moment, but I have heard talk of having as many as 4,500,000 men under arms, which would mean a land army of 3,000,000 men. If we are going to try to put a million and a half or 2,000,000 men in Europe or available for transportation to Europe within a few weeks of Russian attack, this may not be unreasonable. But it would certainly increase the Armed Forces bill by another $20,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000 a year. That money would have to be borrowed and we would be perpetually on a deficit basis. I do not believe it is possible to prevent inflation with an annual deficit of $20,000,000,000.

Even with the smaller bill, price and wage controls will probably be necessary and they may be effective to stabilize prices if we are balancing the budget and not creating inflation, but even controls cannot prevent inflation and decrease in the value of the dollar if we permit such a tremendous deficit through an increase in Army expense for any considerable number of years.

Furthermore, the larger the Army with very little to do, the more difficult it will be to maintain its morale. Before Pearl Harbor the morale of our Army was exceedingly low, with frequent desertions and a complete lack of understanding of the necessity for keeping numbers of boys in camp. Russia could desire nothing more than an indefinite condition of economic weakness and inflation, with millions of men taken out of productive work and the inevitable dissatisfaction which will result in turning the United States into a garrison state.

Incidentally, no matter what the program may be, there are certain principles which I think should be impressed on our Army officials. Is it necessary for this country to provide from sixty to seventy thousand men in uniform and half as many more civilians in order to put a division of 18,000 men in the field? Every day industry is creating improvements to increase the efficiency per man of the American population. Every day our inventors are saving manpower. Is not the Army wasting a vast amount of manpower in its operations? Does any other country use as many men to get war power into the front lines? Could we not provide twice as many divisions at the front with the same number of men? Every Senator hears daily, stories of the waste in Army procurement and in the methods by which that procurement is carried out. This whole problem has become of infinitely greater importance than it ever has been before, because we undoubtedly face a long period of heavy militarization such as we have never faced in the history of this country. It should be made the subject of intensive study by men who have had some experience in industrial operations.

Under any program, the American people are going to be called on for vast sacrifices. Nearly every boy of 19 is going to be drafted for 2 years' military service. Tremendous taxes will be imposed which will reduce the income and standard of living of every American citizen. Surely, they have the right to insist upon a program as economical as it can be made to accomplish the purposes on which I hope we may all agree.

The key to all the problems before this Congress lies in the size of our military budget. That determines the taxes to be levied. It determines the number of boys to be drafted. It is likely to de-

termine whether we can maintain a reasonably free system and the value of our dollar, or whether we are to be weakened by inflation and choked by Government controls which inevitably tend to become more arbitrary and unreasonable.

How shall we convince the people of the world that liberty is a better way of life than communism can ever be?

Before the advent of communism the best method of showing the benefits of liberty was to set an example by our own policies. Under a free system we have brought about in this country the greatest production, the greatest productivity per person, and the highest standard of living the world has ever seen. Generally speaking, we have successfully maintained liberty and equality for the individual.

But communism has introduced a new spirit of aggression into the world. It has inspired fanatical zeal in its advocates. It has adopted a combination of deceit, propaganda, and strong-arm methods, which has spread its control over hundreds of millions of men and over many countries. Now we are forced to use the same methods which communism has adopted, even if we do not like those methods, or be swept away. I have outlined the military preparation which I think necessary. I have supported aid to foreign countries in order that they might more successfully combat the attacks of communism. But I also believe we should adopt aggressive methods of propaganda. We have something to sell. Liberty has always been a more appealing philosophy to the people of the world than totalitarian communism can ever be. We have to convince ourselves first that we really believe in the benefits of liberty, but if we do that we have all the arguments and all the results to point to. If we are sufficiently intelligent and understand the thinking of other people, we should be able to win the battle against communism in the minds of men, by setting up an organization to win the appeal against communism.

Finally, I believe we should use the same methods of infiltration as have the Russians. We need a much more effective intelligence force. We need to study the methods by which those millions who yearn for liberty in satellite countries may be organized to seize power wherever they have the support of their fellow citizens. We can back Chiang Kai-shek in his operations in China among the free Chinese and the underground. Today, so far as I can see, there is no central agency anywhere to organize the lovers of freedom throughout the world, and keep in communication with them and their programs; no over-all direction of the appeal against communism.

CONCLUSION

The threat of communism is real. Those who are directing its affairs are brilliant and unprincipled. America must be the leader in the battle to prevent the spread of communism and preserve the liberty of the world. In the field of military operations our strongest position is in the air and on the sea, and we should not attempt to be also a controlling power on the land. We should not be a military aggressor or give the impression of military aggression or incite a war which might otherwise never occur. Operations on the continents of Europe and Asia, if any, should be undertaken only with the greatest care and under careful limitation. We must not so extend ourselves as to threaten economic collapse or inflation, for a productive and free America is the last bastion of liberty.

And finally the policy we adopt must be approved by Congress and the people after full and free discussion. The commitment of a land army to Europe is a program never approved by Congress, into which we should not drift. The policy of secret executive agreements has brought us to danger and disaster. It threatens the liberties of our people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to be permitted to say first that the Senator from Ohio has made a characteristically able speech, and I join with him in the hope that this may be a preface to a thorough discussion of foreign policy. I believe the President has the constitutional power, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, to send troops to the continent of Europe. I believe that under the Constitution, since the power of Congress being limited to a declaration of war, the President can take steps to resist aggression. I developed this point at length on July 5 of last year. But I think this issue is so important that it is necessary to clear the air and to have the various alternatives discussed, and I hope very much that the Senate and, if possible, the House of Representatives, may come to some clear conclusion. So while I agree with much that the Senator has said and disagree with a good deal also, I wish to say that I think he deserves to be congratulated for raising the issue and for pitching the debate on so high a level.

Having said that, I hope I may in good temper and in good spirit be permitted to ask the Senator a series of questions on what I believe to be the fundamental sequence of his arguments.

Am I correct in assuming that the Senator from Ohio is saying in effect that we should not commit ourselves to appreciable land forces in either Europe or Asia, but should instead hold island bases off those continents from which we can launch air attacks as a deterrent to land attacks by Russia and its satellites, and as a protection for those continents if such land attacks take place?

Mr. TAFT. I certainly would not contemplate air attacks unless we were involved in war some place. If we were at war, yes, I would say that such bases should be used where they are. We would not have a great many bases, I imagine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, the Senator would favor island bases for Asia and for Europe, from which, if a military movement by the Chinese Communists in Asia or by the German or Russian Communists in Europe took place, he would then have our Air Force take action?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, if we are at war. If Russia should attack any member of the Atlantic Pact, we would be at war, and I certainly would advocate air attacks upon Russia in that case. I suggest that we might just as well be at war with the Chinese Communists today. We read only yesterday an article by a well-informed columnist, in which he stated that the Communists are almost certain to attack Indochina tomorrow, or within a short period of time. If so, is it not better to be at war and try to have the Chinese Nationalist forces divert the Chinese Reds from the attempt to conquer Southeast Asia and possibly the islands beyond?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator from Ohio to say, if an attack is launched against Western Europe, France, or the countries of Western Europe, by the German Communists or the Russian Communists or by some combination, that we should be obligated to help defend those countries?

Mr. TAFT. We would be obligated to declare war on Russia, as I see it. As to how such a war should be fought ought to be a question of strategy at that time. Once we are involved with Russia we are involved everywhere. It might be found that land forces would be required. I do not think we ought to commit ourselves to do that to a greater extent than I suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Senator places his chief reliance upon deterrent or retaliatory bombing from island bases or from the continent of Europe? I have the text of his speech here, and that is the only inference we can draw from page 11.

Mr. TAFT. So far as our part in a war with Russia is concerned it would be largely conducted by sea and air.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to the Senator's speech, that is true.

Mr. TAFT. There may be various ways in which that can be done. Bombing would probably be the most effective way. I would not bar the sending of troops to Europe if that should prove at the time to be a feasible project with some hope of success. My doubt about it is more as to the practicability of today building up an international army for Europe, since the Russians would be able to overwhelm it at any time during its 3 years of preparation whenever they decided it would be too much of a menace to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio: Is it not true that Korea has pretty well demonstrated that an aggressive land army cannot be turned back by air power alone? There is no question that in Korea we have had complete dominance of the air thus far, but the Chinese Communists have broken our lines once and, as we debate, are apparently going to do so again?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is quite true. I do not think that bombing is going to stop an army. I opposed the President's suggestion of bombing the Chinese Communists, because I do not think it is true that an atom bomb is an effective tactical

weapon against an army in the field. All that can be done is to weaken them by destroying their bases and communications and industrial potential. The Russian potential is not too great in any event, and we can hamper them so that other countries who are defending themselves can have a better chance of success.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it not follow from the Senator's statement that, if continental Europe does not build up a sufficient army to check the Communists on the ground, our threat of bombing from the air will certainly not stop the Communist armies if they start to move in Europe?

Mr. TAFT. Once war is declared it will not stop the Communist armies, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And will not the Communist armies therefore sweep through completely to the English Channel?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think there would be any difference if we have 10 American divisions there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is something else.

Mr. TAFT. It is not something else again. It is exactly the question the Senator is asking. I am saying that the commitment of American troops will not substantially change that situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am pointing out that the Senator would depend upon island bases to keep the Communists off if they are going to be kept off; and I presume that the Senator is chiefly referring to the British Isles as air bases.

Mr. TAFT. There are other places; such as Africa, Turkey, and other areas of the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. But if the Communists were to sweep through to the Atlantic Ocean, does the Senator suppose England could be kept as an air base from which we could operate? What about rocket bombs, guided missiles, and air attacks by the Russians themselves? How could we hold those bases? Would not we need air bases from which to launch aerial attacks?

Mr. TAFT. My suggestion to the Senator is—as he will observe if he will read my speech—that we do not have the power to control the air and the sea and also the land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We will if we have under arms 3,000,000 men, as proposed by the Senator, that will not be sufficient. But a 6,000,000 force plus the rearmament of Europe would give us a much better chance.

Mr. TAFT. From the area I have indicated we could best operate against the Russians, if we were involved in war against them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again I wish to point out that domination of the air does not stop a strong land attack.

Mr. TAFT. Of course not—it will not stop the attack.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If a land attack reached the English Channel, it would tend to cause the loss of the very bases upon which we would depend in connection with such aerial strength as we might develop.

Mr. TAFT. With all due respect to the Senator, let me point out that the question is a practical one. I should like to ask the Senator or anyone else, Why on earth should the Russians let us build up in Europe a vast army which would be a threat to them, when in the meantime the Russians are free to do whatever they wish to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the Senator's contention that we should not arm at all, lest we offend the power which has superiority at the moment? That would keep us in a continued position of inferiority.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Atlantic Pact was a tremendous mistake. In my opinion, it could at least be interpreted as an aggressive move. It seems to me the Atlantic Pact and the present program, if carried out, create the greatest probability of war that could be created by any measure we could undertake.

The European nations themselves do not seem to feel that the Russians contemplate making an attack. As the European nations recover their strength, no doubt they will gradually build up their own military forces to a point where they will be effective. I suggest that at that time we could add further to what we may have done before that time.

I have not excluded the possibility of our giving them some assistance. I think the Atlantic Pact has involved us in a certain obligation which I do not desire to repudiate. However, we must consider the practical possibilities in this situation. We must consider the fact that this particular policy assumes, first, that the Russians want to attack Western Europe. If that assumption is correct, they are not going to wait until this great army is built up. Why should they wait? If they have decided to attack Europe, why should not they attack before the army is built up? It will take 3 or 4 years to build it up. If we do not want to face the possibility of Communist invasion the Senator has outlined, it can only be by assuming that the Russians are not desirous of attacking Western Europe. On that assumption, these countries can gradually develop their strength.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Ohio does rely on that assumption and I submit it is a very dangerous one to make.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand the Senator's speech, he is opposed to a preventive war; and on that point I completely agree with him.

Furthermore, I understand that the Senator proposes complete reliance on our air and sea power. Is it not correct that if we stand idly by and allow the Russians to attack Western Europe and to reach the sea, as it may very well be the Russians have the power to do, they would immediately have both an industrial potential at least equal to our own; and a shipbuilding potential, in the event they took over England, as they undoubtedly would be able to do if they reached the Channel; and a potential in the building of planes, using the productive power of France, of Italy, of England, and possibly of Germany, at least equal to our own?

It would seem to me that we would be completely surrendering any possibility of protecting ourselves, even if we remained isolated in this country.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I wish to deny the premise that we stand idly by. We have not been doing any standing idly by. We have given billions of dollars' worth of economic aid in order that the countries of Western Europe can build up their industrial potential. We have given them billions of dollars, and are preparing to give billions of dollars more, for arms aid, to enable those countries to protect themselves. After all, there are 225,000,000 people in Western Europe—50 percent more than we have in the United States. We are helping them to defend themselves. They have more extra manpower than we have in the United States today.

I have only raised the question of whether we should commit an American land army to Europe.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must request the occupants of the galleries to refrain from making any demonstration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for another question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair inform the occupants of the galleries that they are the guests of the Senate. If they insist on continuing such demonstration, I ask the Chair to direct that the galleries be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will certainly do so, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona, and must emphasize the fact that order must be maintained.

The Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Continuing the question of the junior Senator from New York, is it not true that on a standard basis of measuring steel production, our capacity for producing steel, when taken at the lower figure, is approximately 97,000,000 tons a year; that of Soviet Russia and her satellites is approximately 35,000,000 tons a year; and that of Western Europe, when we consider its capacity, is approximately 62,000,000 tons a year. These figures are substantially correct. Therefore, so long as Western Europe is in combination with the United States, the free world can surpass Russia in the capacity for producing the most essential military and industrial element, and can do so at the rate of about 4 to 1. But if Western Europe should fall under Russian control, 35,000,000 tons plus 62,000,000 tons will equal the 97,000,000 tons which constitute our total capacity. In that event, on the basis of current steel-production capacity, the totalitarian world will be on terms of equality with ourselves?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to answer?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was going to suggest that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is not giving attention to the air power which the Senator from Ohio has said will destroy those plants in Western Europe.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree that we do not want the Russians to take over the productive capacity of Western Europe, either in steel or in anything else. However, where would the Senator have the line to be defended? The best information I have is that for us to try to defend the line of the Elbe is almost impossible, and that therefore we would have to defend the Rhine. That means that we would have to abandon the Ruhr to the Russians. They already have Silesia. What would we do about it if we stood on the Rhine? We could bomb Essen and the Ruhr to prevent the production of steel there; but we could do that without being on the Rhine; we could do that from England or from Africa or from other places besides France and the Rhineland.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that our Air Force in the last war could have completely destroyed the Krupp Works and the other munitions works in Germany, had they been permitted to do so?

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, they did destroy the Krupp Works, because I visited there after the war, and there was only one small building left in the corner of it. They were not destroyed as early as they might have been.

However, it seems clear to me that the entire question is one of practicability: If the Russians today have the determination to conquer Western Europe which the Senator assumes, why should not they do so tomorrow or the next day? Why should they wait until we provide a great many land troops? That is something I cannot understand.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not have any idea whether Russia is going to wait or is not going to wait; but it seems to me that the theory enunciated by the Senator from Ohio is an extremely dangerous one.

I would repeat the question which was propounded by the Senator from Illinois: If it be true that the initiative lies completely with Russia, then why should we take any steps or any means whatever to strengthen either our allies abroad or ourselves?

Mr. TAFT. Is it not evident that neither England nor France is eager for this tremendous international army? Is not that a perfectly obvious fact? Is it not evident that those countries do not think there is going to be a Russian attack on them? Is it not true today that the idea of a Russian attack is much less accepted there than it is in the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I answer that question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not true that France, England, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg are confused when they hear speeches made by a former President of the United States, seeking to prohibit the shipment of a single dollar or a single man, until the Western European countries erect a sure dam against aggression?

Mr. TAFT. That is not my interpretation of the former President's speech.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is the statement. I have quoted it, I believe, substantially verbatim. What possible incentive have the people of the countries of Western Europe to defend themselves with all their power, when they know that there is a school of thought in this country—which I pray God will never prevail—that we should withhold all support from them, either material support or support in the way of human resources?

Mr. TAFT. Those countries are the ones who have held back, because, as I understand, our Government for more than a year has been pressing for an agreement of the kind that was contemplated in the Atlantic Pact, and they have dragged their feet. They have not been eager to enter into such an agreement. Ours is the country that has been trying to make them move. It seems to me this is their affair. The chief point of my speech was that, in any such program, they must take the initiative. They ought to take the initiative. If they do not feel so strongly about it, then there must be some good reason why they feel as they do; and it seems to me perfectly obvious that we have no business going over there and trying to draw a large number of people into a great military program which, in my opinion, is almost certain to produce war, if it actually develops in any large or effective way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the statement made by the Senator from Illinois and other Senators, questioning the effectiveness of air power, and citing as an example the situation in Korea, is it not correct, in the Senator's judgment, that the responsible commanders of the United Nations forces in Korea have had their hands tied, so that they could not make effective use of the air power in striking at the arsenals, the depots, and troop-concentration points from which the reinforcements and supplies are being poured into Korea from Manchuria? They have been operating under those conditions, with an arm tied behind the back. So the situation in Korea cannot be correctly interpreted as showing a lack of the effectiveness of air power, if properly used.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I may say I think it doubtful whether air power can stop the actual physical advance of an army across a front of 200 miles; but unquestionably it can weaken the whole background of such an army. It can weaken it; it can destroy the plants which make the weapons; it can stop all the communications. The Air Force was a very effective element against the North Koreans so long as we could bomb their connections with Communist China in Korea, but, of course, the fact that we are not in a war with Communist China—supposedly—has prevented the use of air power against Communist China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator will permit, as part of his remarks in this colloquy, my placing in the RECORD the official report to the United Nations Security Council, made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, on the 6th day of November 1950, in which he cites a long series of aggressions by the Chinese Communists, which started on the 22d of August, when antiaircraft batteries north of the Yalu River fired on the American planes which were flying south of the Yalu River in support of the United Nations resolution; going through to the 16th of October, when the first Communist aggressive forces from Red China were definitely identified in Korea; and down through the 4th of November, which was a day preceding the time he sent his report to the Security Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTE DATED NOVEMBER 6, 1950, FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TRANSMITTING A SPECIAL REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 5, 1950, FROM THE UNITED NATIONS COMMAND IN KOREA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF JULY 7, 1950

The representative of the United States to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honor to refer to paragraph 6 of the resolution of the Security Council of July 7, 1950, requesting the United States to provide the Security Council with reports, as appropriate, on the course of action taken under the United Nations command.

In compliance with this resolution, there is enclosed herewith, for circulation to the members of the Security Council, a special report dated November 5, 1950, from the United Nations command operations in Korea.

Following is text of special report from commanding general United Nations command:

"I herewith submit a special report of the United Nations command operations in Korea which I believe should be brought to the attention of the United Nations."

INTRODUCTION

"The United Nations forces in Korea are continuing their drive to the north and their efforts to destroy further the effectiveness of the enemy as a fighting force are proving successful. However, presently in certain areas of Korea, the United Nations forces are meeting a new foe. It is apparent to our fighting forces, and our intelligence agencies have confirmed the fact, that the United Nations are presently in hostile contact with Chinese Communist military units deployed for action against the forces of the united command.

"The fact of intervention:

"Hereafter, in summary form, are confirmed intelligence reports substantiating the

fact that forces other than Korean are resisting our efforts to carry out the resolutions of the United Nations:

"A. August 22: Approximately 50 bursts heavy antiaircraft fire from Manchurian side of Yalu River against RB–29 flying at 7,000 feet over Korea in the vicinity of the Sui-Ho Reservoir; damage, none; time, 1600 K.; weather, 10 miles visibility, high broken clouds.

"B. August 24: Approximately 40 bursts heavy antiaircraft fire from Manchurian side of Yalu River against RB–29 flying at 10,000 feet over Korea in the vicinity of Sinuiju; damage, none; time, 1500 K.; weather, 20 miles visibility.

"C. October 15: Antiaircraft fire from the Manchurian side of Yalu River against a flight of four F–51's flying near the Sinuiju airfield on the Korean side of the river; damage, one aircraft total loss; time, 1445 I.; weather, overcast at 8,000 feet; 8 to 10 miles visibility.

"D. October 16: The Three Hundred and Seventieth Regiment of the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Division of the Chinese Communist Forty-second Army, consisting of approximately 2,500 troops, crossed the Yalu River (Korean border) at Wan Po Jin, and proceeded to the area of Chosen and Fusen Dams in North Korea where they came in contact with UN forces approximately 40 miles north of Hamhung.

"E. October 17: Approximately 15 bursts heavy antiaircraft fire from Manchurian side of Yalu River against RB–29 flying at 10,000 feet over Korea in the vicinity of Sinuiju; damage, none; time, 1200 I.; weather, 8 miles visibility, low clouds 2,300 feet.

"F. October 20: A Chinese Communist task force known as the Fifty-sixth unit consisting of approximately 5,000 troops crossed the Yalu River (Korean border) at Antung and deployed to positions in Korea south of the Sui-Ho Dam. A captured Chinese Communist soldier of this task force states that his group was organized out of the regular Chinese Communist Fortieth Army stationed at Antung, Manchuria.

"G. November 1: A flight of F–51's was attacked early in the afternoon by 6 to 9 jet aircraft which flew across the Yalu River into Manchuria. No damage was done to United States aircraft. A red star was observed on the top of the right wing on one of the jet aircraft.

"H. November 1: Antiaircraft fire from the Manchurian side of the Yalu River directed against a flight of 13 F–80 aircraft was observed in the vicinity of Sinuiju at 1345 hours. This resulted in the total loss of one United Nations aircraft.

"I. October 30: Interrogation of 19 Chinese prisoners of war identified two additional regiments of One Hundred and Twenty-fourth CCF Division and the Three Hundred and Seventy-first and the Three Hundred and Seventy-second in the vicinity of Changjin.

"J. November 2: Interrogation of prisoners of war indicates the Fifty-fourth CCF unit in Korea. This unit is reported to have same organization as Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth units, but to be drawn from the One Hundred and Twelfth, One Hundred and Thirteenth and One Hundred and Fourteenth Divisions of the Thirty-eighth CCF Army.

"K. November 3: Further interrogation of Chinese prisoners of war indicates Fifty-sixth CCF unit organized from elements of One Hundred and Eighteenth, One Hundred and Nineteenth and One Hundred and Twentieth CCF Divisions of the Fortieth CCF Army.

"L. November 4: As of this date, a total of 35 CCF prisoners had been taken in Korea.

"The continued employment of Chinese Communist forces in Korea and the hostile attitude assumed by such forces, either inside or outside Korea, are matters which it is incumbent upon me to bring at once to the attention of the UN."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would ask the Senator from Ohio whether he believes, in addition to the fact that air power has not yet been effectively used in the Korean theater, whether he believes that we have used sea power effectively, when for a period from the 24th day of June, when the North Korean aggression took place, down to the time when it was demonstrated that the Chinese Communist forces were definitely involved in the Korean episode, we have permitted, day after day, month in and month out, shipments of strategic war supplies into the port cities of Shanghai, Tsingtao, and other ports, which supplies have come not only from Hong Kong, not only from the Middle East, but also from the United States of America? If the United Nations had been alert to this aggression from Red China, as they very properly were concerned with the aggression across the thirty-eighth parallel, would not an effective use of sea power brought about an immediate sea blockade so as to prevent the Chinese Communists from getting oil and equipment with which to try to destroy our forces in Korea?

Mr. TAFT. I think without question a more effective use of sea and air power could have been made, had we not been deluded by the idea that the United Nations was doing something. That is the thing which put us in a weak spot. That is the thing which today prevents our waging war on Communist China, namely, that we are acting only as representatives of the United Nations. I suggest we simply must abandon that theory. We have to engage in our own wars when we think we should engage in them, and not at other times.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before I ask a question I should like to say that the dragging of the feet of the western European countries was not, as I believe, properly described as such. They were in disagreement as to the part the Germans would play, as the Senator well knows, and the French, in view of their history, I think might have some reason to question German participation. I, myself, for my own part, did not agree with the French, though I can understand why they would be nervous about that point. But it is my understanding that generally the French and the British and the Italians, insofar as they are permitted to express an opinion, being under a rather different situation, were in favor of the creation of a land army. The main question I wanted to ask the Senator was this: Did I correctly understand that under his approach to the problem, if Russia moved by land army—which he says we could not stop by air power—and occupied Western Europe, he would then feel that it would at that time be necessary for us, ourselves, to destroy the steel-making capacity of Western Europe, in order to prevent the Russians from making use of it?

Mr. TAFT. We would undoubtedly do so. For example, consider that today we are destroying the port of Inchon, after having made such effective use of it yesterday. Anything that helps the enemy in war is destroyed, there is no question about that. We would, of course, first try to destroy Russian sources of production before destroying the things which they might acquire from other sources. But let me ask the Senator, supposing this land army is set up in Europe, where is the line of defense? So far as I can ascertain from the best military authority, it would probably be the Rhine. To begin with, why would the Germans be interested in a defense on the Rhine? And if we defend the Rhine, the Russians take over all the rest of Germany. It is very difficult to define the line of the Elbe and Czechoslovakia and Austria to the Danube.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would agree with the Senator that any line is difficult to defend. This whole situation is a very difficult one. However, I think that the policy which the Senator has expressed is very startling, in that we would have Western Europe looking to the possibility of being destroyed, if not by the Russians through their own occupation, by us, in order to prevent it. I think it is a very shocking thing for the Europeans to realize that we are willing to contemplate their destruction.

Mr. TAFT. They surely realize it, because that is what happened to Korea. We have saved Korea at the expense of the destruction of every city in Korea and the killing of an infinite number of Korean civilians. I do not believe that we are so welcome in Korea today, and I do not believe we shall be so welcome in Europe tomorrow, if war ever occurs, and if we are the main instigators of the war, or actively cooperating in a war on European soil in which European cities are being destroyed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not agree with the Senator at this point. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Illinois in saying that I think the Senator from Ohio is entirely correct in raising these questions in his own speech, which was devoted to principles and not personalities, and I congratulate him on his original speech. However, the Senator from Ohio has also stated that he does not know, as no one knows, what is in the mind of the Kremlin. I believe we will have to assume that those in the Kremlin are planning to advance over Europe, and we have a reasonable, legitimate right, along with the western Europeans, to build an adequate defense for ourselves.

I realize we are dealing with things which there is no way to prove ahead of time. But I believe that for the future of our own country, and for the moral standing of the United States not only before western Europeans, but before all the other peoples of the world, South Americans and everyone else, we must take the position that we will undertake

to build a legitimate defense line in Western Europe. Otherwise, the effects would be disastrous to all free people.

Mr. TAFT. The startling thing is not the position I have taken, for what I have stated has been my position on the question we are discussing for the past 2 years, but that we suddenly find ourselves swept into a policy of sending millions of American troops to Europe without any consideration whatever by the people of the Nation as to whether they want to do anything of the kind. That should be the startling thing.

Of course it is proper for me to raise the question. The question is whether we are to drift into a policy or be swept into a policy which is contrary to everything we have done heretofore, and is in no way implied in the Atlantic Pact, and are to be swept into it without even a discussion. I have been complimented by the Senator for raising the issue. It seems to me it is the duty of every Senator to raise the issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I was making was that the approach of the Senator is entirely different from the attacks of some of our colleagues, which have been devoted, not to the issues involved, but entirely to the personalities of the men involved. That was the real point I was trying to make.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator misunderstood the significance of that particular point.

Coming back to the issue which I think is the central one, so far as I know we have not made any positive commitment as to troops. That is what we are in the process of trying to determine now, in this debate, and in speeches which have already been made by Mr. Hoover and others. The debate is already in progress. I merely desire to make my position clear that I do not agree that, certainly at this point, we should adopt a policy which would prohibit our sending any assistance to Europe, whether it be joined in with and dependent upon assistance which may be forthcoming from other nations.

In other words, in order to illustrate what I mean, suppose the Europeans say, "We are quite willing to raise 50 divisions, but we think you ought to raise 15 or 20."

Mr. TAFT. I do not know whether or not I would be in favor of prohibiting the sending of troops to Europe. I did not go that far. I merely say that Congress should decide how many we are to send, just as when we entered into the United Nations Charter we were very careful to provide expressly that the President could not send troops to help the United Nations except after agreements made, to be approved by the Congress, specifying the number of troops. That was in the United Nations Charter, and that is proper. That is the principle which should apply to the sending of troops to Europe under the Atlantic Pact. It ought to be done, if at all, only under an agreement which meets the approval of the Congress of the United States. I suggest, however, that if that is done it should be limited to something more in the nature of a token force than a leading, key part of an international army.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand the Senator to feel that we should not send a land army to Europe. I thought that was his point.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that we have a few divisions there, and I would not object to having a few more if we got to the point where it was practical, if the other nations would cooperate, so that we would not sacrifice our boys if the Russians attacked the next day. That was my point.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has been on his feet for some time, and I now yield to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Ohio a few questions, but before doing so I wish to say to him that I think he has delivered the most able address that has been made to date in the presentation of the point of view that we should place our major reliance upon the naval and air defense of the country, rather than upon the use of ground troops abroad. Although I do not share the point of view that is set forth in his major emphasis and major thesis, nevertheless I respect his point of view and his great sincerity in expressing it. I agree with him that it is the duty of every Member of this body to make his position clear in this historic debate. But I do desire to say that I believe the Senator from Ohio has made the most objective and enlightened contribution to the debate on his side of the issue that has been made to date. I disagree with the position he has taken in respect to the implementing of the North Atlantic Pact.

I have some questions in regard to certain assumptions which I think are inherent in the Senator's speech, about which I should like to carry on a brief colloquy with him. The first question goes to the assumption whether the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon would be right if we assumed that Russia to date has given much indication that she intends eventually to take over Europe. Does the Senator from Ohio share that point of view?

Mr. TAFT. I share the point of view that they intend to take it over by Communist infiltration and persuasion. Assuming something I trust will not happen, assuming they took Germany and swept the opposing armies back to the borders of France, I suggest that Russia would stop, that in all probability they would rely on France turning Communist by itself, and that they would probably rely on making some sort of trade arrangements with British socialism, to which Soviet Russia may not object. I doubt very much if Russia would attack France or Britain in a military way.

Answering the Senator's question, I do not believe it is at all clear that the Russians contemplate a military conquest of the world. In the first place, I believe they know it is impossible. It would take them at least a hundred years to build up their sea power so as to enable them to get across the seas. I do not believe they even contemplate a military aggression with their own soldiers against the other nations. In fact, I would not be surprised, if they ever take over Germany, to see them attempt to do it with satellite troops, rather than with the Russian Army.

Mr. MORSE. Then the Senator thinks that Russian conquest of Europe would be by infiltration, if it could be successful, and that it would be doubtful, if she failed by infiltration, that she would proceed militarily?

Mr. TAFT. I am getting into a field which is so largely speculation that I would hesitate to make any statement; but I have stated the direction of the opinion which I entertain.

Mr. MORSE. I know it is in the field of speculation, but from the standpoint of American military policy, we are going to have to speculate as to which of two courses of action Russia may take. I think Russia intends a military defeat of the United States if she can take over Europe.

My next question is, Assuming that Russia should take over Europe either way, by infiltration or by military conquest, does the Senator from Ohio believe that after the conquest of Europe by Russia, America would be in a more weakened position in the world than she would be in if the freedom of Europe could be preserved?

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree with the Senator in his implication, but it seems to me that what is being proposed is not a practical policy. I do not believe it would prevent the calamities which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Ohio think that there is still a possibility of checking Russian expansion in Europe if we make clear to the Kremlin that we intend to resist Russian expansion in Europe?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it makes very much difference to the Russians whether we have troops in Europe. Frankly, if we made it clear to them that we were going to help Europeans in every way and that we would go to war if Russia attacked the European countries, it would be as big a deterrent as if we added 10 divisions of troops. I do not think our military participation would deter the Russians. In fact, I think it is a little more likely that it would induce them to start another war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is the point I wanted to dwell on in a moment. If we are wise in trying to check Russian expansion by whatever means we adopt, whether it be by means of the Senator's proposal or by means of a proposal by those of us who do not agree fully with the Senator, the time element becomes very important. In that connection I recall that the Senator from Ohio several times raised the question: What is stopping the Russians from proceeding now? If she intends to attack Europe, what is stopping her now? I ask the Senator whether he thinks the great advantage we have over Russia in our stockpile of atomic bombs may be in part what is stopping her from moving now.

Mr. TAFT. It may be a part of the explanation, but I do not think it is the only explanation, or that it is sufficient.

After all, we can make atomic bombs faster than the Russians can make them.

Mr. MORSE. As of now.

Mr. TAFT. We can make them faster than the Russians as of now and as of any time. Certainly we would always be able to outproduce them and to outdo them. Our industrial capacity is greater, and we can move quicker and more efficiently.

Mr. MORSE. But would that not depend on the fortunes of war?

Mr. TAFT. The Russians may have waited until they had the atomic bomb, but I think they will be deterred no matter how many bombs they have. I think the deterrent of our power to bomb Russia will be just as effective.

Mr. MORSE. Would that not depend on the fortunes of war? I refer particularly to the fact that in the early stages of the war they could perhaps destroy our capacity to manufacture bombs.

Mr. TAFT. We should have as good a chance to destroy the Russian capacity to manufacture as they would to destroy the manufacture of bombs in the United States. Our airplanes can fly farther than their airplanes. We should keep ahead of them in every way, including the manufacture of bombs.

Mr. MORSE. I hope that is true, particularly with reference to our air power, but there is beginning to be some doubt about it, it seems to me. However, let us assume that it is true. Does the Senator agree with me that Russia at least will try to take Europe by infiltration? I think she will try it. I think she will try to take Europe by conquest if she fails to take it by infiltration as soon as she feels strong enough and Europe is weak enough. However, did not the Senator overlook the danger of an unfavorable reaction on the part of the free peoples of Europe, if we should take the position that we will rely chiefly on our Navy and Air Force, and will look to them to do all the bleeding on the ground?

Mr. TAFT. I think that has always been the fact. It is not so helpful to them, but neither might the sending of an army to Europe be helpful to them in the end, anymore than it has been helpful in Korea.

Mr. MORSE. Keeping in mind the danger of infiltration, which I think is a real danger, and the apparent hesitancy on the part of some of the European countries to adopt an all-out defense program because they are uncertain as to what we will do and because they fear we will not send in troops to help them if they are attacked, it becomes clear to me that we go through with implementing the North Atlantic Pact including some manpower aid. I think some manpower aid under Eisenhower's command is the best evidence we can give them of our determination to see through with them this contest with communism. I ask the Senator if he does not think that to join manpower with them on a reasonable basis under the North Atlantic Pact is not better rather than to say to them, "We will use only the Navy and Air Force, in the first stages, at least, and leave the dying on the ground for the populations of your countries, and much of that dying caused by our bombs"?

Mr. TAFT. For the past 4 years we have been proceeding on the theory that what we must meet in Europe is Russian infiltration, with which the Senator is concerned. We adopted the Marshall plan with that in mind. I supported economic aid to Europe. I believe such economic aid has helped to build up France and Italy, and has made it possible for them to stand up against communism. I am quite prepared to do anything else which would assist in that general field. So far as Italy is concerned, I think we shall have to continue Marshall-plan aid. That was the whole basis of the Marshall plan, and that whole basis is wiped out the moment we say Russia is going to make a military attack on the European nations.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If we are to proceed now on the basis of a military attack, we have wasted our money under the Marshall plan, because Russia will simply move forward and take over in Europe.

The sending of American soldiers to Europe is a new concept. It is true that one of the reasons I made some concession in sending troops to a limited extent is that once a subject such as that is discussed, it is in a way assumed to be a fact, then to back out causes a bad moral effect. I am willing to go along to some extent because, for one reason, I do not like to give that impression. If the subject had never been mentioned, I do not think there would be any criticism of our not sending troops to Europe. However, the subject has now been discussed, and if we do not send any at all I think it may hurt morale.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator said in referring to the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, he took exactly the same position at the time the North Atlantic Fact was debated as he takes this afternoon. I think the Senator will recall that at the time of the debate on the North Atlantic Pact he and I engaged in a colloquy, along with several other Senators. At that time the junior Senator from Oregon agreed with the Senator from Ohio that the moral obligations of the pact carried along with them the military implementation of the pact. I never agreed with the former Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, when he said on the floor of the Senate that the pact would not carry along with it the clear moral obligation to implement it militarily.

Mr. TAFT. With equipment, that is.

Mr. MORSE. With equipment and with men.

Mr. TAFT. That question practically never arose. Except for the one statement by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I could not find anywhere in the debate any suggestion or thought that we were being committed to send soldiers to Europe; and the Senator from Texas denied any commitment.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to go over the RECORD at a later time and discuss the subject further with the Senator from Ohio. The junior Senator from Oregon took the position that the Atlantic Pact carried along with it the clear moral obligation to stand together with the countries of Europe in case of an attack on any one of them by Russia.

Mr. TAFT. I will add to my statement. I did not mean to say that if an attack were made on Europe by Russia that we would not send troops to Europe. What I insisted on was that, if that time should ever come, we should have complete freedom to fight the war as we wanted to fight it. In the light of the great changes in military tactics and practices we should not tie our hands to fight a particular kind of war in a particular way, such as sending soldiers to Europe.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to be accurate and fair in referring to some assumptions which I think the Senator from Ohio has made in his address today. I think an assumption he made is to the effect that we could not, under the Atlantic Pact, if we fully implemented it, as is contemplated under the Brussels discussion, check the Russians from a military conquest of Europe. That is different from saying that we can march to Moscow. I think there is a serious doubt about the assumption of the Senator from Ohio that we could not check a Russian advance over Europe if we were properly to implement the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. TAFT. I think that possibly after 3 or 4 years of building up our Armed Forces we could do it. I wondered why the Russians should allow us to do it.

Mr. MORSE. My reply to the Senator is that I think there is every evidence that the reason is that they know that if they attack now they would become involved in an atomic war. I am satisfied that they are not ready to fight an atomic war now. They are afraid of the tremendous devastation which would occur to Russia, if they attacked Europe now. That is why I think the next 2 or 3 years are precious and important in bringing about an implementation of the North Atlantic Pact on the ground, because if we do not take advantage of our opportunity, in 3 or 4 years we may not have superiority in atomic bombs.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with the Senator. I do not think the Russians are being held back today simply because they do not have enough atomic bombs. That seems to me to be an improbable explanation, although I cannot deny it absolutely.

Mr. MORSE. If I may ask the Senator from Ohio one more question, I agree with him that so-called executive agreements which involve foreign commitments must be brought to an end. I think the President of the United States has the good-faith responsibility to the people of the United States to submit proposed commitments or understandings to Congress for approval in advance of entering into them, because in my opinion, every time the President enters into such an agreement, in view of present world conditions, he circumvents the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution with respect to treaties, because such an agreement amounts to an alliance and is in effect a treaty.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. In the light of that agreement with the Senator from Ohio, I should like to ask him another question. Does not the Senator from Ohio believe, turning to Asia for a moment, that so far as China and the United States are concerned, the leaders of Communist China consider themselves at war with the United States?

Mr. TAFT. They do. I do not think they talk about the United Nations. I think they represent to their people in their propaganda and their broadcasting that it is the American aggressor against whom they are directing their armies.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator agree with me that we should proceed, through our Chief Executive and the State Department, to an immediate understanding with our allies in the United Nations as to what their position is concerning United Nations treatment of Communist China, which today is killing American boys by the thousands?

Mr. TAFT. I think so. However, I still feel that regardless of what we do about the United Nations, we should not now change our military policy, whatever it may be, because of some reliance on what the United Nations may do.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator from Vermont was first on his feet.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it strikes me that at this moment, under the intelligent initiative of the senior Senator from Ohio, we are witnessing the beginning of one of the great historic debates in the Senate. I should like to make a suggestion, if I may, to the leaders on the Democratic side as well as the leaders on the Republican side, that after the President has delivered his message, this debate be regularized in what is perhaps a new way. I suggest that a unanimous-consent agreement be reached between the leaders on both sides of the aisle so as to allow an adequate amount of time, not for the discussion of some particular measure, but for the discussion of the foreign policy of the United States. I suggest that this debate be conducted under the leadership of two Senators from opposite sides of the aisle, representing opposing points of view, with time restricted and allocated in the same way that it is done when we are approaching a vote on a given measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question along the lines of the questions asked by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for the thoroughness and ableness of his speech.

Secondly, I entirely agree with him that we should have open debate on the subject, and that the President should not go ahead and do things by executive authority when the subjects with which he deals should properly be considered by the Congress.

The Senator from Ohio has said that he agrees that we would be weaker if Europe were taken over by the Communists, either by infiltration or by conquest. The Senator emphasizes the importance of sea and air power. It seems to me that the entire basis of the discussion has been rather on a pessimistic note—that Europe will probably be taken over unless we put extensive manpower into Europe.

I agree that Europe cannot be defended by us if the Europeans will not defend themselves. But at the present time must we not give them the spirit and feeling that we are going to support them, if they are necessary and helpful to us in the long run and to our way of life here? Must we not give them, by whatever means is within our power, the feeling that we are going to help them in the present situation if they are willing really to help themselves?

Mr. TAFT. Have we not already done so? What is the difference, so far as morale is concerned, between promising 5 divisions and promising 20 divisions? If we promise 5, it will be said that that is not enough, that we must furnish 20 divisions to uphold their morale—or 30 or 40 divisions. We could go on indefinitely. We started by aiding them economically. Then we proceeded to aid them with arms. Now it is proposed that we aid them with men, in order to uphold their morale. Where are we to stop? I have tried to suggest a place where I think we must stop. I have suggested that there is a limitation on the number of men we can hold in a permanent land army in this country. There is a limit to the economic strength we have to support such an army. There is even a limit to the will of the people to support such an army. If we impose a limit, we cannot commit the entire American Army to Europe. If we are to have an army of 1,500,000 men, we cannot undertake to commit them all to Europe, and we ought not to commit any very large part of them to Europe, in my opinion, and leave none for our own defense or for other sections of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not better to make perfectly clear to Europe what we are willing to do, and call upon the Europeans to add sufficient of their own forces to give us the feeling that they mean business, rather than to give them the feeling that they cannot count on any assistance from us on the ground? Is it not better to make clear what we are willing to do, within reasonable limits?

Mr. TAFT. I have not suggested that the Europeans cannot count on any assistance. I have suggested that there should be some assistance, provided the program is practical, and that we would not be merely sacrificing a large number of American boys. I dislike to send many more divisions to Europe. At the present moment there are no divisions to send, so we shall not have the problem for some time to come; but I do not think we ought to promise to send them when we have them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We cannot afford to be anything but practical. We must not make promises which we cannot keep. I entirely agree with that position. As I understand the Senator from Ohio, he believes that we should be practical in our aid and make clear what aid we can give over a long period of time, and that we should make perfectly evident to the people of Europe what we will do, and then see what they will do.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to assume the initiative. If the Europeans want this help, I think they ought to come and ask us for it. I think they ought to assume the job of making up the international army and come to us and say, "We would like to have you provide so many divisions." I think we make a mistake in butting into Europe and assuming the leadership of the entire European community, particularly when it is to a large extent beyond our power.

One of the things which I have tried to emphasize is that the initiative ought to come from the Europeans. We ought not be pushing them every minute to build up their military budget and build up a great army against Russia, we will say, whether for defense or for attack.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question along that line?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I see it, we are all agreed that what we must do is to protect our country and our way of life. We must take the initiative for that objective. Is it not fair to ask, How far does that initiative go outside the limits of this country?

Mr. TAFT. Surely it is a question of degree; but it certainly seems to me that we should not assume the initiative in this particular project in Europe. That is why I dislike the idea of having an American commander in chief of such an army as is finally set up. Then it will be the Americans who will be leading. Our action will be represented as American aggression. We shall be constantly called upon for more and more troops, because we are the ones who are pushing the project. That is one of the difficulties.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree that we must take whatever practical steps are necessary to defend our own country to the best of our ability?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So it is a question of degree, really, as to how far to go—a question of degree with respect to initiative, and a question of degree with respect to what is practical in going forward outside this country. It becomes a question of how to be most practical in the defense of our country.

Mr. TAFT. It is a question of how much we can do, and whether what we are proposing to do is going to be effective, or will lead only to the sacrifice of a large number of American boys. There are a dozen questions to determine, among which is the question of how large a permanent army we can maintain for 5 or 10 years. That is a serious problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree entirely with the Senator that when we are dealing with the practical question of how to go about our own self-defense in this country and in Europe, we should have

the fullest debate and should have the fullest information from the executive department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like all those who have interrupted the Senator from Ohio, I wish to express my own personal appreciation that he has initiated this debate upon a high plane. I should like to say, however, that there were two assumptions, it seems to me, implicit in his address which, so far as I know, are not borne out by any facts which have been revealed to me. The Senator seems to assume that we are preparing to form a huge land army to send to Europe to defend European nations who are unwilling to defend themselves. I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. No; with due respect to the Senator, I will say I have assumed always that if we send an army to Europe, there will be some agreement on the part of other nations to provide troops, too. I would not assume that they are not willing to defend themselves. I say they do not seem to be eager to rush out and increase their military forces themselves, and that shows perhaps that the whole program was not so necessary as we thought it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator then wishes to be understood as not indicating a belief that there is any present plan to raise a huge land army of American boys to be sent into Europe, there to be the victims of Communist aggression?

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that the program is very vague, I must say. But I have heard as many as 20 divisions mentioned. If we are going to try to maintain 20 divisions in Europe, we will need for that purpose, as I figure it, about 1,000,000 men under arms for that purpose alone, without anything to do with the rest of the world or garrisoning this country. So it looks to me as if it involves a pretty heavy land army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the Senator himself has just said, that is a vague conclusion. Of course, there have been suggestions of various kinds. But I want to tell the Senator and the Senate, and make the record here, that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I have interrogated all the leading officials of the Department of Defense from Secretary of Defense Marshall down, before the Committee on Appropriations, and I can say that I definitely did not receive from any of them in response to my questions, some of which were on the record and some of which were off the record, any impression that there is any plan to raise an army of American boys to defend a Europe which was unwilling or unable to defend itself.

I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio—and I have stated this over and over again upon the floor of the Senate—that we ought to depend upon the most complete development of our Air Force, the most complete development of our submarine forces, and of our antisubmarine vessels. We ought to understand clearly that we cannot by any possibility compete in manpower with Soviet Russia and its satellites, the people of which the Russian dictators seem to be willing to use as cannon fodder. I know of no respectable opinion in the Government which wishes to commit American boys to any such futile effort as that.

It ought to be understood that if we are deficient in air power—and I am ready to say now that we still have the best air force in the world in spite of the fact that the Russians have been building up—if we have not built up our air and naval power as it should have been built up, it is not possible to attempt to place the blame without remembering how ready so many of us were ready only a short time ago to economize at the expense of military power. There was widespread hope for early peace through the United Nations, and a great desire to cut the cost of Government.

I have in my hand, Mr. President, the report of the Hoover Commission on National Security Organization, which was made to the Congress of the United States in February 1949. From page 11 I read these two paragraphs:

> The present budget of the Armed Forces represents about $100 per capita for the Nation as contrasted with some two and one-fourth dollars before the First World War. Our task force reports that the current preliminary budget estimates of the three military departments for the fiscal year 1950 were for more than $30,000,000,000.
>
> Such a budget—

The Hoover Commission went on—

> would be justifiable only if the Nation were actually involved in war. It would require a sharp reduction in production from civilian consumption, precipitate the needs for controls over the economy, and enormously increase inflationary pressure. It reflects a lack of realistic understanding by the three military departments of the economic and social factors of national security.

The conclusions which are expressed there in the Hoover Commission report as to the effect of high expenditures are perfectly correct. An appropriation of $30,000,000,000 for defense would produce inflationary pressures and would require controls. But at that time the desire for economy in Federal expenditures was so great that even though the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, was seeking to increase the Air Force and modernize the Navy, the great pressure for economy throughout the United States was such that Mr. Forrestal was compelled to take his budget back. It was reduced from $30,000,000,000 to $24,000,000,000, then to $18,000,000,000, and then, as I recall, to about twelve and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Wyoming suggests that the Army says they are not contemplating sending any troops, but I call his attention to the fact that before we heard of the Korean War the Army had not the slightest intention of sending any soldiers to Korea. That was done overnight without even notifying the Congress that it was being done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was done through the United Nations, under the United Nations organization, and the action was applauded on this floor.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know what the program is going to be, but I see it coming; and all I want to do is to raise this question and have the issue debated before we get ourselves so committed that our hands in Congress are practically tied.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy, indeed, that the Senator has opened the debate upon that plane. We all want a factual discussion. I do not want to commit American boys to warfare in Europe because I do not believe we can begin to compete with the manpower of the masses who are under the domination of the Kremlin, and we should not attempt to do so.

I call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that it is not of the present year alone or of last year that we were slow to realize what technological improvement and technological defense are. I remember very well when as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate at the beginning of World War II the then Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, was definitely of the opinion that our air forces were strong enough, though we had practically no air force at all. At the suggestion of the Secretary of War, the Appropriations Committee refused to adopt an amendment which I offered in the committee, to make an increased appropriation for building up our air power. I took that amendment to the floor of the Senate. I was pleased when the Senate adopted the amendment, and that the appropriation bill went to the House of Representatives with unbudgeted funds which the Secretary of War had not approved, for the building up of an American Air Force. The appropriation was stricken out in conference.

Only 16 months ago, in August 1949, we had the same debate all over again, namely, whether the United States Air Force should be expanded.

It is true, as the Senator from Ohio has said in his speech, that the Finletter Commission had suggested a 70-group air force. It is true that the Congress in the appropriation bill that year provided funds for a 58 group air force. It is true that, even though that appropriation was made, the money was not spent by reason of an Executive order of the President of the United States; but it is also true that, when the matter was voted upon on the floor of the Senate, there were only 9 Members of this body who voted against reducing the appropriation from one sufficient for a 58-group air force to one sufficient for a 48-group air force. The record of that vote will be found on page 12315 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1949.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to take my seat while the Senator from Wyoming completes his question. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that I be allowed to take my seat during the remainder of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not object; but I wish to say that I had asked my question, and the Senator from Ohio had answered it; and he then was kind enough to indulge me while I was making some remarks on my own.

However, I am very glad that the Senator remains in the Chamber, because I think it is very important that in the development of this debate we should have clearly in mind the various factors which have controlled our action as we have gone along step by step.

I was saying that the record of that Senate vote on the size of the United States Air Force appears on page 12315 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1949. The nine Senators who that day voted for a 58-group Air Force, and voted against a reduction to a 48-group Air Force, were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Three other Senators, including the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is now on the floor, were absent on that day, but were paired against the reduction of the Air Force. The others were the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. My colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] was absent by leave of the Senate on official business in Europe. I recite this, not to criticize any of the Senators who voted against the larger Air Force—and that vote occurred only a year ago last August—but merely to point out how difficult it has been to comprehend the great problems of international relationships which confront us and how necessary it is now not to forget what was done and not done in years past.

If the United Nations should be a delusion, if the United Nations should not be effective to preserve the peace of the world—although there is no indication to date that it will not be finally effective, that it will not continue to resist aggression, and that the Assembly of the United Nations will not, indeed, prove to be what the great senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] called it, namely, the Town Meeting of the World—but if the fact should be otherwise, then we shall indeed be condemned to become a garrison state, the dangers of which the Senator from Ohio, if I understood him correctly, clearly comprehends—a garrison state compelling us to take young men out of normal pursuits, out of industry, out of science, out of various educational pursuits, and put them under arms, with the manual of arms in their hands, instead of training them in science and other peacetime professions and callings. Then, indeed, the world may be condemned to the most terrible bath of blood mankind ever was forced to endure.

Mr. President, I am happy that the opportunity has come to us to discuss foreign-relations problems in good temper, with all the intelligence we can command. I think it is a very fortunate circumstance that the debate has opened in the tone in which it was launched by the Senator from Ohio.

Let us not assume that in the past all the mistakes were on one side. They were not. Let us not assume that there were men of great vision and public responsibility whose voices were raised but disregarded, because that is not the fact. We have been motivated by conflicting purposes. The people of America have never wanted war and they have accepted it only when it seemed unavoidable. They do not want to go to war now. Of course, they seek to avoid everything of a militaristic character. But, above all else in the world, the people of America desire freedom and liberty.

When the appropriate time comes, Mr. President, I shall seek to take the floor to make some observations upon steps which I think the Government of the United States may take to convince peoples throughout the world that they can obtain without war the things the human mind and heart and body desire; but we must not permit ourselves to drift, as the Senator from Ohio says, or to be driven into a false concept that only war can be the solution of our problems.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for having permitted me to make these remarks in his time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUMMARY OF EXCESS PROFITS TAX ACT OF 1950

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there has been prepared, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, a summary of House bill 9827, the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950. Inasmuch as many calls will be made upon Senators for information which may be supplied by this statement by the joint committee, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is given that this information be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The summary is as follows:

EXCESS PROFITS TAX ACT OF 1950 AS AGREED TO BY THE CONFEREES

The bill provides for the raising of revenue by the levying of a corporate excess-profits tax effective as of July 1, 1950, and a 2-percentage-point increase in the corporate surtax rate effective with respect to taxable years beginning on and after July 1, 1950.

It is estimated that the bill will produce about $3,300,000,000 annually when fully effective under the levels of corporate profits existing in the calendar year 1950 and between $4,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000 under the levels of corporate profits which may reasonably be expected in the calendar year 1951. At the levels of corporate profits present in 1950, the 2-percentage-point increase in the corporate surtax rate will yield about $600,000,000 annually. The balance of the $3,300,000,000, or $2,700,000,000 is attributable to the excess-profits tax.

At the levels of corporate profits present in 1950 about 70,000 corporations will pay an excess-profits tax. The surtax-rate increase will apply to these corporations and to 30,000 others which will not be liable for excess-profits tax.

1. THE RATE, THE BASE, AND THE YEARS OF APPLICATION

(a) The corporate surtax: The bill increases the surtax rate under the regular corporate income tax by 2 percentage points with respect to taxable years beginning on and after July 1, 1950. Thus the total normal and surtax rate will be 47 percent for such taxable years. Since no increase is made in the corporate normal tax rate, the rate on income of $25,000 and less remains at 23 percent for 1950 and 25 percent for 1951 and subsequent years.

(b) The excess-profits tax: The bill imposes an additional excess-profits-tax rate of 30 percent which together with the regular corporate normal tax and surtax represents a total rate of 77 percent when fully effective. The combined rate of 77 percent on adjusted excess-profits-net income is comparable to the excess-profits-tax rate of 85½ percent at the end of World War II, that is, the 95-percent rate reduced by the 10-percent-postwar refund.

Under the bill, the combined rate of the corporate income tax, including the 2-percent tax on consolidated returns, and the excess-profits tax cannot exceed a 62-percent ceiling rate, applied to the corporation's excess-profits net income. Under the World War II tax a similar ceiling limited the combined rate of the corporate income tax and excess-profits tax to slightly more than 72 percent of the surtax net income after allowance for the postwar credit.

As in the case of the World War II tax, the taxpayer is given the choice of the higher of two alternative bases in determining what proportion, if any, of its income is to be subjected to excess-profits tax. The primary credit is an average earnings credit, based on the average income for 3 out of the 4 years 1946 to 1949. The alternative is a credit based on a rate of return on invested capital. A similar choice was provided in the World War II law.

The excess-profits tax is made effective in 1950 for calendar-year corporations by imposing for that year approximately one-half the tax which will apply in subsequent years. Thus, the excess-profits-tax rate applicable to these calendar-year corporations in 1950 is about 15 percent which, when combined with the corporate normal tax and surtax, will represent a total rate of about 57 percent. The excess-profits tax does not apply to years ending prior to July 1, 1950. In the case of a corporation with a year beginning prior to and ending after July 1, 1950, the excess-profits tax imposed will be a percentage of the 30-percent excess-profits-tax rate computed on the basis of the full year's income. The percentage is to be determined by dividing the number of days in the taxable year after June 30, 1950, by the total number of days in the taxable year. These rules are similar to those applied for 1950 to fiscal-year corporations in making the changes in the corporate normal tax and surtax rates under the Revenue Act of 1950.

The bill provides that the excess-profits tax shall terminate as of June 30, 1953. For

corporations with years beginning before July 1, 1953, and ending after June 30, 1953, the same procedures will be used with respect to the termination of the tax as in the case of the initial imposition of the tax.

2. RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX TO THE INCOME TAX

The excess-profits tax is an additional tax over and above the other corporate income taxes. In general the excess-profits tax is computed as follows:

(a) First, the income tax is imposed on the entire amount of taxable net income.

(b) Second, the normal tax net income, after certain adjustments, is reduced by the excess-profits credit (that is, the portion of the corporation's income which for the purposes of this tax is considered normal) and any unused excess-profits credits carried forward or back to the taxable year. The result is called the adjusted excess-profits-net income.

(c) Third, the excess-profits tax at the rate of 30 percent is imposed on this adjusted excess profits net income. This, when added to the aggregate normal and surtax of 47 percent produces a 77-percent rate on adjusted excess profits net income.

Under the World War II excess-profits tax the so-called two-basket approach was followed. The corporate income tax was imposed only on income which was not subject to the excess-profits tax, and the excess-profits tax (comparable to the 77 percent tax referred to above) was imposed on income in excess of the excess-profits credit.

Substantially the same tax burdens are achieved under either method of computation, but under the approach in this bill the normal tax and surtax can be computed without regard to the excess-profits tax, and subsequent adjustments in the excess-profits credit will not require a recomputation of the normal and surtax. Also, the method used in the bill permits the unification of procedures for assessing and collecting the other income taxes and the excess-profits tax. The income tax and the excess-profits tax will be treated as one tax for the purpose of the computation of interest on refunds or deficiencies, the statute of limitations for assessment and refund purposes, the sending of 90-day letters, and so forth.

The consolidated return privilege is made available as in the World War II statute.

3. THE MINIMUM CREDIT UNDER THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

The bill provides a minimum credit of $25,000. Any taxpayer which upon computing its excess-profits tax credit under either the average earnings or invested capital method finds that its credit is less than $25,000 may raise its credit to this amount. In contrast to this the World War II law provided all taxpayers with a specific exemption of $10,000.

4. THE AVERAGE EARNINGS CREDIT UNDER THE EXCESS PROFITS TAX

(a) The selection of the base period and the percentage of earnings taken into account: Taxpayers using the calendar year have a base period under the bill consisting of the 4 years, 1946 through 1949. Such taxpayers will eliminate their poorest year in this base period, adjust the income of the remaining 3 years in a manner to be described below, and calculate from the adjusted income of these 3 years an average base period net income. This average is then reduced by 15 percent for the purposes of the average-earnings credit. Alternative average base period net incomes which may be elected by qualified taxpayers under certain relief provisions described below are also reduced by 15 percent.

Taxpayers with fiscal years ending after December 31 but before April 1 will use as their base period the last four consecutive taxable years ending prior to April 1, 1950. They will follow the same procedure as calendar year taxpayers eliminating the poorest of the four taxable years falling within their base period.

A somewhat different procedure is followed in the case of taxpayers whose fiscal years end after March 31 and before December 31. Such taxpayers are required to use 36 months out of the 48-month period beginning on January 1, 1946, and ending on December 31, 1949. In determining the 36-month period they must eliminate the worst of the following: (a) Any one of the three taxable years falling completely within the period January 1, 1946, through December 31, 1949; (b) the portions in the base period of their two taxable years which fall only partially within the period January 1, 1946, through December 31, 1949; or (c) one of the portions of these two taxable years falling partially within this period plus enough months in the adjoining taxable year in the period to make up a total of 12 months within the period.

Under the World War II law the corresponding credit was 95 percent of the taxpayer's average earnings in the period 1936 through 1939. Also, under the World War II law the earnings of the poorest of the 4 years could be raised to 75 percent of the average of the other 3 years, but the earnings of no year could be eliminated.

(b) Counting deficit years as zero years: In addition to eliminating the poorest year in its base period, the taxpayer counts the earnings of any remaining deficit year as zero. Under the World War II law there was no corresponding provision.

(c) Capital additions during the latter base period years: The average earnings credit is increased under the bill to reflect one-half of the net additions to capital in 1948 and all of the net additions to capital in 1949. The increase is 12 percent of such investment. If they take the form of equity capital or retained earnings, 100 percent of such investments are counted. In the case of borrowed capital only three-fourths of such investments are counted. The 12-percent rate is the same rate of return allowed for net additions to capital in the years in which the excess-profits tax is applicable and is the maximum rate of return allowed those using the invested capital base. There was no comparable provision under the World War II law.

5. INVESTED CAPITAL CREDIT

Under the bill the excess-profits credit of a corporation using the invested-capital method is the sum of its invested-capital credit (reduced by an amount bearing the same relationship to the credit as its inadmissible assets bear to its total assets) and its new capital credit. The invested-capital credit of a corporation includes equity capital, retained earnings, and borrowed capital.

(a) Rates of return on invested capital: The same rates of return are allowed under the bill for equity capital, retained earnings, and borrowed capital. In the case of equity capital and retained earnings the rates of return are applied to the full amount of such investments. In the case of borrowed capital the rates are applied to three-fourths of such investments, and one-quarter of the interest payments are deductible in the current tax year in computing income subject to excess-profits tax. Under the World War II law the full amount of the investment was taken into consideration in the case of equity capital and retained earnings, but the rates of return were applied to only one-half of the borrowed capital, and one-half of the interest payments were deductible in computing income subject to excess-profits tax.

Table 1 shows the rates of return allowed on invested capital under the bill and the World War II law.

TABLE 1.—*Rates of return allowed on equity capital, retained earnings, and borrowed capital under H. R. 9827 and the World War II statute* [1]

Equity capital, retained earnings, and borrowed capital [1] rate brackets	Rates under H. R. 9827	Rates under World War II law
	Percent	*Percent*
Under $5,000,000	12	8
$5,000,000 to $10,000,000	10	6
Over $10,000,000	8	5

[1] Under the bill the capital in each bracket includes ¾ of the borrowed capital and under the World War II law it included ½ of the borrowed capital.

Table 2 shows, for funds borrowed at specified interest rates, the effective rates of return allowed on the total borrowed capital under the bill and the World War II statute, giving effect to the deduction of one-fourth of the interest payments under this bill and one-half of the interest payments allowed in the case of the World War II statute.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of the effective rates of return allowed on borrowed capital in each asset bracket under the bill and the World War II law (including the effect of interest deductions)*

Selected interest rates	Effective rates under the bill for funds in the bracket—			Effective rates under the World War II law for funds in the bracket—		
	Under $5,000,000	$5,000,000 to $10,000,000	Over $10,000,000	Under $5,000,000	$5,000,000 to $10,000,000	Over $10,000,000
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
2 percent	9½	8	6½	5	4	3½
3 percent	9¾	8¼	6¾	5½	4½	4
4 percent	10	8½	7	6	5	4½
5 percent	10¼	8¾	7¼	6½	5½	5
6 percent	10½	9	7½	7	6	5½
7 percent	10¾	9¼	7¾	7½	6½	6
8 percent	11	9½	8	8	7	6½

(b) Definition of equity capital and retained earnings: Under the bill the equity capital and retained earnings of a corporation are generally determined by deducting from its total assets on its books at the end of the base period the sum of the liabilities on its books at the same time, plus any "recent loss" adjustment.

The value of the assets is determined, in the case of all assets other than intangible assets, by taking their "adjusted basis for gain," which is their cost or March 1, 1913, value, whichever is higher, plus or minus subsequent adjustments in basis. The value of intangible assets is determined without regard to the value of the property as of March 1, 1913. Intangible assets are defined as "secret processes and formulae, good will, trade-marks, trade brands, franchises, and other like property."

Assets which are not held in good faith for the purposes of the business are excluded in computing invested capital.

The "recent loss" adjustment referred to above, which is added to the net assets, is the net deficit, if any, in the period 1946–49, or 1940–49, whichever is the greater. The net deficit is the excess, if any, of operating losses over net income in the period.

In addition to permitting the taxpayer to compute its equity capital and retained earnings by the asset method described above, the bill provides the taxpayer with the alternative of computing its invested capital under the so-called historical capital approach used in the World War II statute. Under the historical capital approach, the

equity capital and retained earnings represent the money and property previously paid in for stock or paid in for surplus plus the accumulated earnings and profits of the corporation as of the beginning of its taxable year. A major difference between this approach and the asset approach is in the treatment of deficits. Under the historical capital approach, a net deficit—that is, any deficit remaining after offsetting deficits of loss years against earnings of profitable years—does not decrease paid-in capital or paid-in surplus. Under the asset approach, a net deficit incurred prior to 1946 or 1940 has the effect of reducing capital or surplus paid in prior to that date. However, under the asset approach, a net deficit incurred for the period 1940 to 1949 or 1946 to 1949 reduces neither capital nor surplus paid in at any time; nor earnings and profits realized prior to 1940 or 1946. Thus, in this respect, the asset approach is more favorable to corporations with recent losses, while the historical capital approach is more favorable to corporations with net deficits over the whole span of their existence. However, under the historical capital approach (but not under the asset approach), a net deficit in the base period which has not been utilized for carryback purposes can be carried forward to reduce the excess-profits net income for 1950 and 1951. On the other hand, under the asset approach, new capital additions in the tax period are provided for at a flat 12-percent rate of return, while under the historical capital approach new capital additions in the tax period are provided for at a rate of return of 12 percent, 10 percent, or 8 percent, depending on the asset bracket of the corporation.

The bill provides in the case of insurance companies, other than mutual and other than life or marine, that equity capital and retained earnings shall include 50 percent of reserves required by law (except those constituting borrowed capital). In the case of mutual insurance companies (other than life or marine), the bill provides that equity capital and retained earnings include surplus as well as 50 percent of reserves required by law. The organization expenses of these insurance companies are included in the computation of equity capital for purposes of the invested capital credit.

In arriving at the equity capital and retained earnings of a bank under the asset approach the bill defines liabilities as excluding reserves for bad debts. Since liabilities are deducted from total assets in arriving at equity capital and retained earnings, the exclusion of reserves for bad debts from liabilities has the effect of increasing the equity capital credit.

(c) Definition of borrowed capital: Borrowed capital is indebtedness (not including interest) which is evidenced by a bond, note, bill of exchange, debenture, certificate of indebtedness, mortgage, deed of trust, bank loan agreement, or conditional sales contract. However, the amount to be considered as borrowed capital is limited to outstanding indebtedness "incurred in good faith for the purposes of the business." The definition of borrowed capital is substantially the same as the definition appearing in the World War II statute except for the addition of conditional sales contracts and bank loan agreements. The latter include indebtedness to a bank, but do not include the indebtedness of a bank to its depositors.

In the case of insurance companies 66⅔ percent of the unearned premiums are to be treated as borrowed capital. In the case of a life-insurance company 66⅔ percent of the adjusted reserves and 66⅔ percent of the reserves on certain annuity contracts are to be treated as borrowed capital. Since 75 percent of borrowed capital is taken into account in computing the rate of return on invested capital, treating 66⅔ percent of these unearned premiums or reserves on annuity contracts as borrowed capital means that 50 percent of them are taken into account in computing the invested capital credit.

In the case of a face-amount certificate company 66⅔ percent of the reserves on its outstanding investment certificates are treated as borrowed capital. As in the case of insurance companies, this means that 50 percent of these certificates will be taken into account in computing the invested capital credit.

(d) Admissible and inadmissible assets: The World War II statute had the effect of reducing the capital, to which the various rates of return were applied in order to determine the invested capital credit, by the so-called inadmissible assets. These included stock in a corporation and State and local government and partially tax-exempt Federal obligations. However, in the case of such Government obligations the taxpayer had the option to treat them as admissible assets if it included in its excess-profits-tax net income the interest received on them.

The bill makes no major change in the World War II treatment of admissible and inadmissible assets except to deny the option to treat State and local government and partially tax-exempt Federal obligations as admissible assets.

6. NET CAPITAL CHANGES IN THE TAX YEARS

Under the bill, both the taxpayer using the average earnings credit and the taxpayer using the invested capital credit, if the latter is computed under the asset approach, are allowed to increase their credit by a flat 12 percent of the net additions to their investment since 1949. However, in the case of net additions taking the form of borrowed capital, only 75 percent of the additional investment is taken into account in applying the 12-percent rate of return. The taxpayer computing its invested capital base under the historical capital approach receives a rate of return on net capital additions in the tax period of 12 percent, 10 percent, or 8 percent, depending upon its rate bracket.

Reductions in invested capital in the tax period decrease prior additions in the tax period at the same rate allowed on the increases. Thus, in the case of the average earnings taxpayer and the invested capital taxpayer using the asset approach the excess-profits credit is reduced by 12 percent of any reductions which offset additions previously made in the tax period. In the case of the invested capital taxpayer using the historical capital approach, the rate of return by which the excess-profits tax is reduced depends upon its top invested capital rate bracket, which may be 12 percent, 10 percent, or 8 percent. Any reductions in excess of the additions in the tax years decrease the credit of all invested capital taxpayers by the rates of return used in building up their credit initially. For the average earnings taxpayer, the rate of return applied to such net capital reductions is 12 percent.

In the case of the average earnings taxpayer no allowance was made under the World War II statute for investments in the tax years if they took the form of borrowed capital or accumulations of retained earnings. An increase in the credit was allowed at an 8-percent rate of return if the additions took the form of paid-in capital or paid-in surplus and a 6-percent rate of return was used for reductions of these types.

In the case of the invested capital taxpayer the World War II statute included retained earnings and borrowed capital in the ordinary computation of invested capital at the regular rates for such capital. Additions to paid-in capital or paid-in surplus were also included in the credit at the ordinary rates but as a special incentive they were included at 125 percent of their value.

7. EXCESS PROFITS NET INCOME IN THE TAXABLE YEAR

(a) General: The net income used in the excess-profits tax is an adjusted version of the net income to which the 25-percent corporate normal tax is applied. Chief among the adjustments is an exclusion of capital gains and losses, both long- and short-term, from the sale or exchange of capital assets. The World War II law excluded only long-term gains and losses.

Casualty losses, losses on abandonment, and the excess of losses over gains from involuntary conversions and the sale or exchange of property used in the trade or business (117 (j) losses) are allowed as deductions in computing excess-profits net income. The excess of gains over losses (117 (j) gains) are not included in excess-profits net income since they are treated as gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

Like the World War II law the bill excludes certain other types of sporadic income, such as—

(1) income arising out of the retirement or repurchase at less than the issue price of bonds, and other evidences of indebtedness, outstanding for more than 6 months;

(2) income arising from the recovery of bad debts in cases where no deduction has been claimed in a year for which an excess-profits tax was imposed under the World War II law or would be imposed under this bill; and

(3) refunds of taxes paid under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

The bill excludes 75 percent of the portion of the taxpayer's interest deduction which represents interest on the indebtedness included in the taxpayer's borrowed capital if it uses the invested capital basis. This is consistent with the inclusion of 75 percent of borrowed capital in the taxpayer's invested capital base.

The net income of the excess-profits tax year is also corrected by the elimination of deductions arising out of the retirement at a premium of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness outstanding for more than 6 months. Such an adjustment was provided under the World War II law, but only in the correction of the base period net income. Under the bill the adjustment is also made in the income of the tax period.

As in the World War II law, the net income of life insurance companies is adjusted for contributions to policyholders' reserves so as to conform income for excess-profits-tax purposes with the adjusted net income used in the case of such companies for the corporate normal tax and surtax. If the company computes its excess profits credit on the invested capital basis, the adjustment for contributions to policyholders' reserves is reduced by 50 percent because in effect 50 percent of such reserves are included in the calculation of the invested capital credit.

Taxpayers in certain extractive industries are permitted to exclude a portion of their income from "excess output," in a manner somewhat similar to that provided under the World War II legislation. Amounts received as incentive payments to encourage exploration, development, and mining for defense purposes are excluded both for the purposes of the excess profits tax and the corporate normal tax and surtax.

The bill follows the precedent of the World War II law in allowing a full 100-percent credit for dividends received from domestic corporations. While the World War II law allowed a full credit for dividends in kind, the bill restricts the credit for such dividends to the adjusted basis of the distributed property in the hands of the distributing corporation. This conforms the treatment of dividends in kind under the excess-profits tax with that under the corporate normal

tax and surtax as revised by section 122 of the Revenue Act of 1950.

The bill contains a provision allowing the correction of the net income of the excess-profits-tax years for other abnormalities. This provision is similar to section 721 of the World War II law. Generally, income appearing in particular excess-profits-tax years is reallocated under this provision if it is attributable to events that occurred or work that was done in other years. Such an adjustment is made only if the income of the class deemed to be abnormal, which is received in the taxable year, is more than 115 percent of the average amount of the income of the same class received during the four previous taxable years. In appropriate cases such an excess will be attributed to other years under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Adjustments of this type are limited to income arising out of—

(1) a claim, award, judgment, or decree;

(2) exploration, discovery, or prospecting which extended over a period of more than 12 months;

(3) the sale of patents, formulas, or processes developed over a period of more than 12 months; and

(4) income which is includible in the taxable year rather than another year by reason of a change in the taxpayer's method of accounting; or

(5) income of other classes permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

The bill also contains a number of other provisions designed to adjust the excess profits net income of specific classes of taxpayers.

(b) Installment basis taxpayers: The bill permits taxpayers using the installment-basis method of accounting for income-tax purposes to elect to report their income on an accrual basis for the excess-profits tax. This election is available to taxpayers whose principal business consists of installment sales or the purchasing of installment-sales obligations. Such an election when made is irrevocable and applies to all subsequent taxable years to which the excess-profits tax is applicable.

(c) Long-term contracts: A similar election is provided for taxpayers who receive payments under long-term contracts and who, under the completed contract method, account for such receipts as income for the year in which the contract is completed. The bill permits such taxpayers to elect to report their income from long-term contracts under the percentage of completion method of accounting for the purpose of the excess-profits tax. This election when made is also irrevocable and applies to subsequent taxable years.

(d) Long-term leases: A special adjustment is provided in the case of long-term leases which require the lessee to pay a stated rental to the lessor free of tax. Under such leases an increase in taxes automatically raises the income before taxes of the lessor corporation and may serve as the basis for the imposition of an excess-profits tax, which the lessee will be obligated to assume. The bill provides that in appropriate cases the amount of income or excess-profits tax paid by the lessee is excluded from the income of the lessor corporation, and that no deduction is allowed to the lessee. This treatment is available only in the case of a lease for a term of more than 20 years. However, an agreement for the lease of railroad properties is considered to be a lease for the total number of years during which the lease may be renewed or continued.

To qualify for such treatment it is necessary that the initial lease be entered into prior to December 1, 1950.

(e) Bad debt reserves of banks: Banks which have elected to use the reserve method of accounting for bad debts for income tax purposes will substitute for excess-profits tax purposes a deduction for debts which became worthless in whole or in part within the taxable year.

(f) Blocked income: Special rules are provided under the bill for the treatment of "blocked income" arising prior to 1951. These rules are discussed in paragraph 16 (f) below.

8. EXCESS-PROFITS NET INCOME IN THE BASE PERIOD

Many of the provisions in the bill for removing abnormalities from the income of the base period years are similar to those u ed in the taxable years. Among these are the exclusion of gains and losses from the sale or exchange of both long- and short-term capital assets, and income arising from the retirement or repurchase at less than the issue price of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness outstanding for more than 6 months.

However, net gains and losses from the sale or exchange of assets used in the trade or business (sec. 117 (j) assets) are excluded from the taxpayer's base period excess profits net income even though, when such losses exceed such gains, the excess is not excluded from the determination of income in the excess-profits tax years.

Deductions for premiums paid and expenses involved in the retirement of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness outstanding for more than 6 months are eliminated from the income of the base period years as from the income of the taxable year. Provision is made for the elimination of the deduction based on the repayment of processing taxes to vendees, which parallels the adjustment for processing tax refunds in the income of the excess-profits tax year.

A 100-percent credit for dividends received is allowed in computing the net income of the base period year and the rule applied to dividends in kind is the same as that now used under the corporate normal tax and surtax.

In addition, the bill contains a general provision applying to claims, awards, and judgments against the taxpayer, intangible drilling and development costs of oil or gas wells, development costs in the case of mines, casualty losses, and deductions of other classes subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Generally for any class of such abnormal deductions, the amount in excess of 115 percent of the average amount of deductions of such class for the four previous taxable years is to be eliminated under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, provided that in the base period year the deductions of the class disallowed exceed 5 percent of the average excess profits net income for all the taxpayer's base period years computed without the disallowance of any class of deduction under this provision. For the purposes of the latter limitation, a deficit in any of these years is counted as zero. An exception is made in the bill which excludes from the scope of the 115-percent limitation described above deductions in prior years arising out of the same extraordinary event which accounted for the deduction in the taxable year. The World War II law eliminated only the excess over 125 percent of the average of the deductions for the four previous taxable years, and did not include the 5-percent limitation described above.

The bill does not permit the disallowance of abnormal deductions unless the taxpayer establishes that the increase in the deduction is not (a) a cause or a consequence of either (1) an increase in the taxpayer's gross income in its base period or (2) a decrease in the amount of some other deduction in its base period, which increase or decrease is substantial in relation to the amount of the increase in the deductions of such class, or (b) a consequence of a change at any time in the type, manner of operation, size, or condition of the business engaged in by the taxpayer.

The bill follows the precedent of the World War II law in limiting the amount of the deductions disallowed to the excess over the deductions of the same class in the taxpayer's excess profits tax year.

The income of the base-period years is adjusted to conform to that of the taxable years in the case of taxpayers who elect to change from the installment basis to the accrual method of accounting, or to substitute the percentage of completion method for the completed contract method of accounting for payments under long-term contracts. The base-period income of lessees which are obligated to pay the tax due on the payment to a lessor under a long-term contract is adjusted in the base period to conform with the tax period. Banks using the reserve method of accounting for bad debts during the base period substitute deductions for debts which became worthless in whole or in part within those years for the larger deductions made to establish such reserves.

Life insurance companies deduct their contributions to policyholder's reserves in computing their base period excess-profits net income as in computing the income of their excess-profits tax years.

Banks are permitted to reduce their deductions for assessments paid to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation during the base-period years proportionately with the reductions which occur in the taxable year as a result of the credits allowed under Public Law 797 of the Eighty-first Congress, second session.

9. GENERAL RELIEF PROVISIONS

The bill provides relief in most of the important cases which were covered under section 722, the general relief provision of the World War II law. However, under section 722 a hypothetical base-period earnings credit had to be "tailor-made" for the individual taxpayer on the basis of almost all the factors which influenced the taxpayer's business during its base-period years. Hence a great deal of judgment was necessarily involved in the processing of the relief claims arising under section 722. The bill provides relief by a set of formulas, thus reducing the area of administrative discretion to a minimum.

(a) Abnormalities during the base period: Section 722 (b) (1) and (2) of the World War II law provided relief when the income of the taxpayer's base period years was substantially abnormal because of a physical interruption to production, such as a fire, strike, or flood, or because of a depression in the business of the taxpayer resulting from temporary economic circumstances unusual in the case of the taxpayer, such as a severe price war. The bill contains two formulas which provide relief in these same areas.

If an abnormality existed in the taxpayer's lowest year of earnings during the base period, this year will be eliminated automatically from the average base period net income computation. However, if an abnormality occurred in one of the remaining periods of 12 months or less in the base period, the taxpayer may, if it was in business at the beginning of its base period, substitute for its actual excess profits net income for the period of the abnormality an amount determined by multiplying its total assets for the last day of the period of the abnormality by the rate of return for its industry for that period.

If an abnormality is present in more than one of the three 12-month periods in the taxpayer's base period, a different formula is used. In such cases, a substitute average base period net income is computed by multiplying the average of the amounts of the taxpayer's total assets on the last day of each of its base period years by the base period rate of return for the taxpayer's industry.

The substitute average base period net income described above is available only if the taxpayer's average base period net income in the event of the substitution exceeds 110 percent of the taxpayer's average base period net income computed without adjustment for the abnormality. Similarly, a substitute excess profits net income may be used for a single abnormal year only if it exceeds 110 percent of the taxpayer's excess profits net income for that year computed without such substitution.

Taxpayers having abnormalities in more than one of their best 3 years may not adjust their substitute average base period net income for changes in capital during the last 2 years of the base period, since their substitute income is not dependent primarily upon their own earnings record. However, the taxpayer which has only one abnormal year, after eliminating its worst year, and, therefore, uses an average base period net income computed largely from its own earnings record, may claim the adjustment for capital additions in both 1948 and 1949, provided the year of the abnormality is 1946 or 1947, and may claim an adjustment for capital additions in 1949 where the year of the abnormality is 1948.

The industry rates of return used under this and other provisions of the bill will be determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of the Treasury. For this purpose the Nation's industry will be grouped into the classes shown in appendix A. This is a slightly modified version of a classification developed by the Bureau of the Budget for general use in the Federal Government, and the description of the classes appears in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual prepared by the Bureau's Division of Statistical Standards.

The computation of industry rates of return will be based on data regularly compiled from income-tax returns by the Treasury Department in preparing the statistics of income.

The industry rate of return for an individual year will be computed by dividing the sum of the aggregate net income and the aggregate interest deduction shown on the income-tax returns filed by the corporations in the industry by the aggregate total assets of such corporations as of the close of the taxable year for which the returns were filed. Since interest is added to net income in the calculation of the rate of return which the taxpayer applies to his assets, the amount of interest accrued by the taxpayer during a single year of abnormality is subtracted in determining his substituted income of that year. A similar adjustment is made in other cases where the industry rate of return for a single year is applied.

The industry base period rates of return will be computed by aggregating the net income and the interest deductions reported by the corporations in the industry during the 4-year period 1946 through 1949 and dividing by the aggregate of the sum of the total assets of these corporations for the 4 years in question. In this and other cases where the taxpayer computes a substitute average base period net income with its industry average base period rate of return the taxpayer makes an appropriate adjustment to eliminate 1 year's interest.

Since it will not be possible to assemble immediately the data necessary for computing the final rates of return for the last year or years in the base period, or for the entire base period, provision is made in the bill for the calculation of tentative rates of return. These are to be proclaimed prior to March 1, 1951, and will be used until the final rates have been proclaimed. The final rates will, of course, supersede the tentative rates and applications for adjustments based on the latter will be redetermined when the final rates are available.

The taxpayer adjusting only one of his three best years will use the rate of return for the industry to which is attributable the largest amount of its gross receipts in that year. The taxpayer using the industry rate of return for the entire base period will use the rate for the industry accounting for the largest amount of the taxpayer's gross receipts in the period.

Fiscal year taxpayers adjusting a taxable year beginning in 1945 and ending in 1946 will use the rate of return for the taxpayer's industry classification for the calendar year 1946. Those adjusting a taxable year beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950 will use the rate of return for the calendar year 1949. In other cases fiscal year taxpayers will use the index for the calendar year in which falls the greater number of days in such taxable year.

Since the rates of return are computed on the basis of total assets, the taxpayer using such rates will apply them to its total assets; that is, the sum of the cash and property other than cash or inadmissible assets used by the taxpayer for a bona fide business purpose. Such property is to be valued at its adjusted basis for determining gain on sale or exchange except that in the case of certain intangible property the basis shall be determined without reference to the value on March 1, 1913.

The taxpayer desiring to adjust its base period net income under these provisions will make an application with its return, or file a claim for refund within the period of limitations applicable to claims for refund, or file an application to offset a deficiency proposed against it. If a taxpayer files a petition with the Tax Court for redetermination of a deficiency, such application must be filed not later than the date of the filing of the original petition.

The definitions of total assets, gross receipts, industry classification, and base period rate of return described above are generally similar to those used under the formulas developed for most of the other hardship cases. The taxpayer's claim for adjustment in such cases will be made in the same manner and will be subject to the same special rule concerning the statute of limitations which applies when an adjustment is made for abnormal years.

(b) New products or services introduced during the base period: Corporations which commenced business before the base period and made substantial changes in their products or services during the last 36 months of the base period may elect a substitute average base period net income. This provision is the counterpart of the new-products adjustment authorized under section 722 (b) (4) of the World War II law. Corporations which commenced business after the beginning of the base period are not eligible under this provision, but may qualify for a substitute average base period net income under the new-corporation rule described below.

To qualify for relief under the "new product" provision the change in products or services must have been "substantial" in the sense that by the end of the third year (or earlier) following the year in which the products or services were introduced, the gross income from such products must aggregate to more than 40 percent of the taxpayer's gross income or 33 percent of the taxpayer's net income in that year. The taxpayer must also demonstrate that its net income in any one of the taxable years in which it has met the percentage of gross or net income test was in excess of 125 percent of the average excess profits net income during the base period year or years preceding the first change in product or service used in qualifying under the gross or net income test.

The taxpayer who qualifies prior to January 1, 1950, may use a substitute average base period net income computed by multiplying its total assets for the last day of its last pre-excess profits tax year or of the earliest year in which the taxpayer qualifies for relief, whichever day is later, by the base period rate of return in its industry. If the year in which the taxpayer first meets the aforementioned tests ends after the base period, the substitute average base period net income is computed by multiplying the total assets for the last day of such taxable year by the base period rate of return for the taxpayer's industry classification.

A taxpayer who obtains relief under the new product provision may obtain an adjustment for new capital additions in the tax period in those years which follow the year in which the taxpayer qualifies for relief under the new product provision. It is given no adjustment for capital additions in the base period.

Where a taxpayer establishes that it has made several substantial changes in products or services during the last 36 months of its base period, the aggregate effect of such changes is to be considered in determining whether the eligibility requirements of the section are met. The various income tests can be met in a particular year by considering all substantial changes made during the three preceding years.

(c) Increase in capacity during the base period: A corporation which commenced business before its base period and made substantial changes in its capacity during the last 36 months of the base period may also elect a substitute average base period net income. This provision is the counterpart of a portion of section 722 (b) (4) of the World War II law.

To qualify for relief under the "change in capacity" formula the taxpayer must have added to its facilities in a manner which—

(1) resulted in an increase of 100 percent or more in its productive capacity; or

(2) resulted in an increase of 50 percent or more in its productive capacity and the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities after the addition or replacement exceeds by 50 percent or more the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities prior to such addition or replacement; or

(3) the unadjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities after such addition or replacement exceeded by 100 percent or more the unadjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities prior to such addition or replacement.

These tests must be complied with prior to the end of the taxpayer's base period.

For the purpose of these tests the term "facilities" means real property and tangible depreciable property held by the taxpayer for a bona fide business purpose.

Taxpayers which qualify under one of the afore-mentioned tests may elect to use an average base period net income calculated by multiplying the base-period rate of return for the taxpayer's industry classification by the taxpayer's total assets for the last day in its last pre-excess-profits tax year. Since the alternative net income is computed on the basis of the assets as of the close of the base period, no adjustment is made for capital additions during the base period.

(d) Depressed industries: The bill provides a substitute average base period net income in cases where the taxpayer's industry was depressed during the base period. The World War II law contained section 722 (b) (3) (A), which permitted the reconstruction of a hypothetical base-period income when the taxpayer could show that the industry of which it was a part was depressed during the base period. Relief was available only when the depression was characteristic of the entire industry to which the taxpayer belonged, and this is also true of the provision contained in this bill.

The existence of a depression in the taxpayer's industry during the base period is to be determined by comparing the industry's average rate of return during the years 1946 though 1948 with its average rate of return during the period 1938 through 1948. Under the bill a depressed industry is one in which the industry average rate of return on total

assets during the years 1946 through 1948 is less than 63 percent of its average rate of return over the period 1938 through 1948.

Taxpayers in depressed industries are permitted to use a substitute average base period net income computed by multiplying their average total assets during the base period by 80 percent of the depressed industry's average rate of return during the period 1938 through 1948.

For purposes of the depressed industry test, taxpayers will be classified in general conformity to the three-digit classification of industries used by the Treasury Department in compiling its statistics of income data for the years 1938 through 1947, using such combinations of subgroups as the Secretary determines are necessary to provide reasonably comparable data over the period 1938 through 1948. This classification is substantially more detailed than that shown in appendix A which is used in other relief provisions contained in this bill. The taxpayer's industry subclassification will be the one from which it derives the majority of its gross receipts.

The depressed industry formula also provides relief for the type of case covered under 722 (b) (3) (B) of the World War II law. These are cases in which the industry is characterized by sporadic and intermittent periods of high profits and such profits fail to appear in the base period. Hence the industry rate of return in the base period years may be expected to fall well below its long-term average since the latter will probably include one or more of the high profit periods.

10. ALTERNATIVE BASIS FOR NEW CORPORATIONS

Unlike the World War II law, the present bill combines the relief treatment for new corporations which commenced business during the base period with those which commenced business subsequent to the base period. In both cases an alternative average base period net income is provided which will make it unnecessary for the taxpayer to reconstruct a hypothetical base period experience as he did under section 722 of the World War II law.

Except in the case of a new corporation which acquires the assets of an old corporation (dealt with in pt. II of the bill) and certain ineligible corporations, an alternative average base period net income is provided for a corporation which commenced business at any time after the beginning of its base period. The alternative is computed by applying the average base period rate of return for the taxpayer's industry classification to the amount of the taxpayer's total assets. If the taxpayer's first three taxable years ended in the base period, the industry rate of return is applied to the taxpayer's total assets on the last day of the year preceding its first excess-profits tax year. This alternative net income may then be adjusted for retained earnings or net capital additions or reductions subsequent to the close of the base period. When the taxpayer's first, second, or third taxable year ends after the base period, the credit is determined for each of these years by applying the industry average base period rate of return to the taxpayer's assets for each of such years. The credit for subsequent years is determined in a similar manner on the basis of the assets at the close of the taxpayer's third year. A new corporation receives an adjustment for capital additions in the tax period when made more than 3 years after it commences business.

The new corporation treatment is denied in certain cases where taxpayers might transfer assets between corporations in order to obtain the benefit of the industry average rate of return available to new corporations.

11. ALTERNATIVE BASIS FOR GROWING CORPORATIONS

The bill provides an alternative average base period net income for a corporation which commenced business before the beginning of its base period and experienced an unusually rapid growth during its base period. This alternative is not available to a corporation commencing business at a later date which may qualify for relief under the new corporation formula described above.

The alternative average base period net income for growing corporations is a substitute for the so-called growth formula used in the World War II law which permitted all taxpayers to calculate their base period credit by adding to the average income of the last half of the base period 50 percent of the difference between the average income of the first and second halves of the base period, subject to the limitation that the alternative credit could not exceed the net income of the highest taxable year in the base period. The use of the World War II growth formula in the present bill would have resulted in the widespread use of the income of the year 1948 as the sole basis for calculating the average base period net income.

There are two alternative sets of tests provided in this bill for establishing the existence of unusually rapid growth during the base period. One set of tests, designated here as "test A," permits a corporation to qualify if its total payroll for the last half of its base period is 130 percent or more of its total payroll for the first half of its base period, or alternatively if its gross receipts during the last half of its base period are 150 percent or more of its gross receipts for the first half of its base period. It is important to note that an alternative average base period net income is available to a taxpayer who qualifies under test A only if the taxpayer's total assets at the beginning of the base period are not more than $20,000,000. For the purpose of this test the assets of a group of corporations which are privileged to file a consolidated return are aggregated whether or not a consolidated return is actually filed.

A taxpayer may also qualify as a "growth" company if it meets test B, which requires compliance with all of the following:

(1) The taxpayer's net sales for the period January 1 through June 30, 1950, when multiplied by two are 150 percent or more of its average net sales in the calendar years 1946 and 1947.

(2) Forty percent or more of the taxpayer's net sales for the calendar year 1950 are attributable to a product or class of products not generally available to the general public prior to January 1, 1946. For this purpose a product or class of products includes articles of which the product or class of products is a principal component and articles which are themselves a component of such product or class of products.

(3) The taxpayer's net sales attributable to such product or class of products in the calendar year 1946 are 5 percent or less than such net sales in 1949.

A corporation which qualifies under test B may obtain an alternative average base period net income even if its total assets at the beginning of the base period are more than $20,000,000.

A calendar year corporation which qualifies under either test A or test B may compute an alternative average base period net income on the basis of—

(1) its income in the years 1948 and 1949;

(2) its income in the year 1949; or

(3) one-half of its income in 1949 and 40 percent of its income in 1950.

Corresponding provisions are made for the fiscal year taxpayers.

Still another alternative is available to certain taxpayers which qualify under test B and whose excess-profits-net income for 1949 was not more than 25 percent of their income for 1948. Such taxpayers, if using the calendar year, may compute their alternative average base period net income on the basis of one-half their income in 1948 and 40 percent of their income in 1950. Corresponding provisions are made for fiscal year taxpayers.

12. CARRY-OVERS OF NET OPERATING LOSS AND UNUSED EXCESS-PROFITS CREDIT

The bill permits the use of the net operating loss carry-back and carry-forward in calculating the net income of an excess-profits-tax year. With the exceptions discussed below the same rule is used as under the corporate normal tax and surtax; that is, the carry-back is limited to 1 year and amounts not so absorbed are carried forward until exhausted over a period of not more than 5 years. This compares with a carry-back of 2 years and a carry-forward of 2 years used under the World War II law after 1942. Thus the averaging period under the bill will be 7 years as compared with 5 years under the previous law.

The bill also permits a taxpayer, other than an invested capital taxpayer using the asset approach, to elect to carry forward to the years 1950 and 1951 the total of the operating losses in the base period reduced by the losses carried back to years prior to the base period and by the income of the base period years.

The net operating-loss carry-over or carry-back is not used for computing the excess-profits-tax net income of the base-period years.

Like the World War II law this bill provides for a carry-back and carry-forward of an unused excess-profits credit. The carry-back is for 1 year and the carry-forward for 5, thus producing the same 7-year averaging period as under the net operating-loss carry-over. The unused excess-profits-tax-credit adjustment under the World War II law was limited to a carry-back of 2 years and a carry-forward of 2 years which conformed to the net operating-loss carry-over provisions of that law.

For a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1950, and ending after June 30, 1950, the unused excess-profits credit is the same percentage of such credit, computed as if all of such year were subject to the excess-profits tax, which the number of days in the taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in the year.

The bill provides that any unused portion of the $25,000 minimum credit shall not be counted for purposes of the unused excess-profits carry-over.

An unused excess-profits credit cannot be carried back from a period after a corporation has distributed substantially all of its assets.

13. MINIMUM CREDIT FOR CERTAIN REGULATED INDUSTRIES

The bill provides a minimum excess-profits-tax credit which is available to taxpayers in certain specified types of regulated industries. This credit is an alternative to the average earnings credit and the invested capital credit for such taxpayers and is not subject to the 15-percent reduction generally applied to the average earnings credit.

In general, this minimum credit consists of the corporate normal tax and surtax payable by the corporation for the taxable year in question plus 6 percent or 7 percent of the sum of the equity capital, retained earnings, and borrowed capital, less interest payable on the borrowed capital. Equity capital and retained earnings of the regulated industries availing themselves of this alternative credit are reduced by the so-called inadmissible assets. However, the normal tax and surtax under the bill are not reduced by inadmissible assets.

The 6-percent rate of return is available to regulated industries supplying the following types of services or products:

(1) Electric energy;

(2) Gas;

(3) Water;

(4) Sewage disposal;

(5) Transportation on an intrastate, suburban, municipal, or interurban electric railroad, trolley system, or bus system; or

(6) Transportation by trucks or busses; where the rates charged by such corporations are subject to regulation by a governmental body.

The 6-percent rate of return is also available to a regulated industry supplying the following types of services or products:

(1) Transportation of oil or other petroleum products (including shale oil) or gas by pipeline if the corporation is subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Power Commission;

(2) Transportation by railroads regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

(3) Transportation by water subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Maritime Board under the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933.

The 7-percent rate of return is available to regulated industries supplying the following types of services or products:

(1) Telephone and telegraph services where the rates charged are subject to regulation by a governmental body; or

(2) Air transportation subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In the case of interstate trucking, busses, railroads, and the transportation of oil by pipeline, and in the case of air transportation and transportation by water the equity capital and retained earnings on which the rate of return is computed under this alternative credit are the same as those of an ordinary corporation determining the value of its assets under the "asset approach." In the case of all other regulated industries receiving the benefits of this provision where the corporate books of account are maintained in accordance with systems prescribed by a regulatory body or maintained in accordance with the uniform systems prescribed by the Federal Power Commission or the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, the equity capital and retained earnings are the sum of the average outstanding common and preferred capital stock accounts and the capital surplus and earned surplus accounts as shown on the corporation's books.

The use of this alternative credit, in addition to being limited to corporations supplying the types of services or products described above, is limited to corporations deriving 80 percent or more of their gross income from regulated sources. Where a public utility supplies services or products in one or more "interconnected and coordinated" systems, and where the regulation to which the corporation is subject in part of its operating territory in effect controls rates in the unregulated territory, and these rates are as favorable to the users in the unregulated territories as the rates in the regulated territory, the whole "interconnected and coordinated" system or systems are considered to be regulated.

Since only some of the members of an affiliated group eligible to file a consolidated return may be regulated companies to which the special alternative credit is available, the bill specifies how consolidated returns should be handled in such cases. The regulated companies which are eligible for the minimum credit may be split-off and a consolidated return may be filed for them as a group, but if all the members of such an affiliated group file a single consolidated return, none of the regulated companies involved may claim the special minimum credit.

14. EXEMPTION OF STRATEGIC MINERALS

An exemption is provided under your committee's bill for domestic corporations mining strategic minerals with respect to the income attributable to such mining in the United States.

Strategic minerals as used in this provision include antimony, chromite, manganese, nickel, platinum (including the platinum group metals), quicksilver, sheet mica, tantalum, tin, tungsten, vanadium, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, perlite, long-fiber asbestos in the form of amosite, chrysolite or crocidolite, beryl, cobalt, columbite, corundum, diamonds, kyanite (if equivalent in grade to Indian kyanite), molybdenum, monazite, quartz crystals, and uranium. In addition "strategic" minerals include any other minerals which the agency created to carry out the duties under section 303 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 certifies as being essential to the defense effort of the United States and as not being normally produced in appreciable quantities in the United States.

The World War II statute provided for the exemption of antimony, chromite, manganese, nickel, platinum, quicksilver, sheet mica, tantalum, tin, tungsten, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, and vanadium.

15. EXEMPT INCOME FROM CERTAIN MINING AND TIMBER OPERATIONS AND FROM NATURAL-GAS PROPERTIES

The bill continues the relief which was provided by section 735 of the World War II statute with respect to certain mineral mining, timber, and natural-gas properties. For this purpose the term "mineral" includes the following: Ores of the metals, coal, and such nonmetallic substances as abrasives, asbestos, asphaltum, barytes, borax, building stone, cement rock, clay, crushed stone, feldspar, fluorspar, fuller's earth, graphite, gravel, gypsum, limestone, magnesite, marl, mica, mineral pigments, peat, potash, precious stones, refractories, rock phosphate, salt, sand, shell, silica, slate, soapstone, soda, sulfur and talc. This list is the same as under the World War II provision with the exception that "shell" was not included in that provision. The relief under this provision is provided by exempting from excess-profits tax a certain portion of the current income from these properties. Generally this portion is determined by multiplying the normal unit profit during the normal period 1946 to June 30, 1950 (1936 to 1939 in the case of the World War II statute) by a specified proportion of current production in excess of normal output during the base period. The provision in the bill differs from the World War II version in that a taxpayer is given the option to aggregate his mining properties for this purpose.

In the case of coal and iron mines, timber properties, and natural-gas properties, a World War II provision determined the exempt portion by multiplying current excess production by one-half of the current net income per unit. Such a provision is contained in the bill but is extended to apply to all metal mines.

The World War II statute also contained a provision providing partial exemption for coal and iron mines and timber properties not in operation during the base period. One-sixth of the net income in the current taxable yen. of these properties was exempt from excess-profits tax. The corresponding provision in this bill differs in a number of respects. The exemption from excess-profits tax for properties coming under the provision is increased from one-sixth to one-third of the net income from such property. Natural gas and metal mining properties not in operation during the normal period (the taxable years included in the period January 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950) are given the benefits of this provision as also are metal mining properties in operation in the normal period but having an aggregate loss for this period.

The bill exempts from both income and excess-profits taxes amounts paid to the taxpayer by the United States or any of its agencies or instrumentalities for the encouragement of exploration, development, or the mining of critical and strategic minerals or metals.

16. FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND INCOME FROM ABROAD

(a) Foreign corporations: The bill imposes an excess-profits tax on foreign corporations only if they are engaged in trade or business within the United States and the foreign corporations subject to excess-profits tax are taxable only on income derived from sources within the United States. If such corporations were engaged in trade or business within the United States during all of their taxable years in the base period, they are entitled to use either the average earnings credit or the invested capital credit. If they were not engaged in trade or business within the United States during the entire base period, they are entitled to use only the invested capital credit. In computing the average earnings credit for corporations eligible to use this credit, only income derived from sources within the United States is taken into consideration. In computing the invested capital credit only United States assets and liabilities are taken into consideration. Where the Secretary of the Treasury determines that these assets and liabilities cannot satisfactorily be segregated from the other assets and liabilities of the corporation, the equity capital and retained earnings of the corporation, for purposes of the excess-profits tax, are to be the same proportion of the total equity capital and retained earnings of the corporation as its net income derived from sources within the United States is of its total net income. Borrowed capital in such cases is also determined from the relationship of net income from sources within the United States to the total net income of the corporation. The treatment provided under the bill for foreign corporations is substantially the same as provided by the World War II statute.

(b) Corporations deriving most of their income from United States possessions: Domestic corporations to which section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code is applicable—that is, corporations deriving a large portion of their income from sources within the possessions of the United States—are subject to excess-profits tax on only so much of their income as is derived from sources within the United States. They are given the same treatment under the excess-profits tax as foreign corporations engaged in trade or business within the United States during a tax year but not all of their base period years. This is the same treatment accorded under the World War II law.

(c) Western Hemisphere trade and similar corporations: The World War II statute provided an exemption for Western Hemisphere trade and other domestic corporations where 95 percent or more of their income over the last 3 years was derived from sources outside the United States, and where 50 percent or more of their gross income was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business. The bill continues this exemption.

The bill amends the provision relating to the filing of consolidated returns to provide groups of affiliated corporations with the opportunity to make a new decision as to whether or not they desire to file a consolidated return with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950. While this provision is not limited to affiliated groups including a Western Hemisphere trade corporation, its primary effect will be to give such groups an opportunity to file a separate return for their Western Hemisphere trade corporation, and thus receive an exemption from the excess-profits tax with respect to the income of such a corporation.

(d) Dividends received from foreign corporations: Under the World War II law, dividends received from foreign corporations by domestic corporations were included in the excess-profits tax net income of average-earnings taxpayers, both for the base period

and the tax period. On the other hand, they were not included in the excess-profits net income of invested capital taxpayers in the tax period and the stock in the foreign corporation was excluded from invested capital. Under the bill foreign dividends are excluded from excess-profits net income in the tax period in the case of both the average earnings and the invested capital taxpayer. In addition, such dividends are excluded from the base-period income of the average-earnings taxpayer, and the stock in a foreign corporation is excluded from invested capital in the case of the taxpayer computing his tax in this manner.

(e) Foreign tax credit: Under the bill, as under the World War II statute, domestic corporations operating branches abroad are subject to excess-profits tax on the income derived from such branches in the year in which it is earned. However, any tax paid a foreign country with respect to such foreign operations which is in excess of the tax credit allowed by the United States for purposes of the normal tax and surtax is allowed as a credit against excess-profits tax subject to certain limitations. The tax treatment accorded branches is the same as that provided by the World War II statute.

(f) Blocked income: Taxpayers deriving income from sources within a foreign country are permitted under the bill to exclude such portion of the income as would, but for monetary, exchange, or other restrictions imposed by the foreign country, have been includible in the gross income of the taxpayer prior to its first excess-profits tax year.

The Secretary is directed to prescribe rules for a reasonable allocation of the blocked income which arose prior to the end of the base period in cases where specific identification cannot be made.

A special rule is provided for the reallocation of income which arose during the first excess-profits tax year but became "unblocked" in later years.

Deductions properly allocable to income which is excluded under this provision are not allowed.

17. EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN AIR-MAIL SUBSIDIES

As under the World War II law, airlines may exclude air-mail subsidies paid by the Federal Government if the airlines have no adjusted excess-profits tax net income when these air-mail subsidies are not taken into consideration.

18. PERSONAL SERVICE CORPORATIONS

The World War II law provided that personal service corporations could elect to be exempted from the excess-profits tax if the stockholders of such corporations agreed to take up as part of their income for individual income-tax purposes the pro rata share of the undistributed profits of the personal service corporations. This did not, however, exempt a personal service corporation from the corporate normal tax or surtax. A personal service corporation was defined as a corporation whose income was to be ascribed primarily to the activities of shareholders who are regularly engaged in the active conduct of the affairs of the corporation and who are the owners of at least 70 percent of the stock of the corporation. The bill retains this provision of the World War II statute.

19. CORPORATIONS COMPLETING CONTRACTS UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Under section 505 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, if any contracting party in its taxable year completes one or more contracts or subcontracts for the construction of a vessel under this act, it is required to pay to the Maritime Board any profit in excess of 10 percent of the total contract prices of the contracts and subcontracts. These profits paid to the Maritime Board, together with all other receipts of the Board, are placed in a revolving construction fund and are available for further ship construction.

Under the bill the amount received by the contracting party and recaptured by the Maritime Board first will be excluded in computing the excess-profits tax. An alternative computation requires the taxpayers to increase their excess-profits net income by the amount of the payments to the Maritime Board. The tax computed upon this basis is then reduced by the amount of such payments, and the remainder constitutes the tax which is to be paid, if it is less than the tax computed under the first method.

20. SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE EXCESS-PROFITS-TAX CREDIT FOR RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

The bill provides that where substantially all of the properties of one railroad have been leased to another railroad prior to December 1, 1950, under a lease for more than 20 years, which requires the lessee railroad to pay the Federal income taxes of the lessor railroad, the excess-profits-tax credit may be equitably apportioned between the corporations pursuant to an agreement between the corporations which is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The same treatment is provided for leases which are automatically renewed and where the whole term, including the renewal period, exceeds 20 years. Where such leases have been first entered into prior to December 1, 1950, they are to be considered as having been entered into prior to such date even though renewed after such date. The benefits of this provision are also available where more than one lessee is involved.

The bill provides that the invested-capital credit of a railroad which was formerly a lessor shall include the fair value of betterments and additions made by a lessee railroad to property of the lessor railroad if the lease has been canceled.

21. RECOMPUTATION OF THE EARNINGS CREDIT IN THE CASE OF CORPORATE REORGANIZATIONS

In the case of certain corporate reorganizations during the base period or subsequent to the base period, the experience of the corporations prior to the reorganization may be aggregated for purposes of determining excess-profits credits based on earnings. This is provided for in part II of the excess-profits tax subchapter in this bill. The reorganizations dealt with in part II are the type with respect to which gain or loss is not recognized. In addition to the general type of case where substantially all the assets of one corporation are taken over by another corporation, part II provides rules for the recomputation of base period net income in the case where substantially all the assets of a partnership or a sole proprietorship are acquired by a corporation and in cases where only part of the assets of the partnership are placed in a corporation or where only part of the assets of the corporation are split off into a new corporation.

Part II also covers those corporate reorganizations under section 112 (g) (1) (D) which are commonly known as split-ups, where the assets of a corporation are split up among two or more new corporations followed by the liquidation of the corporation originally transferring the assets. The inclusion in the definition of this type of transaction in section 461 (a) of a reference to section 112 (b) (4) is sufficiently broad to cover this type of a case, as well as the case where the transferring corporation, following a transfer in a reorganization of only a part of its properties in exchange for the stock of the acquiring corporation, retains that stock as its own. The above definition excludes transfers of assets by a corporation which is exempt from income tax under section 101 of the code.

In general, if all the properties of the corporation are taken over by another corporation in an exchange to which part II is applicable, the old corporation is no longer entitled to use its business experience prior to the exchange for purposes of computing average base period net income. Instead, the corporation which acquires the properties may use the experience of the corporation which gave them up if this will result in a lower tax for the acquiring corporation. In a case where only part of the assets of a corporation go over to a new corporation in an exchange in which gain or loss is not recognized, the old corporation loses that portion of its base period experience which is allocable to the assets it loses in the exchange, and the acquiring corporation may utilize such experience in computing its average base period net income.

Where a corporation computes its excess-profits-tax credit simply on the basis of its excess-profits net income during the base period, the effect of part II is to provide that, after the corporation acquires assets in an exchange described in part II, it shall recompute its excess-profits net income for each month of the base period prior to the exchange by combining its own earnings experience during those months with the earnings experience of the corporation whose assets it acquired. If the corporation whose assets were acquired was not in existence during a month in the base period in which the acquiring corporation was in existence, then the recomputation described above is made for such month by combining the earnings of the acquiring corporations with 1 percent of the equity capital of the corporation whose assets were acquired (after adjustment for inadmissible assets).

In addition to providing rules for the recomputation of excess-profits net income for purposes of the earnings credit, part II also provides for the recomputation of excess-profits net income and the attribution of payroll, gross receipts, net sales, and total assets in the case of the alternative earnings credit based on growth. It provides rules for the recomputation of excess-profits net income and rules for the determination of average base period net income in the case of part II transactions involving corporations with base-period abnormalities. It also provides rules for the computation of average base-period net income in the case of part II transactions involving corporations which have had changes in the products or services furnished during the base period, corporations which have had increases in capacity for production or operation during the base period, new corporations, and corporations which were members of depressed industries during the base period.

A corporation which is created incident to a part II transaction is not denied the growth alternative by reason of being a new corporation.

In the case of the type of exchange described in part II in which the assets of one corporation are split among two corporations the base period earnings experience of the one corporation prior to the exchange is allocated among the corporations in business after the exchange in proportion to the fair market value of the assets of the old corporation which are held by each of the corporations after the exchange. The bill permits also the determination of the fair market value of the properties involved and the determination of the division of such value among the parties by agreement between the parties to the transaction with the Secretary's consent and permits in lieu of an allocation based on fair market value, an allocation based on the earnings experience of

the assets transferred where the parties to the transaction agree to the allocation and it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the allocation fairly represents an identifiable earnings experience of each group of assets transferred or retained. The allocation as among the component corporation and any acquiring corporations shall not exceed 100 percent of the excess-profits net income (or average base period net income) of the corporation whose assets are transferred except in the case where part of the assets of a partnership were transferred to an acquiring corporation or corporations in a part II exchange which occurred before December 1, 1950. In such a case the earnings experience of the assets transferred may be used in the determination of excess-profits net income by the acquiring corporation even though this earnings experience may represent an amount in excess of the net income of the partnership while it held the assets, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such an allocation fairly represents an identifiable earnings experience of such transferred assets.

In order to prevent double counting of base period earnings experience in applying the recomputation rules provided by part II, the Secretary is authorized to issue regulations providing for reduction of the average base period net income of the taxpayer and adjustments of transferred capital additions and reductions to the extent necessary in cases where, in general, the taxpayer acquired stock in a component corporation for other than its own stock. This provision is carried over from the World War II law and serves to prevent a taxpayer using assets which have had a base period earnings experience in its hands from purchasing stock of a corporation holding other assets which have similarly had a base period earnings experience and subsequently acquiring that latter experience by reason of a part II transaction.

In the case of part II transactions on or before December 31, 1950, abnormal income received in the tax period which is attributable to a year of the component corporation during or prior to the base period is treated in the same manner as though the business of the component during such period has been the business of the acquiring corporation.

Adjustment is provided for both net capital additions during the last 2 years of the base period and net capital additions and reductions after the close of the base period in the case of parties to an exchange described in part II.

22. BASIS FOR COMPUTATION OF THE INVESTED-CAPITAL CREDIT AFTER INTERCORPORATE LIQUIDATIONS

Part III of the excess-profits-tax subchapter provides rules for the determination of the invested capital in the case of certain exchanges and liquidations. These rules correspond to those provided by supplement C of the World War II law.

APPENDIX A

INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN GENERAL RELIEF PROVISIONS

Industry group	*Major group No.*
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries:	
Farms and agricultural services, hunting, trapping	01, 07
Forestry	08
Fisheries	09
Mining:	
Metal mining	10
Anthracite mining	11
Bituminous coal and lignite mining	12
Crude petroluem and natural gas extraction	13
Nonmetallic minerals, except fuels	14
Contract construction:	
General contractors	15, 16
Special trade contractors	17
Manufacturing:	
Ordnance and accessories	19
Food and kindred products	20
Tobacco manufactures	21
Textile mill products	22
Apparel and other finished products made from fabrics	23
Lumber and wood products	24
Furniture and fixtures	25
Paper and allied products	26
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	27
Chemicals and allied products	28
Products of petroleum and coal	29
Rubber products	30
Leather and leather products	31
Stone, clay, and glass products	32
Primary metal industries and fabricated metal products (except ordnance, machinery, and transportation equipment)	33, 34
Machinery (except electrical)	35
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	36
Transportation equipment	37
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries including professional, scientific, and controlling instruments; photographic and optical goods; watches and clocks	38, 39
Transportation, communications, and other public utilities:	
Railroads	40
Local and interurban railways and bus lines	41
Trucking and warehousing	42
Highway transportation not elsewhere classified	43
Water transportation	44
Transportation by air	45
Pipeline transportation	46
Services incidental to transportation	47
Telecommunications	48
Utilities and sanitary services	49
Wholesale trade	50, 51
Retail trade:	
Building materials and farm equipment	52
General merchandise	53
Food	54
Automotive dealers and gasoline service stations	55
Apparel and accessories	56
Furniture, home furnishings, and equipment	57
Eating and drinking places	58
Miscellaneous retail stores	59
Finance, insurance, and real estate:	
Banking	60
Credit agencies other than banks	61
Security and commodity brokers, dealers, exchanges, and services	62
Insurance carriers	63
Insurance agents, brokers, and service	64
Real estate	65
Holding and other investment companies	67
Services:	
Hotels, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places	70
Personal services	72
Miscellaneous business services	73
Automobile repair services and garages	75
Miscellaneous repair services	76
Radio broadcasting, including facsimile broadcasting, and television	77
Motion pictures	78
Amusement and recreation services except motion pictures	79
Other services	80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89

VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES ESPIONAGE LAWS—DECODING OF TOP SECRET MESSAGES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Armed Services Committee, the Justice Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to what would appear to be one of the greatest breaches of security that perhaps we have ever witnessed during wartime. I read a story in a local paper last Saturday which, if true—I repeat, which, if true—means that we have a man in the decoding room in the Pentagon who is guilty of high treason. If this story is true, it means that we have had a breach of security which endangers the lives of millions of American young men and which endangers the very life of this Nation. Before going into the facts, I should like to recite a bit of history.

One of the outstanding military men in Japan was Admiral Yamamoto. He it was who did much of the planning for Pearl Harbor, at which Japan from a standpoint of destruction of shipping won the greatest battle against a navy of all times.

It will be recalled that Yamamoto bragged that he would dictate the terms of the peace treaty from Washington. In the spring of 1943, Yamamoto was making a survey of what then appeared to be the impregnable Japanese chain of island defenses strung across the Pacific. As Yamamoto's very heavily escorted and guarded plane took off from the airfield at Kahili on April 7, 1943, a few American fighter planes dropped out of the clouds and headed directly for Yamamoto's plane. The American fighters were outnumbered more than 10 to 1. They did not waste any time on the Japanese fighters, but headed right through them and tore Yamamoto's plane to shreds and within a matter of seconds it exploded in the air. This was possible only because we knew exactly the time his plane was taking off, exactly the type of protection it would have, where it would be in the formation, and so forth.

Because of the brilliant planning of Yamamoto many Amercans had already died. Had this brilliant strategist lived, many American boys who are living today would be dead. Had he lived many Japanese who are dead today would undoubtedly be living.

At the time, of course, we could not notify the American people just how this brilliantly successful attack upon and destruction of Japan's most valuable military man could have been timed to the second. Since then, however, it has been made public knowledge that we had broken Japan's code and from radio messages picked up and decoded we could plot his trip all through the Pacific and decide the ideal time for his destruction.

The Senate will recall the Battle of Midway at which time we once and for all broke the back of Japan's seapower. Since then many papers and periodicals have carried the story, which, of course, could not be made public at the time, namely, that we had broken the Japanese code and that this breaking of the

code contributed vastly to this great victory over the Japanese Navy, which marked perhaps more than anything else the turning point of the war.

Some of the unsung heroes of the war were the men who worked night and day in our decoding rooms. Those unsung heroes saved the lives of a vast number of American young men. To them should go substantial credit for the crippling of the Japanese Fleet at Midway and for destroying a substantial part of the brains of the Japanese military when Yamamoto's plane disintegrated over the Kahili airfield, and also for a great number of other American victories.

It isn't necessary to tell this Senate or the country how inconceivably painstaking, almost beyond words, is the job of breaking the enemy's code. The young men who work at this task are called cryptanalysts. One of the greatest helps that can be given them in finding the key to a code is possession of at least one of the enemy's messages, both encoded and decoded. If one of our cryptanalysts can be handed the same message in code and also decoded, a long and important step is taken toward breaking the enemy's code. For that reason the strictest possible rules of top secrecy are imposed upon the handling of any message which has been sent in code. Our military realizes that if even the most unimportant message which has been sent in code falls into the hands of the enemy after it has been decoded that may well break our code, which during wartime would undoubtedly result in military disaster as it did for the Japanese.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McMAHON. I desire to ask a question. Does the Senator recollect how the story of the breaking of the Japanese code was made known during World War II?

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not. But I wish the Senator would allow me to finish. I think this is too important a story for us to go back and get into a discussion of the question of how it was made public. The fact is that we can safely talk about it now. It has been made public. It is public information now, that we were eminently successful because of having broken the Japanese code; and we all know now that many American boys are living today because we broke that code. We know that if the code had not been broken, thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of American boys would have died. I merely mention that to point out why it has been made such a grave crime to assist the enemy in breaking our code.

Now, as I say, if one of the young men who work in the decoding room, one of the unsung heroes, can get the enemy's message, both in code and decoded, he has then won a tremendous victory; he is then well on the road toward breaking the code.

In our entire area of combat operations only two officers were entrusted with the important task of encoding and decoding. If either of them had made a decoded message available to anyone except the commander to whom it was directed, he would have been subject to immediate court martial and the most severe penalty. In fact, I cannot think of any document which was guarded more carefully and destroyed more quickly when it had served its purpose than a decoded message.

Any man who would sneak from our decoding rooms at the Pentagon secret messages that have been decoded and then make those messages available to the enemy would be guilty of the most reprehensible moral and legal crime against the United States. Under our laws he would be guilty of treason.

In that connection I would like to call the Senate's attention to an article appearing in the local Daily Worker, the Washington Post, on December 30, 1950, an article written by the great smear artist and mouthpiece of Moscow, Drew Pearson. In it he gave the dates upon which top secret coded messages were sent from MacArthur's intelligence headquarters to the Pentagon. Then he gives what he claims to be the messages decoded and verbatim. For example he states:

> On December 6, just 2 days after MacArthur had announced his million-man Chinese army estimate, General Willoughby cabled as follows:
>
> "Units believed to be on Eighth Army front are, west to east: Elements Fiftieth CCF (Chinese Communist Field) Army; elements Sixty-sixth Chinese CCF Army; Thirty-ninth CCF Army; Fortieth CCF Army; Thirty-eighth CCF Army; Forty-second CCF Army."

Again he states:

> In mid-December, General Willoughby cabled the following description of Chinese arms equipment: "Battalion CCF Army with three grenades and rifle or Russian submachine gun per man and 300 North Korean Army stragglers crossed Taedong."

And again he says:

> Another of Willoughby's intelligence cables to Washington about mid-December is interesting: "Lack of CCF on Eighth Army front. Due to deep withdrawal executed by Eighth Army, it is evident that enemy, lacking any great degree of mobility, has been unable to regain contact."

And another quote:

> Another of General Willoughby's reports at about the same time, states: "Those well-versed in Chinese military operations stress an inherent lack of elasticity in planning and similar inelasticity in staff and command structure. Such deficiencies can only result in stereotyped campaigns, and hold offensive action to slow succession of limited objectives.
>
> "It follows, then," continued General Willoughby, "that CCF high command, being unable to predict degree of success for his initial offensive of November 28, was confronted by the problem of immediately realining his forces for the continuation of the offensive; or of continuing to objectives according to their set schedule."

If Pearson is telling the truth and correctly quoted top secret messages which go from General MacArthur's headquarters to the Pentagon, he is rendering the enemy a service of untold value and is endangering the lives of every American boy either in our Armed Forces or about to be drafted. If he is telling the truth, it means that someone in the Pentagon is stealing top secret messages and passing them to the enemy and is thereby guilty of high treason.

This is a matter which should receive the immediate attention, not only of the Army but of the Armed Services Committees of both Houses and of the Justice Department. This Congress cannot stand idly by and allow a traitor access to the files in the decoding room in the Pentagon.

One of two things is true—either this man is telling the truth, and I should hate to have to accuse him of that—either he is telling the truth, in which case it means that we have in our decoding room a man guilty of high treason, a man who should be court martialed instanter and be subjected, of course, to the most severe penalties which are provided; or, if he is lying—if again this is the work, I may say the typical work, of a degenerate liar, then that also must be exposed, because by printing the alleged verbatim intelligence reports in this attempt to destroy a great intelligence officer, General Willoughby, he is attempting to sap and destroy the morale of our Army, which, again, during wartime, certainly approaches treason.

I would like also to call attention to another aspect of this article. Let me quote again from the local Daily Worker, the Washington Post:

> If all these six Chinese armies were of full strength with no casualties—which is doubtful—the total Chinese force which sent the UN Eighth Army, into a 120-miles retreat in less than 2 weeks was only 96,000 men.

This is, of course, a deliberate falsehood, one which can easily be detected by any man who knows the first thing about the organization of an army, but the type of falsehood which can greatly disturb the American wives and mothers who are not expected to understand the make-up of an army. Pearson, who has known not one hour of war, claims, however, to be a military expert. Therefore, he should know that the "type" army contains 3 corps and that each corps contains 3 divisions; that a division contains 15,000 to 18,000 men. In other words, an army would contain from 135,000 to 162,000 men, which would mean that 6 armies would run close to a million men, rather than 96,000. There is, of course, considerable indication that when the Chinese refer to an army they actually are referring to an oversize corps. Pearson, however, sets a Chinese army at 16,000, which is less than the size of an American division, which even a private in the Army can tell you is ridiculous to the point of being ludicrous.

The purpose of this lie is obvious as you read the article. It is to create the impression that actually our young men outnumber the Chinese and that, therefore, there is something wrong with our fighting forces, or they would not be retreating before inferior numbers of Chinese.

This is a part of the Communist Party line attack upon General MacArthur. General MacArthur must be destroyed if international communism is to win out in Asia. They know that MacArthur must be destroyed before they can create a Red Pacific—hence this deliberate, degenerate type of lying.

Now I assume that this additional exposure of this man, who claims to be working with someone who is stealing American secrets from the decoding room at the Pentagon—a man who is then making those secret messages available verbatim to the enemy so they may break our code—I assume this exposure will be referred to by some of the bleeding hearts of the radical wing of the press as interfering with freedom of the press.

It is high time that the American people distinguish between freedom of the press and license to poison and pollute the waterholes of information at which 152,000,000 American people drink. It is time to quit confusing freedom of the press with prostitution of the press.

Freedom of the press never did carry the right to bring into the readers' homes the mouthings of an exposed, degenerate liar. Two weeks ago, I quoted to the Senate the highest type of witnesses we could find who had exposed this man as a deliberate liar on 45 different occasions. Those witnesses ranged all the way from two Presidents to outstanding men in the Senate and House from both sides of the aisle.

Does it interfere with freedom of the press to call the attention of the publishers and editors throughout the country to the fact that when they carry this man in their papers, they are in effect stamping with approval deliberate lies.

To my good friends who say "we must present both sides of the question," I say, 'Yes, both sides of the question, but that does not involve presenting lies and serving them up as the truth."

Freedom of the press, perhaps, is the greatest bulwark in a democracy. I certainly hope we have freedom of the press in this Nation for all times to come.

The quickest way to lose that freedom of the press is to prostitute it. The best way for editors and publishers to endanger that freedom of the press is to carry in their columns the work of an exposed, known, deliberate liar. The 45 Senators and Congressmen and the 2 Presidents who went out of their way to expose that liar, so that editors and publishers would know what they were buying, have actually rendered a great service toward assuring freedom of the press. Removing deliberate, degenerate liars from the news columns does not endanger freedom of the press, it protects it.

Mr. President, I wish to say something else now for Mr. Pearson's benefit.

The other day he sent a man to me to ask me not to use certain photostats which somehow he found I had in my files. He explained why he did not want them used.

I desire to assure him that he is wasting his time sending anyone to me, that if I do not use those photostats, it is only because I refuse to sink to his level in exposing to the American people exactly what type of man this individual is. I intend to continue to expose him, to continue to show he is the mouthpiece of Moscow. I intend to continue showing what a great danger he is to freedom of the press. But I tell him here and now that if he sends another man to my office, either with threats or promises in regard to the use of those photostats, then on the next day those photostats will all be presented to the Senate.

SUSTAINED VIGIL THE PRICE OF SECURITY—EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is particularly important that the articles I am about to ask to have inserted in the RECORD be printed in the RECORD today, in view of the address made by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], because I feel that these two articles call attention to another and somewhat different emphasis on the great foreign policy problem which confronts us.

Therefore, I first ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, very short excerpts from a great statement by the Secretary of Defense, Gen. George C. Marshall, entitled "Sustained Vigil the Price of Security."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSTAINED VIGIL THE PRICE OF SECURITY

I think probably the best way for me to start is to explain that we are in a very difficult situation, militarily. There are worldwide hazards because we have had no basis of preparation for a partial mobilization.

Heretofore, in our history we have been either on a peace basis—however weak that was—or on a full-mobilization basis.

When we go to full mobilization, which is a terrific undertaking in so many respects, it is necessarily somewhat wasteful and very disturbing to the whole public. Yet, when we go into that, we all go together and, in one respect, it is a rather simple procedure because it is all-out everywhere.

How long we can maintain that all-out state is something else in relation to the public reactions, which I'll refer to later.

When we are on peacetime status, you of course are familiar with our difficulties in procuring the necessary funds, the struggles we have, the criticisms of military expenses in this field or in that field, and things of that nature.

A CRITICAL SITUATION

Now, today, we are confronted by a situation—very, very critical and of an increasingly critical nature. We could meet it by all-out mobilization, which would be a relatively simple adjustment for the Department of Defense, but I think it would be too precipitate to take that line of action.

I feel that we should develop a workable system of partial mobilization from which we can move with great rapidity into a full mobilization.

The degree of partial mobilization is something else. It becomes a matter of degree, once we can set the base and get the laws rearranged and take other steps that will permit us to do this.

The background of all this is the fact that our whole military system or posture is based on a citizen army. We have a National Guard of 27 divisions and some 20 combat teams.

We have a considerable number of Reserves, of individuals, as officers, and then we have the necessity of bringing into the Armed Forces by means of the Selective Service Act, whatever its terms are at the time, the necessary men to fill these units up, to keep them filled after you once get them going, and to organize all new units. That is a long, time-consuming process, but the basis of all our procedure has been a citizen army.

A PROBLEM FOR LEGISLATORS

At the present time in considering any degree of a partial mobilization, we find the laws are not adapted to that purpose, I am not criticizing Congress. I am not criticizing the public. I am not criticizing the Pentagon. Nobody had quite the vision to see that we were going to be faced with a period of long tension requiring partial mobilization.

How long will the American public carry themselves through this tension, making the necessary contributions and sacrifices to maintain what we feel is a necessary military set-up, both as to individuals and as to matériel? Well, when it comes to that, I find differences of opinion.

I can best explain one of them by a conversation that took place shortly after I came into the building here.

In that conversation, a high official said, "Do you consider that I am naive to say that the American public has learned its lesson?" We were disagreeing as to what had to be done. I will come to that later when I am talking about an enduring system. And I said, "I don't think you are naive. I just think you are incredibly naive, because when you come to this tension and it becomes a monotonous tension without all of the excitement that keeps booming up such tensions, the bottom will drop out, unless we have completely changed."

I have gone through, personally, some very destructive periods. Maybe I have been bumped too often and am not a good guide, but I saw the destruction of 1920, when General Pershing, with all his prestige, was utterly unable to do anything to save even the remnants of what we call a ground force.

Then we came to another example in August 1941, when the insistent demand all over the country was for the return of the National Guard men to their homes, the return of the selective-service men to their homes. Had we complied, we would have had nothing left.

In August 1941, in the middle of a world war with all Europe under the Nazis and with this situation in the army that I have described, we saved that army from complete, utter, entire disintegration by one vote in Congress.

So when I say that it was incredibly naive to believe that America has learned its lesson I relate my own lesson, but I had a graduation exercise, too.

When I came in as deputy chief of staff and later as chief of staff, we had 15 flying fortresses without enough money to maintain them or enough gasoline to do the appropriate flying. In my last week as chief of staff here, in the fall of 1945, I signed the agreement for the destruction of 2,700 of these fortresses. That is a considerable bracket—from 15 and not enough money for them, to the destruction of 2,700 of them for very evident, logical reasons.

A TIDAL WAVE

And then the great demobilization was on with which you are all familiar. I am more familiar with the pressure to produce that demobilization than you are, because I had to go before Congress twice to try to save this situation in some way. It was a tidal wave for demobilization.

Now we are confronted at the very best with a period of long tension, we hope—we hope.

Now, the point I want to make here hastily is that for the first time, in Korea, we had to fight the first week. We would have fought

the first day if it had not been that we had to wait until we had a United Nations front, which was of such vast importance. You will hear more about that in detail this morning, but we had to fight the first week, and I would like to tell you what we had to fight with. I was not in the Department then, so I can be quite impersonal about this. I did not come in until well after the liberation of Seoul and the landing on Inchon.

We had four divisions in Japan when the dikes broke out and they were all pitifully under strength. We had about three divisions in this country. Only one of them was up to 60 or 70 percent of strength.

They were outnumbered about 200 to 1 at the start.

We had a situation in Korea of putting men with 3 weeks' training who did not speak our language in the middle of our units and that course of action enabled them to go ahead and function, but, of course, they get tired, get worn down, and suffer very constant casualties. The problem is to keep these units up to strength.

I have just given you the items of our own deficiencies of our own soldiers at the present time. You cannot get soldiers in a minute. It is not a question of "springing to arms overnight," as Mr. Bryan once said. It is a long, tedious process, and you have to have a system.

You have to have a method or you are sunk, especially if we get into any large affair. We got out of this one by a miracle as far as we have gotten out.

It has been a desperate procedure from start to finish because, for the first time—for the first time—we had to fight the first week, and we know that if there's a second time, it will be the first day.

Now, what seems to me so important—and this gets into the whole procedure of material procurement which interests the industrialists and interests labor—is that we do not pick up an emotional wave, just build a mountain and then slide right off into a valley again.

MENACE OF PUBLIC BOREDOM

We have got to figure out how long the people will be able to carry the load. Of what nature must it be in order for the American public to carry it along? We must have an enduring system.

There is a complete unanimity about that. We have got to build up now as rapidly as we can. But we have got to have a system in doing so.

We just must not fall of our own weight with the boredom of the public to a prolonged tension into another catastrophic state of great weakness, which in the present state of the world would be terrible.

What is an enduring system that will endure through these various fluctuations and through this evident period of long tension that is in front of us? If we are thrown under the necessity of full mobilization in one respect, terrible as it is, we can meet it but we have to have an enduring system, one that can be taken and carried on without a collapse of public support.

We have got to get matériel quickly, right now and build up a certain peak—but in such a way that we do not get to the top and then fall to the bottom. Everybody wants some security in the continuity of the procedure. We are more interested in such continuity even than the industrialists and even labor. We have got to get—I keep repeating that word—an "enduring" system.

We have another aspect in addition to the partial mobilization and the enduring system of defense which requires great understanding on the part of all the leading citizens in this country that you will hear about in detail later. That is the United Nations.

UNDERSTANDING AS THE KEY

Now we are in a situation where it is paramount, as I see it and my associates see it, that we have a common front among many nations, if there is any conceivable way to find it, because we must not be alone in the world. We must have allies with us, and they have a world of different ideas, a world of different confidence.

As to matériel, we have got to procure great quantities of matériel and get them quickly, as rapidly as we can, for ourselves, Western Europe and ourselves, and others, particularly for Western Europe and ourselves.

Now, there are ways of doing that. We can just pile it up, you might say, and get into the numbers racket, which is what we were pressed with all the time in 1939 and 1940. What we do want is a basis of rapid increase of production.

I will express it in simpler terms this way—it is far better for us to begin at once with existing assembly lines on a 40-hour week, an 8-hour day, and double or treble the shifts to get production going rather than wait for the construction of new lines which in their stride could increase the flow of munitions 600 percent.

We have got to maintain a solid front. Understanding is the most important aspect of the problem. If I have made two points clear to you—the question of the complications involved in partial mobilization and the necessity of an enduring procedure—why, then I have discharged my functions so far as this particular meeting is concerned.

THE STATE OF EUROPE—THE WEST'S STRENGTH — ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The State of Europe—The West's Strength," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF EUROPE—THE WEST'S STRENGTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—Readers of these dispatches are fully aware that Western Europe is today perilously exposed to aggression because it is militarily unprepared to defend itself.

It is only by facing this fact, not trying to conceal it—since it is clearly visible to Moscow—that the decisions essential to speed military preparedness will be taken—as they are at last beginning to be taken right now.

But what also needs to be realized is that Western Europe is not intrinsically weak and impotent; that is the lie which the Kremlin seeks to impose upon the minds of the people of these nations and to insinuate into the thinking of the American people.

The truth is that Western Europe is intrinsically strong and powerful; it is economically strong and industrially powerful.

The combined economic and industrial potential of the west is vastly greater than that of the Soviet Union and all its satellites together.

At a time when Moscow is trying to panic the west in order to prevent the free nations from mobilizing the power which is in their hands, it is well to look at some of the facts on the side of the free world.

The United States, Western Europe, and their associate countries now produce—

More than four times as much steel and pig iron as Russia and all its satellites;

More than five time as much electric power as Russia and all its satellites;

Ten times as much petroleum;

Three times as much coal;

Eight times as much wool, rayon, and cotton;

Three times as much wheat;

Four times as much livestock as Russia and all its satellites.

That is what the west is doing now, and the west has only begun to go to work.

We know that in the past, as today, the free nations are exposed to aggression when their gigantic resources are largely unmobilized and when the aggressor has been almost totally mobilized. Russia is the only great power which did not demobilize after World War II; it kept its army and air force on a war footing.

But the balance of economic strength and industrial capacity—and therefore the balance of military potential—is with the west. The west is strong materially as well as morally when it gears its capacity to defense.

This will not be accomplished overnight; there are grave dangers in the coming months, but there is no reason in faith or in fact why the free world should be intimidated by Moscow into partial or complete inaction. The pattern of totalitarian imperialism, whether Nazi or Communist, is clear. The totalitarian aggressor attacks—

When the free nations are confused and divided within;

When the free nations are weak and unprepared;

When the free nations are alone and divided from one another.

These are the conditions which the Communists have sought to bring about in Western Europe since the end of the war. These are the conditions which Western Europe, with the aid of the Marshall plan and with the military assistance of the United States through the North Atlantic Treaty, has been slowly but steadily correcting—in awareness that the aggressor shrinks from attacking—

When the free nations have the will and determination to resist;

When the free nations are strong and prepared;

When the free nations are united—within themselves and with each other—for the common defense.

No counsel is more applicable to the problems the free nations face today than the theme of Wendell Willkie's 1940 Presidential campaign, uttered at a time when the west was only a little less in peril than it is at this moment:

"Only the productive can be strong and only the strong can be free."

The United States and its allies possess the material, military, and spiritual resources needed for their survival, but if they are not put fully to use now there is no foreseeing the outcome.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. About what day does the Senator think the Senate will be ready for organization in respect to its committees?

Mr. McFARLAND. When will the minority be ready to submit its committee list?

Mr. WHERRY. I think both sides should get together as expeditiously as possible. When does the majority leader feel that the majority will be ready with its committee list?

Mr. McFARLAND. The majority leader will try to be ready before the minority is ready.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not say that a horse race would result in the minority being ahead of the majority, but I do wish to see the committees organized just as soon as both sides are ready.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; and I hope they may be ready by Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. The minority will not have a conference by Monday, probably not until Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, we will wait on the Senator.

I should like to announce that following the President's address on Monday, the Senate will reconvene, at which time Senators will be given an opportunity to introduce bills and present other routine business.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to hear the announcement of the Senator from Arizona.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, January 8, 1951, at 12:30 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1951, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1951

The Senate met at 12:30 p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who in the toils and troubles of time has set vistas of eternity in our hearts, save us from the supreme hypocrisy of making this holy moment of communion with the unseen and eternal but a conventional gesture of unfelt piety. At this high altar of the national life, preserve us from praying with our lips only, and not with our hearts and minds. As with anxious hearts, together with a listening world, we hear this day a diagnosis of the state of the Union, help us to face with utter honesty the state of our own inner lives. May we be deeply concerned that our personal attitudes shall be a part of the answer, and not a part of the problem of our social order.

As we come in a high hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, help us in these testing days, rising above all that is base and small, to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, January 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today because of official business.

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today by reason of illness.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Malone
Anderson	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Conor
Carlson	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smathers
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ecton	Long	Tobey
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Young
Gillette	Magnuson	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO HEAR THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution No. 1, I move that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing the address of the President of the United States on the state of the Union, and that the Senate reconvene thereafter, at which time Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills, submit resolutions, and transact other routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The annual message of the President of the United States was this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress.

(The full text of the message will be found in the proceedings of the House, pp. 98–101.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate, having returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the Pershing Hall memorial fund, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the association for the period ended May 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY PAID TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy, the average monthly fight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and disbursements under the helium-production fund, fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director of the Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, reporting, pursuant to law, that no agreements

were entered into during the calendar year 1950 pertaining to the naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's operations for the year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Agricultural Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories, for the year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the clerk of the United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all judgments rendered by the court for the year ended September 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Corporation and its subsidiary, the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, together with required schedules showing data relative to individual loans of $100,000 and over (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration, as of June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Director, Washington office, Philippine War Damage Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth semiannual report of the Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Journal of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, Regular and Special Sessions of 1949 (with accompanying volumes); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOURNAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Director of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1949 (with accompanying volumes); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ENTITLED "INTERNATIONAL CARTELS IN THE ALKALI INDUSTRY"

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of a report of the Commission entitled "International Cartels in the Alkali Industry" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RELATING TO OPERATIONS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Department of Commerce under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and a report on personnel of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a complete statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS ADJUDICATED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of adjudications rendered during the year 1950 by the Department of Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a complete statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON MEETINGS OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the regular annual meeting and a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report relating to land acquisitions by the Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER IN INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION FOR NAVIGATION AND POWER

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the opinion and accompanying order of the Commission, recommending the development of the water resources of the St. Lawrence River in the International Rapids section for both navigation and power by the Government of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF EXECUTIVE MANSION

A letter from Acting Chairman of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission on a plan for the preservation or other appropriate disposition of all the materials removed from the Executive Mansion in connection with the renovation thereof and consistent with their symbolical value and without commercial exploitation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Authority covering its activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 1)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE COS.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the companies for the year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of paper and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Rev. J. F. Sullivan, of New Kensington, Pa., relating to the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., signed by Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk, relating to the establishment of an agency of the Government to be known as the Federal Civil Defense Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A petition signed by Mrs. Dorothy A. Lemme, Mrs. Arnold H. Lemme, and Ruben H. Lemme, of Oshkosh, Wis., relating to the tax on profits of co-ops and other mutuals; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Earl V. Jones, of Rogers, Ark., relating to the tax on profits of cooperatives, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by members of Chicago Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the granting to veterans of the Korean campaign the benefits granted to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, Newport, Ky., protesting against the giving of economic assistance those governments whose people are denied the rights of economic, political, and religious liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the general assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, at Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the approval of the convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Assembly of Lares, Puerto Rico, condemning the acts perpetrated against the order and prestige of the people of Puerto Rico by the terrorists affiliated with the Nationalist Party; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Petitions of Venus Patriotic Association, Inc., and Jupiter Patriotic Association of America, Inc., both of the State of Illinois, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the College of Social Workers of Puerto Rico, signed by Ana Luisa Alvarez, secretary, expressing gratitude to the Congress for enacting Public Law 734, extending the benefits of the Social Security Act to the people of Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Omar Brown, chairman, legislatve assembly of the Seventh Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., extending sincere holiday greetings to the Senate; ordered to lie on the table.

CONTROL OF INFLATION—RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning an important communication from the distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Allan B. Kline, who has commented on the vital issue of control of inflation. I believe that the position of the federation will be most earnestly studied as the Congress further considers this issue, and in particular by the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees.

I invite attention to Mr. Kline's able suggestions for cutting down on nonessential governmental expenditures, increasing governmental efficiency, pay-as-we-go taxation, and sane fiscal steps in order to curb the inflationary threat.

Attached to Mr. Kline's letter was the text of the resolution adopted by the delegates to the annual meeting of the federation held in Dallas, Tex., between December 11 and 14, and attended by numerous distinguished leaders, for example, from the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, including Mr. Curtis Hatch, president.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Kline's letter to me be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, together with the federation's resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1951.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The inflationary threat created by our present defense program has become a matter of common knowledge. Firm and effective action is necessary to counter this threat. Counter measures obviously are being taken. The grave danger facing us on the economic front is the possibility that the laudable desire to check inflation will lead to adoption of the wrong measures.

Price, wage, and ration controls cannot prevent inflation. If we put our faith in such measures, we not only will fail to prevent inflation, but we will also sell the defense program short by curbing the productive power, which is our greatest source of strength. In an emergency of long duration, such controls could destroy our free-choice economic system.

A part of the agitation for controls appears to stem from a misunderstanding of the situation we are in today. We are in a period of international tension which may last for several years. Our national policy is still (1) to prevent the outbreak of a third world war, and (2) to build up our national military and economic strength as rapidly as possible so that we will be able to win such a war if it proves unavoidable. We cannot estimate the probable duration of the present tension, or calculate when we may face the greatest test of our strength. Accordingly, we must adopt policies which will not only serve our present needs, but contribute to the rapid development of a much greater national strength.

Price and wage controls would hamper the development of the increased production we so badly need. This can easily be illustrated by reference to livestock and meat, although similar results can be expected if price and wage ceilings are applied in other areas of the economy.

Meat production is at a high level, but even greater production is needed. The production of meat—particularly pork—can be substantially increased in the coming year if hampering restrictions are avoided. We have a large hog population to supply brood sows; we have the second largest supply of corn in our history; and we have the equipment and know-how.

Production, both of feed and of livestock, can be stepped up on an enduring basis. This is what we need in America. Farmers are ready to produce. The most effective steps which could be taken by Government to assure an adequate production of livestock would be to (1) make the fullest use of the outlook material of the United States Department of Agriculture indicating probable firm demand, (2) assure farmers that price and ration controls are not going to be put on meat, and (3) suspend corn acreage allotments for the 1951 crop.

Price and ration controls on livestock and meat inevitably will mean less meat. Farmers must make many decisions which influence the quantity of meat they will produce. Price and ration controls cannot help but tip the balance on many of these decisions toward less production. Stepped-up production on an enduring basis is the consumer's best hope for adequate meat suplies and reasonable prices. Under a control system, meat might seem to be cheap in the butcher shops, but it would not be in the shops.

Experience has demonstrated that ceilings on meat invite black markets. Under OPA, black markets resulted in enormous waste of labor in legitimate plants; reduced volume for such plants and consequent reductions in the taxes paid by them; loss of valuable byproducts which were vitally needed; and creation of a public health hazard by the sale of uninspected meat. Experience under OPA definitely proved that, even if more effective measures can be developed to cope with the black market, an army of administrative personnel would be required, both in government and in the industry. Manpower is one of our most serious shortages; we cannot afford to divert thousands of workers from the production of goods to the administration of unnecessary and unworkable regulations.

In this time of national emergency, we are calling on you to support measures—such as (1) the elimination of all nonessential governmental expenses, (2) increased efficiency in Government, (3) pay-as-we-go taxation, and (4) necessary steps in the field of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy—which action will really control inflation. In addition, it is only reasonable that we make greater use of techniques which have enabled our economic system to outstrip every other system of production and distribution.

It is because price controls are clumsy and inefficient substitutes for the automatic functioning of market prices, that we oppose such controls. Our policy in this regard is not taken with the idea of serving the special interests of farmers as a group; instead, we have firm conviction that our recommendations are in the general interests of all Americans. Price, wage, and ration controls have more in common with totalitarian principles than with the principles which support our free American system. Such measures cannot prevent inflation, but certainly would impair our national strength by interfering with production.

Our position on these vital matters is set forth more completely in the enclosed copy of a resolution, inflation control, which was approved by the elected delegates from our member State farm bureaus at our annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., last month.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. KLINE,
President.

RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE VOTING DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, HELD IN DALLAS, TEX., DECEMBER 11–14, 1950

INFLATION CONTROL

The American Farm Bureau Federation has long urged that aggressive steps be taken in the monetary, credit, and fiscal policy fields to bring greater stability to the general price level. Since the control of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy rests in the hands of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, the problem is not one of delegating authority to the Federal Government in new areas. It is a matter of reshaping and coordinating policies in a field in which Government policy now largely prevails so that such policies will make a greater contribution to the development of a more stable price level.

Monetary, credit, and fiscal policies which affect the general stability of prices are indirect and impersonal as contrasted with the direct and personal controls that are required by specific programs designed to rectify the dislocations and injustices resulting from an unstable price level. Greater stability of the general price level offers the only opportunity for greater economic security without programs which require specific and direct controls on each farm, business, or individual.

The inflationary pressures generated by our present national defense program make effective action to stabilize the purchasing power of the American dollar more urgent now than ever before.

Inflation cannot be stopped by price, wage, and ration controls. Such measures deal with symptoms rather than fundamental causes. They interfere with production; impair the flexibility of our economy; reduce our capacity to expand output; require huge administrative staffs; and invite black markets. We face an emergency of indefinite duration. In such a situation the premature adoption of price, wage, and ration controls could strangle our economy to the point of impairing our ability to fight an all-out war should such a conflict prove unavoidable.

American farmers have produced beyond belief in times of need and we pledge ourselves to ample production now. We believe that if we are given full information as to production desired, and if productive aids are made available to us, we can produce more food and fiber more efficiently if controls are held to an absolute minimum. We insist that we be given an opportunity to demonstrate our productive capacity without controls. If total war forces the application of price and wage ceilings, we will insist that they be applied on an across-the-board basis.

The present situation calls for a bold attack on the fundamental cause of inflation, which cause is an increase in the supply of money in relation to the supplies of goods and services available to consumers.

Most importantly, we must pay the bill. There is no possibility of controlling inflation without taxes high enough to get on a pay-as-we-go basis.

We must strive to meet increased demand with increased production wherever possible. To do this we must enhance the opportunity of individuals to be productive and increase the length of the workweek. Strict Government economy is a must. Nonessential Government expenditures must be eliminated. Necessary Government borrowing must be planned so as to prevent an increase in the Government debt to the banks, because such an increase would both directly and indirectly increase the supply of money. To this end we urge that efforts to sell E bonds be intensified; that careful consideration be given to the desirability of offering additional inducement for holders to reinvest the proceeds of maturing E bonds in Government securities; and that steps be taken to prevent a further shift of non-bank-held negotiable bonds to the banking system.

The national debt should be so handled as to make the maximum contribution to price and economic stability, rather than to finance the debt at a minimum cost.

Monetary and credit policies carried on by the Federal Reserve System cannot alone achieve a stable level of prices. Yet they are an important factor and should be geared toward that objective. The Federal Reserve's authority to vary the member bank reserve requirements should be increased. If the inflation threat continues reserve requiremnts for banks should be raised, with appropriate adjustments in the bank holdings eligible to be counted as reserves.

The Government's present policy of restricting the expansion of housing and installment credit should be continued in effect, with such adjustments as may be necessary from time to time to keep these restrictions consistent with the requirements of an effective program to control inflation.

We reiterate our recommendation that the Congress establish a bipartisan Joint Congressional Monetary Study Commission, charged with the responsibility of making studies and submitting recommendations to the Congress on means of bringing greater stability to the purchasing power of money.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 5, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edward Cooper, professional staff member	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Halford Davis, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
Harriet Gray, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Edward Jarrett, chief clerk	10,846.00	5,422.98
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
Dorothy Prout, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Evelyn Rosenkranz, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Vera Rudolph, clerical assistant	5,197.21	2,598.60
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$30,000.00
Amount expended:	
To June 30, 1950	10,499.05
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,815.38
Balance unexpended	7,685.57

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 50, AGREED TO APRIL 11, 1949, AND S. RES. 308, AGREED TO JULY 27, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John R. Butz (resigned Sept. 11, 1950), clerical assistant	$4,154.38	$819.31
Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Ralph B. Dewey (resigned Aug. 20, 1950), consultant	7,022.16	975.30
Catherine L. Harrington, research assistant	5,197.21	2,598.60
Douglas W. Hartman (resigned Aug. 15, 1950), consultant	6,326.94	790.86
Hugh C. McCarthy, attorney	8,438.93	4,219.44
Edgar R. McShane (resigned Aug. 15, 1950), consultant	6,326.94	790.86
Elizabeth G. Moore, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,859.88
Frank Pellegrini (resigned July 26, 1950), chief counsel	10,846.00	783.32
Edward A. Stern (resigned Nov. 30, 1950), special assistant	8,438.93	3,516.20
Helen A. Thompson, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.14
Willard B. Van Horne, Jr. (resigned Dec. 31, 1950), attorney	8,438.93	4,219.44
Ernestine Vigil, clerical assistant	3,806.78	1,903.38
Charlene D. Wolfarth, research assistant	3,719.87	1,859.88
Charlotte D. Worden, clerical assistant	3,198.46	1,599.18
Nicholas Zapple, attorney:		
July 1 to Sept. 30	8,438.93	4,613.46
Oct. 1 to Dec. 31	10,015.02	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:	
Under S. Res. 50	$165,000.00
Added by S. Res. 308	69,000.00
Total	234,000.00
Amount expended:	
To June 30, 1950	141,659.01
From July 1–Dec. 31	43,737.12
Total amount expended	185,396.13
Balance unexpended	48,603.87

ED. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Laurance G. Henderson, professional staff member from Aug. 22	$10,846.00	$3,886.45
Charles E. Shaver, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.97
Blake O'Connor, professional staff member from Sept. 20	8,521.88	2,390.83
Walter B. Stults, professional staff member from Nov. 1	9,019.59	1,503.26
Minna L. Ruppert, chief clerk	8,853.69	4,426.79
Ruth N. Thomas, assistant chief clerk from Sept. 25	5,544.82	1,478.59
Sarah Anne Johnson, clerical assistant	4,067.49	2,033.70
Minnie Moulirie, clerical assistant	4,067.49	2,033.73
Saidee F. Blair, clerical assistant from Sept. 16	4,067.49	1,186.32
Esther M. Joyce, clerical assistant from Oct. 2	4,067.49	1,005.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$21,625.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	13,191.93
Balance unexpended	8,433.07

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 15, 1950.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (CONDUCTING A FULL AND COMPLETE INQUIRY INTO THE ADEQUACY OF FUEL SUPPLIES IN NEW ENGLAND PURSUANT TO S. RES. 344, 81ST CONG., AS AMENDED)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from September 19, 1950, to December 15, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Olga U. Baker, clerk from Oct. 28 to Nov. 7	$2,763.95	$76.77
Joanne Coffin, clerk from Oct. 19 to 31	2,763.95	92.13
Margaret P. Ezzell, clerk from Oct. 27 to Nov. 4	2,763.95	61.42
Mary A. Feiman, clerical assistant from Sept. 25	4,328.19	1,132.86
Charlotte F. Jones, clerk from Oct. 28 to Nov. 9	2,763.95	92.12
Francis J. Keenan, professional staff member from Oct. 16	6,066.23	1,168.63
Edgar R. McShane, consultant from Oct. 16	9,351.40	1,620.83
Charles E. Mason, clerical assistant from Oct. 2 to 28	5,631.72	281.57
Alice T. Ruffner, clerk from Oct. 27 to Nov. 8	2,763.95	92.13
Emma Trenchi, clerk from Oct. 28 to Nov. 11	2,763.95	107.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$5,000.00
Amount expended	4,950.03
Balance unexpended	49.97

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES

Payroll:	
Washington staff	$63,349.75
Field staff	20,490.12
	83,839.87
Transportation	11,603.86
Per-diem allowances	11,810.25
Hearings expense (deputy marshals, conference rooms)	1,233.12
Consultation and witness expense	1,970.76
Stenographic record	5,333.23
Office equipment	1,048.93
Telephone and telegraph	2,870.39
Postage	235.62
Stationery and supplies	1,028.82
Miscellaneous (press clipping service, newspapers, electric letter writing, microfilm, photos, photostats, air express charges, etc.)	1,054.51
Total	122,029.36

EDITH M. KNIGHT,
Chief Clerk.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from May 15, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Amis, William D., investigator	$5,805.53	$1,738.27
Arnold, Julia Oles, receptionist	3,459.17	1,777.60
Blair, Saidee F., stenographer	3,893.68	335.28
Booke, Barbara R., stenographer	3,632.97	302.74
Burling, John L., assistant counsel	9,019.59	1,603.47
Collins, Robert B., Jr., messenger	1,393.90	770.36
Coutsonikas, Melba J., stenographer	4,241.29	2,596.48
Elich, John F., investigator	6,587.65	2,470.36
Fay, Martin F., investigator	6,066.23	1,112.12
Garrett, William C., investigator	5,892.43	2,735.03
Halley, Rudolph, chief counsel	6,066.23	3,791.32
Hileman, Elsie V., stenographer	3,806.78	2,315.77
Kiley, Henry P., investigator	7,194.65	4,236.82
Klein, Alfred M., assistant counsel	7,526.46	3,972.26
Knight, Edith M., chief clerk	5,371.02	2,387.21
Longland, Mary E., stenographer	3,806.78	1,956.25
Lustick, Freda, stenographer	3,459.17	490.04
Mack, Joyce W., stenographer	3,806.78	793.07
Martin, George H., investigator	6,066.23	1,381.73
McCormick, John N., investigator	4,588.89	2,402.40
McDonnell, Vyonne G., stenographer	3,980.59	2,249.57
Mitchell, Mary V., stenographer	3,980.59	2,096.39
Murphy, John J., investigator	4,241.29	2,497.64
Nellis, Joseph L., assistant counsel	7,526.46	961.70
Newland, Paul A., clerk	2,850.85	1,427.11
Rice, Downey, assistant counsel	9,019.59	5,409.08
Robinson, Harold G., associate counsel	12,000.00	7,300.00
Sears, Lillian F., stenographer	4,067.49	2,239.68
Total		63,349.75
Robinson, George S., associate counsel (loaned to the committee, on a reimbursable basis, by the Air Force)	10,750.00	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$200,000.00
Amount expended	122,029.36
Balance unexpended	77,970.64

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from May 15, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMITTEE EMPLOYED IN NEW YORK, N. Y.; PHILADELPHIA, PA.; MIAMI, FLA.; CHICAGO, ILL.; KANSAS CITY, MO.; ST. LOUIS, MO.; CHEYENNE, WYO.; SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.; LOS ANGELES, CALIF.; AND WASHINGTON, D. C., ON THE BASE ANNUAL SALARIES AS INDICATED

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Howard R. Brand, investigator	$5,940	$1,377.98
Thomas E. Myers, investigator	5,940	1,528.30
Patrick C. Murray, investigator	5,940	2,856.17
George Fickeissen, investigator	5,940	2,505.41
Boris Kostelanetz, special counsel	(1)	421.78
Thomas L. Karsten, special counsel	(1)	1,084.58
Ralph Mills, investigator	5,940	4,058.78
Louise Bowie, research analyst	4,620	39.97
Marion S. Towne, stenographer	2,760	712.80
Margaret A. Brenner, stenographer	2,760	769.06
Mary Louise Karcher, stenographer	3,420	45.48
Dolores K. Harvey, stenographer	3,420	227.40
Maurine C. Dupuy, stenographer	3,420	166.76
Yvette G. Scharfman, stenographer	2,760	125.05
Charles J. Swartz, investigator	4,680	464.95
Betty M. Smith, stenographer	2,760	25.01
Edward T. Burns, investigator	5,940	100.21
Elsie Matsumoto, stenographer	2,760	100.04
H. R. Van Brunt, investigator	5,940	425.92
Lillian L. Phillips, stenographer	$2,760	$375.15
Ben E. Jackson, certified public accountant	(1)	150.63
Lillian Steinberg, stenographer	2,400	707.63
Grace D. Gillette, stenographer	2,760	50.02
Ella M. Gansner, stenographer	2,160	50.45
Edward J. Halligan, stenographer	2,400	586.01
Inez L. Johnson, stenographer	2,160	70.64
Mary A. Smith, stenographer	2,160	50.27
Agnes S. Wolf, editor	3,420	318.36
George H. Harvey, investigator	5,940	50.10
George C. Bolles, Jr., investigator	5,940	25.05
William P. Deegan, investigator	5,940	50.10
Eve Brammer, stenographer	3,420	459.97
Evelyn Ell, stenographer	3,420	15.16
John R. Kopczynski, special employee	2,400	132.68
William L. Davis, special employee	2,400	121.62
Howard G. Williams, special employee	2,400	110.57
Frances Allmendinger, stenographer	2,760	150.06
Total		20,490.12

(1) $25 per day.

ADDITIONAL PER DIEM EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMITTEE IN CITIES OUTSIDE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., WHOSE VOUCHERS WERE OUTSTANDING AS OF DEC. 31, 1950

Thomas J. Cahill, investigator	$3,420
Francis J. Ahern, investigator	3,420
Warren J. Taylor, investigator	(1)
Herbert A. Blomquist, investigator	5,940
John E. Kenny, investigator	5,940
Marie A. Cranley, stenographer	2,160
Elna J. Schretter, stenographer	2,760
Jean McKellar, typist	2,160
William G. Ruymann, special counsel	(1)
Fannie R. Ginsburg, stenographer	2,400

(1) $25 per day.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (UNDER RES. 280 AGREED TO JUNE 7, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

SALARIES PAID FOR JULY 1 THROUGH JULY 31, 1950

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S., assistant counsel	$7,941.22	$661.76
Flanagan, Francis D., chief counsel	10,846.00	903.83
Hatcher, Howell J., chief assistant counsel	10,844.54	903.71
Kenny, Lucille O., assistant clerk	3,372.27	281.02
Lee, Lydia, record clerk	5,631.72	469.31
McCahill, Myles C., investigator	6,326.94	527.24
McElroy, Robert J., investigator	4,762.70	396.89
Montier, Gladys E., assistant clerk	4,588.89	382.40
Morris, Constance L., assistant clerk	3,980.59	331.71
Sheridan, James F., investigator	6,326.94	527.24
Thomas, James H., assistant counsel	5,718.63	476.55
Young, Ruth M., clerk	4,588.89	382.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,881.46
Balance unexpended returned to the contingent fund of the Senate	3,118.54

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Expenditures Committee Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

REPORT OF SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (PURSUANT TO RES. 206, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 1, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from August 1, 1950, to December 31, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S., assistant counsel	$7,941.22	$3,308.80
Flanagan, Francis D., chief counsel	10,846.00	4,519.15
Hatcher, Howell J., chief assistant counsel	10,844.54	4,518.55
Kenny, Lucille O., assistant clerk	3,575.04	1,422.00
Lee, Lydia, record clerk	5,631.72	2,346.65
McCahill, Myles C., investigator	6,326.94	2,636.20
McElroy, Robert J., investigator	4,762.70	1,984.45
Montier, Gladys E., assistant clerk	4,558.89	1,912.00
Morris, Constance L., assistant clerk through Nov. 12	3,080.59	1,279.89
Sheridan, James F., investigator	6,326.95	2,636.20
Thomas, James H., assistant counsel	5,718.63	2,382.75
Young, Ruth M., clerk	4,558.89	1,912.00
Bellino, Carmine S., accounting consultant July 1 through Dec. 31	(1)	3,765.93

[1] $30.12 per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$64,446.31
Amount expended	37,690.83
Balance unexpended	26,755.48

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Expenditures Committee Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bassett, Ellsworth W., professional staff	$10,846.00	$5,423.00
Burnett, Frank, chief clerk	10,846.00	5,423.00
Dekom, Otto, professional staff (minority)	10,846.00	872.76
Jeffreys, Barbara S., clerical staff (to Aug. 31, 1950)	3,980.50	663.42
Kerr, Roy Dean, clerical staff	5,892.43	1,473.09
Ortiz, Frances, professional staff	7,941.22	3,970.00
Porter, Eloise, clerical staff	6,326.94	3,163.47
Sneed, Theo W., professional staff	10,346.83	5,173.41
Stovall, Frances A., clerical staff	5,197.21	2,598.60
Walker, Emily N., clerical staff (minority)	4,762.70	2,381.35
Wilson, Thomas L., professional staff (to Aug. 31, 1950)	10,846.00	1,807.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under Legislative Reorganization Act, and S. Res. 123, 81st Congress	$60,000.00
Amount expended	23,703.91
Balance unexpended	36,296.09

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by request of the Committee on Armed Services, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3. A bill to provide for Federal loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 4. A bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 5. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations) of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 6. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 7. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the merger and the consolidation of international air carriers for the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 8. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; and

S. 9. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 11. A bill to provide for the appointment of committees to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, or physical incapacity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 12. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 13. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 14. A bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States;

S. 15. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 16. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges;

S. 17. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies;

S. 18. A bill to authorize suits against the United States to adjudicate and administer water rights; and

S. 19. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 20. A bill to provide for the use of 25 percent of grazing receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 21. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to provide for the payment of certain tort claims to employees of contractors with the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 22. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 23. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris;

S. 24. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended;

S. 25. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

S. 26. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes;

S. 27. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 28. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Teresa E. Dwyer; and

S. 30. A bill for the relief of Friederike Strachwitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 32. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile;

S. 33. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code;

S. 34. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; and

S. 35. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 36. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 37. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; and

S. 38. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 39. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 40. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish recreational facilities in reservoir areas of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 41. A bill prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Klemens Kalman Schlosser;

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Joseph Fleury Paluy;

S. 44. A bill for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri;

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche;

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet;

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Madeleine Quarez; and

S. 48. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucilio Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. GILLETTE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen;

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Delfo Giorgi;

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Quilici;

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 55. A bill for the relief of Julia Sanchez Andaluz;

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu;

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow;

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Vernon Crudge;

S. 60. A bill for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova;

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Sister Carmen Teva Ramos;

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou; and

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Helen Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 65. A bill to abolish the commissioned officer grade of brigadier general in the Army, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; to provide for the classification of major generals of the Army, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps as major generals upper half and major generals lower half; and for other purposes; and

S. 66. A bill to abolish the classification of rear admirals of the Navy and Coast Guard as rear admirals upper half and lower half; to establish the grade of commodore in the Navy and Coast Guard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Durang;

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. P. Mason;

S. 70. A bill for the relief of Sono Mary Theresa Nishimura; and

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Lumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 72. A bill to establish the Passamaquoddy power project for the development and use of tidal energy in the waters of Passamaquoddy Bay for the production of electrical power; and

S. 73. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. BENTON):

S. 74. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 75. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 76. A bill for the relief of Herbert H. Heller; and

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 78. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valentine Averdoff;

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Hentz; and

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Devora Rabinowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 81. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 82. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 83. A bill for the relief of First Lt. James E. Willcox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 84. A bill to provide automatic national service life insurance coverage for certain persons in the active military or naval service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 85. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 86. A bill to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 87. A bill requiring a loyalty oath to be taken by officers and employees of the United States Government;

S. 88. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 89. A bill for the relief of the city of Harriman school district;

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson;

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lem Motlow;

S. 92. A bill for the relief of William M. Greene;

S. 93. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Company, a Tennessee Corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; and

S. 94. A bill for the relief of the widows or other close kin of the members of the Tennessee Air National Guard who were killed in an aircraft accident near Conway, S. C., on June 23, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 95. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp commemorative of the Eleventh Tennessee Walking Horse Celebration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 96. A bill to provide for a Federal court building in Winchester, Tenn.;

S. 97. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Kentucky; and

S. 98. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Cumberland Dam and Reservoir on the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 99. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; and

S. 100. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HOEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. IVES, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 101. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 102. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 103. A bill to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to "Harry Strunk Lake";

S. 104. A bill to provide that the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii shall be elected

by the people of the Territory, and for other purposes; and

S. 105. A bill to provide that the Governor of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 106. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 107. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 108. To amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; and

S. 109. A bill to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 110. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1935, so as to bring issuers of workmen's compensation insurance policies within the protection of payment bonds required of contractors under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Rina Caprioglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 112. A bill for the relief of James W. Rennie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 113. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in Michigan to the State of Michigan for use in National Guard, Air National Guard, and other military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 114. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 115. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 116. A bill for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.;

S. 117. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Gray;

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 119. A bill for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 120. A bill to authorize certain work projects as an aid in rehabilitating inmates of Federal and State penal and correctional institutions, to improve the resources of federally owned conservation lands and to provide increased benefits from these properties, and for other purposes;

S. 121. A bill for the relief of Tryntje Bierema;

S. 122. A bill for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.;

S. 123. A bill to provide for preference under the immigration quotas;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Roy Albert Hamilton, Sr.;

S. 126. A bill to require the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (northern division) to sit during a part of its term at Flint, Mich.;

S. 127. A bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes; and

S. 128. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 129. A bill to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress; and

S. 130. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 131. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 132. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 133. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans;

S. 134. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 135. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 136. A bill to reduce certain taxes;

S. 137. A bill to provide a $25 credit for income-tax purposes for persons who vote in elections of Federal officers;

S. 138. A bill to increase the credit allowed for dependent children of a taxpayer in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 139. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land of John Little Crow; and

S. 140. A bill to establish a Federal waterlands reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 141. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to the manufacture and distribution of goods; to strengthen small business in its economic struggle for survival; to promote competition by prohibiting a manufacturer from engaging in the retail field and by prohibiting a retailer from engaging in manufacturing; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Vito Rizzi;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Mordka Szaja (also known as Mordka Wiener);

S. 144. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Wrangham;

S. 145. A bill for the relief of Wei Yuan and S. T. Chang;

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Herbert Kiilsgard;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Harun Chowdhury, Suruj Mean, Abdul Motlib, Moklish Miah, Aftab Miah, and Jabid Ullah;

S. 148. A bill for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft;

S. 149. A bill to provide that aliens who have arrived in the United States shall not be excluded without a hearing;

S. 150. A bill for the relief of Mahammed Tahid Ali and certain other aliens;

S. 151. A bill for the relief of Albertas Bauras and his family;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Jersey Hadrosek and his family;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Emiko Mori;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla;

S. 156. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of William Zumsteg;

S. 158. A bill conferring authority on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to regulate admission to the bar of the District of Columbia;

S. 159. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Brandner;

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Attar Ali and Abarath Ullah;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Alex Adbul Ghane Tassie;

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Lee Hong Dick;

S. 163. A bill for the relief of Chang Han Wen;

S. 164. A bill for the relief of Aron Tejbus Birenbaum;

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Leon Engel;

S. 168. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Russow and Volker Harpe;

S. 169. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Shunafor Ullah and certain other aliens;

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy;

S. 172. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen;

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Gerd. Anni Berger Fedje;

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex;

S. 175. A bill for the relief of Azman Ali;

S. 176. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians and Estonians;

S. 177. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians and Estonians;

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Zdenek Marek;

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens;

S. 180. A bill for the relief of Walter Engelbert;

S. 181. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Froehlich;

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Erhardt Otto;

S. 184. A bill for the relief of certain alien refugees;

S. 185. A bill for the relief of certain alien refugees;

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Werner Otto Wenk; and

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Rena Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 188. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation as to the cause, prevention, treatment, and possible cure of epilepsy, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 189. A bill providing for the right of hearing and appeal by classified civil-service employees, and for other purposes;

S. 190. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services;

S. 191. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government;

S. 192. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 193. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service;

S. 194. A bill to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency;

S. 195. A bill to provide for election of postmasters by the people;

S. 196. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Carl Schurz in the United States;

S. 197. A bill to increase the limit on postal savings from $2,500 to $5,000; and

S. 198. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 199. A bill to provide for acquisition from sources within the State of North Dakota of sand and gravel for use in the construction of Garrison Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 200. A bill to grant permanent residence to Joan Violet Laun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 201. A bill making an appropriation for emergency repairs to the Canadian River siphon, Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 202. A bill relating to the payment of national service life insurance of Leo E. Chavez; and

S. 203. A bill repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Cardenas, also known as Alcadio Cardenas;

S. 205. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Roberta Madrigali;

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Renzo Petroni;

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Chaskiel Wajnryb and his wife, Anna;

S. 209. A bill for the relief of Joseph Chiana;

S. 210. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Lianderal;

S. 211. A bill for the relief of Maria Enriquez;

S. 212. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Tutton;

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Gallegos; and

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Reese, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. A bill to correct an injustice by providing for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 216. A bill to amend section 631b of title 5, United States Code, by adding a new subsection, to be cited as subsection (c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 217. A bill authorizing the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua;

S. 218. A bill to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of, and accessible to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 219. A bill to describe the boundaries of the United States Capitol grounds, to regulate the use of the Capitol buildings and grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 220. A bill for the establishment of the United States Joint Commission on Foreign Trade; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 221. A bill to provide for disposition and use of funds held in trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 222. A bill to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Azy Ajderian;

S. 224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Maria Mateo;

S. 225. A bill to facilitate the admission of certain foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States;

S. 226. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker, of El Paso, Tex., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the operation and use by the United States Army of certain lands in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., as an antiaircraft artillery practice firing range; and

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 228. A bill relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 229. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 230. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 231. A bill to authorize use of rental and operating income from defense housing facilities of the National Military Establishment for payments in lieu of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 232. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 233. A bill to authorize payments on automobiles purchased by certain amputee veterans of the Korean operations equal to those authorized for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON):

S. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 235. A bill for the relief of the town of Lancaster, Mass.;

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Nicholas George Strangas; and

S. 237. A bill for admission to the United States of Mr. Margot Kazerski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LODGE (for himself Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HUNT) introduced Senate bill 238, to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HUNT) also introduced Senate bill 239, to amend the act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), relating to the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 240. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 241. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Daniel Lindsey Payne;

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Dewey Pickett;

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Edwards;

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Harriet T. Johnston;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Ivan Norman Genit; and

S. 247. A bill to permit retired officers of the Armed Forces to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HOLLAND introduced Senate bill 248, authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova; and

S. 250. A bill for the relief of Bernard Joseph Usiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 251 (by request). A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 252. A bill to admit Julius Pfeilmeier to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 253. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to David Brown to certain lands; and

S. 254. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Oglala Sioux Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Pine Ridge Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 255. A bill to amend the minimum-wage law by extending the application of minimum-wage orders to men, and for other purposes;

S. 256. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights in the government of the District of Columbia;

S. 257. A bill to make unlawful in the District of Columbia the interception of telephone and telegraph communications by means of any device, contrivance, machine, or apparatus by any person other than a law-enforcement officer of the District of Columbia or of the United States acting in

the performance of his official duties in compliance with an order or warrant of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;

S. 258 (by request). A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 259 (by request). A bill to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 260 (by request). A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia;

S. 261 (by request). A bill to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902;

S. 262 (by request). A bill to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes;

S. 263 (by request). A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended; and

S. 264 (by request). A bill to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces compensatory time for working on holidays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 265 (by request). A bill to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. IVES):

S. 266. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, District of Columbia, theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 267. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 268. A bill to amend section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Papaeconomou; and

S. 270. A bill for the relief of Gerald E. Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 271. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 272. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markham's Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 273. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Reisky-Dubnic;

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Armando Santini;

S. 275. A bill for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik;

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolau and his wife, Emilia;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Peter Szecsi;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Frederick Wiesinger; and

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the same rights to the Indian tribes which are enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to authorize the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion to preserve or dispose of material removed from the Executive Mansion during the period of renovation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the anniversary of the sinking of the United States ship *Dorchester* as Dorchester Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENLISTMENT OF CERTAIN ALIENS IN THE ARMY AND REGULAR ARMY OF UNITED STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in association with a bipartisan group of Senators, including the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I introduce for appropriate reference two bills, both of which have the purpose of making it possible for foreign young men who have a common cause with us to fight for the cause in which we and they both believe.

The first bill is simply a modification of the existing law. It extends the program from the present terminal date of 1953 to a terminal date of 1955 and it increases the ceiling of the present law from 2,500 to 25,000 men. Existing law, it should be mentioned, makes it possible for these men to be used in any assignment designed to promote the best interests of the United States.

The second bill is a renewal of the bill which I introduced at the last Congress to set up a Volunteer Freedom Corps of 250,000 men. Where the first bill would aim to obtain potential officers and non-commissioned officers who would be available for training and leading larger numbers of young aliens in case of war, the second bill concerns itself with the large number of young men who would be interested only in wartime service and who would not be making a career of the military life. The young men of the Volunteer Freedom Corps would, presumably, be enlisted abroad and would only serve abroad. They would not have the same privileges or the same status as those in the first bill who would be subject to a very thorough screening, with United States citizenship at the end of 5 years of honorable service.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a statement by me giving further particulars on this subject, together with the texts of the two bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bills and the statement by the Senator from Massachusetts and the texts of the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The Chair hears no objection.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

Today, in association with a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senators BREWSTER, HICKENLOOPER, IVES, MUNDT, and HUNT, I am introducing two bills, both of which have the purpose of making it possible for foreign young men who have a common cause with us to fight for the cause in which we and they both believe.

The first bill is simply a modification of the existing law. It extends the program from the present terminal date of 1953 to a terminal date of 1955 and it increases the ceiling of the present law from 2,500 to 25,000 men. Existing law, it should be mentioned, makes it possible for these men to be used in any assignment designed to promote the best interests of the United States.

The second bill is a renewal of the bill which I introduced at the last Congress to set up a Volunteer Freedom Corps of 250,000 men. Where the first bill would aim to obtain potential officers and noncommissioned officers who would be available for training and leading larger numbers of young aliens in case of war, the second bill concerns itself with the large number of young men who would be interested only in wartime service and who would not be making a career of the military life. The young men of the Volunteer Freedom Corps would, presumably, be enlisted abroad and would only serve abroad. They would not have the same privileges or the same status as those in the first bill who would be subject to a very thorough screening, with United States citizenship at the end of 5 years of honorable service.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point further particulars on this subject, together with the texts of the two bills:

One vital element of the struggle for existence in which we are now engaged relates to the question of who does the fighting. It is made especially acute by the fact that our opponent fights without expending his own manpower. We Americans, on the other hand, have been required to shed the blood of our own young manhood in order to combat those who fight at our opponent's bidding. One of the most urgent questions of our time is therefore: How long we can tolerate an arrangement in which we, in terms of manpower, can never win, and they, in the same terms, can never lose?

Money and matériel have great importance, but our greatest and inestimable treasure is our manpower. Certainly, one great object of a successful foreign policy is that there be other people who have a common cause with us and who are both willing and able to fight for that cause. This means that our allies in the Atlantic Pact must promptly get in a strong defensive posture. It means integrating into the defense against Communist imperialism the former enemy nations, Germany and Japan. It means removing the obstacles which now exist to the participation of the former neutrals—Ireland and Spain. It also means immediate formation of military units composed of stateless anti-Communist Slavs. These measures, if taken promptly, will all mean that our American manhood will not in the future be required to carry alone the full load of combat.

The Soviet Union, ever since 1945, has used puppets and satellites to do its fighting for it and to work behind the lines, using political and subversive methods. We Americans will always do our full share of the fighting ourselves, but we must meet this new threat with as much imagination and as much willingness to use new methods as the Soviets do.

Coming to the Senate in 1947, I introduced legislation authorizing the enlisting of selected aliens in the United States Army, thereby making use of some of the millions of anti-Communist young men in the world who would like to fight on our side. It was only last August—more than 3 years later—that this bill finally became law, but the figure had been cut down to 2,500 men. In the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced legislation for a Volunteer Freedom Corps of 250,000 men. Surely, the staggeringly effective use which the Soviets are making of puppet armies must at last have aroused us to the value—not of having puppets of our own—but of having stout-hearted and enthusiastic allies on our side, whether in the uniform of their own country or in the uniform of the United States.

There is one more category, and that is the great mass of anti-Communist freedom-loving young men from behind the iron curtain. Estimates of the number having an effective potential of military service run as high as 2,000,000. One of the greatest authorities on the subject told me that in case of war the United States could recruit as many of these young men as we could clothe and equip, provided—and he stressed this proviso—we have professional officers in sufficient numbers who spoke their language and knew their customs to organize them into effective military formations and lead them in combat.

One of Hitler's most glaring errors in World War II was his stupid handling of the millions of anti-Communist Russians who hated their Russian rulers so much that they welcomed the German conquerors with open arms. One of the most famous Russian anti-Communist leaders was General Vlasov, who organized an army of non-Communist Russians to fight on the German side. I saw some of these Vlasov soldiers at the time of the invasion of southern France. They were in German uniform and appeared to be Mongolians. There were several millions of anti-Communist men available, but Hitler did not have enough professional officers who spoke their language and knew their customs to organize them into effective military formations and lead them in combat.

It is unfortunate that the Soviets interested themselves in the possibilities of using alien soldiers long before we did and we are paying a big price for this in Korea at this moment. Their employment of alien troops, however, depends basically on force and compulsion whereas the essence of the employment of alien troops such as we propose is voluntaryism. In fact, we must never lose sight of the fact that the American way to receive the foreign soldier is on a basis which is both voluntary and equal. The argument that it is pernicious and debilitating to hire mercenary adventurers as replacements for your own men, who would thus escape military service, is sound; and we should actively oppose such a proposal. But we should as actively seek, instead, the help of selected alien soldiers on the same voluntary basis which actuated the countless aliens who fought for our country during the War of the Revolution, the Mexican War, the Civil War, and thereafter. It is safe to say that we could never have made our maximum effort in those wars without the alien soldier, fighting on a vounteer basis in the uniform of the United States. In all our wars we have welcomed allies who fight at our side under their own flag and in the uniform of their own country. We should not reject—indeed, we should warmly welcome—the individual ally who wears our uniform and fights under our flag. We should sense the immense difference between the mercenary hireling and the volunteer citizen candidate for which our present law provides.

We should start now to organize the many young men in Europe whose fatherland is in the grip of the Communist dictatorship, and who cannot join the army of their own country. There is obviously no organization which is as ready to receive these young men; process them; clothe, house, and feed them; and arm, equip, and train them, as is the United States Army.

The fact that under this plan these young fighters for freedom would be part of the United States Army means that their services could be used in support of the United Nations. Without the United States Army, it is highly doubtful that these men would be available in significant numbers, since no other country would be able to organize them at anything approaching a rapid rate of speed.

I say this in the knowledge that there are sincere persons, some of them Members of this body, who favor a so-called international police force in which men from many nations serve as individuals—a force in which all those who serve in it—the man from the palms, the man from the pines, the Christian, and the Arab—are supposed to give up their citizenship and cheerfully submit to a common pay schedule, a common ration, and a common code of justice and discipline. Of course, that is something which as civilians they would never even think of doing. Those who advocate this proposal fail to realize that an army is but the military expression of the civilian community—that the army must be based on the civilian society, and not the civilian society based on the army. There is also the financial burden which such a force would be to the United Nations, a burden which most of the nations would find unbearable, even though the United States would defray, as it does now, the largest share of the United Nations' cost. Perhaps the time will come when such a scheme is feasible, but all must agree that it cannot possibly be of practical help in the present crisis.

To sum up. There are five sources of manpower with which to build armies to fight for freedom: First, the United States; second, our allies; third, our former enemies; fourth, the former neutrals; and fifth, the anti-Communist, freedom-loving aliens who have no army of their own to join.

Such men fighting side by side with Americans, allies, former enemies, and former neutrals would present a front of fervent, ardent, and convinced anti-Communist fighters for freedom. This would strongly tend to prevent aggression. It would also insure that, if war should come, the cost in terms of precious manpower would be equitably shared by men from all the freedom-loving peoples. Such a policy is both militarily sound and morally right, and we should waste no time in putting it into action.

The bill (S. 238) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HUNT), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized until June 30, 1955, with the approval of the Secretary of State and subject to the provisions of this act, to accept voluntary enlistments or reenlistments in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, of qualified, unmarried, male aliens in such enlisted grades and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed from time to time by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That the total number of persons serving under the provisions of this section shall at no time exceed the sum of 250,000.

SEC. 2. Persons enlisted in the Army of the United States under provisions of the first section of this act shall—

(a) be not less than 18 years of age or more than 35 years of age;

(b) be without dependents as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949;

(c) be enlisted for such term of enlistment, not less than 2 years, as the Secretary of the Army shall prescribe;

(d) while serving under such enlistment receive such pay and allowances as the Secretary of the Army shall prescribe, except that such pay and allowances shall not be more than the pay and allowances received by nationals of the United States who are serving in like enlisted grades, have the same length of service, and are serving under the same or similar conditions;

(e) not be assigned to any duty within the territorial limits of the United States.

SEC. 3. No person enlisted in the Army of the United States under provisions of the first section of this act shall, by reason of his service therein, be entitled—

(a) to receive any benefit provided by any law administered by the Veterans' Administration or any other law providing any retirement, pension, compensation, or other benefit for nationals of the United States by reason or their service in the Armed Forces of the United States; or

(b) to be admitted into the United States under any of the immigration laws of the United States, or

(c) to qualify for naturalization as a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 4. Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to persons enlisted under provisions of the first section of this act.

SEC. 5. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1955, with respect to all persons enlisted under provisions of the first section of this act.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as he shall deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Army is further authorized to appoint civilian citizens of the United States and of other nations to serve with the Volunteer Freedom Corps in such positions and for such periods of time as he may deem will fulfill the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army may discharge any officer or member of the corps for cause, disability, or for the convenience of the Government. The officers and members of the corps shall be subject to such disciplinary regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including provision for the punishment by summary discharge, and shall be subject to the Articles of War.

The bill (S. 239) to amend the act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), relating to the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, introduced by Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HUNT), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army," approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), is amended (1) by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955," and (2) by striking out "two thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five thousand."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

AUDUBON CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 248) authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HOLLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND CONCERNING THE AUDUBON CENTENNIAL YEAR

The year 1951 is the centenary of the death of John James Audubon, the distinguished pioneer artist and naturalist who made outstanding contributions to American life and art through his paintings of American birds and mammals. He successfully completed the monumental task to which he dedicated his life in painting 1,065 birds of 489 species in 435 separate paintings.

Such a task was not easy in Audubon's time. There were no photographs nor mounted specimens to guide him. He traversed the wilds from Labrador to Louisiana and the Florida Keys, and from Pennsylvania to Texas, enduring the hardships of primitive travel to paint his birds in their natural habitat.

Audubon lived in a pioneer era when America's natural resources seemed as limitless as the horizons to the west. Yet Audubon cried out against the wanton destruction of birds and animals that he witnessed wherever he went, and warned, "The war of extermination cannot last many years more."

It is little wonder that, when in 1886 an organization was formed for the protection of American birds not used for food, it should take the name Audubon Society. Today the National Audubon Society and its affiliated organizations across the continent constitute one of the greatest conservation organizations in the world. The major purpose of the society is to advance public understanding of the value and need of conservation of soil, water, plants, and wildlife and the relation of their intelligent treatment and wise use to human welfare. To achieve this object it has enrolled nearly 9,000,000 children in Audubon Junior Clubs; it conducts four Audubon camps for the instruction of youth leaders in nature and conservation subjects; it carries on a regular educational lecture program in 140 cities; it provides warden service for the protection of birds and other wildlife on some 2,000,000 acres of land and water in the United States; and it conducts research in an effort to find ways and means of saving and restoring species of birds and other animals threatened with extinction.

The year 1951 offers a singular opportunity to pay tribute to John James Audubon and his contributions to our cultural heritage. Therefore, I am introducing in the Congress this bill which authorizes the President of the United States to issue a proclamation in observance of Audubon Centennial Year.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF CONFERENCE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representative concurring), That there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement, in writing and signed by at least a majority of the managers on the part of each House, explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

Sec. 2. The foregoing section shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

WRITTEN REPORTS TO ACCOMPANY BILLS, ETC.

Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That on and after January 3, 1952 section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives other than Appropriation Committees shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned with the expenditure of any funds required to meet the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included within the accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and quarterly shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) in the form of anticipated legislative budgets for each of the ensuing 5 fiscal years for the information of the Congress."

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-second Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN CLERICAL AND OTHER ASSISTANTS ON PAYROLL OF SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in the case of the resignation of a Senator during his term of office, his clerical and other assistants on the payroll of the Senate on the date of such resignation shall be continued on such payroll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed 30 days: *Provided*, That any such assistants continued on the payroll, while so continued, shall perform their duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and he hereby is authorized and directed to remove from such payroll any such assistants who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued: *Provided further*, That this shall not operate to continue such assistants on such payroll beyond the expiration of their Senator's term of service.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 6), which was

referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1951, and ending on January 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTERNAL SECURITY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before December 31, 1952.

(Mr. WHERRY submitted Senate Resolution 8, providing that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

EVA MALENA THOMAS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Eva Malena Thomas, mother of Mark Poulton Thomas, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SEATING OF COMMUNIST CHINA IN ORGANS OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the forces of freedom and democracy, bound together under the Charter of the United Nations, are engaged in bloody conflict against the forces of totalitarian aggression; and

Whereas by its constant intransigence and complete disregard for the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the fundamental principles of international law, Soviet Russia has continuously flouted the desires of the great majority of the member states of the United Nations and impeded the orderly operations of the organs of the United Nations; and

Whereas Communist China, an unlawful puppet and satellite of the Soviet Union, is now engaged in hostilities against United Nations forces in Korea and is seeking to be seated in the organs of the United Nations; and

Whereas if Communist China be seated in the organs of the United Nations an additional disrupting and unlawful influence would be added, serving to impede further the orderly processes designed to maintain peace in the world; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the seating of Communist China in any of the organs of the United Nations would constitute sanction by that body of acts of international piracy and brigandage which makes mockery of the aims and purposes of the United Nations, its organs and its agencies; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States reaffirms its faith in the United Nations as a means of maintaining international peace and security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to instruct the delegation of the United States to the United Nations, its organs, and agencies to take all possible appropriate steps to insure that representatives of Communist China not be seated in any of the organs or agencies of the United Nations.

Resolved further, That the President is hereby requested to instruct the United States representative in the Security Council to exercise the veto on any proposal to admit Communist China to membership in the United Nations.

PARDONS TO CERTAIN CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the President is requested to grant pardons to all persons heretofore convicted and sentenced for failure to register or report for service in the military forces as provided in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Act of 1948, by reason of their religious convictions.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE OF EXISTING CEMENT SHORTAGE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the existing cement shortage with a view to ascertaining the causes for such shortage. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to determining (1) whether large amounts of cement are being withheld pending further price increases or by any Government agency, and (2) whether such shortage appears to be the result of unlawful actions on the part of any group or groups.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than January 15, 1951.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE OF COLLISION ON LONG ISLAND RAILROAD

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the cause or causes of the collision which occurred on the Long Island Railroad on November 22, 1950. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of justice in the American zones of occupation in Germany and Austria with a view to ascertaining (1) the extent to which persons who are or have been Communists were given responsibility for the policies and administration of justice in such zones; (2) the extent of which persons who are or have been Communists were given responsibility for the program for denazification of several million Germans; (3) whether or not the activities of such persons were responsible for the moving of many German and Austrian engineers, scientists, and other highly trained men to Russia; and (4) whether any of the persons now employed by the State Department in connection with the administration of justice in such zones are or have been members of the Communist Party. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem necessary to provide for improvement of the administration of justice in the American zones of occupation in Germany and Austria.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSITION OF MONEYS PAID FOR ADMISSION TO THE BAR OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to

conduct a full study and investigation into the alleged practice of the Committee on Admissions and Grievances of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of appropriating to its own use moneys paid for admission to the bar of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The committee shall report the results of such study and investigation to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations for such legislation or other action as it deems necessary.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES, ETC., IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of supplies, materials, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities in connection with the national defense, including (1) the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States; (2) the methods by which such contracts are awarded and contractors selected; (3) the utilization of the facilities of small business concerns, through subcontracts or otherwise; (4) the geographic distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities; (5) the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor; (6) the performance of contracts and the accountings required of contractors; (7) benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for the purposes of taxation or otherwise; (8) practices of management or labor, and prices, fees, and charges, which interfere with such program or unduly increase its costs; and (9) such other matters as the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have heard the President's message, and I have already stated that I thought it temperate in character. I desire now to send to the desk a resolution prompted by the message, which I ask to have read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. In his message, I think the President exercised the best of judgment when he invited constructive criticism and debate. I think his message is encouraging in its recommendations for expanding the military establishment and for producing more planes and munitions, but I think his failure to present a global policy indicating the use to be made thereof is a disappointment. The message leaves the inference that the past policy of drift will be continued.

But on the vital issue of whether United States ground troops should now be sent to western Europe—and I emphasize "now"—the President is silent, although in a recent press conference he stated he would send divisions of United States troops to western Europe. Apparently he has committed us to the sending of ground troops, regardless of the opposition which has been made and is being made to that character of mutual aid, and regardless of the fact that, under the North Atlantic Defense Treaty, Congress has full power to determine the character of the mutual aid that shall be provided.

The issue of whether America's resources in money and manpower are to be dissipated pursuant to that policy or directed to the establishment of mastery of the air, with a ring of air bases surrounding Russia, is fundamental to all preparedness plans.

Therefore, I am submitting to the Senate a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that no United States ground troops shall be sent to western Europe pending determination by the Congress of a policy on that matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and will lie on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORTS ENTITLED "AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND THE MOBILIZATION PROGRAM" (S. DOC. NO. 3) AND "NICKEL" (S. DOC. NO. 4)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recent reports of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee entitled "Agricultural Products and the Mobilization Program" and "Nickel," be printed as Senate documents.

The subcommittee has made rather thorough studies of these problems and its efforts have already resulted in the taking of many constructive steps by the departments concerned. We are confident that additional steps will also be taken as a result of the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. I am sure Senators will be interested in reading these reports, and I ask that they be printed as Senate documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on December 31, 1950, at Springfield, Ohio, entitled "Justice for Poland," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. HOLLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Today's Guest of Honor," published in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, of November 21, 1950, and an editorial entitled "A Sound Thinker," from the same newspaper, under date of November 23, 1950, paying tributes to James A. Farley, which appear in the Appendix.]

FEWER STRIKES FOR MORE PEOPLE—EDITORIAL BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fewer Strikes for More People," written by Maurice R. Franks and published in Partners magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACKGROUND OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION—ARTICLE BY RAY CARPENTER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Background of the Twenty-eighth Division," written by Ray Carpenter, division historian, which appears in the Appendix.]

YULETIDE PRAYERS—NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the special Christmas column written by A. L. Shultz and published in several Kansas newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "The UN Must Act," from the New York Herald Tribune, the second entitled "UN Put to the Test," from the New York Times, both dealing with the problem now facing the United Nations of deciding whether to declare Red China an aggressor.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1951]

THE UN MUST ACT

Spurred by growing bewilderment and doubt throughout the country, the State Department has undertaken a vigorous diplomatic offensive to get from the United Nations a statement that China has been guilty of aggression in Korea. Less could hardly be asked of an international organization which is, among other things, the standard bearer of the world's concept of right and wrong. An argument was possible directly after the Chinese intervention, and before the thirty-eighth parallel had been crossed, to the effect that the branding of China as aggressor would hamper efforts to achieve a truce. Even then, however, it seemed to us the proper course to keep the facts on the record straight, calling aggression by its obvious name, and proceeding to deal with the situation with patience and statesmanlike magnanimity.

Some hope apparently persists among non-Communist nations that, in spite of all, cease-fire arrangements can be worked out. Some fear exists that to name China as aggressor will be a prelude to all-out war. The hope is so slim as to be negligible; moreover, if the Chinese were to find it in their interests to call a truce, the charge of aggression would hardly deter them. As for the

fear of all-out war, the definition of China's offense does not in any way commit the UN or the United States to such an engagement. With the aggressor recognized for what he is, it then becomes the task of policy makers to decide by what means and to what extent he is to be checked and punished.

Originally the charge of aggression was to be made by the Security Council; but the inevitability of a Russian veto where any of its satellites or minions are involved led to the provision which makes it possible for the veto-free Assembly to take up the issue. For the Assembly not to act would be a shock indeed. For it to act unconvincingly, with numerous abstentions, would be almost as bad. The need is for a decisive move—for an unequivocal statement which will have the effect of restoring to the international scene a reality of which protracted evasions have robbed it. For lack of such a statement the free world remains divided and confused, and the Chinese breach retains a shadow of wholly improper justification. For lack of it, too, the UN declines daily in men's opinion. The State Department, in presenting forcefully the United States point of view, is serving not only the interests of our country but of law and freedom everywhere.

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1951]

UN PUT TO THE TEST

In urging members of the United Nations to take a firm stand against Chinese Communist aggression in Korea and to call that aggression by its rightful name the United States is acting in the interest of the United Nations. The positions that the world organization takes and the degree to which it is willing to stand by its professions of principles will largely determine whether it can and will survive. If it surrenders its integrity now in the name of a supposititious expediency it will have betrayed the purposes for which it was conceived and in its confession of impotence invited its own dissolution.

The reasons for hesitation on the part of many countries are quite understandable and they should be viewed sympathetically. They are deeply concerned lest the Organization, or one of its major members, become involved in a war with Communist China. Some are likewise concerned lest a large United States commitment in Asia leave too little for purposes of commitment in Europe. The first of those two feelings is the more praiseworthy but they are both very real.

The United States shares both of those feelings. This country does not want to see the battle for Korea develop into a war with the Communist Chinese or with anyone else. This country certainly does not want an overcommitment in any theater to the detriment of another point of need. Because of those attitudes the United States has expressed its willingness to explore all possibilities for a peaceful settlement of the Korean struggle. But that exploration must be realistic, both in the physical and in the moral sense.

Some of the delay in United Nations action has been caused by just such an exploration. There is a hopeful waiting to see if a successful peace formula can be devised. Some parts of the various formulas thus far advanced have been anything but realistic. Both the Asian-Arab bloc and the three-man truce committee, as well as Prime Minister Nehru, in London, have suggested that as part of a general settlement there should be the establishment of a free and united Korea with nation-wide elections under United Nations auspices. There is nothing in the record to suggest that the North Koreans, the Chinese Communists, or the Soviet Union would consent to such a plan for the fraction of a second. To put it forward therefore as an objective to be gained, perhaps, by negotiation with Peiping (contingent, of course, upon Peiping's admission to the United Nations) is pure fantasy.

The Chinese Communists are in Korea today, more than a million strong, precisely to prevent the establishment of a free and unified Korea under United Nations auspices. They are fighting the United Nations on the battlefield, just as the Soviet Union has steadily fought the United Nations in the diplomatic arena, to keep the United Nations from carrying out, in Korea, the very purposes to which it is honorably committed. To assume that their admission to the councils of the United Nations will reverse this objective is to lose touch with reality. No Communists, Korean, Chinese, Russian, or American, want a free Korea, and they are willing to risk a war to prevent it.

Likewise, they not merely risk but boldly demand the complete moral disintegration of the United Nations. The United Nations is told upon what terms it can capitulate in the face of aggression. It can admit its grievous and illegal error in denouncing that aggression in the first place and take the sponsors, abettors and finally the partners in that aggression into its humbled bosom. The alternative is to be driven into the sea. If the United Nations does so capitulate it will have announced to the world that there is one moral principle of resistance to aggression when the aggressor is small and quite another and quite opposite principle of resistance when the aggressor is sufficiently powerful and arrogant. To make that admission is to put an end to the moral value of the United Nations Charter. If aggression against the free Republic of Korea was wrong last June it is wrong now and a million Chinese Communists can't make it right.

The United Nations, thanks to Soviet obstruction, does not have the physical force to counter any and all aggression. But it does have the moral obligation to remain committed against it. The present United Nations forces may be defeated in the field and obliged to retreat. That is no reason why the United Nations need be defeated in the world of morals and forced into oblivion.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the policy committee is a committee established by statute. I send to the desk the names of the members of the Republican Policy Committee.

The names of the members of the Republican Policy Committee are as follows:

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, chairman of conference.
ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, chairman, policy committee.
KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, floor leader for minority.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, whip for minority.
MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, secretary for conference.
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.
H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey.
HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan.
EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota.
OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine.
EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a list of the membership of the majority policy committee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MCFARLAND, Arizona, chairman.
Mr. RUSSELL, Georgia.
Mr. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming.
Mr. GREEN, Rhode Island.
Mr. HILL, Alabama.
Mr. KERR, Oklahoma.
Mr. CHAPMAN, Kentucky.
Mr. JOHNSON, Texas, majority whip, ex officio.
Mr. MCMAHON, Connecticut, secretary of the Democratic conference, ex officio.

THE FINANCING OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to have 2 minutes for the purpose of addressing the Senate on the question of the financing of government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the financing of government is more important now than any time in our history. Herman A. Lowe, a special writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, under date of January 6, has given some alarming figures as they relate to local and State government indebtedness. The figures reveal an increase of almost 50 percent in local and State government debt in the last 4-year period.

In these critical times we all realize that nondefense expenditures must be cut to the bone. Many of us who have had long experience in the lower levels of government realize that State and local governments could almost be destroyed by the taxing power of the Federal Government.

Without delay, we should work out a plan allocating taxes to each level of government and also setting forth the functions to be performed by each level of government.

Such a plan would cut down greatly the over-all cost of government because we could then do away with grants from the higher level of government to the lower level of government. The great strength of the American form of government is the part played by local government and State government.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Lowe's article inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW TREND TOWARD ENORMOUS DEBTS GRAVE THREAT TO STATE GOVERNMENTS

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, January 6.—Debts of the State and local governments are beginning to follow Federal debt into the stratosphere—although in a much more modest way. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the combined debt of the 48 States and their local subdivisions reached a record total of $23,600,000,000.

Of course, that was small potatoes compared with the Federal Government's debt of $257,400,000,000 on the same date.

But the local-State debt has climbed nearly 50 percent in the 4 years since 1946.

That's a lot of climb. It provides something to think about for people whose Federal taxes were hiked twice by Congress in 1950, and who are promised at least one more stiff increase from Congress in 1951.

Economy and economy talk have gone out of fashion. Today Washington and the remainder of the Nation hear plenty about hurrying rearmament and providing the wherewithal to pay for the job. That's as it should be.

But much Federal spending has nothing to do with rearmament. There's room for cutbacks there. And only a minute share of

local and State spending has any connection with rearmament or civil defense.

A breakdown of the over-all State-local debt shows this—the States owe $5,300,000,000. The cities owe $10,100,000,000. Counties and townships combined owe $2,000,000,000. Independent special district and independent local authorities owe $3,500,000,000; and the local school districts owe $2,700,000,000, aside from what the States owe on behalf of their school systems.

What this seems to add up to is that the States are in pretty good financial shape, but that the localities had better watch their step.

In the case of Pennsylvania the State's gross debt at the end of fiscal 1950 amounted to $804,715,000, a jump of about $500,000,000 over the previous year. The Keystone debt was only a little behind New York's $844,712,000 for the last fiscal year. Pennsylvania's gross per capita debt stood at $76.65, fourth highest in the Nation. These figures, of course, are exclusive of the debts of Philadelphia and other local units of the Commonwealth.

While the Federal, State, and local debts sound a warning to curb nondefense spending all along the line, they tell another interesting side story of the voracious growth of the Central Government in Washington, compared with the growth of the State and city governments.

That had been the general pattern of the country through most of its history.

World War I reversed the situation. By 1922, 69 percent of governmental debt was Federal, only 27.5 percent was local, and State debt was a mere 3.5 percent.

In 1902, for example, the Federal debt was only 35 percent of the total governmental debt. State debt was only 8 percent of the total, and local debt was 57 percent.

Today more than 91.5 percent of all governmental debt in this country has been run up by the Federal branch.

The bulk of this, of course, is due to the cost of the Second World War. But a very substantial part may be charged to the fact that the Government at Washington has been moving in continually upon functions which formerly belonged to the towns and States.

There are experts here who foresee the passing of the State governments as this country has always known them unless the trend is halted.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the minority leader if he is prepared to file at this time a list of committee assignments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are not prepared today to file such a list. I might say to the distinguished Senator that the reason for that is that we have conference rules, and one of the rules provides that if matters of organization are to be brought up, such as the appointment of members of committees, or the size of committees, notice is required. I am perfectly frank to say that the earliest possible moment of filing such a list will be Thursday of this week. I want to make a forthright statement in that connection and recite the exact situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection, but I should like to say to the minority leader that there has been no delay in the Senate by reason of the fact that the President made his address today. The majority will wait to file its committee assignments until the minority leader has filed his, and I propose to suggest that the Senate take a recess until next Thursday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say that the minority has been attempting to use the talent and ability which we find available. There have come to the Senate new Senators whom we desire to put to work without their serving an apprenticeship of 2, 4, or 6 years before they are advanced to membership on important committees, so they can render real service. I should like to say to my friend the majority leader, that we attempted to do this by suggesting that both sides change the number of members of committees. As an illustration, I may say that it seems to me there is not a Senator present who will not agree that there is nowhere near the amount of work in connection with the Committee on the District of Columbia as there is in connection with the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or the Committee on the Judiciary. We attempted to decrease the number of Senators on the committees on which Senators have not asked for service. It is felt that if a reduction could be made from 13 to 11 members in the case of the District Committee, for instance, and an increase made in the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations, the Senate of the United States would have the benefit of the ability of the Senators who have recently become Members of the Senate, and could carry on its work more efficiently. We were unable to do that on a voluntary basis. Therefore, Mr. President, we must iron out our committee appointments under the existing rules. As I said before, the earliest possible date when the minority can do it will be sometime on Thursday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was not making any statement in criticism of the distinguished minority leader or of the minority. I wish to work along with them, and I am willing to wait. It is perfectly satisfactory to wait until Thursday, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his observations. I did not feel that he was criticizing anyone. I merely wanted to make my explanation as to why the minority would not be ready until Thursday. I had hoped that we would be able to iron out applications that have been made for committee assignments to what I call the important committees.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, never before has representative government in these United States been reduced to such a spectacle.

Congress has now heard the President's state of the Union message.

In the midst of America's gravest crisis the President of the United States has been reduced to the role of a mouthpiece and errand boy for an international superstate which has already fastened such a strangle hold on us that it is squeezing out our resources and our very lifeblood.

Again I want to warn my fellow Americans that until this stranglehold of foreign parasites over our own destiny is broken, we shall continue to finance our suicide as a free people.

The tragedy is, Mr. President, that the President of the United States has maneuvered us into such a desperate predicament that he does not dare to tell the American people the truth.

Instead, he uses his office of high trust to continue deceiving himself, the American people and even our so-called allies.

The only ones he cannot deceive are Stalin and his puppets.

The root of this deception, Mr. President, lies in President Truman's continued insistence that he has not blundered, tricked, or betrayed us into a war; but that, instead, we—and I am quoting him—"are simply carrying out our obligations to the United Nations in the Far East."

Mr. President, this is merely another illustration of the technique used by our leadership during these tragic years, based on what I call, "the bigger the blunder, the bigger the lie."

And, this monstrous deception must now be finally and completely exposed.

It is obvious, Mr. President, that Congress alone can now put an end to this frightful fraud, and this Congress had best put an end to it within the next few months.

If the Members of Congress have a shred of courage and patriotism left, they will lay down an ultimatum to the President, demanding either a declaration of war or the bringing back of American GI's to home shores. It is absurd to call it a police action and to say that we are not at war.

The need for this action, Mr. President becomes more apparent with every passing hour.

If it is true that we are only engaged in what President Truman continues to describe a "police action" and "an obligation to the United Nations," then we have already been committed to permanent war all over the globe, to be undertaken at the whim and fancy of one man and we have already lost even the right to defend ourselves.

For, Mr. President, war is only an extension, by force, of national policies and national objectives.

Its purpose is not to make "the world safe for democracy" or to impose the four freedoms at the point of a bayonet all around the globe.

Its primary reason for existence is to defend a nation's capacity to defend itself and preserve freedom.

It is no wonder President Truman says we are not at war; for his ordering American GI's into Korea had neither Congressional sanction, constitutional sanction, nor United Nations sanction, and if it is permitted to become a precedent, this Government has already been reduced and degraded to military dictatorship, and the essence and form of representative government is gone from the face of the earth.

The hypocrisy of President Truman is unmatched in America's history; for he continues to insist we are not at war in

face of the casualty list to which I now refer.

I quote from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, January 2, 1951, from an article by Peter Edson, titled "Korea and World War I":

The United States was in World War I only 19 months—April 1917 to November 1918.

In the first 6 months of that war only about 15,000 United States troops got to France.

First United States troops went into the line only on October 21, 1917—7 months after war was declared.

So United States troops were at the front only a year and 22 days.

The United States First Division did not get into the line as a full combat division until April 25, 1918.

So there was a United States front for only the last 200 days—or less than 7 months of war.

This is where the Korean War begins to take on the proportions of World War I.

United States casualties in Korea, confirmed to December 22—

And there are many more now—

included 6,432 killed and died of wounds; 27,012 wounded; and 5,571 missing.

Total casualties for nearly 6 months, 38,015.

By comparison total American casualties in World War I were 50,000 battle deaths, 57,000 deaths from disease, 205,000 wounded, and 46 finally reported missing in action.

As another illustration, Mr. President, of the enormity of the President's hypocrisy, I call to mind the $17,500,000,000 which already has been requested by the President and the anticipated $75,000,000,000 budget for next year, which is designed to pay the cost of backing up this alleged police action.

This is not war, the President says, in face of the fact that my distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], one of America's greatest authorities on Federal budgetary and fiscal problems, warned December 29, 1950, that these demands, unless reduced to essentials, face this country with financial chaos and ultimate disaster.

I am sure the American people have not forgotten Lenin's prophecy that he would force America to spend herself into bankruptcy. I ask, Mr. President, what simpler means for fulfilling this purpose can the Communists find than through a series of terrible Korean wars which an American President laughs off as police action in international brawls that break out spasmodically in the four corners of the earth. Senators heard the President's message today. We are going all over the world to stop this thing. The timetable is set by Stalin. Indochina will be next, and then probably Formosa. But it is not war. It is only police action.

Mr. President, there is also what the President would laugh off as the insignificant police action destruction which has led to a scorched earth policy in the middle of a deadly winter which forced our own command to fly 17,000 wounded and frost-bitten American GI's out of the Korean death trap and which has turned loose 10,000,000 homeless, starving, helpless people in one of the most pathetic and tragic death marches in history.

I wonder what the rest of the world, looking at Korea, is saying. I wonder if the Koreans themselves are not saying, "We might have survived Russian occupation, but we do not know whether we can survive being liberated by our friends the Americans in this police action." The country is devastated. There are 10,000,000 people helpless and starving. That is the price they have paid for our part in the police action.

Then there is the frightening fact of the transformation of the American economic and social system into the engine of military destruction which is now under way and going full blast.

The President would never dare tell how far reaching his plans are for taking over America; and Congress continues to rubber stamp blindly the outlines of separate pieces of this mass-mobilization puzzle, which are being fitted together by the National Security Council as parts of a detailed top-secret study of this country's global strategy.

Can any Member of the Senate honestly say that he has even seen this top-secret plan No. 68 which calls for the projection of the so-called Korean police action to the rest of the globe?

Mr. President, I now come to the final proof of the degrading spectacle to which representative government has been reduced in this country.

For we need not extend the so-called Korean police action any further to discover that the President of the United States is caught in such a hopeless trap that to save his political face he is determined to continue turning the world into an international graveyard for American GI's even if it means the continued killing of American youth to fill it.

Mr. President, I know of no other instance in history of a free people having permitted their elected leaders to carry on such a wanton, senseless, brutal, useless destruction of the flower of their youth, their own flesh and blood. No free people have ever stood silently by for so long and watched the blood of their youth so senselessly poured out.

Mr. President, behind the despicable propaganda about what a triumphant retreat is being conducted in Korea by American fighting men, in face of overwhelming odds, lies the outrageous, treasonable fact that our boys cannot even bomb the source of supply and power of their deadly enemies because they are being used as puppets by a bunch of international gangsters and parasites in the United Nations under whose directives our own boys are fighting and dying.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, as the rout continues and the senseless destruction and killing goes on, the "cease-fire commission," set up by the United Nations finally reports the complete failure of its mission, and its complete inability to make any recommendations for future action.

Yet, on Thursday, January 4, 1951, President Truman told the American people that he would make no recommendations for future action against Communist China to save our own American GI's until the United Nations, which has admitted its impotence and bankruptcy, acts first.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, the inhumanity of the President of the United States toward American GI's becomes barbaric.

Civilized nations have always drafted rules and regulations for the protection of the physical and mental health and the fighting morale of their menfolk, upon whose ability to fight a nation's ability to exist depends.

Yet, the President of the United States today continues to serve as a puppet for the war-breeding, inhuman absurdity called the United Nations, while American GI's continue to fight, suffer, and die under inhuman conditions.

Mr. President, what must happen to the American youth to arouse the American people to the manner and extent to which they continue to be betrayed?

Our own military experts admit that in modern warfare a division can stand intense high-level combat for 30 days at the most.

Think of it, Mr. President. Up to this moment American youth has been forced to endure the horrors of front-line combat for from 3 to 5 months at a stretch without relief, and General MacArthur is fighting desperately to save American GI's from the folly of the political leadership which has produced this catastrophe.

Yet, General MacArthur has been informed by this administration that he can expect no more reinforcements or replacements.

I have never been so completely convinced that if Congress does not act to remedy this frightful situation and to call the President's hand, we shall dishonor ourselves as Americans and for all time prove ourselves unworthy to represent a free people.

Again, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to take a stand. There are two courses before us if we are to maintain our integrity and our sovereignty as a free people. We must either declare war against the forces which under the protection of the United Nations are murdering our youth or bring our boys home.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Can the Senator from Arizona tell the Senate what the program will be when the Senate reconvenes on Thursday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the minority will have its committee lists ready by that time, and that the committee assignments can be made. Today we have had the message from the President, and the order of the introduction of bills has been followed. The Senate is ready to begin work. That will be one of the principal objectives.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I know that is the hope of the minority.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, January 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, our Father, we rejoice that in Thee our baffled minds and burdened hearts may find shelter and safety, serenity and strength.

Grant that in all the difficult tasks and perplexing problems of each new day we may have the interpreting and guiding light of Thy divine spirit.

May we be numbered among the believing souls who are impervious to all thoughts and feelings of cynicism and fear, assured and confident that Thy holy will and purposes cannot be thwarted or defeated.

We pray that we may never accept and endure our hardships and trials in the spirit of sullen or passive resignation but may we be enabled by Thy grace to transform them into blessings, bringing us nearer unto Thee.

Inspire us with fidelity and diligence in our high vocation of lifting the life of humanity into the loftier altitudes of amity and peace. May we be true for there are those who trust us; may we be strong for there are heavy burdens to carry; may we be courageous for there is much to do and dare.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 4, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution fixing the hour of meeting of the two Houses of Congress for the purpose of receiving the President's message.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker, at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE (HELD PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 1) TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

At 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress: I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, this Eighty-second Congress faces as grave a task as any Congress in the history of our Republic.

The actions you take will be watched by the whole world. These actions will measure the ability of a free people, acting through their chosen representatives and their free institutions, to meet a deadly challenge to their way of life.

We can meet this challenge foolishly or wisely. We can meet it timidly or bravely, shamefully or honorably.

I know that the Eighty-second Congress will meet this challenge in a way worthy of our great heritage. I know that your debates will be earnest, responsible, and to the point. I know that from these debates there will come the great decisions needed to carry us forward.

At this critical time, I am glad to say that our country is in a healthy condition. Our democratic institutions are sound and strong. We have more men and women at work than ever before. We are able to produce more than ever before—in fact, far more than any country ever produced in the history of the world.

I am confident that we can succeed in the great task that lies before us.

We will succeed, but we must all do our part. We must all act together as citizens of this great Republic.

As we meet here today, American soldiers are fighting a bitter campaign in Korea.

We pay tribute to their courage, devotion, and gallantry.

Our men are fighting, alongside their United Nations allies, because they know, as we do, that the aggression in Korea is part of the attempt of the Russian Communist dictatorship to take over the world, step by step.

Our men are fighting a long way from home, but they are fighting for our lives and our liberties. They are fighting to protect our right to meet here today—our right to govern ourselves as a free nation.

The threat of world conquest by Soviet Russia endangers our liberty and endangers the kind of world in which the free spirit of man can survive. This threat is aimed at all peoples who strive to win or defend their own freedom and national independence.

Indeed, the state of our Nation is in great part the state of our friends and allies throughout the world. The gun that points at them points at us, also.

The threat is a total threat and the danger is a common danger.

All free nations are exposed and all are in peril. Their only security lies in banding together. No one nation can find protection in a selfish search for a safe haven from the storm.

The free nations do not have any aggressive purpose. We want only peace in the world—peace for all countries. No threat to the security of any nation is concealed in our plans or programs.

We had hoped that the Soviet Union, with its security assured by the Charter of the United Nations, would be willing to live and let live. But, I am sorry to say, that has not been the case.

The imperialism of the Czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty, and more menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union.

This new imperialism has powerful military forces. It is keeping millions of men under arms. It has a large air force and a strong submarine force. It has complete control of the men and equipment of its satellites. It has kept its subject peoples and its economy in a state of perpetual mobilization.

The present rulers of the Soviet Union have shown that they are willing to use this power to destroy the free nations and win domination over the whole world.

The Soviet imperialists have two ways of going about their destructive work. They use the method of subversion and internal revolution, and they use the method of external aggression. In preparation for either of these methods of attack, they stir up class strife and disorder. They encourage sabotage. They

put out poisonous propaganda. They deliberately try to prevent economic improvement.

If their efforts are successful, they foment a revolution, as they did in Czechoslovakia and China, and as they tried unsuccessfully to do in Greece. If their methods of subversion are blocked, and if they think they can get away with outright warfare, they resort to external aggression. This is what they did when they loosed the armies of their puppet states against the Republic of Korea, in an evil war by proxy.

We of the free world must be ready to meet both of these methods of Soviet action. We must not neglect one or the other.

The free world has power and resources to meet these two forms of aggression—resources that are far greater than those of the Soviet dictatorship. We have skilled and vigorous peoples, great industrial strength, and abundant sources of raw materials. And above all, we cherish liberty. Our common ideals are a great part of our strength. These ideals are the driving force of human progress.

The free nations believe in the dignity and worth of man.

We believe in independence for all nations.

We believe that free and independent nations can band together into a world order based on law. We have laid the cornerstone of such a peaceful world in the United Nations.

We believe that such a world order can and should spread the benefits of modern science and industry, better health and education, more food and rising standards of living throughout the world.

These ideals give our cause a power and vitality that Russian communism can never command.

The free nations, however, are bound together by more than an ideal. They are a real community bound together also by the ties of self-interest and self-preservation. If they should fall apart, the results would be fatal to human freedom.

Our own national security is deeply involved with that of the other free nations. While they need our support, we equally need theirs. Our national safety would be gravely prejudiced if the Soviet Union were to succeed in harnessing to its war machine the resources and the manpower of the free nations on the borders of its empire.

If Western Europe were to fall to Soviet Russia, it would double the Soviet supply of coal and triple the Soviet supply of steel. If the free countries of Asia and Africa should fall to Soviet Russia, we would lose the sources of many of our most vital raw materials, including uranium, which is the basis of our atomic power. And Soviet command of the manpower of the free nations of Europe and Asia would confront us with military forces which we could never hope to equal.

In such a situation, the Soviet Union could impose its demands on the world, without resort to conflict, simply through the preponderance of its economic and military power. The Soviet Union does not have to attack the United States to secure domination of the world. It can achieve its ends by isolating us and swallowing up all our allies. Therefore, even if we were craven enough, and I do not believe that we could be—I say even if we were craven enough to abandon our ideals, it would be disastrous for us to withdraw from the community of free nations.

We are the most powerful single member of this community, and we have a special responsibility. We must take the leadership in meeting the challenge to freedom and in helping to protect the rights of independent nations.

This country has a practical, realistic program of action for meeting this challenge.

First, we shall have to extend economic assistance, where it can be effective. The best way to stop subversion by the Kremlin is to strike at the roots of social injustice and economic disorder. People who have jobs, homes, and hopes for the future will defend themselves against the underground agents of the Kremlin. Our programs of economic aid have done much to turn back communism.

In Europe, the Marshall plan has had electrifying results. As European recovery progressed, the strikes led by the Kremlin's agents in Italy and France failed. All over Western Europe, the Communist Party took worse and worse beatings at the polls.

The countries which have received Marshall-plan aid have been able, through hard work, to expand their productive strength—in many cases, to levels higher than ever before in their history. Without this strength, they would be completely incapable of defending themselves today. They are now ready to use this strength in helping to build a strong combined defense against aggression. [Applause.]

We shall need to continue some economic aid to European countries. This aid should now be specifically related to the building of their defenses.

In other parts of the world, our economic assistance will need to be more broadly directed toward economic development. In the Near East, in Africa, in Asia, we must do what we can to help people who are striving to advance from misery, poverty, and hunger. We must also continue to help the economic growth of our good neighbors in this hemisphere. These actions will bring greater strength for the free world. They will give many people a real stake in the future and reason to defend their freedom. They will mean increased production of the goods they need and the materials we need.

Second, we shall need to continue our military assistance to countries which want to defend themselves. [Applause.]

The heart of our common defense effort is the North Atlantic community. The defense of Europe is the basis for the defense of the whole free world—ourselves included. Next to the United States, Europe is the largest workshop in the world. It is also a homeland of great religious beliefs shared by many of our citizens—beliefs which are now threatened by the tide of atheistic communism.

Strategically, economically, and morally the defense of Europe is part of our own defense. [Applause.]

That is why we have joined with the countries of Europe in the North Atlantic treaty, pledging ourselves to work with them.

There has been much discussion recently over whether the European countries are willing to defend themselves. Their actions are answering this question.

Our North Atlantic treaty partners have strict systems of universal military training. Several have recently increased the term of service. All have taken measures to improve the quality of training. Forces are being trained and expanded as rapidly as the necessary arms and equipment can be supplied from their factories and ours. Our North Atlantic treaty partners, together, are building armies bigger than our own. [Applause.]

None of the North Atlantic treaty countries, including our own country, has done enough yet. But real progress is being made.

Together, we have worked out defense plans. The military leaders of our own country took part in working out these plans, and are agreed that they are sound and within our capabilities.

To put these plans into action, we sent to Europe last week one of our greatest military commanders, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. [Applause.]

General Eisenhower went to Europe to assume command of the united forces of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, including our own forces in Germany.

The people of Europe have confidence in General Eisenhower. They know his ability to put together a fighting force of allies. His mission is vital to our security. We should all stand behind him, and give him every bit of help we can. [Applause.]

Part of our job will be to reinforce the military strength of our European partners by sending them weapons and equipment as our military production expands.

Our program of military assistance extends to the nations of the Near East and the Far East which are trying to defend their freedom. Soviet communism is trying to make these nations into colonies, and to use their people as cannon fodder in new wars of conquest. We want their people to be freemen and to enjoy peace.

Our country has always stood for freedom for the peoples of Asia. Long, long ago we stood for the freedom of the peoples of Asia. Our history shows this. We have demonstrated it in the Philippines. We have demonstrated it in our relations with Indonesia, India, and China. We hope to join in restoring the people of Japan to membership in the community of free nations.

It is in the Far East that we have taken up arms, under the United Nations, to preserve the principle of independence for free nations. We are fighting to keep the forces of Communist aggression from making a slave state out of Korea.

Korea has tremendous significance for the world. It means that free nations, acting through the United Nations, are fighting together against aggression.

We will understand the importance of this best if we look back into history. If the democracies had stood up against the invasion of Manchuria in 1931, or the attack on Ethiopia in 1935, or the seizure of Austria in 1938, if they had stood together against aggression on those occasions as the United Nations has done, the whole history of our time would have been different.

The principles for which we are fighting in Korea are right and just. They are the foundations of collective security and of the future of free nations. Korea is not only a country undergoing the torment of aggression; it is also a symbol. It stands for right and justice in the world against oppression and slavery. The free world must always stand for these principles—and we will stand with the free world. [Applause.]

As the third part of our program, we will continue to work for peaceful settlements of international disputes. We will support the United Nations and remain loyal to the great principles of international cooperation laid down in its Charter.

We are willing, as we have always been, to negotiate honorable settlements with the Soviet Union. But we will not engage in appeasement. [Applause.]

The Soviet rulers have made it clear that we must have strength as well as right on our side. If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world.

That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about.

That is the only realistic road to peace.

These are the main elements of the course our Nation must follow as a member of the community of free nations. These are the things we must do to preserve our security and help create a peaceful world. But they will be successful only if we increase the strength of our own country.

Here at home we have some very big jobs to do. We are building much stronger military forces—and we are building them fast. We are preparing for full wartime mobilization, if that should be necessary. And we are continuing to build a strong and growing economy, able to maintain whatever effort may be required for as long as necessary.

We are building our own Army, Navy, and Air Force to an active strength of nearly three and a half million men and women. We are stepping up the training of the reserve forces, and establishing more training facilities, so that we can rapidly increase our active forces far more on short notice.

We are going to produce all the weapons and equipment that such an armed force will need. Furthermore, we will make weapons for our allies, and weapons for our own reserve supplies. On top of this, we will build the capacity to turn out on short notice arms and supplies that may be needed for a full scale war.

Fortunately, we have a good start on this because of our enormous plant capacity and because of the equipment on hand from the last war. For example, many combat ships are being returned to active duty from the "mothball fleet" and many others can be put into service on very short notice. We have large reserves of arms and ammunition and thousands of workers skilled in arms production.

In many cases, however, our stocks of weapons are low. In other cases, those on hand are not the most modern. We have made remarkable technical advances. We have developed new types of jet planes and powerful new tanks. We are concentrating on producing the newest types of weapons and producing them as fast as we possibly can.

This production drive is more selective than the one we had during World War II, but it is just as urgent and intense. It is a big program and it is a costly one.

Let me give you two concrete examples. Our present program calls for expanding the aircraft industry so that it will have the capacity to produce 50,000 modern military planes a year. We are preparing the capacity to produce 35,000 tanks a year. We are not now ordering that many planes or that many tanks, and we hope that we never have to, but we mean to be able to turn them out if we need them.

The planes we are producing now are much bigger—and much better—than the planes we had during the last war.

We used to think that the B–17 was a huge plane, and the blockbuster it carried a huge load. But the B–36 can carry five of those blockbusters in its belly, and it can carry them five times as far. Of course, the B–36 is much more complicated to build than the B–17, and far more expensive. One B–17 costs about $275,000, while now one B–36 costs about $3,500,000.

I ask you to remember that what we are doing is to provide the best and most modern military equipment in the world for our fighting forces.

This kind of defense production program has two parts.

The first part is to get our defense production going as fast as possible. We have to convert plants and channel materials to defense production.

This means heavy cuts in the civilian use of copper, aluminum, rubber, and other essential materials. It means shortages in various consumer goods.

The second part is to increase our capacity to produce and to keep our economy strong for the long pull. We do not know how long Communist aggression will threaten the world.

Only by increasing our output can we carry the burden of preparedness for an indefinite period in the future. This means that we will have to build more power plants, and more steel mills, grow more cotton, mine more copper, and expand our capacity in many other ways.

The Congress will need to consider legislation, at this session, affecting all the aspects of our mobilization job. The main subjects on which legislation will be needed are:

First, appropriations for our military build-up.

Second, extension and revision of the Selective Service Act.

Third, military and economic aid to help build up the strength of the free world.

Fourth, revision and extension of the authority to expand production and to stabilize prices, wages, and rents.

Fifth, improvement of our agricultural laws, to help obtain the kinds of farm products we need for the defense effort.

Sixth, improvement of our labor laws to help provide stable labor-management relations and to make sure that we have steady production in this emergency.

Seventh, housing and training of defense workers, and the full use of all our manpower resources.

Eighth, means for increasing the supply of doctors, nurses, and other trained medical personnel critically needed for the defense effort.

Ninth, aid to the States to meet the most urgent needs of our elementary and secondary schools. Some of our plans will have to be deferred for the time being. But we should do all we can to make sure our children are being trained as good and useful citizens in these critical times ahead.

Tenth, a major increase in taxes to meet the cost of the defense effort. [Applause.]

The Economic Report and the Budget message will discuss these subjects further. In addition, I shall send to the Congress special messages containing detailed recommendations on legislation needed at this session.

In the months ahead, the Government must give priority to activities that are urgent—like military procurement and atomic energy and power development. It must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. [Applause.] Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed.

But in a long-term defense effort like this one, we cannot neglect the measures needed to maintain a strong economy and a healthy democratic society. [Applause.]

The Congress, therefore, should give continued attention to the measures which our country will need for the long pull. And it should act upon such legislation as promptly as circumstances permit.

To take just one example—we need to continue and complete the work of rounding out our system of social insurance. We still need to improve our protection against unemployment and old age. We still need to provide insurance against loss of earnings through sickness, and against the high costs of modern medical care.

Above all, we must remember that the fundamentals of our strength rest upon the freedoms of our people. We must continue our efforts to achieve the full realization of our democratic ideals. We must uphold freedom of speech and freedom of conscience in our land. We must assure equal rights and equal opportunities to all our citizens.

As we go forward this year in the defense of freedom, let us keep clearly before us the nature of our present effort.

We are building up our strength, in concert with other free nations, to meet the danger of aggression that has been turned loose on the world. The strength of the free nations is the world's best hope of peace.

I ask the Congress for unity in these crucial days.

Make no mistake about my meaning. I do not ask, or expect unanimity. I do not ask for an end to debate. Only by debate can we arrive at decisions which are wise, and which reflect the desires of the American people. We do not have dictatorship in this country, and we will never have one in this country. [Applause.]

When I request unity, what I am really asking for is a sense of responsibility on the part of every Member of this Congress. Let us debate the issues, but let every man among us weigh his words and deeds. There is a sharp difference between harmful citicism and constructive criticism. If we are truly responsible as individuals, I am sure that we will be unified as a Government.

Le us keep our eyes on the issues and work for the things we all believe in.

Let each of us put our country ahead of our party, and ahead of our own personal interests. [Applause.]

I had the honor to be a Member of the Senate during World War II, and I know from experience that unity of purpose and of effort is possible in the Congress without any lessening of the vitality of our two-party system.

Let us all stand together as Americans. And let us stand together with all men everywhere who believe in human liberty. [Applause.]

Peace is precious to us. It is the way of life we strive for with all the strength and wisdom we possess. But more precious than peace are freedom and justice. [Applause.] We will fight, if fight we must, to keep our freedom and to prevent justice from being destroyed.

These are the things that give meaning to our lives, and which we acknowledge to be greater than ourselves.

This is our cause—peace, freedom, justice.

We will pursue this cause with determination and humility, asking divine guidance that in all we do we may follow God's will. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkceper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

(Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess until 2 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 2 o'clock p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. ROBERT CROSSER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 1, he did, on Friday, January 5, 1951, administer the oath of office to the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, at Bethesda, Md.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 47) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas ROBERT CROSSER, a Representative from the State of Ohio, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said ROBERT CROSSER as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. WILSON D. GILLETTE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WYSOX, PA., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 2, Eighty-second Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect WILSON D. GILLETTE, of the Fourteenth District of Pennsylvania, I have the honor to report that on the 4th day of January 1951, at Towanda, Bradford County, State of Pennsylvania, I administered the oath of office to Mr. GILLETTE, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. GILLETTE subscribed.

I have the honor to be,
Yours respectfully,
JAMES L. FISHER,
Captain, USN, Retired, Justice of the Peace, Standing Stone Township (Bradford County), Wysox, Pa.

(My commission expires first Monday in January 1954.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 48) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas WILSON D. GILLETTE, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Fourteenth District thereof, has been unable, from sickness, to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before Capt. James L. Fisher, United States Navy, retired, and Justice of the Peace, Standing Stone Township, Bradford County, Wysox, Pa., authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said WILSON D. GILLETTE as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 49) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas HOMER D. ANGELL, a Representative-elect from the State of Oregon, from the Third District thereof, has been unable to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said HOMER D. ANGELL at Portland, Oreg., and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said HOMER D. ANGELL.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 49, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints Hon. James A. Fee, United States district judge for the District of Oregon, to administer the oath of office to the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ECA STEEL TO RED CHINA

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the President in his state of the Union message today, told about the success of the Marshall plan as a means of helping to contain communistic expansionism throughout the world. Some Members of Congress, myself included, never have been so sure that hand-outs of American money and goods, on what has come to be almost a global scale, would assure the loyalty of other nations to our effort toward holding the line against Russia's territorial ambitions.

At any rate, here is a case in point. It offers an example of the utter lack of good faith, and the suicidal weakness and corruption, of at least one of the Western European nations, on which the Truman administration appears to believe we can depend, in the event of a Russian military move toward the west.

I refer to the fact, as revealed in a dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, by John Barth, Chicago Daily News and Washington Star foreign correspondent, that French steelmakers are selling steel rails to Red China. The dispatch said that the agreement calls for 139,000 tons of rails, sufficient for a total of 450 miles of railway.

Not only was this agreement made, but it was made in the knowledge that the new railway would connect Kwangsi Province in China with the Indochina border. French troops now are fighting a losing battle to preserve French interests in Indochina. The new railway would be used to carry munitions to those Indochinese Communist forces with whom the French troops are engaged.

All of this, of course, is bad enough, although not without some precedent elsewhere in recent years. But it is not half so bad as the further factor that American taxpayers, through the Marshall plan, have made possible this betrayal by French steelmakers, not only of their own national interests, but of American interests as well.

An Economic Cooperation Administration press release, No. 1928, dated December 11, 1950, reveals that an expenditure of $8,218,000 in American tax money was authorized for building up the French steel industry. The money was to be spent for generators and motors, machinery and tools, and technical services.

In addition, an ECA report entitled "Trade With France" shows that between January 1, 1949, and January 1, 1950, this country shipped to France, at ECA expense, more than 92,528 metric tons of steel in various forms. These shipments, many of them comprising special alloy steels, consisted of scrap, blooms, bars, billets, strips, and 5,782 tons of steel rails.

Thus American taxpayers provided additional capacity for French steel mills, rails that might be used in France, while French-produced rails were sold to Red China, and a portion at least of the steel from which the rails for Red China might be manufactured.

If this is the kind of use we may expect to see made of American charity dollars, and if this is the measure of the French desire to help keep the free world free, then God help America in any conflict with Soviet Russia in which we may become involved on the European Continent.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks and include some tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER'S DEFENSE THESIS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the Nation, ex-President Herbert Hoover, from his world-wide wealth of experience, outlined a sensible, sane program for the safety and security of the United States in a war-weary, war-torn, war-threatened world. In substance, Mr. Hoover said that our first line of defense should be located neither in Europe nor in Asia, but should embrace the Western Hemisphere; that North America and South America, separated from the rest of the world by the width of the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, should constitute both our American sphere of influence and our first line of defense. With that thesis I am in full accord; in fact, I have been saying the same thing for over 10 years. Many Members of Congress have opposed the world-wide messianic program of both the Roosevelt and the Truman administrations, a program which requires our American boys to fight the battles of the rest of the world.

President Truman and his advisers until last spring considered Asia as of little or no importance to us from the standpoint of our national defense, so Asia was written off and was allowed to slip into Stalin's communistic sphere of influence. The whole Acheson-Lattimore-Hiss policy was based on the idea that China was expendable, and was not important to us in the struggle between communism on the one hand and American democracy on the other. Then overnight President Truman reversed himself, without consultation with either our military leaders or the Congress, and impulsively ordered General MacArthur to send American soldiers into Korea to drive back the North Korean Communists. This was done in the face of the fact that we had no heavy tanks, big guns, or war planes in that area, to speak of, for our boys to use, and also in the face of the fact that our military leaders advised that Korea, from a military standpoint, was not defendable.

President Truman, again without consulting Congress, now proposes to send 200,000 American boys into Europe to defend that continent from an expected Stalin invasion. According to our military experts Stalin with his immense war machine could within 6 weeks overrun the whole of Europe, and no force we could send to Europe could prevent it. Our atom bomb stockpile is the only deterrent Stalin fears. So again our boys are to be sent forth to be massacred in a futile attempt to protect our European neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, what is the world situation today? Must we not acknowledge that our efforts during the last 5 years to contain communism have resulted in complete failure? As I see the world situation today it is about as follows:

During World War II Stalin was dictator over 300,000,000 Russians. Today, 5 years later, he is dictator over 900,000,000 people. He has surrounded Russia with satellite nations, puppet nations, iron-curtain nations, until today Joe Stalin sits in Moscow like a big fat spider in the center of his web. He pulls a string and the flames of war break out in Korea, and we have to send our boys there and spend three or four billion dollars to put out the flames. Then he will pull a string in Indochina, in India, in Siam, in Turkey, in Greece, in Yugoslavia, or in Berlin, and the flames of war will break out, and again we will have to send our boys and spend billions of dollars to put out those war flames. After 3 or 4 years we will be exhausted, bled white; and Stalin, without losing a man of his own, will then be ready to take over.

During these same 5 years we have spent $100,000,000,000 to contain communism, to fence it in, to keep it from spreading. This we have termed a "cold war." It has been under the management of Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore, Dr. Jessup, and others. Is it not about time to change our cold-war leaders and to place someone in charge of our interests in Asia that knows something about the situation there, someone like General MacArthur? We should get rid of Acheson, the man who got us into the present mess in Asia, and rely upon the advice of General MacArthur.

The situation in Korea today is the result of placing General MacArthur under the orders of the United Nations, and the UN has refused to follow his advice. They have prevented MacArthur from bombing the Communist Chinese troop concentrations and war supplies in Manchuria. General MacArthur has been forced to fight with one hand tied behind his back, an impossible position to be in, and American boys have died and are dying as a result. This situation has been brought about by our State Department's "panty waist" foreign policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks with the following pertinent excerpt from Isbrandtsen's article on Nationalism that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on January 3, 1951. It is a true picture of the position we are in.

The United Nations, a supergovernment, foisted upon us, has a mandate to deplete our resources, suck our strength and decide life or death of our people. We have been engineered into an inferiority complex of bowing to our wards and debtors. This lack

of national pride was capitalized upon by a foreign directorate to furnish men, money, and material to carry on a war to perpetuate foreign interest at the cost of our own possible destruction or deterioration.

The cry goes out that the United States is in peril and vulnerable. This is a reality. From the United Nations comes the plea we must not quit in Korea. Korea, the graveyard of the flower of our Army. International leaders would risk an all-out war with Asia that they may survive at the cost of American life and treasure.

PAY OF 18-YEAR-OLD DRAFTEES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, certain of the brass hat section have proposed that we draft 18-year-old boys and pay them $10 a month.

I want to go on record as being absolutely opposed to paying these boys only $10 a month. I maintain that if they are good enough to be drafted, these 18-year-olds ought to have full Army pay and full benefits. I think it is the most outrageous proposal I ever heard of. I am in favor of giving these boys full Army pay and retirement benefits if they are drafted. In addition to that, if 18-year-olds are drafted into the Armed Forces, they have every right to expect just as many privileges as older men already in service. I am unalterably opposed to any other treatment.

All of which gives rise to another question. Is this the plan of those in authority to lower the high standards within the armed services which we in Congress have worked so hard to obtain for our GI's?

I should hate to see adventurers capitalize on our presently insecure position and appeal through false patriotism to these young men who are so sincere, yet naive, and try to compel them to work for nothing.

We have not yet arrived at such a state of economic depravity that we have to ask 18-year-old boys to go into our Army and Navy and sacrifice all the emoluments which are today accepted as regular.

If our leaders expect to do this, they must also propose that the brass hats likewise serve for $10 a month and divest themselves of all privileges of rank and circumstance.

Let the generals, the admirals, and the other bigwigs make similar sacrifices to what they request of the 18-year-olds. Perhaps they would not be so anxious after that to press their case.

I am determined to see justice done to these youngsters if and when it becomes necessary to include them in the defense program.

COMMUNIST CHINESE AGGRESSION IN KOREA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting two editorials in the Appendix today which I think every Member should read. Both are entitled to the same effect: "UN Up to the Test," "UN Must Act," from the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune. They deal with the fact that the United Nations has not yet taken action to condemn Communist Chinese aggression in Korea.

The least that the United Nations can do is to remain the world's moral force for peace and justice. The only way to do that now is to condemn as unqualifiedly for their aggression in Korea, the Chinese Communists, just as the North Koreans were so properly condemned when they undertook the unprovoked aggression against South Korea.

The United Nations remains mankind's best and perhaps last hope for peace. At this stage of its development it has been unable to muster enough of its members—with some notable exceptions—for the military support in Korea which should have been forthcoming to implement UN military sanctions. But that makes all the more important the retention of its position as the moral force for justice and peace in the world. In the matter of the UN condemning Chinese Communist aggression in Korea time is on the side of the aggressor.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

BEFORE WE ACHIEVE UNITY, WE MUST FIRST HAVE CLARITY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech is a challenge to the Soviet Union. If our Government had been as vigorous and forthright in dealing with the threat of Soviet aggression 3 or 4 years ago, we should not be facing the present world crisis.

Unfortunately, the President did not see fit to consider the specific major questions which have already been raised. Are we prepared to use Chiang Kai-shek's forces? How much aid will Western Europe need to build her military defenses? What specific commitments have we already made to the North Atlantic Treaty nations? Here at home, does the administration intend to introduce rationing? What are the plans for combating the inflation which is already threatening?

These unanswered questions must be read against the background of American boys thrown into battle in Korea without equipment and without air protection. We have an obligation to the Nation to prevent recurrence of any such unpreparedness. There are still many questions unanswered after the President's speech. Before we achieve unity, we must have clarity.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MARSHALL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Secretary of Defense Marshall asserted publicly that the "situation in Korea is developing almost as anticipated."

That is an astounding statement, implying that Marshall and other high officials anticipated the heavy loss of American lives, evacuation, ultimate defeat, and practically no help on the ground from other members of the United Nations.

If Marshall and others knew what to "anticipate" in Korea why was the war launched in the first place?

Are we now going to be forced out of that area or are we going to be able to wage a successful holding action? If the latter, at what price in the lives of Americans; and where is the defense line to be established?

Other than the bare statement that the Korean situation is developing almost as anticipated, Marshall failed to amplify. The question is: Does Marshall actually know any more about this situation than he did about his whereabouts in the critical hours preceding Pearl Harbor?

Let us have the facts.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to one of the greatest messages ever delivered to a joint session of the Congress by a President of the United States.

It is a message of understanding and of appreciation; a message of recognition of the responsibility of all of us; one that also recognized the gravity of the world situation; one ringing with American thought, expression, and tradition.

It is a message of optimism, of confidence and of strength; a message to which we can all respond because it called for unity, recognizing that basic unity can exist without unanimity of opinion. It was a message calling for constructive criticism, if criticism is offered; a message that each and every one of us in positions of trust can read with interest in assuming our responsibilities of trust. I think I can safely say, based upon experience—and I hope the other Chamber will benefit by the fine example set by the Members of the House

during the past years—that the National House of Representatives will meet the test, and any criticism that might be made from time to time will be on a high plane and on a plane that is consistent with the responsibility of the office that we all occupy in this body. Of course I cannot speak for the other body; I would not undertake to. However, I can express my own personal opinion about the membership of this House. Where there has been a difference of opinion we have always maintained a high level of debate, and I know that the unity of the membership of this body, in relation to the emergency, as evidenced in the past, will continue to manifest itself during this Congress.

But, Mr. Speaker, in any event, we have listened to one of the truly great messages of the entire constitutional history of our country; a message that has sunk into the minds of each and every one of us, and a message that, in accordance with our judgment and our conscience, we should and will respond to, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, not as Independents, but as Americans.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHY ARE AMERICANS BEING SLAUGHTERED IN KOREA?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one primary reason is found in President Truman's July 19 message to Congress.

From that message we learn that, when the North Koreans invaded the Korean Republic, President Truman, without consulting the people or the Congress, ordered the American Armed Forces to fight. That meant war. War meant killing.

Thousands of our men have died, and they will continue to be slaughtered by the hundred thousand if President Truman and his advisers pursue their present foreign policy.

The real foundation for the slaughtering of our men in world war III was the program, even before 1942, of men like Charles Davis, Clarence Streit, Owen J. Roberts, John Foster Dulles, Russell W. Davenport, Harold L. Ickes, Gardner Cowles, Jr., and internationalist organizations to make us, through membership in an international organization, subservient to other nations, permit other nations to influence our national policy.

The proposed organization was named by some as "One World," by others as "United States of the World." Still others called it either "Federal Union, Inc.," "Union Now," or "World Fellowship, Inc."

The proponents of this ideology were politically, economically, and financially powerful. They and the editors, columnists, and commentators who supported their views proceed upon the assumption that all who oppose them do so from unworthy motives.

Their program and propaganda are based upon the premise that the creation of a world-wide supergovernment, where all people and nations would be united, where there would be no conflict of interests, would end all war.

That premise was false, as the lesson learned at the Tower of Babel and subsequent history demonstrates.

Only when people and nations forget their greed, selfishness, ambition, desire for security and freedom of action, will the people and the nations of the world live together in harmony.

But even on the most distant horizon there appears as yet no the slightest indication that the millennium is even approaching.

Let us be fair and charitable. We will assume that many of those advocating this over-all Government, which calls, at least in some degree, for the surrender of the individual's freedom of action, of the Republic's independence, were sincere and believed that it would bring peace to the world.

Nevertheless, again, as always in every proposed Utopia, there were, there are, greedy, selfish, ambitious, power-hungry individuals and nations.

Proof? Look at the record.

Our men and resources were the deciding factor in World War I—our avowed purpose the end of all war, to be accomplished by the defeat of what was then called Kaiser Wilhelm's imperialism. On foreign battlefields the blood of our men flowed like water. They froze in Siberia. Their bodies lie buried in cemeteries throughout the world. Their lives were sacrificed for an ideal which was unattainable.

In World War II, the declared purpose was the carrying of the Four Freedoms to all peoples throughout the world. Again, our men died, our resources were spent to stop Hitler and nazism, only to create a Frankenstein under Stalin. Our men suffered and died in the building of an easy road to the top of the mountain, where Stalin envisioned himself as the master of the world.

It was once Britain's proud boast that the sun never set on the British Flag. At the end of the fighting in World War II, it might truthfully be said that the setting sun never failed to illuminate a white cross marking the burial place of an American who had given his life in an effort to bring world peace.

The fighting in World War II at an end, revengeful individuals and groups exacted of the German people an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. Having destroyed—and it should have been destroyed—Hitler's political war-making machine; disarmed the German people—and they should have been disarmed—these individuals and groups still wanted their pound of flesh.

Unfortunately, in taking that pound of flesh, they destroyed not only the ability of Germany to rearm, but its ability to recover from war's ravages. They drained from the German people the lifeblood which today might have enabled them effectively and as our ally to present a united front to Stalin's Communists.

Nor was that all. At the behest of a trade-obsessed England and a fear-ridden France, we split the German people and we split their country; abandoned to Stalin's Communists Eastern Germany and millions of its young men and women.

Nor was that all, our State Department, into which had infiltrated Communists like Hiss; dominated by Acheson and others of his thinking; with ears attuned to British diplomacy, in part because of England's demands; in part, because of incompetency or worse, followed a policy of not only appeasing the Communists; but stopped Chiang Kai-shek's army in its tracks when it was winning its battle against the Communists with whom we are now at war.

Our men are being slaughtered because Mr. Truman (a) ordered them to fight in Korea; (b) sent the Seventh Fleet to bottle up Chiang Kai-shek's 500,000 trained fighting men in Formosa; (c) thus depriving our Armed Forces of their aid; (d) refused to encourage the almost 2,000,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland in their battle against the Communist armies.

In my humble judgment, it is folly—utter and complete folly—to permit our men to be sent to Europe to be butchered, after we have been warned that those nations for whom we are supposed to be fighting will not go all out in such a war.

The executive departments in Mr. Truman's administration, all under his control, ever since the fighting ceased, have been permitting the shipment from our shores of munitions of war to Russia, which either have been or will be, in the event of war, used against our men.

England and France have a 20-year nonaggression treaty with Russia, which, by its terms, precludes them giving full aid to us.

Moreover, England, through Hong Kong, has been supplying the Chinese Communists with copper and other raw materials which can be used for war.

Great Britain, in the first 11 months of 1950, shipped 9,878 tons of vital strategic raw rubber to the Soviet Union. That is more than 20 times the amount exported to Russia during the same period in 1949.

In fact, Britain furnished Russia more raw rubber, which a nation must have if it is to successfully carry on a war, than Russia imported in 1948 and 1949.

France has sold war materials to Red China, one of the latest deals being for 139,000 tons of steel rails—sufficient to lay 450 miles of track to carry supplies to the Reds who are fighting the French.

Worse yet, with the full approval of the administration's authority in Germany, West Germany has supplied East Germany, under the direct control of Russia, 13,000 tons of steel rails. Over those rails Stalin's army and supplies for that army will flow into West Germany, if and when Stalin moves from the east.

Do not the foregoing facts show the folly of sending 200,000 Americans to Europe? Why fight alone for nations which will not help?

Reliable information tells us that a common expression on the streets, in the pubs—yes, even in the Parliament—of Britain is "Let America fight her own war." Are we in Europe to fight alone?

President Truman stubbornly refuses to use the military might of Spain, because, it is said, during World War II Franco did not actively oppose nazism. We ourselves did not then oppose—we

fought side by side with—Stalin and his Communists.

Is it better that more and ever more Americans be slaughtered in Korea and probably in Europe, or that the 500,000 Chinese, the 2,000,000 or more guerrillas in China, the Spanish Army or all others who will aid in the battle, be turned loose on Stalin's hordes?

The Pentagon is reported to have said that the Army's operations in Korea were proceeding "as planned." No one with any sense believes that statement.

Certainly, the Pentagon did not "plan" that our Armed Forces should drive north from the southern tip of Korea—thousands of them sacrifice their lives, and then be forced back to their original starting point or even completely out of Korea.

The situation in Korea is desperate, if not hopeless. Yet, on January 3, at Lake Success, according to the United Press, Warren R. Austin, our representative, told the United Nations political committee that the United States intends to "fight on in Korea."

For what? With what? And how long, may we ask? Until MacArthur's force has been completely destroyed?

When, if ever, will Mr. Austin, his associates in United Nations, and the internationalists here in the Nation's Capital learn that there is a limit to what our men can do?

Has Mr. Austin forgotten that his first duty is to the United States of America, not to the United Nations?

EUROPE

What of Europe?

Having deprived Germany of its ability to successfully oppose Stalin, where again, if military information is accurate, our men will be hopelessly outnumbered, have no fair chance of successfully opposing any attempt by Russia to overcome Western Europe.

We are now told that 200,000 Americans are to be sent to fight in Europe. We have also been told by military experts and others that Stalin can overrun Western Europe in from 30 to 60 days. Are we to sacrifice another American Army in Europe?

Mr. Truman is a determined man. He is an egotistical man. And it is evident that, if he is unchecked, he will continue to follow the policy of the Achesons, of the internationalists, regardless of its effect upon the security of this country.

At his press conference on the 4th, he told the reporters that he did not need authority from Congress to send additional troops to Europe.

Despite the fact that thousands of our men have been slaughtered, the President still insists, and he so told the reporters on the 4th, that we were not in a war; that we were simply carrying out our obligations to the United Nations in the Far East.

What of the President's obligation to the people of this country? What of his duty to so shape our national policy as to make secure the future of our Nation?

What consideration, what encouragement, is it to young Americans who may enlist, who may be drafted? To the fathers and the mothers, the wives, the brothers, and the sisters of those fine, young Americans who have been killed in Korea to now learn that those boys were not fighting for the United States, nor even for United Nations?

Was Mr. Truman in his right mind when he said, as he did say on last Thursday, as he has insisted all along, that we are not in a war?

Were the thousands of men who have died in Korea not fighting a war? Were they only doing police duty?

If Mr. Truman believes that we are not engaged in a war, then he has been guilty of a most despicable fraud and deception, for time and again he has called for our men to lay down their lives, for the taxpayers to supply billions upon billions of dollars, because, he said, by his requests, the country was in great danger; that the men and the dollars were necessary to prevent Stalin and the Communists taking over our country; that we were at war.

Mr. Truman's demands for the drafting of men, for the appropriation of money, have been based upon the theory that our country, through war, was threatened with disaster. Now he says there is no war, just a police action.

Unless Mr. Truman is prevented from following the policy of the Achesons and the internationalists, he will strip us of our manpower, of our ability to defend ourselves, leave us as a Nation helpless, open to conquest by Stalin.

What can the average citizen do to prevent this disaster?

Mr. Truman refuses to carry out the will of the people as expressed at the last election. There will be no opportunity to vote him out of office until 1952.

The Congress, even though it knows the will of the people, refuses to actively, vigorously, effectively oppose him.

Unless the people, in overwhelming numbers, insist upon a sound American policy, the President will continue his mad course.

But one remedy seems left open to the people. That is this: Write scorching letters to the President and to those Senators and Congressmen who have so little faith in our form of government, in the ability, courage, and endurance of our people, that they believe we are utterly dependent upon some foreign nation or nations for our national security.

Advise the President and your Representative that it is time to conserve our manpower, our resources; put an end to wastefulness and sinful spending by our National Government. That it is time to follow the advice of Herbert Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy, by putting into effect the desires of an overwhelming number of our people that we keep our Nation free from foreign entanglements and wholeheartedly devote ourselves to making secure our Nation here in the Western Hemisphere.

That objective can only be attained if we insist upon getting our men out of Korea, if any are there as this is written; refuse to sacrifice in Europe the men and resources necessary for our own national security.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I am very happy that the gentleman is bringing these matters to the attention of the country on the floor of the Congress. I commend the gentleman for speaking out. During the last 2 years that I have not been a Member of this body, I have rebuked myself many times for not having asked more questions. I think we should have unity—we owe that to our country, but we must have clarity before we have unity. We must understand what we are doing and we must have the courage as representatives of the people to speak out. We have a man from Ohio in the Capitol who spoke out and he was elected by the biggest vote that any man ever received running for office in the State because he did have the courage to speak out.

During the next 2 years I hope we will have the courage to do what the gentleman from Michigan is doing right now.

ARMED SERVICES PAY

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to the gentlemen who have previous orders, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] made reference to the proposed draft of 18-year-olds and also made reference to some statement by someone to the effect that they should be paid $10 per month. I have seen a statement quoting General Eisenhower as having said that there should be some distinction between the pay of a career soldier and the pay of a man who is drafted for a relatively short period of time or for the duration of a war. I do not know what General Eisenhower may have said, but as chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the recent pay bill, I want to assure you that our attitude has always been that a man in the service should be paid for the service rendered, and the responsibility assumed. A man who enters the service for the purpose of rendering service is entitled to all the pay and emoluments that anyone else is entitled to receive.

Our entire Career Compensation Act was based upon the idea that every man should be paid on one basis and one basis only, and that is the service rendered and the responsibility assumed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The country will applaud the statement the gentleman from Texas has just made. I think it is a very commendable statement.

Mr. KILDAY. I can assure the gentleman that that is the theory of compensation to the members of the armed services.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARMY DEMANDS ITS SHARE OF BEST FIGHTING MEN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we need more men to add muscle to the thin frame of our military manpower.

The Selective Service System will soon reach out to gather in many younger registrants, and some older ones.

No one will question the necessity of this. A realistic appraisal of the world situation leaves us no other choice. Our people expect positive action on the part of their Representatives to make up for the deficit in defense.

We are united in our determination to lead from strength rather than weakness in our opposition to aggression.

That being the case, we recognize that selective service, or the draft of suitable manpower for the protection of this Nation, is essential.

In spite of some favoritism concerning individuals and occupations, that method functioned as well as could be expected during World War II.

Bear in mind that we then had a Secretary of War and a Secretary of the Navy, as the respective heads of two separate defense establishments. For one whole year after December 7, 1941, we employed the dual device of voluntary enlistment sparked by the forced draft of selective service to beef up the Army and the Air Force which was then subordinate to it. Meanwhile, the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marines siphoned off the "cream of the crop" because they had the psychological advantage of seeking only elite volunteers. This exclusiveness, which sharpened the distinction between volunteer and draftee, took away from the Army its proportionate share of the best personnel.

That same discrimination is at work now, even though the Army, the Navy, with the Marines, and the Air Force, are supposed to be brother services under the one unified Department of Defense.

As the draft for the Army nears, the registrants flock to the Navy, Marine, and Air Force recruiting stations partly on the theory that they are exercising the individual freedom of choice in preference to compulsion.

In this lopsided competition for manpower, we fail to see evidence of the balanced teamwork that we had in mind when we voted for unification of the Armed Forces.

The Army, which is called upon to do the bulk of the fighting, and under the worst possible conditions, as in Korea, is not getting its proportionate quota of those who are mentally and physically fit.

The Selective Service System is a misnomer. The Navy, the Marines, and Air Force do the selecting, picking the best among those who come forward to volunteer. The Army, at the end of the manpower line, takes what is left through the draft.

Of more than 40,000 casualties suffered by the United States in Korea, close to 90 percent of this sacrifice has been borne by the Army. For fear of offending the feelings of the enemy, the official spokesmen of our Government avoid any mention of war. As if pain and misery and death can be glossed over as something less than agony by referring to the grim operation as a mere "police action." Meanwhile, as some appeasers in the United Nations forfeit principle and try to arrange a deal with the aggressors, preparing to give in to international blackmail by some face-saving formula that will hide their base surrender, our mainstay, the Army, is not getting the proper replacements and reinforcements that it requires.

Day in and day out, it is the foot soldier who is called upon for strength and stamina of the highest order. His weapons are becoming more complex, and the varied tasks he must do in the field demand intelligence and initiative This has been one of the lessons we should have learned in Korea. As an appalling number of junior officers have been killed or wounded, the noncoms and men in the ranks have been forced to go it alone. This imposes upon them the extra burden of greater resourcefulness. Witness the number of battlefield commissions that have been awarded to fill the gaps. Under such emergency conditions, we cannot wait for OCS or the reserves in the States to supply leadership. The plain answer to this problem is that the Army must get its share of the best men, those who have the physical and mental qualifications to strengthen the ranks, and to provide on-the-spot leadership when officers and noncoms are cut down in combat.

The pressure of selective service, which is identified with the Army, induces highly qualified young men to enlist in other branches of the Armed Forces.

The Army is thus denied its fair choice of the best.

We had a similar experience in World War II, even after we had discounted the larger numerical needs of the Army.

To overcome this imbalance, all enlistments were frozen under Executive Order 9279, signed by President Roosevelt on December 5, 1942.

It provided for the most effective mobilization and utilization of the national manpower. It stipulated, among other matters, that, and I quote:

> The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall after consultation with the Chairman, determine the number of men required to be selected each month in order to fulfill the total respective requirements of the Army and Navy as approved by the President. The Chairman (of the War Manpower Commission) shall furnish the required number of men through the Selective Service System.

I believe that we should reinstate this policy now, in January of 1951.

As the supply of skilled industrial workers is completely absorbed by defense production, and the need for more becomes acute, it will become necessary to allocate manpower for industry, agriculture, and the Armed Forces under a set-up similar to the War Manpower Commission.

That organization, even with its defects, was good. Eliminating the contradictions and bottlenecks that were revealed by experience, we can build a better system of limited mobilization that can be expanded quickly, should the need arise.

The one factor that currently disturbs me is that our present program does not provide for over-all control through selective service in a way that will be fair to the rival claims of the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

As it is working now, it puts the Army under a definite disadvantage that will become worse as it strives to build up to authorized strength and quality.

We can understand why the Air Force and the Navy will insist that we stick to the free-choice method. Under it, they are getting first call on the brightest and healthiest youngsters.

But this is not serving the national security, under which the Army is still the largest and the most important arm of our defense. The opening phases of the great debate which will shape our foreign policy in the present crisis and determine how far we can go in our commitments, already point to this fact. In spite of our unchallenged sea power, and our qualitatively superior air power, the debate will resolve about the inadequacies of our land power, which means the Army.

To face this situation realistically, we have two alternatives.

Either we must freeze all enlistments and ration manpower for military purposes through the channels of selective service or assign enlistees and draftees wherever they are needed.

Both of these solutions are democratic. Whichever one we approve of will establish a common pool from which all services will draw without discrimination.

The present waste, confusion, and misassignment of individuals would be largely eliminated.

The Selective Service Act, as we know it, was designed to promote a continuing flow of enlistments into the Armed Forces. It did for the Air Force, Navy, and Marines but not for the Army. As a result, our military posture, as they call it, is that of a short-legged swimmer who can also fly. But can he move on the ground?

Even a mechanized Army has to walk, and for that we must have plenty of physically fit men with heads on their shoulders. Sure we need seamen and airmen, but we also need combat infantrymen, not in the Air Force or the Navy, but in the Army.

Do not leave the Army out in the cold when it comes to the allocation of brains and brawn.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's statement is most important, but would not the gentleman feel that his recommendations of freezing enlistments would discourage voluntary enlistment? Does the gentleman recommend the selection of men in all services through the draft?

Mr. LANE. I assume what the gentleman suggests may be so to a certain extent. I offer this for what it is worth. I think the matter should have some study and I say that for the reason that during the Christmas holidays I had occasion to meet hundreds of young men who ventured from my city to the metro-

politan area of greater Boston for the purpose of volunteering. They went to the city hall, they obtained their birth certificates, marriage records, or whatever was needed. They were interviewed by the Navy, by the Marines, by the Coast Guard, and by other persons in charge of voluntary enlistments. They produced whatever records were needed in reference to age, marriage, citizenship, and so forth.

They went through a complete physical examination, including the necessary X-ray examinations and passed the required aptitude tests. Those men in the recruiting service gave of their time to these boys in order to encourage them to come into the various services for which they were seeking men in this recruitment program.

Those boys after many trips back and forth into the recruitment office, having passed all of the necessary physical, mental, and aptitude tests and what not, having presented the proper papers that were necessary, were selected by the officers, only to find upon return to their homes a selective-service notice which barred them, after all of that procedure for voluntary enlistment. All of this waste of time, not only of these young men who wanted to volunteer for service, but also wasting the time and the taxpayers' money of the personnel in the Coast Guard, the Marines, and Navy who are assigned to this recruitment program. All of this work gone for naught, as I see it.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I found that to be true in my district; however, voluntary enlistments were encouraged by the recruiting officers from these various services, getting the young men who were going to be drafted anyhow to come to the recruiting office to make their selection, with the result that voluntary enlistments went up. There is no question about the fact that there is a lot of waste time and a lot of money expended in examining these volunteers at a time when the selective-service machinery is rolling along. But in the gentleman's formula, however, he would eliminate all voluntary enlistments and freeze the securing of manpower to the selective service.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his observation, but may I add further that some procedure should be worked out between the selective service and the various military services that no voluntary enlistment be entertained until such time as the various draft boards are contacted to make certain that the applicant's draft call is not presently contemplated.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A WAR COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS AND WORK FOR MR. HOOVER AND MR. BARUCH

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe with President Truman that this is the most dangerous year our Nation has ever faced and I believe, too, that the manner in which our Nation as a whole applies itself at this particular time will determine our survival as a free people.

Speaking last night in Passaic, N. J., in my home district, I discussed the bewilderment and confusion existing among our people in this hour of crisis.

I made two proposals before my people that I truly believe to be proper, wholesome, timely, and calculated to promote the unity for which the President appeals. In Passaic last night I said in part:

President Truman and former President Hoover want America to be saved and they may not be so far apart as some believe. I think it would not only be the magnanimous thing to do, I think it would be most patriotic and helpful if Mr. Truman were to give Mr. Hoover a place in the councils of the Nation during this crisis. I think, too, we need to draft men like Bernard Baruch, who has been proven to be so right in the past. The appointment of General Electric's Charles E. Wilson to head the mobilization-production effort was a lift to a people bewildered by the lack of action.

Then, I went on to say, discussing another problem:

Consider the situation of the governors of our 48 States, so many of whom today have different views on civilian defense.

One governor has ordered the rapid construction of atom bomb shelters; another expresses doubt as to the defense merits of such construction.

Several governors insist that their States cannot possibly match the Federal Government in providing the necessary funds for bomb shelters.

I believe it timely to propose the formation of a war council of governors to meet in Washington at the earliest possible time on this and other problems affecting the war of survival. If such a council feels there should be amendments to the new and untried national civilian defense legislation then Congress can go to work at once on such amendments.

My Washington mail reflects the feelings of thousands of Passaic County fathers and mothers anxious to know if the United Nations is going to do more in this world's struggle. They are disturbed over reports that friendly European nations lack the will to fight and are leaning on us for men, money, and material which may be lost when the real shooting begins. Personally, I feel General Eisenhower is determined to get the right answer for himself and the American people, and I am certain that he will soon report the facts to us. It is extremely important that his present mission be speeded.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who has been so active in behalf of a real civil-defense program on all levels.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is not the gentleman very glad that Gen. Lucius Clay is associated with Mr. Wilson in his production effort?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes. I think, too, that the people of the United States got a real lift when his appointment was indicated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He had a brilliant career in the Army as well as in his peace work as an engineer on flood control and navigation. During the war he had a brilliant career in Germany.

Mr. CANFIELD. And upon his return he started the State of New York off on a real civilian-defense program; the State of New York being now ahead of any other State of the Union in that respect.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Very modest and very unselfish.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed in the President's address for more reasons than one, but most particularly because he failed to state anything concerning our policy of preventing Communist infiltration of Russian espionage agents and saboteurs here at home. Following World War II, during and after the Eightieth Congress, President Truman called the investigations being performed by the Committee on Un-American Activities and other committees of Congress "red herrings" no less than a dozen times. I was glad to see that the President did not refer to any of these investigations in his message as being "red herrings," but I wish that he had made some definite policy and stated something definite to the American people and to we Members of Congress regarding his proposal in protecting us from the infiltration of saboteurs and espionage agents during this very crucial time in American history.

MORAL REARMAMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested yesterday afternoon in listening in to the Moral Rearmament Conference at the Shoreham Hotel. It was chiefly a military services meeting. I was very much interested in hearing British military officers speak of the great need to guard against and fight against communism in England and in the governments of the world, against communism in high places in government, in executive offices and all through the different departments, against communism in our offices in this country, against communism among all the peoples of all countries. There are representatives from many countries of the world at the conference now being held. I was deeply interested also in the work they are doing in industrial relations, in bringing about the settlement of strikes between management and labor. Certainly their aim is very fine, and they seem like a great, high-minded group. Today the Moral Rearmament Conference feels the fight against communism of major importance.

THE ASSUMPTIONIST FATHERS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, of recent date, a truly epochal event transpired, which attracted wide interest in my native State of Massachusetts and throughout the Nation. I refer to the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the religious order of the Augustinians of the Assumption, noted and revered in many places throughout the world and known particularly with fame, respect, and gratitude throughout my own district as the Assumptionist Fathers of Worcester.

It was entirely fitting that special exercises should have marked this significant event. The centennial observance was noted in the National Capital on Sunday, December 31, where a solemn pontifical high mass of thanksgiving was celebrated at the St. Vincent de Paul Chapel of Catholic University. Presiding over this impressive ceremony was his distinguished excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, D. D., titular archbishop of Laodicea and apostolic delegate to the United States, who by express direction of the Holy Pontiff brought papal greetings, compliments, and felicitations to the members of the Assumptionist order and its friends assembled in the Capital.

Father Ignatius Smith, O. P., noted member of the Catholic University staff, delivered a powerful commemorative address and paid appropriate and moving tribute to this outstanding religious group, which has made such noteworthy spiritual contributions during the past century.

I can speak with a sense of intimate personal knowledge of the great work of the Assumptionist Fathers. It has been my happy privilege to enjoy warm friendship with many of the leaders and members of this famous religious group and those they have trained and instructed. The magnificent work, the unselfish devotion, the spiritual motivation second to none, the monumental contributions in education, in teaching, in charity, in propagation of the faith, in many worthwhile spiritual activities, indelibly stamp this splendid order as an organization distinguished by rare achievement and notable leadership. I am, therefore, personally very happy and proud to be able today in the Congress of the United States to add my voice to those which have been raised, during the centennial, in commendation of this great order and to express my heartiest congratulations and to extend my genuine best wishes for the future upon this occasion.

If my colleagues would bear with me briefly, I should like to present the chronology a short, and I hope interesting, historical outline of the Assumptionist order. It is significant to observe that it was just 100 years ago on Christmas Day in the year 1850 that the Assumptionist order was founded in the holy chapel of the College of the Assumption at Nimes, France, by a zealous, able, and pious young priest, Father Emmanuel d'Alzon. From this small, humble beginning of a few heroic, but zealous, souls in a small community in beautiful and historic France, banding together in a common cause, has developed the present great and widespread order, which at the present time numbers almost 2,000 members and is established in 22 different countries throughout the world, engaging in its magnificant activities in some 19 colleges, 11 seminaries, 20 apostolic schools, 8 novitiates, 5 orphanages, and over 500 parishes.

Not confined to orthodox educational, charitable and spiritual work alone, the Assumptionists also conduct the well known and celebrated Maison de la Bonne Presse at Paris, which is in effect in our accepted American usage, a substantial publishing house, issuing some 20 weekly and monthly magazines widely distributed and read in many countries. This publishing house established and conducted by the order, also prepares and issues La Croix, which is, in fact, the largest Catholic daily publication in the world.

The growth of the order in this country has been truly phenomenal. First arriving in this country about the year 1900, it founded Assumption College in Worcester, Mass., which has since become one of our best known and outstanding institutions of secondary and higher learning in New England. I believe there are few, if any, counterparts of this school in the Nation. It is indeed unique in that about one-half of its curriculum is offered and conducted in the French language and the remainder in English. It was quite natural, therefore, that Assumption College should attract from the very start an increasing number of young men of Franco-American heritage, particularly from New England, who have received the benefit of sterling training and education and thereafter have taken their places in positions of trust, responsibility, and fruitful contribution in the professional, religious, business, and civil life in the communities of our section. And in turn these citizens of proud Franco-American birth are among our best and most loyal Americans.

I am also proud indeed to allude to the illustrious and brilliant leaders, who have graced the labors of the Assumptionist order in the United States. Every successful human endeavor springs from gifted, imaginative, energetic leadership. This order has been particularly and abundantly blessed with leaders of the very first magnitude. First and foremost, these men have been distinguished by their profound faith and a moving quality of piety and humility. Because of the breadth and depth of their training and instruction, as well as native endowments, these men have been policy makers and administrators in the best sense of these words. Possessed of great natural gifts, powerful intellects, dynamic energy, and unselfish zeal for the great cause they espouse, the leaders of the Assumption order have made a most distinctive and enviable record. From my own district comes that fine priest and learned gentleman, the Very Reverend Wilfrid J. Dufault, A. A., North American provincial of the order, who has administrative charge of all its activities in Mexico, Canada, and the United States. Born in Spencer, Mass., and himself a graduate of Assumption College, he is one of the youngest provincials of the order, and at the age of 43, he most ably and most admirably discharges the heavy responsibilities and duties of this important office. He succeeded another outstanding figure, the Very Reverend Crescent Armanet, A. A., now one of the provincial councilors and Superior of the Assumption community at the church of Our Lady of Esperanza in New York City, cultured and able spiritual leader, who for many years did magnificent work as president of Assumption College. The present head of the college is the Reverend Henri J. Moquin, A. A., another warm friend of mine, a real leader of personality, zeal, and marked attainments, who comes from Marlboro, Mass., also in my congressional district.

Many Members of the House will recall another able and world-famous young priest of this order, the Reverend Leopold Braun, A. A., of New Bedford, Mass., who, you will remember was stationed for 12 long arduous years at Moscow where he was the only American priest in the unhappy land which can claim within its broad domain only one single evangelical church of any Christian faith. Still another distinguished young priest in my district has since replaced him, the Reverend John O. A. Brassard of Leominster, also an able and effective representative of the order and of our American principles of freedom and justice.

I think it is most appropriate that we should pause here to note the unselfish endeavors of these fine men and the order whose heritage they have so brilliantly illumined.

America can be thankful to the Almighty for many things. For the matchless beauty of our land, the wealth of our resources, the genius, loyalty, and prosperity of our people and the religious and patriotic faith which has been the ceaseless source of our spiritual strength. It is men like the Assumptionist Fathers and their associates who have nourished the wellsprings of this faith.

The Nation is rich indeed which can attract to its border groups like the Assumptionist Fathers whose piety, patriotism, and unselfish labor in the vineyards of the Almighty must ever be a deep inspiration to citizens of every race and creed who cherish the real meaning of American liberty.

May this order grow and prosper in the future. May it spread its benign good influence. When another 100 years have been recorded in the master book of Father Time, may it be again written in imperishable gold letters, as it has been during the past century, that this order has continued undying devotion to its ideals and steadfast loyalty to its purpose and has added still more glorious chapters to its brilliant achievements.

May the Assumptionist Fathers continue to find in their noble service to the Almighty and humanity that supreme satisfaction and happiness which come from the knowledge of having done something for others, from having stood ever loyal to the cause of God and country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article which appeared in the December 1950 issue of Rural Electrification magazine.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the grand jury of Greenwood County, S. C.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Mr. B. M. McElvey at the Welcome to Washington dinner.

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, entitled "Heartbreak Highway."

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial entitled "The Tidings."

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some statements by the Iowa Development Commission on the theme Iowa Was a Better Place To Live in 1950.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article which appeared in the American Legion magazine for this month entitled "Why You Buy Books That Sell Communism" notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $451.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., appearing in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and, in each, include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and resolution.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered yesterday in the Washington Cathedral at services of prayer and dedication for Members of the Eighty-second Congress, sponsored by the Washington Cathedral and the Washington Federation of Churches, by the Reverend Doctor O. Frederick Nolde, of Philadelphia, director of the Commission of Churches on International Affairs.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

26. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

28. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend further the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes,' approved May 16, 1947, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

29. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide that personnel of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States shall have common Federal appointments or enlistments as Reserves in their respective services, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

30. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report for the period ending May 31, 1950, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 (c) of the amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C., sec. 164), establishing a special helium-production fund; to the Committee on Armed Services.

32. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

33. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

34. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to provisions of the act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056), on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

35. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

36. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a supply corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary ration basis"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

37. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

38. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for crediting certain service of nurses, dietitians, and physical therapists in the Armed Forces toward retirement"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

39. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

40. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act, 1948, to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

41. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army

provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippine Islands, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

42. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

43. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

44. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

45. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 191)"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

46. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

47. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

48. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758, ch. 465), as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

49. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

50. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "a bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

52. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to ratify the organization and operations of the Island Trading Co. of Micronesia and to provide for its incorporation"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

54. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill."; to the Committee on Public Works.

55. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 1041), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 846, 847), so as to make permanent certain temporary provisions thereof"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

56. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to eliminate the additional internal revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

57. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of revolving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Public Lands.

58. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, transmitting a report to the Congress on all agreements entered into under authority of the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280), for the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1001. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1002. A bill to strengthen the Republic of the Philippines and make permanent the friendly ties between our respective countries by permitting certain persons from the Philippines to receive instruction at the United States service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1003. A bill to increase to $600 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1004. A bill to reduce certain excise tax rates, to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1005. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1006. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1007. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1008. A bill to amend section 1603 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code and section 303 (b) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1009. A bill to provide the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1010. A bill to reduce to prewar levels the excise tax on automotive transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1011. A bill to repeal the excise tax on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 1012. A bill to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1013. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1014. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with respect to the guaranteeing of home loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1015. A bill to facilitate the admission of alien spouses and minor children of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 1016. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1017. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1018. A bill to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; to restore the right of American citizens to own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to open up foreign trade through the channels of private enterprise; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1019. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1020. A bill to make certain provisions for the regulation of steam vessels inapplicable to vessels operated exclusively for the training of officers and seamen for the United States merchant marine or the United States Navy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1021. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over certain foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1022. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said land and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1023. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1024. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for expansion and the production and processing of ramie in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1025. A bill to exempt certain real property in the District of Columbia from taxation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1026. A bill to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 1027. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1028. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1029. A bill to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1030. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the San Antonio River, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R 1031. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1032. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1033. A bill to promote more economical and efficient use of the Nation's resources by providing for a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 1034. A bill to amend the authority given the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 25, 1947, to construct the Paonia reclamation project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1035. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1036. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 so as to permit certain persons who served in the United States Merchant Marine Academy to enlist in the Navy or Coast Guard at any time prior to their induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1037. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 1038. A bill relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1039. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1040. A bill to provide adequate compensation for the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1041. A bill to provide adequate compensation for certain law-enforcement officers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1042. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1043. A bill to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1044. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), as amended, so as to remove the discrimination now existing against certain members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1045. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1046. A bill to provide for the evacuation of dependents of Armed Forces personnel from occupation zones or areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1047. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 1048. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to exempt therefrom any railroad which operates wholly within a State if 95 percent or more of its passenger revenues are derived from intrastate transportation of passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1049. A bill to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefore because of service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950, and to provide certain benefits upon appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 1050. A bill to amend the act incorporating The American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 1051. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1052. A bill relating to compensation for veterans of World War II who have a service-connected or a service-aggravated tuberculous condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1053. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfork Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1054. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam in Baxter and Marion Counties, Ark., as Lake Tom Shiras; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1055. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Monroe County, Ark., to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1056. A bill to permit any veteran of both world wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1057. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the Armed Forces during the present war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1058. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1059. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the Armed Forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1060. A bill to provide for the sale of certain submarginal lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1061. A bill to increase to $1,500 the income limitation upon the payment of compensation under the act of June 28, 1934, to widows without children and to children of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1062. A bill to establish a Tax Settlement Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1063. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1064. A bill authorizing transmission in the United States mails of personal mail addressed by individuals in the military and naval service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1065. A bill to name the twin highway bridges over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia the George Washington Memorial Bridge and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1066. A bill to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1067. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1068. A bill to promote the extension of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital in the northern Virginia environs of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1069. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Kellogg Airport and Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1070. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the eligibility for benefits of certain employees on furlough on the date of enactment of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFER (by request):

H. R. 1071. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1072. A bill to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1073. A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1074. A bill to extend the basis for appellate reviews in Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1075. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to children where there is no widow, and

to dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1076. A bill to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service connection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1077. A bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1078. A bill to revise the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1079. A bill to revise the basis for award of death pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1080. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the United States Army during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1081. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1082. A bill to amend paragraph I (a), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to provide more equitable disability compensation for those in the armed services during the Korean conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1083. A bill to provide for an increase in monthly rates of compensation and pensions payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1084. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war-risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1085. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of officers discharged from the armed services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1086. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1087. A bill to amend title 25, section 247, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1088. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1089. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1090. A bill to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 1091. A bill to repeal provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide that the first Navy supercarrier shall be named the *James V. Forrestal;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Nation-wide whole blood plasma bank as a measure of protection against atomic warfare or other major disaster; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to clarify the application of the existing excise tax imposed on certain fans under section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution requiring that notice be sent to the Members when the President convenes the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late George Smith Patton, Jr., a lieutenant general, Army of the United States, a commission as a five-star general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to clarify responsibility for acts of aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Police Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution expressing favor of extending assistance to India to avert food shortage and famine during 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that a civilian physical fitness and training program should be established in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 50. Resolution calling for retail price control of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 51. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue investigations begun under House Resolution 107 of the Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations continued and authorized by House Resolution 51; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 53. Resolution to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 54. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 55. Resolution providing for one additional clerical assistant for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Miss Miyoko Miyagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of Ethel White, Frankie Ezell, and Ralph James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Bellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Emilio Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of R. F. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of Albertha Y. M. Arrindall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1107. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Satirios Christos Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1109. A bill for the relief of Francis J. Clearly, captain, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Florida Giusti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Taro Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1112. A bill for the relief of Christian Johansen Krogh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1113. A bill for the relief of Sam Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1115. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Commander Wendell H. Froling; the estate of Mrs. Anna C. Froling, and the estate of Margaret A. Froling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Aba Abysz Warszawczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUGATE:

H. R. 1117. A bill for the relief of Miss Kimiko Shibuya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1118. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Francesca Fiorenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Mario DiFilippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of William Yinson Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 1121. A bill to the relief of Chin Yok Kong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1122. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1123. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Dewey Pickett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of Young Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1126. A bill for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Jenny Evelyn Elsie Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Harvey McFarland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1129. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co., and Edward Barbera; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of the endorsers on certain Government checks drawn to the order of Henry C. Schrader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Brunett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Roscoe H. McCulloch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Roy J. Bricker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Sister Monica Grant; to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Siachta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of Alfred Joseph Huter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of Josef Burger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Erna Hahn and her minor sons, Erwin Hahn and Theo Heinrich Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1140. A bill for the relief of Fares Nujra Saliba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of R. L. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1143. A bill granting to Frank S. Howell certain pay and allowances for his travel from the Philippine Islands to the United States following his discharge from the Army in such islands in 1900; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Miria Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of George Tongas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1146. A bill for the relief of Tanju M. Ergil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of Julio Henrique Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of Hanna Mussbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 1149. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Vernacchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Elderina Janna Pols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Angela Siradakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Felice Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of James Starozynski, Brucha Laja Starozynski, his wife, and their daughter, Reveca Starozynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Lum Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Isao Ishimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Dezso Szilagyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of Kenneth McRight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kaiko (Kay) Fair and her minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Paolo Danesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of Pietro Giannettino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 1166. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Charlie Joe Starnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 89 citizens and parents of New Galilee, Pa., urging that the sale of alcoholic beverages be prohibited within a 10-mile radius of Army camps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. C. Blum, president, New Port Richey Townsend Club, No. 1, New Port Richey, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the way, the truth, and the life, wilt Thou now hear us as, in simplicity and sincerity, we offer unto Thee our penitential prayers.

We humbly and penitently confess that, as members of the family of God, we have not been heeding Thy voice when Thou didst say, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

Our own conscience tells us that we have often allowed materialism, as a habit of life, to take such a strong hold upon us.

The windows of our souls have become opaque and our vision of the higher values has become eclipsed by our ambition to gain for ourselves a vast accumulation of the world's goods and of material strength and power.

We have been misdirecting so much of our energy by striving feverishly for that which is not bread and laboring for that which can never satisfy.

We have neglected to keep in mind the great spiritual goals and objectives and have failed to see that the soul of all culture is the culture of the soul.

Grant us Thy pardoning grace and during this year may we venture forth eagerly and courageously upon the nobler ways of life. May we unite our wills and purposes with Thine in bringing in the day of peace.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 22 of the act of June 18, 1929, as amended (2 U. S. C. 2a), relating to the decennial censuses and the apportionment of Representatives in Congress, I transmit herewith a statement prepared by the Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, giving the whole number of persons in each State as ascertained under the seventeenth decennial census of population, and the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under an apportionment of the existing number of Representatives. All Indians are included in the tabulation of total population, since all Indians are now subject to Federal taxation.

Under the law, each State will be entitled commencing in the Eighty-third Congress, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement. In a House of 435 Members, the number fixed by law, the population changes reflected by the census will require a change in the number of Representatives for 16 States. Seven States will gain, and nine States will lose seats.

In accordance with the statute, it will be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, within 15 calendar days after the receipt of the statement I am now transmitting, to certify to the executive of each State the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled. The statute then prescribes the ways in which any changes in the number of Representatives shall be handled until the States shall have redistricted in accordance with the changes in population.

These procedures of existing law are of great value to the operation of our Government. They provide an established method of carrying out, almost automatically, the constitutional plan for apportioning Representatives among the States on the basis of population.

However, certain problems have arisen with respect to the creation of appropriate districts within the States, which merit the consideration of the Congress.

Over the years, widespread discrepancies have grown up between the populations of the various congressional districts. While some variation is inevitable, the extreme differences that now exist can and should be corrected. For example, there is one State in which, according to the 1950 census, the smallest district has a population of under 175,000 and the largest district has a population exceeding 900,000. In many States, there are differences of 200,000 or 300,000 people between the smallest and largest existing districts in the State. While about half of the congressional districts throughout the country are between 300,000 and 400,000 in population, there are some 50 districts with a population of 250,000 or less, and, at the other extreme, some 50 districts with a population of 450,000 or over. Furthermore, as population has increased, several States have added Congressmen at Large instead of redistricting, as they should.

Such defects in our system of congressional districts obstruct the effective operation of the democratic principles on which our whole Government rests. It is fundamental to the whole structure of the Constitution that all citizens have equal representation, so far as practicable, in the House of Representatives. This basic principle is not carried out unless congressional districts are drawn up to reflect population changes.

The present statute clearly contemplates that the States will redistrict after an apportionment. Redistricting is the task of the State legislatures and must, of course, continue to be so. However, it is also a matter of national concern, and the Congress has a constitutional obligation in this field which cannot be overlooked. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution provides that the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but Congress may by law make or alter such regulations.

For many years the Congress exercised this power. From 1842 through 1911 the apportionment statutes enacted by the Congress as the result of each succeeding census required each State having more than one Representative to divide itself into single-Member districts, thus holding down the number of Congressmen at Large. This requirement is not included in the legislation which now governs the subject. Furthermore, prior to 1929, many of the apportionment statutes enacted by the Congress called upon the States to follow certain standards in establishing congressional districts. They usually provided, as for example in the 1911 act—Thirty-seventh United States Statutes, page 13—that in each State entitled under the apportionment to more than one Representative, the Representatives should be elected by districts composed of contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. These standards provided a guide for the States which was, in most cases, followed.

It seems to me desirable that the Congress at this time should give its attention to this important problem and enact legislation, supplemental to the permanent legislation on this subject, which would provide the States with standards for establishing congressional districts and indicate the congressional interest in compliance with such standards.

Such legislation might reaffirm the basic policy of our Government to have single-member districts. It might also repeat the old and accepted standard that congressional districts be composed of contiguous and compact territory and contain as nearly as practicable the same number of individuals. To give more definitiveness to such standards, it might be advisable for the Congress to consider establishing limits for the permitted deviations in population between districts. It would be possible, for example, for the statute to specify that no district in any State should deviate upward or downward from the average population of all congressional districts within that State by more than a specified percentage. In terms of the present census, assuming an average district of about 350,000 persons, a percentage permitting a range of about 50,000 above and below that figure would probably allow for the practical difficulties which State legislatures face in drawing up district boundaries.

The Congress should not be satisfied merely with enacting such standards. It should assume responsibility for seeing that the standards are in fact complied with. This might be done by providing for adequate reports from the States on the action they have taken in redistricting and by providing for continued congressional attention to the results. I believe that the enactment of the standards by itself will have a tremendous influence and that most States will seek earnestly to comply. If there are occasions in which flagrant refusal to comply is made manifest, the Congress has the power under the Constitution to take the matter in its own hands.

In any case, it is important that the proper redistricting be done promptly. Redistricting should be completed not later than the spring of 1952 so that the congressional elections of that year may give fair representation to all citizens of our country.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1951.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington 25, D. C.

Population of the United States, by States, 1950, and apportionment of Representatives in Congress, 1950 and 1940

State	Population, 1950	Present number of Representatives	Apportionment of 435 Representatives according to 1950 population		
			Number	Change from present number of Representatives	
				Increase	Decrease
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
United States	150,697,361	435	435	14	14
Alabama	3,061,743	9	9		
Arizona	749,587	2	2		
Arkansas	1,909,511	7	6		1
California	10,586,223	23	30	7	
Colorado	1,325,089	4	4		
Connecticut	2,007,280	6	6		
Delaware	318,085	1	1		
District of Columbia	802,178				
Florida	2,771,305	6	8	2	
Georgia	3,444,578	10	10		
Idaho	588,637	2	2		
Illinois	8,712,176	26	25		1
Indiana	3,934,224	11	11		
Iowa	2,621,073	8	8		
Kansas	1,905,299	6	6		
Kentucky	2,944,806	9	8		1
Louisiana	2,683,516	8	8		
Maine	913,774	3	3		
Maryland	2,343,001	6	7	1	
Massachusetts	4,690,514	14	14		
Michigan	6,371,766	17	18	1	
Minnesota	2,982,483	9	9		
Mississippi	2,178,914	7	6		1
Missouri	3,954,653	13	11		2
Montana	591,024	2	2		
Nebraska	1,325,510	4	4		
Nevada	160,083	1	1		
New Hampshire	533,242	2	2		
New Jersey	4,835,329	14	14		
New Mexico	681,187	2	2		
New York	14,830,192	45	43		2
North Carolina	4,061,929	12	12		
North Dakota	619,636	2	2		
Ohio	7,946,627	23	23		
Oklahoma	2,233,351	8	6		2
Oregon	1,521,341	4	4		
Pennsylvania	10,498,012	33	30		3
Rhode Island	791,896	2	2		
South Carolina	2,117,027	6	6		
South Dakota	652,740	2	2		
Tennessee	3,291,718	10	9		1
Texas	7,711,194	21	22	1	
Utah	688,862	2	2		
Vermont	377,747	1	1		
Virginia	3,318,680	9	10	1	
Washington	2,378,963	6	7	1	
West Virginia	2,005,552	6	6		
Wisconsin	3,434,575	10	10		
Wyoming	290,529	1	1		

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in reference to this message from the President, I wish to call attention to something that occurred in my district which may be rather significant. In one small town I found upon investigation that 137 persons had not been counted. I asked for a recount. It is rather late to get the result into the official report, but the recount showed that they had overlooked 137 people even in the small village—a Republican village, of course.

THE SPIRIT OF OUR SOLDIERS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during a very brief visit to my home in Galveston, Tex., at Christmas time, a friend of mine stopped me on the street to show me a letter he had received from his son in the Army. The son was one of those veterans recalled to active duty last summer.

The attitude which is reflected in his letter struck me as exceptionally fine and worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an inspiration not only to other young men who may face military service, but also to the people at home who frequently need a boost in morale even more than the men in service.

The part of the letter which is of such timely interest and which is inserted in the RECORD with the permission of the writer, Tom Affleck, Jr., follows:

I think that we all must go in order to see this thing through to a victorious conclusion.

I for one am ready to defend my country at any time and in any capacity that I am needed.

When I joined the Reserve component of the Army, I did so deliberately—knowing full well that when my country was in need I would be among the first to be called.

This is not the time for indecision or the putting of one's personal hopes, wishes, and aspirations above the needs of the Nation.

PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the last session I introduced a concurrent resolution directing the President to establish a physical fitness program in this country. As a physician I am greatly disturbed about the physical defects that are being found among our draftees. In July 58-plus percent of the draftees were turned down due mainly to psychopathic, physical, and mental defects. That has gradually dropped until in October less than 35 percent were being turned down, but in November there was an increase of fourtenths of 1 percent above October. That may mean that we are hitting the bottom of the barrel; or it may mean leveling off of our qualified men for military duty. The Nation is just as strong as its citizens are physically fit. It is important that this country do something to improve the fitness of our citizens as rapidly as possible. On yesterday I reintroduced House Concurrent Resolution 19, hoping that the President will take some action immediately in this regard.

THE CRISIS FACING THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a supreme crisis this week faces the United Nations. If it fails to meet that crisis in a bold and forthright manner, it is difficult to see how it can survive as an effective force for world peace. As one who has enthusiastically supported the organization as the world's best hope, I am greatly troubled by its apparent ineffectiveness in the face of naked aggression. We, who are the elected spokesmen for the people, can perform a service this week by speaking out plainly.

When a small country, North Korea, crossed the thirty-eighth parallel last June, the United Nations was quick to condemn this action as aggression. It placed its armies, 90 percent of them Americans, at the side of the invaded Republic of Korea to repel the invasion.

Now a large country, Communist China, is the aggressor. This last week end the world has witnessed the sorry spectacle of the United States delegation to the United Nations running around among the other delegates begging them

to fall in line behind a resolution to brand the Chinese Communists, like the North Korean Reds, as aggressors and threats to the peace of the world. If aggression by 100,000 North Korean Communists was wrong in June, certainly aggression by a million Chinese Communists is at least equally wrong now.

There is great danger that public opinion in this country, heretofore generally favorable toward a world peace organization like the United Nations, will withdraw its support, unless there is a prompt change in the present weak-kneed attitude of the delegates representing the other countries, which have, at least, as much at stake as the United States in preventing the Communists from overrunning all of Asia and Europe.

Whether their motive in pursuing the appeasement mirage be a desire not to interfere with profitable commercial ventures in the Orient or a feeling that the Kremlin, mastermind behind the Chinese Communists' move, will seek to punish those nations with courage to face up to the facts or a fear that a forthright attitude will cause Russia to strike in Western Europe in retaliation or whatever their motive be, it makes no difference. In the long run, they are the losers, not the gainers, by their intransigent position and must be made to see it. Unless they display the same fortitude on the political and moral front which has been demanded and demonstrated, mostly by American boys, on the battlefield, the public reaction in this country will be such as to lead almost inevitably to the collapse of the United Nations as an effective force in stabilizing world conditions.

The patience of the American people has already been stretched to the breaking point through the failure of other governments whose professed aims and ideals parallel ours, with a couple of notable exceptions, to supply anything like their share of the fighting forces to repel aggression in the Far East. If the same attitude characterizes response to the request of our representatives for a forceful stand on the diplomatic front, it may well break that tenuous thread which binds the loyal backing of the people of this country to the United Nations.

The argument is sincerely advanced that a condemnatory resolution would be ineffective and might even have the effect of emphasizing the difference in treatment accorded a large and a small power, unless the members of the United Nations are prepared to follow up such a resolution with tangible force to repel aggression. To that view I cannot subscribe. Overwhelming force of numbers may dictate different treatment, but the evil is the same. Morality demands that an international crime be recognized and denounced.

It would be a tragedy to see the collapse of this organization which has held the sincere hopes of so many millions for future world peace and security. Its testing time is here. The fate of the United Nations rests with those who are prepared to demonstrate that they will match pious utterances with forthright action.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Communist aggression in Korea, there has been a growing dislocation of our economy resulting from both artificial and real scarcities of basic raw materials. The Department of Defense has been hampered in the procurement of essential military equipment. The housewife has been forced to pay unconscionable prices for daily family needs. Legitimate businessmen, particularly those operating small plants, have been jeopardized in the operation of their concerns. With the increased demands of our rearmament program this condition will inevitably become more critical.

A substantial portion of this disruption has occurred because of unscrupulous black marketing. Numerous complaints by responsible parties have come to my attention. For example, in one case a regular check for the materials purchased must be sent to the supplier and then cash paid "on the side" for the black-market mark-up. Steel is apparently available but only at outrageous prices. Fly-by-night suppliers have steel while those who have been in business for long periods cannot obtain even a fair share. The situation in steel is atrocious and must be remedied.

Under the Defense Production Act of 1950 which Congress approved in September of last year, the executive branch of the Federal Government does have authority to cope with this very serious problem. However, the Congress itself does have a continuing obligation to investigate conditions of this sort. I believe that this job can best be accomplished by the Congress by setting up a select committee to scrutinize and police certain activities related to the defense effort. Therefore, I am today introducing a resolution which would create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of, and methods of preventing, the black-marketing of materials essential to the defense program.

Those responsible for and participating in the black market while our youth are fighting for our country should be exposed and punished. The committee after a comprehensive investigation of such reprehensible conduct should recommend to the Senate and House new legislation, if necessary, for a full crackdown on such gougers who are hindering the rearmament effort.

RESTORATION OF PROPER MAIL SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department is our first line of defense. With millions of young men going away to join the colors and to don the uniform of our country I believe the greatest builder of morale, not only of our Armed Forces but of our home population, is to see that the Post Office Department gives a proper and prompt mail service to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill entitled "To Direct the Postmaster General To Restore Proper Mail Service to the People" which does not involve the expenditure of one additional penny. This proposed bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby directed to—

1. Restore delivery of mail to two trips daily.
2. Increase hours of collection to normal.
3. Restore former hours of distribution for all classes of mail.
4. Insure previous high percentage of accurate delivery of mail through restoring the direction section.
5. Increase hours of service at windows and over the platform.

I believe that the greatest builder of morale of our Armed Forces is the restoration of service by the Post Office Department to where it should be.

Such a bill will give our postal service back to the people. I remember during World War II the splendid work done by the personnel of the Post Office Department.

They saw to it that the mail went through.

They gave cheerful and efficient service to the folks back home by rushing letters from their GI sons and relatives.

They built up a secure feeling among our troops by promptness in handling their messages of devotion to loved ones.

Today the Department needs a shot in the arm and a return to the old routine.

Let us take a hand to assure our people in their time of need a mail service unhampered by regulations which shrink efficient operation but one which personifies the age-old slogan, "The Mails Must Go Through."

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I listened with attention and courtesy to the speech on the state of the Union delivered before the joint session of the House and Senate by the President. I must say, however, that I was astonished at some of the statements he made; one in particular I shall quote at this time:

> Our programs of economic aid have done much to turn back communism.

Mr. Speaker, where has communism been turned back? In 1945 the Soviet Union and her satellites controlled a

little over 300,000,000 people. Today they control over 800,000,000 people.

If that is turning back communism, I would like to see some other method tried.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report of the Committee on the Reapportionment of Congress of the American Political Science Association.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include newspaper articles.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Courier-Journal of January 7, entitled "Abandon Europe to Conquest Is Taft's Policy Once More."

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article and an editorial.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway, and in the other on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Detroit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article concerning former Member of the House Robert F. Rich, published in a Williamsport paper of December 31, 1950.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article taken from the Washington Observer entitled "Senator MARTIN Sensed Red Peril Early."

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent regarding the Korean situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include historical quotations.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorial matter.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a telegram from the mayor of Hagerstown and in another an editorial from the Washington Post.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next, and that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet the following Monday. I might also announce that on Friday there will be no business, so that the Members can govern themselves accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Friday next following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Friday next following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WILL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BE HEARD?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, upon the administration and the Congress rests the duty of deciding within the next few days or weeks whether this Nation shall again for the third time within a period of 40 years become irrevocably committed to an all-out, world-wide war.

In England the minority party, disagreeing with the policies of the majority, may in Parliament call for a vote of lack of confidence. If that move wins, the issue then goes direct to the people and the people, with the issues before them, elect to the Parliament individuals pledged to carry out the then will of the people.

Here, the people cannot officially make known their decision as to the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the administration's present policy until 1952, when it may be too late.

Here, the people have but one remedy left to them if they wish to change the present trend of events. That remedy is the turning loose upon their Representatives in Congress of an overwhelming flood of protesting communications.

There is one sure way of making a Senator or a Congressman respond to the people's will; that is, to convince him by personal messages that the home folks demand, will insist upon, a certain course of action.

While our Government is said to be under the two-party system, neither party has a firm, clear-cut policy.

The membership of the Democratic Party is not in complete accord as to our foreign policy. They are in hopeless disagreement on some phases of our domestic policy.

The same may be said of the Republican Party and its members.

Whether a Member of Congress is a Democrat or a Republican is determined not by the principles to which he adheres, the program for which he votes, but by the party label under which he was elected. That, at least, has been the situation up until the present time. Sometimes the label is a misleading one. Yesterday Senator MORSE, of Oregon, reelected in November upon the Republican ticket, told Republican leaders that he did not wish to be a member of the Republican committee, which in 1952 will be charged with the election of Republicans to the Senate.

The press reports that one faction of the Democratic Party in the other body, displeased over its inability to elect the party leader and the party whip, was holding a conference to determine upon ways and means of putting over its own legislative program.

In the House, while the Democrats are fairly well united upon a foreign policy, there are two factions, one determined as in the last Congress to put across the President's so-called social program; the other, equally determined that such a policy shall not go through.

A majority of the Democrats would probably go along with the President in some sort of a program which would tax our resources and our manpower in aid to our professed but unreliable allies.

On the Republican side there is a somewhat similar division of opinion.

A majority of the Republicans in the House would probably oppose such a policy, believing as they do, that complete involvement in world war III would undermine the welfare of our people, destroy our individual liberty, make us subject to a military dictatorship, make the future of the Republic insecure.

In my humble opinion, there should be a realinement of our political forces—this, not only because we must have a degree of unity if any foreign policy is to succeed, but because no foreign policy can succeed unless we have a sound domestic policy of which the people approve.

Ever since 1933 our domestic policy has been based upon the premise that the Federal Government owed an obligation to the citizen to protect him from want or hardship, even though the fault be his own. The result is that today, to a large extent, the citizen has lost the will to act independently, to work and to sacrifice to make his future secure.

The people, as always in the world's history, choosing the broad and apparently easy way, thinking more of the present than of the future, in part, because of the failure of those of contrary opinion to aggressively point out the danger, have endorsed that policy.

Ever since 1916, when President Wilson was elected upon a platform of "He kept us out of war," our foreign policy has been one of confusion.

The administration, elected upon that platform, at once became involved in World War I.

From that day on, internationalists have been an ever-increasing force in formulating our foreign policy. Through propaganda, they apparently convinced our people—at least they convinced those in authority—that the United States of America had so few friends abroad, that its people were so lacking in faith in their Government, in courage, and endurance, that our existence depended, at one time upon the British fleet, and since then upon the purchasable good will and aid of other nations; that, to protect the Western Hemisphere, our men must fight abroad wherever war reared its ugly head.

The internationalists believe that safety for the Republic lies only in the surrendering of a degree of its independence, our membership in some sort of a world-wide organization.

They are willing to surrender a part of our sovereignty, join a world-wide organization, where we, though the most powerful and wealthy member, will be at the beck and call, our fighting men subject to the orders of, a majority of that organization.

Opposing that sort of foreign policy are those who believe that, while we should be charitable and helpful to all people seeking and willing to fight for their own freedom, we should retain our right of independent action; become involved in only those wars which actually, not theoretically, endanger the welfare of our people, the security of our Republic.

Today the cleavage between these two schools of thought is clear and definite. In my humble judgment, believing as I do in a two-party system of government, to me it seems apparent that there either should be a shifting of party names, as for example, a conservative and a liberal party or a realinement within each party.

The latter procedure might result in four parties, that is, a conservative and a liberal group in each of the two present political parties. That procedure, however, would make it still more difficult for the people to effectively express their will.

An accurate and a correct definition of either a liberal or a conservative is difficult for all to agree upon. Each, in the minds of different individuals and groups, has different meanings.

A liberal has been described to be one who desires to spend other people's money—a radical and a wild-eyed, long-haired irresponsible, with foolish notions.

A conservative has been described to be a penny-pinching, reactionary old fossil, who prefers candlelight to electricity, a horse and buggy to modern methods of travel; one who might eat his food raw.

Of course, such a characterization of either is absurd. But both are used by the smear artists, some of whom concede neither good sense nor patriotism to their opponents.

An internationalist or a one-worlder has been described as a starry-eyed joiner who believes that universal permanent peace can be obtained through some world-wide organization wherein everyone has divested himself of all human frailties.

He has also been described as a warmonger, a profiteer willing to turn the flesh and blood of his countrymen into dollars.

An isolationist has been charged with being a coward, one who would dig a hole, crawl into it, block the entrance, let the rest of the world go hang.

Again, neither definition is accurate.

Beyond question, there are liberals and conservatives, internationalists and isolationists, more preferably nationalists, who seek only the welfare of mankind, peaceful security for all peoples and nations. The objectives of all are, or at least should be, the same—the welfare of mankind, peace on earth.

As always in the world's history, there are at least two methods of approach to these two supremely desirable ends.

We will, at the moment, forget the domestic problems, the so-called liberals, the so-called conservatives; concern ourselves only with the solution of the international problem.

That problem today has its two schools of thought. On the one hand, we have those who believe that the welfare of our people and the security of our Republic is dependent upon our involvement, our participation with all our arms, our men and our resources, in world war III. That program is backed by President Truman, Dean Acheson, Tom Dewey, John Foster Dulles, to name but a few.

Opposed to that program are those who believe that while we can with caution extend aid to other nations which profess to be opposed to communism, to dictatorship—those nations and those peoples who are willing to make a fight for their freedom and independence, if they desire freedom and independence, we cannot with safety to ourselves, send our land forces to fight everywhere, whenever, wherever in the world Stalin, his stooges, or any other would-be ambitious dictator starts a war.

The views of this latter group have been expressed by former President Herbert Hoover, by Senator Taft, by Joseph P. Kennedy, all of whom but gave voice to the thought and convictions of millions of Americans of like opinion and upon whom would fall the burden of world war III.

Senator MORSE may have unintentionally rendered a worth-while service to his country in disassociating himself from the Senate Republican group which will be charged with electing Senators in 1952.

Just the other day, in a Republican conference of the House Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], when I disagreed with him, called attention to the fact that, in a district where registered Democrats far outnumbered registered Republicans, he was elected on the Republican ticket.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, it was my privilege to be elected, after having expressed views similar to those of former President Hoover and Senator TAFT. Undoubtedly, the gentleman from New York, gifted though he is, could not even be nominated on the Republican ticket in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, if he expressed his sincere convictions prior to election.

Equally true, I could not be even nominated, certainly not elected, in the district which he represents, if I there spoke my convictions.

Many other similar illustrations showing how both Senators and Congressmen have been elected under a party label, though their convictions differed from those of the majority of the party whose label they carried on election day, might be cited.

Is it not time that those in the Republican Party who do not hold the convictions held by a majority of those elected as Republicans withdraw from that party organization, as apparently has Senator MORSE, and aid in forming new parties?

If party solidarity is their goal, our Democratic friends are in no better situation than are Republicans.

The southerners are determinedly opposed to much of the President's so-called social program. They, like a majority of the Republicans, have profound convictions as to the soundness of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

In the Senate, they have a stanch group led by such men as BYRD, RUSSELL, and MCCLELLAN, to mention but a few, who believe, as do TAFT, WHERRY, and MILLIKIN, in a balanced budget, in a Federal Government which lives within its income.

There has been much talk and newspaper comment about some sort of a coalition between southern Democrats and northern Republicans. Actually, there is no such coalition. The hard, cold fact is that individual members of both parties, both liberals and conservatives, when an issue arises, vote on that issue, not according to their party labels but according to the principles and the program in which they believe.

This situation makes clear that the party label is no guaranty of party loyalty or of the principles or convictions entertained by the individual party member.

Whether Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, and those of their political school, or Senator BYRD, Congressman COX, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, and those who follow their political philosophy, represent the Democratic Party is a question which must be left to the determination of that party's political organization.

But, do I hear you ask, who does represent, for example, the Republican Party? Is it Mr. Dewey? Is it Mr. TAFT?

On that subject, at least this may be said—that, ever since 1932, the Republican Party has been led by those who might truthfully be termed "internationalists," perhaps designated as liberals; in some instances, characterized as imitators of the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy. Three times have Deweyites, twice led by Mr. Dewey himself, gone to the people in November, and three times in the last 18 years under their leadership Republicans have failed to win a national election or any one of the eight congressional elections other

than in 1946, when they obtained control of the Congress.

Now, to the internationalists—to Mr. Dewey and his followers—I plead, isn't it fair that, having struck out three times, in succession, failed to win in seven out of eight tries you go back, sit down on the bench and let the so-called isolationists—in reality, the nationalists, and conservatives—in the Republican Party go just once to the people of the Nation on a clear-cut, simple issue?

Is it improper to suggest to Mr. Dewey that he, his protege, John Foster Dulles, and others of like mind follow the courageous example of Senator MORSE, openly disassociate themselves from the Republican Party, and, under their own label and symbol, join the liberals, the one-worlders, the internationalists; then, as such, under their true party label, seek the people's support?

If Mr. Dewey, Mr. Dulles, and those who follow their policies and program are willing to announce themselves as internationalists, adopt a program setting forth their well-known views on this one issue, it is my humble judgment that those of us who have been challenged as isolationists are quite willing to go to the country as nationalists upon a platform opposing appeasement of the incessant demands of our so-called allies, of our known enemies; expressing faith in the principles of our Constitution, confidence in the productive ability, the courageous determination of our people to remain independent and, with their associates in the Western Hemisphere, fight their own battles, protect themselves against any aggression.

If a situation of that kind can be created, then the people will have a chance to effectively, conclusively, make their wishes known as to the policies, both domestic and foreign, which the Congress should follow.

If this country is to have political integrity, a new party alinement, based upon principles, is necessary. Such an alinement is necessary, not for political reasons or partisan purposes, or as a springboard to office, but because the people have the right to be represented in the White House and in the Congress by individuals who will follow express and make effective the people's desires, their convictions, as to our future foreign policy.

Failing such an alinement, the only remedy the American people have available in this, the great, crisis which confronts them, is the right of petition to their Congress—petitions signed by so many written in such unmistakable language that the Congress will be induced to follow the course which the people believe, and by their vote indicate, will promote the people's welfare—make our Republic secure against foreign aggression.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I recall to the gentleman's mind that 10 years ago I suggested just such a division. I suggested that BRICKER and BYRD run against Roosevelt and Wallace, making a clear-cut division and a clear-cut issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I remember. But, as we know, they did not take your advice. Had they done so we would have since that election have had a Government somewhat approaching one of, by, and for the people instead of one established by the paid propagandists.

And the Republican Party three times, permit a repetition, the Republican Party, that great Republican Party, three times let Mr. Dewey, the internationalists, and the so-called liberals go to bat. Three times they struck out. And in twenty-odd years we have not won a single election, except the one in 1946 when we took over the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

THE UNITED NATIONS—LAST ROUND-UP?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the UN, despite its weaknesses, has been at least a symbol for the expression of the collective moral judgments of mankind on international questions. If it fails to say soon and overwhelmingly that Communist China is an aggressor in Korea, it will have failed of its purpose, reduced to its lowest common denominator. What the free world can do about aggression, how to do it, involves questions upon which there can be honest differences of opinion. What civilization can do about crime is always a question, but whenever civilization fails to recognize and denounce crime for fear of the consequences of its own moral judgment, civilization is gone. I do not think that civilization has failed in this crisis. If, however, the United Nations fails to record the moral judgment of civilization by recognizing and denouncing this aggression in Korea, it is headed for its last round-up. I hope that, in this grave crisis, the representatives of the free nations of the world act wisely, rightly, bravely—and soon.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, following the President's message to us yesterday on the state of the Union, all of us are even more keenly aware of the monumental task before us and the vital importance to the survival of civilization of the steps the United States of America takes in this critical hour in world history.

All of us have noted in the many excellent reports appearing in the public press of an unusual conference which has been taking place here in Washington. Many Members of this House and of the Senate as well have attended its sessions.

I refer to the National Assembly for Moral Rearmament, which took place December 30 to January 8 at the Shoreham Hotel. The theme of the assembly was "An ideology that can win the world."

It has been encouraging indeed, at a time when we are compelled to appropriate billions of dollars and mobilize millions of men to meet the threat of world communism, that evidence should be presented in our midst of a burgeoning world force which is answering communism in men's minds and hearts, and through the capture of key leadership in critical areas has actually turned the tide of communism in some of the most vital danger spots in Europe and Asia.

Mr. Speaker, a most representative cross-section of American citizens attended this conference from every section of the country. They are, of course, too numerous to mention here. I would like only to point out as one example of the effectiveness of moral rearmament in producing national unity in this time of crisis, that the presidents of two of America's major airlines brought their top management personnel and the leaders of the pilots' associations in both companies and announced that serious strikes had been averted on both sides because of the influence in their companies in recent weeks of the program of moral rearmament.

Mr. W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, said that the strike which would have taken place but for this new spirit in his company would have cost at least $12,000,000. It would be an interesting speculation, Mr. Speaker, to visualize how many millions—perhaps even billions—might be saved this Government in its present mobilization effort if such a spirit of honesty, teamwork, and unselfish cooperation and patriotism were to be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of this land.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is not the purpose of these remarks. For in addition to the many outstanding Americans who attended this conference a number of very prominent and distinguished leaders of government, industry, and the military from 22 countries came especially to participate in this assembly and to bring evidence of moral rearmament at work in critical areas of the world.

These high-ranking visitors have made an important contribution to us. We trust that their visit to these shores has also been of some help to them, and as they return to their lands we may continue to work together in the common cause to which we are dedicated.

These distinguished delegates are visiting us today on Capitol Hill and I am glad to have this high honor of giving them the recognition in this House which is their due.

I cannot mention all of them as I would like to do but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include a list of their names.

The British delegation includes a number of prominent generals and admirals who served with distinction in both world wars. They include Rear Adm. Sir

Edward Cochrane, wartime commodore of North Atlantic convoys, and Maj. Gen. S. Kirby, former deputy chief of staff for the Control Commission of Germany. Others from Britain include prominent industrialists as well as a number of labor leaders from the London and Glasgow docks and the Ford Motor Co. of England. These dock workers have reported that because of moral rearmament the Communists are no longer able to paralyze the life line of Britain with costly strikes, and these reports have been made here by some of the very men who fomented those conflicts before meeting moral rearmament.

France, that pivot country in European defense, also sent a number of noted military leaders as well as prominent representatives of government and industry. Lt. Gen. J. Touzet du Vigier, wartime commander of the First French Armored Division and who until 1947 was chief of staff to Gen. De Lattre de Tassigny, was sent as the official delegate from the French Government to the Moral Rearmament Assembly. Other French delegates include Maj. Gen. H. de Vernejoul, wartime commander of the Fifth Armored Division; Mr. Robert Prigent, Vice President of the National Assembly and Minister of Health under five Prime Ministers; and Mr. Joseph Wasmer, an MRP Deputy in the National Assembly and close associate of Foreign Minister Robert Schuman.

The delegation which perhaps most caught the attention of the press was the one from Germany. For in addition to men like Dr. Hermann Katzenberger, Secretary of the Upper House of the Bonn Parliament, and Mr. Hans Dutting, a director of the Gelsenkirchen Coal Mining Co., there are a number of former Communists who have begun to fight effectively for democracy, and who have left the party because they have been convinced by what they call the superior ideology of moral rearmament. Since breaking off their affiliation with the Communist Party these men have suffered a great deal of persecution from their former comrades, and the party has officially ordered its members to have nothing to do with moral rearmament, so fearful is the Communist leadership of the ideological inroads already made into their ranks by this dynamic, democratic faith.

The Italian delegates report similar encouraging progress in their country.

The efficient Netherlands sent three leading industrialists: Herman Hintzen, president of a leading Rotterdam bank; Mr. Fritz Philips, of Philips Radio Corp.; and Mr. Charles Redele, president of the Victoria Biscuit Co.

Charming and industrious Switzerland also sent an outstanding delegation, including Mr. Gottlieb Duttweiler, leader of the Independent Party in the Federal Parliament and president of a large chain stores company; Mr. Rudolf Huber, director of a major locomotive works; and Prof. Theophil Spoerri, former rector of Zurich University.

From the Nordic North have come a distinguished group of Navy and Army officers as well as industrialists and labor leaders, including Vice Adm. Yngve Ekstrand, formerly commanding the Swedish Baltic Fleet; Capt. Axel von Heijne, of the Swedish Life Guards; Mr. Heikki Herlin, of Helsinki, a member of the board of directors of Rotary International; and Mr. Alexander Kraft, son of the Foreign Minister of Denmark.

That great Belgian officer, Lt. Gen. A. Lesaffre, represents his country here.

Growing, expanding Brazil sent Ernesto G. Diedrichsen, textile manufacturer, of São Paulo, to name only one of the Latin-American delegates.

Senator Eleanor Butler came as a delegate from Ireland to the conference.

A member of the Burmese Cabinet, the Honorable Mahn Ba Saing, Minister for Karen Affairs, flew especially to Washington for this assembly.

Dr. Heinrich Gleissner, Governor of Upper Austria, and frequently mentioned as a probable successor to the late President Renner, participated in the deliberations.

Other countries represented include British West Indies, Korea, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Canada, South Africa, Ceylon, and Australia.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has been greatly enriched by the presence of these distinguished visitors and I am sure I express the sentiments of the House in wishing them Godspeed and pledging ourselves to fight along with them in the global struggle for a free and united world.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

59. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the twenty-third annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the thirteenth quarterly report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

61. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

62. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, pursuant to section 4 (k) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

63. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

64. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1167. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1168. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1169. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1170. A bill to provide that personnel of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States shall have common Federal appointments or enlistments as reserves in their respective services, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1171. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1172. A bill to limit the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone to October 1, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1173. A bill to equalize taxation on earned income, encourage individual financing of social security, encourage individual ownership of United States Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1174. A bill authorizing the appointment on X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1175. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial fountain to Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the city of Washington; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of certain pharmacists employed in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1177. A bill to equalize taxation by imposing income taxes on cooperative corporations and on the business income of certain other tax-exempt corporations and organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1178. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1179. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aero-

nautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1180. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1181. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1182. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of the official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1183. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1184. A bill to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1185. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 1186. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1187. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of survivor annuities to individuals for months in which they render service for wages of less than $75; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1188. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1189. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1190. A bill to authorize certain work projects as an aid in rehabilitating inmates of Federal and State penal and correctional institutions, to improve the resources of federally owned conservation lands and to provide increased benefits from these properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1191. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide for the deportation of certain citizens of foreign countries relieved from liabilities for training and service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1192. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to permit certain suits for the recovery of taxes to be brought in the district of the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1193. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 so as to remove certain limitations upon the retirement of members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD (by request):

H. R. 1194. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to institute a program to assist in the rehabilitation of veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric diseases by means of conservation work on public lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1195. A bill to direct the Postmaster General to restore proper mail service to the people; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1196. A bill to provide for the construction of a naval radiological defense laboratory at the naval shipyard in San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1197. A bill to authorize the exchange of damaged timber for certain property within Olympic National Park, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1198. A bill to amend section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments received because of disability arising solely out of employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1199. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1200. A bill to correct an error in section I of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1201. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary ration basis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1202. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1203. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1941, as amended, to authorize Air Force officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1204. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, as amended, to provide exemption from payment of personal property tax in the District of Columbia for veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1205. A bill granting relief to retired members of the Metropolitan Police Department and Fire Department of the District of Columbia who have been disabled by injury or disease contracted in actual discharge of their duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1206. A bill to exempt from the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act sales of food for human consumption in hotels, restaurants, cafes, bars, and other establishments where the sale price of the food furnished an individual patron is more than $1.25; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1207. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1208. A bill to authorize the application of sodium fluoride to the teeth by dental hygienists licensed to practice in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1209. A bill relating to the construction of a hospital in the Northeast section of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1210. A bill to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1211. A bill to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1212. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Davis-Monthan Field, Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1213. A bill to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park south approach highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1214. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1215. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1216. A bill to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1217. A bill to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces on active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1218. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1219. A bill to prohibit the sending of blasphemous matter through the mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1220. A bill to repeal a proviso which limits, in certain cases, the amount which may be paid to rural carriers on heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1221. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1222. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1223. A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1224. A bill to provide for crediting certain service of nurses, dietitians, and physical therapists in the Armed Forces toward retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1225. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1226. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1227. A bill to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1228. A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1229. A bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1230. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 1231. A bill providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction, in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-first President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution relative to reform in procedure before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FORD:

H. Res. 56. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of blackmarketing of materials essential to the defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 57. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 56; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 58. Resolution to bring about rescission of the order curtailing postal service of the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 59. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXVII of the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Kettlewell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of John Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1236. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Ronald Chaplin LeMar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eng Yoke Mee Wong, Chee-on Wong, Chee-Leong Wong, Qew-Yuen Wong, and Mee-yuen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1239. A bill for the relief of Bruce M. Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1240. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1241. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1242. A bill for the relief of Rev. Joseph L. Capote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H. R. 1243. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ludwig A. Sternberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1244. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1246. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1247. A bill for the relief of Tryntje Bierema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1248. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 1249. A bill for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of Simone Lucacich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1252. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 1253. A bill for the relief of Jack A. Witham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1254. A bill for the relief of Shizue Sawai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1255. A bill for the relief of Jan and Juliana Magura, and Eugene and Mary Potvoricky and minor children, Teresa, Luda, and John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1256. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg) Samuel E. McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1257. A bill for the relief of Samu Meiseis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Stephen Pecoraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1259. A bill for the relief of David Rabinovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Constantin David, Paule David, Claire David, and Ariane David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciszka Deyczakowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1265. A bill for the relief of Zora Novacek, Daniela Novacek, and Frantisek Novacek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1266. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Spyridon V. Karavitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1267. A bill to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAUGHN:

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jiri Liska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Boris Kowerda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

5. Mr. CANFIELD presented a resolution of the Lions Club of Paterson, N. J., petitioning the Congress to initiate an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, or industrial enterprise in competition with its citizens except as specified in the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that Thou hast implanted within us the breath of a divine life; that there is an infinite in us which, with all our cunning, we cannot quite conceal beneath the finite; that by the very constitution of our nature, we hunger and thirst after Thee. Forgive us that knowing this we have sought to satisfy the deepest cravings of our spirits with the things of time and sense.

Grant us some part, we beseech Thee, in the fulfillment of Thy mighty purpose for the world. Let Thy hand be laid in healing upon our turbulent day. Show us where we have gone wrong. Enlarge the areas of our sympathy for the want and woe of all mankind. Stir up our wills and kindle our imaginations that we may find the way to a just and ordered society where all will gain the due reward of their labor and where men will serve Thee and one another in harmony and good will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, January 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Murray
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McKellar	Williams
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Hayden	Malone	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has a message from the President of the United States relating to the decennial censuses and the apportionment of Representatives in Congress, which was laid before the House of Representatives a couple of days ago. It has already been printed in the RECORD in the House proceedings. Therefore, the Chair will refer this message, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on the Judiciary, without having it read or printed in the RECORD at this point.

REPORT ON CONDITION OF FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1951.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit petitions and memorials, and make insertions in the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his thirteenth quarterly report on export control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of the company for the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-fourth annual report of the Commission, for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines anthracite research laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CREDIT REPORT OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, the annual credit report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Resources, Branch of Extension and Credit, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the National Park Service and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixteenth annual report of the Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the

applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 302, title III, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through the Post Office Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, and the number of pieces accounted for and on hand or on order at the close of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Fred C. Cole, of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of the World Peace Act of 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Fred G. Cole, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of the Leadership Emancipation Act of 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the biennial assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the establishment of a Federal Commission on Civil Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the biennial assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring ratification of the treaty on genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Biennial Assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, approving the actions of the United Nations in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Biennial Assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, urging strong support by members of the United Nations to action taken in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Biennial Assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the process of negotiation for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Biennial Assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, relating to economic aid to underdeveloped areas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Biennial Assembly of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, relating to effective action against aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce, Abilene, Tex., relating to the reaffirmation of our faith in God and the use of daily prayer, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Veteran Association of the Seventy-first Regiment, National Guard of the State of New York, New York, N. Y., favoring the adoption of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., DELHI, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Delaware County Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Delhi, N. Y., urging approval and construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 140—RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Whereas an abundant supply of low-cost electricity is needed for the operation of the Delaware County dairy industry now facing a labor shortage due to defense manpower need; and

Whereas the people of only six other States pay more for electricity in the home than the residents of New York; the industries of New York are burdened with power costs exceeded by but seven other States, and commercial business in New York is charged more for electric power than commercial enterprise in any other State; and

Whereas a large portion of Delaware County farms receive power from an electric cooperative which pays about 50 percent more for wholesale power than similar electric cooperatives throughout the United States; and

Whereas the economy of Delaware County is dependent upon the prosperity of its farm people who are now at a serious competitive disadvantage in relation to farmers in other areas; and

Whereas the northeastern States comprise the largest area in the country having no sizable hydroelectric power development to attract industry and expand farm markets; and

Whereas the abundant low-cost power potentials of the St. Lawrence River are undeveloped due, in a large degree, to controversies in regard to the seaway phase of the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Delaware hereby recommends construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on a self-liquidating basis, and further recommends that provision be made to deliver the power so generated to lead centers where it will be made available to the people of the county of Delaware at the lowest possible cost; and be it further

Resolved, That our duly elected State and Federal representatives be urged to endorse the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and that copies hereof be forwarded to them and to the Governor of the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That construction on the project be started as soon as economic conditions permit.

GOVERNMENT ENCROACHMENT IN FIELD OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE—RESOLUTION OF LIONS CLUB OF CATONSVILLE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the widespread concern currently felt by a great number of our citizens with regard to Government encroachment in the field of private enterprise is expressed most forcibly in a resolution adopted by the members of the Lions Club of Catonsville, Md., at their regular meeting on January 5, of this year.

Because it represents so completely the views of Maryland citizenry as I have received them and because I am so thoroughly in accord with the sentiments expressed, I send the resolution to the desk for inclusion in the RECORD and appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas America is the product of a people's faith in constitutional law designed to protect the property and enterprises of each citizen from political competition or confiscation; and

Whereas attacks upon this principle have produced many governmental agencies which are now in active conflict with the individual enterprises of the American people; and

Whereas many proposals now before Congress, will, if adopted by a mere majority, further jeopardize the rights of the American people to their individual property and enterprises; and

Whereas the intent and purpose of the tenth amendment to the Constitution was to prohibit governmental exercise of powers not specifically delegated to it; and

Whereas the intention of the fifth article of the Constitution was to provide a means for the proper delegation of powers to government through a procedure which requires a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress and the approval of three-quarters of the States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Lions Club of Catonsville, Md., in regular session assembled this 5th day of January 1951, exercise our constitutional power to petition the Congress to preserve the intent and purposes of the Constitution by initiating an amendment to the Constitution, for submission to the people of the various States, to provide that, the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial or industrial enterprise in competition with its citizens except as specified in the Constitution; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting, and that copies of it be sent to (1) the President of the United States, (2) both Members of the United States Senate from this State, (3) Members of the House of Representatives from this and adjacent districts, (4) the Governor of this State, and (5) two copies to the American Progress Foundation, 7179 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 46, Calif.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have received this morning a letter from the distinguished national commander of the American Veterans of World War II, Harold Russell. This splendid American has rightly asked the support by the Congress of this great project which has been so long delayed, but which is now so essential in the interest of continental defense. It is utterly fantastic that we should allow ourselves to go without the use of this vital inland artery with its protected route for strategic materials.

I congratulate the officers and members of AMVETS for their continued heart-warming support of this magnificent project, and I assure them that I, for one, will continue the battle for its completion. We hope in the not too distant future to introduce a bill for this objective. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Harold Russell's fine communication be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1951.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At our national convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in September

1950, the AMVETS reiterated their stand in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. As a veterans' organization, we are vitally interested in the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project because of the major contributions the project will make to national security.

AMVETS favor the St. Lawrence project because it will greatly add to the economic strength of Canada and the United States. We favor the project because of the need for low-cost St. Lawrence power to help in the expansion of aluminum and other essential defense industries. We favor the project because the protected inland waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of St. Lawrence will save lives and assure us a supply of critical materials, particularly iron ore, in time of war.

This last factor is of great importance to AMVETS. It would be tragic if we are forced to risk the loss of ore boats, Navy convoy ships, and men exposed to submarine attack on the open seas, merely because construction of the seaway is delayed.

We urge that you declare yourself in favor of this project, so important to the lives and security of all Americans.

We should greatly appreciate a reply from you expressing your opinions as to the desirability of undertaking construction of the St. Lawrence project as a part of the mobilization program.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD RUSSELL,
National Commander, AMVETS.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Barbash, Jack, staff member	$10,015.02	$5,007.48
Bowman, Edna Raye, secretary	4,154.38	2,077.14
Christie, Alexander K., staff member	7,858.27	3,760.78
Cooley, Thomas M. II, counsel to July 12	10,846.00	361.53
Cullum, Robert M., staff member	7,022.16	3,337.26
Dillard, Patricia, secretary from Sept. 16	4,154.38	1,211.66
Dunstan, William N., staff member	7,022.16	3,337.26
Egan, John F., clerk	5,457.92	2,555.12
Freehill, Joseph H., associate counsel	10,097.97	4,656.24
Gustin, Evelyn M., secretary	5,197.21	2,424.78
Kaufman, Frances L., research analyst to Dec. 15	5,197.21	2,208.23
Klein, Samuel C., staff member	7,109.06	3,554.52
Johnson, Curtis E., staff member	8,936.64	4,468.32
Murdock, Ray R., counsel from July 12	10,846.00	5,091.57
Presbrey, Vesta N., research analyst to Sept. 15	4,154.38	865.47
Prothero, John T., legal assistant from July 13	4,415.10	2,060.35
Stone, Russell E., staff member	7,858.27	3,760.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$133,000.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	126,628.06
Balance unexpended	6,371.94

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$9,849.11	$4,924.50
Janice Everly, stenographer	4,936.51	2,468.22
Sam Orlesby, stenographer	4,588.89	2,294.40
Betty Mae Tapy, stenographer	3,980.59	1,894.67
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk	3,980.59	1,990.26
Hal P. Phillips, professional staff member	7,775.31	3,887.64
Serge Benson, professional staff member	9,766.16	4,883.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$15,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950	9,146.80
Amount expended July 1 through Dec. 31, 1950	1,909.93
Balance unexpended	3,943.27

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Cecil H. Tolbert, assistant chief clerk	10,512.73	5,256.36
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	10,512.73	5,256.36
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	9,932.07	4,966.02
Thomas J. Scott, assistant clerk	9,932.07	4,744.82
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	9,268.45	4,634.22
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	8,770.74	4,385.34
Edmund T. King, professional staff member	8,770.74	4,385.34
Kimball Sanborn (to Sept. 15) professional staff member	8,770.74	1,827.22
Cecil C. McDaniel (from Sept. 15), professional staff member	8,273.03	2,412.93
Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk	8,521.88	4,260.90
Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk	7,194.65	3,597.30
Mamie L. Mizen, assistant clerk	6,326.94	3,163.44
Lois C. Joy, clerical assistant	4,241.29	2,120.64
Richard C. Venne, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.52
Corinne Bryan, clerical assistant	4,849.61	2,283.55
Doris M. Elliott (to July 20), clerical assistant	3,719.87	206.65
Gloria S. Butland (from Aug. 16), clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,492.69
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Hal Lackey, counsel	$10,512.73	$3,559.78
Roy J. Bullock, agent	9,932.07	3,463.00
Francis A. Johnston, agent	9,268.45	3,352.40
Gabriel R. Vogliotti, agent	9,268.45	3,352.40
Robert L. Fallow, agent	8,853.69	2,951.20
John F. Zimmerman (from Sept. 1 to 30) agent	6,587.65	548.97
Daniel W. Sullivan, fiscal officer	8,853.69	2,951.20
Emily Whitman, administrative assistant	4,849.61	1,659.96
Katherine S. Florence, clerical assistant	4,849.61	1,659.96
Olga K. Greene, clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,413.74
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,413.74
John W. Wedge, Jr., clerical assistant	4,328.19	1,442.72

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report, in addition to the statement, showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

	Total salary received
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of July 1, 1950	$24,151.49
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 126, 185, and 293, 81st Cong., as of July 1, 1950	15,238.79
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	12,432.09
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	2,806.70
Funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759)	50,000.00
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	[1] 27,895.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	22,104.84

[1] Includes $27,769.07 payroll of temporary employees.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,066.23	3,025.82
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerical assistant	4,328.19	2,149.59
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,185.79
Velda Blanche Holder, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,178.55
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	3,893.68	1,925.09
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	9,766.16	4,827.74
Miles Scull, Jr., professional staff member	10,015.02	4,966.00
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
Thomas A. Sappington, professional staff member	9,434.35	4,164.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	5,325.74
Balance unexpended	4,674.26

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. RES. 205)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the

funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul H. Menk, Jr., staff member	$9,932.07	$4,813.94
Mary A. Feiman, clerical assistant [1]	3,806.78	888.24
Margot Lindsay (Mrs.), clerical assistant [2]	3,806.78	74.02
Janet Valdes (Mrs.), clerical assistant [3]	3,806.78	941.11

[1] To Sept. 24, 1950.
[2] Sept. 25 to Oct. 1, 1950.
[3] Oct. 2 to Dec. 31, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 205, 81st Cong	$15,000.00
Amount expended under S. Res. 205, 81st Cong	11,891.37
Balance unexpended	3,108.63

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (S. RES. 205)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli E. Nobleman, counsel	$9,019.59	$4,509.78
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), secretary	4,328.19	2,149.59

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res 205, 81st Cong	$18,000.00
Amount expended under S. Res. 205, 81st Cong	11,754.75
Balance unexpended	6,245.25

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE AVAILABLE FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 374, AGREED TO DECEMBER 21, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittee for the period from October 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittee:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Lenore V. Choate, clerical assistant	$3,806.78	$645.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	645.03
Balance unexpended	19,354.97

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mills Astin, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,423.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	8,438.93	4,219.46
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	8,438.93	4,219.46
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	8,438.93	4,219.46
Stewart French, professional staff	8,438.93	4,219.46
Arthur A. Sandusky, professional staff	8,438.93	4,219.46
Charlotte Mickie, clerical assistant	4,328.19	2,164.09
Saides Blair, clerical assistant [1]	3,719.87	300.14
Mary Moran, clerical assistant [2]	4,328.19	1,278.00
Marie Mathew, clerical assistant	4,328.19	2,164.09
Geraldean B. Colevas, clerical assistant	4,154.38	1,384.80

[1] Terminated July 31, 1950.
[2] Terminated Nov. 15, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$45,000.00
Amount expended	23,208.76
Balance unexpended	21,791.24

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 292, AGREED TO JULY 13, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittee for the period from October 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittee:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Louis D. Luttrell, staff director	$8,438.93	$2,109.72
Mary Ryan, clerical assistant	3,806.78	687.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure	$25,000.00
Amount expended	3,381.98
Balance unexpended	21,618.02

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably a resolution to continue until May 1, 1951, the authority to study operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The subcommittee unanimously recommended the resolution, and the members of the full committee who have been available have been polled and have approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, and under the rule referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 17) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on February 8, 1950 (providing for a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries), as continued by Senate Resolution 279, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on May 19, 1950, and Senate Resolution 307, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on July 13, 1950, is hereby continued until May 1, 1951, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $20,000.

REFERENCE OF COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO HAZARDOUS EMPLOYMENTS IN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, so that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may continue its study with regard to performance ratings and additional compensation for hazardous employments in Federal agencies, I am respectfully requesting that the Senate rerefer to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am chairman, the following executive communications which were referred to the committee during the Eighty-first Congress:

First. Report to the Senate by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission dated January 31, 1950, on efficiency ratings; and

Second. Report to the Senate by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission dated October 26, 1950, on additional compensation for hazardous employments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham;

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Baliquette Adele Rundle; and

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WHERRY also, for Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 284, to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against hostile forces in the Korean theater certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 285. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved April 4, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 286. A bill to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions

when admission is free of charge; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

S. 288. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; and

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Arno Edvin Kolm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 290. A bill to authorize the coinage of 25-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the Pine Tree Shilling; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 291. A bill for the relief of Claude Pierre Connelly;

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Michel H. Frank, Bessie Frank, and Herbert Frank;

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna M. Alzbeta Sijarto-Hajdukova (also known as Sister M. Elizabeth);

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Urbana Cihovics (also known as Sister M. Urbana Cihovics);

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Michail Ioannou Bourbakis;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Chaim Locker; and

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

S. 299. A bill for the relief of Pietro Bruno Tonino;

S. 300. A bill for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart; and

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Joubran A. Abou Joubran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 302. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Richard F. Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 304. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 305. A bill to supplement the national transportation policy and to aid in achieving such policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 306. A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration hospital being constructed at Birmingham, Ala., shall be named in honor of Gen. William Crawford Gorgas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 307. A bill to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; and

S. 308. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 309. A bill to eliminate the additional internal revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. 310. A bill to make permanent the act of December 5, 1942, to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 311. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; and

S. 312. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 313. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 314. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary ration basis;

S. 315. A bill to provide for crediting certain service of nurses, dietitians, and physical therapists in the Armed Forces toward retirement;

S. 316. A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes;

S. 317. A bill to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 318. A bill to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

S. 319. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes;

S. 320. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs;

S. 321. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers of their respective services;

S. 322. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1941, as amended, to authorize Air Force officers, designated by the Secretary of the Air Force, to take action upon reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property;

S. 323. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 324. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve Components of the Air Force of the United States;

S. 325. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 326. A bill to provide that personnel of the Reserve Components of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States shall have common Federal appointments or enlistments as Reserves in their respective services, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 327. A bill to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended;

S. 328. A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes;

S. 329. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; and

S. 330. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 331. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Brunhilda Elizabeth Baechle;

S. 333. A bill for the relief of the Thomas Cruse Mining & Development Co.;

S. 334. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain Finnish sailing vessels;

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Fares Nujra Saliba; and

S. 336. A bill to amend Public Law 441, Eighty-first Congress, so as to provide for the annual proclamation of National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 337. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 338. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; and

S. 339. A bill to prohibit the transfer of strategic commodities to countries whose armed forces are in conflict with Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 340. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to coffee; and

S. 341. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 342. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Federal Alcohol Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 343. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labeling of soaps and detergents; and

S. 344. A bill to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of injurious, misrepresented, and uninformatively labeled household cleansers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 345. A bill to enlarge the definition of cosmetic contained in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by removing the exception made in the case of soap; and

S. 346. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to nonnutritive ingredients in food; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 347. A bill for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 348. A bill for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT (for Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 349, to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 350. A bill for the relief of the Z. D. Gilman Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 351. A bill to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 352. A bill to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 353. A bill relating to the time for publication of the Official Register of the United States; and

S. 354. A bill to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 355. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILLIAMS introduced Senate bill 357, relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 358. A bill to amend the authority given the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 25, 1947, to construct the Paonia reclamation project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 359. A bill for the relief of John F. Condon; and

S. 360. A bill for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima;

S. 362. A bill for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Kohler;

S. 364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve;

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Anna Krueger, Jean Krueger, and Edith Krueger; and

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 368. A bill for the relief of Karl A. Eriksson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 369. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; and

S. 370. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 374. A bill to authorize the payment to the estate of Col. Ernest R. Baltzell, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O-476408, of a sum equal to that which he would have been entitled to receive if his claim for disability retirement pay had been filed, determined, and granted prior to his death; and

S. 375. A bill for the relief of William B. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON):

S. 376. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 377. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 378. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 379. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 380. A bill to extend the maximum amortization period of loans made under sections 3 and 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, from 35 years to 50 years; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 381. A bill to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69);

S. 382. A bill to provide for the payment of subsistence allowances to members of the Armed Forces who were held captive by the enemy during World War II; and

S. 383. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 384. A bill to provide judicial procedure for determining a taxpayer's liability for income-tax deficiencies;

S. 385. A bill to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income-tax purposes;

S. 386. A bill to grant to veterans of World War II equal treatment in the matter of unemployment readjustment allowances;

S. 387. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; and

S. 388. A bill to allow an exclusion from the gross income of an employee for income-tax purposes of payments, made by his employer, of premiums on not to exceed $10,000 of term insurance on the employee's life; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 389. A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 390. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Holger Kubischke;

S. 392. A bill to make it a crime for Federal employees to make unlawful threats to a taxpayer for the purpose of collecting taxes;

S. 393. A bill to reimburse certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes;

S. 394. A bill providing for the substitution of their successors as parties in actions by or against public officers;

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Fazal; and

S. 396. A bill prohibiting copyright in pictures, paintings, photographs, prints, or pictorial illustrations portraying Jesus Christ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 397. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes;

S. 398. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended;

S. 399. A bill to increase annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by 25 percent, and for other purposes;

S. 400. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; and

S. 401. A bill to make available medical and hospital treatment to certain individuals who have had a minimum of 10 years' service as civil officers or employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 402. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of Federal agencies;

S. 403. A bill to clarify the provision of section 6 (b) of the act of August 24, 1912, relating to the payment of compensation to Government employees restored to duty after erroneous removal or suspension;

S. 404. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to prescribe a uniform dress for groups of postal employees and to extend existing penal provisions covering unauthorized wearing of uniforms to these groups;

S. 405. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit redeposit by reemployed annuitants of refunds of contributions and to allow credit for service covered by such redeposits;

S. 406. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps to encourage the mailing of good-will letters between citizens of the United States and those of foreign countries;

S. 407. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948;

S. 408. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees;

S. 409. A bill to amend the provisions of the postal salary law relating to rural carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 410. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to include immigrant inspectors within the provisions thereof relating to annuities of personnel engaged in hazardous occupations;

S. 411. A bill to provide for granting 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave per year to postmasters and employees in the postal service;

S. 412. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit the retirement of postal employees who have rendered at least 30 years of service;

S. 413. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, with respect to automotive-equipment-maintenance payments to special-delivery messengers in post offices of the first class, and for other purposes;

S. 414. A bill to grant an option of overtime in lieu of compensatory time to postal employees for work performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; and

S. 415. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Waclaw Betlejewski;

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong;

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Kristjan Kogerma;

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Henning C. L. Meyer;

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Gloria Wilson;

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ubaldino Trombetta;

S. 422. A bill for the relief of Wang Chi-Yuen;

S. 423. A bill for the relief of Orazio Balsso;

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel;

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Sverre K. Nedberg;

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Teruko Okuaki;

S. 427. A bill for the relief of Nene Baalstad;

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Brother John Muniak;

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Constance Jenkins; and

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 431. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 432. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; and

S. 433. A bill to eliminate the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 434. A bill to authorize the training of an adequate backlog of airmen to meet the civil and military needs of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 435. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 436 (by request). A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate bill 437, to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 438. A bill to provide economic, financial and other aid to China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 439. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas;

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Varee Woods;

S. 442. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co. of Juneau, Alaska; and

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAGNUSON also introduced Senate bill 444, to provide for the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey; Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 446. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into special agreements for certain switching service by railway common carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of blue and gray stamps to symbolize our national unity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to create a National Cemetery Commission for the consolidation of national cemetery activities within one civilian commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN KOREA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], for himself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr BRICKER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in Korea certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the purposes of the bill by the Senator from Washington be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 284) to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against hostile forces in the Korean theater certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WHERRY for Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement of Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

On July 10 of last year the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the junior Senator from Washington introduced a bill which would provide to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against hostile forces in Korea, the same benefits as provided by law for veterans of World War II. The bill was never reported out of the Finance Committee, to which it was referred.

The cruel and bloody war which was in progress in Korea and is in progress today is a war in every sense of that word, despite the official label "police action." There have been more than 40,000 casualties, including 6,761 dead, 27,997 wounded, and 6,148 missing in action.

Certainly no war in the history of our Nation has been more real to the men who are doing our fighting, certainly no war more heartbreaking to the families of these men than is our present so-called police action in Korea. Certainly the Congress of the United States will feel no hesitancy in extending to these soldiers the same care and benefits as were extended to the members of our fighting forces in World War II.

Section 4 of the original bill which would provide insurance benefits, has been struck out of the new bill as these benefits have now been provided by law.

As a part of the record there is included a copy of a letter written by the then Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. E. H. Foley, on December 29, to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, in which it is stated that the Department of the Treasury is in accord with the basic principles of the original bill but suggests certain technical changes. These changes can best be referred to the Finance Committee, which is much better qualified to consider them than is the junior Senator from Washington.

The letter reads, as follows:

"Further reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1950, requesting the views of the Treasury Department on S. 3890., to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces engaged in operations against the forces of the Government of North Korea certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes.

"Section 1 of S. 3890 provides that any active service performed by members of the Armed Forces against North Korean forces shall be deemed to entitle such members to receive all benefits, under laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, as if this service had been performed during World War II. Section 2 would extend to such persons certain benefits of national service life insurance, which were

available only to persons serving in World War II. Section 3 would extend to such persons the educational benefits, loan guaranties, employment privileges, and readjustment allowances provided for by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, with limitations to prevent duplication. Section 4 would reinstate to such persons family allowances as provided for in the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. Section 5 would extend to such persons certain benefits of the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, relating to low-rent-housing projects.

"The Treasury Department is in accord with the basic principles of this proposed legislation, but is of the opinion that these meritorious objectives may not be achieved entirely in case S. 3890 is enacted. The bill would limit its benefits to those who become actively engaged against North Korean forces. Such a provision would be extremely difficult to administer and would inevitably result in denial of benefits to deserving individuals. Section 4 should no longer be considered inasmuch as Public Law 771 of the Eighty-first Congress has dealt fully with the problem of family allowances.

"The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

"Very truly yours,

"E. H. FOLEY,

"Under Secretary of the Treasury."

The junior Senator from Washington is confident that the bill will receive the just and prompt consideration it deserves.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement and synopsis prepared by the Senator from South Carolina which analyze the bill be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and synopsis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement and synopsis by Senator MAYBANK are as follows:

A STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK ON THE DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES BILL OF 1951

The defense housing and community facilities and services bill of 1951 is intended to equip the Federal Government to plan and develop housing and community facilities concurrently with plans for defense installations, and is sufficiently broad and flexible to meet various conditions, ranging from rapid expansion of activity in defense areas to major installations in nonindustrial areas, such as the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River project and others in Kentucky, New Mexico, Idaho, and other States.

The bill carries provisions for special FHA insurance for housing for defense workers, authority for federally financed housing where defense needs cannot otherwise be met, and Federal assistance to communities to provide community facilities and services for defense installations and workers.

The bill also authorizes Federal acquisition, development, and planning of land for housing, community facilities, and defense installations in relatively isolated areas to prevent land speculation and uneconomic use of land. Such property would then be disposed of to private and public developers for actual construction.

Other provisions of the bill include additional authorization for FHA mortgage insurance programs, extension of FHA's authority to insure loans for military housing and includes also loans for housing for atomic energy installations, authorizes loans for prefabricated housing in the interests of defense, and amends existing law to enable federally aided low-rent public housing to serve defense purposes where needed.

The bill authorizes the FHA to insure up to an additional $3,000,000,000 in mortgages, principally for housing in defense areas, under its various mortgage insurance programs, including the proposed special defense housing title. The President would determine the maximum amounts to be used for the various FHA mortgage insurance titles under the National Housing Act. The bill also would authorize an appropriation for a revolving fund of $10,000,000 for acquisition and development of land for defense facilities in isolated areas, and would authorize loans up to $15,000,000 for the production and marketing of prefabricated housing in order to maintain current housing prefabrication capacity for use in meeting defense needs. Funds for federally financed housing and aid for community facilities and services would be determined by Congress through appropriations.

The bill would place over-all administrative responsibility for the program in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, subject to the President's determination as to defense requirements. The President could transfer to other agencies certain functions relating to community facilities and services where this would more effectively serve defense needs.

The program will rely primarily on private enterprise in the field of housing and on local communities and agencies for provision and operation of community facilities and services, with direct Federal financing and operation to be used only where defense needs cannot otherwise be adequately served.

The bill would provide for payments in lieu of taxes to local and State taxing jurisdictions for federally owned defense housing and for service payments for community services to defense installations and related housing and other developments.

The bill would also call for federally financed housing, as far as feasible, to be one to four-family permanent structures, available for individual sale to occupants and veterans when defense needs permit, and for any temporary needs to be met with housing that can be moved and reused in other locations.

Hearings on the bill will begin at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, January 16.

A SYNOPSIS OF THE KEY PROVISIONS OF THE DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES BILL OF 1951

Policy: The bill sets forth a policy of planning concurrently with the planning of defense facilities for necessary housing and community facilities and services to support them; for providing such housing through private enterprise, as far as practical, with Government help if needed, and for provision and operation of community facilities and services by local agencies wherever possible, with Federal aid if needed; for the provision and operation of housing and community facilities and services directly by the Federal Government only where they cannot be otherwise provided; for permanent construction of one- to four-family units for defense housing, as far as practicable, and for their sale to occupants and veterans as soon as possible consistent with national defense requirements.

The bill contains five titles, as follows:

TITLE I

This provides a new title IX to the National Housing Act, for special FHA mortgage insurance for privately financed defense housing, to be used in addition to existing FHA programs in defense areas.

The President would determine the maximum amount of mortgages that could be insured under this new title out of a total maximum authorization of an additional $3,000,000,000 authorized in title V of this bill for new commitments on all FHA mortgage insurance programs under the National Housing Act. (See further explanation under title V in this summary.)

The new title IX of the National Housing Act would be available only in areas designated by the President as having or about to have need of housing for defense purposes. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would determine the maximum number of units to be insured under this title in any such area.

Workers in defense activities would have priority in the purchase or rental of such housing.

The FHA Commissioner could require that any housing insured under this title be held for rental so long as he determines that this is necessary to serve defense needs and could prescribe maximum rentals and rate of return on such housing.

Terms for insured mortgages on one- and two-family units (sec. 903): 90 percent of FHA appraised value, maximum maturity 25 years, maximum interest 4½ percent. Maximum mortgage amount, $8,100 for one-family, $15,000 for two-family residences, except that the FHA Commissioner could increase these amounts by $900 each for a third and fourth bedroom where necessary to maintain sound standards for larger units.

Terms for multifamily projects (sec. 908): 90 percent of FHA appraised value, but not more than the FHA estimate of cost, maximum term to be prescribed by FHA, maximum interest, 4 percent; maximum single mortgage, $5,000,000; maximum mortgage amount per unit, $8,100, or $7,200 if the units average less than four rooms.

TITLE II

This title authorizes the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide with Federal funds housing for defense workers and assist in providing or provide community facilities and services required for defense operations where they would not otherwise be provided.

The title authorizes appropriations for this purpose, with the amounts to be determined by the Congress through usual appropriation processes.

Defense housing: Such housing would be available for occupancy by workers and military personnel. To the maximum extent possible, this housing would be one- to four-family structures of permanent construction, suitable for sale as individual structures. Where located in places where the duration of need appears temporary, the housing would be so constructed as to be capable of being moved and reused in other locations.

Cost limit would be $9,000, with an additional $1,000 each for a third and fourth bedroom. Such limits could be increased by the President by one-third in the Territories.

Such housing would be sold as soon as possible in the public interest and consistent with defense use, with preference to occupants and veterans, or, in multifamily structures, to cooperatives of veterans and occupants.

Full payments in lieu of taxes would be authorized on such property.

Rents to be charged would be fair rents based on value.

Community facilities and services: The title would authorize the Administrator to make loans, grants, and other payments to communities to provide, operate, and maintain community facilities and provide community services needed for defense purposes. Federal grants and payments would be authorized to the extent that the community's costs result from defense activities and are not recovered through increased tax or service revenues. The Federal Government would be authorized to maintain and operate community facilities only when it is not feasible for this to be done through local agencies.

The President would be authorized to transfer from the Housing Administrator to other agencies certain functions relating to community facilities and services functions if he considered this to be in the interest of the defense effort.

TITLE III

To prevent land speculation or uneconomic use of land which would impair the defense effort, this title would authorize the Administrator, upon a finding of the President, to acquire and develop land for housing and community facilities needed in connection with a defense installation in a relatively isolated area, and, where the President found it desirable, to acquire land for the defense installation itself.

The use of such land would be planned, necessary site improvements would be provided for, and the land would then be disposed of to private and public agencies for actual construction. No funds under this title could be used to erect any buildings.

Payments in lieu of taxes are authorized, such payments to take into consideration the services rendered by the taxing jurisdictions to the defense installation and related housing and other facilities.

The title authorizes the appropriation of not more than $10,000,000 to a revolving fund in the Treasury and requires the payment of interest upon any advances from such fund.

TITLE IV

For the purpose of maintaining the operations and the present capacity of housing prefabricators to be available for use in meeting defense housing needs, this title authorizes loans and commitments up to $15,000,000, outstanding at any time, to be made for the production and distribution of prefabricated housing.

TITLE V

Title V contains the new authorization for FHA mortgage insurance programs and various miscellaneous and technical amendments to existing housing legislation.

FHA authorization: The bill authorizes the FHA to insure a maximum of $3,000,000,000 in additional mortgages under all its mortgage-insurance programs for defense and regular housing. This includes any additional authorization that may be needed for small homes under section 8, title I, of the National Housing Act; sale, rental, and cooperative housing under title II; military and atomic energy housing under title VIII, and defense housing under the new title IX proposed in the bill. The President would determine the maximum authorization within the $3,000,000,000 over-all limit that could be used for any of these FHA mortgage-insurance titles.

The miscellaneous amendments in title V of the new bill that are of general interest are:

Perfecting amendments to existing law to permit the use of housing under the federally aided low-rent public-housing program to be more effectively geared to defense needs, where necessary.

Extension of the availability of FHA mortgage insuring authority for loans on military housing under title VIII, National Housing Act, from July 1, 1951, to July 1, 1953. The use of such mortgage insurance would also be made available for housing serving atomic energy installations.

Authority for the President to extend time limits set in the Housing Act of 1950 for applications and actions to be taken in the disposition of federally owned World War II housing.

Designation of an appointee of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Perfecting amendments to title VII of the National Housing Act to make FHA insurance of yields or direct investments in moderate-priced rental housing more workable in a defense economy.

SALARIES AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, SPEAKER, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and Speaker and Members of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak in explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

The bill (S. 357) relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. President Truman has said that the people of our Nation must be taxed "until it hurts" in order that we might carry out our rearmament program. In the face of the substantial increase in expenditures which will be required, no one will dispute the fact but that taxes in 1951 will be increased substantially. However, when the President made the statement that taxes must be increased until it hurts, I venture to say that there are millions of American taxpayers who think they are already being hurt and that any increased burden will mean great hardship.

In view of the fact that such an increase does seem inevitable, I think the best way in which some of the sting from any prospective tax increase could be diminished would be to first convince the American people that we as Members of Congress, as well as the President of the United States, are willing to pay our proportionate part of the tax increases.

This can only be accomplished by repealing the present unfair special $50,000 tax exemption to the President, the special $10,000 tax exemption extended to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, and the special $2,500 tax exemption extended to each Member of Congress. These exemptions in each instance are in addition to the usual exemptions which all taxpayers get.

As you all know, the President's special tax exemption has nothing to do with his regular expense allowance which includes such items as the yacht, *The Williamsburg*; the winter home in Florida; the airplane, *The Independence*; which are at his constant command, plus the expenses of the White House in Washington and any transportation expenses which are interpreted as nonpolitical—which includes all trips.

In addition, another $40,000 is set aside to cover other expenses.

It is not the amount of revenue involved in this case—it is more a matter of principle. Our country was established on the basis that we would recognize no privileged group, and extension or continuation of these special tax benefits to the top officials might well mark the departure from that principle.

The President of the United States, Members of Congress, and other top officials of the executive branch of our Government are responsible for the fiscal affairs of our country. We as policy makers authorize these large expenditures which necessitate increased tax rates amounting in some instances to near confiscation. I think it is a healthy condition for our own good and particularly for the good of our country that we as officials of the Government suffer along with the other taxpayers.

For this reason I send to the desk a bill which would repeal such special privileges, thereby placing the President, the Vice President, and the Members of Congress on the same basis as all other American taxpayers.

While I recognize that the Senate cannot initiate tax bills, I am introducing this bill as a matter of record and serving notice that it will be reintroduced as a part of any future tax legislation coming from the House.

As the Eighty-second Congress takes control in this critical year 1951, the President of the United States, the Vice President, and all Members of Congress should take this pledge: "We will place upon the American people no heavier burdens than we are willing to carry ourselves."

BIPARTISAN NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which all levels of government are represented to study those problems in our Federal, State, and local governments which make for overlapping services, duplication of effort, and sheer waste in tax dollars, and

I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in reference thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

The bill (S. 437) to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. IVES) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. This bill represents the views and expresses the considered judgment of many Members of this body who have served in State government. It is a result of their experience at local and State levels of government that it now comes before us for study, consideration, and appropriate action.

The activities and the deep interest shown by the members and the experts of the Council of State Governments in this matter over the past years clearly demonstrates that there is a definite need for the study established by this bill.

This bill, Mr. President, as I have indicated, provides for the establishment of a bipartisan or, better still, a nonpartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which will examine all aspects and phases of national, State, and local government with special attention to the serious fiscal problems which threaten to overwhelm us today. While it may be true that there have been many studies in this general field in the past, none of them have had the full participation of our National Government.

Under this bill, the Commission will represent all of the parties in interest, both public and private, Federal, State, and local, legislative and executive, and where necessary, judicial. It will be given the opportunity and the responsibility to report its findings to the people of the Nation.

It is not intended that this group shall lend itself to any criticism of the basic structure of government levels as we know them, or to their general purposes, but it is our intention that we improve the services of government at each level and at the same time, stretch the value of the tax dollar in respect to the rendition of those services.

When the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts introduced the bill to establish the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, he said:

> This is not a job which Congress alone, working through congressional committees and using its own staffs, can do. We in Congress have not the time. There is no use deluding ourselves about that. We have not the time to do the job that needs to be done. We would have to leave it to our staffs; and our staffs would not have the standing which the members of this Commission would have in relation to the departments. * * * All sorts of expert knowledge would be required, including the services of industrial engineers and management experts. It would take time and money.

I most heartily agree that such an undertaking requires full-time work from many experts of proven ability in the several fields we propose to study.

Since this bill envisages a full-scale investigation on all levels of government, it is necessary to include representatives of local and State governments, Members of Congress, administrative officials, and men and women from private life.

The purposes as stated in the bill itself open exciting vistas for tremendous progress in efficient and effective government. To me, they spell new opportunities to employ sound economic and scientific business methods in public operations.

The entire world watches us day by day as we conduct our public affairs. To friends and foes alike, we are the outstanding example of the democratic processes of government. If we are to prosper and be worthy of the hopes of those who trust and rely upon us, we must be eternally vigilant that our system does not become fatally enmeshed in coils of its own construction.

The time is long overdue for an undertaking such as this—indeed, our present situation demands positive and definite action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text of the bill (S. 437) introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and other Senators) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a national bipartisan commission, in which the various levels of government are represented, to be known as the National Commission of Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). In view of the constantly increasing complexity, during the last century and a half, of a vast network of relationships among the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments in the United States, this Commission is established for the purpose of studying and making recommendations to the President and the Congress, in an effort to bring about—

(1) the finding of ways and means of establishing a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government. Major aspects of this problem include the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the increasing demands made upon the Federal Government and the States for tax-sharing and grants-in-aid, without following any consistent over-all pattern;

(2) the elimination of duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions, and the securing of a better coordination of such services, activities, and functions among the several levels of government;

(3) the attainment of such an allocation of governmental functions among the several levels of government as will contribute to economy in governmental administration on the one hand, and maximum service to the public on the other;

(4) a reduction in the total governmental expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(5) the development, within the existing constitutional framework, of a governmental structure, and such cooperative policies and procedures as will tend to overcome existing obstacles to efficient governmental administration, and to lay a sound foundation for future development.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members, as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government and three of whom shall be private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience with or knowledge of major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be State officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted by the Council of State Governments;

(5) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be municipal officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(6) One appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be a county official, from a panel of at least two, submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) Of the members enumerated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), not more than three members shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to make a thorough and comprehensive study of the subjects listed below, and of any related subjects, with a view to determining what changes in existing relationships, in its opinion, are necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act—

(A) the origin and development, and present status, of the relations and interrelations of the Federal, State, and local governments of the United States;

(B) the allocation of governmental functions among the Federal, State, and local governments of the United States;

(C) the problem of geographical areas as related to governmental functions, field administration, and metropolitan communities;

(D) the gradual encroachment upon our Federal system of current and impending developments in the fiscal relations of the Federal Government with the States, and of the States with their political subdivisions;

(2) to submit its final report and recommendations to the President and the Congress on the subjects indicated above, and suggest plans and procedures for carrying these recommendations into effect, not later than February 1, 1953.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings and take such testimony, sit and act at such times and places as it deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information

it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or vice chairman.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a Director of Research and all other necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 are applicable, and within the provisions of subsection (c) of section 5, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(c) Each member of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall receive, in addition to the compensation for duties performed in the executive branch, $50 per day for each day he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission: *Provided, however,* That his total aggregate annual salary shall not exceed $12,500; and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the fiscal year during which its final report to the President and the Congress is made.

EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORK BY CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 444) to provide for the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

A gross inequity exists at the present time among men in the Customs Service who have performed inspectional duties at our ports of entry during the past 20 years. Because these men are expected to work long hours and on days when other Federal employees do not work, there are long-standing statutes which provide that they shall be paid at premium rates for these extra services. In 1920 and 1922 the basic extra pay acts for such customs work were revised to broaden their scope and to fix the rates at which the men were to be paid. But the inspectors did not receive the benefits intended by these changes. It was not until 1944, after 15 years of controversy with the administrative department, followed by 7 years of litigation, that the customs men finally secured a decision by the United States Supreme Court which established their right to be paid for the services at the rates written into the law in the early twenties. This Supreme Court decision in 1944 allowed the inspectors whose cases were before the Court to recover unpaid amounts to which they were entitled back to September 1, 1931.

A few months after the Supreme Court decision in 1944 the Congress passed Public Law 328, which stated that all unpaid services by customs inspectors performed prior to that time were to be paid in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision. Following enactment of the 1944 act, the Treasury Department and Bureau of Customs led the inspectors to believe that all who had performed the same kind of services after September 1, 1931, would be treated alike, even though they did not file formal claims or suits. Many employees relied on this and did not file claims with the General Accounting Office or the Court of Claims.

It later developed that the 1944 act was considered not sufficiently implemented to make it possible for any existing agency actually to make back payments in full. But this view of the act was not made apparent for a number of years. In the interim a great many men lost altogether the right to recover amounts they had earned. Others who filed formal claims have been paid in part.

The over-all result is that, among inspectors who performed identical services, some have been paid back to September 1, 1931, in full, some in part, and some not at all. The purpose of this legislation is to provide for payment to all inspectors with similar claims of amounts which they earned under the law but have never received. To carry out this purpose a committee is created with the authority and duty to direct a determination of the amounts which are payable and certify such amounts back to the Congress. The work of examining and auditing records is left with the Bureau of Customs, which is to perform this function under the guidance of the committee.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a joint select committee on the organization of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with a letter addressed to me by the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, Washington, D. C., signed by Robert Heller, chairman, and an editorial from the Washington Post of January 9, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and editorial presented by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress, to be composed of 14 members, as follows: Seven members who are members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and seven members who are members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. These studies shall include, but shall not be limited to, the operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses, the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; the structure of, and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress; and the rules, parliamentary procedure, and practices of each House.

SEC. 3. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to changes in the organization or operation of the Congress shall be referred to the joint committee: *Provided,* That the existing jurisdiction of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall remain unimpaired.

SEC. 4. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall report to the Senate and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall report to the House, not later than July 31, 1952, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (a) referred to the joint committee or (b) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 5. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 6. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 7. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

The statement, letter, and editorial presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am today joining Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California, in introducing for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress. The joint committee would be authorized to continue the work so well begun by the La Follette-Monroney committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress. The work of that former committee, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which it fathered, went far to strengthen the internal organization and operation of our national legislature. But the experiences of the last 3 years, and especially of the past session, have led most of us, I think, on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses, to believe that much remains to be done to increase the efficiency of the legislative branch of the Government.

The current defense emergency makes it all the more crucial that the Congress of the United States examine its internal organization so as to act effectively during times of emergency.

In the procedures of our committees, in the staffing of Congress, in the lightening of our onerous workload, in the performance of the oversight function, in controlling public expenditures, and in the regulation of lobbying, there is much room for improvement.

In these as well as in other respects, the reorganization of Congress to keep it abreast of the requirements of the times is a continuing problem which demands continuous attention. Our resolution, therefore, provides for a select committee which would make continuing studies of the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein with a view to strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, and improving its relationships with the other branches of the Government. The executive branch of the Government is in process of reorganization after the disruptive influences of the late war. As a coordinate branch of the Government, Congress must also be organized and equipped to perform its vital functions effectively.

The joint committee would be composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed from the Senate and the House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Not more than four Members of either group could be chosen from the same political party.

The joint committee would not be barred from studying and making recommendations with regard to the rules and parliamentary procedures of either House. Such a prohibition was imposed upon the La Follette-Monroney committee which was thus not at liberty to suggest any changes in floor procedure. The appalling delays of the past session in the Senate and the unprecedented log-jam of appropriation bills, have convinced many of us that the time has come for a reconsideration of our standing rules. The rules of the Senate have not been revised since 1884—66 years ago. Is there any other mechanism in America that is powered by an 1884 motor? Where would American industry be today if it had not been retooled for 66 years?

The joint committee would have jurisdiction over matters relating to the organization and operation of the Congress, but it would not be authorized to trespass upon the existing jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration of either House. Like the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it would have legislative authority to report by bill or otherwise.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1951.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: This is our fourth annual letter to the membership of Congress. It is inspired by our deep devotion to representative government and by our earnest desire to strengthen Congress as the chief bulwark of American democracy in a dangerous world. After reviewing the procedural performance of the 1950 session, we find much in its record to praise and some aspects to criticize. We also offer our suggestions of next steps toward a more efficient Congress.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION: AN AUDIT OF ITS PERFORMANCE

The Congress which adjourned on September 23, 1950, revealed signs both of strength and weakness in its internal organization and operation. On the credit side were the following developments:

Credits

1. The streamlined structure of the standing committee system was kept intact without change during the session. The reformed structure of the standing committees has now survived four annual sessions of the Congress without successful attack and apparently has won general acceptance.

2. A new "watchdog subcommittee" of the Senate Armed Services Committee was created last July to determine whether or not the administration of the National Defense Establishment is up to maximum efficiency. Its first two reports have been models of penetrating analysis and nonpartisan inquiry in the public interest.

3. A new Joint Committee on Defense Production was established by the Defense Production Act of 1950 to operate as a watchdog committee in its field. We commend the growing use of joint committees and joint action in the performance by Congress of its supervisory functions.

4. Increasing reliance for research, fact finding, and bill drafting upon its own expert staff aids is enabling Congress to do a better job. We applaud the gradual growth of the nonpartisan professional committee staffs, the Legislative Reference Service, and the Office of Legislative Counsel.

5. Congress has put growing emphasis upon performance of its overseer function. Ten standing committees and five special committees were actively engaged during the session in supervising the operations of the Government. The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities conducted an especially thorough investigation of lobbying methods, improved the registration forms, and paved the way for needed amendments in the lobby law.

6. Consolidation of 11 separate supply bills into one omnibus appropriation bill, for the first time in modern history, was the outstanding procedural experiment of the session. Hitherto, the supply bills have gone through the legislative process one at a time. This year they were merged into one measure which reduced the executive budget by $2,000,000,000 and was ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date in 1949.

7. Passage of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 was another noteworthy step taken during the session, toward strengthening control over the purse. This act authorizes the performance budget and certain accounting reforms, thus carrying out earlier recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney committee.

8. In floor procedure, the House of Representatives made use on several occasions of its new 21-day rule to break blockades in the Committee on Rules and bring important bills to the floor for action by the whole House.

9. We also noted with approval the introduction of a resolution on August 2, 1950, to amend the Senate's cloture rule to provide for majority cloture, and the introduction of a concurrent resolution on April 26 to establish a joint committee on the organization of Congress in order to continue the work begun by the La Follette-Monroney committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress. We renew our endorsement of both of these proposals.

Debits

On the debit side of the congressional performance sheet, we have noted the following items:

1. The spirit if not the letter of the Legislative Reorganization Act was disregarded during the Eighty-first Congress by the creation of nine special committees, six in the House and three in the Senate.

2. Bills to reform procedures before congressional investigating committees, introduced in both Houses by their majority leaders, failed to advance beyond the subcommittee hearing stage, despite widespread public support for the adoption of a code of fair committee conduct.

3. While noteworthy gains have been achieved in the staffing of Congress, some standing committees are still understaffed in terms of their workload, and some professionals have been appointed on a patronage rather than a merit basis.

4. Congress continued to be handicapped during the second session by a heavy workload of private and local legislation. Fifty-four percent of all laws enacted by the session through September 23, 1950, were private bills dealing mostly with private claims and immigration matters. Half of the States of the Union now delegate the settlement of these private questions to appropriate administrative or judicial authorities. Congress might well do likewise and relieve itself of this burden.

5. Although the Senate approved home rule for the District of Columbia in May 1949, without a dissenting vote, the Eighty-first Congress continued to be saddled with the local business of the District, while the home-rule bill rested in a House District Committee pigeonhole.

6. Demands from the folks back home for all manner of personal services continue to convert our national legislators into errand boys and to divert their attention from more important national and international legislative matters. The services of administrative assistants are not being fully utilized to relieve Members of home State business.

7. In the fiscal control field, the chief setback of the session was the failure to enforce the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act of 1946. After ineffectual efforts in earlier sessions, the legislative budget this year was ignored. If this condition continues, it may become defunct.

8. The House spent 192 hours during the session on 145 quorum calls and 143 yea-and-nay votes—the equivalent of 32 legislative days. Most of this time could have been saved by electric voting.

9. In the Senate, the first trial of the new cloture rule, adopted last year, proved that it would be even less effective than the old 1917 rule in breaking filibusters in that body. Efforts to end a filibuster against the FEPC bill failed by a margin of 12 votes, despite claims that the new cloture rule would be more effective in limiting debate than the old rule. Unlimited and irrelevant debate in the Senate was largely responsible for keeping Congress in session for almost 2 months beyond the July 31 dead line set by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

10. Long-standing abuse of the "leave to print" and franking privileges reached new heights during the Eighty-first Congress.

Matter inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under this privilege during the first session occupied five huge volumes and consumed 6,800 pages. For the second session through October 20, the Appendix ran to 7,734 pages. At the current printing cost of $82 a page, the extensions and insertions of the Eighty-first Congress through October 20, 1950, thus cost the taxpayers, $1,191,788. Wholesale use of the franking privilege by private lobbies was disclosed at hearings held in June 1950 by the House Committee on Lobbying Activities.

11. Absenteeism, both in committee and on the floor, was especialy conspicuous during the second session. The Senate granted its Members 265 individual leaves of absence, and the House granted 284 leaves of absence through September 8, a total of 549 leaves of absence granted by both Houses up to that time.

Next steps toward strengthening Congress

In the light of the foregoing audit of its recent performance, we strongly recommend that the Eighty-second Congress take the following steps toward strengthening its internal organization and operation:

1. Create machinery for continuing improvement.
2. Further trial of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure and the legislative budget.
3. Adopt majority cloture and a rule of relevancy in the Senate.
4. Keep the 21-day rule in the House and vote by electricity.
5. Plug the loopholes in the lobby law.
6. Increase party responsibility.
7. Reduce the extraneous work load on Congress.

Create Joint Committee on Organization of Congress

We renew our recommendation made last year that a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress be established. The work of the La Follette-Monroney committee and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which it fathered went far to strengthen internal organization and operation. But the experience of the last 4 years, and especially of the past Congress, indicates that the process of improvement should be a continuous one and that much remains to be done to increase efficiency. In controlling public expenditures, in performing the overseer function, in the staffing of Congress, in committee and floor procedures, in the regulation of lobbying, and in the lightening of the extraneous workload, there is much room for improvement.

Keep the big money bill and the legislative budget

The consolidated supply-bill procedure falls short of the objectives of the legislative budget we have advocated in the past in that it does not fix a ceiling on Federal expenditures or give a coordinated view of prospective income and outgo. But it is a step in the right direction, and we urge its further trial. The record of its first trial shows, as Senator BYRD has pointed out, "that enactment of the single appropriation bill this year required less time, promoted fuller participation in debate, and resulted in savings rather than increases." After experience with the new procedure, Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, said that "the single appropriation bill offers the most practical and efficient method of handling the annual budget and the national fiscal program. Judged by our experience, there is no legitimate reason which can be advanced against it." We also urge further trial of the legislative budget.

Limited and relevant Senate debate

The efficiency of the Senate continues to be stymied by its practice of unlimited and irrelevant debate: Two weeks and 500 pages of the RECORD to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; 3 weeks to pass the Gas Act, which the President promptly vetoed; 27 roll and quorum calls on the displaced-persons bill after it had been pigeonholed for months; a one-man filibuster for 11 hours on the slot-machine bill at the end of the session.

We again urge the Senate to modernize its antiquated procedures, to adopt an effective cloture rule, and to require its debate to be germane to the pending business: In these perilous times, unlimited and irrelevant debate is a luxury that a busy legislature can no longer afford.

Keep the 21-day rule

Before 1949 the House Rules Committee had power to prevent the House from considering bills favorably reported by its other standing committees. This power, frequently exercised, denied the House its constitutional right to legislate according to the majority will. On January 3, 1949, the House adopted the so-called 21-day rule which enables a legislative committee to bring a bill to the floor of the House after the bill has been pigeonholed in the Rules Committee for 21 days. During 1949 the new 21-day rule was twice used: to bring the anti-poll-tax and rivers and harbors bills to the House floor. The threat of its use forced action on the housing and minimum-wage bills. During 1950 an attempt to repeal the 21-day rule was defeated in the House by a vote of 236 to 183. The basic issue at stake here is whether legislative action shall be controlled by a majority of the House or by a coalition of seven members of the Committee on Rules. It is reported that another attempt to repeal this democratic rule will be made early in the Eighty-second Congress. We urge the Members of the House to reject this attempt just as they did a year ago.

Electric roll call systems are now in successful operation in 16 States where they save much legislative time and shorten the sessions. The national House of Representatives spends 1 month each session answering the roll call. We recommend that this time be saved by the installation of a modern electric roll-call system.

Strengthen the lobby law

In 1946, Congress passed a law which requires all persons whose principal paid activity is seeking to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation to register with the Clerk of the House and file quarterly statements of their receipts and expenditures. From the effective date of the lobby law down to the end of 1949, 2,878 organizations filed reports showing contributions received of $55,195,548, and expenditures of $27,431,517 for lobbying purposes. Four hundred and ninety-five different pressure groups filed at one time or another under the law up to 1950.

During 1950 the House Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities conducted an intensive investigation in this field. The committee found that the lobby law was poorly drafted and contained many loopholes, allowing many lobbyists to avoid registration. They also shed much fresh light on lobbying techniques. We urge the Congress to study the reports of this committee and to act favorably upon its proposals for amending and improving the lobby law of 1946.

Increase party responsibility

There is growing realization in this country of the inadequacy of our existing party system and of the need for a more democratic, responsible, and effective party system. We invite your attention in this connection to the recent report of the committee on political parties of the American Political Science Association entitled "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System." We endorse their proposals for strengthening party responsibility, many of which are consistent with our own suggestions on this subject in the 1945 Heller report, Strengthening the Congress.

A higher degree of party responsibility in Congress calls for the consolidation of the various leadership groups in both the Senate and the House into one truly effective and responsible leadership committee for each party. Each of these four leadership committees should be responsible for—

1. Calling more frequent meetings of the party membership in each House.
2. Submitting policy proposals to the party membership.
3. The selection of committee chairmen and ranking members and the assignment of party members to the standing committees.
4. The scheduling and guidance of legislative traffic on the floor.

The gulf between promise and performance on legislation is traceable, we believe, to party irresponsibility in Congress, to the lack of cooperation between the President and his legislative leaders, weaknesses of leadership, and to the subordination of national to sectional and special interests. Unless these conditions are soon corrected, there is grave danger of the disintegration of the two-party system into a three-party system in Congress, of overextending the Presidency, and of the development of unbridgeable political cleavages in the country.

Reduce the workload

Once again we call attention to the urgent need of reducing the extraneous work load on all Members of Congress. In these times, when Congress must concentrate on momentous international issues and act as a board of directors for our vast Federal establishment, we believe that Congress should divest itself of petty private and local business. The time has come to plug the loopholes in the Federal Tort Claims Act; to delegate the settlement of immigration and deportation cases, 5,000 of which cl[illegible]ed the calendars of your Judiciary Com[illegible]tees during the Eighty-first Congress; to get rid of duties as a city council by granting home rule to the people of Washington; and to make fuller use of administrative assistants on district and home-State business.

We respectfully urge the Eighty-second Congress to consider the above recomemndations seriously and to act upon them promptly.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER,
Chairman.

[From the Washington Post of January 8, 1951]

A LOOK AT CONGRESS

In surveying the work of Congress last year, the National Committee for Strengthening Congress found that nine commendable steps were taken. The overseer function of Congress was further developed. Appropriations were consolidated into one omnibus bill, and a number of other procedures were improved. The emphasis naturally shifts, however, to the pressing reforms yet to be accomplished. Congress is still far from being the efficient and well-managed lawmaking body that the country ought to have—especially in these critical times.

The House, for example, used up 192 hours—the equivalent of 32 legislative days—in quorum calls and yea-and-nay votes. Most of this time might have been saved by means of an electric voting device. The Senate is still at the mercy of any windbag who can claim the privilege of the floor. It required 2 weeks to repeal the tax on oleomargarine and 3 weeks to pass the gas bill which the President vetoed. The easy-going Senate tolerated an 11-hour filibuster against the slot-machine bill. Senators are still free to talk as long as they can about corn liquor, fairy tales, the sex life of frogs

or the craters of the moon, regardless of how urgent prompt action may be. The milk-and-water cloture rule adopted last year has thus far proved no more effective than the old rule which gave free rein to filibusters.

In spite of public pressure, the last Congress failed to prescribe rules of fair procedure for its investigating committees. It continued to fritter away an enormous amount of time on private claims and immigration bills and ordinances for the District of Columbia. Some of its committees still lack professional staffs and various positions created for experts are occupied by political hacks. The committee also found that the franking privilege is grossly abused; the Lobbyist Registration Act is in need of amendment; and many legislators still function as errand-boys for their constituents.

The reformers make a compelling argument for establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Most of the recent improvements are traceable to the work of the La Follette-Monroney Committee a few years ago. Now it is evident that a continuing effort to keep the organization of Congress abreast of its responsibilities is needed. Perhaps even more important is the plea for consolidation of the various leadership groups in the House and Senate into "one truly effective and responsible leadership committee for each party." We suspect that the performance of Congress could be vastly improved if, as the committee suggests, a unified leadership group in each House selected chairmen and committee members, controlled the legislative program, and arranged frequent meetings for discussion of major questions of policy.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending December 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-second Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $3,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF EXCESSIVE PROFITS MADE DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study with respect to the earnings of war contractors and others making excessive profits during World War II, for the purpose of ascertaining the feasibility and desirability, during any future wars in which the United States may be engaged, of limiting annual profits to amounts not in excess of 10 percent of capital investment. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study together with such legislation as it may deem necessary to carry out its recommendations.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN OIL CONCESSIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the granting of oil rights and concessions to United States oil companies by foreign governments and (2) to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem avisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the causes of the existing shortage of railroad equipment for transportation purposes, and (2) means of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eighty-second Congress as it deems advisable.

INVESTIGATION OF CONTRACTS WITH RAILROADS FOR CARRYING MAILS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to contracts with railroads for carrying United States mail with a view to ascertaining whether, in the light of changes in the volume of mail carried, any change in the rates charged for such service is necessary or advisable, and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF LEASING OF POST-OFFICE QUARTERS AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation into the leasing of post-office quarters in and around Detroit, Mich., with a view to determining whether any favoritism or other irregularity has occurred. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to the desirability and feasibility of instituting a hospitalization program for the benefit of civilian employees of the Government of the United States, such program to include provision for prepayment of hospitalization and surgical costs in hospitals to be designated by such employees to be attended by physicians and surgeons also of their choice.

SEC. 2. The committee is directed to complete its studies and submit a report and recommendations for appropriate legislation not later than May 1, 1951.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings and to act at such times and places during the Eighty-second Congress, to employ such assistants as may be needed and to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000 for this project, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS INVOLVING THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling for an investigation of the problems involving the United States merchant marine, and I ask unanimous

consent that a statement by me in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 26), was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the United States merchant marine, allied industries, and trained personnel therein are indispensable to national security; and

Whereas geographical dispersion and utilization of repair and construction facilities and the skilled manpower related thereto is essential to national defense and economy; and

Whereas the transfer of American ships and those of other countries to flags of certain nations jeopardizes world-wide stability of the maritime industry; undermines seafarers' and safety-at-sea standards; and deprives the United States Treasury of substantial tax revenues; and

Whereas revival of ship construction and operation in occupied countries is of legitimate interest to the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas participation of American bottoms in transporting United States financed cargoes has been threatened first by failure of certain Government agencies to give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining an adequate United States merchant marine, and second, by actual or proposed use, directly or indirectly, of funds and scarce materials to build or acquire ships for foreign nations; and

Whereas Congress, agencies affected, and industry have found no long-range solution to the problems of water transportation to Alaska and coastwise and interconstal shipping; and

Whereas shipping operations of the armed services bear a definite relationship to the present and future welfare of the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas it is imperative to insure efficient utilization of manpower and shipping resources that the privately owned and operated American merchant marine be properly integrated with the general mobilization effort; and

Whereas it is essential, even in a national emergency, to plan for peacetime operation of the privately owned and operated merchant marine; and

Whereas the administration of our maritime laws and policies by the executive departments is of legitimate concern to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all such matters pertaining to the merchant marine as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 31, 1952.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

A resolution to investigate the problems involving the United States merchant marine was introduced in the United States Senate today by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate subcommittee which conducted an exhaustive study of the merchant marine during 1949–50.

Under the term of the resolution the Senate would establish the subcommittee under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In presenting his resolution Senator MAGNUSON pointed out that in any period of national emergency the merchant marine is a strong arm for both the Navy and the Army. He also pointed out that there has been a threat to the American merchant marine by failure of certain governmental agencies to give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining an adequate United States merchant marine and also by actual or proposed use of funds and scarce material to build or acquire ships for foreign nations.

Transfer of American ships to flags of certain nations jeopardize world-wide stability of the merchant marine, undermines seafarers and safety-at-sea standards, and deprives the United States Treasury of income-tax revenues. Such transfers need investigation and study, Senator MAGNUSON said.

Senator MAGNUSON also declared that the subcommittee would investigate the problem of transportation involving Alaska, shipping operations of the armed services, efficient utilization of manpower, and the utilization of repair and construction facilities in all areas of the United States.

The subcommittee in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress advocated a long-range shipping program and helped instigate the reorganization of the Maritime Commission in line with the recommendation of the President's Committee on Governmental Reorganization. Its work was lauded by all segments of the industry and also by organized labor.

The resolution introduced today by Senator MAGNUSON would have the committee report not later than March 31, 1952, and provides that the expenses of the committee shall not exceed $50,000.

"It is vital for the successful prosecution of the war effort that we have a strong American merchant marine and that we take every possible step to insure having a strong and growing shipping industry. The work of the proposed subcommittee will be of the greatest possible value to the defense program of the Nation and also will help to insure a strong maritime industry for the Nation," Senator MAGNUSON stated.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FARM PRODUCTION IN THE PRESENT EMERGENCY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator ANDERSON before the Maryland Agricultural Society, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and affiliated organizations, on January 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRINCIPLES FOR FOREIGN POLICY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on foreign policy made by him and broadcast on the Capitol Cloakroom program of the Columbia Broadcasting System, January 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION IN NONDEFENSE SPENDING—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from President Truman on reduction in nondefense spending, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEMISPHERE INTEGRATION NOW—ADDRESS BY HARRY F. GUGGENHEIM

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Hemisphere Integration Now," delivered by Harry F. Guggenheim, at the University of Florida on December 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WEST EUROPE'S MORALE—ARTICLE BY WES GALLAGHER

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Europe's Morale Called Harder Problem Than Arms," written by Wes Gallagher and published in the Washington Star of January 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER BY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration on manpower adopted by the Association of American Colleges, at their annual meeting in Atlantic City, N. J., January 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UN SHOULD ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The UN Should Act," published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SERMON BY REV. JOHN T. JASPER ON "DE SUN DO MOVE"—ARTICLE BY BETTY FESSLER

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "De Sun Do Move," written by Betty Fessler, and published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of December 31, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON FRONT—ARTICLE BY WILFRID PARSONS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Secretary of State Acheson, entitled "Washington Front," written by Wilfrid Parsons, and published in the December 30, 1950, issue of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ORDEAL OF DEAN ACHESON—ARTICLE BY FRANCIS DOWNING

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Ordeal of Dean Acheson," written by Francis Downing and published in the December 29, 1950, issue of the Commonweal, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SLAP ON THE WRIST—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "A Slap on the Wrist," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALES OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "From the Record," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEO-ISOLATIONISM IS SURRENDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Neo-Isolationism Is Surrender," published in a recent issue of the Miami Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLE FROM TIME MAGAZINE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the United States foreign policy entitled "Giant in a Snare," published in the current issue of Time magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

FATHER LOUIS J. MENDELIS—CITATION FOR MISSION WORK

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Priest magazine, of Huntington, Ind., citing the mission record of Father Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus Catholic Church, of Baltimore, Md., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONSTITUTION, GUARDIAN OF PEOPLE'S RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY EUGENE BRANTLEY

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Constitution, Guardian of People's Rights, delivered by Eugene Brantley at the annual fall rally of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, in 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO DEBATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pay-As-You-Go Debate," published in the New York Times of January 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM AND AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS—ADDRESS BY DAVE BECK

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Communism and American Labor Unions, delivered by Dave Beck, executive vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco, Calif., August 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF UNITED STATES SHIPPING EVENTS OF 1950

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Review of Passing United States Shipping Events of 1950," prepared by the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., for publication in British shipping journals, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF B'NAI JESHURUN—ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Charles H. Silver at the jubilee dinner of B'nai Jeshurun in New York City on December 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPRAISAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excellent editorial appearing in the Grand Forks Herald, Grand Forks, N. Dak., on December 31, 1950.

This editorial, by Mr. M. M. Oppegard, the able editor of the Grand Forks Herald, contains, in my opinion, one of the best appraisals of the international situation I have read to date. It seems to me that this is a sane and sensible approach, and I wish to associate myself with his views.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

The word for today is "phantasmagoric," and I'll beat you to Mr. Webster's sparkling tome by telling you it means "a shifting succession of things seen, imagined, or evoked in the imagination, as by a fever."

That's my boy, as the vernacular has it. The fever is real, and it has been whipped up by the frenzied declarations of folks with access to radio and newspapers, but it is not all a cry of "wolf, wolf."

There is such grave fear of war on a big scale that we find the United States and most of the democratic world greeting a somewhat punch-drunk 1951 on a whirligig of preparedness for a war they do not want.

Ever since the ill-fated Korean adventure hit us in the face last June, we have been looking bug-eyed under every bed, peering furtively around every corner, striving to look beyond every horizon, fearful that we will discover the start of a cataclysmic world war III.

Some say we already are in that war, or are treading its blood-soaked fringes, and our hurried best may not be enough to shape our defenses adequately before the world comes tumbling down about our ears.

We are now winding up 5 years of aimless shadow boxing, clever buck passing, jumbled and elusive foreign relations, bitter political partisanship, and a mess of low-grade performances from the sanctity of the White House.

For those 5 years we have heard the spectral beat of war drums in a cold war, now suddenly warmed to a measure of reality that has us scurrying in every direction, physically and mentally, in a frantic endeavor to make up for lost time.

Phantasmagoria may be too mild a word to describe the current scene, but it does pretty well as far as it goes in giving a rather grim picture of the state of the Union.

Certainly no one knows just where we are heading or even where we are at, for our top authorities on the subject apparently have no special information denied the public as to the status of possible world war III.

We have recently heard the utterances of the President of the United States and three top Republicans in picturing our status and the potentialities of the future.

President Truman, in his December 14 speech to the Nation and the world, gave a general outline of our part for 1951, blaming Russia for the "great danger" to our country and its free institutions.

Governor Dewey, twice defeated Republican candidate for President, the night before had called for the United States to drop its defensive mood and begin the greatest mobilization in its history to combat Communist aggression.

Herbert Hoover, our only living ex-President, on December 20, urged the United States to concentrate on preservation of the Western Hemisphere by holding the Atlantic and Pacific oceans with the island outposts of Britain, Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines.

Then, finally, John Foster Dulles, Republican foreign policy adviser to the State Department, last Friday night countered Hoover's plan with a statement that America can never stand alone as a Gibralter against the world.

Governor Dewey out-Trumaned Truman in his call for preparedness. He would register all men and women over the age of 17 for national service; he wants a 100-division army and an 80-group air force, with the Navy taken out of mothballs and the National Guard federalized immediately.

Dulles would encircle Russia as far as possible with an economic, political, and military ring; then, if all-out war came, the free world will have the capacity to counterattack.

Hoover's view was called isolationist by President Truman, but even Dulles, who also rejected it, said "it is not necessary to spread our strength all around the world in futile attempts to create everywhere a static defense."

This would seem to raise the question of what constitutes "all around the world" and what description fits Dulles' call for a ring around Russia and the Communist countries. Certainly that is not just our back yard.

We can only judge what Mr. Truman means by what we have done under his immediate direction, without congressional debate, and without any mandate from the people.

We have had a fling at fighting communism "wherever it may rear its ugly head," testing our resources in the sorry affair in Korea. We would have done all right there, of course, if the Chinese hordes had not come flooding into the picture.

But we must plan our defenses on a basis adequate to cope with just such contingencies as the Chinese intervention, even though we would be foolish to take on China now as a diversion from the main focal point of Europe.

Indications are we intend to hold the small beachhead at Pusan, if we have the men and matériel to do it, which seems likely, for it's hardly possible for the Chinese to pour in the men needed to offset our air, naval, and artillery power, and have enough left when they get to Pusan to be fully effective.

Hoover may be right in his measurement of our capacity to withstand any Russian invasion of Europe or countries on the Asiatic mainland. Whether his proposal goes too far in limiting our sphere is something this column will not attempt to decide.

I know, however, we must be tremendously strong at home and in our island redoubts before we can hope to make important contributions in manpower to the defense of Europe's mainland.

It would be purposeless to put an inadequate force in Europe, either our own manpower or that of the democratic countries; that would mean only another Korea should Russia decide to march to the Atlantic.

Naturally, a considerable force in the countries of Europe, backed by our air and sea power, might prove a deterrent to Russian aggression. However, Moscow would not strike without almost certainty of success, and there isn't much we can do psychologically to stop her.

We need, then, to be sure that we are prepared for what would come after the overrunning of Europe, for that is when we would be put to the real test. Then, instead of Europe or even Britain, our base of action from the air likely would be north Africa.

One thing is certain: Herbert Hoover's speech has made it apparent that the Eighty-second Congress convening this week will find sharp division over the matter of foreign policy.

There are charges even now that our administration is heading us for another Korea

in proposing to send 200,000 Americans and $12,000,000,000 to defend Europe.

The "internationalists," it is declared in congressional circles, have controlled the Democratic Party for more than 30 years and have "dominated the Republican Party" for the past decade.

"They have taken this country into three wars in a generation in pursuance of the dogma that it is the mission of America to police the world," as one "nationalist" put it.

Obviously, there will be unanimous support for all measures for our national defense, but there will be warm debate on the proposal to carry that program to the very doors of Russia by sending big armies to Europe.

Truly, 1951 may be a fateful year. The aspect is darker than it has been on any of the five more recent New Year days. But despite it all, I wish for all a happy New Year, with a prayer that we may come through 1951 reasonably unscathed.

M. M. OPPEGARD.

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER IN KOREA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a one-page letter from a constituent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The letter is as follows:

LEXINGTON, VA., *December 29, 1950.*

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I just received a letter from my son in Korea and I want to call to your attention the feelings of one of our boys serving on the front lines. He went into Korea on July 8 and is with the — Division. For two weeks he was reported "missing in action" and to use his own words, "I can thank the good Lord. That is all that brought me out." I realize that my son is just one of our fighting men but I believe his feelings represent that of thousands of our men in Korea.

This is what he says: "I suppose things are changing a little in the States since Truman declared a national emergency. I think he was about six months late. I don't see how they expected us to operate an army over here with what little they gave us. Most of our Division is about half strength from the lack of equipment and replacements. I think they should either do the job or move out. They are letting the Chinese make fools out of us. I'm a radio repairman and when I left our detachment they couldn't give me as much as one screwdriver. If I hadn't gotten a few tools on my own I would be useless in case of an emergency. The jeep they gave me had one end of the front bumper hanging loose (said they couldn't get welding equipment), no battery cover, no radiator cap, and I had to pull it to get it started. From this you can see that the American forces over here are doing an exceptionally good job with what little they have." He goes on to say that if some of our Congressmen could experience for a short time what they are having to endure things might be different. Then he closes with these words: "I don't want to sound bitter, but sometimes I just stop to think. I'm okay myself and I don't mind doing my job."

Senator ROBERTSON, I urge you to use your influence to right this deplorable situation. This is certainly not upholding the democratic way of life for which our men in Korea are fighting and dying.

Sincerely yours,

TRIBUTE TO "DOC" WATKINS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at this point I desire to pay a tribute which I think is well deserved. Tomorrow one of the members of the Press Gallery retires, after 41 years of service with the Associated Press. Twenty-three of those years he has spent here on the Hill. For the last 13 years he has reported events, developments, and legislation affecting the great and growing Pacific Northwest.

I am speaking of Charles D. Watkins, known so well to the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives as "Doc." During his 13 years of reporting Pacific Northwest news, "Doc" has become the trusted and respected friend of all congressional Members from the Pacific Northwest States. We admire his work. We respect his judgment. We enjoy giving him a story.

Between 1937 and 1950, tremendous development has occurred in the Pacific Northwest. Woven through "Doc's" stories are the fascinating tales of the Columbia River power, irrigation and navigation program; the building of the gigantic Hanford plant; the development of the military defense installations at Fort Lewis, Bremerton, and elsewhere. "Doc" Watkins, dispatches constitute a "news man's history of the Pacific Northwest."

I personally am proud of the job Watkins has done. I know the Associated Press and its member newspapers are likewise proud of that job.

"Doc" has prided himself on accurate reporting. He has drawn personal satisfaction from seeing the clue, and then following the track that leads to a scoop. He has thrived under the pressure of deadlines.

We are going to miss "Doc's" daily call to our offices. We hope he misses us sufficiently to drop in when he can. We wish him well in his post-retirement days.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish at this time to ask the majority leader what his plans are in regard to when the Senate shall convene after the recess of today's session, but I wish to advise him that I am satisfied that if the majority will be ready to organize the committees tomorrow noon the minority will be glad to cooperate with the majority and proceed with the organization of the committees of the Senate at that time—at noon on tomorrow, Friday.

THE NEED FOR UNITY AND COOPERATION IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the President of the United States has now delivered his State of the Union message. Bills and resolutions have been introduced. The time has come for the Senate to go to work.

My colleagues have paid me the signal honor of electing me leader of the majority. I hope to repay their trust by performing my duty as faithfully, as seriously, and as considerately as it can be done. I am fully conscious of the heavy responsibility imposed upon me. My conception of the leadership is to represent carefully and conscientiously the aggregate viewpoint of a majority of this body. In my judgment, one of the functions of the leadership is to bring into accord, so far as is humanly possible, varying opinions and judgments, with the purpose of reaching decisions and objectives that have the approval and support of all—legislative and executive alike.

With that in mind, I desire to pass on to the problems ahead of us, the things we must do. The answer is brief—it can be said in one word—unite! We must stand united against our enemies, foreign and domestic.

It is becoming trite to say these are turbulent times. Men whose judgment we respect have told us that we live in the most dangerous days of the Republic; they say we are at a crossroads; that moments of extreme crisis are ahead of us. No sensible, informed person denies this.

There are, of course, differences of opinion here and throughout the Nation as to what we should have done and what we should do to meet these crises. I do not quarrel with such differences of judgment. They are a proper, even a necessary part of our form of government. It is this clash of honest judgment and conviction threshed out publicly in the press, on the air, and in public and political forums which results in sounder policy. It is in this cauldron that the dross is burned off and the pure gold remains.

But there are no differences of opinion between honest and patriotic citizens that our country, our way of life, our people are the first and paramount concern of all of us.

There are no differences of opinion among us that we must give heed to an evil and sinister concept of government which seems bent on engulfing the world.

There are no differences of opinion among us that rational and civilized methods of dealing with its mentally dwarfed leaders are frustrated and ignored.

There are no differences of opinion among us that we seek peace—peace for us and peace for all peoples; that peace in today's closely knit earth is indivisible, since a threat against peace almost anywhere is a direct threat to our own peace; and that, finally, to bring about that peace, our land must become and remain the strongest military force on earth.

If all of us can agree that these concepts are fundamental; if all of us will stand united now and forever for them; and if all of us will evidence that unity and firmness of purpose so clearly and so loudly that it will be heard around the world, and not misunderstood, we may well avoid that which we and all decent peoples everywhere shun and dread—another world war.

Perhaps I can illustrate briefly what I mean. Historians now tell us that the Kaiser and his cohorts interpreted America's public clash of varying viewpoints from 1914 to 1917 as clear evidence that we would not go to war. They mistook the processes of democracy in action for indecision, fear, or something worse. The same historians assert that had Wilhelm known we would enter the lists against him, he would not have permitted the Germans to plunge the world into the First World War. Already, Mr. President, we have evidence that

Hitler possibly, and Mussolini certainly, would have shunned the ruin of the Second World War, had they not misinterpreted the viewpoints of a few of our people to be the judgment of the many. A Japanese admiral, who was that nation's ambassador here, has been quoted as saying that his Government believed our people were soft, not militarily minded, of divided opinion about what our course should be, and that therefore we would not go to war.

Mr. President, I cite these telescoped bits of history merely to emphasize that even though all of us know the facts, and even though all of us agree that we are not going to allow a rampaging communism to push us to the wall, the masters in the Kremlin may not understand; they may, in fact, already have misinterpreted the free expression of views here as an evidence of indecision, weakness, division, and disunity.

My purpose, therefore, is to urge upon my colleagues a constant awareness of this situation in whatever they say and do; to remember that we have been misjudged in the past, and probably are being misjudged today. Always, the war makers have believed we were split, divided, irresolute, and weak. Always, that belief, however erroneous, has either directly or indirectly been responsible for plunging the world into war.

All of us know that we are resolute in our purpose to resist the military or economic threat of the Soviet; that there is a point beyond which we will not be pushed. On this we are united as one. We have taken steps, by majority vote, which should make clear to the blindest that we will not be coerced or intimidated. Perhaps we can make that fact clearer by taking action here which will emphasize our previous affirmation of policy to be followed. Perhaps such legislative action is not necessary if we guard our tongues and our actions with respect to programs already adopted. It has been said that we talk too much; and in times like these loose talk is indeed a danger to all of us.

It seems pertinent to observe that already there have been discussions of our foreign policy. In my view, strained constructions have been placed on certain public utterances. A careful analysis shows that most of these statements have emphasized disagreement with methods rather than with basic policy, and even such disagreement appears to be a matter of degree. It seems to me that a careful consideration of the President's message and of what has been said in this Chamber by responsible people must give all of us a sense of hopefulness for the future. It fortifies the belief that there are no great differences among the majority of us as to our overall policy.

Our Government has made clear that it expects and hopes for a particular degree of cooperation from the western European nations. Our Government has, in fact, proposed that these nations give prompt and clear proof that they are going to raise a minimum number of troops, arm themselves, with our help, and give unmistakable evidence of a will to resist Soviet Russian threats of aggression. We have said that if this is done promptly, effectively, and sincerely we stand ready to send a limited number of American divisions to aid in the defense of those countries.

Mr. President, some have suggested that the time has come for a major debate on American foreign policy. While I have no objection to such a debate, and in fact I would welcome it if it were conducted on a high plane, I am constrained to observe that we must be cautious and prudent in what is said. The interests of our country and the peace of the world will be better served if we weigh our words carefully. I say that, simply because one of this Nation's most trusted and competent citizens, a man whose judgment and ability all of us respect and value, is now in Europe to gather certain pertinent facts which are essential to the carrying on of an intelligent debate on American foreign policy.

General Eisenhower has gone to Europe to learn the facts, to make the evaluation. He is expected to return to this country some time next month with those facts. Is it wise for us to make statements here which would make his great task more difficult? Is it prudent to prejudge the facts he will assemble? Is it sensible to proclaim judgments and assert positions which we may find untenable or improvident later?

All of us know that his report will be complete, honest, and forthright. All of us know that he will call a spade a spade; that there will be no varnish, no double meanings, no evasions in what he tells us. It may be that his report will make meaningless much of what some of us would say now. In any event, it seems to me that prudence and plain common sense would dictate that we ought to know more and, meanwhile, talk less.

I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that I am not suggesting for one moment an end to debate, or even to controversy, on many matters which will come before us in the days ahead. There will be ample opportunity for us to differ, perhaps even sharply. That is a part of our process of government, and I, for one, shall welcome it as a sign that our democracy is healthy. But it must be observed that those differences will be noted and magnified, even distorted; and that such distortion may well be to the grave disadvantage of our country and our people. I should like to suggest that, once a policy is adopted, voted upon and set into motion, we accept the democratic principle of majority rule and stand united and firm for that policy; that all of us stop petty bickering and name-calling and face up shoulder to shoulder to the great task before us.

For it is a great task, Mr. President, the greatest task that free men and women have ever had to face. What kind of people do our adversaries think we are? Is there any doubt that we can and will overcome them? Is there a faint heart among us? What have we to fear? Industrially we are the strongest nation the world has ever seen. When it comes to the waging of modern war—war that involves machines and electronics and the atom—we can have no equal. If the need requires, we can deal death, destruction, and desolation, measure for measure, and with interest compounded. We are a people made up of the great qualities of all the nations of earth; a sturdy, resolute people who know the benefits of liberty. We have proved time and again that we will shed our blood and spend our substance for that which we believe right. We will do it again and without limit, if need be. The place to demonstrate that we mean this is here in the greatest free legislative assembly in the world; the place where the people's representatives are supreme; the place where, in the final analysis, policy is made.

Mr. President, call these poor words of mine a plea for cooperation or what you will. I am asking frankly that my colleagues in this Chamber remember that there are no aisles separating Republicans and Democrats in the ships at sea, in the aircraft aloft, in the marching regiments; I am asking that my colleagues stand together, unite, make clear by their every action and their every word that all of us have a single overriding objective—the good of the Nation and the peace of the world. Once we have achieved that unity of thought, of purpose, and of action, it will resound throughout the world with such force that many of the problems which now seem unsurmountable will solve themselves.

NECESSITY TO MEET FAIRLY AND SQUARELY THE ISSUES FACING THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a solemn and serious hour when we are to consult each other regarding the paramount interests and security of the people of the United States.

Nearly 175 years ago our forefathers dissolved the political bands that bound the Colonies to England. They did so because their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were in danger.

As the Eighty-second Congress debates the President's state of the Union message, every American expects to preserve for our Nation, with his life if necessary, those same inalienable rights. Indeed, I am sure we are all agreed that the prime objective of American policy is to maintain the liberty and the security of our people.

We are today engaged in a notable debate. The debate is not on the ends of our foreign policy, but on the means to the end. We bring to this debate a great tradition. That is the tradition of the free exchange of ideas that has taken place on the floor of the Senate since our Government was founded. Our debates here reflect and distill the thinking of our rulers—the American people. Out of this debate will come new ideas, new conclusions, and, I hope, a new unity.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested last week that appeals for unity from administration sources may be attempts to cover past faults and failures. That is not the case. The unity I ask for is the unity that comes in a democracy as the result of our confidence in the ability of the American people to hear all sides of issues, to determine the merits of the proposals, and

then to pull together toward our common goal.

I hope sincerely that we will not spend our time here fighting the battles of the past. There have been times when consultation between the administration and the Congress has been forgotten. There have been times when the American people have not had sufficient information to enable them to pass judgment on the issues before our Government. I think there have also been times when opponents of administration policy have not been willing to discuss issues on their merits, or have cultivated issues for their own purposes. But let us look ahead to the tremendous problems we face.

Thomas Jefferson once remarked that "error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." In these halls we will hear error of opinion, but reason is free. What I ask now is that we meet fairly and squarely the issues that face the United States. Our discussions here can help the people of this great Nation to know and understand the tremendous responsibilities our size and strength and freedom impose upon us.

PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING UNITED STATES POLICY SINCE WORLD WAR II

During the past 5 years, certain basic themes and principles of American foreign policy have emerged on which the programs that express our policy have been built. I review them now because they need frequent restatement so that in the pressure of this crisis we will not lose sight of them.

I want to emphasize in the first place, as strongly as I can, that the primary objective of this Government has always been the security of the United States. Closely linked to this fundamental is our continuing effort to contribute to the world framework for a just and lasting peace. As one means to these ends, we have given, and will continue to give, unflagging support to the United Nations. That is, and must remain, a cornerstone of our international policy.

While the United Nations must remain the cornerstone of our policy, I do believe that its members must take careful and solemn note of the growing concern of the American people that the United Nations is not fulfilling its great promise. I say in all sincerity to each and every Member of the United Nations that if the international community is not willing now as a matter of principle to recognize aggression for what it is, whenever and wherever it occurs, then the United Nations will die as surely as the tree without a tap root.

Mr. President, I say these things because the primary purpose of the organization of the United Nations was to resist aggression and to settle international disputes by peaceful means.

It was aggression in June when the North Korean Communists attacked the Republic of Korea. It is aggression today when Chinese Communists attack our UN forces. If the United Nations wants to retain the confidence and support of our people, it must not run to cover when the going becomes a little rough.

It has been said that "peoples and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it." The League of Nations failed because the great powers, despite the constant urging and pleadings of the small states, would not back up the League. The United States learned that lesson. But now, strange as it seems, we are confronted by the uncertainty and unwillingness of the smaller powers to accept the fundamental principle of the Charter that the United Nations will take effective collective measures to suppress aggression. That means aggression by great powers as well as by small powers.

Our determined adherence to the United Nations demonstrates our flat rejection of the thesis that war is inevitable. We believe that war can be avoided and that the differences between the free world and the Soviet Union which are at the root of every current major problem can be resolved by negotiation and agreement.

But we know now that war can be avoided only if the free nations have the economic and military strength to guarantee such rough handling of acts of aggression that the Communist imperialists will abandon aggression as a tactic. This economic and military power will also enable the free world to make certain that the Soviet Union will live up to its agreements both in letter and in spirit.

This principle has been described as the building of situations of strength. It has been put to the test at various points during the past 5 years, and in each instance where we have led from strength we have always been able to resolve the issue in our favor—whether in Berlin, in connection with the airlift, or Italy, or Greece, or Western Europe. The political, economic, and military programs which have been developed since the end of World War II have all been keyed to the creation of the necessary strength in areas that are threatened by Soviet imperialism.

I believe that the reception given these measures in the Senate—evidenced by votes of approval which, without exception, were overwhelming—is proof of wide support for them on the Senate floor, and that in each instance the measures were a clear expression of the popular will.

The major components of this policy were seven. The first was the United Nations Charter, which was approved in the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2, evidencing the hunger of the American people for some civil agency established to preserve the peace of the world and to settle international quarrels by peaceful means. The treaty of Rio de Janeiro was ratified by 72 to 1, Greek-Turkish aid was passed by 67 to 23, and the Vandenberg resolution was adopted by 64 to 4. The European recovery program, as to which we have had some complaint in recent times because of the foreign policy that is involved, received 69 ayes and 17 nays. The North Atlantic Treaty, which has been attacked in recent times, was ratified by a vote of 82 to 13. On the mutual defense assistance program the vote was 55 to 24. One year later, shortly after the invasion of Korea, the program was extended by a unanimous vote of 66 to 0.

Is that not evidence by the elected representatives of the people of a firm determination to carry forward and to enact measures which embody the foreign policy of the United States of America?

Step by step, these basic elements of our foreign policy have been considered by the Senate. Their conception has been adjudged sound and their objective consistent with the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, this is an amazing voting record. It indicates a spirit of unity and determination that should be heartening to freemen everywhere.

THE ISSUES WE MUST DEBATE

I have already commented on our great tradition of debate in this body. I stand for the freedom of debate. That freedom is greater even than the freedom of the press and many of the other freedoms we enjoy. It is free so that the people of the United States may know the issues and may know the attitude of their representatives on the floor of the Senate.

Last Friday the senior Senator from Ohio set forth his views on the foreign policy of the United States. He discussed a number of issues that go to the heart of our foreign policy. His statement has attracted considerable attention in the United States and in foreign countries, some friendly, some unfriendly. As a consequence of this debate I expect there will be reactions that many of us do not expect.

My information regarding the impact of the speech upon the people of Western Europe is that many of them have been stunned in view of the North Atlantic Pact, our signature to the pact, and the suggested repudiation of the pact. I recall vividly, and I know many other Senators will also recall, the ceremony which was held on the occasion of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact. The high representatives of the nations who were parties to the agreement appeared and with appropriate ceremony affixed their signatures to the great document in behalf of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area. No wonder they are stunned, and no wonder many of them feel despair, unless they know that we will remain true to our obligations and to our pledged faith.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I prefer not to yield at this time. However, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he claims that I advocated any repudiation whatever of the North Atlantic Pact. He is implying that I did. I want to know whether he claims I did, and, if so, in what way he so claims.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not charge the Senator from Ohio with repudiating the pact.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states an untruth, because the Senator stated that my speech stunned the people of Western Europe because it involved a repudiation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said my information was to that effect. I said my information was that the people were stunned.

Mr. TAFT. By my speech, according to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that. I will repeat what I said, if the Senator from Ohio has any doubt about it. My information regarding the impact of the speech upon the people of Western Europe is that many of them have been stunned. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. TAFT. The speech to which the Senator has referred has already been identified as my speech.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator deny that the speech has stunned many people in Europe?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator implies that the people in Western Europe are stunned because what I said involved a repudiation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator certainly did say it. I leave it to the RECORD to show what he said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said they did not want to believe that we had repudiated the North Atlantic Pact.

I did not say anything about the Senator from Ohio. I said the people of Europe did not want to believe it, and that they were stunned at the thought that we might repudiate our pledged word. I will emphasize what I said.

Once again the specter of doubt has been raised as to our determination to live up to our international commitments. It has given rare and tragic credence to Soviet propaganda that America is sharply divided on the degree of leadership it will assume in this world crisis, that we are faltering when the chips are down, and that after all the best policy for Europe to follow is neutrality.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With reference to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, in view of the fact that he voted against the North Atlantic Pact, and because of many statements contained in his speech of last week, I do not think it is at all unreasonable for people to believe that he has a very restricted view of the application of the North Atlantic Pact, and that if interpreted along legalistic lines it could be made ineffective. It would certainly explain why people were disappointed in his speech. It certainly could be interpreted in that way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

I desire to take this occasion to say to our friends in Europe that they must seek to understand the United States. We believe that the destiny of our country is best guided by the people of our country. In the debate that is now underway all points of view will be expressed. Our friends abroad will hear many things they do not like. They will hear many things they do like. I am sure that they will find that the American people will be ready in the future, as they have in the past, to stand with their full strength on the side of the freedom, the tradition, and the culture that is European in origin and ours by adoption.

Let me first speak for a moment about the subject of attaining security for the United States and some of the questionable conclusions which have been advanced from several quarters in recent days.

The charge has been made that the President has violated the Constitution of the United States by sending troops to Korea. The President's power to send additional troops to Europe has also been challenged. The scope of the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to send the Armed Forces to any place required by the security interests of the United States has often been questioned, but never denied by authoritative opinion.

Mr. President, the Constitution provides that the President of the United States shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. When was the Constitution adopted? It was adopted, of course, after the Revolutionary War and after the experience of the States under the Confederation. Why was it provided that the President should be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy? The founding fathers still had vividly in their recollection the mistakes and troubles of the Continental Congress in trying to conduct the military affairs of the United States. They remembered that General Washington had to overcome many difficulties by reason of the activities of certain Members of the Continental Congress. Under the Confederation the same troubles existed. So the Constitution provided that the President should be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. If our forefathers had wanted Congress to be the Commander in Chief, they would have said so. But they did not. They said that the President of the United States should be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. That principle has never been seriously questioned as a legal proposition. It follows, furthermore, that with such power the President of the United States has the authority to send the Armed Forces to any part of the world if the security and safety of the United States are involved.

Former President, and later Chief Justice Taft expressed the view that the President had the authority to send the Armed Forces to any place where, in his judgment, their presence would contribute to American security. On more than 100 occasions our troops have been sent abroad on the authority of the President including such cases as the dispatch of marines to Nicaragua and other Central or South American states, and troops to help suppress the Boxer Rebellion in China. As for the future, I am confident that the executive branch will consult with Congress on troop commitments to the integrated European defense force now being mobilized. Indeed it is my understanding that administration leaders are not hostile to such an idea.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding. I ask this question in the light of his last observation. Does the Senator understand that no commitment has been made by the President to furnish foot soldiers for an integrated army in Europe, and that if and when such commitment is made, it will be brought to the Congress for consideration?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the Senator ought to ask that question, because that is a highly executive question. I really do not know, but I assume that there is some feeling that a commitment of that kind will be made, or we would not have General Eisenhower in Europe now.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I wanted to make. I am asking this question in the best of faith, because I think this is the crux of the whole debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I have said is simply my view. I am confident that the executive branch will consult with Congress on our commitments with respect to the integrated European defense forces now being mobilized.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a very reassuring statement. I ask the question because certainly under the North Atlantic defense treaty the Congress determines the character of the aid to be given, and certainly Congress will carry out the policy. The reason I ask the question is that there have been headlines in the newspapers—I do not say that they are true—wherein the Senator is quoted to the effect that he feels that the Congress should determine whether or not land forces should be committed. I hope that is the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that.

Mr. WHERRY. I was trying to give the Senator from Texas credit for saying it. If he did not say it, very well. But the point I am trying to bring to his attention is that if that is the policy now, the American people should know it. The Senator is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the administration is to submit to Congress the question of determining the character of the aid, then I believe that that is fully in keeping with the treaty. The Congress will then determine the policy. If it is the sentiment of the Congress that land soldiers should be committed, very well. I simply asked the Senator whether he knew of any commitments which had been made for foot soldiers to become a part of the integrated army in Western Europe.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have answered the Senator. I am not going to agree with him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Texas often disagrees with me. I am not asking the Senator to agree with me. I am asking a simple, fair question. The Senator from Texas is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope I am.

Mr. WHERRY. We all treat him with great respect because he is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is the mouthpiece, the spokesman, of the administration on foreign policy, and I treat the Senator with great respect. All I am asking is a simple question in which I think every American is interested. Has the President committed us to the furnishing of foot soldiers in Europe? That is all I am asking.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a little beyond the scope of these remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator declines to answer, very well. I do not wish to ask for any information which is secret. If such information is secret, I withdraw the question. However, the subject has been discussed in the newspapers. It has been said that we have committed five divisions, six divisions, or some other number of divisions. All I am asking, as an American citizen, is this: Does the Senator know whether any commitment has been made? I was about to congratulate the Senator on the statement which he made, which was most reassuring, that before any commitment was made the question would be submitted to the Congress, and the Congress would determine the policy, as to whether we are to commit foot soldiers to an integrated army in Europe.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator stretches what I said. I stated that I felt that the Congress would be advised.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that it would be.

Let me say to the Senator that I do not agree with him in the idea that the Congress must say exactly how many foot soldiers shall be sent to Europe, just how many airplanes shall be sent there, and just how many battleships shall be sent. I do not agree with that view. That is a military question which must be decided under the guidance of the President of the United States and his military advisers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield. I hope the Senator will not interrupt too much.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to heckle the Senator. I do not wish to put on a shadow dance or hula dance. All I want to do is to find out from the Senator the answer to one simple question. Have foot soldiers been committed? If they have not been committed, will the administration let the Congress determine the policy? That is a very simple question, but every American wants to know the answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator knows it——

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know it. I am trying to find out.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator knows it, it will not take long for the American people to know it.

Mr. WHERRY. I will do my level best, when I get the information, to let them know.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will remain quiet for a moment, I shall answer the question further.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall keep quiet.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already answered the question. I have told the Senator that I do not know. I stated that at the outset. But I assume that before any considerable number of troops are sent to Europe the Congress will be advised about it.

The Senator from Nebraska talks about the Foreign Relations Committee. I am a member of that committee. I wish to say to the Senator that there has never been any attempt in that committee to shut off debate or to keep information from any member of the committee, whether he be a Democrat or Republican.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not charging anything of the kind. I have never said anything about shutting off debate. I appreciate the Senator's statement that he wants debate. That is what we are giving him.

I think the American people have the right to an answer to these questions. To me they represent the crux of the entire debate. I hope the debate will center around the questions which I have raised. I say that in all sincerity and with deep respect and affection for the Senator from Texas. The question which I ask is vital. It is a question of policy. All I want to know is whether the Congress will have the right to determine the policy before commitments are made.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have answered the Senator three or four times. The reason I urge him not to interrupt me so much is that other Senators desire to follow me.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry. I will not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am trying to accommodate them. They are Republicans, too.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I shall not interrupt.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to hear them speak. Regardless of what party a Senator belongs to, I am glad to hear him speak on the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that during my tenure as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate I have never raised a partisan question at any time on any bill before the Foreign Relations Committee. Every member of that committee who has served on it for any considerable period of time will confirm what I have just said. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from any demonstrations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator that I am not raising any partisan issue.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the Senator from Nebraska is not. As I have stated, several other Republicans want to speak, and I want them to speak. I want to hear them. The Senator from Nebraska, as minority leader, can get into the debate whenever he wants to.

Reference has been made in recent months to what is described as the administration's resort to the practice of secret negotiation and secret agreements. The Senator from Ohio referred, as an example, to the Marshall plan. I wonder if the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would agree with him. I am grieved that our distinguished colleague from Michigan has been ill for so long. I pray God that he may speedily recover, and may soon return to the floor of the Senate to lead many of his misguided followers back into the paths of rectitude and knowledge.

I recall clearly the developments which led up to the adoption of the European recovery program during the Republican Eightieth Congress. All Senators remember the speech delivered by Secretary Marshall at Harvard, where he first broke the news as to the plan respecting ERP. The extensive and exhaustive airing given all aspects of the program has no equal in the history of this country. For months prior to the passage of the ERP Act the newspapers, the radios, and the public forums of the Nation devoted millions of words to the discussion of the program. Both Houses of the Congress sent unofficial quorums to Europe during the summer of 1947. The word "quorums" is not perhaps exactly accurate, but what I meant was that large groups from both the House and the Senate went to Europe during the summer of 1947. Lengthy hearings were held on the proposal and after the conclusion of the hearings there was full and open debate on the floor.

Allegations of this nature tend to obstruct the intelligent and constructive debate that is needed in this situation. And I repeat, such debate is necessary if we are to arrive at an international policy which will command the full confidence of the people and draw the essential support of the leadership of both parties. It is up to the Members of the Senate to make sure that debate is kept strictly within the limits of fact and reality.

Let us turn now to certain assumptions which have been made and which could lead this Nation into tragic error if they were widely accepted.

It has been said that there is no conclusive evidence that the Soviets expect to start a war with the United States. That is a dangerous delusion. Millions of people the world over signed the Stockholm peace petition, and then the Communists launched their attack in Korea. The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], while serving as United States representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations, offered a quotation from Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky which is highly pertinent and which could properly be considered as evidence on this point. Mr. Vishinsky was distinguishing between the Communist version of "just" and "unjust" wars. He said:

> Lenin said that just wars are those which are designed to liberate people from capitalistic slavery. * * * According to Lenin a just war is not an aggressive war but a liberating war which is designed either to defend people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave it, or the liberation of

people from capitalistic slavery, or else the liberation of colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialists.

From all I have heard, I believe America meets the Soviet definition of a capitalist country.

There is another bit of evidence which ought also to be considered. There is no doubt in any Senator's mind that the Chinese Communists, who are currently attacking the United Nations Army in Korea, receive not only encouragement but extensive military aid and equipment from the Soviet Union. This equipment from the Soviet is being used to kill boys from many United Nations.

This is conclusive evidence to me that the Soviet masters are ready to have their people or their puppets shoot American troops, or UN troops, or any other free people who stand in their way. We are strongly of the opinion that when one person shoots at another, he is being unfriendly. The same reasoning leads me to regard Moscow's present policy as hostile. If we must take time arguing over the extent and the precise expression of that hostility, we are quibbling over words.

There were among us in 1941 some who scoffed at the possibility that any nation would dare attack the United States. This attitude did not prevent the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor. No American wants a war. But let us beware that we do not let our desires color our view of the realities of the day.

Some of my colleagues have opposed, in principle at least, the sending of additional American troops to Europe on the ground that the Soviet will regard the construction of an effective defense for Europe as preparation for aggression. They fear that the Soviet may attack before the defenses reach effective size and would overrun the Continent—destroying such forces as we have sent there. Why should we "feather the bed for Stalin," cry the critics.

It is clear that without steps of a defensive nature, the Soviet Union has the military strength—as it has had for the past 5 years—to overrun Europe any time it desires. Consequently, proponents of this view must believe that Europe is lost, and that nothing can be done to defend it. Or perhaps that is not a fair construction to put on this argument. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that those who advance this idea believe that an attempt to strengthen Europe will invite attack. The logical extension of that premise is that it is safer to leave Europe weak. So we arrive at the curious conclusion that if we want to avoid attack, we should make no preparation for it. It is a sort of strength-through-weakness philosophy.

The Senator from Ohio recommended last week that we aid in European defense with a naval and air force of Gargantuan power. We could, he believes, protect Europe as it has been protected now for 5 years through fear of what sea and air power can accomplish against Russia. Such a view is based on the presumption that the Soviet Government would not react to the establishment of such a force, although it would react to strengthening the ground forces of the European countries. Mr. President, I do not understand this line of reasoning. The leaders of the Soviet are not fools. If they are going to launch an assault because we try to build what is obviously a defensive force in Europe, then why would they not also strike back if we mount a sea and air force which is a serious threat to them?

There is a second factor involved. A combined sea and air force, such as ex-President Hoover and others have proposed, would commit us to weapons that have, so far, shown themselves incapable of executing the mission which they would assign to them. I do not profess to be an expert on the military actualities and potentialities of air power. However, I have been informed that the action in Korea has been conducted under circumstances highly favorable to the optimum use of aircraft. The distance from base to target is relatively short, and we enjoy absolute air supremacy. Despite these highly advantageous conditions and a vigorous and skillfully pressed air strategy, air power was unable to halt the North Korean offensive, and it has been unable to stop the onrush of the Chinese Reds.

This comment is in no way intended to detract from the magnificent job our flyers have done in Korea. They have scored heavily there. But this experience does raise grave doubts that an air force is capable of stopping the westward advance of a huge, well-equipped Soviet force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; very briefly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not fair to say, in defense of the Air Force and its work in Korea, that it has been handicapped by very uncertain, foggy, rainy, icy weather; and also, insofar as helping the Ground Forces is concerned, that the Air Force has been very much handicapped by the mountainous country?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So it would not be a fair statement to say that the Air Force has fallen down in Korea.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Even though our Air Force had no opposition from hostile forces, it is operating there under the most difficult and most severe conditions which could be found in almost any part of the world. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. I was not criticizing the Air Force. I think it has done a magnificent job in Korea. However, I was pointing out that an air force alone cannot stop an overwhelming mass of foot soldiers as they sweep in. An air force can kill or disable many of them; but what are left will sweep on. So, according to my view, air power alone would not be sufficient.

There are those who suggest that an attempt to construct effective defenses for the North Atlantic community is certain to fail because the Soviets would strike before the job was half done. Therefore, they oppose the sending of our ground units to participate in that defense. But, Mr. President, if this reasoning is correct, why do not these same people urge the withdrawal of our troops from Germany? Surely no greater provocation, according to this faint-heart philosophy, could exist than United States troops so close to the iron curtain. Realizing that such a view is untenable, the senior Senator from Ohio has declared that when the nations of Western Europe see the need of, and demand, a coordinated defense, and if it appears that the defense has a reasonable chance of success, he would not object to the commitment of a limited number of American divisions to work with them in the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact.

But where does that leave us? Do the proponents of this point of view expect that our allies will see the need for and demand something that they know is bound to fail? Are they willing to spend even a limited number of American divisions to partake of the disaster they fear? Peace cannot come so long as there remains a critical unbalance of military power between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. We must move with speed and determination to strengthen our own forces and those of our allies. Only thus can we adjust the unbalance which exists and erase any temptation on the part of the Soviet Union to launch an aggressive war.

In considering the question of a European defense, we must not gloss over the Franco-German dilemma. It has taken our representatives nearly 2 years of painstaking labor to lay the foundations for the resolution of this century-old problem and to reach a point where they are in sight of a working accord between these two major nations of Western Europe. The compromises that France has made, which go counter to all her bitter experience with her neighbor to the east, rely for the most part on assurance from the United States that the Prussians will not be again permitted to gain military dominance in Europe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is not there one more underlying factor which the Senator has not fully stated—although perhaps he will do so later in his speech—namely, that we must take the initiative for our own defense? Can we assume that we can defend ourselves if Europe falls?

I disagree with the premise of the Senator from Ohio, as set forth in his speech in the Senate the other day, when he said that the Europeans must take the initiative for building up the armies in Europe. I believe they must supply most of the men, a great proportion of them; but it seems to me that we also have a responsibility, in safeguarding our own defense, to provide some of the initiative, perhaps the stimulating initiative. Is not that another point which the Senator from Texas believes is important in connection with the subject he is now discussing?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for the interruption and for his question.

All along, the United States has been the leader in the idea of the Atlantic

Pact; that is the reason why General Eisenhower is now in Europe, where he is trying to rally the nations of Western Europe to carry out the program we have in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that a part of the initiative which is definitely connected with the defense of the United States and with the maintenance of the security and safety of our own people?

Mr. CONNALLY. I expect to discuss that point a little later. However, if I do not, I shall say now that I regard our safety as being dependent upon the safety of Western Europe; and if Western Europe can be made safe, we shall be made safe.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The question which has bothered me, and to which I have not been able to obtain an answer—perhaps the Senator from Texas can answer it—is this: If the Russians are able to conquer Europe today, why should they wait for us to complete, after 3 years, an international army? Why will not the Russians attack the moment it becomes a threat to them? Assuming, as the Senator says, that they intend to be a threat to the rest of the world, why will they wait until we are able to stand up against them?

Mr. CONNALLY. One reason may be that they may not be ready for war. Another reason may be that they fear the atomic bomb, and fear that we could make greater use of it than they could.

I am not in contact with the Russians; I cannot state their reasons. However, I have simply stated my reaction.

Mr. TAFT. Would not it be obvious to them that we would double and quadruple our production of atomic bombs, and would produce many more of them than they would, and that, therefore, in regard to the production of atomic bombs, we would have a constantly increasing superiority, rather than a falling off?

Mr. CONNALLY. Much guesswork is involved in that assumption. We are producing atomic bombs, but we do not know the rate of the production of such bombs by the Russians. At one time we did not think the Russians had the atomic bomb, but we found out that they did.

There are among us many who approve the idea of internationalism if the price is right. They will accept internationalism if it can be bought at the bargain counter.

Mr. President, this is one of the supreme fallacies of our time. You simply cannot put a price tag on world peace. The price of peace, like the price of liberty, is eternal vigilance, coupled with a readiness to make whatever sacrifices are necessary, to pay whatever the price may be.

Of course, it would be splendid if we did not have to support a large ground army. It would be encouraging if we found it unnecessary to spend huge sums on our defense program or to impose controls upon our domestic economy. It would be comforting if we could act as if there were no real threat to our national security. But that kind of reasoning is not in conformity with the brutal facts of international life which we confront.

Mr. President, I bow to no man in the strength of my feeling that America must maintain its economic power and that we must take fast and decisive action to check inflationary trends before they have a chance to gain impetus. However, I refuse to place a price tag on the security of the United States. I am not a devotee of the school that believes in keeping and strengthening our allies—only if it does not cost too much. I do not believe in shopping for security at the bargain counter.

A POSITIVE POLICY

Mr. President, the underlying fallacy of the suggestions I have been considering derives from the failure to assign appropriate weight to the actual components that make up American security.

There are three major factors which have been dominant in keeping the uneasy peace which has prevailed since the Japanese surrendered. They are the three main elements which have deterred the Soviet Union from all-out aggression. The existence of the first has given us an interval of time that is all too brief to develop the second and the third.

The first great deterrent, of course, is American supremacy in atomic weapons. Beyond doubt, our possession of a quantity of atomic bombs combined with the operation of bombers capable of delivering them has held the Soviet in check. This deterrent will be effective until such time as the Soviet is able to build up a stockpile of bombs sufficient to challenge American superiority.

The second great deterrent is the tremendous productive capacity represented by the combination of our own industrial might plus that of Western Europe and the Ruhr.

The third is the fact that in this struggle for survival the vast majority of the nations of the world stand with us against the forces of evil and tyranny.

Some people lose sight of the fact, for example, that Western Europe is the second greatest industrial complex in the world, second only to the United States. If the capacity and the technical skills of the workers of the area were allowed by super caution on our part, or timidity as regards our commitments, to fall into Soviet hands, we would have suffered a decisive loss. One of the great points of our strength is our industrial power. But if the Soviet should conquer Western Europe and take over all its manufacturing, it would be a very serious blow. With the Ruhr and the factories of Western Europe under Russian control, the primacy of the United States would be seriously challenged. Industry under Soviet control would then exceed that available to us by an uncomfortable margin. They would add enormously to their technical resources and to the raw materials available to them. Correspondingly, this country would find itself cut off from many strategic materials required by our production. For example, it is well known that our main source of uranium comes from an area under the control of a country of Western Europe.

I could go into this phase of our interest in Europe in far greater detail if time permitted. But I feel that what I have said is sufficient to document my point that we need Western Europe as much as Western Europe needs us. The security of the United States is inseparably coupled with that of our allies in the North Atlantic community. Consequently, we cannot seriously entertain a policy of limited, half-hearted participation in the defense of that area, even though it has the appeal of being economical. It would be a cosmic example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. John Foster Dulles recently observed that—

> Any nation which at a moment of supreme danger sheds those of its allies who are most endangered, and to whom it is bound by solemn treaty, is scarcely in a position thereafter to do much picking and choosing for its own account. It elects a dangerous course, for solitary defense is never impregnable. It is possible to plan, on paper, and describe in words, what it seems should be an impregnable defense, a China Wall, a Maginot line, a Rock of Gibraltar, an Atlantic and Pacific moat. But the mood that plans such a defense carries within itself the seeds of its own collapse. A defense that accepts encirclement quickly decomposes. That has been proved a thousand times.

We must have allies to realize our full potential of strength. At the moment, both our strength and that of Western Europe is only partly realized, partially organized. The atom bomb has given us time to work with our friends there, to help them achieve their full strength. As I have pointed out, the probable interval of time allotted to us for this task has been alarmingly shortened. But, if we buckle down to the job, and if they buckle down to the job, it can still be done.

Let me emphasize that self-help and mutual aid have always been the basis of the whole North Atlantic defense effort. This will continue to be the condition of our participation in the build-up of the pact nations. They have already made extreme sacrifices, and they have promised to do more. The French Parliament recently passed a military budget double that of last year—and we should never forget that France has maintained a force of 150,000 of her front-line troops in Indochina. For France, this has been an extraordinarily costly operation. Her losses of officers exceed the number graduated in the same period from the French West Point.

Britain, too, has been fighting Communist guerrillas in Malaya for more than a year. These actions have placed an additional burden on economies already severely strained.

What has been done thus far under the pact organization can be taken as a concrete manifestation of the serious intent of our European partners. Although they have accomplished considerable, we do not think it enough. We will require more. I must remind you, however, that the additional effort put forth will, in large measure, be conditioned by our action.

We may be unable to see why the peoples of the continent doubt that we are serious. But, remember, we do not live in

the shadow of the iron curtain. We have not suffered invasion twice in a generation. Our homes are not within a few days' march of a hundred Russian divisions. Their exposed situation makes them cautious. It is understandable that they should be extremely sensitive to signs that might be interpreted as weakened American intent.

Thus, in practical terms the initiative rests with us. It has been said that an increase in the American forces in Europe would put a sudden end to these hesitations and fears. The indications are that this statement is well-founded in fact.

The boost in morale and popular spirit resulting from a troop commitment of that nature would probably be more than sufficient to support the parallel effort which we should demand from them in return. That, in practical terms, is probably the manner in which the effective defense that we are determined to build will be fashioned. It will be a joint effort; and the point on which we and our partners must make up our minds is that nothing short of an all-out effort will do. That is the minimum.

There is no time to waste. The appointment of General Eisenhower is a long step forward. If any commander can achieve the maximum possible participation in the shortest possible time, he is that man. His appearance in Europe has had an electrifying effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has confined his argument in this paragraph of his statement to manpower on land, ground troops. He intends to say, does he not, that it is equally as important that the United States shall increase and improve its air power and sea power?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes. The reason I paid attention to manpower was because there was so much stress on that subject by the opposition.

The United States today bears a tremendous responsibility. I believe that never before has one nation had the destiny of mankind so within its control. True, we say that the Soviet Union can decide whether there will be war or peace in our time. But it is the United States that can decide whether life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or death, tyranny, and misery are to be the fate of mankind.

This responsibility is upon the people of the United States and upon us, their elected representatives.

We have a great people, a people peculiarly adapted to leadership of the free world. We draw our heritage from more races and creeds than any other nation on earth. We have banded ourselves together in a union based on the dignity of the individual. Our people have created a productive system that is stronger and more efficient and better for the common man than is any other on earth. We have created a government able to express the will of the people and incorporate that will in our national policy.

My friends in the United States Senate, we have at this time a high duty to do all we can to thrash out the divergent points of view of our people and help them determine the path we are to follow in the years ahead. The responsibilities we have discharged in the past few years, the unanimity we have been able to achieve in program after program, speak well for our system.

Democrats and Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee have always exercised their right, and, indeed, viewed it as their duty to examine administration proposals, test them against the public mandate, criticize, and amend. We have exercised our judgment on behalf of the American people, trying at all times to reflect their will. Our record of bipartisan unanimity on all matters of major importance since the war is one of which I am extremely proud.

We bear a heavy responsibility today in the United States Senate. What we say here, what we do here, can give the people of the world hope, or turn them away in despair from the citadel of freedom.

While this is a terrible responsibility which our country bears, it is also a rare opportunity.

The President of the United States asked that we stand together as Americans and that we stand together with all men everywhere who believe in human liberty. We will do no less. We can do no more. Let the unfair critics sheathe their swords. Let us not employ our weapons against each other. Let us face the enemy together in defense of our security and our liberty.

With the unity of purpose that comes from the justice of our cause, and with firm belief in the divine guidance that has made our country great, we face the future with courage and determination.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall take approximately half an hour, at the end of which time I shall welcome questions, but I should like to make this statement without interruptions.

There is no doubt whatever that throughout our history free debate has added greatly to the strength of our national decisions. It is one of the greatest services rendered by an institution such as the Senate. If all we had now to consider was American opinion, we could unhesitatingly say that the freest debate on foreign policy would without any doubt be good.

But we cannot build a wall around the United States and confine this discussion solely to the ears and eyes of the American people. What we say here is heard and read—and misinterpreted—all over the world—and the reaction of the world closely affects American welfare. While there is undoubtedly a legitimate area for public discussion, we help our enemies if we here discuss details of strategy and tactics, talking about the places we will hold or abandon. Such discussion will lose us the support of peoples who otherwise think we might some day be able to help them. Senators have recently calmly discussed what places we might have to bomb—places whose inhabitants we still hope might someday have a common cause with us. This does not make friends for us abroad, however much it may reassure people at home. If we do not discuss these matters our debate may lack realism and may not give reassurance, but at least it will not mean the loss of potential partners should a future conflict occur. Let us never forget that up to June 1949 our two divisions in Korea, which were 6,000 miles from home, close to the Soviet border, and overwhelmingly outnumbered, had been unmolested either by the Soviets or their satellites. Then we withdrew the troops and announcement was made that the United States defense line ran from the Aleutians through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, and that the area bounded by the thirty-eighth parallel was not essential to our defense. We know what happened after that. Let us not make another error of this type insofar as other parts of the world are concerned.

It is good that to date this debate has been conducted without personalities. May it so continue, and may there be no political motivation in anything that is said. These few remarks are not a rebuttal to or a defense of any individual. It is hard for me to side consistently with any individual or party as regards foreign policy. I honor and respect the motives and objectives of the Senators who may differ with me. Insofar as this particular administration is concerned, I have held consistently that its lack of foresight and its tragic miscalculations clearly deserve censure; its belated efforts to meet the challenge of communism deserve support; and its present efforts toward building military strength should be both bigger and faster. That is my stand.

The aim of foreign policy is to preserve peace and, if the struggle against communism should turn to war, to have made it possible for other peoples in the world to have a common cause with us, so that, having effective partners, we will not have to bear the full load of combat alone. This means that the United States must not only be strong, but that it is highly desirable that our allies in the Atlantic Pact, the former neutral nations, the former enemy nations, and all stateless anti-Communist men, whether they be Slavs in Europe or Nationalist Chinese in the Far East, be able and willing and ready to make their military contribution. This was the purpose of legislation which would have made it possible for the United States actually to organize military units of stateless men—not just mercenaries or Hessians, but what is far better: volunteers for freedom who have a common cause with us. I believe that if such legislation had been passed in 1947, there would now be dependable military forces in many places where we must either employ Americans or do nothing.

The yardstick by which the success of foreign policy must be measured is thus basically the extent to which it provides resolute and effective partners so that the whole load will not be carried by our

American military manpower. That manpower is our most precious resources.

We doubtless have more dollars per capita than any other nation, of which fact I used to be reminded in the United Nations, but obviously we have no more manpower per capita. In this respect all nations are alike and all alike should share the burden. It is for that reason, Mr. President, I say that those nations who have shared with us the burden of fighting in Korea are entitled to our very special consideration and appreciation.

II

The public announcement that a "great debate" is to be held in the Senate instinctively seems to invite a division of everyone into two groups. Apparently one must either be a "globalist" or a "retreatist." This creates a false impression. Actually a careful reading of the Senate discussion in the past few days, notably the speech of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], shows substantial agreement on many fundamentals of future foreign policy, however much we may differ on what has happened in the past. To dispel the artificial idea that we here in the Senate are more divided than is actually the case, I should like to list 16 points of basic agreement:

First. We agree that constructive criticism is essential, that it adds strength to a nation's foreign policy and that the only unity which is worth having is the unity which comes after and not before such criticism has been urged. While we must not recriminate, call names, or pervert this awesome moment for political purposes, Monday-morning quarterbacking fills a useful purpose if it enables us to win next week's game. Bipartisanship emphatically does not oblige the minority to support the majority when it thinks the majority is wrong, just as bipartisanship does require the minority to support the majority when the majority is right. It is as simple as that. For the minority to prod the majority into making a greater effort to win this struggle is a solemn duty and a valuable characteristic of the two-party system. The minority can rightly contend that the struggle against communism did not start soon enough.

To this I add my own belief that it was with the help of minority leadership that the much maligned Eightieth Congress, by overwhelming votes, set up the Marshall plan, without which the fight against communism would be largely lost in Europe today, selective service legislation, and the Vandenberg resolution, which, if we rapidly take full advantage of the common action to which it pointed the way, can be a vital factor in saving the day for the free world. Incidentally, it was in connection with the Vandenberg resolution that I said in June 1948:

> The purpose of the Vandenberg resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries, but it does not commit us to anything definite. They must make the showing. If they make a good showing and if it is advantageous to our national security to help them, we shall help them. If the showing is not good enough, we shall not help them. It is the most perfect arrangement from the standpoint of American interest that could possibly be imagined.

Second. We agree that the United States made a mistake in dissipating its Armed Forces in 1945, in failing correctly to estimate the aims of the Soviet Union, and in secretly agreeing at Yalta to decisions from which so much tragedy has flowed.

Third. We agree that we have an interest in the military strength of other nations and in their economic welfare. A revolution is under way in the world, and we cannot expect less favored nations to stand still and be content with the low living standards which they have always had. It is often stressed in the Senate that aid to other nations must only be undertaken to the extent that it benefits us. Of course, that is true, but I should like to point out that, while we have a selfish interest, it is obviously to our advantage by our words in Congress to avoid stressing as much as possible, and as often as we get the opportunity, a selfish attitude on our part.

Fourth. We agree that war is not inevitable and that it must be avoided.

Fifth. We agree that there is a determined plan to communize the world but that there is also no cause for panic.

Sixth. We certainly agree that we unfortunately cannot place our full reliance on the United Nations as a practical device to protect this country from aggression. The UN Charter sweepingly promises to repel aggression without there being the force which is able to do it. We put the cart before the horse. We do not wish to withdraw from the United Nations, certainly, and while we hope to build it up as time goes on, we must depend on our own strength and that of our partners to protect our security. May our partners be strong, and may they be numerous.

Seventh. We agree, too, that our first consideration must be the defense of America, that America can often be defended outside of America, but that if we undertake to respond, with military force, to every call for help in every part of the world we shall be bled white.

Eighth. Equally we agree that our major effort must be through our Air Force and our Navy. It has been clear since the end of World War II that if we were to maintain a proper Air Force and Navy, it would be far more difficult than in the past simultaneously to raise more than 35 or 40 American divisions. The World War I and II visions of a 100-division army are over. We now appreciate that if it becomes necessary, in the struggle against communism, for a major effort to be made on land—and that could happen—the United States cannot possibly make it alone. We need allies, either in the uniform of their country or in the uniform of the United States. There seems to be general agreement on that point both here and abroad.

Ninth. We also agree that a limited number of American divisions could be used in Europe as part of an Atlantic Pact force with advantageous results for us, provided that our military authorities favor their use.

Tenth. We agree with the idea expressed here in the Senate that the United States cannot abandon the rest of the world and rely solely on the defense of this continent and that we must do what we can so that Communist influence may not spread.

Eleventh. We agree that it would be obviously a colossal error to seek a decision by pitting our manpower and that of our partners against the teeming millions of Russia and China. Indeed, I know of no qualified student of the problem who wants to do this.

Twelfth. We can agree with the proposition that we should not force our decisions on nations who have no desire to arm themselves. To go further, we should not commit one single additional soldier to Europe without an iron-clad agreement that the dispatch of that soldier means the automatic commitment of a very much larger number of European soldiers. Such a commitment is not unfair to Europe since we will do so much in other ways. In truth, as I will try to demonstrate later, such a commitment could be highly advantageous both to Europe and to the United States.

Thirteenth. We also agree with the statement made here that we need a far more effective intelligence force and a great improvement in measures to help those who yearn for liberty in the satellite countries. In this connection, incidentally, the proposal for enlisting alien soldiers can be most helpful.

Fourteenth. We agree that our allies should make the greatest effort of which they are capable. Their stake is as great as ours.

I certainly agree with the statement, which may be more widely challenged, but which I have heard made on the other side of the aisle, that the dragging of feet of the nations of Western Europe has been much exaggerated. When a country like France, for example, votes conscription, increases its military budget by 75 percent in 1 year, substantially diminishes its entire program for the rebuilding of the areas which were devastated in World War II, undertakes to set up 10 modern divisions in 1 year in addition to the very large force of more than seven divisions which it maintains in Indochina, agrees to the rearmament of its traditional German enemy—and does all this after it has been bled white in two world wars—candidly, it seems to me that that compares favorably with what we have been doing over here. We, too, have been dragging our feet a good deal insofar as preparedness is concerned, and while part of the inadequacy of the effort in Europe is doubtless their own fault, part of it is also due to the fact that they were requested by the United States to put all their energies into economic production and not into national defense.

I know that there are those in all free nations who are "neutralists." I need hardly tell Senators that that sentiment exists here. There are tremendous separatist forces constantly trying to pull us and our partners apart and away from each other. There are forces in America seeking division for its own sake—not just honest disagreement over matters of judgment. It is not remarkable that separatist forces exist. What is remarkable and what gives hope for the future is the extent to which they have been and are being overcome. There is probably not a Senator here who does not think in his heart of hearts

that it is better to fight abroad with the help of partners than to fight alone in the United States in the midst of the ruins of our great factories. Admittedly, the fighting of a land battle on American soil is not an immediate threat. But are we in the Senate concerned only with this year and next year? Have we no thought at all for our children and grandchildren? Unless we exercise some foresight and statesmanship they—and we—could confront conditions here which would make the dreadful overseas battles of World War II seem like the good old days. It is worth a great deal for a country with our limited and precious manpower resources not to have to stand alone, and we are justified in making sacrifices and in running risks to avoid such an outcome—to keep what partners we have and to add new ones.

Fifteenth. Then we can agree completely with the idea that we must have complete freedom to fight a war, if it comes, as we want to fight it. That goes for all the questions which war raises—Who? What? Where? When? and How?

Sixteenth. Finally, there is no doubt that Congress has the right and duty to determine the size of the Armed Forces, increasing or reducing them as it sees fit above or below the figure desired by the Executive.

Those are 16 points of substantial—though not unanimous—agreement. They seem to me to be numerous and overwhelmingly important. They certainly do not justify the impression either here or abroad that the Senate is split right down the middle with globalists on the one side and retreatists on the other.

In all truth—and I am very happy to say this—there are no fundamental principles which divide us. There are questions of degree and questions of method—but nothing which really goes to the heart of the matter. The most contentious question which a reading of the record discloses is the idea that American Armed Forces cannot be sent overseas without consent of Congress. But this is not an issue of principle; it is entirely an issue of degree and of method. Let me discuss it for a moment.

III

I share the great and legitimate concern which so sincerely animates Senators who make this proposal. Their sincerity is in the highest degree praiseworthy and it is to be hoped that some procedure can be devised to satisfy the legitimate worry which we all feel.

But it is hard to understand, Mr. President, how Members of the House and Senate, even making due allowances for their fine qualities, can possibly attempt to function as the operations section of a general staff and decide where and how and in what amount troops, ships, and planes should be sent to foreign lands. Assuming that we in Congress have the ability, how can we, with all our many other duties, possibly possess professional strategic knowledge? How can we preserve the secrecy and conduct the tactics of deception and surprise which are so essential if we are to debate troop movements?

Imagine a situation in which there are already two divisions overseas. If three more are sent, the total of five divisions might be successful, whereas if the two remained they might be lost.

In these considerations, two and two do not always make four. If we doubled the number of divisions, we may increase our power by more than twice. If we cut the number of divisions in half, we may decrease the power of our forces by much more than half.

To determine whether or not these three additional divisions should be sent requires knowledge of logistics, terrain, enemy capabilities, and a host of other factors which men go to West Point, to the Command and General Staff School, and to the Regular Army in order to learn. Are we to start making such decisions here?

If we require congressional approval for sending troops abroad, how can the President carry out his oath of office and take the steps which are required by the Constitution to "preserve, protect, and defend" the United States if a crisis should come when Congress is not in session? If we undertake to decide such questions in Congress, we shall defeat ourselves probably more quickly than an enemy could do it. We would be putting ourselves on the spot when we did not have to do so. In the language of the prize ring we would be "telegraphing our punches." Ship, plane, and troop movements must be decided by the Executive. Read the history of the War Between the States and the unhappy experiences of the congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under the Constitution of the United States, in time of war I take it the Commander in Chief has unquestioned authority over the Army, and may conduct the war in any way he sees fit. I would question even the constitutional right of the Congress to attempt to stop him from doing so.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. However, in the case at hand, it seems to me that we have a question of foreign policy rather than of arms. We have a question of whether or not we are going to commit the United States. Certainly there is a tremendous difference between sending an army of 30 divisions to Europe and occupying Germany with two divisions as a force of occupation. Those are basic questions, which it seems to me are well within the authority of Congress to determine in time of peace.

Is it not true also that for many years the law provided that the President could send no troops outside of continental United States in time of peace?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Ohio was not in the Chamber when I made the earlier reference to that point. I stated that there is substantial agreement here—and I base that on a reading of the speech of the Senator from Ohio—that it would be a proper thing to send a limited number of divisions to Europe if our military authorities thought it would be advantageous to do so.

Mr. TAFT. No; if it would accord with the general policy which Congress might think desirable—not because our generals might think so. I do not think the generals have anything to do with the question.

Mr. LODGE. I will find the quotation.

Mr. TAFT. "In the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact," I said.

Mr. LODGE. This is what the Senator from Ohio said:

> I should not object to committing some limited number of American divisions to work with them in the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but I did not say that that was to be determined by any generals or necessarily on any military basis. It is a question of foreign policy, as I see it, which is wholly within the jurisdiction of Congress.

Mr. LODGE. I presume the Senator would not want to send them to Europe if the generals thought it was unwise to do so from a military standpoint.

Mr. TAFT. No. My objection to sending them to Europe at all is based on the fact that I cannot see the safety of any such movement. I cannot see that it would not rather in the first place induce war as a question of foreign policy, and, in the second place, that it would not induce a war which would be most disastrous to the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I am going to come to that point of whether it is a provocation or not.

Mr. TAFT. I am here only raising the question as to whether the nature of the commitment for Europe is not primarily now a question of foreign policy and not a question of military policy. That is the point.

Mr. LODGE. I have been endeavoring to say that to try to draw a line between foreign policy and military policy today is like trying to cut a pail of water in two. They are absolutely merged together and we cannot have the one without the other.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Not now. Before I yield to the Senator from Louisiana I wish further to respond to the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio is quite right in saying that there is a great difference between sending a limited number of divisions in the spirit of the Atlantic Pact, which is one thing and to which, I gather, there is no objection, and sending a huge land force, which is another thing. I will agree at once that those two points are entirely different. If we are going to go beyond sending a limited number of divisions in the spirit of the Atlantic Pact, then certainly that calls for a major policy decision in which Congress should participate. I do not think there is any occasion to send a major land force to Europe. In the first place we have not a major land force to send even if we wanted to. It would be absolutely out of the question to do it. All that is involved here is a question of sending a limited number of troops to Europe. We already have two divisions in Europe, and I have not heard anyone suggest that we withdraw those two divisions.

Certainly, I said when the Senator from Ohio was not here, when we withdrew the two divisions from Korea in 1949 it turned out to be a colossal mistake, and I do not think I have heard anyone on the floor suggest that we withdraw the two divisions from Germany.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there are many troops to withdraw at the moment, but I do not think that changes the question, because the President has now proposed to Congress that we create a great land army of many divisions. In his request for 3,500,000 troops Monday I would say that at least 2,000,000 of those certainly are to be in the land army, and consequently whatever is determined now will be applied when those divisions are created. I said that that is a consideration we should dismiss for the moment from our consideration.

Mr. LODGE. What the administration wants in the way of an army is 18 divisions. I do not think by any stretch of the imagination that would be called a vast army. If 18 is vast then what is 61, which is what we had in Europe alone in World War II? We have got to get another adjective. We have seven divisions in Korea, and we are starting to build a total of 11 more to be ready by the end of this year some time. That is not a vast land army.

Mr. TAFT. Is it the Senator's understanding that to get 18 divisions we have to have 2,000,000 men in the Army in uniform, besides another million civilians?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot answer that question. I do not know offhand how many civilians it takes in the War Department to have 18 divisions in the field.

Mr. TAFT. Roughly speaking one civilian to two men in uniform seems to be the general rule.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator is trying to get me to admit that the military are great wasters of manpower, I will hurriedly and enthusiastically agree with him. I think there is no question about that. I should like to see our military department utilize manpower very efficiently.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not agree legally with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the President has power to send troops anywhere in the world in any quantity where the security of the United States is involved? I think those are the words the Senator from Texas used.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Massachusetts has spent his time in the Senate trying to say what he, as the Senator from Massachusetts believes; and not to say whether he disagrees with paragraph 8 of a statement made by the Senator from Texas, or paragraph 3 of a statement made by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. This is the main subject of debate. What does the Senator from Massachusetts think of the President's power, in time of peace, to send troops anywhere in the world where the security of the United States is involved?

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator from Ohio came into the Chamber I said that I would much prefer to discuss the question on the basis of common sense and wisdom, and what is involved in this question, rather than to get into a legal question. I am not a lawyer, for one thing. I think if we could all agree on what was wise and what was practical and what was advantageous we would not find any legal obstacles in the way.

The President takes the oath of office—I believe I am quoting correctly—"to preserve, protect, and defend" the United States. That is a pretty big commitment. I think one of the things that is confusing us in this country so much, and confusing the free world so much, and helping the Soviet so much, is that we here are used to thinking that we are either at peace or war. This means that if we are at war the President can do this—a certain thing. If we are not, he cannot. Of course, the Soviet are not tied down by any legalistic principles of that kind. I do not know whether they have any law schools, and if they have, whether any of the members of the Politburo attended them. I believe they operate without them. They operate equally well whether it is good weather or foggy weather. In fact, they work better in the fog.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts as one who has had a large amount of experience in World War II as a combat officer of the United States, whether it might not be entirely possible that some of the factors that determine how many troops would be needed in Europe might depend largely on secret matters which could not be safely trusted to 96 United States Senators and four-hundred-and-thirty-some-odd Representatives for debate on the floor of the Senate and the House?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. I tried to make that point a moment ago. The question of deciding the matter of troop movements and ship movements and plane movements is highly technical. Persons who must make such decisions ought not to have to do anything else. They ought not to be obliged to study a multiplicity of domestic legislation, or make speeches, or answer mail, as Senators do. What such men should decide ought to be in the interest of the young men who are engaged in combat. Men who have to make such decisions ought not to have to make decisions on other questions.

Mr. LONG. Would there not also be the question of time involved? The executive must be able to decide in a relatively short period of time what, in the executive opinion, should be done. However, if an attempt were made to make a decision respecting the sending of one or two more divisions to Europe, the question of whether to send not two but three and so forth, and that had to be debated on the floor of the Senate and the House, an interminable time might expire before a decision could finally be reached by a majority of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives respecting the number of divisions that should be sent.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct.

IV

Let us now consider the question of "who" will bear the brunt and "where" the effort is to be made and of "how" it is to be done.

In response to the question of who, my conviction is that, in addition to the United States, there must be the help of our allies in the Atlantic Pact, of the former enemy nations, of the former neutrals, and of the stateless anti-Communist men.

When it comes to how, it is obvious that, if there should be war, the American main effort must be by air and sea but that the allied main effort can also have a substantial army. The statement that the Air Force is the one weapon which can damage those bases from which air attack can be made upon us is not completely accurate. Strong, effective army occupation of a hostile base is another weapon which can achieve a result not merely by damaging the enemy but by neutralizing him completely. Sea and air power cannot at all times and under all conditions, particularly in a struggle with a tremendous land power, achieve complete protection.

To answer the question where, we must first of all make up our minds that if the Ruhr and Japan were to fall, the whole strategic picture would become almost inconceivably serious. These are the two great industrial potentials which are still in the free world. If the Ruhr and the great shipyards of Western Europe were taken by a hostile aggressor, it would not be long before our present ascendancy in air and naval power would be neutralized. Anyone who is a strong advocate of American air and naval supremacy should realize that a prime requisite for maintaining that supremacy is to prevent the aggressors from intervening in the Ruhr and Japan. This is not interventionism by America; it is simply an attempt to hold what we already have.

This raises clearly the question of the defense of Western Europe against aggression. The word "defense" is to be stressed. There is no question here of our adopting aggressive tactics based on Western Europe and aimed at the Soviet Union. It is hard to understand how anyone can contend that the development of a defensive holding force in Europe without serious offensive capabilities could look like aggression to such realistic men as the rulers of the Kremlin. The same Senators say, almost in the same breath, that the building of an army in Europe would be regarded as aggression by the Soviets and that undoubtedly the Soviets would destroy that army within a few months after it was begun. If the army would be so easy to destroy, how could the Soviets seriously believe that it had a serious aggressive potential?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator seems to pass over the element of time; he seems to wipe time off the books. Of course, in time it is possible to build an army. However, the only suggestion which has been made is that until an army is built, it is at the mercy of the Soviets. An army in the process of being built might reach the point where it was easy to

wipe out when the Soviets moved in—which is the basis of the whole thesis.

Mr. LODGE. No; the basis of the thesis is not that the Soviets have that intention in regard to all forms of armed force development at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Furthermore, how is it possible to have an army which is absolutely able to defend Europe but does not have all the offensive potentialities capable of taking from the Russians a large part of their possessions?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to try to give an opinion on that point. I think one of the ways in which Switzerland maintained its neutrality—to give a small example—was by maintaining a strong army which had very great defensive power, but relatively small offensive power. If we give a man a rifle, he has some offensive power, of course. But obviously the Atlantic Pact force, even if it lived up to the highest expectations of its supporters, could never outnumber the 175 divisions the Soviet Union is supposed to have. If we read the history of the campaigns of the Third Army, for instance—General Patton's army—I think it will be found that before that army, which certainly was one of the best armies in World War II, took the offensive against the Germans, it had built up a superiority of almost 3 to 1, as I recall the figures. That is one reason why I think the Atlantic Pact force can never develop offensive possibilities.

Moreover, as I understand, it is not even believed that the relatively small Atlantic Pact force will have very serious defensive capabilities, unless it has strong tactical aviation support. That is why I say I am sure the Soviets have no worries about ever having that force become an offensive threat to them.

Of course, the potential American offensive threat arises from the capacity of our Air Force to drop atomic bombs; and, of course, that is a very strong offensive potential.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that a tactical air force is just as effective for offense as for defense?

Mr. LODGE. No; not necessarily, in all cases.

Mr. TAFT. Why not?

Mr. LODGE. A tactical air force is not necessarily always as effective for offense as for defense, because it often must go farther when it engages in offense.

Mr. TAFT. It simply goes from just behind the lines, in either case.

Mr. LODGE. However, by means of a succession of strong points we try to canalize the enemy's advance—well, we should not be talking about these things in public, so there is no use in going into these matters at this time. I see that I am about to begin to violate the precept I suggested when I began to speak, namely, that in these debates we should not discuss detailed tactics. However, I shall be glad to go to the Senator's office at any time and explain to him why I think this defensive army can never develop offensive potentialities against a Russian force.

Mr. TAFT. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that we can build up such a defensive army which can have no offensive capabilities?

Mr. LODGE. No serious offensive capabilities.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that just the Maginot-line complex?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that, regardless of whether a force moves forward or moves backward, there is a war in either case?

Mr. LODGE. It would be the Maginot-line complex if we were to envision a third world war as being fought entirely in Western Europe. But, of course, we do not visualize it in that way, because it will be a triphibious war, if it comes. If we hold at one point and attack at another, that is not a Maginot line, if we proceed everywhere in accordance with a triphibious concept——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that an army representing not only the United States, but also France, Belgium, Holland, and other smaller nations, would not be an army which the powers in control of it would agree to use to attack any great power? That army could be used only for defense, because the smaller powers never would agree that their forces should be used to attack Soviet Russia. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think it is simply incredible to think that the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, and other nations, could possibly get themselves into a condition to march on Moscow. I think it is the most fantastic dream one could imagine.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator understand that the army which will be built up there will never be able to defeat the Russians if they attack?

Mr. LODGE. No; that is not the point. I am sorry the Senator was not here earlier.

Mr. CAPEHART. But a moment ago I understood the Senator to say that the army would be a defensive army and never could be an offensive army against the Russians.

Mr. LODGE. No; I said it could have no serious offensive capabilities.

Mr. CAPEHART. No serious offensive capabilities?

Mr. LODGE. That is what I said.

Mr. CAPEHART. Those are strong terms.

Mr. LODGE. I say it has no serious offensive capabilities.

Mr. CAPEHART. If Russia were to attack the United States from some place other than through Western Europe, what good would we get from the Western European army we are talking about?

Mr. LODGE. It would be good as a holding force, as a dam. Recently we heard ex-President Hoover talk about such a dam.

Mr. CAPEHART. Suppose the Russians should decide to attack us from South America, from Alaska, or from some point other than Western Europe. What good would the Western European army be in that case?

Mr. LODGE. That question requires a long answer; but a quick answer is that such an army would keep the Russians from obtaining the Western European shipyards and other industrial plants. That is at least one good reason for maintaining such an army.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I should like first to answer the question asked by the Senator from Indiana, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts declines to yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota as soon as I have answered the Senator from Indiana.

I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that of course he is correct that all these things should be ready. If they are not ready, of course, they are not any good. That is true.

Now I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at the time the able Senator from Indiana asked his question of the Senator from Massachusetts, this question occurred to me: If the Soviets should attack the United States, what should we do? If the Soviets should attack us, if the sirens were to scream the announcement of the attack this very afternoon, I think we would want bases all over the European Continent, in order that we could make a speedy and effective strike, because we would have to strike fast, or else all our centers of communication and centers and hearts of production on this continent would be shattered. Therefore, the possession of bases on the Continent is, in my opinion, absolutely essential to our safety.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, so that I may answer the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the able Senator from Minnesota misses the point of the debate. The able Senator from Massachusetts said that the army which is being built up is for defensive purposes and could never be, or might not be effective offensively against Russia. That was the point in the debate, not what the able Senator from Minnesota is talking about.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I am trying to give what I said before the Senator from Ohio came in. I quoted from his very able and interesting speech a good deal, to show that we are not very far apart, and I am very happy about it. I suppose there are some people who wish that we here in the Senate would divide up into globalists on one side and retreatists on

the other, but when we can find a common ground on any matter I think it is a fine thing. I agree with those who are filled with horror at the idea of a huge allied army marching through the snows into the middle of Russia. I am just as much opposed to that as is any other Member of the Senate, and that is why I am so happy to find that everybody agrees with me about that, in the first place; and I am so happy to find that nobody contemplates doing such a thing, in the second place.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I have one question. The Senator has emphasized the value of the Ruhr. Is it not true that even with an army in Europe it is very uncertain whether we could do anything but defend the Rhine anyway? And is it not most likely that that would involve a surrender of the Ruhr?

Mr. LODGE. We are now getting into the topics which I said at the beginning we should not discuss, because if in the United States Senate we start talking about the places we are going to leave and the places we are going to hold, it is all going to be cabled by the able ladies and gentlemen of the press all over the world, and the people who are living in the countries that we say we are not going to hold will read about it, and we will lose some partners whom we might otherwise have.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true——

Mr. LODGE. Let me answer.

Mr. TAFT. Let me put it in this way——

Mr. LODGE. Let me answer the Senator. I am trying to answer him, and to answer him in my own way. I cannot answer the Senator from Ohio in his way; I must answer him in my way. So I say that, if it is desired to hold line B, it is a good thing to say that we will hold line A. If we propose to hold line A, and to try to hold line A, then we may be able to hold line B. Does that answer the question?

Mr. TAFT. Is it not also true that the chief reliance in World War II was the bombing of the Ruhr, and cannot the production there be very substantially reduced at least by bombing?

Mr. LODGE. The idea of bombing the Ruhr and destroying all the people in the Ruhr is one that does not appeal to me. I do not think it is a good solution for the problem which we face.

Mr. TAFT. The Essen plant was never taken by the Allies in the late World War.

Mr. LODGE. I am not talking about what was done. I thought the Senator was advocating it for the future. I think it is unfortunate for us publicly to advocate the bombing of this area, and that. I think it is a mistake.

Mr. TAFT. With due respect, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts I am not advocating anything.

Mr. LODGE. I am sorry if I misinterpreted the Senator's suggestions.

Mr. TAFT. I am only trying to answer the Senator's argument that we must retain the Ruhr because of its industrial potentialities to Russia and the possible occupation of the Ruhr; and I was suggesting that bombing is one method of meeting that particular problem, as well as a land army in Europe. That is all I wanted to bring out.

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt that bombing is a weapon we can use if we have to; but I think it is a last resort. As I have said, I think we ought to try to keep the free world as big as we can, where we think we have a good chance of being successful.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have been very much interested in the Senator's remarks, and I think he has made a very fine contribution to this debate. I believe he has left some unfortunate implications as to his theory of the military purpose of forces in Western Europe. Early in his debate he spoke of the necessity, in substance, of our selling our goods to our western allies. I doubt very much whether we would sell a case to the western allies, if we ask them to become a completely garrisoned state, and to do nothing but sit on the defensive while they are bombed out by the enemy. If that is good tactics for Western Europe, it is good tactics for the United States. I think the Senator has left some bad implications, which perhaps he did not intend to convey.

Mr. LODGE. I do not follow the Senator. What is there wrong——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say, in substance, that the purpose of the Western European armies is defensive?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That means that they stand still. It means that they take the blows of the enemy. The Ruhr would be blown up, everything else blown up, no movement. They would take the enemy's attacks. Is that a constructive piece of salesmanship for Western Europe?

Mr. LODGE. I doubt whether anybody even——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I put the complementary question: If that is the proper tactics for Western Europe, why not for the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I can answer that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that both are bad.

Mr. LODGE. I can answer that. I do not think that even so persuasive a gentleman as my friend from Colorado could sell the idea to anyone that war is attractive. I think the idea of fighting a defensive war in Europe is not going to be attractive. I grant that to be so. I think the idea of an offensive war into the cold wastes of Siberia is not very attractive either, and I do not think the Senator from Colorado means seriously to advocate such a course.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not, sir.

Mr. LODGE. Wait a minute. Let me answer. The Senator has raised both points. I should like to answer them both. The second argument was that if a defensive war is the proper course for Europe, why is it not the proper course for the United States? There is a very simple answer to that, which is, of course, that our situation is far stronger; we are in a far more advantageous position strategically. We are not nearly so weak or so divided and so up against the gun as are the people of Europe, and therefore we have a good chance to regain the initiative, so that the arrow of pressure will be pointing from west to east. One of the first things that must be done in order to regain the basic strategic initiative is that there be a dam in Europe insofar as the offensive threat of the Red Army is concerned. But that is just a small part of the whole strategic picture.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am in entire agreement that we should pick up effective allies in Western Europe. Let there be no question about that. I am opposed to falling back on the United States and adopting a cornered-rat defense policy.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well. But I do not like the implications of the Senator's argument that we should sell our allies by giving them help, merely to reduce them to the complete inertia of a defensive status, which is the Maginot line business, as has been pointed out.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I do not think that is what happens at all. I think either the Army is going to have a defensive role or an offensive role. If it is going to have an offensive role, then there are Senators who are opposed to that, because they say it takes us into a highly dangerous adventure into Russia; and, of course, I agree with them. Then, if we say it is going to be a defensive army, that idea is opposed by the Senator from Colorado. If both arguments are good, then the only army which is any good is one which merely stands still in one place and does not move at all.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not accept either of the alternatives as exclusive. I believe in an offensive and defensive program, according to the task before us. I think we make a big mistake when we consign Western Europe to being solely a defensive military area.

Mr. LODGE. We shall be very lucky, I may say to the Senator, if we can be defensive in the next 2 or 3 years. We can thank our stars if that can be achieved. I am not urging that Europe be turned into a garrison state; far from it. I think that the army in any country has got to rest on a sound political and economic basis, and I do not think Europe can arm itself faster than at a certain rate. That is one of the reasons why I think the Marshall plan has been such an excellent thing, because it has provided the economic basis on which an army can now be built. There is nothing I have said, I may say to my able friend from Colorado, which justifies the inference that I want to turn Europe into a garrison state. I want to do no such thing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that when the Senator studies the RECORD there will be a number of remarks which he has made which lead to that conclusion, and I think that would be a very unfortunate conclusion, if we are out to pick up allies.

Mr. LODGE. I am not for turning any country into a garrison state, and I am not for engaging in a wild adventure in which we commit a huge land army to an invasion of the wasteland of

Siberia. I am not in favor of pitting our precious and limited store of manpower against the teeming millions of Russia or China. I am not in favor of doing those things.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But——

Mr. LODGE. Just a moment. Let me finish. The Senator raises big questions, and he is entitled to an adequate answer. I believe the principal effort must be made through air and through naval power, but that the allied main effort in certain parts of the world can be advantageously made by land. If that be true, then we can put in our percentage there. I am coming to what I think that percentage might be, but there is nothing in what I have said this afternoon which justifies any inference that I am doing anything other than seeking to regain the initiative—to regain the initiative for permanent peace, which we threw away in 1945 and 1946, when we allowed our Armed Forces to disintegrate, when we failed to estimate correctly the aims and aspirations of the Soviet Union, and when we lost the initiative. That has been the whole trouble.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not quarreling with any of the general objectives of the Senator from Massachusetts. I am merely suggesting, and I repeat my suggestion, that if he will study the remarks he has made this afternoon perhaps he will see that may be fairly argued that the net effect is that we would turn Western Europe into a garrison state. I am also interested in having effective allies in Western Europe.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. What kind of an army does the Senator want to build in Western Europe?

Mr. MILLIKIN. An army that can go forward, that would have whatever mobility is necessary to win the war.

Mr. LODGE. There are 175 Soviet divisions and there are 8 Allied divisions. How can we have such a mobile army in the near future?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is arguing that there is no point in doing anything.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I am not. The Senator from Colorado is trying to "lawyer" me around to taking an extreme position. It is not a question of globalism or retreatism. It is a question of common sense, and not of legalism.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has indicated that there is a sensible ground somewhere between, and that is where I place myself. I do not want the Senator to render rigid half of his problem——

Mr. LODGE. I am not rigid at all. I am mentally mobile, and I think that most of us are.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I want the Senator to be mentally mobile, and I want him to keep our military forces mobile—not always moving backward.

Mr. LODGE. This has come about because of the statement made here that to build up this force in Europe will be an aggressive threat and cause the Soviet to rush into war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not taking issue on that. I was merely hoping I was making a friendly suggestion to the Senator that in the interest of those who are not retreatists or not globalists that he not jeopardize a good, sound, mobile position by making half of it rigidly defensive.

I want to make one more suggestion. I think the Senator is quite correct when he shrinks from discussing what points should be bombed and what points should not be bombed, but I do not think there is any secret about certain points that would be inevitably bombed. I am not talking about them or urging the Senator to talk about them, but I would suggest that if the Senator would discuss his strong-point theory it would be an interesting addition to the argument. There is no secrecy about it. War has operated on strong-point theories since the beginning of warfare.

Mr. LODGE. We have not operated on strong-point theories with tactical aviation since the beginning of warfare. I should be glad to discuss any of these things with the Senator off the record, but I do not think we should point out on the floor of the Senate places and areas when it would be reported all over the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am partially agreeing with the Senator, but I am saying that it would be a valuable adjunct to his argument if he would go into his strong-point theory and let us see what it has to offer. Maybe it will make the curse of the garrison state part of the subject.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator has conjured up something which is not really involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let us call it static warfare or semiretreatism.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to join issue with the Senator now, but I do not think we should do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not shrink from that. I wish the Senator to know that I do not shrink from it. Does the Senator from Massachusetts shrink from it?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think we should discuss in public tactics and places and methods of fighting.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The routes of forward and backward moving of armies in Europe are no more secret than that the two of us are on the Senate floor this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The study of strategy and tactics deals with well known routes of advance and retreat; and to say we should not discuss it——

Mr. LODGE. That is not what I said we should not discuss. The Senator is a very able man, but he cannot possibly know what it is that I do not want to discuss now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should certainly hate to base a debate on something that I do not want to discuss.

Mr. LODGE. I am not basing my debate on it at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened with interest to my colleague from Massachusetts. In what I am about to say do I not state his concept correctly? As it lies in my mind, what the Senator wants to do and what I want to do is to keep Europe in a sufficiently strong position so that it can help us to defend ourselves here, and if they have the willingness and the strength, we will help them to defend themselves over there. Our position is that we want to help to keep Europe intact so that we can develop an offensive warfare in the air, if necessary, and warfare on the sea, if necessary, and keep Europe, as such, strong, and keep her as our ally for our own security. Is not that the Senator's position?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is just about it. We want to be able to conduct this struggle, which is a military, political, and economic struggle, all three. It is like a three-pronged spear. We should like to conduct the struggle in an offensive, aggressive, forward-looking manner. We should like to, but we cannot do that now. Let us consider an army corps in battle. It is not attacking with everything all the time. It is going to be quiet at some places. At some places the bridges are out, or there is snow in the mountain passes. I have never heard of a military commander who said we should go on the offensive in everything. The fact is that we have a great advantage on the sea and in the air, but we are weak on the land. It seems to me it would be insane to say that we are going to take the offensive on the land, where we are weak, and go on the defensive in the air and on the sea, where we are strong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding of what the Senator meant. Let us compare it with a football team. We may compare the land army with the line buck, and the Navy and the Air Force with the forward pass. If we can maintain our strength so that we can forward pass, we may win the battle in that way, even though we cannot win it by line bucks.

Mr. LODGE. That is true. Moreover, there may not be a war at all if we speedily regain the initiative.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I recognize the great study which the Senator from Massachusetts has given to military activities. Is it not an axiom of modern warfare that each side seeks to destroy the industrial potential of the enemy?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what the axioms are. We try to damage the enemy as much as is possible.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it not the entire strategy in the last war to destroy the industrial potential of the enemy?

Mr. LODGE. It was certainly an objective.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a major objective, is it not? That is the mission of air power, is it not?

Mr. LODGE. Not entirely, no.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not entirely; but one of the primary objects is the destruction of the enemy's industrial potential. I ask that question only in connection with the Senator's comment that he wanted to keep secret what we might

do. I have been in Germany, as has the Senator from Massachusetts, and no German is under any illusion with reference to the Ruhr. Russia may well think she can keep that potential without destroying it. Is there anyone of the simplest mind who does not recognize that fact?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know who recognizes it and who does not recognize it, but I think we have a very delicate problem in Europe—many problems, in fact. Our problem involves the rearmament of Germany.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have one other question.

Mr. LODGE. Let me first answer the Senator's question. The rearmament of Germany is an extremely difficult political question. A great many Germans are very much against rearmament. I do not think it is a very good idea, when the question is up in Europe and General Eisenhower has his mind full of these things, to go into a great detailed discussion of where we would bomb in case things got bad. I may be wrong, but that is my judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have one other question.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As a matter of Yankee salesmanship, does the Senator think it would be more persuasive to tell Europe that since Europe is vital to our own defense we will defend it whether the European nations do anything themselves, or to tell them that there are some powerful conservative groups in this country who would help out those countries who are willing to help themselves, and that therefore they should help those forces who agree with them? I say that because the President used some unfortunate language in intimating that without Europe we are lost. It may be true, but is it wise for us to inculcate that theory, when General Eisenhower is in Europe trying to persuade European countries to cooperate with us in a united defense?

Mr. LODGE. I have never used that phrase. That is not my language. I went to Europe on my own early in December, in response to an invitation, to address a group of politicians over there. I spoke to them very much along the line of the statement of the Senator from Maine, that they carried a great responsibility for the success of an American foreign policy of alliances, and that they should make their full effort, because there are elements in our country which want to go alone and do not want to have any alliances at all. Before the Senator from Maine came into the Chamber I cited France, as an example. I cited what the French people had done as an indication of the fact that they took that fact to heart. Also, before the Senator came into the Chamber, I stated that the nations of Europe must make the utmost effort of which they were capable. Of course, we cannot demand that they make an effort of which they are not capable. I do think that they ought to make the utmost effort of which they are capable. We should not send one additional man to Europe without an iron-clad agreement that Europe would put up many more men.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to refer to his prepared speech at page 5, and to read from it his point No. 12?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I read:

12. We can agree with the proposition that we should not force our decisions on nations who have no desire to arm themselves. To go further, we should not commit one single additional soldier to Europe without an iron-clad agreement that the dispatch of that soldier means the automatic commitment of a very much larger number of European soldiers. Such a commitment is not unfair to Europe since we will do so much in other ways.

I am certain the Senator from Massachusetts had in mind the furnishing of materials to the Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

In truth, as I will try to demonstrate later, such a commitment could be highly advantageous both to Europe and to the United States.

Is that not in substance exactly what ex-President Hoover advocated in his speech some 3 weeks ago?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know. I would have to reread the speech to be certain.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the able Senator will find that it is exactly what former President Hoover advocated in his speech some 3 weeks ago. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts for placing it in his speech. I agree with him 100 percent. The Senator keeps talking about retreatists. I stand foursquare with what I have read from the Senator's speech, namely, point 12. I believe in it 100 percent. I would not go an inch farther than the Senator has advocated in paragraph 12. However, does that mean I am a retreatist? Why does the Senator use the word "retreatist" in referring to those of us who think there may be a better way of doing things?

Mr. LODGE. I have not applied the term to anyone. There are those in this country who would seek to divide us. The whole burden of my song has been that we are not very far apart, that we are not divided right down the middle, and that there is a basis of agreement in this country. I am very happy to see that there is such a basis of agreement. It may not be so interesting to the galleries, for example, to find that we are rather close to agreement, but I think it is a very good thing for the country, including the people in the galleries, that we are close to agreement. I am not calling anyone any names. I never do that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with the Senator that we all have the same desire for peace, and that we all want to help stop the threat of communism. However, why should those of us who have alternate proposals to make be singled out and called such names?

Mr. LODGE. I am called names, too, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand. Why cannot we have open debate on the floor of the Senate and recognize the fact that an alternative plan could be better, particularly in the light of the fact that the plans which we have been following for the past 20 years certainly have failed to accomplish the purposes for which they were intended? Therefore, is it not time that we take a look at some alternative plans?

Mr. LODGE. I think we ought to look at everything. That is what I want to do. I believe we should keep reexamining everything and keep an open mind. I think it is very proper indeed.

Mr. President, I should now like to continue with my prepared address.

If the Soviets have 175 divisions, and if 30 of those divisions are poised in Europe ready for attack, and if there are 8 Allied divisions in Western Europe, as I believe is the case, it is obvious that an almost astronomical rate of growth has to be achieved for the west to develop any serious offensive capabilities by land of a serious nature. In fact, it will be a very arduous undertaking even to develop a strong defensive force.

Certainly no American troops, planes, or ships should be sent anywhere in the world unless the responsible American military authorities think that their mission has a good prospect of success. That is basic. It must be the law and the prophets insofar as we in the Senate are concerned. If the military authorities think that it is profitable to take a certain course—even though that course may be politically unattractive to us in the United States—we must not let the political factors deter us from giving our support. We here in the Senate cannot possibly tell whether ships, planes, or troops should or should not profitably be sent to any particular area.

If our military leaders decide that limited numbers of American troops could be advantageously sent to Europe the question certainly arises as to how many and how soon. To be realistic let it be noted that it is impossible for us now to send a large land force to Europe because we have not got a large land force. We still have a goal of only 18 divisions by the end of the fiscal year, and the commitments which we have in Korea, plus the training requirements of the new divisions, make it utterly impossible for a large land force to go to Europe. The idea that we can in any near future send a million and a half men to Europe—which is the figure which I have heard—seems to me fanciful.

I do not like to burden the Senate with figures, but I think these are interesting figures. In discussing last September this question of manpower in Europe I pointed out that in World War II the allies had a total of 90 divisions on the western front. Of this number, 61 were American divisions, 18 were from the British Empire, 10 were French, and 1 was Polish. This makes a ratio of 61 United States divisions to 29 foreign divisions, or slightly more than 2 to 1, or about 70 percent.

It is commonly stated in the press that 60 divisions actually on station and in good locations in the eastern portion of the non-Communist part of Europe, supported by adequate tactical aviation and backed by still more divisions which could be in action within 6 weeks, could decisively stand off an aggressor. If the United States were to contribute 10 of these initial divisions, the ratio of United

States troops to European troops would be far more favorable to us than was the case in World War II. It would be the difference between a ratio of 1 to 6 as compared with the ratio of 2 to 1, which existed in World War II. In percentage terms, the percentage would be 16½ percent instead of 70 percent.

At the present time, with eight divisions in Western Europe, of which two are American, our percentage is 25 percent. That percentage seems high.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the percentage figures which the Senator has stated with respect to World War II, the Senator left out the Russians.

Mr. LODGE. I said "on the western front."

Mr. TAFT. The Senator omitted the Russians, who were a vital factor in the result.

Mr. LODGE. I am talking about the western front.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator talks about 90 divisions on the western front. Our allies in Western Europe had more than 90 divisions. Does the Senator mean those actually on the front at any one time, and actually fighting?

Mr. LODGE. In combat.

Mr. CAPEHART. Our allies had a total of 260 divisions.

Mr. LODGE. These figures come from the War Department.

Mr. CAPEHART. Evidently the figures mean divisions on the front actually fighting at any given time.

Mr. LODGE. Divisions in the line.

Mr. CAPEHART. In World War II our allies had a total of 260 divisions.

Mr. LODGE. Counting the Russians.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; the western Allies.

Mr. LODGE. My figures come from the Pentagon.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that they mean divisions fighting at any one given time.

Mr. LODGE. At the present time, with eight divisions in Western Europe, of which two are American, our percentage is 25 percent. That percentage seems high. I hope that this percentage may be reduced with the passage of time and that it will be around 15 percent at the very most—of which a significant number would be stateless volunteers for freedom fighting in our uniform.

There are those who ask: "Why have any American troops in Europe at all? There are 200,000,000 Europeans and only 150,000,000 Americans. Let them carry the load."

This question ignores the fact that the 200,000,000 peoples of Europe are divided into a series of watertight compartments and both literally and figuratively do not even speak the same language. Moreover, every man fights better when he thinks he has a good chance to win, and every man knows that his chance of winning is greater if he is part of a large unified allied force instead of merely being part of a small national army.

To say that we will not extend any help to the nations of Europe until they are completely strong and do not need our help is like telling a sick man that we will not give him his medicine until he has recovered. The test should not be that they are able to carry the load alone; it should be that they are making the greatest effort which they are capable of making.

It was proven in combat in World War II, notably in the Colmar pocket, that the presence of United States troops in the same sector noticeably increased the will to win of European armies. The greater the fighting stamina of the European soldier, the more of the load of combat he will carry, and the lighter becomes the load of combat which is carried by the American soldier. When the presence of our soldiers increases the fighting qualities of our European allies, we actually do ourselves a favor—all other things being equal—by having limited numbers of our troops in Europe where they will do the most good.

V

I now come to my few concluding remarks. It is said that if we mobilize now we shall have a difficult morale problem. This is only true if our leadership cannot rise to the occasion. To say that the American people will not support a real mobilization is to take counsel of one's fears. It is like saying that the nations of Europe will not fight. It is like saying that a bank is insolvent. If enough people say it, it will start a run on the bank. We must not allow ourselves to get into the state of mind of the man who is always trying to guess right and to win his bet even though he bets that a disaster is going to happen. Instead of trying to guess what is going to happen, we ought to be trying to make the right thing happen.

We in the Senate—and we in America—and that goes for all of us—must act like leaders. We should not take counsel of our fears. There is no course which America can take today which is without risk. We can, by timid talk here in the Senate and by refusing to move until every unknown factor is accounted for, until every last chinstrap is in place and every last button polished, lose this struggle for existence just as surely as it could be lost on the battlefield. While prudently realizing the dangers, we should also be impressed with the tremendous elements of strength on our side. We must have the faith and the confidence in ourselves to take the lead. We must then regain the initiative as soon as we are strong enough to do it.

Mr. President, this is the testing time for Europe, surely. But it is also the testing time for the United States, which will show whether we are able to lead and, thus, whether we are able to survive. Facing us is another of a long series of attempts, which have been made throughout history, either by strength or by guile, or by both, to enslave mankind. These attempts have always failed in the end. We on the other hand, are dedicated to the ideal of the free man—free to worship and free to develop himself. Those who follow this ideal have had their dark days and dangers; they have often been clumsy and lacking in foresight. But in the end, this is an ideal which has never let humanity down.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the observations of the distinguished Senator, and also the knowledge which he has of the subject. Of course, he is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I should like to be, but I am not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator would like to be a member?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's wide experience in the Army is sufficient background. Let me ask the Senator a question. I am asking it in all seriousness, and I am asking it constructively. Does the Senator feel that under the North Atlantic defense treaty the President can commit foot soldiers to be assigned as a part of an international army before the Congress has determined the character of the aid which the United States shall give?

Mr. LODGE. Of course he can do it.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the North Atlantic Treaty provisions?

Mr. LODGE. He can do it anyway. He can order them to go anywhere. He has that power.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that he can do it under the North Atlantic defense treaty?

Mr. LODGE. The North Atlantic Treaty does not stop him.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator's answer is that under the North Atlantic Treaty the President does have the right to commit——

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not say that. I said that the North Atlantic defense treaty did not stop him from doing it. I do not believe that the North Atlantic defense treaty commits him to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator follow up with the rest of the answer? The determination as to whether we shall or shall not send foot soldiers is another question. Leaving the merits or demerits of that question out of consideration, all I am asking now is this: Does not the Senator feel that before a commitment is made which assigns soldiers as an integrated part of a land force in Western Europe, under the North Atlantic Treaty, at least, the Congress should first determine the policy? If the Senator would agree with that, then a point which the Senator made in his speech would follow, that is, the point with respect to the size of the Army. The Senator was outlining 16 points with respect to which there was agreement.

Could we not agree on the point that before a commitment is made, under the North Atlantic Treaty, as to troops as a part of an integrated army, the President must come to the Congress for a determination of the policy?

Mr. LODGE. I hope very much that some system can be devised which will call for congressional understanding and approval of whatever is done. I am

hopeful that something can be worked out. I do not believe that we ought to undertake to determine troop and plane and ship movements here in the Capitol.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator. I am not talking about tactics. I am not discussing now whether the forces to be sent should be land forces, air forces, or naval forces. All I am asking is that before any commitment is made under the North Atlantic defense treaty, the Congress should determine the policy. I think we should start from the same premise. Although I voted against the North Atlantic treaty, I am convinced that we are now absolutely bound by its provisions. We are bound to give mutual aid.

Mr. LODGE. We are bound to give it only if they do their part. We are not bound to give aid unless they do their part.

Mr. WHERRY. As I recall the answer of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the junior Senator from Nebraska, he said that if Senators voted for that proposal we would be voting definitely to commit ourselves to give some form of aid. He stated that the thing left for determination was the kind of aid to be given. That is the one thing which he said would be left to the Congress in the event that, under section 9 of the act, an advisory board program were submitted to us. We would determine what the character of the aid should be.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that an important factor is that they must make a showing. The North Atlantic Pact deals with "effective self-help and mutual aid." The word "effective" is very important. If they fizzle out and lie down on the job, I do not think we are under obligation to do much.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that they must produce. I think that was the burden of former President Hoover's speech. But after that is done, after the program has been talked over by the Executive, what is to be the situation? The reason I am asking the question is that the newspapers have been filled with statements with respect to commitments of certain numbers of soldiers, so many divisions, and so forth. All I am asking is this: After there has been a determination by the Advisory Board, and after negotiations are conducted by the executive department, which it has a perfect right to do, does not the Senator feel that after that step has been taken, and before the aid is given, the Congress of the United States ought to determine the character of the aid?

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that the Congress has a responsibility with regard to this subject, and that we are held responsible by the American people. We also have a personal concern as American citizens, and we cannot ignore that or brush it to one side. I am looking for some way to reconcile that with the realities of the situation. Of course, we have a great deal of power in determining the size of the Armed Forces, through our power of appropriation, and if we know there are going to be 7 divisions in Korea, and 3 divisions here, and all we are going to have is 18 divisions, we have a very strong limitation right there.

I should like to see some procedure worked out to take care of the very legitimate and sincere anxiety which the Senator from Nebraska has, but I do not think we ought to require congressional approval as a condition precedent before we send American military personnel overseas, because that is bad for them.

Mr. WHERRY. I hoped that would not be the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, and that he would not say that, because, as I understood the debate in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty correctly—and I believe I did, because I was present when it took place—I was led to believe by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that when the pact was ratified we had definitely committed ourselves, along with the other signatory powers, to do certain things. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that other nations have to show their inclination to act for their mutual aid. But under section 9 the advisory board could submit to us a program, let us say, calling for three divisions before a signatory power is attacked, and five divisions afterward.

What was promised over and over again by the managers of the bill on both sides of the aisle was "If you vote for this pact and Congress is favorable to this treaty, then we are definitely committed to mutual aid under all the conditions."

Mr. LODGE. Yes, but not to send troops.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am making.

Mr. LODGE. We are not committed to send troops.

Mr. WHERRY. We are not committed to send troops, and Congress should determine that. Is that not true?

Mr. LODGE. We are not committed to send troops.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I have not been arguing this on the basis of any legal commitment. I have been trying to consider it from the standpoint of what is good judgment, what is common sense, and if we agree on that basis we will have no trouble with legalisms.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that Congress should not expressly limit the number of American divisions to be sent to this international army?

Mr. LODGE. I think Congress can limit the total number of divisions we can have in the total army. I myself would not be willing to vote on how many divisions we ought to send to Europe.

Mr. TAFT. What I suggest to the Senator is that in this European adventure we are committing these troops to a commander selected by the United Nations, not by us. General Eisenhower is not an American officer in his present capacity.

Mr. LODGE. Not by the United Nations.

Mr. TAFT. Of the North Atlantic Pact nations. It seems to me that Congress should very definitely limit by number the troops that can be committed to the command of an officer who is not an officer of the United States Army or under the Commander in Chief of the United States Army. Does not the Senator think that Congress should limit the number of the men of the American Army that may be committed to the command of such a commander?

Mr. LODGE. I think an argument can be made for that. I should like to see exactly how the provision was phrased, how it was worded. I think there is a theoretical argument for doing it. Whether it can be done practically without doing more harm than good is something I should like to study first.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator the precedent of the United Nations where we did exactly that. The statute dealing with the United Nations provided for a special agreement defining the character and number of the Armed Forces that were to be committed to the United Nations, and that statute reads:

> The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

So in the case of the United Nations, where we were committing a certain American army under certain circumstances to the control of the United Nations commander we provided that Congress itself should pass on the over-all commitment that might be made. I do not quite see why that is not a precedent, if we do the same thing in the case of the Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. LODGE. I think, undoubtedly, there are many things about it which do constitute precedents. Of course, when we did that we were doing it more or less in the abstract, and now we have a very real situation confronting us in which it might weaken General Eisenhower's hand for bargaining purposes or something else if everything was spelled out that much in public. That I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. As the Senator pointed out, the North Atlantic treaty does not provide for any force. It provides simply, I take it, that the Council shall set up a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. So when those recommendations come in, they may well contain provisions for a specific number of troops we are expected to provide in case

there should be a call for troops. There might be some such provision which might then be passed on. I maintain only that such an agreement must sooner or later be made, and that Congress ought to approve it, and it ought to be understood in advance by the European nations that it is subject to the approval of Congress. That is the only suggestion I have in that field.

Mr. LODGE. I can see what the Senator from Ohio is trying to do, and I respect it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the Senator from Ohio by reason of something which came up during the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, regardless of the right of Congress to determine the limit of the armed forces, does not the Senator from Ohio feel that before even that is done, no commitment should be made to assign soldiers to an international army in western Europe?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the President had authority to assign soldiers to the command of an international commander chosen by the United Nations. No, I do not think he has such authority.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to go back again as I did a moment ago, but I wonder if he would be so kind as to return to page 11 of his speech, the second paragraph, where he says:

> We in the Senate—and we in America—must act like leaders. We should not take counsel of our fears. There is no course which America can take today which is without risk. We can, by timid talk here in the Senate and by refusing to move until every unknown factor is accounted for, until every last chin strap is in place and every button polished, lose this struggle for existence just as surely as it could be lost on the battlefield.

I wonder if the able Senator would not believe that we can likewise lose this struggle by adopting a wrong kind of general over-all policy?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, let us put some of the blame on those who might be making the over-all policy rather than on the United States Senate.

Mr. LODGE. There are many ways in which we can lose. I do not think we ought to think about that as much as we ought to be thinking about the ways we can win, as a matter of psychology.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, one last point. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made a most valuable contribution. There is no reason why the solution of the problem cannot be worked out in an amicable way. Whether we can finally agree I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. I, likewise, want to congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts. I think we can very easily get together provided those who are dealing with existing policies and those who have advocated them in the past will accept the theory and the fact that we are as much interested in solving this problem as they are, and that we are just as sincere in our alternative proposals as they are in those which they continually force down our throats and the throats of the American people.

Mr. LODGE. There has got to be partnership and mutuality. I agree with that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask my colleague a question and also perhaps preface it just a little bit.

As I listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Ohio, it seemed to me that it was based on the United Nations and the requirement that the Congress determine the number of troops the United States would furnish to a United Nations security force. I do not say that I do not think the President should not come to Congress and tell Congress what he is going to do in Europe. I heartily believe he should do so. However, I ask the Senator this question: In his opinion, is there not a great distinction between the furnishing of troops to the United Nations, for police action, or to put down an international strife in a case in which our own security might not be particularly endangered, and the sending of troops under the North Atlantic Pact with its mutual-assistance program, if we are to send them, with the approval of Congress, for our own security and safety, in the defense of our own country?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, there are shadings of distinction and differentiation. First of all, there is the question of the sending of troops for occupation purposes. No one questions the right of the President to do that. He has been sending troops for occupation to Germany and Japan ever since the end of the war, and no one has raised any question about that.

At the other extreme there is the sending of an expeditionary force, once war has been declared. Those are at the two extremes on the spectrum.

Then there is the question of the force we have been discussing today, which I agree is more than the question of an occupation force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of this body, I do not wish to place myself in the position of admitting that the establishment of a police force for the United Nations would constitute a precedent in regard to our doing what we should do for our own safety if we are in danger.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is a precedent at all. It is somewhat analogous, but it is not a precedent, because one relates to our ability to continue our existence as a nation and the other was adopted as an abstraction. One is a generality, in connection with a theory; and the other is taken to meet a condition confronting us under specific conditions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not important for Congress to have information in regard to such matters, in connection with our control of appropriations and the number of American troops that are sent? However, certainly we wish to be careful about saying that the President should receive the complete approval of the Congress before such action is taken.

Mr. LODGE. I think Congress should have all the information which can be given to it. However, in connection with a subject of this sort, sooner or later we get into a discussion of things which should not be discussed in public. It is too bad, but it is true because of the nature of the subject and the complexities involved.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

THE ISSUES WHICH CONFRONT THE NATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this Nation, in the age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, can no more return to isolationism than an adult can return to childhood, regardless of how pleasant the recollection may be.

The debate now going on in Congress and throughout the country is necessary for a clarification of the issues. In a free society the people and their elected representatives must know the facts in order to make sound judgments. If they are treated as adults they will respond as such. What all men of good will who believe in a free world of free men should be striving for is to find areas of agreement upon which we can find a high degree of unity in meeting the challenge which threatens our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Most Americans and an overwhelming majority of congressional Democrats and Republicans alike would agree that communism is a threat to our way of life and has clearly demonstrated by its actions during the past 5 years that it is a godless aggressive tyranny determined to destroy the free way of life. Previously in our history we have understood that we must hang together or be hanged separately. Free men everywhere had better understand that now, without delay.

The divisions amongst us, then, are not on the danger, which is apparent, but on the means of best combating it.

There are certain basic facts which all responsible Government officials and private citizens must keep in mind.

Under our constitutional system the present administration will control the executive branch of the Government until January, 1953. The present Eighty-second Congress will be in control of the legislative branch during the same period of time. No effective foreign or national defense policy can be formulated or executed without the cooperative effort of the President and the Congress.

The most critical period in the life of western civilization will be the years 1951 and 1952. We dare not wait until 1953,

when the American people might select a different President or a different Congress, in order to compose the fundamental differences that confront us. As President Grover Cleveland pointed out, "A condition, not a theory, confronts us."

In the period since VJ-day, in 1945, Congress has provided all the defense funds the President has requested in his budget. The controversy has been over the desire of Congress to appropriate a larger amount, as in the case of the 70-group air program, than the President was willing to spend. As a member of both the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, I am convinced that whatever the defense needs of this Nation are, the necessary legislation and appropriations will be forthcoming.

The differences between the executive and legislative branches of the Government will be not over the necessity of having an adequate defense, but over how such forces will be distributed prior to the outbreak of hostilities brought about by the aggression of the Soviet Union or its satellites.

A large majority in the Senate voted to ratify the North Atlantic treaty. I was among that number. There were some who opposed it. It was ratified by more than a two-thirds vote, as provided for under our Constitution. The vote was 82 to 13—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 9916.

Even most of those who opposed the ratification of the treaty recognize that with its approval we assumed definite obligations in the event of aggression against the other signatories, and that we must, of course, promptly meet all of those obligations without debate or delay.

In meeting our North Atlantic Treaty obligations, I do not believe that the hands of the President, as Commander in Chief, should or could be tied.

If the Senate debated, under its liberal rules of debate, the wisdom of sending armed forces to meet our treaty obligations as long as the United Nations has debated for 2½ months whether or not to name the Chinese Communists aggressors, most of Europe, at least to the English Channel and the Pyrenees, would be overrun, and we would be faced with a Soviet fait accompli.

The basic question then arises as to what extent prior to the occurrence of causa belli under the treaty should American forces be disposed on the European continent.

Here, then, is the crux of the problem, and one on which patriotic Americans may and do differ. It is here we must find an area of agreement if our foreign and military policy is not to be paralyzed.

Our European allies should realize that Americans have been disappointed and disillusioned by the fact that in the United Nations' effort to arrest aggression in Korea, after a lapse of 6 months, this Nation has supplied 90 percent of the troops furnished by United Nations members and has had 90 percent of the casualties suffered by United Nations members. In fact, our casualties alone outnumber the total armed forces supplied by all of the rest of the United Nations members combined.

This particular experience is still fresh in our minds. The United Nations activities have largely concentrated on how to word an instrument of surrender that would not make a Chinese Communist aggressor's victory seem quite so humiliating to this Nation which up to now has not lost a war. It would have been better if the other members had shown the same energy in getting land, sea, and air power to Korea to meet this first overt aggression head-on and to stop it in its tracks.

Peace we could always buy, as at Munich, by surrendering the rights of small countries until there were no such assets left. We did not and we do not need the "red tape" of the United Nations to prepare for us a surrender instrument to sign. We are seeking, not peace at any price, but peace with honor. Appeasement of aggressors as at Munich is but surrender on the installment plan. On no such basis can the moral forces of the free world be rallied.

It seems to me that we, our North Atlantic allies, and our fellow United Nations members must determine now whether or not a collective security system against aggression is desired. If such a system is desired, it must not be limited in its application by any geographic or color line. The freedom of the people of the Republics of Korea, China, or the Philippines, of Japan, or of the other Asiatic nations from Communist aggression is not less important to them than is the freedom from aggression to the Europeans. It was Lenin who made the sound observation that the road to Paris is through Peiping.

It is, of course, true that in some areas of the world aggression can be better met than in others. Indeed in some remote areas it may not be strategically possible to mobilize sufficient power to uphold international law and order against aggression, but even in those cases aggression should be labeled as such and the aggressor designated the international outlaw that he is.

Rewarding Chinese Communist aggression because it has had a measure of success to date is bowing to the doctrine of might makes right. Such an abject surrender to force will be fatal to the United Nations and make it unworthy of further support by freemen anywhere. Already the military value of the United Nations has been demonstrated as being inconsequential to meet the needs of the hour. With the self-destruction of its moral standing and leadership the United Nations would become an empty shell of a debating society with a large payroll of bureaucrats interested in preserving their jobs.

I speak more in sorrow than in anger, for I have supported the United Nations in the 5½ years I have been a Member of the United States Senate.

Our British allies must recognize that it is more essential to stop aggression than it is to temporarily hold Hong Kong.

American, French, and British businessmen must realize that it is more important to stop aggression than it is to make blood-money profits growing out of shipments to the Communist aggressor in Red China. Anything that is shipped to or from Communist China strengthens the economy of that country and makes it better able to make war against the United Nations as it is doing today in Korea. Are Great Britain, France, and India going to be as free and easy in sacrificing Hong Kong, Malaya, Indochina, or the border area of India to Red China when their turn comes as some United Nations members appear to be when the 30,000,000 non-Communist people of the Republic of Korea or the 9,000,000 free people of the Republic of China now on the Island of Formosa are the victims?

If communism is a global menace—which it is—it must be met on a global basis. If the false doctrine is sold to the free people of the world that everything must be concentrated on the defense of Europe and no risks taken in Asia, how far is the retreat expected to go? If Korea and Formosa are the sacrificial lambs to this policy, how do you rally world public opinion 6 months or a year from now to hold Japan, the Philippines, Southeast Asia, India, or Pakistan? Or is the free world willing that these also be the tokens of appeasement when the Communist timetable calls for future payments, as it inevitably will, either this year or next? Where do you draw the line?

One year ago, on January 5, 1950, in opening the debate on American far-eastern policy, I stated:

> Within the last 90 days two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development, as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949, and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.
>
> In Europe we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable. In the Far East there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress have not been consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail. The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, part 1, pp. 79–98.)

This was 6 months before the invasion by North Korean Communists across the thirty-eighth parallel. Had a firm stand been taken even as late as a year ago and a line drawn in Asia as it was in Europe, it is doubtful that the Soviet Union and its satellites would have risked aggression in Korea on June 24, 1950. International communism knew that aggression against the North Atlantic countries would bring us into the conflict at a time when we still had and have a superiority in atomic weapons. However, they had reason to believe—as the result of the President's statement of January 5, 1950, that no additional aid would be given to

Formosa and the subsequent speech of the Secretary of State at the National Press Club on January 12 of the same year, wherein he left Korea and Formosa outside of the American defense line—that here were two areas where the chances were reasonably good that Communist gains could be made without involving the United States or the other free nations of the world.

On April 3, 1950, the Secretary of State handed to the Korean Ambassador a note insisting, among other things, that the Korean Government take effective measures to balance the budget which, of course, would require them to proportionately decrease their defense expenditures. One week later, on April 10, in the course of my remarks of that day, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, on pages 4983–4987, I called to the attention of the Senate the following facts:

The Government of Korea has been constantly faced with the overt acts of aggression across the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist irregulars from north of the line. At the time I was in Korea last November (i. e., 1949) there had already been 360 violations of the thirty-eighth parallel by Communist groups from North Korea ranging in size from a squad to a battalion. Many additional violations of the border have taken place since last November, the latest being a few days ago. President Syngman Rhee recently pointed out that there had been substantial casualties on the part of the forces of the Republic of Korea, and there have been considerably greater casualties on the part of the invading forces. Needless to say in that part of the world the cold war is quite warm.

There are a number of responsible people in the Republic of Korea who believe that once the Chinese Communists have liquidated the remaining resistance by the forces of the Republic of China to their regime that they will then move both Communist troops and equipment back into Manchuria and make them available to the North Korean Communists for an invasion against the Republic of Korea.

These remarks were made on the floor of the Senate 3 months before the North Korean Communist aggressors invaded across the thirty-eighth parallel.

Again, over a month ago, on December 4, 1950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 16049, I stated:

All of Asia hangs in the balance. If the manpower and the natural resources of Asia fall into the orbit of international communism there will exist the greatest aggregation of power the world has ever known. With its Asiatic flank fully protected, the Soviet Union will be able to concentrate its strong far eastern armed forces with those it now has in Eastern Europe and greatly offset any new planned build-up in armed forces of the Western World. Therein rests the fallacy of those who would abandon Asia and concentrate on Europe alone.

Nine years ago this week we were caught with our defenses down at Pearl Harbor. A heavy blow which precipitated us into World War II came out of the Pacific, and the invasion by an Asiatic foe of some of the Alaskan Aleutian Islands took place soon after. This was done by a nation of 80,000,000 people. A billion and a half is the population of Asia, a large part of which today is either still outside the iron curtain or not yet fully digested.

During this same debate I urged that steps be taken to immediately help equip the more than 500,000 non-Communist forces of the Republic of China on Formosa. A start on this program is now apparently under way. I hope and pray that it will not be another case of too little and too late.

If the British and our other allies will recognize the global menace and help draw the line against communism in Asia, with India, if possible, but without that nation if necessary, it is my personal opinion that an area of agreement can be found in Congress and throughout the country that will give substantial support to the steps that must be taken to build the defenses of the free world against further Communist aggression.

The President of the United States is to be commended for the tone and content of his State of the Union message of Monday, January 8, 1951, relative to foreign policy. In it he invites constructive debate, and the spirit of the message should make it possible to find an area of agreement on our foreign and military policy so that this Nation will not be paralyzed in carrying out its commitments or in meeting new challenges which may unexpectedly confront us at almost any hour of any day.

Certainly it is vital that Europe not fall into the orbit of international communism. If Europe is lost to the free world, the strategic bases and materials of Africa would be difficult to hold. The bulk of the uranium for the American atomic development comes from Africa. We would be severely handicapped without it.

Yet our European allies and friends must fully realize that they have the primary responsibility and interest in keeping outside the Communist iron curtain. Our contributions in sea and air power will be much greater than theirs. With a larger population in the nations allied with us than we possess, the bulk of the land forces to garrison Western Europe and to discourage Communist aggression should be furnished by the European partners of the North Atlantic Treaty.

If war comes, we must then do with our air, sea, and land forces what the strategic necessities require in support of our commitments. We will not let our allies down nor must they let us down.

We cannot, however, expect them to build any army that would make Europe impregnable to Communist aggression before we place an additional man or dollar on the Continent. As an alternative I suggest as the approximate basis on which we should be willing to expand the forces we now have in Europe the following formula:

For every six divisions raised and put into the field by our North Atlantic allies we will send an additional division to Europe until we have a total of 10 divisions there and they have 60. As long as peace is maintained we would rotate our divisions so that none of them would be stuck with prolonged occupation duties which tend to soften or undermine the morale of the troops thus engaged.

In the meantime we should not delay in calling up and training within the confines of the United States the full number of divisions to meet our ultimate commitments in Europe for the continental security of the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and our occupation forces in Japan.

While our additional divisions are being equipped and are in training in this country we should continue, under the arms implementation legislation, to assist the North Atlantic signatories in equipping the divisions that they should forthwith call up and train.

In the meantime, every effort should be exerted by ourselves and our allies forthwith to bring Spain and Western Germany into the collective security system.

As a practical matter, defense must start at the line of the Elbe or as close thereto as the strategic situation will permit. In no other way could Western Germany be expected to make a full contribution to the common defense.

It is my belief that Winston Churchill has been correct in his view that the reason the Soviet armies have not yet overrun Europe is because of the American superiority in the atomic weapon. We must see to it that no effort is spared to maintain this superiority of the weapon in quality and quantity and the means of delivering it to the heartland of any aggressor. Nor will any outside agency exercise a veto over our use of this weapon when the chips are down.

Our friends as well as any potential aggressor should understand this fact. We are not going again to be subject to an aggressor's blackmail—direct or indirect.

The term "again" is used advisedly:

First. When the North Koreans invaded South Korea the United Nations called on all members to resist the aggression. A limited number offered military aid. One of the most generous offers came from the Republic of China which agreed to send 33,000 of their best troops from Formosa and have them in Korea in 5 days. This was turned down for fear it would incite the Chinese Communists to invade Korea.

Second. The hands of our commanders in Korea have been tied by restrictions against the use of our Air Force against military targets in Manchuria for fear the war might spread in the Far East.

Third. The desire of the Republic of China to raid the coast of China and supply non-Communist forces on the mainland has been restrained because it might make the Chinese Communists more difficult in their dealings with the United Nations appeasement committees.

The free people can lose their liberty if we are blackmailed into restricting our areas of strength and meeting them on unequal terms in their areas and elements of strength.

The critical period upon which we now enter will call for great sacrifice by the people of the United States and the other free people of the world. The men in the Kremlin should thoroughly understand that the free world does not intend to be on the defensive once they have thrown down the challenge.

We have, I hope, learned much in World War II and in the present Korean fighting on guerrilla tactics. We should be prepared to enlist men who

love freedom in Eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and in the Soviet Union itself, to strike behind the armies of the Soviet aggressor and in conjunction with our air power to make difficult the maintenance of his supply lines to supply his aggressive forces. If the Soviet Union is prepared to challenge the free world this year or next, it will be because of their determination to see to it that the free part is destroyed. Ninety years ago Abraham Lincoln pointed out that this Nation could not remain half slave and half free. In this twentieth century we may have reached the point where now the world cannot remain half slave and half free.

It was Lincoln who also said:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to elaborate a little with relation to the situation in Europe? I have not been present throughout his speech, but I understand that the Senator would favor sending over one of our divisions for every six of their divisions. If that be correct, does it mean that the Senator has no feelings about our taking the leadership, so to speak, by sending a man like General Eisenhower to Europe in order to stimulate the undertaking and to work it out; or does the Senator think that the leadership should be left primarily with the Europeans themselves?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I think the selection of General Eisenhower was a desirable one. It might have been better had there been some consultation with Congress before the selection was made and perhaps after some more basic understandings had been reached with respect to the proportion of troops to be furnished. However, that is all water over the dam. It cannot now be changed. I believe there were some valid reasons for the selection of General Eisenhower. Not only is he one of the great military leaders of the world, but he has had experience in working with allied groups during World War II. It is quite possible that had a national of any of the other North Atlantic Pact countries come into the picture certain stresses and strains might have developed which will not be developed under the leadership of General Eisenhower. I think he is an outstanding man. I believe he can contribute greatly to the solution of the problems which confront us. At the same time I think it is extremely important that our friends in Europe clearly recognize that the people and the Government of the United States have no intention, in view of the conditions which face us in Korea today, of getting into a situation again where in a collective security action we furnish 90 percent of the troops and they furnish 10 percent of the troops. I am not even in favor of furnishing 50 percent of the troops. I think that Europe, which has a large manpower, has the primary responsibility of furnishing the bulk of the land forces in Western Europe at this time. I think it should be understood that we would supply a large percentage of the air and naval forces. I do not go to the extent of saying that we should supply no land forces.

I believe the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was correct when he said that there is a certain moral effect involved. I believe it should be on a definite quid pro quo basis. In other words, there ought to be an incentive plan, if I may use the term. It should be understood that if we provide one division they will provide six divisions. Finally it should be understood that we are not going to place in Europe a number of divisions which could not be withdrawn, in case of an emergency situation, unless the European countries have demonstrated that they are willing to carry their full share of the load.

If I may elaborate briefly, I think the situation today requires Western Germany to be brought into the defense picture. I believe it requires Spain to be brought into the defense picture. If the countries of Europe do not know that they are facing the overwhelming force of the Soviet Union, and if they carry their bickerings to the extent of not permitting the Germans or the Spanish to come into the defense plan, I do not think they are taking a very realistic view of the situation which confronts the world today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator care to elaborate on his remarks about removing the shackles from Chiang Kai-shek, so to speak, in order that he could operate at least as a diverting force against the Chinese Communist armies?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to comment on that point. I was in Formosa a year ago, in November 1949 and I was there again last November. I talked to a great many competent observers, both American and others, and there is no question about the fact that the morale of the Chinese forces on Formosa and the morale of the Chinese people on Formosa have greatly increased in the intervening 12-month period. Because of the security situation I am not at liberty to go into specific figures, but I can say to the Senator from Ohio that there are more than 500,000 non-Communist troops of the Republic of China on Formosa. Of these troops I should say at least half are first-class troops. The others are in training, or in what might be called the militia, which would be helpful in the defense of the island, perhaps, but not effective as a commando force. The troops have very able leadership in General Sun Li-jen, who is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute. I am satisfied that the Chinese would be prepared and would be anxious, as a matter of fact, to have the restrictions of neutrality removed so that they could resume their commando raids on the coast of China. That is what they were doing prior to the 26th day of June.

In addition to creating a diversion, which I believe would cause the Chinese Communists to begin pulling troops out of Korea, rather than concentrating them there in order to try to throw us into the sea if they can, they would have to pull some of their best divisions out of Korea in order to protect their coast against the commando-type raids.

As important as the 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops are what I term the approximately 1,000,000 guerrillas, who are operating behind the lines of the Chinese Communists on the mainland of China. A coordinated effort on the part of the air force of the Republic of China and its navy—and perhaps with the aid of some additional equipment from us—could resupply with arms, ammunition, and food these guerrilla elements consisting of approximately 1,000,000 men. I think they could create so many disturbances behind the lines of the Chinese Communists that the Communists would not dare concentrate their best armies in Korea for the purpose of trying to throw our troops into the sea.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to conclude with my thought on this point. Here we have a situation in which over half a million Chinese Communist troops have crossed the international frontier of the Yalu River, have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and are trying to destroy the American Eighth Army and the UN forces in Korea. Yet we restrain the Republic of China from carrying on an operation which would relieve the pressure against our hard-pressed troops.

It is even worse than that. Under the United Nations directive our commanders over there are restrained from attacking military targets—and I am not talking about general-area bombing—in Manchuria, such as depots, ammunition dumps, arsenals, railroad marshaling yards, and troop-concentration points. Therefore the Chinese Communist aggressor has all the cards in his hand. He has a line of communication coming down from Manchuria by which he is sending literally hundreds of tanks into Korea for the purpose of destroying the American Eighth Army and the United Nations forces in Korea. Yet our commanders are restrained from even chasing an aggressive airplane north of the Yalu River. In other words, when our planes get to the Yalu River there is an off-limits sign before them. That simply does not make sense to me.

The third point is that for a period of more than a year, as the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], has so ably pointed out in his committee hearings, there has been a constant supplying by ship of the Communist aggressors in Red China from Hong Kong and from other places in the world—and I regretfully say from the United States as well, which has enabled them to build their war machine and to build the economy upon which their war machine rests. It simply does not make sense to me that

we should not free the navy of the Republic of China, which for a small navy was doing a very effective job of blockading before our neutrality policy was put into effect, and on top of it augmenting it with the American Navy, to see to it that not a single ship of any size or character would get in or out of a Communist port, whether it flew the American, British, or any other flag. I believe it is time that we stopped this trade in blood money in supplying the people who today are destroying American troops.

If we carried out that type of policy, I believe we would bring so many pressures upon the Communist regime in China that they could not devote all their time and energy to being aggressors in Korea.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was curious to know whether we have reasonably accurate information on the activities of the guerrillas within China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I think we have substantially accurate information on the activities of the guerrillas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Are they operating spontaneously, or are they operating under the direction of Chiang Kai-shek or someone representing him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have some material in my office which I think the Senator might be interested in reading, but I can say this, very briefly: The guerrillas are not all of one type.

First, there were certain guerrilla forces which the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China deliberately left on the mainland when they were forced to retreat from the continent.

Secondly, there are a large number of forces which were cut off in some of the battles, and went up into the mountains and developed support from local populations. They generally take their leadership from the island of Formosa, as does the first group.

In addition, there were certain other forces. When the opportunists, the band-wagon jumpers, and the traitors among some of the Chinese generals deserted to the Chinese Communist forces, they marched their armies over with them, without telling the soldiers where they were going. When the soldiers found out about it, they mutinied. The Communists themselves have admitted that they have had several serious mutinies. Those soldiers took to the hills. They generally look to the leadership in Formosa.

Furthermore, there are less well-organized bands of farmers oppressed by tax payments, and of students who have in the past welcomed communism and who now see how oppressive it is.

There are certain people who have never had close ties with Chiang Kai-shek and the Republic of China. I refer to some of the Mongols and some of the others who are in the far interior of China, who are more or less operating on their own. But all of them furnish a substantial body which could be used to create great disturbances behind Communist lines.

The Senator should know—though some claims are made to the contrary—that most of this guerrilla activity is south of the Yangtze River—certainly south of Manchuria—because in those areas where the Chinese Communists have had their power established the longest period of time they have gradually been able to eliminate most of the dissident elements; but they have not yet had time to digest their conquests in south China, and as a result we find the bulk of the incipient rebellion in that area of the country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether there is any authentic history of important accomplishments by those guerrillas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. As a matter of fact, today they hold considerable areas. A little earlier mention was made of islands of resistance. I think we violate no security at this point when we say that they have established islands of resistance behind the Communist lines in south and central China.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We have read a great deal in the newspapers to the effect that when the Communist army is finished with Korea—or perhaps does not finish with Korea—it is likely to move down into Indochina to help the Communists in Indochina and on down the peninsula. Does not the Senator feel that if Chiang Kai-shek were released, there would be a substantial barrier in the way of such future aggression?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Ohio has put his finger on a very vital point. So long as the Chinese Communist forces are kept involved with the forces of the Republic of China, guerrilla or regular forces, and while they have a considerable number of their people involved with the United States in Korea, they are not in a position to concentrate their whole force for an invasion of southeast Asia. But once they liquidate all of Korea, and once they have had an opportunity to move the very well-trained and well-disciplined Communist forces, particularly the Fourth Army under General Lin-piao, out of Korea and leave to the North Korean Communists the job of liquidating all non-Communists in Korea, which will be the inevitable result if they get control of the whole peninsula, they will move those highly trained, disciplined Chinese forces down to guard their coast line, and we may even miss the opportunity of creating a diversion. The Chinese Nationalist forces, together with their guerrillas, cannot only help us by diverting the concentration of power against us in Korea, but in addition they can prevent the concentration of power against southeast Asia.

We are faced with a very practical problem. If we continue to restrain the forces of the Republic of China, we are going to miss the boat entirely. It is going to be another case of too little and too late. Perhaps the next 90 days will be the most crucial days in terms of ability to accomplish anything in that area. Once we permit the Chinese Communists, without any interference from the non-Communist Chinese on Formosa and within the country, to go down and take all of southeast Asia, they will take the bread basket of Asia—I should say the rice basket of Asia. Food is a powerful weapon. The Chinese Communists, being ruthless, as Communists are all over the world, will use the weapon of food, along with their military power, to subjugate the rest of Asia.

They have already started through Tibet. If they get Tibet and southeast Asia, it is my personal opinion—no one can document it as yet—that the people of India, who have been obstructing action by the United Nations in declaring Red China an aggressor, and who have offered not a single soldier, airplane, or ship in defense of the free world and in defense of the Republic of Korea against aggressors, will be looking to the rest of the world for some help against the aggression which will inevitably be leveled against them. I think it may be very difficult to encourage and instill with enthusiasm the free people of the world to come to the aid of India at that late date, when the people of India have obstructed, by every means at their disposal, the resistance by the free people of the world to the Communist aggression.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I can see why we did not accept Chinese Nationalist aid so long as we were fighting the North Koreans. I can see why it was not wise to incite the Chinese Communists into war with us. But now that we are in such a war, now that they are killing American boys, now that they are threatening the security of the entire Eighth Army, I cannot understand the foreign policy or the military policy which refuses to loose Chiang Kai-shek from the restraints which we alone have imposed on him, in order to enable him to join the war against the Chinese Communists.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not understand it either.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "United States Policy: To Bar Red China in UN and Hold Out In Korea," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICY: TO BAR RED CHINA IN UNITED NATIONS AND HOLD OUT IN KOREA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—The United States Government has determined definitely that admission of Red China to the United Nations is not only out of the question so far as American approval is concerned, but that such action would be to reward aggression.

This basic policy is buttressed also by a determination not to withdraw our troops from Korea, but to fight it out there as long as the UN forces are capable of resistance.

What this means is that the United States considers the Far East to be a definite battleground not only for the prestige of the UN, but also for the future morale of all the non-

Communist elements within China, Japan, and the Philippines.

To withdraw voluntarily from Korea is regarded by the American Government as virtually tantamount to abandoning the security of Japan and as an invitation to an attack on Japan and perhaps on Alaska.

MAC ARTHUR'S ATTITUDE

The pros and cons of staying in Korea or withdrawing have been debated here for a long time. The decision is to stay and to inflict as much punishment as possible on the Communist forces. Rumors that General MacArthur wanted to withdraw not only are without foundation, but his attitude is the exact opposite—he wants more troops to assist in holding Korea.

If the Chinese Communists are to be checkmated by any force, it will be by counter-revolutionaries who are expected to be welded together, not necessarily under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek or his lieutenants. The American program is to fight it out in Korea and to afford time for the non-Communist forces in Asia to consolidate.

The intimations from London that the ministers of the British Commonwealth are actually considering a program which would recommend recognition of Communist China and admission to the United Nations produced the comment here that this can hardly be a unanimous attitude and that the viewpoint of countries like India has been well known for some time.

DANGER TO UN

While it is too extreme a statement to say that the UN will die if the dissension within its councils continues on such a matter as admitting Red China, the fact is that the prestige of the international organization will fade away and attention will then have to be focused on the attitude of individual member governments and groups.

The United States at the moment is engaged in a canvass of all free nations to obtain their approval for the branding of Communist China as an aggressor. The exchanges are secret now, but some day they will be published. The American people then will have an opportunity to judge for themselves which countries stood up and were willing to brand the aggressor and which countries flirted with the idea of appeasing the enemy. The list may determine America's attitude toward such nations for generations to come.

It can be stated positively that the United States Government has for some time now been in touch, directly and indirectly, with the Communist authorities and has come to the conclusion that there is no sincerity of purpose in Peking and that to concede anything now would only whet the appetite of the Red Chinese leaders for more concessions.

RESPONSIBILITY OF UNITED STATES

The truth is the policy of the United States is growing firmer every day even as the policy of some other governments is growing weaker. The United States recognizes that it must bear the largest responsibility for what is happening in the Pacific because it cannot permit encroachments which, if unchecked at the start, could lead perhaps to the seizure of Alaska. European nations need have no fear that America considers the Far East a primary theater. The Far East will remain a secondary area and Europe will always be the first consideration. American naval and air forces, however, will operate in the Pacific and a land force big enough to carry on a holding operation there will be continued. The European countries are expected to furnish the bulk of the land forces for the European front, supplemented by American land forces.

American policy is clear and thoroughly understood by those who must express it to other governments. The time is not yet ripe for a public avowal of the American viewpoints. This waits on the evolution of the military situation in Korea and the responses to our note to member governments seeking support for the UN move to brand Red China as the aggressor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator, or how does the administration, or how does anyone else figure that we can win against the Chinese Communists if we are to be able to fight them only in Southern Korea? How can we ever possibly defeat them? If we are to be confined to an area about 100 miles square, how are we ever going to defeat them? What is the plan for winning the so-called Korean War?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I cannot go into a detailed discussion of the strategy which may have been revealed to the committee. However, I think the principal situation with which we are now faced is that we must recognize that neither we nor the rest of the free world have the defensive forces properly to meet the challenge of the Soviet world. The responsibility for that condition rests on many people, including the Executive, the Congress, and the general public. The administration must take a large share of the responsibility, because aggression was not something which came up overnight. We were put on notice, as long ago as the time when the President came to a joint session of Congress and requested the Greek-Turkish aid program, that international communism was seeking soft spots. At the time of the Berlin blockade it was indicated that they were testing us out to see whether they could seize a free area without too much resistance.

The President of the United States had ample warning from his Air Policy Board that with the critical situation in the world, with the possibility of our opponents developing an atomic stockpile, the minimum number of airplanes we should have was 70 groups. Yet what happened? The President insisted that only 48 groups be provided. Even when the Congress of the United States in 1949 provided for 52 groups the President refused to use the funds, and kept the force at 48 groups. So I will say to the Senator that it may be a holding operation in Korea and in other areas of the world until we can start operating from strength rather than from weakness.

Mr. CAPEHART. Holding against whom? We have an army there in a small area, with no possible chance of that army winning so long as they are confined to fight within a 100-mile area. Why do we permit American boys to remain there and fight and be killed when there is no possibility of their winning?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not authorized to speak, nor could I speak, for the administration, but I would say that some other factors are involved in this situation which fit into the holding idea I have just mentioned to the Senate. In the first place, the Republic of Korea was created under the auspices of the United Nations. We have a considerable responsibility for the maintenance of the Republic of Korea because we consented to the division of the country at the thirty-eighth parallel. That was an unnatural division. Two-thirds of the people lived in the free part of Korea and one-third lived in the Communist part of Korea.

The United Nations held in Korea a full and free election. It was testified to be such by the UN Commissioners. As a result, if at this point the United States and the United Nations should pull out of Korea, not only would there be the greatest blood bath in that area the world has ever seen, and sacrifice of the non-Communist believers in democracy who are in Korea to a ruthless extermination by the Communists, but it would have a tremendous psychological impact upon the people of Japan, upon the people of Formosa, upon the people of the Philippines, of India, and, I believe, upon the people all around that periphery, because they would say that "if when pressure comes the United States and the United Nations runs out and abandons us and leaves us to the tender mercies of the Communists, we had better make our deal with the Kremlin now." I do not think that the free world should get the reputation of running out on their friends while the Communist world gets the reputation of standing by theirs, as Stalin has stood by Mao Tse Tung and as Mao Tse Tung has stood by the Korean Communists.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's argument does not ring well with me, because it is the free world, England and the United Nations, which is denying our Army or the United Nations army its right to flank the Communist army and to bomb China and to battle. The Senator suggests that the United Nations are saying that our boys should remain in Korea and be killed like sitting ducks for God knows how long, waiting for somebody to do what? To make up their minds that we are going to bomb China. To make up their minds that we are going to send Chiang Kai-shek into battle? To make up their minds that we are going to do what? How long are we going to let our American boys stay there and be killed? Shall it be 10 more days, 10 months, or 10 years? Everyone knows that an army cannot possibly win if it is forced to fight 300,000,000 Chinese in an area of 100 square miles, and when it cannot move up to attack beyond that limited area.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Indiana that he is no more critical about this policy which has tied our hands than I have been.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have spoken frequently on the subject. When I came back from Korea I spoke on the subject. I talked with some of our pilots there. They told me that they saw Communist planes rise up from the airfields north of the Yalu River, fire on them, and that when our planes went out to chase them, they returned to the sanctuary behind the Yalu, and our men were not permitted to chase them there. The Senator does not have to sell me on the importance of doing something affirmative.

But I say that, even if in the borders of other members of the United Nations there are a number of people who want a far eastern Munich—and I think there are a number of them in the United Nations today who are trying to work out a far eastern Munich—I believe that that would be a futile policy. I think that it would lead to a billion and a quarter people of Asia coming into the Communist orbit, and if a billion and a quarter people come into the Communist orbit, I believe the chances of even restraining communism in Western Europe are almost nil. In my opinion, we have waited 2½ months too long to declare Communist China an aggressor. I think that should be done with or without the United Nations.

I have never favored sending a United Nations land army into Manchuria or into China. I have never favored sending an American Army into Manchuria or into China. I think that would be a futile policy. It would be the same mistake that Napoleon made in Russia, and that others have made in invasions of Russia. I would not operate in an area of terrain in which the enemy is superior to us by 10 to 1. I would operate in areas where we are superior to them by many times that number to one. I would exercise the use of a naval blockade. We have the greatest Navy in the world today and we can bring more of our ships out of "mothballs." We can put a tight blockade on the coast of China. I would operate with air power to strike at the military targets that are in Manchuria, and serve notice on the Chinese Communists that so long as they have a single soldier as an invader and aggressor in Korea, we will continue to bomb these military targets. I think if we use a little intestinal fortitude rather than yielding to blackmail, we will be less likely to be pushed off the globe.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am fully aware that the Senator has taken the same position that I have taken and that many others have taken. I was not questioning him on the ground that he was not taking that position. I am fully aware of the fact that the Senator's answer to me was the answer that others gave to the Senator. But the fact still remains that there is not a living military man who will say that we can win against the Chinese if we are going to be forced to fight within a 100-square-mile area in southern Korea. It cannot be done. It never will be done. Yet the United Nations is denying, and our own Government is denying our military men the right to protect their own lives.

Delegates to the United Nations sit in New York, in a new building, in plush seats, trying to make up their minds as to whether we will be permitted to go into China and defend our Army in Korea. It is ridiculous, it is silly. It is a blight on the intelligence of the United States Government and the United Nations. They ought to make up their minds. I say we ought to get our Army out of Korea or we ought to be given permission to go into China proper and fight the enemy with every weapon we have at our command. If we do not do it pretty soon, I cannot see how we are going to keep faith with the American boys who are giving their lives in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that I do not believe we can fight a big war or a little war—sometimes called a police action—with one or both hands tied behind our backs. I think that is precisely what we are asking our commanders to do in that area of the world.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course it is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have talked with innumerable GI's in Korea, junior officers as well as senior officers, airmen, Navy men, and land forces, and I do not think that what is happening makes sense to them any more than it does to the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from California.

Mr. CAPEHART. Within the last 48 hours the British Foreign Minister said that his country would not stand for any interference by the Chinese Communists, at the very time when the Chinese Communist Army was killing American boys and possibly British boys, because the British boys are fighting now in South Korea. What sort of statesmanship encourages that? Is it any wonder that many of us have no confidence in the leadership of the United States, the leadership of our own Government, and the leadership of the British Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Although I cannot say that I had the same opportunity of discussing matters with the British Commonwealth contingent which is in Korea that I had in discussions with American soldiers there, yet knowing something of the British soldier, and having seen in World War II the fine soldier that he is, I have no doubt in my own mind that if a Gallup poll were conducted among the British soldiers now in Korea, we would find that they would take, as the Senator has said, the same dim view of the collaborating activities that many of us have taken in connection with the activities of the members of the United Nations, since it was organized in my State of California, in the city of San Francisco.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming that the Nationalist Chinese were permitted to leave Formosa and to go on to the mainland of China, what would necessarily have to be our contribution to that effort in the way of munitions, supplies, and transport; and after they got into the mainland of China what would be our further obligations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that they need additional supplies. Again I would question the wisdom of stating on the floor of the Senate exactly what I think would be needed in that connection, because they threw open to me complete information about their training schools, shipping, and other matters, and I cannot betray that confidence. I can say to the Senator from Colorado that they need certain items to supply their forces. In my judgment—and, in addition, I have talked about this matter with some responsible Americans—the things the Nationalist Chinese need are not, for the most part, competitive with the equipment the western European armies most urgently need. I do not think that by giving the limited amount of equipment which is needed in Formosa we would in any sense be jeopardizing the arms-implementation program in Europe, because the types of equipment needed by the Nationalist Chinese are more in the nature, let us say, of small arms and ammunition, perhaps some amphibious craft, and items of that kind, which I do not think constitute the main requirements in connection with the arms-implementation program in Europe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would that help have to come from us?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How about transports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we have a considerable surplus of landing craft which we could make available to them. They have the navy which could operate them. They would need some airplanes. I shall not detail the types now; but I would say it is no secret, and I betray no confidence when I say it, that today the Chinese Nationalist forces have far more competent pilots than they have planes to be flown. With some help—as we are giving help to Indochina and to Europe—I think they would get along very well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. After the Nationalist Chinese landed on the mainland, what would be our further commitment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Probably that would depend considerably upon the nature of their operations. I would not feel qualified to answer the question in detail, because I have always felt that such aid should not be given unless we had there a man who would serve in the way that General Van Fleet served in Greece. Time after time I have offered the suggestion that a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer, who thoroughly knows the country and knows what is feasible and what is not feasible, should be sent there. I would not think that at the beginning, at least, they would be likely to do more than make commando-type raids on the coast of China, and perhaps regain some of the southernmost provinces of that country, so as to drive a wedge between the Ho Chi-minh forces operating in Indochina and the forces of Mao Tse-tung, operating in China. If a wedge could be driven between them, that would certainly greatly improve the situation in southeastern Asia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would there be any moral commitment on our part to support such Nationalist Chinese forces, once they got there, with American troops or American-manned airplanes or other equipment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Nationalist forces do not need American manpower. All their officials with whom I have talked—and I have talked with practically all of them—state that they do not need American manpower. They do need equipment.

In the second place, I do not think it would be nesessary for American Air Force pilots to operate in the civil war which would be involved on the mainland of China, although I believe there would be a need for military pilots to strike at targets in Manchuria. However, I would say we would not use our Air Force as an air force in support of the Nationalist Chinese armies in southern China.

On the other hand, I would say there are a large number of Americans and British and men of other nationalities—I have talked with a great many of them personally—who, in my judgment, would be glad to volunteer, as in the case of General Chennault, who had his Flying Tigers over there prior to our becoming involved with the Japanese—men who would be glad to strike a blow for freedom in that area of the world, and men who have had air experience. However, that would not be the United States Air Force per se.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt that once we embarked, on our part, upon the steps the Senator has advocated, we would be morally obligated then to underwrite the venture?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator that is a difficult question to answer. I do not think we would be morally bound to underwrite the venture. However, I would say that with the unsettled condition of the world, where the Communists are poised perhaps to take over Western Europe, in the over-all world strategy it is extremely important that communism not be able to concentrate all its power for the purpose of overwhelming Europe. I think they will not be likely to concentrate that power so long as they have a far eastern flank which is exposed; and I should like to keep that flank exposed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not arguing the wisdom of such a course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Neither am I arguing as to what should be the strategy. I am trying to ascertain where we would come out, once we embarked upon such a course. In that event, what would we have to do? What would be our obligations, particularly our moral obligations and commitments, once such a step were taken? Must we follow it up, in good honor, with our military forces, to salvage it if it runs into disaster?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think not. However, in the world situation existing today, I think we should be free to exercise our own strategic judgment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is what I wanted to get at. Would we be completely free at all times to exercise our own choice as to going in or staying out?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we would be. I would make it very clear that it would be on that basis that the aid would be given.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have been very much interested in the Senator's remarks. I happen to agree with him in regard to many of the positions he takes in relation to the Orient. I should like to ask him about the specific situation in Korea, and I should like to obtain his views on that subject, if he cares to express them at this time.

I wonder whether the Senator agrees that, regardless of how it is done, the question of Formosa is going to have to be resolved within a comparatively short time. In other words, it seems that as soon as the Korean situation has been settled, the Chinese Reds will then inevitably point one of their next actions toward the reduction of the Island of Formosa. So, getting down to reality, whether Chiang Kai-shek or the Chinese Nationalists move, or whether they merely remain passive in Formosa, the question of Formosa and of an assault upon it in conflict with Nationalist China, will arise almost inevitably in the future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator, whether they remain passive or whether they move, that in the not-too-distant future the Formosa situation is going to be clearly before us. Of course, no one has a crystal ball enabling him to know what the next move of the Chinese Communists will be, if they should be able to liquidate the Korean situation. I think they will move in one of two places; they will either move on southeast Asia or on Formosa. I think from their point of view it is an easier move for them to make against southeast Asia, because there they can transport their land armies with no salt-water barrier. There are 100 miles of salt-water between the Island of Formosa and the mainland of China, and to surmount that obstacle represents quite an undertaking for a nation which is not a naval power; and Red China is not a naval power. Therefore, while I think it is entirely possible that the order of priority may be altered slightly until they can take over Indochina and the rest of southeast Asia, I think that ultimately and in the not-too-distant future they will try to take Formosa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I call to the attention of the Senator the fact of which he is well aware, I am sure, that there is more than one method of crossing 100 miles of salt water, and that ships alone do not constitute the only method.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I saw in the press today, as I recall the rather significant statement, that 40 airborne Communist groups of Communist Russia are poised at various points in Manchuria and in southern Siberia, if not clear down in China proper at various places. I suggest that modern warfare has devised the air-transport assault, which, if in sufficient size and sufficiently manned, may eliminate the necessity of ships to go across the water in the original phases of the assault.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the Senator from Iowa, and I was making my statement based on the premise that the Soviet Union, as the Soviet Union, did not itself want to become involved in an assault on the island. I think that in due time they may have sufficient Chinese pilots and planes and soldiers equipped for an airborne operation, so that they could move by air. Of course, if the Soviet Union comes in and supplies their navy and their air force and their troops to help in the assault, there is no question that the problem of the Formosans and of the Chinese Republic in defending their island will become greatly complicated.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield once more, I want to say that among other statements of the Senator's and other positions he has taken, with which I agree, the incomprehensible position which the State Department of this country has taken in forbidding our American troops, fighting in Korea, to use air power in a strategic way, by going into the enemy country and cutting off his source of supply, happens to be one of the premises of the Senator from California with which I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit, I should like to ask him at that point whether he does not agree with me that the policy which has been followed by the United Nations and the Government of the United States, in tying the hands of the commanders so that they could not properly use strategic air power, has not only had an adverse repercussion on the fighting in Korea, but has also tended to destroy the confidence of Europeans in the ability of American air power to defend them against aggression from Russia; so that it has had a chain-reaction effect which is unfair to air power? I am not one of those who believe that it is possible to win a war with air power alone. I think it is necessary to have balanced forces. But I also believe that in the very nature of things, Europeans are counting, and have the right to count, and in my judgment still should count on American air power and the job it is able to do; but tying the hands of the air power in Korea has tended to undermine confidence in that arm of American power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from California that the vacillation and refusal of nations of power and authority in the world, who hope to be free, together with their refusal realistically and honestly to approach and admit the facts of aggression, have shaken the United Nations more than any other action since its creation. I think time is running out. I think time is running out on the question of creating a diversion south of the Yangtse River by aiding the Chinese Nationalists. I join the Senator in saying that no American troops should be sent there, but I think time is running out.

The great fear I have in my mind is that it has been personalities in the administrative and diplomatic control of this situation within our own country which have led us down this road, rather than any shortcomings in military judgment or military planning, which otherwise might have brought us closer to victory.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, there has been more interest in saving face than in saving freedom.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think diplomacy has stepped into a field of action

wherein the military judgment and military authority should have been preeminent. I hope that this country will change the policies of its leadership before we are brought completely to the precipice of disaster internationally.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was listening last night to a report to the people of Canada from the United Nations, over one of the Canadian broadcasting stations, in the course of which the commentator stated that, while Canada would, of course, go along with the United States in its proposal to declare the Chinese Reds aggressors in Korea, Canada would not go along very enthusiastically, and that the reception given the American proposal by the other countries varied all the way from lukewarm to ice cold. It becomes apparent that we do not have in the United Nations the strength to declare the Chinese Reds aggressors in North Korea, and that, so long as we continue to fight in North Korea, we shall have to fight, as the Senator from California said, with one hand tied behind our back.

What solution does the Senator from California have for extricating ourselves from the unhappy situation into which we have been precipitated through United Nations action? It was, indeed, action of which I think most of the American people approved at the time it was taken. The United Nations could not wait until daylight to declare the North Koreans aggressors; but, when Chinese Reds do the same thing, it is impossible to get a vote to declare them aggressors. How would the Senator from California extricate our troops from the position they are in? Should we merely get out of Korea, and stay out, and say we are not going to embark on any more United Nations ventures; or what should we do?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator from Vermont that, in the first place, I think this country should take a very strong stand, as I believe we are now doing. I would say to the Senator, if he will let me complete the answer to his question, I would take a very strong stand in pointing out to the other members of the United Nations the grave danger which faces them when they themselves may, sooner than they think, have to rely on that organization for collective security in the event of Soviet aggression.

I commend the State Department and the Government of the United States for forcefully, within recent times, bringing home to the other members of the United Nations the fact that the chips are now down. If the United Nations is not prepared to assume its place of moral leadership in stopping aggression now, the whole United Nations organization may be destroyed. That is No. 1.

Then, in my judgment, we should very realistically talk to our British friends and point out to them that the position they are taking today is a dog-in-the-manger position, because they have no intention of abandoning Hong Kong or Malaya or the other areas in which they have an interest, and they are getting themselves into a very untenable position if they think that by throwing Korea and Formosa to the wolves they can arouse world public opinion 6 months from now to stand with them at Hong Kong and Malaya. I would spell it out in language which a 10-year-old child could understand. I think they are under some misconception even yet on that subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Many persons fail to see by what right England endeavors to hold Hong Kong at this time. But assuming that any United Nations act fails, then I understand the Senator from California to say that he would act unilaterally from then on, so far as the Asiatic problem is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Vermont that, of course, I think we have to depend on our responsible commanders. General MacArthur is over there, and we have an able Eighth Army commander. I do not know whether from hour to hour and from day to day it may be their judgment that it involves too great a sacrifice on our part to hold some area in Korea which might prevent a large population of non-Communists being sacrificed to Communist liquidation. It may not be possible to hold it, or it may be possible to do so. If it can be held in conjunction with our naval power and our air power, without putting additional forces into Korea, there are some reasons for doing that. But that is a strategic decision which will have to be determined.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator probably refers to the Pusan beachhead.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That might be as large a beachhead as could strategically be held or it might be larger or smaller.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be held by United Nations forces.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. The British, as I understand, have committed themselves to stay in Korea with us, and I think the other forces of the United Nations, small as they are, are also committed to do that.

The second thing is that I think the time is rapidly coming when we cannot afford to take further casualties in Korea, by reason of the fact that the Chinese are resupplying, reenforcing, and bringing down tanks, guns, and planes from Manchuria to attack our forces. The time is rapidly coming, and I think it is long past due, when we cannot await the palaverings of the United Nations in determining whether China is an aggressor in Korea. She obviously is an aggressor, and in that case I think we should strike unilaterally at the military target in Manchuria from which the supplies are coming.

The next thing, in answer to the Senator's question, is that I have talked with many persons, and I do not know of a single American military, naval, or air commander in the Far East or elsewhere who does not believe that the loss of Formosa into unfriendly hands will jeopardize the entire defense position in the Far East and drive a wedge in the defense line which runs from Japan to Okinawa to the Philippines. They do not advocate that we even ask bases on it, because we have bases elsewhere. The loss of Formosa would ultimately lead to the fall of Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. If that happens, we shall have to move back to the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California. I do not believe the American people want their defenses moved back to that area in the present unsettled world condition.

So I say, in specific answer to the Senator, that, regardless of what happens in Korea, I think we must make every effort to hold Japan, to permit Japan to rearm so she can help to defend herself and not be a sitting duck for Communist aggression, because, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, if the Communists get the 80,000,000 people of Japan and the industrial resources of Japan, it is only second to getting the Ruhr, so far as the war-making potential is concerned.

In order to be sure that we hold Japan and Okinawa, I think it is necessary that our friends hold the island of Formosa. Unless the island of Formosa is held by our friends there is doubt the Philippines can be held. The Philippine Republic and Australia are the southernmost anchors of our defense line. So I think we must take a stand, and take whatever risks are involved in doing so.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is entirely correct in his position on the military importance of Formosa. It might also apply to the maintenance of a beachhead in South Korea. I think he is also correct in saying that the time is running out when action can be taken by the United Nations, if it has not already run out. But what I was hoping to have some Senator indicate is what we shall do if the United Nations continues to debate, as it has, week after week, playing directly into the hands of the opposition by its delaying tactics.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought I had answered the Senator's question. I certainly did not mean to evade or avoid it.

Mr. AIKEN. How can we force action? How much time do we have before we should do something?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I said that I thought we should notify the United Nations we would wait only two more days and give the Chinese Communist regime 48 hours to start reversing their movement and getting out of Korea. We should notify them that if they did not do that, we would untie the hands of our commanders, that we would permit strategic bombing of military concentrations in Manchuria, that we would blockade the China coast, and not permit anything to get in or out that could be of possible military value, that we would free the hands of the Republic of China and encourage the activities of the guerrillas. I thought that 48 hours should have been given a month ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator see any future for the United Nations as an agency to maintain peace in the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I referred to that in my remarks earlier.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not in the Chamber at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator that the United Nations had the overwhelming support of the people of

the United States and of the free world when, because they recognized that unless aggression were stopped in its tracks, there was no limit, and no way of telling where it would finally end, they took action 2 days after the 24th of June.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to North Korea?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In regard to North Korea. Two and a half months have passed since the Chinese Communists invaded Korea against the resolutions of the United Nations, and the United Nations are still filibustering and debating and palavering over whether or not this is aggression.

As I pointed out in my speech, more in sorrow than in anger, because I have supported the United Nations, I believe that if they follow this policy of appeasement, the United Nations will be destroyed, it will lose the moral leadership which it had an opportunity to exercise, and will become merely an organization with a large payroll of bureaucrats, the United States paying roughly 40 percent of the funds. I do not believe the people of the United States or the people of the free world will have any interest in supporting that type of bureaucracy, which could not rise to either military leadership in an hour of crisis, or rise to the moral leadership of the world, which the people had a right to expect. If they do not do what was expected, they are not entitled to the support of free men anywhere.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that the fear of the loss of commerce and trade is influencing some of the members of the United Nations to be very reluctant to declare Communist China an aggressor, or is it military fear?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; to be fair, I think it is both. I think it is fear of the loss of trade by Hong Kong, Malaya, and Singapore, and fear that perhaps it might encourage the Chinese Communists to start moving in their direction. However, I point out to them again that if they destroy the concept that aggression by large aggressors is just as much aggression as aggression by small aggressors, and that if they subscribe to the doctrine of might makes right, it is as certain that their days are numbered as it is certain that we stand on the floor of the Senate. They may shed all the crocodile tears at that late hour they want to shed, but I predict it will be difficult to erase the moral indignation of the world if they sacrifice to communism today Korea and Formosa, and then expect the world to rally to the support of Hong Kong, Malaya, and the rest of southeast Asia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I was very much interested in the distinguished Senator's comments today. Is the Senator from California aware of Mr. Bevin's announcement yesterday that the basis upon which they would discuss peace would be that of withdrawing from Korea, recognition of Communist China, and throwing the question of the control of Formosa into the United Nations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not only recognition of Communist China, but the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. I am familiar with the press dispatches.

Mr. MALONE. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this evening's Washington Star there appears a dispatch headed "Further delay faces the UN in settlement of Korea question."

It states:

> The General Assembly's 60-nation political committee was scheduled to meet at 3 p. m., but informed quarters said it probably would adjourn until next week because no one had any formal proposals to make.

Is the Senator familiar with the continued delay?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had not been familiar with the press dispatch to which the Senator has referred, because I have not had an opportunity to read the evening newspapers or the ticker reports. However, I would say that there is no opportunity on the part of the Americans, the British, the French, and the Turks who are fighting in Korea today to adjourn until next week. I think it is outrageous that when men are dying day by day in Korea in the defense of the free world, the United Nations Organization, which pretends to represent the conscience of mankind, should adjourn from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, while we suffer over 42,000 casualties. I say that it is time for the President of the United States to say to the United Nations, "There comes a time when you must cease talking and begin acting. If you are not going to do it, I shall go before a joint session of the Congress of the United States and ask Congress to withdraw our membership from the United Nations." [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from California has been on the floor for a long time, and probably is not familiar with the fact that the news ticker announces that within the hour the State Department has informed the British Ambassador that their idea of having a holding situation in North Korea was to give them time to make up their minds. Apparently men are to be sacrificed on that basis.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I commend strongly and almost in its entirety the excellent address and the splendid analysis of the whole foreign situation which has been made by the Senator from California. I should like to refer to three points, and then to ask a question of the Senator, if I may. I believe the Senator took high moral ground, and he took a position which will call to the attention of the people of this Nation in a way which has not been heretofore called to their attention, the fact that the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea would bring on a blood bath of unprecedented proportions, and would mean the abandonment and cruel crucifixion of tens of thousands of South Koreans, and of North Korean refugees, too, whose sole offense has been to prefer democracy to communism. I think that this is high ground, and I think it will prove to have been taken to the very great enlightenment of the people of this Nation, in vividly calling to their attention the fact that there is a tremendous moral issue involved in this question which is now causing such deep concern to all of us.

The second point on which the Senator commented at several places in his very fine address, and to which I want to state my strong approval, is the clear word of caution which the Senator uttered, not once but several times, to the Government of India and the governments of other friendly countries in southeast Asia, but particularly India, to the effect that their oft-repeated intervention in sympathy with Communist China may well leave them friendless, alone, and helpless when the time comes for Communist aggression to extend itself against them, as it surely will, in the sequence of Communist plans. I believe this is a point that has long deserved to be clearly made on the floor of the Senate, and I commend the Senator for making it, as a true friend of those concerned.

I believe the third point overshadows the two points which I have just mentioned, and that is the one which was adverted to in the Senator's recent colloquy with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. This point was mentioned several times by the Senator from California. The point is that it is quite apparent that a Munich of unparalleled proportions is being suggested and supported and advocated by those nations who as members of the United Nations are now unwilling or reluctant, and heretofore they have completely refused, to take action indicating a fact which is known to all the world, namely, that Communist China is an aggressor; and these nations are going a great deal further in suggesting and now insisting that Communist China be admitted to membership in the United Nations, as one of the great powers with veto power, which would present the spectacle of a new member, coming in on a plane equal in influence and authority to that of the United States of America, with hands red with the blood of American men, and assuming to sit down in that condition to participate in a solemn conclave which is devoted to the cause of peace and to the negotiation of world-wide peace and harmony. Such a Munich and such appeasement would, it seems to me, be so completely unforgivable by the conscience of mankind throughout the world that it would inescapably lead to the early dissolution and to the untimely death of the United Nations, the greatest effort which mankind has made up to now in its devoted search for peace. I hope that no such result will be accomplished.

The question I wanted to address to the Senator from California was for the

RECORD. My own mail, going up into hundreds of letters, has indicated to me that the people of my State, as well as of other States who have written to me, clearly recognize the fact which I have last mentioned, and which was so much more ably mentioned by the Senator from California; namely, that such utter appeasement on such a grand scale would constitute an unparalleled Munich and would inescapably mean the death of the United Nations and the defeat of what that great organization stands for. My question is: Has the mail of the Senator from California, coming to him from the people of his great State—and I am sure that it comes from an even much greater and wider area in the United States—also indicated to him that the conscience of the American people, as reflected in hundreds and thousands of letters, has already reached the point that the American people have concluded, as expressed in their very solemn and dignified written expressions—and that they have unalterably concluded that such a Munich, such appeasement, and such refusal to brand red-handed aggression as such, and the proposed admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations, would in their judgment forever deprive the United Nations, so long as such philosophy prevailed, of the approval of the conscience of the American people? Has the Senator's correspondence, great as it is, indicated that that conclusion has been reached by hundreds and thousands of our best people throughout the Nation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida, specifically in answer to his question, that my mail, in great quantities, has indicated the point which the Senator has raised.

I should like to make this observation: There are some of our colleagues, some of our editors, and some in the executive branch of the Government of the United States who wonder why it is that at this critical hour there is so much confusion among the American people on this very basic issue. I venture the opinion that one reason for the confusion has been that the American people have had held up to them, and have themselves held up, the United Nations as an ideal, as an organization which would morally stand strong when aggression threatened in any sector of the world. They have been disillusioned by the fact that the United Nations has failed in its leadership of the free people at this critical hour in our history. They have been so disillusioned in the thing to which they had tied their hopes, the thing in which they had expressed a great hope for saving the world from aggression, that it was like casting a ship loose from its moorings during rough weather.

As a result, when they see 2½ months of aggression on the part of Communist China, and the United Nations does not have the intestinal fortitude to say that it is aggression, how can we expect them to tie to such an organization? It is like telling them, as Mr. Malik does in the United Nations, that black is white or white is black. It is a topsy-turvy world. I believe that one of the reasons we are forced to have this great debate today is that the United Nations itself has contributed to undercutting the faith of the people in the moral leadership of that organization.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I think the Senator has made a great contribution to this historic debate. I think it was necessary that somewhere in the course of this debate it be stated, as it has now been stated, that thousands and thousands of our best American citizens have reached the conclusion that this bald, inexplicable, unforgivable, shameless effort at appeasement, which is so clearly in progress, is recognized as such by them, and that if persisted in it will necessarily destroy the United Nations. I think that out of this record, those who can read and who are working for such an appeasement will understand that, detested as is the memory of a man named Chamberlain, with his umbrella, who once practiced appeasement, and whose name is connected with the original Munich, yet the thing which they propose, and the thing which they insist upon, defrauding of any chance of successful completion the prayers and devout efforts of all peace-loving humanity, would leave them in a position so far overshadowing Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella that his memory would scarcely persist on the pages of history, so much greater, so much more enormous, so much more miserable, is the deliberate act which they have proposed, and to which apparently they are giving their every effort.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the Senator has been a strong advocate of American assistance to the end of helping the Chinese Nationalist troops to the mainland, where they would be supplied with the means to at least divert the Red China armies.

I will not say that there has been opposition to that plan, but skepticism has been raised in the minds of many people, for three reasons.

First, they feel that if we assisted the Chinese Nationalists to land on China, there would then be at least a moral commitment to assist them with the Air Force and eventually with troops. That has been one deterrent, and the Senator has expressed his opinion on that subject this afternoon.

However, there are two other reasons why so many American people are reluctant to go along with this proposal. The first is that they fear that the means and the money put into such a venture on the part of the United States might not be spent for the purpose for which it was intended, but would be dissipated in one way or another. They believe that some of the contributions of the past have been dissipated, and that in the future such contributions might not be properly used.

The third reason is fear that the Nationalist Army of three or four hundred thousand men, once landed in China, would be ineffective in coping with the Red troops, which are supposed to number something like 4,000,000, I believe, at the present time. Will the Senator briefly express his opinion on the last two points—first, that the means and money would not be properly spent for the purpose for which they were given; and, second, that the comparatively small army of Chiang Kai-shek would be ineffective in opposing the greater armies of the Chinese Communists?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very briefly in answer to the two queries, which I think are quite proper, let me say this: I am cognizant of the fact that there are those who have some misgivings for the reasons which have been stated. As I pointed out earlier, I have never advocated that aid be given to the Republic of China, or, for that matter, to any other Asiatic or European country, unless there was proper supervision. It was necessary to do that in Greece, and it is no disparagement of the Greek people to say that it was necessary. It was necessary to do it in other areas of the world. Therefore, I would not advocate giving this aid unless we were prepared to send a mission under the leadership of a man such as General Wedemeyer. There may be many others, but I mention him because he knows the Chinese theater. He knows the weaknesses of China. All nations, including our own, have weaknesses. If one reads his report on China, he will find that he was very critical, as properly he should have been critical, of some of the things which the Government of China had done or failed to do. Nevertheless, the Chinese knew him to be a critical friend, a man who recognized the importance of not letting China go down the drain into international communism.

So I believe that that phase of the problem could be safeguarded by sending a mission under the leadership of a man such as General Wedemeyer to supervise the distribution of the equipment and the training of the troops who would get it.

We did not have success in Greece until General van Fleet and his mission went over there to see that the Greeks were properly trained in the use of the equipment, and that it was getting to the troops where it was needed. That is the best answer I can make to the second question.

The third question is whether or not the army of 500,000—and there are more than 500,000, but I do not wish to use the exact figures for obvious reasons—of the Republic of China would be able to make an adequate showing against the several million troops reportedly on the side of the Chinese Communists.

I want to point out that it would be very difficult for the Chinese Communists to concentrate all their troops at any one point for several reasons. First, their railroad transportation and road network in China is very bad by our standards, and it takes a long time to move troops.

Second, the terrain of the country is such that it is a very difficult operation to concentrate large bodies of troops.

Third, there is enough discontent in the country that if large areas of China are stripped of Communist troops the

guerrillas may come out and the civil population rise up and take over those areas behind the Communists. So the Communists would not dare to concentrate all their troops.

The Government of the Republic of China has the advantage of having a compact force, a very large coast line of China which is most difficult to defend, large areas of which do not have even today, with the Chinese Communists there, one soldier along the coast in a good many miles. So that the Nationalists are able, with a concentrated striking force, to strike at any one of several hundred places along the coast line of more than a thousand miles. In that situation they have an opportunity, in my judgment—and I do not rely on my own judgment, but I have talked with a great many persons in whom I have confidence—of bringing at the particular scene of activity a larger body of trained troops than the Chinese Communists will have, unless they can outguess the Nationalists as to where they are going to land.

In addition to that, there are a great many people who believe quite sincerely that once there has been made a substantial landing on the coast of China the disillusioned people of China who thought that nothing could be worse than the conditions under which they had lived, and that communism was going to bring them the new blessings of liberty and so forth; the farmer, who is now paying a larger tax than he ever paid under the Nationalist regime; the businessman, who has had his small business destroyed; the student, who thought, for idealistic reasons, that communism was the "wave of the future" who now understands that it is destructive of all the teachings of China of family life and religious life and everything else—will in considerable numbers augment the invasion force, as guerrillas and others who would join up so that they would have a chance to live again as freemen.

In this uncertain life in which we live and the uncertain world in which we exist no one can guarantee that those things would happen, but I would say from my personal observation, from seeing the morale of the people, many of them educated in our western universities and our eastern universities, and in New England and in the South, who are in the Republic of China today, that there are thousands of men of integrity in China who love freedom as much as we love freedom, and who recognize that they made some very serious mistakes in the past, and they are not going to repeat those mistakes if it is humanly possible to prevent it. I personally believe that if given some moral help now and some material aid, which they need, they would be able to make a successful invasion of the mainland.

COMMUNISM OR COLONIAL EMPIRE BONDAGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the wrong kind of thinking has got us where we are today. It is time for those who have been doing this wrong thinking to change the pattern of their thoughts. There is no hope if wrong thinking continues to prevail.

As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Nevada has long suspected that action has been substituted for thinking, in our dealings with world affairs.

There is nothing basically wrong with the United States, except our assumption that every nation that fought with us in World War II is and will forever be our friend.

PERMANENT INTERESTS DETERMINE FRIENDSHIPS

We need to remember that a great Englishman, Viscount Henry Temple Palmerston, a former Prime Minister, once said:

> We (England) have no permanent friendships or enmities; we have but permanent interests.

Mr. President, the British do not fight for principle; they frankly fight for profit.

This is still the basic policy, not only of England, but of all European and Asiatic nations.

Complete understanding of this pronouncement is the key to successful dealing with all foreign nations outside of the Western Hemisphere; a knowledge of where their current interests lie is the answer to the now pertinent question of where will our erstwhile allies be "when the chips are down" in the next war.

OBJECTIVE: OUR OWN ULTIMATE SAFETY

The present uncertainty makes it imperative that we start any defense preparations with a determination of the areas in the world that are necessary for us to currently defend for our own ultimate safety.

Proceeding upon this basis, the United States has nothing to fear.

The "permanent interests" to which that great former Prime Minister of England referred were doubtless the colonial empire possessions stretching from Hong Kong and Singapore to East Africa.

In my speech on the Senate floor on December 14, I listed 10 steps which in my opinion we should take in our present international difficulties.

The first step listed was:

> Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for World War III.

I have previously dealt with this point, listing 96 trade treaties under which Marshall plan countries are arming Russia and her satellites and providing the necessary manufactured and processed goods to enable Russia to consolidate her gains in Eastern Europe and China.

The second point is:

> Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

It is this point to which I wish to address myself briefly today. In order, I intend to discuss on future dates the remaining eight recommendations.

GRAVE SITUATION

The matter of going into a global war is a grave question that only the citizens of these United States should decide. They do the fighting and make the supreme sacrifice. No one man should take unto himself the right to gamble with our heritage and with the lives of our young men. Their only voice is through the Members of Congress.

Looking back to VJ-day, Mr. President, we see these things:

The greatest period of prosperity ever known to any nation has been squandered.

The public debt has gone up, instead of down.

The largest peacetime military appropriations in history have left the Nation unprepared.

The billions spent in foreign aid have left the Nation without one countable ally in all of Europe.

And the Nation at the present time is fighting a losing fight with Red China.

UNDERTAKING MORE THAN WE CAN DO

It would appear that our foreign policy can be summed up in this way:

Six percent of the people of the world live in the United States; and this 6 percent of the world's population has contracted to support as wards or be prepared to fight the other 94 percent of the people of the world.

The administration is to blame for committing this Nation to such a situation. History is replete with examples of how nations in the past have destroyed themselves in undertaking more than they were capable of handling.

The Elamites, 600 years B. C., destroyed themselves; the Athenians never recovered from their invasion of Sicily; the Romans took on more of the world than they could defend; Napoleon never recovered from his invasion of Russia; and a century later Hitler repeated Napoleon's folly.

So moves the world story.

FREE NATIONS BELIEVE IN DIGNITY AND WORTH OF MAN

In the President's state of the Union message he said:

> The free nations believe in the dignity and worth of man. We believe in independence for all nations.

The dignity and worth of man.

The junior Senator from Nevada is deeply interested in the working men and women of the world, particularly those oppressed by the nations we have aided. This Senator has not been stampeded into actions against labor, possibly because he himself has been a workingman. I know what it is to stand in front of a furnace and shovel in the coal when the heat was of such intensity as to cause my gloves to catch on fire.

I have known what it is to work in a glass factory. I grew up on a ranch. I have been associated all my life with working people, and I am not going to turn my back on them, whether they live in the United States, or in the work camps of colonies despoiled for England, France, or the Netherlands.

COLONIAL EMPIRE SLAVES WANT BETTER EXISTENCE

The people who are fighting Russia's battles in Asia today are fighting in the hope that communism can provide them a better existence than they obtained under colonialism.

If I were a laborer in Indochina or one of the other colonies of Asia and had

to choose between communism and the continuance of colonial empire bondage, I would probably choose communism, just as the people of the Far East are now doing, because in their minds nothing can be worse than the colonial slavery under which they are living.

We are offering them nothing better.

CAPITALISM MEANS COLONIALISM TO NATIVES

We cannot expect to win the native of Indochina over to a love for capitalism, our system of economic life, as long as the native associates in his mind capitalism with the colonial slavery to which he is accustomed.

EASY CONVERTS TO COMMUNISM

All people under the yoke of colonial bondage are easy converts to communism or any other "ism" which means a change.

Empire-minded nations have farmed their colonies for the sole benefit of the mother country in each case. Apparently, it has never occurred to the officials of empire-minded nations to help the people of their possession.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I take it that the Senator from Nevada refers to political colonialism, such as that which has been practiced by the countries of Europe in times past. Is there not also an industrial colonialism, such as is occurring today in countries in the Near East, particularly in regard to oil? I shall not mention by name the countries—the Senator knows which ones they are—where oil has been discovered. In those countries a few persons have become extremely rich as a result of the discovery and development of oil, whereas the great mass of the people of those countries are almost destitute. As the situation exists there today, Russia could take over those people without having them raise a hand in opposition, because of the industrial colonialism which prevails there.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to have the Senator understand that I am referring to the nations which have been dominated by colonial policies for more than 150 or 175 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I understand the nature of the reference the Senator from Nevada has made. I was simply pointing out that the same thing is happening today, in a different way, in other countries, and in my opinion, it creates a very fertile field for the spread of any unknown doctrine which has not been practiced there up to the present time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would point out that at least the industrial colonizing nations make contracts with the leaders of those countries, they pay an enormous amount of money to the countries, and perhaps assist those in power within those countries to prevent much of the money reaching the wage earners. Some of the people are not even wage earners. How they e[illegible] hard to determine.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not saying that outside countries are doing the exploiting. It is done by a few people within those countries. It is domestic exploitation, which is as bad as colonial exploitation.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada intends to discuss that particular subject at a later date, as one of the things laid down in his opening address on December 14; but at this time he wants to discuss particularly the matter of the colonial possessions of, let us say, England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium, where, frankly, the colonies are farmed out as one would operate a farm in Vermont and expect an income from it. If one paid for the farm, he would expect to receive an income; and those countries expect incomes from their colonial possessions. For a hundred years they have prevented the industrial development of those nations. The existence of the raw materials in those areas constitutes the primary consideration for wanting to control them, in the first place, in order to force those raw materials to be sent to the mother country, and then to force their processing within the mother country. While I think the system is bad, we have not realized it. In other words, through contributions to empire-minded nations, we are in effect supporting a system which makes every native of these areas unhappy. Stated clearly, what we are doing is to give them a choice between our form of government, capitalism, and the form of government offered by Russia. The capitalistic form of government, our American way of life, is represented by colonial slavery; and the natives do not see how anything could be worse than that particular form, regardless of what might happen in the future. The result is that we are making Communists, hand over hand.

UNITED STATES GUILTY OF FINANCING SLAVERY SYSTEM

I am unhappy to say that our own Government, through the Marshall plan give-away program, has been guilty of financing a slavery system repulsive to every true American. Look how we have aided those who have perpetuated the colonial slavery system in the Malayan States, Indochina, and the Negro states of Africa.

MARSHALL-PLAN MONEY USED FOR VILE PURPOSE

Our taxpayers' money has been used by the ECA for the vile purpose of strengthening the yoke of bondage and slavery and perpetuating misery among the primitive peoples ruled and worked by imperial overlords. We should immediately stop this filthy business of bolstering colonial slavery.

WE HAVE TO OFFER SOMETHING BETTER

We cannot succeed in stopping communism in Asia and Africa by supporting a system which is considered worse by the residents of those areas.

We condemn Russia for her slave labor camps, while at the same time our Government helps Britain, France, and the Netherlands maintain theirs. In times past, we Americans prided ourselves upon being protectors of downtrodden people and champions of independence, but we no longer can make that claim. The United States has fallen from its high pedestal.

WE HELP ENGLAND DESPOIL HER COLONIES

We have gone too far in helping England develop her colonies, later to be more profitably despoiled. Britain's colonies cover 2,000,000 square miles. They consist of 36 separately governed areas with a total population of approximately 60,000,000, most of whom are uneducated and unskilled. Millions are primitive peoples still living in the tribal state. The bulk of the territory they inhabit is untouched by civilization. These are the downtrodden people Britain is keeping under the yoke for her selfish gain.

WE TURNED OUR BACK ON NORTH AFRICAN NATIVES

We should no longer help France to consolidate its economic and political domination in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. The French are operating a police state in north Africa.

President Roosevelt at Casablanca pledged American support for the independence of Morroco. That pledge has not been kept. We turned our back on these people, despite the fact that north African forces in the late war numbered 275,000, some 65,000 of whom died on the Allies' battlegrounds.

United States officials announced upon the formation of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 that henceforth all nations would be free under the auspices of that organization. In five short years we have repudiated that pronouncement and are now supporting the 150-year-old colonial empire system.

HALF SLAVE AND HALF FREE

President Lincoln's pronouncement that the United States could not exist half slave and half free is equally applicable to the world today.

We speak continually of defending the American way of life and at the same time support with our money and our military might a system quite different.

Is history to say of us that the United States of America fought to support a diabolical system of colonialism?

We are not going to get Asia to turn its back on communism unless something better than colonialism can be offered them in its place.

Our first step must be to deny all aid to those countries which practice the diabolical system of colonialism.

BLACK PEOPLE NOT YET ACCEPTED

Let us face the facts. Black people the world over are not yet accepted as equals. We condone this when we finance France which continues its slavery system in Africa.

We have been maneuvered into protecting Hong Kong for the British.

HONG KONG AND OPIUM TRADE

The history of Hong Kong and its control by the British is an ugly story criss-

crossed with opium wars and opium traffic.

Britain's gaining of Hong Kong, confirmed by the Treaty of Nanking in 1842, was the chief result of the opium war. The history of Hong Kong since the British took it over has been inseparably connected with trade. First, and for many years, it was the opium trade. Next it was the center for traffic in slave labor for Australia. British interest in Asia has been trade.

NO PERMANENT FRIENDSHIPS—ONLY PERMANENT INTERESTS

What the Prime Minister of England said in 1860, "We—England—have no permanent friendships or enmities; we have but permanent interests," is still the English philosophy which dominates all European thinking today. The colonial empires—Britain, France, and the Netherlands—have their interests in what they can get out of their colonies. As things are now, with no change in our relations with these countries, when we fight communism in Asia, we are but protecting colonial slavery, which does not represent the American way of life.

WE MUST OPPOSE COLONIALISM

We should do everything in our power to oppose the ideological and economic system of colonialism which has always been distasteful to the American people, as emphasized by the American Revolution in 1776.

WE MUST PROVE TO NATIVES WE OPPOSE COLONIALISM

We must then sell the Asiatic people whom we would help on the idea that we are not on the side of colonialism and that we do not condone its abuses.

We cannot win them over unless we prove that we are against the colonial empire system of exploiting the weaker nations for the benefit of the stronger nations. We cannot do this as long as we support this system.

After we have cleared our skirts of the taint of aiding colonial slavery, then we must educate the Asiatic countries to the fact that capitalism, the American way of life, is not colonialism; it is our job to prove to them that we are not for colonialism any more than we are for communism.

WHAT MEN FIGHT FOR

Down through the centuries men have fought for self-preservation or for more bread or other substance. It appears that those who have been deciding our foreign policy have overlooked the great intercourse of trade, commerce, and profit. Peoples thoughout the world would rather work for profit than fight for glory and a grave. Nations are built by businessmen; destroyed by diplomats.

UNITED NATIONS WORTHLESS TO UNITED STATES

In his state of the Union message, the President also said that we "have laid the cornerstone for a peaceful world in the United Nations."

UN HANDICAPS OUR EFFORTS IN KOREA

Let us look at the United Nations.

While our boys in a desperately uneven struggle are being killed by the thousands by the Chinese Communists, President Truman announces that the United States has no intention of bombing Communist China or the enemy supply lines in Manchuria—the sources of men and material being used against us—unless the United Nations tells him to. The United Nations has proved itself to be simply a forum for continuous smear for our honor, our ideals, and our purposes.

The United Nations is being utilized for a purpose which it cannot, by its very nature, fulfill.

A FORUM FOR INSULTS TO UNITED STATES

After Pearl Harbor in 1941 there was no international forum in New York where Japanese and other Axis representatives could blackguard the United States as much as they wished. But there have been no restrictions on the activities of Mr. Wu and Mr. Vishinsky.

How long the American people will put up with a situation which combines the worst features of both war and appeasement remains to be seen.

UN CANNOT PRODUCE

We expect something from the United Nations which it is not prepared to produce.

In a United Nations, which is supported almost wholly by our dollars and whose present fighting forces are 90 percent that of the United States, the commitment to resist aggression everywhere is a commitment to fight perpetual war, and, as it turns out, these wars are to be in the places, against the forces, and on the terms of Communist Russia.

The worthlessness of the United Nations as an agency for directing an army has been proved, yet it is this ineffective morally bankrupt debating society to which President Truman looks for authority and field direction in fighting for the best interest of the United States.

RUSSIA HAS NOT LOST A MAN

Russia now has taken over in all of Eastern Europe. It now has most of Asia. Yet not a Russian has been killed on any battle line.

ARE ENGLAND AND FRANCE OUR ALLIES?

Who are our allies?

A news dispatch of January 6, by the Associated Press, tells us that Great Britain has stepped up its shipments of raw rubber, an essential war material, to Russia. In 1950 it shipped around 10,000 tons, or 20 times as much raw rubber, to Russia as it shipped in 1949.

I would say, Mr. President, that on the occasion of my visit to Singapore in November 1948, huge shipments of raw rubber and tin were being made directly from Singapore to Russia at that moment; and they have never ceased.

BRITAIN ARMING THE REDS

Recently, Winston Churchill charged—and the Labor government admitted—that British factories were turning out tools, including those to repair tanks, on order from the Soviet Union. Only within the past few days have such orders been embargoed.

The rubber-shipment figures did not include the amount of rubber which the Soviet Union purchased directly from British Malaya. Some sources estimated this at 62,598 tons in the first 11 months of 1950.

England is not the only country sending to the Reds war materials with which to kill American boys.

FRANCE ARMING THE REDS

France has only recently refused to cancel an order for 139,000 tons of steel rails for the Chinese Communists. When our Ambassador threatened to stop Marshall-plan aid to France unless France canceled the order, the French said our demand was "brutal." Our dollars build French mills to produce steel with which to kill our boys. Could that be what the State Department likes to refer to as "total diplomacy"?

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION ARMING THE REDS

The French, in refusing to stop arming our enemy, point out that Red China also has ordered 13,000 tons of rails from West Germany and that this has been done with the full approval of the American authorities in Germany.

France also points out that the United States was daily doing business with the Communists until late October, months after the beginning of the Korean conflict.

BRITAIN AND FRANCE ON BOTH SIDES

As a matter of fact, France has denied the Soviet accusations that she broke the Franco-Russian military and economic alliance by joining the North Atlantic Pact with the United States and other countries. In other words, France is insisting that she is a friend of Russia.

In 1942 Britain and Russia entered into a 20-year military and economic alliance. Now both the French and British solemnly insist that their alliances with Russia are as good as ever.

The Government of the United States has been acting for almost 2 years on the assumption that Britain and France are its military partners, and that their good faith is not to be questioned. But, even as Mr. Truman, Secretary Acheson, and General Eisenhower plan to pool American troops in Europe with the forces of these nations for common defense against Russia, both Britain and France assure Russia that they are its military and economic allies. That is a pact which each has signed separately with Russia and which they insist is in operation. There is no attempt to cancel it, Mr. President, and it reads startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact which has been signed by us.

SOMEONE IS LYING

Someone is lying, and the subject of interest to Americans is whether they or the Russians, or both nations, are to be played for suckers by the British and French. There is going to be an awful let-down if it turns out to be us.

NO HARD-HEADED EXAMINATION OF WHAT WE CAN DO

War or no war, it is obvious this country is contributing to its own destruction by refusing to shorten its lines and define its commitments. In attempting to save face, it is losing its shirt in an ideological struggle that has far less practical bearing on American survival than is imagined generally.

With so much money and effort down the drain already, it is surprising there has been no hard-headed examination of possible alternatives to the disastrous policies of the past 5 years. There have

been few attempts to appraise realistically the probable effects of measures other than those taken.

PRACTICAL STEPS IN ASIA

Mr. President, China can be blockaded. Its centers of military concentration, industry and communication can be shattered by air attack. Chiang Kai-shek can be encouraged and aided in using Formosa as a base for raids and descents on the China coast. Anti-Communist guerrillas can be helped. Japan can be rearmed. If Chinese volunteers can appear in Korea, why not Japanese?

ASIATICS CAN STOP ASIATICS

The flood tide of aggressive Asiatic communism can be stemmed by Asiatics. Our repeated failures to give a fighting chance to our potential friends in Asia, to the South Koreans before last June, to the Japanese, to the Chinese Nationalists is calculated to raise the old question: Stupidity or treason?

CAN WE WIN WITH THIS STATE DEPARTMENT?

Probably there is nothing in prospect in Asia but defeat, disaster, and disgrace until the State Department is put in charge of someone with wit enough to realize that a regime which throws a million men in battle array against us is really waging war, and firmness enough to make a clean sweep of "experts" of the Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore type of thinking.

Mr. President, in an Associated Press dispatch in an afternoon newspaper, it is reported that the United Nations, not having made up its mind on anything, and no one having anything to offer, has adjourned until next week. I suppose it is generally known that when President Truman washed his hands of the American Army, after taking what he called a police action in Korea, and was successful in getting the United Nations to approve his action, he left the matter in the hands of the United Nations. What did that organization do? It arranged for a cease-fire committee, the so-called Committee of Three. This committee is made up of the representatives of Canada, Iran and India. It is interesting to note that Canada's mother country, Great Britain, has recognized Communist China, and so has India.

This committee is to arrange for a cease-fire or a truce, on terms the Chinese Communists will agree to. There is no attempt to call the Red Chinese outright agressors, but only weak-kneed attempts to placate the enemy and cater to his sensitivities. This, of course, is also born out by the failure to permit MacArthur to bomb the bases and northern-most supply lines of the enemy.

Seemingly unmindful of all history, heedless of much experience, and somewhat thoughtless about its safety, this Nation rushes forward to a destiny unknown. In other words, it is substituting action for thinking.

STATE DEPARTMENT SAYS CHINESE REDS ARE OUR FRIENDS

As a horde of Red Chinese swept southward in Korea, the Secretary of State spoke of starting a number of measures designed to increase the effectiveness of United Nations action against aggression. About the same time Mr. Dulles, the United States representative in the General Assembly of the United Nations, held forth. Reviewing the occasions upon which the United States had demonstrated its good will toward China, he told of the bond of friendship which had been forged between the peoples of the two countries, and then added that this is a bond "that the Soviet Government is now trying, and I am convinced, fruitlessly, to break."

AMERICAN BOYS LOOKING INTO MUZZLES OF CHINESE GUNS

Such was the language of the American diplomat as the American soldier in Korea looked into the muzzle of a Chinese gun, and tried to figure out how the man who was about to shoot him could be his friend.

LET US FACE THE PAINFUL TRUTH

Lacking indeed in the administration was a voice that spoke with the clarity of one that still echoes in the annals of history. Have we forgotten the words of Patrick Henry? Speaking to a convention of citizens in Richmond, Va., on March 23, 1775, he said:

> Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth. * * * Is this the part of wise men engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? * * *
>
> For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth—to know the worst and provide for it.
>
> Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer.

Thus rang the voice of Patrick Henry.

BOAST LOUDLY AND CARRY A LITTLE STICK

Theodore Roosevelt embodied his concept of foreign policy in the homely proverb, "Speak softly but carry a big stick." This administration not only departed from that policy, but it reversed it. It has boasted loudly and carried a little stick.

The question that must be faced now is not what we might like to do, or what, under better conditions, we ought to do, but what we can do.

CAN WE FIGHT 20 KOREAS?

Is anyone so foolish as to think that the United States can meet aggression wherever it occurs? Must we fight another Korea? Must we fight 20 Koreas?

EISENHOWER TO EUROPE

Without the approval of Congress, the President has sent General Eisenhower to Europe. For what purpose? We should withdraw General Eisenhower from his military headquarters in Europe, because his presence there is regarded by the Europeans as a pledge of unlimited American support. If such a pledge has been made, the Congress of the United States has no knowledge of it, and all reference to the Constitution of the United States has been swept aside.

THE THOUGHT OF MANY AMERICANS

The defense of America is the paramount duty of Americans. This is the thought that has been occurring to many Americans as the United States wallows deeper in its vague commitments and spends billions from one end of the world to another.

EUROPE TAKES ALL, GIVES NOTHING

Europe has taken aid, picked from the pockets of our hard-pressed taxpayers, and has called for more, but she has not used that aid for her own defense. Europe's will to defend cannot be imposed from the outside.

EUROPE SHOULD SHOW INTEREST IN DEFENDING HERSELF

If we should withhold foot soldiers from Europe, at least until she shows some interest in defending herself, it would serve notice on the world that we are determined not to involve the country in another war just as futile as the two world wars and the Korean War. Europeans cannot expect us to do for them what they have failed to do for themselves.

We must do the practical, sensible things to protect our American people.

UNITY?

Mr. President, let me mention one more important point before I close.

The President asked for unity in his state of the Union speech, and on the same day his representative, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, William M. Boyle, Jr., issued a statement asserting that the Democratic Party would continue to seek new partisan advantage in the fields of foreign relations and national defense.

What does the President mean by "unity"?

Are we asked to turn all decision-making over to a single official in charge of our country? Does the administration want no scrutiny, no examination, no study, only obedience?

THE UNITY THAT TOOK CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AWAY FROM CONGRESS

Is it not this kind of philosophy that has caused the administration to take away from Congress its exclusive constitutional authority to approve treaties?

UNITY IN MISERY

There certainly is unity in the misery of our times and the President bears no heavier burden upon his spirit than the smallest among us.

UNITY IN COST

There is also unity in the terrific cost of these troubled times upon each family. This cost is represented in different ways:

First. Taxes.

Second. The constantly rising cost of living.

Third. Depreciated currency, which lessens and destroys the value of our savings, including insurance policies.

These costs are as great upon each of our families as they are upon Mr. Truman's family.

NO UNITY IN TAX EXEMPTION OF PRESIDENT

As a matter of fact, Mr. Truman is tax-exempt to a certain extent. In that, there is no unity.

His advantage seems to be unwarranted. The cost of maintaining him in the White House with cars, private airplanes, private yachts, and so on, bur-

dens the taxpayer with nearly $5,000,000 a year.

It would seem that when all of us are paying terrifying taxes, the President might become unified with the rest of the country by paying full taxes and cutting down his running expenses, for which we pay.

After all, no one should get rich out of these troubled times. The country would welcome unity on that score.

A LITTLE SICK OF WORD "UNITY"

Let me read you a few lines from an editorial in the January 2, 1951, issue of the New York Daily Mirror:

We have heard so many appeals for unity of recent days that, frankly, we are a little sick of the word and more than a little suspicious of the chorus of appealers.

Unity for providing arms for Americans who must fight, yes.

Unity in sacrifice and in the period of austerity that is ahead of us—in which it appears we will say good-by once and for all to the good old days, yes.

Unity to the point that we are supposed to shut our lips and refrain from criticizing the bird brains in Washington who have got us into this awful mess, no.

As far as we can determine, there are a lot of people in Washington who confuse unity with dictatorship.

They would like us to swallow Acheson without a burp—in the holy interest of unity.

They would like us to forget the long series of tragic bunglings, extending from the Roosevelt administration into the Truman administration, and to be good little boys and never mention them again—in the interests of unity.

Bunk. Stalin has that kind of unity. Hitler had it. Mussolini had it.

It is not the kind of unity that can be fostered in a free country, and it is not unity at all. It is dead rot.

If we have strength, it is because we have critics, men of courage and patriotism and status, unafraid of the petty insults of the one-world political mob.

True unity can come only in the tempering fires of national, controversial discussion, among a people alert, aware, free, and permitted to speak their minds. Suppression, whether it is voluntary or enforced, is the agent of disunity.

Thank God that Americans who hold American interests paramount to all other interests have not lost their voices. Unity is not the sheeplike, blind pursuit of a crooked trail over a precipice.

A RE-CREATION OF A NATIONALISTIC SPIRIT

A rereading of the Declaration of Independence, a re-creation of a nationalistic spirit, is called for. Let us get back on the road of self-determination, self-respect, and self-preservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the list of 10 points submitted in my address to the Senate on December 14.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for world war III.

2. Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

3. Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

4. Three suggested approaches to the war in Korea and Asia:

(a) We could do the obvious thing—arm Chiang Kai-shek's Nationals and guerrillas to furnish the foot soldiers for the job, then under General MacArthur make the most efficient use of our air power, our Navy, including submarines, to destroy the war-making power of Communist Korea and the aggressor Communist China troops.

(b) We could withdraw from Korea, arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops and let him do the job. It would require a longer time but he would engage the Communist forces to the extent that it would be doubtful if they could harass us for a considerable time and Nationalist China would then be fighting Communist China in a China civil war and the Russian dominated Communists would eventually be defeated.

(c) We can completely abandon Korea and China, with all of its possible consequences and repercussions. We can then establish our first line of defense through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia.

(d) If these suggestions should be discarded, then we can come home and defend the Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to defend this continent in any case.

The one thing that we cannot do is to continue the present course of indecision and nervous jittery attitude in Asia.

5. Inform the governments of Europe which still maintain political and economic agreements with the Soviet Union that these should be terminated at the earliest possible date, as a prerequisite to the continued friendship and assistance of Europe by the United States. Both England and France have separate economic and military pacts with Communist Russia reading startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact that they have signed with us.

6. Give no more money as loans or gifts to any government, but if such help is necessary, then loan such funds to private business in strategic areas, without weakening our economy, in the same manner and upon the same terms that the RFC loans such funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

7. Build as rapidly as possible a military force, spearheaded by an adequate submarine fleet and an air corps of whatever number of groups may be called for, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere.

8. If the European people will enlist in their own armies and furnish the ground troops, then serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with an aggressive aerial attack on their means of making war, using every means at our command to defeat their purpose of controlling Europe.

9. In every possible way protect and strengthen our national economy; while making all possible speed toward proper preparedness, guard well our national economy; stop wasting the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers through Marshall plan and other give-away schemes; inaugurate a business-like fiscal policy.

10. Clean up our own Government. Throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness, and other dangerous security risks. The Armed Services Committees of the Congress should immediately institute a thorough investigation to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a United Press dispatch from London dated January 10, according to which the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, laid down several points for stopping the war in Korea, which included recognition of Communist China, withdrawing from Korea, and putting Formosa in the hands of the United Nations for discussion and disposition.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS CEASE-FIRE PRELIMINARY, BEVIN PROPOSES UN SEAT FOR CHINA

LONDON, January 10.—British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin has told the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference that Communist China should be admitted to the UN to bring about a cease-fire in Korea and a solution of far eastern problems, it was learned today.

Mr. Bevin submitted a working paper to the conference outlining six main points:

Recognition and admission of Communist China to the UN.

Negotiations should be started after this action to bring about a cease-fire in Korea.

Establishment of a security zone in Korea.

Thereafter a UN commission should be set up to handle subsequent problems.

Gradual withdrawal of all UN and Chinese Communist forces from Korea.

A free and impartial plebiscite regarding the unification of Korea.

The conference has laid aside the far eastern problem temporarily to await future developments on the subject, including those in the UN.

"It would be safe to say that British policy in the Far East today greatly depends on what happens in Korea," informed sources said. "Neither the British Government nor any commonwealth government yet knows what the policy would be if the Chinese Communists persist in their drive to force the UN into the sea."

The conference turned to a discussion of the world's supply of raw materials today and also may discuss European affairs.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from Lake Success, outlining the fact that the General Assembly's Political Committee was scheduled to meet at 3 p. m., but that informed quarters said it probably would adjourn until next week because no one had any formal proposals ready yet in regard to how to stop the war, while delaying any possible defense by cutting the supply lines of the Communist troops.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 11, 1951]

FURTHER DELAY FACES UN IN SETTLEMENT OF KOREAN WAR QUESTION—NO FORMAL CEASE-FIRE PROPOSALS READY YET; ADJOURNMENT LIKELY

LAKE SUCCESS, January 11.—The United Nations today faced a new delay in its quest for a Korean peace settlement.

The General Assembly's 60-nation Political Committee was scheduled to meet at 3 p. m., but informed quarters said it probably would adjourn until next week because no one had any formal proposals ready yet.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "British Papers Hit UN War Reports," published in the New York Times of January 9,

1951. The article is written by Benjamin Welles, and is dated London, January 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH PAPERS HIT UN WAR REPORTS—MIRROR SAYS ESTIMATES BY AIR FORCE OF ENEMY DEAD IN KOREA ARE "ALMOST ALWAYS FALSE"

(By Benjamin Welles)

LONDON, January 8.—Today for the fourth successive day one of Britain's mass circulation newspapers attacked alleged distortion and hysteria in communiqués issued on the Korean fighting by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters.

The Daily Mirror, which reputedly has the widest daily circulation in Britain, has been maintaining that estimates of the enemy killed and buildings destroyed issued by the United States Fifth Air Force, under General MacArthur's command, have been valueless because almost always false.

This campaign has been taken up in other widely read newspapers.

The Daily Mirror's campaign led off last Thursday with front-page editorial entitled "Silly Headquarters Hand-Outs on Korean War." Next day the front page was dominated by a headline, "Fairy tales from Korea: the world is not getting the truth."

[The United States Far East Air Forces, taking note of charges in the British press, denied on January 6 that Air Force communiqués exaggerated the losses inflicted on the enemy by air action.]

CORRESPONDENT BACK FROM FRONT

"The picture of actual events in Korea and especially of the fighting—or lack of it—has been dreadfully distorted," said David Walker, Daily Mirror correspondent, who recently returned from the Korean front.

"This," said Mr. Walker, "was the fault of Alice in Wonderland information handed out to the press in Tokyo or at Eighth Army headquarters."

Specifically he listed Air Force claims such as 341 enemy killed, 91 enemy killed, or, on another occasion, 50 enemy killed in a tunnel.

"A modern 10-year-old boy in short trousers knows that, whether it be low-flying jets or high-flying B–29's, no air force can possibly know exactly how many people it has killed," Mr. Walker asserted.

Yesterday the Sunday Pictorial, which is owned by the same interests as the Daily Mirror, said in a front-page editorial headed "Is this a private war?" that British troops had been ordered by United States headquarters to retreat continuously, in some cases 200 miles, without ever sighting the enemy.

WILLOUGHBY IS CHIDED

Lord Beaverbrook's Sunday Express also took up the cry yesterday by turning its attention to Brig. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, General MacArthur's intelligence chief.

"If his communiqués are to be believed," the Express said, "his intelligence system is nothing short of miraculous." Noting that a communiqué of December 26 stated that there were 444,406 Communist enemy forces in Korea, of whom 277,173 were Chinese and 167,233 North Koreans, a Sunday Express columnist said:

"I have never seen a wartime report of enemy strength in such precise terms. * * * What kind of man is this General Willoughby? Is he, as his critics say, publicity officer for MacArthur or is he a secret service genius?"

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Sure Road to Disaster," published in the Boston Evening American of January 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURE ROAD TO DISASTER

The Truman administration, having bungled the Nation into a disastrous war in Korea and into the imminent prospect of a world-wide conflict, chooses this anxious moment as the time to deliver a damaging blow to the Nation's economy.

The administration, hostile as it is to American industry, nevertheless recognizes the fact that only a swift and enormous increase of industrial output now can save the Nation from disaster.

Accordingly, the administration is urgently appealing to industry for fresh miracles of production.

But at the same time the administration has sent a delegation of State Department officials to Torquay, England, to give away to foreign nations the American market on which American industry depends for its strength and its existence.

This betrayal of American security is being accomplished through the International Trade Conference, and the method is simple.

The State Department delegation, acting on and abusing the authority of the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, simply grants drastic reductions in our tariff rates on whatever products foreign nations wish to send into our domestic market to compete with our own products.

And since the products of many of those nations come from machines operated by low-wage labor or even slave labor, our products frequently cannot compete.

Already the Truman administration's fatuous tariff reductions have put long-established American industries out of business.

Every such collapse takes away the jobs of American workers and gives them to workers in a foreign land. It is always an economic disaster to America.

But in these times it is also a military disaster, since it deprives the Nation of an urgently needed source of production.

In view of this obvious fact, the Truman administration's insistence on continuing and accelerating, at Torquay, the progress of destroying American productive capacity can only be attributed to the pathological confusion that pervades all the administration's thinking.

The administration must be halted in its bemused and disastrous course, for the Nation's safety.

Senator MALONE, of Nevada, suggests that the Eighty-second Congress accomplish it by permitting the Trade Agreement Act to expire next June 30.

Better still, let the Eighty-second Congress repeal the Trade Agreement Act immediately before the current sell-out at Torquay can be consummated.

HEALTHY SIGN

It is a very good and beneficial thing for the United States that some of its statesmen have not lost the courage to speak their minds.

One of these statesmen is Senator GEORGE MALONE, who recently told his colleagues:

"We have fumbled ourselves into a position of defending the self-interest of almost every nation in the world at the expense of our own.

"We have been soft-talked into apologizing that the appropriations passed on the floor of the Senate for the benefit of foreign nations are not larger—and if someone inadvertently mentions our own best interests, he is immediately branded an isolationist."

As long as statesmen can speak out like that, our freedoms will survive.

Unity based on silence, or fear to express one's mind, is not unity at all.

It is the selfsame regimentation which has made Stalin a dictator and a tyrant.

If we enjoy strength, it is because we have leaders like Herbert Hoover who exploded the greatest issue of our times—the one involving our very lives—and who caused millions of Americans to demand a reexamination of our policies and practices.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled, "Unity Is Not Silence," published in the New York Daily Mirror of January 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY IS NOT SILENCE

We have heard so many appeals for unity of recent days that, frankly, we are a little sick of the word and more than a little suspicious of the chorus of appealers.

Unity for providing arms for Americans who must fight, yes.

Unity in sacrifice and in the period of austerity that is ahead of us—in which it appears we will say good-by once and for all to the good old days, yes.

Unity to the point that we are supposed to shut our lips and refrain from criticizing the bird brains in Washington who have got us into this awful mess, no.

As far as we can determine, there are a lot of people in Washington who confuse unity with dictatorship.

They would like us to swallow Acheson without a burp—in the holy interests of unity.

They would like us to forget the long series of tragic bunglings, extending from the Roosevelt administration into the Truman administration, and to be good little boys and never mention them again—in the interests of unity.

Bunk. Stalin has that kind of unity. Hitler had it. Mussolini had it.

It is not the kind of unity that can be fostered in a free country, and it is not unity at all. It is dead rot.

If we have strength, it is because we have criticism.

Why, even Mr. Acheson apparently no longer feels that the Chinese Communists are simple agrarians, and he has become quite a vocal anti-Communist.

If we have strength, it is because we have great critics like Herbert Hoover, men of courage and patriotism and stature, unafraid of the petty insults of the one-world political mob.

It was Herbert Hoover who exploded the greatest issue of our times, the vital issue of our lives, out into the open, into national debate and scrutiny and reexamination.

And the reverberations of that explosion from among the people have had a rocking and shocking and altogether salutary effect upon the policy makers who smugly believed they knew the temper and will of the people and who were wrong.

True unity can come only in the tempering fires of national, controversial discussion, among a people alert, aware, free, and permitted to speak their minds. Suppression, whether it is voluntary or enforced, is the agent of disunity.

"We have fumbled ourselves into a position of defending the self-interest of almost every nation in the world at the expense of our own," says Senator GEORGE MALONE on the Senate floor. "We have been soft-talked into apologizing that the appropriations passed on the floor of the Senate for the benefit of foreign nations are not larger—and if someone inadvertently mentions our own best interests, he is immediately branded an isolationist."

Thank God that Americans who hold American interests paramount to all other interests have not lost their voices. Certainly they have not lost their audience. Unity is not the sheeplike, blind pursuit of a crooked trail over a precipice.

UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN THE ANTHRACITE AREA OF PENNSYLVANIA

During Mr. MALONE's address,

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for about 5 minutes to make a statement, without the Senator losing the floor thereby?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania under those conditions, with the understanding that whatever the Senator has to say shall appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the American people will be called upon to assume an extremely heavy burden of taxation to pay the cost of our preparations for national defense.

Even though we escape the tragedies of another world war, as we all hope and pray, the cost of these defense preparations will have a profound effect upon the standard of living which we now enjoy.

We are now engaged in a great program of industrial expansion. We are pouring out billions of dollars in order to assure vastly increased production of everything needed to arm and equip our Armed Forces. In planning and administering that program it is incumbent upon every agency of Government to protect the taxpayers from every form of wasteful expenditure.

In this connection I have called the attention of the President, the Secretary of Defense and the heads of the war mobilization agencies to a situation in my own State of Pennsylvania where there is an opportunity to save many millions of dollars and at the same time alleviate the worst unemployment condition in the Nation.

I refer to the anthracite coal area of Pennsylvania which, according to the Federal Government's own survey, has been the hardest hit economically in the United States.

The metropolitan districts in two counties in this area, Lackawanna and Luzerne, are the only remaining districts in the Nation that are classified by the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor as E areas. That classification, as the Senate is aware, is the lowest designation given.

It means that at least 12 percent of the available labor force is unemployed.

This labor force, of which more than 12 percent is unemployed, is made up of skilled workers, good hard working, patriotic Americans. They ask only a decent opportunity to work. They are well qualified to render a real service to the Nation in the defense program.

Here is a surplus of manpower, ready and able to apply their skills and craftsmanship in the national interest. That is why I urge that contracts be channeled into these areas where they are so badly needed.

The expanding defense production program will call for the construction of many new manufacturing plants. Some of these unquestionably will be located in sparsely populated sections.

In such areas much additional construction will be required, such as housing for workers, service establishments, recreational centers, hospitals, schools, and churches. In many places it will be necessary to provide transportation facilities. In addition it will be necessary to recruit workers from other parts of the country and relocate them in the new defense factory areas.

Mr. President, none of these costly factors will enter into the building of defense plants in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania.

With economy in mind it seems to me that every consideration should be given to the advantages from which the Nation can benefit in this section.

An adequate supply of skilled manpower is immediately available.

Existing churches, schools, hospitals, recreational facilities, and cultural centers are ample to serve the needs of their respective communities.

All necessary transportation facilities are now functioning.

Mr. President, in bringing this situation to the attention of my colleagues, I do not imply that the anthracite area in Pennsylvania is the only one which is in need of such help as may be gained through the defense program. There are other sections where similar conditions exist but not to the same critical extent.

I am therefore urging that a substantial saving be made by placing a share of the defense contracts and building some of the new defense plants in areas which have a labor surplus, adequate housing and other facilities rather than in places where the Government will have to start from scratch.

Such a policy would not only speed up the program, but, in addition, would save scarce building material for other essential construction and would lighten the burden on the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I have made these facts available to the President and to the heads of various agencies which have the responsibility for mobilizing our industrial strength for defense production.

For the information of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter I have addressed to President Truman, General Marshall, the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, the Honorable William H. Harrison, Director of the Defense Production Administration, and the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to call your attention to an area in my State of Pennsylvania, which, according to the Federal Government's own surveys, has been the hardest hit economically in the entire United States.

I refer to the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania where there is a surplus of manpower which can render a real service in the national defense program.

On November 5, the United States Bureau of the Census issued a population report covering the 168 standard metropolitan areas of the Nation. The figures are for April 1, 1950, the official date of the 10-year census of population.

The report shows that Luzerne County, Pa., which includes the cities of Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton, had a population of 391,226 on April 1. In striking contrast, the county population was 441,518 in the 1940 census. Thus, in a decade, the district's population declined by 11.4 percent. In the same decade the national population gain was 14.3 percent.

Bordering Luzerne County on the north is Lackawanna County which includes the city of Scranton. This county's population was 256,208 in the 1950 census, a drop of 14.9 percent from its 301,243 population of 1940.

Of the 168 standard metropolitan areas listed on November 5, nearly all reported population gains. Among those which had losses, the Scranton and Wilkes-Barre areas were by far the hardest hit.

Recent reports of the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor disclose that the Scranton and Wilkes-Barre areas are the only two remaining E areas in the United States. As you know, an E area is the lowest classification given. It means that at least 12 percent of the labor force is unemployed.

Thus, unemployment conditions in these sections are the worst in the Nation, despite the fact that such a very large portion of the population has already moved away to seek work.

At present our Government is engaged in a vast industrial expansion program for national defense. If some contracts under that program were placed in Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties it would go a long way toward alleviating the critical unemployment situation and at the same time would give these patriotic, hard-working people an opportunity to do real service in the country's time of need.

In the expanding defense program, it will be necessary to erect new factory buildings. I urge that some be built in these areas. If the experience of World War II means anything, many manufacturing plants will be erected in open, thinly populated portions of the Nation. This means the Government will have to build and pay for much construction in addition to the new factories.

It will have to provide housing for workers. It will have to build schools and recreation centers. It will have to provide transportation systems to serve these workers.

In addition, it will have to recruit workers in other parts of the country and transplant them in the new defense factory areas.

For your consideration, I submit the advantages offered by the Wilkes-Barre and Scranton areas:

An adequate supply of skilled labor is available immediately.

Schools, transportation, and stores are already there.

So are theaters, playgrounds, athletic fields, and other recreational facilities. The money to build them can be saved for the taxpayers. The scarce building materials can be saved for other essential construction.

I urge the Government and its agencies to take advantage of these factors. In that way, not only the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area, but also the State and Nation would be helped.

Will you please give this matter prompt attention? I would deeply appreciate being advised concerning any steps your agency can take in the establishment of defense plants or the placing of defense orders in this area where they are so badly needed.

QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have today introduced in the Senate for myself and 11 other Senators from Southern States a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors participating in the election of elective Federal officials, including electors for President or Vice President, and Senators and Representatives in Congress. The proposed new article of the Constitution contains two sections, as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualifications.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The adoption of this amendment as a part of the Federal Constitution would result in preventing both the United States and any of the States of the Union from denying or abridging the right of citizens from participating in the election of Federal officials because of failure to pay any poll or head tax or any tax of any other kind or to meet any property qualification. The adoption of this amendment would, therefore, bring a complete end to the so-called poll tax controversy and would at the same time prevent the setting up of some new requirement as a qualification for voting, such as the requirement that some other tax be paid or some certain class or amount of property be owned by a citizen in order to qualify him for voting.

It will be recalled that I introduced an identical joint resolution in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress on January 13, 1949, for nine other southern Senators and myself. This resolution was never acted upon during the Eighty-first Congress by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to which it was referred. I am now glad to announce that in reintroducing this joint resolution today I am joined by the following distinguished Senators as cosponsors, namely, my colleague from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, of Georgia; Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH, of North Carolina; Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Mr. O'CONOR, of Maryland; Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG, of Louisiana; Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

We sponsors of this joint resolution strongly believe that the resolution should be speedily submitted by this Congress to the States for ratification, and, if so submitted, we believe that it will be quickly ratified by at least the required 36 States. Because we are so sure that the requisite number of States would speedily ratify the resolution we are quite agreeable to the allowing of any reasonable short period of time for the consideration and ratification of this resolution. In the case that either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Senate feels that such a time limitation should be imposed, we are agreeable to limiting the time of consideration of the amendment by the States to as little as 3 years. We call attention to the fact that when the seventeenth amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators, and opposed on many of the identical grounds voiced against our proposed amendment, was submitted to the States for ratification on May 13, 1912, the ratification was completed by the 36th ratifying State on April 8, 1913, or less than 11 months after the date of submission. Of the 37 ratifying States, 5 of them were Southern States which at the time had in force under State law poll-tax requirements for voting. The nineteenth amendment, providing suffrage for women, required less than 15 months for adoption.

At the present time only six States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—require the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. South Carolina, until recently, had a constitutional provision requiring poll tax, but this was repealed by the adoption at the general election last November of a constitutional amendment proposed by the 1950 State legislature. I am advised that the South Carolina Legislature, which is now in session, must approve the action of the electorate in the November election, and that such approval appears to be imminent. For the record I want the Senate to know that the poll-tax requirement was repealed by the State of Florida by legislative action in 1937 at which time I was a member of the State senate and was one of the supporters of the action by which repeal was accomplished.

The poll-tax requirement, now limited to the six States already mentioned, has been accorded far greater importance than it deserves. The fact of the matter is that the amount of poll tax required to be paid in the several States is so small as to impose only a slight economic obstacle for any citizen who desires to qualify to cast a ballot. This requirement operates, of course, equally on citizens of all races and colors and is generally subject to important exemptions which limit its application, such as the exemption of veterans, of women, and of citizens beyond a certain age limit.

Notwithstanding the fact that all cosponsors of this proposed amendment feel that the importance of the poll-tax question has been magnified far beyond its actual effect, it is our feeling that the problem has been so widely discussed and has been so generally regarded as the imposition of an undemocratic handicap on Negro citizens who comprise a minority group in our Nation, that it would be good public policy and in the interest of sounder democratic government to speedily move, through this proposed amendment, to bring a complete end to the imposition of the poll-tax requirement as a condition of participation in Federal elections. The proposed amendment would have no effect whatever upon the election of officials at the State or local level, but would leave this subject, as heretofore, to the discretion and jurisdiction of the several States.

Since there are many good citizens who have indicated their feeling that this subject matter should be dealt with through the passage of a Federal statute rather than through the adoption of a Federal constitutional amendment, we feel that it is proper to call attention to the fact that as shown by the debates on this subject over many years, in both the Senate and House of Representatives, there are many able constitutional lawyers, coming not only from the South but also from all other portions of the Nation, who have always believed and contended that the only legal way to deal with this question, other than through action by the States themselves, is by Federal constitutional amendment, and that action through Federal statute would clearly violate the provisions and requirements of the Federal Constitution under which the qualification of electors, as prescribed under the laws of the several States, is adopted as the qualification of electors to vote upon Federal officials.

The sponsors of the resolution which I have just introduced have very deep convictions on this matter, and I feel that I should say for each and all of us that we regard the Federal Government as without any authority whatsoever to deal with this subject matter except by the submission and ratification of a Federal constitutional amendment.

While this is no time or place for a full statement of the position of the sponsors of the proposed amendment, I feel that it is proper to call brief attention to the following facts which support our conviction:

First. The framers of the original Constitution in 1787 provided for the election of Members of the House of Representatives under section 2 of article I of the original Constitution, part of which reads as follows:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

At the very time that the original Constitution was being drafted and while it was being considered by the several States there appeared in the constitutions of most of the Original Thirteen States specific requirements for electors of the most numerous branch of their respective legislatures, which requirements were described by the use of the very word "qualifications," which requirements comprised either ownership of property of a stated nature or value or payment of taxes in a stated amount, or payment of poll taxes, specifically named as such. In the case of the State of New Hampshire, under its constitution of 1784, a poll or head tax was specifically required as one of the qualifications for a citizen to vote for a member of the House of Representatives of New Hampshire which was the most numerous branch of the State legislature. It was against such an existing background in 1787 that the members of the Constitutional Convention wrote into our original Constitution the provision of section 2 of article I which I have already mentioned and which adopted as Federal qualifications for electors of Members of

the House of Representatives the "qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Second. In 1912, 125 years after the drafting of the original Constitution, the Congress submitted the seventeenth amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators. The Congress saw fit at that time to incorporate in the seventeenth amendment and as a part of it the exact words which appear in section 2 of article I of the original Constitution where they apply to the election of Members of the House of Representatives. In other words, in submitting the seventeenth amendment the Congress used, and in ratifying the seventeenth amendment the several States again approved, the specific requirement thus made applicable to Members of the Senate that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." It is, of course, well known to every Member of the Senate that at the time of the submission and ratification of the seventeenth amendment a considerably larger number of States than the six which still preserve the poll tax requirement, not only enforced that requirement but had embodied the same in their several State constitutions as a qualification for voting, which fact was well known to the general public and to the Members of the Sixty-second Congress which submitted the amendment.

Without arguing the matter at greater length at this time, I simply want to restate the fact that the sponsors of the proposed amendment have strong convictions that the Congress is without power to deal effectively with this subject matter through the passage of a Federal statute and that the adoption of such a statute would bring on protracted and unfruitful litigation, long delay, and questionable results. In the event such a statute should ever be upheld by the Supreme Court in the face of what we believe to be its complete unconstitutionality, it is clear that such a ruling would invite the Congress to adopt further provisions affecting the qualification of electors, as for instance provisions affecting the age requirement, the period of residence in the State or county, or both, and other requirements, all of which would seriously impinge upon the rights of the several States to fix these matters of important public policy within their own respective jurisdictions and based on their own experience and judgment.

The introducers of the proposed amendment are exceedingly anxious that it be acted upon speedily and favorably by the Congress so that this subject matter, which has been the source of such long controversy and fruitless debate, and on which both of the political parties are so fully committed, may be quickly submitted to the States where we believe that it will be promptly ratified. We feel that such a conclusion of this long-standing controversy is decidedly in the interest of sound democratic government and stronger unity among all of the people of our Nation. Perhaps the speedy settlement of this issue may lead the way to moderate and clearly legal settlements of other long-standing questions on which we have been long divided and sometimes even bitterly divided.

We are offering this amendment in the hope that it may receive friendly, favorable, and speedy action by the Congress. In the event it appears that this hope cannot be realized, but that the issue will again be subjected to long, protracted, and even bitter debate, we would prefer of course that it be laid aside, as the grave national and international problems which confront our Nation do not justify in our judgment the expenditure of any great time or effort or the indulging in any extended discussion of this subject. These perilous times call, in our opinion, for unity and harmony, and for quick, just, and lawful settlement of domestic controversy where such is reasonably possible. Where not possible we believe that such controversies should be laid aside so that all citizens may unite in the tremendous joint effort which our national and international problems require of us.

AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND AMERICAN TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several times this afternoon in colloquy I have addressed a question to Senators who have spoken, as to whether or not they were in favor before the Congress has an opportunity to determine the policy, either under the North Atlantic Treaty or under the Constitution, of making commitments of our American boys to be assigned to an integrated international army in Europe.

In his message on the state of the Union the President was silent as to the particular provision which I have just mentioned. However, the news ticker this afternoon carries a purported statement by the President. Of course, as the majority leader well knows, there is always an opportunity for human error. This is what the President is reported to have said this afternoon:

> Over and over again at a news conference, the President said there was no question about the authority of a President to send troops anywhere in the world.
>
> He said this authority is recognized abundantly throughout the history of this country.
>
> Mr. Truman said, however, that this Government always consults with congressional committees on foreign policy decisions, particularly the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.
>
> The only restriction Congress could place on his power to send troops where needed, he said, would necessarily be by restricting appropriations for this purpose.
>
> And Mr. Truman made it clear that present plans are to supply troops for the united command of General Eisenhower for the defense of the North Atlantic countries.

Mr. President, if that report is true, and I take it to be true, the President for the first time has flatly told the Congress and the American people that he expects to send troops abroad, and, if I correctly interpret the release, the President feels he can do so without coming to the Congress of the United States for it to determine whether or not he has the authority, either under the North Atlantic Treaty or under the Constitution, to take such action.

My reason for mentioning the matter—and I do so with the desire to be constructive, as the majority leader knows—is because I have submitted a resolution on the subject. I did so after I had read headlines in the newspapers saying that commitments had been made. Feeling that the Congress should determine whether American foot soldiers are to be placed in an integrated army in Europe, I submitted a resolution which reads:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no Ground Forces of the United States shall be assigned to duty in European areas for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

The resolution asks only one thing; that before any commitment is made or American soldiers are assigned to this integrated army, the President shall permit Congress to determine whether or not we are to follow such a policy. I took the matter up with the majority leader, who has very kindly cooperated. It had been my intention to move or to ask unanimous consent, before the session today ended, that the resolution be made the unfinished business, because I think the issues are now joined. I think Members of Congress will agree on that point. To me this question represents the crux of the whole foreign policy, because our appropriations, our taxes, our allocations in this country—yes, the question of manpower, including even 18 year old boys—will be dependent upon the policy of sending land troops to Europe as a part of an integrated army.

I respectfully call the matter to the attention of the distinguished majority leader, and I hope that after the Senate convenes on Monday as soon as possible after the business of the Senate with respect to organization matters has been concluded, we may determine upon a time when the resolution can come before the Senate and be debated and disposition made of it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as has been stated by the minority leader, I told him that I would discuss with him the time for taking up the resolution. However, I also told him that I thought it should have the consideration of a committee. At the proper time I shall move that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I shall also discuss that matter with the minority leader.

Mr. President, I understand that the minority have about completed their committee assignments, but that they are going to have a caucus tomorrow when they will determine whether they will make a motion which will in effect change the Reorganization Act. I had hoped that we could complete the committee organization today. I had hoped, as a matter of fact, that we might have completed it several days ago. But I understand the difficulty in making assignments, and I have wanted to give the members of the minority party every possible consideration. For that reason, Mr. President, I feel that under the circumstances, it being uncertain as to just

what will be done, the only thing we can do is to wait until after the caucus has been held, and then there can be presented to the Senate the proposal to be made which will in effect change the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the RECORD ought to show that, as stated by the majority leader, a conference will be held tomorrow to approve the assignments of Senators on the minority side as proposed by the Committee on Committees. I want the RECORD also to show that, while one can never be sure what a conference may approve, I have no doubt that by noon tomorrow the minority will be able to present its committee assignments for the organization of the Senate, and that we can cooperate with the majority leader in that respect.

Mr. McFARLAND. But the Senator has not given us information as to whether there will be an attempt made in effect to change the Reorganization Act. Of course, we need to have some notice of such a proposal. I would certainly appreciate it if the Senator from Nebraska would communicate with me tomorrow in regard to the action taken by the caucus on that point, so that I can notify Members on this side, in order that we can be ready to proceed to a vote on that question possibly on Monday. The Reorganization Act is regarded as very important by a great many Senators, and they do not want to change it. So, in fairness to them, I feel that they must have at least 24 hours' notice of any effort the caucus may propose to make along that line. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska can communicate with me tomorrow as to what the caucus decides in that regard, without going through the inconvenience of having a session so that the communication can be made on the floor. I will take the responsibility of notifying other Senators as to what the caucus decides.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I can give the distinguished majority leader assurance now that there will not be any attempt made permanently to change the Reorganization Act. That would have to be done by submitting a measure to the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which hearings would be had, and a subsequent report by the committee to the Senate. But I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that we are going to attempt to convince the majority that we need more Republican members on more committees, so as to distribute more equitably the load of work that must be done. I suggest once more to the majority leader that something be done along that line.

Since the majority leader feels that he should have a full attendance of the membership, I believe the thing to do is to take a recess to Monday, and I serve notice now that it is agreeable to us that the committees of the Senate be organized at that time. We are giving more than 24 hours' notice, so the majority leader can prepare for it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from Nebraska kindly communicate with me the decision in regard to what kind of motion will be made after the Republican caucus has been held? Will the Senator be at liberty to do so?

Mr. WHERRY. I myself do not know what will be done. Since the Senator believes he should have a full representation on Monday, or any other day he wants to take up the subject of organization, I think he ought to move a recess until Monday, and I will give him all the information I can in the meantime. I suggest to the Senator, in view of the fact that he desires a full attendance, that I believe it would be best to recess until Monday.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I would appreciate it if the Senator would convey to me tomorrow, after the Republican caucus, the nature of the motion which will be made, if it is agreeable to the caucus membership for him to do so.

I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Friday, January 11 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATOR

William H. Harrison, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

Peggy Sappington, N805037.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be major

Raymond Maret, MC, O329011.

To be captains

Blanche C. Albright, ANC, N728982.
Edythe Alt, ANC, N742202.
Ida B. Ayer, ANC, N768699.
Dorothy J. Barber, ANC, N735521.
Jane T. Becker, ANC, N728047.
Grace D. Boisvert, ANC, N730776.
Dorothea V. Bowers, ANC, N721221.
Margarita E. Breton, ANC, N783005.
Mary C. Bryan, ANC, N726867.
Doyle E. Burns, DC, O1775377.
Frances E. Cale, ANC, N763747.
James D. Caskie, MC, O1705710.
Elizabeth S. Chamberlin, ANC, N757040.
Dorothy M. Chartrau, ANC, N733447.
Gertrude M. Classen, ANC, N775131.
Ethel W. Coeling, WMSC, M516.
Edward F. Counts, Jr., MC, O935617.
Gladys M. Crosno, ANC, N736195.
Myrtle A. Croswell, ANC, N771131.
Elizabeth J. Davies, WMSC, M2497.
June M. Dickie, ANC, N751533.
Mary L. Dombrosky, ANC, N723550.
Helen I. Dunne, ANC, N726819.
Ruth Edenfield, ANC, N767392.
Margaret M. Egan, ANC, N722650.
Vera A. Enquist, ANC, N736267.
Gladys M. Eppright, ANC, N779972.
Adeline C. Evans, ANC, N767057.
Mercedes M. Fischer, ANC, N732315.
Georgia I. Fleet, ANC, N723382.
Janet M. Fleming, ANC, N741892.
Lillian Fore, ANC, N779252.
Gladys O. Fowlie, ANC, N727976.
Sybil C. Freiman, ANC, N726035.
Edith F. Frew, ANC, N742165.
Mary H. Gayle, ANC, N736305.
Rita M. Geis, ANC, N732135.
Beatrice Goldberger, WMSC, R1331.
Mary M. Grant, ANC, N745086.
Mabel Hammarlund, ANC, N733333.
Elizabeth T. Hanna, ANC, N727354.
Ebba V. Hanson, ANC, N787479.
Levenia E. Hill, ANC, N764708.
Alice E. Holland, ANC, N723789.
Edith E. Hopkins, WMSC, R2222.
George W. Houck, MC, O1725757.
M. Marguerite Huff, ANC, N724643.
Helen F. Kay, ANC, N743771.
Marie Kimmet, ANC, N736074.
Nancy B. Kinsey, ANC, N724922.
Mary S. Kollner, ANC, N744834.
Olga R. Kugler, ANC, N756911.
Janie L. Lassiter, ANC, N763875.
Marguerite M. Lavin, ANC, N759550.
Mary S. Lawrence, WMSC, M601.
Margaret L. Loucks, ANC, N723105.
Martha C. McLaughlin, ANC, N743335.
Florence C. Malone, ANC, N720370.
Maria L. Marshall, ANC, N728687.
Dorothy C. Martone, ANC, N759391.
Beulah L. Marwine, ANC, N745567.
Margaret E. Megill, ANC, N724008.
Hubert W. Merchant, DC, O487380.
Mary C. Morris, ANC, N744161.
Clara R. Oberg, ANC, N730086.
Marie A. Oswald, ANC, N779052.
Floyce Parham, ANC, N775813.
Sylvia R. Pavlovich, ANC, N741620.
Loucelle E. Peck, ANC, N758550.
Alice E. Pettengill, ANC, AN721998.
Ollie W. Plunkett, ANC, N745327.
Mary M. Preston, ANC, N763725.
Eleanor R. Reimers, WMSC, R1087.
Mary E. Riley, ANC, N772827.
Sophia D. Sedor, ANC, N761695.
Geraldine S. Smith, ANC, N724120.
Thelma I. Sooman, ANC, N783778.
Barbara C. Sox, ANC, N727839.
Ruth M. Steenburgh, ANC, N756235.
Alice E. Still, ANC, N742943.
Ida R. Strickland, WMSC, R408.
Ruth M. Stroemer, ANC, N772941.
Mary A. Taney, ANC, N755309.
Elizabeth P. Taylor, ANC, N728297.
Gladys A. Theiss, ANC, N736098.
Jeanne M. Treacy, ANC, N724830.
Celestia H. Uftring, ANC, N767068.
Fanny Urette, ANC, N730574.
Eileen M. Waite, ANC, N737274.
Nellie E. Walls, ANC, N759333.
Gladys M. Welch, ANC, N731925.
Margaret H. Wheeler, ANC, N774699.
Mary E. White, ANC, N752315.
Althea E. Williams, ANC, N733494.
Miriam E. Young, ANC, N733473.

To be first lieutenants

Mayna R. Allen, ANC, N776564.
Eugene J. Bell, Jr., JAGC, O989155.
Angela R. Benda, ANC, N784722.
Eugene F. Chandler, MC, O976732.
Betty P. Chellman, WMSC, R2293.
Edwin T. Cooke, MC, O984778.
Alyce-Marie C. Cushnie, ANC, N793733.
Virginia L. Jones, WMSC, R1394.
Robert L. Massonneau, MC, O975718.
Dorothy J. Matheson, ANC, N785581.
Patricia T. Murphy, ANC, N752652.
Marjorie K. Neuman, ANC, N797941.
Joseph P. O'Leary, DC, O980923.
Edwin M. Schmidt, JAGC, O989985.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Marion C. Allbright, O1179758.
Raymond H. Beaty, O2021091.
Ian K. Burgess, O2203170.
Edwin D. Chavous, O2205567.
Jack R. Clawson, O978547.
Harry H. Collier, O2203917.
Carroll C. Davis, O2202355.
Eley P. Denson, Jr., O2211054.
Thomas J. Dilbeck, O967483.
Earl D. Downing, O2207320.
Robert C. Ebersberger, O966933.
Robert C. Effinger, Jr., O2204907.
Elmer D. Gates, O2201156.
Angelo Giambusso, AO712799.
James C. Griffith, O2207065.
Robert L. Harper, O2704789.
Gerald G. Hennis, O2202952.
William J. Hoar, O2200449.
Ernest P. Hoff, Jr., O971161.
Edward B. Kenney, O2205222.
Richard D. Kolter, O973381.
Keith E. Larsen, O2210833.
John F. Prendiville, Jr.
Albert E. Riley.
Hansel Y. Smith, Jr., O2209902.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. Harry Lynn Bolen, O185986, Illinois National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, O113537, California National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. James William Cook, O298148, California National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Vincent Paul Coyne, O236410, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from August 28, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513, California National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Naylor, O265997, Connecticut National Guard, to date from August 28, 1950.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. James Aloysius Murphy, O143370, Rhode Island National Guard, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Julian Olson, O232882, Wisconsin National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Fred Calvin Tandy, O206131, Iowa National Guard, to date from October 26, 1950.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All medical officers nominated for promotion have been found professionally qualified for promotion as required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Ellenbogen, Edward, 18771A.
Rogers, Vernon Otto, 18770A

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Anderson, Robert Seymour, 15199A.
Andrews, George Allen, 15103A.
Antosz, Leo Joseph, 15197A.
Bales, Glenn Edward, 15055A.
Bartek, Joe John, 15211A.
Barth, John Craig, 15152A.
Bathurst, John Forrest, 15144A.
Blunk, John Robert, 15066A.
Borbe, Alfred Thomas, 15050A.
Brazelton, Leslie Felix, 15214A.
Brock, Arthur Wellington, 15173A.
Brown, Bernard Leon, 15081A.
Brown, Henry William, 15225A.
Bryan, Warren Leroy, 15109A.
Burke, John Thomas, 15181A.
Butler, Ralph Joseph, 15142A.
Campbell, Glenn Vincent, 15070A.
Carlstrom, Robert Donald, 15098A.
Cavanaugh, Charles Elmer, Jr., 15200A.
×Chafin, James Troy, Jr., 15113A.
Chauret, Colin Joseph Nicholas, 15218A.
Chmura, Edward, 15077A.
×Cismowski, Aloysius Michael, 15106A.
Clark, Frederick A., 15189A.
Coleman, Fred, 15119A.
Conway, Jack Melvin, 15124A.
Corbin, Zane Edwin, 15082A.
Cox, Harold Donavon, 15068A.
Daffern, Troey, 15048A.
Dankof, Karl Elson, 15171A.
Deschamps, Elzeard John, 15216A.
×Di Labbio, Paul, 15047A.
Dix, Roy Arthur, 15111A.
Doering, Edward Wayne, 15118A.
Douglas, Logan Albert, 15227A.
Downey, Richard Forrest, 15190A.
Drake, William Henry, 15219A.
Edens, Billy Gene, 15209A.
Eggleston, John Waller, 15169A.
Elrod, John Hale, 15187A.
England, John Brooke, 15188A.
Englebretson, Robert Edward, 15088A.
Erickson, Arnold Theadore, 15215A.
Fairbank, Charles Edward, 15059A.
Falkenberg, Harold Stanton, 15083A.
Fisher, Harrison Lee, 15148A.
Fisher, Robert Jeremy, 15166A.
Fox, Bob Duane, 15058A.
French, George Holmes, 15201A.
×Frost, Douglas Hugh, 15194A.
Frost, Jack Junior, 15150A.
Garrison, Keith M., 15180A.
Gibson, John Raymond, 15122A.
Glasgow, Thurman Arnold, 15080A.
×Goldblum, Theodore, 15174A.
Graham, Harold Bruce, 15183A.
Graham, Neil James, 15052A.
Hall, Marvin Russell, 15163A.
Hanlen, John Wayne, 15195A.
Hardy, Nathan Chester, 15069A.
Hargis, Horrace Peyton, 15139A.
×Hartman, Richard John, 15056A.
Harvey, Theodore Richard, 15204A.
Hasselbaum, Roth Oscar, 15196A.
Heller, Richard Frederick, Jr., 15089A.
Higgins, Richard William, 15153A.
×Hilburn, John E., 15213A.
×Hinkle, Arthur Lee, 15061A.
Hobbs, Robert Alan, 15206A.
Hoyl, Basil Landon, 15154A.
Hunt, Hollis Hubert, 15133A.
×Hunt, Raymond Dale, 15051A.
Hurley, Raymond Leo, 15054A.
×Hurrie, Robert Paige, 15138A.
Hurst, Eugene Edward, 15170A.
Iannacito, George James, 15101A.
Jensen, Loyd Eugene, 15074A.
×Johnson, Haddon, Jr., 15100A.
×Jones, Paul Daniel, 15146A.
×Keppler, Elmer Charles, 15158A.
Kerr, Teddy Junior, 15179A.
Lane, Harry Wesley, 15096A.
Laster, Tom Garrison, 15110A.
Leone, Joseph Michele, 15102A.
Lindsey, Wilbur Ross, Jr., 15071A.
Lozito, Francis Carmel, 15065A.
Mabrey, Thomas Franklin, 15063A.
Madara, George Leonard, Jr., 15202A.
Madsen, Lawrence Edwards, 15092A.
Maloney, Robert Alphonse, 15078A.
Martin, Walter Don, 15108A.
Martin, Warren Harry, 15210A.
Matthews, Albert McKay, 15131A.
Mattick, Stephen, 15049A.
McCulloch, Donald Edward, 15151A.
McDaniel, Henry Bailey, Jr., 15105A.
McGill, Allen Keith, 15175A.
McKee, Donald Eugene, 15149A.
McKee, William Vincent, 15172A.
Meintsma, Seward Mortimer, 15127A.
Melton, Ramon Reeves, 15086A.
Miller, Francis Leo, 15128A.
Mitchell, Frank Grover, Jr., 15177A.
Moore, Robert Edward, 15126A.
Morrow, Craig Godfrey, 15094A.
Morrow, Russell Ellis, 15168A.
Moser, Fred A., Jr., 15141A.
Mullins, George Herbert, 15067A.
Myers, Thomas Ellis, 15136A.
Neuharth, Richard Emanuel, 15182A.
Nevill, Rex Ferrall, 15162A.
×Noll, John Roger, 15134A.
Nourie, Robert Baron, 15114A.
Ochs, Robert Glen, 15229A.
O'Grady, Joe Milton, 15164A.
Parks, Joseph Wayne, Jr., 15212A.
Pensinger, Wilbur Carl, 15167A.
Peters, Marvin Leroy Wells, 15057A.
Plummer, John Augustine, 15087A.
Poindexter, Walter Edwin, 15205A.
Popham, Jack Edward, 15097A.
Preston, William Nathanial, 15076A.
Rattie, Joseph Jackson, 15090A.
×Rayner, Clyde Frederick, 15159A.
Regis, Edward Robert, 15223A.
Robinson, Lester William, 15075A.
Rodriguez, Miguel Ramon, Jr., 15120A.
Rohr, Charles Edmond, 15117A.
Rose, Eugene Simon, Jr., 15060A.
Rose, Franklin, Jr., 15224A.
Savage, Thomas Potter, 15208A.
Scheider, Rube Frank, Jr., 15185A.
Sewell, Jack Kennard, 15130A.
Sharp, William Carmen, 15160A.
Sittler, Lloyd Wayne, 15178A.
Smith, Bernard Cyril, 15112A.
Smith, Douglas Ray, 15186A.
Smith, Robert Ritchie, 15191A.
Sorensen, Glenn Kenneth, 15132A.
Sparkman, Donald Herrick, 15165A.
Stewart, William Henry, 15123A.
Stout, Carl Edward, 15221A.
Stringer, Thomas Henry, 15135A.
Stuempfle, Robert Alan, 15125A.
Svimonoff, Constantine, 15072A.
Swaim, Thomas Stephen, 15203A.
Swigler, Adam William, Jr., 15099A.
×Taylor, Robert Guilford, 15116A.
Tench, William Cabell, 15115A.
Thomas, Lyle Scott, 15121A.
Thomas, Richard Jay, 15147A.
Thompson, Lyle William, 15228A.
Thorne, Richard Eugene, 15079A.
Torgensen, Elmer, 15107A.
Upton, Julian Bernard, 15064A.
Upton, Thomas Jefferson, 15053A.
Van Camp, Lawrence Fisher, 15155A.
Vickery, William Wilson, 15073A.
Voss, Robert Henry, 15129A.
Walker, George Thomas, 15161A.
Wallace, Jamie Walker, Jr., 15207A.
Warmack, Charles William, 15140A.
Waterhouse, William Carson, 15104A.
White, Alan Ralph, 15085A.
Wienberg, Harold Frank, 15220A.
Wilhelmi, William Henry, 15095A.
Willoughby, Albert Milton, Jr., 15156A.
Wilson, Edward Spaulding, 15217A.
Wilson, Thomas Lee, 15143A.
Winn, Earl Hardy, 15157A.
Wise, Earl Hardy, 15157A.
Wise, Henry Grady, Jr., 15084A.
Wright, Tandy Allison, 15222A.
Young, Herbert Lee, 15137A.

MEDICAL

Foley, Francis Edward, 19543A.
Hamilton, Charles Irving, Jr., 19558A.
Leavel, Boude Bowman, 19542A.
Payne, John William, 19544A.
Thornton, Nathaniel Albert, 19583A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Goings, Charles Edward, Jr., 19522A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Adams, Gordon Sackett, 18186A.
Adcock, James Kenneth, 20589A.
Ahrens, George Leo, 17732A.
Alexander, Ernest Lee, 18143A.
Allison, Thomas I., 17713A.
Anderson, Charles Keller, 20616A.
Anderson, George Olaf, 18184A.
Anderson, Hunter Wilson, 17737A.
Anderson, Jack Garner, 18188A.
Avise, Herbert Jack, 18114A.
Aust, Abner Maurice, Jr., 20631A.
Ayres, Frank Lawrence, 18173A.
Baker, Marshall Erbie, 20675A.
Baker, Wilson Kirby, Jr., 17740A.
Baldwin, Richard Allen, 18562A.
Barns, William Frederick, 20630A.
Barry, Russell John, 20656A.
Barter, John Wallace, 18208A.
Bass, Robert Albert, 20632A.
Baumann, Robert Price, Jr., 18203A.
Becker, Bertram David, 17971A.
Beisner, Gerald Jean, 18251A.
Bell, Robert Malcolm, 18145A.
Bennett, George Alfred, 18154A.
Beno, William George, 18205A.
Bieber, Robert Warren, 17739A.
Blanton, Franklin Dickinson, 21459A.
Blodgett, Henry Parson, Jr., 18214A.
Blount, Buford Charles, 17699A.
Bobbitt, Aubrey, Malcolm, 20644A.
Bohannon, James Raymond, Jr., 18146A.
Boone, Warren Wallace, 17708A.
Borders, Charles Wesley, 18149A.
Bostick, Arthur Worth, 18239A.
Boswell, Marion Lillard, 17719A.
Bowman, Ralph Irving, Jr., 18209A.
Boyle, William Fredrick, 17729A.
Bray, Leslie William, Jr., 18136A.
Brennan, Joseph Xavier, 17728A.
Brinson, William Leslie, 18117A.
Brisley, Bernard Anthony, 18265A.
Brown, Jack Riley, 20599A.
Brownfield, Paul Wehrle, 20597A.
Brumm, Robert Ellsworth, 17717A.
Burkhart, James Murrell, 18230A.
Burnett, Elvin Earl, 20601A.
Burns, Robert Bernard, 17727A.
Bush, Frederick Eugene, 20643A.
Busha, George Francis, 20628A.
Byrn, John Stanford, 18196A.
Canning, Douglas Strickland, 20577A.
Chapman, John Monroe, Jr., 17700A.
Clark, Earl Otis, Jr., 20682A.
Clements, Ben Hill, Jr., 17733A.
Clifton, Leecroy, 20650A.
Collington, Frederick, 20663A.
Collings, Perry Velmont, 18156A.
Cook, William, Jr., 18257A.
Cooney, Jack Bernard, 20657A.
Cooper, Dewey Glenn, 18260A.
Craig, Robert Peter, 20649A.
Crosby, Samuel Eugene, Jr., 20612A.
Crowley, John McBride, 18217A.
Crowther, Frederick Earl, 18221A.
Cude, Willis Augustus, Jr., 21463A.
Cummins, James Dirickson, Jr., 20618A.
Curry, Ralph Jack, 18245A.
Davis, Bruce, 18120A.
De Gennaro, Carlo Nicola, 20570A.
Doe, Irving Chester, 18155A.
Doiron, Claude Joseph, Jr., 20596A.
Donegan, Charles Edward, 18283A.
Doran, Patrick Leo, 18207A.
Dotson, Herbert Forrest, Jr., 20587A.
DuFault, William Francis, 20680A.
DuMontier, Louis Devine, 18171A.
Eagle, Comly Joel, 18115A.
Eberhardt, Donald Elwin, 18182A.
Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.
Eckmann, Frederick Charles, 17718A.
Elliott, Donald Ancil, 20636A.
Elzey, J. Murray, 18204A.
Ernst, William Joseph, 20609A.
Escue, Walter Harbin, 17702A.
Eubank, Graydon Knox, 18132A.
Fahrney, Richard Lee, 18191A.
Farnsworth, Al W., 18229A.
Farr, John Wesley, 20660A.
Foote, Richard Harold, 18219A.
Fowler, Oscar Frank, 20583A.
Fraser, Paul Victor, 20654A.
Frazier, Max Eugene, 21456A.
Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.
Gallagher, Rial Frederick, 20621A.
Geary, James Eugene, 17701A.
Gentzler, Robert Francis, 20678A.
Gilpin, Harry Duncan, 18124A.
Gleaves, Donald Heavner, 18282A.
Glines, Carroll Vane, Jr., 20579A.
Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
Goppert, Jean Glen, 18167A.
Gourley, Edwin Parker, 18181A.
Gray, Donald Underwood, Jr., 18223A.
Green, Norman Morgan, 18237A.
Greene, Sidney, 20658A.
Greenamyre, Vernie Baird, 18140A.
Gregory, Willie Preston, 18236A.
Griffard, Robert Marcel, 18264A.
Gruber, Kenneth Willis, 20623A.
Haggard, Richard Lowell, 17725A.
Hall, Benny Bob, 18272A.
Hall, Harvey Preston, 20674A.
Hamilton, Calvin Lee, 18139A.
Hanigan, Edward James, Jr., 18222A.
Hansen, Robert Paul, 18159A.
Hanton, John Thomas, 18138A.
Hawes, Warren Harding, 18160A.
Haynes, Clarence Gilbert, 20653A.
Henry, David Watters, Jr., 20590A.
Henry, Mervin Lester, 20604A.
Herrera, Alfred Charles, 20608A.
Hicks, Malcolm Glenn, 18185A.
Hill, Marcus Lee, Jr., 20622A.
Hinerman, Maurice Elwyn, 18218A.
Hink, Harry Devere, 17710A.
Hochstetler, George Edward, 18216A.
Hoffman, Charles Addison, Jr., 18244A.
Holt, Garland Edward, 20607A.
Horn, Robert Paul, 17743A.
Houghtby, James Kenneth, 18240A.
Howes, Lewis Langdon, Jr., 18220A.
Humphries, Buford Milton, 18175A.
Hurlburt, Dana Follett, 18119A.
Hurst, Guy, Jr., 18243A.
Hutchinson, Paul Eugene, 18158A.
Jensen, Lloyd Kenneth, 20624A.
Jensen, Sigurd Lars, Jr., 20651A.
Jewell, Malcolm Eugene, 20588A.
Johanson, Alvin Lars Anton, 18248A.
Johnson, Clarence LaVerne, 18213A.
Johnson, George Alvin, 20672A.
Jones, David Boone, 18183A.
Jones, Donald Alfred, 18157A.
Jones, Richard Ernest, 18170A.
Jones, William Monroe, 20641A.
Kane, Richard Weidner, 17711A.
Kar, Edward George, 18252A.
Kelly, James Wyatt, 21462A.
Kemerling, William Earl, 21460A.
Kennedy, Dean Lewis, 18235A.
Kent, Joseph Francis, Jr., 17724A.
Kenyon, Benjamin Clarence, Jr., 18215A.
Kenyon, Donald Edward, 18268A.
Kester, Clifford Daniel, 18163A.
King, Edwin Vernon, 20585A.
Kirschman, Iran Paul, 18258A.
Kohrman, Elwood Netherton, 20602A.
Latta, Arthur W., 18273A.
Lauterbach, Harris Young, 18256A.
Lawson, Francis Robert, 20606A.
Lewis, Oliver Wendell, 18227A.
Light, Herbert Myron, 18128A.
Lineham, Thomas Uriah, Jr., 18112A.
Little, David Lee, 18253A.
Littlewood, Theodore Peterson, 20642A.
Lloyd, Glenn Howard, 18226A.
Lockhart, George Andrew, Jr., 20594A.
Locklear, James Quinton, 18133A.
Loman, William Thomas, Jr., 20669A.
Long, Paul Henry, 20635A.
Long, Robert Francis, 18142A.
Lopez, Donald Sewell, 18164A.
Luber, Vernon Norton, 18127A.
Lunos, Austin Edward, 20645A.
Magill, Francis William, 20652A.
Maher, Thomas Joseph, 20655A.
Malloy, William James, 18197A.
Mandina, Sidney Reginald I., 18125A.
Marshall, Sidney Currier, 18206A.
Martin, Eugene, Jr., 18233A.
McAnally, Paul Edward, 20581A.
McBride, Hugh Walker, 17736A.
McCleary, George Carlton, 17735A.
McCully, Robert Humes, 18274A.
McGaughey, Donald Keith, 20662A.
McGowan, Samuel Benjamin, 20572A.
McKay, Allen Fraser, 20613A.
McMinis, Jonathan Burns, 18249A.
McNeil, Edwin Evan, 18192A.
Melton, Carl Mudgett, 18190A.
Melucas, Paul Joseph, 20640A.
Melvin, Robert Elwood, 18193A.
Meredith, Jim Tom, 17706A.
Merino, Robert Francis, 18224A.
Mertely, Frank, 18201A.
Miller, Edgar Cornelius, 20614A.
Miller, John William, 18198A.
Miller, Sidney Harry, 21459A.
Mills, Arthur Julius, 18180A.
Mills, James Edward, Jr., 18231A.
Moehle, Charles Fred, 18131A.
Moir, James Ferriss, 17712A.
Monaco, Anthony William, Jr., 20605A.
Montgomery, Bill Alexander, 17705A.
Montgomery, Joe Sheldon, 20633A.
Moore, Jack Kenneth, 18135A.
Moore, James Conway, Jr., 20664A.
Moore, Richard Raymond, 19795A.
Moore, Winston Eugene, 17722A.
Morton, Walter Pickney, Jr., 18129A.
Mullan, Alfred William, Jr., 17709A.
Munns, Orlin Charles, 18199A.
Myers, Andrew Jackson, Jr., 20769A.
Nanney, James Thomas, 18177A.
Neville, Harry Walter, 17704A.
Newgarden, George Joseph, 3d, 20591A.
Newton, Frederick Carter, 18228A.
Niemczyk, Julian Martin, 20671A.
Nole, Jack Dean, 20598A.
O'Donnell, William Joseph, 20574A.
O'Halloran, Christopher John, 18259A.
Olivera-Barroso, Manuel, 17744A.
Orillion, Arthur Joseph, Jr., 20593A.
Paige, Carl Addison, 18241A.
Payant, Peter, 18232A.
Pedersen, Stanley Cartwright, 20617A.
Pendergraft, Wesley Lael, 18242A.
Penick, Everett Smith, Jr., 18234A.
Perry, James Wallace, 20673A.
Perry, Roland Archibald, 18231A.
Peters, Francis David, Jr., 18137A.
Peters, Warren Edmund, 18276A.
Peterson, Harry William, 18275A.
Pettitt, Bert Edward, Jr., 17698A.
Philips, Thomas Roland, Jr., 18266A.
Phillips, Lowell Gene, 18050A.
Pierce, Russell Kurtz, Jr., 18118A.
Potter, Edward Mac, Jr., 17716A.
Prager, Arthur, 20681A.
Prager, John William, 20586A.
Preller, Gordon Charles, 18144A.
Price, Robert Harold, 20571A.
Purcell, Richard McKnight, 18267A.
Radcliffe, John Bilton, Jr., 20667A.
Raley, Theodore Maxwell, 18200A.
Randall, Richard Clary, 18212A.
Raphun, Leland Richards, 18130A.
Rath, Leland John, 20620A.
Rea, Thomas Samuel 17707A.
Reeder, William Dean, 18161A.
Reid, Milton Morgan, 20647A.
Reisner, Horace Jackson, 18271A.
Rementer, William John, Jr., 18250A.
Reuteler, Bruce Ervin, 18168A.
Riley, Eldon Stanley, 17703A.
Ristau, Siegfried Edward, 18169A.
Roderick, Jack Victor, 18122A.
Rogers, Dan Terrance, 20665A.
Rosenberg, Leslie Benjamin, 18210A.
Rotstan, Robert, 17723A.
Rutherford, Richard Thomas, 18134A.
Salyards, John Albert, Jr., 18279A.
Sandvig, Kenneth Leslie, 20595A.
Sanna, Francis Patsy, 18148A.
Saylor, Warren Daniel, 20637A.
Scarpero, William John, 20677A.
Schmidt, George Robert, 18202A.

Schmidt, Howard Richard, 18123A.
Schoeffler, Clifford, 18179A.
Schuering, Alvin George, 18166A.
Scroggin, Orville Oliver, 3d, 17738A.
Schwalier, Charles Dale, 17731A.
Schwaner, Charles Fred, 17714A.
Selbie, Frederick Donald, Jr., 18225A.
Sever, James Edward, 20592A.
Sharp, Stuart Mayer, 20629A.
Shawhan, Zac George, 20576A.
Sheperd, Olen Dean, 20619A.
Shewan, Clifford Wayne, 18150A.
Shusta, Chester Joseph, 21461A.
Simpson, Russell Reavely, 19565A.
Singer, Solomon Elias, 20666A.
Sinnett, Jefferson David, 18269A.
Slade, William Arthur, 20573A.
Smith, Bennie Cozzens, 18141A.
Smith, Clark Bridgland, 17730A.
Smith, J. B., 20638A.
Smith, Mart, Gary, Jr., 17976A.
Smith, Maurice Hunter, 18172A.
Snyder, George Francis, 18153A.
Son, Herman Franklin, 17734A.
Spencer, Jack, 20661A.
Spencer, Loren James, 18255A.
Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.
Springer, Paul Richard, 17715A.
Staples, Johnston Raleigh, 20578A.
Stephenson, Wayne Louis, 18238A.
Stevens, Jack Duane, 20679A.
Stevens, Wendelle Castyle, 18195A.
Stewart, Walter Claiborne, Jr., 20639A.
Stone, James Samuel, 18247A.
Stroff, Michael John, Jr., 20648A.
Sturm, Wilmer Ross, 20676A.
Suttie, James, 20646A.
Talbot, George Edward, 18126A.
Taylor, Charles Kersey, Jr., 18113A.
Taylor, Jay Johnson, 20580A.
Taylor, Joseph Thomas, 20611A.
Theus, Lucius, 18270A.
Thomas, Alan Brainerd, 17721A.
Thompson, George Willard, 17726A.
Titus, Frank Alvin, 17741A.
Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.
Trammell, Andrew Jack, 17720A.
Traylor, Horace Cleveland, Jr., 18165A.
Urquhart, Charles Thomas, Jr., 20584A.
Urquhart, Roland Leslie, Jr., 18162A.
Van Bloom, Jay Clark, 18147A.
Vega, John William, 18280A.
Vincent, Robert Wilson, 20575A.
Volger, Alfred Fritz, 20670A.
Volet, Leonard, 18174A.
Voris, George Arthur, 17968A.
Warner, Walter Eugene, 20610A.
Watkins, Marvin Maurice, 17742A.
Weeks, Roy Franklyn, Jr., 18189A.
Welsh, Stephen Jackson, 20634A.
Wendt, Willard Arthur, 20625A.
Werber, William Alexander, 18178A.
White, Boyd Barnard, 20626A.
Wilborn, William Thomas, 18194A.
Williams, James Coleman, 18261A.
Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.
Williams, Wilson Byron, 20668A.
Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.
Wilson, Richard Stanley, 18121A.
Winfree, Douglas Woodson, Jr., 18278A.
Winner, Donald Carlton, 17973A.
Wolfe, Charles Spurgeon, 18176A.
Woolf, Simpson Molen, 20569A.
Yeager, Paul Meryald, 18116A.
Yusievicz, John Joseph, 20582A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Allinson, John Nils, 21626A.
Beck, William Stanislaus, 21612A.
Cook, Raymond John, 21610A.
Garner, Walter Frank, 21609A.
Herrin, Daniel Monroe, Jr., 21620A.
Holihan, Francis Leonard, 21607A.
Johnson, John Alfred, 21611A.
Little, Herman Ivy, 21616A.
Marolf, Kenneth Loyd, 21613A.
Nicely, Harry Benson, Jr., 21622A.
Roftis, Robert Jesse, 21623A.
Ruffing, Donald Joseph, 21621A.
Schult, Harold George, 21617A.
Smyth, Kenneth E., 21619A.
Weller, William Edger, 21618A.
Whitt, Orbin Russell, 21625A.
Winkelblech, Donald Ray, 21624A.
Woolf, Henry McCune, 21615A.
Zellers, Billy Bob, 21614A.

The following-named officer for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. This officer is subject to physical examination required by law.

×Hetland, Mona Oline, AN1737.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of January 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Geigel, Francis Gerald, 18772A.
Montcalm, Rosario Louis Ulric, 18773A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Abbott, Charles Whitney, 15243A.
Alexander, James Constantine, 15372A.
×Amundson, Ray Kenneth, 15367A.
Angelakis, Charles, 15362A.
Atkinson, Berkeley, 15329A.
Baker, William Harding, 15261A.
Barthelmess, Robert Platt, 15309A.
Baxter, James Marvin, 15301A.
Beasley, Roland Clark, 15293A.
Benham, Harold Nolan, 15249A.
Bennett, Robert Alexander, 15312A.
×Beveridge, Richard Franklin, 15352A.
Bird, Raymond Casimer, 15256A.
Blake, Earl Gifford, 15303A.
Blizzard, Alpheus Wesley, Jr., 15290A.
Bosworth, Richard Arnold, 15330A.
×Boyd, Raymond Andrew, 15295A.
Brady, James William, 15285A.
Brown, Albert James, 15246A.
Butler, John Bryon, 15308A.
Butt, Oscar Adolph, 15346A.
Cahill, Robert Joseph, 15334A.
×Caples, James Edward, 15315A.
Cardin, Philip George, 15257A.
Carlisle, Paul Leroy, 15306A.
Carter, Richard Bruce, 15363A.
Chance, James Harvey, 15355A.
Collins, Fred Alvin, Jr., 15374A.
Collins, Richard Vincent, 15380A.
Cook, Harvey Andrew, Jr., 15382A.
Croyts, Harold Simon, 15277A.
Cundiff, Jack Baker, 15269A.
Dacus, Rector Claiborne, 15258A.
Dallman, Howard Marvin, 15281A.
Danielson, James Elmer, 15323A.
Dewberry, Raymond Kenneth, 15344A.
Dingivan, Edward Arthur, 15262A.
Donohue, William Roberts, 15233A.
×Driskell, Claude Thomas, 15381A.
Duckett, Wayne George, 15265A.
Dunlap, Carl E., 15364A.
Evans, George Ollie, 15337A.
Evans, Ivor Parry, 15353A.
Farrar, George Balch, 15354A.
Fernbaugh, Richard Mathew, 15370A.
Galligar, Newton Ray, 15379A.
Gammons, David Bradley, 15297A.
George, Harry Hendrick, 15271A.
George, Rex Hall, 15242A.
Goetz, Paul Arthur, 15376A.
Goodson, John Schley, Jr., 15339A.
Grobe, Joe Bailey, 15328A.
Harris, Paul Edgar, 15278A.
Hart, Frederick Francis, 15351A.
Hartzell, James Harris, 15263A.
Hayes, Robert Ralph, 15255A.
Hearne, Alfred Carroll, 15321A.
Hesse, George Albert, Jr., 15311A.
Hight, James Russell, 15325A.
Holman, Albert Hugh, 15319A.
Howze, Stuart Alston, Jr., 15345A.
Hoza, Paul Peter, 15268A.
Hughes, Lloyd Chalmers, 15267A.
Hunt, Robert Louis, 15234A.
Hybki, Casimir Francis, Jr., 15273A.
Johnson, Milo Claude, 15241A.
Jones, John Preston, 15360A.
Joseph, Edward Bell, 15366A.
Keegan, George Joseph, Jr., 15333A.
Kielgass, Earl Lehman, 15292A.
Kinder, Richard Oscar, 15245A.
Kinkade, Otis Mansel, 15266A.
Kirschbaum, Everett Julius, 15317A.
Klibbe, Frank William, 15342A.
Knight, Lyle Franklin, 15316A.
Kocher, John Wayland, 15254A.
Kopit, Alfred Leo, 15327A.
Kunkel, William Roy, 15231A.
Lathrop, Robert Young, 15250A.
Latimore, Henry James, Jr., 15368A.
Lawrence, Willard James, 15369A.
Leonard, William Charles, Jr., 15279A.
Lester, Clarence Dewey, 15338A.
×Lollis, Clyde Washington, Jr., 15314A.
Macken, Gerald Bernard, 15291A.
×McCarthy, Peter James, Jr. 15244A.
McDonald, Bill, 15358A.
McDonald, William Allan, 15350A.
McKnight, Douglas Knox, 15365A.
Mikell, Emory Allen, 15232A.
Miller, Homer Britt, 15322A.
Mims, Hayden Pegram, 15375A.
×Montone, Neil Anthony, 15248A.
Myers, George Harvey, 15324A.
Newmeyer, Howard Walter, 15300A.
Neill, John Cleo, 15286A.
Oberg, John Joseph William, 15348A.
Ostrye, Norbert Benedict, 15299A.
Parnell, Roland Cleveland, 15313A.
Pazin, Peter, 15239A.
×Peterson, John Francis, 15356A.
Polyea, Albert, 15275A.
Prichard, Artist Hudson, Jr., 15326A.
Provancha, Earl Deloss, 15383A.
Queen, Thomas Walter, Jr., 15335A.
Raymer, John Cecil, Jr., 15310A.
Reineft, Robert Amandus, 15270A.
Rieker, Thomas Henry, 15251A.
Rhodehamel, Wesley Richard, 15347A.
Roberts, John Wendell, 15280A.
Rodgers, John Robert, 15341A.
Roe, David Allen, 15282A.
Ruehle, John Richard, 15276A.
Sales, Robert Newton, 15294A.
Sanders, James Burton, 15235A.
Sanderson, Edward Jennings, 15274A.
Sawyer, Clyde Lenox, Jr., 15238A.
Sawyer, Russell, 15272A.
Scheller, Donald Richard, 15318A.
Schroeder, Norman Clark, 15359A.
Scott, Samuel Woodward, 15264A.
Shafer, Jonathan Karl, 15298A.
Shelton, William Edgar, 15247A.
Simeone, Harold Martin, 15373A.
Smith, Chester Allen Arthur, 15230A.
Snoden, Charles Arthur, 15361A.
Spurrier, Paul McLellan, 15305A.
Stamm, Eugene Clarence, Jr., 15302A.
Stearns, Richard Charles, 15283A.
Steere, Lowell Beall, 15340A.
Stratton, Edward Earl, 15289A.
Stormo, Virgil MacArthur, 15287A.
Swindell, Charles William, 15240A.
×Taylor, Frank Raymond, 15377A.
Terry, Charles Millard, 15378A.
Thome, Joseph Eduard, 15371A.
Tipton, Jack Ray, 15336A.
Tomlinson, William Warren, 15236A.
Townsend, James Gordon, 15260A.
Vincenzi, August, 15252A.
Ward, Walter Karl, 15259A.
Webber, John Wallace, 15331A.
Wengel, Emil Joe, 15296A.
Wheless, Ellis Joe, 15332A.
White, Herbert Richard, 15343A.
Willets, Ray Joseph, 15349A.
Wilson, Joseph Griswold, 15284A.
Workman, John Richard, 15253A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Buchanan, Robert Sylvester, 18292A.
Gross, Fenneth Eugene, 18269A.
Jackson, Charles Wilbur, 18284A.
League, Miles Richard, 18286A.
Matte, Joseph Zannet, 20515A.
Pulley, John Hubert, Jr., 18288A.
Rigsby, Cecil Harding, 18285A.
Tanner, Theodore John, 18287A.
Terrell, Harry Evans, Jr., 18291A.
Werbeck, Donald Louis, 18290A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

AIR FORCE NURSES

Casey, Corinne, 21152W.
×Cigagna, Valarie Prima, 21083W.
Schadt, Sophia Marie, 21130W.
Visnovsky, Helen M., 21043W.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of February 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

The following-named line officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence L. C. Atkeson, Jr.	William K. Mendenhall, Jr.
John B. Pearson, Jr.	Harry D. Felt
Harry Sanders	John M. Will
William B. Ammon	Francis M. Hughes
Roland N. Smoot	Murr E. Arnold
James H. Thach, Jr.	John B. Moss
Frederick M. Trapnell	

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Batchelder
Charles H. Gillilan

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, whose divine love, wisdom, and power are the inspiration and strength of the God-fearing and the faithful, may we daily go forth courageously in the high adventure of building a finer civilization.

May we begin each day with a vital and radiant faith in the Lord, our God. Make us more eager to seek and more willing to accept the overtures of our Master's counsel and companionship.

Grant that our vision of peace on earth may be so clear and commanding that every lofty and holy aspiration within our souls shall respond with a fervent desire and determination to bring it to fulfillment.

We pray that these Thy servants may be guided by Thy spirit in some special way as they formulate the policies and administer the affairs of government and as they labor for a just and righteous solution of all the difficult problems in the areas of international relationship.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 9, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 12, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Hon. ERNEST GREENWOOD as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-second Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New York has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself at the bar of the House to receive the oath of office.

Mr. GREENWOOD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 11, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign, as of this date, from the Committee on House Administration.

Sincerely yours,
EDNA F. KELLY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 12, 1951.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby wish to tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress, Tenth Missouri District.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 30)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1951.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1951, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 38)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1951.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday, January 16, 1951, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; that there be not to exceed 1 hour of general debate, to be confined to the bill, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and myself, after which the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when I had the conference with the gentleman from Georgia and suggested to him I would be agreeable to this procedure provided it was in accordance

with the desires of the Rules Committee, I had forgotten the fact that the State of Pennsylvania and its 33 Members of the House are vitally interested in an inauguration on that day. They have come to me and suggested they would like to have this matter come up on some other day than Tuesday if that is agreeable.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest that the minority leader fix the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wednesday would be satisfactory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Wednesday will be more preferable.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, then I modify my unanimous-consent request to make the date Wednesday, the 17th.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the modification, or to the calling up of a bill under unanimous consent, finally, because I realize the Rules Committee has not yet been organized and ready to function. Does this bill contain, may I ask the gentleman, some $2,000,000,000 of authorizations for expansion of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. It provides for the construction of 171 new ships of war, including a large airplane carrier, and the modernization of some 293 ships already in existence, at an estimated cost of about $2,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is this new supercarrier the gentleman referred to being constructed in place of the supercarrier which was voted by the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that it is not being constructed to take the place of the one that was canceled. It is being constructed as a new ship. It will be only 60,000 tons or less.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What was the weight of the original carrier?

Mr. VINSON. The one that was canceled was some 68,000 tons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What was the cost of that cancellation?

Mr. VINSON. The cost of the carrier that was canceled was estimated at around $189,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But what was the cost of the cancellation itself; I understand some $20,000,000, is that right?

Mr. VINSON. I do not have that figure, but I will develop all that in the discussion on the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I am just trying to point out, under my reservation, that we are now building a new carrier, when the administration refused to build a better carrier for less money a year or more ago. The Eightieth Congress authorized it, but the Secretary of Defense of that time canceled that new carrier. The project was abandoned at a cost of some $20,000,000. The new carrier will now cost how much more than the original one?

Mr. VINSON. It is estimated the new carrier will cost $235,000,000; about $45,000,000 more than the one that was canceled.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then we have lost 18 months of precious time and are spending about $66,000,000 more, while getting a smaller carrier; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman from Ohio is making his point for the RECORD quite clear.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I feel that point should be made quite clear in view of some of the statements that have been made here and elsewhere relative to the Eightieth Congress. It was not the Congress but the administration which made the $66,000,000 mistake in stopping construction of the original carrier.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with the gentleman, and it will all be cleared up in debate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does this new carrier carry out the program that Admiral Denfeld had in mind?

Mr. VINSON. Well, it carries it out partly, as far as the carrier is concerned; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, why is debate on a $2,000,000,000 bill at this stage in this session limited to 1 hour?

Mr. VINSON. I thought probably being confined to the bill that the Committee on Armed Services could present the facts justifying favorable consideration in that time. I think we can cover the whole thing in 30 minutes a side.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, you still have the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. You still have the 5-minute rule, of course, and it will be liberal. We do not have anything else before the House at that time, and there will be no desire to speed it through any faster than orderly procedure requires.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have no idea of limiting debate under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. No. The gentleman can talk all he wants to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

OPERATION CESSPOOL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include several communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today sending a letter to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and requesting that an investigation be undertaken at once to uncover the situation outlined in the letter I will read to the House and to punish those responsible for these difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I have referred to has been sent to me by a personal friend and one in whom I have the utmost confidence. The situation is so rotten that action should be undertaken at once.

The letter reads as follows:

SOUTH KOREA, *December 31, 1950.*

DEAR MIKE: It is with some reluctance I write this letter to you, but I suppose whatever I might say won't be exactly news to you.

This has been a "rough drill"—as the boys say—especially that 3 weeks or more up around the Chosen Reservoir. That was the toughest soldiering any of us had ever done. In fact, the whole damned thing was a nightmare.

Mike, you've known me for some time now, and I think you know I don't lie. So help me God, there are some awfully rotten things going on out here, that should be looked into, and someone hung for them.

I am deliberately refraining from comment on the strategical or tactical operations. But—when I see American canned beer, purchased for the Armed Forces, and shipped overseas in Navy ships, being sold in Korean grog shops to our men for $1.25 per can, I can't stomach the situation. Medicinal brandy, the 2-ounce type issued to medical departments, is being sold for 75 cents each. United States whisky is being peddled for $35 a fifth, United States cigarettes, in vast quantities, may be found in any Korean house or shop. We have even had instances of Koreans approaching our camps offering to sell us United States Army issue clothing. It is so obvious that the black market is doing a tremendous business that it leaves us country boys stupefied. I have personally asked various CIC and CID personnel why they don't move in on this "Operation Cesspool"—and they tell me they "can't touch it." It doesn't require a genius to figure out the answer there.

There's not much more I feel like writing, Mike—except that I've never been so disillusioned and disgusted in my whole life. Something is tragically wrong somewhere, and must be rectified in the United States. Our men are bitter—and they are not damned fools, either. They can detect the odor of manure after their noses have been shoved into it a few times.

Best wishes for a happy new year, and I would appreciate a note from you.

Sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting with my remarks a copy of the letter I am today sending to Chairman VINSON:

JANUARY 12, 1951.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CARL: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just received from a man in whom I have the utmost respect and confidence. The letter speaks for itself as you can see, and I am herewith making a formal request that you, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, undertake an investigation of the charges made. The situation described in this letter is so rotten that, in my opinion, something should be done immediately to correct it and I am very hopeful that with your usual good judgment and finesse that you will get to the bottom of this matter at the earliest opportunity, correct the difficulties cited, and see that those responsible for them are punished.

I would appreciate hearing from you about this matter at your earliest convenience, and it is my sincere hope that you will immediately conduct an investigation of the charges made.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ENLISTMENT OF GERMANS AND JAPANESE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, all people throughout the world are properly disturbed over the prospects of war. Nobody wants war. Everybody wants peace, but not "peace at any price." Most everyone believes the most effective way to maintain an honorable peace is for the free world to build up its armed forces, but America alone cannot supply the manpower and the industrial goods for such an effort. Nor should our boys be called to make all the sacrifices. We should invite the people of other nations to join these forces even though their governments are unable or unwilling to provide armies. This is especially true of the people of Germany and Japan.

The best jobs in these countries are in the United States Army. We should accept enlistments of Germans and of Japanese. We could in this way increase our Armed Forces by probably 2,000,000 men in a minimum of time and at a minimum of expense.

I have heretofore offered legislation to accomplish this. I have today reintroduced a bill for this purpose. I shall from time to time discuss various aspects of the matter with the House.

GIVE THEM HELP OR GET THEM OUT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, not one of us wants to see a continuation of what is taking place in Korea. Let us give our boys enough help to do the job that is before them, or let us get them out of Korea. We need not—we cannot—fight alone; yet virtually that is what we are doing. There are Chinese who want to help and who are ready to help. There are Japanese who will help if we permit it. Let us stop fighting on the other fellow's terms. Manpower is our need in Asia and a sea of manpower is available to us. Let us use that help. Let us give our boys a better break, or let us get them out. We have already shown that we will fight for principle. Let us not bleed ourselves unnecessarily into exhaustion.

QUADRUPLE AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you have all read about the quadruple amputee who is out at Walter Reed Hospital. He has been spoken of in the papers and on the radio. General Streit called me the day before yesterday and told me that letters are pouring in from all over the country with donations for this boy, to try to make his lot a little easier. General Streit has assigned an officer and two secretaries and several women to open the mail that pours in for young Veteran Smith. These donations are chiefly of dimes, quarters, and dollars, small amounts. This shows the feeling of the people all over the country, no matter how moderate their means, for these men. There is nothing we really can do for them except to show our appreciation and make them more comfortable.

I should like to remind the country and the Congress that there are very many terribly wounded men at the Walter Reed. There is another boy at Walter Reed Hospital who is almost equally badly hurt. There is one that is perhaps more severely handicapped. He has given both legs for us. He has given a part of one hand, and he has given a part of one arm. We cannot fit that boy with prosthetic appliances. His plight is even worse than that of some of the others, although people do not realize it because he cannot be fitted with prosthetic appliances.

There were four quadruple amputees in World War II. One of them was Jim Wilson, the boy that came to Washington about legislation. That boy walks and dances and uses both hands. These veterans have a spirit that is beyond compare.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR MEMBERS OF MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, during World War II members of our military and naval forces were given an income-tax exemption of $1,500 of their compensation for active duty service.

Although the President has not admitted the action in Korea to be a war—a "bitter campaign" he called it in his state of the Union message—the effect upon the finances of the participating Armed Forces personnel and their dependents, and upon the economy of the Nation, is just the same.

I am therefore introducing today a bill to exempt from income tax $1,500 of compensation received during any taxable year for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States during a period of war, or a period of declared emergency during which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in combat or occupational military operations.

These men, and women, should not, in justice, be called upon to fight those battles and pay for them too.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the bill will be given immediate consideration and unanimous support.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS WITH CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of a matter of deep concern in critical times like these.

Three enormous office buildings are to be erected on what is known as the Golden Triangle at Pittsburgh Pa. The name given to the development is the Gateway.

The sponsors of the project are the Mellon Bank interests, the United States Steel Corp., the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., and the Aluminum Co. of America. This building group is the initial development of this area and the cost of the buildings is estimated at in excess of $100,000,000—60 percent of which is being loaned the above-mentioned group by the Equitable Insurance Co. of New York.

Plans for the three buildings have been under way for some time and the general contract to erect the buildings has been given on a cost-plus basis to Starrett Bros. & Eakin, of New York. At this time caisson footings are being placed for the first building. The plans for the superstructure are not yet completed, but it is the firm intention of the group to use an all-aluminum facing or a combination of aluminum and stainless steel—a development which is entirely new in the construction field. It is obvious that thousands upon thousands of square feet of these critical materials will be utilized for this enterprise—materials which are, at the present writing, highly restricted and vitally necessary to the war effort. These buildings could be faced with orthodox masonry facings immediately available and not at all in short supply, nor of any consequence to the war effort.

I plead with the Committee on Armed Services to look into this matter at once.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we have had the Wilson war, the Roosevelt war, and are now approaching the Truman war. I assume we will continue to have wars as long as we have Democratic Presidents. However, what disturbs me the most is the fact that we have turned

over the direction of our armies in Korea to that debating society called the United Nations. Just recently President Truman stated that he would confer with the United Nations before dropping any atom bombs. On that basis I assume that if Russia were to drop bombs in the United States he would call a meeting of the United Nations and discuss the matter for at least 3 months before deciding whether to retaliate or not.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, January 22, 1951, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted, on the subject of Federal taxation.

ADDITIONAL SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the past week a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, has been taking testimony from representatives of the Reserve Officers Association, the Air Force Association, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other organizations on the question of the Reserve components of our Defense Establishment.

While I do not want to create the impression that I am reporting for the subcommittee or reflecting its views, yet I do want the membership of the House to know that because of the mishandling of the Reserve program, much hardship has resulted. The uncertainty that each Reserve is faced with today has thrown both officers and men alike of the Army, Navy, Air Reserve, National Guard, Marines, and Coast Guard into a complete tail spin.

Two years ago I called to the attention of Congress these unfavorable conditions among the Reserves and at that time recommended that action be taken immediately by creating additional Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force whose sole responsibility would be to look after the affairs of the Reserve components. My recommendation, which was incorporated in H. R. 1439, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, was the first step necessary to bring about a complete overhauling of all Reserve activities with the hope of eventually building a strong Reserve force. Unfortunately, the legislation was ignored by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with the Reserve problem acute today and thousands of reservists being called to active duty, it is incumbent upon this Congress to take immediate action in remedying conditions. With this thought in mind, I have reintroduced my bill to create additional Secretaries for the Reserve components of our Military Establishment. I hope that it will receive favorable consideration.

FIVE-PERCENT OPERATORS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it has been just 11 days since Congress approved the second supplemental appropriation bill authorizing more billions for defense. Already the 5-percenters have begun their nefarious activities to get a part of it.

Therefore, I have introduced in this Congress a bill similar to one which was proposed by me in 1949. This bill, H. R. 485, would require persons who, for a fee, engage to obtain Government contracts for business firms to register with the Congress.

These 5-percenters are already flocking to Washington to fleece the unsuspecting small-business men who come here from all parts of the country to try to get Government defense contracts. Too many small-business men, after the unsavory situation revealed by the Senate Investigating Committee with reference to the activities of certain administration favorites, have come to believe that the only means of obtaining Government business for their plants is through one of these influence peddlers.

This situation must be corrected at once, before our defense funds, obtained from the toil of our taxpayers, are needlessly dissipated and go to line the pockets of these slick operators.

Already, a carpenter contractor of my district in modest circumstances has written that he has paid traveling expenses amounting to $750 to someone posing as being connected with a fictitious organization called the Atomic Bomb Proof Shelter Division. He represented himself as being able to produce Government contracts for which he stated his charge would be 5 percent of the net profits. Having advanced the money for traveling expenses, the carpenter has heard nothing further from him.

Of course, some influence peddlers are not that flagrant. Some merely charge exorbitantly to obtain contracts which in most cases could have been acquired through legitimate dealings with the Government department involved. The State of New York and, no doubt, other States have established offices in Washington, staffed by experienced personnel, to assist business concerns which do not maintain Washington offices in their dealings with the labyrinthian Government departments. They stand ready to help at any time without charge or obligation.

However these 5-percenters operate, their activities must be curbed at once. Unfortunately, as the excellent Senate committee report admitted, it is the practical fact that they cannot be stopped entirely, but some of the most vicious abuses can be curtailed by the passage of legislation, followed by vigorous enforcement.

I believe that my bill, if enacted, would tend to eliminate the irresponsible sharpshooters and racketeers by exposing their dealings to the light of day. Under it anyone who accepts or obtains a commission for rendering assistance in getting Government contracts is forced to register with the Congress. If he is a legitimate operator, and there are some who perform a valuable service, he would not hesitate to register. Those with venal motives to extort funds from the unsuspecting would be more likely to hesitate, if they were required thus to record officially the nature of their retainer.

In the present mobilization effort, this is a matter of urgency in order, first, to stop the victimizing of innocent small-business men; second, to insure that defense contracts are let on an honest, nonpolitical foundation of merit in the contractor and his product; and third, to prevent a complete undermining of confidence in our Government and those directing its procurement policies.

TRIBUTE TO DOC WATKINS

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of a long and distinguished career of an outstanding member of the reportorial staff of the Associated Press. Doc Watkins is retiring today after more than 40 years as a member of that fine organization. He has handled Associated Press work for the Northwest region of the United States for a long time. He is a personal friend of all Members of Congress from that area. He was conscientious in his work, and accurate and factual in his reporting. He is loved and respected by all those who have associated with him. I know that all of us wish him continued good health and happiness in his retirement, and thank him for the fine work he has done during his long and distinguished service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

INSPECTION OF FORT KNOX GOLD

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 1949, I presented a resolution to this body requesting that a select committee be chosen to inspect the gold at Fort Knox. There has never been anything done about this, and it seems to me, with all the billions of dollars that we appropriate in Congress, we ought to know how secure our gold reserve is.

I am sure if a medical doctor was ever brought in here he would find that most

of the Members of the House have "billionitis," because all we hear in monetary terms is that of billions of dollars.

Further, I will be glad to withdraw this resolution at any time any Member of the House or any Member of the Senate can tell me that he personally has inspected the gold at Fort Knox.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR MORE REVERENCE AND RESPECT FOR THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when the Philippine Islands were under attack by the Japanese, a suggestion was made to Gen. Douglas MacArthur that the Stars and Stripes should be hauled down from the headquarters building of the Far Eastern Command in Manila in order to avoid identifying it to Japanese bombers.

The general's historic reply was:

Take every other normal precaution for the protection of Army headquarters, but keep the flag flying.

With this statement General MacArthur expressed again that respect and esteem which loyal Americans have held for Old Glory since the United States was created out of the sacrifice of a bloody revolution.

The fighting men of America have followed the Stars and Stripes into battle in the defense of our Nation whenever danger threatened America. The flag waved from the masthead of the *Constitution—Old Ironsides*—when naval history was made. It flew proudly over the *Bon Homme Richard* in the Mediterranean. It moved defiantly above the carrier *Lexington* as that valiant vessel plunged to a watery grave in the Coral Sea.

Old Glory flew from Fort McHenry at Baltimore in the War of 1812 during the battle which gave birth to our National Anthem. The flag waved from Cemetery Ridge for three bloody days in the Battle of Gettysburg. It stood beside Custer at Little Big Horn. It charged up San Juan Hill with the great Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders. Old Glory moved with American troops through Belleau Woods and in the action at Chateau-Thierry. And our flag was carried with the American forces from Pearl Harbon to Tokyo, from North Africa to Sicily, from the beachhead at Normandy to Berlin.

Never before in our history have we needed a Nation-wide surge of old-fashioned patriotism as we do today. Our Nation is in danger both from forces within as well as from international communism abroad. And there is no more effective way to bring to mind this need than through an increased display of the American flag.

The flag should wave from every flagpole in the United States, a constant reminder to every citizen of the blessings of liberty and freedom that are our heritage. Our flag floating free in the breeze will help awaken the American people to the increasing danger of the growing subversive forces and influences that are undermining our national life, and which, if not checked, will inevitably lead to disastrous results.

The American flag has always been a sacred symbol to citizens of this Nation. Since 1892, for more than half a century, each generation of American children have solemnly repeated the American pledge of "allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." During more than half a century this affirmation has been a part of the ritual of American citizenship.

To encourage the display of the American flag from every flagpole in the United States for the inspiration of every citizen as a reminder that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, I submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the flag of the United States should be displayed on buildings of States, counties, cities, and municipalities, and on privately owned buildings to the same extent as on buildings of the Federal Government and in accordance with applicable rules and customs pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday and Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a vast number of the 2,000,000 Federal civil-service employees have at one time been employed in private industry. Many so employed were under covered employment as defined in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Act, and as a result had regular deductions made from their weekly or monthly pay checks. Such social-security payroll deductions, a 1 percent tax in the past and a 1½ percent tax now are lost for all practical purposes under existing law when such persons are no longer employed in occupations covered by the Social Security Act.

All civilian employees of the Federal Government qualify for retirement benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1950, as amended, by contributing 6 percent of their wages to the reserve fund. It would seem desirable as well as feasible to permit Federal employees to receive a credit from their social-security payroll deductions toward their civil-service retirement account. Obviously it seems inequitable to have their social-security payroll deductions lost by reason of the fact that there has been simply a transfer of employment from private industry to a Federal job. There is no apparent basis for objection to this bookkeeping transaction which would merely amount to a totaling of payroll taxes paid to the Federal Government and the transfer of that credit to the individual Federal employees' civil-service retirement account.

I am introducing legislation today which should remedy this situation. The bill provides that the tax on wages under section 1400 of the Internal Revenue Code may at the option of the individual be credited to his account in the civil-service retirement and disability fund. The amount to be transferred for civil-service retirement is, of course, limited to the aggregate amount of the tax so deducted under the social-security program.

It is nearly impossible at this time to estimate the number of Federal employees who would be affected by this proposal, but from my investigations to date there should be no adverse effect from the enactment of such a proposal on either of the retirement programs. The Federal Government has the money in either case. If the credit to the civil-service retirement program is not permitted, the social-security program is reaping an unwarranted harvest or windfall at the expense of the individual. If the transfer or credit is allowed, the soundness of the civil-service program is not upset for the Federal employee is permitted to acquire only additional benefits up to the aggregate amount previously deducted under social security.

COMPOSITION OF VARIOUS COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 60) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-second Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 35 members;

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on House Administration shall be composed of 23 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 29 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of 23 members;

The Committee on Public Lands shall be composed of 27 members; and

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall be composed of 23 members.

. The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what is the status of the resolution that was just introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The SPEAKER. It has just been agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did not hear any request to pass it, and I was on my feet before it was passed to ask a question. What are my rights in the matter? I would like very much to speak on it.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman might have reserved the right to object at the proper time, but it is too late now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was put through before I heard it.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was read fully and consisted of a whole page. I think the gentlewoman is too late to raise any question now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman has already proceeded for 1 minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for that purpose at this time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an excerpt from a publication on public speaking, also to include a speech I made in the House in 1940 on Thomas Alva Edison.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SENDING OF YOUNG AMERICANS ABROAD

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the press of last night tells us that General Marshall and Anna Rosenberg are formulating plans to take some millions—I do not recall whether it is 5 or 6, or whether it went up to the number mentioned by Mr. Dewey, 9 or 10—young Americans and send them abroad.

I wonder if Mrs. Rosenberg has a plan, and if so, if she will tell us how she is going to work it, to replace those young Americans with displaced persons from abroad. There will be vacancies over here when many of those young men do not come back. Our folks would like to know whether she intends to bring over displaced persons to replace the American boys who never come back. That is about the procedure that was followed before. Just who is Anna Rosenberg that she should be selected to tell American mothers when and where and for what their sons should give up their lives?

Mr. RANKIN. Being one of them, I do not think she will.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When I spoke previously, it really was a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Speaker recognize me to speak for 1 minute now?

The SPEAKER. Has the gentlewoman spoken for 1 minute this morning?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. I submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman may proceed.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked at the reduction of members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The committee has now been cut from 27 members to 23. There are under this plan only two committees of the House that have fewer members than the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I think, in fact, I know what the effect on the people of the country will be. We are in the most horrible, most devastating, most cruel war that this country ever fought and to reduce this committee to only 23 members to my mind is appalling and entirely unjust.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield. I do not think the gentleman had anything to do with this.

Mr. RANKIN. I knew nothing about it until it was reported. But, the most unjust thing is this. They did all the cutting on the Democratic side. They took off 4 Democrats, from 17 to 13, and left the Republicans at 10 as in the last Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have increased representation on the Republican membership side of the House, however. We should have greater representation than we had in the last session of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Not to that extent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Perhaps not. But it is the principle of the thing when we have more work to do than ever before. It makes a minor committee of the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It treats the veterans with disrespect at a time when we should treat them with especial respect.

Mr. Speaker, when the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946 was enacted, rule X set forth the number of Representatives each committee should have. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was assigned 27 members, and it has operated satisfactorily with that number ever since its organization.

The resolution which has been presented reduces the number of members to 23—and I cannot find anyone who can tell me the reason for such a drastic change. The powers of the committee have not been lessened in any way that I can discover. Certainly the workload has not been lessened. Every Member of this House who has served upon the committee on Veterans' Affairs knows that such service is not easy. In the Congress just adjourned more than 600 measures were referred to it for consideration, and there is no reason to expect that the number of bills affecting veterans will be any fewer in number in the days ahead.

Service upon the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is a service of sacrifice and devotion to a cause. Sometimes it is tedious, technical work, but it is work that must be done. I have always been a little disappointed in noting the large number of changes in the membership of the committee, and can lay it only at the door of reluctance to devote one's time to a field of endeavor that does not primarily affect one's own district.

I regret exceedingly the move to reduce the standing of this committee. The millions of war veterans of all wars will look upon it as another evidence of the lack of interest in their well-being.

WEST GERMANS VOTE "NO ARMING" IN POLL

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, without any comment on my part at this time I would just like to read to you a short article appearing in the Washington Post under date of December 25, 1950, by the Associated Press:

A magazine's poll of its German readers showed today that a large majority opposes West German rearmament.

Der Spiegel (the Mirror), an independent weekly news magazine, said 33,000 Germans answered its questionnaire. The results were published as the western allies and the West German Government were negotiating terms under which West Germany might agree to contribute troops to aid in a united defense of Western Europe.

Eighty-five percent said they do not want to become soldiers or to have their close relatives become soldiers. Only 12.8 percent answered "Yes."

Opposing the creation of voluntary troop units were 60.8 percent, while 82.6 percent voted against compulsory military service. Only 35.4 percent favor voluntary troops and 15.8 compulsory service.

An overwhelming percentage, 95.5, opposed accepting the plan proposed by France to restrict any German troops raised to small units with no general staff and no war ministry. Even if West Germany were given full equality with other nations in a European army, 68.4 percent would still oppose German rearmament.

On the question of whether West Germany should join the North Atlantic defense pact, 81.5 percent said "No."

SECOND LT. JOE BARTLETT

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday here in the Capitol there was an auspicious ceremony which may have escaped the attention of many of the Members. Yesterday our chief page on this side of the aisle, Joe Bartlett, was sworn into the Marine Corps Reserve as a second lieutenant. Those of us who have come to know and admire Joe, his ready smile, his willingness to be helpful at all times, are delighted to hear of his good fortune, and we know that he will take to the Marine Corps the same qualities that have endeared him to all of us here on the floor of the House.

Our best wishes go with Joe wherever he is and in whatever he may be doing. Our loss will be the gain of the Marine Corps.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can, in any way, advise us of the program for the following week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only legislation for next week that I can advise the House of is the naval ship-construction bill to come up on next Wednesday. Any other legislation that might come up next week, and I know of none, except it comes out of the Committee on Armed Services, because they work pretty quick and they have been able to get in some advance work by reason of the organization of the committee at the outset of the session, will come from that committee. I know of no other legislation for next week, but I would like to have a reservation so that I may keep faith with the Members of the House. If any is scheduled to come up, I will advise the House as quickly as I can so that Members may have as much advance notice as possible. I wish I could be more definite.

Mr. ARENDS. I think we understand the situation. I thank the gentleman.

OUR NATION'S INDUSTRIAL STRENGTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in considering the grave situation that confronts this country, many of us are inclined to overlook the industrial strength of this Nation.

Never before has industry of this country been in a better position to produce for defense and domestic consumption purposes. And plans for expansion of productivity capacity are the greatest this year of any in our history.

At the start of World War II, according to the reliable Whaley-Eaton News Letter, the value of industrial plants, after depreciation, was around $30,000,000,000. During World War II, the Government invested $18,000,000,000, and private industry another $6,000,000,000. Since 1945, nearly $100,000,000,000 has gone into new plants, equipment, and facilities. Capacities of basic industries range from 40 percent to several hundred percent above prewar. Moreover, this is capacity now in use, and this requires less costly conversion than idle plants. And private industry is prepared to continue expansion programs indefinitely at peak postwar rates.

The Government's program is geared to encourage industrial expansion to meet the new needs of the present situation. Industry has been assured of priorities to complete expansion programs underway and needed expansion by specific industries will receive the same consideration, with Government loans where private capital cannot be obtained.

One of our problems will be to obtain the basic materials to permit the use of the new plant capacity. That is being attacked intelligently.

For those of us who doubt the strength industrially of this Nation, I cite the following article in the New York Times of Sunday, January 7, 1951, by Hartley W. Barclay, one of its leading financial and industrial writers:

United States industry started the largest expansion program in its history last week as 1951 budgets were put into use by manufacturing, mining, transportation, power, and communications companies throughout the country. The assurance of success was given to expansion steps essential to national defense by the announcement of the National Production Authority that such projects would get all the steel and steel products they might need to complete current programs.

EXPANSION OPERATIONS UP 10 PERCENT

For the first week in January, general levels of industrial expansion operations were up on an average of 10 percent above those at the opening of 1950. Price advances, being reflected in costs, were generally up about 5 percent or more above levels of last midsummer, when much of current work was in the planning stages.

Preparations were also under way for a final drive for all-out production of civilian materials and products in the remaining weeks before stern cut-backs come.

In closed sessions of industrial executive groups in individual companies here, sales and marketing executives were ordered by the highest company officials to enter all possible orders as early as possible, from all kinds of customers, on items not essential to national defense. On defense items affected by current or expected cut-back rulings, salesmen were told to book as much "defense order" or "D. O." business as could be obtained.

As a result of such activities, some companies found themselves sold out for the first month, and in some cases for the first quarter, as the week closed. Others, unable to accept any additional orders, prepared budget data to show Washington why further new plant expansion programs should be approved immediately.

The remarkable aspect of these facts, according to analysts, is that much of the most important work of plant expansion has not yet been announced, approved by industry, or put up to the Washington officials.

For example, many plant expansions needed for production of basic chemicals, not yet classed as essential to national defense, have no priority status for obtaining materials, steel, or equipment. Now these chemical industry executives are seeking prompt recognition of their importance by the highest governmental executives.

SOME BUDGETS REVISED

In industries now provided with some priority status, budgets were being revised to provide for all possible absorption of higher costs for many essential raw materials. Experiences of executives who have conferred with NPA and Economic Stabilization Authority officials on price problems created strong feelings of confidence that all sound decisions about budgets and prices eventually would be approved in Washington.

Top officials in key industries said on Friday that "never before" had they experienced such a marked degree of understanding between Government and business, on appreciation of mutual problems.

It became clearer, at the end of the week, that President Truman was putting it up to industry to make the "guns and butter" program succeed. Important steps were taken, but have not yet been announced, further to expand supplies of scarce materials, to reactivate plants and mines now in mothball status, and to put administration of these operations in the hands of industrial, and not politically appointed, personnel.

The result is that industrialists are starting to use Government and industry cooperation as a dual weapon—for fighting inflation on the home front and for providing adequate arms for defense on foreign fronts. In some cases, this has meant setting up more flexible budget features, to provide for industrial expansions instead of for cut-backs previously expected. That is the explanation of the wave of new plant expansion announcements which occurred here last week.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 61) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley, chairman, North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Pat Sutton, Tennessee; James F. Lind, Pennsylvania: W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr., Florida; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; Harold A. (Porque) Patten, Arizona; E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Alaska; Antonio Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Appropriations: Fred Marshall, Minnesota; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.

Committee on Armed Services: Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence, chairman, Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Abraham J. Multer, New York; C.

B. Deane, North Carolina; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Clinton D. McKinnon, California; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Clarence G. Burton, Virginia; Tom B. Fugate, Virginia; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois.

Committee on District of Columbia: John L. McMillan, chairman, South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard Worth Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin Earl Teague, Texas; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Paul C. Jones, Missouri.

Committee on Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden, chairman, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., New York; John S. Wood, Georgia; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Wingate H. Lucas, Texas; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Leonard Irving, Missouri; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Charles R. Howell, New Jersey; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota; Boyd Tackett, Arkansas; Ernest Greenwood, New York.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: William L. Dawson, chairman, Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; M. G. (Burnie) Burnside, West Virginia; Richard Bolling, Missouri; John F. Shelley, California; William Jennings Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Sidney A. Fine, New York; Bill Lantaff, Florida.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: John Kee, chairman, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; Laurie C. Battle, Alabama; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Thurmond Chatham, North Carolina; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Abraham A. Ribicoff, Connecticut; Omar Burleson, Texas; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Chet Holifield, California; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., New York; Edna F. Kelly, New York.

Committee on House Administration: Harry P. O'Neill, Pennsylvania; Clinton D. McKinnon, California; Reva Beck Bosone, Utah; Charles R. Howell, New Jersey; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Victor L. Anfuso, New York.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Robert Crosser, chairman, Ohio; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; John B. Sullivan, Missouri; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; John A. McGuire, Connecticut; Tom R. Underwood, Kentucky; F. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Homer Thornberry, Texas; Louis B. Heller, New York; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler, chairman, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; William T. Byrne, New York; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky; Ed Gossett, Texas; J. Frank Wilson, Texas; Robert L. Ramsay, West Virginia; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; Woodrow W. Jones, North Carolina; E. L. (Tic) Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Michigan.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Edward J. Hart, chairman, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Phil J. Welch, Missouri; Edward Breen, Ohio; James J. Murphy, New York; John F. Shelley, California; Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Virginia; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Alaska.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray, chairman, Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Albert Whitaker, Kentucky; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; M. G. (Burnie) Burnside, West Virginia; John Lesinski, Jr., Michigan; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Victor L. Anfuso, New York; Bill Lantaff, Florida; Frazier Reams, Ohio.

Committee on Public Lands: John R. Murdock, chairman, Arizona; Clair Engle, California; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Toby Morris, Oklahoma; Ken Regan, Texas; Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., Texas; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Reva Beck Bosone, Utah; Harry P. O'Neill, Pennsylvania; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Sidney A. Fine, New York; Samuel William Yorty, California; Chester B. McMullen, Florida; James G. Donovan, New York; E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Alaska; Antonio Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley, chairman, New York; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; J. W. Trimble, Arkansas; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Tom Pickett, Texas; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; T. Vincent Quinn, New York; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; John J. Dempsey, New Mexico; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi.

Committee on Rules: Hugh B. Mitchell, Washington.

Committee on Un-American Activities: John S. Wood, chairman, Georgia; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: John E. Rankin, chairman, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Olin Earl Teague, Texas; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Hamilton C. Jones, North Carolina; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Clare Magee, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; William Jennings Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Walter Rogers, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to amend rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting the sessions of the House. It is my intention that this shall apply only to major debates on major issues.

The resolution suggested itself to me following the extremely successful television coverage of the debates of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations at their current sessions. People responded enthusiastically to the face-to-face coverage which was given in this way. It brought into the homes of millions of Americans a personal relationship to the United Nations and an understanding of the points of view and the problems considered which was invaluable. This coverage took place at the height of the debate between Vishinsky, Malik, and other representatives of the Soviet bloc, and Senator Austin, Senator Sparkman, Senator Lodge, Mr. Dulles, and Ambassador Gross, on the issues raised by the aggressions of the North Korean and Communist Chinese against South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the coming sessions of the House of Representatives are likely to produce debates regarding America's role in leading the defense of the free peoples against the totalitarian challenge of the Soviet bloc which will determine the fate of world peace and the destiny of our country for centuries to come. The people should have the most effective means which modern science can make available for personally seeing and hearing these debates, and this means the full use of television and radio.

I have discussed this project with the leading television and radio broadcasters in the East, the National Broadcasting Co., CBS, American, Mutual, and Dumont. Those are the principal networks. They all agree, and they have authorized me to state that they will give coverage to the principal debates of the House, if permitted to do so. They point out that coverage of the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations ranged between 1 hour to several hours a day, even covering certain of the sessions in full, with the most enthusiastic audience reponse, despite the protracted nature of these broadcasts.

Television coverage is now very wide, as there are 109 television broadcasting stations, covering the major cities of the United States, with a few exceptions in the Mountain States and the Southwest States. There are 10,000,000 television receivers in the United States today, and the monthly sales continue at the rate of about 750,000 additional television receivers. To this network should be added the over 3,000 AM and FM broadcasting stations, reaching practically every one of the 45,000,000 American families.

I would like to tell the Members that I have just had a survey made, which I am going to release in connection with my reintroduction of a resolution to find out why less than 50 percent of Americans vote, and that survey shows that 37 percent of the people who wrote, said that they did not know the candidates and therefore they did not vote. Here is one way in which men who are in the House can get known to their constituents in a very graphic way.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that the practical effect of the resolution I am introducing is to open the subject for discussion, because it continues powers which the Speaker has under rule XXXV, which gives him complete direction and control of any television broadcast of the sessions, even if my resolution should be passed. In point of fact, the Speaker could probably permit such television broadcasting anyhow, as he does today, on the occasion of delivery by the President of his annual message to the Congress in joint session, but knowing the great fairness of the Speaker, I judge he would want an

expression of the House before exercising that authority.

In a sense, we would really be using the scientific advance of television to expand the size of the gallery of the House, to which the people are today invited as the guests of the House, and make that gallery country-wide.

I hope very much that Members will feel that my suggestion, and I emphasize that it is a suggestion, is designed to make the individual's discharge of his duty more gratifying and productive, and that my suggestion will be considered in this light. I wish to emphasize, too, my profound regard for the Speaker, and to pay a tribute to the great fairness with which his authority is exercised.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It seems to me that if the United Nations is being televised, the Congress of the United States ought to be. I think the gentleman's proposal is an excellent one, and I would like to see it passed. I would say, however, that I notice the gentleman limits it to some of the major debates. I think it would only be fair to have all sessions of the Congress televised.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say that as a practical matter I do not think the television companies would do that? Further, I think this, that there is something to the fact that you do not want a snooping camera. You want a camera with a purpose to bring debates of importance to the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, Monday the President of the United States in his state of the Union message called for unity. He is to be commended for citing that unity does not forestall constructive criticism—that unity does not mean closing debate where differences of opinion can be aired. However, there are many people who believe that you can only have unity by repressing expressions from people who have different points of view. Unless unity is based on sound principles and realistic implementation, it is arrogant and superficial.

During these trying times it certainly is desirable for our Government to express the will of the majority of its people—that is the best way to have unity. If my mail is any indication, the majority of the American people have lost confidence in many of the policy makers within the administration—particularly in the State Department. Unity can only be realized when these individuals have been replaced by men in whom the people have the utmost confidence. Then, and only then, will true unity exist. There is a feeling among many people that differences in philosophy concerning our foreign policy should be treated entirely different from our domestic policy. There is no more reason, Mr. Speaker, for a so-called bipartisan foreign policy than there is for a bipartisan domestic policy. We all know that a majority of the domestic legislation dealt with by the Congress is not partisan in nature. The same should hold true when we consider our foreign policy. A deviation in domestic policy is never challenged on the grounds that we are destroying its bipartisan nature and the same should be true in deviation from the administration's foreign policy. But somehow the idea has been fostered in the United States that our foreign policy is different, that it is comprehensive and complex and hence a matter solely to be formulated by the experts within the administration.

It is unfortunate when the country is faced with a great emergency that when policies are scrutinized, in an effort to determine where mistakes have been made in the past, and what course we will follow in the future, that those people who take a different view from the administration are labeled as obstructionists to our defense effort. It was the great Democrat, President Woodrow Wilson, who said:

> You do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

These words of Wilson are as sound today as when he uttered them.

Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress, which is now in its swaddling clothes, will have to make many important decisions during the next 2 years—decisions which will affect not only the institutions and the freedoms of the United States but which may well determine for all time whether freedom throughout the world will have to give way to the forces of international communism. Such decisions will not be easy to make. There is a variance of opinion, not only here in Washington but throughout the country, as to what our policies should or should not be. Since June 25 last, Mr. Speaker, American boys have been fighting and dying in Korea. We, as a Nation, have suffered in Korea one of the greatest disasters in our military history. Reports have come to us, that contrary to our military tradition, our soldiers are not fighting with the will that has typified them in other engagements. This, Mr. Speaker, is not due to lack of bravery nor intestinal fortitude on their part, but as Americans they must know for what they are fighting. Not only is it necessary for our fighting men in Korea to know their objectives, but every American today is asking this question, What are we trying to do in Korea? People are confused, they know that our Constitution provides that only the Congress shall declare war. But Congress has had no say in committing our troops to Korea.

We are fighting under orders from the United Nations as a United Nations force. Yet, the same United Nations which committed our troops to Korea still is reluctant to cite the Chinese Communists, their own enemy, as aggressors. Possibly one reason the United Nations is reluctant to do so is because the 53 nations which signed the resolution on Korea are not making proportionate sacrifices.

The latest reports we have on combat troops in Korea under the United Nations flag list this breakdown:

The United States	150,000
South Korea	100,000
England	10,000
Turkey	4,000
Australia	1,500
France	1,400
Canada	1,200
Philippine Islands	1,200
Siam	1,200
Belgium	1,000
New Zealand	900
Greece	800
Netherlands	600

No other member countries of the 53 which signed the Korea resolution have furnished ground forces for the war in Korea. Some have given token naval and air support. The great country of India, with the third largest population in the world, has favored the United Nations' forces with a medical unit as has Sweden. The 24,300 men actually sent to MacArthur by the foregoing nations number less than half of the casualties the United States has suffered to date. It is pitiful that the members of the United Nations, who committed our troops into fighting Communist aggression in Asia, oppose the imposition of political and economic embargoes against Communist China. Many of these same countries are still trading with Communist China in essential war materials. The American people are bitter and disgusted over the episode of the Security Council's inviting representatives of the Chinese Communist government to New York merely to denounce the United States as the aggressor. The United Nations is failing pitifully in meeting its responsibilities. It will continue to do so until the Soviet Union and its satellites are expelled from the United Nations. It is inconceivable to me why we should continue to allow a Trojan horse within our boundaries when Communist troops are shooting down our men in Korea. Russia has never been a bona fide member in principle of the United Nations and has used her seat to perpetrate propaganda warfare against us. If we are to save the day, let us kick out the Trojan horse.

Our men today in Korea are tragically outnumbered with no hope of sufficient reinforcements, and to regain ground lost will take at least a couple of years. Our military advisers tell us that Korea is of little strategic importance from a military standpoint. But assuming that Korea is of strategic military importance and say that we are in a position to hold a beachhead in Korea against onslaughts of the enemy, what is to be gained by continuing to sacrifice American lives simply to hold a beachhead? There is only one conceivable reason for not removing our troops from Korea, and that is to divert and contain Communist troops to that area. But if we are to utilize that advantage, certainly they should take the handcuffs off Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese forces on Formosa, equip and allow them to invade the mainland of China as Chiang has requested

permission to do. With the concentration of Chinese forces on the peninsula of Korea, and the other concentration of Chinese Communist forces on the French Indochina border, it is conceivably possible for the Nationalist Chinese to gain a substantial foothold in southern and central China. Authentic reports have come to us that there are probably a million and a half trained guerrillas within China who will fight on our side if they are encouraged and given arms. We should do everything possible to utilize these groups to our advantage, thereby turning into a civil war what may otherwise develop into global conflict.

It is stupidity of the first order for us to continue to absorb the punishment as we are doing in Korea and not take advantage of the only trained anti-Communist troops of any size in Asia who have the will and the organization to fight. I realize by taking the handcuffs off the Nationalist forces on Formosa that Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and Marshall will be losing face. Fifty thousand American casualties in Korea is a mighty stiff price to pay for "operation face lifting."

All patriotic Americans recognize that international communism is a threat to our security, and they are willing to fight for freedom rather than either appease or accept communism. But we must not let our emotions get the best of our common sense. We must face facts as they are—not as we would like them to be. I think it behooves all of us to analyze our international position today in the face of present realities. First, we must have an objective. It is not enough to say that we are fighting communism, but we must have some immediate objectives as to how far we are going to go and how we are going to do it.

The President in his state-of-the-Union message Monday cited the advantage we have in resources over our enemy. The one resource—and an essential one if defense is dependent in large measure on land armies—that the President failed to mention, where that advantage does not hold true, is manpower. Being an ex-doughboy, it is difficult for me to confess that we should not, and cannot, engage Communist attacks on the ground. That is where Russia and her satellites are the strongest. If we continue our present policy of endeavoring to contain communism within its present borders with ground troops and meet ground attacks wherever they might occur in friction areas, we will dissipate our strength and eventually destroy ourselves. If Russia desires—and I do not doubt but that she does—to bring Western Europe under her sphere of influence, the only deterrent to an act of that kind, since the end of World War II, has been our possession of the atom bomb and our ability to deliver it. That advantage is still ours today. This does not mean, however, that ground troops will not be needed, but they should assume a secondary position rather than the first line of defense as is now the case and as is contemplated.

I am firmly convinced that rather than encouraging the cosigners of the Atlantic Pact to build up large land armies, that it would be more to the advantage of our mutual security if we aided them in developing and expanding their air power, particularly fighter groups and developing bases not only for their but our use. Ground troops, of course, will be necessary in substantial numbers to protect such bases. However, there is a considerable difference between building up land armies as a first line of defense and training ground soldiers for defense of air installations which should be our first line of defense.

We should make it plain to the members of the Atlantic Pact nations that, while we are willing to do everything possible to assist in building up their defenses and recognize an attack on them is an attack on our own security, they must show they themselves have the will and determination to stand up and be counted. This will mean Atlantic Pact countries will have to show us by action what they can contribute toward the mutual defense effort. If they are timid and lack the will to fight, any amount of aid we give them would be wasted and a sense of false security would be our only harvest. It was Daniel Webster who said back in 1834:

> God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always willing to guard and defend it.

Again I say, the members of the Atlantic Pact countries must be firmly given to understand that the United States cannot, and will not continue to furnish money, arms, and also men unless they are willing to make similar sacrifices for collective security. I say it is up to them to act, and if their action does not show a determination to make an all-out effort, then it would be utter stupidity to continue to rely on them.

It is my hope when General Eisenhower completes his tour of the Atlantic Pact nations that he will come back and report to Congress on the display of cooperation manifested by these nations. Congress should make the decision, based upon information reported to it by General Eisenhower—and other information that might be available—as to what we can and should do to expedite the defense program of the Atlantic Pact nations. Congress should decide whether we can, and should, send ground troops to Europe.

I am wondering, after our experience in Korea, what the attitude would be of the Western European nations, who have a larger population than does the United States, if we asked them to send ground troops to Alaska to help us protect that vital area. Many people today believe that Alaska is just as vulnerable to attack as Western Europe. Mutual aid for security purposes has been a one-way street.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have any hope of containing the tide of communism, it is necessary for us to utilize every anti-Communist country in the world. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we should immediately use our influence to bring Spain into the family of United Nations, and certainly a member of the Atlantic Pact nations. Spain not only has proven herself as being an anti-Communist government, but she holds a strategic position in Europe. He who controls Spain controls the Mediterranean. That means also, Mr. Speaker, that we should use our influence immediately to rearm both Western Germany and Japan. It is a known fact that the Germans possess some of the best military know-how in Europe, and in Japan we have a million and a half trained men who would fight against Communist aggression. Russia has always been a potential enemy of Japan. Certainly no one here in Congress would be afraid of rearming Germany or Japan. They are not in a position to challenge our security by being armed. That is the only way they will be able to protect themselves against attack. If Japan should be attacked today, we would have to send our men to Japan to protect her while her trained men would be unorganized and unarmed. We should use our influence to change the Japanese Constitution so as to allow them to build up a military arm.

Yes, my colleagues, the greatest material weapon we have, and the greatest contribution we can make to freedom-loving people of the world is to build up our already mighty Air Force, reconstruct a mighty Navy, and expand our efforts to sow seeds of discontent in the homes behind the iron curtain by realistic propaganda which reveals communism for what it is as compared to life in a free society. When that has been done, we then should give full warning to Russia that any further acts of aggression by Communist forces—whether they be in Asia or in Europe—will be met by our greatest weapon—our power to retaliate by plane and bomb, and any such retaliation will be in the country of the master switchman.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the President to realize the urgency that exists. I appeal to him to use the powers he now has to speed up our mobilization program. The people are becoming impatient with the lagging in our military production and with his failure to invoke over-all controls to halt our present run-away inflation. If the inflationary trend is not checked, and checked promptly, our economy will be even more seriously dislocated than it is at this time with the result our war effort will be greatly hampered.

I hope we have learned our lesson, Mr. Speaker, and will use the same practical firmness in our diplomatic dealings that is necessary in a military operation. To quote Basil O'Connor:

> The world cannot continue to wage war like physical giants and seek peace like international puppies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman upon his splendid address. I only wish that the administration would study very carefully the recommendations made by the gentleman from Michigan, who has first-hand knowledge of what war really is.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the able gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that the retention of Secretary Acheson is leading to national disunity?

Mr. POTTER. As I stated in the body of my speech, if my mail is any indication, the Secretary of State does not have the confidence of the people. I believe the confidence of the people is necessary if we are to have unity. Therefore, it would be a great service to the country if Secretary of State Acheson were removed.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My mail indicates the same feeling.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to express on my own behalf and that of my colleagues the gratitude of the House for the penetrating and thoughtful analysis of the world situation which the gentleman from Michigan has given us. I feel sure that it is very helpful to us in our attempt to arrive at a conclusion which will be in the best interests of our country.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR A PERMANENT CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for a congressional Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy, responsible only to the Congress. The Commission would keep the Congress advised at all times with respect to the improper and unnecessary use of Federal funds, the overlapping and duplication of Federal functions and activities, and nonessential Federal expenditures.

It will be the function of this Commission, among other things, to advise Congress regarding the extent to which the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are carried out and the amount of savings of funds and manpower which would be achieved.

Under the terms of the bill, the Commission is required to make an annual report to the Congress in January of each year. This report shall contain, in addition to a statement regarding Government fiscal and budgetary policies, specific information, data, studies, and recommendations relating to the following: First, all nonessential Federal expenditures; second, the overlapping and duplication of Federal functions and activities; third, excessive numbers of Federal personnel; fourth, procurement and disposal of Federal property; fifth, Federal personnel and administrative management practices; sixth, exercise of authority or performance of functions by the Federal Government in excess of constitutional or statutory authority; and, seventh, specific problems related to the expenditure of Federal funds which may be referred to the Commission from time to time by any Member or committee of Congress.

Thus far during fiscal year 1951 which ends June 30, the Congress has appropriated in excess of $70,000,000,000 to carry on the functions and activities of our Government. Notwithstanding the excess profits tax approved by the Eighty-first Congress—effective July 1, 1950—appropriations for Government expenditures during this fiscal year will exceed Federal revenues by almost $25,000,000,000.

Since 1930 the expenditures of the Federal Government have exceeded revenues, except during the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress. Of course, much of this expenditure was for the purpose of supplying manpower, supplies, and materials necessary for the successful prosecution of World War II. However, much of this money was wasted and could have been saved if there had been in existence an agency responsible to the Congress which would have reported to Congress concerning those expenditures that were nonessential or unnecessary.

Reports of congressional committees during the war, including the Truman committee, the Byrd committee, and the investigating subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, have pointed out how Federal funds were extravagantly used or spent unnecessarily.

A distinguished member of the majority party recently pointed out that nonmilitary expenditures during fiscal year 1951 will be approximately $9,171,000,000, compared with $3,591,000,000 for similar purposes during 1946. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who is universally recognized as an outstanding expert in governmental fiscal affairs, has reached the inescapable conclusion that the Government can reduce nonmilitary expenditures by several billions of dollars during the coming year. I am in accord with his views. Some time ago I called attention to the particular items that could be reduced without injury to our Government.

It is almost impossible to reduce Federal expenditures in any sizable amounts without an agency whose sole function it is to investigate and report to the Congress regarding the waste of Federal funds. Under my proposal the Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy would be cut clear from the administrative entanglements of the executive branch of the Government. It would not be under the thumb of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, or other administration advisers.

In my examinations of the Federal budgets presented to the Congress each year by the President, I have observed that, without exception, these recommendations contain hundreds of millions of dollars that are really unnecessary and represent "boondoggling" and "pork barrel" products. The approval of this legislation would deal directly with that problem.

The alarming fact about the national deficit is not only its gigantic proportion of $256,000,000,000 but the fact that year after year the Federal Government continues to run in the red without the slightest regard for the effect upon the national economy, high prices, and standard of living of the American people. The serious impact of excessive Federal expenditures is felt in every home of the Nation through higher prices and inflation. This continued annual insolvency of our Government must be eliminated wherever it is possible to do so.

The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government made a careful study of the operations and activities of the executive branch and has made certain recommendations with respect to the reorganization of the Government. It is estimated approximately $4,000,000,000 could be saved by following these recommendations. In the areas where the greatest savings can be made by adoption of the Hoover commission recommendations, little action has been taken. Most of the recommendations which will result in greater efficiency and economy in the Government must be carried out by the departments and agencies themselves. For example, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee recently pointed out where savings could be made by a more effective utilization of Federal employees and transferring employees engaged in nondefense activities to vital defense work. This requires administrative rather than legislative action.

The Congress is not equipped, nor has it ever been equipped, to point out with particularity, agency by agency, bureau by bureau, division by division, and unit by unit, wherein a more effective Government service can be provided at less cost to the taxpayers.

The approval of this legislation and the creation of the Commission is the proper and effective way to solve this problem. In the years when our Government remained small, or between 1941 and 1946 when winning the war transcended all other matters, it may have not been so necessary to examine closely the expenditure of each dollar of Federal funds. However, we have reached a point today where it is extremely necessary for the Congress to have a permanent agency, similar to the Hoover commission, which will keep the Members and committees of Congress advised regarding these important matters.

In each new Congress many committees and subcommittees are created to make studies of Government inefficiency and waste and report their findings and recommendations to the Congress. Most often these reports, based upon many months of lengthy hearings and staff work, are filed and forgotten. Only the newspaper headlines of a particular day reveal the story of the findings of these congressional committees. The approval of this legislation would eliminate the necessity for the appointment and for the expense of these additional committees and subcommittees.

In many instances the reports and recommendations of congressional committees are ignored by succeeding Congresses. There is no concerted effort on the part of the legislative or executive

branches to determine whether the recommendations are carried out or what final action is taken with respect to them.

The Appropriations Committees of the Congress perform outstanding work. But they have neither the permanent personnel nor the time to devote to the detailed and careful follow-up necessary in connection with following the expenditure of all of the billions of dollars which are appropriated.

The time has come for the Congress to adopt measures and methods of operation in keeping with present day needs. The Congress cannot perform its work effectively or perform its functions under the Constitution in this twentieth century if it must rely upon antiquated and outmoded practices, methods, and procedures.

The facilities and assistance available to Members and committees of Congress were greatly improved by the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but much remains to be done. I propose the establishment of the Commission created under my bill as the next step which should be taken. The legislation I have submitted provides for the appropriation of $200,000 for the activities of the Commission during the remainder of this fiscal year, and for not more than $400,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. In my judgment, the expenditure of $400,000 annually for a Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy will pay for itself a thousand times over during the first year after its creation. The mere existence of the Commission would cause the executive departments and agencies to analyze more carefully their operations. They would devote more time to the improvement of their activities in order to demonstrate economies which can be made if they so desire.

The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, under the able leadership of Chairman Robert I. Johnson, has rendered invaluable assistance to the Government in connection with following up the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. However, their activities are restricted and the Congress cannot require the Citizens' Committee to engage in additional studies even though such work is clearly necessary.

At the conclusion of the work of the Hoover Commission, President Hoover, Chairman of the Commission, stated:

> The burden now passes from the shoulders of the Commission to the citizens themselves who must undertake a real and continuing responsibility.

Since the Members of Congress represent the citizens of our country who overwhelmingly support the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for economy and efficiency in government operation, it is obvious the Congress must equip itself for the task of carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The Hoover Commission in reporting to Congress stated:

> The Nation is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of organization in the executive branch.

Despite the steps which have been taken in the direction of improving our Government's operation, much remains to be done.

The recent slogan of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is "better government at a better price." My proposal for the creation of a permanent Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy, responsible only to the Congress, is the clear and obvious answer.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country in various walks of life are deeply concerned with respect to the question of efficiency and economy in government. Almost every day attention is called to inactivity by the legislative and executive branches of the Government with respect to this problem.

At this particular time it is extremely important that we have the highest efficiency and the greatest economy in government expenditures, especially as it relates to expenditures not necessary to carry out the program of expanded defense of our country.

I believe it is fitting that at the outset of this, the Eighty-second Congress, this proposal should be presented which will approach the problem of Federal expenditures in a more constructive manner. The Commission which I offer will not usurp the powers or prerogatives of the Congress. It will be completely subservient to its wishes. It will provide an up-to-date, modern and effective method of preventing waste, eliminating useless expenditures and securing a successful and efficient government in this period of national crisis.

In my judgment, this legislation should be approved before the Congress takes action with respect to increased taxes or additional appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHITE HOUSE SURPLUS MATERIAL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House on the subject of the surplus material of the White House. Every Member of Congress will be interested in this, and I will try to be as brief as possible.

Next week in the Speaker's lobby there will be a board showing the materials that will be available to the Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Commission on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion, it is my pleasure to come before the Members of this body to inform them of the details of the plan which has been adopted for the disposition of the surplus made available by the reconstruction work now in progress at the White House.

Members will appreciate, of course, the widespread historical interest which attaches to this material coming as it does from the residence of American Presidents from John Adams to Harry S. Truman.

In this connection, the Congress, through its passage of House Joint Resolution 714, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, now Public Law 377, has decreed that the plan of disposition adopted by the Commission shall be consistent with the symbolical value of the materials and that the plan shall be accomplished without commercial exploitation of the materials.

Consequently, the Commission has gone to some pains to devise a plan for the most equitable distribution of this material which has a definite historical value for many Americans. I feel that the Members of Congress will agree that the Commission has accomplished this end and that the plan proposed meets the very proper requirements laid down in Public Law 377.

The adopted plan has the approval of President Truman and it is expected that deliveries of the surplus material will commence about February 1, 1951.

The display board shows the material that will be available and some of the suggested finished products that can be made therefrom. Members will note the cane and gavel which can be turned from rough pieces of wood; the book ends which can be cut from rough pieces of stone; the old square nails, rough pieces of small stone and wood which can be mounted on plaques or used for desk ornaments.

However, it should be noted, that it is not the intention of the Commission to manufacture these items and such prices as will be charged will cover only the costs of processing the unfinished material for shipment.

There is one exception to this, however, one small and one large desk ornament can be contracted for to be supplied at approximately the indicated price, depending on the demand and the prices prevailing at the time.

The Commission has inventoried the surplus material and a quota for each Member of Congress has been established. This quota is a percentage of the quota for the individual Member's congressional district which is based on the population of the district. I am advised that it is not too rigid and could be varied to a small degree in special, individual cases.

Members should note that their individual quotas cover the materials they wish for their own use and for which they are to make an advance payment. It has nothing to do with direct requests to the Commission from interested persons. Payments in such cases are to be made by the applicant.

I have here a sample of the special order blank which has been prepared for the use of the Members of Congress, which shows their quotas and the handling price to be charged for each item. This differs from the blank to be used by the public.

Shortly after this announcement there will be a public announcement and applications will be received from the public either directly by the Commission or through Members of Congress. I would like to emphasize that while deliveries are expected to commence about February 1, there is a deadline of June 30, after which time no applications for this material will be considered.

A study of this plan will, I believe, be convincing proof that the Commission has not taken lightly its responsibility to the Congress and to the country in

providing for the disposition of this historically symbolical material.

The White House, the Capitol Building, and the Supreme Court are the physical structures which symbolize the constitutional framework of our Government. It is altogether right and proper that these magnificent buildings be revered by all loyal Americans who hold our system of government in high esteem. The Commission has accepted its responsibility for the renovation of the Executive Mansion with a proper respect for that feeling and it is my hope that this proposal will merit the approval of the Members of Congress as the most fitting and equitable device possible under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I was very greatly concerned over the remarks of the President when he recently appeared before our joint session of the Congress and gave us his message upon the state of the Nation.

We all realize that these are perilous times and that we are dealing with people who have no conscience, no respect for the spiritual side of life, and no wish to compromise, except on their own terms. The blueprint and master plan have been prepared and apparently the underlying thought of the aggressor nations is conquest by infiltration or conquest by force. Many of the peace-loving nations of the world resent the attitude of certain aggressor nations and are united in an attempt to destroy communism.

The fighting forces of the United Nations at the present time comprise some 12 or 13 countries, but it has fallen our lot, I mean the lot of the United States, to carry the brunt of the burden. The United States has furnished more men in the Korean conflict than all of the rest of the United Nations who are engaged in this war added together, including South Korea.

The Eighty-first Congress, which adjourned on the 2d day of this month, authorized a total appropriation of some $74,903,274,567 in appropriations, contract authorizations, and loan authorizations, which are an obligation on all of the people of this Nation. The majority of this huge sum will be spent for the procurement of goods and services by various agencies of the Federal Government in the next 12 months. Should all of the authorized spending be completed in the year 1951, the average rate of Federal spending based upon the 260-day Federal work year—including holidays and allowances for annual and sick leave—will be at the average rate of $288,088,469 per work day. On the basis of the Federal 8-hour day, the spending will be at the rate of $36,011,058 an hour, or $600,184 a minute. Every time the clock ticks off 1 second the Government expenditures will amount to more than $10,000, provided there are no further appropriations for the fiscal year of 1951.

I give you these figures in order that we may realize the huge expenses that the taxpayers of this Nation have and will incur in connection with the conflict which is being forced upon us. Such condition demands unity and cooperation on the part of all Government agencies.

It has not been my lot to be a Member of this body very long. As you all know, I am now beginning my second term, but since my election to Congress I have been keenly interested in the operation of the agencies of this Government. I know that it is impossible that any agency as large as our Federal agencies can be letter-perfect. But, on the other hand, there is evidence and concrete assurance of unnecessary bungling, malfeasance, and misfeasance in office, and I fear, misappropriation of the taxpayers' money, to the extent that borders on criminal.

The taxpayers of this Nation are reconciled to the fact that the defense program is going to cost many billions of dollars. Our people are accustomed to freedom. They would not sacrifice their free way of life for all of the imperialist governments on earth, and are willing to pay whatever is necessary to retain this Republic.

One of the greatest necessities of our defense program, not considering, of course, munitions of war, is the problem of housing. Billions of dollars must necessarily be expended in all parts of the world to house our fighting men and to take care of the respective military headquarters. Furthermore, already we have authorized huge expenditures for a second atomic-bomb plant to be erected near Paducah, Ky. Likewise, billions of dollars will be expended at the hydrogen-bomb plant being erected in South Carolina. A large portion of these expenditures will go for housing. As the houses are erected, the expansion of the respective projects proceed. Until quarters are maintained for the personnel, delay can naturally be expected in the completion of our defense projects.

The Congress, many years ago, foresaw the possibility of dire need for projects such as will be necessary in the defense program, and for that reason, set up what we now refer to as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This Corporation was empowered to loan money to businessmen for the purpose of developing new ideas and, among other things, was authorized to come to the rescue of businessmen throughout the country when they had certain types of patents or projects in mind that would be helpful to the Government in times of peril, or ideas that would coincide with the aggressiveness or protection of our Nation. It has come to my attention that the RFC has made numerous authorizations, many of which run into large figures.

At the present time, I note that the total assets of the RFC, according to their annual report and financial statement of June 30, 1950, were $2,161,084,203. From this huge amount we can imagine the number of loans and amount of business that is being transacted by this Government agency.

The RFC should be a godsend to the American people in times like these. However, I regret exceedingly to say that apparently very poor business judgment has been used in many cases as there is concrete evidence that some of those who were connected with this great agency possess that well-known lust for gold. Apparently it has been their desire to acquire the almighty dollar, in some cases, rather than to take care of the interests of the taxpayers of this Nation.

It is amusing to reflect back on some of the dealings that have been negotiated in the RFC. I understand that there is a concern in Texas who procured a loan from the RFC in the amount of $300,000, to be used in purchasing and drying eggs. When interrogated, it was determined that the egg-buying concern in Texas relied principally upon the Federal Government for the sale of their product. The RFC maintained that the loan was an excellent one because $269,000 of the original $300,000 loan had been repaid. But they denied any knowledge of the fact that the Government was guaranteeing the prices of eggs. In other words, they loaned money to buy eggs to be sold back to the Government at a profit.

There is another plant in Texas, known as the Novelty Plant and Pottery Co. They grow cactus in rock gardens. They baked their own pottery to put the cactus in. They also engaged in the sale of mistletoe, which, as we all know, is used for getting-kissed purposes during the holidays. Kissing business being good, the Novelty Pottery Co. needed to expand; therefore, they applied to the RFC for money for expansion purposes and to pay some of their back debts. One of their appraisers, I mean the pottery company appraisers, indicated to the RFC that the property was worth $90,037, which included $36,214 of rock garden for growing cactus, $9,450 for a warehouse to store the cactus in the pots, and $8,715 for kilns in which the pots were baked.

The RFC office at Dallas, Tex., approved the loan in the amount of $48,000. The taxpayers put up some $36,000 and a bank down in Ranger, Tex., furnished the remaining $12,000. For 2 years their business boomed, and the notes were paid at a regular $400 monthly installment. Later, the bottom fell out of the cactus plant business and apparently kissing lost some of its savor and thrill, as the mistletoe business likewise went on the rocks.

When queried, the company stated that they did not know what was wrong but that they did know that they could not meet the remaining $400 monthly payments, which were 7 months in default.

Not long ago, the RFC demanded payment of $40,800 balance on the cactus-mistletoe loan. The proprietors admitted that they were sorry, but were certain that the Government could not get blood out of unsold cactus. Shortly thereafter, the RFC obtained a judgment in the Abilene, Tex., Federal district court in the amount of $42,545.06. After the judgment was obtained, the RFC sent their own appraiser to take a look at their $98,000 cactus factory. This is what he found and what the appraiser set out in his report. The $36,214 rock garden, which he referred to as concrete, was appraised at $100. The $9,450 warehouse referred to in the appraiser's report as a shed, was valued at $150. The

$8,715 worth of kilns were valued by the RFC appraiser at $600. The whole shebang, including a couple of thousand pots of cactus, and a 1946 Ford truck, were reported by the RFC appraiser as not being worth the original $98,000, but according to his judgment, only $4,514. The RFC ordered the United States marshal to sell the works at public auction on February 7, 1950. Apparently no one wanted the bankrupt cactus and horticultural kissing laden store, so the RFC bought it in for $2,000. Then it sold the truck for $450. The taxpayers now own the rest of the enterprise.

The Waltham Watch Co. got into financial difficulty. The RFC slipped about $4,000,000 into the company in a vain attempt to keep it ticking, but the firm went bankrupt anyway.

The RFC grabbed the assets, which were $500,000 in cash, $50,000 in completed watches, and $200,000 in watch movements, which needed cases before they could be strapped on the wrists. The United States District Court in Boston—Judge George Sweeney—was trying to reorganize the firm and get it out of bankruptcy. The legal snarl became so complicated that nobody understood what was going on, except the judge. Not long ago, the judge ordered the Government loan agency to turn back to the trustees of the Waltham Corp. all of its assets. The RFC gave up the watches and the movements, but it held on to the $500,000. But the judge ordered them to fork the money over too. The RFC refused, on the ground that it was Government money. The court fined the RFC for contempt of court in the amount of $50,000, and announced that he would impose a second fine later to pay the defunct watch company for the damages suffered.

John J. Hagerty who was in charge of the Waltham Watch Co. at a salary of $30,000 a year, presumably a requirement before the loan would be made, operated the company for approximately 6 months, after which time the watch company went into bankruptcy. Then, Hagerty was rehired by the RFC as a special assistant to the Board of Directors. So far as I know, this is the only case on record where a fine has been imposed upon the Government and then the Government loan the money to pay the Government's bailiff.

Another case of misfeasance upon the part of the officials of the RFC involves a loan from the RFC to what was known as the American Stenographer in the amount of $300,000. This was a concern located down in Broward County, Fla. The American Stenographer was supposed to manufacture a device which would retail for $42.50, and would do away forever with smudges or ink on stenographers' fingers.

The RFC examiners at the Jacksonville, Fla., loan agency, disapproved the application, stating that the firm did not have enough assets and found that the ribbons were not sufficiently perfected. RFC agreed. So did the advisory committee. However, one of the owners of the ribbon company appealed to Washington, and sent some of the ribbon attachments to the Nation's Capital for the Federal financiers to try out on their stenographers. Apparently, the head men in Washington thought that the gadgets were fine. They reversed their Florida representatives and granted the loan. Two months later, the Ribbon Rider Corp. of America was bankrupt.

Another case of much concern happened during World War II. The Aieron Manufacturing Co., of Kansas City, made parts for flying machines. When the shooting was over, it went into the juke-box business, and applied to the RFC for a loan. A loan in the amount of $1,500,000 was approved. Eight months later, the firm went into bankruptcy. The RFC foreclosed and for more than five long years the taxpayers have owned a first-class, but dusty, juke-box factory.

A short time ago, the RFC negotiated a sale of the plant for $700,000, but it later developed that their purchasers were income-tax evaders standing trial for income-tax evasions, thus necessitating the rescission of the sale agreement. Uncle Sam still owns the juke-box factory. The inventory discloses that the manufacturing company's liability as of June 17, 1950, was $1,773,069.28. The liquidating value is approximately $450,000.

Then, we all, of course, remember Sam Evans, of California, the old rattlesnake maestro. Sam repeatedly applied for $20,000 loan from the RFC to build a modern home for his pet rattlesnakes. The RFC eventually approved the loan for the snake quarters, but they got into a squabble, and argued so long about the specifications of the house, that by the time the snake mansion was ready for occupation, the snakes were all dead. Sam, of course, automatically went out of business, and the taxpayers are the proprietors of a snake farm, without any snakes.

The RFC officials maintained that the loan was made in the public interest. When asked why they had determined a snake farm to be of public interest, and why they did not intend to operate the same, one of the RFC directors volunteered that it was a small business, and the law says that we should help small businesses. Sam Evans charged that he was forced into bankruptcy because the Government inspectors kept changing their minds on exactly how his modern snake apartment should be built.

Of course, these are isolated cases, and I do not want to infer that the RFC has not been of material benefit in numerous other instances.

At the present time, I am very much concerned over the loan of the RFC to Lustron Corp. From the information reaching me, this loan was meritorious. One Mr. Carl Strandlund, an industrialist and engineer of proven ability, and who knows mass-production methods as well as any man in America, conceived the idea of developing a plant for the construction of metal prefabricated houses.

During World War II, Engineer Strandlund was connected with the Chicago Vitreous Enamel Product Co. As we all know, they were the producers of armor plate, used for tank turrents and commander domes. He was the principal developer of a press-quench method for hardening armor plate which cut production time to 30 man-hours per ton, when many other plants were taking 500 man-hours per ton. His method cut processing time for one operation from 14 hours to 8 seconds, and was called one of the most outstanding war-production contributions in the vast Chicago ordnance district. He was executive vice president of the plant, which was tooled in a period of a few months to make commander domes at the rate of 24 a day when the largest other plant making this equipment was turning out only 1½ domes a day. The invalued service that he rendered during World War II is unquestioned and was recognized by the Government in the awarding of the Army-Navy E. He also received the Chicago Tribune special award.

When the war was over, Mr. Strandlund appealed to the RFC for a loan to erect a plant for building prefabricated homes. Different loans were approved totaling some $37,500,000, and over a period of a few months, the Lustron Corp., headed by the afore-mentioned Strandlund, completed one of the most modern metal plants in the world.

It covers some 23 acres, or over a million square feet of floor space, and is tooled with over $15,000,000 worth of special machinery and equipment, all of which is now intact near Columbus, Ohio. The plant was fully completed in late June of 1949, and demonstrated that it was capable of producing 100 houses a day. Before the RFC foreclosed, it had produced and shipped nearly 2,500 houses to all parts of the country, including houses to Alaska and Venezuela. At a time when ordinary machinery required 14 to 18 months for delivery, Mr. Strandlund had his plant completely tooled, tested, and ready to go with specially designed equipment in a matter of less than 18 months, and had produced over 2,000 houses.

The $37,500,000 loaned by the RFC to the Lustron Corp. was evidenced by several notes, the first note being in the amount of $15,500,000 which was a 7-year note. The remaining $22,000,000 was loaned on notes for less than a year's duration, and several million dollars of it for as little as 60 days. In other words, RFC foreclosed on suicide notes which Lustron could not possibly have paid back in the time demanded by RFC.

I am advised that the interest on all of these notes was current, and that the Lustron Corp. was operating smoothly, and had just procured orders for some 8,000 houses. However, the officials of the RFC had become very greatly interested in the operation of the Lustron plant and had made certain demands on Mr. Strandlund that he employ persons to be selected by them as officials in the corporation. It was finally determined that one of their requirements was that he relinquish a majority of his stock, and that the RFC would name a new board of directors.

At the suggestion of certain members of the Board of the RFC, one Merl Young, a former RFC employee, was placed upon the payroll of the Lustron Corp. at a salary of $12,000 a year, which was later raised to $18,000 at the suggestion of the chairman of the board, Mr. Harley Hise. The salary of Mr. Young

was specifically approved in writing by the RFC. It was later revealed that at the same time that Mr. Young was on the payroll of the Lustron Corp. at a salary of $18,000, he was also drawing $10,000 a year from a Mr. Rex Jacobs of Detroit, a washing-machine manufacturer.

Extended hearings have been held by a special committee of the Senate on the Lustron Corp. project, and I understand that it was testified that on May 4, 1949, one of the RFC directors, Mr. Walter Dunham, visited the Lustron plant in company with other RFC employees. On June 29 Mr. Dunham advised the president of the Lustron Corp. that Mr. Rex Jacobs, one of the employers of Merl Young, would visit the Lustron plant. It is common knowledge that Merl Young had visited in the home of Rex Jacobs, on the week end of the 4th of July in Detroit. On July 6 Rex Jacobs called at the Lustron plant in Columbus, Ohio. While he was in the office of the president, Mr. Walter Dunham of the RFC called from Washington and asked if Mr. Jacobs was there. He stated that Jacobs was his good friend, and he urged the president of the Lustron Corp. to "talk freely" to Mr. Jacobs, repeating the phrase "talk freely" several times. Jacobs inspected the plant and proposed that his company furnish the washing machines to be used in all Lustron houses, and stated at the time that Merl Young, who it was later determined was on Jacob's payroll, and likewise drawing $18,000 a year from the Lustron Corp., would receive $15 for each washing machine installed in a Lustron house. Not bad, since it is an established fact that the Lustron Corp. can produce 100 houses a day. It is a matter of figures that Mr. Young would have been receiving a juicy yearly income of possibly $375,000 in addition to his salary from the manufacturers of the washing machines and the $18,000 paid by the Lustron Corp.

Because of an existing contract which Lustron had with another company Mr. Strandlund was not in a position to comply with Mr. Jacob's demand, even if he had wanted to do so, and he turned Mr. Jacobs down.

About the same time, on June 22, 1949, to be exact, Mr. Strandlund filed an application for an additional loan with RFC. The amount of this loan previously had been worked out in extended conferences with RFC officials and was, in fact, considerably larger than Mr. Strandlund felt he would need to put the company in the black.

Very shortly after the Jacobs proposal that the Lustron Corp. utilize his washing machines was rejected, unfavorable publicity concerning the operation of the Lustron Corp. began to appear in the newspapers quoting Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials, and the loan that Lustron needed to put it in the black was never granted.

After refusing to approve the loan which had already been worked out, the officials of the RFC began putting pressure on the president of Lustron Corp. to force him to give up 60,000 shares of his personal stock and control of the company to a new group headed by Rex Jacobs and some of his friends, included among whom were Merl Young and Walter Dunham, one of the directors of the RFC. According to the record, Strandlund refused to be a party to what was termed a conspiracy, so from what transpired thereafter, it is natural to assume that if the new group could not control Lustron Corp. that they would not permit the company to operate. Accordingly, foreclosure proceedings were instituted in February 1950, and Lustron Corp. has been closed and tied up in court ever since. I am advised that the officials of the corporation have been hopeful that the plant could be reactivated and for that reason have not permitted the fires to die out of the furnaces. In times like we are now experiencing according to my way of thinking it is close to treason to permit a modern plant with more than $15,000,000 in the best of machinery to lie idle because of the maladministration of a few money-hungry officials of a Government agency.

There is no question as to the type of product Lustron was producing. Some 60 houses were erected at the marine base at Quantico, Va., and at this point I want to call your attention to what General Shepherd, who is now in charge of the Marine Corps in Korea, had to say about the Lustron houses. This is a letter from General Shepherd to Admiral Merrill, which I want to read in full:

HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS,
Quantico, Va., April 28, 1949.

Vice Adm. A. STANTON MERRILL,
United States Navy (Retired),
Natchez, Miss.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL MERRILL: It was a very pleasant surprise to learn that you have taken a serious interest in the handling of Lustron houses on the market. As you perhaps know, we have a very special interest in these houses because here at Quantico we are just completing 60 of them. They form the first major Lustron project to be erected in the United States.

We had on two previous occasions solicited bids in the open market for conventional houses. However, our remote location here in the country and the large amount of on-the-site work forced the prices up to levels above those which we were allowed to pay. Since it was apparent that work at the site must be reduced to a minimum, we placed our housing project on the market a third time and solicited bids for prefabricated houses.

We received bids from eight manufacturers of plant-fabricated houses. The units offered to us varied widely in quality and price, but the lowest of all in cost per square foot was the Lustron steel house.

Now that we have had some of these houses occupied for several months and have had a chance to study them thoroughly, we are more than satisfied with them. I like them because their attractive architecture, their trim appearance, and their varied colors do so much for the appearance of the station. My engineers like them, because they are efficiently designed along sound engineering lines and offer the promise of great durability. The quartermaster likes them, because they are so well insulated that it takes a relatively small amount of fuel to heat them comfortably. The maintenance officer likes them, because they are not subject to rot nor to termites. Moreover, they offer no fire hazard whatever, since there is nothing in them except the furniture which can burn.

The housewives like them, because they are so easy to keep clean and because their convenient lay-out reduces the housework to a minimum. Some of them have reported that their lively youngsters require less attention, because there is so little about the house that can be damaged. All of them are enthusiastic about the large amount of convenient storage space. From the viewpoint of the husbands, of course, the most attractive feature is the automatic dishwasher.

Those of us who have studied this problem at some length feel sincerely that the Lustron Corp. has opened the door to a tremendous future. I myself believe that the techniques used in building these houses will be perfected as time goes along, so that with reduction in housing costs there will be a corresponding rise in housing standards throughout the country.

I believe you have taken a wise course in looking into the Lustron house and wish you every success with it in the future.

Yours very sincerely,

LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, Jr.,
Major General, United States Marine Corps, Commandant, Marine Corps Schools.

Commander Davis, who is now the public works officer in the Quantico Marine Reservation, is a great booster of Lustron houses. Recently I had occasion to talk with him personally and he advised me that the best evidence of the very high type house that Lustron produces, could be procured by a personal inspection of the 60 houses that are now in use at the Quantico Marine Barracks. He informs me that they require no upkeep, are less expensive to the Government, and more satisfactory to the people than any other type of house that the Marines have ever had.

I further understand that these 60 houses were erected at a saving to the taxpayers of the Nation of some $6,000 per unit. The Government could save the full $37,500,000 it has loaned Lustron if it bought only 6,000 houses. The Lustron Corp. is not only the producer of residences but has produced buildings that are suitable for barracks, mess halls, hospitals, and other facilities that the military agencies desperately need. It is a proven fact that the type of house that Lustron was building can be produced at a material saving over any other type of conventional house.

Furthermore, the evidence in the RECORD proves that the Lustron house may be removed from pillar to post at a small cost and without material damage. At this particular time when the Federal Government must spend billions of dollars for housing over the country, it is easily understood how millions can be saved for the taxpayers if the Lustron Corp. plant is immediately put into operation.

When the foreclosure proceedings were instituted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the plant offered for sale, the Government was the highest bidder and purchaser at $6,000,000.

I am advised that it is admitted by those in authority at the RFC that if the Lustron plant is to be salvaged, that they cannot hope to realize more than some $5,000,000 for their $37,500,000 investment.

Recently, in conference with some of the officials of the Lustron Corp., they advised me that they had heretofore con-

tacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an effort to reschedule their loans in the full amount and, if permitted to repay the same over a reasonable period of years, could assure the construction of some 100 houses a day after the plant had regained its full operating capacity. They assured me that they could repay the entire amount of the RFC loans if they were given a fair opportunity to do so.

In view of the President's remarks recently when he spoke to us on the State of the Nation regarding the practice of economy, it appears to me that it is sound business to operate a plant in which the Government has invested some $37,500,000 if we can show a saving on billions of dollars' worth of houses to the tune of some $4,000 or $6,000 a unit. Certainly now is no time to destroy a plant that is considered one of the finest of its kind in the country for the comparative measly sum of some four or five million just because apparently some of the members of the RFC were disgruntled over the fact that one of their former employees could not receive $15 for each washing machine installed and $90,000 cash for his influence with the RFC, together with their desire to procure complete domination and control over the operation of the Lustron Corp.

As will be borne out when the report comes from the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, several thousand dollars have been accepted by the officials of the RFC in bribes to secure loans on different projects, and because Lustron would not follow the precedent that some of the members of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had set in granting loans they would not go along in trying to help the housing project which is so drastically needed in this time of emergency. I refer to this casually in that I would be betraying the confidence of those who have given me the information that has been given to the Senate committee investigating the RFC, but not yet officially and publically reported, but which report, so I understand, will be available on January 31, when the Senate subcommittee, under Senator FULBRIGHT, reports to the Congress. I hope that each Member of the House of Representatives will get this report and note the inefficiency and incompetency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board. When this report is released to the Congress I believe that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives will demand that the members of the Board be denied confirmation and that the President request a one-man Administrator for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, whose integrity, honesty, and character is beyond reproach.

On numerous occasions I have talked with officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and with people who have had business with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and it is my unbiased impression that if the Government of the United States is run by officials like certain members of the RFC, then this Government cannot long endure.

As for myself, I am grateful to the Senate subcommittee for investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and I hope that when the report is made available that the people of the country and the Congress of the United States will remedy the situation and put a stop to hoodwinking the taxpayers of the United States such as has been the attitude of the members of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board.

In the first place, I do not believe in bribes, and in the second place, I believe it is beyond the character of any Government officials to insinuate that he will accept bribes, but when testimony brings out the fact that they have accepted money, as well as other bribes, then there is no place in the Government for such men.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, during the Eighty-first Congress the President's Reorganization Plan No. 23 was ordered into force and effect. That plan proposes to transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Administrator, all functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to financing of the prefabricated housing industry, including the financing of large scale modernized site construction.

The transfer would include functions including assumptions by the Administrator of related operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation held by the Secretary of the Treasury, together with the obligation of paying interest thereon and the assurance of new obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury to finance future operations. I understand that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation complied with this reorganization order to the letter, with the exception of Lustron Corp. They have refused to transfer Lustron since Reorganization Plan No. 23 became effective on September 9, 1950.

So far as I am concerned, they are guilty of violating specific instructions from the President of the United States and of the Congress. The hearings in the committee investigating the Lustron loan were closed and all of the testimony has not been made available to me. However, I have been the recipient of enough information to be of the opinion that all is not well and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials are guilty of much maladministration. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress of the United States are as much the guardian of the rights of the citizens and taxpayers of the Government, as are the law enforcement officers and the courts of this land. There has been too much fumbling and too much covering up in the Lustron deal and, as for me, I am of the opinion that now is the time to air the whole thing in detail and let the chips fall where they may.

Personally, I have no interest of any kind in any corporation or the officials thereof, but in times of peril we are certainly entitled to the fruits from plants that have been erected or constructed at the taxpayers' expense. The Lustron plant should be reopened for business immediately; thus bringing about millions of dollars of savings to the overburdened taxpayers of this Nation in taking care of our demands in the defense program.

Our defense program will require the erection of thousands of barracks and military houses in foreign countries, such as Alaska, Guam, Okinawa, and the Lord only knows where else. It is an established fact that prefabricated houses can be utilized at great savings of both time and expense. I insist that the Members of this body go into this matter in detail and demand that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board give us action immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine any citizen of the United States to whom the Capitol building here in Washington, with its exceptional art and architecture and its wealth of history, is not an object of surpassing interest.

Speaker Clark frequently said that one of the most patriotic services Congress could render the country would be to provide that every American citizen once in his lifetime could visit Washington and see the National Capitol.

The same objective may be largely attained through the illumined pages of the charming volume, Constantino Brumidi, just off the press. In this book Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock brings to the reader not only an important chapter in the history of the Capitol of America but in their original colors, the incomparable paintings and decorations of the master artist who left his impress on every wall of the vast building from the entrance to the vaulted ceiling of the great dome itself.

Through these pages you may stand with Columbus as he planted the standard of Ferdinand and Isabella in the New World; with Washington at Valley Forge and with the industrial pioneers of the Nation as the reaper and the telegraph opened up new visions of progress and advanced civilization.

It is not only a volume of absorbing interest but it is a book without which no library is complete. Mrs. Murdock, the wife of our distinguished colleague from Arizona, is to be commended on this notable contribution to American art and literature.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and some texts.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Eugene M. Zuckert.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances and include in one a bill for the GI's and in the other editorials from the National Tribune regarding the lack of hospital beds in this country.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include radio addresses and two editorials.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Star.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a sermon delivered by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, pastor, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some quotations on the powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution from an American Legion post.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

66. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1950, covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense under authority of those acts, pursuant to Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

67. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report, for the period ending December 31, 1950, of the leases entered into by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

68. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., pursuant to the act of Congress approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

69. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo."; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

70. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of all tort claims paid by this Department under the act in the fiscal year 1950, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C., sec. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

71. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of five documents which were delivered to the Governor of American Samoa by a group of Samoans with the request that they be forwarded to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

72. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

73. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

74. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through this Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, by the executive departments, independent establishments, organizations, and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege, pursuant to section 302, title 111, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

75. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft and sectional analysis of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1001. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1270. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 1271. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1272. A bill to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1273. A bill to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1274. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 1275. A bill granting pensions to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the World War equivalent to pensions granted to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1276. A bill to allow to a retail dealer in gasoline a refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline which is lost by the retailer through evaporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1277. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the financing of certain aeronautical developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 1278. A bill to amend the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1279. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain hospital supplies and equipment of the United States to the city of Gulfport and to Harrison County, Miss.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1280. A bill to provide automobiles for veterans of World War I who are entitled to compensation for the loss of use of one or both legs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1281. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1282. A bill to provide the Triple Cities area with air-raid shelters and sufficient protection against enemy bombing and attacks by air; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1283. A bill to strengthen the national defense by affording further relief to persons in the military service of the United States through the suspension of the enforcement of civilian liabilities or obligations secured by home mortgages or by similar security arising out of the ownership of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1285. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide for the economic regulation of air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 1286. A bill to authorize the coinage of 25-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the pine-tree shilling; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1287. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1288. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1289. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 1290. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1291. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1292. A bill to grant to persons serving under the command of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo in the campaign against the city of Manila, Philippine Islands, the right to wear the Spanish campaign ribbon and badge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1293. A bill to amend section 2455 of Revised Statutes, as amended, to provide for preferences to States in securing isolated or disconnected tracts of public domain; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1294. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, to provide for preferences to States in the selection of lands under the school indemnity selection laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1295. A bill to authorize the President to accept enlistments of nationals of other countries into the armed services of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1296. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) by extending the benefits of title III; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

H. R. 1297. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 1298. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1299. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for expansion and the production and processing of ramie and kenaf in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1300. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1301. A bill to extend for a period of 2 years the education and training benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 1302. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, so as to make certain subversive and other publications nonmailable and the transmission thereof through the United States mails a criminal offense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 1303. A bill to provide for the issue of a series of United States annuity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1304. A bill to provide for capital-gain treatment with respect to income received on the redemption of certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1305. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 so as to prohibit the use by Federal savings and loan associations of certain terms commonly used by banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1306. A bill to eliminate compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States from taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1307. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1308. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1309. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1310. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1311. A bill to authorize adjustments of rentals paid for premises leased for use during a national emergency; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1312. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948 by adding thereto a new section to establish an average parity price for fats and oils and to aid in maintaining such parity price to producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1313. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the annuities payable to retired railroad employees and their surviving widows; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1314. A bill to extend pension benefits to certain persons who served, in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the Islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1315. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1316. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1317. A bill to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to restore the exemptions from admissions tax which applied during World War II with respect to members of the Armed Forces and

to theaters operated on military installations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1318. A bill to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1319. A bill to authorize the cancellation, adjustment, and collection of certain obligations due the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1320. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1321. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 1322. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1323. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1324. A bill to authorize the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1325. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse, and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1326. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1327. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1328. A bill to limit the removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1329. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1330. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1331. A bill to authorize additional credits in the accounts of certain employees in the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1332. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1333. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1334. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold $10 pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1335. A bill for the relief of the Greenwood Township school district, Crawford County, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1336. A bill to establish a Board of Education in the Federal Government and to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1337. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1338. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in more adequately financing education in the elementary and secondary schools of States found to be needy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1339. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1340. A bill to provide more adequate and effective rent control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1341. A bill to amend subparagraphs (k) and (l) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide increased compensation for certain specific disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1342. A bill to amend section 3797 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the definition of the term "partner"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1343. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquiring land as enacted August 7, 1947, 61 Statute 913; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1344. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1345. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1346. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1347. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1348. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1349. A bill to extend the benefits of the laws granting pension to veterans of the War with Spain to certain persons who served as teamsters in such war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1350. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1351. A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, and to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps in relation to that of the other Armed Forces to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1353. A bill to establish minimum space requirements for post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1354. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1355. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1356. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new parcel post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1357. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1358. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1359. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1360. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to design and construct a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1361. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1362. A bill to provide for the construction of a new parcel post office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1363. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1364. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1365. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1366. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 1367. A bill to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination and priority of combat connection of disabilities, injuries, or diseases alleged to have been incurred in, or aggravated by combat service in, a war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. R. 1368. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1369. A bill to provide a lump-sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1370. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1371. A bill to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1372. A bill to advance in grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation certain postal employees of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from military areas during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 1373. A bill to amend the Federal Water Power Act with respect to the control of the volume and flow of water in connection with power projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1374. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for legally adopted children of United States citizens and for children coming to the United States for legal adoption by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1375. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1376. A bill to amend section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act so as to broaden judicial relief under that section pending review of administrative action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1377. A bill to provide that pension, compensation, and retirement pay shall be paid during periods of active service and the amount thereof deducted from the amount payable for such active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1378. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement, annuities, and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1379. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1380. A bill to exempt from income-tax compensation and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1381. A bill to increase the compensation of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1382. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1383. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1384. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1385. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1386. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1387. A bill to equalize income-tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1388. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1389. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1390. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1391. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1392. A bill to eliminate any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1393. A bill to increase the expense allowance of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1394. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the citizenship status of citizens of the United States serving as members of certain armed forces, groups, or organizations established to maintain peace in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1395. A bill to exempt from certain penal provisions persons serving in armed forces of the United Nations or of certain other groups for the purpose of preserving peace in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1396. A bill to extend the time for initiating recommendations for certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1397. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1398. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. David (Mickey) Markus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1399. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1400. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1401. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1402. A bill to establish a permanent Congressional Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1403. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1404. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in annuities, pensions, and certain lump sums payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1405. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities and insurance lump sums payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1406. A bill to increase the annuities paid to retired railroad employees under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1407. A bill to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1408. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1409. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1410. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the armed services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to provide for a study to determine the urgency of the need for, and the feasibility of, installing in underground parking facilities equipment which could be used for the protection of the civilian population or for military purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on International Economic Development; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Industrial Exposition to be held at Houston, Tex., March 11 through 17, 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution to seek development of the United Nations into a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a Federal Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 62. Resolution to amend rule XXXV of the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting of sessions of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 63. Resolution creating a select committee to inspect the gold reserve at Fort Knox; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 64. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the more frequent display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 65. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 66. Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Klara Chana Hauptmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Mantsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Franz Geyling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Attilio Cantoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1415. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Wera Fazio, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1418. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Signorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Hata Shockey and her minor daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 1422. A bill for the relief of Carl Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of T. L. Morrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1425. A bill for the relief of William Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1427. A bill for the relief of Domenico La Torraca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Claude Foranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1429. A bill for the relief of William Ginger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 1430. A bill for the relief of the aliens Peter Lukac and his wife, Suzanne Lukac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Tetsuko Hidaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Settimio Mella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Xanthos Volianitou Panagakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Rocco Giannetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Pick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Lovinger and Szerin Lovinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1437. A bill for the relief of Louis Kesselman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER (by request):

H. R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Bartholomew H. Donovan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 1440. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Mrs. Annunziata Vittore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lubomir Pejsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1442. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Leo Battistella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Paul Matelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valerie Arlt and Hermann Arlt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Douds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Irma Felicita Reali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Keicher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of the heirs of William G. Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of George Crisan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Salim Mohamed El Masri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Walter Helbig, Gertrude Helbig, and Gerda Helbig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Antranik Ayanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Jong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Kerop and Ardemis Nahabedian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1462. A bill to admit Mrs. Lucie Gatzke Martinson to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of David Lee Harrigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Zikmund Teba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak, Ekaterina Tirbak, and Igor Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Henry Ty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Selim Salloum, also known as Robert Salloum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Rosario Garcia Jimeno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Adele Vence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Yabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Ester Mittleman Mehr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Elena Erbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Kopf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hsiang-Tung Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of Maria Smeriglia and Irene Smeriglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (by request):

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Tornusciolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Michel H. Frank, Bessie Frank, and Herbert Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Aikaterini Skoufalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of the Duncan Coffee Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Brother John Muniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of the American Legion, department executive committee, Lansing, Mich., supporting the principles of the universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha Chamber of Commerce, Kenosha, Wis., to reaffirm faith in the American voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8. Also, resolution by the Kenosha Retail Council, Kenosha, Wis., to reaffirm faith in the American voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9. Also, resolution of the auxiliary to the Kenosha County Medical Society to reaffirm faith in the American voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who revealest Thyself in all that is pure and true and lovely, we beseech Thee to help us make our hearts and minds the fitting audience chambers for Thy presence. Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be the servants of all. In meeting grave issues growing out of what is wrong with the world, reveal to us what is wrong with ourselves. Make us vividly conscious that we cannot meet and conquer hatred and rampant selfish aggression abroad with material weapons only; but that our own hearts must be the homes of love and purity and honesty if we are to be Thy instruments for the transforming of the world. In these times of tension and strain, keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, sound of heart, in spite of ingratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable Thy servants here, in posts of high public office, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEM was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Armed Services Committee was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Benton	Hennings	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Ives	Pastore
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarran	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Young
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Martin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent in order to attend the funeral of a friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS OF HONOR TO AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN THE KOREAN CAMPAIGN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 9, 1951, there occurred at the White House a deeply

moving ceremony. The President of the United States conferred the Congressional Medal of Honor on five heroic men of the United States Army who died, or who are missing in action, in Korea.

The names of the men to whose relatives the Medal of Honor was awarded are Pfc Melvin L. Brown, Mahaffey, Pa.; Sgt. (1c) Charles W. Turner, Boston, Mass.; Master Sgt. Travis E. Watkins, Gladewater, Tex.; First Lt. Frederick F. Henry, Clinton, Okla.; Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, Berkeley, Calif.

Theirs is the courage which enables a nation to survive the worst dangers. We in the Senate should acknowledge our debt of gratitude to these brave men by spreading the story of their heroism onto the pages of our RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with the complete official texts of the five citations, be printed in the body of the RECORD, as close as possible to the front page of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA SOLDIER AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR FOR SINGLE-HANDED DEFENSE OF POSITION

Twenty-year-old Pfc Melvin L. Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., has been given the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor, for single-handedly defending a position, atop a 50-foot wall, against repeated attacks while his platoon was securing Hill 755 (the Walled City), near Kasan, Korea, on September 4, 1950, the Department of the Army announced today.

The medal will be presented to Private Brown's father by President Truman in a White House ceremony at 11:30 a. m., January 9.

Private Brown is currently listed as missing in action in Korea.

The youthful soldier, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward D. Brown, also of Mahaffey, expended all of his rifle ammunition, then his hand grenades; and finally, though wounded, he resorted to his entrenching tool, a small shovel, to beat back attacks on his precarious perch. His action delayed the enemy troops, and enabled his platoon to repel them.

In addition to Private Brown's mother, those attending the ceremony will include his three sisters, Mrs. Evelyn Dickey, Clearfield, Pa.; Mrs. Dorothy Pease, Mahaffey; and Mrs. Beatrice Seger, of Glen Campbell, Pa.; and a brother, Pvt. Calvin W. Brown, First School Company, Atlanta General Depot, Atlanta, Ga., now at the home of his parents.

Several of Private Brown's comrades, who witnessed his lone battle on the wall, signed a joint statement describing the action as follows:

"During an attack on his platoon's perimeter of defense, whose mission was to secure Hill 755 (the Walled City), Private (first class) Brown took his position on a retaining wall approximately 50 feet high.

"Enemy superior in number started climbing the wall just as Private (first class) Brown's last round of ammunition was expended, and he was wounded by enemy fire.

"Realizing the vital necessity for holding, and without concern for his personal safety, though wounded and without his rifle, Private (first class) Brown continued to throw his few remaining hand grenades into the enemy, causing several casualties with each grenade.

"When his supply of grenades was exhausted, his comrades from nearby fox holes commenced throwing hand grenades toward his position. On several occasions, the grenades were thrown short of his position. When this would occur, Private (first class) Brown would leave his position and retrieve the grenades, exposing himself to enemy rifle and machine-gun fire.

"However, the enemy continued their climb, and Private (first class) Brown, taking his entrenching tool from his pack, waited until the enemy, one by one, peered over the wall, delivering each a skull-crushing blow across the top of his head.

"Private (first class) Brown's conspicuous performance in knocking from 10 to 12 enemy troops from the wall and his outstanding personal bravery served as an inspiration to his comrades, delayed the attack, and enabled his platoon to repel the enemy.

"Private (first class) Brown was seriously injured during this action, and has not been heard from since this attack.

"His courage and devotion to duty reflects the highest credit upon himself and the military service."

Private (first class) Brown entered the Army at Erie, Pa., on October 27, 1948.

The Medal of Honor citation follows:

"Private Brown, Company D, Eighth Engineer Combat Battalion, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against an enemy on September 4, 1950, near Kasan, Korea. While his platoon was securing hill 755 (the Walled City), the enemy, using heavy automatic weapons and small arms, counterattacked. Taking a position on a 50-foot-high wall he delivered heavy rifle fire on the enemy. His ammunition was soon expended, and although wounded, he remained at his post and threw his few grenades into the attackers causing many casualties. When his supply of grenades was exhausted his comrades from nearby fox holes tossed others to him and he left his position, braving a hail of fire, to retrieve and throw them at the enemy. The attackers continued to assault his position and Private Brown weaponless, drew his intrenching tool from his pack and calmly waited until they, one by one, peered over the wall, delivering each a crushing blow upon the head. Knocking 10 or 12 enemy from the wall his daring action so inspired his platoon that they repelled the attack and held their position. Private Brown's extraordinary heroism, gallantry, and intrepidity reflects the highest credit upon himself and was in keeping with the honored traditions of the military service."

ARMY AWARDS MEDAL OF HONOR TO SECOND INFANTRY DIVISION SERGEANT

Sgt. (1c) Charles W. Turner, 157 Huntington Avenue, Boston, Mass., who died from wounds received near Yongsan, Korea, on September 1, 1950, while directing his reconnaissance platoon's fire against a larger enemy force from an exposed position in a tank turret, has been awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously, the Department of the Army announced today.

Sergeant Turner's heroism was responsible for a successful defense by the Second Infantry Division platoon of its position from which it withdrew only when the ammunition supply ran low. He remained in an exposed vantage point for approximately 20 minutes under heavy enemy fire before he was fatally wounded.

The medal will be presented to his mother, Mrs. Hazel O. Turner, of the Boston address, by President Truman in a White House ceremony at 11:30 a. m., January 9, 1951. Also attending the presentation will be a brother, Harry H. Turner, and sister, Mrs. Jaqueline Xavier, both also of 157 Huntington Avenue, Boston.

The action which won the Nation's highest award for Sergeant Turner, an Army veteran of World War II who was taken prisoner by the Germans, was described by his platoon leader, First Lt. Ralph Decker, Jr., 1518 Jewell, Topeka, Kans.:

"On the morning of September 1, 1950, at about 5:30 o'clock, my platoon was attacked by a superior enemy force estimated at 150 to 200 men.

"Sergeant Turner, who was the scout squad leader, after checking his men in their positions and seeing that the main force of the attack was not toward his position, but further around to the left, exposed himself to the enemy fire for approximately 100 yards while making his way from his position to the platoon sergeant's tank to determine the situation and get instructions.

"Upon arriving at the platoon sergeant's tank, which was the keypoint of the platoon defense, and which was receiving the main enemy effort, Sergeant Turner immediately mounted to the exposed deck of the tank and manned the .50 caliber machine gun.

"Though under fire from several enemy automatic weapons and a number of riflemen, Sergeant Turner remained in this exposed position under increasingly heavy fire, firing the machine gun and directing the tank gun even though four men were wounded and one killed in his immediate vicinity, and the turret of the tank itself was struck by more than 50 bullets, 3 of which actually struck the mount of the gun he was manning.

"Sergeant Turner retained his exposed position for approximately 20 minutes before he was shot off; firing his gun, directing the tank fire, and shouting high-spirited encouragement to the other men in the position.

"On two occasions he called my attention to a threatened enemy penetration of the position, enabling me to move personnel to repulse them.

"Sergeant Turner's example of great courage and heroism and his jocular encouragement to the men around him undoubtedly was responsible for the splendid defense put up by the platoon, during which more than 50 enemy were killed, and the successful withdrawal when the ammunition supply ran out."

Sergeant Turner, who was 29 years old at the time of his death, enlisted in the National Guard on June 6, 1939, and entered active Federal service with the One Hundred and Ninety-first Tank Battalion on February 3, 1941. He served with the battalion in the Naples-Foggia and Central Europe campaigns until being taken prisoner by the Germans on November 19, 1943. He remained a prisoner of war until May 8, 1945, when he was returned to United States control.

Following is the Medal of Honor citation:

"Sergeant Turner, Second Reconnaissance Company, Second Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Yongsan, Korea. On September 1, 1950, a large enemy force launched a mortar and automatic weapon supported assault against his platoon. Sergeant Turner, a section leader, quickly organized his unit for defense and then observed that the attack was directed at the tank section 100 yards away. Leaving his secured section he dashed through a hail of fire to the threatened position and mounting a tank, manned the exposed turret machine gun. Disregarding the intense enemy fire he calmly held this position delivering deadly accurate fire and pointing out targets for the tank's 75-millimeter gun. His action resulted in the destruction of seven enemy machine-gun nests. Although severely wounded, he remained at the gun shouting encouragement to his comrades. During the action the tank received over 50 direct hits; the periscopes and antenna were shot away and three rounds hit the machine-gun

mount. Despite this fire, he remained at his post until a burst of enemy fire cost him his life. This intrepid and heroic performance enabled the platoon to withdraw and later launch an attack which routed the enemy. Sergeant Turner's valor and example reflect the highest credit upon himself and are in keeping with the esteemed traditions of the Army of the United States."

ARMY MASTER SERGEANT AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY

Master Sgt. Travis E. Watkins, Gladewater, Tex., who displayed "cheerfulness, fortitude, and unflinching acceptance of fate's decree * * * during 4 days and nights of hell," has been posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry that led to his death near Yongsan, Korea, on September 3, 1950, the Department of the Army announced today.

The award of the Nation's highest honor to the Second Infantry Division soldier came as a result of action in which Sergeant Watkins took command of a beleaguered group of 30 men and directed a defense which repelled continuous, fanatical enemy assaults. At one time, he left the security of his defense position to kill five enemy soldiers in order to replenish his own ammunition and weapon supply. Later he killed six more to erase an enemy machine-gun nest.

The medal will be presented to the widow, Mrs. Maidie S. Watkins, 215 Gay Avenue, Gladewater, Tex., by President Truman in a White House ceremony at 11:30 a. m., January 9. Also attending the ceremony will be his mother, Mrs. Auzie M. Carter, and his stepfather, Marshall R. Carter, both of Odessa, Tex.; a brother, Sgt. Tris T. Watkins, assigned to Hunter Air Force Base at Savannah, Ga.; and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Alma Barnett, of Gladewater, Tex.

Another brother, Master Sgt. Truman R. Watkins, who has been serving in the Far East command, is scheduled to arrive at McChord Air Force Base, Wash., today so that he may attend the ceremony on Tuesday.

An account of Sergeant Watkins' heroic action was related in a joint statement by Master Sgt. Grover L. Bozarth, of 501 Franklin Street, Austin, Tex., and Sgt. (1c) Ralph G. Lillard, of 226 Vancouver Avenue, Tacoma, Wash., who participated in the dramatic events which began at daybreak last August 31.

"It became apparent," they said, "that the fighting was far to the rear, and the men's spirit was adversely affected. Sergeant Watkins, sensing this feeling became very active on the perimeter. He constantly exposed himself to heavy enemy fire as he moved from foxhole to foxhole encouraging and cheering the men.

"By the morning of September 2, the need for hand grenades became very critical. At about 9 a. m., Sergeant Watkins killed two North Koreans about 50 yards outside the northeast edge of the perimeter. Alone, he left the perimeter to retrieve the North Koreans' grenades and weapons.

"When he was about 20 yards from the bodies, three more North Koreans jumped to their feet and opened fire on him. Sergeant Watkins killed the three of them and calmly gathered weapons, ammunition, and insignia of all five. This action, witnessed by the men on the perimeter, was a great boost to their morale.

"At about 10 o'clock the same morning, a group of six North Koreans gained a protected spot about 25 feet from a machine-gun position and were throwing hand grenades into the position making it untenable.

"Sergeant Watkins, although previously wounded in the head, rose from his fox hole to engage the enemy with rifle fire. He was immediately subjected to steady and heavy enemy machine-gun fire, and was hit in the left side, breaking or severing his backbone.

"He never faltered, and completely disregarding his wounds, continued his fire until all six North Koreans were killed and the threat to the perimeter was eliminated. He then collapsed into his fox hole.

"Although paralyzed from the waist down, Sergeant Watkins never lost courage. As he lay in his fox hole for the next 2 days, he could be heard by his comrades shouting, 'Hang on fellows. Help will be here in a short time. Now kill one for me.'

"He refused all rations, telling his buddies that he didn't deserve them because he couldn't fight.

"When it became apparent that the help wasn't going to arrive, he ordered his men to attempt to return to friendly lines. When the position was abandoned, he refused to burden the men because of his helpless condition.

"When last seen, he was wearing a smile and was wishing the survivors the best of luck on their way out.

"His cheerfulness, fortitude, and unflinching acceptance of fate's decree was a predominant influence in the magnificent defense of the gallant band who held the observation post for 4 days and nights of hell."

Sergeant Watkins, who was 29 years old at the time of his death, attended grammar and high school at Turnertown, Tex. He enlisted in the Army on June 6, 1939, at Dallas, Tex., and served in the Pacific theater during World War II. He was awarded the Bronze Star for exemplary conduct in ground combat against the enemy during the Guadalcanal campaign.

The Medal of Honor citation follows:

"Sergeant Watkins, Company H, Ninth Infantry Regiment, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against an enemy near Yongsan, Korea, from August 31 through September 3, 1950. When an overwhelming enemy force broke through and isolated 30 men of his unit he took command, established a perimeter defense and directed action which repelled continuous, fanatical enemy assaults. With his group completely surrounded and cut off, he moved from fox hole to fox hole exposing himself to enemy fire, giving instructions and offering encouragement to his men. Later when the need for ammunition and grenades became critical he shot two enemy soldiers 50 yards outside the perimeter and went out alone for their ammunition and weapons. As he picked up their weapons he was attacked by three others and wounded. Returning their fire he killed all three and gathering up the weapons of the five enemy dead returned to his amazed comrades. During a later assault, six enemy soldiers gained a defiladed spot and began to throw grenades into the perimeter making it untenable. Realizing the desperate situation and disregarding his wound he rose from his fox hole to engage them with rifle fire. Although immediately hit by a burst from an enemy machine gun he continued to fire until he had killed the grenade throwers. With this threat eliminated he collapsed and despite being paralyzed from the waist down, encouraged his men to hold on. He refused all food saving it for his comrades and when it became apparent that help would not arrive in time to hold the position ordered his men to escape to friendly lines. Refusing evacuation as his hopeless condition would burden his comrades he remained in his position and cheerfully wished them luck. Through his aggressive leadership and intrepid actions, this small force destroyed nearly 500 of the enemy before abandoning their position."

OKLAHOMA ARMY LIEUTENANT AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR

First Lt. Frederick F. Henry, Clinton, Okla., who is officially listed as missing in action in Korea, has been awarded the Medal of Honor for sacrificing himself to cover a withdrawal of his platoon in action near Am-Dong, Korea, September 1, 1950, the Department of the Army announced today.

The medal will be presented by President Truman in a White House ceremony, at 11 a. m., January 9, 1951, to Mrs. Lavon P. Henry, 1045 Harvard, Salt Lake City, Utah, the hero's wife.

A graphic description of the action which won the Medal of Honor for Lieutenant Henry was given by Sgt. (then Corp.) Richard A. Siman, 7222 Oxford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., a member of his platoon who was sharing the officer's foxhole when the action started.

"A bunch of North Koreans attacked our position," Sergeant Siman said. "Lieutenant Henry jumped up out of the hole and started running down the line telling his men to stay in place and keep firing.

"He came back a few minutes later and I saw he was wounded in the shoulder. He seemed to be in great pain.

"We fought the enemy for a long time, and it seemed as if we were stopping them. Lieutenant Henry tried to call battalion on the phone, but the line was out. He said he wasn't sure if the rest of the outfit was completely ready so we had to stay put.

"There were bullets and shells falling all around. Our ammunition was running low.

"Lieutenant Henry sent me out after the guns and ammunition of the wounded. When I came back, he put them in the hole with him and told the men to start withdrawing, and he would cover us.

"We started back, and Lieutenant Henry stayed by himself. He seemed to be firing everything at once.

"I didn't see Lieutenant Henry after that."

The action in Korea was not the first time Lieutenant Henry, who is 33 years old, has served in a hero's role. Entering active duty as an enlisted man in 1935, he won a combat promotion to second lieutenant in the Pacific theater on February 12, 1945. He holds the Asiatic Pacific theater ribbon with two bronze stars for New Guinea and Luzon, the Philippines Liberation ribbon with bronze star, and the Bronze Star Medal with a s oak leaf cluster.

Attending the White House ceremony, besides his wife, will be two children, Frederick F. Henry, Jr., 3 years old, and Sharon M. Henry, 14 months old; his father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. James P. Henry, Riverview, Apartment 11, Stockton, Calif., and a sister-in-law, Mrs. Janna Henry, 1025 Acosta, Salinas, Calif.

Following is the Medal of Honor citation:

"Lieutenant Henry, Company F, Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond call of duty in action on September 1, 1950, in the vicinity of Am-Dong, Korea. His platoon was holding a strategic ridge near the town when they were attacked by a superior enemy force, supported by heavy mortar and artillery fire. Seeing his platoon disorganized by this fanatical assault he left his fox hole and moving along the line ordered his men to stay in place and keep firing. Encouraged by this heroic action the platoon re-formed a defense line and rained devastating fire on the enemy, checking his advance. Enemy fire had knocked out all communications and Lieutenant Henry was unable to determine whether or not the main line of resistance was alerted to this heavy attack. On his own initiative, although severely wounded, he decided to hold his position as long as possible and ordered the wounded evacuated and their weapons and ammunition brought to him. Establishing a one-man defensive position he ordered the platoon's withdrawal and, despite his wound and with complete disregard for himself, remained behind to cover the movement. When last seen he was single-handedly firing all available weapons

so effectively that he caused an estimated 50 enemy casualties. His ammunition was soon expended and his position overrun, but this intrepid action saved the platoon and halted the enemy's advance until the main line of resistance was prepared to throw back the attack. Lieutenant Henry's outstanding gallantry and noble self-sacrifice, above and beyond the call of duty, reflects the highest honor upon him and was in keeping with the esteemed traditions of the Army of the United States."

PRESIDENT TO PRESENT MEDAL OF HONOR AWARDED GENERAL DEAN TO MRS. DEAN

A detailed summary of the events leading to the disappearance in Korea at 1:30 a. m. on July 21, 1950, of Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, heroic commander of the 24th Infantry Division, was released today by the Department of the Army as the Nation prepared to bestow its highest award, the Medal of Honor, on the missing military leader.

The medal, which was awarded to General Dean because of his "examples of excessive gallantry committed always at the threatened portions of his front lines," will be presented to his wife, Mrs. Mildred D. Dean, 251 Etna Street, Berkeley, Calif., by President Truman in a White House ceremony at 11:30 a. m. January 9, 1951.

Also attending the ceremony will be the general's mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Dean, and his daughter, Mrs. June Williams, both of Berkeley, and a son, Cadet William F. Dean, Jr., a student at the United States Military Academy.

The events prior to General Dean's disappearance were recorded by Brig. Gen. Pearson Menoher, assistant commander of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division. His summation follows:

"In order to fully develop General Dean's actions during July 19–21, 1950, it is desired to present here all available background material, some of it gained by observation, most of it by personal discussion with General Dean.

"General Dean fully realized that his division could not alone stem the North Korean Army. He did believe that we could considerably delay the enemy at Taejon since it was the strategic key to any advance on the Taegu-Pusan main line of communications in this portion of South Korea, and the enemy would not attempt any farther advance south until he captured this city. He had hoped to hold Taejon until reinforcements could arrive; if this were not possible he intended to inflict the heaviest of casualties upon the enemy. Throughout the delaying action he commanded from July 2 until July 21, when he was reported missing, he repeatedly stated, 'My God, we must hold them; I don't want to have to fight for every mile of this ground again.'

"Thus it was that when our Kum River line was broken and we withdrew to the vicinity of Taejon he knew that the enemy would soon attack here and in a strength greatly outnumbering us. On July 18, 1950, he ordered the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division Advance CP to move to Okchon, 12 miles southeast of Taejon. He kept with him in Taejon a minimum staff consisting of several officers and enlisted drivers.

"All day July 19, 1950, the enemy bombarded our positions north of Taejon in the vicinity of the air strip in preparation for their attack. General Dean stated this artillery barrage was greater than any he had seen in any single day during his 7 months of combat in Europe, 1944–45.

"Despite this artillery he made numerous trips to the front lines to see for himself what the enemy was doing or could be expected to do. On one of these trips he went out in front of our lines to direct the fire of an American tank against approaching enemy. Even though artillery and small arms fire was falling in this area, he stood outside the tank and directed its fire with marked effect.

"On another occasion he visited an advance CP where incoming artillery was particularly heavy and ate lunch in the mess even though other officers deemed it more appropriate to remain in their fox holes.

"Late that afternoon General Dean returned to his division forward CP at Okchon. I insisted that he should remain at his own CP and that if he wanted a general officer with the regimental combat team in Taejon he should send me there. He declined, stating that he wanted to be there himself, that he would be all right and would see me later. He returned to Taejon around 1800.

"Around daylight July 20, 1950, the enemy launched a coordinated attack, probably consisting of two divisions, against Taejon. Our forces, an understrength regimental combat team, were greatly outnumbered. The first evidence of this attack was the appearance of several enemy tanks within Taejon at approximately 0530. General Dean quickly organized bazooka crews and took off in pursuit. During this hunt he spotted a disabled enemy tank in a field on the western edge of Taejon. He directed the fire of a 75 millimeter recoilless rifle against this tank but after firing four rounds without a hit, he started crawling toward the tank with a hand grenade, intending to hurl it into an open hatch.

"While crawling toward the tank he was pinned down by enemy small arms fire; at the same time two other enemy tanks appeared to cover the withdrawal of this disabled vehicle. In getting away he evacuated an abandoned American jeep. He hurriedly rounded up several bazooka teams and returned to knock out the three enemy tanks; however, by this time the tanks had headed away from Taejon and the bazooka crews firing at a range of 200 yards were unable to hit them.

"At approximately 1130 while eating lunch at the Thirty-fourth Infantry CP in Taejon another enemy tank rolled past. Again General Dean secured bazooka teams and started another chase. Upon spotting the tank down a side street he placed one bazooka team on this street to prevent its escape and with the other team he proceeded down a street to the rear and paralleling the tank to gain undetected a good firing position nearer the tank.

"Trying to find such a position in the upstairs of one building a sniper fired on him twice, both shots narrowly missing his head. Unperturbed he had a rifleman return the sniper's fire, the third round hitting and apparently killing the sniper. After several more tries he found a position upstairs in a building from which he could look down directly on top of the tank. He then had the bazooka team fire three rounds into the tank, killing the crew, and setting the tank afire.

"Between these tank hunts, General Dean made frequent trips to our front lines despite heavy enemy fire, and always returned to the Thirty-fourth Infantry CP with targets for our air cover. He minutely directed these air strikes to insure that our own troops were not hit. Had he not made these personal reconnaissances the air strikes would not have been possible.

"Around 1530 to 1630 it was obvious that all our positions were being overrun. General Dean then formed a convoy of all available vehicles left in the town and ordered a withdrawal. Asked if he wanted to proceed with the lead elements, he declined stating to the effect he wanted to see everybody else safely out of town. He proceeded with the last vehicles.

"The column first ran into enemy small arms fire in the southwest edge of Taejon. In its procession for the next 3½ to 4 miles the column with few exceptions was constantly under enemy small arms and mortar fire.

"At the edge of Taejon six or seven soldiers on foot asked for a ride. He stopped, put the men aboard and told his driver to proceed down the road to a covered position where he would join them on foot. On three other occasions he stopped his jeep while under fire to clear the road of disabled or driverless vehicles. Each time he found operable vehicles, he assigned a driver, and placed all wounded men in the vicinity aboard.

"At one point a truck received a direct hit from an enemy mortar round; the truck had run off the road into a ditch and 10 to 15 of our dead lay in the middle of the road. General Dean ordered his driver to slow down and veer off, even though it looked as if they would run off the road.

"About 4 miles out of Taejon, the motor convoy was completely stopped by knocked-out vehicles. General Dean gathered all the men in his vicinity, leading them to temporary concealment in a nearby bean field. After dark he led his group to nearby hills. He helped carry a wounded man up the hill which was very steep and 'rough-going' for an able man on his own feet. He left his group here, stating he and his aide-de-camp were going back down the hill to round up additional stragglers and wounded.

"While on this mission General Dean and his aide became separated around 0130, 21 July 1950. Neither in the darkness that night nor after daylight the following morning could he be found. This is the last eyewitness account of General Dean available at this time.

"It is more than evident that in all his actions against the enemy he was fearless, aggressive, and that he proceeded with utter disregard for his own life. His numerous appearances on the fighting front under fire immeasurably boosted the morale of his troops. Throughout it all he remained calm and cheerful, a difficult task for a normal man under such adverse conditions.

"His intrepid leadership and outstanding valor uphold the highest tradition of the military service. On behalf of the men serving with him at the time of these related incidents, I am proud to recommend General Dean for the award of the Medal of Honor."

In his recommendation that General Dean be awarded the Medal of Honor, General Douglas MacArthur, as Commander in Chief, Far East Command, wrote:

"It is with great pride and warmest personal admiration that I recommend the award of the Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. William F. Dean. The dauntless courage and the selflessness demonstrated by General Dean bespeak the noble character of our brave men who are fighting for a unified cause under the flag of the United Nations."

The late Gen. Walton H. Walker, former Commander of the Eighth Army, who was killed in a jeep accident on December 23, 1950, before his death wrote the following:

"I consider it a privilege to approve a recommendation for the award of the Medal of Honor to this gallant and intrepid general officer. Never in the annals of military history has a general officer written a saga that can compare with this."

Following is the Medal of Honor citation:

"General Dean, Commanding General, Twenty-fourth Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the repeated risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty in Taejon, Korea, on 20 and 21 July 1950. In command of a unit suddenly relieved from occupation duties in Japan and as yet untried in combat; faced with a ruthless and determined enemy, highly trained and overwhelmingly superior in numbers; he felt it his duty to take action which to a man of his military experience and knowledge was clearly apt to result in his death. He personally and alone attacked an enemy tank while armed only with a hand grenade. He also directed the fire of his own tanks from an exposed position with neither cover nor concealment while under observed artillery and small arms fire. When the town of

Taejon was finally overrun he refused to insure his own safety by leaving with the leading elements but remained behind organizing his retreating forces, directing stragglers, and was last seen assisting the wounded to a place of safety. These actions indicate that General Dean felt it necessary to sustain the courage and resolution of his troops by examples of excessive gallantry committed always at the threatened portions of his front lines. The magnificent response of his unit to this willing and cheerful sacrifice, made with full knowledge of its certain cost, is history. The success of this phase of the campaign is in large measure due to General Dean's heroic leadership, courageous and loyal devotion to his men, and his complete disregard for personal safety."

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HENRY L. STIMSON

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, next Sunday afternoon, January 21, at 5 p. m., at the National Presbyterian Church, Connecticut Avenue at N Street NW., memorial services will be held in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Henry L. Stimson. Speakers will be Gen. George C. Marshall and the Reverend Dr. Albert J. McCartney. I have been asked to announce that Members of Congress are invited to attend.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted, without debate, to transact routine business, such as the introduction of bills and to place matters in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all tort claims paid by the Department, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION, ETC., FROM CITIZENS OF SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, five documents consisting of a petition, resolution, etc., presented by a group of Samoans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on leases entered into by the Department of the Navy for the period July 1, 1950, through December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PARKING OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY FOR POSTAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the International Anglers and Casters Association, relating to the issuance of a national license for fishing, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PLIGHT OF TRANSYLVANIA SAXONS—RESOLUTION OF STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA, NEW YORK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the magnificent fight put up by the Germans in Western Germany against communism, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Steuben Society of America, in New York, requesting an investigation and study of the plight of the Transylvania Saxons.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Whereas the American people subscribe to the fundamental principle of the protection of human rights, and to the practice of charity and good will; and

Whereas we have heretofore subscribed to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter abhoring the practice of territorial self-aggrandizement and advocating self-determination and the pursuit of the four freedoms in all countries everywhere; and

Whereas the Saxon people of Transylvania, Rumania, have by reason of the failures and shortcomings of American representatives at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, been caused, unnecessarily, by reason of their German ethnic origin, to suffer and endure diabolic hardships, and to live in the shadow of Draconic laws unexperienced in 800 years of Transylvania-Saxon history; and

Whereas the policy heretofore pursued of "to the victor belong the spoils," reinforced by the spirit of vindictiveness and vengeance, has confronted these oppressed people with only a dark and hopeless future,

Now, therefore, the Steuben Society of America in the interests of American honor and prestige, does hereby advocate and request the creation of a duly authorized Government commission, under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States to investigate and study the plight of the Transylvania Saxons, and report its recommendations to the end that said conditions affecting the fate and destiny of these people may, in the interests of fairness and justice, be alleviated and remedied.

Respectfully submitted.

THEO. H. HOFFMANN,
National Chairman.

THE HARWOOD CASE—AID FOR AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in conference with the Commissioner of Agriculture for my State of South Carolina, the Honorable J. Roy Jones requested my assistance in obtaining aid for the agricultural interests of the Nation.

Commissioner Jones is chairman of the Transportation Committee of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture. This organization at its last annual meeting unanimously approved a resolution that I would like to obtain permission for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The action requested in the resolution should be forthcoming and a favorable decision is expected but, irrespective of the decision made, it should be released immediately.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION I: REGARDING HARWOOD CASE

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission in June 1948 reopened the Harwood case and at the same time instituted a general investigation for the determination of exempted agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the commissioners of agriculture of various States testified at the Commission's hearings in Washington, D. C., in November 1948, and in Atlanta, Ga., in January 1949, emphasizing the vital importance of exempt truck transportation in the marketing of agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the examiner assigned to the case rendered his report and submitted findings in these proceedings in July 1949, wherein he recommended a reversal of the Commission's prior decision in the Harwood case and classified as exempt commodities a great number of agricultural commodities previously held nonexempt by the Commission; and

Whereas oral argument in these proceedings was heard by the entire Commission in December 1949; and

Whereas the Commission has taken no further action in this litigation, notwithstanding the importance of the outcome to the agricultural community, and continues to render decisions under its previously restrictive interpretations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association request the Interstate Commerce Commission to render its decision in this matter without further delay, adopting the report of the examiner.

CLEAR CHANNEL—RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Dallas, Tex., in opposition to any reduction, by international treaty or otherwise, in the number of clear channel stations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAR CHANNEL RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

News and information are of increasing importance to everyone. Many rural people depend upon clear channel radio broadcasting for news, weather reports, and agricultural information. We therefore firmly oppose any reduction, by international treaty or otherwise, in the number of clear channel stations or any interruption of the extent of their service. The American Farm Bureau Federation urges that permission be given to these stations to increase their power to

allow for complete coverage to all areas in their respective territories.

Passed December 14, 1950, at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Dallas, Tex.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. SPARKMAN), from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress, the annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS (S. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the Eighty-first Congress, which was ordered to be printed.

WIRE TAPPING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and myself, members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I submit minority views on wire tapping in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed as part 2 of Report No. 2700, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 9, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, staff associate	10,846.00	5,422.98
Carl M. Marcy, staff associate	10,846.00	5,422.98
C. C. O'Day, clerk	9,351.40	4,675.68
Pat M. Holt, associate clerk	9,019.59	4,509.78
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	5,110.31	2,555.10
Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk (to Nov. 13, 1950)	4,588.89	1,695.30
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	4,588.89	2,294.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	30,000.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	17,330.84
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1950	12,669.16

TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (UNDER AUTHORIZATION OF S. RES. 231 AND S. RES. 237)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Martha W. Hix, assistant clerk (to Aug. 31, 1950)	$3,806.78	$605.49
Helen S. Karpowicz, assistant clerk (to Aug. 25, 1950)	3,806.78	676.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$35,000.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	27,407.11
Balance unexpended	7,592.89

TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
A. Lee Parsons, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,423.00
Joseph P. McMurray, staff director	10,846.00	5,423.00
William F. McKenna, counsel [1]	10,846.00	1,355.74
Robert D. L'Heureux, counsel	10,846.00	5,423.00
Thomas H. Daniel, counsel	10,846.00	5,423.00
Raimond Bowles, assistant clerk	10,846.00	5,423.00
Charles A. Young, counsel [2]	10,846.00	3,163.40
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,946.22
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	4,849.61	2,424.80
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55

[1] Nov. 16 through Dec. 31.
[2] Aug. 1 through Nov. 15.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$35,000.00
Jan. 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950 (already reported)	23,387.69
Amount expended July 1 through Dec. 31, 1950	7,028.05
Balance unexpended	4,584.26

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (OPERATING UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 218)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, investigator	$7,858.27	$3,929.17
William C. Stewart, Jr., investigator	7,858.27	3,929.17
Carter E. Talman, financial adviser	7,858.27	3,929.17
Sarah I. Harley, clerical assistant	4,067.49	2,033.79
Ann Livingston, clerical assistant [1]	3,632.97	1,513.70
Floyd A. Carpenter, consultant [2]	30.12	30.12
Raymond H. Flockelman, consultant [2]	30.12	271.14

[1] From Aug. 1.
[2] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$60,000.00
May 6, 1949, through June 30, 1950 (reported)	39,353.35
Amount expended July 1, 1950, through December 31, 1950	15,773.20
Balance unexpended	4,873.45

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Maurice W. Covert, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,256.72
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,318.91
Robert B. Young, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,298.18
George S. Green, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,256.72
John H. Mathews, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,256.72
Joseph H. Davis, chief clerk	10,846.00	5,318.91
Wayne H. Smithey, assistant chief clerk	10,846.00	5,090.79
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,946.18
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,946.18
Mary Rogers, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,946.18
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,924.46
Orrin E. Creesy, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,642.04
Patience E. Dion, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,924.46
Barbara E. Duborg, clerical assistant	5,892.43	2,924.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$30,000.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	24,748.73
Balance unexpended	5,251.27

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (MAKING INVESTIGATIONS UNDER S. RES. 228, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 27, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Blair, Drury H., staff member	8,024.17	4,012.08
Dales, Patricia A., stenographer	5,023.41	641.87
Davis, Dorothy A., stenographer	5,023.41	2,511.66
Hasser, Stephen G., stenographer	4,415.10	1,839.60
Heckman, Elizabeth R., stenographer	5,023.41	2,511.66
Himes, George H., typist	2,048.97	700.03
Johnson, Ethel L., staff member	7,609.41	3,804.66
Kroeak, Lucille, stenographer	3,024.66	1,319.06
McCloskey, Mary J., stenographer	5,023.41	1,911.65
Massey, Guy M., staff member	8,024.17	4,012.08
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	8,024.17	4,012.08
Morrill, Mary E., stenographer	5,023.41	851.17
Pence, Marjorie W., stenographer	5,023.41	2,511.66
Robinson, Mary L., stenographer	5,023.41	2,511.66
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator	8,024.17	4,012.08
Webster, William H., stenographer	4,936.51	2,446.50

(This figure: Balance of funds under S. Res. 228 July 1, 1950.)

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$53,391.49
Amount expended	45,148.02
Balance unexpended	8,243.47

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joycette K. Jones, chief clerk	$7,775.31	$3,887.64
James M. Kendall, assistant chief clerk	6,674.55	3,337.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,718.02
Balance unexpended	3,281.98

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 36, 81ST CONG., AS AMENDED)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul E. Hadlick, counsel	$10,846.00	$5,422.98
Albert J. Wolken, investigator	7,858.27	3,929.10
D. Porter Waring, marketing specialist [1]	7,609.41	3,043.73
Barbara Cunningham, assistant clerk [2]	3,372.27	1,067.87

[1] Service began Aug. 7, 1950.
[2] Service began Sept. 7, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	29,327.59
Balance unexpended	20,672.41

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE MEANS OF STIMULATING SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY EXPORTS (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 173, 81ST CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Rollis S. Nelson, investigator	$7,858.27	$3,929.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$25,000.00
Amount expended	9,513.91
Balance unexpended	15,486.09

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Earl B. Wixoey, clerk [1]	$10,846.00	$5,151.83
Paul Badger, clerk [2]	10,846.00	271.14
Philip R. Rodgers, assistant clerk	10,846.00	5,422.98
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	5,718.63	2,859.30
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	5,284.12	2,642.04
Helen King, clerical assistant	4,502.00	2,250.96
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,284.12	2,642.04
Marguerite Yost, clerical assistant	3,719.87	1,859.88
Elaine F. Hatch, professional staff member	7,775.31	3,887.64
Herman Lazarus, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
William G. Reidy, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
Thomas E. Shroyer, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98

[1] Resigned Dec. 21, 1950.
[2] Appointed Dec. 22, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	$20,000.00
Amount expended:	
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949	7,406.74
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1949	3,879.67
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1950	2,384.66
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	2,222.60
Total	15,893.67
Balance unexpended	4,106.33

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dean A. Clark, director, appointed June 29, 1950	[1] $25	$1,206.36
Morris Pike, assistant director, appointed July 18, 1950	[1] 25	1,206.10
Elling Aannestad, assistant director, appointed Aug. 24, 1950	6,600	2,964.19
Edward Caygill, research assistant, appointed Sept. 25, 1950	3,780	1,577.85
Maurice Feuerlicht, research assistant, appointed Sept. 25, 1950	3,780	1,577.85
Ben H. Ervin, research assistant, appointed July 3, 1950	3,060	2,366.84
John M. Lexcen, clerk, appointed June 27, 1950	3,780	2,989.62
Mary Jane Del Balzo, secretary, appointed June 2, 1950	2,520	2,077.14
Harriet Gilfoyle secretary, appointed Aug. 30, 1950	2,520	1,384.76

[1] Per day.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong	$37,800.00
Amount expended during 81st Cong	20,273.59
Balance unexpended	17,526.41

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk	$10,846.00	$5,423.02
Russell C. King, assistant clerk and counsel	7,775.31	3,887.64
James L. Harrison, professional clerk	10,846.00	5,423.02
B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research)	5,457.92	2,729.04
Catherine L. Guyon, clerk (research)	5,457.92	2,729.04
Ruth P. Noon, clerk (secretary)	3,806.75	1,903.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended (Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950)	927.63
Balance unexpended (Dec. 31, 1950) to be returned to the contingent fund of the U. S. Senate	9,072.37

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the

funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Mollohan, chief clerk, from Aug. 11	$10,846.00	$4,217.87
Gerhard P. Van Arkel, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
J. George Stewart, professional staff member	10,846.00	5,422.98
William P. Gulledge, assistant chief clerk	7,022.16	3,511.08
Anna H. Monat, clerical assistant	5,197.21	2,598.60
Margaret Hampton, clerical assistant, to Oct. 16	5,197.21	1,530.28
Ruth Bryant, clerical assistant	4,849.61	2,424.78
Vivian Lynn, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.52
Martin Fay, professional staff member, Aug. 30 to Oct. 3	7,858.27	742.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 81st Cong.	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,954.50
Balance unexpended	5,045.50

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE (by request):

S. 447. A bill to extend the time during which a course must be commenced in order to obtain certain veteran's education and training benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 448. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 449. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 450. A bill to encourage expanded production of needed agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 451. A bill for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 452. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by requiring the labeling of bread or rolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 453. A bill to provide for the designation of the Heart-Butte Dam and Reservoir project in Morton County, N. Dak., as the Tschida Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 454. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes;

S. 455. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; and

S. 456. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. CAIN):

S. 457. A bill for the relief of Edwin and Bradford Ripley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 458. A bill providing for the issuance of a patent in fee to Marie James Wilson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 459. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit officers or employees of the United States from accepting payments for appointment or retention of a person in office or employment under the United States; and

S. 460. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bryant David Virmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Maria Maykemper and Henry Maykemper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro;

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne;

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek; and

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 466. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 467. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Kaljo Raid;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Valdeko Kangro;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; and

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Antonino Firetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 474. A bill to provide for nautical education in the Territories, to facilitate nautical education in the States and Territories, and for other purposes;

S. 475. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to local enforcement of safety regulations of civil aviation, and for other purposes;

S. 476. A bill to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes;

S. 477. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes;

S. 478. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use;

S. 479. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes;

S. 480. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of interstate contract carriers by air, and for other purposes;

S. 481. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for transport aircraft adaptable for both commercial and military service, and for other purposes; and

S. 482. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to change the name of the reservoir to be formed above Garrison Dam and known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake to Lake Thompson; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. EASTLAND introduced Senate Joint Resolution 14, to provide for the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations if Communist China is admitted to membership therein, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. EASTLAND also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 15, to provide for use of the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of Formosa, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Aviation Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES FROM UNITED NATIONS—USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT THE ISLAND OF FORMOSA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce two joint resolutions and request that they lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and lie on the table as requested.

The joint resolutions introduced by Mr. EASTLAND were read twice by their titles and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations if Communist China is admitted to membership therein; and

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to provide for use of the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of Formosa.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement at this time, explanatory of the two joint resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have this day introduced two joint resolutions, the first of which provides that the United States shall withdraw from the United Nations if Communist China is admitted thereto, and the second provides that the armed services of the United States protect the island of Formosa from conquest or occupation by any Communist state or power.

I have introduced these joint resolutions because of the new policy of the State Department, which means surrender to Communist China.

Mr. President, at a later date I shall speak at length on these joint resolutions. I have introduced them, however, because I do not believe these great

questions, which mean life or death to the United States, should be decided by back-door deals by officials in the State Department in whom the American people have no confidence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield, let me ask if he will be willing to have the joint resolutions read so that we may know what he is talking about?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have just obtained unanimous consent to explain them, and am doing so at this time.

Mr. President, I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that the State Department as now constituted cannot protect the welfare of the United States. The under-the-table deal at Lake Success on last Saturday was the last straw.

Formosa is necessary for the defense of the United States, and is today one of the great bulwarks of power against the spread of Communist aggression. It appears that our State Department is willing to surrender this island and sacrifice the last great anti-Communist army in the Orient.

Mr. President, what are we thinking of? What is behind these decisions? They must be properly aired and the American people must know and pass judgment on those who would promulgate such a program. If Formosa is surrendered, the very least that can be said is that the task of the United States in the defense of Japan and the Philippines will be weakened and our defense line in the Pacific breached. It would take thousands of American lives to regain what would be lost by this surrender. To admit Communist China into the United Nations and surrender Formosa to the aggressor, whose hands drip with the blood of thousands of American boys, is an insult to the dead and would be a betrayal of the United States.

Communist China today is a bigger aggressor than the Soviet Union because Communist China has resorted to armed warfare for the purpose of aggression. In addition, she wages war against the United Nations itself. To admit her to membership in an organization to preserve the peace would certainly destroy any chance of future effectiveness of this organization, and its continued existence would stand out as a mockery and a fraud upon the highest aspirations of mankind.

Mr. President, this country, in all probability, cannot survive further blunders; and the American Congress must act to protect the Nation. The few remarks that I desire to make at this time are based primarily on the power of Congress under the Constitution of the United States to direct our armed services to protect Formosa from attack. Some people will conscientiously say that the Congress has no such power, but that this power rests in the hands of the President of the United States because he is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the country and is charged wtih the conduct of our foreign policy.

With this argument, I entirely disagree. The Congress of the United States under the Constitution has the sole power to direct the Armed Forces of the United States to make war upon any given country. This is all that a declaration of war means. Congress lays down the policy, while the President, as the Commander in Chief, determines how, when, and where the Armed Forces shall attack. This means that in the case of Formosa the Congress has the sole power to say when military measures shall be resorted to for the protection of any area; and the President, as the Commander in Chief, acting in furtherance of this policy, determines how, when, and where action is necessary to protect the area in question.

The sole power to declare war carries with it all incidental powers; and inasmuch as the Congress possesses the sole power to declare war, it necessarily follows that Congress has the power to direct the defense of any area.

There is no doubt that the Congress has the power, under the Constitution of the United States, to direct the armed services of the United States to attack any country. If we have the power to direct attack, we certainly have the power to direct the armed defense of any area.

COMMISSION ON DISLOYALTY AND SECURITY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am today resubmitting a resolution which I offered at the second session of the Eighty-first Congress establishing a commission to ascertain the facts with respect to disloyalty in the State Department and security of the Department against foreign penetration. The commission is to be bipartisan, highly trained, and wholly independent of the executive.

In the struggle for existence in which the United States is engaged, the State Department is in the front line of our defense. It is thus essential that confidence in the State Department be definitely restored once and for all.

Confidence cannot be achieved by investigation of the executive by the Executive.

Confidence cannot be achieved by Congress undertaking an investigation which it has neither the time nor the training nor the facilities to perform.

But confidence can be restored by an investigation which is independent of the Executive, which is created by and responsible to Congress and which is conducted by highly qualified persons.

Such an investigation will result in cleaning out the unfit and in ending any unjustified suspicion of the many fine men and women who work in the State Department.

This legislation was first recommended in the individual report which I filed as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee on disloyalty charges in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point excerpts from this report which bear on this matter together with the full text of the resolution. I hope that it may be promptly considered and acted upon so that the commission can be speedily appointed and go to work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the excerpts and the text of the resolution will be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) submitted by Mr. LODGE was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) with a view to ascertaining the facts with respect to disloyalty on the part of employees of the Department of State and security of the Department against foreign penetration and taking appropriate action with respect thereto, there is hereby established a bipartisan senatorial commission to be known as the Commission on Disloyalty and Security (in this resolution referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of eight members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members who are Senators, one from each of the two major political parties, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Three members from private life to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate;

(3) Three members from private life to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) The six members of the Commission who are not Members of the Senate shall be comprised of persons who as a result of training, experience, and attainments are exceptionally qualified to ascertain the facts with respect to the matters referred to in subsection (a) and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

(c) All appointees to the Commission shall be confirmed by the Senate.

(d) The persons recommended by the majority leader of the Senate shall be approved by a majority vote of the Senators of the majority conference, and the persons recommended by the minority leader of the Senate shall be approved by a majority vote of the Senators of the minority conference.

(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) Members of the Senate who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Senators; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, for comparable duties; and (2) to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths, to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature

of the Chairman or any member of the Commission designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by the Chairman or any such member.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate fully charges of disloyalty on the part of persons who have been or are now employed by the Department of State. All proceedings of the Commission shall be conducted in secret.

(b) Upon concluding its study and investigation, the Commission shall make a public announcement of its findings no later than 6 months after the enactment of this resolution, and shall make a report thereon to the Senate with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Such report may be made to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Upon the submission of such report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the Commission under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

The excerpts presented by Mr. LODGE are as follows:

BIPARTISAN, TRAINED, INDEPENDENT COMMISSION

An important element of strength in our system of government is that our checks and balances give us as a people the opportunity to criticize ourselves. In a dictatorship, the dictator is free to do whatever he wants—and this includes freedom to make irretrievable mistakes. It has been said that if Hitler had had an independent body like Congress to criticize and challenge his decisions that some of his worst blunders would have been avoided and that he might have won the war. It is certainly true that in this country the existence of a Congress, independent of the Executive and able to make a check at the top level of policy decision without regard to the administrative chain of command, is as complete a theoretical—and in most instances practical—protection against error as the people could have.

When this general truth is applied to the specific subject of this investigation—the existence of disloyalty in the State Department—it becomes immediately obvious that the unique asset which a congressional committee has—that of being independent of the Executive—is, under our present way to doing things, accompanied by the following very serious draw-backs:

1. There is primarily the matter of time. To accomplish fully an investigation of this kind the members of a congressional committee clearly lack enough time because of the fact that they have a great many other pressing public duties.

2. They also are not men who have the technical expertness which is required to make a study of this sort.

3. The tools which a congressional committee has—which are essentially the tools of publicity and development of facts for the use of public opinion—are precisely the implements which cannot be used effectively when it comes to tracking down disloyal persons in the Government departments. This requires long, patient detective work which is obviously something which no congressional committee is in a position to do.

4. Finally, the setting up of a congressional committee on a majority-minority basis inescapably introduces political considerations into a subject where they very definitely have no place whatever.

The result of all these draw-backs became plain during the course of the 1950 investigation, which had a number of unfortunate results, including the besmirching of the reputations of innocent persons, the hampering of the work of the Government investigative agencies, the impairment of the position of the United States before the world, and an unjust reflection on all of the happily numerous excellent men and women who work in the State Department, with the resulting discouragement to other excellent men and women from going to work for the State Department. This was a loss to the country as a whole.

It must, therefore, be obvious that it would be highly desirable if an investigation could take place which would be a completely independent audit of the Executive and yet was not encumbered by these very serious drawbacks.

The other protection which the American people have against foreign penetration of their foreign policy is in the executive branch, where the security personnel of the State Department, the loyalty boards of the State Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation work together to protect the public interests. Unlike Members of Congress, these persons have the time to do the work, they have the technical expertness which is required, and they possess all of the tools which are needed to do the job. They have detectives and listening devices and all the rest of the paraphernalia. The shortcoming is that they are under the Executive, and it is a basic American instinct that it is not human nature to expect an impartial audit of the Executive by the Executive any more than it would be human nature to expect an impartial audit of the Congress by the Congress.

This must bring one to the obvious conclusion that the desirable goal would be an official group of persons who had the time and the technical expertness and the tools to do the job—who were as proficient in their way as the FBI is in its way—and who were, at the same time, as independent of the Executive as is the Congress.

I believe that the concern over this question of disloyalty has risen to such a point that a quicker result and a greater amount of public confidence would be achieved by a simple Senate resolution which would set up a bipartisan commission of 8 persons, 2 of whom would be Senators, 3 of whom would be appointed by the Vice President upon the recommendation of the majority leader, and 3 of whom would be appointed by the Vice President upon the recommendation of the minority leader. The minority leader's selections would have to be approved by a majority vote of the conference of minority Senators, and the majority leader's selections would have to be approved by a majority vote of the Senators of the majority conference. All members would require confirmation by the entire Senate.

The six nonsenatorial persons would be chosen because of their qualifications to pass on a subject of this kind. They are instructed under the terms of this bill to conduct all their proceedings in secret, making a public announcement of their findings at the end, at a date which will be well after the forthcoming election. They would have the power of subpena and completely adequate funds.

This resolution is confined to the Senate because it is here that the original investigation began and ran its course, because the Senate has a unique interest in foreign relations, and because to confine it to the Senate will save a great deal of time. This bill adopts some of the following time-tested features of the bill which set up the Hoover Commission, to wit: The nomination of two Senators to the Commission to provide liaison with Congress and the composition of the Commission with equal representation from both parties.

A Senate resolution can obviously be passed more rapidly than legislation which requires the concurrence of the House and of the Executive. The congressional character of this bill and the fact that it is entirely bipartisan should insure that whatever results were announced would command the maximum amount of public confidence from precisely those elements of public opinion which now lack confidence the most. One of the purposes of such a study must obviously be to provide a clean way to end this business. It will never end at all, cleanly or otherwise, if the practice of having the majority party investigate the majority continues to hold sway. Nor would satisfactory results be obtained if the minority investigated the majority. The investigation must be nonpolitical.

Past history indicates that Congress, when it acts through investigating committees, often acts incompetently and frequently fails in its important task of compelling disclosures. Congress delayed a long time before it finally decided to employ competent people to do its legislative drafting. There was another long delay before Congress decided to set up its own corps of experts on internal revenue taxation and the other expert staffs without which Congress could not function at all today. This process of evolution should continue. We have delayed far too long in the business of setting up congressional investigations on a modern and practical basis. Where foreign governments, proceeding in secret with trained men have achieved prompt results in rooting out espionage, we, with our circus-like proceedings, have bagged only a corporal's guard. Clearly our system is faulty. The setting up of an efficient and independent investigative procedure is long overdue.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the table contained in subparagraph 6 (a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Senate Members of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	"Development and Utilization of Atomic Energy"

ADDITIONAL TRANS-ATLANTIC PASSENGER SERVICE AT LOWER COST

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas travel by United States residents contributes to the creation of vitally needed dollar exchange in European countries; and

Whereas lack of adequate trans-Atlantic passenger service during the summer season at rates within the reach of the middle-income market is limiting the extent of such travel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Civil Aeronautics Board and the United States Maritime Commission are requested (1) to explore every available means of providing additional trans-Atlantic passenger service at lower cost, including maximum utilization of existing service under special low-fare arrangements, charters, and group contracts, and (2) if they find their existing authority inadequate to facilitate and encourage such low-cost transportation, to recommend to the Senate such legislation as may be necessary to enable them to accomplish such objective.

RELIEF FOR FISHING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas the fishing industry is an important part of the economy of the United States; and

Whereas the growing population of the Nation emphasizes the increasing future importance of fish as a food; and

Whereas the men and equipment of the fishing fleets and the shore workers engaged in the preparation of the catches, and the food resource thereby made available, have been demonstrated in two world wars to be necessary to the national defense; and

Whereas operations of much of the fishing industry have been seriously curtailed by reason of steadily growing imports of fish and fishery products, particularly of fresh and frozen groundfish fillets, and there is reason to believe that similar conditions are imminent in the tuna industry on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas if the present trend is permitted to continue, the fishing industry will, within a short time, be so impaired as to force out of business a major portion of the fishing fleet of the United States and force out of employment a major portion of the workmen employed in various phases of the industry; and

Whereas the domestic fishing industry has already been adversely affected and is further seriously threatened by the consistently increasing importations of fish and fishery products into the United States; and

Whereas the imported fish are caught by workmen whose wage scale and standard of living are far below those of Americans in like occupations; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the resulting lower cost of fish in their primary foreign market, the finally processed product is sold to the American housewife at the same price as the domestic fish; and

Whereas representatives of the fishing industry and others from many parts of the United States recently appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and attested to the facts hereinbefore stated; and

Whereas the foregoing indicates the need for an immediate study and investigation of the cause and effect of a situation that will, if not corrected, result in the serious impairment of the oldest and one of the most important food-producing industries in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, requested to cause an immediate study to be made of—

(1) the differences in the costs of domestic production of fresh and frozen fish, especially groundfish fillets, and the costs of foreign production of similar fish; and

(2) the effect on the domestic fishing industry of increasing imports of fresh and frozen fish, especially groundfish fillets, into the United States,

and, with the advice of, and in coordination with, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Tariff Commission, the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury, and other appropriate executive departments and independent agencies of the Government to recommend means by which the United States fishing industry may survive and be saved harmless against the inroads of foreign-caught and foreign-processed fish; and that, because of the urgency of the situation, he be and hereby is requested to make his report and recommendation to the Senate within 30 days after the adoption of this resolution.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES WITH INDIANS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 32), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 292, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 13, 1950 (to investigate the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes), is hereby continued through June 30, 1951.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF FUEL RESERVES AND FORMULATION OF FUEL POLICY

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 33), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 239, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 374, agreed to December 21, 1950 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued through June 30, 1951.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summation of statements by him dealing with measures pertaining to preparedness against communism, compiled by his administrative assistant, which appear in the Appendix.]

VITAL SERVICE OF GRASS-ROOTS PRESS—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO GEORGE H. BECHTEL

[Mr. HOLLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of the vital service of the grass-roots press, written by President Truman to George H. Bechtel, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, and an article regarding th same, written by Walter A. Shead, Washington correspondent, published in the Publishers' Auxiliary, of December 30, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. EDWARD F. ARN, OF KANSAS

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by the new Governor of Kansas, Edward F. Arn, on January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR JORDAN TO THE THIRTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO

[Mr. WELKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Gov. Len B. Jordan to the Legislature of Idaho, at the convening of the thirty-first session of the legislature on January 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN TRADE UNION COUNCIL FOR HISTADRUT—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM GREEN

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, at a testimonial dinner in his honor given by the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut, on January 11, 1951, at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL MANPOWER AUTHORITY—STATEMENT BY THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on December 15, 1950, by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, recommending the establishment of a Federal Manpower Authority, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN LEGION HAS A JOB TO DO—ADDRESS BY O. D. FREEMAN

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The American Legion Has a Job To Do," delivered by O. D. Freeman, State commander of the American Legion of South Carolina, at Loris, S. C., January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WILSON AND THE WORLD OF TODAY—ADDRESS BY SHANE MacCARTHY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Shane MacCarthy, at the Wilson Day dinner celebration before the Knox County Democratic Women's Club, at Knoxville, Tenn., December 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHAPMAN UNJUSTLY ATTACKED—ARTICLE FROM THE TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION NEWS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chapman Unjustly Attacked," published in the December 1950 issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—SUMMARY FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Report on TVA," published in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of December 31, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWING NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY—ARTICLE BY DUDLEY HARMON

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Growing New England Industrial Economy," written by Dudley Harmon, executive vice president, the New England Council, and published in the Washington Post of January 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SLEIGH RIDING—ARTICLE BY JOHN GOULD

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Oh What Fun It Wasn't," written by John Gould and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHESON'S FATAL POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (MAINE) EVENING EXPRESS

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Acheson's Fatal Policy," published in the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of January 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PLACE OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICAN ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him in New Orleans, La., January 11, 1951, before the Members' Council of the New Orleans Association of Commerce and the Southern Farm Forum, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISITORS TO THE SENATE FROM MORAL REARMAMENT ASSEMBLY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a brief word of welcome to some distinguished visitors who are with us today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a group of distinguished visitors who are seated in the gallery today. They come from the Moral Re-Armament Assembly, which has been in session at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington and has included 1,500 delegates from 25 countries. Among them are military, political, industrial and labor leaders from the danger areas of Europe and Asia. They bring evidence of an ideological force for democracy that is seeking to bring an answer to communism in those areas. Among them also are men who, up to a few months ago, were leaders of the Communist Party in western Germany and who are now fighting on the democratic side.

Mr. President, along with our military and economic strategy America more than ever needs to develop ideological strength if we are to win what is primarily a struggle for the minds of men and women. It is not enough for us to expose the weaknesses and evils of those who threaten our way of life and even our existence. We as a people must live and proclaim the inspired experience of our democracy based on moral standards in which alone can freedom survive and flourish. Freedom under God is the big issue in the world today.

Mr. President, these men and women of all races and all creeds, and of widely varying views on life, come together in one common purpose. They are making a distinct contribution to the cause to which I refer. They merit our attention and support.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute along the line of the remarks which the Senator from New Jersey has just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HILL. I am gratified that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, has spoken as he has. I wish to associate myself with his remarks. I have long felt that the world needed the consuming fire of a great spiritual revival to dispel the evils of materialism and selfishness.

In the Moral Re-Armament movement we have an idea. Ideas are more powerful than bullets or bombs. The Moral Re-Armament movement proclaims an idea for the marshaling and building of the spiritual forces of the world to bring understanding to men and peace to the world. The world today, confused and confounded, is groping for light. The Moral Re-Armament movement holds aloft a great light for the world's guidance. It would lift the world to Him who taught us to pray, and who came to save the world. In His name and with His power, in the faith of our fathers, we can remove mountains, subdue kingdoms, and bring peace to this troubled world.

I rejoice with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that we have with us, as the guests of the Senate today, so many of the leaders and representatives of the Moral Re-Armament movement.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] concerning our visitors in the galleries today. Later in the week, on the anniversary of the birthday of Benjamin Franklin, I shall discuss his life as it relates to peace and the securing of peace in the world. I believe spiritual rearmament or moral rearmament in the world will bring peace rather than material armament alone.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we hear so much nowadays with relation to what is wrong with the world. I want to say a few words on the subject of what is right with the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Wisconsin addressing the Senate at this time? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. One of the fine things that is right about the world is the MRA movement. It has been my privilege to attend a number of meetings of that movement in the city of Washington. As those of us who have attended those meetings know, there came from all over the world representatives of labor, representatives of management, representatives of various creeds and religions. They met here in a great convention. One of the things that is right with the world is that they not only talked but they brought men and women here who previously had been literally at each others' throats, in warfare between labor and management, between communism and the Western idea; and these men, as well as women, rose in the meeting here in Washington and in plain unvarnished language told how the moral law, the law of life, the law of compassion, the law of mutual understanding, worked. It eradicated hate, brought about understanding and the desire to work together for the common good.

Now here is an organization that not only talks but breathes into the people who come in contact with it a new spirit. If there is anything the world needs it is the spirit of being willing to sit down and talk one's problems over, understand the other fellow's viewpoint, and learn not to hate him because he differs with you.

Mr. President, I heard some very dramatic utterances at the meetings. I heard former Communists from the Ruhr rise and tell how they hated the people who managed their concerns, 30,000 men were employed in some of them. However, they not only were able to sit down together and discuss their problems with management, but they got to understand each other's viewpoints. The result was that communism went out the window in the minds and souls of the Communists, and they accepted this higher ideology. Strikes were averted, production increased, harmony and understanding resulted.

That is one of the big things that is right with the world, Mr. President, and I am happy to join with my colleagues who have spoken to welcome this group to the Senate. Its members come from afar, from the Far East, and from almost all the lands of Europe—Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Ireland, Scandinavia. Mind you, some of them are senators in their own countries, and they are here as our guests. So, Mr. President, with your consent, let me ask that they rise; and in view of the tremendous work they are doing to stabilize the thinking and the living of the people of the world, I wish to ask my associates to "give them a hand."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the guests to whom he refers may rise in the gallery, in order that they may be identified. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

[The guests referred to rose from their seats in the gallery, Senators applauding.]

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 30 seconds to make a comment regarding a passage of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which stands in need of correction. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Friday, January 12, on page 195, at which appear remarks by Representative SUTTON, in the House of Representatives.

In his speech, reference is made to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. One passage of his speech leaves the impression that the report of the RFC subcommittee will bear out Representative SUTTON's charge that several thousand dollars have been accepted by the officials of RFC in bribes to procure loans.

The report of the subcommittee on the RFC has not yet been prepared, and at the present time no one knows what it will say. However, no charges of bribery will be made in the report because no instances of bribery have been found in the subcommittee's study.

The subcommittee on the RFC will issue its report as soon as it can reasonably do so; and I do not wish to anticipate what it will say, any more than I would endorse the anticipations that others might express.

Not knowing what information may be in Representative SUTTON's possession, I wish not to be placed in the position of supplying an interpretation of his comments. The confidential material supplied to the subcommittee, including executive hearings, has not been made available to Representative SUTTON or anyone else.

NEWS RELATING TO SUPPOSED EXPLOSION OF AN ATOMIC BOMB BY THE RUSSIANS IN SEPTEMBER 1949

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Washington Post a syndicated columnist reported that our scientists are apparently convinced that the Russians exploded an atomic bomb in September 1949. The article further states the present production rate of the Russian's atomic weapons, and forecast a stockpile of more than 100 mobs in the Russians' hands within 2 years.

To my knowledge we in the United States have guarded very secretly our atomic development. We have not made public any details on our rate of production or upon our technical developments.

I have written a letter to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission asking him if he can tell me whether the information which appeared in the recent column is an accurate report. I have also asked for his comments as to whether making a public statement on Russian production may, in his opinion, jeopardize intelligence sources which may be able to develop accurate information about Russian activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I wrote to Mr. Dean may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1951.

Hon. GORDON DEAN,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEAN: In a recent article printed in the Washington Post, December 31, 1950, statements were made to the effect that our scientists have concluded, by appropriate research, that the Russians exploded an atomic bomb in central Siberia in September 1949. The article went on to state, and I quote:

"Subsequently secret intelligence confirmed the findings made in September 1949. The highest intelligence sources now agree, moreover, that current Soviet bomb output is at the rate of about two a month, and at the end of the coming year will rise to five or more a month. Thus, as of now, the officially estimated Soviet stockpile is about 24 bombs; it will be nearly 50 bombs in another 12 months; and in 2 years, it will be well over 100 bombs. The military significance of this timetable does not need to be underlined."

There has been much discussion about the status of Russian atomic enterprise. We must certainly appreciate that Russia is making every effort to develop atomic weapons, yet I have not heretofore seen any public declaration as to specific development.

I would like to ascertain whether, according to your records, the information stated in this newspaper article is valid. If it is valid, I believe our secret intelligence sources may be jeopardized by making this information public.

Your comments on this matter will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS MATERIAL FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, many of my colleagues have spoken to me concerning the plan of distribution of the surplus material from the renovation of the White House.

In order to save the time of the Senate, I should like to call attention to a statement made on the floor of the House last Friday by a distinguished Member of the House, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan, which is found on page 191 of the RECORD of January 12.

In a few days we will have on exhibit pieces of this material for the aid of Senators.

SOME OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF AMERICAN SUPPORT OF THE LATEST CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL AT LAKE SUCCESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I addressed to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on last Friday, January 12, relative to some of the implications of the vote cast by the United States delegate at the UN on the most recent cease-fire proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1951.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A considerable number of us in the Senate have been quite concerned over the implications of the American support of the latest cease-fire proposal at Lake Success. As I understand the situation from reading the press dispatches, this latest proposal does not require the Chinese Communists to either get out of all of Korea or even to get back north of the thirty-eighth parallel before they participate in the conference. In addition, as I understand it, the nations which definitely will participate in the conference on the settlement of far eastern questions are the Soviet Union, Communist China, Great Britain, and the United States. This looks like a "packed jury." Great Britain has not only recognized Communist China but has consistently thrown obstacles in the way of having the United Nations declare Communist China the aggressor that she is.

They voted in June to declare the movement of North Koreans across the thirty-eighth parallel as aggression and joined in the appeal to the nations of the world to help resist this overt action. Now 2½ months after the Chinese Communists cross the frontier at the Yalu River, Great Britain and some of her other Commonwealth associates have resisted designating Communist China as an aggressor.

This seems to me to be a policy of condemning aggression if committed by a small nation and condoning it if committed by a large nation that has had a measure of success. Very simply this is a doctrine of "might makes right."

In the New York Times of today there is an article by Walter Sullivan, one paragraph of which states: "One of the key points discussed by delegations afterward was the possible outcome of talks between the great powers, including Communist China, on Formosa. Sir Benegal indicated that, in India's view, if today's proposal was carried out faithfully Formosa would be turned over to China."

Since Formosa is now a part of the Republic of China and the Government under President Chiang Kai-shek now has its temporary capital on the island, it is obvious that the representative of the Government of India had reference to the turning of Formosa over to the China which his Government recognizes as the legal Government of China, that is, the Communist regime.

Who does the representative of India expect to be the one to do the job of disarming 500,000 troops of the Republic of China? Certainly the other members of the United Nations which to date have placed fewer troops in Korea to resist Communist aggression on that Republic than the United States has to date suffered casualties are not "the mice that can bell the cat."

It is my strong belief that the more than 9,000,000 people of Free China now on the island of Formosa will bitterly resist being trussed up and delivered into the hands of a Communist tyranny. It is also my strong belief that the more than 500,000 men constituting the army, navy, and air force of Formosa will bitterly resist any attempt to take them into Communist slavery. They know, as we all must know, that the delivery of this island into the hands of the Communists will result in one of the greatest blood baths in history.

For that reason I believe that, with or without help from the free world, the armed forces and the people of Free China on Formosa will resist from the air, from the sea, on the beaches and in the mountains any effort to deliver them over to the Communists.

Nor will the free people of China agree to place their liberty in the hands of the United Nations as a defense force while they disarm themselves. They have seen that, with the exception of the United States of America, all of the rest of the members of the United Nations combined have not sent to Korea for the purpose of resisting Communist aggression against that Republic, as many troops as the Republic of China offered to send—33,000—within a few days of the plea for help. They cannot be expected, nor can any other free nation of the world, put its confidence now in either the military capacity or the moral leadership of the United Nations to resist Communist aggression. It would be helpful if the State Department could give a little clearer explanation as to why our representative, Mr. Austin, voted in favor of this latest proposal.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

A VOTE FOR BLACKMAIL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Vote for Blackmail," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOTE FOR BLACKMAIL

The United Nations now stands ready to reward aggression by offering to give Formosa and China's seat in the UN to the Chinese Reds in return for a cease-fire order in Korea.

The old League of Nations had some sordid chapters in its brief history because of its cowardly retreats from aggression in Manchuria and Ethiopia. But it merely looked the other way without condoning aggression by paying it tribute.

The latest UN act is one of infamy.

The UN cannot long survive this base betrayal of the very purpose for which it was created. The memory of every soldier who has died in Korea fighting under its flag will rise to haunt it. The day Red China is seated in the Security Council this country should walk out. That much is due our honored dead.

No nation can have any faith in the idea of collective security as it is adminstered by

the UN, because if it will sell out one government, it will sell out others. Indeed, if the Reds accept the bribe which has been offered them, what more can the organization be considered than a catspaw for aggression?

CHINA'S BETRAYAL

Protesting against the betrayal of Nationalist China, which is a member of the organization, its delegate, Dr. T. F. Tsiang, said that Formosa was being treated as though it were a No Man's Land.

Actually, he said, Formosa is the home of "Free China," defended by an army of a half million men, the largest single unit of power against Communist imperialist aggression in the Far East. The proposed peace talks with the Reds, he added, pose only one question:

"How do you want Formosa, rare, medium, or well done?"

That is not funny.

The lives of 7,500,000 people, including permanent residents of the island and the refugees from the mainland, will be in jeopardy if Formosa is handed over to the mercies of the Peiping Reds. Many of these people on Formosa have been branded as war criminals for no other reason than that they have opposed communism.

Thus we treat our friends—the first government to offer its assistance when we took up arms in South Korea. And we are doing this at the urging of India, which proclaimed its neutrality in that crucial hour.

VOICE OF FREE ASIA

How will the free nations of Asia react to this perfidious act by the great powers? That question was answered on the floor of the United Nations by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines.

"How far can the United Nations keep retreating from established, sound moral positions without courting final disaster?" he asked.

"A retreat in the course of battle is understandable and sometimes inevitable, but a retreat from right principles while a battle is being waged for those principles cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

"My country knows the nameless terror and agony of war as few countries around this table do. Therefore we understand the anxious desire of many delegates to exhaust every possibility of avoiding a general war. But we also know there is at least one thing that is worse than war itself, and that is the degrading enslavement that would surely follow an abject surrender before the threats of a fanatic and implacable aggressor."

The United Nations was saying to Peiping, he charged, "You may stop hitting and killing my boys so that we can discuss how to reward you with the gift of Formosa and a seat in the United Nations."

General Romulo warned the United Nations it would lose its reason for being if it resorted to appeasement in this situation.

"We have heard moving appeals to the free nations of the world to close ranks," he said. "But such appeals cannot be met by an admission of weakness and abject surrender. The march of Communist aggression cannot be arrested by a policy of moral retreat and surrender."

Indeed, doesn't the betrayal of Nationalist China and Korea put every free nation on notice that its best hope lies in making peace with Moscow on the best terms it can?

OUR SORRY ROLE

Where did the United States stand when the roll was called on this unhappy occasion?

Ours was a craven "Me, too" vote.

Warren R. Austin, the American delegate, supported the proposal to buy off the Reds, explaining that he did so in the interest of "unity." Afterward, it was explained that Mr. Austin did not expect the Reds to accept the proposition, and then he would be free to revive his resolution condemning them as aggressors. Would he add as a second count of his indictment their refusal to accept a bribe?

We assume Mr. Austin was carrying out orders of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Nothing less than immediate resignation of both men could in any way relieve this country of even a small part of the embarrassment caused by the indefensible position our Government has taken.

The administration first lost the initiative in the UN by failing to press for forthright action against Red China, then joined Britain and the other appeasement advocates in offering to pay blackmail.

That act is a virtual admission that the whole Korean undertaking was a miscalculation, and that Red China was right and the United States was wrong. The appeasement offer to which our UN spokesman consented cannot be appraised on any other basis.

We don't believe Congress or the American people will buy any part of it. They cannot forget the case of—

PRIVATE (FIRST CLASS) BROWN

Who hasn't been seen since September 4.

That day Pfc Melvin Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., stood atop a 50-foot wall at Kasan, Korea, and beat back the enemy single-handed, while his platoon regrouped to repel the attackers.

Private (first class) Brown fired his rifle until he ran out of ammunition.

Private (first class) Brown hurled grenades until he ran out of grenades.

They still kept coming up that wall.

Private (first class) Brown wasn't a man to let a little thing like no ammunition thwart him. He took his entrenching shovel and bashed those Reds over the head as they came up, delivering skull crushers with his shovel to a dozen of them.

Last week at the White House President Truman presented a Congressional Medal of Honor to the father of Private (first class) Brown.

"Outstanding personal bravery * * *" the citation reads.

And a good solid American brand of personal bravery that Private (first class) Brown delivered atop that lonesome wall in Korea. * * *

Private (first class) Brown was in a position where he had to call a spade a weapon.

Countless hordes of Chinese Reds have swept down on the Private (first class) Browns in Korea.

Our leaders and allies are not in the position they put Private (first class) Brown in, but they should be statesmen enough to call a spade a spade.

JOINT CHIEFS NOT CONSULTED—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Joint Chiefs Not Consulted," written by David Lawrence, and published in today's Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT CHIEFS NOT CONSULTED

(By David Lawrence)

The United States Joint Chiefs of Staff were not consulted before instructions were sent by the State Department here to Ambassador Warren Austin to vote for the United Nations resolution proposing to Red China a cease fire in Korea. This means that neither General MacArthur nor General Ridgway nor anybody else in the United Nations' forces was consulted as to the effect of the proposal on morale of the troops or as to the desirability of a cease-fire step at this time.

Whether all this was by accident or design has not been revealed. It could be that the State Department did not wish to embarrass the military by asking it to concur when the position of our forces in Korea is so unfavorable. To have asked the military might have posed the dilemma in which an affirmative answer could mean an unwillingness to keep on fighting while a negative answer might be construed as blocking the Department of State's policies.

This indifference to the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff creates nevertheless a belief that high-level policy is rather loosely made in the American Government today.

There is considerable anxiety here in military circles about the possible consequences of the American support for the cease-fire proposal. It would not occasion much surprise if Red China accepts the United Nations plan. In fact if the Chinese Communist leaders have any sense left at all and are really not trying to enlarge the area of the conflict they will grab the United Nations proposal. It gives them a rare opportunity to confuse their opponents.

The mere fact that Russia voted against the resolution in the United Nations does not mean, as some reports have surmised, that it is doomed to be rejected by the Peiping government. The strategy might well have been planned for the Red Chinese to accept the plan in the face of ostensible opposition from the Russians as this would tend to foster the impression that the Red Chinese authorities in their diplomacy are truly independent of Moscow.

The advantages to the Red Chinese in favor of accepting the cease-fire plan are that they get what amounts to recognition in a future international conference, and they are also promised an opportunity to sit down with a commission from the United Nations and trade and negotiate about Formosa, and admission to the United Nations.

This does not necessarily signify that the American Government is ready to support a change in its Formosa policy or in its attitude toward admission of Red China. But it does raise this issue: If the other nations of the commission outvote America the United States will be in the position of seeming to wish to resume hostilities and wage war unless it makes important concessions to Red China. This is a severe handicap to America in the negotiations.

Anxiety over what the American Government has done by its support of the cease-fire proposal extends beyond military circles here. Privately, many Members of Congress are even more worried about it. They think the United States has been entrapped and that America will find herself outmaneuvered the moment a cease fire is accepted.

To all those who exhibit concern—and some of the Members of Congress have been in communication with Ambassador Austin about it—word has come back not to worry because the cease-fire resolution isn't going to be accepted by Red China anyway.

So the situation comes down to this: Many influential persons in Washington are hoping the cease-fire proposal will be turned down but they fear it will not be and that the American people may come to feel that the sacrifices made in Korea have been of no avail despite the 40,000 casualties. Trouble is then seen ahead for our rearmament program in Congress.

If, on the other hand, the cease fire is turned down by Red China and fighting continues, the situation cannot be less grave even if our troops are withdrawn or forced out of Korea. If that contingency arises, it would seem that the whole case will turn on whether the United Nations has branded the Communist Chinese as aggressors. Once branded that way, some other steps will have to be taken by members of the United Nations to punish Red China.

If the United Nations refuses to vote for a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor, the stock of the United Nations will go down to zero with American public

opinion. It will become necessary then for the United States to decide for itself whether or what military measures shall be taken on its own to blockade China, including Hong Kong, and to carry on an air bombardment until Red China makes amends for her aggression in Korea. Conversely, the demand to do nothing more and keep our troops from both Asia and Europe will grow immeasurably stronger in Congress.

FACTS OF THE KOREAN WAR IGNORED—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. KNOWLAND. I further ask, Mr. President, that in connection with the various matters I have just requested to have inserted in the RECORD, there be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, an article entitled, "Facts of the Korean War Ignored," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS OF KOREAN WAR IGNORED

(By Constantine Brown)

There are many in this country and on the other side of the Atlantic who apparently want to deceive themselves, for they refuse to recognize the stark fact that the unprovoked attack by the Chinese armies on the United Nations forces in Korea was an act of war.

Because there has been no formal declaration of hostilities they refuse to accept the fact that we are now at war. They overlook the fact that dictators do not declare wars, they wage them.

In this light the attempts of the British and Commonwealth Prime Ministers to negotiate a surrender by the UN to the Chinese appear ludicrous. The representatives of these powers stated last Friday that they would welcome any feasible arrangement for a frank exchange of views with Prime Minister Stalin and Mao Tze-tung.

They added that "We should, in the name of common humanity, make a supreme effort to see clearly into each other's hearts and minds."

We have failed to restore peace in Korea. Moscow took advantage of the effort of the UN members to live up to the principles of their Charter. By unleashing the Chinese Communists at a time when the North Korean aggressors had been soundly beaten, Russia wantonly launched world war III.

We have lost lives and men in that campaign. But the set back suffered by our forces is nowhere as great as that suffered by the British in 1940, when they were compelled to evacuate France at Dunkerque. Nor is our position nearly as bad as that we faced in 1942, when the Japanese captured the Philippines and the large American force which was stuck there.

Not a cry was raised in England during and after Dunkerque demanding that Prime Minister Churchill seek a "frank exchange of views" with Hitler and Mussolini and make a supreme effort to see into their hearts and minds. The British and Americans knew only too well what they contained. And Stalin and Mao are no better than their predecessors.

The French, who refused to continue the fight from Africa, were labeled traitors to the common cause. Yet the treaty between France and Britain was no more binding than the United Nations Charter.

Nobody suggested that President Roosevelt sit down and have a heart-to-heart talk with Emperor Hirohito after the American and Philippines Armies were defeated by the Japanese. Any such suggestion then would have been an act of treason.

The fact that in both these instances there had been a formal declaration of war on the part of the democratic nations against the aggressors does not change the present picture in the least. In those days the democratic nations had the manhood to answer totalitarian aggression with formal war.

The democracies, which claim to be determined to oppose aggressive Communist imperialism, do not seem to have the same strength today. At the present moment British diplomacy is striving to persuade the American Government to accept the cease-fire proposal sponsored by the Asiatic and Arab countries, even if it means, in fact, a surrender to the Chinese Communists.

Until a week ago the administration in Washington was determined to accept no such solution, unless the Chinese withdrew their forces from Korea. But under the continuous hammering of the British and Indian Governments, it appears that there has been a weakening of this stand insofar as American diplomats here and at Lake Success are concerned. They are leaning toward acceptance of these proposals in a form sufficiently modified to save the face of the American Government.

DENIAL BY SENATOR TAFT OF STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO HIM BY TIME MAGAZINE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute, in order to make a denial of a statement in the nature of an alleged quotation appearing in Time magazine. It will not take me longer than 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Time magazine, in its latest issue, that of January 15, 1951, in dealing with my speech of last Friday, said:

> But the most obvious flaw in the whole Taft position was his hopeful prophecy that Russia would not attack the United States. It justified a look at his record as a military prophet. In February 1941 TAFT predicted with equal certainty: "It is simply fantastic to suppose there is danger of an attack on the United States by Japan."

In the first place, I did not make any prophecy; I merely pointed out that that was one of the considerations on which we must proceed. In the second place, I never made any such statement, at any time, as is here put in quotation marks opposite my name.

This particular allegation was first made in the CIO in the 1944 campaign. I denied it then. It appeared in John Gunther's book in 1946 or 1947, and I denied it then. It was published as part of an article entitled "The Record of ROBERT A. TAFT," in the CIO pamphlet which was gotten out in the recent campaign. I denied it then. All that would have been necessary was for them to ask me whether the statement was true. There is no reported statement of that kind to be found anywhere. One man, a political opponent, claims he heard me say it in 1941. I did not say it, because I did not believe it. I always took the position as to the Far East that I thought Secretary Stimson's policy might very easily provoke an attack by Japan, and that I hoped he would get away with the kind of bluff we were making toward Japan. But I thought that we could not be certain, and I did not know whether or not it was likely to produce an attack.

In any event, this particular statement has been repeated so often that I should like to put on record in the Senate the fact that it is absolutely untrue.

ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram I have received from Anchorage, Alaska, and my answer thereto, and to make a 1 minute clarifying statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Georgia is recognized for a 1-minute clarifying statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the course of the debate on the Alaskan statehood bill, I stated on the floor of the Senate that I was opposed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii at this time, because, in view of the critical situation in world affairs, these areas might be first attacked. I did not believe that Alaska should have statehood now, as it might adversely affect the defense of Alaska. I pointed out that it was found necessary to place Hawaii under military law during World War II and that if Hawaii had been a State it would have raised a serious question of the rights of a State.

My statement that I was not prepared to defend States' rights in the case of Alaska at this time has been twisted—I think deliberately—to make it appear that I was unwilling to defend Alaska from foreign aggression. My entire argument was that Alaska and Hawaii could both be better defended from the impending dangers if they remained as Territories. This telegram from the Young Democratic Club of Alaska, and my answer thereto, should clear up that matter, and I therefore ask that these two telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *January 11, 1951.*
Hon. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Young Democratic Club of Alaska unanimously and vehemently protest your stand jeopardizing entire Pacific northwestern America in assuming United States not obligated to defend Alaska, we demand immediate retraction your statement for congressional records.

YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF ALASKA,
ZEBE HARRIS, *President.*

JANUARY 11, 1951.

ZEBE HARRIS,
President, Young Democratic Club of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska:

Retel. I have always sought to defend the constitutional and political rights of the sovereign States against the encroachments of Federal power. I also fully recognize the constitutional obligation of the Federal Government to protect the States and Territories and all of its citizens from foreign aggression. The fact that you and the members of your organization do not understand the distinction between these two principles should explain the doubt existing in the minds of many Members of Congress as to the wisdom of admitting Alaska to statehood at this time. I am happy to assure you that I shall insist upon the defense of the Territory and people of Alaska against any foreign foe exactly to the same extent that I insist upon the defense of any State of the Union and its people. I have never held or expressed any other view.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

CHARLES D. WATKINS—TRIBUTE BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I ask unanimous consent that there may be placed in the RECORD a statement by him in the nature of a eulogy regarding a retiring newspaper correspondent, Mr. Charles D. Watkins.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

For the past 13 years the people of the great Northwest, including those living in my State of Washington, have been kept abreast of the activities of their Senators and Congressmen through the news stories as presented by the able correspondents in the press galleries. All do their job of reporting ably and objectively.

Among these men and women of whom I speak, is a correspondent who has served us from the Northwest and our constituencies, with undeviating faithfulness to the tenets laid down through the years by his profession. He has never allowed his personal emotions or opinions to influence his writings. His loyalty to his employer and to his profession has never been questioned. He has never been known to sacrifice his integrity in furtherance of his career. His kindness and wisdom have saved many of us from grievous error. His advice when, and only when, requested, has been readily, wisely, and freely given.

In the 4 years during which the junior Senator from the State of Washington has served in the Capitol, he has come to depend on Mr. Charles D. Watkins, Associated Press correspondent for the Northwest for the past 13 years, as a valued friend. Last Saturday marked a milestone long anticipated, no doubt, by "Doc" Watkins, but one that we, whom he has served so well, deeply regret. Last Saturday "Doc" retired as an Associated Press correspondent after 40 years as a newspaper writer. The junior Senator from Washington joins with the hundreds of "Doc's" friends in the Congress, among his coworkers, and his thousands of readers, in wishing him Godspeed, and in expressing to him our deep feeling of thankfulness that we have had the privilege of knowing and associating with him, an able newsman, an invaluable friend, and a gentleman.

AMERICAN ECONOMY—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks which I had intended to make today together with a statement I issued on November 2, 1950, calling for a more energetic anti-inflation program.

There being no objection, the remarks and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American economy is being crippled by inflation, and I rise to protest the inertia and lack of decisiveness on the part of the administration which has allowed the cost of living to rise to unprecedented heights.

The issue of inflation is one which transcends political partisanship. It is one which affects the welfare and the security of every American family, and cannot be ignored.

I have had an opportunity over the week end to study in detail the economic report of the President and the report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I am constrained to say that seldom have I seen such cogent, forceful, and eloquent economic analysis end with such disappointing and flat conclusions.

Now is the time to impose immediate and rigid price controls. I called for such controls as early as July 20, following the Korean crisis. I repeated that request on July 23, urging a roll-back of prices to June 25. On August 7 I presented an eight-point program to curb inflation. Finally, on November 2, after spending 3 months visiting and talking with the people of my State, my conviction was reaffirmed that immediate action was necessary, and I called for a temporary price stop of from 4 to 6 months until such time as indirect controls could be made more effective.

Today, with the specter of an inadequate tax program and with inadequate price controls, I repeat with all the urgency at my command that our Nation's welfare and our Nation's security call for action now without any further delay.

The American people cannot understand the confusion and inexplicable lack of an anti-inflation program from Washington. I, for one, agree with the American people that the delay is inexcusable. I do not know for certain who is to blame, and do not care much. I have been told, however, in a private conversation with a member of the Federal Reserve Board that the Federal Reserve Board is itself one of the bottlenecks in achieving an effective anti-inflation program.

Furthermore, the differences of opinion between our Director of Price Stabilization and our Director of Economic Stabilization have also seriously damaged our economy. The fact that those differences have become public is deplorable. I simply cannot understand the shortsightedness which allows the word of a possible price freeze to reach the public before the price freeze is imposed. Every time word of such a possible plan reaches the public, industrial and consumer prices rise, and the American consumer takes it on the chin.

This lack of an anti-inflation program will also have very serious repercussions in the field of labor-management relations. We cannot expect labor-management peace or effective wage stabilization controls while the cost of living goes up. The working men and women, the pensioner, the white-collar worker, and the American farmer are the victims of this Washington ivory-tower attitude.

I warn the American Congress that unless we act to halt inflation now, we will be faced with serious industrial strife.

I, for one, am prepared to call for congressional action and investigation in the next few days if some relief is not provided.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY CALLING FOR MORE ENERGETIC ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM, NOVEMBER 2, 1950

America today faces a serious economic crisis. We are emerging from the Korean action with military victory for the United Nations and for our own Armed Forces. Korea has taught us the lesson that our Nation must be geared to a long-range and ever constant defense alertness. This will call for an annual output of anywhere from $350,000,000,000 to $500,000,000,000 by 1955, depending upon international developments.

Our Korean experience has taught us one other lesson. We have learned that our national economy is so much of an interrelated unit that irresponsibility by any of us has immediate and serious repercussions for all of us. In the 2 months following the Korean invasion, for example, from June 15 to August 15 of this year, retail home furnishings prices increased more than 2 percent. Retail food prices are today 2.7 percent above the June 15 level. Manufacturers' prices are today 8 percent above the pre-Korean level, and are rising steadily. As a result of these and other price developments with which the American housewife is thoroughly familiar, we are today facing a severe inflationary crisis.

This price burden is particularly great because of the fact that we are moving into an inflationary spiral from an already too-high price level. From 1944, the wartime peak, to the first half of 1950 the average weekly buying power of the wage earner fell more than 7 percent.

The problem we face is not only one of upward movement of prices, but also one of an inflationary psychology. Businessmen are acting on the assumption that their costs will be higher and are setting their prices accordingly. Consumers are acting on the same premise. In spite of the fact, that the production of civilian goods is still extremely high, shortages exist. Automobiles have been produced at the weekly rate of 175,000 or more since early June, but they do not appear too plentiful; steel is being produced at the highest rate in our history, but mills are sold out; refrigerators, washing machines, and other consumer durable goods are being produced in vast quantities, but immediate delivery is nevertheless rare.

Nor are future prospects any brighter for the American consumer. Continued upward pressures are evident throughout our economy. The normal seasonal pattern of declining meat prices which usually affects the market at this time every year, will soon be at an end. In fact, processor, distributor, and retail prices have been out of line with the normal seasonal price decline of wholesale agricultural commodities. The relatively stable seasonal process in livestock, meats, and grains has not been passed on to the consumer, who today pays higher prices for meats and breads. By the spring of 1951 we will be faced with further sharp increase in food prices unless immediate and positive action is taken.

The retail market will also be further affected by the current rises in industrial prices. Tin, rubber, copper, burlap, and lubricating oils are continuing to show rises. Smaller producers have recently raised prices on some steel products from $3 per ton to $12 per ton. Since Korea, the prices of textiles have risen 19 percent, chemical 14 percent, and building materials 10 percent. No single important group of commodities has failed to advance. The general index of primary market prices is 5 percent higher than it has ever been before. On the commodity exchanges, industrial materials traded on organized markets are averaging one-third above the pre-Korean level, with some commodities like rubber and tallow more than doubling in price.

Furthermore, many retailers are today being billed for "reorder" merchandise at higher prices and are passing those added costs on to the consumer, even for items already in stock. Many producers and distributors, fearful of future price controls, have increased their prices for no valid reason and with no justification other than a desire for increased profits and a desire to keep their prices higher under any control regulations which may be forthcoming.

To the American consumer, therefore, the picture is one of high prices, continued high prices, and an outlook of still higher prices. By the spring of 1951, not only will food prices be higher unless curtailed, but there will also be sharp increases in apparel and house furnishings where manufacturers' prices have already increased.

As early as July 20, I pointed to the dangers faced by our economy as a result of the Korean crisis, and asked for the abandonment of business-as-usual attitudes and practices. I said "unchecked inflation can be as disastrous as invasion" and I urged that those "who raise prices to take advantage of a critical international situation are guilty of undermining the strength and productivity of our country." "I called for an immediate excess-profits tax, for measures necessary to regulate prices," and for "an adequate distribution of goods and services."

Again, on July 23, I urged the Congress to act "immediately to halt rising prices and irresponsible profiteering now taking place at the expense of the American people.

High prices, I said, were founded on no basis of economic fact. I urged that prices be rolled back to June 25.

On August 7 I presented an eight-point program to curb inflation, calling for the authority to impose price ceilings, priorities and production controls, the allocation of resources, manpower allocation, rent control, tax increases, wage controls, and rationing where necessary.

It is today time to begin imposing these controls without further delay.

The administration has so far moved cautiously to meet the problem of growing inflation. It plans to depend on indirect controls for the long economic pull we face. This is consistent with the administration's desire to preserve free enterprise in our economy. It is also consistent with the understanding that the crisis we face today is different from the crisis we faced after Pearl Harbor. We had then an immediate goal in mind and prepared for a well-defined all-out military effort. An analogy fits the situation. If one Olympic athlete enters a 3-mile marathon and another the 100-yard dash, they both need to make an all-out effort. If the short-distance runner runs the first hundred yards in 9 seconds, he will probably win his race; but if the long-distance runner races the first hundred yards in 9 seconds, he will tire quickly and end his long-distance marathon last and not first. We must adjust our all-out effort to the nature of the race.

As part of its program to prevent inflation, our Government has depended a great deal upon credit controls. Governors of the Federal Reserve System in August, as a first step, required Federal Reserve banks in leading cities to raise the discount rate from 1½ percent to 1¾ percent and thus make loans more expensive.

In early September the Federal Reserve Board of Governors recreated the wartime device known as regulation W, designed to discourage installment buying and thus hamper consumers from using future income to purchase scarce goods. This regulation did not prove tough enough. The total consumer credit outstanding at the end of August was nearly $21,000,000,000, more than twice as much as there was in either 1941 or 1948. Most of this was installment credit, charge accounts, and loans.

The result of the new regulation was that down payments have been increased to 25 percent on television sets, radios, and other major durables, instead of 15 percent. Balances are to be paid in 15 months instead of 18 months. Credit regulations were tightened a few weeks ago on automobiles and other goods, running as low as $50.

Real estate construction credit has also been regulated by the new credit controls. To buy a house now, higher down payments are needed. The American consumer, therefore, cannot borrow as much today as he once could. Less new money will therefore be created which will help prevent inflation.

There is no question but that severe credit controls can be effective, but they take time. They also have certain inherent defects, particularly as they apply to items such as housing. They penalize lower income groups and they therefore ration commodities not on the basis of need but on the basis of available cash.

Credit controls in housing, therefore, must be accompanied by immediate rent control. I therefore plan to urge the Congress to reimpose rent controls, not only on old housing units where there are shortages, but also on new units. Housing credits will create strong pressure for increased rents, and rent control is essential to protect tenants. Under the new credit regulations, instead of 1,200,000 new houses being built in 1951, only 800,000 will be built.

Credit controls must also be supplemented by a steep progressive tax structure. An equitable excess profits tax must be enacted when the Congress reconvenes in a few weeks. From the 1944 wartime profit peak of ten billion eight hundred million after taxes, corporate profits further increased to twenty billion nine hundred million after taxes in 1948. During the first half of 1950, corporate profits after taxes were at the annual rate of nineteen billion seven hundred million. By the end of this year and as a result of wartime profits, corporate profits after taxes may reach $23,000,000,000.

There is no justification for excess profits in wartime. Equality of sacrifice, basic good sense and our economic needs demand an excess-profits tax. It is also necessary that existing loopholes in our tax laws be closed. In September of this year, I led a fight on the floor of the Senate to eliminate the inequities and special provisions in our tax laws which now take the form of privileged treatment to owners of oil wells and those in the higher income groups who can take advantage of capital gains treatment. These and other abuses must be eliminated and I plan to increase my efforts in that direction.

There is still room for additional credit controls. One of the plans being discussed in Washington is to require member banks of the Federal Reserve System to increase their reserves still further which could hold back from the flow of money in our economy about $2,500,000,000. A further tightening of installment credit is possible if necessary. We remember that during the war, buyers had a 12-month limit to complete payment instead of the present 15. Charge accounts may be brought under control also.

The President under the Defense Production Act of 1950 has appointed an Economic Stabilization Administrator, Mr. Alan Valentine. The Department of Labor has begun a detailed study of our manpower needs and resources. The Department of Commerce has already instituted some priority allocations, and the Department of Interior has the responsibility over our natural resources. The Department of Agriculture is now developing a farm program to meet our defense needs. The National Security Resources Board is studying further plans for tooling up our resources to meet the economic problems we face.

A more dynamic and immediate program is vital however.

1. A price administrator should be appointed immediately so that we can begin an administrative tooling up period for whatever price-controls may be required to protect the American economy.

2. A wage stabilization board should begin operations to relate wages and demands for wage increases to our over-all economic needs.

3. Industry committees should promptly be appointed to establish direct controls. All segments of industry, small business and big business, should be represented on the committee.

4. Congress should reimpose and strengthen our rent-control laws as soon as it reconvenes, not only on old housing units but on new units as well. Authority to establish controls on decontrolled units should be granted.

5. An excess profits tax should be enacted, retroactive to July 1, 1950; tax loopholes should be eliminated; and the inequitable tax reductions passed by the Eightieth Congress should be repealed. We must place our economy on a pay-as-you-go basis as much as possible. The Congress when it reconvenes should begin raising an additional ten to fifteen billion dollars necessary to achieve that end.

6. Congress should act to correct the defects in existing legislation, provide subsidy authority where roll-backs are required in order to stabilize the cost of living and thus allow consumer food prices to be directly controlled if necessary.

7. Congress should provide the authority to regulate trading in futures on the commodity exchange market. It is grossly unfair to ask consumers to deprive themselves of essentials and at the same time allow and encourage speculative purchasing on the commodity market.

8. Credit restrictions should be imposed on commercial construction mortgage credit similar to the credit restrictions now in effect on residential construction. This is both equitable and economically necessary.

9. Our consumer-credit restrictions should be under constant scrutiny to determine whether they are operating equitably and also whether they are sufficient to keep inflation under control.

10. We are faced with a problem of expanding bank credit which encourages inventory accumulation and futures buying. The reserve requirements should be increased and the open market operations of the Federal Reserve System should be directed to restricting the extension of commercial-bank credit.

11. Controls over special-problem commodities should be imposed immediately. In particular, these controls should apply to certain import commodities, such as rubber, wool, burlap, tin, and chemicals, and the United States should begin negotiating with exporting nations in regard to those commodities and their prices.

12. Finally and urgently, pending the effectiveness and the application of the above controls, a "price stop" should be instituted which would provide a temporary price ceiling to last from 4 to 6 months. In the absence of an effective tax program, some form of direct price control is essential. The hard fact is that it may be 6 months before indirect controls can become fully effective. A full program of indirect controls cannot be developed quickly and it will be some months before a new tax bill goes into effect. I urge, therefore, that in the period between now and the time indirect controls take hold, general temporary controls be established. By then we should be administratively prepared to undertake any further, new, or more selective controls which may be called for.

This proposal is not intended as a price freeze or a strait-jacket for industry. It is rather a means of stabilizing prices. During the period of this temporary—and I emphasize temporary—"stop," the price administrator would be authorized and directed to grant exemptions where the public interest would not suffer or where such exemptions are necessary for defense purposes. My essential objective is to prevent runaway inflation until such time as indirect controls, which all of us prefer, are made fully effective.

Increased prices and inflation not only operate to the disadvantage of the consumer and the general public, but also severely affect the operations of our defense effort and the Federal budget. Increased prices for materials basic to our defense operations mean drastically increased Government expenditures and high taxes to meet those expenditures.

An example of the effect of price increases can be seen from the following facts:

Prices on some rockets are increased so we can now buy only 870 rockets for the same amount that would have bought 1,000 before Korea; walkie-talkie radio set prices have increased so the money that would buy 1,000 before Korea will now buy only 660; 770 bazookas can now be bought for the pre-Korean price of 1,000; 870 1-ton trailers cost the same as 1,000 did before Korea; 770 rifles for the pre-Korean price of 1,000. In aircraft procurement price increases have cost our Government $360,000,000, or the equivalent of 750 F–86's. In 1944, at the height of the war, we would have equipped an infantry division for $14,500,000; now the cost is $74,000,000. We could then equip

an armored division for $30,000,000; today the cost is $199,000,000.

To impose temporary controls now will save the American taxpayer and the American consumer untold millions of dollars.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the routine business has been finished, I desire to make a brief statement regarding assignments to committees, and I should like to have the committee assignments made, so that the Senate may transact business.

In that connection, let me say that we are willing to have a session tomorrow and the next day and the next day, if necessary, in order that all Senators who wish to make speeches may do so, but of course they cannot all speak at the same time. I hope that Senators will not try to obtain recognition until we can dispose of the assignments to the committees. I send to the desk, in behalf of the majority, the committee assignments approved by the majority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. A large number of Senators have indicated their desire to address the Senate, but the question of committee assignments is a privileged matter, and the Chair thinks it would take precedence over speeches.

As Senators know, the present occupant of the Chair, since he has been presiding over the Senate, has tried not to make commitments in advance as to whom he would recognize on the floor, for the obvious reason that the rule requires the recognition of the first Senator who addresses the Chair. In many cases, where more than one Senator addresses the Chair, it is sometimes impossible to tell who first addressed the Chair; but the Chair will recognize Senators in as orderly a way as possible, though of course we all understand that it is possible to recognize but one Senator at a time. The present occupant of the Chair has found that when he commits himself in advance to recognize some Senator a day or two ahead, or on some future date, he nearly always gets into trouble about it, because matters arise when that day comes which make it impossible to fulfill the promise. So the Chair can only do his best as situations arise. But this report is a privileged matter, and is entitled to consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the desire of the Presiding Officer that the two lists be read in this connection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the opinion of the Chair that that should be done.

Mr. WHERRY. In behalf of the minority, I send to the desk the minority list of committee assignments. I wish to inform the Chair, however, that at the conclusion of the reading of the lists, and before the order is agreed to, I should like to make one or perhaps several motions in regard to the names appearing on the lists.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the assignments to committees on behalf of the majority and the minority.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Ellender, chairman, Hoey, Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Humphrey, Aiken, Young, Thye, Kem, Hickenlooper, and Mundt.

On Appropriations: Messrs. McKellar, chairman, Hayden, Russell, McCarran, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Maybank, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Bridges, Ferguson, Wherry, Cordon, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, Ecton, and McCarthy.

On Armed Services: Messrs. Russell, chairman, Byrd, Chapman, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Hunt, Stennis, Bridges, Saltonstall, Morse, Knowland, Cain, and Flanders.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Maybank, chairman, Fulbright, Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Long, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Schoeppel, Dirksen, and Bennett.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Neely, chairman, Johnston of South Carolina, Kefauver, Hunt, Pastore, Clements, Smith of North Carolina, Case, Butler of Maryland, Welker, Bennett, and Vandenberg.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. McClelland, chairman, Hoey, O'Conor, Humphrey, Benton, Robertson, Monroney, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Schoeppel, Dworshak, and Nixon.

On Finance: Messrs. George, chairman, Connally, Byrd, Johnson of Colorado, Hoey, Kerr, Frear, Millikin, Taft, Butler of Nebraska, Brewster, Martin, and Williams.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Connally, chairman, George, Green, McMahon, Fulbright, Sparkman, Gillette, Vandenberg, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Lodge, and Tobey.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: Messrs. O'Mahoney, chairman, Murray, McFarland, Anderson, Lehman, Long, Smathers, Butler of Nebraska, Millikin, Cordon, Ecton, Malone, and Watkins.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Messrs. Johnson of Colorado, chairman, McFarland, Magnuson, McMahon, O'Conor, Johnson of Texas, Hunt, Tobey, Brewster, Capehart, Bricker, Williams, and Kem.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. McCarran, chairman, Kilgore, Eastland, Magnuson, O'Conor, Kefauver, Smith of North Carolina, Wiley, Langer, Ferguson, Jenner, Watkins, and Hendrickson.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Messrs. Murray, chairman, Hill, Neely, Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, Pastore, Taft, Aiken, Smith of New Jersey, Morse, Ives, and Nixon.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina, chairman, McKellar, Neely, Pastore, Clements, Monroney, Smathers, Langer, Carlson, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler of Maryland.

On Public Works, Messrs, Chavez, chairman, McClellan, Holland, Stennis, Chapman, Kerr, Hennings, Cain, Martin, Malone, Dworshak, Carlson, and Case.

On Rules and Administration: Messrs. Hayden, chairman, Green, Gillette, Benton, Clements, Monroney, Hennings, Wherry, Lodge, Jenner, Hendrickson, Flanders, and Mrs. Smith of Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order providing for committee assignments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I intend to make a motion which has to do with increasing the number of members of committees. In order to cooperate fully with the majority leader, who is anxious to get the Senate organized, I ask unanimous consent that if any debate is involved in the discussion of the motion, which I am sure will not take long if it is confined to the motion, it be upon the motion itself, which has to do with increased committee membership.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that if any debate takes place on the resolution, it be confined to the resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the debate each Senator be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that forces the Senator from Nebraska to make his motion.

I desire to say to the distinguished majority leader and also to the President of the Senate that it is not the intention of the minority leader to delay the organization of the Senate. What I have to say can be said in 15 minutes, and we can proceed with the orderly reorganization of the Senate without any difficulty. I was asking for cooperation in doing that very thing. On this side we have done our level best voluntarily to comply with the assignments to committees. The last thing we can do, in order to satisfy those Members who are not pleased with their assignments, is to make one more effort. I had hoped that this could be done in an orderly way, and for that reason I have made the unanimous-consent requests.

In the absence of such cooperation, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be read and that the Senate proceed to consider it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, in the paragraph designating the members of the Committee on Appropriations, to insert after the word "appropriations" a comma and the words "to consist during the Eighty-second Congress of 23 Senators."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there has been no time in our national life when greater responsibilities have been placed upon the committees of Congress.

All are involved in a maze of legislation, which must be studied, not only within its own scope, but as to how it serves the purposes of our national policy in all its ramifications.

Our Nation is fighting a hot war in Korea and a cold war in every other corner of the globe.

There is before the Congress a budget the size of which has not been paralleled in our history, short of an all-out war.

The internal security of our country is dependent upon the strong position the Congress takes in forthcoming months to improve legislation. A jungle of immigration and naturalization laws exists, which must be brought into line with the needs of our national security.

Problems of finance and taxation are mounting daily.

A period of controls and regimentation is upon us, wherein the very principles of our national economic structure will be jeopardized, unless the most judicious

consideration is given to legislation affecting it.

The weight and burden of our national and international affairs falls upon Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Judiciary, Appropriations, Finance, Banking and Currency, and those committees which we count as major, according to the necessities of the times.

Mr. President, I offer as a prime example the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. Prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act that committee had an authorized membership of 25.

The Reorganization Act—and let me say that I was here when it was passed and I took part in the debate—as it came to the floor of the Senate, proposed an across-the-board number of 13 members for each committee, regardless of the nature of the committee or of the extent of its workload. My friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee at that time, and still its honored chairman, opposed this unreasonable and impractical reduction in the membership of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I refer to the colloquy on this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1946, volume 92, part 5, page 6451:

> Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to point out some very important provisions of the bill. Take for example, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. That committee consists of 24 members at the present time, and I believe it is authorized to have 25 members. If the membership of that committee were reduced to 13 the committee would not be able to do its work.

To which Senator La Follette, the Senate sponsor of the Reorganization Act, later replied:

> I am prepared to increase the membership of the Appropriations Committee from 13 to 21.

A membership of 21 for the Appropriations Committee was finally approved after the able chairman of the committee showed it was a physical impossibility to do the work of the committee with a membership of 13 Senators.

This establishes the fact, Mr. President, that the determination of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress to recommend an arbitrary, over-all figure of 13 members for each committee was not infallible.

The Congress recognized, in making the exception for the Appropriations Committee, that the work of a major committee may require a greater number of members than 13.

I point out further that in 1946, when the Reorganization Act was passed, it was hoped that we were heading into a peacetime economy. The budget which the Appropriations Committee had to consider at that time was $33,000,000,000.

That is when the workload, according to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, was so heavy that he remonstrated and said that 13 members could not do the work. Twenty-one members was the number agreed upon, but I am sure that if he had had his way we would have gone back to a membership of 25.

There are now 10 major subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The committee is very well and properly organized. We have a very distinguished chairman. However, it is necessary for 10 subcommittees, organized within the Committee on Appropriations, to handle the work which comes to the committee in connection with appropriations. Each member of the Committee on Appropriations is assigned to at least four subcommittees, and, in some cases, Senators serve on five subcommittees. For example, the junior Senator from Nebraska is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior and Insular Affairs. He sits also on four other subcommittees to help consider the work that comes before the committee.

Moreover, new sections of the consolidated appropriation, such as the foreign-aid programs, are considered by the full committee, which constitutes, in a sense, an eleventh subcommittee. There have been occasions in the schedule of subcommittee hearings during the past 6 years—and I have no objection, because it is impossible to do the work otherwise—when a Senator received notices to appear at three subcommittee meetings at the same time. Obviously a choice had to be made as to which meeting the Senator would attend, or he could give a few disjointed minutes to each one.

With this situation in mind, Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee today is faced with the prospect of a consolidated appropriation measure which may reach a total of at least $81,000,000,000, instead of $33,000,000,000, as in 1946, when the committee had a membership of 25.

The expansion from a $33,000,000,000 budget in 1946 to the possibility of $81,000,000,000 in 1951 is not nearly so illustrative of the vastly increased work of the Appropriations Committee, as are the expanding numbers of individual items on the budget which must be studied and passed upon by the committee.

Literally thousands of budget items support the complicated structure of our Federal Government, which, in the past decade, has become like the dragon's teeth in the fable. For every expense we try to eliminate, two new ones spring up in its place.

The Appropriations Committee will face this year's prospects with the same number of members apportioned to it as in 1946, and with four less members than it had when working on World War II appropriations.

Certainly this is true of many of the other major committees. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], made the statement the other day in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I believe he also made it on the floor, that more than 50 percent of the legislation which comes to the floor of the Senate is reported by the Judiciary Committee. If that is not a correct statement, I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Nevada correct me.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the workload of the Committee on the Judiciary during the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress consisted of 40.9 percent of all bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate, 52.7 percent of all House bills and resolutions received from the House, and 44.1 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of their origin. Would the Senator permit me to insert at the conclusion of his address, or at this time, a statement which I had intended to make today setting forth in detail the work of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the aid of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Nevada may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement of Mr. McCARRAN appears at the conclusion of Mr. WHERRY's speech.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, getting back to the purposes of the Reorganization Act, we have a distinguished Member of the Senate who, when he was a Member of the House, managed the reorganization bill in the House, when former Senator La Follette managed it in the Senate. As I heard it explained, the prime purpose of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress was to arrange the functions of the legislative branch so as more effectively to carry out its responsibilities under the Constitution.

Instead of having scattered authority among 81 committees of both Houses of Congress, it was intended to have a more compact formation and a clearer identification of the work area of each committee. That was its prime purpose.

In the recommendations of the joint committee, it is quite clear that an objective of the Reorganization Act was to strengthen and consolidate committee functions, rather than to limit the individual committee in any way.

Referring to the section on committee structure and operation, the joint committee's report states:

> Your committee believes that no adequate improvement in the organization of Congress can be undertaken or effected unless Congress first recognizes its present obsolete and overlapping committee structure. This is the first and most important test of whether Congress is willing to strengthen itself and its organization to carry the tremendous workload that present-day governmental problems place upon it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator from Nebraska, in outlining the duties of the membership of the Committee on Appropriations, include a reference to the

ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I did not. I should like to go into detail with respect to that subject. The Senator from Florida has made a very good point. There are six subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations to which ex officio members are appointed by other committees. They sit with the members of the Committee on Appropriations in considering appropriations affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of their committees. For example, if the Committee on Appropriations were considering appropriations for the armed services, three members of the Armed Services Committee would sit with the Committee on Appropriations. The same is true with respect to other ex officio members of the committee.

It goes to show—and perhaps the Senator from Florida mentioned it for that purpose—that the Appropriations Committee requires more members than the number now allotted to it. The ex officio members help tremendously in furnishing advice from their committees—and I do not know what we would do without them—but in order that the workload may be more evenly distributed, more members should be assigned to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is true, is it not, that the original terms of the Reorganization Act provided for ex officio members from six standing committees, three in number from each committee, to have full voting power on the appropriations dealing with their particular field?

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the Senator that the appointment of ex officio members was provided for prior to the Reorganization Act, and that it neither increased nor decreased the number of ex officio members.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator also think that, in addition to the help given by those three members from each of the six standing committees, to serve with full power as members of the Appropriations Committee in their respective fields, the provision of the Reorganization Act which requires that at least one of the three ex officio members in each field shall be assigned to the conference committee is likewise designed to help members of the Appropriations Committee carry the burden upon that committee?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator. I think that is a very good point. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken in stating that this practice began with the Reorganization Act. I believe that the original act authorizing the appointment of the ex officio members was passed in 1923. The Reorganization Act merely continued that plan. Of course, after the consolidation of the appropriation bills, there was some reason for such members not being appointed. But if we are to return to the departmental method of dealing with appropriations, it seems to me that it will be even more essential to continue the ex officio members. I hope the Senator's motion does not propose to interfere with such a plan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not go into the question of ex officio members, because I did not think it was involved in the motion which I am about to make. The Senator from Florida raised the question, and I stated that the Reorganization Act also continued the appointment of the ex officio members. In answer to the Senator from Florida I stated that such a practice had been followed prior to the Reorganization Act. The practice was simply carried through.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. However, I think there was one difference. Under the Reorganization Act the ex officio members had a vote, while under the old practice they did not have a vote. Is not that true?

Mr. McKELLAR. They had a vote under both systems.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not sure about that; but that point was raised.

Mr. President, there are those members who believe strongly, and sincerely, I am sure, that any attempt to correct inequities under the Reorganization Act is tampering with the act to its ultimate destruction. I have heard that statement made. I know that those who make it are sincere. They have a right to their own opinion. But let me remind the Senators that it never was the intention of those who drafted the act that they were drafting a perfect piece of legislation, or that it was above amendment or further change.

Let me quote further from the report by the joint committee, page 2, section I, paragraph 3:

> We feel there is nothing sacrosanct in the present arrangement of our committees. A study of the committee system of both Houses reveals that since the First Congress the committees have undergone many realinements and changes as conditions demanded. As the "workshop of Congress," the committee structure more than any other arm of the legislative branch, needs frequent modernization to bring its efficiency up to the requirements of the day.

That language was in the report of the joint committee when the reorganization proposal was brought to the attention of the Senate; and the bill was passed with the assurance that from time to time the committees could be modernized, with respect to number, and other committees could be established. In that category come the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and certain other committees.

Mr. President, there is also nothing sacrosanct about the rule-changing privileges of the United States Senate. Those changes embodied in the Reorganization Act were enacted—and I quote from title I, paragraph (b), of the act:

> With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules—at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Time after time, by unanimous consent, both the Senate and the House completely override their rules for a particular purpose, to expedite the work of the particular body. I hope the distinguished majority leader will continue that practice—

> With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules—at any time—

Today, tomorrow, next week, or next year—

> in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

The Reorganization Act of 1946 established 15 standing committees in the Senate—in place of the former 33.

The relative importance of those committees is governed as much by the primary powers which the Constitution vests in the National Legislature as it is by the shift and increase in our legislative responsibilties.

Aside from the varying workload between committees—which may be numerically as great in a lesser committee as in a major committee—there are certain committees which the members themselves look upon as offering less opportunity for service. Senators have decided that question for themselves. The Reorganization Act itself takes cognizance of the fact that the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are not as demanding in service as are other standing committees.

Personally I believe that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is a very important committee. I should like to serve upon it. Nevertheless, the Reorganization Act itself recognizes the fact that certain committees are not as demanding as others.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator feel that there has been a little too much emphasis, in the discussion by some Senators, with regard to whether or not a particular committee is more demanding than other committees? Each committee takes all the time a Senator can possibly devote to it. The question is whether or not the totality of work of a given committee requires more Members to do the job of that committee, in comparison with the totality of work of another committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Answering the distinguished Senator's question, I agree. I shall cover that point a little later. I shall be through in a few minutes. However, the point is pertinent here and I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I represent on the Appropriations Committee the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have been perfectly amazed at the length of time required for the consideration of the appropriations for that single department. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the membership of the Appropriations Committee ought to be increased, perhaps even beyond the point he has suggested.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not myself classifying the committees. I am simply stating how Senators themselves have classified them. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that a Senator may serve an apprenticeship on the Committee on Rules and Administration, or on the Committee on the District of Columbia, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There is plenty of work to do. So far as that is concerned, the committees are worked to death.

As I said, the Reorganization Act itself really takes recognition of the fact that the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are not as demanding of service as are other Senate committees. In amending rule XXV of the Senate, section 102, subparagraph (F) (4) provides that—

Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

To these two lesser committees—and the classification is not my own—might also be added the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am the ranking minority member. I say, some would so classify them, but I am not doing so.

That leaves eleven, let us say, more strategic committees, for which membership applications greatly exceed the possibility of gratifying them under present membership limitations, and under the prevailing seniority system.

It is my opinion—and the junior Senator from Nebraska has served on lesser committees as well as on two of the most important—that service on a less important committee can be of tremendous benefit to the individual member and to the Senate, if the necessary and demanding job is well done.

However, I have the greatest sympathy with Senators on this side of the aisle at least, who are not pleased with appointments to the lesser committees, unless they can have a position on one of the so-called major committees.

The minority assignments to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which are about to be made, constitute a perfect example of this situation. Prior to the time when, by telegram, the minority policy committee was able to get the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to change from one committee assignment to membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia, all six of the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia were new members who had come to the Senate this year. With the change I have just mentioned, five of the six are new Senators, but all six minority members of the Committee on the District of Columbia are newly assigned to the committee, whether or not it happened to be one upon which they had selected to serve.

Of course, Mr. President, it is my opinion that an apprenticeship can be served as well on the Committee on the District of Columbia, as on other committees, so far as concerns the amount of time and effort that may be expended.

But it is perfectly natural that when a Senator is forced to serve on a committee, not of his own selection—whether major or minor—that Senator will make an effort to get off the committee as soon as possible.

Although a Senator may at times be "bumped" from a major committee, the main turn-over of service lies in the four so-called lesser committees, where there is a constant shifting of membership, and definite loss of experience in handling the work of those committees.

Continuity of service is of great value, if good legislation is to result.

Very often a Senator has found himself off of one committee and back on it again, in a period of 2 or 4 years, losing in the meantime a very valuable continuity of experience in the preparation of legislation.

How much better it would be, Mr. President, if a Member could have, to a greater degree, the selection of committees for which he asked, and for work on which he is specially qualified, or on which his work will be of greater value to the Senate.

I am heartily in favor of limiting the number of committees to which a Senator may be appointed, as the Reorganization Act now provides, but I am equally opposed to the restrictions upon membership, within the 15 committees, to the exclusion of manpower and talent, which the Senate so desperately needs at this very moment.

Mr. President, my purpose is only constructive, it is to expedite the work of the Senate. I serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration with the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He knows as well as I do that the purpose of the measures acted on by that committee is constructive and that such measures should receive consideration of this body. They have no ulterior motive behind them. I happen to be a member of a major committee and of a minor committee. I was satisfied to give up membership on a major committee in order to make place for another Senator. It was the Committee on the Judiciary, and the change took place 4 years ago. The Senator appointed in my place has been a very valuable member of the Judiciary Committee. It illustrates how the solution of the problem can sometimes be reached. I think the time has come now when we should take steps adequately to distribute the workload.

These are times, Mr. President, when a Member of the United States Senate is entitled to feel that he needs to exert his very best efforts in the most effective manner possible.

These are times when it behooves the Senate to make it possible to utilize every ounce of its strength and talent, in the heavy responsibilities it faces, and to spread the workload in those committees which are more heavily burdened with defense legislation.

There is no attempt in anything I have to say, to evaluate one Senator's services above another, or to say where one Senator should be of more value than another. We are all needed to the fullest extent of our abilities.

My purpose is to recognize and to bring to some solution, the problem that some Senators are unduly burdened with the work of the Senate, while others feel that they are twiddling their thumbs while Rome burns.

Within the past 2 weeks, since the opening of the Eighty-second Congress, there have been at least four conferences, and other less formal discussions, between members of the majority and the minority, to try to work out a solution to this problem, on a voluntary basis. I think I am correct in that statement. I appreciate indeed the work the majority did in trying to help solve this problem.

By that I mean, the majority and minority could agree that membership on certain committees be increased, and membership on certain others be decreased.

I do not know that the membership of the lesser committees should be decreased, but I am certain that the membership of some committees should be increased; and if the only way to obtain an increase of membership on the 11 or 12 major committees is to decrease membership on the lesser committees, I think the time has arrived when that should be done.

On a voluntary basis, of course, it would take unanimous consent to make such changes on a temporary basis at least. It was the hope of the junior Senator from Nebraska, as ranking minority member on the Rules and Administration Committee, that some solution such as that suggested could be worked out.

Unfortunately the effort has failed, in spite of the fact that members from both sides of the aisle worked earnestly and sincerely to accomplish this purpose. I want to pay them tribute for that.

The Senate might have been able to accomplish by voluntary agreement, what has already been accomplished by the House in the past few days.

On January 12, Representative MCCORMACK offered a resolution (H. Res. 60) for immediate consideration by the House, which was agreed to, without objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 60, which I have designated as exhibit A, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution, marked "Exhibit A," was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

COMPOSITION OF VARIOUS COMMITTEES

Resolved, That during the Eighty-second Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 50 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 35 members;

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 2[illegible] members;

The Committee on House Administration shall be composed of 23 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 29 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of 23 members;

The Committee on Public Lands shall be composed of 27 members; and

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall be composed of 23 members.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the House has already recognized the necessity for strengthening its major committees, with increased memberships to meet the pressures of the times.

The House has recognized that it has manpower that should be utilized where it will have the greatest advantage and afford the greatest relief to hard-pressed committees.

Five Members have been added to the House Committee on Appropriations. The House had previously added two positions to that committee in the Eighty-first Congress, increasing the membership then from 43 to 45. Now, in the Eighty-second Congress, the House Committee on Appropriations will have 50 members.

The House resolution has increased the House Committee on Agriculture by three members; the Armed Services Committee by two members; the Foreign Relations Committee by two members; the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by three members; and the Judiciary Committee by two members. Increases in membership were also given to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; to the Committee on Public Lands; and to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

At the same time, the House resolution cuts back membership on the House Committee on Administration; on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which is a separate committee in the House.

The House has done, on a voluntary basis, exactly what the junior Senator from Nebraska had hoped might be done in the Senate.

Mr. President, at this moment we are faced with the assignment of Senators to committees for the duration of the Eighty-second Congress. Lacking a voluntary action, such as that taken by the House, in the form a resolution to which there was unanimous agreement, there is only one way remaining to improve the situation in time to be of some use and service in the Eighty-second Congress.

Of course, there is the means of amending the Reorganization Act. That is an approach with which I am in fundamental accord, and I have prepared a resolution which I submit to accomplish that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That (1) paragraph (b) of section 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the Committee on Appropriations, is amended by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three."

(2) Paragraph (f) of such section, relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia, is amended by striking out "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

(3) Paragraph (g) of such section, relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is amended by striking out "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

(4) Paragraph (i) of such section, relating to the Committee on Foreign Relations, is amended by striking out "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen."

(5) Paragraph (k) of such section, relating to the Committee on the Judiciary, is amended by striking out "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen."

(6) Paragraph (o) of such section, relating to the Committee on Rules and Administration, is amended by striking out "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

Mr. WHERRY. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration will assign it to a subcommittee; and after the hearings which I hope will be had, I trust we shall subsequently receive from the Committee on Rules and Administration a proposal for a change which will be of service to the Congress in 1952. Such a further step will be necessary, because the motion I am making today does not provide for a permanent change.

As I have said, the resolution will take time.

The only way that I see to be of immediate service to the Eighty-second Congress in this respect and to adjust the situation, at least to the degree now possible, is to amend the pending order so as to provide for an increased membership of at least one major committee for the duration of the Eighty-second Congress.

If that motion prevails, I intend to follow it with corresponding motions to decrease the membership of at least one other committee. In other words, there would be no increases in the membership of other committees; but instead of having 13 members on the Committee on the District of Columbia, for instance, there might be 11, inasmuch as the proposed change of membership of the Appropriations Committee would be from 21, as of the present time, to 23.

This effort is being made on my part, with the sincere purpose of increasing the efficiency of the Senate and of providing the broadest possible use, on a temporary basis, at least—because the resolution would apply only to the Eighty-second Congress—of the talents of Senate Members.

It would have been most helpful and encouraging to the combined efforts of this great body, and in the interests of greater unanimity and cooperation in the work of the Senate, if the distinguished majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] had chosen to offer, for voluntary action by the Senate, a resolution which would have made the necessary additions to the memberships of the major committees, and reductions in certain others. I should like to have seen him do so, because if there ever was a time when a gesture which would provide unanimity on the part of all Members of the Senate was needed, it is now.

It would have been wonderful if the Senate could have done that voluntarily, by means of unanimous consent; and I know that the minority would have "hailed the chief" as a great and outstanding majority leader if that could have been accomplished. However, the distinguished majority leader, in his wisdom, and we have to acknowledge that as majority leader he has to thresh out these things—did not see fit to do so.

So, Mr. President, at this time I have made the motion. It affects only the Eighty-second Congress, and does not propose a permanent amendment of the rule. A permanent amendment should be made by means of a proposal reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration itself. However, the present motion is one to increase by two members the membership of the Appropriations Committee in the Eighty-second Congress.

As I have stated, I do not wish to say anything about the qualifications of other Senators; but I desire to say to the majority that if we submit for membership on the Appropriations Committee the names of an additional Senator or two, we would suggest the names of Senators who have had many years of experience in the making of appropriations in the House of Representatives. Why should we wait? Why make those members serve an apprenticeship on the Committee on the District of Columbia, which, in terms of workload, does not compare with the Appropriations Committee, and make them wait for years before they, who have had years of service on the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, can give their talents and their ability to the Senate committee which will handle appropriations in the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. President, I take this step in an effort to be constructive, and in good faith. I should like to have the motion voted on as soon as possible. If the motion is defeated—and I say this to be fair to the majority leader—no more motions will be offered by me.

After the majority leader answers the argument I have made, if he cares to do so, why can we not vote on this one motion, and then organize the Senate? Then those who wish to speak on foreign policy matters can be recognized in the order in which they address the Chair.

(The statement by Senator MCCARRAN, which, on request of Mr. WHERRY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD following his speech is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

From time to time I have reported to the Senate concerning the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

I have done this not only because I have felt the Senate was entitled to such periodic reports but also because I have wanted my colleagues to have an understanding of the volume of work which the Committee on the Judiciary is required to do.

Nothing that I have said in connection with previous reports of this nature, and nothing I say today, is intended or should be taken as a complaint in any sense of the word. It is my pleasure to have associated with me on the Judiciary Committee some of the ablest and most hard-working Members of the Senate. As a committee, we have the assistance of a very fine and hard-working committee staff, and the Senate, in its wisdom, has in the past made provision for

increased staff assistance for the Committee on the Judiciary.

When Congress enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it was anticipated that the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, in some categories, would decline and eventually taper off. Two important categories with regard to which this expectation was entertained were private immigration bills and private claims bills. As I think my colleagues realize, the expectation was not borne out with respect to either of these categories of bills. On the contrary, there has been an increase in the number of bills in each category in each session of the Congress since 1946.

There is, I believe, still some hope of an eventual decline in the number of private claims bills; but the decline has not set in and is not likely to be evidenced during the session which has just begun.

I am hopeful that the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, which is one of the major projects in which the Judiciary Committee is now engaged, will include provisions which may help in reducing the number of private immigration bills in the future; but that reduction also, if accomplished, will not come during the present session of the Congress.

It seems quite certain, therefore, that the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to discharge properly its duties and responsibilities, will have to ask the Senate to provide additional assistance in this Congress to at least the same degree in which it has been provided in the past; and if the Senate sees fit to impose new and additional duties upon the Judiciary Committee, further provision will then have to be made for staff assistance in connection with such duties. But I want the Senate to know that the additional assistance which has been provided for the Committee on the Judiciary has been well employed, and is aiding the committee to produce as the Senate has a right to expect.

Here, then, is a statistical report on the work of the Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-first Congress:

"SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORKLOAD, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST AND SECOND SESSIONS

"The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, consisted of 40.9 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 52.7 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 44.1 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

"Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 2,701 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,417, which represents 52.4 percent.

"The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 4,716 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation. Each immigration case is equivalent to a bill.

"During both sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, the Judiciary Committee has received 2,039 Senate bills and resolutions and 959 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,998 bills and resolutions.

"As of the close of the Eighty-first Congress, the committee had disposed of 1,659 Senate bills and resolutions and 917 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 2,576 bills and resolutions.

"Of the bills thus disposed of 276 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 938 were private relief bills, 1,274 were private immigration bills, 31 were general claims bills, and 57 were general immigration bills.

"Committee approval was granted to 647 Senate bills and resolutions and 783 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,430 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

"(It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 13 of the 1,430 bills and resolutions approved.)

"Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably 149 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 574 were private relief bills, 674 were private immigration bills, 20 were general claims bills, and 13 were general immigration bills.

"Bills indefinitely postponed by the committee included 1,012 Senate bills and resolutions, 134 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,146 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

"Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 127 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 364 were private relief bills, 600 were private immigration bills, 44 were general immigration bills, and 11 were general claims bills.

"Measures pending before the committee at the close of the Eighty-first Congress included 380 Senate bills and resolutions and 42 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 422 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

"Of these bills 102 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 96 are private relief bills, 209 are private immigration bills, 7 are general claims bills, and 8 are general immigration bills.

"Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. When the Eighty-first Congress adjourned sine die, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports had been requested, but not received, was 225, of which 29 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 36 were private relief bills, and 160 were private immigration bills.

"Thus it will be seen that out of the 2,998 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled only 197, of which 73 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 60 were private relief bills, 49 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 8 were general immigration bills.

"It will be noted the committee disposed of 917 House bills and resolutions out of 959 such measures referred to it, leaving only 42 House bills and resolutions pending. This means the committee took action on 95.6 percent of all House measures received.

"In comparison, out of 2,039 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 1,659, leaving 380 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to "start from scratch" in all such cases, action was taken on 81.3 percent of all Senate measures received.

"(In this connection it should be noted the committee received 53 Senate bills and 5 House bills subsequent to the reconvening of the Congress on November 27, 1950.)

"Suspension of deportation by the Attorney General, under authority delegated by the Congress, are reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, there were pending in the committee 1,501 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 6,037 additional cases submitted during the Eighty-first Congress, making a total of 7,538 cases, of which 4,716 were approved, 59 were rejected, and 10 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; leaving 2,753 cases in process.

"During the Eighty-first Congress, the committee received 264 executive nominations, of which 117 were Federal judges, 61 were United States district attorneys, 60 were United States marshals, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 1 was Assistant Solicitor General, 5 were Assistant Attorneys General, 1 was Commissioner of Patents, 4 were members of the Displaced Persons Commission, 4 were members of the War Claims Commission, 5 were members of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, and 5 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

"Nominations not acted upon totaled only 11, all of which were received in committee between November 27 and December 21, 1950.

"During the Eighty-first Congress, the committee and its subcommittees conducted 190 hearings, which involved 330 separate hearing sessions. The records of these hearings total 36,991 folios."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the title of the Reorganization Act, namely, "To provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government."

The Joint Committee on Reorganization of the legislative branch spent many months in studying this problem. They heard expert witnesses, had the benefit of thorough studies, and took much evidence. They carefully considered all the questions the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska has pointed out.

Mr. President, each of the committees is supposed to be a major committee. Some persons may differ as to that view; some Senators may not think that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for instance, is so important. However, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] believes it is a very important committee, and he has often referred to the work done by that committee and to the workload it has.

Another committee which might be mentioned in this connection is the Committee on Rules and Administration. If we are going to change the rules of the Senate by action taken on the floor of the Senate, without referring such matters to the Committee on Rules and Administration, we might as well do away with that committee. As chairman of the committee, we have my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], a distinguished Senator who has served many years in this body. No one is more familiar with the workings of the Senate than he.

We have as the ranking minority member of that committee my distinguished friend, the minority leader, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I concede that he knows a great deal about the workings of the United States Senate and about how it should be organized.

Furthermore, each one of the other members of the Committee on Rules and Administration is qualified to pass upon these very important problems. I call attention to the fact that recently a new member has been added to that committee, in accordance with the list recently submitted, namely, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr.

MONRONEY], who in the House of Representatives handled the Legislative Reorganization Act prior to its passage.

Mr. President, at this time I do not wish to discuss the merits of the motion, because I feel that the Committee on Rules and Administration should carefully consider all the arguments which have been made by the distinguished minority leader; and then, after carefully considering all of them and also carefully considering others which may be made and evidence which may be introduced, it should make its report to this body.

I contend that this motion is an attempt, without changing the rule, to amend rule XXV, which provides the number of members of the respective committees.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make a point of order against——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator going to make the point of order at once?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, to permit me to make a statement at this time?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a moment, if I may do so without losing the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if this motion is directed at the committee, of which I happen to be chairman, I wish to say that of course I desire to get along with the junior Senator from Nebraska. He is on the committee, and is a very valuable member of it, and I always like to agree with him whenever I can. However, the Appropriations Committee now has 21 regular members and, in addition, 18 ex officio members, each of whom has a part in the deliberations of the committee. If my mathematics is correct, 21 and 18 make 39. In other words, there are 39 members of the committee, which is more than one-third of the membership of the Senate. In my judgment, it would make the committee too large.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Nebraska, for the purpose of his addressing a question to the Senator from Tennessee, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished chairman of the committee agrees with me, does he not, that prior to the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, there was the same number of ex officio members of the committee, and that, therefore, there was no increase in the number of ex officio members?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. Let me say that I think the present procedure a very fine method of handling appropriations, but a better way would be to go back to the old plan of handling appropriations through subcommittees on the War Department, the Navy Department, and the various other departments. I hope and pray that we may return to that system, instead of having an enormous committee consisting of 39 members.

Mr. WHERRY. It would not be 39, would it?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be 39. Twenty-one and eighteen make thirty-nine. There are 18 ex officio members. Six times three is 18. Therefore, if we were to agree to the motion of my able friend across the aisle, we would increase our committee by how many? How many would the Senator increase it?

Mr. WHERRY. By two.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would make 41 members. That is certainly a very unwieldy number. The Senator will agree with me that, with the exception of one, that exception being myself, the Appropriations Committee as now constituted is one of the best committees of the Senate. The committee has worked with remarkable skill and ability, even under the system of a unified or consolidated appropriation bill, which entirely upset all the experience which had preceded it, and disregarded the customary methods of handling appropriations. Even so, the committee has worked well, even though there has been an immense amount of work. I hope and pray that we may not change the practice at this particular time. I agree with the majority leader that it would be better to have the matter go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and let that committee report later, if it should desire to do so. The change should not be made now. Let the present procedure continue at least until we get back to the nonunified scheme of handling appropriation bills.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, with the same understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had served with the same number of ex officio members on six subcommittees—making a total of 18—prior to the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, when there were 25 members of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember how many there were.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's statement was that there were 25 active members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, prior to the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, together with six subcommittees being served by three ex officio members each. Therefore, to go from 21 to 23 would still be 2 short of what the distinguished Senator had as a committee prior to the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, at a time when the budget was only $33,000,000,000 instead of $81,000,000,000, as may be today.

Mr. McKELLAR. My good friend is mistaken about the situation. Let me explain it to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. What the Legislative Reorganization Act provided for was a return to 13 members. I opposed that.

Mr. WHERRY. How many were on the committee—25?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there were 25. Twenty-five were authorized.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that there were that many serving.

Mr. WHERRY. But there was an authorized membership of 25.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. We finally agreed on 21, which was an excellent decision. It has worked well. Why change a situation which has worked well? The present practice has worked splendidly, and I may say that is largely due to the fine staff which serves the committee. It has worked very well, so why change it? We might just as well include the entire membership of the Senate, the entire 96 Senators, on the Appropriations Committee. Incidentally, we may come to that, if we start the practice suggested.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment. Let us stand by what has worked well. I have been a member of the committee I think for more than a quarter of a century, or about that long, and I may say that the greatest test which has ever been made of our method of handling appropriations was when our friends in the House sent us the unified appropriation bill. It was a severe test of the efficient working of our committee. The committee met the test. It did everything that could be done. Senators from both sides of the aisle did everything in the world they could to make the plan a success; but it was not a success. Now, when we are returning to the practice of considering the separate deparments in the handling of appropriation bills, as we probably shall, why not take the method which has been tried and has been found to be successful and effective in every way? Why should we experiment with 41 members, or nearly one-half of the membership of the Senate, on one committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment. Let me appeal to my friend, let us not in this haphazard way change the committee at this time. I appeal to the Senator as my friend. I appeal to him as a legislator. I appeal to him as a good Republican. [Laughter.] I appeal to him in every way. He is a good Republican. As a good Democrat, to a good Republican, I ask whether the Senator will not withdraw his motion, and allow us to employ the method and to use the plan which has been so successful in the past.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, with the same understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator remember that on June 7, 1946, he made this observation on the floor of the Senate, when the Legislative Reorganization Act was reported to the Senate,

and when the Appropriations Committee was reduced from 25 members to 13? The Senator said:

I wish to point out some very important provisions of the bill. Take for example the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

That committee was then handling a budget of $33,000,000,000. The Senator continued:

The committee consists of 24 members at the present time, and I believe it is authorized to have 25. If the membership of that committee were reduced to 13, the committee would not be able to do its work.

I am making the same argument the Senator made at that time, but instead of suggesting 25 members, I am suggesting 23. The Senator felt that certainly there should be a committee of 25, but subsequently there was agreement with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to reduce the membership from 25 to 21.

Mr. McKELLAR. We agreed to that. It worked well. Why change it now on the floor of the Senate without the matter going to a committee? In my opinion, it ought not to be changed. I have the greatest respect, admiration, and esteem for my good friend from Nebraska. He works with me on the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I work with a good Democrat.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is one of the most valuable members we have on the committee. I ask him not to revolutionize the committee at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Arizona yield for a moment further.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee has lost a member. I am very sorry it has lost one. There are still 21 members of the committee, but the Democrats have lost one.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Democrats lose one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Because of the elections on November 7; that is why. When the people speak, they come ahead of any of us. The Republican vacancies have been filled. The place of former Senator Gurney has been filled by our Republican friends. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] have been selected as members of the committee. The Republicans have three new members of the committee. They are taking care of their friends. They have an opportunity, so far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, of placing three new members on it, while the Democrats have lost a member of the committee.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate. I have appealed to my friend from Nebraska and he does not seem to be yielding, so I appeal to the Members of the Senate to leave the committee as it is. We try in that committee to work out problems along practical lines, irrespective of party or faction.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the colloquy has clearly demonstrated that the rules of the Senate should not be amended in this manner. So I make the point of order which I previously stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to argue the point of order?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to argue it?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I do not. If there is any way in which we can get the opinion of the Chair, I shall promise, on this side, not to exceed 10 minutes in getting the matter out of the way and getting the Senate organized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act, there was one very definite rule of the Senate in regard to the number of members of each committee. There was no rule at all as to how many committees a Senator might be a member of. In order to distribute the membership on major committees as widely as possible among the Members of the Senate, the Reorganization Act provided that no Senator should be a member of more than two major committees, except that members of the majority might be on one or two additional committees which were named. It also provided for the number of members of each committee. The Reorganization Act, however, provides that each House may determine its own rules; in other words, that each House may amend its rules as it may see fit in regard to members of the committees or the number of major committees of which a Senator may be a member.

The Chair is not concerned personally as to whether there shall be 21 or 23 members of the Appropriations Committee. However, inasmuch as it is a rule of the Senate that the committee shall be composed of 21 members, the Chair is of the opinion that in order to increase the number of members of that committee, the rule must be changed. In other words, if the Senate places 23 Senators on that committee, in the view of the Chair it would be a violation of rule XXV which provides that 21 members shall constitute the membership of the Appropriations Committee.

The rule provides the method by which it may be amended, and the Chair feels that until the rule is amended authorizing an increase in the membership of the Committee on Appropriations from 21 to 23, it is not in order to increase the number from 21 to 23.

The same logic would apply to any other committee. If a resolution or an amendment were offered to make the Committee on Finance a commmittee of 15 Senators instead of 13, the Chair would feel that in order for that to be done the rule fixing 13 members as the number would have to be changed. The rule provides how it may be done.

Therefore, the Chair is of the opinion that the motion is not in order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that forces the junior Senator from Nebraska to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair. I do not want to debate it at length. I desire to raise only two points, and then I shall be willing to have a vote on the appeal, which would be the same thing, really, as a vote on the motion. I do this with a great deal of reluctance, because I do not, at the beginning of the session, want to take exception to a ruling of the Chair. I have great affection for the Vice President, as he knows, but I have no other way to get a vote on the increased membership of committees than to prosecute the question as far as I can from a parliamentary point of view.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair fully understands that.

The Chair meant to make a further observation, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit. If the Senate can increase the number of members of a committee merely by an amendment to a resolution, it can by a similar process increase the number of major committees of which a Senator can be a member. Therefore, without amending the rules in an orderly way, the Senate could complete the organization of a committee by an amendment of this sort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would not want the RECORD to show that the Senator from Nebraska was doing this with any ulterior motive in mind, or that I am trying to gain the end result of a change in the rule only for the purpose of satisfying the desire of the Senator from Nebraska by using parliamentary procedure unfairly. All the Senate would be doing would be to vote on increasing the membership of the Committee on Appropriations for the Eighty-second Congress by two members, and decreasing, if this motion should be adopted, the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia by two members. This would make the membership of the Committee on Appropriations 23, and the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia 11.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made a strong appeal that the Senator from Nebraska join with him. Let me say there is not a Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard than I have for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. In most instances, even without the flattering remarks he made about the Senator from Nebraska, I go along with his judgment and requests. But I submit that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, before the Reorganization Act was passed, rose on the floor of the Senate and used the very arguments which I am now using, not only to preserve the membership of the Appropriations Committee at 25, but not to pass the Reorganization Act if it provided for an Appropriations Committee of 13 members. Former Senator La Follette met with the distinguished Senator and a compromise was made on 21 members.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the compromise was made in the enactment of the law.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was not an effort to change the law by a simple resolution in the Senate, when the proper way to change it is by an amendment to the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. The way to do it is the way which I have attempted to do it, namely, to offer a resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope that before this session is concluded the Senator will join with me in reporting a rule which will correct the situation. I agree with the Senator that so far as the permanent rules are concerned, that is the way to correct the situation.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration will also agree with me that title I of the Reorganization Act provides that, with full recognition of its constitutional right, either House may change its rules at any time it desires to do so. Is that not correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The way to change a rule is to do it through the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. But title I of the act provides that even though the way to make a permanent change is through the committee, the Senate can change a rule at any time it wants to do so. It can do it now if it wants to do so. The Senator from Arizona knows that many times he has asked for unanimous consent, as probably most of us have done, to change a rule of the Senate, and unanimous consent was given and the change was made for a particular purpose. That is different from asking for a permanent change. I have made such an approach also. However, it will not help the situation at the present time.

If the Eighty-second Congress is to get the benefit of the services of new Senators, who are eager to help the Senate do its work, we should amend the rule and increase the membership of the Committee on Appropriations. It can be done by taking the two additional members from the Committee on the District of Columbia. We have the right to do it.

I disagree with the ruling of the Presiding Officer. Title I of the Reorganization Act fully recognizes the right of the Senate to change its rules at any time it wishes to do so. I am not asking for a permanent change in the rule at this time. I am asking only that the change be made for the Eighty-second Congress. I ask that the membership of the Appropriations Committee be increased to 23 members. So far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned the Senate can vote on the appeal from the Chair whenever the majority leader is ready to do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to have the Senate vote on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I hope that the ruling of the Chair will be sustained. However, before doing so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chapman	Ferguson
Anderson	Chavez	Flanders
Bennett	Clements	Frear
Benton	Connally	Fulbright
Brewster	Cordon	George
Bricker	Dirksen	Gillette
Bridges	Douglas	Green
Butler, Md.	Dworshak	Hayden
Butler, Nebr.	Eastland	Hendrickson
Carlson	Ecton	Hennings
Case	Ellender	Hill
Holland	McClellan	Saltonstall
Humphrey	McFarland	Schoeppel
Hunt	McKellar	Smathers
Ives	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Jenner	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Smith, N. C.
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Stennis
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Taft
Kefauver	Mundt	Thye
Kerr	Murray	Watkins
Kilgore	Neely	Welker
Knowland	Nixon	Wherry
Langer	O'Conor	Wiley
Lehman	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lodge	Pastore	Young
Long	Robertson	
McCarran	Russell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is necessarily absent in order to attend the funeral of a friend is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—44

Anderson	Hennings	McFarland
Benton	Hill	McKellar
Chapman	Holland	McMahon
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
George	Lehman	Smathers
Gillette	Long	Smith, N. C.
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bennett	Flanders	Schoeppel
Brewster	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Jenner	Taft
Butler, Md.	Knowland	Thye
Butler, Nebr.	Langer	Watkins
Carlson	Lodge	Welker
Case	Martin	Wherry
Cordon	Millikin	Wiley
Dirksen	Morse	Williams
Dworshak	Mundt	Young
Ecton	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—13

Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	McCarthy	Tobey
Capehart	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Hickenlooper	Malone	
Hoey	Maybank	

So the decision of the Chair was sustained as the judgment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the order making the committee assignments.

The order was agreed to.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 30)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1951.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1951, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE BUDGET (H. DOC. NO. 17)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the budget message of the President, which, he is informed, has been read in the House of Representatives, and therefore there is no need that it be read for publication again in the Senate. The message from the President and the budget will be re-

ferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For message from the President, see pp. 271–288, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House proceedings of today.)

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared commenting on the budget for expenditures in 1951 submitted to the Congress today by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Only a week ago the President appeared before Congress and said: "It (the Government) must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

The applause for this section of the State of the Union address was greater than for any other statement, indicating Congress accepted this policy in good faith.

Yet, today he has submitted to Congress a budget which has actually increased nondefense spending to the highest level in the history of the Nation—whether in peace or in war.

Not only has he, in the time of our greatest crisis, failed to keep his pledge for a rigid reduction in nondefense spending, but the President renews his advocacy of the socialistic measures known as the Fair Deal.

He calls for an increase in taxation of from $16,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 annually and still proposes to continue wasteful domestic spending which has added billions to the public debt.

He asks citizens to make deep sacrifices in their daily living, yet he declines to make political sacrifices by curtailment or suspension of measures for the distribution of public funds for nonessential purposes.

In my experience of 18 years, considering the perils that confront our Nation, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Unity and the sacrifices necessary to save our country must be a two-way street—they must come from the Government as well as from the citizens.

On page M41 of the budget message he renews his support of the Brannan plan, which, if adopted, will add billions to Federal expenditures and disrupt the processes of agricultural production. It is true that he asks for no appropriation at this time for the Brannan plan but, should the principle of the Brannan plan be adopted, huge appropriations will necesarily follow.

On page M54 he advocates a specific appropriation of $300,000,000 for Federal aid to public schools which will open up a pandora box of Federal spending the extent of which no one can foretell.

On page M52 he recommends the so-called socialized medicine plan, with provisions for funds through new taxes which obviously will be inadequate. The adoption of the principle of this plan will be followed by vast expenditures.

On page M30 he recommends establishment of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which, if established, will not only be costly but will result in Federal interference with every man's business.

My statement today will deal with the domestic, civilian nondefense expenditures only.

The President recommends a total of $9,800,000,000 for domestic civilian purposes, as compared with estimated expenditures of $8,400,000,000 in the current year, an actual expenditure of $9,700,000,000 in 1950, $6,100,000,000 in 1948, and $3,600,000,000 in 1946.

In fiscal 1946, beginning July 1, 1945, we were partly at war, with conditions similar to those confronting us today, and the President now proposes to spend for domestic civilian expenditures nearly three times as much as in fiscal 1946.

To this statement I attach explanatory notes.

Within a day or so I will present to Congress an itemized statement of the reductions and increases made in the President's budget, as compared with previous expenditures, and will submit detailed plans as to how these expenditures could be reduced, in accordance with my letter to the President under date of December 22.

Expenditure budget comparisons

[In billions]

Expenditure categories	Actual, 1948 [1]	Actual, 1950	Estimate, 1951	President's requests, 1952
1. Domestic-civilian [2] (exclusive of stockpile, NACA, Selective Service, merchant marine, Coast Guard, Alaska, Panama, Atomic Energy)	$6.1	$9.7	$8.4	$9.8
2. Foreign assistance (military and economic)	4.6	4.6	4.7	7.5
3. Defense (including military, stockpile, NACA, Selective Service, merchant marine, Coast Guard, Alaska, Panama, Atomic Energy)	11.6	13.4	22.6	43.4
4. Veterans	6.6	6.6	5.7	4.9
5. Interest, claims, etc	5.2	5.8	5.7	5.9
6. Legislative and Judicial	.1	.1	.1	.1
Total	34.2	40.2	47.2	71.6

[1] Fiscal year 1948 is included in this table because it comes most nearly representing the post World War II peacetime era and peacetime prosperity.

[2] See table below.

Domestic-civilian expenditures by major categories

NOTE.—The following table breaks down item 1 above.

[In millions]

Domestic-civilian increases and decreases	Actual, 1946 [1]	Actual, 1950	Estimate, 1951	President's requests, 1952
1. Social welfare, health, and security	$1,085	$2,213	$2,520	$2,625
2. Housing and community development	−180	261	409	−102
3. Education and general research	88	114	143	483
4. Agriculture and agricultural resources	701	2,784	986	1,429
5. Natural resources (exclusive of atomic energy)	257	1,004	1,301	1,244
6. Transportation (exclusive of Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, Panama, and Alaska)	413	1,752	1,426	1,073
7. Finance, commerce, and industry	102	227	368	1,524
8. Labor	192	263	212	295
9. General government (exclusive of interest, refunds, claims)	933	1,037	1,082	1,229
Total	3,591	9,655	8,437	9,834

[1] Fiscal year 1946 is used because we were in a semiwar economy at that time as well as now. Then we were descending from the wartime requirements, now we are ascending in these aspects. At that time we still had controls such as those under OPA and we were negotiating to cancel contracts. Now we are building up control agencies and making loans to business for defense production.

NOTES

In connection with the preceding tables and the President's budget message in general, it may be noted:

1. The President requests $71,600,000,000 in expenditures, and $55,100,000,000 in revenue. Deficit $16,500,000,000.

2. He says the budget must be balanced and that he will submit requests for additional taxes at a later date.

3. The President requests $7,500,000,000 in foreign assistance (military and economic aid together) as compared with estimated expenditures of $4,700,000,000 this year and actual expenditures of $4,600,000,000 in 1950, $4,600,000,000 in 1948, and $1,400,000,000 in 1946.

4. The President requests $43,400,000,000 for defense including military, stockpile, NACA, Selective Service, merchant marine, Coast Guard, Alaska, Panama, and atomic energy. This figure is compared with an estimate of $22,600,000,000 for these items this year, $13,400,000,000 actual expenditures in 1950, $10,600,000,000 in 1948, and $45,400,000,000 in 1946.

5. The President requested $4,900,000,000 for veterans as compared with $5,700,000,000 estimated for this year, $6,600,000,000 in 1950, $6,600,000,000 in 1948, and $4,400,000,000 in 1946.

6. The President requested $5,900,000,000 for interest, claims, etc., as compared with an estimated $5,700,000,000 this year, and actual $5,800,000,000 in 1950, $5,200,000,000 in 1948, and $4,800,000,000 in 1946.

7. The budget includes all of the Fair Deal proposals; the Brannan plan, FEPC, $290,000,000 for federalized education in secondary schools, socialized housing, and socialized medicine, with its $275,000,000 in new taxes for this purpose.

8. The most constructive field of reduction was not only virtually untouched but in fact it was increased; namely, grants-in-aid to States. These grants to States were increased from an estimated $2,500,000,000 this year to $3,000,000,000 next year. In these perilous times when the Federal Government is forced to arm the Nation and has undertaken to prop up half the world economically and militarily, the least the States can do is to pay their own bills. I had hoped indeed that the President would come out for basic legislation declaring a moratorium on most of these payments, but there is no mention of such a proposal.

9. Civilian public-works requests in the 1952 budget total $3,400,000,000 as compared with $2,900,000,000 this year and $2,000,000,000 last year.

10. Despite expanded coverage of the social-security system, public-assistance grants would be increased. The whole social welfare, health, and security category would be increased by $105,000,000. Exclusive of the railroad retirement fund the increase in this category would total $57,000,000. Virtually none of it could be justified for the national defense.

11. The President includes at least $3,000,000,000 for civilian defense, including more than $1,000,000,000 for business loans, and a

great many projects which are wide open for boondoggle exploitation by Federal agencies, State and local agencies, and fly-by-night business outfits, all of which are trying to get into the defense act.

12. The President says 40 percent of the items in the budget have been reduced but at the same time there are 304 increased items in the budget.

13. For the first time since the foreign-assistance programs were inaugurated, the defense and economic programs are consolidated in such a manner as to make it impossible to determine how much is proposed for each.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 288–289.)

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in relatively quiet periods those of us who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee seldom speak on the floor of the Senate about foreign policy. At such times we are content to leave the discussion of these issues to those who in committee have pulled the laboring oar.

But when great storms arise and the helmsmen have to make crucial decisions about the future course of action, when the safety and peace of our country and of the world are at stake, then such matters become the proper concern of us all. It was probably such considerations as these which led the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to open the debate 10 days ago, and which has caused certain other Senators who are not members of the committee, including the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], to make their contributions. In the light of these precedents, I hope my colleagues will not think me forward if I rise to discuss the same set of concerns.

I. THE NEED FOR DECISION

Mr. President, along with others I am grateful to the eminent former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, and to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for raising the great issues of what should be America's commitments in the world and the precise military responsibilities which we should assume.

I should also like to compliment both Mr. Hoover and the Senator from Ohio, if I may, for speaking directly and clearly to the issues which they have raised and for their refusal to indulge in any personal attacks. The Senator from Ohio, it is true, made some rather stringent criticisms of the President of the United States and his past actions; but those criticisms were directed toward the President's exercise of his powers, rather than to the person of the Chief Executive.

We are further in debt to the Senator from Ohio for the fact that he chose to launch this debate in the proper forum of the United States Senate, rather than to make himself merely one of a series of prominent citizens relying upon the air waves as a medium for settling a great constitutional and political issue. By his determined forehandedness, he has set in train a Senate debate which in my judgment was both inevitable and proper. He has raised the issues which are at stake, in terms which should call forth a clear-cut decision by the Senate, and possibly by the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO SEND TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. President, I believe that the President of the United States has the constitutional power to send additional troops to Europe; but I also believe that the issue as to whether it is wise for him to send them is so important that it is desirable and indeed necessary to debate it here in the United States Senate, and for us to reach fairly quickly a definite decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer not to yield during the course of my main address, or at least not until I have finished with my attempted refutation of the position of the Senator from Ohio. I do this, not to shut off discussion, but merely in order that I may have a chance to develop my argument in some detail.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not rise to engage in debate, but merely because I seek information. I wondered whether the Senator meant that the President of the United States has the power under his implied powers as Chief Executive or as Commander in Chief, or whether the President has the powers under the United Nations Charter or under the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say to my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, that this will become manifest during the course of my remarks.

Let us start with the first point, namely, the constitutional powers of the President. A few days after American forces first went into action in Korea, I tried to review in the Senate the legislative history of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 with regard to the use of armed force. It is alleged—and I believe the Senator from Ohio so alleges—that since the Constitution in article I, section 8, gives solely to the Congress the power to declare war, the use of armed force by the President without congressional assent is consequently a violation of these powers, and hence a violation of the Constitution.

The true meaning of this provision, namely, to declare war, will be made much clearer, however, if we draw upon the notes which James Madison took of the debates of the Constitutional Convention, and if we trace the legislative history of the phrase, "to declare war." If we do this, we find that when the so-called Committee on Detail submitted its draft on August 6, 1787, it gave to Congress, not the right to declare, but, instead, the broader right to make war. Mr. Pinckney of South Carolina opened debate on this clause on August 17 by saying that he opposed vesting this power in the Legislature. "Its proceedings," he declared, "were too slow."

After further discussion by Mr. Butler of South Carolina, James Madison of Virginia and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts both moved to strike out the verb "to make" and to substitute the verb "to declare." This was for the purpose, as Madison wrote in his Notes, of "leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks." The language we thus find in article I, section 8, was then accepted by a vote of seven States to two, with one State not participating, and three absent.

It is clear, then, that the Convention did not want to tie our country's hands by requiring congressional assent for all employment of armed force. It is obvious, instead, that, as Madison said, they wanted to leave to the President the power to use force to "repel sudden attacks," even though he was not specifically authorized to do so by Congress.

Even in later days, when the speed with which Congress could assemble constantly increased, Presidents continued to use our Armed Forces by executive direction against the forces and persons of other countries. Such action has indeed been taken on over a hundred occasions. Reference to those acts was made by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in his address last week. Last July 5 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9648), I cited 15 important instances dating from 1798 to 1919, and including Jefferson's attack on the Barbary pirates, Polk's use of troops prior to the Mexican War, and Wilson's occupation of Vera Cruz. I shall not again burden the RECORD with them at this point.

Not only have Presidents exercised their constitutional powers as Commanders in Chief of the Nation's Armed Forces without specific declarations by Congress, but in the past they have specifically proclaimed their right to do so, and have recorded their assertions of this right. Thus, ex-President William Howard Taft, for example, wrote in his book, Our Chief Magistrate and His Power, as follows:

> The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this, he can order the Army and the Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation * * * (p. 99).
>
> It is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence (p. 95).

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, does the Senator mind yielding at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is considerable noise in the Chamber, and I wish to hear the Senator. Will he please read again the last sentence?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point made by the Senator from Colorado is well taken, and the Chair asks all Senators to maintain order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I repeat the quotation:

> It is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that

the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Would the Senator mind inserting, in the first quotation, and following the sentence:

Under this, he can order the Army and the Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation—

The following words:

Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. I think that should be added to the first quotation, because I think it is a substantial modification of it, and makes a substantial distinction between the right of the President to do something and his power as a fundamental consideration in this instance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio will be patient, he will find that is a distinction which I shall make in a few minutes.

What I have quoted was the opinion of President Taft; and, while I do not want to start an internecine war within the Taft family, I am sure the Senator from Ohio joins with me and the Nation in the high opinion which we hold of William Howard Taft as a constitutional authority on the legal power of the President, for amongst many other claims to distinction he was certainly the only man in our history who was both President and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

In fact, we could not find a more precise distinction between the constitutional powers of the President and those of the Congress than President Taft's words:

If the appropriations furnish the means of transportation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield for a question, because I am trying to develop my points step by step.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator to yield for an interpolation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I yield; provided I do not lose my right to the floor, and provided the interpolation is of reasonable length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Illinois may be interested to know that on a distinguished occasion the present Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maine wrote an article in the Harvard Law Review, pronouncing William Howard Taft as utterly wrong on a great constitutional question, and ultimately the Supreme Court unanimously decided that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maine were correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Both confession and assertion are good for the soul, but it so happens that this address by President Taft, which I have quoted, was delivered at Columbia University in 1915 or 1916, and, therefore, was subsequent to the learned opinion handed down by the learned Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maine, when they were students at Harvard Law School.

The appropriations to dispatch additional troops to Europe are in the process of being asked of this session of the Congress. If the President, however, chose to dispatch those troops today, and had unobligated appropriations to the Military Establishment with which to carry out the job, he would have the constitutional right to do so.

The Senator from Ohio was at great pains in his address on this floor to assert that the vote by which the Senate in 1949 ratified the Atlantic Pact instrument did not give the President the legal authority to dispatch troops to France, and that only the technicality of our occupation status in Germany gave the President the right to send additional forces to that country. Without going into details of the argument, which seems to involve the question whether agreements under the North Atlantic Treaty are not subject to the requirements of section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, I will say that the Senator from Ohio can make out a strong case.

But the Senator is not correct, may I say, in believing that the President needed any authority from the Atlantic Pact instrument or the United Nations Act of 1945 to send troops to France, Germany, England, Korea, China, or, in the words of William Howard Taft, "anywhere he will." For that power was already given to him by the Constitution, which is prior to all the statute laws of the country.

QUESTION OF WHERE TROOPS ARE SENT SHOULD BE DEBATED

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I believe that the question as to where the United States is to send its forces and the terms under which they shall be sent, is so important, and that public opinion on the question is sufficiently divided to make it highly desirable to have that issue debated and decided on the floor of the United States Senate, and not merely discussed over the air by prominent citizens and officials in the executive branch. In particular we need to come to a decision on the principles of the Brussels agreement. The national interest, indeed, requires that a clear decision on the issue be reached by Congress in some express way. The constitutional powers of the Government are shared powers, and the issue is too important and the dangers to our survival too great, in my judgment, for the Executive to act without positive approval of Congress.

I am, of course, aware that the two positions which I have just been expressing run parallel and, on a strictly logical plane, do not meet. The President, in my view, could commit troops to Western Europe or elsewhere and then merely say to the Congress: "There you are; now to the Congress belongs the awesome responsibility of refusing to provide money and supplies to those American forces." That would be facing Congress with an accomplished fact. But I hope and believe that the President will not do that. The President said last Thursday that he would consult with congressional leaders before committing troops to Europe. But that is not enough, as I shall discuss at a later point in my remarks.

I am also fully aware of the fact that in the matter of sending troops to Europe or of not sending them, we are not starting from scratch. The composition of a joint defense force for the countries of the Atlantic Pact has been under discussion among the 11 nations for over a year. More than that, it was on last September 9 that the President of the United States declared that on the basis of recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, concurred in by the Secretaries of State and Defense, he had that day "approved substantial increases in the strength of the United States forces to be stationed in Western Europe in the interest of the defense of that area." I am not aware that any formal objection was made on the floor of the Senate to this proposal.

The agreement or understanding which was apparently concluded in Brussels in December was presumably in harmony with the President's prior statement. So the idea of our taking part in the collective defense of Europe is not novel.

But this program is being challenged more vigorously now than ever before. This has been partly caused by our defeat in Korea and by the consequent fear that if we go into Europe, we will get ourselves involved in another and more costly Korea. It has been partly caused by the well-justified feeling, which feeling I share, that the European countries have not been of great help to us or to the United Nations in repelling Communist aggression in Korea. We have apparently furnished about seven-eighths of the ground troops. But however caused, this feeling is real and we should face it.

If we can keep essential unity among ourselves and among the democratic peoples of the world, we can defeat Russian communism. In the interest of internal unity, I believe we should submit the Brussels Pact to debate and to decision and that we should not invoke the constitutional powers of the President as an excuse for the Senate not to deal with it. The constitutional argument which I have made thus far is directed to the fact that the President has acted within his constitutional powers and should not be criticized on this score for what he has done in Korea or at Brussels.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that, when he was not in the Chamber, I said that in the interest of developing a connected argument, I did not feel that I could yield for questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator merely allow the Senator from Michigan to make one remark?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I again stop briefly.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would be helpful if the Senator would state whether the Brussels agreement to which he refers is the one of December 1950.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator tell us the terms, in order that we may be able better to follow his argument?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall develop that as we go along, but I agree that, in the interest of national unity, we should now hold these powers in abeyance for a few weeks, and not send ground troops to Europe until we and the country reach a considered decision.

SECRETARY ACHESON'S PLEDGE REGARDING USE OF TROOPS UNDER THE ATLANTIC PACT

This, in my judgment, is all the more necessary in view of the virtual pledge which was given by Secretary Acheson on April 27, 1949, when the North Atlantic Pact was up for ratification. For in reply to the following question from Senator HICKENLOOPER, "Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of those countries' capacity to resist?" Secretary Acheson replied, "The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No'." (Hearings on the North Atlantic treaty, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 47.)

Now I am quite ready to believe that Mr. Acheson gave this pledge in good faith, but that it later developed that the North Atlantic countries would not rearm adequately unless we gave them a pledge that our troops would fight beside them if they resisted and would actually be on hand if and when the trouble started. That is, they wanted to be protected at the time of the initial assault, and not merely rescued after they had been captured.

The aggressions of the Communist satellites in Korea also radically changed the picture. These developments, I believe, led to the Brussels agreement. But the Brussels agreement was negotiated under the North Atlantic treaty. It could not have been negotiated, had not the North Atlantic treaty been ratified. The Senate ratified that treaty after a categorical pledge had been given by the Secretary of State that it was not even expected that we would send a substantial number of troops to Western Europe prior to actual attack. Since that pledge was at least one of the considerations which led many Senators to vote for it, it would not be proper, in my judgment, for the administration now to try to put the agreement into effect by purely Executive action upon the narrow grounds of its constitutional powers. For to do so would violate the explicit pledge given by the Secretary to the Senate when we had the power of refusing to ratify the treaty under which the Brussels agreement was later negotiated. It would be the path of honor instead for the administration to submit the question of approving the Brussels agreement to at least the Senate and possibly the House, and for us on our side to act quickly and not to delay the matter by interminable additional hearings or by what is known outside the Senate as a filibuster.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will yield that I might add, perhaps, somewhat to that point, in connection with the report of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a short space of time.

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry I cannot enter into debate with the Senator, because I have to leave for New York in about 15 minutes, but I should like at this point, because it seems to me to be appropriate, to read what the Foreign Relations Committee said when it reported the North Atlantic Pact:

> The treaty in no way affects the basic division of authority between the President and the Congress as defined in the Constitution. In no way does it alter the constitutional relationship between them. In particular, it does not increase, decrease, or change the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or impair the full authority of Congress to declare war.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional processes of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency.

Of course, the impression given to the Senate was that the President could not execute the treaty without action by the Congress. If this is to be done, it should be done as the expression of the will of a whole people and not merely as a commitment by a dictator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope and believe that the administration will submit this question to the Congress soon, and I hope that the majority leadership will present such a resolution approving the Brussels agreement at an appropriate time. But I wish to serve notice that if this is not done by the leadership in the very near future, I will offer such a resolution myself. Then in good spirits let us accept the results and close our ranks against a common foe.

Perhaps there are detailed schedules and arrangements for troop disposition in the Brussels agreement which cannot be revealed for obvious security and tactical reasons. Then at least the general outline and principles of American troop participation which it calls for should, to the fullest extent that they can be divulged, be embodied in the resolution submitted to the Senate and the House.

There is one final note of caution, however, which I should add on these procedural questions. It is not only important that we decide, but also that we should decide quickly. If the Senate should get bogged down in long drawn out hearings and then in a filibuster, the need for action would justify the President using his constitutional powers and sending the first installment of troops overseas. In other words, since the safety of the country is at stake and since time is of the essence, if the Senate and Congress will not decide, then the President will have to act.

POSITIVE APPROVAL PREFERABLE TO THE NEGATIVE RESOLUTION

I may say that this is why I prefer a resolution drawn in an affirmative form, approving the Brussels agreement, to the resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in a negative form, declaring that the President should not send troops overseas unless and until the consent of the Congress has been obtained. Under the resolution of the junior Senator from Nebraska, a vacuum in time would be created during which no troops could be moved overseas. No action could be taken until affirmative consent was given by the Congress that such troops could be sent.

That would mean that it would be possible for some groups in the Senate to filibuster to prolong the discussion, and possibly the whole question of security would be sidetracked. Therefore, I think the form which I suggest, namely, a resolution approving the sending of troops overseas, is much more in the national interest than would be a negative resolution of the type submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. For a brief question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having left his script for the moment, I should like to ask him to explain to the Senate what the Brussels agreement is, and to what it commits us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not read it, and I doubt if any Senator has read it for I believe its actual text has not been released, but I have newspaper reports of some of its probable salient features which in due course of time will go into the RECORD.

WE NEED TO MAKE A BASIC POLICY DECISION

Mr. President, I, therefore, welcome this debate. I am confident that it will result in reaffirming the principle of collective security. But the debate, if we carry it out quickly and in good temper, will be a gain to the country. It will clear the air and the minds of all of us. It will remove any charge of bad faith that might be leveled at the administration because of Mr. Acheson's pledge. It will enable us to weigh the relative merits and dangers of the Brussels agreement and some of the other issues which are pressing for decision and then allow us to decide. Let us weigh the relative values of the different alternatives and decide. Then in good spirits I hope we may accept the results. Certainly I can pledge that if the decision goes against my particular point of view I will abide willingly and in good temper by the verdict of the majority.

II. THE BRUSSELS AGREEMENT AND THE THREE MAIN POINTS OF VIEW

Where then do we begin? We begin, Mr. President, with the fact that all responsible parties to the debate, both within and without the Congress, appear to be agreed on the basic ends which we seek, namely, to protect our country from Communist aggression. The differences are merely on means and methods, namely, when, at what points, how, and with whom we should prepare to defend our-

selves. The fact that our ends are the same and that we disagree only on means should take all bitterness out of this debate and enable us to discuss the issues as friends and brothers.

It is true that there are still some who hold that the immediate danger of Communist aggression is highly speculative or nonexistent. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for example, stated that it was not clear that the Russians contemplate a military conquest of the world.

I read from his remarks on page 65 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 5, 1951:

> In the first place, I believe they know it is impossible. It would take them at least a hundred years to get across the seas.

The Senator from Ohio apparently believes the Communists do not even contemplate military aggression with their own troops against Western Europe, but that they would move into West Germany with the Communist troops from East Germany, and possibly from Poland and Czechoslovakia as well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What I said was that there was, to my mind, no conclusive evidence of the fact that the Russians were going to attack. Further down I said there was a much greater possibility that they would, or something of that sort. I said I thought the chances were probably in favor of Russia not attacking, but certainly I did not venture to predict what they would do. I do not know what they will do. I think the chances are against attacking, but I certainly said that if there is a much greater possibility of its being done, we must take action against them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator had been willing to trust me a moment or two longer, he would have seen that I had a qualifying phrase about his views. I can assure him that I am trying to be completely fair.

I was going to say that the Senator from Ohio, despite these reservations, agrees with virtually all Americans, except Communists, fellow travelers, and honest pacifists, that—

> There is a greater possibility of a destructive war against our liberty than we have ever faced in the past.

So I did not mean to do the Senator wrong. If he had only waited for another sentence it would have been manifest that I was quoting his complete position.

The general debate which has arisen, therefore, is over the means and methods of averting such a war and of preparing to win it when and if it comes. If narrowed still further, the immediate question is whether we shall approve or disapprove the Brussels agreement.

There appear to be three main groups with conflicting views on these issues of the proper and wise means to use. The first group believes that we should not go through with our part of the Brussels agreement. The other two groups both believe that we should carry through with the Brussels agreement, but differ in regard to the degree of active interest which we should take in the affairs of Asia.

I think there will be no objection if I say that the first position is the Hoover position of protecting the United States and its outposts only.

1. THE TAFT-HOOVER POSITION: "PROTECT THE UNITED STATES AND OUTPOSTS ONLY"

First, there are those of the Taft-Hoover, or the "protect the United States and outposts only," school of thought who would confine our present efforts to the defense of America, but who would not use land armies importantly in that undertaking. I do not mean by this that there are not important differences in the views of the Senator from Ohio and those of former President Hoover. Mr. Hoover would apparently not take any real steps to defend the continents of either Asia or Europe, but would instead use island air bases, including Britain, primarily as a protective screen for the United States. The Senator from Ohio would use such bases, and many more of them than Mr. Hoover suggests, not only for this purpose but also for retaliatory and deterrent bombing over the continents of Asia and Europe themselves.

Both, however, see it as unwise and impractical to use American land forces on foreign soil to any appreciable extent, and certainly the general drift of their argument is against our committing more American ground troops upon either the continent of Europe or Asia. This group will, therefore, be opposed—unless they are convinced by the logic of this debate—to our furnishing 8 or 10 divisions for the defense of continental Europe as is reported to have been provided under the Brussels agreement.

2. THE "PROTECT EUROPE BUT NOT ASIA" POSITION

The second group, representing the "protect Europe but not Asia" position, believes that we should join in the defense of Western Europe and carry out the Brussels agreement. But this is about as far as they would go. They would slight any defense of Asia and would tend to confine our efforts to the defense of Western Europe. For Western Europe, it is said, is the vital seat of power and the only permanent head for the Russia serpent, which has its coils in so many satellite states of Europe and Asia.

These same persons would restrict our binding military commitments in the Pacific area to those outposts of our sea approaches—Japan, Okinawa, the other Ryukyus, Formosa, the Philippines, the small islands of the Pacific, New Zealand, and the subcontinent of Australia.

This group is supported by many in the councils of the executive government and by a number of able publicists. These men hold the view, of which the British are the strongest exponents, that the Communist timetable is geared for the next 3 years to picking up soft spots—and, incidentally, raw materials—in Asia, thus affording a considerable amount of time in which the west may vastly improve Europe's defenses. This school of thought sincerely believes that anything which diverts America's interests from the vital European theater merely serves the interests of Russian aggression. The advocates of this point of view are, therefore, more or less willing to let the continent of Asia go. They are resigned to this because they believe that we and Western Europe do not have the strength to defend both Asia and Western Europe and that if we are to protect the latter, we must abandon the former.

BRITAIN SEEMS TO AGREE WITH HOOVER'S POLICY

While this comparison may shock our British friends, it is nevertheless true that their reluctance to back us up in the Far East is very similar to Mr. Hoover's reluctance to back them up in Europe. The British are at present, therefore, largely isolationist in their attitudes toward the Far East. They apparently do not want to use any more of their strength to help defend the principle of collective security in areas such as Korea and China where their own national and material interests are not directly involved, although they probably would feel very differently were Malaya, Singapore, and India to be directly and immediately threatened. While I want to make it clear that I shall try to keep the term "isolationist" out of this debate in my remarks, if the British regard Mr. Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as isolationists, so far as Europe is concerned, they should not object if others regard them as isolationists in the matter of Asia, or at least the Far East.

This isolationism is the most charitable explanation of why the British early recognized the Chinese Communists; why, after the open and barefaced aggression by these Chinese Communists, they are still opposed to having the United Nations brand them as such; why they are opposed to having the United Nations or ourselves invoke economic sanctions against the Chinese Communists; and why they want the Chinese Communists seated in the United Nations itself. The British attitude is probably stiffened by the large profits which their traders are making from handling the huge volume of trade with Communist China through Hong Kong.

According to a report from Hong Kong which appeared in the New York Times January 3, section C, page 52, Hong Kong in the first 11 months of this year had 35 percent more trade than it had during the preceding 12 months. It had $1,150,000,000—American money—of trade. On a monthly rate this was 42 percent above the preceding year. And yet 1949 had previously been the year of greatest trade in the history of the port. In other words, the traders of Hong Kong have been making enormous profits out of supplying the Chinese Communists, and they are therefore strengthening the Chinese forces which are shooting down our troops and, indeed, British troops in Korea. I hope the British people will wake up to what is happening for I do not think they will approve of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question, on my promise that I shall not take more than a minute? I think it is timely to ask the question at this point in his address.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for an interjection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Illinois, who is making a very able address—and I wish the full membership of the Senate could be present to hear it—agree that the policy of doing business with Communist China is on a par with what was done by businessmen, both British and American, who were shipping scrap iron and oil to the Japanese war lords prior to Pearl Harbor, and that commercial dealings with blood money in support of a potential aggressor may have the same disastrous effects upon the peace and the security of the world which resulted from the dealings with the Japanese war lords in scrap iron and oil prior to December 7, 1941?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from California for his observation. I agree with him. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times of December 16. According to this dispatch written by Henry R. Lieberman from Hong Kong and appearing on page C 3, the British merchants in Hong Kong are opposing the United States ban on exports to Red China and to Hong Kong, saying it is a vicious blockade. The British colony in Hong Kong, at least, wants to continue this obviously profitable trade, even though at the time this dispatch was written the Chinese Communist armies were in the field attacking our men and others in the UN forces. I want to make clear, however, that this is not the sole reason for British action. It is merely one strand but a powerful one. British diplomats, elements of left-wing labor and the Hong Kong traders with their influence in the city of London are all at work to favor Red China. The British view of military strategy is, therefore, intensified by their short-run economic interests, although the same is not true of those Americans who follow the same line. They have no such economic interest.

3. THE "PROTECT FREEDOM EVERYWHERE WE CAN" POSITION

Third. There is finally a third school, to which I belong, which believes that the United States must strive to help put down aggression everywhere; provided, however, first, that other nations will adequately join us in the attempt; and second, that the places in which the aggression occurs, or threatens to occur, are accessible to our forces. I would call this the "Protect Freedom Everywhere We Can" position. It would be impracticable and unwise, for example, for us to try to resist Communist aggression in Tibet. But if joined by other nations in an equality of sacrifice, we believe that it is vital to resist Communist aggression not only in Western Europe, but also in Indochina, in Malaya, in Indonesia, in North Africa, in the Near East—yes, in India too.

We favor this because we believe that peace is indivisible, and because we believe that if aggression, particularly of the concerted Communist type, is allowed to succeed, it will build up the strength of the aggressors and encourage them to further aggression. We believe that it is better to check aggression in its early stages before it has gathered great headway, rather than merely deal with it later when, in full armor and swollen strength, it attacks us where the material and territorial interests necessary for our security are directly at stake.

We do not believe in this policy in order to be aggressive ourselves, nor from any desire to throw our weight around. We believe in it because we want the reign of law to triumph and want all men and nations to be able to live relatively free from the fear of attack, and hence be able to enjoy freedom and justice and to cultivate the arts of peace. We would like to have the United States, as the strongest Nation in the world, continue to take the lead in these efforts, although we have no desire to dictate to anyone, even in these worthwhile pursuits. For we believe that the ultimate safety of the United States lies in having a secure world and that our own safety, like that of other nations, is involved in the maintenance of peace everywhere.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield for an interjection, but not for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator repeat the conditions which he attaches?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, that other nations will adequately join us in our attempts to stop aggression. Second, that the places in which the aggression occurs, or threatens to occur, are accessible to our forces.

In the much-quoted words of John Donne, we believe that—

> No man is an island unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main.

Mr. President, let us consider the substance of these views. I hope I shall be able to state fairly the arguments for each and to pass a balanced judgment upon them. In all this discussion, we should remember that while the approval of the Brussels agreement or understanding is in the immediate foreground; in the background lies the question of our whole foreign policy and the proper programs for our military and economic defense.

III. THE TAFT-HOOVER PROGRAM OF "PROTECT THE UNITED STATES AND OUTPOSTS ONLY"

I shall try to state the so-called Taft-Hoover program to protect the United States and outposts only, and I shall try to state it as clearly and as strongly as I can.

The Taft-Hoover program, as I see it, rests upon the following four pillars as arguments. I may say that I merely wish to state their contentions. I do not agree with them. Nevertheless, I believe they should be stated concisely and vigorously.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, before the Senator goes into the discussion, will he yield for a question, not for the purpose of debate, but for the purpose of developing information?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; provided it is not too long.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice numerous references to the Brussels agreement. I also believe I heard the Senator say that we do not have the Brussels agreement before us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to have the Senator's opinion as to what is in the Brussels agreement, and the relation of General Eisenhower's visit to the Brussels agreement. I do not see how we can relate these things if we do not know what they mean.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to tantalize the very able Senator from Colorado excessively on this point. I may say that I shall come to that question later. We have all read the newspapers. We all have a rough idea of what is probably in the Brussels agreement. When I come to discuss the military situation I shall make explicit what the newspapers have to say, so far as the probable total number of divisions is concerned, and so far as target dates and American participation are concerned.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether he knows whether either our Committee on Armed Services or our Committee on Foreign Relations has been advised of the contents of the Brussels agreement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not a member of either of those committees. Therefore, of course, I do not know. But we all read the newspapers, and we have probably a fairly accurate idea of what that agreement is. Furthermore, we are all very certain that the Brussels agreement will provide for our furnishing further troops to the joint defense of Europe. While we may not know the precise number of troops called for, the principle of sending more troops is the real issue at stake.

Mr. President, let me state the four arguments, as I see them, behind the Taft-Hoover program.

First. The first argument runs to this effect: The countries of Western Europe, they say, will not cooperate fully or adequately in building a joint army capable of holding a military line against the Russians. The assumption here seem to be that Europe is so war-weary and so undermined by Communist strength and propaganda that it will not have the resolution to arm itself adequately or to resist. Even with the addition of 10 divisions or even 1,500,000 American troops, the total European forces, according to the Senator from Ohio, would not be enough to check the huge and well-organized Communist armies coming from the east. To commit any appreciable number of American troops to the continent would, therefore, according to him, and to others, be to invite their virtually certain destruction. It is implied that our troops would be either annihilated or captured, while less temperate exponents of this point of view have said that the very blood of those American boys would be upon the hands of those who sent them overseas.

Second. The second argument, as I see it, is that according to the Senator from Ohio, in order to fulfill our admitted commitments under the North Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program, however mistaken such agreements originally were, we should concentrate our support in the form of sea and air power. Without risking any appreciable number of ground troops, we should furnish a well-equipped air force to bomb the advancing Communist armies in the event war is declared. Then if the Communists took Western Europe by force, our airplanes could be used to destroy the steel and iron plants and in fact the whole industrial potential of that area, as well as targets in Russia.

Third. The third argument seems to be that the sending of additional American troops to Europe might provoke a Russian attack and hence hasten rather than delay war. "We should not," Mr. TAFT says, "be a military aggressor or give the impression of military aggression or incite a war which might otherwise never occur"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 5, 1951, page 61. The Senator from Ohio says that he does "not believe we shall be so welcome in Europe tomorrow, if war ever occurs"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 5, 1951, page 64—and that we would be less popular there if we were the "main instigators" of war, presumably by drawing a defense line in Western Europe and thus provoking Russia to attack.

Fourth. The fourth argument is that the giving military aid to Western Europe, including the use of ground troops, would involve us in such terrific expense that, according to the Senator from Ohio, there would be a yearly deficit of at least $20,000,000,000. This would mean inflation, the imposition of controls and an inevitable loss of what the Senator, calls "liberty at home." The Senator from Ohio believes his own program could be carried through with 3,000,000 men under arms, with a military budget of forty billions and a total budget of sixty-five billions. This sum, he believes, is about the most which can be raised by taxation and hence the most that can be spent without inflation and all its terrible results.

IV. A REFUTATION OF THE TAFT-HOOVER "PROTECT THE UNITED STATES AND OUTPOSTS ONLY" POSITION

I want to consider the relative soundness of these four main pillars upon which the conclusions of Messrs. TAFT and Hoover so largely rest and which have led them and their followers to regret the further commitments of troops contained in the Brussels agreement or understanding. I shall consider each of these objections in order and then I shall show some of the positive advantages of the Brussels agreement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of information with reference to the Brussels agreement and its commitments? Would I be correct in assuming that the Senator is speaking of the Brussels agreement as synonymous in terms with the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I have been waiting to develop this point, but inasmuch as the same question arises over and over, I may say that I have before me a number of copies of the New York Times, including the issues of Wednesday, January 3, and Sunday, December 24 and so on. The statement of reputable correspondents on several occasions is that it is believed that the Brussels agreement calls for a total strength in Western Europe of approximately 55 divisions; that it is probable that the American contribution is to be 10 divisions—possibly 8, but probably 10—and that the target date at which this maximum strength is to be reached, which was originally 1953, may possibly have been shoved forward to the end of 1952.

The Brussels agreement has not been given to the public. I do not know what its precise contents are. I have no inside sources of information, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I do not know whether any Member of the Senate knows more. But we do know that the correspondents of one of the most reliable newspapers in the United States, competent correspondents, have stated that these are the general terms. I have never heard a denial from the State Department that these are not the terms.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of information?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am assuming that the statements which we have seen in the press represent approximately the facts, although, so far as I am concerned the real issue is not so much how many troops shall we send, but shall we send further troops.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have again and again stated that in order to preserve continuity in my remarks I did not wish to yield for extended questioning.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me aid the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the Senator from New Jersey, at a hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee, asked the very question which is raised here. I asked what, if anything, were the agreements at Brussels. I was told that there were no fixed agreements, but that whatever there was was top secret, and that even the Senator from New Jersey, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, could not get any information whatever on the subject. I think my colleagues on that committee will bear out that statement. We were told that no comment of any kind should be made because of the danger of leakage to the press.

I am very much concerned about the statement that there is some agreement, because certainly the Foreign Relations Committee should know about it if it exists.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I read from the New York Times of Wednesday, January 3. If it is in the New York Times, I take it that it is available to everyone, and cannot be classified as secret. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with me in that statement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. All the Senator from New Jersey can say is that if the New York Times has this information and members of the Foreign Relations Committee cannot get it because it is top secret that is something that we ought to know about. It is a very important disclosure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know how the New York Times got this information. I merely say that to the best of my knowledge it is a responsible newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I merely say, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that we were told that it was such a top secret that we could not even be trusted with it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it the Senator from New Jersey reads the New York Times. I wonder if he noticed the article in the issue of Wednesday, January 3, section C, on page 47——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be regarded as top secret if I were to place it in the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I certainly think not. I am interested in what the New York Times got that members of the Foreign Relations Committee could not get.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] if I would be violating any rules of security if I were to place in the RECORD a quotation from the New York Times on the nature of the Brussels agreement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that this is merely an individual opinion. I am not undertaking to express the opinion of the Armed Services Committee, because we have had no meeting on this subject. However, it would not be a violation of any security regulation of which I have any knowledge to place any newspaper article in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Georgia. With the reassurance that I shall neither be subject to court martial as a Reserve officer nor expelled from membership in the United States Senate, I should like to place this passage in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from New York allow me a little time?

At the moment of his arrival General Eisenhower's total force probably will not

number more than eight effective divisions; two United States, two British with a third due soon, three French plus one Belgian. With this General Eisenhower must face for at least a year an estimated 175 combat Russian divisions. However, by the end of 1952—if the Atlantic alliance powers translate their paper plans into armed troops—General Eisenhower should be able to count on upwards of 55 Allied divisions in Europe—with 20 more pledged for the year following.

This is from a rather extended article analyzing and summarizing the results of the Brussels Conference by Benjamin Welles of the Times staff. And there have been other similar references.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I to understand that the Senator from Illinois now proposes that the Brussels agreement be submitted to the entire Senate in all its details, and that until it is ratified by the Senate it would not become effective?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no. I am proposing that it be submitted in its main outlines and principles to the Senate; that the general gist be submitted for discussion and approval, but that in the meantime it shall be operative. I am agreeing that the President has the constitutional power to act, and that no constitutional vacuum, so to speak, exists.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I ask one other question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Simply to clarify my own thinking. It is not quite clear to me how, if an agreement is submitted to the Senate for its consideration and ratification——

Mr. DOUGLAS. "Approval," I think, is a better word than "ratification."

Mr. LEHMAN. "Approval." I should have used that term. It is not clear to me how the President can then proceed to operate under the agreement, if, on the one hand, he submits an agreement to the Senate for its approval and then by action of a small body of men——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senate of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is rejected. I do not see how the President can then proceed without virtually defying and flouting the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is quite true. If it is submitted to the Senate, and the Senate votes it down, while the President could still have the constitutional power to act, I do not think he would have the moral right to act unless subsequent developments made it absolutely imperative.

Mr. LEHMAN. What would happen if the Senate took no action whatsoever; if there was a filibuster?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senate did not act, then the President would have the moral, as well as the constitutional, right to act. In other words, it is important that there should be a right to act, and if the Senate does not take advantage of its opportunity and decide, then the President should decide and act as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I listen to the siren from Colorado. He is a very attractive siren. I know unless I stuff wax in my ears or lash myself to the mast he is likely to lead me onto the rocks. However, I shall take that chance and yield for a slight observation, but not for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that we may get rid of the confusion of the nondisclosed Brussels agreement, I wonder whether we may assume that when the distinguished Senator contrasts these various views which have been offered, he himself is speaking in terms of sending ground troops over, say of the order of 8 or 10 divisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That will clarify the debate completely so far as getting the Senator's viewpoint of these various proposals is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and on the other hand the essence of the Taft-Hoover proposal is that we should not send further ground troops.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is explaining the essence of various proposals by others. I want to know what the Senator is proposing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for an observation, not for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I desire to clarify one point about the agreement. I have not read all the article from the New York Times. I do not think it is quite right to leave the impression, which is left, unless there is something else in the article that says there was a formal agreement at Brussels. I believe that article—the one which I read—leaves the impression that there were no more than tentative discussions as to plans; that there was no agreement. From what little discussion I have heard that is, I believe, a more accurate way to describe it than to leave the impression that there was a formal agreement arrived at in Brussels. My own view is that I think there were only discussions as to perhaps the proper way to proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is pretty hard to determine when flesh and tissue turn into cartilage, and cartilage into bone, and so on, and so on. The degrees of solidification are difficult to map out. But I read again from the New York Times, this time from the issue of Sunday, December 24, and for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan and others I will say it is in section 4 E, page 1, the second column, near the bottom:

> The contemplated Atlantic army would by no means equal Russia's—

And notice this—

> (One estimate puts the theoretical western figure at 55 divisions.)

In addition, it may be worth while to note that in the Atlantic Council's communique from Brussels on December 19, which appears in the New York Times for December 20, on page C 11, the following is stated:

> The North Atlantic Council, acting on the recommendations of its defense committee, today completed arrangements initiated in September last for the establishment in Europe of an integrated force under a centralized control and command. This force is to be composed of contingents contributed by the participating governments.

And 3 days later the report of the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, as reported on page C 3 of the Times for December 23, included the following:

> The important thing now in the future is action. At Brussels we did several things. We took recommendations which had come from the meetings immediately preceding in London and acted on those recommendations. They had to do with the creation of the united, unified, integrated army which is to provide for the defense of Europe.
>
> The papers which came to us laid out the structure of that army, how it should be composed, of what troops, where should the troops come from, how should it be organized, what was its command structure which would give that army its direction, and how should the supreme commander be selected and appointed. All of those matters were dealt with in the papers that came to us, and all of those matters were acted upon.
>
> The structure was agreed upon and the force was created.

From all of these reports it seems reasonable to conclude that agreements of substance were concluded.

1. WILL WESTERN EUROPE COOPERATE?

Now to return to the refutation of the Taft-Hoover contentions, the first pillar in the Taft-Hoover argument is their insistence that the morale of western Europe is so bad and its military strength so weak that it is foolhardy to endanger the lives of American troops by putting them beside the Europeans.

One strand in this argument is the widely held assumption that England, France, and the other European nations are shirking the job of rearmament. It is this belief, namely, that France and other European nations are shirking the job of rearmament, which lies behind the contention that, if we help western Europe with ground forces to the degree which we apparently promised at Brussels, we will be bearing far too much of the load. It was this feeling which apparently prompted Mr. Hoover to say that "before we land another man or another dollar on their shores" the European nations must supply "organized and equipped combat divisions in such huge numbers as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood."

A. DO WE HAVE AN EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE?

What then is the truth behind these assumptions which the advocates of the Taft-Hoover policy make hourly that Europe is not doing its share to protect itself?

Somewhat to my own surprise, I must confess, I find that even before the increases reported to have been decided upon at Brussels are added, the defense efforts of the western European nations are largely comparable to our own. Anyone who will look into the facts, Mr.

President, will discover that the picture that has been painted of our promising aid to people who will not help themselves is not an accurate picture at all.

What has helped to create the mistaken impression has been the superficial comparison of the total number of men we in the United States have under arms with the total number which a given European country such as France, Britain, or Holland has in its armed forces, and the absolute amounts which we spend for armaments compared with the total sums being expended by a given government. When, for example, it is found that we have more than three times as many in our Armed Forces as France and are spending 10 times as much on armament as Great Britain, the average person almost immediately forms the conclusion that these countries are lying down on the job. But what this snap judgment ignores is the fact that our population is more than three times as great as that of France—almost four times—while our national income is approximately six times that of the United Kingdom.

To use absolute figures to determine the relative degree of sacrifice as between countries is, therefore, absolutely fallacious. For we would not expect a middle-sized man to bear the same load as a giant or a poor man to contribute as much to the armed services as a millionaire. We, therefore, should use the relative degree of sacrifice rather than the absolute amount of sacrifice to find out how the various countries in the North Atlantic alliance compare with each other. In other words, we should not compare the total number of men under arms in the various countries, but the number per 1,000 population, or better still, if the figures were available, the number per 1,000 males between the ages of 18 and 45. And similarly we should not compare the total amounts spent for military purposes, but instead the percentages which these military expenditures form of the national income in the various countries.

But up to now, it has not been possible to find such comparisons as these upon which, in a sense, a large part of the argument actually turns.

I, therefore, have been trying for a considerable period of time to get the facts on these all important questions and have studied official publications and all other available sources. As a result, I think I am now able to present for the first time a series of these comparisons which should go a long way toward settling the question.

LET US COMPARE OUR EFFORTS WITH THOSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks table I comparing for this year and the year just ended the number of men in the Armed Forces per 1,000 population in the United States and the principal western European countries. I have put the same figures on the chart on the easel at the side of the room.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Numbers in armed forces per 1,000 population, North Atlantic treaty countries, except Canada*

Country	Population (millions)	Total armed forces	Number in armed forces per thousand of population
United States	[1] 152.3	[2] 2,106,633 [3] 2,771,121	14 18
United Kingdom	[4] 50.6	[5] 820,600 [6] 899,900	16 18
France	[7] 41.6	[5] 656,136 [6] 739,317	16 18
Italy	[7] 46.0	[10] 300,000	6.5
Norway, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, Portugal	[7] 35.2	[11] 350,000	10

[1] As of Jan. 1, 1951, Washington Star, Jan. 1, 1951, p. 1.
[2] Total armed strength under regular defense appropriations for 1951 and first supplemental appropriation of 1951.
[3] Total anticipated armed strength on June 30, 1951, under second supplemental appropriation bill of 1951. For source of this and preceding note see U. S. House of Representatives, hearings on second supplemental appropriation bill for 1951, pt. 1, p. 42.
[4] Mid-1950, UN Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Dec. 1950.
[5] As of Mar. 1950, including auxiliaries and territorials.
[6] Anticipated end total by Mar. 1951, under supplementary estimates for current fiscal year, New York Times, Dec. 6, 1950, p. 24.
[7] Mid-1949, UN Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Dec. 1950.
[8] As of Dec. 31, 1950, New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 1, 1951, p. 4.
[9] According to provisional budgets adopted for January and February 1951, New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 1, 1951, p. 4.
[10] This is the figure set by the Peace Treaty as the upper limit for Italian armed forces including the Carabinieri. Present forces are under treaty strength.
[11] Estimated. The actual number would probably be between 300,000 and 400,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that if any Senators wish to follow the argument in detail, I can have copies of the tables, and indeed, of my whole speech furnished to any Senators so they can follow the figures.

NUMBER OF MEN IN ARMED SERVICES PER 1,000 POPULATION

Table I, Mr. President, shows that the number of men per 1,000 of population in the Armed Forces of the United States for 1950 was 14 per thousand; for the United Kingdom, 16; for France, 16; for Italy, which has treaty restrictions on its forces, that is, a ceiling fixed by treaty, 6.5; and then I have pieced together the best estimates I can obtain in regard to Norway, Denmark, Luxemburg, Portugal, Holland, and Belgium, and I have lumped them together. I believe they have in their armed forces somewhere between 300,000 and 400,000, in total, and I have given the figure 350,000 as the most probable one. So for the Atlantic Pact countries in Scandinavia, the Low Countries, and Portugal, the figure is approximately 10 men in the armed services per 1,000 population.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator included in the calculation the number in the Reserves?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I have not; I have included only the actual number in the field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois has not taken into consideration the universal military training program in those countries, has he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not; that is correct; nor have I included in the calculation the number of men who have now passed out of the active armed forces in those countries.

So, Mr. President, we see that England and France had in their armed forces a larger number of men per thousand of population than the United States had, based on a total number of approximately 2,750,000.

Comparing anticipated strengths as of some date in the first half of 1951, Mr. President, we find, for the United States, 18 men per thousand in the armed forces; for the United Kingdom, 18; and for France, 18. Therefore it will be seen that this is a precise equality. Italy's figures remain restricted under treaty, and I do not have comparable 1951 figures for the smaller Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that in yesterday's Washington Star, if I am not mistaken, in the editorial section there was a special report, published by one of its contributing editors or one of its staff members, setting forth what the new developments were in the defense strength of the North Atlantic countries. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will include that report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I have pieced out some material, and in a few moments I shall include it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact, Mr. President, that I strongly criticized the small degree of sacrifice which other members of the United Nations, particularly Great Britain, have made so far as the war in Korea is concerned, it is only simple justice, and I am very happy to do so, to assert, that the principal Western European nations have, up to this time, gone step by step with us in at least mobilizing their total forces against the common danger. I think the figures I have cited are of enormous significance for this debate—perhaps more significant than my own remarks about the feasibility of committing United States troops to the defense of Europe, for our troops, Mr. President, will not carry a major share of the burden that must be borne.

Following out the query of the Senator from Minnesota, let me say, Mr. President, that the first table I have presented does not include figures on the strength of the organized reserves in the various countries. If these are included, France, with its compulsory military service and its approximately 1.5 million in reserve divisions, makes a still better showing, for its ratio of organized military strength is then approximately

50 per 1,000 population, as compared to our 20 per 1,000. On this basis, the French are doing twice as much as we are. It should not be forgotten that they and the British have had universal military training—not merely selective service—for some years, whereas we have not yet adopted it.

I think I should say that the French reserves are organized into divisions. It is not certain how fully equipped these are, and there may have been some slackening in combat efficiency. So I do not wish to overstretch the reserve strength which lies in the million and one-half French reserve troops; but they are there, and in some degree they are ready to take the field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Inasmuch as I have been declining to yield to other Senators for questions, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota only for an observation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make the observation that recent evidence indicates that most of the North Atlantic Pact countries are extending the period of their compulsory service and universal military training.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I shall make that point in a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall read ahead, then, in the Senator's prepared remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is always so alert that the point he makes is one which in simple logic should follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes he should announce that the Chair has no . .ht to recognize a Senator who is yielded to by another Senator, in order to permit the making of an observation only, unless unanimous consent for that purpose is given; and from this time forth the Chair will insist that unanimous consent must be obtained before a Senator may yield to another Senator to make an observation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question which will help the consecutiveness of his argument?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provided it does not take too long, and provided it does not lead me too far astray, and provided further, that it does not establish a precedent in regard to future yieldings.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator how many divisions France has uncommitted and how many divisions the United Kingdom has uncommitted—divisions which would be available for action in Western Europe at the present time if there were need for action?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know; but I read from the January 3 edition of the New York Times in which it was stated that at the moment of his arrival, General Eisenhower's total forces probably will not number more than eight effective divisions: two United States; two British, with a third due soon; three French; plus one Belgian.

Now let me continue with my presentation. Would the Senator from Colorado think me impolite if I were to ask to be permitted to continue, in order to develop the full force of my argument?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would never consider the Senator from Illinois impolite.

In speaking of the contributions of France and of the United Kingdom, which have been mentioned by the senior Senator from Illinois, and in connection with which he read from the New York Times, let me ask a question: Both of these nations are committed to actions against communism at the present time, are they not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The divisions which I mentioned are on the continent of Europe, and therefore those forces will be available.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean that of the armies committed, France has strength in Indochina, and it is committed; and the United Kingdom has committed divisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The United Kingdom has committed two divisions in Malaya, I believe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The United Kingdom has stationed divisions at other places in the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Colorado adds further strength to my argument that France and England are now, although not in the same degree, participating in this world-wide struggle. But the divisions they are to furnish in Europe are in addition to those now in service in other areas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Illinois makes the mistake of thinking that I am trying to weaken his argument. However, that is not the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I am delighted, for the Senator from Colorado is a very formidable antagonist; and now that I know he is in my camp, my spirits bound up. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Illinois does not completely obscure his argument by strict insistence upon consecutiveness, he may find an ally in his camp.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am trying to develop that these charts do not reach the end point of what is available for action in Western Europe if there is need.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but the chart shows the relative contributions of the various countries. As a matter of fact, if and when we commit 10 divisions or so to Western Europe, that will not be all we have. We will have some more in Asia and Japan and some more at home.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is very interesting, but not decisive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that last year the French had in their army more men per thousand of population than we had in ours, I could, indeed, pardon an ex-President of France—although I would not agree with him—if he were to go on the airways to proclaim that France would not contribute another man or another franc until America had matched them with an equality of service. I hasten to say that I hope no ex-President of France would do so, for I do not think it would be correct for such a statement to be made. However, I could understand it if an ex-President of France were to make such a statement, and it might be just as sound for him to do so as for another ex-President to say that not another man or another dollar should be contributed on our part until France had matched us.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To go into the matter of statements by ex-Presidents is dangerous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This ex-President of France is nameless; he could be one of a number.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to throw a little light on the question I raised a moment ago, before we pass beyond that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the New York Times of January 5, I have noted a question put to General Eisenhower, as follows:

> Question. At the last meeting of the North Atlantic Defense Ministers they announced that they had reached an agreement on what each nation should contribute in types and numbers.

This is the answer by General Eisenhower:

> Answer. I simply shall have to plead ignorance. I am not dodging the question. I know nothing about it, and I don't see how—until someone in a relative position of authority can dig into it—how it could be fixed beyond peradventure of change.

I think General Eisenhower certainly must have known if there had been an actual agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The principle was established. There were undoubtedly some understandings, and with the high record for accuracy of the New York Times, I believe that it is not too far from the truth. If General Eisenhower stated that final agreements on details were not reached, I am confident that also is true.

Let us remember also that under the Brussels plan, according to reports, the French, British, and all the smaller countries have pledged themselves materially to increase their armed forces. The proportions for all countries are going to rise, but I have not been able to obtain the figures. The Senator from Arkansas says the proportions have not yet been agreed upon, but I am confident they will show a substantial equality of sacrifice on the part of the other members of the pact. I hope that the terms of the Brussels agreement will provide for a substantial increase in the relative contributions which the smaller countries, such as Belgium, Holland, Canada, and other nations, will make to the common defense. All too frequently there is a tendency on the part of the small countries to take a free ride upon the strength of the large countries and to depend for their protection upon the strength of the large nations, but since this is a common battle, they should make their own contributions as well, and these should approach an equality with the three big powers. Belgium and Holland, for example, should rise nearer to the level of France.

OTHER FACTORS INDICATING WESTERN EUROPE IS INCREASING HER STRENGTH

I now come to a further point, namely, what is in the works for these other countries. I have gone over the foreign press and periodicals, and have pieced

together what I think is happening in the other nations.

The Belgian Parliament, for example, is considering an increase in military service from 12 to 24 months. There should be an increase of about 50 percent in military forces by the end of 1951. The military budget is being substantially increased.

Luxemburg, a country large enough to have an ambassador from us—or is she but a minister—is considering increases in both military forces and defense budget.

Denmark has increased its military budget more than 50 percent and is planning a sizable increase in armed forces by the end of next year. It is considering increasing military service from 12 to 18 months.

France is undertaking a rapid build-up of forces, despite the heavy drain caused by operations in Indochina.

This I think is not classified, but I believe is in the newspapers. They have announced a new 20-division program, of which 5 will be created and equipped in 1951. The period of military service has been increased from 12 to 18 months.

The Italian forces are limited to the present level by the peace treaty. Italy is improving the quality of her troops and undertaking large military production. That country now conscripts for 12 months and is planning an increase to 15 months.

The Dutch picture is complicated by the planned reduction after the Indonesian war ended. Both military forces and the defense budget were reduced then and have not yet been substantially increased. However, they are raising, according to my understanding, another division next year. Military service is now 12 months, and they are considering an increase to 18 months.

The Norwegians are undertaking an immediate increase in forces and conscript for 10 to 12 months. So far they have not announced an increased budget or increased the period of military service, but are considering an increase in military service to 18 months.

The United Kingdom has announced an increased strength next year of about 100,000. It is my impression, though I may not be able to verify it, that they have since said that their strength would go up by 200,000. In fact the wire services today carry a story of substantial British increases reported to General Eisenhower. She has increased military service from 18 to 24 months and has urged other Atlantic Pact countries to do likewise. She is also undertaking a very large production program which should provide the bulk of equipment for her own forces.

All this bears out the statement on this point which the President made in his state of the Union speech on last Monday.

Mr. President, I am not contending that all the other countries are doing everything they should; I am not contending that any of them is doing everything it should. I do not think we are doing all we should. I merely say that on a comparative basis the European countries are marching along with us, and that they cannot be disregarded, and cannot be said to be shirking their duty. That is all I say on this point, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, provided I do not establish a dangerous precedent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe my question will be very germane. Was not the military preparedness of some of the North Atlantic Pact countries diminished or weakened by reason of the fact that many of them came out of World War II practically destroyed, immobilized, after having been under the occupation of German armies?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also a fact that they had no equipment or manpower organized into divisional strength, or military power?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. The European countries, including France and England, as well as Italy, bore the direct burden of the war. As we all know, they have been in an extremely bad condition, with plants destroyed, people starving, and industry in difficulties. They are building up slowly. They are getting on their feet now, but, in view of the burdens they have sustained and the losses they have suffered, I do not think we should condemn them, particularly in view of the efforts which they have made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that most of these countries, such as Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Luxemburg, and even France, were without military forces even as late as 1946, in terms of a real, organized strength?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Their strength was broken through the war, and they did not have a wartime basis of strength upon which to build in peacetime. They had to start to build up their armies again from scratch.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that one of the requirements of the Marshall plan of economic assistance was that the Marshall-plan funds were to be used for domestic economic peacetime development, not for the military potential?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. We were hoping that the world would be at peace, and our purpose was to build up Europe so that the countries might enjoy the fruits of increased production, and not have it siphoned off into war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me at that point, I should like to say that I saw an article recently——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield only for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield for a brief observation, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wished to say that I read in the press recently certain itemized statements regarding refunds we had required from certain European countries, when some of the materials had been diverted to military purposes. The theory was that it was partly by way of propaganda and partly for other reasons that we were extending Marshall-plan aid for the purpose of building up the strength of those countries.

PERCENTAGE OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT DEVOTED TO DEFENSE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again, Mr. President, if we look at the question of equality of sacrifice in the total defense effort from the point of view not of men but of relative expenditures—dollars, not men—we find no great disparity between what the British and French have been demanding of their people and what we have been demanding of ours.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert table II which compares the percentage of gross national product devoted to defense in the United States with the principal countries of Western Europe.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Percentage of gross national product devoted to national defense—United States, United Kingdom, France, and Italy*

Country	Defense budget (millions)		Percent of gross national product	
	Present rate	1951 rate	Present rate	1951 rate
United Kingdom	2,380	3,108	6.4	8.0
France	1,640	2,451	7.3	9.7
Italy	595	915	4.5	6.4
United States	[1] 25,000	(2)	8.7	(2)

[1] Estimated present annual rate. Appropriations have totaled about $47.7 billion which would be 16.7 percent of the gross national product, but we are not spending as fast as we appropriate.

[2] Not available.

Source: Statistical office of the United Nations—National and per capita incomes, 70 countries 1949; various newspapers; Department of State.

Mr MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may yield for a question only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield for a very brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the degree of peril should also have some relationship to the degree of preparedness.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, certainly; but, if the Senator will permit me to show these figures——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am coming back.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator was going to be like Captain Shotover in Bernard Shaw's Heartbreak House, who would always ask questions and then go out the door before anyone could answer them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I never get on a bicycle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Table II which I have incorporated in the RECORD shows the defense budget of the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and the United States, and the percentage relationship of that budget to the gross national product of those countries. The gross national product, though it is a substantially accurate figure, is somewhat higher than national income, since it includes such items as interest on the national debt and payments to veterans, for which no current services are being given, and does not deduct anything for depreciation.

At the present rate, the percentage of gross national product devoted to national defense in the United States is 8.7; in the United Kingdom, 6.4; in France, 7.3; and in Italy, 4.5. The disparities between those three countries except for Italy, which is limited by the peace treaty, and our own country at the present rate of expenditures are therefore significantly small. This is shown graphically by the chart which I have here placed on this easel.

I may say that I took the American figure at the present rate of $25,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for a brief observation by the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe my observation will throw some light upon the proposition stated by the Senator from Illinois. I understand the figures named are percentages of the gross national product at the present rate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it should be made clear that the national product itself was not too large. The British have been living under a program of austerity. The American people have been enjoying a relatively high standard of living. The average workingman in England has been suffering from low wages and high prices. A man who is receiving only $800 a year would be paying the lion's share, but if we take such a percentage from a man who receives $10,000 a year, it is merely spending money. These percentages are more of a sacrifice in terms of the national product than is the percentage of 8.7 in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota moves so quickly that I no sooner mention a point than he draws a logical conclusion with reference to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am moved by the Senator's argument. I have a sensitiveness to the logic which he is putting forth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Until we get a chance to study the President's budget message which came here only an hour or two ago, we are not, of course, able to project a rate for the United States, but I think the rate projected for Britain, France, and Italy is of the greatest significance, in view of the effort it reveals.

I have spent a little time in trying to study the budgets for 1951 for those nations. In brief, they show that the British rate will rise from 6.4 to 8 percent of the gross national product, while the French rate will go up from 7.3 to 9.7, or virtually 10 percent. Even the Italian rate will increase to 6.4 percent. These figures show that the European countries are buckling down to the task—and the budgets were presented before the Brussels conference, I think—and that France, whose willingness to sacrifice has been so disparaged, has, on a comparative basis, probably been doing the best of all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarifying inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the charts which the able Senator has presented show the total expenditures and projected expenditures for the several countries out of their own funds, or whether the rate of expenditure includes expenditures from the arms-implementation aid for which they are getting United States funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They come from their appropriations, and, therefore, would not include military equipment directly furnished by this country. Cash contributions from this country probably are included but I do not have any record of their amount.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me ask one additional question for clarification. Of course, the Senator, in pointing out the various considerations, all of which are properly brought before the Congress of the United States, I am sure, would not lose sight of the fact that the cost of fitting and equipping a division in France, Britain, or Belgium, is nowhere near comparable to the cost of equipping a division in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall point that out in a few moments. It strengthens the point I am trying to make, that their contributions will be greater than is indicated by the budget itself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But, by the same token, for the same amount of money they would be getting more divisions proportionately than we would get.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These comparisons are in proportion to income, not total amounts of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not had the opportunity to examine the French budget in the detail which I should have liked to examine it. There may be some padding of military expenditures in the current French budget. I am told that in previous years military expenditures in France have sometimes been concealed in civilian expenditures. There is a possibility that this year the French may have concealed some civilian expenditures in the military budget, and that, therefore, the figures for next year may somewhat exaggerate the French effort. I want to put that in as a clarification. Nevertheless, it is probable that these inclusions are not grossly significant in amount. The evidence does indicate that the French, on the whole, have been doing quite well.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was exactly what I was going to ask.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought from the gleam in the eye of the Senator from Michigan that that was what he was going to ask, and that therefore I should make the point before he did. I was, however, going to make it anyway.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has the correct analysis of the gleam.

PERCENTAGE OF PER CAPITA INCOME DEVOTED TO DEFENSE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Given our enormous per capita income, Mr. President, and the after effects of World War II in Europe, it is perhaps unfair to compare the United States, British, French, and Italian defense efforts in terms of amounts spent per capita. In table III which I shall insert, I have done just that, but I then made a second comparison in the same table of the percentage of per capita income spent for defense purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks table III, which compares the United States with the principal Western European countries on the basis of percentage of per capita income devoted to defense.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Percentage of per capita income spent for defense purposes—United States, United Kingdom, France, and Italy*

Country	Population (millions) [1]	Defense budget (Millions of United States dollars) [2]		Per capita expenditure for defense (United States dollars)		Per capita income (United States dollars) [3]	Percentage of per capita income spent for defense	
		Present rate	1951 rate	Present rate	1951 rate		Present	1951
United Kingdom	50.6	2,380	3,108	47	61	773	6	8
France	41.6	1,640	2,451	39	59	482	8	12
Italy	46.3	595	915	13	20	235	5½	8½
United States	152.3	[4] 25,000	[5]	164	[5]	1,453	11	[5]

[1] For population references see notes 1, 2, and 3 of table I.
[2] Source: Department of State and various newspapers.
[3] Statistical Office of the United Nations, pp. 14-17.
[4] See note 1 of table II.
[5] Not available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at first glance, it would seem that the United States is contributing much more on a per capita basis than the other countries. However, when we consider the much lower per capita income of these countries compared to that of the United States, we get a very different picture. When we compare the percentage of per capita income spent for defense, we find that now, the United Kingdom spends 6 percent; France, 8 percent; Italy, 5½ percent; and the United States, 11 percent. In 1951, the rate will be United Kingdom, 8 percent; France, 12 percent; and Italy, 8½ percent. I do not have the 1951 figures for the United States. Thus, by comparing the percentages of per capita income spent for defense, we find the figures even closer.

Furthermore, it is much more difficult for a country with a small per capita income to spend the same percentage for defense as a country like the United States, with a high per capita income. Or, conversely, with a high income a country can spend more with no greater sacrifice. It can spend a larger percentage for defense with no greater sacrifice, possibly with less sacrifice, than can a poorer nation. It is this principle which lies behind our use of the graduated income tax for individuals. I am not saying that Western Europe is contributing more than we are. But I do say that the difference is not nearly as great as is commonly believed.

THE MILITARY DOLLAR GOES FARTHER IN WESTERN EUROPE

There is yet another factor to which the Senator from California referred, which makes the European sacrifice greater than it seems to be even on the basis of relative money figures. This is the fact that a considerable portion of our military expenditures goes to provide a relatively high scale of pay and of comforts for our troops in comparison with those enjoyed by the European soldier whose pay is insignificant and whose comforts are meager.

This means that there is a greater sacrifice per European soldier and his family, which does not show up in the money figures, than is the case with us. I hasten to add that, of course, I approve of the American system, since we certainly should not discriminate against the soldier in favor of the stay-at-home. But this fact should make us realize more vividly the nature of the real sacrifices which the peoples of the European countries are already making. This point is further strengthened when we remember that the cost of producing the same machine gun, cannon, shell, airplane, or ship is much greater in the United States than abroad and that they consequently can buy more defense with less money than we.

So, Mr. President, whatever one can say about the lack of sacrifice by the European countries in Korea, and we should recall that they are, of course, heavily committed in Indochina and Malaya, in Western Europe we are decidedly not offering to defend nations which have refused to meet their own military commitments. They are doing pretty well. I do not think this debate should therefore proceed on an assumption which facts show to be completely unwarranted.

I have said some rather bitter things this afternoon which I think, nevertheless, are true, although in saying them, it should be remembered that the nations are heavily charged with many burdens. I think that in the long run the fact that all the nations of the world have contributed only about 20,000 troops to back up the United Nations in Korea in comparison with our approximately 140,000 is something which the people of Great Britain and France will ultimately regret when they have learned the truth. But whatever we may say about their failure to support the United Nations action in Korea, they are doing fairly well so far as their total contribution to their own defense is concerned.

So much for the first fallacy in the argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

B. THE SHARE OF WESTERN EUROPE UNDER THE BRUSSELS AGREEMENT

A second fallacy in the Senator's assumption that Europe lacks a willingness to resist is revealed by the relative proportions of the future European army which, according to the best unofficial estimates, are to be contributed by us and by the other countries.

According to press reports, and as repeated on the floor of the Senate, it is estimated that the Brussels Agreement calls for a total ground force by the end of 1953, or somewhat earlier, of about 55 combat divisions. On the basis of the repeated and responsible press speculations as to the agreed ratios of troop contributions, apparently only 10 of these divisions are to be furnished by us while Western Europe is to supply the balance, with the question of Western Germany's participation still to be worked out. Instead of the United States being expected to furnish the major portion of the Western European army, as so many believe, if these reports are even reasonably accurate, we are obligated in fact to furnish a little less than a fifth, or about 18 percent of the total. Even if it is impossible to get the West Germans to contribute the quota desired of them, the American share on the basis of the lower ratio estimates of 3½ to 1 would still be only two-ninths, or 22 percent of the total.

When we take into consideration the supply troops and reserve components which France and England would undoubtedly furnish and the relatively greater dangers which the civilian populations of Western Europe would experience, it should become crystal clear that the overwhelming proportion of the military burden of the hardships will still be borne by the Western Europeans. This is only proper, because they are the ones who stand to lose most from conquest by the Communists. But it also happens to be not only proper, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, but apparently also true that they will have the main burden.

C. WILL 10 UNITED STATES DIVISIONS DO ANY GOOD?

The third strand in the first argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that Western Europe will not cooperate, is indicated by his query on the floor of the Senate as to what good 10 divisions will do, and by his still more extraordinary statement that even a million and a half of our men would not be enough to save Europe. Of course, his position is partially based on the assumption that the Western European nations are shirking their job and that they will not contribute enough under the Brussels agreement. I think I have shown that these assumptions are contrary to the fact.

Here again the Senator from Ohio, for all his ability—and it is great—misses the real point most grievously. No one contends that 10 divisions by themselves could stop the Communist armies. Perhaps even a million and a half men could not do so, although it is possible that they might, if we furnished them with adequate equipment and fire power. But the 10 American divisions, as we have shown, would merely be additions or increments to a European force which would be from four to five times larger. Moreover, the American forces would be the vital increment which would to a great extent create the willingness of Western Europeans to enlarge their armies. For Western Europe is largely in the following position: They have been doing about as well as we in arming, but they do not want to make the extra effort or to take the risk of attack unless we contribute our share of the added effort and unless we stand along with them. If we add 8 more divisions to our existing 2 in Western Germany, the European nations will add from 28 to 36 more. If we refuse, they will probably not add any and may indeed throw in the sponge.

What we should really take into account, therefore, is not the 10 divisions which we furnish, but the added 28 to 36 which they will call forth. Ten divisions will not be able to hold the Communists, but 55 will have a good chance of doing so. Anyone who has ever tried to raise money for a charity or a college knows the evocative power of the contingent gift. When a man says "I will give a million, provided others will give three million," he imparts hope to the fund raisers and makes it easier for others to give. For they know that their gifts will carry with them a portion of the contingent gift, and hence provide a sum greater than that which they directly furnish.

It is by this principle that Tolstoi and Lloyd Douglas explain the miracle of the loaves and fishes. For in their version, nearly everyone who went out into the desert with Jesus had bread and fish in their pockets, but did not want to take their lunch out to eat, lest others ask them for a share. But our Saviour, by sharing what he had with the needy, made them somewhat ashamed of themselves, so the multitude took out what they had and shared it. And when they had done this, there was more than enough for all.

There is a direct moral in this story which followers of Senator TAFT would do well to ponder. Nor is any such venture of faith required of us as that which our Saviour made. For the response of

our allies will not be conjectural but contractual. If we put up 8 more divisions, they will put up from 28 to 36 more.

2. WILL AIR AND SEA POWER AID TO WESTERN EUROPE BE ENOUGH?

Now may I take up the second main argument of the Senator from Ohio, namely, that we will be making an ample contribution toward the defense of Europe by using our air and sea power and virtually that alone without land forces.

The experience of World War II and the experience of Korea, Mr. President, have surely taught us that air attacks will not stop land armies. I am not overlooking the point made here on the floor by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that in Korea our air forces were prohibited from attacking the major sources of Communist supplies behind the Manchurian border. But neither did they deter the continued advances on the Korean Peninsula itself of Communist infantry possessed of superior numbers and willing to take huge losses, even though almost throughout the entire Korean campaign we had the mastery of the air and could bomb both the front line and the enemy bases in northern Korea.

In World War II we found that air attacks as a deterrent to enemy troop advances were feasible only in opening up a temporary beachhead or permitting a limited withdrawal. And even in these cases how many times did not the Army and the Marines find that an area that was alleged by the Air Force to have been cleared by our air operations bristled when the troops arrived, with not only the infantry, but the artillery and in some cases the tanks of the enemy. Those who fought at Tarawa, Pelelieu, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa know to the full the bitter truth of this statement.

But would not the atomic bomb and the still more powerful H-bomb prevent the Russians and their satellites from conquering Western Europe? I would state that I do not believe that the use of the atomic bomb on Russian troops before they engaged the troops of our western allies would by itself deter the Red Army from overrunning the continent. Moreover, if the A-bomb were dropped upon the Communist armies when they were closely locked in combat with the western Europeans, it might do almost as much harm to our allies as to our enemies.

But is the H-bomb, which Mr. W. L. Laurence estimates may possibly destroy everything within an area of 300 square miles, a sure defense against land armies? All I can say is that I understand it is still a gamble as to whether the H-bomb will actually go off and that, even if it does, its military effect is still uncertain. It is, therefore, foolish to put our trust in something which may never materialize.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say that although it may still be a gamble, as the Senator from Illinois says, whether the H-bomb would actually go off, if it were to go off its military effect would not be uncertain. I say to the Senator that if it did go off its military effect would be very certain indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it might destroy as many of our troops as it would destroy enemy troops if it went off while the troops were closely locked in combat.

Mr. McMAHON. It would not be dropped at that point of combat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The only conclusion we can draw from all this is that our air power by itself will not stop the Communist troops from moving to the English Channel. An adequate supply of ground troops will be needed to do that. Infantry and artillery are still needed, as Korea has shown, and all the scientific push-buttons and military gadgets have not made them obsolete.

What the proposal of the Senator from Ohio in effect amounts to is, therefore, that we should reconcile ourselves to letting the Communists take over Western Europe. Indeed, when I pressed him on this point in the debate on January 5, with the candor which makes us all admire him even when we disagree with him, he replied that such in effect would be the consequences.

But Mr. TAFT apparently believes that even though the continent of Europe were to fall, we would still be able to retain Britain as an air base from which we could launch retaliatory attacks and destroy the heavy industry of Europe in order to prevent its being used by the Russians.

Two comments are sufficient on this latter point. In the first place, island bases, whether relied upon as a protective screen or as a place from which to harass the European and Asiatic continents, cannot be held for long in the days of robot bombs, guided missiles, and so on. In the Second World War we learned how to use antiaircraft fire against the V–1. It was, however, powerless against the V–2 even in 1944, and their captive German scientists have no doubt helped the Russians vastly improve the V–2 model. Unless the source of the enemy's missiles can be pushed back by ground action, an island base on the periphery of a continent already lost is, therefore, the constant object of attrition. If the continent of Europe falls, then England, only 20 miles across the channel, despite all its heroism, can either be neutralized or forced to give up. We will then lose the very island bases upon which Mr. Hoover and the Senator from Ohio so greatly depend.

HOW NOT TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE

The Europeans, moreover, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has pointed out, cannot be thrilled with joy by the fact that the Senator from Ohio first offers them aerial aid which he admits will be ineffective and then promises them that after this has failed, he will destroy their industrial plant and possibly their cities by attacks from the air. This is hardly the way to win friends and influence people and, in fact, almost no better way than this could be devised to develop anti-American and pro-Russian sentiment on the continent of Europe.

Now suppose we were to adopt the policy of the Senator from Ohio of refusing to support Western Europe with ground troops and offering air and sea power only. It would, in effect, withdraw our strength from continental Western Europe and create a power vacuum which the Communists would inevitably fill. For, while we do not at present have a large force of ground troops there, the potential of further American ground forces plus our possession of the atom bomb has been the force which has heretofore filled the vacuum. It has at once kept the Russians at bay and the anti-Communist governments in power.

The freedom-loving peoples of Western Europe would certainly feel that they had been abandoned if after having assurances of our help, we were suddenly to deny it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield for an observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to bring to the Senator's attention what is fairly well known in postwar history, namely, that if American forces had not been in Austria—for one example, Vienna—on repeated occasions the Russians would have moved in and taken over the entire country. I think that is the thesis which the Senator is advancing here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All we have to do is to leave a vacuum, and Mr. Stalin has plenty of force ready to move into the vacuum. We found that out in the Berlin area, and in every other place where our occupation forces were located.

It seems to me that rather than try to project an argument into the future, as the Senator from Ohio is trying to do, the wise thing to do would be to observe what is going on in the world now. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that he check into the political and military history which centers around Austria. Time after time there has occurred the very thing which the Senator from Illinois has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the observation of the Senator from Minnesota may be conveyed to the Senator from Ohio.

Faced with the prospect of a long-drawn-out war, many western Europeans might feel it to their advantage to join wholeheartedly with Russia, and willingly produce for and fight with them against us because of this abandonment.

Pro-American governments would fall on all sides, and the Communists would seize power as they did in Czechoslovakia. We remember Czechoslovakia as one of our best friends in Europe. But once the Communists seized power, suppressed free speech and free press, and purged the anti-Communists, Czechoslovakia became our enemy and will now, if called upon, fight against us. I am not sure the people of Czechoslovakia will like this, but their rulers will compel it.

We cannot consider this problem by itself. In the first place, the two possibilities of having Western Europe fight

or not fight the Communists are not the only ones. We should also consider the possibility of Europe fighting against us. There are strong Communist elements in these countries and when they are coupled with the neutralists, appeasers, and those who would become disgruntled with our refusal to help defend Western Europe, the ranks of the Communist armies might be further filled and the productive might of Western Europe might be willingly turned against us.

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE

But what if we show a genuine desire to cooperate on terms of equal sacrifice with the countries of Western Europe? We would be telling them, "We will help to defend you at once. We will not wait until you are conquered, but will do everything in our power to prevent you from being conquered and do it immediately. We will fight with you, side by side. If we are ultimately pushed off the Continent we will regroup our joint forces and fight on from England. If we are pushed out of England, we will again regroup and fight on from America. We will never give up. We will never let you down. And we mean it. For we consider your security as our security."

What kind of a response would this get? Of course the Communists might say it would be an act of war. But to freedom-loving people it would be hope; and this hope would be the rallying focus about which all the anti-Communist forces of the world could unite and stop the Russian onslaught.

Suppose after a hard struggle, we were ultimately pushed out of Europe. The people there—knowing that we had honorably fought for their defense and knowing that we would never give up, would certainly be encouraged to go underground and to form as effective resistence units as possible. Their cooperation with the Communists would take place only at gun-point. But if we abandon Western Europe, do not be surprised if they more compliantly fight and produce against us.

We simply must recognize this foreign and military policy problem for what it is—it is a problem of survival. I have great faith in American fighting men and American productive capacity. But if we decide on a policy of abandoning Europe, we should face the consequence of having nearly the whole world against us. Perhaps we could ultimately win such a war—perhaps not. But one thing is certain. If war does come, it would be far better to have the manpower and productive might of Western Europe on our side. Even though the Russians might ultimately take it over, we would still have most of the people on our side. To the degree that resistance is possible in a police state and on a lost continent, Russia would be weakened by the opposition of the people. But if we abandon them, the people might well be against us.

Even were we to win the final war, with the people of all of continental Europe against us, it would take years longer, sap our strength and cause the loss of hundreds of thousands more lives than if we had the cooperation of Europe.

We cannot and should not attempt to pull in our forces, abandon our allies, and try to fight the Communist world alone. It would be a great mistake, and it could very well lose a war.

3. WILL SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO WESTERN EUROPE PROVOKE RUSSIA TO WAR?

Then, Mr. President, we are told that committing American troops to the land defense of Europe would stimulate the Russians to attack. That argument virtually says you should maintain yourself in a position of permanent inferiority lest you offend someone who is stronger. The end result is always to put yourselves at the mercy of the strong, whereas I believe that nothing in recent American foreign policy has been so clearly correct as the view that one must build up areas of strength from which to negotiate. The trouble has been that while we have talked about this, we have not built up the military strength required to defend the areas which we have so blithely talked about. It is not enough to have young men in tweed suits on Foggy Bottom write memoranda about "areas of strength." It is necessary to have men in khaki who will make this talk come true.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Dakota well knows that there is no Member of the Senate whom I like more than I do him. I should very much like to yield for a question, provided it does not take too long.

Mr. LANGER. It is a very simple question. If we have not built up the necessary strength, whose fault is it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is our fault. A part of the fault lies right here in Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Whose fault is it, that of the Democrats or the Republicans?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Both. It is the fault of the administration, the Democrats, and the Republicans. I must confess that I think I have some share of the guilt myself. I think the Senator from North Dakota may have a little share of the guilt.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the Democrats have been in charge of the Government ever since 1932? The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] mentioned the Berlin airlift. Whose fault was it that the Russians had all the land surrounding Berlin? He mentioned Austria, and particularly Vienna. Whose fault was it that all around Vienna the Russians had full and absolute control? Whose fault was it that American blood was shed to take the northern part of Austria? When the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was High Commissioner over there, whose fault was it that he received an order to surrender all that territory to Joe Stalin?

As I understand the situation now, the distinguished Senator from Illinois is going all over the world. If we do not whip the enemy in Germany we will whip him in Austria. If we do not whip him there, we will attack him in Russia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not say that.

Mr. LANGER. If we do not win there, we are going to defend India. If we do not win there, we are going into China.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not say that, either. The Senator from North Dakota is letting his imagination carry him away.

Mr. LANGER. Did not my distinguished friend say a moment ago that no matter where the enemy was, we would fight him there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In my judgment, we should resist Communist aggression everywhere with two provisos: First, that the places are militarily accessible; second, that other countries help us in adequate numbers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am torn between my affection for my dear friend and my desire to finish my speech before midnight.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator just one more question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for one more question.

Mr. LANGER. I want my distinguished friend to tell me where all the young men—and old men—are to come from to defend countries all over the world. We have not got them in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They should come from the free world as a whole. Of course, we cannot resist Communist aggression all over the world by ourselves without help. Other non-Communist countries should share the burden. But what I do say is that if we can encourage such help by our own willingness to resist aggression, it would be far better than letting the Communists take over the whole world, even excepting the Western Hemisphere. For, if we do not resist this aggression now, I say that we will be alone, without allies, to face the Communists. I would rather the young men—and the old men—had allies with them if we have to fight Russia than for them to face Russia alone.

It could only have been an injudicious and hasty remark of the senior Senator from Ohio after his formal address of January 5 when he said during a colloquy that the United States, to the people of Europe, might appear the main instigators of war, presumably by drawing a defense line on the European continent and thus provoking Russian aggression. I hope that statement does not reflect the considered opinion of the Senator from Ohio, and I feel sure it does not. I think that was a hasty statement which he injudiciously made. I hope very much that it does not reflect his considered opinion. Without his intending it, I think it has already done a great deal of harm and will do more unless corrected. For the only implication the average man could draw from his statement "if we are the main instigators of the war" is that we would be the instigators if we sent men and arms to Europe. This statement can be used against

us in Europe even though it will not be so.

Mr. President, at this late day it can hardly be true either in Europe or America that we must still debate what power appears to be the main instigator of world war III, if that war should come upon us. There are plenty of issues which do need debate, as my own remarks today explicitly assume. But this is certainly not one. We have but to examine the record, Mr. President, to see whether Russia or the United States has been the more vigorous seeker of peace.

WHO HAS BEEN THE MORE VIGOROUS SEEKER OF PEACE, THE UNITED STATES OR RUSSIA?

I should like to touch very briefly on the history of the 5½ years between World War II and the Korean War. After World War II we disarmed from a military strength of 13,000,000 men to 1,500,000 with a scant 12 divisions prior to the Korean attack. Russia probably did not cut its total force by more than one-half and now has 175 divisions, which, as compared with our somewhat larger tables of organization, would probably be the equivalent of 135 to 140 American divisions.

We offered to share the secret of atomic energy with the whole world, including Russia and to denature our atomic bombs, provided only that there should be an adequate international inspection to which we ourselves would be subject, to prevent any country from making atomic bombs. Russia refused to agree to this international inspection.

We sought, through the United Nations, to create a pooled force to resist aggression. Russia failed to cooperate. Russia has hamstrung the United Nations by using the veto no less than 44 times, even prior to the Korean crisis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must say now to my dear friend from North Dakota that I cannot.

Mr. LANGER. Just one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The Senator from Illinois says he cannot yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Dakota said he would ask me to yield for just one more question a while ago, and I yielded to him. But that apparently——

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Illinois is now condemning the veto power. Who is to blame for the veto power being in existence if not America and England

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator saying we should not have the veto power in the United Nations?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly I said that the veto power should not be included in the Charter. I followed the lead of the Prime Minister of Australia who wanted to carry out the principle of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought it was the fear of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators like himself which made the State Department feel that no treaty which deprived the United States of the veto power could be ratified on the floor of the Senate. I had thought that the Senator from North Dakota, whom I love, is one of the men who throughout has argued that there should be no abolition of the veto power.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Illinois. If he will read my speech, when I voted against the adoption of the UN Charter, he will find that I said I voted against the United Nations Charter, among other reasons, because it contained the veto power. Other Senators compared the situation to that when the Thirteen Colonies were organized into the United States. If the veto power had been in the Constitution, does the Senator from Illinois suppose that, for example, South Carolina would have joined the Union with New York having the veto power over South Carolina?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to know that the vote of the Senator from North Dakota, which was one of the two votes, I believe, cast against the United Nations—was because the UN was not powerful enough.

Mr. LANGER. That is right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The general fear was that if the veto power was abolished most Senators would feel that the UN had been given too much power. Apparently the arguments now are that it was "either too hot or too cold, either too young or too old." The fear of surrendering too much sovereignty to this new organization was substantial, and I had always felt that this was the reason for inserting the veto clause.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, no, Mr. President. I will say to my dear friend that the situation at that time was that we had 13,000,000 men.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is out of order.

Mr. LANGER. We had 13,000,000 men under arms at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I would rather not yield to my distinguished friend at this time. I should like to develop my speech.

Looking further at the record, we have helped to organize international agencies to enhance the arts of peace, such as WHO, FAO, the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, UNESCO, and others. Russia has refused to join any one of them. We have sought to negotiate treaties for Italy, Austria, Germany, and Japan. After nearly 2 years of wrangling, we finally got a treaty with Italy, but Russia has stopped all others.

Russia refused to join in the pledge of Secretary Byrnes for first a 20-year, and then a 40-year joint occupation of a united Germany. This would have allowed the people of both East and West Germany to live together and at the same time would have offered Russia protection from the fear of a German attack which she felt was real.

We have stripped ourselves of our colonial empire by freeing the Philippines and giving up any rights to intervene in Cuba.

Russia acted in direct violation of the Yalta agreement. The trouble was not so much in the European features of the Yalta agreement as in the violation of the Yalta agreement by Russia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I prefer not to yield at this time. Russia did not permit free elections in Poland, Bulgaria, or Rumania, and applied covert military pressure upon Hungary and Czechoslovakia to make them go Communist.

We offered ECA aid to all of Europe, including Russia and her satellites. Russia not only refused to come in herself, but also prevented her European satellites from coming in.

Russia kept troops in Persia in 1946, violating a previous pledge, and threatened Turkey. She conducted border warfare against Greece in 1946 and 1947, and in 1948 she suspended our land transportation to Berlin.

In the face of this record, I cannot see how anyone could ever say that we would be the "main instigator" of a war by sending troops to Europe as a defensive measure. Were we to mass 10,000,000 men over there, the charge might conceivably be made. Senator TAFT says that 10 divisions could not deter Russia conquering Europe, and I say it will be of tremendous help. But it can obviously be helpful only for defense, and in no sense could such a force be considered enough to wage an aggressive war against Russia. No one proposes an invasion of the land mass of Russia. Certainly I do not propose it.

WE HAVE EVERY REASON TO FEAR RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

But we are now in January 1951. A totalitarian power which most of us have long believed was committed by its very nature to a garrison state threatening expansion, has now committed its largest satellite, China, to the risk of a general war. Acting through the United Nations we prevented Russian aggression in Iran, in the Dardanelles and in Greece. Acting with our British and French allies, we prevented the Russian seizure of Berlin.

Wherever we showed strength to resist Communist aggression the Russians backed down.

Last June 24, however, the forces of world communism, solidly backed by Russia, committed armed military aggression across the whole of a national frontier. Korea, Mr. President, is all too grim and bloody a fact, as is known to many American families. If war comes, it will have been instigated by Russia, not by us. And we should not by an injudicious use of words, such as the Senator from Ohio's [Mr. TAFT'S] statement implying that we would be the main instigators of a war if we sent additional troops to Western Europe, give the Russians a propaganda weapon which, though untrue, can be and is being used against us.

In his speech of January 8 before the National Press Club, the Senator from Ohio laughed at the reputed statement of one of our military officers that it would be easier to get 10 American divisions out of Europe if war came than to get 2 out. That he says, is a poor reason for sending the additional eight.

Mr. President, if we send 10 United States divisions to Europe, or send there the million and a half United States troops the Senator at one point mentions, we shall not send them to get them out again if war comes. We shall send them to help hold a line beyond the Rhine—not upon it, as the Senator from Ohio fears, and to hold it along with four times as many Europeans—until reinforcements from all the North Atlantic countries arrive. But we shall not, of course, agree to hold such line with only American troops, and I know of no one who advocates such a policy.

SHALL WE WAIT FOR ENGRAVED INVITATIONS FROM A UNANIMOUS EUROPE?

The Senator from Ohio says, however, that even the participation of American troops in a western European land defense would no doubt spur Russia to attack, because Russia would believe that the project had been undertaken upon American initiative. I think that is a very neat logical box, since our great power would truly appear to give us the initiative in any joint venture with Britain, France, the Low Countries and the other European nations, regardless of whether or not they had taken the initiative in extending the formal invitation. I doubt that any engraved invitation from Western Europe would take the onus of American initiative off the project, either to the Russians or to ourselves.

I must confess that I agree with the Senator from Ohio that we should only help to defend these nations which will help themselves, and that we should have their invitation so to do, but I am at a loss as to why, in his address, he constantly emphasized the importance of formal invitations for our aid. The enemy we face, I am afraid, does not regard us the more kindly because we place our strength only where we are formally invited to place it. Our good intentions may save us with many peoples—though I am inclined to doubt the fact—but they will never save us from the ruthless men who have marked us out as their natural enemies.

Our very existence, to say nothing of the mobilization of our forces on which all of us agree, can be said to be provocative to the Russians. I do not see how the promise to send 10 divisions to Europe when we have them to send will increase the degree of that provocation. As I shall attempt to show later in my remarks, such a promise may in fact provoke the rulers of the Kremlin to a more sober understanding of their true position.

NOT BEING WILLING TO SEND TROOPS TO WESTERN EUROPE WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO CAUSE A RUSSIAN ATTACK

Moreover, the evident belief of the Senator from Ohio that we should not strengthen Europe lest we provoke the Russians to attack is equivalent to saying that the weak must not strengthen themselves relative to the strong lest the strong should take alarm. But this condemns the weak to continue in a state of inferiority to the strong and means that they exist only on the sufferance of the powerful. This is not a very safe source of protection when we are dealing with Communist Russia. It is far better for us and our allies to win this protection by our own efforts. Our combined armed strength will be a greater deterrent to Russian aggression than any feeling of pity or any qualms of conscience which may develop inside the breasts of the members of the politboro. For I have never known the Russians to spare anyone because they were weak.

On the contrary, I think history shows that weakness, not strength, provokes aggression and is much more likely to lead to war. Where have the Communist gains been made, Mr. President? They have been made in the weak Baltic and Balkan countries and in Czechoslovakia which had no hope of our aid. They have been made in a weak and divided China which we did not think we could defend, and as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has pointed out, they now seem to be making gains in Korea from which we originally withdrew our troops.

The danger confronting us is a totalitarian Communist danger. The record of their gains, Mr. President, gives conclusive proof that it is the weak and not the strong who are in danger, and if there is any hope for peace with Russia, we will find it in strength.

4. WILL THE COSTS OF SENDING ADEQUATE TROOPS TO WESTERN EUROPE BE TOO HIGH?

The fourth and final objection which Senator TAFT makes against accepting the Brussels agreement is that it will cost too much. I shall deal later and in some detail with this contention. Let it be enough to say here that the Senator from Ohio would tailor our security to fit his conception of proper military costs instead of adjusting our military costs to conform to the needs of true security.

What, then, shall we say of the argument of the Senator from Ohio as a whole? Simply this—never have I seen so plausible a set of contentions based upon so many false premises. I say this with sorrow mixed with sympathetic affection.

V. THE POSITIVE ARGUMENT FOR THE BRUSSELS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, thus far in the argument I have dealt with two negatives and two positives with respect to our policy in Europe. I must agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and many other Senators in so far as the two negatives are concerned. We are not legally bound to furnish more troops than we already have for the joint defense of the Atlantic Pact countries, and we are not morally bound so to do. On one of the positives the Senator from Ohio agrees with me; namely, that we are bound to furnish arms aid to the signatories of the Atlantic Pact instrument. The other positive, of course, is that our self-interest demands that we help the Europeans in the land, sea, and air defense of the European continent; and that is the organic kernel of this entire debate so far as the Brussels agreement and the defense of Western Europe are concerned.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I should like to have done with the negatives. I shall deal with the positive argument for Congressional approval of the principle of the Brussels agreement; namely, the sending of more troops to Western Europe. Beside the great positive factor of our national self-interest, I should like briefly to array another, the moral climate shared by the peoples of Europe and America. I shall not hang back if some legalistic critic transmutes "moral climate" into "moral responsibility."

Mr. President, it was the vacuum left between Russia and the United States after World War II which most powerfully affected developments in our foreign policy, and made us pour billions of our substance into Western Europe. It was the desire to transfer to the nations of Western Europe both power and the responsibility which goes with power, which led us to embrace the Marshall program. Had the nations of that area been unrelated to us in everything save their abhorrence of the totalitarian police state, I believe the Congress would yet have approved the European recovery program.

But the significant point, Mr. President, is that despite the existence of sizable Communist parties in some of the European countries, none but the most fatuous American critics doubted our kinship with those peoples. Dealing with the peoples of Western Europe, Mr. President, we are dealing with those who taught Jefferson and Madison and other early Americans about the democratic experiment, and were taught by them in turn.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION ITSELF IS AT STAKE

But the issue is even broader than the survival of any political philosophy, even one which can call out so bravely what there is of good in man. Western civilization itself is at stake, and the democratic form of government is but one element in that great complex. The peoples of Western Europe and America are the heirs of the most dynamic tradition the world has ever seen. There are men in other regions of the earth just as brave, just as thoughtful, as are those of the West, and I am mindful of the great—in some instances, the unique—contributions of the culture of the East. But, Mr. President, it is in the West, it is among the heirs of a civilization cradled in the Mediterranean and nurtured in the northern fastnesses of Europe, that the dignity, the worth, and the rights of the individual man have been most strongly asserted. To the peoples of the West, life is dear, and it ought not to be sold for something that is not dear.

Animated by this conviction, the people of the United States wield a power greater even than their great resources could by themselves command. They could look the world over for allies more alert to the power of this faith than our partners in the Atlantic Pact and the Brussels agreement. By the same token it is not only our great economic power which turns European eyes toward these shores. Even the very presence of their American brothers in the joint force of the Brussels nations, the fact that American divisions stood on European soil for this express purpose, conceivably could end whatever hesitancies the Europeans

have thus far shown toward their own commitments. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made a significant contribution, I think, when they reminded us that men are more tangible than diplomatic instruments.

All I am saying, Mr. President, is that it was not only the precise conditions left by World War II, not only our self-interest in keeping Western Europe from going the way of Czechoslovakia, which caused the Congress to embrace the Marshall plan. It was a marriage between members of a common society, wedded to common ideals, moved by common hopes—and common fears.

The Atlantic Pact, and the consequent agreement at Brussels, shows the same recognition. The seed of the pact, the resolution honored by the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], was quite properly an expression of American self-interest. The principles of the Brussels agreement deserve the sanction of Congress for that paramount reason. But, Mr. President, if the danger of imminent war is great—and I think it is—the Brussels nations are a magnet to draw to a common task and a common victory precisely those men who have the most to live for, the most to die for, of all men on the face of the earth. Those are good men to have beside you when the battle for survival is joined, Mr. President. Mr. President, on this floor I have criticized very strenuously British foreign policy, but no one can criticize the heroism of the British soldier under fire. No one can criticize the bravery of the French soldier under fire. They are good men to have with us.

CONGRESS SHOULD PLACE ITS STAMP OF APPROVAL ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE BRUSSELS AGREEMENT

So much for the moral imperative, Mr. President, and I do not apologize for touching on it briefly, since I firmly believe it is a definite quantity in the arsenal which the Communists will challenge at their peril.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I regret to say that I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am asking that Congress, as the immediate representatives of the people, stamp its formal approval on the sending of more troops to Western Europe as is embodied in the agreement made at Brussels. The people will rightly ask what more tangible assets are represented in the force General Eisenhower has been sent to command.

In the course of my remarks on the views of those who would leave the land defenses of Europe to the Europeans, I analyzed the scale of armed men and monies by which the Brussels nations intend to defend themselves. I pointed out that equality of sacrifice is an approximate fact, and that the military increment of the 225,000,000 people of Western Europe will match, on a per capita basis, the military increment of our own 150,000,000. The most positive argument for the Brussels agreement is the willingness of the Europeans to help themselves.

UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE SHOULD BUILD UP THEIR STRENGTH TOGETHER

This principle can and, in my judgment, should be carried out in the process by which the ultimate goals are obtained as well as merely in those goals themselves. Stated briefly, it was probably agreed at Brussels, according to the estimates to which I have referred, that in the 3 years we would add eight divisions to our European forces, while the Western European countries added from 28 to 36. Our ratio of the respective increments would, therefore, be as 1 to 3½ or 1 to 4½. It would seem wise therefore, for a timetable to be prepared under which at stated intervals the Europeans would add three and one-half or four and one-half divisions and we would thus add one. This would prevent our bearing too large a share of the load at any one time. It would also give an incentive for the Europeans to meet their schedules since they would obtain the added protection of an American division for each three and one-half or four and one-half which they put into service; but only when they added three and one-half or four and one-half divisions. If this is not already included in the Brussels agreement, it should quickly be made a part of the compact although, for security reasons, the precise scheduling of these additions of course should not be published.

THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF WESTERN EUROPE

I have also discussed before this point in my remarks the strategic importance of the European continent to the military defense of the United States. But the area is strategically vital not only to our defense. It is also vital to the war-making potential of any power, be it friend or enemy. Let us consider steel, in terms of world production in 1950. At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks table IV, showing the estimates of the two trade journals, Iron Age and Steel, for the steel-producing countries of the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I see the schedule?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have a feeling that a very clever parliamentary trick is about to be played upon me now. I know that the Senator from North Dakota will not object to the insertion of this table in the text. However, since he does object——

Mr. LANGER. I am not objecting; I am reserving the right to object. I simply wish to see what the Senator wishes to place in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota reserves the right to object to my inserting the table, I withdraw it.

Mr. LANGER. I am very sorry the Senator does so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that at a later time the heart of the Senator from North Dakota will be sufficiently melted so that he will permit the table to be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert table IV in its proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE IV.—*World production of steel ingots and steel for casting, 1950*

[In thousands of net tons]

	Iron Age estimate	Steel estimate
World total	197,154	203,200
United States	96,954	96,500
United Kingdom	18,078	18,000
Western Germany	13,101	14,700
France	9,108	9,600
Belgium	3,863	4,150
Luxemburg	2,560	2,700
Italy	2,503	2,500
Saar	1,925	2,050
Sweden	1,071	1,000
Austria	1,017	1,000
Spain	904	900
Netherlands		450
Japan	4,970	5,000
India	1,525	1,500
Canada	3,270	3,350
Mexico	390	350
Brazil	798	800
Australia	1,519	1,400
Union of South Africa	849	800
U. S. S. R.	26,500	27,000
Czechoslovakia	2,850	3,000
Poland	2,525	2,750
Hungary	875	1,000
Rumania		550
Yugoslavia		550
Western Germany, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Saar	30,557	33,200
Same, plus Italy, Sweden, Austria, Spain, and the Netherlands	36,052	39,650
All continental Western Europe plus United Kingdom	54,130	57,650
All continental Western Europe plus United Kingdom and United States	151,084	154,150
Western World, all above, plus Japan, India, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Australia, and Union of South Africa	164,405	167,350
U. S. S. R. and satellite countries (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania)	32,750	34,850

Sources: Iron Age, Jan. 4, 1951; Steel, Jan. 1, 1951.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can say that the figures included in the table, which I hope to be able to place in the RECORD, show that in 1950 the United States produced 96,500,000 tons of steel ingots and steel for casting. Russia and its European satellites produced 34,900,000 tons. Western Europe, including Britain, actually produced 57,700,000 and its capacity was approximately 65,000,000. Moreover, Mr. President, if the United States, Western Europe, Canada, Mexico, Australia, and South Africa but stand together, they control 159,400,000 net tons of steel production, of which 154,000,000 is in the United States and Western Europe.

If, as Mr. Hoover proposes, we desert Western Germany, France, Belgium, Luxemburg and the Saar, we have lost 33,200,000 tons. If we join Mr. Hoover in pulling out of the rest of Europe to the Atlantic, we lose a total of 40,000,000. If Britain falls, as it very possibly will if Europe is lost, there will go another 18,000,000.

I am aware that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] says we could stand on the Rhine with our air power and deny Western Europe's steel to Russia by bombing the Ruhr. I think our national defense would be much better served by standing somewhere east of the Ruhr, in the first place.

I do not see, in the second place, how we can obtain from the Europeans the European and African bases necessary to bomb the Ruhr or anywhere else in Eu-

rope after having left them to their own resources in the matter of troops on the ground. Since steel is the strongest material component in our defense and the base of all other industry, we should not lightly give it up to the enemy or accept its destruction at our own hands. We in the free nations need that 65,000,000 tons of steel a year on our side.

THE BRUSSELS AGREEMENT WILL ADVANCE COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Mr. President, I think we are in the familiar position in which men so often find themselves. I hope it is not trite to say that if there were no Brussels agreement, we should have to invent one. That is precisely why I think it so important that the Congress express its approval or disapproval of the main features of that instrument. Always with the proviso that the Europeans continue to help themselves, and at an accelerating rate, the Brussels agreement—more properly the Atlantic Pact behind it—is the most convincing single and immediate pledge of the principle of collective security.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not desert me.

Mr. LANGER. I am going to return.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. It is the principle of collective security which I am really seeking to advance, and that not only in Europe. But the debate was initiated over Europe and over the agreement made at Brussels. General Eisenhower is even now surveying the definite prospects for putting into effect the agreement made or the understandings arrived at by diplomatic officials at Brussels. We must know what the attitude of Congress is toward the principle of collective security in Europe, or the people will not know how to judge the fruits of the Eisenhower mission.

Every argument that comes to my mind convinces me that to reaffirm our common security with that of Europe is vital to our survival as a free nation. There is, Mr. President, poetic justice in the fact that it was the civilization of Europe in turn which helped to teach us the value of freedom. In portraying some of the dangers involved in such a program as this, we should paint not only the sunny side, but also the dangers, which are real.

Let us frankly face the fact that the allied armies which are to be raised under the Brussels agreement may be overpowered and defeated. We may be driven into the sea. Our losses may be heavy. No one can take this possibility lightly. Everyone who cares for human life must consider it. But what Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover seem to insist upon is that we should not use land troops on the continent unless we are certain to win. Thus Mr. Hoover says that he would not give Europe another man or another dollar until it had erected "A sure dam against the Red flood." Mr. TAFT says he would not agree in advance to use land troops unless we were, quoting his exact words—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 5, page 58—"almost certain of success."

But what these gentlemen overlook is the fact that if we do not help, Europe and Asia will likely fall. It will be a certainty then that we will have to face the Communist world alone. We will then be in the greatest danger of all and our ultimate losses will be even more terrible.

In order to protect ourselves against such a calamity, is it not wise to take some chances in the effort to avert it? If we only try to resist the Communists when it is a sure thing that we will win, the Communists will conquer the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I prefer not to yield just now.

Then the only sure thing will be either the destruction or the vital crippling of America itself. This is not the kind of certainty which Mr. Hoover, Senator TAFT, or any of us desire.

VI. WHAT ABOUT ASIA?

Mr. President, thus far I have attempted to state the case I have against the Taft-Hoover approach to the issue of our proper strategy and to defend the Brussels agreement, or the Brussels understanding, as it has been reported. I disagree, somewhat less exhaustively, with what I have described as the second school of thought on the subject—namely, the "protect Europe but not Asia" school which asks us to restrict our major commitments to Europe. But I nevertheless disagree with it.

Mr. President, it is not because I underestimate the vital importance of Europe that I disagree with those who, like the British, would largely restrict our commitments to that area. I go the whole way with them as to the vital importance of Europe. But on the other side of the world, they do not go the whole way with us. The American defenders of this idea would defend Japan, Formosa, the Ryukyus, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, I am sure. But that is about as far as they would go.

However, this school seems to feel that the combined forces of Western Europe and the United States cannot be spread thin and that, even together, we do not have the strength to protect free Asia as well. Asia, according to them, is not industrially developed, and the Communists would not gain too greatly by taking it over.

THE DANGER OF LOSING SOUTHEAST ASIA AND INDIA

With this I firmly disagree. While it is true that Asia is not a greatly developed industrial area, southeast Asia is the major source of at least two very vital war materials, namely, tin and rubber, as well as a vast reservoir of manpower. Its loss would endanger India, which is one of our major sources of manganese.

Indochina is now in grave danger of falling to the Communists. Not only is there a strong internal Communist movement, but a Chinese Communist army is poised at their gates and is ready to strike. If this happens, Burma, Thailand, Malay, and Indonesia will be sitting ducks and will fall very quickly. Ceylon will then be in great danger. India, already facing the Russian Communists from the northwest through a thin strip of Afghanistan, will find herself suddenly faced with terrific pressure from the east in a Communist-held southeast Asia. To the west of India are only the weak, semineutral, feudal countries of Afghanistan, Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

Now vast masses of people in India live a submarginal existence, and India in 1949 imported over three-quarters of a million tons of rice from southeastern Asia—350,000 tons from Thailand and over 400,000 tons from Burma. I am told that India's minimum grain requirements are 6,000,000 tons more than her current crops. She still gets a very important part of her food supply from this area. If the Communists get Indochina, Burma, and Thailand, they hold the "rice bowl" of the Orient. One of their biggest problems at the moment is securing adequate food for their Asiatic fighting forces, so the Communists will be vastly strengthened if they take over southeast Asia.

Meanwhile, India, having great supplies of rice cut off, would be weakened internally. The hunger, disease, and unrest upon which the Communists thrive would flourish. Sitting in the jaws of a nutcracker with Russia as one jaw, a Communist-held southeast Asia as the other jaw, weakened internally by lack of food, facing an enemy greatly strengthened by access to an abundant food supply for its fighting forces, India, whether Prime Minister Nehru recognizes it or not, will surely fall.

With India gone, the countries of the Middle East, lacking our help, or even the threat—as against Communist aggressors—of our help, will also go to the Communists. Then Africa, and so on.

IF WE LOSE SOUTHEAST ASIA, WE LOSE 95 PERCENT OF OUR NATURAL RUBBER

Meanwhile, how does all this affect us? In the first place we would lose practically all of our sources of natural rubber. Malaya, Indonesia, Thailand, Ceylon, and Indochina produced 1,497,000 long tons of natural rubber in the first 11 months of 1950. This is nearly 90 percent of the world total. From this area the United States alone imported 700,000 tons during the same period which accounted for 95 percent of our total rubber supplies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving the break-down on rubber production and United States imports of rubber.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Major sources of natural rubber*

[Figures are for first 11 months of 1950]

Country	Production (long tons)	United States imports (long tons)
Malaya	628,000	332,000
Indonesia	630,000	194,000
Thailand	100,000	97,000
Ceylon	101,500	59,000
Indochina	38,000	19,000
Total for Southeast Asia	1,497,500	701,000
Other [1]	172,500	35,000
World totals	1,670,000	736,000

[1] Primarily Liberia, Belgian Congo, and other parts of Africa. Some from the Philippines and South America. Brazil produces only 400 tons which is not enough for her own consumption.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Virtually all this natural rubber will be lost. We can use synthetics for passenger automobile tires, but we must have natural rubber for bomber tires, heavy truck tires, and many other uses.

I regret to say that the Munitions Board, in charge of the stockpiling, lagged woefully behind in their acquisitions of rubber as has been reported by Senator JOHNSON'S preparedness subcommittee—Senate Document 230, page 18. I desire to pay tribute to the junior Senator from Texas for the magnificent work he has done in showing the inadequacy of the efforts of the Munitions Board and the defense officials in accumulating a sufficient stockpile of strategic raw materials. This, despite the fact that Congress had made adequate appropriations for stockpiling purposes.

We can exist for some time, perhaps, on what we have by severe curtailment of rubber for civilian uses. We did so during World War II. But if we follow the Taft-Hoover program, or even the "protect Europe but not Asia" school of thought on foreign policy and abandon Asia, we shall be at a terrific disadvantage if war comes, especially if the war is a long one, which it very likely will be if the Communists control all of Asia.

LOSS OF SOUTHEAST ASIA WOULD CAUSE US TO LOSE TWO-THIRDS OF OUR TIN SUPPLY

We would also find ourselves virtually hamstrung with respect to tin. Asia accounts for nearly two-thirds of the world production of tin-content ore, or 99,000 metric tons out of a world total of 162,000 metric tons. Of this 99,000 tons, China, which is already lost, accounts for only 4,000 tons. Ninety-five thousand tons come from Southeast Asia which is the immediate danger spot. This is made up as follows:

TABLE VI—*Sources of tin content ore in Southeast Asia*

	Metric tons
Malaya	55,000
Indonesia	30,000
Thailand	8,000
Burma	2,000
Total	95,000

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I regret to say to my dear friend——

Mr. LANGER. On the question of tin, I want to show where much of the tin is. It is in South America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will wait a minute; after completing one sentence, I will yield.

Another 23,000 tons comes from Nigeria and the Belgian Congo, both in Africa, which will be in danger if all of Asia falls. Our only worthwhile source of supply which will be left if we lose southeast Asia is Bolivia with only 34,000 tons. And even in peacetime, the United States alone consumes 60,000 tons annually.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only because I am so fond of the Senator that against my better judgment and against my best interests, I yield for one brief question.

Mr. LANGER. With reference to the purchase of tin, is it not true that we have spent billions of dollars all over the world and that the Democratic administration has not developed tin in South America, where the supply is greater than in any other area in the world?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this a rhetorical statement?

Mr. LANGER. It is a question. Is it not true?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know how much money has been spent for developing tin in South America. I might say that such a program could very well have taken place under the Point 4 program which more Republicans than Democrats opposed. However, this question of foreign policy seems to me to be far too grave to make into a partisan issue. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will join me in an endeavor to keep this from happening.

Again I regret to say that the Munitions Board allowed themselves to fall behind, in this case, in the stockpiling of tin. Mr. Hubert Howard, former chairman of the Munitions Board, reported that, as of December 31, 1949, there were stocked 60,713 long tons of tin, including 22,500 tons held by the RFC which is permitted to sell its holdings to industry—reported in Armed Force, May 13, 1950. This left a net frozen tonnage as of that date of only 38,000 long tons for strategic use against a background of an essential civilian and military demand under peacetime conditions of 60,000 tons annually. This should give us some idea of how far behind we are so far as stockpiling is concerned.

Of course we can severely curtail civilian goods which use tin as we did in World War II. But how long can we fight a war without more tin? Five years, perhaps. But what if the war lasts 10 years or even longer? Can we afford to take that chance by allowing southeast Asia to fall to the Communists?

THE DANGER OF LOSING MANPOWER AND STRATEGIC MATERIALS

We used to get a large portion of our manganese requirements from Russia. Russia has largely cut this off, and we are getting 552,000 metric tons of manganese annually from India. But if we do nothing India will go to the Communists, so we will have lost that. We also get 655,000 tons from the Union of South Africa and 331,000 tons from the Gold Coast in Africa. But these supplies are not safe, either. It takes 14 pounds of manganese for every ton of steel. Can we afford to let this vital ingredient to the heart of our war-making defense capacity go by the Boards? I do not think so.

Then, if we lose Southeast Asia and India we will very likely lose the Middle East. This region has vast reserves of precious oil. Oil is the lifeblood of modern armed forces, and losing these reserves would weaken us and give great strength to the Communists.

Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota does not object, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks table VII, which will give an idea of what we would lose in oil reserves if we should lose the Middle East.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE VII.—*Estimated petroleum reserves—Major producing areas, as of Jan. 1, 1950*

Area and country	Estimated reserves	Percent world reserves
	Barrels	
U. S. S. R. and satellites	4,800,000,000	6.24
Europe (outside the iron curtain)	209,950,000	.27
Far East	1,570,000,000	1.99
Middle East and Africa	33,115,500,000	42.31
South America	10,548,000,000	13.47
North America	27,961,800,000	35.72
Total world reserves	78,280,250,000	100.00

Source: Based on figures given in DeGolyer and MacNaughton, Twentieth Century Petroleum Statistics (1950), p. 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as we can see by this table, the Middle East has 42⅓ percent of the world oil reserves. Russia and her satellites already have 6¼ percent so, if the Communists take over the Middle East, they will control nearly one-half of the world's oil reserves. We cannot afford to let this happen.

There are other strategic materials to consider. I am no expert in geopolitics, but when I consider what we lose in terms of manpower and vital materials—not to mention the destruction of cultures and of nations and of freedom—by letting the Communists take all of Asia, frankly I am alarmed. I simply do not think we can take the chance.

While we would be denied access to these materials and manpower, Russia would be integrating them and strengthening herself.

The problem is not one merely of economic survival. The problem is one of political survival—the survival of freedom. And if we are to survive, we need the people and the war-making materials of that part of Asia which is still free. If protecting free Asia as well as Europe would spread our forces too thin, then by all means let us build up our joint forces so that they will be sufficient. Let us not allow our weakness to dominate our policy. Let us instead develop adequate strength to support a policy which is wise. That means trying to prevent the Communists from taking over Asia and keeping it instead in the hands of free native governments.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think all parties to this debate agree that the islands of Japan should be not only defended with the aid of American forces, but should be rearmed in the common effort against Communist aggression. I should like to inquire how the 80,000,000 people of Japan can successfully live, to say nothing of maintaining large armed forces, unless there is at least part of a friendly Asia which is left open to Japanese trade. The policy of surrendering Asia but defending Japan would require vast permanent subsidies from the United States going far beyond the military assistance program to which we are com-

mitted. I do not say that we may not be forced to embrace such a policy, or that our occupation policy has not already embraced it in part. I do say that we should strive to prevent the conditions which would force such a policy upon us.

TO PROTECT SOUTHEAST ASIA, WE NEED NOT GET BOGGED DOWN IN A LAND WAR WITH RED CHINA

Mr. President, our military capacities and the strategic position we now confront will, of course, not permit us to deploy huge land armies on the continent of Asia. We can use air and sea power in the defense of most of Southeast Asia. With adequate help from other nations, we can also use some land forces in the defense of all Southeast Asia, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and India. Our Navy can both help defend Formosa, as it is now doing, and blockade the Chinese ports.

In committing ourselves to aid in the defense of Europe, Mr. President, we should not adopt a policy of totally neglecting the importance of the continent of Asia. That is the point at which I disagree with what I have called the second group debating the means of our defense, those who would largely restrict our efforts to Europe. That is also the point, Mr. President, at which I would like to suggest to our British friends that they should not become European isolationists while deploring the views of those in America who are isolationists toward Europe. In fact, it is their isolationism toward Asia which directly helps to strengthen American isolationism toward Europe. If they would only help us more in Asia, it would become more possible for us to help them more in Europe.

If there is one message which the English now in this city can carry back to their country, it is this: How can they ask us to defend them in Europe if they do not make their contributions to the defense of Asia?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot yield at this time.

Russian domination of the Eurasian land mass, Mr. President, would leave us no place to base the air and sea defense of the Belgian Congo, the Gold Coast, or any other vital spot in Africa, including Suez. We should lose valuable resources of uranium, cobalt, and other materials. To the loss of India's half a million metric tons of manganese, we would have to add the loss of 655,000 tons from the Union of South Africa and 331,000 tons from the Gold Coast. How the Senator from Ohio thinks we can defend Africa once we have lost Europe and probably Asia as well is beyond me. Frankly, I think Africa would be almost impossible to hold if we lost all of Asia and the Middle East, even if we did manage to hold Europe itself.

VII. WHAT WOULD BE THE FATE OF AMERICA IN A COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED WORLD?

Mr. President, I have tried to demonstrate that we must adopt a foreign policy of resisting Russian aggression everywhere we can. We must adopt this policy for our own security as well as for that of the other free and independent nations of the world. I should like to emphasize, however, that we are not the only ones who should take this stand. Every nation with a stake in freedom and independence should do the same. Is it not apparent that unless we help, the Communists could now sweep over all of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa? Since this might be done, and I believe it is possible, our answer should not be a quavering retreat and abandonment of our allies. The answer, Mr. President, lies in building up our combined strength to meet this challenge.

For, Mr. President, what would happen if the Communists came to dominate the rest of the world? Can we believe that the Communists, with their record of aggression would sit still indefinitely? Of course not.

Our weakness and abandonment of allies would provide the Russians with an engraved invitation to take over the world except for us. In view of the Communist doctrine that they will not be safe until the whole world is Communist, it is inevitable that they would move. And they would immediately take over what Sir Halford Mackinder has called the World Island, all of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

What kind of a world would we live in then, Mr. President?

In the first place, we would be alone with our major allies gone. We would be sitting in the jaws of the greatest military nutcracker ever to exist in the history of the world; between a Communist Asia on the one hand and a Communist Europe and Africa on the other.

The loss of Europe, Asia, and Africa would bring an irresistible drive toward isolationism in the United States and the consequent erection of a garrison state. The effort to build an unconquerable bastion while surrounded by a Communist world would bring in its train the suppression of many of our precious liberties. We probably could not avoid the realities of the police state, however we might avoid the name.

COMMUNISTS' RESOURCES WOULD BE OVERWHELMING

As I have pointed out, we would be cut off from extremely important strategic materials. We would have lost two-thirds of our source of tin, virtually all of our sources of rubber and manganese, and vast quantities of oil. The Communists would have steel resources equal to ours. Our capacity to defend ourselves would be so weakened that we would be at a great disadvantage. Communists would have their own productive might combined with that of Europe and Japan. They would have a virtual monopoly of many strategic materials which they would deny to us and use against us. Their supply of manpower for their armed forces and productive capacity would be limitless. Let us look at this manpower situation for a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to insert table VIII, which shows how the manpower of the non-Communist world will deteriorate as the Communists take over the various countries.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE VIII.—*The location of the world's population and how it will be changed if the Communists gradually take over selected areas*

[All figures in millions. Figures rounded and do not add up to totals]

	1948 population	The changing line-up	
		Communist	Non-Communist
World (present)	2,350.8	[1]749.6	1,601.2
If we lose Western Europe (excluding United Kingdom)	246.3	995.9	1,354.8
Plus—			
United Kingdom	50.5	1,046.4	1,304.3
Southeast Asia	145.2	1,191.7	1,159.0
India (includes Ceylon, Nepal, and Pakistan)	430.9	1,622.6	728.1
Middle East	89.6	1,712.3	638.4
Africa	193.7	1,906.1	444.7
Far East (includes 20,200.0 in South Korea)	130.4	2,036.5	314.2

[1] Based on world situation in June 1950.

Primary Source: Statistical Office of the UN Population and Vital Statistics Reports, series A, No. 12.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer not to yield. I shall be glad to have a private conversation with the Senator after I have concluded.

Table VIII shows that the present division of the world's population is 750 million under Communist control and 1.6 billion in non-Communist countries. So the present ratio is better than 2 to 1 in our favor. But if we lose Western Europe the division will be nearly 1 billion Communist to 1.4 billion non-Communist, so the ratio in our favor will drop to less than 1½ to 1. Then if we lose the United Kingdom, we lose another 46 million which will be picked up by the Communists.

The ratio will shift to favor the Communists if we then lost Southeast Asia with the Communists controlling countries with a combined population of 1.2 billion, while the non-Communist will have only 1.16 billion. If we then lose India, the Communist ratio will jump to nearly 2½ to 1.

After this, if the Communists take over the Middle East, Africa and the rest of the Far East, they will control the whole World Island of Asia, Africa and Europe along with peripheral areas such as Japan and England. If they control Europe, Asia and Africa, they will hold control of 2,036,500,000 people while we in the free nations will have only 314,300,000. Russia would outnumber us almost 7 to 1.

RUSSIA MIGHT CONQUER US AND RULE THE WORLD

Were this manpower combined with the productive capacity and strategic materials of Europe, Asia, and Africa, it would be extremely difficult for us to survive. I do not say it would be impossible. I merely say it would be difficult to survive. War would finally come to us on our own soil when we would be stripped

of allies by our abandoning them. Russia might well take us over and rule the world.

It is this picture, Mr. President, which causes me to reject both the Taft-Hoover approach and the program of those who would restrict our efforts almost wholly to Europe. I believe we should strive to marshal as many people and countries as possible to resist Russian aggression, and, to the extent of our resources, help them to resist if they will help themselves.

VIII. WHAT SHOULD WE DO AT HOME?

Mr. President, we heard the President of the United States repeat on January 8 that the Government's immediate goal is a mobilization of 3,500,000 men, with the maintenance of further sources of manpower in the National Guard and Reserves. By the testimony of General Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg 2 days later, it appeared then that the target for July 1 of this year is 3,200,000 men under arms.

That figure has since been raised to about three and one-half million men. This would be at the rate of approximately 23 men under arms per 1,000 population. Presumably, our industrial mobilization is being geared to equip 3,500,000 men under arms some time in the summer of 1951, to carry out an increased program of military aid to our allies, and to build the added plant capacity which would be necessary in a general war. The President, for example, tells us that such capacity, when constructed, would be adequate to produce 50,000 planes and 35,000 tanks a year, if that became necessary.

THREE AND ONE-HALF MILLION MEN NOT ENOUGH

I believe that the final target of 3,500,000 men under arms within 8 to 9 months is too low, and that the timetable for reaching it is too slow. We need not only to raise our goals, but to speed up the process of reaching them. I do not know the assumptions about the world crisis on which our military leaders have erected their target of 3,500,000 men. They are, however, obviously not the assumptions to which I have been addressing myself in these remarks.

My assumptions, moreover, were clearly not those held by the North Atlantic ministers at the Brussels Conference. According to press reports, it was agreed there that the joint defense force on the European Continent should be built up to an estimated total of 55 divisions of which we were to furnish 10, by the end of 1953. Does this assume that the Russian danger will not really come upon us until 1954, and that we have therefore 3 years in which to get ready? I can see no basis for any such assumption. Indeed, in view of what is happening in Korea today, and was happening there when the Brussels Conference met, this idea seems not so much an assumption as a delusion. We cannot safely operate on the assumption that the Russians will not move in 1953, in 1952, or even in the next 6 months.

WE HAVE ONLY SEEN THE FIN OF THE SHARK

Mr. President, the manifestation of Communist aggression in Korea during these last 6 months is but the showing of the fin of the shark above the water. It is but a fraction of the striking power of the man-eater which lies beneath the surface. Day before yesterday, it was Czechoslovakia; yesterday it was China; today it is Korea. What will it be tomorrow?

WHERE WILL THE COMMUNISTS STRIKE NEXT?

I would say to my British friends that Hong Kong lies deep within the very jaws of Communist China. They may close at any moment. And when they do and that profitable colony is swallowed, I wonder if the British diplomats will still look as kindly upon the Chinese Reds as they do now. When Hong Kong falls I wonder if the British foreign office will still refuse to brand the Chinese Communists as aggressors, whether they will work to place them on the Security Council, even though this would reward successful aggression with a seat on the Council which was designed to prevent aggression. I doubt it. And perhaps the British diplomats need just such a jolt as this to bring them to their senses, although I, for one, shall be sorry to see the occasion for it occur.

Perhaps it will be Indochina, on whose borders a Communist army now rests. It may be Iran, where a Russian move would have overwhelming tactical advantages.

It may be free Berlin, which is deep within Communist East Germany, and which latest reports indicate may even now be facing another cruel blockade. It may be a surge westward into free Germany by East German Communists, just as the North Korean Communists moved southward last June. It may be that Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary will attack Yugoslavia. It may even be an attack by airborne Russian divisions across the narrow Bering straits into the vast and empty spaces of Alaska, there to establish air bases from which the continental United States could be attacked.

These are no chimeras, Mr. President. They are not nightmares conjured up to frighten the American people. They are real possibilities. They are consistent with expressed Communist intentions, with the actions of the Communists since 1945, and with the realities of military power.

Mr. President, the bell is tolling in Korea. It is tolling for the British in Hong Kong, Malaya, and Singapore, even though the British may not know it. The bell is tolling for India, even though Nehru may not know it. The bell is tolling, and the people of Asia and of Europe should listen to its warning. The bell is tolling not merely for the people who are being attacked in Korea, but it is tolling for free men everywhere. To me the danger is real.

(At this point Mr. DOUGLAS yielded to Mr. MCCARRAN and other Senators and debate ensued as to the order of speakers, which, on request of Mr. DOUGLAS and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. DOUGLAS.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not think I am an alarmist and certainly I do not want to be one. And I have no access to military intelligence reports. But the danger to me is real and present. I believe our security and that of the world itself is at stake. The disparity is too great between our military strength with a present total of not more than 16 to 18 divisions, as compared with Russia's 175, her satellites with their 60 divisions, and the Chinese Communists with probably at least 125 more. I think we do not have a moment to lose.

WE NEED AT LEAST 6,000,000 MEN UNDER ARMS BY DECEMBER 1

Mr. President, I suggest that we should have 6,000,000 men under arms by next December 1, and that we should have 4,250,000 of this number under arms by the 1st of July. This is approximately three-fourths of a million more than the President's most recent plan calls for by July and two and a half million more than his schedule by the time snow flies next winter. To do this, we should take men into the service at an average rate of approximately 340,000 a month, or nearly the top rate reached in World War II, but with a somewhat lower rate for the first 6 months and a somewhat higher rate for the last four.

On this schedule, by December of this year, when we should have reached the 6,000,000 mark, of which perhaps 4,000,000 will be in the ground forces, we should have activated approximately 55 combat divisions, though we cannot do that if the armed services cling to their present wasteful ratio of overhead to combat troops.

Mr. President, the armed services waste manpower more than any other group in this country. They are top heavy with supply troops and administrative troops. They get the smallest amount of fire power per 100,000 men of any army in the world, for only about 23 percent of the army consists of combat troops. There is great need for our Army to improve its position and to cut down the wasteful overhead. If it does not do so, it will not be making the full contribution to this country which I know it wants to make.

Some of these units should be National Guard divisions which are already in a fair state of readiness; some should be formed from men who have recently finished their basic training, stiffened up by cadres of experienced soldiers, while I hope that at least five would be Marine divisions. Despite the opposition of the general staff of the Army, the Marine Corps has earned by its record the right to exist as a combat organization. The Army is trying to prevent the Marine Corps from being a combat organization, and trying to prevent the Marine Corps from growing. At the same time it is providing for a vast expansion in the Army. I repeat, I believe that the Marine Corps has earned by its record the right to exist as a combat organization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that only about 22,000 out of each 100,000 in our Army are combat troops?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is true; and I think, in that 22,000, the head-

quarters units inside a division are regarded as combat troops. In other words, the overhead inside a division is counted as combat troops, although we know that in practice that frequently is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not estimated that the Chinese have about 80,000 out of 100,000 as combat troops?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true. The Army must change its policy, and I hope the Armed Services Committee rides herd on the General Staff to see that they diminish this overhead.

But, it is not only necessary to assemble men and to form divisions. It is also necessary to equip them. Here also the responsible administrative and military authorities give every evidence of having been dilatory, even in working toward the goal of 3,500,000 men, or before that, of 2,700,000. Congress has appropriated enormous sums for military purposes. Last September we passed a supplementary appropriation bill of $17,000,000,000 for rearmament over and above the large sums provided for 1950–51 in the general appropriation bill. In December we added a further twenty billions. What use has been made of these moneys, Mr. President?

The official statistics of the Government tell a surprising story. According to the daily Treasury statement for January 3, total expenditures of the Department of Defense for the 6 months up to January 2, 1951, were seven billion nine hundred million as compared to seven billion two hundren million during the comparable period of the year before. This was an increase of only seven hundred millions, or 9 percent in the expenditures of the Department of Defense. Yet the military situation is certainly more than 9 percent more serious than it was a year ago. It is, indeed, several times as serious.

After making full allowances for the fact that expenditures actually made do not include contracts let for which payments have not yet been made, it nevertheless seems clear that we have been dragging our feet in the provision of matériel as well as in the assembling of men.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would prefer not to. I shall finish very shortly, and when I finish the Senator can ask any question he wishes.

Mr. WHERRY. My proposed question deals with the subject the Senator is discussing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand, but when I have concluded, the Senator can ask the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Moreover, we see little tangible evidence in industry as yet of any real transference from civilian to defense orders.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A 6,000,000-MAN FORCE REFUTED

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that I realize the basic differences between an assumption of our international position that would lead to an armed force of 3,500,000 and one which would lead to a force of 6,000,000. And before passing a verdict, let us consider what rejoinders could be offered to the charge of undue delay which I have made.

First, may I say that some of the arguments for a slow rate of rearmament are mutually contradictory. Thus, it is argued that we cannot induct troops more rapidly because we do not have enough facilities to equip and train them, while it is sometimes said that we do not need to order more equipment because we do not have the troops ready to use it. These two arguments, when advanced separately, may appear strong, but when taken together they are obviously self-defeating.

The new argument, the new defense of this position, I understand, is that we do not have enough shipping. Yet, certainly, at the end of the last war the seas abounded with ships which were under the control of the Government.

The plain answer is that we should speed up both the training of men and the provision of equipment, and that if we do the first, the military will then be forced to do the latter, namely, provide the equipment for the men. It is not necessary for training camps to be equipped with officers' clubs, swimming pools, golf courses, post exchanges, and steam heat before troops can be moved into them. It is better to train our young men now, than to wait until we can afford them the comforts of middle-class homes, particularly in view of the fact that the whole world may meanwhile catch on fire. There are many unused army camps in the South and Southwest where troops can be trained this winter and spring, even though a considerable proportion may have to live under tents. And if this appears to be too rigorous—and there are complaints from constituents about it—it is well for us to remember that many of the men in the line in Korea do not even have tents.

So far as weapons are concerned, there should be no shortage of rifles and carbines in view of the enormous numbers which were used during the last war. If there are still not enough to go around, it should be remembered that a considerable part of basic military training—close-order drill, extended order, physical conditioning, military discipline—can be carried through without rifles. If we use speed, the needed weapons could certainly be ready by the time the men were assigned to their service schools and rifle companies and then later formed into divisions.

Mr. President, it is better to do needed acts imperfectly than not to do them because we may not have facilities to do them perfectly. That is the inner meaning of the malapropism, "Whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing badly." Discomforts and difficulties should not be allowed to stand in the way of training a large number of our men. We may be in the process of subjecting 18-year-olds to universal training of some kind, but whatever kind it proves to be, it will not be peacetime training, for there is no peace.

WILL A 6,000,000-MAN FORCE COST TOO MUCH?

A second objection to such an increase in our rearmament goals is that it will cost too much, or more than we want it to cost. That is why the Senator from Ohio objected to a force of 4,500,000 or 3,500,000 men.

There is no doubt that the costs will be high. I estimate a probable average cost of $10,000 per man per annum. To equip and support a force of 6,000,000 men will cost approximately $60,000,000,000 a year or $46,000,000,000 more than the direct military costs for the year 1949–50. This is on the basis of an average of $10,000 per man per year. This is the best estimate I can make based on World War II costs and the increase in prices since then. Senator TAFT's figure seems to be an average of $13,000 per man per year. Since we will be fortunate if we can reduce nonmilitary cost by six billions to a total of twenty billions, this would mean total national expenditures of at least eighty billions of dollars, or approximately 32 percent of the net national income of 250 billions of dollars. I am using the more conservative figure of net national income rather than that for gross national product, which probably amounts to between two hundred and ninety and three hundred billions. I am doing this because the figure for gross national product, first, includes transfer payments such as interest on the public debt and allowances to veterans which do not add to the real flow of goods and services; second, apparently includes payments to men in the armed services; and, third, does not include allowances for the depreciation of buildings, machinery, and equipment. Only after these charges have been met does net income, properly speaking, begin.

When some twenty-two billions which are spent by State and local governments for such services as schools, roads, fire, and police protection, and care of the unfortunate are added to a Federal budget of $80,000,000,000, we reach a total of slightly above one hundred billions to be spent by Government. That is about 40 percent of the net national income.

This would be a severe and, in many ways, a frightening burden. It would certainly require a reduction in the general standard of living, and I think business labor, agriculture, and the consumer should all be warned that such a reduction is probably coming. Unless Congress and the country met the challenge effectively by taxing, such a diversion of our national income to defense would also lead to borrowing from banks, to the creation of check-book money, and hence to inflation with all its hardships and injustices.

THE PROBLEM OF POPULAR OPINION

These admitted facts have led to a new argument on the part of those who oppose stepping up the rate of American mobilization in the crisis. In Russia, it is said, people cannot object to a heavy military program since, living under a dictatorship as they do, they find their wishes ineffective. But in a democracy such as ours, the desires of the people will ultimately be followed. If a political party is bold enough to impose a heavy burden which is not immediately needed, it is argued that this party will soon be swept from power and another

group pledged to a milder policy of armament will soon take office in its stead. Neither the Government nor the people—it is said—would be able to stay the course, and ultimately we would be forced back upon a much lower level of armament.

Therefore, it is argued by our military leaders we should not overstrain the economic and spiritual resources of our people, but rather should fix our pace at a rate which can be maintained both in terms of manpower and in terms of expense. If war actually were to come, or immediately threaten, it would then be easier for us—so it is said—to increase our forces above the 3,500,000 mark, than it would be if we had once been more intensively armed and then had been compelled by public opinion to fall back.

Such an argument is indeed weighty and deserves to be carefully considered. It rests, however, on the basic assumption that the Russian Communists will not start a war for several years, and that we should prepare for a long, slow pull rather than for sudden danger. It is of course possible that this may be so. But it is extremely dangerous to assume that it is.

The State Department has gone for some time on the theory that Russia would not be ready for war for some years. Events in Korea have certainly shaken this assumption. The fact that Russia gave the signal to its satellites for open aggression would seem to indicate that Russia is willing to risk general war and that Russia will strike again unless we speedily rearm. For we must face the fact that our efforts in Korea, which I believe to have been thoroughly justified, have nevertheless depleted our reserve strength to an alarming degree. Most of our combat troops have been committed in Korea, and the margin left to resist elsewhere has been cut to a relatively small figure.

CAN WE MEET THE CHALLENGE?

In World War II it took from 18 to 24 months to get a division ready for combat. We cannot begin to start too quickly. The danger is that we shall be too slow, and if the blow should fall, many of the consequent losses would be irretrievable. It will not do for us to say then that we would have been ready had the Russians only postponed their attack for another 2 or 3 years!

The generals of the Pentagon, like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], seem to be obsessed by the fear of what would happen if the Communists were not to attack. If we have a large army, they say, and Russia does not take the aggressive, then our forces would be all dressed up but would have no place to go. The morale of the troops, says the Senator from Ohio, will suffer as it did before Pearl Harbor. But I will confess I am more worried by another query. Suppose we slowly build up an army of only 3,500,000 men and the Russians do attack? What would happen then? I submit that the results would be far more harmful to us in this case than if we were to have some idle divisions. Would it not be better to be caught long rather than to be caught short?

As for the ability of the American spirit to stand the burden of such heavy armament—if that is, indeed, to be our necessary choice—I do not believe we should underestimate either the priceless worth of liberty or the American willingness to sacrifice in its pursuit. If there has been any reluctance to date, has it not proceeded in large part from the fact that the dangers we all have felt about us have not been fully explained, that no stirring call to action in the face of those dangers has been sounded, and that the trumpet has not given a clear sound? I have faith that if the issues can be presented to to the people of this country they will resist all temptations to give up our security for greater ease and comfort.

This is not blind faith. It is borne out by our record in the past, and there is no reason to suppose that the American character has weakened. If the Russians make such a supposition, they do so at their peril.

THE MATERIAL SACRIFICES WE MUST MAKE

Mr. President, while we should recognize the reality of the material sacrifices which we must make, we should not, in my opinion, overestimate them. The program proposed calls, as I have said, for an added military expenditure of $45,000,000,000 above 1949–50 expenditures, and for 4,500,000 more men than we had under arms then, and for 3,500,000 more than we now have. The added burden of $45,000,000,000 is approximately one-sixth of our national income. While this burden is heavy, it can be borne. This is shown by the following facts:

An increase by 10 percent in the average length of the working week from 40 to 44 hours should increase national output by about 7½ percent, or approximately $19,000,000,000. This would be two-fifths of the added costs which I have outlined. A raising of the work week to 48 hours should send up output by about 15 percent, or by nearly the extra amount needed.

Let us assume that half of the added costs were borne by an increase in hours worked and in output, and half by a reduction in the standard of living, or a cut of about 8 percent. Since the average real income per capita is now about 40 percent higher than it was in 1929 (i. e., or 140, relative to 1929's 100), this would mean a reduction of between 11 and 12 points. This would still leave average real income per person close to 30 percent above what it was in 1929. And it is worth remembering that the 1929 level was thought only 20 years ago to be an almost idyllic high-water mark.

Furthermore, if war does not come, we can maintain a 6,000,000-man force and still ultimately cut back our losses in living standards by increasing productive efficiency. Meanwhile, we would be much better prepared. The task is not too difficult, therefore, if we have the will to survive, but it requires a clear realization of the dangers, and a determined readiness to prevent them.

A program of rearmament of this nature does call for heavy sacrifices; that fact should not be overlooked. But the gains in security, freedom, and in justice will outweigh them.

IX. WHAT WE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY DO ABROAD

Hitherto, I have discussed in general terms the need for us to resist Communist aggression wherever it occurs, provided that the area in question is accessible and that other countries join us in adequate strength. I have emphasized that this principle should apply to Asia as well as to Europe. I have tried to argue that we should do this, not in order to be international busy-bodies, nor to waste our blood and resources abroad, but because our own safety depends upon keeping Western Europe and as much of Asia as possible non-Communist. It is now time to narrow our sights and to try to indicate what are some of the more immediate steps which should be taken to carry out such a general decision.

When one does this, he should do it with due humility, and without the slightest touch of cockiness. None of us knows all the answers. All of us make mistakes. The decisions are grave, involving as they do, the fortunes and the very lives of hundreds of millions of people. With a due sense of the errors of the human mind, and the errors of my own mind, in particular, I should like to suggest the following:

First. Approve the principles of the Brussels agreement by congressional action, subject to a time-table under which each division of American troops sent abroad must be matched by a given number of European divisions, in a ratio of either 3½ to 1 or 4½ to 1, and speed up the terminal date at which we reach the maximum strength, so that it will not be the end of 1953 or even the end of 1952, but, if possible, the middle of 1952.

Second. Continue to urge the United Nations to recognize the plain fact that Red China has committed aggression, and work for a blockade of the Chinese coast. If the other nations refuse to act, frankly recognize that the United Nations has failed as an instrument to resist aggression, as the League of Nations failed over Manchuria and Ethiopia in the 1930's. In this event, while still keeping the United Nations as a forum, place no reliance on it as a source of immediate protection and build up our security, instead, through alliances or union alongside or outside of it. I regret that this seems to be necessary, but it is Russia's fault and not ours. In any event, prevent aggression from being rewarded, and hence do not permit Red China to be seated as a member of the United Nations. Let us use the veto to prevent this should it become necessary.

Institute a naval blockade of China to shut off supplies and force China to deplete Russia's resources. Bomb isolated Chinese supply dumps and power plants in Korea, although not the civilian population. Mr. President, I do not wish to see the civilian population of China bombed, because if we were to do so and if we killed large numbers of Chinese people, that would not only cause tremendous hardship to the individuals, but it would be likely to inflame all of Asia against us, and the Russians would try to turn the war into a race

war of the yellow man against the white, which we must not permit to happen. For the struggle is not that, Mr. President, but a common effort of men of all colors to resist the aggression of the Communist states so that all may develop freely.

Third. Make no deal in Korea in order to get out. Try to resist as long as possible. If we leave, let it be an honorable withdrawal under gunfire because of overwhelming odds. To withdraw otherwise would shake the confidence of non-Communists and anti-Communists everywhere, and would enormously strengthen the forces of communism.

Fourth. Try to promote democracy, land reform, and an increase in production and living standards in all non-Communist countries, especially those threatened by Communist aggression. Do this not only for itself, but also so that the poor of these countries have something more to defend than is now the case, and hence may oppose communism more vigorously. Let us do this especially on the Malay Peninsula, in India, where I hope we give or sell supplies of food, to the Middle East, and, yes, in Italy itself.

Let us range ourselves, not as white imperialists trying to take over those countries, but as a body of nations trying to resist aggression, so that the new nationalisms which are developing in Asia—the new nationalisms which at this time are trying to develop the freedoms we developed in the American Revolution—may come to fruition and may extend the benefits of a fuller life to all their people and so that they may have a chance to be free from the imperialism of Soviet Russia and of Communist China.

Fifth. Be ready to help with naval and air power if the Communists strike in Indochina, the Malay Peninsula, or the Near East. Get Great Britain and France to make the preponderant contributions to the necessary land forces in order to compensate for their relative failure to help in the Korean struggle.

Sixth. Try to get as good allies as we can, but have no squeamishness from now on about taking associates whose records may be somewhat soiled. Our civilization has the right to survive. It is infinitely superior to that of Russian communism. If we wait until we have perfect allies, we shall be very lonely.

No one who sits as a spectator on the sidelines has the right to complain if we, battling for our survival and for the survival of the free world, of necessity take imperfect allies who are willing to help. Therefore, let us try to bring Franco, Tito, and Chiang Kai-shek in on our side. They are not democrats, but they are anti-Communists. While they do not stand for freedom themselves, in resisting totalitarian communism they will be helping to protect our freedom. Try to help the constructive forces in Chiang Kai-shek's administration, and use his and our resources for a common end.

These leaders have at least one and one-half million troops available. These can be very helpful in checking the aggressive onrush of the police state. Their sins can be forgiven, and they can stand beside us in the battle. If spectators complain that we are not associating with the best people, let us remind them that the struggle is for survival, and that a defeat because of failure to use available non-Communist forces may not be as virtuous as they assume. Moreover, those who sit in the icy seats of the scornful and decline to take part in the struggle, when freedom is at stake, may not be so virtuous as they assume. Let them remember that we took Joe Stalin as an ally in the last war, and that these men, to put it mildly, cannot be worse than he.

Take pains to make the reasons for this action plain to the working people of Great Britain, France, and the West and to the free people in the East, and make it clear that in accepting the aid of dictators we do not subscribe to their antidemocratic ideas but instead are actively promoting the democratic faith. We may not support their form of government, I certainly do not support their form of government, but we do support their stand against communism and we will join them in resisting Communist aggression wholeheartedly.

Seventh. Serve notice upon Russia and the world that the next act of aggression by a Communist satellite will be regarded by us as an aggressive move by Russia which will be punished by us to the full extent of our power. We have been extraordinarily forebearing with the Russians as the recital of the last five and one-half years of history has indicated. We have treated the invasion of South Korea by the North Korean Communists and the aggressive war started in Korea by the Chinese Communists as isolated and independent acts. We know, however, that both of these aggressions were started at Russian prompting and have proceeded under Russian dictation.

The Russians would like to bleed us white by a series of such moves by satellites for which they will then deny responsibility. If we and the rest of the world allow ourselves to be sucked in by this, it will be fatal. Instead of fighting off only the tentacles of the octopus, let us recognize that these tentacles are directed by a central intelligence. Let us serve notice, therefore, that at the next act of aggression by a satellite, we will reserve the right to strike at the eye of the octopus itself. This is much more likely to be a deterrent than a stimulant to aggression.

Eighth. Although the hopes for settlement are but slender, keep open the avenues for honorable negotiation, and strive, without let-up in the mobilization of our defenses, for peace without any surrender of freedom or justice.

Ninth. Let us tell the nations of the world our aims and intentions. They are honorable and we should make them known. Modesty is becoming in the case of individuals, but as a nation we must get across our ideas to the peoples of the world.

Police states are historically more effective at propaganda than democracies in the short run, although the ideas of democracy have survived over the years because they are superior. But we now face a very grave short run proposition which may very well turn out to be a long-run proposition. We should not preach the "big lie," as do the Communists. We need only preach the truth, but we must preach it well. For we need the people of the world on our side, and we have much more to offer than the Communists.

X. CONCLUSION

Mr. President, let us determine that our civilization is not to fall and that the icecap of the police state shall not descend upon either us or Western culture. If that were to happen, then the liberties which we take for granted, as the air we breathe, would disappear; men could be arrested in the middle of the night without a warrant, taken to stations of the secret police, and kept there without having the right of habeas corpus; they could be sentenced without trial, condemned to death, or condemned to being worked to death in a prison camp. The icecap of tyranny would descend over the world, and with that would go control over the schools, the radio and the churches. Those who hate war and think perhaps that it is not worth while to resist would be submerged and their very children would be taken away from them.

It would be hundreds of years, perhaps many centuries, before that icecap would melt. During that time the western civilization of which we are proud, would largely disappear. Mr. President, I think that is a far worse thing to happen to the world than physical death itself.

Civilizations such as Greece and Rome have fallen in the past, and most profound students of history believe that they fell because men lost faith in themselves and failed to meet new challenges. To Gilbert Murray, the cause of the failure of Greece and Rome was that the Greeks and the Romans lost their nerve. To Dean Inge, the failure of civilizations was caused by "resignation," which he said was "the disease from which civilizations die." Arnold Toynbee, in his recent great work on history, says that civilizations fail because of "insufficient response" to "stimulus"; and the gloomy German, Spengler, had the same version, that civilizations fall because the inner faith of a civilization wears itself out. The Communists believe that this is what will happen to us. They think the stream of history flows with them.

It lies within our power to prove them right or to prove them wrong. If we have faith in the essence of our society, namely, respect for the individual and a deep desire to improve human life, and if we translate such a faith into acts, we will survive. If we do not, we are likely to fall.

We have not sought world leadership. It has been thrust upon us by time and the mysterious workings of history. It would be far more comfortable for us all if it had never come. But it has. We cannot escape it. Whatever we as a nation do, will probably be determining.

By withdrawing, we can allow the police state to take over Europe, Asia, and virtually all of the world. If this

happens, we shall be hemmed in, and our own survival will be more doubtful. For such a confession of weakness would be contagious and would prevent the free world from rallying in unity. There would be a general rush of men and countries to save themselves. The result, in my judgment, would be disaster. War of course, would be a certainty.

But if weakness is contagious, so also is courage and determination. If we really resolve to resist aggressive communism, others will rally more fully to the cause and will join with us. We may not get the support of many whom we would like to have on our side. We will get the aid of others whom in calmer times we would not wish to have. But the free world will ultimately group around us. And this non-Communist world, if it will only unite, still holds the preponderance of power. It has over twice the population of the Communist world. It has many times the industrial strength of the Communists. For the moment, it is weak in military strength at its very center. But we can repair this.

Freedom can win if we and all the free peoples are united. Such determined unity can perhaps still deter the aggressors from going further and give us peace. It is confessedly a slim hope, but it is the only hope for peace.

Even if—God forbid—open struggle comes, if we are determined to preserve the faith by which we live, we can rebuild much of the damage done and free ourselves and others from the fear of tyranny. In the words of Lincoln which are as appropriate for this crisis as for that of 90 years ago, "We can nobly win or meanly lose the last, best hope of man on earth." Let us resolve to win. Let us have faith and in that faith let us act.

ORDER OF SPEAKERS IN THE DEBATE

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. DOUGLAS,

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may have an understanding? I know the Senator from Illinois has not concluded his speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am near the end. I shall be glad to yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Illinois gained the floor under an understanding between him and myself that he should have the floor. As a result I withdrew my effort to get the floor. I know that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is next on a list of speakers which is before the Presiding Officer. Undoubtedly debate will probably continue until nearly 8 o'clock this evening. I wonder if we could have an understanding that on reconvening tomorrow the Senator from Nevada will be recognized to make an address, with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the present Presiding Officer, to follow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no unanimous-consent request has been proposed, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; no such request has been made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield without prejudicing his right to the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state that it was my hope at least to make an explanatory statement with reference to my resolution. Earlier in the day, of course, I understood that the organization of the Senate had to be effected. Therefore it was impossible to take up the resolution at that time. I notice that the names of approximately six Senators are on the list of Senators who are to follow the Senator from Nevada. Of course no announcement has been made that we shall have a session tomorrow. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada would permit the junior Senator from Nebraska to make a brief statement on the resolution he has submitted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Nevada has been attempting to get the floor since Thursday of last week. I have tried to accommodate other Senators who desired the floor. Finally I again yielded today. Whether I had any right to yield is another question, but I did yield under whatever right I had to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for another inquiry, without losing the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada recalls that I, too, tried to obtain the floor last Thursday.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I attempted to work out, before the session was over, some understanding under which we might proceed. The majority leader persuaded me to wait until Monday, with the statement that possibly an arrangement could be made at that time.

Mr. President, I always like to accommodate Senators in the orderly procedure of debate. However, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada would modify his suggestion so as to permit the junior Senator from Nebraska to have at least 45 minutes tomorrow. Then the Senator from Nevada could proceed, followed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I think that request is not unreasonable.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to assist the Senator from Nebraska in every way possible. I have yielded to a number of Senators. My speech will probably require not more than 40 minutes, and then I shall be through with the particular subject I have in mind. So far as yielding to the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, or consenting that he may have the first 45 minutes tomorrow, I certainly would have no objection. However, this situation arises by reason of the practice of farming out time. Such practice has been opposed right along by the Vice President of the United States. When he was majority leader he opposed the farming out of time in advance. But the question has again arisen, and time has been farmed out. There is a list before the Presiding Officer, and time has been farmed out. It is not right. It is not in accordance with the spirit of the rules of this body.

I am not criticizing the Senator from Illinois. He took his chances. He and I were taking our chances earlier in the day. I yielded to him whatever chance I had, because I wanted him to go ahead. What I wanted to do was to make progress. When I went to the desk today to find out why I was not to be recognized, I was told that the Vice President thought I had made my speech on Thursday, which I had not. If he thinks tomorrow that I have made my speech today, I shall be out tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has yielded to the Senator from Nevada for an observation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada wish to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, provided the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has an opportunity to make his speech this evening, after the morning hour the Senator from Nebraska shall have 45 minutes on the subject of Senate Resolution No. 8, and that following that the senior Senator from Nevada may have the floor, to be followed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to know where the junior Senator from Minnesota is to be sandwiched in. I have been waiting for an opportunity to obtain the floor. I thoroughly enjoy the opportunity of listening to my distinguished friend from the great State of Illinois. However, I have a few remarks to make which have something to do with the state of the Union. I shall be compelled to object to the unanimous-consent request unless I hear the name of Mr. HUMPHREY from the State of Minnesota read from the list which has been projected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to suggest to my good friend from Minnesota that it is always a matter of great inspiration to me to see him on the floor of the Senate. If he will remain with me tonight, I assure him that I will remain until he finishes his remarks tonight.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the practice of farming out time is leading to the condition with which we are confronted. I knew that I could not be

heard for several hours, because the Senator from Illinois would have the floor. He now has the floor. Therefore, I absented myself from the Chamber, as did other Senators. If we had been trying to obtain recognition, we would have been in the Chamber, where we should be, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I promise the Senator from Nevada that I shall be present in the Chamber when he makes his speech tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There is a unanimous-consent request before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to put in a plug for the competitive system on the floor of the Senate. I am perfectly willing to take my chances of recognition, and to remain here to listen to these remarkable addresses and keep up with the business of the Senate. I am of the mind that the list which reposes on the Presiding Officer's desk provides an easy opportunity for some Senators to return to their offices and catch up with their correspondence. I believe in the rugged life, and in individual enterprise, so I am compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a question to the acting majority leader?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will not yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield if he may do so without losing the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall finish my speech very shortly. I do not wish to seem abrupt to the Senator from Nebraska. I yield, provided he will make his question brief.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding. The question is very brief. I simply wish to ask the acting majority leader whether he knows if there is to be a session of the Senate tomorrow. I think the answer to that question will help many Senators out of this difficulty.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as I understand it, it is the intention of the majority leader to have a session of the Senate tomorrow. If I had my way now, the Senate would remain in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader has stated that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. McMAHON. From the size of the list, there seem to be a great many speeches in prospect. We should remain and listen to them.

I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that the practice of having a list ought to go out the window. We ought to revert to the practice of being present and being recognized when we have something to say.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that all this colloquy appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the colloquy and remarks referred to will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

After the conclusion of the speech of Mr. DOUGLAS,

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for 30 seconds so that I may make a comment on the speech of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to accommodate my good friend from Connecticut, but I know I shall have to disappoint a number of Senators who will want me to yield, and I hope the Senator from Connecticut will accept my apology for not yielding. I have advised the minority leader and other Senators that I shall not yield. I am going to proceed, without interruption, to make this speech. I think it would be most unfair of me to start yielding at this late hour, if for no other reason than that of consideration for the members of the staff of the Senate and for Senators, at this late hour, with a speech of the length of that which I am about to make. I feel that decency and courtesy call upon me to make the speech without yielding for any purpose whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are now engaged in the United States in the first round of an historic debate on foreign policy, the outcome of which will have tremendous and far-reaching consequences not only for us in the Western Hemisphere but for the entire world. Some 2 weeks ago the distinguished ex-President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, made a major speech, in which he suggested that this continent should be made a "Gibraltar of western civilization" and that we in the United States should refrain from committing ground forces in the continent of Europe, but instead should rely upon the Air Force and the Navy and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans for our defense against communism.

On January 5 the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made his first major speech on foreign policy in this session of Congress. In the course of that speech the Senator from Ohio said:

> We must not assume obligations by treaty or otherwise which require any extensive use of American land forces. In the first place, we should be willing to assist with sea and air forces any island nations which desire our help. Among those islands are Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand; on the Atlantic side, Great Britain, of course.

Later on in the speech the Senator from Ohio stated:

> The power of great sea and air forces is not necessarily limited to island nations. The policy I suggest certainly would not abandon to Communist conquest the continental nations. In the first place, we may give economic assistance to many such nations providing they really want that assistance. We can give arms as we are bound to do under the Atlantic Pact, and as we are now doing in Indochina, in Greece, and in Turkey.

Then later he said:

> The greatest question of policy before the country and before this Congress, however, relates to our undertakings in Europe. Under the general principles I have laid down, I would say that we had better commit no American troops to the European Continent at this time.

I desire to repeat that sentence, Mr. President, because it is one on which I shall dwell somewhat later in my speech. The Senator from Ohio said:

> Under the general principles I have laid down, I would say that we had better commit no American troops to the European continent at this time. Some modification is required in that theory because, first, we are now occupying Germany with the obligations growing out of the Second World War, and second, we have made certain promises under the Atlantic Pact, which we are bound to carry out.
>
> It might be well, first, to consider just what our obligations are under the Atlantic Pact. One thing seems certain. There is no legal obligation to send American land soldiers to Europe.

A careful study of Senator TAFT's January 5 speech, as well as his subsequent speech before the National Press Club, shows that the thinking of the senior Senator from Ohio is still very fluid on the issue of committing American land troops to Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. As one reads parts of his speeches, it would appear that the Senator from Ohio is opposed to any implementation of the North Atlantic Pact with additional American troops; but when one has just about reached that conclusion, then he reads in the speech of January 5 the following comments:

> If these nations really do desire to build up their own arms, and do so with our assistance, which we are obligated to give, and if the time comes when they see the need of and demand a coordinated defense, and if it appears at that time that that defense has a reasonable chance of success, I should not object to committing some limited number of American divisions to work with them in the general spirit of the Atlantic Pact. Such a program, however, never ought to be a key point in our over-all military strategy. And the initiative should be theirs and not ours.

By taking the Senator's speech of January 5 and his speech before the National Press Club and weighing them in their entirety, it would seem to be a fair interpretation that the Senator from Ohio does not favor entering into any agreement, at this time, to commit any additional American troops at this time, as a part of the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact. Rather, the Senator from Ohio seems to favor a reliance primarily upon our Air Force and Navy for the protection of our security at home.

He also seems to rely upon the bombing power of our Air Force for crippling

or destroying the striking power of a Russian Army if it seeks to occupy Western Europe. However, here again one cannot be exactly sure just what are the proposals of military strategy of the Senator from Ohio, because the conclusions in his two speeches do not seem to have jelled into any consistent set of foreign policy principles. The speeches contain paragraphs which seem to be on again, off again in regard to the North Atlantic Pact or any obligations we in the United States may have to help implement it with some additional military manpower.

Likewise, the two speeches seem to leave the distinguished Senator from Ohio suspended or fluttering in midair, not quite certain whether he will light on the perch of preparation for a land war in Europe, because of the possibility of Russia taking Europe by force if the Atlantic Pact is not strong enough to prevent it, or whether he will land on the perch of not preparing for a land war in Europe, because of the theory that implementing the North Atlantic Pact with land armies might incite the Soviet leaders into an aggressive attack against Western Europe.

Convenient as it may be for a speaker to fluctuate to all sides of an issue, it is very disconcerting and confusing to those who try to weigh and evaluate the premises and principles of any program or policy set forth in such a speech. I believe it is fair to say that the two recent speeches of the Senator from Ohio are subject to the interpretation that he does not believe we should implement the North Atlantic Pact with any additional American military manpower—at least not until our allies in the North Atlantic Pact have raised enough divisions of ground troops to indicate that a checking of Russian aggression in Western Europe could be greatly aided by ground troops—and that in the meantime the Senator from Ohio would rely primarily upon naval and air power for defense against Russian aggression.

It seems to me that the Senator from Ohio does not give sufficient weight to the negative psychological reactions in Western Europe induced by many of the policies he advocates in his two historic speeches. We Americans need to face the fact that our allies in Western Europe are not filled with enthusiasm and rejoicing when they hear of various leaders in the United States proposing to surround them with the protection of a perimeter of bombing bases so that American air power will be able to liberate them in case Russia decides upon a military conquest of Western Europe.

Such talk is bound to cause them to hesitate in developing their defense plans, because such talk does not offer them very much by way of a choice. Such talk seems to leave them in the middle, with Soviet totalitarianism on the one side and American bombing pulverization on the other. Such talk in our country tends to increase the propaganda in those countries for working out the best appeasement program possible with Russia.

I say, Mr. President, most respectfully, that our best defense at home is to cooperate with our allies in the North Atlantic Pact for an adequate defense in Western Europe through a cooperative, military-aid, mutual defense program involving land, sea, and air forces. Such a program not only would serve clear notice to Russia that there would be no time lag as far as the participation of the United States in a war with Russia is concerned, if she should start a military conquest of Western Europe, but it would also put us in the strongest possible defense position from the first hour of that war, because it would give us the best assurance of maximum Allied preparedness in Europe.

I would urge that the people of the United States carefully evaluate the clear import of the foreign policies proposed by ex-President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It seems to me that they are premised upon the idea that this continent can survive if we withdraw unto ourselves alone and let our allies in Europe go down if necessary, if they do not do exactly what we wish them to do in the matter of implementing the North Atlantic Pact.

However, I wish to make clear that although I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in respect to a great many of his premises, as well as the conclusions which he draws therefrom, nevertheless, I think that in his address to the Senate on January 5 he performed a notable service to the Nation.

Striking through the controversies which have centered about our national policy during recent months—improperly directed all too often against personalities—the Senator from Ohio cleared the air and focused attention where it should be—on the issues themselves. At a moment of great world crisis, which threatens American security, he has initiated in the Congress a necessary and highly important debate on the critical question of what policy we should pursue and how best we may carry it through to success. In his able address, the Senator from Ohio gave a splendid demonstration of the proper role of the minority party in a democracy—that of objective debate of the foreign policy in the interests of the safety of the Nation.

No one can, and no one will, I am sure, dispute the two chief aims of our policy as defined by the eminent Senator from Ohio; namely, that the principal purpose of the foreign policy of the United States is to maintain the liberty of our people; and that, after liberty, peace must be the goal of our policy and of our leaders.

The Senator also stated a fundamental truth and a guiding principle when he continued:

> Certainly when policies have been determined, unity in execution is highly desirable, and in the preparation for and the conduct of war it is essential.

The formulation of our foreign policy is, of course, the prime responsibility of the President, with the aid of the Secretary of State and other officers of the executive branch of Government. But Congress participates in the determination of policy, and it is unquestionably necessary that our Nation's policy shall have the support of the Congress and the people.

Therefore, it is a healthy circumstance to have a public debate on aspects of our policy which may be under dispute. I am confident that the conduct of this debate in a nonpartisan spirit can lead to a meeting of minds enabling us to press on with the execution of our policy with that unity which the Senator from Ohio has himself asserted is a necessity.

In this connection I found it most encouraging that, whereas the Senator from Ohio, on January 5, expressed an apparently unalterable opposition to sending more than a token number of American troops to Europe for the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, he subsequently stated that his opposition was not unalterable.

On January 7, during the radio broadcast of Meet the Press, the Senator from Ohio was asked:

> Suppose Eisenhower comes back and says we have to do this thing that you are against and Congress debates it and decides that is what we shall do, you will oppose it? After it has gone through that constitutional process will you acquiesce in that decision?

The Senator from Ohio responded:

> Oh, yes; I would accept it. I voted against the Atlantic Pact and I am willing to accept the obligations of the Atlantic Pact.

In short, I gather that the Senator's position is that he believes we should not commit more than token troops as a part of an international army in Europe under the Atlantic Pact, but that if a majority of Congress thinks otherwise, he will go along with that decision.

Meanwhile, it appears that the Senator is strongly opposed to committing our troops abroad in an Atlantic defense for the following reasons:

First, he sees no convincing evidence that Russia intends to start a war with us. He points out that Russia knows that we are obligated and will enter the war if any Atlantic Pact nation is attacked.

Second, he believes that the effort to build up an Atlantic Pact army capable of checking a Russian invasion must also be large enough to wage aggressive war against Russia, and the attempt to build up that army would probably incite Russia into beginning a war.

Third, the Senator from Ohio believes that the responsibility for the defense of Western Europe rests largely with the nations of Europe.

And finally, he appears to believe that in the event of war in Europe, we could attain mastery of the sea and the air, safeguarding our own country, while aiding Europe primarily by air and sea support.

Mr. President, I must take issue on every one of the points which I believe the Senator from Ohio has set forth in his speeches.

First. According to my sights, it is folly to base our actions on speculation about what the Soviet dictators may or may not do.

Second. No one has proposed an Atlantic Pact army large enough to invade Russia. On the contrary, speaking now as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it is my understanding that the objective of the North Atlantic Pact is to build up among the members of the North Atlantic Pact a common defense

in Europe which would be sufficient to check Russia from taking over Europe. That is quite different from suggesting that there is any contemplation to build up an armed force which would be adequate to invade Russia.

Third. The defense of Europe may be the responsibility of Europe, but it also happens to be vital to our own safety.

Mr. President, I repeat that the defense of Europe may be the responsibility of Europe, but it also happens to be vital to our own safety.

Finally, if the last war taught any lesson at all, it taught that mastery of the sea and air can be won only after years of struggle, when the enemy has been reduced to the verge of collapse, and that, furthermore, the successful defense of Europe requires all the air support, all the sea support, and all the ground support we can throw into battle in case of an invasion of Europe.

I suggest, therefore, that rather than speculate on what the Russians may or may not do, and try to shape our policy accordingly, we must fix our minds on one cardinal fact, and act accordingly. That fact is that the defense of Western Europe and the defense of the United States cannot be differentiated; they are one and the same thing, at least in the early stages of world war III, if it comes.

I would expect the Senator from Ohio to pause before taking the role of prophet and minimizing the danger of a war being started against us by Russia. I should think that he would uncomfortably remember that he said, only 2 months before Pearl Harbor:

> I believe that if we choose to defend the United States on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, it is so impossible for Hitler or anyone else to attack us that there will not even be an attempt to make such an attack.

Mr. President, as my documentation for the quotation from the speech of the Senator from Ohio, I refer to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 13, at page A4363. I read as follows:

> Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations on September 22, 1941.
>
> There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From page A4365, column 1, I read the following excerpt from the speech of the Senator from Ohio:

> I believe that if we choose to defend the United States on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans it is so impossible for Hitler or anyone else to attack us that there will not even be an attempt to make such an attack.

It is a rather interesting speech. If I felt time permitted I would dwell at some length upon the speech of September 22, 1941. I wish to call attention to two more sentences in it. The Senator from Ohio continued, in his speech of September 22, 1941, to say:

> We have the largest Navy in the world. We have unlimited ability to increase our shipbuilding capacity. The President's argument that the total shipbuilding capacity of Europe is greater than ours is utterly unsound, because ours can be increased indefinitely, and our ability to manufacture steel and other ship materials is greater than all of Europe combined. Furthermore, we will have several years' start on our two-ocean Navy, and Hitler could never catch up with us. It would not be easy for him to organize the productive capacity of Europe. How is he going to get any enthusiastic cooperation from the shipbuilding labor in a dozen countries whose people he is oppressing with an alien dictatorship?

Mr. President, I have no doubt as to how Russia would get that cooperation if she proceeded to take over Europe and impose her slave labor policies on Western Europe, as she has on other countries in Europe which have become her satellites. The only choice she gives them is, "Proceed to produce for Soviet Russia or be shot." That is the police-state method. That is the slave state method.

I am not one of those who hold the view that a conquest of Europe by Russia would make it impossible for Russia to get the production out of Europe that Russia would need in order to carry on a long whittling war against the United States, because when she gives those people only the choice of working or being shot, the instinct of self-preservation will cause most men, as we all know from the success she has had with production in the satellite countries she now has enslaved, to work, even for Communist Russia.

There are some other theories in the speech of the Senator from Ohio of September 22, 1941, which are identical with the views which he expressed on January 5, including that section of the speech entitled "The President Has No Legal or Constitutional Right To Enter Upon a Naval War With Germany." As I was scanning that speech this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, I thought that it was rather interesting to read the following statement in the speech of the Senator from Ohio of September 22, 1941:

> The war policy has never been thought through. It seems to me impossible to bring a war with Germany to a successful conclusion except after many years of destructive warfare. Vast expenditures of money and men will exhaust this country as they are exhausting the world. In the end we may crush Hitler, but in the process of doing so we are likely to set up a complete dictatorship in this country from which we may never return to American democracy as we have known it.

Our experience shows how wrong he was then. Thank God, we did crush Hitler. Thank God, Mr. President, that in World War II we rid the world of one dictator who sought to enslave freedom, and we kept our freedom. I am satisfied that if Russia continues down the road of aggression against freedom again freemen everywhere will rise up, as they did in World War II, and take a stand on the side of freedom. I am satisfied that once again, although at terrible cost, we would crush totalitarianism and preserve freedom, no matter how high the cost.

In my judgment, the prophecy of September 22, 1941, of the senior Senator from Ohio was as unsound then as his prophecy of January 5 and January 7 of this year in regard to foreign policy.

I thought it would be interesting to cite this comment from the speech of September 22, 1941, which the Senator from Ohio made with respect to a great commentator. He said:

> Of course, it is being said now that there will be no expeditionary force. Mr. Walter Lippmann is now advocating the policy of a naval war while we reduce the Army. But just as the President advanced from peace to lease-lend, and from lease-lend to a shooting naval war, the adoption of a naval war policy, after a few months of stalemate, is bound to lead, Lippmann or no Lippmann, to another American expeditionary force.

I take the time to quote from that interesting speech of September 22, 1941, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 25, 1941, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], not in a spirit of personal criticism of the Senator from Ohio, but in a spirit of sincere, friendly disagreement with him as to the underlying thesis of foreign policy set forth in the speech of September 22, 1941, which I think in many respects is similar to the theory of foreign policy set forth in his two historic speeches of January 5 and January 7 of this year.

I suggest, Mr. President, that elementary common sense should tell us that we have to be prepared for the fact that Russia may move into Europe any day from now on, whenever it suits her convenience, and that we must not lose time or momentum in developing adequate defenses here in America and in common with our allies in Europe. I do not venture to predict anything. I merely say that the danger is grave and that we must proceed to take proper precautions.

As for relying almost exclusively on air and sea power, while regarding the defense of Europe merely as the responsibility of the European nations, we cannot do better than to harken to the wise words of Cordell Hull on October 26, 1940, when he warned the American people in circumstances most similar to those of today:

> Should the would-be conquerors gain control of other continents they would next concentrate on perfecting their control of the seas, of the air over the seas, and of the world's economy; they might then be able with ships and with planes to strike at the communication lines, the commerce, and the life of this hemisphere; and ultimately we might find ourselves compelled to fight on our own soil, under our own skies, in defense of our independence and our very lives.

I think that great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, enunciated in that statement words of such deep and significant meaning that all Americans should ponder them anew.

If we have any question about the paramount importance of guaranteeing that Western Europe shall not be permitted to fall into Russian hands, we have only to recall the last war. Surely we cannot have forgotten already the cost in lives and machines and the agony of effort required to defeat the industrial potential of western Europe when the Nazis used it to sustain their military operations. Let us reflect today that it took the combined, all-out power of Russia, the United States, Great Britain,

and many other nations to defeat it. Let us therefore reflect what it would mean to our security today if that Western European industrial potential were to be added to that of Russia and aimed against us.

The Senator from Ohio noted that "there is sufficient evidence of a determined plan to communize the entire world, which can be clearly outlined from the writings of Lenin and Stalin just as Hitler's intention could be found in Mein Kampf." He noted that we are now, in fact, engaged in a world-wide battle with Communist imperialism. But then he disclaimed any convincing evidence that Russia intends to start a war with us, and stated to the contrary that "I believe they are still thinking in terms of a slow but steady advance by the methods which they have used up to this time. Those methods are dangerous enough." Indeed, Mr. President, they are dangerous enough, but they are not so dangerous as a war against Europe and against us would be.

I fear that this minimizing of the Russian threat has disheartened the free nations and given aid and comfort to those who would destroy us. The Senator has seemed to endorse the pious Soviet claims of their abhorrence of war and their devotion to peace. He has seemed to support the Russian allegations of warmongering on our part. The Daily Worker, the mouthpiece in the United States of the Kremlin, in a front-page editorial, under date of January 8, entitled "Senator TAFT's Valuable Confessions," used the Senator's remarks as proof of the truth of Russian propaganda, as branding President Truman as the enemy of peace, and as exposing our policy of peace as the Big Lie. Pravda has been having a field day with the Senator's thesis that Russia is not likely to start a war. The entire Communist propaganda machine is capitalizing on this statement to lull the world into a false sense of security and to divide the free nations.

Though some of our political spokesmen may have unwittingly furnished ammunition to the Communist propaganda machine by their words, we can soon correct that circumstance by our deeds. We cannot allow our allies in Western Europe to think that we are going to fail to join with them in building up a common defense in whatever fashion, in whatever magnitude, we jointly agree is essential. We cannot afford to encourage the Communist dictators to think that there is the remotest possibility that we will waver in our determination to resist Russian aggression in Europe. We cannot afford to let them doubt for a minute that we are going through with this job of building an Atlantic force which can prevent the conquest of Europe by the Red army.

In the long run, it is obvious that there is only one means of putting a final halt to Russian imperialistic expansion, whether that expansion is by subversion and infiltration, or by armed assault—and that is by bringing the organized economic, moral, and military strength of the free world to a point where it cannot be challenged by the aggregate forces of the Communists. We must therefore proceed with the building of that defensive force. We must build it primarily in the North Atlantic community where men and machines are in a conclusive superiority in our favor.

Our goals are obvious. They are to prevent a world war if possible, and to win it if it is forced upon us.

But as for the military strategy we should pursue and the way in which we should go about this task of mobilizing our own strength and linking it with that of our allies in a common defense, I submit that these are questions so vast and weighty that they are beyond the power of any one man to answer. No man is wise enough to master all the potentialities and actualities and to prescribe what we should develop in the way of air, sea, and land forces, and the kind and degree of support which we should provide to our allies under the Atlantic Pact.

On this point, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] spoke with great cogency—it seems to me—when he said on January 11 on this floor:

> It is hard to understand how the Members of the House and Senate, even making due allowances for their fine qualities, can possibly attempt to function as the operations section of a general staff and decide where and how and in what amount troops, ships, and planes should be sent to foreign lands.

There is only one acceptable, reliable basis for such enormous decisions. Our decisions must be arrived at by the process of consultation between the executive branch, our military leaders, and the leaders of both parties in Congress. As far as is practicable, we must draw upon the best brains throughout the Nation, for, when all is said and done, in the great task of administering a democracy there are no substitutes for brains. I think in this great crisis we must call upon the brains of America in every field of endeavor to make their maximum contribution to the security and the defense and the safety of our great Republic. So I say, so far as is practicable, we must draw upon the best brains throughout the Nation—the scientists, industrialists, labor leaders, farm leaders, and all the rest. In short, we must draw upon every particle of expert knowledge, intelligence, and professional skill at our command.

I submit that this is the only way in which to determine what we shall do toward implementing the Atlantic Pact.

Incidentally, I would like to say that I can see no grounds whatsoever for questioning the President's constitutional authority to send United States troops abroad. However, in the case of the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, it is clearly desirable, I agree, that the Congress be consulted in advance of proposed commitments, in the interest of national unity.

I digress from my manuscript long enough to say, Mr. President, that I think the President of the United States has a great opportunity for leadership in connection with the entire issue involving the sending of troops to Europe. In my opinion, the President of the United States should do more than consult and advise with the leaders of Congress and the other leaders of our great country. I think the President of the United States should sit down with those leaders, put all the facts and problems on the table, and work out with them, in the interest of unity, for which he pleaded in his great address at the joint session of the Congress the other day, a program for implementing the North Atlantic Pact around which there can be the maximum possible amount of agreement among us in carrying out the clear obligations of that treaty.

I believe it is a mistake, Mr. President, for the Chief Executive of this land to take any narrow technical position from the standpoint of his constitutional powers and say, "I will stand on those powers alone." I do not question under our Constitution the power of the Commander in Chief in time of great national emergency to take the steps necessary to protect the security of the Nation. But I want to plead with him this afternoon, Mr. President, to recognize that in an hour of crisis it is true that unity is of tremendous importance to security. I would that he would make clear to the Congress and to the other leaders in our country that he intends to work out, in conference and in exchange of ideas, a program involving the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact, including the question of the use of American ground forces.

Speaking of unity, I applaud the President's call for unity in his state of the Union message, and I applaud the immediate endorsement by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] of that call for unity. I particularly welcome the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the National Press Club that he is "quite prepared to sit down with the President of the United States, or anybody else on the majority side, and try to work out a program which could command the unanimous and consistent support of the people of the United States."

I would in good spirit remind the Senator from Ohio, however, that under the organization of the Congress, the formulation of official policy is done through the official committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over the subject matters with which their existence is concerned. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Ohio will be willing to sit down and confer, and consult, and discuss these questions of foreign policy, always keeping in mind, however, that he does not speak individually for the Senate of the United States or for my party, but only as one Member of the Senate of the United States and as one member of my party, and that the formalization of policy must necessarily, insofar as the Senate is concerned, go through the channels of the appropriate standing committee of the Senate, which in respect to foreign policy happens to be the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and in respect to my party happens to be, in the last analysis, so far as our Senate organization is concerned, the Republican conference.

I pray that all of us will respond to the stirring invitation of the majority lead-

er, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] when he said:

> I am asking that my colleagues stand together, unite, make clear by their every action and their every word that all of us have a single overriding objective—the good of the Nation and the peace of the world.

I think, Mr. President, this is the spirit in which we must determine our policies and actions from here on out.

One most ill-considered statement by the Senator from Ohio was that of January 5, when he said, with respect to Communist China:

> We might as well have a declared war.

Surely the Senator from Ohio cannot have forgotten that our action in Korea is part of the United Nations action against aggression, and is nothing more than that; and surely the Senator cannot have realized the extreme gravity of his suggestion.

This gravity becomes clear when we recall the terms of a joint resolution of Congress declaring war, as for instance the joint resolution of Congress on December 8, 1941, when war was thrust upon the United States and we were forced to take action in our own defense. I shall read that resolution because I would call to the attention of the Senate and of the American people what it means to declare war. That joint resolution of war reads, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, the consequences of a declaration of a state of war are clear from the terms of the resolution. With its approval by the President, we start down a road from which there is no turning back. We pledge all our human and material resources to winning the war. We will fight until one of the parties capitulates or until there is a negotiated peace.

Is that what the Senator from Ohio would have us undertake against Communist China? I do not think it is. I do not think he took proper thought before uttering those words. During these precarious times I think we must be very careful to avoid such ill-considered statements.

It is my belief that we should do everything possible to prevent war from spreading in the Far East; but here, again, I say that the determination of our strategy and tactics in the Korean crisis must also, and solely, be determined on the basis of consultation and agreement between the executive branch, our military leaders, and the leaders of both parties in Congress.

As I said in a major speech which I made on foreign policy during the last week of the last session of the Congress, I happen to be one who believes, on the basis of at least such information as has been made available to me to date as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that we should not permit ourselves to become sucked into a war in China. I believe that is exactly what Stalin would like to see us do, because I think he knows that the great danger to us is that if we were to become involved in a war with China, we could not win it, because even though we were to win the military victories of such a war—at the great sacrifice that I am sure we would find they would cost us—we still would lose the war, in the last analysis, because to conquer China would be to occupy her, and to occupy her over the years would bankrupt us. That is why I said in that speech—and I repeat it today—that at least on the basis of the information made available to date, I think we should be careful not to become involved in a war within China, but we should establish the strongest possible blockade and embargo against China; we should make perfectly clear to China that we consider her to be an aggressor against the peace and that we recognize her to be a stooge and a tool of Russia, which, after all, is the power behind the hot war that China in a very real sense in some segments of Asia is presently carrying on.

Mr. President, the Chinese question is one concerning which I think we should delay taking any course of action which might fall within the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio of a procedure which might as well amount to a declaration of war.

For a long time to come, in my belief, the Atlantic Pact and its implementation must figure as a cardinal factor in the defense of freedom. I also believe that we must continue to do everything in our power to strengthen and support the United Nations.

I think that it is going much too far to say that we have to write off the United Nations as powerless to put a brake on aggression.

The frantic efforts of the Soviet Union to escape the censure of the United Nations and the determined efforts of the Chinese Communists to bludgeon their way into membership, attest the importance which the Communist states ascribe to the United Nations. The United Nations has demonstrated the very real power of the mobilized opinion of the world, and has proved that this power can both check aggression and halt warfare, as we saw in Indonesia, Palestine, and India. This power of mobilized opinion, even with the backing of military force, has so far failed in Korea, but that does not at all mean that justice will not yet be won for the Korean people and that the United Nations will not be due the credit for that victory of justice.

The United Nations has introduced a new factor in world affairs—a means of solving problems otherwise insoluble. It offers the means for solving by international cooperation world problems which cannot be solved by the separate action of nations. It affords the possibility of curing the conditions of human ignorance, want, and misery, which furnish the seeds of war and offer communism its opportunity to victimize people too confused and too weak to resist. We should be short-sighted indeed not to recognize that the United Nations is indispensable to the defense of freedom and to the ultimate establishment of a decent and orderly world.

It is true that the United Nations was established on the assumption of the collaboration of the great powers, and that the Soviet Union has betrayed its promise of collaboration. But the Soviet Union has by no means been able to prevent the growth of the power and influence of the United Nations.

The decline in the effectiveness of the Security Council has been matched by an increase in the power of the General Assembly, where the voice of all nations is heard. The General Assembly may have only the authority to recommend, but the member nations have the power to act on those recommendations. That is of vital importance.

The United Nations obviously can be no stronger than its members and their ability and determination to support its steps against aggression. It is incumbent on the United States to give that support; it is equally incumbent on all the other free member nations to give that support. I am one of those who believe that this collective support will be given.

I wish to set forth the following 10 suggestions which I think should be heeded in the crisis which confronts our Nation:

First. The danger that the Soviet Communists will resort to war to advance their imperialistic aims is of the utmost gravity and reality. There is no doubt whatsoever that Communist imperialism is out to spread over the world—over Europe and Asia by indirect aggression if possible, ultimately, I think, by war if necessary. If the Communists were to get the men and machines of those areas working for them, they could produce all types of guns, tanks, planes, and ships in tremendous quantities. They would have bases much closer to the United States from which to launch all-out atomic attacks as their stockpile of weapons increased. They would be in a much better position to strike at us than they are now. With airpower operating from European bases, and snorkel submarines operating off our coasts, they would pose a threat to our very existence as a free nation. That is why I think that the issue of America's survival is before us in the years immediately ahead.

Second. The problem of apportioning our economic aid and military manpower and matériel among Europe, Asia, and the United States is immensely complicated. No one man is wise enough to answer this question. No one man is wise enough to say hold Japan and Formosa, and let the rest go. No one man is wise enough to say use air and sea power but not land forces. The only proper basis for answering such questions is through consultation between the executive branch of the Government, military leaders, civilian experts, and the congressional leaders of

both parties. This task should be approached with humility and in a nonpartisan spirit.

Third. Domestically, we must make an all-out effort to improve our military posture. The way to do this must be determined by consultation and agreement by our leaders in the executive and legislative branches of the Government. We must mobilize our economic and military resources into a coordinated working team, with every American citizen devoting his full effort and interest to the success of our mobilization effort. It is only by an all-out national effort that we can build up the war-making strength which will make clear to Russia that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain with a continuation of her aggression against freedom and her threat to peace. Such a program means sacrifice, spelled with capital letters, sacrifice for each one of us; but it also means freedom. It also means that each one of us must grasp the meaning of the struggle—that each one of us has an obligation to preserve the spiritual, moral, and cultural values of civilization against the onslaught of those who would destroy them.

Fourth. As for our international cooperation, I believe that it is essential that we continue to give the fullest possible support to the United Nations and that we do everything that we need to do to assure the effective implementation of the Atlantic Pact. The United Nations Charter and the Atlantic Pact are a part of the law of the land. We should continue to meet our obligations under these two treaties. These treaties are not, of course, a one-way street. We expect to fulfill our responsibilities, but we expect other nations to do the same.

Fifth. Our goal is peace. In all our defense effort, let it never be forgotten by the people of this and other countries that we want peace and will only depart from it if our liberty and lives are threatened. That is why I list our goal of peace as the fifth suggestion I would have the American people emphasize in their thinking on the problems involved in this international crisis.

Sixth. We must be aware of our national purpose. What we are really trying to do is to defend our liberties and to assure that they shall not be replaced by the tyranny and terror of a Communist regime.

Seventh. In order to preserve our liberties, every American citizen must do his duty. Our circumstance is not unlike the colonial days when the early settlers took their stations in the blockhouse when danger threatened from without. All of us today must be alert against those who would commit treason against our purpose. There are thousands of Communists in our midst today who are ready to stick a dagger in our back at a word from Moscow. As I have said many times, and now repeat, we need to remember that Soviet Russia never moves from the outside in against a nation until she is ready to move from the inside of that nation out to meet her forces coming from without.

Eighth. The need for unity applies to management and labor. We must have cooperation in keeping the great workshop of America at full production. We cannot afford the luxury of strikes or of employer intransigence.

Ninth. There are three great means of getting the public behind our national effort and of sustaining their morale through the long period of effort ahead. Our press, radio, television, and movies have a great opportunity to keep the public informed and alert. Private organizations and universities have the same opportunity. And the churches of the land, perhaps above all, have the opportunity to keep us dedicated to our high moral purpose and to inspire us to a rededication to the spiritual values of democracy unknown in Communist dictatorships.

Every institution of enlightenment in North America, including the church, lodge, press, radio—every group where free men gather—should join forces in the struggle for peace. We cannot win the peace by wishing for it, nor by blaming the politicians because we do not have it, nor by adopting the fatalistic attitude that war is inevitable, nor by placing all the blame on our enemies in the war now gripping the world.

But while we must not abandon the struggle for peace nor go to the other extreme of adopting a fatalistic attitude that all-out war is inevitable, the freedom-loving nations must nevertheless build up their strength to the end that the dictators in the Kremlin may be persuaded to the view, before all-out war engulfs us, that Communist aggression must stop.

Tenth. There is no need to be panicky in America. The American people will proceed with courage, determination, and faith that, if we do these things, we shall successfully defend our liberties and our Nation against the menace of Communist imperialism.

The struggle for peace, which is the major crisis of our generation, is a struggle for men's minds rather than for their emotions. It is a struggle for human decency rather than for human debauchery. It involves an appeal to reason. Peace can be won and maintained only if we can convince freedom-loving people elsewhere in the world that rules of reason, procedures of international justice, relinquishment of many selfish interests must be substituted in the thinking of people everywhere for the emotional nationalism that still dominates the world in spite of all our laudatory efforts to set up a system of international justice through law by way of the United Nations.

The Senator from Ohio is entirely right in his contention that it is unwise ever to admit that war is inevitable. But it is even more unwise to insist that it will not happen because we do not want it to happen or because there is no conclusive proof, to the particular satisfaction of any Senator, that the nation we fear does not intend to wage war on us. Russia may seek other, cheaper, and less risky means of destroying us, as it successfully did in the Balkan states, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. It may, as a temporary device, when other methods fail, employ the troops of satellites as the spearhead of conquest. It may concentrate at first, as Stalin has in fact been doing, on nearer and easier victims. But we would be closing our eyes to the enormous perils we face and the entire free world faces if we failed to recognize that we are not only an intended victim of Soviet aggression, but indeed its absolutely inevitable target. Our very strength makes us such a target. If Russia can knock us out, the rest of the world would fall like a ripe apple in her outstretched hand. If she fails to do so and as long as she does, she is certain to have the uneasy feeling that she may some day have to disgorge all the ill-gotten gains that she has acquired during these last years.

The Senator from Ohio says the purpose of our foreign policy must principally be the maintenance of the liberty of our people not "to reform the entire world or spread sweetness and light and economic prosperty to peoples who have lived and worked out their own salvation for centuries, according to their customs, and to the best of their ability." That is so.

But it is precisely because we prize our liberty and want to preserve it that it is so essential that we rally around a common banner with all other nations and people who want to be free and who, like ourselves, are willing to fight to maintain their freedom, if necessary.

The Senator from Ohio admits that the Russian leaders have set forth in their writing sufficient evidence of a determined plan to communize the world.

He declares, and there can be no doubt about it, that it has sought to attain this objective through propaganda and infiltration and, latterly, through the use of satellite troops to attack countries. But he sees no conclusive evidence that the Russians expect to start a war with the United States.

It is difficult to see—

He says—

how the Russians today could reasonably entertain the hope that they can conquer the world by military action. * * * I believe they are still thinking in terms of a slow but steady advance by the methods which they have used up to this time.

The logic of events, the dynamics of the Russian drive for world mastery, do not support this hopeful view of the Senator from Ohio. The very fact that when propaganda and infiltration failed to achieve the Soviet objective in Korea, as they did fail, thanks to our efforts and the efforts of the UN, and Russia pushed her North Korean satellite into a military campaign which clearly involved the risk of a general war, suggests that when necessary, Russia will risk war to accomplish her aims. She is far more likely to do so if the risks are slight, if her would-be victims are weak and divided among themselves, than if they are strong and united.

Why did Russia keep up an incessant propaganda barrage against our aid to Greece and Turkey, against the Marshall plan, against western union, against the North Atlantic Pact, against the establishment of the Bonn Republic in West Germany, and against every other measure we and other free nations have taken during these last years to build a barrier of strong, economically

stable states in the path of Russian aggression?

The Ohio Senator says he thought at the time and thinks still that the Atlantic Pact was a tremendous mistake, that it helps create the greatest probability of war. "The Atlantic Pact," he says, "could at least be interpreted as an aggressive move." This is what the Russians themselves have been saying in season and out and in every language in which the Voice of Moscow broadcasts its lying propaganda. But was our aid to Greece and Turkey, the economic assistance we gave to the war-stricken nations of Western Europe—and had offered to Soviet Russia and her satellites as well—could they, too, be interpreted as aggressive moves? To believe that is to believe that any move is aggressive which Moscow says is aggressive.

The fact is that Moscow opposed these moves not because of any legitimate fears for its security but because the stronger the free world becomes the less likely those nations are to become victims of Communist propaganda, Communist infiltration, and Communist subversion. It is no coincidence that the peak of Communist strength in France, Italy, and elsewhere in Western Europe occurred when they were at the low ebb of their economies and that the internal menace of communism began to fade when recovery got underway, recovery which the Marshall plan did much to foster in Western Europe.

And, externally, it is also no coincidence that the period of greatest spread of Russian Communist imperialism occurred in the years after the war, when the nations of Western Europe were still bleeding from the terrible wounds they received during the war and we were in the midst of that headlong flight into unilateral disarmament which began for us as soon as the formal fighting had ended. It is no coincidence either that this expansion of the area of Communist imperialism occurred at a time when there was no unity of aim and purpose among the free nations, particularly between this country and its present allies.

Two things were responsible for the maintenance of that precarious peace we enjoyed during those years. The first was that Russia did not have to fight to spread her domination over the large area that between 1944 and 1948 came under her control. Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, the Baltic States, Poland, were taken over from within without a struggle.

Mr. President, ever since that time they have been working under a police-state system of slave labor, and the most reliable information we seem to be able to gather is that they are producing at a rate higher than that at which they produced before World War II, which is some evidence of how effective the police-state method of slave labor can become when people are given the choice of either working or being shot.

The second obstacle was our exclusive possession until 1949 of the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb may not have been the only deterrent that held back the masters of the Kremlin; they may have gambled on that economic collapse which the Kremlin's soothsayers consulting the crystal ball of Karl Marx and Nikolai Lenin have already insisted was both inevitable and imminent. But the atomic bomb was certainly a deterrent, and a powerful one, in preventing Russia from going to extremes.

I digress long enough to repeat what I said in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Ohio on the floor of the Senate on January 5, that in my opinion our superiority in the stock piling of atomic bombs is probably the prime deterrent against Russian aggression upon Europe. When the Senator from Ohio raises the question as to whether or not implementing the North Atlantic Pact at this time may incite Russia to militarily move against Europe now, I can only answer that I do not know for a certainty. However, I can also answer that it is my sober judgment that so long as we have a superiority in stockpiling of atomic bombs Russia will not take the risk. We will not have such superiority indefinitely. That is why I think it is so important that we take advantage of the precious time which is now available to us, to implement the North Atlantic Pact, so that under a mutual defense program we will have a combined land force, air force, and navy available to the free nation members of the North Atlantic Pact to check Russia, if at a time she has a larger stockpile of atomic bombs she should decide to move her forces over Europe.

Again I say today, as I said on January 5, that the best military advice I have been able to obtain as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, from the top military experts of our Military Establishment, is that the North Atlantic Pact can be implemented by a mutual common defense program, so as successfully to check a Russian advance across Europe. I think we should take advantage of the precious time which is allowed us by our superiority of our atomic stockpile at the present time to carry out what I consider to be our clear obligations under the North Atlantic Pact by joining with the free nations who are members of it in building up the mutual defense program, which our military experts tell us offers us the best hope of checking the conquest of Europe by Soviet Russia. Therefore, I believe that the atomic bomb is still a deterrent, but a steadily diminishing one. The time may not be far distant when it will cease being a deterrent at all, when Russia will possess a stockpile of atomic armaments great enough to destroy our quantitative superiority as, previously, she succeeded in destroying our monopoly of the bomb.

What, then, should we do in the meantime? Should we sit idly by hugging to our bosom the vain hope that if we become strong within our borders the tides of aggression that threaten to sweep across Asia and Europe will bypass us? Or should we seek with the help and cooperation of other, and even more imperiled, nations than ours, to establish a continuation of power that would give the Russian aggressors pause?

We helped establish the United Nations in the hope that it would serve as an instrument with which to maintain peace. But let us not forget that we never dared and never did entrust our security to the protection of the United Nations alone. The United Nations was to be a peace instrument for the future; there was never, since its foundation in 1945, any assurance that it could serve its intended purpose immediately. It was the recognized weakness of the United Nations, certainly no discovery of this moment, that prompted us to seek, within the provisions of the Charter and in line with the Charter's principles and purposes other means of bolstering the peace and our security and the security of the free world. That is why we negotiated and concluded the Rio Pact. That is why we negotiated and concluded the North Atlantic Pact.

By the latter agreement, to which the Senate gave its overwhelming consent, we formally linked our fate with the fate of nations who, in many instances, had twice been associated with us in two world wars. These wars had had their origin in Europe. Both times we had been the aloof spectators of the struggle for power that had led to devastating conflict; we had stood by while aggressors rampaged, doing nothing to deter them, only ultimately and inevitably to be drawn into the conflicts these aggressors had provoked. Is there any assurance that the third time we will be any more successful in staying out of a conflict arising on that continent? There is, in fact, far less likelihood of that now than there was in 1914 or in 1939. Indeed, in addition to all other compelling factors that link our fate with the nations of Western Europe, we are now bound, as we were not then, by a legal commitment to intervene if they are attacked.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] not only admits this but, let it be said to his credit, insists on this. Though he opposed the Atlantic Pact at the time it was made and regards it as a dangerous development, he recognizes that because of it an attack by Russia on any of the European nations that signed the pact would be treated by this country as an attack on us. He says:

> We have clearly notified them—the Russians—that any attack in Europe upon the members of the Atlantic Pact means a third world war, and we are obligated to enter such a war under the terms of the Atlantic Pact.

But in that case, I ask, does not common sense dictate that, as a Nation eager to avoid war, we do all we can to build up the strength of our partners and reinforce the alliance in every way we can, so as to make sure that the aggressor will not be tempted by Europe's weakness to seek new territorial gains?

In view of the history of these last 37 years, it would seem to be silly to say that we have no direct stake in Europe's peace, for Europe's peace is ours; or in Europe's security, for Europe's security is part and parcel of our own. The defense of Western Europe is no ill-considered act of idealism on our part, no expression of charity, no move on our part to interfere in the activities of other nations.

The defense of Western Europe is our concern precisely because our first consideration must be, as the Senator from Ohio insists it is, the defense of America.

Nor is it our concern merely for reasons that are found written indelibly on the pages of history or because of the legal commitments we have made. There is also the overriding fact that if Europe is lost to Russia, our position, already as grave as any we have ever found ourselves in since we became a Nation, would become perilous in the extreme.

The free world today possesses a vast potential preponderance of power over the slave world of Russia and her satellites. All the tests that one can apply—comparative steel production, electric power output, production of coal and cotton and essential raw materials, the possession of technical skills, and so forth, all prove that contention. Taking the free world as a whole, its population, too, is greater than that of the slave world. But this potential strength has no meaning if the free world is divided and it would turn into an active inferiority, so far as we are concerned, were Russia to take possession of the mines and smelters and factories of West Germany and France and the Benelux states.

The one area in which the west is clearly inferior is in the military sphere, and it is precisely here where the greatest danger arises to the pease and freedom and security of the free world.

It was this fact, among others, which led the nations of Western Europe, together with the United States and Canada, to join in the North Atlantic Pact. Since Western Europe was only beginning its economic recovery, the corollary of that pact was the military assistance program. The rearmament of Western Europe, under that program as originally envisaged, was to be a slow-paced affair. We thought we had time. We assumed that while Russia would indefinitely continue to wage her cold war, she would stop at the point of military aggression. Events in Korea beginning last June proved us wrong. They proved that, if other means failed—and throughout the world other means were failing—Russia would use force. The Korean assault development was an alarm bell. It awakened us to the peril we were in, the peril the world faces. It was an alarm bell to other nations, too, although their response was not, in all instances, as rapid and as far reaching as many of us felt their perilous situation demanded.

This time lag between our reaction to the Soviet menace and the reaction of our allies is unfortunate. The sooner it is overcome the stronger and more secure the free world will be. Yet we would be flying in the face of facts to assume, as many are apparently doing, that the nations of Western Europe are doing nothing in their own defense. That simply is not true. They have been laggard in this regard, as we have been; they have not done as much as they should; nor have we. But they have not been sitting by with hands folded, fatalistically awaiting the attack from the east by Russia's hordes. They have begun to build up their armed strength and with our encouragement and assistance, yes, with our prodding, will do more.

Jules Moch, the tough Minister of War of the French Republic, announced recently that by the end of 1951 France will have an armed force in excess of 50 divisions of between 23,000 and 24,000 men each, which means between 1,150,000 and 1,200,000 soldiers.

On the basis of population then, France's force 11 months from now will be comparable in size to a 4,500,000-man American force. This is larger by a third than our own present rearmament plans now contemplate. It may not be large enough. But since even we, with our vastly greater industrial establishment, are fearful of imposing a regime of total mobilization on our economy for fear of what it may do to that economy, so the French and other West Europeans are fearful and with even more reason, since an overburdened economy might give the large Communist element in their midst precisely the talking point they need.

There must be an increased rearmament effort throughout the North Atlantic area. But there is every reason why everything should be done to cushion the seriously weakening effect rearmament may have on the standards of living of those countries, countries only just recovering from the last war.

In the meantime, we cannot afford to stand idly by and take the complacent attitude that Western Europe's rearmament and military strength is Europe's own concern and none of our business. It is our business—for we are all in this together. As Ben Franklin said on another but not dissimilar occasion in the past, "Either we hang together or we shall certainly hang separately."

I am no military expert and do not profess to know exactly how much rearmament is needed to hold the Russian hordes at bay; or what specific forms that rearmament effort should take. I do not know how many troops, how many planes, how many tanks, how many ships, are needed to secure the peace. In this matter, I trust the judgment of the real experts. If we are to fight a common war—and the same holds for the effort which we all pray will be successful to build up sufficient strength so we can avoid a war—it makes no difference where our strength is deployed. If it will do more good to deploy part of it in Europe rather than keep it here at home in the defeatist belief that Europe is lost anyway, then by all means, that strength or the necessary part of it should be deployed in Europe.

When I say it makes no difference where our strength is deployed, I hasten to add that I think the decision as to where it should be deployed should be left to the military experts, because from the standpoint of their military strategy it of course makes a great deal of difference. I believe we must put them in a position so that they will have the power and the authority to deploy it where they can best check the advance of Russian aggression against freedom.

It seems to me there is all the more reason for doing so if, by this practical example of our readiness to combat aggression should an agression be launched against the west, we inspire West European nations to do more than they have been doing for the common defense of all of us.

As Eisenhower said to the French and British people over the radio the other day, "There is power in our union—and resourcefulness on sea, land, and air. Aroused and unified, there is nothing which the nations of the Atlantic community cannot achieve."

I say, Mr. President, that I believe Eisenhower is right in that if we will stand together as united, free peoples, members of the North Atlantic family, we can make perfectly clear to Russia that she does have everything to lose by a continuation of an aggressive course of action against freedom. I think it plain that each and every one of us must recognize the fact that the hour in which we live is one of the darkest and most critical in the history of the Western Hemisphere. We must, therefore, keep calm, keep our heads clear, and keep our courage strong. This is no time for emotional, hysterical reaction. It is a time which calls for facing resolutely the ugly reality of Soviet aggression against freedom.

We must make clear to Russia and Communist China, through the procedures of the United Nations, that we stand ready to negotiate an honorable peace without appeasement, and that we are firmly determined to resist, along with our allies in the United Nations and through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a continuation of Communist aggression whether by direct assault or through the subterfuge of satellite attacks.

The people of the United States and freedom-loving peoples elsewhere must demonstrate to the other peoples of the world that we intend to practice our democratic principles, that we intend to put into practice the spiritual meanings of democracy, that we intend to translate into action our faith in the dignity of the individual, and that we intend to establish in the century of struggle ahead a system of international justice through law under which conflicts between nations can be settled through the processes of adjudication rather than through a resort to arms.

Whether or not mankind in the next century attains peace through a system of international justice by law depends in no small measure upon what we do in this session of Congress. If we keep faith with our allies in the North Atlantic Pact and if they in turn keep faith with us to the end that a mutuality of strong Allied defense confronts the Soviet leaders, I think time will be in our favor and on the side of peace.

If, on the other hand, we show weakness now by way of division among us over the defense of Europe now, I fear that time may prove to be on the side of war.

Granted that the risk of war is very great in this dark hour no matter which course of action we may follow in Europe; nevertheless, it seems clear to me that our greatest strength is to be found in standing with our allies in defense of principles of human liberty which we know to be right.

ATLANTIC UNION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when General Eisenhower arrived in Europe, he said:

Aroused and united, there is nothing which the nations of the Atlantic community cannot achieve.

President Truman, in his state of the Union address, said:

The heart of our common defense is the North Atlantic community.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who just preceded me, stated in very forceful terms the necessity of having unity and of standing together with our democratic allies of the North Atlantic under some system of law.

All of us undoubtedly agree with these sentiments. The lessons of history teach us that if the people of the democratic nations stand together and are willing to work for their freedom, no dictator, however ruthless he may be, would dare upset the peace and stability of the world.

In an effort to bring about a closer working together and unity among the people of the world who believe in freedom, I am pleased again to submit a concurrent resolution proposing the Atlantic Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may send to the desk a concurrent resolution, submitted by me, for myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 4), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THYE, and Mr. YOUNG) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law," and "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security"; and

Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of 13 sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

Whereas these federal union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories to the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

Whereas the United States and the other six democracies which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a Federal Convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in connection with the agreement by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to join as a sponsor of the concurrent resolution I desire to say that he feels, as do many of us, that more stress should be put on economic aspects of Atlantic union, and that at an appropriate time he expects to offer an amendment to stress the economic aspects. He has asked that I make that explanation, which I am pleased to do.

An identical measure (S. Con. Res. 57) was submitted on July 26, 1949, on behalf of 20 Senators.

Our own resolution aims to back up General Eisenhower by calling a convention to begin creating the Atlantic Union.

It is General Eisenhower's task to organize a powerful Atlantic army. Yet there is no effective Atlantic civil power to which he can report now—nothing but the 12-headed Atlantic Council, which has power only to recommend.

The solution of this problem is our own responsibility. The Atlantic Union resolution would have us tackle this problem at once.

Since that time impressive progress toward Atlantic Union has been made, but it has not been nearly enough. Our fellow citizens are organizing behind it through the Atlantic Union Committee, whose president is Justice Owen J. Roberts, and whose vice presidents are Will L. Clayton and Robert P. Patterson. The committee now has 112 chapters in 42 States. Organization is proceeding in Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium. In June the Canadian Senate, in which the Government has an overwhelming majority, passed, with only one negative vote, an Atlantic Union resolution almost the same as ours.

This resolution is plain and direct. It is not a plea for world government; it is a means of setting in motion the machinery to attain once again the ideal of peace and freedom as a primary object of free people in the Atlantic community. It is investigative only; it commits us to nothing except to look at a prospective method for real peace.

This is what the Atlantic Union Resolution does, and this is all it does: It requests the President to call a convention of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact, and any other free countries the group wishes to invite, to explore together the extent to which they might apply among themselves, within the framework of the United Nations organization, the principles of American federation.

A resolution identical to this gained the support of more than 90 Senators and Representatives of both parties in the Eighty-first Congress. Many distinguished Americans testified in support of it in hearings before the Senate and House Committees on foreign relations.

A Gallup poll showed that 64 percent of Americans favor "a closer relationship or union" among Atlantic Pact countries.

Today the picture is undoubtedly gloomy. But we can have much hope because I know that we sincerely believe that there is no problem that man cannot solve if he looks squarely at it and does several things: First, if he clearly and calmly analyzes the nature of the problem; second, if he settles on a course of action adequate to meet the problem; and Third, if he pursues that course with persistence, determination and the faith that what is right deserves his every ounce of energy.

I see the present problem like this. The Soviet Union is bent on world conquest. Her weapons are propaganda and brute force. Her success has been phenomenal. Already she has reduced

11 countries to the rank of satellite, not counting the crumbling Korea. Without putting a single Russian on the firing line, the Kremlin has become master of an area stretching from the Elbe to the Pacific—15,000,000,000 square miles of it—one-third of the earth. It contains over 700,000,000 people. But still the Soviet prowls for plunder and conquest. A dozen areas tempt her next move.

In a world increasingly engulfed by the Red tide, it is up to the people who love and value freedom, both for themselves and for others, to cope with both these Soviet tactics. The present regime in Russia is rooted in revolution and is using revolutionary methods. To face this threat, we must bring to bear something more than the customary and ordinary. The situation is extraordinary.

The Atlantic democracies have already taken some steps to meet this growing threat: The Truman doctrine, Marshall plan, Western Union, and now the Atlantic Pact. All these steps showed recognition of the need for concerted effort. But they were only piecemeal steps and have not provided an over-all solution to the problem.

The Atlantic Union Resolution proposes that we begin now to see if we cannot improve upon our first essay, the Atlantic alliance. This resolution proposes that we invite the other six sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty—Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxemburg—to meet in a Federal convention with our delegates and begin now to explore, at least, whether we cannot work out a constitution of government which will give all free nations the power that there is in our own Union of 48 States.

Some fear that to call the proposed Atlantic Federal Convention now would interfere with the efforts the Government is already making to meet the emergency. Let me stress that this convention is not a substitute for any of the existing machinery, whether that of the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, or any other.

The convention would merely explore whether a still stronger solution than the Atlantic Pact could not be found on Federal Union lines, at least for the democracies that sponsored the pact. It would explore only whether such a union could be made—to quote the resolution itself—"within the framework of the United Nations" for the purpose not of replacing but of strengthening that organization.

Let us wait no longer for another Pearl Harbor, Dunkerque, or Verdun to unite us. Let us begin now to back General Eisenhower with all the power there is in union.

The fact is that the Kremlin's forces are united politically, militarily, and economically in one huge mass of power. The democracies are divided. The Soviet empire has one foreign policy, and is under one command ready to move quickly at its will. The democracies have 12 foreign policies, 12 heads of command. They cannot function as a unit.

As matters are going now, unless we take steps toward effective union for our own defense, we are confronted with a growing neutrality on the part of the nations of Western Europe.

In the thirties, Hitler rubbed his hands to see neutralism in the United States delivering Western Europe to him. Today Stalin gloats over the spectacle of neutralism rising in Western Europe. This anxious European desire to keep out of war by being neutral is now causing some Americans (who forget they fell for the same delusion themselves a dozen years ago) to say in effect: "To the devil with you. You're no good. You are not worth helping. We'll go it alone."

Nor is this ever-developing split between the United States and its European allies the only division among them that Stalin is gloating over now.

Stalin knows how deeply divided the French and British are over European Union and the Schuman plan. Stalin knows how little real agreement there is, despite all the outward show—between the United States and France on the issue of how to rearm Germany. How can he help but know how divided we and Britain are in the Far East, with one ally recognizing Red China diplomatically and the other refusing such recognition and insisting that Red China be recognized now only as an aggressor?

Do you suppose that Stalin is blind to the fact that the Atlantic Community is shot through with the divisions which the principle of unlimited national sovereignty has always produced?

The problem then boils down to this: How can the Atlantic democracies—for they are the ones to which the rest of the still independent world looks for security against Kremlin grabbing—how can they achieve a unity comparable to, or even surpassing, that of the Communist bloc? The bitter question of today is how can we avert war; or, if it comes, how can we win it.

Undoubtedly, unity in the Atlantic Community is an absolute necessity in this crisis. Its unity is necessary for the future of free men everywhere. Actually the policy of the United States and Western Europe has been to move toward more integration and union since 1947—militarily, economically, and politically. We moved through the Marshall plan, Western Union, the Council of Europe, the Schuman plan, and the Atlantic pact.

When the North Atlantic Council was set up, it spanned the Atlantic. The Council is composed of the foreign ministers of the pact countries who meet periodically. Now that General Eisenhower has been appointed supreme commander of the Atlantic forces and a Defense Production Board is being set up, many people believe that the ultimate, and the necessary, in unity has been achieved. This is not correct, in my opinion.

Take a look at the machinery of the NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. What kind of unity does it permit? Is there a single command that can move with decision? Not really. General Eisenhower is the supreme commander. But he is responsible to the standing group of the NATO and this group is responsible to the defense committee which, in its turn, is responsible to the Atlantic Council. Therefore, at the very minimum, the general has 12 bosses. Likewise, the projected head of the North Atlantic Defense Production Board will be hedged around with bosses. This is hardly a set-up for quick, decisive action, such as the Soviet Union can set in motion.

The resolution, as I said, merely calls for an exploratory convention. It would commit us to nothing. Whatever came out of the convention would have to be referred back to the voters of each participating nation for ratification. This country cannot be committed without the say-so of its citizens.

It is well to be reminded that we are challenged by a government based on revolution and using revolutionary methods. We must defeat it with revolutionary methods of our own. Our Government, too, is based on revolution, the most inspiring and the least bloody revolution the world has known, the American Revolution, that combined the ideals of liberty and union.

The great difference is that the Communist revolution is based upon dictatorship and a denial of freedom. The American revolutionary method, which this resolution seeks to extend, is based upon freedom and a recognition of an individual's worth. It is to a limited extent based upon the same revolutionary idea which brought the representatives of the Thirteen Colonies together in 1787 out of which developed the greatest political and economic federation the world has ever known.

No propaganda could have the electrifying, hope-inspiring effect on freemen everywhere as that which would result from the prompt passage by Congress of the Atlantic Union resolution.

I do not think it would take too long to get the federation under way, if we determined to enter such a union. After all, the Constitution of the United States—which had no precedent—was written in about 100 days and ratified in 16 months. That was an age when communication was largely by word of mouth and voting devices very unwieldy.

Merely convoking the convention would electrify the whole free world. We remember how the whole West perked up when the Marshall plan was announced even though it was not implemented for some time. When the Atlantic Treaty was signed, it inspired immediate confidence.

Should the Union be actually started, the West will feel for the first time that it is a unit; there will no longer be doubts of who will come to whose support in times of peril. The whole community will be rejuvenated—revitalized—supremely confident of its powers to maintain its own way of life. The Soviet would be far less likely to risk war for she would know that she would have to take on the whole union if she did. Gone would be her chance of keeping us divided, of picking us off one by one.

The delegates to the federal convention will have to work out many problems by compromise, just as we did in the American federal convention, but I believe that any final union would be

largely patterned after our own. The union should have limited powers, I think, dealing only with those affairs which concern the welfare of the uniting peoples as a whole. We have failed utterly to establish peace and freedom using the traditional methods of diplomacy which developed in nineteenth-century Europe; it is time we turn back to the method of federation which was created here in America and which has proven so successful.

We have great confidence in the ability of General Eisenhower to organize a powerful Atlantic army, but we cannot wait until he stalks among freezing, hungry men in some new Valley Forge before recognizing that treaties and alliances cannot be adequate substitutes for government by law.

The task of General Eisenhower is to organize militarily the Atlantic army. He has not the authority to institute a plan by which the Atlantic community can govern its basic foreign and defense policy. This authority rests with the people, and it is the responsibility of civilians—of us and our colleagues in other Atlantic democracies—to stage the setting in which the free people may determine whether they wish to apply a different method than we are now applying in this crisis.

Already, voices are calling for a streamlining of the machinery. Just the other day the Washington Post said:

> There ought to be no further delay in clearing the channels and providing machinery to obtain quick political decisions.

In other words, it is high time to stop trying to achieve integration in a piecemeal, patchwork manner. Let's take the bull by the horns and do what has to be done. Let us give the Atlantic community real unity. We can do this by forming an Atlantic union. We will be following the same pattern by which the diverse States of this Country built a cohesion and force that made it the most prosperous, liberty-loving, forceful country in the world. Our original Thirteen States, you will remember, accomplished little by diplomatic negotiation, but, once they united and set up a Federal Government, military and economic integration were quickly completed and our vast future lay before us for the taking. It can happen again.

There is no reason to fear that the calling of the convention proposed in this resolution might interfere with the efforts we are already making to meet this emergency. In no wise would this convention seek to substitute for existing and operating diplomatic machinery—be it that of the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, or any other. We would merely investigate the possibility of finding a stronger situation of strength in federation by law than we have in alliance by treaty.

Industrially, 80 percent of the world's production is accomplished in the Atlantic community. Next to the United States, Western Europe is the most important center of industry in the world. Bound to us in federal union, this rich area would be in no more danger of falling to communism. In minerals alone, the Atlantic union would be virtually self-sufficient in the 15 most important ones. The United States by itself has only six of them.

Looking at the industrial capacity of the Atlantic union, any potential aggressor would have to take into serious consideration this tremendous productive might translated into military power. The Economic Cooperation Administration says that the productive power of Western Europe can be made to equal our own. Productive power determines military power.

The union of 400,000,000 people would mean an expanding market. In these days of specialization and mass production, such an expanded market can only mean increased prosperity and higher living standards for the whole community.

From the defense standpoint, the unified Atlantic community would have the vast advantages of unified command, unified forces, standardization of weapons avoidance of wasteful duplication, and a pooling of specialized skills and aptitudes. Its bases would be widely dispersed and so would its industrial areas and vital points, making it infinitely more difficult for a potential enemy to win a rapid war by surprise attack.

There would be 1 foreign policy for the whole community—instead of the 12 it now has under the Atlantic Pact. With only one policy, it would fortify itself against the Soviet technique of divide and conquer—of always trying to drive a wedge between the democracies and capitalizing on their differences. Differing policies make for dissension and suspicion among the democracies—as is happening now on recognition of Red China, relations with Spain, on branding Red China as the aggressor in Korea.

A true union of the democracies would make for peace. Such a combination of resources, productive capacity, and defense forces would create an entity of such vast power that it could not be defeated in war. Hence, a potential aggressor would hesitate about starting something he could not finish. The Union would place a predominance of power on the side of the people who respect law, order, and freedom. Such a combination would put real strength behind the principles of the United Nations. It would provide the armed backing the United States is now unable to create. A decision of the United Nations would then have far more meaning than it has today. There would be no conflict between an Atlantic federation and the United Nations. The purpose of the United Nations is to attain peace. That purpose would be strengthened by Atlantic Union. The Union would be for peaceful purposes and not a federation for aggression. But if war were forced upon the free people, they would indeed have real and united strength for their own defense. We should, of course, continue to support and to endeavor to strengthen the United Nations in the hope that the time may come when all nations through it would be willing to settle their differences. The passage of this resolution would be a great step in bringing the United Nations toward the dream all have for it.

By forming an Atlantic Union, we would bring together peoples with a common heritage and common viewpoint. The whole Atlantic community is characterized by its love of freedom. We Americans love our freedom so much that we have many times placed it even before peace. We must not forget that free men everywhere are the major assets of free men anywhere and to keep our hard-won freedom, we must defend freedom elsewhere. We can best do this by banding together in union.

Forming an Atlantic Union will also enable the Atlantic community to effectively help the underdeveloped countries of the world. Instead of the United States having a rather inadequate point 4 program and the British Commonwealth a Colombo plan, wouldn't it make for efficiency to have the plans combined into one substantial, coordinated program? The democracies could then translate the meaning of democracy into better living conditions. This would effectively meet communism's false promises and make for political stability in backward areas now threatened by the Soviet.

The remaining independent nations of Asia have always depended upon the Atlantic democracies for most of their trade. If the Atlantic democracies form a union, these Asiatic nations will derive tremendous economic benefits from increased trade as well as better prospects for peace.

The union, of course, would not be a static thing. As other nations qualified for entrance—and I think the qualification should be experience and success in self-government because it is essential that the union remain democratic—the union would grow, just as our Union grew. And as this democratic society grew, the likelihood of wars would become less and less.

The Atlantic Union resolution applies directly to the present emergency. The convention could move immediately toward the establishment of a single department of Atlantic defense and foreign policy. As a Rhode Island newspaper recently said:

> If the situation is serious enough for a common army, it is serious enough for a common political command.

We simply cannot risk any longer the differences of opinion on foreign policy which make the democracies misinterpret each other's intentions.

All the features of Atlantic Union do not have to be worked out simultaneously. Under crisis conditions, the first things to take up would be those having to do with Atlantic security—defense and foreign policy. Calling the convention would not mean discontinuing any of the measures now at work for our defense; it would help them and speed them and promote their success.

If I may repeat myself, man is never helpless if he comes to grips with a problem, chooses a course of action, and pursues it energetically.

To my mind, the Atlantic Union plan is realistic and attainable. If anything can avert war, Atlantic federation can. But if even it fails, at least the free world will be in the strongest position to win.

Communism fills the air with dynamic noise. Let the democratic peoples accept that challenge, and show that freemen can work out their destiny and put their ideas on the march again for the benefit of all mankind.

We warned the Eighty-first Congress that we were proceeding too slowly and too incompletely. We urged this investigation in the brief period when gunfire was not being heard. It would have been better to have begun in the comparative calm of two whole years ago. Perhaps we would not be mobilizing for the conflict today if our warning had been heeded.

We lost time while we marked time. We can no longer afford the luxury of killing time, because time will kill us if we do. Korea came quicker than we thought. Another Verdun, another Dunkirk, another Pearl Harbor may come tomorrow.

The Chief Executive extolled us to "stand together with all men everywhere who believe in human liberty."

The way to achieve is to try. The way to stand together is to try to get together. The way to get together is to meet. The free people remaining are ready. The time remaining is short. These look to America that refused to lead before. If there is to be a meeting, we shall have to call it.

It is our move, Mr. President.

BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we of the Eighty-second Congress have convened at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century. America has faced peril at many times in her history, but never since the dark days of Valley Forge has America faced such a desperate fight to survive as a free nation.

America is fighting world war III, today—now. Make no mistake. Not one of America's leaders has dared tell the people this simple truth—a truth so evident that the people can see it for themselves.

Dictators do not declare war. Dictators wage war. At this very hour the free world is fighting a war with Communist Russia, a war far more deadly than any in the recorded history of mankind.

It is not a formal war, fought according to the rules of a chivalry long dead. This is modern, twentieth-century war, an insidious war, a war in which deceit, trickery, subversion, propaganda, and double-dealing are as much the weapons as are tanks, planes, and warships.

World war III began before World War II was ended. For seven long years we have lost the battles of world war III. But it took some 45,000 American casualties of the conflict in Korea to make the American people realize this is a real war.

There is a deadly parallel between the world today and the world of 1940. In that year the dictator was Hitler, and his tyranny was called fascism or nazism. Hitler wheeled his divisions into position in Western Europe, and confronted the free nations which had burrowed into the Maginot line. While the free nations hoped there would be no war, Hitler proceeded, by conquest and deceitful diplomacy, to reduce Eastern Europe. While the Allies fought a phony war, Hitler proceeded to make secure his eastern front.

In 1951, on a global scale, we find a similar situation. The Communists have arrayed their divisions in Europe and in the Middle East. The free nations quaver in the face of this threat. Meanwhile, in Asia, the Kremlin is attempting to reduce and secure its eastern front.

Let us be coldly objective. In this stage of world war III, there are five major fronts. The active shooting front is in Korea. The cold fronts are in the Middle East and Europe. There is the home front in America. Finally, there is the front behind the iron curtain. There is a Communist objective in each of these fronts. The Soviets must achieve victory on each if they are to achieve their objective for the conquest of the world.

In Asia the Red imperialists seek to gain the objectives of unlimited manpower and raw materials, with a secondary purpose of bleeding America's strength.

In the Middle East the objective is that primary essential of modern warfare—oil.

In Europe the objective is industrial potential and know-how. In America their purpose is to raise false issues, to weaken, to divide, to disrupt. Behind the iron curtain they seek to destroy opposition, and by lies to frighten their people into hating America.

Much has been said in recent weeks of the great debate facing the Eighty-second Congress. It is implied that the issue is our foreign policy. The issue, I submit, is not foreign policy. When a nation engages in war its foreign policy is replaced by its strategic concept of how to gain the victory. Our debate is not with regard to policy. The issue is one of strategy. It is not how to prevent war. It is how to win that war.

It is time the administration and the Congress faced squarely this issue. How many battles must we lose before we realize we are fighting a grim, bloody, no-holds-barred war to the finish with Communist Russia?

This is an hour for new beginnings.

America needs a government which will begin anew by throwing off indecision, inaction, quibbling, and side issues.

There are forms of human slavery which man had better die opposing than submit to. The most degrading of these is Soviet communism. Twice in this century the productive force, the physical courage, and the moral will of America have been the decisive factors in saving the world from an endless night of slavery.

But the vice of tyranny is that it ever forgets and it never learns.

It is time we let Soviet Russia know that America will never surrender freedom. Let the Communists ponder well on this. Other dictators have mistaken our will, have miscalculated our intent.

Let Josef Stalin and his Politburo understand this: Since they are determined to rule the world, since they persist in subjugating free peoples, they will inevitably encounter the unconquerable will of America.

Let the Kremlin think on these words, words which diplomatic niceties preclude: Since they are bent on war and conquest, they shall have it. They shall have it with all the strength this Nation can summon—with every freeman who will fight against slavery for his birth right of freedom.

Historically and up to this hour of new beginning, all nations which have wanted peace have found America ever willing to have peace—honorable peace, peace with freedom and justice. The choice has been made not by us, but by the Kremlin.

On this we all agree: They will not take away our freedom.

Today America faces a crisis which demands unity. We are being asked to rally to the support of men and policies which have failed. In all fairness, is it possible to build unity on failure, on incompetence, on expediency? Any Senator has only to read his mail to know there has been a real, a serious—yes, a critical—deterioration in the public's confidence in its leadership.

The very essence of government is to foresee the future.

Even the most naive citizen is aware of the succession of failures on the part of the administration to foresee the future which has brought about the shooting phase of a global war. There is no need to recite this record. It is too well known. The time for bitterness and recrimination is past.

We must compose our differences, and we must agree not on a policy to prevent war, but a strategy to win war.

Today I offer a blueprint for victory. This is a positive program, a constructive approach. I readily concede that those who support it must break with the thinking of the past. In a traditionally American way they must boldly plan for the world of today and tomorrow.

The people must understand an accomplished fact: The United States has been committed to a continuing policy of collective security.

I believe America must stand by her commitments. I believe America must take the leadership in making collective security effective.

It is vital that we have a global strategy grounded on the basic concept that America is the hard core of the free world's strength. We must conserve that strength and must budget its use. It is essential that America does not dissipate its strength in indecisive incidents in the four corners of the globe. American power must be brought to bear on the key fronts.

In a broad sense, as I have indicated, this war will be fought on five fronts. While it is not our intention to lose on any of these fronts, it is clear that America alone cannot overcome the enemy except on the home front.

It is also clear that America can very largely furnish four of the five components of victory. Our Nation has productive capacity equal to that of the rest of the world, we have air power we have sea power, and we have the atomic bomb in quantity. We lack the manpower to fight land wars single handed. We must husband our strength for use to the free

world's greatest advantage in the five-front war.

The problem, then, is the issue of our global strategy. We have three original choices.

We can continue by inaction and indecision to lose this war in large and small incidents, while refusing to admit we are engaged in all-out conflict.

Or we can draw lines on maps, erect imaginary walls, establish perimeters, and let the initiative remain with the enemy.

Or we can adopt the course I advocate. We can recognize that this is total war, that each day Russia delays the shooting on the fronts in Europe and the Mid-east gives us that much longer to increase our strength and marshal the forces of freedom; that our ultimate victory is to be won by harassing the dictators on the three fronts in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, while driving a wedge between the Communist rulers and their common people—those miserable human slaves who yearn for peace and freedom just as we do.

This is not the so-called preventive war. Such argument is specious. If we admit the truth that we are already in war, that free peoples, including American soldiers, are fighting and dying, and have been for many months, this muddle will suddenly come into sharp focus. We are in war. We cannot fight to prevent this war. We must fight to win this war.

Above all else, let us forthrightly admit the great fallacy of our past policy. We have patiently and persistently tried to negotiate with Stalin and his criminal conspirators. We have failed. By now we should realize that the Soviet imperialists are the incarnation of willful evil. We cannot negotiate with Stalin. We had as well try to treat with Satan.

If there remains a place for policy, let it be this: Let us ever hold out to the slave peoples the hope for peace and freedom with but one condition—the condition that they purge themselves of their Communist leaders bent on the conquest of mankind, in order to join with us.

I offer a blueprint for victory:

First. The peoples of all the free world must assure themselves of competent leadership. American responsibility probably is greatest, for our leaders must inspire all nations. It is imperative that President Truman call new men to his executive department, men capable of restoring the confidence and regaining the support of the American people.

Second. America's crying need is military manpower, combat troops. We must raise the ratio of fighting men to the total already in uniform. We must enact a universal military service and training act

Third. We need more modern weapons now—guns, tanks, planes, ships. This means all-out industrial mobilization and round-the-clock production.

Fourth. Over-all ceilings should have been placed on prices, wages, and allocations of materials months ago.

Fifth. The North American continent is the hard core of freedom's strength. It is urgent that we protect America with a modern radar screen in depth, correlated with the most modern interceptor aircraft on full combat alert.

Sixth. Civilian restraints must be matched by government austerity. The frills of bureaucracy must be ruthlessly stripped away. Hand-outs must be abolished. Nonessential spending must be stopped.

Seventh. Only after governmental economies are a fact, should the Congress have the gall to ask the American citizen to pay additional taxes; and then the tax program should be fair, equitable, and aimed at encouraging free enterprise.

Eighth. Any program for victory must be predicated on a loyal, competent, vigorous American State Department. I demand that this administration rid the State Department of the architects of disaster, the termites, and the muddled incompetents whose thinking has led us from victory to disaster, to war, in five short years.

Ninth. We must encourage and assist anti-Communist movements throughout the world, especially those movements operating behind the iron curtain.

Tenth. We should take immediate steps to protect the security of our combat forces against the senseless advertising the troop movements and dispositions, the type and quantity of our military equipment, and the location of new defense installations.

Eleventh. We must budget our military and economic assistance to free nations on the basis of their demonstrated will to fight communism. America cannot be expected to guarantee the freedom of nations which coddle Communists and trade with the enemy.

Twelfth. The confusion of military strategy by diplomatic policy in Asia is ridiculous. We must realistically face the fact that we are at war with Russian communism in Asia. The administration must give General MacArthur the authority to fight a military war. This means bombing enemy supply lines and supply bases; accepting the help of Nationalist China; assisting, with matériel and naval support, the Nationalist invasion of the mainland, through the establishment of numerous beachhead perimeters. If the administration cannot obtain authority from the United Nations or if the administration is unwilling to grant such authority, America's land army should be withdrawn from the fight in Korea which diplomacy renders hopeless.

Thirteenth. We have at last returned our Ambassador to Madrid. Now let us be consistent: Let us invite Spain with her anti-Communist army to join our war.

Fourteenth. We should create an American Foreign Legion of anti-Communists—with or without the consent of governments which call on us to defend them against Russian aggression.

Fifteenth. We must immediately sign with Japan a peace treaty which will permit that country to arm for its own defense and to exploit its production potential in the cause of the free nations.

Sixteenth. We must exert the utmost economic pressure on communism, through a blockade of Red China and the imposition of sanctions against trade of any military significance between the free world and the slave world.

Seventeenth. We must recognize that United Nations' failures are the result of strong Communist obstruction and weak American leadership. The United Nations can survive as the instrument of collective security if we insist that cooperation become a two-way street for free nations. Obviously, Communist nations should be thrown out of the United Nations if the very name of this organization is to have any meaning.

Eighteenth. We must recall the dependents of all servicemen, as well as civilians with nonofficial status, from the war fronts. They must not be permitted to become hostages of the slave nations in the event of all-out attack.

Nineteenth. The administration should vigorously use every law on the books until we achieve absolute control of the Communist conspirators in America.

Twentieth. Let us put an end to the diplomatic farce. We should immediately outlaw international communism by severing diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and her puppets. When the slave peoples cast out their Kremlin masters, we can welcome them back to the family of nations. Until that day, we have enough home-bred spies without importing them from Russia.

Mr. President, I hope my words today will penetrate the iron curtain, so that the Politburo will know Americans have taken off their gloves.

I hope my words will help rekindle the will for freedom among the nations of all the earth.

I hope I have made it plain that America will fight with her bare fists until this war is won, so that peace with justice will come at last to all mankind.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Monday, January 15 (legislative day of January 8), 1951.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years. (Reappointment.)

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

John D. Erwin, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

Horatio Mooers, of Maine, now a foreign service officer of class three and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey, now a foreign service officer of class four and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles H. Whitaker, of Rhode Island, now a foreign service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named foreign service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey.
Arthur G. Lund, of Utah.
Reed P. Robinson, of Colorado.
Girvan Teall, of New York.

The following-named foreign service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Jack C. McDermott, of Texas.
Forney A. Rankin, of North Carolina.
Charles A. Thomson, of Maryland.

DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Director for International Security Affairs.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATOR

Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., of Florida, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Edgar P. Caffrey, of Reno, Nev., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada, in place of Robert L. Douglass, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Albert Schrage
Charles R. Maxwell

To be senior assistant veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Robert E. Kissling
Arthur H. Wolff

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

Dwight H. Dexter	Herbert F. Walsh
Lewis H. Shackelford	William W. Storey
Edward W. Holtz	Edwin J. Roland

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Christian R. Couser	Russell W. Thresher
Willard L. Jones	William E. Schweizer
Robert N. Williams	

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

George F. Erwin	Hamlett I. Allen
Wilfred Pantzer	Michael J. Hoosick
Walter G. Davis	David H. Douglas
Martin Lentz, Jr.	Theron H. Gato

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Edwin W. Coleman	Raymond J. Evans
Robert S. Capp	Scott P. Berryman
Leslie F. Cool	Willis G. Partridge
John D. Roberts	

The following-named person to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Nelson W. Allen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom alone we can find our strength and hope, inspire us now with an earnest longing to lead humanity out of its desperate plight and moral agony into the glorious splendor of a new day.

Grant that we may have a greater faith in Thee and in the spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal, as we accept the challenge of this high calling. Give us courage as we strive to bring to fulfillment the vision of a social order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace.

We pray that we may never lose heart or allow our hopes to change to doubt and despair. Help us to open widely the windows of our souls that we may see the dawning of that day when love and friendship, good will, and brotherhood shall take their rightful place in the life of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 12, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, now that Defense Secretary Marshall has asked for the drafting of our 18-year-olds, as an educator, it seems only reasonable to me that if these boys are old enough to fight they are old enough to vote and have a say as to what is going on in government.

The advances made in the study of current affairs in the high schools throughout the Nation today, especially in the classes in problems of democracy, have properly enlightened the youth of our country and no doubt this study has trained them sufficiently to make them intelligent voters.

If the Defense Department insists on the drafting of our 18-year-old boys, I urge the States to enact legislation that will make it possible for these young men to vote, or it may require a constitutional amendment. I repeat, if they can fight, they can vote.

PROPOSED FEDERAL SALES TAX

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the position taken by some administration leaders, as well as prominent Members of Congress, on the proposal to impose a Federal sales tax as a means of raising revenue for financing our national-defense program or to balance our national budget.

I want to protest this invasion of a field of taxation already preempted by the States and their subdivisions. My colleagues should know that in a vast majority of the States, this source of revenue is earmarked for the support of public education in the form of State aid to equalize educational opportunities.

My own State of West Virginia not only levies a 2-percent consumer sales tax that is designated for schools, but it levies in addition a gross sales tax which includes a manufacturer's excise tax which is a major source of State revenue.

The National Government has for more than 30 years operated largely in the field of personal and corporate incomes. Many States have kept out of this field of taxation for this reason. At the beginning of World War II, the State of West Virginia repealed its State income laws so as to leave this field of taxation to the Federal Government.

My State receives annually in excess of $46,000,000 from the source of revenue which the Federal Government now proposes to invade by this legislation. The imposition of a Federal super sales tax on top of this would be confiscatory.

I want also to advise my collegaues that this kind of tax would rest mostly on the shoulders of those least able to pay. Twenty-eight percent of our American families have annual incomes of less than $2,000 a year. Unless the proposed legislation would exempt articles of food and clothing we would only add more misery to their already subnormal existence.

No one should be misled by the term "manufacturer's excise tax." Since this excise tax would be figured as a part of the cost of production, it would in the end be paid by the consumer.

In recent years, many of the Nation's larger municipalities have entered the field of consumer's sales tax in order to meet their budget for ordinary operation expenses. I am advised that New York City would be unable to finance current needs were it not for their sales-tax revenue. What is true in New York City would be true throughout the Nation and far too many millions of our population would be unfairly affected in that they would be forced to pay double taxes while many other millions of our people would escape. This inequality in taxation cannot be justified.

I voted against the proposal in the Eighty-first Congress to impose a sales

tax in the District of Columbia. I did this not that I was opposed to the District getting this added revenue, but on the ground that it would set a precedent for the imposition of a national sales tax. Little did I think, only a few months ago, that this move on the part of those most able to pay would come so soon.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES A. KENNEDY

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad mission to announce that Hon. Charles A. Kennedy passed away January 10. Mr. Kennedy had the honor of representing the First Congressional District of Iowa in the Sixtieth to Sixty-sixth Congresses inclusive from 1907 to 1921. He served with great distinction as chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the Sixty-sixth Congress and he served also as chairman of the Mileage Committee in the Sixty-first Congress.

Mr. Kennedy was born in Montrose, Lee County, Iowa, March 24, 1869, and he lived in Montrose his entire lifetime. He served as mayor of Montrose from 1890 to 1895 and as a member of the Iowa State House of Representatives in the thirtieth and thirty-first general assemblies.

At the end of the Sixty-sixth Congress Mr. Kennedy retired from public life voluntarily and was not a candidate for renomination. However, he continued his keen interest in public affairs to the end of his life and he was a grand counselor to all men of the district who took active part in public affairs. He was especially interested in getting young men into active roles in public affairs and I have found his counsel and his judgment extremely helpful to me throughout my own entire public life.

I have just looked through the Congressional Directory and I find that only seven Members of the House of Representatives today served during the period of Mr. Kennedy's membership in the House of Representatives. I have always enjoyed hearing from them of the high regard in which Mr. Kennedy was held by all who served with him.

MILITARY FORCES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the feasibility of war in Korea is increasing in tempo everytime we hear another adverse report from that unhappy land.

In order to accurately determine public opinion on this vital question the Binghamton Press, in my home city, a Gannett newspaper, is conducting an interesting poll.

I am placing the latest findings by the Press on this poll in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I am sure they will be of interest to everybody as they are to me.

It is apparent that the Korean War is an unpopular one if a sampling of feeling in our section means anything. Whatever my personal slant on strategy or methods in combating world communism, I can assure the House that the sentiment of people in the Triple Cities, as expressed in the Press survey, will carry a tremendous weight with me in making the necessary decisions as to our procedure in this session of Congress.

It is also significant to note that feeling among Press readers concerning the shipment of American troops to Europe is pretty one-sided, in the negative.

As for me, I believe we ought to make sure that every American soldier or sailor who leaves these shores should be equipped with the finest, most modern weapons that it is within the power of the Congress to provide.

My stand in this regard goes back to August 1945 upon the cessation of hostilities in World War II.

At that time I deplored the wholesale mustering out of millions of our fighting men and pointed out that dismantling our Armed Forces and allowing them to fold up could only end in eventual disaster.

Five years later, when the crucial test came in Korea, my observation was proved right.

Let us cloak our boys with the proper fighting gear before we send them anywhere to defend us.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTRAORDINARY POWERS REQUESTED BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of our State, Governor Dewey, has asked for almost unprecedented powers during this so-called emergency. The powers that he asks for are almost fantastic and unbelievable. He would arrogate unto himself all judicial, legislative, and executive functions in the State of New York. He would not wait until there was an actual war or an invasion. He wants those powers now. A legislature would go berserk if it would grant any governor such powers. They would be an unwarranted interference with Federal authority and run athwart the jurisdiction of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the National Production Authority, the Economic Stabilization Agency, the National Defense Manpower Authority, the Civil Defense Administration. The Governor wants to conscript labor and confiscate property. He wants to ration foods and services. He wants to allocate scarce materials and grant priorities. He wants to do everything that was done during the war by Federal authority, but he wants authority to do it now.

His regulations which could be issued without restraint would have the effect of law and violations thereof would incur severe penalties, including jail.

Governor Dewey might honestly believe such authority should reside in him. But even hell is paved with good intentions. Such grant of power would offend against the Federal Constitution and the New York State Constitution.

He and a figurehead defense council of 23, he would in the main appoint, could supersede all mayors, county commissioners, and local officers. The latter might well resign. While he supposedly would work and confer with this council, it would be his own personal agency. He could act without this council if it were, for example, not practical to have it assemble. While this council would include members of his cabinet, as it were, they are all his political henchmen. Disobedience to Dewey orders could mean dismissal as far as all nonelective State officials are concerned.

So adverse and hostile was the reception accorded Dewey's proposals that even he was forced to pause. He asked a 30-day waiting period.

I do not relish setting up Dewey as a sort of satrap. His ideas should be banished to limbo.

ARMING WESTERN GERMANY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an Associated Press article, under date of December 24, 1950, Hannover, Germany, which will be found at page 185 of last Friday's RECORD, stating, among other things, this:

> A magazine's poll of its German readers showed today that a large majority opposes West German rearmament.
>
> On the question of whether Western Germany should join the North Atlantic Defense Pact, 81.5 percent said "No."

If we attempt to arm Germany with that kind of a set-up will it not result in a dangerous and unwise policy? As a matter of fact, will it not become, and is it not, in fact, an impossibility to accomplish this policy? I ask your consideration of this question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my

remarks a treatise on communism prepared by a high-school class of Chestatee High School, located in the congressional district I serve.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities several years ago prepared for publication and release a series of educational publications entitled "One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism." These pamphlets deal with communism in the United States of America, government, labor, education, and religion. Hundreds of thousands of these publications have been distributed throughout the United States. The value of these publications as an educational document is demonstrated by the fact that the school system of Harlan County, Ky., had adopted the series of One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism as a text in sociology and other classes.

Prof. Elbert C. Harris, principal of the Chestatee High School, Gainesville, Ga., has adopted these publications for study by a class in communism. Professor Harris has submitted to me a paper prepared by the students of the Chestatee High School after studying communism for only 4½ months.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House who reads this paper on communism should be deeply gratified by the part he has played in making this document available in order that people might learn the true aims, purposes, and operations of communism. A nation possessing knowledge of this international conspiracy cannot be duped by the propaganda of the Communist Party.

I feel a sense of deep personal pride in being permitted to represent such splendid, upstanding American citizens as compose this fine class in this rural high school in Georgia.

COMMUNISM

Communism is a system by which a comparatively small group of people is trying to rule the whole world. Today it is a world force which governs millions of the human race, and threatens the safety of the democratic, Christian nations of the world. It is seeking to gain control of education, religion, labor, government, and the whole thinking process of humanity from the cradle to the grave either by legal or illegal methods. Conspiracy and iron force are the basic tools of communism, and it works both inside and outside the law and constitution of the nation of which it seeks to gain control.

In Communist-controlled countries the party operates the government, industries, schools, hospitals, labor, homes, and the work and play of the people from birth till death. The party enjoys the profits of the countries controlled and the enslaved peoples pay the bills.

Christian living, under communism, is horribly punished. Belief in God is outlawed. God and Christian living are marked as enemies, and Communists attack them with all the force they possess, because they know God, Christianity, democracy, and communism can never exist side by side; and when they do not dominate by force, they seek to dominate by deception and corruption from within just as they do in government, education, labor, and in general throughout the entire life of the nation. They know communism can never completely control the mind and the body, which is their aim, so long as people have an abiding faith in God. This is why they so persistently persecute the churches, belief in God, and all forms of Christianity. The only hope for religious training under communism is that parents teach their children at home in secrecy.

Since all property belongs to the government in Communist-controlled countries, there is no private initiative. Laborers are compelled to work where they are told, when they are told, how they are told, and at whatever wage the government designates, and this without question. Complete subordination is demanded and obtained. No one is free. No labor union, even, can be free. They deal with the future of your job, your security, the conditions under which you work, union membership, if any, and one's whole life which makes it impossible to live the life of a free citizen.

In the field of education the child is no longer free under Communist domination. Children are forced to attend schools of Communist selection which are completely dominated and controlled by them and in which the teachers are continually watched by their spies. In these schools the children are taught the nonexistence of God. The children are taken early in life, put into uniform with a hammer and sickle flag in one hand and a gun in the other, and sent forth to conquer the whole world for the Red flag of Russia. They are taught to spy upon their parents at home and to report to the authorities any breach of Communist doctrine.

The child comes from these schools and colleges with anything except a mind of his own. He is trained, but not educated. He only knows to obey unquestionably and to solve only the problems handed him, and to consider it a heinous crime to even think for himself. He is only a child-man of communism when his training—not education—is completed.

Should communism take over in the United States today, the education which American boys and girls are receiving would stop immediately and Communist training begin, training to do a particular thing and do it well without any consideration for the ideals of the individual whatever.

Communists consider themselves actually at war with every individual and every nation that does not take its orders from Moscow, and the United States of America is no exception. The leopard never changes his spots. Our country today is being attacked from within and without. Communism has already made its inroads into key Government positions, the Army, the Navy, diplomatic corps, the Treasury, and other capital point of Government to say nothing of its inroads into labor unions, schools, churches, and other patriotic organizations.

We are apparently asleep as individuals to the danger which America is facing in this crucial hour of Communist deception and intrigue. Every citizen owes it to himself, his country, and his God to awake and acquaint himself with the minutest details of his danger. None of us is safe so long as Communists and communism lurk in even the remotest corners of this Nation.

Let us, as true Americans, wake up, individually, inform ourselves and others of the danger we are facing, arm ourselves with knowledge, equip ourselves with zeal and determination, and fight communism in all its forms; and wherever found, until the last vestige of its curse is forever erased from this good land of freedom.

(Prepared by the class studying communism in Chestatee High School, Forsyth County, Route 1, Gainesville, Ga., January 8, 1951.)

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, and I further ask that my remarks may follow the reading of the President's message on the budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

POWER OF PRESIDENT TO SEND TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, once again there arises in the House of Representatives concern with the constitutional problem of the implied powers of the Executive. The obvious expression of this concern is the Coudert resolution. This analogous situation arises, however, when the means to this end devised by the gentleman from New York begs another constitutional question having to do with the power of Congress to forbid the ordering of the Armed Forces overseas.

I do not object to the House concerning itself with foreign policy. I think the increasing interest shown by the House in such matters is one of the healthiest developments in the Congress in the last 25 years. As a matter of fact, I have always been a leading advocate of the right of the House to act on treaties—that treaties be ratified by a single majority of both Houses of Congress.

Section 8, article I of the Constitution is, of course, the basis for the existence of the legislative weapon in all controversy with the Executive of this nature—"the power of the purse" and clearly is with reference to the resolution in question for there also is to be found the power of Congress to raise and maintain troops.

I take it for granted that no one seriously contends that, as the law now stands, the President does not have the power to send troops out of the country, in certain cases.

The House has time and again stated its willingness to listen to the advice of the Chiefs of the Armed Forces on all matters of troop disposition for the national defense. I believe the Executive has done so and will do so. That being the case, the Executive would hardly act under implied power unless after the advice of the Defense Chiefs in the interest of the national security, and if that is so, very few Members of Congress would care to superimpose their contrary opinion. Why then, other than for

academic reasons, select this hour for a vitriolic and tumultuous debate as to "which comes first, the chicken or the egg."

In view of the long series of precedents of the implied power of the President with reference to the dispatch of troops to foreign soil, the Coudert resolution amounts to a request for a vote of lack of confidence in the Executive during a period of grave national emergency—and if that is the purpose—I challenge the gentleman to unmask his attack and introduce a resolution which asks such a vote and let that issue be met head-on.

It is clear that the resolution is an attempt to give legislative voice to certain of the arguments of Mr. Hoover's recent statement on foreign policy. Consequently, this resolution could be the vehicle for a full dress debate in the House on foreign policy rather than that of violent constitutional and jurisdictional issues between the legislative and the executive, but that is a forlorn hope if one recalls the history of such debates down through the pages of our history.

There is no basis for the assumption that in advance of aggression the President would not ask the approval of Congress to send additional troops to Europe.

In the face of world events there is no margin for error. All doubts must be resolved against the creation of a constitutional crisis at this time.

Soviet imperialism, which seeks the enslavement of the whole world, could be granted no more precious boon than the adoption of a policy by this Congress which would paralyze American armed strength outside the United States, reduce our foreign policy to a tragic absurdity and deliver the remains of the free world into the ravenous maws of Moscow.

The mere suggestion that the American giant be bound hand and foot at an hour when the fate of this Nation and the democratic world hangs in the balance is illustrative of the crisis of faith that afflicts us in so many quarters. Allowing for the very best intentions of the authors of such proposals, and knowing full well their patriotism, nevertheless the stern fact remains that the course advocated by the Coudert resolution and similar legislative proposals in this House, would deliver victory to the Soviets by default. Such a course would shame the name of America down through the ages and would represent the abnegation of everything this Republic holds dear and valid.

What makes such a proposal all the more disserviceable to the United States is that it comes at an hour when our democratic friends in far parts of the world, under the menacing shadows of aggressive communism, are looking to us for moral support, material assistance, and visible signs that the champion of the free world, America, will not abandon them to vicious appetites of Russian expansionism.

At this very hour what is needed more than anything else is firm and eloquent reaffirmation on our part that all of the resources of the United States, moral, physical, and spiritual, will be found totally in this fight for survival—and it is nothing but a fight for survival for Soviet imperialism is insatiable and is a victim of its own dynamism.

Under direct authority of the Constitution the President is charged with the responsibility of the conduct of foreign policy. Certainly this duty and responsibility would become a nullity if he were not permitted, in the national interest, to implement such policies by forces adequate to enforce them.

Down through our history there is precedent after precedent for the Chief Executive acting quickly and directly in committing our Armed Forces to action in the national interest. In this connection, Edward S. Corwin, the recognized expert in this field, in his volume The President: Office and Powers, dealing with the Presidency from 1787 to 1948 has this to say on this subject:

> But the President may also make himself the direct administrator of the international rights and duties of the United States, or of what are adjudged by him to be such, without awaiting action either by the treaty-making power or by Congress, or by the courts.

One President after another has availed himself of his prerogative.

Upward of 140 separate instances of such direct Presidential action are cited in James Grafton Rogers' volume entitled "World Politics and the Constitution." They start with the undeclared naval war with France from 1798 to 1800, down through Caribbean engagements from 1814 to 1825, including the Barbary wars, various landing of marines in numbers in many countries, military encounters with Mexico, naval demonstrations of Commodore Perry against Japan, military action against China in 1854, again in 1855 and 1856, numerous actions against South American countries, incidents in Korea in 1871, and again in 1888, and so on down to the action taken in connection with the Philippine Insurrection in 1899–1901.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century at least a score of such direct military engagements were taken in the protection of American interests in the international field by direct authority vested in the Presidential office. Similarly in the years from 1940 through 1941 this country undertook a series of vital steps, geared to foreign policy and in the national interest, upon Presidential initiative, including the exchange of destroyers for British bases, the United States occupation of Greenland, the occupation of Iceland. Not the least of such steps was the Presidential order to the Navy to patrol ship lanes to Europe in an effort to check the Nazi submarine menace.

The record in this respect is clear and beyond question. It behooves us in the face of the perils which confront our security to remember this record and not reduce our chances for survival to academic considerations which certainly are weak reeds to lean upon when the Soviets possess the apparent capabilities to ravage our homeland with scientific agents of warfare.

Let it be noted that all actions taken in regard to commitment of our Armed Forces abroad are not done abritrarily or capriciously but only after the most serious and profound consideration and upon the advice of our military and congressional leaders and in consultation with the State Department.

The prime objective of Soviet diplomacy at this moment is to drive a wedge into the unity of America and her allies. At one fell swoop the activation of the philosophy of the Coudert resolution would accomplish this and the Kremlin would be saved any further trouble. The free world would fall apart to await isolation and devouring, piece by piece.

What is incomprehensible to me is that in this day of undeclared war, when science has annihilated time and space, when atomic warfare in all its fury can be launched without warning in the middle of the night, is that responsible citizens would advocate a policy which must perforce assent to a degree of destruction that might well be fatal before our Nation could take steps to begin its fight for life.

No, our good judgment must not be swallowed up in the quicksand of fear. We must not be rigid or unimaginative and helpless before menacing forces. This crisis, created by Soviet imperialism, cannot be postponed by equivocation. It cannot be solved by wishful thinking.

Shall we, America, the font of liberty, truly the "home of the brave," run away from the struggle where the forces of history are being brought together? No, this is the road to national disgrace and ruin. It would be the crime of the centuries for America in this hour of great decision to be craven and cowardly.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S PROPOSAL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while the Members are greatly shocked. That was my condition this morning when the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] made that terrific attack upon Governor Dewey.

If I understood what the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was saying, it was that Governor Dewey of New York was asking for dictatorial power to do in the State of New York the very things which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has over the years insisted should be entrusted, first to the then President Roosevelt; later, to President Truman.

A grant of arbitrary power equal to that possessed by a dictator carried no terror to the heart of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] if that power was granted to a Democratic President, to an internationalist, to a so-called liberal, or one socialistically inclined.

One uninformed, listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] a few moments ago, would be terrified by the picture of what might happen if, perchance, similar powers were granted to

a Republican Governor in the gentleman's home State of New York.

The gentleman is frightened, he is terrified, at the mere thought that a governor of one of the 48 States—a so-called Republican—and I use that word advisedly—should even venture to ask for powers within his home State equal to those which the gentleman has insisted must be granted to a President—provided he is a so-called Democrat—and again I use that term advisedly—if the Republic is to be saved.

When a New Dealer, packaged under the label "Democrat" or an internationalist, whether that label be Democrat or Republican—asks for support for a blank check, either on the Treasury or for authority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in his support is as busy as a hen in a dust heap—if you know what I mean.

But let one who is a conservative, a nationalist, make a request for a little bit of either and the gentleman throws a fit.

For myself, I am not in favor of giving blank checks to anyone.

The old Constitution with its three checks on absolute power in any one branch of the Government is still my guide.

ENLISTMENT OF GERMANS AND JAPANESE IN UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation authorizing the enlistment of Germans and Japanese in the United States Army. I want to make it perfectly clear that I said in "the Army of the United States," not in the army of the United Nations or of any other nation, but our own Army.

From day to day I want to call attention to some of the numerous and varied reasons for such enlistments. Today I direct your attention particularly to the need of manpower in the labor field of this country. I have just come from a meeting that has been discussing the shortage of agricultural labor. It is generally recognized that we cannot expect to make and harvest a crop as large as seems desirable for 1951 without additional supplies of farm labor. Instead of expecting more farm labor this year it seems clear that we shall have less. Not only are the armed services reducing our farm labor supply, defense industries are going to take more and more of the supply of labor that remains on the farm.

Shortages of labor are going to break out in every field of endeavor in the United States during the coming year, and all of us realize that. We all know that we will be short of labor in our field and in our factories and we know that the products of these fields and factories are absolutely essential to our military effort. Why are we overlooking the fact that our present policy of allowing none but 100 percent physically perfect specimens of young American manhood to serve in our Armed Forces is going in the long run to leave these very forces without adequate supplies.

At best we are going to have to take enough of our American boys. Why should we not at least allow the citizens of Germany and of Japan to have a part in defending their particular sections of the world? We do not have to give them American citizenship or promise them the kind of benefits we extend to American boys. We need only to give them the opportunity to eat American army food and wear American army clothing. A place in the American Army is still a better job than is available to millions of Germans and millions of Japanese, and every German and Japanese who enlists in our Army reduces by one our need to take an American boy out of production either on a farm or in a factory.

The advantages of such enlistments are obvious. What serious objection can be offered?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SOUVENIRS OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, out in the lobby there is a card on which are placed samples of souvenirs that may be had of the White House. As will be recalled, about a year ago I mentioned the fact there would be some 800,000 pieces of the gutted White House available for our constituents if they desired them. I have been advised that our colleague the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made announcement of this on Friday last and that his remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

WE SHOULD BRING OUR BOYS HOME FROM KOREA, STAY OUT OF EUROPE, GET OUT OF THE SO-CALLED UNITED NATIONS, BUILD UP OUR OWN DEFENSES, AND STRENGTHEN OUR OWN COUNTRY TO WHERE NO OTHER NATION WILL DARE ATTACK US

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being called an isolationist by those wild-eyed internationalists who seem to be bent on dragging our country to destruction, I feel it my duty as a Member of this Congress to express my honest convictions relative to the grave problems with which we are now confronted.

First. We should bring our boys home from Korea. They never should have been sent there in the first place. There was no law for it; Congress had not declared war.

I am not in favor of permitting the President of the United States to send our boys all over the world to fight the other fellow's wars, especially when war has not been declared by the Congress of the United States, as the Constitution requires.

Second. I am in favor of getting out of Europe and staying out of Europe.

Third. I am also for getting out of the so-called United Nations, which has proved to be a farce, a fraud, and a failure.

It has attempted to interfere with our internal affairs, subordinate the American people to the domination of foreign powers, and has declared wars, or emergencies, for us to fight and pay for, while the very countries, whose representatives have so voted, have not turned their hands to help.

We have already suffered more casualties in Korea than we suffered in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, and the Spanish-American War, all combined, and the chances are that if we do not get out of there, we will lose a million men before it is over, and accomplish nothing.

Let us get out of Asia, bring our boys home, stay out of Europe, build up our own defenses, including the strongest Air Force on earth with an ample supply of atomic bombs, with such radar and naval facilities as are necessary to protect this continent, and to enforce the Monore Doctrine, then communism in Europe will collapse of its own weight.

In that way, we can develop the strongest country on earth, and lead the world by precept and example into a new day of peace, progress, and prosperity.

But, we cannot do it by bribery, with money taken from the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of America, nor can we force the rest of the world to it with a bayonet.

We have just gone through one war which untold millions of people have already called the most useless war in history. Our boys won the fight, and then the powers that be turned the victory over to the worst enemy civilization has ever known.

If we continue to follow this course, I fear that our country will not survive.

But we can survive and lead the world by following the course which I have suggested.

Let us build up our own country, let us build up our own strength, let us build up our own Nation, then communism in Europe will fall of its own weight and we can protect our country and pass it down to posterity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 67) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-second Congress the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of 24 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF VARIOUS STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 68) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Ernest K. Bramblett, California; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations: Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma.

Committee on Armed Services: Paul Cunningham, Iowa; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts; Gordon L. McDonough, California; William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio.

Committee on District of Columbia: Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Edward L. Sittler, Jr., Pennsylvania.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania, Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Wint Smith, Kansas; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Thruston Ballard Morton, Kentucky; Thomas H. Werdel, California; Harold H. Velde, Illinois; Charles E. Potter, Michigan; Richard B. Vail, Illinois; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; George H. Bender, Ohio; Charles B. Brownson, Indiana; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; William E. Miller, New York; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; George Meader, Michigan; William E. McVey, Illinois; Alvin R. Bush, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Robert B. Chipperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Jacob K. Javits, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; Edward L. Sittler, Jr., Pennsylvania.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Robert Hale, Maine; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; John V. Beamer, Indiana.

Committee on the Judiciary: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Frank Fellows, Maine; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Edgar Jonas, Illinois; Ruth Thompson, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Shepard J. Crumpacker, Indiana.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles P. Nelson, Maine; John C. Butler, New York; Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Connecticut; Charles J. Kersten, Wisconsin; Albert C. Vaughn, Pennsylvania; Timothy P. Sheehan, Illinois; Walter M. Mumma, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Katharine St. George, New York; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; H. R. Gross, Iowa; James S. Golden, Kentucky; William R. Williams, New York; O. K. Armstrong, Missouri.

Committee on Public Lands: Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Dean P. Taylor, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Norris Poulson, California; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Edward H. Jenison, Illinois; Fred G. Aandahl, North Dakota; William H. Harrison, Wyoming; J. Ernest Wharton, New York; Hamar H. Budge, Idaho; Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Public Works: George A. Dondero, Michigan; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Myron V. George, Kansas; William G. Bray, Indiana; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; John T. Wood, Idaho.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Harold H. Velde, Illinois; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Donald L. Jackson, California; Charles E. Potter, Michigan.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; James P. S. Devereaux, Maryland; William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Allan Oakley Hunter, California; William L. Springer, Illinois; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Harmar D. Denny, Jr., Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET, 1952—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 17)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my recommendations for the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

This is a budget for our national security in a period of grave danger.

It calls for expenditures of 71.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952—a total 78 percent above expenditures for the year which ended last June 30. That increase is one measure of the vast new responsibilities thrust upon the American people by the Communist assaults upon freedom in Asia and the threats to freedom in other parts of the world.

BUDGET TOTALS

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated
Receipts (excluding proposed new tax legislation)	$37.0	$44.5	$55.1
Expenditures	40.1	47.2	71.6
Deficit	−3.1	−2.7	−16.5

The new emphasis on military preparedness reflects the necessities of the world situation today. It reflects no shift of purpose. Our purpose remains to secure and strengthen peace. We are determined to seek peace by every honorable means—mindful of our responsibility to ourselves, to our friends and allies, and to humanity everywhere to spare the world the tragedy of another world war. We are likewise determined to spare ourselves and the world the even deeper tragedy of the surrender of justice and freedom.

Another system—powerful in resources, hostile in intent, and ruthless in method—is seeking the destruction of all the values we would preserve. That system is under the mastery of men unrestrained by considerations of responsibility to their people and guided by twisted dogma. They can be restrained only if defensive strength is arrayed against them. Our best hope now is to build our strength to the point necessary to bring them to caution, if not to wisdom. We are compelled to make the creation of strength a paramount aim.

In our drive to build up our defenses, we and the countries associated with us have a twofold goal—first, military forces strong enough to provide a powerful deterrent to those who may be contemplating new aggression; second, readiness for immediate mobilization of all our power if that becomes necessary.

This Budget reflects our determination.

First, it incorporates our expenditures for military purposes—to build swiftly an active force of highly trained men, equipped with the most modern weapons, and supported by ready reserves of men, supplies, and equipment.

Second, it includes our expenditures to help other threatened nations rebuild their strength and to participate with them in a program of mutual aid and common defense.

Third, it embodies our Government programs for the expansion of productive capacity and the concentration of needed capacity on defense

requirements—at the expense where necessary of normal civilian purposes.

Fourth, it contains expenditures for programs which will maintain and develop our national strength over the long run, keeping in mind that the present emergency may be of long duration and we must therefore be prepared for crises in the more distant as well as in the immediate future.

Fifth, it reflects reductions in other expenditures, in order to divert a maximum of resources to the overriding requirements of national security.

As a sixth budgetary measure, I shall shortly recommend an increase in tax revenues in the conviction that we must attain a balanced budget to provide a sound financial basis for what may be an extended period of very high defense expenditures.

CONTENTS OF THE BUDGET

The accompanying comparative table shows projected expenditures for the major programs or functions of the Government for the fiscal year 1952, revised estimates for the current year, and actual expenditures for the year which ended last June 30. Estimated appropriations and other new obligational authority for 1952 are also shown. Differences between obligational authority and expenditures are accounted for by the fact that obligational authority granted in one fiscal year may be spent in part in subsequent fiscal years.

The table covers expenditures from general and special funds of the Treasury, plus net expenditures of wholly owned Government corporations. The estimates include requirements under proposed as well as existing legislation. Expenditures from trust funds are excluded from this table, but operations of the major trust funds are discussed in subsequent sections of the Budget Message.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND AUTHORIZATIONS BY MAJOR FUNCTIONS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Military services	$12,303	$20,994	$41,421	$60,971
International security and foreign relations	4,803	4,726	7,461	10,956
Finance, commerce, and industry	227	368	1,524	1,568
Labor	263	212	215	225
Transportation and communication	1,752	1,970	1,685	1,414
Natural resources	1,554	2,117	2,519	2,111
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,784	986	1,429	1,483
Housing and community development	261	409	[2] −102	1,018
Education and general research	114	143	453	468
Social security, welfare, and health	2,213	2,520	2,625	2,552
Veterans' services and benefits	6,627	5,746	4,911	4,426
General government	1,108	1,252	1,351	1,140
Interest	5,817	5,722	5,897	5,897
Reserve for contingencies	-------	45	175	200
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement	+330	-------	-------	-------
Total	40,156	47,210	71,594	94,429

[1] This column excludes 4,075 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

[2] Excess of receipts over expenditures.

The requirements of national security are reflected in every major function of the Budget. The entire Government is being redirected to meet the compelling demands of national security, and each functional category includes activities which support, directly or indirectly, the defense effort.

The two largest categories—military services and international security and foreign relations—are devoted in their entirety to the broad objectives of national security. The military services category includes the costs of the Armed Forces and certain additional programs closely related to the military, particularly the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and the activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Under the international security and foreign relations heading are the costs of weapons provided to our North Atlantic Treaty allies and to other free nations, as well as expenditures for economic assistance and for the expanded international information program.

The military and international categories account for expenditures of 41.4 and 7.5 billion dollars, respectively, in the fiscal year 1952. Together they total 48.9 billions, or nearly 69 percent of the total Budget.

This total is an increase of 90 percent over the 25.7 billion dollars estimated as expenditures for these purposes during the current year—accounted for almost wholly by the great expansion of the military procurement program.

Our military requirements are of several kinds. We must maintain and supply our forces fighting in Korea. We must provide modern equipment for the expansion of our Army, Navy, and Air Force to the present combined goal of nearly three and a half million men. We must provide equipment for training purposes and for the civilian components not on active duty. We must provide military items to our allies as an essential part of our own defense. We must build a production base and matériel reserves against the contingency of full-scale war.

These demands do not press evenly on all sectors of defense production. In some areas, large supplies of military items remain from the recent war and reduce the need for new large-scale production. Our reserve naval fleet, for example, is an asset which reduces sharply the need for mass construction of new warships. In some cases, the record-breaking military production of the war years has left us with reserves of productive capacity. In other cases present capacity is far from adequate. The economic mobilization program will therefore be selective in character—in some areas, an all-out drive, with extensive conversion of civilian capacity; in other areas, a comparatively small expansion of present production rates.

At the same time that we sharply increase our own military production, Canada and the Western European nations with whom we are allied under the North Atlantic Treaty will be making comparable efforts. Nations outside the North Atlantic organization, including our neighbors in Latin America, are also making important contributions to the common security. Our international programs recognize that this Nation's own security is directly related to the security and defensive strength of our allies and that equipment and materials supplied to help arm their forces or to support their military production are, in fact, additions to our own defensive strength.

Figures shown in this Budget for both the military and the international security programs may be subject to substantial adjustment as the defense program progresses. Detailed estimates of new obligational authority for these categories are not included in the Budget at this time, in order to permit more thorough programing of specific requirements. Actual expenditures will depend on how rapidly we are able to produce the military items for which funds are made available.

A defense program of the size now being undertaken must be suported by a strong and expanding economic base. Five major categories of Federal programs contribute directly to this economic base. These are: (1) finance, commerce, and industry; (2) labor; (3) transportation and communication; (4) natural resources; and (5) agriculture and agricultural resources. Together these categories make up 7.4 billion dollars of expenditures in the fiscal year 1952, or 10 percent of the Budget.

This total compares to 5.7 billion dollars estimated as expenditures for these purposes in the current fiscal year. The increase reflects primarily our programs to expand private production facilities through Federal action, to administer economic controls, and to add capacity for atomic energy activities.

Four other categories of Budget expenditures include programs which contribute to national strength through protecting and improving the health, education, and well-being of the individuals and families who make up the Nation. These classifications are: (1) housing and community development; (2) education and general research; (3) social security, welfare, and health; and (4) veterans' services and benefits.

These four categories account for a total of 7.9 billion dollars, or 11 percent of Budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1952. This represents a reduction of nearly a billion dollars from the current year's anticipated expenditures. If it were not for the major new programs of civil defense and defense housing, community facilities, and services, the total reduction would be even greater.

The general operations of Government—including the legislative and judicial branches and such general activities of the executive branch as tax collection, civil-service retirement payments, and central supply, records, and buildings services—amount to 1.4 billion dollars, or 2 percent of the 1952 Budget. Apart from the expected costs of dispersal of Government agencies, this group of expenditures is also scheduled to decline from the 1951 level.

Interest payments will amount to an estimated 5.9 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952, or 8 percent of the total Budget.

In order that our resources can be diverted to meet the demands of national security, strict economy in nondefense spending is required. Such a policy is incorporated in this Budget. For example, the only major new public works projects included in the Budget are those directly necessary to the defense effort. Construction on many public works projects now under way has been substantially curtailed. Many other activities are being contracted. Expenditures for the maintenance of Government property have been held to a minimum consistent with protection of Government investments. Cost increases, such as the rise that has already taken place in the prices of what the Government buys, are in many instances being absorbed by the agencies through compensating economies. Increases have been allowed where increasing work loads must be met or where further accumulation of backlogs of work cannot be tolerated, but only to the extent that the work cannot be taken care of through increased efficiency or reductions in service standards.

MANAGEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAM

Direction of the Nation's security program in this critical period will require the highest degree of administrative effectiveness in the Federal Government. Concerted efforts are being made to strengthen the organization and management of the executive branch for the extraordinarily difficult tasks that lie ahead. During the coming period, we must be able to make quickly such changes in the assignment of governmental functions as are needed to carry out national security programs. Under the Defense Production Act, I have by Executive order created the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Defense Production Administration, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and other emergency agencies with extensive delegation of authority. However, authority under that act covers only a part of the range of defense functions. During World Wars I and II the President was given emergency reorganization powers. These powers were extensively used to keep Government organization continuously in line with mobilization needs. Such authority for temporary changes is needed in the current emergency and should be one of the early measures considered by the Congress.

In addition to concentrating on the organization and management of the defense program, I shall continue to emphasize throughout the Government the management improvement program, instituted in 1949 to achieve greater efficiency in all Federal activities.

The last Congress took many important legislative actions aimed at improving governmental administration. Other actions are, however, still required. Some of these measures I shall incorporate in reorganization plans to be submitted to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949. Others require legislation, including such important matters as improvements in the civil-service system and in the administration of the postal service.

The actions in the field of organization and management which we have taken in the past years have increased the ability of the Government to deal with a major defense effort. We must continue to make progress in this field.

PAYING THE COSTS OF DEFENSE

When the American people resolved to undertake the defense program now under way, they accepted also the necessity for the increases in their taxes that the new level of expenditures requires. National security in the present world can be attained only with direct and heavy cost to each one of us.

High taxes are indispensable to our successful mobilization. They are required to preserve confidence in the integrity of the Government's finances, to distribute the heavy financial costs of defense fairly among all the people, to reduce excessive demand for raw materials and industrial products required for national defense, and to choke off inflationary pressures. We cannot as a nation buy a defense establishment of the size that is now being constructed and still as individuals expect to spend our money to the same degree as before for normal peacetime purposes. Unless positive action is taken on the tax front, our defense effort will be in continuous jeopardy.

The tax legislation passed last year substantially increased our revenues. The Revenue Act of 1950, approved within 3 months after the invasion of the Republic of Korea, increased income taxes on individuals and corporations and closed some loopholes in the income tax laws. The corporation excess profits tax, passed in the final week of the Eighty-first Congress, also increased our revenues while at the same time placing the higher levies upon those businesses which can best afford to pay increased taxes.

In spite of these new tax measures, a deficit of 16.5 billion dollars is estimated for the fiscal year 1952 if no further tax legislation is enacted. At this time, sound public finance and fiscal policy require that we balance the Budget. I shall shortly transmit to the Congress recommendations for new revenue legislation.

Even a balanced budget will not of itself serve to keep our economy stable during a period of rapidly rising defense expenditures. The full amount of inflationary pressure is not measured by the budget deficit alone, since this reflects only payments actually made. The Department of Defense alone will have been granted for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 an estimated 112 billion dollars of obligational authority for its military functions, and additional amounts will have been made available for foreign military-aid programs. Bidding for manpower and materials, which pushes prices upward, begins as soon as procurement contracts to be paid from these authorizations are signed, even though expenditures may not take place for a year or more. Other positive stabilization measures, including allocations, and credit, price and wage controls, are essential to offset the inflationary pressures which are not reflected in the single figure of the budget deficit.

The following table provides a breakdown of anticipated budget receipts during the fiscal year 1952, based on existing legislation, compared with actual receipts during the fiscal year 1950 and revised estimated receipts for the current year.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Source	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated
Direct taxes on individuals:			
Individual income taxes	$17,409	$21,599	$26,025
Estate and gift taxes	706	710	755
Direct taxes on corporations:			
Income and excess profits taxes	10,854	13,560	20,000
Excises	7,597	8,240	8,222
Customs	423	600	620
Employment taxes:			
Federal Insurance Contributions Act	2,106	2,960	3,823
Federal Unemployment Tax Act	226	239	263
Railroad Retirement Tax Act	551	565	613
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act	9	10	10
Miscellaneous receipts	1,430	1,325	1,333
Deduct:			
Appropriation to social security trust fund	−2,106	−2,960	−3,823
Refunds of receipts	−2,160	−2,336	−2,703
Budget receipts	37,045	44,512	55,138

NOTE.—Includes only receipts under existing legislation.

Under existing legislation, including the recently enacted tax measures budget receipts for the fiscal year 1952 are estimated at 55.1 billion dollars. This is 10.6 billion dollars higher than the estimate for the current year. Receipts from direct taxes on corporations show the greatest increase, 6.4 billion dollars over corresponding receipts for the current fiscal year. The combined effects of the Revenue Act of 1950, the Excess Profits Tax Act, and peak levels of corporate profits are reflected in this estimate. Direct taxes on individuals increase 4.4 billion dollars as a result of the high levels of income anticipated and a full year of operation under the Revenue Act of 1950. Although the collections from certain excise taxes will decline as production of some manufactured goods is affected by shortages of materials, receipts from other exises and all other major sources will increase.

BORROWING AND PUBLIC DEBT

At the beginning of the current fiscal year the public debt stood at 257.4 billion dollars. The debt will rise to approximately 260 billion dollars by June 30, 1951, as a reflection of the financing of the budget deficit for the current fiscal year. The amount of the increase in debt beyond June 30, 1951, depends upon the extent to which the projected deficit for the fiscal year 1952 is reduced through the enactment of additional tax legislation.

PROGRAMS

The following sections outline in more detail the character and extent of the programs which are to be financed from

this Budget. Further detailed descriptions of the programs of the Government, as well as certain special analyses covering public works, grants to State and local governments, investment and operating expenditures, and Federal credit programs, are included elsewhere in the Budget.

MILITARY SERVICES

The free nations of the world will continue to seek settlement of international disagreements peaceably and honorably within the framework of the United Nations—but they will rebuild their defenses rapidly. The communist attacks in Korea have served notice upon us all that the Soviet rulers are willing to risk the peace of the world to carry out their ambitions.

In response to the grave common peril, the free world is now moving forward, with increasing speed, determination, and unity, to build powerful defenses. This mutual effort is required both to deter further communist aggression and to insure that we shall emerge victorious if war is thrust upon us.

This Nation, as the strongest member of the free world, must provide the leadership in this great undertaking by developing its own military forces and, at the same time, assisting the other free nations on a large scale, in order to quickly achieve adequate mutual defenses.

The recommended program for building our own military strength is discussed in this section. The program for assisting other free nations in developing their strength is discussed under international security and foreign relations.

Department of Defense.—One year ago, I proposed a military program for the fiscal year 1951 based on active forces totaling about 1.5 million men and women, in a state of relative readiness, and backed by a moderate rate of military production and a substantial level of research and development.

The communist attacks in Korea and the imminent possibility of further attacks elsewhere have already caused us to quadruple the budget for the Department of Defense. To the initial enactment of 13.3 billion dollars in new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1951, including nearly a billion dollars of prior year authorizations made available, the Congress has in the past 6 months added 28.7 billion dollars. In this Budget I am tentatively including an additional 10 billion dollars of obligational authority. This will make a total of 52 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1951.

Because of the extensive planning involved, I am not submitting detailed 1952 estimates for the Department of Defense at this time. The Budget includes, however, an over-all estimate of 60 billion dollars, which is expected to be the approximate total of new obligational authority requested this spring for the fiscal year 1952.

The expenditure estimates for the military functions of the Department of Defense are also tentative. At the present time expenditures of 20 billion dollars are estimated for the fiscal year 1951 and 40 billion dollars for 1952.

MILITARY SERVICES

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Department of Defense—military functions	$11,889	$20,000	$40,000	$60,000
Activities supporting military services:				
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	438	900	1,300	620
Selective Service System:				
Present program	9	37		
Proposed legislation			45	60
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	54	62	78	68
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (net receipts)	−107	−40	−43	
Other	20	35	41	33
Total	12,303	20,994	41,421	60,771

[1] This column excludes 2,702 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authority.

The increased funds for fiscal years 1951 and 1952 will serve four major interrelated purposes. First, they will support the current increase in the strength of our active forces; second, they will finance the military production program designed to produce rapidly the modern equipment needed to supply our forces; third, they will provide reserves of equipment for still larger United States forces should these become necessary; and, fourth, they will help us to develop the production capacity of the country to the point where we could move rapidly to full mobilization should the need arise.

Six months ago our active military forces numbered less than one and a half million men and women. They have already been increased by about a million and this Budget includes funds to reach and maintain our present goal of nearly a million more.

We also have now available for rapid mobilization more than two million men and women in the National Guard and the Reserves of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Budget provides funds to increase the strength and degree of readiness of these Reserve organizations.

While the exact size and disposition of our active forces by units and geographic location must be kept secret in times like the present, in general we are increasing rapidly the number of active units. In the Army, we have called to active duty several National Guard divisions and reactivated certain regular divisions. We shall soon have a force more than twice as strong as our pre-Korea Army. In the Navy, by continuing to reactivate ships from the "moth-ball" fleet, we shall soon raise the active fleet to a strength more than 50 percent above that of a year ago. This Budget provides for maintaining two full Marine divisions plus additional separate units. In the Air Force, we are expanding the structure from 48 to 84 air wings; these will be rapidly brought up to full strength in trained men, and additional wings will be added.

The expansion of the active forces is reflected in the Budget not only in larger total amounts for pay and allowances, but also in increased funds for housing, training, and maintaining such forces.

We are now establishing training centers, bases, and camps for the enlarged forces. Furthermore, in order to prepare for the possibility of further mobilization, we shall be opening facilities with sufficient capacity to handle larger active forces than our immediate goals require. This Budget will provide, therefore, for a considerable increase in military public works expenditures—primarily to expand and improve troop training centers and air bases.

By far the largest part of the funds requested for the military services will be used to procure modern equipment. We have large stocks of some types of equipment, such as rifles and naval ships, which need only to be taken from storage and, in some cases, modernized. But in many other types, such as planes, tanks, electronic equipment, recoilless weapons, and rockets, we need to put into rapid production new models incorporating basic improvements that have been made since the end of World War II. This means a major production effort in order to obtain the best and most modern equipment for our enlarged active forces and for large reserve stocks.

This effort will require prompt and accurate planning and scheduling of military procurement and production in order to anticipate and forestall potential bottlenecks in materials, manpower, or facilities. For example, schedules must be laid out for producing the many complicated components of modern military airplanes, such as jet engines and electronic fire-control equipment, so that the components can be brought together as smoothly and efficiently as possible into finished aircraft. Some delays and frictions will inevitably occur in a production program as large and urgent as that upon which we are now embarked. But the experience and teamwork of military and civilian officials, of private businessmen and workers, will produce results very rapidly.

At the same time that the output of military equipment is stepped up, a base is being developed for moving to full-scale mobilization if the need should arise. For this reason, military orders are being spread among suppliers, instead of being concentrated in a few large firms. Production lines will be set up and manufacturers will be made familiar with our production needs over and above the immediate necessities of our present procurement plans. In this way, military production can be increased still further on short notice if that becomes necessary.

For example, we expect to develop an aircraft industry that will be capable of turning out 50,000 planes in a year, even though we will not be actually procuring that many. These planes, on the average, will be approximately 50 percent heavier than those used in World War II. Similarly, we shall organize to produce 35,000 tanks in a year, although we are not ordering that many now. This means, of course, planning for the readiness of basic materials, manpower, and

components, as well as final assembly lines.

The process of putting military equipment into production will not stop or retard our research and development work. On the contrary, we shall increase our efforts to maintain superiority in all kinds of weapons and equipment. Expenditures for the military research and development program will amount to nearly a billion dollars in the current fiscal year. The developmental work and the production program will be planned so that our troops will be supplied with the best weapons in the world.

Stockpiling.—If full mobilization becomes necessary, larger quantities of scarce materials such as copper, chromium, cobalt, and nickel will be required immediately. Many of these scarce materials are not produced in the United States, and others cannot be produced at a rate sufficient to meet all-out military needs. We are consequently acquiring and storing large reserve stocks of these materials.

This program will be expanded and developed in accordance with our total defense needs. The controls which have been established over the use of certain of these materials will assist us in meeting our stockpile requirements. We are also participating in the development of international controls. In addition, vigorous steps are being taken, by ourselves and our allies, to expand the production of strategic and critical materials both at home and abroad.

A total of 2.9 billion dollars of new obligational authority has been made available for the stockpile program during the current fiscal year and I am requesting an additional 820 million dollars of obligational authority for fiscal year 1952. Expenditures for fiscal year 1951 are estimated at 900 million dollars and for fiscal year 1952 at 1.3 billion dollars. These estimates must be considered tentative since the stockpiling program is constantly changing in response to new developments in both requirements and supply.

Selective service.—To provide the personnel needed for the expansion and maintenance of our military strength it will be necessary to rely heavily upon continued inductions through the Selective Service System. I shall therefore shortly request the Congress to enact the necessary legislation.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.—The basic and applied research of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is an essential part of our total military research program for maintaining and increasing our lead in the design of military aircraft. The spending authority recommended for this agency will provide for substantial expansion during fiscal year 1952.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The combined strength of the free world, in people, in industrial capacity, and in natural resources, greatly exceeds that of the Soviet Union and its satellites. This great strength must be mobilized and organized. Most of all, it must be united in purpose. The Soviet rulers are doing their best to split apart the free nations. If the free world let that happen, we would be handing the Soviet Union a victory without a struggle.

The Soviet rulers since the last war have been devoting a very large percentage of their resources to building military forces greatly in excess of any justifiable defense requirements. If these forces should be unleashed and succeed in conquering western Europe, the Soviet rulers would more than double the industrial power now in their hands. If the Communist forces should seize other major areas of the world, the Soviet rulers would control vastly increased reservoirs of manpower and raw materials. In either case they would win new strategic bases for further aggression. The key to United States security is to join in building the free world's defenses.

In the joint effort, the citizens of other free countries, like our own citizens, will be making personal sacrifices. Each free nation must make the largest contribution it can to the mutual defense. This Nation has greater industrial strength than the rest of the free world combined, and must therefore provide assistance on a large scale to other nations working with us in the joint defense drive. This assistance will permit the other free nations to accelerate the efforts they are already making with their own resources and their own energies.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Military and economic assistance (present programs, and proposed legislation)	$4,572	$4,466	$7,112	[2] $10,664
Conduct of foreign affairs:				
Overseas information and education	34	57	166	115
Participation in international organizations	55	53	35	32
Other State Department activities	142	150	148	145
Total	4,803	4,726	7,461	[2] 10,956

[1] This column excludes 47 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authority.

[2] Includes 1 billion dollars in new lending authority for the Export-Import Bank.

I estimate that expenditures of 7.5 billion dollars will be required for all of our international programs in the fiscal year 1952. This total will be 2.7 billion dollars more than the expenditure for international programs in each of the fiscal years 1951 and 1950. In 1952, the great preponderance of total expenditures for military and economic aid will go directly for the rapid build-up of mutual defense forces. More than one-half of total expenditures will be for procurement of military equipment to be shipped from this country to our allies. I shall request appropriations of 9.7 billion dollars for these mutual security programs, in addition to an increase of 1 billion dollars now requested in the lending ceiling of the Export-Import Bank. Actual expenditures by the Bank, in the fiscal year 1952 will, of course, be only a fraction of the increase in lending authority.

The complete request for appropriations will be presented to the Congress as soon as remaining details of the program are worked out.

In general, our assistance programs will continue to take two forms—provision of military equipment and provision of economic assistance. But the balance between these two forms of aid will shift very sharply, and will differ according to the strategic, political, and economic situation in each free world area requiring assistance.

Military and economic assistance to Europe.—The heart of our foreign policy in Europe is the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified by the Senate on July 21, 1949. Like all international undertakings which endure, this treaty is founded upon mutual interest. Americans know that the survival of this Nation would be gravely imperiled if the free peoples and industrial power of Western Europe were to fall under Communist subjugation. Correspondingly, the majority of Europeans are fully aware of the interdependence of their security and ours. Over the coming months, the nations of Western Europe will be calling up increasing numbers of their young men for military service. They will be diverting their resources to production of military weapons. They will be imposing additional controls on their civilian economies, particularly on civilian consumption. They will be joining with us, through the joint staff organizations which already exist, in standardizing equipment and training and in strategic and tactical planning. They are placing major elements of their forces under the unified command of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is now a going concern. It is backed by an impressive reservoir of skilled people and industrial power. It includes not only the military potential of this country and Canada, but also the combined strength of the nine European members of the North Atlantic Treaty—Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, and Portugal. These nine nations alone number altogether 175 million people, or almost as many as the Soviet Union. Iceland is also a full participant. Greece and Turkey, which within the past few years have proved their steadfastness under the threat of aggression, are closely associated with the mutual effort.

The power of all these nations, pursuing a common course under the United Nations, is being directed to the creation of highly trained and well equipped forces-in-being, and a much large mobilization base. The combined European and American forces will serve as a powerful deterrent to communist aggression in Europe. There is genuine hope, moreover, that arrangements can soon be completed for German participation in the common defense.

In order to reach the required level of combined strength in the shortest possible time, it will be necessary for the United States to give our European

partners considerable assistance. The bulk of this assistance will be in the form of military equipment and supplies. We and our allies are determined that the mutual defense forces shall be equipped with modern and effective weapons. Although the European countries are undertaking to convert a substantial portion of their industries to arms production, they cannot by themselves produce rapidly enough all the complex and expensive weapons needed to arm their forces. Our tremendously productive economy must turn out many of the weapons needed to arm the European forces.

To achieve the rapid increase in European defenses that is necessary, our program of economic aid to Europe must, with a few exceptions—notably the aid program in Austria—be directed to support of the European military build-up, rather than to promoting further general economic expansion. The progress made to date under the recovery program is standing us and the entire free world in good stead in the present situation. In most European countries industry is now producing at well above prewar peaks, and this enlarged industrial strength can in substantial part be converted to military production. Moreover, the improved lot of the ordinary citizen, made possible in part by the European recovery program, has resulted in a higher degree of political cohesion and a firmer resolve to defend democracy and free institutions against aggression.

Western Europe's requirements for economic aid to support her program for building defensive forces arise directly from the disparity between her requirements for essential imports from the dollar area and her ability to earn dollars. In order to move ahead rapidly with defense plans, European countries will require materials and equipment of certain types which they can obtain only from the United States. These supplies include items essential directly in their armament factories, materials for essential consumer goods, foodstuffs, and materials for their most vital export industries. But because these countries will be diverting to rearmament a large proportion of the resources which would otherwise be engaged in producing for export, they cannot for the time being obtain, without help from us, all the dollars needed to pay for these essential dollar imports.

Much remains to be done in the mutual effort to achieve rapid strengthening of European defenses. In general, the commitments made by the European countries to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have not been large enough up to this time. But these countries share the deep new sense of urgency which recent events have given us, and these difficulties will be rapidly overcome. It must be clearly understood that the military and economic aid which I am recommending to assist European nations to rearm will be conditioned upon their carrying out their full responsibilities for building the defensive strength of the North Atlantic Treaty community. The entire free world is in grave peril. This peril can only be surmounted by arduous joint efforts, in which each nation carries out to the full its allotted responsibilities.

Assistance to other areas of the free world.—The heightened communist pressures in Asia, the Near East, and other non-European areas require that we accelerate our exsiting programs of military assistance, which now provide military equipment to certain countries which can use it effectively and are faced by internal and external communist pressures. However, in comparison with our assistance to Europe, which will be predominantly in the form of military equipment, our total program of assistance to the non-European areas of the free world must place proportionately more emphasis upon building security through helping the people and governments of these areas to solve pressing economic problems.

To varying degrees, in different parts of the non-European free world, the crucial problem in resistance to communism is the attitudes and aspirations of the people. In some of these areas, millions of people live in desperate conditions of poverty, insecurity, ill health, and illiteracy. To them communism may appear as a possible escape from unendurable conditions of life. These people must be given real faith in their future within the free world through concrete evidence that their age-old problems have been recognized and that effective steps are being taken to solve them.

In many of these countries the governments are increasingly aware of the real problem presented by the low living standards of their people and are taking such steps as they can to deal with this problem. But many of these governments do not yet have adequate numbers of trained administrators and technical and professional personnel, and lack the capital funds necessary to carry out critical developmental projects. The United States cannot close the gap between reality and aspirations with generalized economic aid, especially in the present period of extreme pressure on our economy. What we can do is to work with these people and their governments to help them solve their problems. By making available to them knowledge and skills to supplement their own, together with modest amounts of loan capital and assistance grants, we can help these governments to bring tangible benefits to their people, and achieve an increase in the unity and resource strength of the free world.

In certain other non-European areas many of the countries have more experienced governments and a better start toward economic development. In these instances, economic and technical assistance can make an important contribution by breaking economic bottlenecks. Often the necessary projects in these areas are suitable for financing through loans.

We do not propose to assist countries where the governments are not sincerely trying to improve the economic conditions of their people. Our economic and technical assistance will be granted only where it is asked for by national governments which adopt in good faith the policies necessary to make the aid effective, and to make full use of their own resources.

Our total program of economic assistance to non-European areas of the free world will make a major contribution to increasing productivity in agricultural, industrial, and extractive industries. Part of the increased output must go directly to improving living standards and public services. Another part, including raw materials and particularly strategic materials needed for the mutual defense of the free world, can be traded with the more industrialized nations for capital goods needed for further economic development.

In Asia, we are now supplying military equipment to certain nations faced by communist threats against their independence. We are also providing economic assistance to help meet urgent problems in various parts of Southeast Asia, including Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, Thailand, and Formosa, and a developmental program in the Philippines is being inaugurated. Both military and economic aid may have to be extended to additional Asian countries, and certain present programs will have to be accelerated. In addition, we are continuing our economic assistance to Japan, which is progressing steadily toward self-support.

In the crucial Near East, we are providing military assistance, loan capital, and technical assistance. We are continuing our support of the United Nations effort to reintegrate the refugees from Palestine. Our assistance to the Near East nations is essential to build up their strength against Communist pressures.

In Africa, developmental and technical assistance programs are being carried out in the overseas territories of the Western European countries, in large part through the use of European recovery program counterpart funds. These programs, by improving living standards, will help to curb the growth of communist pressures and will bring about expanded output of vitally needed strategic materials.

In the Western Hemisphere we are joined with our Latin-American neighbors in a mutual effort to strengthen our combined defenses and to build increased economic strength. The balanced economic development of Latin America has been, and continues to be, an essential objective of American foreign policy. This policy is being supported by the public lending agencies which are providing capital for essential projects for which private financing is not available. The activities of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in the field of technical cooperation are a demonstration of the practical value of the Point IV concept. It is essential that our lending and technical assistance activities be continued, with a special concentration of effort on projects to develop further the economic base of the Latin-American countries and to facilitate and expand the production of strategic materials vital to the free world in this emergency period.

In many of these areas, extremely important contributions to the total effort are being made by American private capital and nonprofit institutions.

The technical assistance program, administered in part by United Nations agencies, is gaining momentum in many areas, and through small expenditures is making an important contribution to productivity.

A steady outflow of loan capital for critical projects is being maintained by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank. The increased need for undertakings to expand output of defense materials adds to the importance of the functions of the Export-Import Bank at this time. The Bank now has only about 500 million dollars of uncommitted lending authority. I recommend that the lending authority of the Bank be increased at this time by 1 billion dollars.

Our total program of assistance to non-European areas of the free world is making a major contribution to the ability of these areas to withstand internal and external communist pressures. The recommendations to be sent to the Congress will in part represent a continuation of these going programs, modified to take account of physical limitations of supply in this country, the increased dollar earnings of some of the areas, and the general sharpening of communist pressures.

Conduct of foreign affairs.—Effective conduct of our foreign relations takes on increasing importance in the critical world situation. The role of the diplomatic forces of the Government is of highest importance in organizing and making effective the mutual defense program. The need for a continuous flow of political and economic intelligence and the heightened tempo of activity in all aspects of international relations places a heavy burden upon the existing facilities of the Government.

This Government in cooperation with others is now organizing international machinery for dealing with world shortages of materials. In order to insure that scarce materials are used in the manner which will best serve the common defense, application of controls over international movements of certain commodities will be required. A substantial proportion of world trade will continue, however, through normal markets. In order to carry forward our long run policy of developing among the free nations workable trade patterns and a greater volume of world trade, I urge the Congress to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Through the international information and education program, we are carrying to the rest of the world the truth about our own objectives, and exposing the evil objectives of the communist conspiracy. During the fiscal year 1951, I requested, and Congress approved, a considerable expansion in this activity, including construction of additional overseas radio broadcast facilities in the United States and abroad. I intend to request from the Congress an additional appropriation of 100 million dollars for this purpose during the current fiscal year. The expanded program will result in expenditures of 57 million dollars in fiscal year 1951 and 166 million dollars in fiscal year 1952.

In order that our political, economic, and military efforts may have their maximum effect, our purposes and objectives must be made clear to all. We must promote understanding and unity among the free peoples of the world and instill hope in the hearts and minds of those who have already fallen victim to aggression. Truth is on the side of the free nations of the world. We must make full use of this advantage.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

In the modern world, more than ever, military strength depends on economic strength. Since World War II, the Government's programs have been directed toward achieving a strong and growing economy. The strength of our economy is now one of our greatest assets in deterring communist imperialism and in enabling us to meet military emergencies.

In the last 6 months, we have moved rapidly both to meet immediate defense requirements and to expand our capacity to produce airplanes, tanks, and other defense necessities. This has meant action by private initiative and by Government along a broad economic front. We are reopening all our reserve synthetic rubber plants. A substantial increase in steel and aluminum capacity is already well under way, and we will soon take measures to increase production of other key materials. Freight car production is being sharply increased. Expansion of both private and public power capacity is being accelerated. Mineral resources are being explored and developed both at home and abroad.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Defense production and economic stabilization:				
Expansion of production (net):				
Present programs	.....	$220	$100	.....
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	700	$1,200
Allocations, price and wage controls:				
Present programs	.....	26	3	
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	273	
Rent control:				
Present program	$22	13	1	330
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	23	
Export control:				
Present program	4	3	(1)	
Proposed legislation	.....	.....	4	
Business loans and guaranties: Reconstruction Finance Corporation (net expenditures)	166	26	90	.....
Business promotion and regulation:				
Department of Commerce	20	19	17	17
Antimonopoly programs	8	8	8	8
Other	6	6	6	6
Promotion and regulation of financial institutions:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (net receipts)	−12	−10	−8	.....
Other (mainly Securities and Exchange Commission)	7	7	7	7
Total	227	368	1,524	1,568

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

The broad authority provided under the Defense Production Act has been a major factor both in increasing the output of defense equipment and materials and in guarding against inflation and disruption of our economy. While expenditures under this authority help to finance defense-supporting programs in other functional categories, they are all shown under the finance, commerce, and industry category of the Budget. They comprise over 90 percent of the 1.5 billion dollars in expenditures estimated for this category in the fiscal year 1952.

Major provisions of the Defense Production Act expire next June 30. It is already clear that they should be not only extended but broadened in several important respects. After the Director of Defense Mobilization completes his review of the legislation that is needed, I shall transmit specific recommendations to the Congress.

Expansion of production.—The most immediate and direct stimulants to defense production are the procurement contracts of the armed services. The Department of Defense is spreading contracts among as many contractors as practicable in order to develop the broad industrial base necessary for rapid mobilization. Where necessary, financial assistance is provided through advance payments and through Federal guaranties of private loans to defense contractors and subcontractors. In addition, the Department of Defense is constructing additional plants and facilities to produce military items not ordinarily produced by private firms for the civilian market.

Rapid expansion in output of defense equipment and supplies also depends on an adequate supply of raw materials and components. To encourage private businessmen to expand capacity in these areas, the tax laws now permit the portion of new investment attributable to defense requirements to be written off in 5 years for income tax purposes. Where the need is greater than private lenders can finance or the risk more than they can properly take, the Government is making direct loans or participating with private lenders. In other cases, the Government is entering into long-term procurement contracts, or is purchasing and installing Government-owned equipment in defense plants. Even with these liberal incentives, however, private enterprise cannot be expected to construct certain urgently needed, specialized productive facilities. For this reason, new legislation should include additional authority to construct Government-owned plants and facilities.

Production and distribution controls.—In order to build our defenses rapidly and efficiently, we must resort to direct governmental allocation to assure the proper use of our industrial facilities and materials. This means reimposing many of the production and distribution controls which were so successfully employed in the recent war years. Already steps have been taken to prevent excessive inventories, to cut back the amounts of critical materials going into nondefense uses, and to limit the production

of certain nondefense goods using critical materials.

These controls must be augmented to keep pace with our rising production program. When the full impact of defense procurement is felt this spring and in the fiscal year 1952, even more comprehensive controls over the use of materials will become essential.

Price and wage controls.—While expansion in productive capacity will eventually mean a larger total output, its immediate effect is to add to inflationary pressures by absorbing manpower and materials which otherwise could be used to produce consumer goods. Vigorous use of credit controls and increased taxes, together with voluntary restraint by business and labor, have made it possible until recently to avoid direct controls over prices or wages.

At the present time, we are beginning to impose price and wage controls. Extension of such controls now appears inescapable. To administer such controls, as well as to promote effective voluntary cooperation, price and wage specialists are being recruited and offices are being opened in various cities as rapidly as they can be manned.

Rent control.—The developments in our defense program clearly require a further extension of rent control. Excessive rent increases will inevitably occur in many decontrolled communities where military installations are reopened or defense production expanded. The Congress has already recognized the changed situation by providing a temporary extension of controls beyond December 31, 1950, for all cases where communities have not taken affirmative decontrol action. I am recommending a further extension of rent control authority with provision for recontrol where necessary to protect tenants in defense areas against exorbitant rent increases.

Export controls.—Continuation of export controls is necessary to prevent undue drain from our economy of materials necessary for defense and essential civilian consumption and to make sure that the supplies made available for export make the maximum contribution to our international security objectives. These controls also help to prevent inflationary price increases. I recommend that export control authority be extended beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1951.

Business loans and guarantees.—As part of the realinement of credit programs last summer, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation sharply curtailed nondefense loans involving substantial amounts of materials and other resources important for defense requirements. Within these limits, loans to small business production have been emphasized.

Under this policy, new loan authorizations this year have been reduced to less than half the level for the same period last year. Net expenditures for the fiscal year 1952 are estimated to decline by 76 million dollars from the fiscal year 1950. Estimated net expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 are even lower, but this reflects repayment last September of the 92-million-dollar Kaiser Steel Company loan.

The Corporation will continue to make loans for defense purposes, wherever borrowers are unable to obtain adequate credit elsewhere on reasonable terms but can meet the usual credit standards under the Corporation's statutory authority. Only if borrowers cannot qualify for loans under these standards are they eligible for loans from Defense Production Act funds.

LABOR

A sustained defense program calls for a highly productive and mobile working force—well-trained, with skills fully utilized, and with good working conditions and labor relations. Mobilizing our strength requires changes in the numbers, location, and use of workers. We must make the most effective use of the technical ability, energy, and resourcefulness which have always characterized America at work.

Already, as defense production begins to rise, shortages of skilled workers such as machinists, tool and die makers, and draftsmen are occurring. Although there are still more than 2 million unemployed, in most of the 150 major labor market areas the number of idle workers has been decreasing, and in more than a third of the areas unemployment has practically disappeared.

In the next few months, nearly a million more men and women will be called into the Armed Forces. At the same time, more workers will be needed for defense industries. This means that hundreds of thousands of new workers—primarily women, but also older men and physically handicapped persons—must join the working force and that many people already employed must move to more essential activities.

To assure full utilization of manpower, we must quickly train new workers. We must increase our efforts to avoid losses of production caused by accidents, disputes, or poor working conditions. Production will be scheduled, materials allocated, and new plants located with careful consideration of labor supply. Where migration cannot be avoided, the Federal Government will assist localities to the extent necessary in getting adequate housing and other community facilities and services.

Although the Federal Government can assist in many ways, solving our manpower problems calls primarily for initiative and cooperation by management and labor. Agreements on seniority and welfare provisions will be needed to facilitate transfers of workers to essential activities. Training, upgrading, and other improvements in manpower utilization must be accomplished in the plant and the community. Labor-management committees are being set up in major labor market areas to promote all possible voluntary adjustments.

Because existing Federal labor programs are being redirected, most expenditures for defense activities in the manpower field will be made under regular appropriations. For additional defense activities which may become necessary, Defense Production Act funds will be used. Total expenditures under regular appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 are estimated at 215 million dollars. Three-fourths of this total is for grants-in-aid to pay all costs of administering the Federal-State system of public employment offices and unemployment insurance.

LABOR

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Placement and unemployment insurance activities:				
Department of Labor	$214	$165	$165	$175
Railroad Retirement Board	13	7	10	10
Labor standards and training:				
Department of Labor	11	14	14	14
Department of the Interior: Mine safety	4	4	4	4
Labor relations	13	13	13	13
Labor information, statistics, and general administration	8	9	9	9
Total	263	212	215	225

Placement and unemployment insurance activities.—The State employment services will have greatly increased responsibilities for recruitment, transfer, and placement of workers for defense industry and for our basic civilian economy. To minimize labor pirating and unnecessary migration, I urge that employers hire through their local employment services to the greatest extent possible. The employment services will try to place local workers, including women, older workers minority groups, and the physically handicapped, before recruiting from other areas. I also urge industry to use each individual's skill to the utmost and to adopt hiring specifications which do not exaggerate the strength and skills required.

In contrast to the expansion in employment service activities, the work of handling unemployment insurance claims will decrease because of high employment stimulated by defense production.

Labor standards and training.—In recent years, Federal programs of on-the-job training have emphasized the promotion of better apprenticeship standards. At the end of the fiscal year 1950, registered training programs employed 215,000 apprentices. A drive to increase the number of apprentices in key defense industries such as machine tools, metal working, and aircraft manufacture is now being launched. Further, a program to encourage on-the-job training of production workers and supervisors is being started with funds allocated to the Department of Labor.

World War II experience indicates that unless we intensify our preventive efforts, accidents will increase during a period of defense build-up, because of new kinds of production and new workers. To prevent loss of workers and loss of production, Defense Production Act funds will be used to help States plan special industrial safety campaigns and to train industrial supervisors and State safety inspectors.

To produce enough for defense, we must use wisely all our available labor

resources. Even less than in other times can we now afford to discriminate in employment against the millions of workers in our labor force who are members of minority groups. Following the Federal experience with a Committee on Fair Employment Practice in World War II, eight States and a number of cities have established successful regulatory commissions to deal with employment practices. I again recommend that the Congress enact legislation to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent discrimination in interstate industries.

Labor relations.—Prompt handling of disputes in the sensitive field of labor relations is imperative if we are to avoid interruptions in defense production. A 25-percent increase is being recommended in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service's mediation staff to enable it to act in any dispute affecting defense production.

Trust accounts and unemployment insurance legislation.—The receipts from payroll taxes on employers and the benefit payments for unemployment insurance go into and come out of the State and railroad accounts of the unemployment trust fund and are not included in Budget totals. For the fiscal years 1949 and 1950, unemployment insurance benefit payments exceeded the tax collections because of the temporary rise in unemployment. This year and next, the reserves in the trust fund will build up as unemployment continues to drop.

UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	$1,113	$1,215	$1,296
Interest	167	175	183
Payments:			
State and railroad unemployment withdrawals	−2,013	−962	−715
Net accumulation	−733	428	764
Balance in fund at close of year	7,425	7,853	8,617

In this high employment period, we should take steps to bring the self-supporting unemployment insurance system up to date. After the Congress enacts improved Federal standards, time will be required for the States to bring their laws into conformity. Recommendations are now before the Congress to raise benefits, which now average less than a third of previously earned weekly wages, and to extend coverage, which has not kept up with that of other social insurance programs. The revision of unemployment insurance should also repeal last year's amendment which places a premium on court litigation as a means of determining claims for benefits.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Our transportation and communication systems, already handling a high level of traffic, must be prepared for the even greater loads that would result from the full impact of mobilization.

New freight cars, ore boats, and other equipment recently ordered by the carriers will increase their capacity for meeting these larger needs. Equally important, however, will be the steps that must be taken to obtain the maximum utilization of existing capacity. Such action depends principally upon the cooperative efforts of carriers and shippers, but the Federal Government will provide leadership for these efforts and, where necessary, will impose controls to assure that all appropriate conservation measures are put into effect.

The Government must also continue to carry out its responsibilities for regulating the economic and safety aspects of transport and communication, for providing basic facilities and services, and for furnishing necessary financial aid. Federal programs have contributed to the growth of well-developed transport and communication systems; they must now assist these systems to adjust to the new demands placed upon them.

To carry out its many responsibilities in these fields, the Government will spend an estimated 1.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952, or 285 million dollars less than in the fiscal year 1951. This expenditure decline depends, however, upon legislation which I am recommending to increase postal rates and thereby reduce the postal deficit.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

[Fisca. years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Promotion of merchant marine: Maritime Administration and other	$100	$190	$354	$57
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:				
Panama Canal and Panama Canal Company	8	18	8	.....
Corps of Engineers:				
Present programs	190	193	202	221
Proposed legislation: St. Lawrence project	.....	.....	15	20
Coast Guard	149	189	200	197
Promotion of aviation:				
Civil Aeronautics Administration	159	182	199	166
Provision of highways:				
Bureau of Public Roads	472	466	468	[2] 524
Alaska roads (Interior), and other	25	30	28	17
Regulation of transportation	16	15	15	16
Other services to transportation:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−11	−3	−5	.....
Coast and Geodetic Survey	12	11	12	12
Alaska Railroad	32	40	22	17
Postal service (deficit):				
Present programs	593	632	521	521
Proposed legislation: Postal rate increase	.....	.....	−361	−361
Regulation of communication	7	7	7	7
Total	1,752	1,970	1,685	1,414

[1] This column excludes 748 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

[2] Includes 500 million dollars in obligational authority already provided by Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

Merchant marine.—Recent experience demonstrates again the large shipping demands imposed by an overseas military operation. To transport and supply our troops in Korea, more than 150 vessels of the Maritime Administration reserve fleet have been placed in operation to augment the merchant ships already operating in the Pacific and those which could be transferred from other areas. Our ability to meet rapidly this emergency need can be credited largely to the Government's long-range programs for supporting an active merchant marine and for preserving the surplus vessels of World War II.

Substantial assistance to our active merchant fleet is now provided through direct subsidies, tax benefits, long-term construction loans at low interest rates, and various other aids. Most important among these measures are the construction and operating subsidies, designed to offset lower foreign costs on essential trade routes. In fundamental scope and concept, this subsidy program continues to provide the most workable means for assuring an adequate base of vessels and shipyards, labor and management, for possible future expansion.

We are, however, supplementing this program with certain emergency measures, directed toward specific mobilization needs. Funds appropriated a few days ago will permit an immediate start on the construction of new and faster cargo ships better able to avoid attack by modern submarines. The desirable level of construction in future years is now under study. As a further measure, the Secretary of Commerce is establishing a National Shipping Authority within the Maritime Administration to handle existing functions related to shipping operations and to serve as the nucleus for future expansion of operations if circumstances require. Among other functions, this Authority will be prepared to provide marine war-risk insurance for private operators, should the need arise.

Navigation aids and facilities.—The defense program has attached a new and special urgency to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Besides the large amounts of additional electric power which the project would make available, it would also provide economical and safe access, through the seaway, to the large deposits of iron ore in Labrador and Quebec. As expanding requirements for steel bring us closer to the depletion of our high-grade domestic ore reserves, the importance of these nearby deposits will correspondingly increase. Construction of the St. Lawrence project should be started at the earliest possible date, and I urge the Congress to authorize this program without delay.

The river and harbor program of the Corps of Engineers includes three other new power development projects, with estimated expenditures of 28 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952. These projects are discussed below under natural resources. Except for these and other projects involving power generation, construction and maintenance in this program have been substantially curtailed.

In addition to its normal functions of promoting the safety of life at sea and enforcing the maritime laws, the Coast Guard has recently been assigned responsibility for protecting our ports against sabotage. In the fiscal year 1952, the port security program will account for 23 million dollars of the total Coast

Guard expenditures of 200 million dollars.

Aviation.—Facilities and services provided by the Civil Aeronautics Administration are essential for the safe operation of both civil and military aircraft. The present program for modernizing the Federal airways system has been expressly designed to meet the common needs of both groups, and the new facilities now being installed will permit the efficient handling of increased military traffic in the present emergency.

Some adjustments in aviation programs are being made in order to meet special military needs. Air navigation services in the Pacific have been expanded because of the airlift to Korea. The air traffic control system, normally concerned only with safety in flight, is now taking on the new function of identifying and controlling civil aircraft movements as a part of our air defense.

In keeping with the general public works policy of this Budget, construction of new facilities in the fiscal year 1952 will be limited to those projects which are most closely related to national security, or to civilian needs of an urgent nature. The same standards will be applied to grants for State and local airport construction.

In addition to the nearly 200 million dollars that will be spent in 1952 for aviation facilities and services, the Government will spend a substantial amount in subsidies to the airlines through mail payments. Federal financial assistance has been a major factor in the industry's rapid growth, and should be continued to the extent necessary for the sound development of civil aviation. The method of paying this subsidy should be changed, however, in order to provide the public with full information as to its cost. At present, the airline subsidy is merged with compensation for the cost of handling mail and included in postal expenditures. These two elements should be separated, and the subsidy portion paid by the Civil Aeronautics Board from funds appropriated specifically for that purpose. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing for this separation.

Highways.—Partly as a result of reduced construction and maintenance during World War II, our highway system is not yet fully prepared to handle the current peak levels of motor traffic. While long-range improvement is needed in all classes of roads, we must concentrate in the present emergency upon overcoming those road deficiencies which are most serious from the standpoint of national defense or essential civilian traffic.

The impact of defense traffic will be especially heavy upon the National System of Interstate Highways, a limited network of roads selected because of their special importance to both peacetime and defense needs. Substantial relocation and reconstruction are required in order to provide the width, strength, and other characteristics needed to handle anticipated traffic. In reviewing State and local requests for Federal aid, the Bureau of Public Roads will give primary emphasis to projects on this system, and to the principal urban roads which connect with it.

Construction will be started in the fiscal year 1951 on a small number of access roads immediately required to serve defense installations. As additional factories and military camps are activated for the defense program, the need for new or improved access roads will correspondingly increase. So far as possible, these and other emergency needs should be met by diversion of funds from roads of less urgency.

Postal service.—On the basis of existing postal rates, the postal deficit for the fiscal year 1952 is estimated at 521 million dollars. This actually represents a higher level than that shown for 1951, since the 1951 estimate of 632 million dollars includes a nonrecurring expenditure of 152 million dollars, for retroactive adjustment of railway mail rates. No allowance is made in these estimates for possible future increases in mail transportation rates which may result from regulatory proceedings now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The Postmaster General is taking many steps to reduce the cost of postal operations. Significant economies have already been realized through recent reductions in service. Experimen'ts in the mechanized sorting of mail are being conducted. A streamlined money-order system will be established by July 1951. These and other similar measures will permit reductions in postal expenditures, some of which will be realized in the fiscal year 1952. At best, however, the total potential savings from improved efficiency are relatively small in relation to the present size of the postal deficit.

Since the end of the war, the productivity of postal employees per man-hour worked has increased by over 10 percent, and the steps now being taken will permit further gains in the future. Despite this improved productivity, however, the average cost per postal transaction has increased by nearly 60 percent during the same period, mainly as a result of employee pay raises and transportation rate increases. In the absence of adequate postal rate increases, the average revenue per transaction has increased by less than 10 percent. The resulting deficit of over one-half billion dollars would be unsound at any time, but it is especially untimely in a period when the Federal Budget must sustain extremely heavy defense expenditures. I therefore repeat, most emphatically, my many previous recommendations for rate legislation which will bring postal revenues into line with present costs, reducing the deficit to the costs of handling Government mail and other costs which are not properly chargeable to the general users of the postal service.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The economic and military strength of this country is dependent upon the availability and wise use of our basic natural resources. These resources, while extensive, are not unlimited. Our land, forest, water, mineral, power, atomic, and other resources made a vital contribution toward winning World War II and are now called upon to support the present military expansion. The Federal Government has a large responsibility for assuring the use of these resources to maximum advantage.

Our natural resources programs are being modified in order to make the greatest immediate contribution to our national security. In some cases, it is necessary to postpone desirable long-range developments in order to accomplish urgent immediate objectives. Maintenance and rehabilitation on all programs are limited to those expenditures necessary to prevent deterioration of the vitally important resources which are basic to our continued economic expansion. The resource programs of the various agencies emphasize the development of Alaska for economic security and national defense.

Expenditures for natural resources are estimated at 2.5 billion dollars for fiscal year 1952, half of which will be spent on the atomic energy program. Other large expenditures are those for flood control and reclamation, including hydroelectric power generation, and for the Tennessee Valley Authority program.

Estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1952 exceed those for 1951 by over 400 million dollars. This net expansion reflects increases of 459 million dollars for atomic energy and 65 million dollars for the Tennessee Valley Authority, a combined decrease of 141 million dollars for the flood control and reclamation programs, and small changes for other programs.

NATURAL RESOURCES

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Atomic energy: Atomic Energy Commission	$550	$818	$1,277	$870
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers: Flood control	438	469	412	401
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Reclamation	298	349	259	257
Hells Canyon project (proposed legislation)	.....	.....	6	8
Power transmission (Bonneville, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administrations)	36	54	65	63
Indian land resources	26	41	25	22
Bureau of Land Management and other (Interior)	10	9	9	10
Tennessee Valley Authority (net)	19	171	236	249
International Boundary and Water Commission, and other	4	7	14	17
Forest resources:				
Forest Service and other Agriculture	75	86	93	92
Department of the Interior	3	2	4	5
Mineral resources: Bureau of Mines and other (Interior)	34	29	33	36
General resources surveys: Geological Survey	16	18	22	23
Fish and wildlife resources: Fish and Wildlife Service and other	23	28	31	30
Recreational use of resources: National Park Service	22	36	33	25
Total	1,554	2,117	2,519	2,111

[1] This column excludes 370 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Atomic energy.—At the same time that we are actively pursuing industrial and other peacetime applications of atomic energy, present world developments demand intensification of the national security aspects of the program. The very substantial increases appropriated for the atomic energy program in fiscal year 1951 will provide for enlargement of production capacity for atomic materials and weapons. A portion of the funds recommended for 1952 provides for certain construction projects under this expansion program.

The Budget recommends increases also for the procurement and processing of raw materials, the production in existing plants of fissionable materials and weapons, and the investigation and development of new and improved weapons. The 1952 funds also allow for continuing development of new designs of nuclear reactors, including those for the production of fissionable material, the generation of power, and the propulsion of ships and aircraft. The Atomic Energy Commission will continue its vigorous program in basic and applied research in the physical sciences and in biology and medicine.

Land and water resources.—A year ago I appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission to recommend policies to guide Federal participation in the development, conservation, and use of water resources. This Commission has now submitted the first volume of its report and will submit two additional volumes. The Commission's report will be reviewed to determine what administrative actions and legislative recommendations may be needed to improve the Government's water and related land-use programs.

Although long-range improvement of our river basins is essential for the continued economic strength of the country, in the fiscal year 1952 we must emphasize those aspects of the programs which primarily support the national defense. Immediately after the first attack in Korea, all Government agencies were directed to review their programs and to adjust them to meet urgent needs. Many of the river basin projects contribute to defense as well as civilian industrial requirements through providing low-cost electric power in shortage areas. These projects are being pushed forward. Other projects, though desirable from a long-range standpoint, are being curtailed or deferred. As a result of these actions, combined expenditures required in the fiscal year 1952 for continuation of projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers now under way—involving dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees—are estimated to decrease by nearly 150 million dollars from the 1951 level.

Following a careful review of power requirements for the defense program, seven new projects, all of which will provide substantial power benefits, are included in this budget. These new projects, together with the installation of additional power units in projects already under way and the related facilities required to transmit the power, are estimated to cost in total 1.5 billion dollars and to provide 3.9 million kilowatts of installed capacity. The projects are Hells Canyon, The Dalles and Ice Harbor in the Columbia Basin, Old Hickory on the Cumberland River, a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley, Gavins Point on the Missouri River, and the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. These seven are the only new projects recommended for the river-basin programs. Four of them are in the river and harbor program, and funds for them are included in the transportation category.

The new projects together with projects completed or under way by the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, and Tennessee Valley Authority will provide ultimate capacity of 20 million kilowatts. Funds recommended in 1952 for the Bonneville, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administrations, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tennessee Valley Authority will provide properly scheduled facilities to transmit power to principal load centers.

I am also including funds in this Budget to plan for the urgently needed redevelopment of Niagara power facilities made possible by the recent treaty with Canada.

Following the Flood Control Act of 1950, I directed the Federal agencies concerned to work together on preparation of a comprehensive plan for development of the resources of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins and the New England-New York area. The Budget for 1952 provides funds to continue the surveys.

Mineral and other resource programs.—During and since World War II, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey have concentrated upon research on the adequacy of mineral resources, the discovery of new resources, and means for improved development, conservation, and use of existing reserves. All of these activities have a clear defense significance and budget increases are recommended to accelerate them.

Funds for the management, protection, and development of other resources are at somewhat lower levels than would be desirable for good conservation practice. Increases are recommended for supervision and sale of timber resources and construction of access roads to increase the cut of timber, and for range improvement and fish and wildlife development to add to the supply of food and other essential products. Because of their importance to planning for defense projects, increases are also recommended for topographic mapping and water resources investigations. Programs for the management and development of national park areas and resources of Indian lands, and for other services to Indians have been held to the 1951 level or below.

To insure effective use of their lands, the Indians are in need of credit facilities. I recommend legislation which would augment the loan fund authorized in 1934 in an amount sufficient to meet the demands for credit over the next 5 to 10 years. Such legislation is preferable to a piecemeal approach of providing credit for selected tribes through individual bills.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

During the period of concentration upon defense expansion, our Federal agricultural programs must serve one central purpose—the maintenance of our capacity to produce abundant quantities of food and fiber to meet our own needs and critical needs of friendly countries. Government farm programs now in effect make up, in general, the kinds of activities needed for the defense period. Some of these programs are being redirected to provide a greater contribution to the defense effort, as for example the production of fibers required for clothing and equipment for the Armed Forces.

American agriculture today is in a strong financial condition. The high postwar demand for agricultural products has maintained farm production and income at high levels. Gross farm income in the calendar year 1950, although below the peak level of 1948, was approximately three times as high as in 1940, and will show a further increase in 1951.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:				
Commodity Credit Corporation—price support, supply, and purchase programs (net)	$1,606	[1]—$296	$258	$427
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	96	92	75	[2] 73
International Wheat Agreement (Commodity Credit Corporation)	76	117	115	77
Sugar Act	60	61	70	72
Federal crop insurance and other	7	8	6	8
Financing farm ownership and operation	146	157	141	163
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones	294	312	269	118
Agricultural land and water resources:				
Conservation and use (including administrative expense accounts)	275	309	304	310
Soil Conservation Service and flood control	61	65	63	64
Research, and other agricultural services	163	161	148	171
Total	2,784	986	1,429	1,483

[1] Excess of receipts over expenditures.
[2] Excludes $77 million of this permanent appropriation recommended to be made available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1950 costs of the International Wheat Agreement.

With this outlook for agricultural prices and farm income, total Federal expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources are expected to decline from 2.8 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950 to 1 billion dollars in 1951 and to 1.4 billion dollars in 1952. Most of the change in agricultural expenditures from 1950 to 1952 is due to decreased

expenditures for agricultural price supports.

Stabilization of farm prices and farm income.—Expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation for price-support purposes have declined greatly since mid-1950 because of the rise in farm prices and the short cotton crop. During the fiscal year 1951, it is now estimated that the Corporation will realize net receipts of 296 million dollars compared with net outlays in 1950 of 1.6 billion dollars. Receipts from sales of nearly 3.5 million bales of cotton acquired from the 1948 crop will alone more than offset other expenditures for price support.

Present estimates of production, consumption, and exports of 1951 crops indicate that net expenditures for price support will be 238 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952. While commodity inventories are currently proving to be valuable in meeting increasing needs for foods and fibers, losses have occurred in the disposal of a number of perishable commodities, and further losses are expected to occur in 1952. To avoid the unnecessary accumulation and loss on perishable agricultural commodities, legislation is needed to permit direct payments to producers in lieu of market price supports through Government purchases. This would allow excess perishable commodities to move into consumption and would make our price support provisions more compatible with our international trade policy. To help the Commodity Credit Corporation dispose of its existing surpluses, it should be authorized to pay transportation and repackaging costs on surplus commodities distributed to public and private welfare organizations.

In addition to Commodity Credit Corporation price support expenditures, a permanent appropriation, equal to 30 percent of customs duties, is available for removal from the market of surplus agricultural commodities, mainly perishables. With increasing demands for farm commodities, the total amount of this fund will not be necessary for this purpose in the fiscal year 1952. Accordingly, I recommend that 77 million dollars of the permanent appropriation be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs of the International Wheat Agreement in the fiscal year 1950.

Under the International Wheat Agreement, the United States guarantees the export of a certain quantity of wheat at the maximum price of $1.80 per bushel during the 4 years of the Agreement. The loss arising from the difference between this agreed-upon price and the higher domestic price of wheat is met from Corporation funds, with reimbursement later from appropriated funds. Because of an increase in export quotas and higher domestic wheat prices, expenditures for the Wheat Agreement are estimated to rise to 117 million dollars in the fiscal year 1951 and 115 million in 1952.

Expenditures under the Sugar Act of 1948 will increase in the fiscal year 1952 because of the larger volume of domestic sugar production in 1950 and 1951, and the provision in the law for mandatory payments to sugar producers.

Financing farm ownership and operation.—The loan programs supervised by the Farm Credit Administration will, in the defense period, facilitate farm operations and encourage farm ownership. These loan programs are largely financed by borrowing in the open market, and only the supervisory expenses of the Farm Credit Administration and changes in net investment of Government capital in the supervised banks and other corporations are included in Budget totals.

The loan activities of the Farmers' Home Administration, which also assist farm operations, are financed by funds borrowed from the Treasury. These activities are expected to remain at approximately the same level in the fiscal year 1952, with a decrease in farm ownership loans offset in part by some expansion in production and subsistence loans to meet the needs of reclamation settlers and low-income farmers for essential operating credit not available from other credit sources. The disaster loan program is expected to decline in 1952 below the abnormal levels required in 1950 and 1951.

Financing rural electrification and rural telephones.—By June 30, 1950, approximately 86 percent of all farms were electrified, compared with 48 percent in 1945. Last year, a new program to extend and improve rural telephone systems was begun. Although under normal conditions it would be desirable to continue the rapid progress on rural electrification and the provision of adequate rural telephones, shortages of metals, particularly aluminum and copper, and of electronic equipment, make it necessary to proceed more slowly with both the electrification and telephone programs. I recommend that the Rural Electrification Administration new loan authorization be reduced from the 297 million dollars available in 1951 to 109 million dollars in 1952. Expenditures will decline by a smaller amount because of the backlog of loans committed but not yet advanced. The reduction in new loan authorization will permit improvement and expansion of existing distribution capacity where essential, but will require some curtailment of loans for new facilities.

Conservation.—Efforts to promote conservation and development of agricultural land and water resources are aided by the Department of Agriculture through the technical advice and assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, the flood control program, and the conservation payments program. Although some phases of these programs may in future years need to be expanded to maintain and improve our soil resources, the higher priority which must now be given to defense programs requires in the 1952 Budget a policy of no expansion of present conservation programs. I, therefore, recommend that funds for flood control and the Soil Conservation Service be held at the present level and that the advance authorization for the conservation and use program in the 1952 crop year, which will largely determine expenditures in the fiscal year 1953, be continued at the 1951 crop-year level of 285 million dollars.

Research and other agricultural services.—An appropriation of 171 million dollars is recommended for the continuing basic services for agriculture, including research on crop varieties, livestock and poultry, and the production and marketing of farm products; control and eradication of insects and plant and animal diseases; meat inspection; payments to States for experiment stations and cooperative extension work; and general overhead expenses of the Department of Agriculture. This amount also includes 33 million dollars to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for 1950 expenses of the program to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. Although there are many worth-while research and service programs which it would be desirable to expand under more normal conditions, I recommend at this time that they be held at or below their 1951 level. Finally, I recommend legislation to enable the Commodity Exchange Authority to control speculative trading and to strengthen its regulation of commodity exchanges.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

In the years since World War II, we have made a good start toward achieving adequate housing and community facilities for our people. In the last 12 months over 1,350,000 new housing units were produced, a third above the previous record level. About half of this new housing was financed with mortgages insured or guaranteed by Federal agencies. Under the comprehensive legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Government has begun to aid in clearing slums and redeveloping our cities; to assist local housing authorities in providing adequate housing for low-income groups; to promote better farm housing; and to conduct or sponsor the basic research needed to realize the full potentialities of the construction industry.

Continuance of the high level of housing construction achieved in 1950, while entirely desirable in normal times, would use materials and manpower now needed to meet defense requirements. Accordingly, to help the defense program go ahead full speed and to reduce inflationary pressures on construction costs, it has been necessary to take measures to reduce residential construction this year by more than a third, to a level of about 850,000 units annually.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Net expenditures or net receipts (−)			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Defense housing, community facilities and services (proposed legislation)	------	------	$100	$150
Civil defense:				
Federal Civil Defense Administration	------	$10	265	450
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	------	5	65	------
Aids to private housing (present programs):				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Federal National Mortgage Association	$579	189	−530	------
Federal Housing Administration [2]	−30	−6	−5	------
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−242	−80	[3]	------
Other	5	7	−11	------
Veterans' Administration: Direct loans	------	73	−5	------
Department of Agriculture: Farm housing	12	28	23	23
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−25	−40	−20	------
Other housing and community development programs:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Public housing programs	−37	158	−138	28
Loans to educational institutions	------	1	36	------
Slum clearance and urban redevelopment	[3]	10	65	[4] 350
Advance planning loans and other	4	32	15	5
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−6	14	24	------
Other (mainly Interior)	1	8	14	12
Total	261	409	−102	1,018

[1] This column excludes 5 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

[2] Excludes net receipts of mutual mortgage insurance fund, now shown under trust accounts.

[3] Less than one-half million dollars.

[4] Represents obligational authority already provided by Housing Act of 1949.

To meet defense needs, four major revisions have been made in our housing and community development programs. First, comprehensive limitations have been imposed on all types of credit to finance new housing construction, as well as on all Government-guaranteed credit to finance purchase of existing homes. Second, in both existing and proposed new programs, we are giving top priority to military and defense-related housing and community facilities. Third, subject only to defense priorities, we are giving special emphasis to housing for lower-income groups in accordance with the general objectives of national housing policy. Fourth, we are rapidly organizing under newly enacted legislation to meet the civil defense requirements of the Nation.

Most of the existing Federal programs are financed by authorizations already made by the Congress in basic statutes. Partly because of the sharp curtailments in programs, only a small part of those authorizations will be spent in the fiscal year 1952. Moreover, sales of mortgages purchased by the Government in earlier years and collections on loans will cause a substantial excess of receipts over new expenditures for several going programs. Therefore, despite increased expenditures for civil defense and for the proposed new defense-supporting legislation, the housing and community development category as a whole in the fiscal year 1952 will realize estimated net receipts of 102 million dollars.

Defense housing, community facilities and services.—As the defense effort accelerates, additional housing and community facilities and services in many key areas will undoubtedly be required to take care of the influx of defense workers and military personnel. We shall continue to place primary reliance on the initiative of private builders and local communities to provide the new construction and services required. To reinforce and supplement this initiative, I am recommending several basic changes in legislation to meet specific defense needs for housing, community facilities and services.

The expansion in the defense program makes more urgent the provision of an adequate supply of rental housing. Military installations and defense plants will find it difficult to meet their expanding manpower requirements if adequate housing is not available at reasonable rents. For this reason, despite the cutbacks in total construction, it is essential to increase new private rental housing in defense areas. The legislation which I am proposing will provide more liberal insurance for loans financing construction of a limited number of rental units in these areas. In addition, it will extend the temporary program for insurance of military housing loans beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1951, and will include similar insurance for mortgages to finance rental housing near installations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The adaptability of prefabricated housing to defense housing requirements makes it imperative that present producers of proven efficiency be able to obtain adequate financing for their operations—especially for the distribution of such housing. The proposed legislation will help meet the special financing problems of this industry.

In some areas where the most rapid expansion in military or defense-related activities will occur, local communities and private builders cannot be expected—even with these new aids—to meet all the emergency requirements for housing and community essentials. This problem will be particularly acute where large installations are located in small communities or isolated areas. To prevent delays in recruitment and to assure a reasonably stable labor supply in such areas, the Federal Government should have authority, as in World War II, to construct housing units and to make loans and grants for community facilities and services. This authority should be limited to meeting defense needs and even then should be available only when these needs could not otherwise be met. Accordingly the proposed legislation would authorize direct Federal construction of defense housing and provision of Federal funds for community facilities and services. For these purposes, as well as for the necessary extension and expansion of defense-related private housing aids, the Budget includes estimated appropriations of 150 million dollars.

Civil defense.—With modern methods of warfare our Nation could be subjected to a sudden, devastating enemy attack. The military services have responsibility for warding off attack, but effective civil defense can sharply reduce the injuries, loss of life, and destruction of homes and factories that otherwise might occur.

Under legislation just enacted, the Federal Civil Defense Administration will provide equal matching grants to States for the construction of shelters and other protective facilities in critical target areas. These grants account for the larger part of the expenditures projected for this program in the fiscal year 1952. The Administration will also begin building a national reserve of supplies and equipment. In addition, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will make loans to public authorities for public works which can serve both as shelters and for other community purposes, when the Administrator certifies that there is a civil defense necessity for such projects.

Aid to private housing.—The record levels of private housing construction in recent years have been stimulated in large part by widespread and generous Federal credit aids—mainly Federal insurance or guarantees of private mortgage loans and Federal purchases to support the market for these mortgages. By reducing the liberality of these aids, it has been possible to cut back housing construction in recent months wtihout imposing direct controls.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—Changes in law and administrative policy governing the Federal National Mortgage Association have sharply curtailed new purchases of mortgages (except those covered by earlier commitments) and have helped to stimulate an increasing volume of sales of mortgages previously purchased. As the large backlog of old commitments is gradually drawn down, the net expenditures of this program will continue to decline. In the fiscal year 1952 net receipts of 530 million dollars are expected, primarily from the accelerated sales program. By that time, we plan to return this secondary mortgage market largely to a stand-by status and to place a substantial part of the unused mortgage purchase authority in reserve for possible future emergency requirements.

Federal Housing Administration.—The higher down payments and other limitations placed on housing credit have caused a sharp decline in applications for mortgage insurance under existing Federal Housing Administration programs. Nevertheless, in 1952, roughly one-half the total new housing produced, as well as purchases of nearly 200,000 existing homes, will probably be financed with the aid of Federal mortgage insurance. From the standpoint of the Federal Budget, these programs will continue to show net receipts, since the estimated premium income

will exceed administrative expenses and probable losses.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation.—The Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be liquidated before the close of the current fiscal year. All of the Federal investment of more than 3.7 billion dollars made during the depression years of the 1930's will be repaid in full and in addition the earned surplus of 14 million dollars will be paid to the Treasury. These payments will successfully complete one of the largest emergency financing operations of the depression years.

Direct veterans loans.—Under the Housing Act of 1950, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was given temporary authority to make a maximum of 150 million dollars in direct housing loans to veterans in areas where, even with the support of the secondary market, adequate financing is not obtainable. Experience to date indicates only a limited need for such loans, which private lenders should be able to provide. Accordingly, I do not recommend the extension of this program beyond the current fiscal year.

Farm housing.—As part of the general limitation of new housing construction, new loans for farm housing in the fiscal year 1952 will be held to less than a third of the 75 million dollars authorized in the basic statute.

Public housing programs.—In the fiscal year 1952, construction of an estimated 75,000 new units will be started under the low-rent public housing program, well below the annual level of 135,000 units authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. These units will serve two major purposes. They will not only help meet the long-neglected housing needs of low-income families, but will also make an important contribution to defense housing requirements. To make sure that the full defense potentialities are realized, the Public Housing Administration, to the maximum extent feasible, will give preference to projects serving defense areas and will require local housing authorities to give military personnel and defense workers preference as tenants.

During the current year, the initial construction is being financed largely through temporary Federal loans. In 1952 and later years, however, both the initial construction and the permanent capital investment in the local projects will be largely financed by obligations issued by the local housing authorities to private investors on the security of the annual Federal contributions. In the fiscal year 1952, collections and private refinancing of earlier loans will cause substantial net receipts. Federal expenditures for annual contributions to help pay rentals of low-income tenants will increase moderately, but in the case of projects occupied by defense workers the income of the occupants will be sufficient to make Federal contributions unnecessary to help pay their rents.

Loans to educational institutions.—Soon after the aggression in Korea last summer, authorizations under this program were suspended to permit reappraisal of college housing needs. On the basis of this reappraisal, a maximum of 40 million dollars out of the 300 million dollars authorized by the Housing Act of 1950 has been provided, to be used only for college housing directly contributing to defense. No other loans will be made under this program until the outlook for college enrollment shows a clear need for such housing.

Slum clearance and urban redevelopment.—The long-range program for clearance of slums and redevelopment of the major urban areas, for both private and public use, is still in its early stages. Commitments for planning advances have been issued to 70 cities.

Because of the great importance of encouraging orderly development of our cities—and the small amounts of manpower and other resources involved in the early years—steady progress should continue in the planning stage of this program. Local authorities also may acquire sites, but will not demolish existing buildings or otherwise redevelop areas unless the redevelopment is consistent with defense requirements. Under this basic policy, net expenditures of $65,000,000 are anticipated for the fiscal year 1952—primarily for planning advances and temporary loans for acquisition of sites. This contrasts with the additional $350,000,000 in authority which becomes available in 1952 under the basic statute.

Advance planning loans.—Advances to State and local governments for public works planning have been suspended except when the projects involve defense-related or essential civilian requirements. While in a normal peacetime economy this program makes a major contribution to economic stability, it does not now appear advisable to extend it beyond the present expiration next October.

EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH

The challenge of communist imperialism requires the full potential of all our people—their initiative, their knowledge, their skills, and their ideals. These qualities have given this Nation world leadership in science and industry. Education and research are vital to the maintenance of this leadership.

The highly developed technology of the Nation requires an educated people equipped to operate this productive system efficiently. Likewise, it requires continuing basic research and the practical application of new knowledge and new techniques. Yet we start our defense effort with an educational system which fails to provide adequate educational opportunities for all our people, and with a lack of balance in the Nation's research activities.

The Federal Government took a major step last year toward achieving a better balance in research through the creation of the National Science Foundation, but urgently needed general legislation in the field of education was not enacted. This Budget includes provision for grants to the States for the operating expenses of elementary and secondary schools to assist in improving educational opportunities for our children. This proposal accounts for more than half of the total estimate of $483,000,000 of expenditures for education and general research in the fiscal year 1952, and for most of the estimated increase over 1951.

In addition to programs included in this total, many Federal agencies carry on specialized education and research activities which are included under other categories, such as veterans' services and benefits, military services, and agriculture.

EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Promotion of education:				
Office of Education:				
General aid for operating expenses, elementary and secondary schools (proposed legislation)			$200	$300
Vocational education	$27	$27	27	27
Education of children on Federal property and in emergency areas		39	106	78
Other programs	14	8	8	9
Educational aid to special groups	5	7	8	5
Library and museum services	9	11	12	12
General purpose research:				
National Science Foundation		(2)	2	10
National Bureau of Standards	9	12	11	8
Seventeenth decennial census (Commerce)	42	32	10	9
Other (mainly Census Bureau)	8	7	8	10
Total	114	143	483	468

[1] This column excludes 29 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

[2] Less than one-half million dollars.

Promotion of education.—Strong elementary and secondary education systems throughout the country are vital to national strength and to the improvement of individual opportunity Although educational opportunities are excellent in some parts of the country, children and youth in too many of our communities still do not receive adequate education. Inequalities exist primarily because of differences in the financial resources of the States and localities.

The Nation as a whole suffers from these inequalities. The results are demonstrated most sharply in times like the present. The military services even find it necessary to teach some inductees reading and writing before they can begin combat training. From the standpoint of national security alone, as well as the enlargement of opportunities for the individual, the Nation needs to see that every youth acquires the fundamental education and training which are essential to effective service, whether in the Armed Forces, in industry, or on the farm. I therefore urge the Congress to authorize Federal financial assistance to help the States provide a level of elementary and secondary education that will meet the minimum needs of the Nation. The Budget includes a tentative appropriation estimate of 300 million dollars for this purpose.

To help meet one particular educational problem, laws were enacted last year to make a single agency—the Federal Security Agency—responsible for giving financial assistance to schools or, if necessary, establishing schools for the education of children living on Federal property or in areas especially affected by Federal activities. Previously a variety of arrangements existed, and some of these children were denied free public education. The Budget includes expenditures of 106 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952 for buildings and current operating expenses under these new laws.

In view of the present necessity to provide training for defense production, a part of the appropriations for the general purpose of vocational education and training should be used for the training of workers for defense and essential civilian production. This Budget provides for the designation of 10 million dollars of the proposed vocational education appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 for this purpose.

Last year I recommended a program of aid to college students to help equalize educational opportunities. The proposal is omitted from this Budget pending reconsideration of the kind of program that will best fit into Selective Service policies and general manpower requirements.

Science Foundation.—The National Science Foundation, established by law last year, is now organized and planning its program. The limited funds available to it in the current fiscal year will not permit the Foundation to proceed beyond initial preparations. An appropriation request for the fiscal year 1952 will be submitted this spring to enable the Foundation to initiate the important work of formulating a national policy for basic research, stimulating such research, and training scientific personnel.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE, AND HEALTH

Last year the Congress enacted important improvements in our social security program. Coverage under old-age and survivors insurance was extended to some 10 million additional workers. Eligibility requirements were relaxed for older people, so that many more will qualify for retirement annuities in the near future. The level of benefits was raised substantially and the taxable wage base was increased moderately, to make the benefits and the taxes more commensurate with earnings.

In taking this step, the Congress clearly decided that social insurance, rather than public assistance, is to be the primary vehicle for providing social security in this country. This accords fully with our American tradition of self-reliance. In the future, the great majority of American families will obtain, through their own and their employers' contributions, a considerable degree of insurance protection against poverty arising from the old age or death of the wage earner.

In spite of these far-reaching improvements, however, the Nation's social insurance program still does not measure up to the full needs or aspirations of the American people; nor has it by any means achieved the scope of protection that our economy can afford and should give. Millions of people, including self-employed farmers, many domestic and agricultural workers, many public employees, and members of the Armed Forces, still are not under social insurance. Our aim should be to establish for all employed people a minimum protection that each person takes with him wherever he works. Pension and insurance plans for special groups should supplement social security benefits, as industry pensions already do for several million workers. Moreover, we need to fill important gaps in our social insurance system by providing protection on a prepaid basis against the costs of medical care and the loss of family income in cases of disability. These measures will help to provide that material security which is essential to a vigorous democracy and a highly productive labor force.

All Federal programs of social security, welfare, and health are estimated to require expenditures of 2.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952, an increase of 105 million dollars over the current year. Three-fourths of the expenditures are for public assistance, for accident compensation payments, and for the transfer of railroad payroll tax receipts to the railroad retirement trust account. The amounts of these expenditures are all determined by statutory requirements. The remaining one-fourth provides for all the public health activities of the Government, for aid to various special groups, and for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other crime control and correction services.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE, AND HEALTH

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Public assistance: Federal Security Agency	$1,125	$1,282	$1,302	$1,302
Aid to special groups:				
Vocational rehabilitation (Federal Security Agency)	20	22	24	24
School lunch (Agriculture)	83	83	83	83
Indian welfare and other (Interior)	29	41	43	44
Other (Federal Security Agency)	1	1	1	1
Retirement and dependents' insurance:				
Railroad Retirement Board	583	598	646	646
Federal Security Agency and other	9	7	7	7
Promotion of public health: Federal Security Agency and other:				
Present programs	242	349	350	268
Proposed legislation:				
Aid to medical education	------	------	25	30
Local health services	------	------	5	5
Crime control and correction: Department of Justice and other	91	107	106	109
Accident compensation: Department of Labor	24	30	33	33
Total	2,213	2,520	2,625	2,552

[1] This column excludes 141 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Public assistance.—The same legislation which extended coverage of old-age and survivors insurance also made changes in the Federal-State public assistance program. It authorized Federal grants for assistance to totally and permanently disabled persons, extended the aid for dependent children to include a relative who takes care of such children, and provided for Federal sharing of payments made by the States to hospitals and doctors furnishing medical care for persons receiving public assistance.

With many more persons eligible now or in the near future for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and with the increased employment opportunities of the defense economy, public assistance should conform more nearly to its intended purpose of filling gaps in social insurance. Thus, increases in expenditures resulting from the new public assistance legislation are expected to be largely offset by decreases resulting from a reduction in the number of children and old people on the public assistance rolls. The estimated expenditures of 1.3 billion dollars for public assistance in the fiscal year 1952 exceeds by 20 million dollars the amount for the current year.

Aid to special groups.—The present Federal-State program for rehabilitation of the disabled will return 65,000 persons to productive work this year. This program should be expanded. Bringing these people into the ranks of the gainfully employed, besides improving their economic self-reliance, adds to our national productive capacity.

Railroad Retirement Board.—Expenditures shown for the Railroad Retirement Board represent principally a bookkeeping transfer of payroll taxes, collected from railroad workers and companies, to the railroad retirement trust account, where they are added to the reserve against future benefit payments. The estimate for the fiscal year 1952 also includes a 33-million-dollar payment by the United States to the trust account for the cost of military service credits for railroad workers. Increased railroad payrolls expected in 1952 are responsible for a rise of 48 million dollars in the estimate. I again recommend that these taxes be transferred to the fund as they are collected, rather than in advance of collection, in order to correct the present indefensible practice whereby the Federal Government pays interest on money that it advances to the fund.

Promotion of public health.—If we are to meet successfully the challenge that confronts this Nation, we can less than ever afford to waste the good health of our people. But the present emergency makes even more difficult the maintenance of good health.

Our chronic shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses will be aggravated as more of them are called into the Armed Forces. Therefore, we need, more than ever, prompt enactment of legislation that will help to increase enrollment in medical and related schools, by assisting them to meet their costs of instruction and to construct additional facilities

where needed. Scholarships should be provided to attract larger enrollments in nursing schools and grants should be made to States for vocational training of practical nurses. Estimated Budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1952 include 25 million dollars for this proposed program.

Many communities that will be faced with added health burdens arising from defense needs do not have adequately staffed local health departments—indeed, some communities have none at all. To help overcome this deficiency, I urge the Congress to enact legislation which will make possible more adequate Federal grants to the States for the strengthening of their local health services. The Budget includes 5 million dollars as the estimated first-year cost of this proposed legislation.

More than one-half of all Federal expenditures for the promotion of public health—estimated at 350 million dollars for the existing programs in the fiscal year 1952—consists of grants to State and local governments. These grants are available for a variety of public health programs, including general health services, hospital construction, maternal and child health, and control of certain specific diseases such as venereal disease, tuberculosis, cancer, mental illness, and heart disease.

Federal expenditures for hospital construction grants are estimated at 136 million dollars, about 4 million dollars less than in the current year. Federal expenditures for other existing programs of grants to States are estimated at 72 million dollars, a slight increase over 1951, due entirely to the expanded grants for maternal and child welfare services provided by the recent amendments to the Social Security Act. The principal direct Federal programs are the research and hospital activities of the Public Health Service.

Trust funds.—The three major retirement systems administered by the Government are the old-age and survivors insurance, railroad retirement, and Federal employee retirement and disability programs. Benefit disbursements are made directly from trust accounts and are not included in Budget expenditures. Receipts of the trust funds are mainly employer and employee payroll contributions. In the case of the railroad retirement system, these receipts are included in total Budget receipts and are transferred to the trust account as a Budget expenditure. The Government contributes as an employer to the Federal employee retirement funds and, for those Federal workers who are not covered by these special programs, to the old-age and survivors insurance system. These contributions appear as Budget expenditures. Payroll contributions received from other employers and from workers for old-age and survivors insurance are transferred directly to the trust fund and are not included in total Budget receipts. Accumulated assets in the three major trust funds now total 20 billion dollars; the money is invested in Government securities and the interest earned is added to the principal of each trust fund.

Receipts and expenditures under the proposed medical care insurance program would be handled through a trust account, paralleling the procedures for old-age and survivors insurance. A period of preparation will be required to set up the health insurance system. I am proposing that in the meantime a small payroll tax of one-fourth of 1 percent each on employees and employers be levied to provide for initial expenses.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE, AND HEALTH

(*Major trust funds*)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Transfer of employment taxes	$2,106	$2,960	$3,823
Interest and other	257	299	313
Transfer from Budget accounts		4	4
Payments of benefits and administrative expenses	−783	−1,674	−2,177
Net accumulation	1,584	1,589	1,963
Balance in fund at close of year	12,885	14,474	16,437
Railroad retirement fund:			
Receipts:			
Transfers from Budget accounts	583	598	646
Interest on investments	62	70	75
Payments of benefits, salaries, and expenses	−304	−329	−350
Net accumulation	341	339	371
Balance in fund at close of year	2,064	2,403	2,774
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Employee contributions	359	227	311
Transfers from Budget accounts and other	305	305	325
Interest	144	161	175
Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses	−268	−287	−312
Net accumulation	540	506	499
Balance in fund at close of year	3,860	4,366	4,865
Medical care insurance trust fund (proposed legislation):			
Receipts from payroll contributions	.....	.....	275
Payment for initial expenses	.....	.....	−35
Net accumulation	.....	.....	240
Balance in fund at close of year	.....	.....	240

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

In the fiscal year 1952 expenditures for veterans' services and benefits will be under 5 billion dollars for the first time in 6 years. This results from a further decline in requirements for the readjustment of veterans of World War II.

During the coming years, because we shall need to maintain larger Armed Forces, virtually all our able-bodied young men may be required to serve their country in its military forces. Before many years, nearly all the population may be veterans or the dependents of veterans.

This means a profound change in the social and economic import of Government programs which affect veterans. It requires a clear recognition that many of the needs of our veterans and their dependents can be met best through the general programs serving the whole population. Therefore, in legislation directed particularly to the problems of servicemen and their dependents, we should provide only for those special and unique needs which arise directly from military service. We should meet their other needs through general programs of the Government.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	$2,596	$2,159	$1,414	$1,117
Loan guarantees	61	105	110	94
Unemployment and self-employment allowances	141	18	10	
Other	76	79	45	24
Compensation and pensions	2,223	2,198	2,223	2,223
Insurance	480	95	74	73
Hospitals and medical care:				
Current expenses	605	601	650	659
Hospital construction	159	212	155	.....
Other services and administration (mainly Veterans Administration)	286	279	230	236
Total	6,627	5,746	4,911	4,426

[1] This column excludes 28 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Readjustment benefits.—A decline of nearly 800 million dollars in expenditures for veterans' readjustment, to 1.6 billion dollars estimated for the fiscal year 1952, will result almost entirely from reduced enrollments for education and training.

Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, eligible veterans are required to initiate their courses of training by July 25, 1951. Accordingly, with the program drawing to a close, the enrollment in institutional, on-the-job, and farm-training courses in the fiscal year 1952 is expected to average about 1 million, a decline of some 600,000 from 1951. By the end of the fiscal year 1952 more than 7,500,000 veterans will have received education and training under this program at a cost of 13.9 billion dollars.

Other expenditures for readjustment benefits cover guarantees of veterans' loans, unemployment allowances, tuition and supplies for the training of disabled veterans, and Government grants to certain seriously disabled veterans. Government expenditures for the loan guarantees in the fiscal year 1952 are estimated at 110 million dollars, largely for a gratuity of 1 year's interest on the guaranteed portion of each loan. By the end of the fiscal year 1952 over 3 million veterans will have borrowed 18 billion dollars in Government-guaranteed loans for homes, farms, and businesses.

The Eighty-first Congress enacted legislation to meet the special rehabilitation needs of disabled veterans injured in Korea. By renewing the program of vocational rehabilitation which was in

effect during and after World War II for disabled veterans, and by providing medical treatment, hospital services, and monthly compensation, the Government is assisting our disabled veterans to return to a self-reliant and productive role as civilians.

Broader problems of policy arise when we consider the readjustment needs of nondisabled veterans. In preparing to meet their needs, we naturally think first of the combat veterans of the Korean fighting, but we must remember that during the coming years the lives of nearly all our young men also may be interrupted for service to their country. When the time comes that these future veterans can be discharged, we must be sure that they will be able to readjust rapidly to normal civilian pursuits.

The provision of education benefits, vocational training, loan guarantees, and unemployment allowances to World War II veterans represented a new and more positive approach to the veterans' readjustment problem than the pensions and bonuses previously provided. There is ample evidence that the "GI bill" has benefited the Nation as well as millions of veterans, despite abuses which impaired the readjustment of some veterans and added to the cost of the whole program.

Any future program should not only avoid past mistakes but should also be fitted to our changed economic and military outlook. The readjustment needs of the men in the Armed Forces now and in the future are likely to be quite different from the needs of World War II veterans. The requirements of future veterans will depend on how long our young men serve, what they do while in military service, and their ages and family responsibilities at time of discharge. The need for special programs for veterans will depend also on how many of our young men serve, the job opportunities open to them afterward, and the types of services available to them under governmental programs for the population as a whole. When all these factors are considered, it is clear that an extension of the "GI bill," without material changes, would perpetuate provisions not suited to changed conditions. It could result in excessive expenditure of public funds and still fail to accomplish the objective of helping the veteran to readjust.

The full assessment of these complicated problems requires careful study in order that we may adopt the best policies for future Government programs affecting veterans. In that assessment, we need to take careful account of our own national experience over the last 6 years and the requirements imposed by our changed military and economic needs.

Compensation and pensions.—It is estimated that payments for compensation and pensions will total more than 2.2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1952, and will be made to an average of 3,168,000 individuals and families. This is an increase over the current year of 113,000 in the average number of cases, and of 25 million dollars in expenditures. Of the compensation cases, which result from service-connected disabilities or deaths, 82 percent relate to military service during or after World War II. Of the pension recipients, 7 percent are veterans or the dependents of veterans of World War II.

The total of 2.2 billion dollars for 1952 includes 1.5 billion dollars in compensation payments, covering an average of 345,000 families of deceased veterans and 2,010,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities. Also included is 80 million dollars for subsistence allowances to service-disabled veterans in the vocational rehabilitation program, a decrease of 56 million dollars below the 1951 level. Pension payments will be made in an estimated 812,000 non-service-connected cases. The total of 605 million dollars for these pension payments is 75 million dollars higher than in the current year.

Insurance.—Government liabilities for life insurance programs for servicemen and veterans are mainly for the costs of administration and for payments on account of deaths traceable to the extra hazards of military service.

In view of the Korean hostilities and the current enlargement of the Armed Forces, there is pressing need for new legislation to assure financial protection to the families of servicemen. The present national service life insurance program does not meet this need. Because it is optional, the protection is not carried by some servicemen and is held in less than adequate amounts by others. The system is complex and costly and absorbs excessive manpower, especially when the Armed Forces are large and manpower scarce.

It would be more equitable, and over the last decade it would have been more economical, to provide a free and automatic $10,000 indemnity to the survivors of all who die while in military service, and to establish a special new system of voluntary insurance open only to veterans whose insurability at standard rates has been impaired by military service. I recommend that this Congress now enact such legislation and extend its benefits to the dependents of those servicemen who have died while on active duty since June 27, 1950, if they did not have a like amount of servicemen's insurance protection.

Hospitals and medical care.—Expenses for hospital and medical care are estimated at 650 million dollars in the fiscal year 1952, 49 million more than in the current year. The average number of patients in hospitals and homes is estimated at 138,000, an increase of 5,000 over the current year. Approximately two-thirds of present patients are being treated for non-service-connected disabilities.

The presently approved construction program of 766 million dollars, to provide 36,500 new hospital and domiciliary beds, will be four-fifths completed by the end of the fiscal year 1952. Obligational authority already available is more than adequate to complete the program.

Trust funds.—About 6.5 million life insurance policies are now outstanding under two trust funds operated for servicemen and veterans. One is for the Government life insurance program established for servicemen in World War I; the other is for national service life insurance, its World War II counterpart.

VETERANS' LIFE-INSURANCE FUNDS

(*Trust funds*)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$475	$90	$68
Interest on investments	249	210	204
Premiums and other	440	490	514
Total	1,164	790	786
Expenditures:			
Dividends to policyholders	2,687	334	546
Benefits and other	414	478	505
Total	3,101	812	1,051
Net withdrawal	−1,937	−22	−265
Balance in funds at close of year	6,692	6,670	6,405

Expenditures from these trust funds are expected to exceed receipts by 265 million dollars, because dividends estimated at 546 million dollars will be paid to policyholders in the fiscal year 1952. During the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 dividends which had accumulated over an extended period were paid from these funds, so that the trust fund expenditures in those two years exceeded receipts by 2 billion dollars. At the end of the fiscal year 1952, the Government securities and cash held by the funds will still exceed 6.4 billion dollars.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Expenditures for general government in the fiscal year 1952 are estimated at 1.4 billion dollars, an increase of 99 million dollars over the current year. This total includes 164 million dollars for the dispersal of governmental facilities.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Dispersal of Government facilities (proposed legislation)	----	$6	$164	----
Federal financial management:				
Bureau of Internal Revenue	$227	248	254	$256
Customs collection, debt management, and other (mainly Treasury)	129	139	134	139
General Accounting Office	25	33	31	32
Other central services:				
Central property and records management (mainly General Services Administration)	118	139	164	145
Civil Service Commission	16	18	20	20
Legal services (Justice)	8	9	10	11
Government Printing Office	9	10	11	19

[1] This column excludes 5 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1952 [1]
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system	302	$305	$320	$320
Legislative functions	40	43	48	39
Judicial functions	24	31	25	25
Executive direction and management	7	12	8	7
Other general government:				
Immigration control (Justice)	31	33	36	37
Public building construction (General Services Administration)	9	38	9	
Weather Bureau	24	25	26	27
Claims and relief acts (Treasury)	71	66	50	
Other	58	67	41	63
Total	1,108	1,252	1,351	1,140

[1] This column excludes 5 million dollars of recommended appropriations to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Dispersal of Government facilities.—The acceleration of the defense effort requires additional Government buildings to accommodate the increased number of Federal employees in the District of Columbia. From the viewpoint of security, the new buildings should not be located in the central area of the District of Columbia but should be located within commuting distance and sufficiently removed from each other to assure continuity of operations in the event of air attack. Long-range planning goals for the Capital area also call for dispersal of Government buildings. I therefore urge the Congress to provide the necessary authority and funds to begin promptly a program for the dispersal of Government offices now located in the District of Columbia.

As distinct from dispersal, functions will be decentralized to locations outside the vicinity of the District of Columbia only in those instances where the functions involved can be permanently located at further distances without significant loss of efficiency.

Federal financial management.—New tax legislation has created additional problems of tax collection. The increase in the estimate for the Bureau of Internal Revenue will permit continued strengthening of audit and enforcement activities to try to insure that every person pays his full and fair share of taxes.

Present customs law imposes unnecessary difficulties upon the Nation's importers and hampers the conduct of international trade. I therefore urge the Congress to enact legislation to simplify customs procedures along the lines of recommendations previously transmitted.

Central property and records management.—When the General Services Administration was established in 1949, the Federal Government inaugurated a Government-wide effort to improve real and personal property management, including procurement, warehousing, traffic, utilities, and records management. In the last few months, special emphasis has been given to measures to eliminate every nonessential requirement for supplies and equipment; to set inventory ceilings at minimum levels in each agency and make any excess stocks available to other agencies; to screen thoroughly all surplus property declarations before making sales to the public; and to reduce the volume of records so as to release scarce office space and equipment.

Payments on Federal real estate.—As an outcome of conferences with State and local government officials, a proposal will shortly be transmitted to the Congress for a general plan to reduce the effects of Federal real estate acquisitions on State and local government finances. Payments to State and local governments would not generally begin until the second year after enactment of this measure.

Civilian employees retirement.—The Budget includes 320 million dollars for the annual Government contribution to enable the civil-service retirement and disability fund to cover its currently accruing obligations. Federal employees covered by the system are required by law to contribute 6 percent of their salaries toward future benefits. The Government contribution, designed to cover the remaining cost of benefits, amounts to approximately 2.6 percent of the payrolls of covered employees plus interest on the Government's liability to the fund for deficiencies in previous contributions.

INTEREST

The interest payments made by the Federal Government arise primarily from the huge additions made to the Federal debt in World War II. All interest payments are financed by permanent indefinite appropriations and therefore do not require annual Congressional action.

INTEREST

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Expenditures			Obligational authority (permanent indefinite)
	1950 actual	1951 estimated	1952 estimated	
Interest on the public debt	[1] $5,720	$5,625	$5,800	$5,800
Interest on refunds	93	90	92	92
Interest on uninvested trust funds	4	7	5	5
Total	5,817	5,722	5,897	5,897

[1] Includes 225 million dollars in nonrecurring payments resulting from a shift in reporting methods.

Interest on the public debt.—Interest payments on the public debt are estimated at 5.8 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1952, continuing the gradual increase of recent years. This increase is the product of a great number of factors, relating not only to the amount of Federal securities outstanding, but also to the composition of the debt by type of security and the interest rate structure of the debt.

About one-third of the increase in interest for the fiscal year 1952 is accounted for by the continued expansion of special issues to Government trust funds at rates of interest higher than the average on the public debt as a whole.

Second, the current increase in public debt is also reflected in higher interest expenditures.

A third important factor is the accrual of interest on savings bonds. These accruals are continuing to increase as the large volume of World War II savings bonds gets closer to maturity. Interest on savings bonds alone accounts for a little more than one-fourth of the total interest on the public debt. Most of this interest is received by individuals and is a reflection of the widespread distribution of the public debt at the present time.

Interest on refunds.—On most refunds of receipts interest is paid because the Federal Government has had temporary use of the funds. Most of the refunds result from overpayment of taxes. The interest rate paid on tax refunds, like that collected on tax deficiencies, is considerably higher than the average rate paid on the public debt.

I have presented a Budget to meet our country's needs in a period of danger.

We are building the military and economic strength which alone has meaning to the men who control world communism. This is the only realistic road to a world peace based on justice and individual freedom.

For the third time in this century we as Americans must subordinate our peacetime goals to what is required for the survival of the Nation. Our national objectives in the coming months demand unity of purpose among us and a spirit of dedication on the part of everyone. Our young men will devote more years to military service. All of us will work longer and harder than we have worked before. We will pay much heavier taxes. We must defer, in many cases, new governmental programs to enrich our national life and contribute to our individual and family welfare. But in return we will get something precious—strength to meet and overcome the barbaric threat of communism in whatever manner it confronts us.

We in this Nation have always, in time of national emergency, risen with unity and vigor to the defense of our free institutions and way of life. We are responding now. We go forward with faith and confidence to meet and win the tests ahead.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 15, 1951.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On January sixth, I approved H. R. 9893, Eighty-first Congress, an act "To authorize certain construction at mili-

tary and naval installations, and for other purposes."

The installations which will be provided under this act are urgently needed by the military services. I approved H. R. 9893 for that reason. However, one provision of this legislation, section 407, will have unfortunate results, which may not have been foreseen by the Congress. I recommend that this section be repealed as soon as possible.

Section 407 reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may not grant or transfer to another Government department or agency other than a military department or to any other party any land or buildings of a permanent nature, or any interests in such property, except equipment no longer serviceable and except easements, leases, or permits deemed to be in the public interest, which shall have been acquired, constructed, or installed pursuant to the provisions of this or any previous act except as authorized by an act of Congress enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

This section, if permitted to stand, may seriously impede our mobilization effort by causing unnecessary and unwarranted delay in the transfer for other governmental uses of property excess to the needs of the military departments. The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, is not a military department. In time of emergency, transfers of Army, Navy, or Air Force property to enable that Commission to carry out its responsibilities should not have to be handled by separate enactments of the Congress.

By the same token, the military departments should not be delayed, as this section would delay them, in effecting exchanges of property with private owners. To illustrate, section 407 would prevent the Air Force from extending a runway at an air base by exchanging a portion of the air base lands for private lands contiguous to it needed for the runway extension. I am sure no such restriction was intended by the Congress.

There are contained in the Federal Property and Services Act of 1949, provisions which were enacted for the specific purpose of making possible the most efficient utilization of excess military property, including fixtures. In my judgment, section 407 repeals these provisions by implication. Furthermore, this section would appear to circumvent the provisions of that same act which charge the Administrator of General Services with the duties and responsibilities to promote maximum utilization of excess property among Government agencies. I cannot believe that it was the intent of the Congress to bring about this effect, or that the Congress will wish section 407 to stand in the way of immediate administrative action for transfer of property vital to the conduct of programs assigned to defense agencies other than the military departments.

Finally, it seems to me unwise at a time when the Congress will be fully concerned with matters of greatest national importance, to go through the process of reviewing in detail, transaction by transaction, the sale or disposition to the general public of such few pieces of property as may be determined to be surplus to the needs of the Government as a whole. It seems to me inevitable that there would be delay in handling such matters with a resulting expensive administrative burden upon agencies of the Department of Defense for maintaining and protecting such property until congressional action has been completed.

For these reasons, therefore, I urge the Congress to repeal section 407 of this act at its earliest opportunity.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1951.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EFFECTS OF IMPORTS ON AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, during the Eighty-first Congress I had the honor of serving as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor to study the effects of imports on American employment. The hearings this subcommittee conducted are being printed and soon will be available to the Congress.

While most of the difficulties that some 17 American industries were facing because of unfavorable import conditions imposed on our country through reciprocal trade agreements have been temporarily eased because of the new rearmament program, our hearings show conclusively that the same ills will return to plague these American industries as soon as the present emergency passes.

Since the Congress will be called upon this session to consider again the reciprocal trade program, I commend these hearings to the Members who desire more factual information on just what far-reaching authority is granted and how the careless use of this authority can and does frequently undermine whole industries in this country.

These hearings contain considerable information about how we have permitted reciprocal trade agreements to benefit nations behind the iron curtain and to harm American factories and workers. I hope the Congress will provide the safeguards in the new reciprocal trade legislation that we need to avoid these abuses in the future.

But we now find another entirely new field of danger in the field of export and imports on the American scene. It is to this new danger that I desire to address my remarks today. I consider this new threat so serious that it should command the close attention of every Member of this Congress.

Within the past 2 years, two agreements have been made by various member nations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, better known as UNESCO, which provides for the free flow of certain specified materials among the signatory nations.

The first of the two agreements relates to visual and auditory materials on which the existing duties would be eliminated under certain conditions. The materials that would be affected are films, filmstrips, and microfilms, sound recordings, glass slides, models, wall charts, maps, and posters.

Any one of the contracting States would be permitted, if it should so elect, to impose regulations upon the importer to the material to insure that it shall only be exhibited or used for non-profit-making purposes. There is, however, nothing mandatory about this provision. It is wholly permissive in character.

This agreement was opened for signature at Lake Success, N. Y., July 15, 1949, and has been signed by 18 countries and ratified by 4. It will go into effect upon ratification by 10 countries. It was signed by the United States and was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 22, 1950, by the Department of State.

The second of these two UNESCO agreements provides for the free importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. Among these are printed books, newspapers and periodicals, catalogs, manuscript music, maps, and certain engineering and architectural plans; scientific instruments or apparatus, intended exclusively for educational purposes or pure scientific research, provided that no instruments or apparatus of equivalent value are manufactured in the importing country.

This second agreement was completed in Florence, Italy, at the fifth session of the general UNESCO conference in June 1950, and was opened for signature by the member countries at Lake Success on November 22, 1950. Nineteen countries have signed the agreement but none has ratified it. It will go into effect when 10 States have ratified the agreement.

Article XII of this agreement provides that the parties to it shall take all the necessary measures for its fully effective operation within 6 months after the date on which it goes into effect. This means, of course, that any conflicting laws on the statute books must be set aside and positive action taken to implement the agreement.

Here are two agreements ranging in age from 6 months to a year and a half, that are virtually unknown to the American public; and their existence is perhaps news to most Members of the House of Representatives; yet they embody provisions which would rob the House of its joint constitutional authority as one of the two Houses of Congress, to impose duties and to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Ratification of the two treaties by the Senate would remove the items and materials subject to the agreements from the dutiable list or otherwise provide for their free importation. This end could not be accomplished under the regular legislative procedure without initiation of legislation by the House. Article I, section 7, of the Constitution provides that "All bills for raising revenue shall

originate in the House of Representatives."

Not only does the Constitution—article VI—provide that treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, thus requiring that existing laws in conflict with provisions of a treaty be repealed; but article XII of the second UNESCO agreement, cited above, provides specifically that the parties shall take all the necessary measures for its fully effective operation within 6 months after the date on which it goes into effect.

This is to say, the United States must not only modify its law to conform to the agreement, it must set aside the constitutional process—and must do so within 6 months. This represents a method of amending the Constitution without submitting the proposed amendment to the 48 States in the Union. The Senate thus becomes the supreme arbiter of how the Constitution may be amended by particular proposals arising outside of the legislative channels.

No public hearings were held preceding the two UNESCO agreements. There was a minimum of publicity. The meetings in which the agreements were drafted and revised were held in Europe. No elected representative of the American people participated in the meetings. Although the subject of import tariffs is a highly technical subject, the agreements were not drawn by tariff experts. No interested parties were given an opportunity to express their views or to provide practical information.

How many persons know the names, much less the background and training, of the UNESCO personnel whom we are asked to vest with powers to set aside the laws of our Congress and the provisions of our Constitution? Who knows how many Americans are represented in UNESCO? Can anyone name them?

If UNESCO has the power to make agreements that will permit the free importation of printed material, scientific apparatus, and other educational scientific and cultural materials, what is to prevent FAO from making agreements that will permit the free importation of food and agricultural products? Or the World Health Organization from agreeing to the free importation of pharmaceuticals and medicinal products? Or some other present or future subsidiary of the United Nations from abolishing the tariff on other groups of products? And if agreements can be made to abolish the tariff, why cannot the same principles be extended to other fields of agreement which would repeal domestic laws in other fields or amend our Constitution in other respects?

The provisions of the two UNESCO agreements, one of which is before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the second of which no doubt will come before the committee, are so far reaching in their implications that they should be examined and studied in the greatest detail—not so much for the substantive contents of these particular agreements as for the impact they may produce, as precedents, upon the powers of Congress and upon our Constitution.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I want to thank the gentleman very much for bringing this up. There seems to be a very real danger of our failing to recognize the implications of the California decision of last year. You will recall that the Federal court held that under our Constitution a treaty superseded the law of the land. Is it not true that we should be particularly careful in any of these agreements we enter into? I am happy that the gentleman has emphasized this point at this time.

Mr. STEED. May I say that the purposes designed here are very desirable, but there is a much better way to achieve them than through these trick treaties they bring in here.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is exceedingly good that the gentleman is emphasizing this so thoroughly.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has made a statement which I am convinced Members should examine with great care.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman on making a very good Republican speech.

Mr. STEED. I do not think the Republicans have a right to say that for a man to stand up for what he thinks is good constitutional procedure is solely the province of the Republicans.

RADIO CHAIN MONOPOLIES STRANGULATE OUR ONLY DEFENSE MASS COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it has been forcibly brought to my attention that radio broadcasting stations are steadily closing up throughout important communities of our country. Only recently WOPT, located in Oswego, N. Y., the terminus of the vital barge canal and Lake Ontario, was forced to cease operation and surrender its license to the FCC because of the inability of the radio station to sustain further losses in its operation. This radio station was the only radio station located in this vital waterway community.

Further investigation made by me at the Federal Communications Commission disclosed these startling facts to be true. In 1947, 365 AM broadcasting stations operated in the red; in 1948, 581 AM radio broadcasting stations operated in the red; and in 1949, the latest report available at the FCC, showed that the startling total of 686 radio broadcasting stations were operating in the red. These figures are only for AM stations, and do not include the newer FM or television stations. The radio public being served by these stations have invested millions of dollars in radio receivers and there is at least one receiver in almost every home in our land. In light of the serious war situation which now faces us, it is imperative that each and every one of our radio broadcasting stations maintain radio service to the public.

A careful study of the problem shows that more money is being spent each year by the advertisers over the radio broadcasting medium, but still each year more stations close their doors and more stations are operating in the red, which soon will force them to close their doors. Further investigation shows that at this time, subsidies are not necessary to prevent the collapse of radio broadcasting facilities in many communities of our country.

Investigation does show, however, that many radio stations are being restrained from doing business with the advertisers which support the industry, by certain unlawful and monopolistic practices of the four major radio network chains operating in this country. This restraint is in direct violation of the intent of Congress as outlined in the legislative history of the Communications Act of 1934.

It has been brought to my attention that certain radio stations owned and controlled by the four major radio network monopolies have been restraining the broadcast of many important and high-grade radio programs under the intentional misinterpretation of section 325 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934.

By such restraint, these network monopolies have prevented millions of people from hearing these high-quality programs and they have prevented millions of dollars of revenue from reaching the various network affiliated, independent, both AM and FM, radio broadcasting stations, by the act of deliberately restraining trade between these stations and the numerous national radio sponsors and advertisers of the country.

A careful legislative history study of the act conclusively discloses that it was the intent of this Congress, in formulating the act that rebroadcasting of radio programs should be permitted where permission for the rebroadcast was obtained by a radio station from the person who paid large sums of money to prepare and produce these radio programs, and it was also the intent of this congressional body that the networks in no way should exert monopolistic influences or restrain trade within the radio-broadcasting industry.

Some years past certain labor organizations attempted to restrain the broadcasting of radio programs and this Congress acted quickly and decisively in preventing such restraint by enacting legislation which amended the Communications Act by inserting section 506 in the act, which section was entitled "Coercive Practices Affecting Broadcasting." This section came under the penal provisions of the act and carried severe fines and imprisonment for those who willfully violated the section.

It is even more important that this Congress act quickly and decisively, at the time when the radio industry in a

large measure faces strangulation by the network monopolies, particularly when in view of the serious war situation, that each and every radio broadcasting station be allowed to continue operating without monopolistic restraint and in a free market, in order that the economic structure of each station will be on a sound footing, thereby allowing these stations to continue serving their vital and important role in the present serious defense emergency.

It is after a serious and thorough investigation into this very important medium of mass public communication that I offer the following radio legislation to correct a very urgent situation.

You will note that I have introduced two bills, one, H. R. 10, a simple solution to the rebroadcast rule which will give immediate economic relief to the hundreds of radio broadcasting stations in the country.

The other bill, H. R. 73:

First. Prevents radio networks from falling into the hands of aliens;

Second. Calls for the licensing and regulation of the radio networks, directly by the FCC, in a similar manner to the licensing and regulation of the individual radio stations by the FCC for the past 23 years;

Third. Considerably reduces the regulation of individual radio stations by the FCC, by regulating the networks direct and relieving all network affiliated stations of the responsibility for the violation of the network rules of the FCC by the networks;

Fourth. Prevents radio network monopolies from controlling the radio broadcasting industry and the very economic heart of the individual radio stations of this country.

In light of the fact, that radio stations are closing their doors; that the FCC reports indicate that last year 686 radio broadcasting stations were operating at a loss; that the FCC has no legislation by which it can licerise and regulate the radio network monopolies; that the FCC cannot at present investigate and prevent the radio networks from being owned and controlled by aliens; I urgently request that this Congress take immediate steps to correct these serious situations as one of the musts of this state of emergency and total mobilization, for the protection of our way of life and our country's only real mass form of communication in the event of attack by an enemy.

Radio broadcasting is not only a must in every community during disaster, but it is a must in the general mobilization of our country.

The enactment of these two bills, first, will insure the immediate strengthening of our mass communication medium without the need of Government subsidization; second, will prevent the control of the radio networks from falling into the hands of aliens; third, will for the first time in radio history lessen the regulation of the individual radio stations licensed by the FCC; fourth, it will allow free and unrestricted commerce within the economic framework of the broadcasting industry; and fifth, it will allow the American public to hear many of the high quality radio programs which are now not heard by them.

Is this Congress cognizant of the fact that there is no legislation whatsoever to prevent the ownership and control of the radio networks by aliens, which networks control most of the programs broadcast over all of the major radio stations of our country?

This most serious situation, in this critical time of total mobilization and defense, calls for immediate action by our body.

AVAILABILITY OF COPIES OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. How can Members of Congress obtain copies of the President's budget message? I have just been informed that copies will not be sent up from the Printing Office until 3 o'clock, and then maybe we can get them. I understand copies have been circulated to the press but, as is usual with Presidential messages, Members of Congress cannot obtain them. I happen to get things better in my mind through my eyes than through my ears. While I have sat here and tried to absorb this message, I should like to get a look at it. My inquiry is, when may Members of Congress be permitted to have copies of the budget message?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman has information that they will be at the document room at 3 o'clock, they will be available then. They will be available to every Member as soon as they come from the Printing Office and are placed in the document room.

Mr. VORYS. Will they be delivered, or will we have to go get them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know that they will be delivered. We will not have a session of the House tomorrow, so they will not be delivered to Members on the floor.

Mr. VORYS. My inquiry, then, turns into a request. May I ask our great Speaker if he can make it possible for Members who want to see the budget to get it without running around, and can he see that in the future Presidential messages are made available to Members at the time they are made available to the press and the public?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has hardly stated a parliamentary inquiry. He can send a page to the document room for a copy as soon as copies are made available.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On that same question, Mr. Speaker, does that apply to the members of the Committee on Appropriations only? Where do we go to get our copies? Do we go to the document room?

The SPEAKER. All Members of the House are on the same footing, regardless of what committee they serve on.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the point which the gentleman from Ohio seemed to raise, is that while Members of Congress may be on the same footing with each other we would like also to be on the same footing with people outside the Congress who receive copies of the message before we do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might agree with the gentleman on that.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I come into the well of the House today with a heavy heart. My heart is heavy, not solely because our policies have failed to bring a just and lasting peace but heavy, because our leaders have sunk to a new low in an unholy effort to save face when confronted with diplomatic and military defeats. Mr. Speaker, they have within the last 36 hours embraced the principles of a Munich appeasement. On last Saturday, through the United Nations Truce Committee, our Government joined with other countries, in asking Red China to cease fire while its delegates could talk about a peace plan for Korea. This is abject surrender to appeasement. As a Member of this Congress, I am ashamed. For what purpose have our men in Korea died; for what purpose have our men in Korea suffered? Was it to appease aggressors in Asia and in Europe? My colleagues, what are you and I going to say to the wives, the mothers, and fathers of these men when they ask us: "What did our husbands and sons die for?" We had better prepare to answer that question.

Mr. Speaker, for a year or more the President has been telling the world how we hate the aggressors and dictators and how we love the free peoples everywhere. Indeed our love is so great that we will protect them at any cost, anywhere, at any time. Yet on last Saturday the President just brushed those promises under the rug when this Nation, under his leadership, forgot all about the free people of South Korea. Their representatives were not even invited to the meeting where their rights were being considered. And now if the cease-fire order is agreed to, the United States has promised to sit down with the Reds and consider the questions of Formosa and the admission of Chinese Communists to the United Nations. What a travesty on the simple principles of justice and fair dealing as our people understand them. Here is unqualified unadulterated appeasement in capital letters. Here again is another Yalta and Poland where appeasement motivated the principal actors. God help these United States under this kind of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, people all over this country are demanding a change in Truman's foreign policies. From my own congressional district, 95 percent of the letters received on this subject are violently opposed. Never in the years of my service in this body have my constituents been so bitter in their denunciation of our present leadership in foreign affairs. They demand that Secretary Acheson be fired; they ask for the impeachment of the President.

We cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that the people are not justified in the criticism they make today. They had a right to expect peace after a great military victory. That was the promise made to them; that was what our sons and daughters died for in 1941–45. They also had the right, Mr. Speaker, to expect capable leadership during the war to the end that when the war was over this country would be in a position to capitalize on its victory. Yet, while our military forces were fighting their hearts out on the battle fronts and while our farmers and workers in our industrial plants worked long hours to help our fighting men, the politicians were bargaining away the principles that were to make a just and lasting peace possible. Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam sealed the fate of the Christian world and today we face the Asiatic hordes of godless communism in a life-and-death struggle. We have temporized, we have repudiated the moral basis for our entry into World War II. We are today reaping the whirlwind. Another war is about to impose the garrison state upon us and with it the loss of our liberties and freedom.

People are bewildered; they are confused and Members of Congress cannot stand dumb and inert and place the responsibility upon the President alone. What to do, that is the question. It was Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech, when confronted with a critical situation said:

> If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, most people in this country know where we are. It is not a pleasant thought but our foreign policies have led us to the brink of another global war which calls for the sacrifice of human lives and the loss of billions of dollars. Since last June our young men have been giving their lives in a full-fledged war in Korea without congressional assent. All over the world, our policy has been to meet the thrust of communism. In Greece and Turkey, Yugoslavia, Western Europe, and Asia, the Truman doctrine to contain communism has been invoked. This has called for prolific spending of American dollars in the hope that our dollars would buy friendship. It has failed because we find in the United Nations a deep resentment and unfriendliness toward us. Those nations that have benefited most from our largess find they cannot go along with us now because of a conflict in their own national interests. So today we stand without friends in Western Europe, contrary to our hopes.

Soon, Mr. Speaker, we shall consider a plan for universal military service, the drafting of 18-year-old boys, and an acceleration of our industrial organization in the making of material for war. Attention is now focused on Western Europe and it seems that it is this administration's policy to send 50 or more divisions to defend countries in Europe whose people have no will to fight for their own freedom. This can only mean a commitment to engage mass armies on the continent. This will be a tragic mistake.

Mr. Speaker, the sad fact at this moment is that in two world wars this country was the principal force that upset the balance of power in the world. Prior to World War I and the last war, Russia was successfully contained by Germany and Japan. Now those bars are down permitting her to dominate one-third of the world's population. On its face there is no combination of free peoples, who are willing to fight, which can match the manpower and numerical strength of Russia and China. That is what we are up against today, Mr. Speaker.

If we are to engage the Russians, reinforced by the Chinese, in ground combat, we are hopelessly outnumbered. The lessons of Korea are sufficiently clear, Mr. Speaker, to convince even the rankest amateur, that the problem of fighting the Red army will be worse than fighting the Red Chinese in Korea. But as I have already intimated, the White House and the Pentagon have decided we must fight Russia in Europe with a great preponderance of the odds against us. At least that is the situation as I see it.

Mr. Speaker, there never was justification for the unauthorized war in Korea. When the North Koreans struck last June 25, there were only a few hundred American soldiers there and they were not equipped to fight. When the President, a few days later, ordered our men to fight it was murder, nothing less. The terrible nightmare of Korea haunts all of our people today. Our soldiers should come out of Korea; they have no business there after the main elements of our troops had been withdrawn.

Korea was untenable with China and Manchuria in the hands of the Communists, thanks to the support by Truman, Acheson, Marshall, Lattimore, Service, and others in behalf of the Red agrarian reformers. It was General Marshall who said that Korea was untenable under the circumstances I have mentioned. It was General Helmick who testified that in case of attack that "any troops that we have there would suffer another Bataan." Is this what we can expect at Pusan? God forbid, but it can happen. It was General Timberman who testified: "If we left troops in Korea, I do not think anyone would suggest we enter into combat with the Korean forces." How, then, did we enter into combat with them? General Timberman was asked as to our national security and how it was affected in Korea. He said it was not and then volunteered in part, "besides we might get into trouble later on, after we are in there militarily, which would be unfortunate." The general has, in view of the present situation in Korea, proved to be a prophet. I wonder if he was called to confer with the President when it was decided to fight the North Koreans? Generals Timberman and Hamilton and Admiral Woolridge all testified it would be unwise to keep troops in Korea. But all this sound advice was ignored by the President and the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker, just as they ignored the recommendations of General Wedemeyer and our own colleague, Mr. Judd; and China went down. Korea is next. We cannot hold that peninsula against the overwhelming forces of Russian and Chinese Communist forces. It is the duty of the President to withdraw our troops from Korea so they may not suffer a Bataan or a Dunkerque. This is what our people are demanding.

The question now, Mr. Speaker, is what to do. In view of our desperate situation it is not unkind or unfair to suggest that our foreign policies for the past 5 years have failed. We need to make a new start. The hit-and-miss, day-by-day policy is inadequate for these times. We must have a long-range over-all policy to succeed against communism.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ally myself with Joseph P. Kennedy, Herbert Hoover, and Senator Taft in the suggestions they have made toward a new approach in United States foreign policy. Not all perhaps but some of all three suggestions are possible. The issue is pretty well drawn between these men on the one hand and Truman, Dulles, and Dewey on the other.

Since our entry into World War I in 1917, Mr. Speaker, Democrats have contended that our national security from the military standpoint rested in some other continent. We have been told that if we must fight, let us do it in some other country. That same argument was used in 1939–40 before World War II. We hear it again as another war is about to start. It is a fallacious argument as we discover that people overseas do not want their countries overrun in another war. There is no will to fight.

I have already alluded to the dangers inherent in a land war against the Russians and Chinese. Russia could strike with a thousand divisions were she to need them. Our 50 divisions in Europe and the reinforcements which we plan to rush there will, without a question, be sacrificed as expendable. We must lead from strength, through the air and on the sea, if we are to be successful. We are superior in these arms and we must use them. Day and night they can attack strategic bases in Russia from outside Europe and Asia. What we need is a strategy based on air power as the primary striking force. I do not pose as a military strategist but there are obvious basic considerations that must be clear to the most casual observer of events today.

Mr. Speaker, in all of the testimony that I have listened to as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, no one has ever suggested that we make an accurate survey of our national resources before starting on a dangerous venture such as we face today. This seems like a fundamental proposition to me, yet when it is suggested to Government witnesses as a starting point it is considered of no consequence and wholly irrelevant.

Is there anybody in the executive department or in Congress who can say with some degree of certainty that our resources are sufficient to justify great spending and fighting abroad and still more spending at home in support of an-

other war? If not, why not? One man has well said:

Let us have a competent survey of our resources before it is too late. After appraising what we have in manpower, minerals, agriculture, electric power, and other resources, then we should ask what it is most important to defend.

He then goes on to say that most of us will agree:

(1) The United States; (2) North America; and (3) South America.

Then he suggests that we consider what resources we have left over after taking care of these three.

Our need then—

He continues—

is for a survey committee, a competent group weighted with industrialists who have budgeted expertly for their own companies and faced bankruptcy as a penalty for error.

Mr. Speaker, it is futile to talk about promoting unity behind a policy that has failed. Our people have lost confidence in Mr. Acheson and they question the ability of the President to match his wits with Stalin. They will not unite behind a policy that insists upon an unauthorized and useless war in Korea. They will not unite behind a plan to send thousands of young men to Europe who can in no way successfully resist the Russian juggernaut when it starts to roll. There can be no unity behind a program to organize a land army of American boys to fight for nations who have no will to defend themselves. Wes Gallagher, AP foreign correspondent, in a recent dispatch said:

A large part of Europe hasn't the will to defend itself. On a grand scale, General Eisenhower is in the position of a football coach trying to instill the will to win in his team.

Is it unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, for the people in Britain and France to abhor the very real possibility of engaging in another war on their own soil? I think it is understandable. But I ask in all sincerity, is it our responsibility to needle them into action? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, in all humility I respectfully suggest a constructive program of action behind which a great majority of our people can unite:

First. The President should establish a Civilian Advisory Committee on National Defense with authority to investigate, counsel, and advise with him on all matters pertinent to our own security.

Second. The confidence of the people must be restored. This calls for the resignation of Secretary Acheson and all his policy makers in the State Department who are responsible for present policies.

Third. Order our troops out of Korea and establish a defensive perimeter from the Aleutians through Japan and south to Australia. On this line establish strong air and sea bases.

Fourth. Use the oriental technique of smuggling to undermine the Red Chinese in China. It can be done with American dollars and the help of the Nationalist Government on Formosa.

Fifth. Establish strong air and sea bases outside of continental Europe and in Alaska and Canada. Use Spain, its manpower and strategic position on the continent of Europe.

Sixth. Serve notice on Russia and Communist China that any aggressive move against a free nation will compel us to bomb important areas in those countries.

Seventh. Demand that the United Nations act to declare Chinese Communists as aggressors in Korea. Failure to respond would result in withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations organization.

Eighth. Uncertainty and indecision in official quarters has created an air of confusion and hysteria. If war is a possibility, then full mobilization is necessary—now.

Ninth. Write treaties of peace with Germany and Japan immediately.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I read in the morning paper that General Collins, Chief of Staff, announced that they were sending fresh troops into Korea. It may be that the gentleman has some information that he cannot disclose or some that he may be able to disclose. But, let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that we had a complete military victory in Korea, if you were to disregard the cost in human lives, what would it actually gain us? Would it not be something temporary in the way of a military victory, because I would assume that you would always have the threat of another horde of Chinese Communists coming over the border. Does the gentleman agree with me on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; I think the gentleman is right. So long as the mainland of Asia, which is China proper and Manchuria, is held by the Chinese Communists, any victory we achieve in Korea now is purely temporary.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman think that Congress should have something to say about the Korean War as well as the matter of sending troops to Europe?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I take the position, as I have said in my remarks, that Congress should have been consulted before we ever moved into Korea, because it is a war and not police action.

Mr. O'HARA. It is true we have not been consulted, but does not the gentleman think it is the responsibility of Congress to begin to exercise some judgment on Korea also?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt about it. I think this Congress, when it is called upon to consider appropriations for this venture, should look very closely on all requests that come through, for it follows that, once we appropriate, we approve whatever action that has been taken. Its legality thereafter cannot be questioned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to ask the gentleman one or two questions on one or two points he made. If the so-called intelligentsia of the Western European countries continue to so deeply feel that this American polyglot is kind of a semisavage, still Indian territory setup, and that they do not propose to accept our leadership, and that therefore they will not go along with the proposition of letting Europe be a fourth battlefield for our protection within a period of 40 years, on what grounds can we hope to make progress with them?

I say, if the so-called intelligentsia of Europe continue to maintain the position they have maintained, that they do not propose to accept our leadership militarily or otherwise, they do not propose to accept United States culture, because they substantially look upon us as pretty much of a bunch of savages yet, how are we going to make much progress over there whether we send 25 divisions or 100 divisions or 1,000 divisions? Will the gentleman give us the benefit of his comment on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is a pretty big order. If the so-called intelligentsia continue to run the affairs of Europe, I do not see that there is much hope for us or for them, either.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, I think what my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] means, if you boil it down, is, just how are you going to make those folks over there take something they do not want?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They have been ready to take our money for a long time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I go a step further: We have an economic and financial concept here that was put down for the benefit of the 48 countries that came together, and by that I mean our 48 States. We run our show for the benefit of those 48 States, I mean politically, economically, financially, from a tariff standpoint, from an international trade standpoint, and all that goes with it. Here sit the prime ministers of those 48 countries, those 48 States. But Europe thinks of 48 countries. We sit here and think of something, we think of something on that plane, on that thesis, on that basis. How are you going to get the high intelligentsia of Europe, of France, of Belgium, of Spain, or of Luxemburg, to think as we do? We send General Eisenhower over there and they say, "What are you over here for, to impose the American philosophy on us? We do not want your enterprise system, we do not want your banking system, we do not want your political system. What are you doing over here? Why come over here and interfere with us all the time?" They are constantly afraid that we are going to try to shove our philosophy as related to these 48 States down their throats. That is why we do not have any friends in Europe today. I do not think we will have any friends of consequence as long as we go out here on the ground that we are God

Almighty and that we set ourselves up to lead the world and save the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I agree with him.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I just want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin on making a great speech.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The columnists and commentators are referring to the discussion of our foreign policy as the great debate. If it is the great debate, the gentleman from Wisconsin has made an outstanding contribution to the discussion. I agree with a great deal of his speech because in it he said that Acheson ought to be dismissed and that we ought to get our troops out of Korea, with both of which propositions I agree.

I believe that there is more appeasement of Russia than the gentleman has mentioned. In the year 1949 the nations of Western Europe shipped to Russia and her satellites more than $1,000,000,000 worth of goods. Of that $1,000,000,000 worth of goods more than one-fifth, or more than $200,000,000 worth, from France, Britain, and Belgium, consisted of steel, iron, copper, lead, zinc, rubber, tin, ball bearings, and, yes, barbed wire. Does not the gentleman believe that this trade is going on between Great Britain, France, and Belgium, and Russia, the selling of war supplies to the enemy we are urging our people to fight, is an appeasement of Russia?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Absolutely. I referred to the fact that they are today, at this very moment, appeasing Communist Russia and the Communist Chinese.

Yesterday's newspaper carried a report that wherever rubber is produced, the British are selling it to the Chinese Communists. They are selling them all they can possibly produce. That is a highly inconsistent position to take, when the free nations assert they are against communism.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Is it not also a fact that the United States is buying vast quantities of goods, mostly luxury items, such as furs, crab meat, and caviar from the Russians, and supplying the Russians with dollars with which they are paying for the war goods that they are buying from Britain, France, Belguim, and other nations of Western Europe?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I compliment the gentleman for his very able speech. I am in substantial agreement with everything the gentleman has said. Does not the gentleman feel that we are in this thing all over the world because of the fact that we have in power today in this Government of ours a group of people who believe to a great degree in the socialistic way of doing things and because of that we have given aid and comfort to socialism and to too great a degree to the communistic philosophy of government? In fact, we have many people in high places in Government today who, I am sure the gentleman will agree, have communistic leanings. That is being nice to them.

What can we expect in this international situation when we have here in America the philosophy, to a great degree, of the people who claim are our enemies. How can we be effective in trying to show the rest of the world that we really believe in peace and freedom and democracy?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, the answer is obvious—you just cannot do it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER WITH A LEGITIMATE GRIPE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentlemen who have special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). If that is agreeable to the gentlemen having special orders, and if there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the criminal waste of money which Congress has appropriated for national defense and so forth. We understand that 82 percent of the billions Congress has appropriated for National defense since VJ-day has been spent for housekeeping and only 18 percent for armaments. I have just received a letter from a soldier in one of our training camps, which is good proof of what has been going on in this respect, hence today we have men training for war with little to train with. I will read the letter from this soldier. It is as follows:

DEAR SIR: I know you are a very busy man so I will try to make this as short as possible. They say a soldier is always griping, but having been in the Army only 4 months I couldn't swear as to the truth of that statement, but I do believe we, down here, have a few legitimate gripes.

I'm in a tank battalion in the Forty-fifth Infantry Division. There is only one tank battalion in the whole division. We at full strength are supposed to have 22 tanks in our company. We have three worn out M-4's in our company, so you can imagine how good our training can be with so many men trying to train on so few a number of tanks plus their being worn out so their operating efficiency is at a minimum. I fully realize our country is in a bad way as far as armed strength is concerned but it only makes common sense that if you are going to train a soldier you should at least give him something to train with. We cannot possibly become fully trained when we have such a lack of equipment and training aids as to make practical work impossible.

At the end of our inadequate day's training we have the happy thought of sleeping in a cold barracks.

I'm sure if you could but visit this camp you would see that these are not gripes but bare facts.

I fully realize that, this letter, if it does any good, won't help me, but it may help some of the men who will be following in my footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I have omitted the soldier's name and camp for obvious reasons. I thank him for bringing this serious matter to my attention. I now direct it to the attention of Congress and especially to the Armed Services Committee of Congress for proper action.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

GOVERNING BY EAR

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is not only playing by ear, but apparently expects Congress and the people to do it, too.

Here in the House we cannot get a copy of the budget message, so that we can see it while it is being submitted to the House. Apparently we are supposed to play the budget by ear. This morning a constituent called and asked for the details of the building freeze that was announced today, but effective last Saturday night. I was informed in the NPA office that, although the Executive order is in force now, I could not get a copy of it this morning; also, that relief from the freeze would be by application for a license, but the form of application was not available, as it had not been thought up yet.

Here we go again. Government by press release, oral statements, telephone information. Our forefathers sought a government of laws, not of men. We are getting more and more government by men, not of laws, and we cannot even see the words, the orders, that are to govern us.

We are all supposed to play by ear. I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all of the Republicans from the Midwest I think will agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] said in his sound, constructive, and timely talk. The Midwest is in accord with what the gentleman said about the President and Secretary of State Acheson—I am wondering what the opinion of the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is on this proposition:

In my judgment, the Republicans have been just a little lukewarm, to put it charitably and kindly, toward the New Deal during the last 5 or 6 years, and also in that they have not made the fight they should have made against what the gentleman told us was coming. Have we been an active, constructive, aggressive opposition party?

What have you got to say about that, if you desire to comment? If you do not, we will just let it drift along, and I will say it for you.

There is no question about it. We have not. We have set back and let those fellows like Acheson and Hiss follow a policy which deep down in our hearts we knew was going to be ruinous. We ought to do a little sitting in sackcloth and ashes, and then get up and go at them, instead of drifting along as we have been doing. Over the years, dazed by their eloquence, befuddled by their bipartisanship, frightened by their false charges of lack of loyalty.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I certainly want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that he is not one who has sat back and drifted along.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, I have at times. There have been a great many times when I was not as great a nuisance to my colleagues as I should have been, and I am sorry for it, because, while I respect and admire my colleagues and want their good will, after all, my duty to my country comes first. I wish I had made it hotter for them than I have. Some say I have talked too much. In fact I have not said enough. At least I never was able to prod them into concerted effective action.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] said one thing with which I cannot agree. I do not think he, on further deliberation, will agree with it either. I am sorry. That is on point 7 of his program. If I understood him correctly, he said we should oppose admission of the Red Chinese to the United Nations. I think what the gentleman should have said was that we should let the United Nations go hang, and get out of there ourselves, if the rest of the folks want to take the Reds in. What is the use going along with an international organization which has been doing as the gentleman demonstrated, appeasing these Communists? Playing England's game?

I am warning the gentleman that his talk today, tomorrow, by the international, New Deal, Red radio commentators, columnists, editorialists, and their smear artists is going to be branded as cowardly appeasement; they will say that we should stand up and fight; no matter what the chances of success, no matter what the cost. They are going to say that we are cowards or that we lack the courage to fight, when the fact is the gentleman is exhibiting outstanding courage in opposing them when they insist upon the sacrifice of our American youth, perhaps in Europe, as they have been sacrificed in Korea, to no purpose. I have watched the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] for the last 10 years here in Congress, and I do not recall a single occasion when he has failed, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to point out our danger and to warn our people of what was coming. I regret, as I am sure he does, that his predictions have been so accurate. He told the Congress. It would not listen. Now the people are paying. But all the advice he has given has been disregarded, and we have gone along, following the Achesons and the Trumans, until today we are in a situation where now we must determine whether we are to destroy the security of the Republic by sending our resources and our men abroad until we have nothing left.

From the bottom of my heart I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] for what he has said today for the clear over-all picture that he has given us of the situation in which we are now. I wish the Congress had followed his advice in the past.

Again from the bottom of my heart may I express the hope that my Republican colleagues will have the courage for once at least to take a stand and to think first of this country and express their thinking and their convictions through their votes here in the House in this next session. But again we are being squeezed here in the House because these appropriation bills are coming up. I would not vote one single cent to send our men across if it were not for the fact that we cannot desert those who are there and if we vote against appropriation bills we will be told, "You will not even vote to arm the men who are over there; you will not even vote to sustain those who are fighting now in this battle." So you see where we are. I wish there was some way by which we could curb the President in his stubborn, disastrous program of sending all our men abroad. I hope that a way may be found whereby we can separate, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], said, we can separate those appropriations which are needed to protect our own interests from those which are to be in furtherance of this program of internationalism.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The first thing we shall have to do then will be to do away with the one-package appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am all for that, too.

Mr. JENSEN. Then we will have an opportunity to vote on domestic matters, on civilian matters and on military matters separately.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With that I agree. What the gentleman means is so that Mr. Truman will be forced to do a little sacrificing on the domestic program and on Federal employee appropriations. That is what the gentleman is getting at.

Mr. JENSEN. Exactly. But we will not have a chance unless we can vote on each departmental appropriation bill separately.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. I am with you on that. We might go one step further and support the gentleman in the other body who said we all should pay an income tax on the expense item which is now tax exempt. How do you like that?

Again, in behalf of my constituents, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] for his clear, courageous, helpful talk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SYNTHETIC AND NATURAL RUBBER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the subject I wish to discuss is rubber, synthetic and natural rubber for the use of our military forces and civilian population. It may be well to review just for a moment the fact that during World War II the taxpayers of this country provided about $750,000,000 for the purpose of building a group of synthetic rubber producing plants in the United States so that we might protect ourselves insofar as rubber is required in every phase of our life. The capacity of those mills amounted to about 900,000 tons of synthetic rubber per annum, or that was what the production was brought up to during World War II. When we went into the conflict we had a few thousand tons of natural rubber on hand. The rubber-producing areas were controlled by the British, Dutch, and French combinations, trusts, you might call them. We either had to go into the production of synthetic rubber or shut down our transportation system.

After World War II was over, theoretically the question came up of disposing of those synthetic rubber plants to private industry. Many of us in both the House and the Senate protested against that disposal and felt that a certain number of those plants should be kept in production and that some of them should be kept in a stand-by position, that we should continue the production of synthetic rubber to the extent of about 275,000 tons per annum. So now we are down to the present emergency and some of us from this body and the other body, led by the whip of the other body, the gentleman from Texas, I believe it is now, have brought many of those plants back into production and we are again moving up toward the 900,000 tons of synthetic rubber production per annum. That will relieve our momentary situation and if we can get a few thousand tons of natural rubber into the country that will give us another lift.

Then we should go one step farther, and that is the real point I want to make today. When will the United States begin to produce natural rubber on a substantial scale? We have the land area, we have the climate, we have carried out sufficient experiments in the Southwest to know that we can do it. There is now a movement on foot to produce a great many thousand pounds of guayule rubber-plant seed.

The Munitions Board has added guayule seed and seedlings to the list of strategic and critical materials. I know that efforts have been afoot to have this done for at least 2 years. However, it took the combined efforts of the entire

Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee to make the administration see the light and open the way to grow natural rubber in the United States in case our supplies from the Far East are reduced or shut off.

The final action in this matter by the Munitions Board was taken under its new chairman, John D. Small, who had been with the War Production Board and the Civilian Production Administration during World War II and the reconversion period immediately thereafter. It is apparent that this gentleman takes full cognizance of the fact so well expressed by Mr. Bernard Baruch in 1943 which closes with the statement, "Thus the rubber situation gives rise to our most critical problem."

Again with some strenuous urging by our former colleague now the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, we are endeavoring to produce as rapidly as possible every pound of synthetic rubber that our war-built synthetic producing plants are capable of turning out.

Gentlemen, synthetic rubber is good but it cannot take the place of natural rubber in all products as yet. We must have a substantial percentage, probably around 30 percent or more, natural rubber to support all-out synthetic-rubber consumption.

When it comes time for the House to act on that proposition, I hope that the necessary authorization and appropriation will be made for the production of this seed so that later on we can produce the plants and extract the raw rubber from those plants, thereby supplementing the synthetic rubber which we will produce in our synthetic plants.

If you will study the tonnage and poundage of rubber that is required for a military truck, for a military fighting machine that flies, or for your automobiles and trucks, and every other kind of implement or gadget which we use in military operation and which contains more or less rubber, you will find we simply have to have that rubber or we do not move. The railroads of this country are utterly incapable of carrying the tonnage which is necessary for peacetime and wartime production. That means we have to substantially rely on trucks to move the goods and the people. That means you must have enough natural rubber to go into truck tires in order to enable those trucks to travel at very high speed on the highways with extremely heavy loads on each axle. It further means that you have to put natural rubber in these truck tires. You do not have to have natural rubber in the automobile tires we use for touring purposes. A few weeks ago I took a set of tires off of my Buick automobile, strictly synthetic rubber, which I had driven over 35,000 miles. These casings are now being used by my boy on his so-called tin lizzy which he drives to school. He will probably put another 5,000 miles on those casings. They were made of synthetic rubber. But we do not have to carry heavy loads; we do not have to drive 75 miles an hour in our touring cars; but with trucks averaging 40 to 45 or 50 miles an hour on these long hauls, carrying from 10 to 30 tons of weight, they must have natural rubber in those tires.

There is no assurance that anybody can give that is worth a nickel that ships will clear from far-eastern ports—that is, the Dutch Malay Straits—with natural rubber from now on. I understand that the American military officials have ordered all of the American rubber-producing companies in the Far East to get out of that area such rubber as they have ready for shipment without any further delay. It is reasonable to assume that if hostilities break out on a big scale the ocean channels will be closed in that part of the area and what natural rubber we may have on hand at that moment and have moving that has cleared the submarine area will be about the only natural rubber we will have for some time.

So these statements I have made are strictly in the interest of getting more natural rubber for the use of our people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is engaged in what has been termed "The Great Debate." It was launched by a former President and almost every day since some member of the Republican Party has emphatically displayed the wide diversity of opinion existing among leaders or spokesmen of that party. There is, in a sense, no debate at all. Instead we are hearing a series of political speeches made with a view toward 1952, at a time and in a manner likely to further confuse our own people and our allies. We are compelled under the circumstances to be curious as to just what policy or whose policy the Republicans are recommending and to wonder why they do not hold a caucus, settle their wide differences, adopt a definite policy, and then present that policy in an orderly way instead of using a sort of Tower of Babel approach. How can we adopt a bipartisan foreign policy that will give us the unity circumstances require while the Republican leaders are recommending many different policies and each one implies that adoption of a policy other than his own will not be bipartisan enough to enlist his support and acquiescence. Is there any one spokesman who can clearly state the present Republican policy in foreign affairs? Is it the isolationism of the former President, the semi-isolationism of the Senator from Ohio, the militance of the titular head of the party, the boldness of the Senator from California, or the positive approach espoused by Mr. Dulles or Mr. Stassen? Is it the policy of the Republican Party that we leave Korea, which seems to be the view of the Senator from Ohio, or that we stay in accordance with the view of the Senator from New Hampshire whom the Republicans have recently placed on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not witnessing a debate. We are witnessing a seminar. The theory of isolationism might have provided material for a debate in another era long past, but inexorable fact has exploded the theory completely although it creeps up as a sort of infantile emotional desire for an easy way out when we find ourselves perplexed by the heavy burden or responsibility fate places upon us. Having twice within a few decades been forced to liberate Europeans from evil, predatory conquerors, both for their sake and our own, we dare not allow our yearning for tranquillity to hypnotize us into thinking that we need not meet the menace until all the rest of the free world has been shackled and enslaved.

No matter how much we dislike the prospect, we all know almost instinctively that when the fatal hour strikes we will not stand idly by and watch the decent people of the world ruthlessly ravaged. If we squarely face this fact now, the frustration stemming from indecision will dissipate and we will begin to act like the proud, courageous people which we are capable of being. Surely a just God would never confront us with an evil challenge without also giving us the strength to meet it, provided we are willing to carry our cross and accept necessary sacrifices until freedom arises again wherever it has been trammeled. Have we lost faith in God or the justice of our cause? How can we doubt that we will ultimately win this struggle, the outcome of which will vitally affect the lives of our own children and the generations following after them? We have no intelligent alternative. Our choice is made. We must lead the forces of freedom and we must and we will win. If the lustful war lords choose to expand the war they are waging against us they will ultimately learn that the demoralizing theory of the dialectics of materialism is erroneous—that the free will exercised in accordance with conscience gives man strength and control over his own destiny within the limits prescribed by the laws of the universe; that freemen inspired by the love of liberty will never cease fighting fiercely against any force that threatens to degrade them, to destroy their individual dignity or their right to experience a relatively short span of life on this whirling sphere free from arbitrary and tyrannical restraint.

If we face the facts, we can remove from the area of debate any question of our firm resolve to stand side by side with our fellow men to block the path of the aggressor. Our assignment in the struggle then becomes primarily a matter of military decision to be based upon the capabilities and capacities of the units making up the total available forces. We can trust our military leaders to see that our Armed Forces carry no more than their fair share of the burden and that they are deployed in a manner best calculated to deter or defeat aggression, provided we leave to them the military decisions which they are singularly qualified to make.

Political policies must, of course, be determined by Congress. In order to unify the Nation, the executive branch should be extremely careful to avoid overstepping its rightful constitutional authority. For instance, if the North Atlantic Pact leaves any reasonable doubt as to the

right of the President to deploy air, ground, or naval forces in Europe, that doubt should be cleared up at once in cooperation with the Congress. We can ill afford to allow such an important matter to become the cause of interminable controversy.

It seems hollow to me to argue that the President would have the power of deployment in the event of war, but not now, when in fact we are already at war. What are we fighting in Korea if not one phase of the battle for Asia? It took General MacArthur's brilliant defeat of the North Korean puppets to unmask for even the most reluctant nonbelievers the solidarity of the Kremlin's forces of whatever race or nationality, and their willingness to resort to war to achieve their evil ends. It is evident that the Kremlin conquerors, as part of their world-wide plot, intend to drive all western influence out of Asia and to enslave the peoples of the entire continent. The conclusive proof of their world-wide designs is in plain view for all who are willing to see.

Twelve years ago, as chairman of the California State Committee on Un-American Activities, I came to the conclusion that the Kremlin was bent on world conquest. I have never had reason to doubt this, except for a brief interval after the war when I dared hope that their policy was shifting somewhat. There is not a country where their stealthy and cunning advance agents are not directing groups of native traitors. Everywhere they are spreading vicious propaganda, working to confuse and frighten their intended victims.

We all know that some of our allied nations were internally undermined almost to the point of collapse before we gave them sufficient help to enable courageous leaders to unite majorities determined to remain free. At this time, we must use great care lest our actions demoralize or discourage people living in the ominous presence of powerful, threatening armies. In their struggle to prepare their defenses, they must be assured of our unwavering support.

Irresponsible statements made here are certain to be fully utilized by the Kremlin's propagandists.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the fact that no man's judgment is any better than the information upon which it is based. Right now, we would all have more confidence in our judgment if we knew we understood the true facts. For military reasons, it is obvious we cannot be advised in advance of plans like the Inchon landing, which brought victory over the North Koreans from the brink of apparent defeat.

I find many phases of the war in Korea puzzling. Having served in the Air Forces and having been subjected to bombing, I am amazed that any army can sustain an offensive with no air support, against a well-equipped opponent possessing full control of the air. We may ask just what are we now trying to accomplish in Korea? It would have strategic value as a beach head on the continent, if we were prepared to vigorously expand and extend it, but we are not even permitting our Air Force to support our infantry by bombing enemy supply depots outside of Korea. Under such circumstances we are fighting under most disadvantageous conditions. Korea has proved that we will fight. It has also proved, beyond further doubt, that the Communists under the Kremlin are one unit, and that they will fight where the advantage is in their favor. Korea has roused us from our lethargy. It has started us on the road to the preparedness which is our only hope for security. For this, our people have paid an awesome price. Surely no deceptive peace overtures will again lull us back to sleep and cause us to slacken our defense efforts. Surely we can disengage our divisions in Korea and still continue to build our strength to where we will not need to worry about loss of face, consider seating another cynical aggressor in the United Nations, or handing over a strategically located island, which is a vital link in our outer defense chain.

It seems obvious that, whether or not we can hold on in Korea, we certainly cannot consider leaving the same divisions there indefinitely. Yet no one seems inclined to send fresh divisions to relieve them. If we are not going to, or cannot, relieve them, we surely should get them out now. They have brought honor to themselves and their flag. They can depart with their heads high. This is only the first round. We need not listen to the defeatists among us who are ready to throw in the sponge and write off all of Europe without even a fight, because Korea has proved a bitter experience. They argue that, because we are not fully prepared now, any effort to get strong will cause the Kremlin's forces to attack before we are ready. This is actually arguing that we should resign ourselves and our children to a life of abject fear. Such defeatism is unworthy of a great nation. If the Kremlin were confident of its ability to succeed, I think it would attack Europe and the Middle East at once. Only the Kremlin knows its own weaknesses. Ours are pointed out daily.

Historically, I am told, Russian armies have stockpiled heavily before hostilities. This would be more important now with their factories and supply lines vulnerable to air attacks. It may very well be that we can use our superior industrial power to reach a security level of preparedness before the Kremlin feels able to risk full scale hostilities. At any rate, we have no choice. It is our only hope for avoiding full scale war. We must, in this Congress and throughout this Nation, conduct ourselves with such resolution that the oppressed everywhere will take heart and dare to hope that if they strive faithfully, God will point the way to a better day. Ours is a tremendous responsibility. Like our forefathers, we will pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor—we will not let freedom perish from the earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the printing of my remarks the table which I have prepared and which is part of my statement may appear in tabular form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, so that it may be easy to understand, I have prepared a little table that shows what the President's budget does:

Carry-over from 1950	$13,000,000,000
Appropriation for 1951	88,668,000,000
	101,668,000,000
Estimated expenditures, 1951	47,210,000,000
Carry-over to 1952	54,458,000,000
1952 estimates, net	94,429,000,000
	148,887,000,000
Estimated expenditures	71,594,000,000
Balance to be spent after 1952	77,293,000,000

The estimates for civilian activities have very generally been increased, although there are some minor exceptions. Items are included for very large amounts for medical aid and for aid to education. It is very evident that there is lots of work for the Appropriations Committee, and that the opportunities for cuts and savings were never better.

The military item estimated request is $62,000,000,000 for 1952, with $10,000,000,000 remaing to be asked in 1951. Never before, even in wartime, have we failed to have a budget for military expenditures submitted when the Congress met. The budget for 1952 contains no detail for the committee to work with. I assume it will come later.

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

PORTLAND, OREG., *January 12, 1951.*

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 49, Eighty-second Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect HOMER D. ANGELL, of the Third District of Oregon, I hereby report that on the 12th day of January, 1951, at Portland, State of Oregon, I administered the oath of office to Mr. ANGELL, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. ANGELL subscribed.

Respectfully,

JAMES ALGER FEE,
Chief Judge, United States District
Court for the District of Oregon.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 69), which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas HOMER D. ANGELL, a Representative from the State of Oregon from the Third District thereof, has been unable to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before Hon. James A. Fee, United States district judge for the district of Oregon, authorized by resolution

of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said HOMER D. ANGELL as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great many speeches today and in the immediate past about the international situation and about what we should do for mobilization and bringing both political parties together in greater harmony. Some of the Members of this House have tried to answer some of these questions, or have at least asked preliminary questions which might give us the answers to the basic questions more thoroughly than we have such answers at the present time.

I have here a statement which was drawn up, with the cooperation of both Republicans and Democrats, with the idea of trying to bring to a head some of the things beneficial to our country. A great majority who participated in this work have the feeling that this is a good statement and expressed at least our ideas. It is as follows:

To assist in the defense of our country we join together to state our opinions on matters which we feel require immediate action by Congress.

We feel that we need more information on the degree of self-help being experienced in Europe to resist Soviet imperialism, our specific foreign policies in the areas of the world in greatest danger, the requirements of military and economic aid in those areas, the priorities of strategic importance among those areas, the ability of the United States to respond to financial and military programs which are required to assist our allies in the present circumstances, what domestic services now rendered by our Government can be eliminated or curtailed during the present emergency as a means of giving our country the additional strength required by the international situation, and what can be done to utilize more fully America's manpower in tasks which face this country.

In order to secure this information we are sponsoring two resolutions which have been introduced today. One would direct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ascertain and report on specified matters relative to international affairs and the other would establish a select committee to report on functions of the Federal Government which can be eliminated or severely curtailed in the present emergency and also upon manpower problems of the Federal Government.

The first of these resolutions is specific but the resolution on the select committee is necessarily general in nature, as the committee is expected to develop places for curtailment which may not be obvious to the average Congressman.

We believe that the request of the President for rigid economy in these times will be accomplished by the standing committees of the House with whatever assistance they can secure from other agencies. However, the resolution introduced today is primarily concerned with curtailing or postponing nondefense activties. Illustrations of places where economies could be effected by great reductions or curtailment of activities when not connected with defense are in such programs as the following: Housing, agriculture, harbor development, reclamation, roads, public printing, Government public relations, etc.

We hope that the committee can develop more efficient utilization of Government manpower. For instance, we recommend that the work week of Federal employees be increased commensurate with the mobilization effort (as it should also be in private enterprise), and that vacations be standardized throughout Government service on a basis comparable with private enterprise. The increased working days would provide Government workers with increased income and would lessen the requirements for additional Government personnel to meet the present emergency.

The two resolutions which have been mentioned do not cover all aspects of the defense effort required in the present emergency. There are other matters related to mobilization which have been omitted because they are in active consideration by committees in he House at the present time. For example, we believe that the danger of world war is imminent and, having accepted such premise, that our present national effort is not sufficient; that substantially all of the National Guard should be immediately mobilized and that industrial mobilization should be speeded up so that necessary arms and equipment can be furnished such units; that all able-bodied military personnel now involved in "housekeeping" duties in desk, recruiting, and training positions should be reassigned and replaced by those less fit physically; that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a foreign legion in which recruits from all over the world would be enlisted and to permitting the Japanese and Germans to rearm for their own defense and as bulwarks against the spread of communistic aggression; that deferments for gifted students in American colleges should be available only for students pursuing courses of practical value to the defense efforts; that there should be fewer rejections in the selective service; that wage and price controls should be imposed without delay; that, in order to pay for the needed outlays and to assist in combatting inflation, despite such savings as can be made, it is essential that taxes be very substantially increased or substantial new sources of taxation developed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point of my remarks a resolution which I wish to read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The resolution on elimination of nondefense expenditures reads as follows:

Resolution Creating a Select Committee to Conduct An Investigation and Study of the Activities of the Government During the Existing National Emergency

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 11 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) all activities of the Government, to determine which activities, not essential to the national defense, should be terminated or curtailed during the existing national emergency, and to determine ways of performing more efficiently and economically other activities of the Government, and (2) manpower problems of the Government to determine ways of more effectively utilizing such manpower.

The committee is authorized to coordinate its activities with other committees of the House so as to evade duplication of effort and shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

From now on my remarks are going to be my own entirely, although they will have a bearing upon what I have already said of our joint efforts.

It is the thought of these Congressmen who gathered together to study this particular situation that there are many fields of Government activity and service which could be eliminated entirely. We do not see any particular reason, for instance, why there should be any public relations work done in various branches of the Government, as for example in the Veterans' Administration and particularly in the branches of the armed services when everybody is being called by Selective Service anyway. There seems to be very little reason for recruiting work of that kind at this time. Every Congressman receives many publications to distribute amongst his constituents. That is a very fine thing in ordinary times, but the expense of sending them out and the expense of compiling them seems to us to be inconsistent with the defense needs of our country.

I represent a district which has flood control and harbor projects. There are many like me. Some of those projects probably come within the scope of the national defense effort but we all know that tremendous sums of money could be saved by the elimination of some of those projects during this crucial time whenever the particular projects are not connected with the national defense efforts. If that policy could be established and rigidly carried out, I am sure we would all cooperate, for then we could say that we had done the best we could,

consistent with a policy of defense priorities. Another field, that of agriculture, seems to be one where great reductions in costs can be effected and portions of the programs eliminated for the purpose of this emergency. If we eliminated the Federal finances which were not necessary to the national defense, hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved. Another field where immense savings could be made is that of public roads. Good roads are very important, of course, for the development of our country, but we know that much of what is being done today could be eliminated or curtailed for the time being at least.

We have pointed out some improvements which could be made in the field of working hours, and they should be carried out in this time of national emergency. They would help in problems which face the Post Office and Civil Service Committee right now. At the present time there are great inequities between the various branches of our Federal Government. Some people receive a 4-weeks vacation, some receive 2; some receive different benefits from others in practically the same fields.

Before I close my remarks I would like to say a word about this very important resolution on foreign affairs, which has been introduced. It deals with finding out the facts with regard to our international situation so that we will have more facts to go on and less talk. It seems to me we should be getting together in order to work out the proper solutions that we can find. There should be less talk about disunity, there should be less talk about criticizing any particular person. After all, this Congress has the power to do everything which we desire to do if we will just take the initiative. We should not be talking about politics in times like these and we should not be making our speeches for the purpose of getting votes back home or for the purpose of doing anything except to try to strengthen our country. It is for that purpose that these young men got together in an effort to bring forth these two resolutions and the statement included in the first part of my remarks.

There undoubtedly are imperfections in them. They may not be well founded in some respects; however, we have done the very best we could. Perhaps some of the information called for cannot be made available to the general public, perhaps cannot be made available to the Congress as a whole, but the committees should study these things so that we may have a better foundation upon which to build our future strength.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida upon his forthright statement and for his effort to cut civilian expenses as far as that may be done. I join with him in his suggestion and in his proposal that all expenditures of Government outside of the military be cut to the bone and that no expenditures be approved except those that are absolutely necessary to carry on the work of these agencies and funds that are required to carry on the defense program.

I also want to commend the gentleman for his views in respect to the use of personnel in our Government. We should not have more personnel in any of our agencies than is absolutely necessary. The expenditures for our civilian agencies should be made in the light of absolute need and for such funds as are required to carry on the defense program.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I would like to commend him on the resolution he has introduced to bring about savings with reference to the work of the Hoover Commission, and having such a commission made a permanent matter. I heard his speech the other day, and it was a very splendid one. His resolution is a good one.

I do not think the proposals made in the resolution I introduced overlap those of the gentleman from Kansas. I think the proposals supplement each other. The gentleman's effort is to cut out unnecessary and wasteful expenditure in Government which to a certain extent may overlap this, but the primary objective of this resolution is to cut out services now rendered by the Government in this present emergency when such services are unnecessary in our effort to give our country greater strength.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They can be worked out together.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement. I think the Congress and the people should know that the distinguished gentleman from Florida was the moving spirit and the moving force which brought about this very fine statement. I hope through the action he has taken that we will have a speeding up of effort in our mobilization program.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a resolution with regard to foreign affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to on foreign affairs is as follows:

Whereas in order to successfully implement our foreign policy, it is imperative that the Government have the confidence and support of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas reverses suffered by the United Nations in Korea and the imminent danger of another world war, have caused the people of this country to become vitally concerned as to whether or not the foreign policy being pursued by the United States is one that will insure the security of our country and our democratic form of government, and lead to a lasting peace; and

Whereas since the end of World War II Congress has ratified the United Nations Charter, committing the United States to collective security measures; the North Atlantic Pact, committing the United States to the mutual defense of the member nations; and did in 1949 pass the foreign military aid bill to implement the North Atlantic Pact; and

Whereas resultant actions taken by the United States in furtherance of the aims and objectives of the United Nations and under the North Atlantic Pact have been the subject of acrimonious attack by many citizens, including some Members of this body; and

Whereas the Congress is concerned with effecting a clarification of our foreign policies and the reasons therefore, including, but not limited to, those involving Europe, the Middle East, and Asia; and

Whereas the criticism, if untrue, directed toward various members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for not making a comparable effort with the United States in the defense of Western Europe is harmful to a unified defense against communism; and

Whereas the Soviets have been conducting an increasingly bitter propaganda campaign against the United States, thereby necessitating an increased effort on our part to inform the peoples of the world that our cause is the preservation of peace, freedom, and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is forthwith directed to investigate and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, specific findings of fact and recommendations concerning the following:

1. Whether or not the North Atlantic Pact signatories are making a military and economic effort comparable with that of the United States to defend Western Europe against Soviet imperialism, and whether or not there exists throughout Western Europe, including Western Germany, a determined will to resist vigorously any attack.

2. Our specific foreign policies in Western Europe, the Mediterranean area, the Middle, Near, and Far East, together with an estimate of the military and economic aid required to fully implement such policies.

3. The areas in the world which are of such strategic importance that their subjugation by Russia would seriously impair the ability of the United States to defend itself, together with an analysis of the relative priority that should be accorded such area.

4. Whether or not the United States is conducting an adequate program to convince the peoples of the world, both within and without the Soviet sphere of influence, that our cause is the preservation of peace, freedom, and justice.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that perhaps some things which I have said may not meet with the entire approval of all of the membership of the group of Congressmen I mentioned, but these young men have worked together in an effort to bring out the things that have been brought out. Some of the suggestions made in my speech, which was unprepared, may not represent everything I have in mind, but all of the young men who worked together on this are young men who put their country ahead of their reputation, ahead of their own personal desires, and we are trying to make an effort to give whatever impetus we can to strengthening our country.

INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, today, the American people are being called upon to make great sacrifices to defend our cherished freedom. Thousands of our young men have given their lives in Korea to stop Communist aggression, and in furtherance of our policy, and that of the United Nations, to preserve peace, freedom, and justice for the liberty-loving peoples of the world. Many more of our young men will be called to arms in order to adequately prepare our country for a global conflict that may be precipitated at any time by Russia. The citizens of the United States will be called upon this year to pay higher taxes and to make numerous other sacrifices for the defense of America, and to implement our foreign policy.

We, in Congress, if we are to have the confidence of the people must ourselves have a deep conviction that the policies to which we commit our country will insure the security of America and a lasting peace. We, ourselves, must have confidence in our foreign policy. The acrimonious debate in Congress is indicative of the fact that there are widely divergent opinions throughout the country which must be harmonized into a unified effort.

Our policy, in general, has been to create situations of strength throughout the world to enable the free peoples everywhere to resist communism. In pursuing such a policy will we so weaken our domestic economy that we are unable to fully protect ourselves? How much military and economic aid will be required to fully and effectively implement our policy of making all countries strong outside the Soviet orbit? If the Soviets instigate a series of Korea incidents around the Soviet periphery tomorrow, as they are fully capable of doing, we will be confronted with numerous decisions which cannot possibly be made intelligently without a thorough analysis of many factors.

How much military and economic effort would be required of us to successfully resist the subjugation of Yugoslavia through a Soviet-directed attack by the satellites? How much military and economic aid would be required to insure that the rubber supply of Malaya does not fall to the Communists through a Viet Minh offensive, supported by the Chinese Communists? Would the loss of the Malay States or of Jugoslavia seriously impair our ability to defend ourselves? Is it wiser to scatter our strength throughout the world or should our energies be directed to the full support of strategic areas, in order of their priority, which are necessary to the preservation of our freedom?

All of these questions and many more are running through my mind and I am sure they are running through the minds of many of our citizens.

In the hope of obtaining these answers and to insure the confidence and support of all citizens of the United States in our foreign policy, I introduced, this morning, the following resolution:

Whereas in order to successfully implement our foreign policy, it is imperative that the Government have the confidence and support of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas reverses suffered by the United Nations in Korea, and the imminent danger of another world war, have caused the people of this country to become vitally concerned as to whether or not the foreign policy being pursued by the United States is one that will insure the security of our country and our democratic form of government, and lead to a lasting peace; and

Whereas since the end of World War II, Congress has ratified the United Nations Charter, committing the United States to collective security measures; the North Atlantic Pact, committing the United States to the mutual defense of the member nations; and did in 1949 pass the foreign military aid bill to implement the North Atlantic Pact; and

Whereas resultant actions taken by the United States in furtherance of the aims and objectives of the United Nations and under the North Atlantic Pact have been the subject of acrimonious attack by many citizens, including some Members of this body; and

Whereas the Congress is concerned with effecting a clarification of our foreign policies and the reasons therefore, including, but not limited to, those involving Europe, the Middle East, and Asia; and

Whereas the criticism, if untrue, directed toward various members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for not making a comparable effort with the United States in the defense of Western Europe is harmful to a unified defense against communism; and

Whereas the Soviets have been conducting an increasingly bitter propaganda campaign against the United States, thereby necessitating an increased effort on our part to inform the peoples of the world that our cause is the preservation of peace, freedom and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is forthwith directed to investigate and report to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, specific findings of fact and recommendations concerning the following:

1. Whether or not the North Atlantic Pact signatories are making a military and economic effort comparable with that of the United States to defend Western Europe against Soviet imperialism, and whether or not there exists throughout Western Europe, including Western Germany, a determined will to resist vigorously any attack.

2. Our specific foreign policies in Western Europe, the Mediterranean area, the Middle, Near, and Far East together with an estimate of the military and economic aid required to fully implement such policies.

3. The areas in the world which are of such strategic importance that their subjugation by Russia would seriously impair the ability of the United States to defend itself, together with an analysis of the relative priority that should be accorded such area.

4. Whether or not the United States is conducting an adequate program to convince the peoples of the world, both within and without the Soviet sphere of influence, that our cause is the preservation of peace, freedom, and justice.

With this information before us, I feel sure that all of us, as sincere Americans, seeking to preserve peace, will make sound decisions that will have the confidence of all our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a prayer by Hon. BROOKS HAYS.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

Mr. SCHWABE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each instance to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement appearing in the New York Herald Tribune by Hon. FREDERIC COUDERT, JR., of New York.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an obituary note.

Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include newspaper material.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the resolution passed by the Rockford (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several editorials by the distinguished editor of the New Orleans States, William H. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, and in the other some observations of the happy relationship now existing between this Republic and the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in one to include a resolution of the Polish National Alliance, in one to include a letter from a man in Pennsylvania, and in the others to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial, and to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $218.68.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a letter and in the other an editorial; and further to extend his remarks and include an address by Commissioner Henry D. Smyth, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $246.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, January 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

76. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

77. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the report of civil defense activities and expenditures authorized under Public Law 686, approved August 11, 1950 (District of Columbia Civil Defense Act), pursuant to section 6 of said Public Law 686, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

78. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a proposed amendment of section 410 of the Communications Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

79. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a proposed amendment entitled "Amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act which would authorize the Commission to expend funds in connection with its radio monitoring services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

80. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Sixteenth Annual Report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1012. A bill to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 136. A bill allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer; with amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1492. A bill to include in section 16 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Sioux Indians of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1493. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1494. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1495. A bill to raise revenue for the national defense by regulating contributions which further the election to the House of Representatives of all candidates in primary elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1496. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1497. A bill to repeal section 342 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1498. A bill to provide compensation for duty voluntarily performed on their days off by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 1499. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1500. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1501. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1502. A bill relating to amounts made available for grants for hospital construction for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1503. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1504. A bill to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1505. A bill to extend certain benefits now provided by law for veterans of World War II to personnel on active service with the Armed Forces of the United States of America during the military, naval, and air operations in Korea or other places while serving under the flag of the United States of America and the United Nations, or under the flag of the United States of America alone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1506. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 1507. A bill to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1508. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1509. A bill to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 1510. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1511. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1512. A bill to exempt admissions to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admission tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1513. A bill to provide that overages in postal clerks' accounts may offset shortages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1514. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1515. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1516. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1517. A bill to authorize the Public Printer to furnish copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Department of State for distribution to all United States missions abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1518. A bill providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1519. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1520. A bill for the creation of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 1521. A bill to provide for the training of civilian aircraft pilots, technicians, and mechanics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1522. A bill to amend sections 174, 200, 200a, and 200b of title 21, United States Code; section 2557 (b), title 26, United States Code; and section 2596, title 26, United States Code, to provide minimum and maximum penalties upon conviction of violation of the act of May 26, 1922, as amended; the act of December 17, 1914, as amended; and the act of August 2, 1937, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1523. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to make employees eligible for annuities after 30 years of service, regardless of age, and to make widows eligible for annuities, regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1525. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1526. A bill to provide additional benefits with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1527. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide certain retirement benefits for civilian marine inspectors, officers in charge, and marine inspection officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1528. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1529. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain unenforceable judgments on the records of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1530. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1531. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of a lump sum equal to their retirement pay for the period during which they remained in an inactive status without pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1532. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1533. A bill to allow an income-tax exemption for any child who is supported by the taxpayer and who is a member of his household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 1534. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1535. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1536. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1537. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1538. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1539. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1540. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay bonus for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1541. A bill to provide for a manufacturers' excise tax on jewelry in lieu of the retailers' excise tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1542. A bill to exempt from income tax so much of any Christmas bonus paid to an employee as does not exceed $100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1543. A bill to exempt from income taxation the interest on certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1544. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to require that at least one member of each local board and each appeal board shall be a veteran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1545. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1546. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay bonus for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1547. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1548. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1549. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1550. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1551. A bill to confer civil and criminal jurisdiction on the State of Wisconsin in certain cases involving Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1552. A bill to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1553. A bill to provide hospital care for certain veterans residing in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 1554. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1555. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works or disposal facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1599. A bill to provide for a commission to determine the need for coordinated regional planning and action in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia with respect to tax legislation and other matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the issuance of visas authorized by section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late George Smith Patton, Jr., a lieutenant general, Army of the United States, a commission as a five-star general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

My Br. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution inviting the countries which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution inviting the countries which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Police Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution inviting the countries which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to call a conference for the revision and strengthening of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 70. Resolution favoring an increased educational program by the United States in combating communism in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 71. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the activities of the Government during the existing national emergency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. Res. 72. Resolution concerning the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1556. A bill for the relief of John C. Schoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1557. A bill for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1558. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1559. A bill for the relief of Edmon Burgher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1560. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1561. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,861,647; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of the estate of Shirley Hendrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1563. A bill for the relief of Thomas I. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1564. A bill for the relief of Arthur Koestler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1566. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1567. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Trapolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 1568. A bill for the relief of George Postma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1569. A bill for the relief of L. D. Trabert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1570. A bill for the relief of Silvestro Napoleon Ramos Canizal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1571. A bill for the relief of Antonio Novoa y Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1572. A bill for the relief of Albino Anta Y. Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1573. A bill for the relief of Manuel Bello Y. Llanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 1574. A bill for the relief of Ettore Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Oscar Neumann, Mrs. Magdalena Neumann, and Judith Gabrielle Neumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 1576. A bill for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1577. A bill for the relief of Victor Tenaglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Heinz Langerhans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1579. A bill for the relief of Angelita Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1580. A bill for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1581. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Fabinyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1582. A bill for the relief of Warner Fahrenhold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Chester E. Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Dr. F. Homburger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Joseph Saganich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1589. A bill for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Baliquette Adele Rundle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1590. A bill for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOULSON:

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Sante Martinoli, Mrs. Giuditta Martinoli, and Maurizio Martinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Evans County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Maulden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Earl L. Doss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Majewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1596. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of George H. Wadsworth and Pearl Wadsworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

10. Mr. KING presented a petition of Southwest Women's Republican Club of Los Angeles, to make the handbook entitled, "Health Services and Special Weapons Defense," available to the public free of charge, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world filled with the clamor of those who trust in violence and with the boasting of those who reckon not with the ultimate supremacy of forces unseen and eternal, save us from being victims of the apparent and the transient. Help us to command this new day, meeting its joys with gratitude, its difficulties with fortitude, its doubts with faith no darkness can extinguish. Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil. Help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. And in dark and dangerous days may we still be able to utter the glad and grateful confidence: "Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident: The Lord is my light and my salvation; the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Long
Anderson	George	McCarran
Bennett	Gillette	McCarthy
Benton	Green	McClellan
Brewster	Hayden	McFarland
Bricker	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bridges	Hennings	McMahon
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Millikin
Carlson	Holland	Monroney
Case	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Hunt	Mundt
Clements	Ives	Murray
Connally	Jenner	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Dworshak	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kerr	Pastore
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Langer	Saltonstall
Flanders	Lehman	Schoeppel
Frear	Lodge	Smathers
Smith, Maine	Thye	Wiley
Smith, N. J.	Tobey	Williams
Sparkman	Watkins	Young
Stennis	Welker	
Taft	Wherry	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are attending the inauguration of the Honorable James F. Byrnes as Governor of the State of South Carolina, being held today at Columbia, S. C., and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS RELATING TO MINERAL ENTRY, PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the laws relating to mineral entry on the tribal lands on the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 410, COMMUNICATIONS ACT

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission requesting early consideration of section 410 of the Federal Communications Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 (G) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT

A letter f.om the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission embodying an amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act, and requesting its early consideration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIVIL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on civil-defense activities in the District (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CODIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 252, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a codification of all Federal laws relating to housing (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Old Age Assistance Union of Illinois, the Adult Recreation Club of Hamilton Park, the Old Age Pension Club of the Metropolitan Church, and the Forget Me Not Club, Volunteers of America, all of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the adoption of a Federal sales tax, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a copy of the resolutions adopted by the National Reclamation Association at its nineteenth annual meeting at Spokane, Wash., last November.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE APPROVED BY EACH OF THE STATE CAUCUSES AND ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING, SPOKANE, WASH., NOVEMBER 15, 16, AND 17, 1950

(Foreword)

The resolutions contained herein are the latest public expression of the western people with regard to their reclamation problems.

Spokane, Wash., was host to the National Reclamation Association membership during its nineteenth annual meeting, November 15, 16, and 17, 1950. This meeting, again, presented an opportunity for reclamation people from the 17 Western States to discuss and act upon their mutual problems.

Our annual meeting was one of the most successful ever held by the National Reclamation Association. "Grass roots" speakers representing irrigation districts from seven regions in the West had their day on the program. A majority of those present throughout the meeting were officers and directors of irrigation districts, canal and ditch companies, as well as officers and directors of the 17 Western State organizations. Thus, these resolutions are the voice of representatives of the water users on the land.

The resolutions were first considered and approved by a committee made up of one member from each of the Western States. The resolutions were then submitted to each of the State caucuses for full consideration, after which they were acted upon by the convention membership as a whole.

We submit this program for the West as a constructive, forward step in continued western reclamation development.

We earnestly solicit your support in furthering the advancement of this worth-while cause.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY E. POLK,
President.
WM. E. WELSH,
Secretary-Manager.

Resolution No. 1

BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Whereas during recent years a trend has developed toward the obtaining and assertion by agencies of the United States of increasing governmental power over the development of water resources and the economy of the 17 Western States, and the control and authority of the States and their agencies over their own future welfare has been correspondingly diminishing; and

Whereas still further extensions of Federal domination over the welfare and economy of the West have been proposed and advocated in connection with a movement to establish Federal valley authorities in the river basins of the Western States; and

Whereas for obvious reasons the National Reclamation Association has rejected the Federal valley authority concept as having no proper place in the American system of Government; and

Whereas it is recognized by the association that the most effective and beneficial utilization of the water resources of the West can be obtained through coordinated, basin-wide planning and development; and

Whereas in order that the association should undertake its proper responsibility for leadership of public opinion, in relation to basin-wide development, the president of the association has appointed a special basin development committee and said committee has submitted to the association its report, wherein it makes affirmative proposals for solution of problems of basin development: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the National Reclamation Association:

1. That the association approves the broad, general objectives laid down in the report of the basin development committee as indicated by the preamble of this resolution;

2. That the association deems it essential that the trend toward Federal domination be reversed;

3. That the basin development committee report be transmitted to each of the 17 affected States and interested organizations and agencies, and the interested Federal agencies for study, review, and comment within a time fixed by the board of directors;

4. That the comments of such States, organizations, and agencies be studied and analyzed by the board of directors, and that its analysis and recommendations be submitted to the twentieth annual meeting of the National Reclamation Association; and

5. That the National Reclamation Association expresses its appreciation to Chairman Marshall Dana and his fellow committeemen for their untiring and fruitful efforts in the study and preparation of the project report.

Resolution No. 2

VALLEY AUTHORITIES

Whereas the National Reclamation Association by its Resolution No. 4, adopted in 1938; Resolution No. 17, adopted in 1941; Resolution No. 15, adopted in 1943; Resolution No. 15, adopted in 1944; Resolution No. 21, adopted in 1946; Resolution No. 15, adopted in 1947; Resolution No. 13, adopted in 1948; and Resolution No. 4, adopted in 1949, has consistently and emphatically registered its opposition to all proposals for creation of so-called valley or regional Federal authorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That said association does hereby again reaffirm its position as outlined in the above-mentioned resolutions in opposition to the creation of Federal valley or regional authorities and administrations.

Resolution No. 3

BASIN ACCOUNT

Whereas varying proposals have been made as to the establishment of a so-called basin account in one or more river basins for the general purpose of pooling revenues from reclamation and power projects for use in financing such projects; and

Whereas question has been raised as to the propriety of some such proposals, and the Congress has not enacted them; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the president of the association is directed to appoint a committee for the purpose of studying such proposals and reporting as promptly as possible to the board of directors of the association whether and under what circumstances, and for what purposes and with what provisions such basin account proposals should be supported by the association.

Resolution No. 4

WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMLIISSION

Whereas the President of the United States, on January 3, 1950, appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission and directed it to study and report to him by December 1, 1950, upon the general subject of national water resources policy; and

Whereas the report of said Commission is expected to contain recommendations relating to subjects of particular interest to the National Reclamation Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the president of the association is directed to appoint a committee for the purpose of studying the final report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and any action which may be taken by the Eighty-second Congress thereon, and of reporting to the board of directors of the association from time to time its recommendations relating to said report.

Resolution No. 5

9 (E) CONTRACTS

Whereas the National Reclamation Association by its Resolution No. 4 adopted in 1947, Resolution No. 1 adopted in 1948, and Resolution No. 1 adopted in 1949 has consistently opposed the use of contracts made under section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for the purpose of placing the United States, through the Bureau of Reclamation in the business of operating as a public utility for the sale of irrigation water; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association supports congressional legislation assuring water users organizations contracting with the United States through the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Reclamation Laws, the right to acquire permanent water rights and control of their distribution facilities.

Resolution No. 6

JOINT LIABILITY

Whereas it is the general policy of the Department of the Interior to require, pursuant to existing law, that there be incorporated in contracts with irrigation districts for furnishing water, a clause making owners of land under any irrigation project jointly liable for the repayment of construction costs and the costs of furnishing water; and

Whereas it now appears there are some areas proposed for development within the 17 reclamation States, wherein operators refuse to accept any plan or contract that requires "joint liability"; and

Whereas there are projects functioning successfully without the inclusion of the "joint liability" clause; and

Whereas such policy was referred to in the Special Repayment Commission report sent to the United States House of Representatives on May 18, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 873) in these words, * * * "It fails in its purpose, particularly on projects which have soils of varied production power. * * * One serious result of joint liability on reclamation projects is the discouragement and mental depression of landowners whose assessments are increased because others do not pay * * * many financial agencies refuse to make loans on project lands, even though the individual farmer is a first-class risk"; and

Whereas experience has since proven that this policy, incorporated in section 45 of the act of May 25, 1926, and in section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, has failed to obtain the desired results: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the inclusion in future contracts of a joint liability clause should be optional with the contracting organization and that existing laws with respect thereto should be so amended.

Resolution No. 7

APPLICATION OF 160-ACRE LIMITATION TO DEVELOPED PRIVATE LANDS

Whereas the 160-acre limitation prescribed by the Reclamation Act of 1902 represents a valid Federal policy, as applied to the public lands for which the law was originally designed; and

Whereas on the other hand, as applied to privately owned lands for which a supplemental water supply is to be furnished, and which private lands have already been developed by irrigation, and have as a result of decades of trial and error established economic patterns of development suitable to their conditions, said 160-acre limitation does not have validity, nor in fact represent any Federal policy at all, since other Federal laws relating to water-resources development do not contain this limitation; since it is not embraced in any of the general laws relating to assistance of farmers by farm support prices and like benefits, and since there have been repeated special exemptions from the limitation in respect to particular reclamation projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That, reaffirming its Resolutions No. 6, adopted in 1944; No. 3, adopted in 1946; and No. 21, adopted in 1946, as applied to supplemental water projects for developed private lands which have established patterns of economy through decades of irrigation experience, the acreage limitation of the reclamation law is unjust and unworkable, and said association again urges that the Congress enact legislation repealing said acreage limitation as to such lands.

Resolution No. 8

SUBJECTION OF ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES TO STATE WATER LAWS

Whereas by section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of said act, is

directed to proceed in conformity with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water used in irrigation, subject to any vested right acquired thereunder, but the Secretary of the Army and other Federal officers and agencies having to do with water-resources development are not so limited; and

Whereas the authority to regulate and control the distribution of the waters of streams arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian is properly the exclusive sovereign function of the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That, reaffirming its position taken in its Resolutions No. 12 adopted in 1946, No. 8 adopted in 1947, and No. 10 adopted in 1949, said association urges the enactment of legislation by the Congress directing the Secretary of the Army and all other Federal officers and agencies having to do with water-resources development projects, to proceed in conformity with State water laws and subject to rights vested thereunder, in like manner as the Secretary of the Interior is now directed by said section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902.

Resolution No. 9

COURT PROCEEDINGS

Whereas this association has heretofore urged—

1. That the integrity of the water laws of the Western States should be preserved and that the basic provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 should be reaffirmed.

2. That legislation be urged to strengthen the basic concept of section 8 to require that the administration and distribution of such appropriated waters shall at all times be under the control, direction, and supervision of the established water officials and courts of the State which would be vested with jurisdiction if the appropriation had been made by a nongovernmental agency.

3. That the Board of Directors consider the advisability of seeking legislation from the Congress of the United States granting to the Secretary of the Interior for and on behalf of the United States of America the consent and authority of the United States to adjudicate the amounts and priorities of water rights in which the United States has an interest and authorizing and consenting that the Secretary on behalf of the United States may sue or be sued in all suits necessary for the protection of the interests of the United States in water appropriation matters in the State courts of the State where such waters are appropriated and/or beneficially used and under and pursuant to the applicable water laws of such State.

Whereas since the formulation of said policy, the United States Department of Justice, as the legal representative of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, has chosen the courts of the United States, and disavowed the courts of the States, as the forum for the adjudication of water rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers, employees, and committees of this association be and they are hereby directed to seek the passage of a law of the United States consenting to court proceedings by or against the United States in the courts of the various States in connection with the adjudication and determination of water rights, in language so clear and unmistakable that there can be no misunderstanding as to its meaning, and finding that such language is not amendatory of but only definitive of existing law.

Resolution No. 10

BROADENING SECTION 1, 1944 FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Whereas by sections 1 (a) and 1 (c) of the 1944 Flood Control Act certain procedure is prescribed for the submission by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior of their project reports to each other and to the Governors of the affected States for comment; and

Whereas the underlying purposes of such submission of reports are not confined to reports of the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association does hereby urge that the provisions of sections 1 (a) and 1 (c) of the said act be so broadened as to make like reporting procedure required of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Power Commission and other Federal agencies having to do with water and power development projects.

Resolution No. 11

BROADENING SECTION 1 (B), 1944 FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Whereas, section 1 (b) of the 1944 Flood Control Act subordinates the use of water for navigation in the West, in connection with works authorized by that act, to beneficial consumptive uses such as domestic and irrigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the National Reclamation Association that said section should be so broadened in connection with all works authorized for construction by the United States as to subordinate the use of water for power, as well as navigation, to consumptive uses in the West, and also to make the section apply to all works for navigation and power, as well as only works authorized for construction by said 1944 act.

Resolution No. 12

FEDERAL WATER DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Whereas in the report of the Hoover Commission recommendations are made for the incorporation of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers into the Department of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That said association believes it to be in the national interest that the water-development functions of the Federal Government remain in the hands of the existing agencies which now have such functions and opposes the incorporation of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers into the Department of the Interior.

Resolution No. 13

NONREIMBURSABLES FOR NONFEDERAL PROJECTS

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers are by law authorized to expend funds as appropriated by Congress in the construction of reclamation and flood-control projects, including certain nonreimbursable costs; and

Whereas publicly owned projects proposed under State laws and financed with funds other than those appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers are unable to finance the cost of such nonreimbursable items above-mentioned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association favors congressional authorization for the expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers of funds for such nonreimbursable costs on such projects; be it further

Resolved, That the proper officials of this association are hereby directed to cause the necessary legislation to be introduced in Congress to authorize such expenditures.

Resolution No. 14

AUTHORIZING PREPARATION OF SMALL-PROJECTS LEGISLATION

Whereas the small-projects committee of the association has submitted its report, dated November 8, 1950; and

Whereas the association approves in principle the recommendations made in that report: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the small-projects committee be continued and collaborate with the legislative committee in the preparation and support of suitable Federal and State legislation to effectuate the recommendations of the small-projects committee.

Resolution No. 15

OWNERSHIP OF SMALL POWER GENERATING PLANTS

Whereas it has been the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation, in negotiating the terms of repayment contracts or amended repayment contracts on Federal irrigation projects, to retain ownership of any small power plant which may be incidental to an irrigation project, and in instances where said plant is primarily designed to furnish power for pumping of irrigation water to the lands of said project; and

Whereas it may be the desire of landowners on the project to repay the construction cost of said power generating plant in the same manner as the cost of the diversion dams and irrigation canals are repaid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That where small power generating plants are determined to be feasible of construction as an adjunct of an irrigation project and where the principal purpose of said plant is the generating of power for the pumping of irrigation water to the lands of that project and where all or the major part of the output of said plant is consumed in the process of said pumping, then and in that event, the water users of the project shall have the option of taking possession of said plant, and the operation thereof, under the same terms and conditions as are extended with respect to the canal and other irrigation works on that project.

Resolution No. 16

CODIFICATION OF RECLAMATION LAWS

Whereas the National Reclamation Association, through the adoption of its Resolution No. 5, adopted in 1948, initiated a movement for the codification of the reclamation laws; and

Whereas the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Codification of Laws has undertaken to provide for the codification of the reclamation laws, and the work of preparing a draft code is now in progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association does hereby express its hearty appreciation of the action taken by the House Judiciary Committee and by the Secretary of the Interior in support of such action, and does hereby offer to said Judiciary Committee at the appropriate time to suggest competent persons to serve on an advisory committee for the purpose of examining and criticizing such draft code.

Resolution No. 17

AMEND FEDERAL POWER ACT WITH RESPECT TO STATE DAMS

Whereas under the existing Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), before a State or State agency can build a power dam on a navigable stream, it is required to obtain a license from the Federal Power Commission in which the United States reserves the right to take the dam and power plant after 50 years at their depreciated value; and

Whereas such provisions are inequitable to States and their agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, reaffirming its Resolution No. 13, adopted in 1949, the National Reclamation Association urges the Congress to amend the Federal Power Act as follows:

1. So that neither a State, State agency, nor any public entity created under State law shall be required to file with the Commission a declaration of intention to construct a power dam across a navigable stream unless the Department of Defense shall have first determined that such dam will materially and adversely affect the navigability of the stream; and

2. So that whenever a State or its agency, or any public entity created under State law,

may be required to file such declaration of intention and an application for a license, such license when issued shall contain no provision for recapture by the United States of such publicly owned project.

Resolution No. 18

CONTINUED RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the National Reclamation Association is dedicated to encouraging the development, conservation, and utilization of the water resources of the 17 Western States under sound policies in the interests of the country as a whole; and

Whereas the National Reclamation Association, while recognizing that the Federal Government has important responsibilities in the prosecution of programs for the development, conservation, and utilization of water resources in the 17 Western States, believes that those States likewise have important responsibilities in the same field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association:

1. That the National Reclamation Association urges upon the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government and hereby pledges its wholehearted support for the vigorous prosecution of a well-balanced program for the development, conservation, and utilization of water resources in and throughout the 17 Western States, including the construction of projects now under way and the authorization, adequate appropriations for, and the construction of projects for the improvement of navigation, the control of floods, river regulation, and the development, storage, conservation, and use of waters for all beneficial purposes, including particularly the fulfillment of domestic, agricultural, and industrial needs, the development of hydroelectric power, the improvement and protection of national parks, monuments, and recreational areas, and the protection and improvement of conditions favorable to fish and wildlife to a reasonable and practicable extent consistent with the essential needs of water conservation and development, all to the end of enriching the country as a whole, by providing domestic water, food and fiber for an expanding population, and by augmenting the source of electric energy and water for farms, municipalities, and industries, thus making this country strong in peace and in war.

2. That the National Reclamation Association urges upon the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government and hereby pledges its wholehearted support for such legislation as, consistent with the acquisition and preservation of rights in water under State law and with the preservation of the integrity of the laws of the 17 Western States in this field, will tend to relieve water and power users of the financial burden of costs properly allocable to broad national purposes served by Federal reclamation projects; to assure continued financial assistance from power revenues where applicable in the return of irrigation costs that are beyond the reasonable ability of the irrigation water users to return within a reasonable period of years; to clarify and to improve the terms of repayment and other contracts for the return of irrigation costs by water users; and to provide, to the fullest practicable extent consistent with serving and protecting the broad national purposes thereby served, for the local administration and operation of Federal reclamation projects, and features thereof.

Resolution No. 19

GERLACH CASES

Whereas controversy long existed regarding the integrity and enforcibility of State laws and water rights created and existing thereunder, on the one hand, and the attempted application of national laws at variance therewith, on the other; and

Whereas in the case of *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.* and five associated cases, the Department of Justice urged and insisted before the Supreme Court of the United States that there are no vested private rights to the use of irrigation waters of western navigable rivers, but the Supreme Court, held squarely and conclusively that such vested private rights do exist; and

Whereas by section 8, Reclamation Act, 1902, the Secretary of the Interior is carrying out the provisions of said act, is directed to proceed in conformity with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use and distribution of water used in irrigation, subject to any vested rights acquired thereunder: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That said Association does vigorously condemn the efforts of the Department of Justice to destroy State rights in western navigable streams; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association reaffirms its position that State laws and water rights created and existing thereunder, should be respected, and that the Bureau of Reclamation, in carrying out the provisions of the reclamation laws, should, in pursuance of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, recognize and respect such vested rights created and existing under State laws.

Resolution No. 20

SELF-DETERMINATION ON INTEGRATION OF PROJECTS

Whereas in some instances the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed to integrate one project into another for the purpose of aiding the feasibility of the latter project by adding to it the so-called excess repayment ability of the former project, and such integration is opposed by the people of the former project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That such integration should be made only when it is freely and voluntarily approved by the decision of the project to be integrated.

Resolution No. 21

SUPPLEMENTAL WATER PROJECTS

Whereas in many localities throughout the West farming areas which have been established for generations are facing curtailment of their future operations by reason of deficient or failing water supplies; and

Whereas in such communities hundreds of millions of dollars of investment are in jeopardy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That adequate consideration should be given in the preparation of investigations and reports to projects to furnish supplemental water supplies to areas now suffering from insufficient water supplies.

Resolution No. 22

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Whereas there have been statements on various occasions by high Government officials indicating the possibility of diversion of waters from the watercourses or watersheds of one State to other watersheds in another State; and

Whereas it is conceivable that such diversion might interfere with the logical development of the individual States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association recommends that such situations be adjusted by compacts between the States involved.

Resolution No. 23

SUGAR ACT

Whereas a balanced agricultural economy of irrigation farming often includes the production of sugar beets; and

Whereas the present sugar law, which restricts production of sugar in continental United States expires December 31, 1952: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association urges the renewal of the Sugar Act with revisions to increase the domestic sugar-beet production with special relation to reclamation development.

Resolution No. 24

TITLE TO SUBMERGED LANDS

Whereas in the cases of *U. S.* v. *California*, *U. S.* v. *Louisiana*, and *U. S.* v. *Texas*, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the States do not own lands submerged under the marginal sea belt within their boundaries, nor the resources therein, and has based its decision on the need of the United States to exercise its powers under the Constitution to handle international affairs and national defense; and

Whereas the United States, under the decisions in said case, may raise claim to the beds of navigable inland streams which are owned by the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That reaffirming its resolution No. 14 adopted in 1947, its resolution No. 8 adopted in 1948, and its resolution No. 16 adopted in 1949, said association urges that the Congress promptly adopt legislation recognizing or vesting in the several States the absolute title to the submerged lands within their respective boundaries, as established when annexed or admitted to the Union, subject only to the paramount rights granted the United States by the Constitution to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and intercourse with other nations, but expressly excluding any claim of the United States to any proprietary rights in any such lands or resources except upon payment of just compensation and under due process of law.

Resolution No. 25

COOPERATION WITH LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The National Reclamation Association reaffirms the position taken in Resolution No. 14 of the 1949 convention with respect to cooperation in the planning and construction of reclamation projects with the Bureau of Reclamation by the western land-grant colleges and the universities and the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. The progress made in the last year as reported by the Secretary of the Interior to the Committee on Irrigated Agriculture and Water Resources in the form of 17 new memorandum of agreements with the colleges, including 1 with the Department of Agriculture is gratifying but it is urged that the western land-grant colleges take greater leadership, as recommended by said committee at the focal points of coordination of the reclamation program in their respective States in order that the full technical skills of Federal agencies and land-grant institutions may be brought to bear on this program.

Resolution No. 26

SMALL AREAS FOR RECREATION

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation is cooperating with the National Park Service in order to make available recreation areas along the shores of reclamation reservoirs throughout the 17 Western States; and

Whereas under existing Federal law the Bureau of Reclamation lacks the necessary authority to acquire additional small areas of land lying continguous to reservoir areas for recreation purposes except upon reimbursement by the water users; and

Whereas under existing Federal law the Bureau of Reclamation lacks the necessary authority to transfer federally developed recreation areas to States, or subdivisions of the States, wherein the reservoir and recreation area is located: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association endorse the passage of the necessary laws to carry out the intent and purposes of the foregoing preamble: Be it further

Resolved, That the proper officials of this association are hereby directed to cause the necessary legislation to be introduced in Congress to carry out the intent and purposes of the foregoing preamble, such legislation to be subject to the consent of the governor of the affected State and the governing board of the affected county.

Resolution No. 27

FARM CREDIT

Whereas the Farmers Home Administration has the authority to make loans to settlers on reclamation projects who cannot obtain such credit from any other source; and

Whereas funds available for distribution by the Farmers Home Administration are entirely inadequate to meet the pressing needs of families selected for settlement on these projects; and

Whereas the National Reclamation Association has adopted a resolution for the last 2 years urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate and allot funds; and

Whereas the appropriation bill for 1950 appropriated and specifically allotted a certain amount of money for development loans through Farmers Home Administration for reclamation projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That sufficient funds be appropriated and specifically allotted to provide loan funds for the purpose of land development and building construction as well as operating costs and purchase of livestock and machinery.

Resolution No. 28

STUDY OF PERCENTAGE CONTRACTS

Whereas an orderly and workable plan for repayment of construction costs of reclamation projects is necessary to protect Federal investment and at the same time enable irrigators to discharge their obligations for such construction; and

Whereas present laws do not permit the Bureau of Reclamation to enter into repayment contracts providing for the application of the proceeds of a fixed percentage of each year's crops; and

Whereas it appears that in some instances, both in original contractual negotiations and in renegotiation of existing contracts, that it would be in the best interests of all parties concerned that such provisions of repayment be permitted; and

Whereas former laws respecting repayment provisions embodying these principles have not met the needs which prompt the needs for such provisions, and it appears that study should be had to determine the advisability of making such provisions available where advisable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the president of this association be, and hereby is, directed to refer to a committee the matter of the study of the advisability of repayment contracts embodying the principles of the proceeds of a percentage of the crop being applied upon the contract each year, to recommend the policy of this association with respect thereto, and such other matters as appear to need study in connection therewith, and report to this association at its 1951 convention.

Resolution No. 29

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

Whereas the United States of America and Dominion of Canada have and cherish continued friendly international relations; and

Whereas the economic and political problems of both nations are closely interwoven and mutually dependent; and

Whereas there has been created by the treaty of 1909, an International Joint Commission for the purpose of resolving boundary water disputes which may arise between the two nations; and

Whereas there are many international streams and streams which flow across the boundary between the two nations, and the development and use of these water resources are to the mutual advantage of the two countries; and

Whereas it would be to the serious disadvantage of both nations to allow any dispute over the use of such waters to affect adversely or otherwise impair the friendly relations heretofore existing between the United States and Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas such occurence would not only deter developments in the immediate States or Provinces in which proposed projects might be located, but would also adversely affect the negotiation of other such matters in other States or Provinces all across the international boundary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the International Joint Commission continue the splendid work it is now accomplishing on the many important matters now before it, and in the interest of promoting continuing cordial relations between the States, the Provinces, and the nations and that it be encouraged to expedite its recommendation to the two Governments looking toward an equitable apportionment of the flows of international streams between the two countries for the mutual benefit of the citizens of the United States and Dominion of Canada.

Resolution No. 30

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the comprehensive, multiple-purpose development of our major river basins logically falls into four phases—planning, financing, construction, and operation; and

Whereas development of such comprehensive programs, necessary to serve the public interest by enhancing the well-being of the people through development and conservation of all land and water resources, results in innumerable problems; and

Whereas adequate consideration of all resource potentials has not always been given in the planning phase of multiple-purpose projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association endorse the principle of multiple-purpose development but urge that they be planned and put into effect by joint and coordinated action of existing and interested Federal and State agencies of government and in accordance with interstate compacts where appropriate, and a prompt and practical time schedule and in such a way as to insure:

1. Adequate consideration of all resource potentials in each basin such as irrigation, drainage, power, flood control, fish and wildlife, recreation, navigation, soil conservation, watershed protection, and other related purposes as they contribute to the development of industry, agriculture, forestry; and

2. The proper participation of all local, State, and Federal interests in the planning and consummation of such developments; and

3. Compliance with section 1, Flood Control Act, 1944.

Resolution No. 31

CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Whereas the National Reclamation Association recognizes that the further development of irrigation agriculture is an integral part of the Nation's program of conservation, utilization, and improvement of its soil and water resources to meet the increasing demands of a growing population; and

Whereas the wise use and development of the watershed lands is essential to a continuing supply of irrigation water; and

Whereas conservation practices on all other lands lying above irrigation reservoirs will reduce the amount of silt deposited in such reservoirs, thereby prolonging their period of usefulness; and

Whereas the effectiveness of comprehensive programs of watershed development of irrigation, flood control, navigation, and allied purposes depends on all lands being so managed as to reduce erosion, floods, and reservoir siltation, and guarantee the continued productive uses of such lands; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association affirms its previous position:

1. As favoring the enactment of a policy recognizing the constructive and productive multiple-use of all the resources of the West.

2. Of urging the practice of all activities that aid in establishing conservation farming on the farms and ranches lying above all reservoirs, where such practices do not adversely affect the existing irrigation water supply.

Resolution No. 32

INTANGIBLE BENEFITS

Whereas the continuing development of our water resources for domestic, navigation, flood control, irrigation, recreation, and other possible benefits are of prime importance; and

Whereas we realize that water is a vital natural resource, essential to our expanding economy, and we believe that every measure should be employed to safeguard the supply and promote the beneficial use of water. We also know that the public at large receives many remote and intangible benefits from water conservation projects, such as the storage of water for future use, recreation, pollution abatement, and kindred uses and that none of said uses can readily be evaluated in monetary terms, but that the results of said uses are all essential to our economic well-being;

It is, therefore, the sense of this association that the Congress establish a formula for use by the Federal agencies which will operate to give an economic valuation basis to all such potential beneficial uses and that credit therefore be included in computing the economic cost benefit ratio in all projects involving water conservation.

Resolution No. 33

ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the primary objective of the National Reclamation Association is the complete development of the land and water resources of the West; and

Whereas the accomplishment of these objectives calls for adequate appropriations by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association hereby directs its officers to support before the Congress requests for sufficient appropriations to:

A. Permit the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to continue progressive construction programs in consonance with the needs therefor;

B. Support acceleration of the Forest Service program of revegetation, range improvements, and physical improvement of national forests;

C. Support and continue the snow survey service of the Department of Agriculture;

D. Permit prompt and continuing acquisition by the Geological Survey of basic data respecting both stream flow and ground-water resources throughout the Nation, and full support by the various States of this program is urged;

E. Permit completion of standard topographic mapping of the United States, if possible, within 20 years;

F. Support research, investigation, and action programs in soil and water conservation, basic and essential to the sound development and full continued care of the Nation's land and water resources, basin-wide

and in harmony with multiple-use projects development.

Resolution No. 34

CODIFICATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Whereas throughout the history of the National Reclamation Association it has established its policies by resolutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors is requested to designate a committee for the purpose of codifying the resolutions which constitute the present policy of the National Reclamation Association.

Resolution No. 35

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Be it resolved, That the president of the association shall appoint a committee of not less than five members to formulate and recommend to the board of directors legislation relating to the objectives of this association, and, when directed by the board of directors, to take specific action in regard to legislation: Further

Resolved, That the officers of the association shall, and the Bureau of Reclamation is requested to, cooperate with the committee by keeping it advised as to the development of legislative measures affecting reclamation, and the committee shall make appropriate recommendations to the board of directors relative thereto.

Resolution No. 36

RECLAMATION LEGISLATION

Be it resolved, That the board of directors direct the legislative committee to proceed in the Eighty-second Congress with respect to reclamation legislation in such manner as in the judgment of the board of directors may be practicable at the time.

Resolution No. 37

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolved, That the secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association is directed to call the resolutions adopted at this meeting to the attention of the appropriate Federal officers and agencies and to the Members of the Congress and the governors and attorneys general of the 17 Western States and all others concerned therewith, and that the officers and staff of the association carry out the policies declared in said resolutions.

Resolution No. 38

APPRECIATION

Whereas the arrangements made by, the services given, and the entertainment provided by the citizens of Spokane as represented by the city officials, the chamber of commerce, and many other organizations, hotels, and individuals have contributed much to the success of the nineteenth annual meeting of the National Reclamation Assocation on November 15, 16, and 17, 1950: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association does hereby extend its thanks and appreciation to all the members of the convention committees, to the press and the radio stations, to the hotels and auto courts of Spokane and environs, to those who have participated in the program of the meetings and to those who have provided entertainment and to all others who have contributed to an outstanding meeting.

Resolution No. 39

ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

Whereas in the interest of good association practice it is believed that there should be a limitation on the tenure of office for elective officers of any association: Be it therefore

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That its president be requested to appoint a committee of five for the purpose of drafting recommendations with respect to the tenure of office and also the eligibility to office of the president, first vice president, and second vice president, of the National Reclamation Association, that such report be so submitted to the board of directors so that any suggested amendment to the constitution may be acted upon and be effective at the 1951 annual meeting of the association.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 483. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 485. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; and

S. 486. A bill to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. BRICKER introduced Senate bill 487, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 488. A bill to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia;

S. 489. A bill to provide compensation for duty voluntarily performed on their days off by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force;

S. 490. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia";

S. 491. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 492. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes;

S. 493. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 494. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Walling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Dennis Ralph Selvon; and

S. 497. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Horst Luellen (formerly Horst Kluge); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 498. A bill to provide hospital care for certain veterans residing in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 499, to incorporate The Military Order of the Purple Heart, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 500. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employes who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of William Houwink; and

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers, authorized certifying officer, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 503. A bill to revise the basis for award of death pension, and for other purposes;

S. 504. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to children, where there is no widow, and to dependent parents, and for other purposes;

S. 505. A bill to revise the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; and

S. 506. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 507. A bill to authorize the training of an adequate backlog of airmen to meet the civil and military needs of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 508. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; and

S. 509 (by request). A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 510. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity at age 60 after 30 years' service, and for other purposes; and

S. 511. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of officers discharged from the armed services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 512. A bill to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 513. A bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced Senate bill 514, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, to provide for the elimination of the board of directors, and to vest the management of the Corporation in a governor, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. FULBRIGHT also introduced Senate bill 515, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. FREAR introduced Senate Joint Resolution 17, to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement prepared concerning the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 487) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SEC. 1. (a) There is hereby established a temporary national bipartisan commission, in which the various levels of Government are represented, to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and two private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience with or knowledge of the major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Three appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be State officials, from a panel of at least nine, submitted by the Council of State Governments;

(5) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be municipal officials, from a panel of at least six, submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors; and

(6) One appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be a county official, from a panel of at least three, submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) Of the members enumerated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), not more than two members shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2), (3), and (5), not more than one member shall be from any one political party; and of the four members enumerated in paragraphs (4) and (6), not more than two members shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of eight members, except that for the purpose of taking sworn testimony a quorum shall consist of one member.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to submit to the Congress specific recommendations based upon a study of—

(1) (A) the past and present relations between the National, State, and local governments of the United States; (B) the past and present allocation of governmental functions and powers among the National, State, and local governments of the United States; (C) governmental functions and powers exercised by two or more such governments, the distribution of jurisdiction over such functions exercised by each such government;

(2) the fiscal relations among the National, State, and local governments with a view of determining the possibilities, and mechanism for achieving, on a continuous basis, consistency in the fiscal policies of the several levels of governments. In making such study the Commission shall give particular attention to (A) intergovernmental tax immunities in terms of the problems they create for governments and taxpayers, and means for resolving these problems; (B) revenue sources and means for reducing or eliminating intergovernmental tax competition; and (C) grants-in-aid, tax sharing, and other similar measures for adjusting financial resources to the needs of State and local governments, with a view to proposing guides to the use of such devices and improvements in their operation.

(b) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities, and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before the end of the second fiscal year which commences after the date of enactment of this act, and shall cease to exist upon the submission of such final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) The Commission shall have the power, without regard to the civil-service laws, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary, who shall be the chief administrative officer of the Commission, and such other personnel as it deems advisable, but the rates of compensation of such personnel shall not exceed the rates prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949 for comparable duties.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Any member or members of the Commission who are appointed from among Members of Congress or from the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress or in the executive branch, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsection (a) is applicable, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

On February 3, 1949, I introduced, on behalf of the then junior Senator from Maryland, Mr. O'CONOR, and myself, S. 767, a bill to establish an intergovernmental commission to make a study of our Federal system and to recommend to the Congress of the United States appropriate allocation and distribution of duties and powers among the local, State, and national levels of government. The bill grew out of the experiences of State and local officials across the Nation who found the expansion of the Federal Government invading those fields of police, welfare, and tax powers which had historically been reserved to State and local governments.

The careful men who drafted the Constitution of the United States recognized perhaps better than most of us, the perils of a strong central government. They cautiously delineated the powers to be granted to the National Government, reserving the rest to the States and to the people. The past half century, and particularly the past 20 years, have seen a continual assault on the historic separation of powers specified by the Constitution. The growth of the National Government and the corresponding diminution of the powers of State and local governments have been continuing apace.

This phenomenon cannot be attributed to any single source. The bureaucrats of a national government have made grabs for power, and all too frequently a so-called liberal judiciary has sustained them. On the other hand, the local and State governments, in some instances, have been unwilling or financially unable to provide services demanded of them by one group or another, and these groups have turned to the Central Government. Whatever the cause or causes, the fact remains that the National Government has centralized and taken to itself many of the functions and powers which had been regarded as exclusively allocated by the Constitution to the several States.

I am one who believes in the Federal system of government as providing our strongest bulwark against state socialism and the best possible guaranty of individual liberty. It may be that the sovereign state is becoming obsolete, and that State and local governments must inevitably degenerate into administrative units of an all-powerful central government. Certainly, if the present trend continues, that is the unavoidable result. I do not believe the trend is irreversible, and I, for one, do not intend to permit it to continue if I can help stop it.

It is probable that there are those who would welcome the destruction of State and local governments and call it progress. Certainly, should State governments retain their traditional powers, no national socialism could succeed. I doubt that the advocates of overpowering central government represent a majority of the people of the Nation. Regardless of the number and of the arguments, this change in form of government which we are undergoing should not be the product of State abdication, executive usurpation or judicial misinterpretation. This is a proper subject for open debate in the political arena.

Therefore, I am today reintroducing, in somewhat modified form, the bill to which I have earlier referred. This bill provides for a thorough study of the entire question, from which should emerge an intelligent chart for our future course. If our Federal system is to be altered, the alteration should be the result of deliberate choice, after free debate and with full knowledge of the consequences.

It will be noted that I have retained the so-called panel system of selection of members for the Commission. It was this point which forestalled the passage of legislation during the Eighty-first Congress. In my judgment, if the Commission is to be of help to the Congress, it must be entirely above partisan suspicion and truly representative of the various levels of government. The only real guaranty of these two criteria, as I see it, is to insure that organized officials of

the various levels of government be given advisory roles in the selection of Commission members.

The executive branch of the Government, as I understand it, objected during the Eighty-first Congress to a panel form of selection on the ground that it unduly restricted the President. In my judgment, that is the only guarantee of a properly representative commission. With that view in mind, on February 14 of last year, I wrote each of the Governors of the United States, asking for advice and support. Most of them responded. Most of those who replied agreed with the panel form of selection. Two disagreed, and others, although strongly in favor of the establishment of such a commission, were not indicative of any particular disposition on the matter of selection of commission members.

If I may quote from a few of the letters, I may be able to illustrate the interest of State executives across the Nation in this problem. The Governor of New York, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, stated, in part:

"I think your bill is sound and exceedingly constructive. I agree with your position."

The Honorable Frederick G. Payne, Governor of the State of Maine:

"I concur wholeheartedly with you in this matter, and believe that the points you have set forth in your letter are sound and practical. * * *

"The panel form of selection as outlined in the original bill whereby the Council of State Governments, the municipal officials, the National Association of County Officers should be represented, to me is most important. After all, these are the groups who are vitally concerned with this problem and know more about what is needed than any other groups."

The Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of the State of South Carolina:

"Should this diversity of viewpoint be sacrificed, the very purpose of such a Commission would be jeopardized."

The Honorable J. Bracken Lee, Governor of the State of Utah:

"There is no question as to the fairness of your position with which I am in wholehearted support."

Similar letters were received from other governors, both Republican and Democratic, from Oregon to Georgia.

Finally, I should point out that this measure implements the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, under the chairmanship of the distinguished ex-President of the United States, Herbert Hoover. The recommendation of the Commission was stated as follows:

"We recommend that the functions and activities of government be appraised to determine which can be most advantageously operated by the various levels of government, and which require joint policy making, financing, and administration."

And, further, that an "agency on Federal-State relations be created with primary responsibility for study, information, and guidance in the field of Federal-State relations."

INCORPORATION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am reintroducing today S. 3599 of the Eighty-first Congress, for the purpose of incorporation of the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

I know that my colleagues are familiar with the outstanding record of this splendid organization which has served so well the men who bear on their bodies the greatest badge of patriotism of all—scars inflicted in the service of their country.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which explains very clearly the work of this fine veterans' group and that there be recorded thereafter a list of the officers of the military order's department in Wisconsin and of the officers of its auxiliary.

The letter is a Christmas message sent by the department commander, Richard P. Golick, to families of the Korean wounded, as printed in the December 1950 issue of the magazine, the Wisconsin Purple Hearter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter, together with the list of officers will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 499) to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter and list of officers are as follows:

THE WISCONSIN PURPLE HEARTER,
DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN,
MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
Christmas 1950.

To the Families of the Korean Wounded:

In recent casualty lists issued by the Department of Defense, the name of your loved one was included as having been wounded in action against the enemies of our beloved country and other freedom-loving peoples.

The Department of Wisconsin, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and its Ladies' Auxiliary wish to extend their sincere sympathy and render this tribute to him and to you for the great sacrifice that has been made on behalf of liberty and freedom in the world. We hope and pray for his speedy recovery and safe return home when his duty has been fulfilled.

In recognition of this highest of all meritorious service—the suffering of wounds in combat—he will receive, or has already received, the Purple Heart decoration, originated by Gen. George Washington himself, in the year 1782. It will interest you to know that it is the only award servicemen win themselves, without any recommendation of superior officers.

All those receiving the Purple Heart Medal automatically become members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. There are presently close to a million living wounded veterans of all wars who have been awarded the Purple Heart. Their feminine blood relatives (mother, daughter, sister, grandmother, and wife) are all eligible for membership in the Ladies' Auxiliary.

Both organizations exist and function to render service to living holders of the Purple Heart and their families, and the dependents of those who were killed in action or die subsequently. The chapters and units throughout the State of Wisconsin are therefore at your service.

We have mailed this Christmas issue of the Wisconsin Purple Hearter to you, with the thought in mind that you would be interested in knowing of our organization which is ready to assist you with any problems with which you may be confronted. If you feel your son or husband or brother would like to receive our magazine, simply send us his APO address.

We extend to you a most cordial invitation to meet with any of us who are bound together through our mutual interests and common experiences.

Very sincerely yours,
RICHARD P. GOLICK,
Department Commander.

DEPARTMENT OFFICERS

COMMANDER

Richard P. Golick, 903 North Sixth Street, Sheboygan, Wis.

SENIOR VICE COMMANDER

Thomas N. Corcoran, 225 North Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.

JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER

James A. Sinkovits, route 4, box 35, Waukesha, Wis.

ADJUTANT

Ernst L. Ihbe, 6645 West Lloyd, Milwaukee, Wis.

FINANCE OFFICER

Albert A. Ullenberg, 1550 South Tenth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

CHIEF OF STAFF

Lawrence T. Burdick, 810 Emerson Street, Madison, Wis.

LEGISLATIVE OFFICER

William Siemering, 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wis.

SERVICE AND WELFARE OFFICER

Newell A. Alexander, 1518 North Thirty-fifth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

JUDGE ADVOCATE

William Markhoff, 1512 West State Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

INSPECTOR

A. Valentine Drew, 626 Niagara Avenue, Sheboygan, Wis.

CHAPLAIN

Rev. Gustav Stearns, 1727 South Thirtieth Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

HISTORIAN

Frank J. Schneller, 714 Miami Pass, Madison, Wis.

AMERICANISM OFFICER

Robert G. Jones, 423 Summit Road, Kohler, Wis.

SERGEANT AT ARMS

William H. Werner, 1014 West Chambers Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

ASSISTANT SERGEANT AT ARMS

Ray Sommerville, 1126 Hughitt Avenue, Superior, Wis.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMAN

Ernst L. Ihbe, 5545 West Lloyd Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEPARTMENT AIDES DE CAMP

Louis V. Benjamin, 1220 West Summit Street, Appleton, Wis.

Walter J. Friese, 508 South Eighth Street, Sheboygan, Wis.

Fred A. Fenner, route 14, box 340, Milwaukee, Wis.

Walter B. Bogan, 909 North Summit Street, Appleton, Wis.

Herbert J. Menard, post-office box 862, Green Bay, Wis.

Conrad J. Melberg, 1706 Broadway, Superior, Wis.

AUXILIARY OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

Hilda Bellows, 1417 Rawson Avenue, South Milwaukee, Wis.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

Evelyn Bogan, 909 Summit Avenue, Appleton, Wis.

JUNIOR VICE PRESIDENT

Frieda Altman, 711 Huron Avenue, Sheboygan, Wis.

SECRETARY

May Keyes, 3430 North Thirty-seventh Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

TREASURER

Eva Gottfried, 118 Frame Street, Waukesha, Wis.

CHAPLAIN

Emma Baumbach, 2246 Rawly Avenue, Madison, Wis.

SERGEANT AT ARMS

Irene Clelland, 6335 Twenty-seventh Avenue, Kenosha, Wis.

PARLIAMENTARIAN

Hattie Corcoran, 225 North Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.

PATRIOTIC INSTRUCTOR

Mathilda Krumpus, RFD No. 7, Green Bay, Wis.

INSPECTOR

Hazel Pearsall, 432 Hawthorne Court, Madison, Wis.

MARSHAL

Margaret Haunfelder, 3266 North Eleventh Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

HISTORIAN

Ruth Sinkowitz, 428 Oakland Avenue, Waukesha, Wis.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN, HOSPITAL AND WELFARE

Ruth Sinkowitz, 428 Oakland Avenue, Waukesha, Wis.

LEGISLATIVE

Meta Ihbe, 6645 West Lloyd Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

PUBLICITY

Lola Olson, 721 Story Street, Appleton, Wis.

VIOLA

Hattie Corcoran, 225 North Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF LIFE OF EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell. As many Americans undoubtedly know, Emily Bissell founded and promoted the sale of the famed Christmas seal which has since become probably the greatest single factor in the fight against tuberculosis. It is extremely regrettable to me that the Eighty-first Congress did not see fit to act favorably on that joint resolution. Certainly, in times such as these, when we are devoting many billions of dollars for the economic and military security of nations throughout the world, it is little enough to ask that we approve a simple undertaking such as this one, whose effects will redound to sufferers of tuberculosis all over this great Nation.

The issuance of a commemorative stamp would serve to focus additional public attention on the Christmas seal, and would unquestionably increase its sale. That is the primary purpose I have in reintroducing this joint resolution, and I earnestly solicit the support of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in securing its passage. Its approval would be a boon to the National Tuberculosis Society and to the various State chapters of this organization which each year devote their time and efforts in the cause of eradicating this disease. No large expenditure of Federal funds is involved. The joint resolution affords an opportunity for Congress to enlist its services in the struggle to save human lives here at home.

Emily Bissell, who founded the seal in America back in 1907, led the crusade for that little stamp until her death in March of 1948. She was a gallant woman whose enthusiasm and humanitarian work against tuberculosis resulted in a great victory over this dreaded disease. In this undertaking, she was generously aided by Americans who had faith in her proposal and who have supported her over the years.

Miss Bissell sought nothing for herself. Her objective was a healthier America, for she knew, as so many of us do, the terrible toll that tuberculosis has taken and is continuing to take in American lives. Her own State of Delaware considers Emily Bissell as one of its most distinguished late citizens; and I, therefore, consider it an honor to be able to introduce this joint resolution. Irrespective of the policy which the committees of Congress, in considering proposed legislation of this type, saw fit to adopt during the Eighty-first Congress, I want to urge, in the strongest possible terms, that this joint resolution be given the most careful attention, for I am certain that because of the one principal objective it seeks to attain, it should have the unqualified support of all of us. It will implement the fight against tuberculosis in a manner which is urgently needed.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference the joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, together with a brief biographical sketch of Miss Emily P. Bissell, the founder of the Christmas seal, together with copies of letters which I have sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees in behalf of this joint resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the biographical sketch and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell and of her service to mankind through the founding and promotion of the Christmas seal, the sale of which has been a vital factor in the battle against tuberculosis.

The biographical sketch and letters presented by Mr. FREAR are as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Miss Emily P. Bissell was born in Wilmington, Del., May 31, 1861, and was a native of her State all of her life. Her grandfather, John Bissell, settled in Windsor, Conn. Her father, C. A. Bissell (1829–99), graduated from Yale in 1850. Her mother, Josephine Wales (1832–1919), was a daughter of John Wales who was born in New Haven, Conn., but later settled in Wilmington, Del. He was a United States Senator. Miss Bissell was educated in Delaware and New York. She attended Miss Charlier's private school in New York City.

Pioneer work always interested her. She started the West End Reading Room in 1889 and it had the first free kindergarten, the first children's playground in Delaware, the first better babies' demonstration, the first Boys' Brigade (forerunner of the Boy Scouts), and the first free gymnasium for boys. In 1917, it began the first Americanization work in Delaware in its Italian Neighborhood House.

Miss Bissell was instrumental in putting through the first child-labor law in Delaware, and served on the first child-labor commission. She was one of the organizers of the children's bureau, and served on its board until her death.

She was the first president of the Consumer's League and aided the passage of the first law limiting the hours of women in industry. At the request of the Hon. George Grey, she aided him in establishing the Delaware chapter of the American Red Cross in 1904 and was its secretary for many years.

She was a director of the associated charities for many years and was chairman of social service in the Federation of Women's Clubs for 8 years.

In connection with all these responsibilities came the raising of large amounts of money. The Christmas stamp of 1907 was not a momentary idea—it was the result of a great deal of practical experience in starting and carrying forward new experiments in Delaware applied to this government idea from Denmark. The Story of the American Christmas Seal, written by Miss Bissell herself, was published in booklet form in 1946 by the National Tuberculosis Association.

Miss Bissell's contribution to mankind has been acknowledged nationally and internationally. In December of 1936, she was honored in Wilmington, Del., at a Christmas seal birthday luncheon attended by 400 friends and health workers representing many sections of the country and several foreign countries. In December of 1937, the city of Wilmington, the State of Delaware, and two nations again paid honor to Miss Bissell when the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States unveiled a bronze tablet which was placed on the main building of the Brandywine Sanatorium, Marshallton, Del., with this legend: "This tablet commemorates the founding of the first Christmas seal in this country by Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, Del., December 1907. From small beginnings, the annual Christmas seal sale has financed the development of the organized fight against tuberculosis in every State, resulting in saving thousands of lives. Erected by the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States, December 1937."

In 1942, Miss Bissell was awarded the Trudeau Medal of the National Tuberculosis Association, the first nonprofessional worker to receive this award since it was inaugurated in 1925. The award is given annually to the individual who, in the judgment of the association, has made the most meritorious contribution to the cause, prevention, or treatment of tuberculosis.

In 1946 Miss Bissell was honored by the Delaware State Board of Health when the main building at Brandywine Sanatorium was dedicated in her honor, hereafter to be known as the Emily P. Bissell Building. Miss Bissell is the author of many poems, which have been collected in a volume entitled "Happiness and Other Verses."

Miss Bissell was president of the Delaware Anti-Tuberculosis Society from 1909 until her death.

She was an honorary member of the National Tuberculosis Association and in 1946 was again honored when her portrait appeared on each sheet of Christmas seals. Miss Bissell passed away on March 8, 1948.

JANUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLIN: I have just introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to authorize the

issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, the founder and promoter of the famed Christmas seal, whose sale and use have done so much to eradicate tuberculosis. Approval of this resolution will, I am sure, do much toward increasing the purchase of Christmas seals by the American people and, therefore, materially aid the National Tuberculosis Society and its various chapters in their great task of combating this dreaded disease.

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am aware of the policy which existed in the past Congress of dealing with legislation requesting commemorative stamps. However, in this case, because the objective of this resolution is so far more profound than the mere honoring of a personality or an organization, I strongly feel that its approval should be effected.

I will be most appreciative of your personal interest and support of the resolution.

Sincerely yours.

JANUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: I have just introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, the founder and promoter of the famed Christmas seal, whose sale and use have done so much to eradicate tuberculosis. Approval of this resolution will, I am sure, do much toward increasing the purchase of Christmas seals by the American people and, therefore, materially aid the National Tuberculosis Society and its various chapters in their great task of combating this dreaded disease.

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am aware of the policy which existed in the past Congress of dealing with legislation requesting commemorative stamps. However, in this case, because the objective of this resolution is so far more profound than the mere honoring of a personality or an organization, I strongly feel that its approval should be effected.

I will be most appreciative of your personal interest and support of the resolution.

Sincerely yours.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby established a committee to prepare the legislative budget (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee'), to be composed of five members of the Senate Committee on Finance and five members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and five members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and five members of the House Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and not more than three members of each of said committees shall be members of the majority party. A vacancy in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. At the beginning of each Congress the committee shall meet at the call of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and shall select its own chairman and vice chairman, except that the first meeting shall be called in , 195 . A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum and the powers conferred upon them by this section may be exercised by a majority vote.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare and report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives at the beginning of each regular session of Congress a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall be based upon the studies and investigations of the committee, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by the committee. In addition to setting the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year, including a reserve for deficiencies, the committee may also recommend that public revenues or the public debt be increased or decreased, as the case may be; and such recommendations shall be reported to Congress and referred to its appropriate committees by February 15. All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned with the expenditure of any funds required to meet the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews shall, when practicable, be included within the accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported. It shall be the responsibility of the committee to study such reports and report to the Congress as soon as possible thereafter the effect of that cost on the legislative budget.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and such clerical and other assistants and to fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. At least one-third of any staff so employed shall be nominated and appointed by, and assigned to assist the minority party.

"(d) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of the committee, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman."

REFERENCE TO COURT OF CLAIMS OF S. 334, FOR RELIEF OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN FINNISH SAILING VESSELS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 334) entitled "A bill for the relief of the owners of certain Finnish sailing vessels," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as claims, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

ATLANTIC UNION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him expressing his views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, proposing an Atlantic Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—RADIO DISCUSSION BETWEEN SENATOR ANDERSON AND SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion between Senator ANDERSON and Senator WHERRY on the state of the Union, broadcast on the American Forum of the Air January 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRIMACY OF POLITICS—ADDRESS BY JAMES K. POLLOCK

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the presidential address entitled "The Primacy of Politics," delivered to the American Political Science Association at its annual meeting in Washington, December 28, 1950, by Dr. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan, which appears in the Appendix.]

WELFARE OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS—ARTICLE BY MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bill Now on Hill May Strike at American Indians," written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and published in the Washington Daily News of December 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN AND THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Truman and the Constitution," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of today. It seems to me that in this article Mr. Lippmann makes a very distinct contribution to the discussion now taking place with respect to the authority of the President to send troops or armed forces anywhere in the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN AND THE CONSTITUTION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The argument about the President's right to send an army abroad is demonstrating once more that the great rule of the Constitution is common sense. The system of our Government is impossible if headstrong theorists take charge. The system is workable when the men who hold the offices mean to make it work by being themselves sensible and practical.

Thus one set of theorists is arguing that the President has the right to send armies abroad without the permission of Congress. Another set of theorists is arguing that Congress, which must pass laws to draft men and

to appropriate money, has a right to say whether there shall be any armies for the President to send abroad. Each of these theories leads to an absurdity: the ultra-Presidential theory to a Commander in Chief who might not have any army to command; the ultra-congressional theory to an army which was not under the orders of the Commander in Chief.

These absurdities disappear under the rule of common sense. Since the President needs the continuing support of this Congress and its successors in order to maintain large forces, the sensible thing for him to do is to convince the Congress that his policies are sound and then to commit the Congress to them. This, as I understand it, is the position of Senator TAFT and also of Senator GEORGE and of Senator DOUGLAS. They recognize that this is a question of policy, not of legal right, and that the practical and sensible, the expedient and the wise, thing for the President to do is to invite the Congress to participate in the decision.

His unwillingness to do that is hard to understand. The decision to place large American armies on the European Continent, to place them within striking distance of the greatest of all existing armies, is to accept an enormous risk. Those of us who believe that it is a correctly calculated risk and that we should take it ought to feel that the whole Nation has understood and accepted the reasons for the decision, and that with its eyes open the Nation has agreed to share the responsibility.

Why Mr. Truman should want to take the whole responsibility on himself, why he should reject rather than invite, indeed insist upon, sharing his awful responsibility with Congress, I cannot imagine. Last June, the day after he intervened in Korea, Senator TAFT offered to support a resolution approving his action. Was it wise to ignore this offer from the leader of the opposition? Is it really a good idea to wage wars and to leave the opposition party without formal responsibility for them?

It might be a good idea to do that, or at least it might be good clean fun to snub the opposition, if it were certain that all wars would end promptly, agreeably, and triumphantly. But for hard, bitter, and long wars it is downright folly to let the opposition escape the responsibility. Mr. Truman, if he possessed the faculty of seeing ahead and of seeing the consequences of his decisions, would be demanding that the Congress stand up and be counted.

Had the President done that, he would not now be confronted with the Coudert-Wherry effort to deprive him of his constitutional powers, or with the deeply destructive and demoralizing debate as to whether the Korean war is legal and whether the Eisenhower mission is constitutional. There was never any doubt that the overwhelming majority of the Congress would support the Korean intervention. Nor, had the matter been handled with common sense, would there have been any doubt that the Congress would support by a substantial majority the Eisenhower mission. Mr. Truman's troubles with Congress are self-induced. The whole question of his rights and powers would never have been raised, had he exercised his rights and powers with tact, with discretion, and with a broader understanding of what is involved.

Here, I think, he is getting bad advice from some of his supporters when they cite al the many instances where a President has committed our Armed Forces abroad without prior congressional consultation and approval. Are those who cite all these precedents meaning to say that because the President has often landed troops abroad and engaged in hostilities without going first to Congress for approval—that therefore he ought as a matter of principle never to go to Congress in matters of this sort?

As I read the history, the President has the right and the duty to act for the security of the United States, and need not consult Congress first if to do that would jeopardize the vital interests of the United States, and he may even break the law if in his judgment the highest interests of the United States require it. But at the earliest opportunity the President is accountable to the Congress for his action, and he must seek as soon as the national interest permits it the approval of the Congress for what he has done.

Applied to the Korean war, the President had a right to intervene without the prior approval of Congress, since he had a right to believe that there could be no delay if a great interest was not to be sacrificed. But when the next day Senator TAFT offered to support a resolution approving the President's intervention, Mr. President would have served the Constitution, his policy, and himself had he snapped up Senator TAFT's offer.

Applied to the troop commitment in Germany, it is necessary to remember that there is plenty of time to consult Congress and to obtain an affirmative vote of approval. All the precedents which arise from emergencies that the President had to meet are irrelevant here. So, also, are all the cases where the whole military action by the President was concluded with the forces already in existence and already under his command. The army that is to go to Germany is not yet in existence, and when it is in existence it will require continuing action by the Congress to maintain it.

Is there any historical precedent, which in these essential respects, is at all analogous? I believe not.

We are, in fact, planning to do something which we have never done before. We are planning to station more or less permanently abroad a large American Army. This is not an army of professional soldiers. It is a citizen army that we plan permanently to station abroad. This is a wholly different operation, different in kind and not merely in degree, from sending naval forces abroad, or landing some marines, or maintaining armies of occupation at the end of a war.

This is a new and radical departure in the high policies of the United States, involving great costs, great risks, far-reaching responsibilities, and consequences that are not clearly predictable. I myself have long favored this new and radical policy. But I can think of no surer way to add to its difficulties and dangers than to make it Mr. Truman's personal policy, to exclude the Congress from all personal responsibility for it, and to enter upon it with the Nation uninformed, unconsulted, and divided.

WAIVING OF GOVERNMENT CHECKS BY A DISABLED VETERAN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a news dispatch which appeared in the January 13 issue of the New York Times. It is very brief. Permit me to read it:

VETERAN WAIVES CHECKS—SAYS UNITED STATES GAVE ENOUGH

SUFFOLK, VA., January 12.—A disabled veteran who was a ditch digger before the war and whom the Government assisted in learning to be a butcher says he doesn't want any more disability checks from the Government. He has even returned two checks totaling $126.40.

"Now I feel like the Government has done enough for me, especially with so many fellows coming back from Korea all shot up," he says, explaining that for 3 years he got $12 to $15 a month disability payments and more than $100 a month for on-the-job training.

The veteran didn't want his name used. He said he was afraid people would think he was "grandstanding."

"There are enough of us sucking the country dry, and it's time we stopped sucking and started giving," he said.

Mr. President, the action of this disabled veteran must make all of us proud—proud of this good citizen and proud of the American spirit which moved him to act as he did.

This man does not stand alone. There are millions like him in this land. There are many Americans in humble places and in high places who are eager to demonstrate their readiness for sacrifice to help their country.

I hope all of us will take to heart the homely and straightforward statement of this veteran: "It's time we stopped sucking and starting giving."

Let us be worthy of the sacrifices made for America and the cause of world freedom in Korea. Here in the Senate we represent the heroic people of a free nation. We must give the kind of unselfish leadership they expect of us.

Let us push all thoughts of personal or partisan advantages away from us when we come to make our great decisions. If we do so, we shall be true to the best traditions of American leaders in times of crisis.

SEDIMENTATION AT HYDRO RESERVOIRS—ARTICLE BY ELMER K. NELSON

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Mr. Elmer K. Nelson, entitled, "Sedimentation at Hydro Reservoirs." The article appeared in the magazine Public Utilities Fortnightly.

Mr. Nelson is the staff engineer of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has been a valued member of that committee's staff for nearly 4 years. The article is a very careful and practical discussion of the problem of controlling sedimentation behind the hydroelectric dams we are building, and I believe it should be made available to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEDIMENTATION AT HYDRO RESERVOIRS

(Hydroelectric dams and other dam structures are of such a lasting nature that they may even defy depreciation estimates. But the usefulness of such structures may be permanently impaired over the long range due to the silting up of reservoirs behind such dams. How rapidly are these dams becoming silted? Will their usefulness eventually approach comparison with the pyramids? This article, by the staff engineer of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, discusses the over-all problem of sedimentation from the standpoint of reservoir construction and erosion control.)

(By Elmer K. Nelson)

In recent years there has been considerable discussion about the problem of silt accumulating in the reservoirs behind our major dams. Questions have been raised as to how long these structures will continue to function before their usefulness may be impaired by silt deposits. In the case of hydroelectric dams the power production capacity of the installation is a matter of obvious concern along this line. How would

the demand for power, which has been stimulated by the initial large-capacity output of the plant, be accommodated in the event the hydro potential eventually deteriorated? Would steam plants be required for replacement? How practical is the process of desilting? Officials of the Department of the Interior, its various bureaus, Army engineer spokesmen, have tried to allay such fears. They also have been investigating the actual degree of silting or sedimentation at certain of the major dams. Soil Conservation Service and Forestry Service agents of the Department of Agriculture and members of the Federal Power Commission's river basin survey group have looked into this rather basic problem, posed by nature, affecting the useful life of these expensive structures.

One notable example of such investigations has been that conducted in Lake Mead. The United States Navy and the United States Geological Survey have been looking into the murky waters impounded by Hoover Dam. The Secretary of Interior, as a result of this survey, has been able to announce that the dam has a life expectancy of another 275 years. Everyone knows, Secretary Chapman pointed out, that any dam will eventually fill up with silt and debris deposited by the slowing down of the waters. The answer to how soon this would happen determines the economic feasibility of any such project.

For long-life expectation, Arrowrock Reservoir, on the Boise River, stands first in the geographical group. In its 32 years of operation, silt has taken only 2.76 percent of its capacity. The slow rate, which indicates that it will serve more than 1,100 years before filling, is explained by the low erosion rate on the heavily wooded slopes through which the river drains. Poorest of the silting prospects is that of Guernsey Reservoir, which catches the North Platte River in Wyoming. In 20 years it has lost one-third of its capacity.

The Department of Interior estimates that even such a high sedimentation rate will leave it a useful life beyond its estimated payout time of 40 years. But for corrective purposes the Department apparently anticipated construction of another reservoir upstream, to reduce the rate to less than 1 percent a year.

Before considering the pertinent factors concerning the actual siltation picture in the United States, some basic definitions may assist the reader to grasp the over-all impact of the siltation problem.

First of all, what is silt or sedimentation? Sedimentation, for the purpose of this discussion, is the disposal of the products of erosion from the land surfaces of the earth. Exposed rocks of all kinds are continually subjected to the influences of temperature, wind, and water, which is to say they are affected by the weather. The principal interest in the disintegration of rocks, and in the erosion of land areas, is in the movement of the loosened particles, particularly by wind and water.

In the United States relatively little sediment is believed to be moved by winds. In the more arid portions of the West aeolian (wind-borne) sedimentation is, however, taking place. In the past, vast areas on the earth were blanketed by loess, a kind of soil, which is chiefly composed of aeolian deposits. But as of the present time, from year to year, the average annual wind-blown deposits are not noticeably large. If they were multiplied by, say, 10,000,000 years the results become important. Most of the destructive erosion in the Yellow River Basin in China, for example, occurs upon aeolian deposits, which, by their nature, are poorly cemented and are readily dissolved by rain or flood waters. (This kind of soil is to be distinguished, therefore, from clay or other well-bound soils which resist surface runoff much better.) It has been estimated that the earth loads moved from west to east, in this Chinese river basin, probably exceed 1,000,000 acre-feet annually. This large amount of soil shift is by wind and water. Geologists think that such shifts of masses are chiefly responsible for the earthquakes occurring in that section of the world.

Sedimentation in North America

(Maxima of marine deposits)

(Columns 2, 3, and 4 are concerned with actual mud, sand, and minute skeletal remains of marine animals which have been deposited and solidified over the years)

Periods	Totals (feet)	Shale	Sandstone	Limestone	Geosynclines and regions
Cambrian:					
Lower	10,200	2,350	6,100	1,750	Inyo County, California.
Middle	6,200	850	400	4,950	Cordilleran, Alberta.
Upper	11,725	6,825	----------	4,900	Do.
Ozarkian	5,700	----------	----------	5,700	Appalachian, Alabama.
Ordovician:					
Lower	4,800	300	----------	4,500	Appalachian Pennsylvania.
Middle	12,200	7,100	4,100	1,000	Appalachian, Newfoundland.
Upper	6,050	2,140	3,910	----------	Appalachian, Pennsylvania.
Silurian	6,385	2,286	2,104	1,995	Fort Daniel, Quebec.
Devonian	12,745	8,015	4,135	595	Appalachian, Pennsylvania.
Mississippian	5,800	----------	200	5,600	Cordilleran, Utah.
Pennsylvanian Early	2,200	1,500	600	100	Appalachian, Alabama.
All Pennsylvanian	18,000	500	8,500	9,000	Cordilleran, Utah.
Permian	9,000	1,800	----------	7,200	Glass Mountains, Texas.
Total Paleozoic [1]	111,005	33,666	30,049	47,290	
Triassic	7,700	2,750	450	4,500	Pacific, California.
Jurassic	14,700	9,425	4,715	560	Pacific, Cook Inlet, Alaska.
Lower Cretaceous	26,000	15,600	10,400	----------	Pacific, Northern California.
Upper Cretaceous	38,200	20,700	17,500	----------	Cordilleran, Wyoming.
Total Mesozoic [1]	86,600	48,475	33,065	5,060	
Eocene	14,000	8,400	5,600	----------	Pacific, California.
Oligocene	15,000	6,000	9,000	----------	Do.
Miocene	20,800	12,480	8,320	----------	Pacific, Southern California.
Pliocene	10,000	6,000	4,000	----------	Do.
Pleistocene	1,600	640	960	----------	Do.
Total Cenozoic [1]	61,400	33,520	27,880	----------	
Final grand total	259,005	115,661	90,994	----------	About 50 miles of deposits.

[1] Paleozoic: An era characterized by the culmination of nearly all classes of invertebrates except insects. In its latter epochs land plants, amphibians, and reptiles first appeared. Mesozoic: The era was the age of dinosaurs, of marine and flying reptiles, of ganoid fishes, and of cycads and evergreen trees. Cenozoic: An era marked by a rapid evolution of the mammals and birds, of grasses, shrubs, and higher flowering plants, and by but little change in the invertebrates.

The concern of planners of public works, particularly for multipurpose projects in the West, is the effect of stream-borne sediments upon the economic feasibility of the works. Engineers, both publicly and privately employed, have recognized the many technical problems inherent in studies of the origin and disposal, of the chemical and physical natures, and of the behavior of sediments transported, and soluble minerals contained in surface waters. Fortunately there is now general support of continued comprehensive studies in this complex field.

The most common question is, When will a given reservoir be filled with silt? The engineer seldom has been able to answer this apparently simple question with a direct answer for the good reason that the answer is not simple. It is, in fact, so complicated that predictions on it are but "educated" guesses. Final answers can come only when some storage units actually fill and the sediment is permitted to consolidate. Stream-borne sediments are composed of materials varying from colloidal clay, a gelatinous substance, to large boulders. The load capacity of a stream depends upon the velocity of flow. The velocity is dependent upon the hydraulic gradient (the influence of gravity), and upon the characteristics of the channel. These factors are not constant in any reach of a natural stream, because their beds are constantly changing. Where a stream enters a channel reservoir, especially one of changing water surface elevations, other variable factors also enter.

When mountain streams emerge upon plains the gradients flatten out. The first deltas appear as small piles of debris consisting of the coarser materials. These tend to spread the flows into distributaries. These, in turn, result in further reduction in velocity, and the water-borne sediments are deposited with the currents traveling the farthest distances. Deltas are built over long periods of time, the streams playing over them as old channels fill and the new ones are cut by water, which dropped portions of their burden. In this way the water flow gains ability to shift older deposits to other portions of the deltas. Uncontrolled streams which flow from side to side over their deltas continually tend to alter their character and to increase the areas.

Along the flood plains of the larger streams, there are continuous changes due to much the same causes as affect delta building. The alluvial flood plains gradually build up, but channels also fill as the bed load deepens. Under certain flood flow conditions beds of streams have been moved up into bodily suspension (flowing mud) and carried onto the adjacent flood plains. Large areas of older alluvial deposits forming the flood plains may be moved to new positions downstream. In short, valleys of major streams are unstable, all alluvial sediments tending to move toward the seas or toward the bottoms of inland basins as each flood crest passes.

It has been noted that the channel and the flood plain of a large stream rise gradually. Although there are downstream movements of bed loads and the materials of the flood plains, the inflow of silt from tributary areas is generally greater than the volume actually moving down the valley.

It is for these reasons that it is risky to encroach upon the flood plain of a major river.

So much by way of brief preview of the over-all sedimentation picture, as the present geologic age experiences that process. The origins of the water-borne materials, presently of concern to planning in the United States, are the sedimentary deposits of both recent and ancient times. Sedimentation is a grand natural phenomenon. Since the beginning of the Paleozoic era,

500,000,000 years ago, there has been measured on the North American continent some 50 miles of sedimentary deposits. The extent and occurrence of erosion from land surfaces, as reflected in sediments of known age, are summarized in the table on page 795, beginning with the oldest.

The principal rivers of this country are often the greatest hazards to life and property. They are subject to flood flows now known to be unpredictable because the history of precipitation and runoff is too brief. Protection of municipal and agricultural developments on the flood plains by reservoir regulation, by channel confinement within levees, and bypasses, has given engineers much valuable data.

Through some leveed river reaches suspended materials have been discharged without channel aggradation for several decades. Engineers know that conditions are so variable that this cannot be accomplished in all cases. It is reported that silty flows of the Nile River, at the Aswan Dam, are passed through, and only the clear flows which follow are retained in storage, thereby preserving the storage capacity of the reservoir. Most streams do not have such flow characteristics. About 15 years ago an eminent American engineer, J. C. Stevens, wrote:

"Man cannot hope to halt the processes of mountain erosion and plain building. The land he cultivates could not exist except for these forces. He must expect that rains will gully his fields, or cover them with mountain debris, and that streams will continue to carry sediments that will fill the canals and reservoirs."

The writer spent his early boyhood on the western plains, where the normal annual precipitation is about 15 inches. He experienced dust storms of great violence and duration. And this was before the advent of trough plowing and other practices which are popularly held unduly responsible for latter-day erosion. At that time there was no overgrazing of the prairies. Only a fraction of a percent of the lands were farmed and only natural conditions were obtained respecting the land areas. The dust bowl then was not manmade. A noted geologist once said that a 10-percent reduction in average wetness and similar increase in wind would bring about erosion in the arid West at a rate which would make much of the area uninhabitable. If severe drought periods were followed immediately by sustained seasons of heavy precipitation erosion and removal of windblown materials by surface waters would be relatively rapid. The optimum condition is doubtless an average weather, without extremes of wind and precipitation, where native vegetation can flourish in desert and semiarid regions.

The origins of water-borne sediments are chiefly, as above indicated, large areas of poorly cemented geological formations of both recent and ancient ages. In some basins where most of the land area has been used for agricultural purposes for a few decades the erosion problem is being studied in the light of land-use operations. There is little disagreement on the desirability of improvement in soil-conservation and erosion-control practices, when real feasibility is demonstrated. The determination of feasibility should be based upon all of the benefits and not solely upon one or two.

Stream	Station	Drainage area (square miles)	Annual sediment load (acre-feet)	
			Total	Per square mile
Potomac	Washington, D. C	11,560	3,650	0.31
Ohio	Paducah, Ky	203,000	38,570	.19
Wisconsin	Prairie du Sac, Wis	8,900	420	.05
Des Moines	Tracy, Iowa	12,400	10,320	.83
Canadian	Calvin, Okla	28,700	49,060	1.71
Willamette	Salem, Oreg	7,280	484	.07
Tuolumne	Don Pedro Dam, Calif	996	198	.20
Missouri	Fort Peck Dam, Mont	57,800	2,200	.04
Yellowstone	Sidney, Mont	69,450	31,870	.46
Missouri	Williston, N. Dak	164,500	44,600	.27
Do	Kansas City, Mo	484,200	86,000	.18
Mississippi	Near mouth, Louisiana	1,234,700	393,540	.32
Arkansas	John Martin Dam, Colo	18,933	4,284	.23
Boise	Arrowrock Dam, Idaho	2,170	239	.11
Colorado	Lees Ferry, Ariz	107,900	117,800	1.09
Do	Grand Canyon, Ariz	137,800	148,600	1.08
Do	Lake Mead	167,800	105,500	
Tributaries of Colorado River:				
Little Colorado	Coconino Dam, Ariz	24,120	25,800	1.07
San Juan	Bluff, Utah	23,000	27,600	1.20
Green	Green River, Utah	40,600	15,450	.38
Colorado	Cisco, Utah (above mouth of Green River).	24,100	12,050	.50
Gunnison	Bridgeport Reservoir, Colo	8,020	2,640	.33
Rio Grande	Elephant Butte Reservoir	25,923	14,250	.55
Tributaries of Rio Grande:				
Rio Jemez	New Mexico	1,009	2,780	2.76
Rio Chama	do	3,200	5,950	1.86
Rio Puerco	do	5,860	11,720	2.00
Rio Salado	do	1,434	2,765	1.93
Big Horn	Kane, Wyo	15,900	9,050	.57
Powder River	Moorhead Reservoir, Wyo	8,080	8,250	1.02
Grand	Shadehill Reservoir, S. Dak	3,070	276	.09
North Platte	Guernsey Reservoir, Wyo	5,400	1,240	.23
South Platte	Littleton, Colo	1,324	133	.22

The slogan, "Save the priceless heritage of our top soil," does not always express the sole reason for unlimited expenditures for soil conservation. Many agricultural soils are formed from the existing clays, shales, and sands of the formations at hand, and, for the most part, they are formed, in this country, more rapidly than their removal by erosion. The effects of the eroded materials upon the streams carrying these loads, and upon storage and other flow-control structures, are always detrimental. The maintenance of the functions of these structures is sometimes of more concern than the loss of the soil because of ultimate damage downstream in a basin. Viewed in this perspective, soil conserved, and thus withheld from streams, may have a value of many times its single-purpose value on a farm.

Studies by the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, are now progressing to the point where definite proposals for retarding erosion soon can be presented. The most forward-looking step to date was the creation within the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee of a subcommittee on sedimentation in 1946. Its present chairman is Carl B. Brown, of the Soil Conservation Service.

The first technical meeting of national scope on sedimentation problems was held in Denver, Colo., in May 1948, under the sponsorship of this subcommittee. In his opening address Chairman Brown said that the harmful effects of sedimentation may be divided into five major categories, as follows:

1. Sediment concentration in water may be harmful even though the stream is fully competent to carry all of its load without deposition. High turbidity may destroy the value of the stream for fish and wildlife. It makes the stream or lake undesirable for swimming. Coarse sediment in transportation may damage power turbines. Fine sediment must be filtered at considerable cost before the water is acceptable for public, domestic, and industrial uses.

2. Sedimentation in improved channels, floodways, ditches, and canals used for navigation, drainage, irrigation, and flood control must be prevented or the sediment removed if these improvements are to function effectively.

3. Sedimentation in reservoirs causes loss of storage capacity, which depreciates the value of the storage development and causes other losses, such as increased evaporation, decreased recreational opportunities, and impaired esthetic values.

4. Deposition on land, improvements, and habitats, mainly during flood flows, causes severe damages in many areas to agricultural land, to urban areas, to transportation facilities, and to native wildlife.

5. In addition to these direct damages, aggradation of stream channels and natural or artificial floodways has the effect of increasing flood stage for any given discharge. Consequently, the area inundated and the extent of floodwater damages may be increasing as a result of sedimentation, although the volume and rate of runoff remain substantially the same. As floods affect all classes of enterprise and resources, this is an all-inclusive form of damage.

Thomas Maddock, Jr., of the Branch of Project Planning, Bureau of Reclamation, in discussing reservoir problems, noted that reservoirs do not silt up from the bottom altogether, but that sediments may settle in the upper or flood-space portions in greater amounts than in the dead-storage space. He also directed attention to the need for continuous reservoir surveys for determining the changes in reservoir operation schedules necessitated by reductions in capacity of the spaces set aside for the various purposes for which the reservoirs were authorized.

Mr. Maddock concluded with this statement:

"What I would like to point out, in closing, is that reduction in acreage of irrigated areas will have to take place before the last reservoir site is utilized. We can expect full development of our western streams before our present reservoirs are filled with sediment. Water will not be available to provide for the excessive losses that will take place in these reservoirs in later periods of their life, and, for evaporation from newly constructed reservoirs. We therefore must, to the extent possible, preserve what we now have."

Gail A. Hathaway, special assistant, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in his comprehensive statement on sedimentation problems related to floodways, channels, and harbors, summarized the more important problems as follows:

"Sedimentation problems are encountered in the development and use of alluvial rivers from the headwaters to the mouth, extending generally to the river deltas or outer bars

of coastal harbors. The most important of these problems usually relate to:

"(a) Obstruction of floodways and navigation channels by deposition of sediment.

"(b) Major changes in channel alinement resulting from deposition and scour in unstabilized channels.

"(c) Blocking of outlets of sewers, water intakes, and drainage canals by sediment.

"(d) Destruction of river improvements, bridges, and similar works as the result of scour and bed movements.

"(e) Readjustment of hydraulic conditions below newly constructed reservoirs, resulting from retrogression, deterioration of channel efficiencies caused by storage or diversion of normal flows and intermittent releases, changes in channel alinement, and similar factors."

The proceedings of this meeting were published by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Suspended sediments in streams are measured by sampling the moving fluid and determining what portion of the flow, by weight, these sediments represent. When the suspended particles first settle out, space they occupy as a sedimentary deposit is quite different in water than on land where dehydration and condensation take place. The sediment in some reservoirs has been found to weigh about 45 pounds per cubic foot. The same sediment consolidated on a river delta may weigh nearly 90 pounds per cubic foot.

It may well be then that it would be possible to drain a rapidly silted reservoir, dry the sediment, and thereby recapture about 50 percent of its original capacity.

The ultimate weight of sediments in reservoirs is only an estimate at best. Recent investigations show that the 1935-49 annual average sediment deposition in Lake Mead occupies 105,500 acre-feet, while the estimated silt in the flows passing the Grand Canyon station average about 150,000 acre-feet annually, assuming a dry sediment weight of 70 pounds per cubic foot. There is additional drainage area between the Grand Canyon station and Hoover Dam of 30,000 square miles which produces considerable sediment. Allowing for some silt discharge, there is still a considerable discrepancy, unless these values are used with proper understanding of the periods of record. Most engineers now believe the life of Lake Mead, as a storage and power project under present river storage conditions, will exceed 300 years. Additional upstream reservoirs and erosion control could increase this to 1,000 years. Long before 300 years have passed erosion will be abated to a considerable degree for the logical reason that the storage is worth too much to ignore the causes of its reduction.

It has been estimated that presently observed erosion in the arid West results in suspended sediments in streams that are derived in approximately equal amounts from (1) channel changes in the flood plains of main streams, (2) gullying on the smaller tributaries, and (3) sheet erosion of tablelands. When these quantities become more exactly allocable the costs of alleviative measures may be accurately evaluated, and true benefit-cost ratios calculated. Urgency in these problems is recognized even if a permanent solution is not likely. It is a matter of economics. Not only does storage cost tremendously but reservoir sites are limited.

Data supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers on transported sediments are not to be assumed as final. Rather, they are approximations under existing conditions of erosion opportunity. The calculated quantities are based on weights which are, on an assumed value of the weight of a unit volume, in turn, reduced to volumes. It is not claimed that the measurements of weights of suspended and moving sediments are absolute, nor that unit volumes, as calculated, represent the volumes under all conditions of age and cover. The values shown are therefore usable only by those competent to understand the chemistry and physics of soils, the several subdivisions of hydraulics, and the pertinent elements of physical geology. These subjects are highly specialized and expanding. They involve research and applied science. It may be correctly concluded that sufficient funds must be made available to carry on adequately the investigations prerequisite to proper planning by the cooperating agencies.

With the qualifications suggested the data presented in table on page 799 are submitted for key gaging stations on some principal streams, the sources being noted above.

The foregoing data as heretofore noted, are not necessarily comparable for all points on a stream or in a common basin. They represent, rather, the bare preliminary data now available, and are therefore subject to revision. The stations in the Missouri Basin indicate that the silt burden below the mouth of the Yellowstone River comes chiefly from the Yellowstone. In the Missouri River Basin the deposition of silt under present conditions is not a problem, most of it being carried to the Mississippi. But the construcure of reservoirs for irrigation, flood control, and power purposes above Sioux City, Iowa, must give consideration to their ultimate filling with stream-borne sediments now totaling at least 50,000 acre-feet annually. Consideration, in particular, involves the design as well as the operation and maintenance of the reservoir system.

The capacity of Fort Peck Reservoir and other storage reservoirs of the ultimate total built and to be built above is in the Missouri Basin, and will probably exceed 30,000,000 acre-feet. In the Yellowstone Basin the ultimate total will probably exceed 2,000,000 acre-feet, and this storage will be affected by siltation. Downstream from Fort Peck Dam main-stem reservoirs will ultimately have a combined capacity of 40,000,000 to 45,000,000 acre-feet. These multipurpose reservoirs have control of all residual flows from a large drainage area subject to relatively heavy erosion, and here the treatment of the area is not complicated by a highly unfavorable ratio of canyon exposures.

In the upper Colorado Basin, above the mouth of the Little Colorado River, a study is being made of a storage system which, as to main stream locations on the Colorado, the Green, and the San Juan Rivers, will ultimately aggregate about 48,000,000 acre-feet. These units, some to a greater degree, will all be affected by sedimentation. It is conceded that erosion in much of the drainage area above Hoover Dam will be difficult to control, and that here is a complex problem of first magnitude.

The sedimentation of reservoirs in the Colorado and the Missouri Basins, as noted heretofore, is a factor in design, but the sources of these sediments and their nature are also matters of concern.

When additional silt-sampling stations are operated it will be possible to isolate the portions of the drainage areas which produce the most sediment per unit area. The critical areas may then be surveyed in detail and the sources of the sediment discovered. As was pointed out heretofore, over-all sedimentation statistics only show whether erosion is of importance in a particular watershed. The data submitted, for example, can be arranged to show that a portion of southeastern Utah, in the Colorado River Basin, contributes three times the average silt per unit area produced by the whole basin above Lake Mead. Sampling at stream-flow stations must be supplemented by sufficient precipitation measurements to enable scientists to analyze storm routes and the intensity as well as the quantity of rain, snowfall, and snow melt.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY ON THE FIVE-POINT CEASE-FIRE FORMULA FOR KOREA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read into the body of the RECORD a brief statement I released on Sunday, January 14, after I had noted in the press the United Nations action in approving the five-point cease-fire formula for Korea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The statement which I have obtained unanimous consent to read is as follows:

I am greatly disturbed by the unbelievable news today that the United States has agreed to a five-point cease-fire formula for Korea, which, among other things, provides:

"Immediately following agreement on a cease fire, the creation of a body by the General Assembly to achieve a settlement—conforming to the UN Charter and existing international obligations—of far-eastern problems, including Formosa and a UN seat for Communist China. On this body would be representatives of the United States, Britain, Russia, and Communist China."

This seems to mean, bluntly, that the UN has sacrificed moral principle for expediency.

How the UN can deal with the defiant aggressor and negotiate the possible rewards of aggression is beyond my comprehension.

What the members of the UN should do as a minimum at this moment is:

1. Declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors in Korea.

2. Withdraw the recognition of the Chinese Communists Peiping government by those governments which have hitherto recognized Peiping.

3. Serve notice immediately that the Chinese Communist troops must be withdrawn from Korea under penalty of (a) immediate bombing of those targets in North Korea and Manchuria such as airfields, depots, ammunition dumps, and supply lines that UN military commanders deem of strategic value to the Communists; (b) the imposition of economic sanctions on the Chinese Communists under article 41 of the UN Charter, cutting off all shipments by member countries to Chinese Communist territory, and (c) the full support of all anti-Communist movements in China and other far eastern countries.

In the event of the unwillingness of the other UN nations to support such a program of uncompromising opposition to this flagrant and defiant Korean aggression the United States may be compelled to reexamine its whole relationship to the UN. This is not any denial of our support of collective security and the principles of the UN Charter.

It is an affirmation that even a temporary defeat with honor is to be preferred to an appeasement for the sake of a temporary expediency based on fear. Moral principles can never be surrendered to physical force.

We are facing the issue of the very survival of the United Nations.

I also ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks there be inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, January 15, on the same subject and which was entitled "The Moral Issue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL ISSUE

On December 1, 1950, President Truman sent a message to Congress describing the

crisis produced by Communist China's intervention in Korea. In this message he said: "The moral issue now is the same as it was in June. The aggression of the Chinese Communists is a direct assault upon the United Nations, and upon the principles of international law and order which are its foundation. By their action the Chinese Communist leaders have proved themselves lawbreakers in the community of nations."

Can these words be reconciled with the American acceptance of the five-point cease-fire proposal which the Assembly's Political Committee has sent to Peiping? On the principle that no cease-fire can be bad they can be reconciled. But the details of this action, fully considered, include much that must be a cause of regret and apprehension to all friends of the United Nations—that is, to all friends of peace, security, and freedom.

The five-point proposal contains not a single syllable remotely suggesting any wrongdoing on the part of Red China. It contains not one word indicating that we or our friends are even mildly displeased with the government whose troops are at this moment trying to annihilate United Nations soldiers in Korea. The military defeat, the lost battle, could not be prevented. The courage of the wounded and the dead, the valiant efforts of the living have not been enough. But we do not have to accept a moral defeat. We do not have to submit—we cannot safely submit—to what General Romulo, in his impassioned speech on Saturday, described as intimidation and blackmail.

At this moment the important point for us in the five-point proposal is point one, which calls for a cease-fire. This means, if it means anything, that there can be no peace talks with Communist China until a cease-fire is in operation—that is until Communist China has ceased her aggression in Korea, or has at least desisted in her attempts to extend the area of aggression.

But what General Romulo was thinking of was point five, in which we would agree to sit with Britain, Russia, and Communist China on a committee to discuss far-eastern problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations. When President Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet into the Straits of Formosa on June 27, 1950, he laid down the stipulation that the determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan or consideration by the United Nations. Thus, on the record, we can consistently take up this question. But it ought to be clearly understood that we will not accept as good and righteous the forcible reconquest of the island by the Peiping regime, and that we will not vote for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations until she has given convincing evidence that she has abandoned her policies of direct and indirect aggression, in Korea and elsewhere. And for such evidence we may have to wait a long time.

We want no war, limited or otherwise, with China. Every humane instinct cries out against such a war, every sentiment of prudence demands that it be avoided. But let us have a care that we do not apply to great and powerful nations a different moral yardstick from the one we use in judging small and weak nations. We cannot prevent all wrongdoing in this unhappy world, but we need not condone it, we need not call it peace. Let us do all we can to bring about a real and lasting peace. Let us meanwhile avoid commitments we cannot fulfill. But let us not sell our souls. Let us not stand silent at Lake Success if Communist China presumes to attempt to dictate a conqueror's peace to a beaten United Nations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have taken up with the majority leader and with the minority leader the question of acting on one of the nominations on the Executive Calendar; and at this time, as the representative at the moment of the Armed Services Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., of Florida, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator. I make this request, sir, because it is very important that the Senate take action on this nomination as promptly as possible.

This nomination has the unanimous favorable report of the Committee on Armed Services.

A subcommittee, consisting of the chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] considered the testimony submitted on the nomination of Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., to be the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, by representatives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and also heard testimony by Governor Caldwell. After hearing that testimony, the subcommittee unanimously reported to the full committee that the nomination should be confirmed, and the full committee has so decided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., of Florida, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of Leroy D. Stinebower to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, together with other messages from the President submitting nominations which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA TO BE HONORARY DEPUTY SHERIFF OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, NEBR.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this body is called the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is a unique, a distinct, and a great honor to be a Member of the United States Senate. We all affirm that in our hearts. But there are some honors that may transcend even the honor of being a Member of the United States Senate—the office of delegate at large to some great convention, Ambassador Extraordinary, Minister Plenipotentiary to some foreign nation, the heads of the great bureaus of control, positions in the Army and Navy, but I think an opportunity will be lost and we shall miss a trick in the Senate this morning if I do not, as a humble Member of this body, rise to call the attention of the Senate of the United States and of the people throughout the country to a very signal honor which has come to one of our Members. I shall take pleasure in doing so if the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska, sitting to my right, will rise.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska rose.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on the honest, manly bosom of the Senator from Nebraska is a gold star, the meaning of which is that he was appointed to the high and signal position of honorary deputy sheriff of Douglas County, Nebr. He is the envy of all the other 95 Senators. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his expression.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska expects to discuss his resolution, Senate Resolution 8, and I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 8 be made the unfinished business, and that it be—

Ordered, That on the calendar day of January 23, 1951, at the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment, motion, or appeal that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the resolution (S. Res. 8, submitted by Mr. WHERRY on January 8, 1951), and upon the question of agreeing to the resolution itself: *Provided*, (1) That after the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., debate upon any amendment or motion, including appeals, and upon the resolution itself, shall be limited, not to exceed 20 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled respectively by the mover of such amendment or motion and the chairman of the Committee on For-

eign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane or with reference to the subject matter of the said resolution shall be received; and (3) that no vote on any amendment or motion, including appeal, proposed to the said resolution, shall be had prior to the said hour of 3 p. m. on said day.

Ordered further, That on the said day of the 23d of January 1951, the time between 12 o'clock noon and the said hour of 3 o'clock p. m., shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the said resolution, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether the unanimous-consent request would include a substitute. I heard the word "amendment" read, but does it also include a substitute resolution of the same purport?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would include a substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A substitute is an amendment, so a substitute would be included, in any event.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether it is necessary that we first have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. We have just had a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum call is not required under the rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand this is a unanimous-consent request that is being made by the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would it inconvenience the Senator from Arizona if the matter were allowed to be held in abeyance for a little while, in order that we may examine it? I have no desire to delay it, but I desire to know what is in it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a proposed agreement regarding a simple resolution, and I hope the Senate will accept it. I submit a copy of the proposed agreement to the Senator from Nevada for his perusal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When Senators have concluded their conversation, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, in my own right——

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. As I understand, the resolution simply provides that at 3 o'clock on next Tuesday the resolution referred to will be taken up. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. I have asked that it be made the unfinished business, and that it be voted upon next Tuesday, together with any motion, and so forth. Of course, as the Senator knows, we have discussed the possibility of the resolution being referred to an appropriate committee, and such a motion will be made.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. That will be voted on first.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do I correctly understand that it is proposed to make the resolution the unfinished business at this time?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why is that?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it must be made the unfinished business before we can enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on it. There is at the moment no business before the Senate, anyway.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that, but I am not aware of any such rule as the Senator suggests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion can be made at any time. The Senator from Arizona is in order. The motion can be made on the resolution, as the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, whose advice is strongly persuasive with the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not disagreeing.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished minority leader wanted it to be made the unfinished business, and I could see no objection to it. I am merely endeavoring to obtain the agreement, in order that we may vote on the resolution next Tuesday, accommodating as many Senators as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the proposed unanimous-consent agreement provide for debate on the resolution? The Senator said something about the time from 12 o'clock until 3.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. On next Tuesday it is proposed that the time be divided equally between the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but before that time there will be plenty of time for debate. Every Senator who desires to do so will have an opportunity to speak on it this week, or, if he does not, he may speak on something else. I expect that the Senate will be in session so that that may be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I am concerned about is that the reference to a vote at 3 o'clock Tuesday does not mean an agreement to vote on the resolution, but simply provides that any motions, amendments, substitutes, and all that, shall be first considered, after which the vote will come on the resolution. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. Of course, the votes on motions and amendments would necessarily come first.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then following their disposition, the vote would come on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that a motion to commit takes precedence over amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. May I make one observation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. What the Senator from Texas has suggested be done would be in accordance with the required parliamentary procedure in connection with this matter anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There would first be a vote on an amendment, then a vote on a motion, and finally, after all such matters were out of the way, there would be a vote on the resolution. Am I not correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct, in the opinion of the Chair. It depends on whether a motion to refer is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the resolution has never been referred to a committee, as I understand, so a motion to refer would be in order also.

Mr. WHERRY. Any motion would be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to refer would be in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. This resolution is in the negative. If a substitute were offered which was in the affirmative, would it be considered as an amendment to the resolution in the negative? It seems to me the word "substitute" should be added in order to make it absolutely certain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A substitute is always considered as an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the resolution is not in the negative. I do not care whether he offers one in the affirmative, in the negative, or halfway between, I shall be glad to include it in the unanimous-consent request so that it may be subject to a vote of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 23, 1951, at the hour of 3 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to Senate Resolution 8, submitted by Mr. WHERRY on January 8, 1951, as follows:

"*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress."

And upon the question of agreeing to the resolution itself: *Provided,* (1) That after said hour of 3 p. m., debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) and

upon the resolution itself shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Mr. CONNALLY); (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane or relevant to the subject matter of the said resolution shall be received; and (3) that no vote on any amendment or motion (including appeals) proposed to the said resolution shall be had prior to the said hour of 3 p. m.

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, January 23, 1951, the time between 12 o'clock noon and said hour of 3 p. m. shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposed to the said resolution and controlled, respectively, by Mr. WHERRY and Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk read the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 8, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to modify the resolution by striking out the word "formulation", which is the fifth word in line 4, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "adoption."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to amend his own resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. But, Mr. President, he cannot make me agree to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am aware of the difficulty involved in getting the Senator from Texas to agree to many things; but let me state the reasons for the modification. Some Senators have come to me and said that the word "formulation" ran only to the negotiations in connection with the forming of an army. So I said I should be glad to strike out that word and to insert the word "adoption." As Senators read the resolution—I think it has been misinterpreted and misunderstood by many persons—they will see it provides that there shall be no assignment of troops for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty—it is limited to the North Atlantic Treaty—until the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress. That is all that is involved in the resolution. I want to make that clear.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that the resolution is not now subject to amendment and will not be so subject until next Tuesday, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator introducing a bill or resolution has the right to modify it, has he not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. He has a right to modify it, but he cannot amend it, under the unanimous-consent agreement, until 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 8, now that it has been modified, reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

The meaning of this resolution is plain. It neither approves nor disapproves the sending of United States ground forces to Atlantic treaty countries to become part of a peacetime international army.

Senators in voting for this resolution in no way commit themselves for or against the sending of American boys to Western Europe, to become part of a peacetime army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says that under his resolution it is simply provided that the sending of United States troops to Germany, as a part of a peacetime army, is forbidden.

Mr. WHERRY. Has not the distinguished Senator read the resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have heard it read by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I just read it, but I did not say anything about sending troops to Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say anything about sending troops to Germany.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what the Senator said.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment——

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I asked a question.

Mr. WHERRY. And I have answered it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator has not answered it.

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution does not say anything about sending troops to Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not talking about Germany; I am talking about sending them anywhere in Europe. Under the Senator's resolution, even though war should break out in Europe, we could not send, under the resolution, a single foot soldier to Europe until Congress had passed on the question.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is correct?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator admonishes me many times to be still for a few moments, and if the Senator from Texas will remain still for a few moments, he will know what is in the resolution.

To begin with, it is limited only to sending troops to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty. That is one thing. So that eliminates half the question the Senator asked. The other thing is that, notwithstanding the fact that the President might or might not have the power under the Constitution, outside the treaty, the President of the United States should make no commitment prior to the time that Congress determines whether or not it wants to send American boys abroad to become part of an integrated army. Prior to that time, under the resolution, no commitment shall be made.

If the resolution should be adopted by the Senate, as the Senator indicated in his press release this morning, Congress would determine the policy. When the President presents his program, that is the time to discuss whether or not Congress will determine whether American boys will be sent as part of an integrated army in Europe. All this resolution does is to advise the President of the sense of the Senate.

The Senator was quoted in the newspapers this morning as stating that he would not object to letting Congress make that determination. If that be correct, there is no difference between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Nebraska except that, before that determination is made, no commitment shall be made.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what the newspapers may have said in connection with my statement——

Mr. WHERRY. I was referring to the statement of the Senator from Texas. If I mentioned the majority leader, I want the RECORD to be corrected. I was referring to a statement made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think any of us will object to a vote upon the question as to whether armed forces should be used to implement the North Atlantic Pact, but a vote on that question and a vote on the Senator's resolution are two different propositions. As I understand the Senator's resolution, it provides that no Ground Forces of the United States shall be assigned to duty in the European area. I take it that the Senator does not include the Navy or the Air Corps.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to present the case in an orderly fashion. I think most of these questions will be answered in the course of my remarks. In order to keep my argument intact I shall ask Senators to wait until I have finished my address. Then I shall be very glad to answer all questions.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I yield to anyone, I shall yield to the majority leader.

Mr. President, if the majority leader wants to perfect the resolution so as to include all military forces, it is agreeable to me. However, I want a basic assurance. If the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, could give the assurance that no commitment will be made by the executive branch of the Government as to the sending of any armed force to Europe until Congress determines the policy with respect to it, I would be happy to withdraw the resolution. I do not wish the resolution to be considered as a resolution which would decide whether or not we shall send troops to Europe. The resolution provides for only one thing, namely, that the question of commitments by the President of the United States shall be held in abeyance until Congress itself has made the determination.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, perhaps the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has answered the question I had in mind. Unfortunately, I shall have to leave the floor and shall be ab-

sent during the delivery of a part of his able address. I have a few questions I should like to ask him before I leave.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield now. However, after I begin my address, I should like to make it without interruptions. The questions which have been asked convince me that the purpose of the resolution has been misunderstood. I shall be glad to accept modifications of the resolution if the main purpose of the resolution is preserved. What I am attempting to do—and I think most Senators agree with me—is to provide that no commitment shall be made by the President of the United States, whether he has authority or does not have authority, for American boys to be assigned to an integrated army in Europe. If it is desired, any other military service in addition to ground forces can be included in the resolution. However, it is intended that no commitment shall be made until the Congress of the United States has determined the policy. The resolution is limited only to the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator answer my question as to whether or not the provisions of the resolution apply to the Navy and the Air Force?

Mr. WHERRY. No; it applies only to the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact. In the North Atlantic Treaty, as I shall explain later, we were assured that the character of the aid to be furnished would be decided by Congress, not by the President of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the resolution include the Navy and Air Force? Would the resolution prohibit the use of the Navy and Air Force to implement the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. No; but if the Senator from Arizona would like to include such a prohibition, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senator from Nebraska misunderstands me. I am simply trying to find out what the resolution includes.

Mr. WHERRY. As I shall explain a little later, it has been stated by the President of the United States, both in the press and over the radio, that he has authority to send ground troops to Europe without consulting Congress. The only forces that have been mentioned by the President have been land forces. My contention is that for the purposes of the North Atlantic Pact the President of the United States does not have authority to commit American boys to an integrated, international army in Europe until the Congress of the United States determines the policy. It is as simple as that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I am always glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator. As I understand, General Eisenhower is a member of the Ground Forces. Is the resolution intended to prohibit General Eisenhower from doing the work he is trying to do? Undoubtedly a commitment was made to send him to Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Arizona is going far beyond even the realms of imagination. The Senator knows what is meant by land forces in an integrated army in Europe. He knows what is meant by the term. I am referring only to land forces in an integrated, international army in Europe. However, if for any reason he doubts what I have said, I shall be very glad to have him suggest an amendment to the resolution accordingly. I am serious about the resolution, and I hope the majority leader will support it. I am merely trying to do with reference to the North Atlantic Treaty what was done with reference to the United Nations agreement. The resolution provides simply that prior to the time Congress makes a determination of policy no commitment can be made by the President of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Before we act on the resolution we should find out what it means.

Mr. WHERRY. If the majority leader will let me make my speech, I am sure it will answer his questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have only one or two more questions to ask, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the resolution include the Marine Corps?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer would be the same with reference to the Marine Corps as it is with reference to the Navy or any other military contingent that might be sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty. If the Senator wants me to do so, I shall be very glad to amend the resolution to include not only the Ground Forces but any other military contingent which would be assigned or committed under the North Atlantic Treaty. The resolution would not prevent the President of the United States from ordering the Navy to go to any part of the world, provided he meets the conditions under which he is ordering it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator misunderstands me. I am not trying to perfect his resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would perfect it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am merely trying to find out what it means.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to explain it to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does it or does it not include the Marine Corps?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I have stated time and time again, the resolution provides that the President shall not make a commitment of land forces.

Mr. McFARLAND. What is meant by land forces?

Mr. WHERRY. A commitment of land forces to an international, integrated army in Europe. Under the resolution such a commitment could not be made until Congress had first determined the policy. If the Senator is anxious to include the Marine Corps, or if he thinks the President would commit the Marine Corps under the North Atlantic Treaty, he can take care of the situation with an amendment to the resolution. I am not particularly anxious about the point. I am anxious about committing land forces to Western Europe. That is what bothers me.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret that the Senator from Nebraska has not answered my question. It is important to find out what is meant by land forces. If we are to issue a directive to the executive branch of the Government, it should be clearly stated. We should know what the resolution means.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to explain the resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask one more question, if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I yield. However, I think the questions which the distinguished majority leader is asking will be answered in the course of my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I ask one more question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, even though I think that if I yield again we shall keep on going around and around, in a sort of round robin, and we shall not get anywhere. The Senator has had it explained time and time again that the resolution applies only to the North Atlantic treaty. That is the first point. The second point is that we do not want the President of the United States to make any commitment to assign American boys to an international army in Europe until Congress has determined the policy. That is as plain as it can be. If the Senator is bothered about whether or not the Navy or the Marine Corps is included, and wants to clarify the point by amending the resolution in that respect, it is agreeable to me. However, the resolution in its present form does not affect the assignment of the Marine Corps or the Navy wherever the President may want to assign it, provided his action comes within his authority under the Constitution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; the Senator has excepted the Marine Corps. I should like to ask one more more question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not like to preclude the distinguished majority leader from asking any more questions, but I should like to proceed with my speech. I have been trying to make the speech since last Thursday. If I could make the speech I think it would answer probably 90 percent of all the questions which are being asked of me, because the questions which have been asked so far have convinced me that the resolution is not clearly understood.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree that it is not understood. Therefore I should like to ask one more question.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has excepted the Air Force. Would it permit ground personnel of the Air Force to repair the airplanes which were sent to Europe? Could such ground forces be sent to Europe for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again the Senator is expanding the theory which he is attempting to put forth on the basis of my use of the term "ground forces." He asks whether the term includes everything. If he wants

to include everything in the resolution, it is all right with me, and I shall be glad to accept the modification.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. If he wants to write in the name of General Eisenhower, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to know what the Senator wishes to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have answered the questions. If the Senator does not understand my answers to the questions he has asked, I regret it very much. The resolution strikes at the heart of the policy—and it is a new policy, completely outside the Constitution and completely outside the North Atlantic Treaty—as enunciated by the President when he claimed authority to commit American soldiers to an integrated army in Europe without first coming to Congress for a determination of such a policy.

If the Senator is worried about whether or not "ground forces" include Marines or any other branch of the service, he can offer an amendment to the resolution to define "ground forces." What the junior Senator from Nebraska is doing is submitting a resolution which is self-explanatory, and which says that the President should make no commitments on the basis of this great policy until the Congress of the United States makes the determination.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from New York, because he was first on his feet. Later I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the minority leader has said that his resolution provides that it is the sense of the Senate that until there is a determination of policy by the Congress, the President should not, regardless of his constitutional rights, send any ground troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has stated that Senators may vote aye or no.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that we are rather familiar with filibusters in the Senate? In view of the provision of the resolution that no action should be taken by the President pending a determination by the Congress, would it not be possible for a small group of men in the Senate to filibuster and hold up action endlessly?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. Action could be indefinitely postponed, thus rendering the Nation completely impotent, in my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. While I admit that the filibuster, if it is used successfully, can hold up legislation, I am here to advise Members that a resolution coming from the Armed Services Committee or the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a program submitted by the President himself, would have the right-of-way in the determination of the policy with respect to what land forces should be sent. When such a resolution is brought forth by the appropriate committee, there is no further need for this resolution. All this resolution provides is that until the determination is made, until the program is submitted—until General Eisenhower, for example, may make his report—this question should be held in abeyance.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will not yield further, unless the Senator wishes to ask a different question, which is not along the same line as previous questions.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was about to ask how, under the Wherry rule, it would be possible to shut off debate within any measurable time, even if there were only a small group of Senators who determined to invoke the filibuster.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall answer the Senator's question. I am familiar with the rules of the Senate. The minute a program comes to the Senate the question can be submitted, to determine whether or not land soldiers shall be sent over there. In the meantime, this resolution would provide that the question should be held in abeyance. I think it is fantastic to say that the Wherry resolution would be filibustered. We have agreed to vote on the resolution on Tuesday of next week. There will be no filibuster in connection with the Wherry resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not referring to the Wherry resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. If there were a filibuster on the Wherry resolution, there would be no difficulty about getting a vote on the question of determining the policy with respect to manpower, under a resolution to send ground forces to Europe.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not referring to the Wherry resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. To what was the Senator referring?

Mr. LEHMAN. I was referring to the resolution under which the policy of the United States with regard to implementing the Atlantic Pact would be determined.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of the Wherry resolution, there would be debate on the floor of the Senate on that question. If a resolution is brought before the Senate, as is the intention, to implement the North Atlantic Treaty with ground forces, there will be debate just the same. The Wherry resolution has nothing to do with that situation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will; but this is the last time I am going to yield until I conclude my speech. The questions which are being asked are all answered in my speech. After I am through, I shall remain here all afternoon and answer any questions any Senator wishes to ask.

Mr. KERR. If I correctly understood the Senator a while ago, he said that after he had heard the questions being asked he was convinced that the resolution was not understood.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I said that it was misinterpreted, and possibly misunderstood.

Mr. KERR. I wonder by whom the Senator thought it was not understood.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is naive. I suppose that, in his eloquent way, he wishes to create the impression that the Senator from Nebraska does not know what he is doing.

Mr. KERR. No; I merely wished to ask a question.

Mr. WHERRY. If Senators will give me an out-and-out vote on this resolution, it will meet the approval of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. We will give the Senator an "out" vote, but not an in-and-out vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's observation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I always respect seniority. However, these asides, these undercutting answers and responses which come from Senators who do not even address the Chair, show the limits to which some will go in an effort to defeat a resolution in which the American people are interested, even though the Senator from Texas is not interested. We shall see who is out and who is in, in the judgment of the American people.

Mr. President, I decline to yield further until I finish my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall begin at the beginning.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

The meaning of this resolution is plain. It neither approves nor disapproves the sending of United States ground forces to Atlantic treaty countries to become part of a peacetime international army.

Senators in voting for this resolution in no way commit themselves for or against the sending of American boys to Western Europe to become part of a peacetime army.

The only purpose of this resolution is to hold in abeyance the assignment of United States troops to Western Europe until the Congress, as the policy-making branch of the Government, acts upon the matter.

Senators may try to explain it away. They may say that it does not mean what it is said to mean. They may imply that it is misunderstood by the Senator who submits it. However, it is just as simple as that 2 and 2 make 4. Either the Congress is in favor of continuing its right under the North Atlantic Treaty to determine the policy, or it is willing to abdicate that right and give it to the President of the United States. I am not ready to do that, and I do not believe the American people want us to do it.

While this resolution seeks to hold in abeyance only the sending of ground forces for inclusion in the North Atlantic Treaty army, the junior Senator from Nebraska points out that the President has no authority to implement the treaty in any way except as already authorized by the Congress.

Ground forces are cited in this resolution because to start assigning them to the international army would be a far-reaching departure from the policy of the Congress as provided in existing treaty implementation legislation. It is a completely new policy, outside the authority of the Constitution. It certainly is not provided for inside the North Atlantic Treaty.

It should also be pointed out that the resolution in no way seeks to restrict the authority of the President over movement of naval forces under established customs and practice.

As I attempted to explain to the distinguished majority leader, that is the reason why naval forces were not included in the resolution. If the majority leader wishes to include them, it is all right with me.

The issues raised in sending ground forces to Western Europe at this time are of supreme importance. Upon the determination of this question rests our entire national preparedness effort. It may be that our very destiny rests upon it.

It is a question of highest policy in national defense.

It is a question which vitally affects every man, woman, and child in our beloved country.

It is a question the answer to which will determine the whole global policy of the United States to meet the danger of armed Communist aggression.

It is a question to answer to which will determine how many young men shall be called to the colors, how large our governmental expenditures shall be, what the tax burden will be, and how far the United States shall go in becoming a regimented state.

All those questions are involved in the determination of a new policy, to commit a land army to Western Europe as a part of an integrated international army.

And it is a question which no one man, even though he be President, should have the right or power to answer and bind all our people to his decision.

The junior Senator from Nebraska confidently hoped that the President would discuss this paramount question in his recent message to the Congress on the state of the Union.

The junior Senator from Nebraska had noted, as other Members of this body, no doubt had noted, press dispatches reporting the President as saying he possesses full authority to send United States ground forces to Western Europe; and that he intends to do so. That statement was carried by the whole press. It went all over the country. Great headlines appeared over it.

This subject has become widely discussed among the people, and properly so, since it affects them vitally.

In view of the President's reported statements in press and radio conferences, and his silence on this paramount issue in his message on the state of the Union, the junior Senator from Nebraska felt compelled to offer his resolution. I did so within a few minutes after the Senate reconvened following the joint session of the Congress to hear the state-of-the-Union message delivered by the President.

Since the convening of the Eighty-second Congress foreign policy has been the major subject of debate in this Chamber.

It has been a wholesome, constructive debate. Every member of this body knows communism is a serious threat. We are united in our determination to do everything prudent to protect our own country and other freedom-loving countries.

There are differences over methods. These differing approaches are desirable, coming from many thinkers, from the people. Through debate and deliberation the wheat is sifted from the chaff. When the sound policy is distilled from the great debate now under way in the Congress there will be national unity and America will go forward recovering her lost leadership in the world.

Members of this body do not emulate that mythical judge who never listened to the other side of an argument because he did not want to be confused.

Mr. President, so there will be no confusion over the history of Senate Resolution No. 8, the Senate is reminded that on January 11, 1951, 3 days after the President delivered his state of the Union message and 3 days after the junior Senator from Nebraska submitted his resolution, the President held a news conference.

While that news conference was under way Members of the Senate were debating the issue of whether ground forces should be sent now to Western Europe to become a part of an integrated international army. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was addressing the Senate. In his remarks, which may be found on page 142 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senator from Texas made this statement:

> As for the future, I am confident that the executive branch will consult with Congress on troop commitments to the integrated European defense force now being mobilized. Indeed, it is my understanding that administration leaders are not hostile to such an idea.

At this point the junior Senator from Nebraska rose and said:

> Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding. I ask this question in the light of his last observation. Does the Senator understand that no commitment has been made by the President to furnish foot soldiers for an integrated army in Europe, and that if and when such commitment is made, it will be brought to the Congress for consideration?

I think that is a very simple, a very intelligent, and a very timely question, and the American people want to know the answer to it.

The senior Senator from Texas replied:

> I do not think the Senator ought to ask that question, because that is a highly executive question. I really do not know, but I assume that there is some feeling that a commitment of that kind will be made, or we would not have General Eisenhower in Europe now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I just stated that I cannot yield. I regret very much, but I cannot yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I said to a Senator on the other side a moment ago that I wanted to proceed to deliver the speech uninterrupted. I have stated that I would not yield, in answer to a request from a Senator on the other side, so I must say to the Senator from Wisconsin I cannot yield to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wanted to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he would yield so I might suggest the absence——

Mr. WHERRY. I will not yield for any purpose to the Senator from Wisconsin, because I stated a moment ago to a Senator on the other side that I would not yield any further.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President. A quorum call was had before I began speaking. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] walked out when I asked him not to question me until after I had concluded my speech. If he wants to remain away until I have concluded my observations that is his privilege. I wish he were present. I wish other Senators were present. But after a quorum call had been had I began to speak, and I will continue to speak. I hope Senators will read my speech in the RECORD. I shall continue with the speech now, because I have tried since last Thursday to explain my resolution. I say it is completely misunderstood by some who can read the English language and it is misinterpreted by many.

Mr. President, thus, the senior Senator from Texas, as recently as January 11, told the Senate he did not know whether the President had made a commitment to foreign governments that American boys would be sent to their countries to join an international army. But the senior Senator from Texas said he assumed that there is a feeling such a commitment will be made, and that Congress would be consulted on it.

Earlier on the same day, January 11, and before the President began his news conference, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the majority leader, in an estimable appeal to the Senate for unity and patriotic devotion to duty, advised us not to become excited about the matter of sending American boys to western Europe at this time.

The majority leader stated, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, on page 140:

> General Eisenhower has gone to Europe to learn the facts, to make the evaluation. He is expected to return to this country sometime next month with those facts. Is it wise for us to make statements here which would

make his great task more difficult? Is it prudent to prejudge the facts he will assemble? Is it sensible to proclaim judgments and assert positions which we may find untenable or improvident later?

All of us know his report will be complete, honest, and forthright. All of us know that he will call a spade a spade—

He was talking about General Eisenhower—

that there will be no varnish, no double meanings, no evasions in what he tells us. It may be that his report will make meaningless much of what some of us would say now. In any event, it seems to me that prudence and plain common sense would dictate that we ought to know more and, meanwhile, talk less.

Mr. President, the last observation about knowing more and talking less is always good advice.

The sound advice of the distinguished majority leader applies forcefully to Senate Resolution No. 8, because the sole purpose of the resolution is to hold in abeyance the sending of foot soldiers to Western Europe at this time, until the Congress knows more about the implications of such action and can assert its prerogative as the policy-making department of the Government.

While all this was being said on the floor of the Senate, the President, at his simultaneous news conference, left no doubt that he believes the President has absolute control over the Armed Forces of the United States and can assign them to any place on earth, in peace or war, and for any purpose he deems wise.

He, the President, told the press and radio there are a hundred precedents sustaining his asserted right to draft American boys, and order them to Western Europe to become part of an international army to carry out the purposes of the Atlantic defense treaty.

Members of this body no doubt have read the newspaper reports of the President's January 11 news conference. And Members of this body, no doubt, have heard over and over on the radio the reported assertion by the President, that the Chief Executive has full authority to assign American boys to an international army for the purpose of carrying out provisions of the Atlantic defense treaty.

Again and again, times without number, the statement has been drummed into the ears of the American people that the President has full power to send American troops anywhere and for any purpose he considers in the interests of the United States.

This headline appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1951:

Truman will consult Congress on troops, then act on his own.

Insists he has full power to send GI's to Europe; accepts challenge, ready to go to people.

The story in the Herald Tribune, under the byline of James E. Warner, and dated January 11, says:

President Truman declared today he will consult with Congress before sending American troops to Europe, but made it clear he will not seek congressional permission to do so.

At a news conference held as the Senate proceeded with a debate on the issue, the President said that, as Commander in Chief, he does not have to seek congressional approval to send troops abroad.

With vigor he accepted the challenge of those in Congress who would seek to exercise control over such troop commitments by tying up military appropriation. If they want to go to the country on that, Mr. Truman said, he would go with them.

He added that he had gone to the country once before and licked his congressional critics.

There is no question, Mr. Truman said, about the authority of the President to send troops anywhere in the world. This authority has been made abundantly clear throughout the history of the United States.

But, he said, this Government always consults with proper congressional committees, such as the Foreign Relations and Armed Services groups, on foreign-policy decisions.

The Baltimore Sun for January 12, 1951, carried a story by Dewey L. Fleming, and dated January 11. It says:

President Truman intends to consult Congress on the question of sending American troops to Europe, but he does not feel he is obliged to get Congress' permission to do so, he declared.

He is convinced that he has a clear authority to assign American Armed Forces to any place in the world where he believes they are needed to insure the security of this country, and he regards consultation with the legislative branch as an act of courtesy rather than a legal requirement.

Further on the Baltimore Sun story says:

The reporter remarked that in a Senate speech this afternoon Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had said the President would consult Congress on the current dispute over sending troops to Europe to participate in the combined defense force which is to be established and commanded by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The President said that was correct; he did intend to consult Congress; but again he remarked that did not mean that he had to abide by congressional wishes in the matter.

"And you do expect to send more troops to Europe?" a reporter asked.

"Certainly," said the President, adding that he saw no point in going to all of the trouble of making the Atlantic Treaty arrangements and sending General Eisenhower over to take charge of Western European defense unless we meant to go through with the project.

Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun story, as well as reports in other newspapers, explained that by consulting Congress the President meant consultation between Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, other administration officials, and members of the congressional Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Armed Services.

The President wanted it understood that he did not mean consultation with Congress as such, through official submission of his plans to the Congress as a whole for its official consideration and action, but only what the President described as consultation with committee members.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has a high regard for the members of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. The members of these committees would quickly disavow any authority to speak for the Senate as a whole.

The Committee on the Judiciary also has an important interest in this matter, because questions involving the constitutional powers of the Congress and the Chief Executive are involved, and may become more frequent as we move into consideration of the Communists' international conspiracy on a global scale.

It is not the prerogative of the junior Senator from Nebraska to speak for the Democratic membership of the Senate; but the President seems to have overlooked the fact that no one among the Republican Members of this body has the right to make commitments for the Republican Members until they have given authorization to do so; and the Republican Members of the Senate are most unlikely to give any of their Members free rein to commit them on important matters of public policy.

The 47 Republican Members alone of the minority can determine party policy in the Senate. No individual Member has that authority.

It will be recalled that the Republican Members of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, in a meeting last month, adopted a resolution pleading wholehearted cooperation with the administration in the development of foreign policies provided the term "consultation" was accepted as a two-way street.

Consultation does not mean mere transmittal of information after the administration has reached a decision such as the President has reached in the matter of sending American boys to Western Europe to join an international peacetime army.

Mr. President, at this critical time when there is a great urgency for comity and patriotic cooperation between the executive and legislative branches, it is very unfortunate that President Truman creates a serious friction point by contending he has full power to decide what the national-defense policy of the United States shall be, and by bluntly serving notice that, if Congress does not provide the funds for expenses, he will go to the people.

The junior Senator from Nebraska would not shrink from such a contest before the people, for the junior Senator from Nebraska is quite confident of what the verdict of the grand jury of the people would be on this issue.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is hopeful that the President, in the interest of national unity, and to spare our country a needless stalemate at the very inception of the great push for national preparedness, will reexamine his position and submit his plans to Congress for its approval.

Once again I wish to renew my suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that if he is informed, or if he will visit the White House and there gain the information, that the President will not commit or assign American boys to an international army for purposes of the North Atlantic Pact, until the Congress determines that policy, I will withdraw the resolution, for the purposes of the

resolution will then have been served. That is all that is in the resolution.

The junior Senator from Nebraska will wholeheartedly abide by the action of the Congress, always retaining his right to seek correction in the light of experience.

The solid truth is that there is no constitutional authority and no precedent to support the President's announcement that he is going to send United States Armed Forces to North Atlantic Treaty countries to be integrated into a North Atlantic Treaty army.

The solid truth is there is no authority in the North Atlantic Treaty for the President alone to decide the character of aid the United States shall furnish under the provisions of the treaty.

Plainly, the President is seeking to implement the North Atlantic Treaty by indirection, under assumed authority of the Constitution, which he cannot do alone under the North Atlantic Treaty. Mr. President, that is sheer usurpation of congressional power by the President.

The American people want no more Yaltas, Tehrans, and Potsdams; no more back-room secret agreements sealing the fate of themselves and their children.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT

Down through the years, constitutional lawyers have argued and debated the authority that the President has under the Constitution to use the Armed Forces of the United States around the world.

The one thing, it seems to me, that has to be decided, in determining the extent of that constitutional authority, is what the President orders the United States troops to do.

If their assignment is merely to protect, in local actions, the person and property of our nationals, that is one thing.

If their assignment could be construed as an act which could involve this country in another world war, that is another.

This question was brought up and thoroughly debated when Senate bill 1580 was presented to the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and it would be well for all of us to refresh our memories as to what happened in that historic debate with reference to the furnishing by the United States of troops to carry out the mandate of the Security Council.

That debate on the floor of the Senate relative to the so-called constitutional authority of the President to send our troops abroad resulted in the passage of Public Law 264. Section 6 of that law provides as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress—

I stress that provision and call it to the especial attention of all Members of the Senate—

by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

That is section 6 of Public Law 264, which was enacted as the result of extended debate on the floor of the Senate relative to the so-called constitutional authority of the President to send American troops around the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield a little later.

I may point out, however, that the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations had much to do with the enactment of section 6 of Public Law 264. For the information of every Member of the Senate, I desire to call attention to certain observations which were made in that report by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. In discussing section 6, the report reveals that—

Among such obligations is that of supplying armed forces to the Security Council concerning which provision is made in section 6.

Although the ratification of the Charter resulted in the vesting in the executive branch of the power and obligation to fulfill the commitments assumed by the United States thereunder, the Congress must be taken into close partnership and must be fully advised of all phases of our participation in this enterprise. The Congress will be asked annually to appropriate funds to support the United Nations budget and for the expenses of our representation. It will be called upon to approve arrangements for the supply of armed forces to the Security Council and thereafter to make appropriations for the maintenance of such forces.

Another quotation from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations reads:

The first part of section 6 would authorize the President to negotiate a military agreement or agreements with the Security Council for the purposes and within the limits prescribed by article 43 of the Charter. While in constitutional terms, the prior authorization of Congress is not needed to enable the President to negotiate an international agreement—particularly when such an agreement is necessary in order to give effect to existing treaty obligations—the committee believed it desirable that on a matter of this scope and importance the Congress should record its views in advance. In this way the President may proceed with full assurance that the Congress as a whole desires an agreement to be entered into on this subject. At the same time the bill, providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

Quoting further from the report of the Foreign Relations Committee, submitted to the Senate during the consideration of Senate bill 1580, the distinguished chairman said:

On the last day of the debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference, sent a message to the Congress in which he stated that "When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them." The committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask, What did the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee mean when he said the "committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all"?

The question constantly asked by constitutional lawyers was whether the President had the constitutional authority to send troops to carry out the mandate of the United Nations without the approval of Congress. That is exactly the question involved in this debate today. Does the President, under the Constitution, have the right to commit American boys to service in an integrated international army without first coming to the Congress of the United States for its determination?

If the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee then decided that, once and for all, it was necessary that the Congress give its approval of the agreements negotiated by the President, it is just as necessary today, in the consideration of the sending of troops to this international army, that the Congress have the right to determine that policy.

As the chairman said, a full-fledged partnership with the President is necessary in the making of such a high policy as the one which now confronts the Senate.

We all know what has happened in Korea. Without prior approval of Congress, the President committed large ground forces of the United States on the theory that the action was a mere police action, only to find that by so doing he has brought about an actual state of war, even though undeclared, between the Chinese Communist government and the United States, which, if carried to its logical conclusion, will mean bringing to bear on the Chinese Communist government all of the power of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 264 and the solemn commitments given to the Senator from Texas, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, by the President in his message from Potsdam, as set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the President has never submitted to the Congress, and secured its approval, the question of the use of American military and naval forces, or as to the elements thereof which are to be available for use to the United Nations Security Council.

Congress was thus met in the Korean situation by a fait accompli. What else could the Congress do but go along with the Presidential action. Thousands of American boys had been sent into action. Our casualty list was high and growing. A similar situation will face us if the President commits ground forces to continental Europe without the consent of Congress.

It is to avoid such another fait accompli, without first having full congressional debate as to the desirability of sending large ground troops to Europe, that the resolution submitted by me is directed.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The President's announced course is in direct conflict with the procedures prescribed in the North Atlantic Treaty. The legal, orderly course is to adhere to the procedures defined in the treaty. If the President alone decides what the character of mutual aid and self-help is to be, then the procedures set forth in the treaty become useless, and Congress becomes a rubber stamp to finance the President's commitments.

Before any real damage has been done, and before foot soldiers are committed overseas, the President can prevent a calamitous situation—calamitous, that is, for national defense—by brushing aside his power-grabbing advisers and enlisting the eager will of the Congress and the people to support every worthy proposal he makes in the defense effort.

Mr. President, three articles in the treaty are relevant to this discussion, articles 3, 5, and 9. Article 9, which provides for a council which is to plan and recommend measures for implementation of the treaty, reads as follows:

The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in partfcular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

Article 3, which covers mutual aid and self-help in preparedness against possible war, reads as follows:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 5 covers mutual aid and self-help in the event of aggression against any party to the treaty:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Make no mistake about it. Weigh carefully the situation that now confronts us. All the procedure for implementing the North Atlantic Treaty, so far as the United States is concerned, becomes a dead letter if the President carries out his announced decision to send foot soldiers to Western Europe, thereby alone setting the pattern for mutual aid.

Senators who participated in the debate on ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty will recall the assurances that were given by proponents of the treaty, among them that under it the Congress retained complete discretionary authority over what character of aid the United States would furnish other parties to the treaty.

This assurance was given to the Senate by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on July 21, 1949, when the treaty was being considered. It may be found in volume 95, part 8, page 9894, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The senior Senator from Texas, then as now, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was discussing article 3, the part of the treaty that is operative before aggression against a party or parties to the treaty, the situation which prevails today.

This is what the distinguished and able senior Senator from Texas said:

But it is said that under article 3 we are obligated to furnish arms. Mr. President, we are not specifically obligated to furnish anything. There is nothing in the treaty that says we shall give them tanks or bombs or arms. * * *

In other words, after the treaty has been ratified, if the other nations request arms and point out their reasons and their situation and their inability to provide themselves with arms, then it would be for the people of the United States, through the Congress, to determine whether it was desirable or suitable, under article 3, to give or to furnish them arms.

Some feel sensitive about the matter of providing arms. Will not the Congress have to be the one to decide whether to provide them? Will not Senators who now are in the Senate Chamber be here then? Are Senators afraid to trust future Congresses? Do they wish to tie the hands of future Congresses and make a pronouncement that would embarrass a future Congress if it were to consider the matter of giving or withholding arms? I believe the Congress can be trusted. The Congress is being trusted now in connection with this treaty. Cannot we trust future Congresses in regard to the granting of arms?

On page 9896 of the RECORD for July 21, 1949, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said:

The obligations are plainly set forth in the treaty, and to the Congress itself must be remitted the matter of whatever we furnish under article III or under other articles of the treaty. I am willing to trust the Congress. Congress is where the Constitution puts the responsibility, and that is where we shall put it.

Mr. President, that was a great statement by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. "Congress is where the Constitution puts the responsibility, and that is where we shall put it," he said.

Oh, that President Truman would listen to the advice of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The American people implore you, Mr. President Truman, to ponder well these words of the senior Senator from Texas—that Congress is where the Constitution puts the responsibility, and that is where it should be placed in determining this new policy.

Law and order must be preserved at all costs, for without law and order the freedoms of the people perish.

Listen to these words of the Secretary of State, in a letter to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on July 11, 1949. They will be found in the RECORD of that date, at page 9193:

Any further military-assistance program involving Atlantic Pact countries will be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis of recommendations which will be made by the organization to be established under article IX of the treaty.

What could be clearer than that? That was Secretary of State Dean Acheson speaking in July 1949.

Can it be that Mr. Acheson is now advising the President to bypass the Congress in this supreme matter of policy regarding assignment of American troops to spearhead a puny international army against possible attack by millions upon millions of well armed and equipped Russian ground soldiers supported by air power?

Is the present Secretary of State the chief architect of this ill-advised plan to consume America's manpower and resources in this vain project for defeat of Russia on the ground?

It was, back in 1949, he who promised the North Atlantic Treaty countries that the United States would arm them. That is what the leaders of the foreign governments said at that time.

Mr. President, is this to be the crowning failure, the mortal blow to our beloved Republic? I ask that question. I think it is a question which is on the lips of every man, woman, and child in America this afternoon.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is going to give his reasons why he did not support the North Atlantic Pact. It is not a question at issue under the resolution at all. I have attempted to limit the resolution to the commitment of troops prior to the time Congress shall determine the policy, but in view of the fact that so much has been said about what I favor and what someone else favors, I shall bring to the attention of the Senate many observations in speeches which I have made and which I hope will be helpful, at least, in giving my position on the question, although I think the decision should be made when the recommendations come to the Senate in a resolution from the committee, or from the President of the United States, or when General Eisenhower returns.

The junior Senator from Nebraska voted against ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty because the showing of

proponents of the pact was that they were depending upon the establishment of ground forces in Western Europe adequate to defeat Russia if she attacked.

Mr. President, I contended that the exclusion of Spain and Western Germany from the defense pact made doubly sure that it was a futile gesture. I pleaded time and time again for the inclusion of Spain as a member of the North Atlantic Pact. For 5 years, as Senators will remember, I asked that Spain be armed. If Spain and Western Germany had been included in the defense pact, the situation today might be different.

As Members of this body well know, the junior Senator from Nebraska many times and for many months urged that there be an end to the stupid, revengeful Morgenthau plan for the destruction of Western Germany's industrial plants. Resolution after resolution was introduced. The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. They never came out of the committee. They should have been given consideration.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, now, when we need the steel potential of the Ruhr, the plants are gone. Many of the plants have been shipped to Russia. If we had that steel potential today we would be in a much better position, and it would not take the money of the taxpayers of the United States to rebuild the Ruhr in order to get the steel potential.

For many months the junior Senator from Nebraska urged that Spain be recognized.

At long last, and as the failures in foreign policy have resulted in the present critical threat of Communist imperialism, we have completed a circle of administration policies toward Western Germany and Spain. Now we ask both to help arm against possible Russian attack.

At the end of the war a forthright American policy toward Western Germany, after the manner of Abraham Lincoln's admonition, "with malice toward none," and "bind the wounds," would have averted much of the difficulty we face today.

In discussing the North Atlantic Treaty on the floor of the Senate July 21, 1949, the junior Senator from Nebraska said:

> Now, I want to make my position clear on article 5 of the treaty. It is the heart of the treaty. In effect it is a multilateral assumption by the parties to the treaty to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.
>
> I am in favor of extending the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to all of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. I take this position with a full understanding of the heavy responsibilities involved. * * *
>
> I am willing to extend the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, because America has been in two world wars which America did not start. Certainly these experiences have proven that when the conflagration of war starts in Europe, America inevitably is drawn in. If we are going to be in all the crash landings, we ought to be in a position to help prevent the take-offs.

Let no one, now or ever, in Europe or Russia, think for one moment that the United States will welsh on her commitments in the North Atlantic Treaty.

If Russia or any of her captive countries launch war upon any of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, the United States will be swift to aid in subduing the aggressor. But the character of our aid must be determined by the American people, through their representatives in Congress.

Obviously, prudence dictates that there must be preparedness against possible attack.

In the debate on ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, the junior Senator from Nebraska took the position that our best insurance against war with Russia and for victory, if war should come, is a superior hard-hitting Air Force and an invincible Navy. We must have mastery of the air, and we must be invincible on the seas.

The junior Senator from Nebraska failed to stir a ripple of support in the Senate at that time for an air-sea defense tailored to the peculiarities of a war with Russia. He was called an isolationist, an ostrich. It was charged that he wanted to pull the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans around him and let the rest of the world go by.

But, with the passing of time and a more general appreciation of the magnitude of the problem of containing Russia, more are seeing that air power, supported by the Army and Navy, must spearhead any war with Russia, and that to major in a ground war is simply playing Russia's game.

Remember that back in 1924 Lenin, while Russian dictator, said:

> Someday we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction.

After hearing the figures which were presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], Americans should wake up and think about the prophecy of Lenin. I am not certain that the figures quoted by the Senator from Illinois were correct. They are different from the figures which I studied as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. However, when we are faced with an annual budget of $100,000,000,000, it is time for Americans to wake up and decide whether the prophecy of Lenin might not come true. This terrible prophecy will come true if we attempt to put a ring of bayonets around Russia.

A second-rate army in numbers and in fire power, in Europe or in the oil-rich Middle East, straddling the Suez Canal, jugular vein of the free world east and west, is worse than none at all. It is worse because it digs the graves for countless thousands, perhaps millions, of dead.

I implore Members of this body, in whose hands now rests the fate of the Republic, and, indeed, the free world—yes, the yearning for liberty by the people of Russia themselves—to consider the realities, and not be bogged down by the Maginot line hypnosis which proved France's undoing in the last war.

Before us in Korea we have an immediate object lesson. We are hopelessly outnumbered, and we are compelled to take appalling losses. But these Korean losses are almost negligible compared to what we would suffer if our ground forces received the full weight of the Red army in Europe.

Be prepared for verbal brickbats from those who see overwhelming, invincible land armies spread over the free world, where there is none at all and no visible prospect of there ever being one to take Moscow until and unless Russia's war-making power is pulverized by air power.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is accustomed to the smears of the unwitting stooges of the Communists. The junior Senator from Nebraska for years has opposed the New Deal lock, stock, and barrel, on the solid ground that preservation of the American heritage, the never, never-dying principles of our Republic, is mandatory.

Mr. President, the observations made by the junior Senator from Nebraska on the Senate floor on September 28, 1949, when the bill to arm North Atlantic Treaty countries was being considered, are of equal force today. This is what he said:

> The bill to arm Atlantic Treaty countries, now in its final stage of passage by Congress, sets the pattern for rearming treaty nations.
>
> It is the wrong approach, because it emphasizes establishment of huge ground forces in Western Europe, when the main emphasis should be put on air power and naval power.
>
> It is the wrong approach, because it will drain American taxpayers of billions upon billions of dollars in a wasteful, ineffective policy. I think it could not be worse if it had been planned in Russia.
>
> The policy of making Western Europe an armed camp, at the expense of the American taxpayers fits the propaganda line of the Kremlin.
>
> The Kremlin is using the rearming of Western Europe to scare the Russian people and make them supple to the will of the dictators.
>
> Through fear propaganda they hold the freedom-loving Russian people in the dictator's grip.
>
> If the United States bends its efforts to prepare for a ground war with Russia, should the latter attack any or all the Atlantic Treaty countries, it will mean the loss of a generation of American boys on European soil.
>
> Figures of the last war support these views. When World War II ended there were 63 American divisions on the western front.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that at the height of World War II we had 63 divisions on the western front.

> American forces were assisted by 12 British, 5 Canadian, and 11 French divisions. The total was 91.
>
> With the German air force destroyed, our forces were driving the German ground forces back to Germany. On the eastern front, however, the Russians were pushing Hitler's legions westward with 502 divisions.
>
> This allied effort in the west was our maximum effort for World War II—91 divisions. But the 502 divisions of the Red army did not represent Russia's maximum strength, for Russia had already lost about 10,000,000 Red soldiers in absorbing the shock of the Nazi army.
>
> Military observers believe that in the next war—God forbid it shall ever come—Stalin could launch an attack against Europe with 1,000 divisions.

I do not know what he could do, and I doubt that anyone else knows.

> Thus the Allied ground forces would be outnumbered 10 or 20 to 1.

Anyone is free to choose his own figures.

The numerical inferiority in ground forces is not the only danger in the administration's military-assistance program. Russia is believed to have about 16,000 combat aircraft. The cost of building an Allied tactical air force able to neutralize Stalin's 16,000-plane tactical striking force is staggering. * * *

The futility of the military-assistance bill, with its emphasis upon ground forces, must be apparent to anyone in the light of the announcement by President Truman that Russia has achieved an atomic explosion. Obviously, this required a realistic approach to the entire defense policy.

In modern lightninglike warfare, in which planes can be flown over the North Pole and nonstop halfway around the world, America must allocate ample funds for the technical development of defensive measures, such as a radar screen to detect oncoming planes, and intelligence agencies to ascertain the potential enemy's planes.

Advocates of the pending military-assistance bill constantly harp on the argument that Western Europe would feel the first shock of war, if it comes.

The first shock—and possibly the decisive shock—might be the United States, with our National Capital, New York, Boston, Hartford, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Houston, or even New Orleans receiving the first bombs from Russian planes.

Argument that only a suicide plane could get through to bomb America is shallow. America must be prepared even against suicide planes.

That was said on the floor of the Senate back in 1949. Is it not about time we should proceed to make our own homeland impregnable, and then do what we can to help other freedom-loving peoples?

How long, Mr. President, do you suppose America can escape becoming a garrison state when annual expenditures are running at the rate of a hundred billion dollars?

Is it not about time for us to look before we leap to make sure we all leap together?

Continuing my remarks to the Senate back in September 1949:

The true war deterrent today is the long-range bomber. The American taxpayer's sound, sensible choice is to buy this essential security.

America must also maintain an effective Army and Navy, in order to have suitable bases, supplied and secure from which air and naval attack can be unleashed.

These bases cannot be counted upon if all are in Western Europe, though it would be wise to junk the administration's present fatuous policy toward Spain and open the way for establishment of air bases in Spain.

Spain is anti-Communist. Unlike France, Spain is not infested by hundreds of thousans of Communists, who stand ready to sabotage any preparedness or war effort that might be made.

Bases must be so located that they will have the incidental protection of water or mountains or deserts, or combinations of these natural barriers. Bases so located would not be subject to the full weight of an attack by the Red army. They could be defended.

Any policy to contain Russia within her borders must consider her as an entity, a solid mass of territory and population.

A chain of mutually supported air bases in England, Africa, Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines would enable us to launch air strikes against any target in Eurasia.

For the most part these bases are already built. The cost of maintaining them and keeping them up to battle strength is not great, compared to the tremendous appropriations needed for the pending legislation.

America needs a navy to supply these bases, and to help defend them, and America needs an army to defend them from airborne and triphibious attack.

America needs allies to help defend these bases.

America needs plans for allied air and naval power and ground forces to be integrated with our forces in collective defense.

But America should never engage the Red army in Europe, or on her home ground, until our air power has pulverized the source of the Red army's strength.

Destroy Russia's railway bridges, and she cannot distribute food to feed her population, nor can she deliver coal to keep her people warm.

Destroy all her oil fields, refineries, and munitions plants—the lifeblood of modern war—and Russia is gone.

With her population hungry and cold, with the lifeblood and sinews of modern war, we can punish Russia into submission by bombing.

Napoleon tried to whip Russia with ground forces. He failed.

Hitler tried it. He failed.

Russia's vastness, her dependable ally of extreme winters, and her reckless disregard for human life, Russia's own people, make the ground approach tragic.

There is still another weapon in our arsenal to prevent another war; a weapon that is rusty but still available, and it is more powerful than all other weapons combined.

That is our convincing psychological weapon—truth.

Tell the Russian people, who do not want war as people everywhere do not want war, the wonders that have been accomplished by our American Republic for the prosperity, happiness, and contentment of our people.

Assure the Russian people, to whom the truth has been denied, that these blessings will flow to them if they have a liberal government that believes the people should be the masters of their government and not its slaves.

Mr. President, there is more, much more, to that address delivered in 1949. But there are several other arguments being made by those who have their eyes fixed upon the rubble and dust of the ground for guidance, instead of on the stars, upon which the junior Senator from Nebraska desires to comment.

President Truman dwelt upon one of these arguments in his recent state of the Union message, and it is being drummed into the ears of the American people around the clock through the press and radio.

The industrial resources of Western Europe and her fountains of culture are emphasized to support the ground army approach.

The President said:

If Western Europe were to fall to Soviet Russia, it would double the Soviet supply of coal and triple the Soviet supply of steel. If the free countries of Asia and Africa should fall to Soviet Russia, we would lose the sources of many of our most vital raw materials, including uranium, which is the basis of our atomic power. And Soviet command of the manpower of the free nations of Europe and Asia would confront us with military forces which we could never hope to equal.

Mr. President, this statement by President Truman, of course, is true, but our chances for keeping them in the free world without a ring of air bases around Russia with complete mastery of the air, are exactly zero.

If war comes, we could not stop Russia from invading Western Europe, but we could make the Russian horde powerless, because it would not get any more bread or bullets out of Russia. The Russian armies would have to survive off the country, and it would disintegrate.

There is nothing unique about trading space while getting in knock-out punches by air and sea. It is not pleasant to contemplate Europeans taking another occupation, temporary though it be, but there will be many more Europeans left, and more of their industries still standing, in that circumstance, than if we wage ground war, with another inferno of guns and tanks and bombs consuming Europe. It is a case of the lesser of two evils.

We cannot make every spot in the free world secure against capture by the Russian Army, and therefore, even though some may be temporarily occupied by the enemy; we must choose our spots for attack upon Russia, if Russia starts a war.

We simply cannot make every country on the perimeter of Russia impregnable against capture in the event of war. If we tried to do that we would bankrupt our country and fritter away our manpower, so that we would not be strong anywhere.

Spain is defensible. The Pyrenees Mountains, which comprise Spain's border, could be made impregnable against Russian hordes, even as Switzerland has maintained her independence amid the swirling wars over the centuries. Spain should be considered as one starting place for taking Moscow, after Russia's war power to fight has been demolished by air and sea power. And Spain will fight the Communists if they attack.

We must raise our sights in air power much beyond the administration's blueprints for 50,000 war planes; if and when they are needed.

America should have 100,000 war planes, with an ample supply of the best strategic bombers, and impregnable air bases around the world as quickly as they can be built; that is, planes in being and bases in being and on the alert, to spearhead a sound defense policy.

Joe Stalin knows that the atomic bomb is our best weapon. He knows that his best chance to win is on the ground.

Our best weapon, the best aid we can give to Europe and the oil-rich Middle East, with its Suez Canal, is mastery of the air and seas, so that we can deliver the atomic bomb.

Europeans may not see maneuvers and parades of an inferior land army, but they will have the comfort of knowing that poised and ready to strike Russia on her home ground are planes from a noose around Russia.

Mr. President, before concluding my remarks, there are a few grim questions the advocates of massive, bankrupting land armies that will rob our schools and colleges of youths must answer.

Before American boys are sent to Europe to become part of a land army, these questions must be answered to the American people. They must be answered in the realm of realism, not the realm of dreams.

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff should answer:

First. Is it proposed that we undertake a land war with the Communist-controlled horde, with its 300 combat divisions, its 30,000 tanks, and its more than 16,000 planes and unlimited resources in manpower in Russia and China?

Second. Can the Allied armies get to Moscow and produce a military victory out of which communism can be destroyed and peace brought to the world?

Third. Is the land army approach accepting Stalin's own battlefield where his strength is overwhelming?

Fourth. How many American divisions do you propose now to send to Western Europe?

Fifth. And how many American divisions will have to follow if we adopt this course and war comes?

Sixth. Will these American divisions sit on the defense line for years?

Seventh. If you plan to send 10 American divisions, how much sea-transport tonnage must be employed to serve them? Suppose it develops into 50 divisions, and over 2,500,000 men. How much tonnage is necessary?

Eighth. Why have you failed to develop a hard-hitting ring of air bases around Russia and put most of your eggs in the land-army basket?

Here are some questions the administration should answer to the American people:

First. How much is the peacetime land operation going to cost every year? First, as to 10 divisions, and, second, if we have to send 50 divisions or more?

Second. What will be the economic strain upon the American people?

Third. What commitments were made at Brussels?

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, all Senators, I am sure, are agreed that wholesome respect for the dignity, the rights, and the responsibilities of the executive and legislative branches is proper at all times, and especially during a national emergency. With that in mind we can get on with the great work ahead.

All my observations about a land-army approach, rather than our becoming masters of the air and invincible on the seas, are raised to suggest that before our country is committed on high policy different approaches should be debated and considered upon the floor of the Senate.

Whether Senators agree with the land-army approach or believe that war with the potential enemy makes mandatory the building of a ring of air bases around her, together with an invincible navy, it all should come to the attention of the Senate.

The conclusion of the Congress upon fundamental, over-all defense planning should be arrived at through open debate and in response to the will of the people.

That is the sole purpose of the resolution. And, as I said in the beginning, this resolution should be supported by every Member of the Senate, because the Congress does have the responsibility and duty to establish matters of high national policy, such as sending troops outside the country, when our country has not been attacked, and for purposes spelled out in the North Atlantic Treaty.

Certainly land troops are not made mandatory by the North Atlantic Treaty.

Some Senators may believe that the President has full power to send United States troops wherever he chooses, and for any purpose he chooses.

Some Senators may believe that all the Congress has to do is appropriate whatever money the President asks to implement the North Atlantic Treaty as he chooses.

Senators have a right to that opinion. I do not subscribe to that view. I do not believe the American people want it done that way.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], as expressed in the Washington Star of last Saturday. The Senator from Georgia brings to the question profound wisdom gathered over many years as a highly respected Member of this body. He is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has been chairman of that committee, and is now chairman of the great Committee on Finance.

This is what the Senator from Georgia said:

> Regardless of whether the President has the power to commit American troops to combat in foreign areas without the consent of Congress, we will not obtain national unity that is essential in these times until the President advises the people that he will submit the question to Congress before finally acting.

The Senator from Georgia said he did not mean consultation with a few Members of the Congress, but presentation of his plan to the Congress. He said:

> Basically, the people feel that for the President to commit our forces without approval of Congress is not in keeping with the American tradition.
>
> The people have a right to be heard through their representatives in Congress. This would be a real bipartisan spirit in the handling of international affairs.

Mr. President, to me that is sound Americanism. The meaning of this resolution is crystal clear. At most it is an expression of opinion by the Senate that United States foot soldiers should not be sent to Western Europe for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending adoption of a policy thereon by the Congress.

This does not mean interminable delay, because there will be new legislation to implement the treaty. General Eisenhower within a few days will return and report. His observations will be carefully considered by the Congress and the country, along with views expressed by others, for this is a national issue. That is the American way.

In the national interest, I urge the adoption of Senate Resolution 8.

Mr. President, I wish to say one thing more. If I have not prepared the resolution in such words or such phraseology as is acceptable to the Senate, I shall be glad to accept a modification of the resolution if only the one principle remains in it, namely, that prior to the time the Congress shall determine the policy, either when General Eisenhower returns, or when the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations has presented a resolution on the subject, or when the President presents one. The President shall hold in abeyance any commitments he says he has the right to make. That is all I want to do by the resolution. I will modify it to meet the terms or language which Senators may wish to have used. I want the RECORD to show that I am not partial to the phraseology of the resolution, and am not trying to use words which will not result in what is intended to be achieved. I simply want the Senate to go on record as saying that it is the sense of the Senate that whether the President has the constitutional authority he says he has, or does not have it, we want no commitments made until the Congress determines whether under the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty we shall furnish ground forces to an integrated army in Europe. I want the Senate to inform the President that we want no commitments made until the Congress determines the policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the eminent junior Senator from Nebraska what the practical procedure would be if his resolution were to be adopted? Am I to understand that until the Congress—meaning both Houses—specifically authorized the sending of ground forces to Europe, no troops would be sent? Is that the meaning of his resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I shall state the interpretation I should like to have placed on it. The Senator was not on the floor when I made the statement in respect to that point. If the Senator wants all military units included in the resolution, it is all right with me. I am not objecting to that. All I want to make sure of is that the President will not commit troops to become a part of an international army until the Congress determines the policy; that is all. I do not want the President to commit troops, either under provisions of the treaty, or by his constitutional authority, if he has it, until that policy is determined by Congress. I do not want him to exercise that authority, if he has it or if he does not have it, until the Congress makes that determination. The resolution probably will not need to be considered if the President within a few days submits a proposal, or if, when General Eisenhower returns, recommendations are made on the subject, because then a resolution will be presented, and if no commitments have been made in the

meantime, the purpose of my resolution will have been accomplished. But I do not want commitments made by the President so that we will have a fait accompli, when all that is left is for the Congress to appropriate money under a policy declared by the President, for I think the Congress itself ought to be a full-fledged partner in determining that high-level policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator would say that the President or Members of the Congress should submit a policy in the form of a resolution, and the resolution, I take it, would be referred to the respective committees of the House and of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. If a resolution were presented to us which asked us to determine the policy, a resolution such as I undersand the Senator from Illinois would like to present, it would go to the appropriate legislative committee. The committee would have hearings on it. Probably action upon it would be held in abeyance until General Eisenhower's return. All I am asking is that the President hold in abeyance the making of any commitment prior to the time action is taken on my resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. The Senator would have such a resolution referred to the appropriate committees that may be interested?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Certainly if a resolution were presented which dealt with the question of deciding whether we were to send ground forces to Europe, it would go to the proper legislative committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the Senator would wish to have protracted hearings on the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly would.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So there would be quite a long period of time during which the committee or committees would be considering the matter?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, and for the Senator's information—as I know what the Senator is about to say, for I can read his mind on that subject, and I know that he would suggest that my resolution should go to a committee—I will say that my resolution does not need to go to a committee to have hearings upon it. What would the hearings be? We would have the same thing all over again that we had in connection with the United Nations—the question, "Does the President have the constitutional authority to act or does he not? We have threshed that matter out once, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee finally said, "We are going to settle this question once and for all. We believe the Congress should have the right to determine the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 264."

Mr. President, the same question is involved here. It is for the Members of the Senate to decide whether or not we are going to give the President that power. Hearings can be held from now until doomsday on that great constitutional problem, and we will have constitutional lawyers split bird seeds over phraseology and words, and come here with their conclusions, and we will not know any more when they get through than we did before they began, and the debate on the question of constitutional authority will continue.

Mr. President, whether the President has the authority to make commitments or not, I am asking that no commitments be made until the Congress determines whether or not under the provisions of the North Atlantic treaty, we shall furnish ground forces to an integrated army in Europe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has been on his feet for some time, awaiting an opportunity to ask questions; therefore, I now yield to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether I correctly interpret his position in connection with the North Atlantic Pact. Article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact provides that—

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

In article 5 they "agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to wait a moment before he asks his question. Article 3 specifies the kind of aid which shall be furnished before an attack is made. That is what is involved in my resolution. If there is such an attack, we are bound, at the present time, to send our forces abroad and to protect all those countries. I am not arguing about that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; I think the Senator is explaining just what I have in mind to ask him. In the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, it was brought out by Secretary of State Acheson, in answer to a specific question, that that did not mean sending men, but that it meant sending arms; and under the military-assistance pact we later authorized that to be done.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the purpose of the Senator's resolution is simply that before there is an extension of our obligations under article 3—in other words, in addition to sending arms, to send land troops—Congress should state its decision with reference to that policy under article 3?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Senator from Nebraska states it as his opinion, does he not, that the President would then be extending the interpretation of article 3 as it was adopted by the Congress and as it was explained to the Congress by the administration?

Now the Senator says that all he wishes to have Congress do is to prevent the interpretation of that article from being extended without giving Congress a chance to pass upon the specific point of the sending of our land troops or air troops or Marines or any other of our forces. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, and I wish to compliment the Senator from Massachusetts, for he has stated exactly what my position is, and he has stated it in clearer terms than I can.

Heretofore I have referred to article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact, doing so at a time when the Senator from Massachusetts was not on the floor.

The resolution refers only to the extension of authority which the Secretary of State or whoever is formulating the policy is attempting to bring about.

When the North Atlantic Pact was under consideration in the Senate, we had the debate at that time on the question of the meaning of the various articles of the pact. That question was raised then. Of course, I cannot speak for the other Members of the Senate; but for myself I am satisfied that many Members of the Senate voted in support of the North Atlantic Pact because of the explanation that it referred to arms, but not to men. That was one of the explanations made of the pact.

I contend that the President does not have the right to make a new policy of sending American boys to become a part of an integrated international army, even though the Congress might later determine upon such a policy. I maintain that the President should not do so until the question comes before the Congress and until the Congress determines upon that policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from Nebraska takes the position that his resolution is confined to article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska is not questioning, is he, the right of the President to send troops abroad, under his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, in defense of the United States or when the security of the United States is involved?

Mr. WHERRY. No, sir. I did not make a constitutional argument, because, as I have said before, we could debate that from now until the end of the present session, and still not get anywhere with it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's resolution does not mean that, does it?

Mr. WHERRY. It does not; the resolution does not relate to what shall be done following an attack.

I agree that when the Congress adopted article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact, it meant that we have to come to the assistance of those countries, to stop any aggressor. Article 5 means that we have to do more than send supplies; we have actually to stop the aggressor.

However, article 5 is not involved in my resolution.

My resolution refers to a determination of the kind of mutual aid we are to furnish under article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact, prior to an armed attack. Therefore, article 5 is entirely removed from the scope of the resolution.

When the North Atlantic Pact was before the Senate, I was opposed to having the pact ratified, because neither Spain nor Western Germany was included, and also because the approach which I thought should be taken was not taken. However, now that the North Atlantic Pact has been ratified, I would be the last Member of the United States Senate to welsh upon our coming to the aid of those countries, under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact. In other words, if there is an attack abroad which comes under the provisions of article 5 of the pact, the authority is already given.

On the other hand, I am discussing the commitments made under article 3 of the pact, which specifically reserves to the Congress the right to determine the kind of mutual aid we are to give; and that involves the sending of land troops.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the Senator from Nebraska interprets article 3, does he, to mean that the President, when he requested the adoption of that article, stated to the Congress, through the Secretary of State, that it meant arms, but not men; and the Senator believes, does he, that if the President now wishes to change that interpretation, as it was given to the Foreign Relations Committee, and thus to the Senate, that question should again be considered in committee and debated on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, prior to the time when the Congress determines upon such a policy.

If a resolution to that effect comes to the floor of the Senate from the Armed Services Committee, after hearings, and upon the recommendation of General Eisenhower or of the President himself, then we shall have an opportunity on the floor of the Senate to debate the very issue about which I am talking.

All my resolution provides is that before the time arrives, before that determination is made, the President shall not commit us to provide manpower, because he does not have authority to do so under the North Atlantic Treaty. I have narrowed the resolution until it relates only to providing American troops under the North Atlantic Pact. The resolution involves only that much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If in the meantime, before that question was debated in committee and on the floor of the Senate, upon another request, let us say, by the President or upon a resolution introduced by a Member of Congress, if the security of the United States became involved in Europe, then, regardless of the North Atlantic Pact, or if the security of the United States became involved in any other section of the world, it would be the Senator's interpretation, would it, that the President, acting under his constitutional authority, could send our troops abroad?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is a double-barrel question. Let me first answer the first part of the Senator's question as follows: Under the North Atlantic Pact, if any one of those countries is attacked, we are committed to go to its aid. So that is settled.

Now let me answer the second part of the Senator's question: The President does have constitutional authority to send our troops anywhere in the world, but it depends upon what the purpose of sending them is. I do not wish to enter into a debate regarding the power of the President to send our troops anywhere, to do anything. He already has the powers the President customarily has had, such as the power to use our troops to protect the property rights of our citizens, and so forth.

However, if we are attacked anywhere—for instance, an attack such as that on Pearl Harbor—certainly the President has the right to use our forces immediately to resist the attack. My resolution does not apply to such a situation as that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska then makes a distinction, does he, between our obligations under article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact and our obligations in a situation in which the security of the United States might suddenly become involved?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want the President at this time to commit our troops abroad, under his constitutional authority, for purposes of carrying out the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact. If the President wishes to use our troops under the North Atlantic Pact, under article 3, let him come to Congress and ask for that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the President would have to do that under article 5, would he?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and in case of such an attack, article 3 would not apply.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate to whom I would prefer to yield than to the Senator who is now asking me to yield. However, an arrangement has already been made in regard to the program of the Senate today. Therefore, I hesitate to use very much more time, inasmuch as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is waiting to make his speech. I have forced him to wait quite a while, because following the conclusion of my speech I have been queried at considerable length.

I wonder whether the Senator from Nevada will mind if I yield to the junior Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly not; the Senator has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for the constructive and sincere tone of his remarks. I think it is most valuable to have that tone at this particular time.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is an advocate of air power, as I am. Of course, the North Atlantic Treaty concept embraces army, air, and navy.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator's resolution would make it impossible for the President of the United States to order an expert Air Force mechanic to our Air Force base in England at the present time?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts was not on the floor when I explained my resolution. I have narrowed it, so that it now applies only to land troops that are to be supplied under the North Atlantic Treaty; that is all.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator speaks of ground forces. The Air Force has mechanics who are on the ground, and who are now in England, under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact. That is why I wanted to know whether the resolution covered them.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no dispute about that; they are there now, and no one is complaining about it.

Mr. LODGE. I am talking about replacements for them.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am talking about, as the Senator well knows, is the commitment of armed foot soldiers in divisions going to Europe to become a part of an integrated army. I am not questioning the President's power with respect to the Navy. I have said that in my speech. I am not questioning the power of the President to do what he has always done, or to do as he pleases. But I mean that I do not want him to make commitments to send American boys abroad to become part of an integrated army on the ground. I think that before that is determined, the Senate ought to have an opportunity to consider and determine such a policy, for many reasons.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that, but it seems to me that an expert mechanic—let us say a man who is an expert on instruments, or an expert on bombs, or an expert on airplane motors—a young American boy, who is a part of the North Atlantic force, is on the ground, and his presence in England in the next 3 weeks or 2 months might be very important. It merely seems to me, from the way the Senator's resolution is worded, that it would prevent the President from sending such a man abroad. I merely wanted that point elucidated.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I am sure the resolution would not have that effect, but if for any reason the Senator thinks it would, if he will suggest a modification, I will accept it. That is not the intention, at all. The intention is clear. My thought is that the President is going beyond his constitutional authority. As I said, I do not want to become involved in a constitutional argument, which could never be settled, but personally I think the President is going completely outside the Constitution and outside the North Atlantic Treaty, if he provides, by his own action, or by action

on the part of the Secretary of State, or in whatever manner it may be done, through the executive branch, for a commitment of troops to the land army of Europe, without first submitting the matter to the Senate for decision, as provided in article 3.

Mr. LODGE. Would not the Senator's resolution more nearly meet his purpose if, instead of saying "ground forces," he were to say "combat units of the United States Army and United States Marine Corps?" Is not that what he means?

Mr. WHERRY. As I have already told the Senator, not on the floor but elsewhere, if the Senator is in doubt about whether, under the resolution, one man or another could be sent, or if the Senator feels that it would involve a violation of the North Atlantic Treaty as to sending the Air Force or the Navy, I should like to have him suggest a modification. I am getting back to the North Atlantic Pact. That is all that is intended by the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it involves the North Atlantic Pact. I was thinking of an amendment to strike out the words "ground force" and to substitute "combat units of the United States Army and the United States Marine Corps." It seems to me, from hearing the Senator's speech, that that is what he means.

Mr. WHERRY. That is perfectly all right with me. I will accept such an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely trying to ascertain the Senator's intention. I do not propose the amendment, but I was trying to find out what the Senator had in his mind.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can propose it.

Mr. LODGE. As the language is now drafted, it would include a mechanic's going to England for the purpose indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the intention.

Mr. LODGE. I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's constructive suggestion, and, if this matter comes to a vote, I shall be very glad to modify the resolution. I shall also appreciate any other suggestions concerning it. I have no pride of authorship.

Mr. LODGE. I am studying the resolution very carefully, and I may have some further suggestions.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no one who has had more experience in Army circles than the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and I may say to him, since he was not present when I began, that all I am attempting to do is to prevent commitments being made by the President, under the Constitution, or under the North Atlantic Pact, with or without authority, until the matter comes to the Congress and a determination is made by the Congress. I shall be glad to change the language in any way that is satisfactory.

I may say there is something else I shall be glad to do. If the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will make a statement on the floor of the Senate that he has advised with the President, and that he can assure the Senate that no commitments will be made along the line I have indicated until the policy has been determined, I shall be willing to withdraw the resolution, as in that case the purposes of the resolution would have been served. Does the Senator not think that a fair statement?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator's remark shows his sincerity and his fairness, and I am glad to say that I should be opposed to having this or any similar resolutions buried in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I may vote to have it referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, but if I do so vote, I am glad to assert now that I think the committee should report a resolution which will give a definite directive and a definite expression of the will of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduced on January 11, 1951, S. 438, a bill the title of which is, "To provide economic, financial, and other aid to China."

That title is not inaccurate, but I want my colleagues to know that the main purpose of this bill is to provide military assistance to the Republic of China; and by "the Republic of China" I mean what the columnists refer to as "the Chinese Nationalists," the government presently headed by Gen. Chiang Kai-shek.

The bill which I have introduced is very similar to a bill having the same title which I introduced on February 25, 1949. My 1949 bill had its greater emphasis on economic and financial aid, but it also provided for substantial military aid. At that time it was necessary that military and economic aid complement each other. Today it is essential that military assistance be made paramount, with economic and financial aid still important, but secondary.

I am confident that, had the policy enunciated by my proposal in 1949 been vigorously undertaken, we would not find ourselves, as we do today, bogged down in a desperate struggle, with every advantage favoring our adversary, because we attempt to limit the scope of the conflict, while he really has the power to determine that issue.

Until we take the offensive in action—and I do not mean mounting a military offensive with our troops in Korea—we shall have to content ourselves with the fact that the enemy has the initiative, and is able to call the turn.

It should be perfectly obvious to anyone with even anserine intelligence that our past policy of letting the dust settle, has proven to be a bankrupt one. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the dust has settled on the boys whose bodies are buried in Korea. Surely no one in possession of the facts seriously believes that the Communist movement—and the Communist government—in China is anything but a stooge and tool of the Kremlin, a puppet playing its part in carrying out the Politburo's imperialistic design for world domination.

These are the facts we face. What then can we do about it?

Late as it is, I believe there is still some time left. Our range of possible action is more limited than it was; but if we will adopt an aggressive course, without further delay, we can still take action which will be effective to improve our situation.

On the Korean Peninsula we have a sizable military force. It is opposed by a vastly superior force of Chinese Communists. Whatever one may choose to call the present fighting, there is no escaping the fact that it is a real and serious war. And even though newspaper correspondents may bow to the edict that there are no retreats, but only withdrawals, and even though some may insist that the fighting in Korea is being done by forces of the United Nations, not forces of the United States, there is still no escaping the fact that American fighting men are taking a terrible licking.

Unless we are prepared to either commit additional United States forces, in very substantial numbers, or adopt some plan to divert the pressure in Korea, our boys are going to go on taking one licking after another.

Mr. President, this is a queer kind of war in Korea.

We are trying to fight it without admitting that we are in it. That makes it a tough war to fight, and an easy war to lose. In that kind of war, if the enemy loses, we do not win; but if the enemy wins, we lose. So if we are going to go on fighting this war, we are suckers if we do not use every weapon available to us.

Mr. President, the evidence is preponderant that weapons are available which we are failing to utilize; and I do not refer to the bomb. On the island of Formosa there are troops, Chinese troops, well trained but lacking much equipment. On the mainland of Asia there are from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 Chinese guerrillas. All of these forces are prepared to fight the Communists if we will provide the necessary equipment.

The time has come to use General Chiang's troops, and to make use of the available forces on the mainland, against the foe that is daily killing and wounding American boys.

The time has come for us to recognize facts as facts, and to begin to act on the basis that this fight is for keeps.

A man or a nation fighting only a defensive action can never win a victory; without offense, the best possible result is stalemate. But there are many forms of offense, and it is not unarguable that we must commit vast armies of American personnel in order to mount an offensive.

Realism and common sense require that we recognize the fact that the world Communist conspiracy is moving to encompass our downfall, and shape our own course accordingly. For the United States, the problem of Asia will be unsolved as long as China is controlled by a Russian-dominated Communist dictatorship. And so we must come eventually to a policy which embraces support of a non-Communist Chinese Government in China. Today, there is no non-Communist government which has any

foothold on the Chinese mainland. But if we have not the vision to look ahead, we are self-condemned forever to the contemplation of what might have been.

Before we entered Korea, I said, in a speech in the Senate:

We cannot afford to mobilize the forces necessary for a crusade to liberate the Chinese people. We must avoid committing too many of our resources on the continent of Asia. Above all, we must avoid being maneuvered into a position where we look like foreign invaders attempting to subjugate an oriental people. But we cannot allow Russia to make an island civilization of the United States of America.

The United States, therefore, should be ready to get behind whatever forces rise to unify China, and should be resolved to do everything possible to help the redemption of China. In the meantime, we should support the one Chinese leader who is willing and able to get into the fight now—Gen. Chiang Kai-shek.

The majority of China's millions are not Communists. The Chinese basic devotion to the family precludes this worse-than-pagan philosophy. If the United States does not wait too long for the dust to settle, the majority of the Chinese people, given American help, and the help of the nations in the anti-Communist alliance, can be rallied to fight to expel communism from China. But they must have Chinese leadership. For if China is to be liberated, and remain free, the job of deliverance must be accomplished by the people of China themselves, not merely performed in their name.

Well, Mr. President, it was some months ago when I said that. But I think every word of it was true then, and every word of it is true now. That is why I have introduced a bill to give aid to the Republic of China.

The aid for which provision is made in this bill is divided into three separate categories. As I have already pointed out, the principal category is military assistance. Such assistance is the primary need, as of today. The most important thing we can do, right now, is make it possible for the Chinese Nationalists to invade the mainland of China. But it is of such importance only if done promptly. So done, it offers the best chance of retrieving victory in Asia. But if we are forced out of Korea, permitting the Red armies to be redeployed, the chance is gone.

My bill provides for $1,000,000,000 to be allocated to the Secretary of National Defense to be used in providing military assistance that is appropriate under the terms of the act. Among the terms of the proposal is a provision that the use of this aid shall be under the supervision of American military personnel, so as to insure its most effective utilization.

If the forces of Nationalist China, now in Formosa, should be able to invade the mainland and consolidate with the guerrilla forces there, it will become urgently necessary for the government of Nationalist China to exploit its successes by bringing to the areas which come under its control immediate economic help and certain financial stability. It is for this reason that my bill contains provisions to furnish such types of assistance when needed. The manner of furnishing either economic or financial assistance is stipulated in such terms as to insure profitable utilization and proper supervision.

Nearly 2 years ago 50 Senators signed a letter pleading for speedy action by the Foreign Relations Committee on the bill I had introduced in February 1949 to provide aid to the Republic of China. The signers of that letter constituted a majority of the Senate of the United States, but their pleas were ignored.

This time, I am not asking any of my colleagues to join me in signing a letter, because the time is very short; and anyway, on past performance, there is no evidence that a letter from some of us would accomplish its purpose. But I hope, Mr. President, that those of my colleagues who agree with me that this proposal should at least be considered will express themselves to those members of the Foreign Relations Committee whom they know best.

I also hope my friends in the Press and Radio Galleries will carry to the American people my warning that the chances are very slim indeed that the Chinese Nationalist forces will be aided or even permitted to get into this struggle, before it is too late, unless Congress orders it; and Congress certainly is not going to order it unless the proposal is at least considered and brought to a vote. If the people of the United States want the Chinese Nationalists brought into the fight to aid us in our struggle with the Chinese Communists, they had better make their voices heard in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. President, it appears that we face two alternatives in Asia. One of them is a new course of action—offensive action—action that will relieve the overburdening pressure of our forces in Korea. The other alternative is continued retreat and defeat. It does not appear possible to regain the ground we have lost in Korea without either committing very substantial additional forces of American soldiers to that conflict, or providing the Chinese Nationalists with assistance so as to enable them to mount an offensive that will divert much of the Chinese Communist strength. Certainly if we undertake a policy of actively aiding the Nationalist Chinese in such a struggle—a continuing daily, weekly struggle with the Communists—it will serve to subject the enemy to pressure, the kind of pressure to which we, so far, have been subjected.

There has been talk about the danger in such a course of action, and it is entirely proper that the cost of such a course should be considered. What might the bad results be? If the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa should attempt to invade the mainland, and this attempt should fail, would we be any worse off than we are now? We should be exactly where we are today. Such a failure would be cheap compared to the failure we are experiencing in Korea. Certainly the goals to be gained in the event of success far outweigh the cost in the event of failure.

Most of those who will oppose my bill belong to the school of thought which "wrote off" the Chinese Nationalists 2 years or more ago. So from their standpoint, if a "second front" can be opened on the Chinese mainland by action of the Chiang Kai-shek forces, something will have been created out of nothing; and if the attempt is made and fails, nothing will have been lost.

But there is a very real chance of success, so we must consider, if such a move is successful, what then?

Communist aggression in Asia will, in that event, have received its first major set-back.

All the world will see and understand the realism of such an event. The short-term results of such success would, of course, mean the freeing of Korea from Communist domination, the major objective we sought when we were pulled into the Korean conflict last June. The Communist pressure in Indochina would be relieved, and the forces of the United States would be free for any eventuality arising in Europe. More important, Mr. President, in the long run, would be the fact that Asians themselves had contributed the major force in preventing further Communist aggression and expansion.

Let me reemphasize that such a course of action, if it is to be successful, must be embarked upon in the immediate future. Time is of the essence, lest we find ourselves completely pushed out of Korea, and thus miss the opportune time to engage the enemy on two separate fronts. If we allow ourselves to be completely pushed out of Korea, the chances for a return by any democratic forces to the mainland of Asia within the foreseeable future are practically nonexistent. In such an event the vast power of the Chinese Communists will be free to provide further assistance to the Communist forces now engaging the French in Indochina, and certainly they will never be satisfied until all western democratic influence is expelled from the whole of Asia.

Most earnestly, Mr. President, and in the sincere belief that what is here proposed is in the national interest, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to give serious thought to this bill. It is much too late to waste time indulging in recriminations regarding where to place the blame for our mistakes of the past. They have been serious mistakes. But we dare not, in the name of unity, disregard the fact that mistakes have been made; nor, in an attempt to prove there were no mistakes, let ourselves be hoodwinked by propaganda designed inevitably to destroy the power of the United States.

We act as though we were shadow-boxing, while the enemy is fighting for keeps. But our boys in Korea know we are not shadow-boxing. The dead bodies of the thousands of men who lie buried in the soil of Korea give testimonial that the enemy is not shadow-boxing.

Why should our military forces be subjected to restricting and hampering decisions of the diplomatic table when the enemy is free to engage in all-out military action against our troops?

Why will we not admit that we are in a war? In a war, we ought to welcome any and all allies. Certainly the Chinese Nationalist troops in Formosa are ready, willing, and able to be our allies.

The time has arrived to do a little nose counting. If our past allies will support us, well and good. If not, let us not for any purpose of appeasement, sacrifice the ideals of our people, ideals which have been bought and preserved by the

sacrifices of countless Americans of all generations.

For these treasured ideals, which are so difficult to define yet so simple that our children understand them, we entered the United Nations. Because of them we undertook and carried out vast programs of relief and assistance to people throughout the world.

For the sake of these ideals, we sent our boys to fight an aggressor in Korea.

Our ideals have been the guiding spirit which has sustained and encouraged this Nation in its darkest hours.

Talking now not about the marches and countermarches of military tactics, but about basic policy, I say that today, Mr. President, we must face squarely the issue of whether we go forward with positive offensive action, or back down in the face of Communist aggression and compromise those ideals which have made us great.

If the answer is made by the American people, I am sure that it will be a resounding "Forward."

Mr. KERR obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator be so kind as to yield for a quorum call, provided his right to the floor is not prejudiced?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE CHALLENGE FACING THE NATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the world resounds today with the harsh din of conflict. The unbridled ambitions of dictators are in mortal combat with the determination of free men to preserve their liberty. This furious clash between the forces of good and evil, involving both our own security and the peace of the world, confronts us with some of the most vexing problems and difficult decisions of all time.

The President of the United States has defined the most critical issue that confronts this Congress. He has described with great vigor and clarity the deadly challenge with which the American people and their way of life are face to face. With equal vigor and clarity he has outlined the plan by which we can meet and overcome this challenge.

I congratulate the President for his courage and frankness in naming the threat of world conquest by Soviet Russia as the gravest danger and evil in the world today.

There are those who claim that this crisis, that the great danger which threatens us, that the awful evil we face, are the results of the failure of the foreign policy of this Government.

Mr. President, I do not agree with that conclusion. I take a fierce pride in the knowledge that our present foreign policy has been developed, and is presently maintained, on a bipartisan basis. It is the product of the finest thinking of many of the ablest men in both parties, and it has been authorized and approved by the overwhelming majority of members of both parties in the Congress.

Already time and trial have proved their wisdom. It is not the failure but the success of American bipartisan foreign policy which has swiftly bared the motives of the ruthless Red dictators. It is not the weakness but the strength of democratic resistance which has frustrated the Soviets' bold designs and moved them to risk world crisis and conflict.

Yes, the lashing of the tentacles of the Russian octopus, and the rattling of the sabers of Communist aggression are the struggles of the evil monster infuriated by opposition and restraint. That opposition and that restraint have been produced through the bipartisan foreign policy of this Government.

The continuing failure of the octopus to reach out and easily grasp its victims must be credited to the successful efforts of this Nation and our allies. These forces of freedom—in America and around the globe—stand firm in their resolution to shackle that evil monster and thwart its wicked purpose.

The present clash of arms in Korea, costly as it is, awful as we know it to be, is the result of the firm resolve of this Nation and 52 others of the United Nations to stop aggression wherever it rears its ugly head, instead of permitting it to roar unchecked to our own shores.

Our President referred to "the threat of world conquest by Soviet Russia" as the gravest evil of our day. Were it not for the bipartisan American foreign policy and the success it has achieved thus far, world conquest by Soviet Russia would not today be a threat—it would be a reality.

It was the purpose of the greedy men in the Kremlin to dominate the world. They hoped to do so by propaganda, if possible. If that failed, they hoped to do so through infiltration, through revolution from within, and by the diabolical process of taking over other nations, one by one, through corrupting their weaker men and twisting them into traitors for communism. If all these failed, then Soviet Russia schemed to conquer by military power.

Mr. President, Soviet Russia is failing in her effort to extend her domination beyond the iron curtain. She is failing to extend her empire with her evil propaganda. She is failing today to achieve her purpose through internal revolution and betrayal of her neighbors by their own citizens.

Flagrant military aggression by the satellites of the Soviet Union is the last fling of the dice, save one, and one alone.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In line with the Senator's statement, is it not true that communism has never been freely accepted by peoples anywhere? At least, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana can recall, everywhere that communism has ever gone it went at the point of the bayonet, either by revolution or by conquest, but the people of no nation have freely made it a Communist state.

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. I believe the correctness of his statement applies even to Russia itself. I think the Russian people were the first ones to become the slaves of the Communist group.

Mr. LONG. And at that time a very small percentage of the people were actually Communists.

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

The very last gamble by these international bandits—and God forbid that—would be to hurl the Red army and the Red air force into the balance.

Our bipartisan foreign policy and the President's proposals, if wholeheartedly supported by the American people, will build the democracy's military power to overcome the threat of the Soviet satellites. They will provide the strength which will either prevent the moving of the Red army and the Red air force or defeat and destroy them if they are moved.

Our aim, Mr. President, is security and tranquillity at home and peace abroad.

Our purpose is to prevent, if possible, any enlargement of the present degree of war which has been thrust upon us.

Our program is to develop enough production and enough power to guarantee the security of our own country and to lead the free peoples of the world in a joint responsible effort to achieve world peace.

This program, Mr. President, not only meets the requirements of our own people, but in the eloquent language of the Atlantic Charter, it will guarantee that "all of the men in all of the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and freedom from want."

Our plan, Mr. President, is to realize that aim, accomplish that purpose, and implement that program through preserving and improving and operating our great bipartisan foreign policy. It has been successful and it has been bipartisan.

Our plan brought about the creation of the United Nations. It has held us firm in our support and participation. I know the United Nations is still far from being what we had desired, what we now hope for, and what we intend it shall be; but it is still mankind's greatest achievement in an age-long struggle for peace.

While its weaknesses have been made dramatically clear in these past months under a baptism of fire, the United Nations is still the greatest hope for peace in the heart of a war-torn world. If we give it, today and tomorrow, the wise and abundant support and patience of which we are capable, it will yet be the instru-

mentality whereby peace will come to the people of this earth.

Our master plan, Mr. President, brought protection to Iran, Greece, and Turkey against Soviet encroachment. It provided economic aid to strengthen and rebuild the free nations. It brought into being the North Atlantic Pact. This effective pattern of mutual aid, fashioned by our Nation, has been embraced by most of the people of the free world. By this means democracy has thus firmly set its course and is on the way to victory.

Mr. President, we must not be lured from the highway of destiny to a strange and risky detour.

Today there are some who would tamper with our master plan to the point of destroying its usefulness and its magnificent opportunity. Others, while giving lip service to the plan's objectives, would force the adoption of other entirely different mediums which either have been rejected heretofore or which, by the very urgency of the present crisis, could not be tested, tried, or proved.

What are these new and untried plans? Who is it that proposes them? For whom do their proponents speak?

I do not know, Mr. President, for whom Mr. Hoover speaks. I know he does not speak for the Republican Party of Vandenberg, Dewey, or Dulles. I know he does not speak for the Republican Party of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY, and his colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee of this Senate. But I do know the folly of Mr. Hoover's efforts. If he is able to make us forsake the bipartisan plan we have already embraced, or if he can bring about the delay and confusion of endless bickering, he would succeed only in compelling this mighty Nation to spin its wheels in neutral when it should be surging full speed ahead.

I do know that his words were spread across the pages of the party organ of the bloody dictator in Moscow.

Mr. President, some men become statesmen, some men become elder statesmen, but some men merely become elder. I regard Herbert Hoover as a fine, patriotic American. I cast no doubt upon his motives as a patriotic citizen. But, Mr. President, I can never forget that when he was determining the policies of this Government, a mighty nation was driven to its knees in economic despair, depression, and want. America will never forget its bitter experience of 20 years ago; and, as it remembers, it is warned. What a contrast there is between Franklin D. Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover. The beloved Roosevelt, though dead, lives on in the hearts and thoughts of millions. Hoover, though living, is part and parcel of the past that is dead and gone.

Then, Mr. President, we have the proposals of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. No man has a higher regard for his character and patriotism than I. I recognize his intellect; but frankly, Mr. President, I cannot determine for myself whether his purpose, in fact, is only to oppose the present American bipartisan foreign policy or some of its operations, or whether his real aim is to put the mighty dynamo of American power into neutral or reverse. The first would be very dangerous; the second would be disastrous.

I know, Mr. President, that the Senator from Ohio does not speak for the colleagues of his own party in the Foreign Relations Committee of this Senate. A vacancy has just been filled in the minority membership of that committee, Mr. President, which I dare say that the Senator from Ohio could have claimed if he had so desired. Can it be that he would rather exclude himself from that committee in order to criticize its work, rather than assume the responsibility for hard decisions that must be taken because of our position in world affairs? Ah, the Senator clearly has a right to speak his own mind, and none can do so more forcefully than he; but I cannot believe that the great State of Ohio has given him a mandate to reverse this Nation's bipartisan foreign policy or, for that matter, to frustrate the same purpose of other leaders of his own party.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Oklahoma has made an observation about the right of the Senator from Ohio to a place on the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Ohio was quoted in the press, and I have in my office a clipping to this effect, as saying that he did not choose to go on the Foreign Relations Committee because he wanted to be free to criticize the policy which was adopted in that committee. I shall send for the clipping and show it to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senator probably has overlooked the statement by the Senator from Ohio himself that he would choose not to be on that committee; he wanted to stand aside, so that he could pot-shot at it.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I had thought that our good friend, the Senator from Ohio, would rather be critical than be informed; and it may be that the statement the Senator has just referred to bears that out.

Mr. President, the Republican Eightieth Congress and the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, by majority votes of members of both parties, after long and vigorous debate, settled the fundamental question which both Mr. Hoover and the distinguished Senator from Ohio now attempt to raise. On June 11, 1948, the Senate by a vote of 64 to 4 adopted the Vandenberg resolution. In that historic paper, the Senate declared that the United States should take part in regional and other collective arrangements which are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and which affect our national security.

A little more than a year later—on July 21, 1949—the Senate expressly, and in concrete form, approved what it had earlier approved in general, by voting decisively to ratify the North Atlantic Pact. That treaty was thoroughly debated, and I remember that the Senator from Ohio and others who opposed it had full opportunity to bring out all their arguments against its ratification. However, they were able to muster only 13 negative votes, as compared with the 82 votes that resulted in the adoption of that treaty, and making it the law of the land.

This Government then and there decided that we would join with Western Europe in building an effective defense by common effort and mutual support against the threat of Soviet communistic aggression.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would hope that the distinguished Senator from Ohio could now give his powerful support to our American bipartisan program and to the North Atlantic Pact. The fate of our country may depend upon how well that treaty works. I know it would work far better with the Senator's support than with his continued opposition.

Article 3 of the treaty reads:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Mr. President, the United States of America did not enter into that treaty out of impulse or kindness in our hearts or just out of sympathy for Western Europe. We agreed to take part in that compact in our own self-interest and because we found it necessary to the preservation of our own national security.

That is the reason, Mr. President, why that treaty should now be implemented as effectively as possible. That is the criterion by which our decisions should be made to support that treaty and make it work.

Mr. President, it is abundantly evident to every man, woman, and child in the land, and must be so recognized by Mr. Hoover and by the Senator from Ohio, that the urgent need for strengthening our defenses against Soviet aggression is far more apparent today than when the treaty was signed and ratified.

This is the vital question, Mr. President: Will we make the security of the United States more certain by helping to build great defenses and strength among the nations of Western Europe; or will we repudiate our bi-partisan foreign policy and the North Atlantic Pact, and see Western Europe, which is the greatest possible source of help we can ever have, taken over and used to make the common enemy stronger, while we would be thus made weaker?

When primordial man first left the cave, and joined with other men in the most primitive community, he learned that cooperation with his fellows was necessary in order to achieve law and order. Can it be that some men have become so civilized that they not only forget that basic law of survival, but even deny its existence?

Both Mr. Hoover and the Senator from Ohio surround their arguments with if's, like a picket fence, but they add up to the same thing.

Mr. Hoover says, "Do not send a single American soldier or American dollar until Europe itself erects a sure dam that can hold back Russian communism."

Mr. President, if they could do that, they would not need, and we would not

propose, our help; but in the present circumstances that is an impossible condition. That is like saying "Don't go near the water until you have learned how to swim." Even the blind can see that Western Europe is absolutely unable to build an effective defense against Stalinism without our help.

The Senator from Ohio at one time proposed that the United States extend the Monroe Doctrine to cover Europe. What folly. What he called for then would mean an unlimited commitment by the United States alone. However, now, in direct contradiction, he opposes sending American troops to Europe to fulfill even the limited cooperative commitment we have under the treaty.

He would put up a posted sign to keep out the Russian giant, but would not station enough guards there to stop bandit pygmies. He says we would go to Europe only after an attack was made. That would be to advertise to the world that too little and too late had become the official American policy. Oh, yes; he would give the patient a little stimulant now, but would wait until the patient was dead before offering the transfusion required to save his life.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator not say that the question is more one of whether we should send troops, rather than of who should send them, whether it be by authority of the President or by authority of the Congress? Does the Senator not think that in all the debate which has been taking place in the Senate we have been wasting time on the question of jurisdiction, rather than discussing the question of whether the foreign policy of the United States should be to implement the North Atlantic Treaty? Does not the Senator think that we should spend more time discussing the question whether the United States should implement that agreement by sending troops, than in discussing the question, whether the President has that authority, or whether the Congress should say whether the troops should go?

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the question. I think there has been evidence of delay, but I frankly think that in view of all the circumstances, the delay will result in more of good than of bad. It seems to me that we are perhaps in the same situation as the woman jury. It was the first time the women had ever served on a jury, and the first time that the court had ever had a woman jury. The court gave a very simple case to the jury for consideration, and, after the evidence was in and the arguments made, he gave his instructions. The jury retired to consider the verdict. They were in the jury room for about 2 days. Finally, the judge called them in and asked them whether anything was wrong. They told him "No." He said, "Did you understand the evidence?" They said, "Quite well." "And the instructions?" "Oh, yes; they were very plain." "Well," said the judge, "what about a verdict?" One good lady said, "Well, Your Honor, we haven't gotten around to considering the verdict," He said, "Is that so? May I inquire as to what you have been doing?" She said, "Why, certainly. We have been trying to elect a foreman." [Laughter.] I believe that as a result of this debate, we shall agree on a foreman, on the implementing of a basic agreement already made, on a better understanding of what the agreement is, on a better understanding of what the implementation of it will do, and on a better understanding of what the failure to implement it, with the full support of the American people, would bring about in the way of tragic results.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Even though we finally elect a foreman, does not the Senator believe that there will be a great many straw bosses?

Mr. KERR. I think it would not hurt if we had a few straw bosses, if we operated it on the basis of getting to the point where their feeling of self-improvement would be gratified, and if the general program would not be delayed too long in the process. I think that is all right, because in a democracy we all have the right of expression, we all have the right of participation, and we all have the right of implementation of decisions. I think it far better that we take this time in crystallizing the sentiment and the wishes of the people in support of a program which has been adopted and which, the more it is discussed, the more worth while it will become, or will appear to be. I think the taking of that time will, in the long run, be very wholesome.

Mr. President, in the present titanic struggle of international diplomacy, as our Government for itself, and in leading our allies, seeks to prevent or stop aggression, it needs the fullest possible cooperation and support of all of its people and of the leaders of both of its great political parties. Yet, Mr. President, as it has in these past months sought to make some of its most important moves, many Republican leaders, either knowingly or unknowingly, have sought to neutralize those moves and make them futile and useless.

First was their stunning blow hurled at the American Secretary of State. Just before Christmas, Mr. Acheson flew to Brussels to meet the foreign ministers of our allies in the North Atlantic Pact. This Nation needed him to be as strong as we could make him. He was going there to take part in discussions in connection with General Eisenhower's appointment as supreme commander of the allied forces for Western Europe. Yet, at that critical moment a majority of the Republican Members of the Congress repudiated him and demanded his removal. They sent him into action with his hands tied behind his back.

In the same way, Mr. President, just as General Eisenhower was leaving to plan the building of the North Atlantic Treaty defense forces in Europe, the Senator from Ohio delivered on this floor a speech calculated to undermine the whole common defense effort.

The Senator and others, notably Mr. Hoover, have complained that the Europeans are not doing enough for their own and the joint defense. Yet, at the very moment that General Eisenhower was preparing to urge them to make a greater effort, the Senator made a speech which could have no other result than to chill their blood with fear and take the starch out of their backbones.

Mr. President, none could fail to recognize that the free people of Europe have been struggling since VE-day to roll back the black clouds of misery, despair, and gloom. It has been our purpose to help them walk into the sunlight of hope and strength. Let our Republican friends beware, Mr. President, lest by their opposition they create a total eclipse for those whose strength is so necessary for themselves and so vital to us.

Mr. President, surely these Republican leaders cannot fail to know that these actions are greeted in Moscow with jubilant pleasure, but received with dismay among our friends and allies in western Europe. The motives of those who sought to embarrass the Secretary of State are quite evident. I must leave it to those who embarrass General Eisenhower to name their motives for doing so and to answer for them.

Mr. Hoover and the great Senator from Ohio deny that the program they propose is isolationism, but their denials have a hollow sound.

The only way to cooperate is to cooperate. Either we have a common danger against which there is a common defense, or we do not. If we do not, then cooperation should be abandoned; but if we do, and I submit that any high school student can recognize the certainty that we do, then isolationism should be abandoned and cooperation should be made a vital and dynamic reality.

The Senator from Ohio says he has seen no evidence that Soviet Russia will attack Western Europe at all. My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has already pointed out the similarity between that statement by Senator TAFT and the one made by the late Senator Borah. Only 6 weeks before World War II broke out, Borah declared that his own sources of information, contrary to those available to the State Department, assured him that there would be no war.

In fact, I am struck by the parallel between certain attitudes now and some that existed in the period just before World War II. The same attitude of retreatism and defeatism infected many people whose opinions were respected. I recall some nonsense about nazism and fascism being the "wave of the future." It was described as the inevitable shape of things to come—and, therefore, we should bend to the storm and join with this irresistible new force, because we could not defeat it.

Can it be that the insidious propaganda about the "inevitable triumph of communism" has poisoned the minds of some in this country, and that unconsciously they are adopting an attitude of retreatism and defeatism? The best antidote for that kind of nerve warfare is the same kind of realism, courage, and energy that carried the fight to our enemies in the last war and brought victory to the free nations.

If we are deceived and beguiled into withdrawing into our own castle and trying to fortify it without regard to the safety of our neighbors, sooner or later we will be under siege, with the total resources of the rest of the world marshaled against us.

There are 153,000,000 people in the United States; approximately 300,000,000 in the Western Hemisphere. My faith in my God and my country forbid a prophecy of doom, but stark reality hurls the question: How long could these numbers stand up against the 2,000,000,000 people in the rest of the world, if they were under the control of a ruthless and fanatic aggressor?

On the other hand, if we use the strength of this inner citadel of ours, this core of freedom's power, to attach worthy allies to our cause and reinforce the entire democratic world, we stand a good chance of preventing an attack on any of us. But, if the attack does come, it can be met far from our own shores and with the rebuilt strength of our allies added to our own.

While some of the minority party attack our foreign policy by advising us to abandon our advanced position in Western Europe and our allies there, others urge us to take steps that would involve us in war on the mainland of China. If we took seriously all this conflicting counsel from the discordant elements of the Republican Party, we would weaken ourselves disastrously by ditching our allies in Europe and taking on an impossible war, much farther from home, against the unlimited manpower of China. The best way to guarantee the success of Soviet communism and our own failure would be to follow the prescriptions of the divided Republican Party.

Some critics of our foreign policy want a bargain-basement defense force. They say we can cut the cost by building up a great air force and a navy while maintaining a small land army. That has to be just another argument for isolation, because that kind of a set-up condemns us to sit back and wait for the enemy to come after us. No war has ever been won, that I know of, without a land army, and we must not risk our national existence on any such unbalanced, unproved defense.

Of course, our economy is important and it will be encouraged and vastly enlarged, but our freedom is no less important. In 1940, we thought one and three-fourths billion dollars was all we could spend on defense, yet in 1942, we spent $94,000,000,000, and in 1944, $87,000,000,000. Last year, we thought $13,000,000,000 was as much as we could spend on our Military Establishment. However, in the past 6 months we have provided $42,000,000,000. The cost of defense is relative to the need.

How much will you pay to live? What price liberty? What price freedom? What price the American way of life?

No man can give us the specifications of the minimum in unity and effort and preparation that will guarantee the security of our beloved Nation. At such a time as this, who would dare to risk all to the bare minimum specified by a few self-appointed armchair strategists?

I remember the story of the French count who wanted to hire a driver for the carriage which took his children to and from school. There was a narrow place along the road; on one side, a steep, high cliff, and on the other side, a deep chasm. He questioned the applicants for the job. He asked each one how near he could drive to the edge of the chasm safely. He was told by one, 12 inches, another 6 inches, and another with haughty pride, proclaimed, "I can drive along the very edge in perfect safety."

Then came one who replied: "I don't know how near I can drive to the edge of the chasm in safety, but I can drive that carriage so close to the cliff on the other side of the road that once in a while I will knock a little paint off the hub cap, but then I will know that your children will be safe."

We should search the recesses of our hearts and fortify our minds and conscience against the questions of our own children. They will speak to us either from the depths of an enforced bondage, or from the glory of a continued American way of life. God grant that they will not ask, "Why did you do so little that you failed to get by?" Let us be certain that they can say: "Thank you for doing enough to let us live as you have lived as free men."

Under the leadership of the President, we have a program for security and for victory—a program already approved in broad outline by the majority of the Senate. Let us get on with the job of implementing that program with whatever it takes to insure success.

We know our greatest danger from without comes from Soviet Russia. But within there is another almost as deadly. It is the threat that the creeping paralysis of fear and dissension will become an opiate to our will and a shackle to our feet. No combination of powers, Mr. President, can defeat us and the allies we now have, if we remain united and acquit ourselves like men, in the American tradition. It is not in that tradition to give up just because the going is rough. Washington had his Valley Forge; Lincoln had his dark days of discouragement. Are we to be craven because we have suffered reverses? Or, shall we take renewed determination to win, come what may?

Some have asked: How strong is our present leadership? How strong are our President and Secretary of State? The answer is: They are as strong as the unity and purpose of the American people make them.

Already, we face a sobering challenge written in blood and tears on the distant fields of battle. Our heroic fighting men have demonstrated the value of teamwork in meeting the common enemy. They have shown the ability to practice the most effective unity under the most trying conditions.

We shall always remember Hungnam. This epic operation snatched a great American force from the very teeth of the enemy. It will go down in history as one of the most brilliant examples of coordinated effort by Army, Navy, and Air Force.

This sets an example for us here at home. We should take to heart this stirring lesson, and we should apply the same principles of unity, courage, and energy. Together we must move full speed ahead to complete the sound program we already have started for the joint defense of the free world.

How can we rally and lead the other nations in this great coalition of free people if we ourselves do not demonstrate the qualities of leadership and united effort? How can we inspire confidence in others if we lose confidence in ourselves? The questions answer themselves.

Joint defense must start at home. Our common hope and faith must be rooted in the heart of every individual. Leadership is the duty of a strong, rich America, and the responsibilities for that leadership fall upon every one of us.

One of those who has responded magnificently to this requirement for leadership, Mr. President, is our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The Senate, the United States and the free nations owe a great debt of gratitude to him for his strong and effective leadership as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in this trying time. If we all respond to the challenge that confronts us as well as the senior Senator from Texas, there will be no doubt as to the outcome.

I want to take this occasion to pay sincere tribute also to those leaders of the Republican Party who are working for unity. One of those is the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has given generously of his wisdom and his strength to help construct our bipartisan foreign policy. A few days ago, he again performed a service for his country when he said:

> Our national heritage and the fate of the free world continue to call for a dependable common front where we and our allies all can be relied on at home and abroad to do our full part.

Then there is John Foster Dulles, who is ably and loyally serving to bring the free nations into a stronger accord. Mr. Dulles is no less a Republican for having declared 2 weeks ago:

> Any nation which at a moment of supreme danger sheds those of its allies who are most endangered, and to whom it is bound by solemn treaty, by common heritage and by fellowship in war and peace, is scarcely in a position thereafter to do much picking and choosing for its own account. It elects a dangerous course, for solitary defense is never impregnable.

Furthermore, there is Governor Dewey, who, far from accepting the philosophy of retreatism and defeatism, is urging us to build up the common defense at an even faster rate. There are other Republicans I could name with these who are not only preaching, but practicing unity in this critical hour. This is the spirit which will save our country and our civilization.

These men express the true spirit and the real sentiments of the American people. On the other hand, those who seek to place themselves at the head of a parade and lead the American people into a storm cellar will find that they have few followers. There is no body of

sand wherein we can bury our heads deep enough without leaving other portions of our anatomy, equally tender, exposed to destruction.

There can be honest differences of opinion among those who have the best interests of their country at heart. But I think some of those opinions, including those of Mr. Hoover and the Senator from Ohio, are ill-conceived and cannot stand the light of searching analysis. I am convinced that this is true in spite of the fact that the Senator from Ohio is "Mr. Republican," himself, and that Mr. Hoover is just as certainly "the late Mr. Republican."

Mr. President, the bitter lessons of our own history teach us that when danger closes in from without, or threatens from within, we must resolve our differences and fortify ourselves in unity. We are reminded that once before dissension and opposing interests so inflamed the minds of the people that the Nation was momentarily torn asunder. In that dark hour, nearly 100 years ago, the issue had to be resolved in a tragic civil war.

In that somber period of our history, the resulting conflict brought loss and damage only to ourselves. Today, we are the recognized leaders of the free peoples of the world. The cost of doubt and dissension to all who look to us with hope would be incalculable. Let us beware, lest in sowing the seeds of disunity among ourselves today, we do not reap a world-wide whirlwind of distrust, repudiation, and global catastrophe tomorrow.

My good friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in his eloquent speech here a few days ago, asked, "Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World?" I am sure the Senator agrees with me that valiant American fighting men are giving the answer to that question in Korea, in Germany, in all our outposts, and in the training camps at home. The American people are giving the answer in the factories, on the farms, in the schools and offices and homes all over America.

Mr. President, the twilight hour has an appearance much like the hour just before the dawn. I believe in America. I believe in our heritage of freedom, of courage, of tenacity, of integrity, and of honor. I have unlimited faith in America. If we are true to ourselves and our heritage, this is not the twilight hour, but the hour before the dawn of a new and brighter day. That day will surely break, if we but dissipate the threatening cloud that is now so small and can be so easily dispelled—the cloud of confusion, of disunity, of doubt in our own strength and our own destiny.

I believe profoundly that there is more in the history of America than meets the eye. When I recall the discovery, the settlement, and the growth of this country as a land of opportunity and freedom, where a great experiment in the self-government and self-realization of man could be worked out—when I consider how this Nation, under God, through the years has achieved a constantly higher standard of material and spiritual development—I cannot, I do not believe that God has raised up this Nation as a beacon of hope for all aspiring peoples, only to have America struck down by a Godless and oppressive regime before its highest destiny is fulfilled. In all humility, I have the deepest conviction that America will go steadily forward as the standard-bearer of the hopes and yearnings of humanity for a better life. Nothing can defeat us but ourselves.

America has come of age in a new world. Our country has reached maturity as the honored leader of all those who aspire to a noble and decent life, in peace and harmony with their fellow men. Only this Nation has the strength and vigor to lead the world to freedom from fear and freedom from want.

I know Senators recall the story of the feeding of the multitudes by Jesus of Nazareth. Through the long day He had taught and worked with them and then provided for their physical needs. As the day wore on and evening approached, the great crowd went home. They came again on another day, but when they learned the stern duties of His service, we are told that again many "went back and walked no more with him." This left the Master alone with the Twelve. He turned to them and said: "Will ye also go away?" To which the irrepressible Peter responded with a question of his own: "Master, if we leave Thee, to whom shall we go?"

Mr. President, under our great bipartisan foreign policy, we have encouraged and helped our allies in the Western World and in the North Atlantic community. We have strengthened them with material help and with that more priceless intangible ingredient, moral and spiritual cooperation. It has been a long day and some are tired—but, Mr. President, the task is far from finished.

If the hundreds of millions of freedom-loving people in the other nations who are willing to work and, if necessary, fight for peace cannot turn to the United States of America for leadership and effective cooperation, to whom shall they go?

Mr. President, there is but one answer, and it is unthinkable.

We Americans of this generation, who enjoy the greatest way of life that man has ever developed or known, are determined that it shall be protected and preserved for ourselves and as a priceless heritage to our children. We cannot do less than our best. We cannot give less than the highest of which we are capable. Thus, we will build that unity of thought and purpose and action among ourselves and with our allies that will carry us forward to that certain success for which every American hopes and prays.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing a couple of bills and making a few remarks?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my colleague for that purpose without prejudice to my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for a very fine speech. I wish also to refer to the speech of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday, which I regard as an extremely important presentation of the facts relating to this subject.

I had intended today to address the Senate on the subject of foreign relations. However, after reading the newspapers this morning and noting how many speeches had been made yesterday, in the Senate and elsewhere, plus the press releases, I decided to defer my own discussion for a few days.

I was particularly impressed by some of the reports in the press this morning which seemed to me to be extremely belligerent and inflammatory with regard to Russia. It is my own view that we still should do everything possible to avoid a war, rather than precipitate one. I am inclined to think that perhaps it may be beneficial to the country, for a few days, at least, if we may have sufficient quietude to digest the vast mass of information which has been presented in the speeches of the past few days.

Mr. President, I now desire to introduce the bills to which I referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNING BODY OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill proposing a fundamental reorganization of the governing body of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I have before me a description of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, together with the bill itself, for the information of the Senate. In view of the fact that there are so few Members of the Senate present, I believe that in order to save the time of the Senate it would be better for me to place the statement in the RECORD. There is no point in reading it at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 514) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, to provide for the elimination of the Board of Directors, and to vest the management of the Corporation in a Governor, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Governor appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Governor shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, but he may continue in office until his successor is appointed and qualified. The Governor shall be eligible for reappointment. Whenever a vacancy shall oc-

cur in the office of Governor, other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term. The Governor shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Governor, and shall receive a salary at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Governor is authorized to appoint two Deputy Governors to assist in the execution of the functions vested in the Corporation. Deputy Governors shall be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum."

(b) The word "Governor" shall be substituted for the word "director," "directors," and "board of directors" wherever such word or words appear in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment, and the offices, powers, and duties of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall thereupon terminate.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

GOVERNOR OF RFC

This bill proposes a fundamental reorganization of the RFC. It proposes that the management of the Corporation shall be vested in a single Governor, who shall take the place of the present five-man Board of Directors. It also proposes that the Board of Directors shall cease to exist 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The purpose of this change is to strengthen the management of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and in this way to enhance its true usefulness during the difficult periods which lie ahead of the Nation.

During much of its existence RFC operated successfully under the supervision of a Federal Loan Administrator, whose authority transcended that of the RFC directors and who functioned, in practical effect, as the General Manager of RFC. In 1947, for the first time since 1939, the Board of Directors became the governing body in RFC.

The position of Governor of the RFC would be a position of considerable responsibility. It should attract the interest of a man of adequate stature and background. Such a man would not be attracted by the prospect of serving as one of five directors with the strong possibility that his four colleagues would be of inferior stature and background. I am convinced that the organization structure proposed in this bill will make it possible for the Government to take into its employ for this position a leader who would not otherwise be willing to devote his efforts to the public service.

A single administrator has proven successful in such lending agencies as the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Hoover Commission, in its report on regulatory commissions, referred to this general problem when it said, quoting from page 5:

"Administration by a plural executive is generally regarded as inefficient."

The history of the surplus-property agencies affords an interesting analogy. In the words of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Eightieth Congress, "In actual operation, the three-man Surplus Property Board failed to accomplish its primary objective. * * * The unwieldy three-man Surplus Property Board was therefore abolished and replaced by a single Surplus Property Administrator."

For the past 2 years, the Board of Directors has been an entirely unsatisfactory vehicle of management for the important responsibilities with which RFC has been entrusted.

The study which has recently been made by the Subcommittee on RFC has shown that in a five-man board, it is possible for the individual members to avoid their responsibilities by "passing the buck" from one to the other, or to subordinate employees of the Corporation. We have found instances in which individual members of the Board have brought about the approval of loans by interference in the work of subordinate employees and in disregard of established operating policies of the Corporation. In these cases the applications would otherwise have been rejected. We have found instances in which important loans were made upon the affirmative vote of a minority of the Board members. We have found a large number of instances in which the Board of Directors has approved the making of loans, over the adverse advice of the Corporation's most experienced examiners and reviewing officials, notwithstanding the absence of compelling reasons for doing so and the presence of convincing reasons for not doing so.

Under the organization form proposed in this bill the side-stepping of responsibility would no longer be possible. If the management of RFC were vested in one man there would be no way in which he could escape the responsibility for the Corporation's acts. This change should greatly strengthen the control which the Congress will exercise on behalf of the people of the Nation over the lending of public money to private individuals and business concerns.

With the enormous growth which has taken place in the Federal establishment since the beginning of the Second World War, there has been a considerable increase in the number of people who must be appointed by the President to important positions in the Government. The number of appointments which must be reviewed for confirmation by the Senate has also increased. Necessarily, the relative importance of each appointment and the relative degree of high-level attention which can be given to the selection of officials has decreased accordingly. In recent years the appointment of the directors of RFC has come to be treated as a matter of little moment.

I am convinced that the change proposed by this bill will enhance the prestige of the RFC management sufficiently so that the President will give his personal attention to the selection of the Corporation's Governor. I am convinced also that the qualifications of a nominee for this position will be examined with considerably more care in the Senate than would the nominations of five men appointed to a board. This alone would justify the change proposed in this bill under the circumstances in which the Federal Government finds itself today.

REVISION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which relates to the revision of the basic Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill for the information of the Senate.

I may say that this revision relates to various aspects of the basic legislation, such as the method of financing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As an example of what I mean, the bill provides for the appropriation of a revolving fund for the financing of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in place of its present borrowing power. There are other provisions of similar character.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation). It shall be the duty of said Corporation to aid in financing industry, agriculture, commerce, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, to assist in promoting maximum employment and production and, when specifically directed, to perform certain duties and functions in connection with the national defense and foreign policy programs of the United States. The principal office of the Corporation shall be in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Governor. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.'

"(b) Within 6 months after the close of each fiscal year the Corporation shall make a report to the Congress of the United States, which shall contain the financial statements for the fiscal year, including a balance sheet, a statement of income and expenses for all operations, a statement of income and expenses for major classes of loans, and an analysis of accumulated net income. Such statements shall be prepared from the financial records of the Corporation, which shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions, including the maintenance of adequate cost accounting records so that the development of data necessary to report the results of its lending activities by major classes of loans can be accomplished. The report shall contain schedules showing, as of the close of the Corporation's fiscal year, direct loans totaling $100,000 or more to any one borrower; loans totaling $100,000 or more to any one borrower in which the Corporation has a participation or an agreement to participate; and the investments in the securities and obligations of any one borrower which total $100,000 or more.

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Governor appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Governor shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, but he may continue in office until his successor is appointed and qualified. The Governor shall be eligible for reappointment. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Governor, other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term. The Governor shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Governor and shall receive a salary at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Governor is authorized to appoint two Deputy Governors to assist in the execution of the functions vested in the Corporation. Deputy Governors shall be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1956, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction,

State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 and any other laws applicable to the Corporation; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its Governor, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act or in the Government Corporation Control Act, the Governor of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds, and such determination shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in section 2412 of title 28 of the United States Code. The Corporation shall also be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. Debts due the Corporation, whether heretofore or hereafter arising, shall not be entitled to the priority available to the United States pursuant to section 3466 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 191) except that the Corporation shall be entitled to such priority with respect to debts arising from any transaction pursuant to any of the following acts or provisions in effect at any time: Sections 5d (1) and 5d (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act added by section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of stock of the Federal home-loan banks; to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; and for other purposes,' approved June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 573); sections 4 (f) and 9 of the act entitled 'An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes,' approved June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 354, 356); section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 26); the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765 and the following); sections 11 and 12 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 214, 215); and section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (56 Stat. 245).

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might, on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"SEC. 4. (a) Where it has been determined by the Corporation that financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and that a substantial public interest would be served, the Corporation within the limitations hereinafter provided is authorized, either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise:

"(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States.

"(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States and to subscribe for or make loans upon nonassessable preferred stock in any insurance company organized under the laws of any State or of the United States. In any case in which, under the laws of the State in which it is located, any such insurance company is not permitted to issue nonassessable preferred stock, or if such laws permit such issue of preferred stock only by unanimous consent of stockholders, the Corporation is authorized to purchase the legally issued capital notes or debentures of such insurance company.

"(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to (A) States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"(4) To make such loans as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophies: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 4 (a) as to availability of credit shall not apply to such loans.

"(b) The powers granted in section 4 (a) of this act shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment.

"(2) No loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, may be made under sections 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4) for a period or periods exceeding 10 years and no securities or obligations maturing more than 10 years from date of purchase by the Corporation may be purchased thereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restriction on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Corporation as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in proceedings under section 20B of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That any loan made or securities and obligations purchased prior to July 1, 1947, may in aid of orderly liquidation thereof or the interest of national security, be renewed or the maturity extended for such period not in excess of 10 years and upon such terms as the Corporation may determine: *Provided further*, That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purpose of constructing industrial facilities may have a maturity of 10 years plus such additional period as is estimated may be required to complete such construction. The Corporation may, in carrying out the provisions of subsection 4 (a) (3), purchase securities and obligations, or make loans, including renewals or extensions thereof, with maturity dates not in excess of 40 years, as the Corporation may determine.

"(3) In agreements to participate in loans, wherein the Corporation's disbursements are deferred, such participations by the Corporation shall be limited to 70 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement, in those cases where the total amount borrowed is $100,000 or less, and shall be limited to 60 percent of the balance outstanding at the time of disbursement, in those cases where the total amount borrowed is over $100,000.

"(4) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments, made pursuant to authority granted by subsections (a) (4), (a) (3), and (a) (2) of section 4, which the Corporation may have outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed (1) under subsection (a) (4) $40,000,000, (2) for construction purposes under subsection (a) (3) $200,000,000, and (3) for financial assistance to insurance companies under subsection (a) (2) $15,000,000.

"(5) No loan or other financial assistance shall be extended under authority contained in 4 (a) (1) unless there is reasonable cause to believe that the total amount of funds supplied including interest thereon can be repaid within 10 years from date of initial disbursement, either from earnings of the borrower or through means, other than liquidation of the borrower, contemplated at the time the application was approved by the Corporation.

"(6) All applications for loans or other financial assistance totaling $100,000 or more to any borrower must be approved by the Governor. In any instance where such an application is approved over the adverse recommendation of the Review Board provided for in paragraph (8) of this subsection, or disapproved over the recommendation of said Board, a memorandum shall be placed in the loan file setting forth the Governor's reasons for such approval or disapproval.

"(7) Each loan made hereafter by the Corporation to any borrower pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Corporation and such borrower by which such borrower shall undertake that it will not, within 2 years after the date of the making of such loan, employ, tender any office or employment to, or retain for professional services any person who on the date such loan was made or within 1 year prior thereto shall have served as a director or Governor of the Corporation, or as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Governor shall have determined to involve the exercise of discretion with respect to the making of loans to borrowers pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section unless—

"(A) the Governor shall have determined that such person, on the date such loan was made and within 1 year prior thereto, was employed by the Corporation only in a branch or field office of the Corporation which did not, and under ordinary procedures of the Corporation would not, perform any function in connection with the negotiation, modification, supervision, or collection of such loan; or

"(B) such person (I) shall be employed at the request of the governor upon his determination that such employment is advisable to safeguard the interests of the Corporation, (II) will receive no compensation from the Corporation for such employment other than his regular salary, and (III) will receive no compensation from such borrower for such employment: *Provided*, That compensation so paid by the Corporation shall be deemed to be nonadministrative expense of the Corporation.

As used in this paragraph, the term 'loan' shall include any extension of financial assistance, by loan or otherwise, pursuant to this act.

"(8) All applications for loans or other financial assistance referred to in paragraph (6) of this subsection shall be reviewed by a Board of Review consisting of five persons selected by the Governor from among the senior examiners of the Corporation. It shall be the duty of the said Board to submit to the Governor a written decision or finding in each case. Each member of the Board shall serve without compensation other than the compensation received as senior examiner and shall not be removed from the said Board without cause.

"(9) No application for a loan or other financial assistance shall be approved by the Corporation unless the basis for the determination of substantial public interest as required by section 4 (a), has been reduced

to writing and made a permanent part of the files of the Corporation. The Governor shall make the determination in all cases where the applications total $100,000 or more to any borrower.

"(c) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(d) No Governor, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(e) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section 4 shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1954, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(f) The Corporation shall maintain as a permanent part of its records a docket which during the regular business hours of the Corporation shall be kept available for public inspection. The following information shall be posted in the said docket without delay upon receipt of an application for a loan:

"(1) The name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applicants, the names of the officers and directors thereof.

"(2) The amount and duration of the loan for which application is made.

"(3) The purpose for which the proceeds of the loan are to be used.

"(4) A description of the security offered.

"(5) The names of all persons who shall represent the applicant or who shall intercede for the applicant or who shall attempt to influence the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in any manner either for or against the applicant in the exercise of its judgment in connection with said loan.

Duplicate copies of this docket shall be maintained both in the agency office in which the loan application is filed and in the Washington office of the Corporation.

"(g) In order to enable the Corporation to carry out the provisions of this act, the Treasury Department, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Reserve banks, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board are hereby directed, under such conditions as they may prescribe, to make available to the Corporation at its request such reports, records, or other information as they may have, relating to the condition of existing borrowers and applicants for loans under this act, or relating to obligors whose obligations are offered to or held by the Corporation as security for loans under this act. Every applicant for a loan under this act shall as a condition precedent thereto, consent to such examination as the Corporation may require for the purposes of this act and that reports of examinations by constituted authorities may be furnished by such authorities to the Corporation upon request therefor.

"(h) Section 410 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"(i) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"SEC. 5. It shall be the general policy of the Corporation to establish interest rates on loans that, in the judgment of the Governor, will cover the costs as determined under section 7 (c), administrative expenses and other expenses, and a risk factor which, over all will provide for losses that may materialize on loans.

"SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"SEC. 7. (a) The Corporation is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the functions, powers, and duties granted to or imposed upon it by this act or any other provision of law, not to exceed a total of $1,300,000,000 outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $1,300,000,000 are hereby authorized. Amounts appropriated hereunder and all income hereafter earned from the Corporation's operations shall become and will be administered as a revolving fund to effectuate the provisions of this act. Advances shall be made to the Corporation from the revolving fund upon the written request of the Corporation. As the Corporation repays the amounts obtained from the Treasury, the repayments shall be made to the revolving fund.

"(b) Within 30 days after the appropriations authorized in section 7 (a) have been made available, the Corporation shall retire its capital stock, shall redeem its outstanding notes held by the Treasury, and shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury the estimated amount of its accumulated earnings as of the date of settlement. Necessary adjustment arising from earnings redetermination shall be made within a reasonable time thereafter. The Corporation's power to issue its notes, debentures, bonds, and other obligations to the United States Treasury, except as provided under section 7 (a), is hereby rescinded.

"(c) Annual payments shall be made by the Corporation to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts by reason of costs incured by the Government, either directly or indirectly, through the employment of Federal funds by the Corporation in carrying out the provisions of this act. These payments shall be computed by applying to the average monthly balance of funds invested in the Corporation, a percentage determined annually in advance by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such percentage shall not be less than the current average rate which the Treasury pays on its marketable obligations.

"SEC. 8. The Corporation shall after June 30, 1950, contribute to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the Corporation's employees and their beneficiaries. The Corporation shall also after June 30, 1950, contribute to the Employees' Compensation Fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Federal Security Administrator for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the Corporation's employees. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Corporation into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 9. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation, or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied, or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"SEC. 10. (a) The Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer within 30 days after the effective date of this act, to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington is authorized and directed to receive, all notes, mortgages, debentures, loan agreements, or other forms of indebtedness, and all loan files pertaining to the loan to the Republic of the Philippines and the loan to the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd. The Export-Import Bank shall reimburse the Corporation for the unpaid balances of the loans, plus accrued interest, as of the date of transfer.

"(b) The Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer within 30 days after the effective date of this act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all notes, loan agreements, or other forms of indebtedness, and all loan files pertaining to the loan to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Corporation in an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the loan, plus accrued interest, as of the date of transfer.

"(c) The Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer within 30 days after the effective date of this act, to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to receive, all mortgages, so classified on the Corporation's balance sheet, which originated under authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cancel notes of the Corporation in an amount equal to the unpaid balances of the mortgages, plus accrued interest, as of the date of transfer. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall sell or otherwise liquidate the mortgages so transferred at no less than the unpaid balance at date of transaction, plus accrued interest. All income and proceeds from liquidation, less reasonable costs of administration, shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 11. Upon the termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this act, the Governor shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. He may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with

the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved.

"SEC. 12. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its Governor shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the Governor under this act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"SEC. 13. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or without being duly authorized, draws any orders or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 14. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person, or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment, and the offices, powers, and duties of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall thereupon terminate.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

REVISION OF THE RFC ACT

This bill proposes a number of changes designed to strengthen the RFC Act by clarifying the Corporation's responsibilities and by improving its accounting methods and its financial structure. The bill has the further aim of strengthening the control which the people of the United States exercise through the Congress over the lending of public moneys to private individuals and business concerns.

The principal change proposed by this bill is the substitution of a single Governor for the present Board of Directors of the Corporation and the elimination of that Board. This is the same change proposed in the separate bill which I have introduced today. I will not repeat my discussion of the reasons why this change is proposed.

The present bill seeks to strengthen the control over the activities of RFC by clarifying the responsibilities of the Corporation in three important respects. It eliminates those provisions of the present act under which the Corporation is enabled to share its responsibility for certain specific loans with other agencies of the Government, it reclassifies one important limitation imposed by the present act so as to clearly require that it be observed as a condition precedent to lending, and it imposes one new requirement as a condition precedent to the exercise of the lending power.

Under the present RFC Act the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board are required before the RFC can finally approve the making of loans to railroads and air carriers. The Civil Aeronautics Board is required by its organic legislation to accept the responsibility of granting such approvals. These circumstances impose on the Board the occasional necessity that it make decisions which cannot possibly be objective decisions. If the Board has approved an RFC loan to a specific carrier it can scarcely avoid the granting of a sufficient subsidy to assure that the loan can be repaid.

This bill eliminates the requirement for ICC or CAB approval of RFC loans and in this way it imposes on the Governor of RFC, without qualification, the full responsibility for any and all loans made by the Corporation.

The bill also eliminates the requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury make certain certifications in connection with RFC loans to insurance companies.

In order to provide that the Corporation will not be deprived of useful or necessary information by these changes, the bill contains a new subsection under which RFC is granted access to reports, records, and other information which may be in the possession of certain agencies of the Government, and which may relate to the condition of existing borrowers or applicants for RFC loans.

In order to clarify the responsibility which the Corporation must accept when it makes a loan, the bill proposes a restatement of the grant of lending authority. It proposes that the Corporation be empowered to lend public money only where it has first been determined by the Corporation that financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and that a substantial public interest would be served.

The requirement that financial assistance be not otherwise available is stated as a limitation on the lending authority in the present act. By its inclusion in the language which grants the authority this bill seeks to emphasize and thus to enhance the significance of the limitation by clearly making it a condition precedent to the exercise of the authority. The limitation has been accorded inadequate recognition in the operations of the Corporation in recent periods.

The present RFC Act does not require the Corporation to determine that a substantial public interest would be served by the making of any individual loan. During the hearings which were held by the subcommittee on RFC in 1950, it became apparent that no great efforts were being made by the Corporation or by its Board of Directors to ascertain that a genuine public interest was served by the loans which were made. Many important loans have been made, in my opinion, in complete disregard of the public interest.

The $15,000,000 loan to Texmass Petroleum Co. was found by the subcommittee to be in disregard of the public interest. The loan to the Mapes Hotel in Reno, repayable in large measure from the earnings of a gambling casino, was made in clear disregard of the public interest. The loan to Waltham Watch Co., under certain circumstances, might have been a loan which furthered the public interest, but under the conditions which were established in the loan agreement, it could not even assist the borrower, let alone the public. The conditions under which the loan to Waltham Watch Co. were made virtually assured the company that it would fail.

The RFC has under consideration at the present time a $12,000,000 loan application which seeks to finance the construction of a privately owned subterranean garage under the Boston Common. There has been considerable controversy about the public interest in this project, and there has even been controversy about its economic feasibility. Most recently the main argument in favor of the loan has been that a garage under the Boston Common would provide an excellent shelter in the event of atomic bombing. The counterargument has been that such a garage would never have less than 40,000 gallons of gasoline in its storage tanks or in

the tanks of the parked automobiles, a circumstance which might interfere seriously with the use of the garage as a shelter in a bombing raid. Certainly the public interest in this loan has not yet been established.

It is for these reasons that the bill proposes to require a specific determination by the Corporation that each loan made will serve a substantial public interest. Separately, the bill requires that the basis for such a determination be reduced to writing so that the records of the Corporation will contain a clear exposition of the reasoning which prompted the making of the loan. Such a record is necessary if the committees of the Congress are to have a satisfactory accounting from the RFC in hearings held weeks after the loans are made. It should prove useful also in the annual audits made for the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States.

In order to clarify the responsibility of the Corporation's Governor, the bill proposes to require that the Governor shall approve all loans in excess of $100,000. It proposes to require further that in those instances in which the Governor either grants a loan or denies it, against the recommendation of the Corporation's review board, he must record in writing his reasons for doing so.

The Subcommittee on RFC has been amazed to learn that many of the loans made by the RFC in the past 2 years have been made by the Board over the strong objection of its advisers and without the creation of any record of the reasons why the advisers were overruled. The testimony given by Board members in later justification of such acts has been unconvincing in every important instance. The requirement now proposed should bring about a considerable improvement at the highest level in accounting for the business decisions of RFC.

The performance of the present review committee associated with the RFC office in Washington has been most encouraging to me and to the other members of the Subcommittee on RFC. The review committee is composed of five of the most seasoned loan examiners of the RFC. They have shown integrity and independence to an exceedingly high degree and they have shown it consistently under circumstances which must to them have been most discouraging.

The members of the Subcommittee on RFC have seen fit to commend these men in public hearings on a number of occasions for the courage with which they have performed their duties. So that the Members of Congress may know who they are, I would like to read into the record the names of the five senior examiners who have made up the RFC review committee during the past 2 years. They are George P. Luce, chairman; Joseph C. Kitt, vice chairman; Frank T. Ronan, Thomas E. Parks, R. Goodwyn Rhett, Jr.

The review committee was created by the RFC many years ago. In recognition of its value, and to make certain that its independence shall not be impaired by the events of any future period, the bill proposes that the continued existence of the review committee be required by statute.

Another provision which will clarify the scope of the Corporation's lending authority is one which refers to the maximum maturity for the repayment of RFC loans. Under the existing law the Corporation may make business loans for a period of 10 years and no longer. The clear intent of this provision was that the Government wished not to place the resources of the public at the disposal of private individuals or private enterprises for more than 10 years in any one instance. But the law has not been interpreted in this way.

The $15,000,000 loan to Texmass Petroleum Co. was earmarked to the extent of about 81 percent for the repayment of existing debt. It was a bail-out, and except for the fact that it eased the debt repayment terms which then existed, it added little to the borrower's repayment ability. In the opinion of expert geologists, the circumstances in which the borrower found himself were such as to preclude repayment of the loan in the 10-year period provided by the resolution of RFC Board of Directors.

Counsel for RFC advised the Senate subcommittee that under the law it was not necessary for the Corporation to determine how the loan would be repaid. Repayment by liquidation of the borrower's enterprise at the end of the 10-year period, in the opinion of the counsel, would meet the requirements of the present RFC Act. The requirements would be met also if the repayment were made from the proceeds of a new loan negotiated at the end of 10 years even if the new loan should be an RFC loan.

This bill proposes that loans shall not be made unless there is reasonable cause to believe that they can be paid with interest within 10 years, either from the borrower's earnings or through other means, excluding liquidation, contemplated at the time the RFC loan was approved. This provision imposes no hardship. It would merely require that the plans of financing in which the Corporation engages be complete and orderly plans, and not haphazard plans based on the hope that unforeseen circumstances will ward off future problems. This should strengthen congressional control over RFC.

Another provision of this bill which will strengthen the control over RFC is the provision that there be a public docket of loan applications. This docket will be available for public inspection during the Corporation's regular business hours, both in Washington and in other cities in which the Corporation maintains offices. Without delay, upon receipt of applications, the Corporation would be required to post in this docket:

1. The name of the applicant, and, in the case of corporations, the names of officers and directors.

2. The amount and duration of the loan applied for.

3. The purpose for which the money is to be used.

4. A description of the security offered.

5. The names of all persons who shall represent the applicant, or who shall intercede for him, or who shall attempt to influence the RFC in any manner in the exercise of its judgment in connection with the application.

In 1949 RFC lent $44,000,000 to Kaiser-Frazer Corp. after protracted secret negotiations. After the loan had been made there was considerable controversy about it, and the public interest which it served was seriously questioned. It would have been helpful to the RFC directors if the arguments pro and con had been at its disposal when the loan was under consideration. Early in December 1950, an additional $25,000,000 loan was made to Kaiser-Frazer Corp. The negotiations for this additional loan were also conducted in secret until the point had been reached at which public discussion could add little value to the negotiations. This loan was crammed through the RFC in the final days of negotiation with great confusion and little objective argument. One of the principle arguments for the new $25,000,000 investment was the contention that it improved the quality of the existing $44,000,000 investment. This is a process which could go on indefinitely.

The provision regarding the publication of names of intermediaries is aimed at discouraging the growth of undue influence in the hands of favored parties. The application of this provision should greatly strengthen the hand of the Governor of RFC and make it possible for him to maintain the Corporation's integrity and independence.

The bill contains a new section which will prohibit the employment of RFC people by borrowers within 2 years after the borrowers have obtained financial assistance from the RFC. There have been a number of instances recently in which RFC officials have accepted employment under very attractive terms with borrowers who might not have been able to obtain their loans had it not been for the efforts of these people.

Mr. John Hagerty took a $30,000-a-year job as agent for the trustees of Waltham Watch Co. less than a week after the final negotiation of the conditions on which the RFC loan to Waltham was made. Mr. Allen Freeze recently took a $25,000-a-year job as vice president of Texmass Petroleum Co. This was done as soon as possible after completion of negotiations of the RFC loan to Texmass. In Mr. Freeze's case employment was delayed considerably by the reluctance of the directors to give it their approval. Although Freeze was employed in the office of the RFC controller and therefore had no official connection in the lending activity, he was nevertheless very active in connection with the loan application and, particularly, with the preparation of material offered by RFC in justification of its decision to make the loan.

A bill to enact the prohibitions proposed in this bill was submitted to the Senate as S. 1871 on July 11, 1949. It was adopted by the Senate but failed to receive the approval of the House of Representatives.

This bill proposes a substantial revision in the financial structure of RFC. At the present time RFC has a capital fund of $100,000,000 provided by the Treasury and it has the authority to borrow whatever other moneys are required. It has always had borrowing authority. In response to a recommendation made repeatedly by the Comptroller General of the United States, and in response to the same recommendation made by the Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Lending, this bill proposes to eliminate the capital fund and to terminate the borrowing authority. The Corporation would be financed, instead, by a revolving fund placed at its disposal by appropriations. This fund would be held by the Treasury and moneys would be advanced to the Corporation from it as requested.

Under this bill the Corporation would repay its present capital and borrowings as soon as the revolving fund would become available. In recognition of the costs incurred by the Treasury in making the funds available, the Corporation would make annual payments determined by applying an interest rate to the average monthly balance invested in the Corporation.

The bill does not refer to these payments as interest payments, but rather it considers them to be payments made in recognition of the Government's costs. Under this provision the operations of RFC would receive a full charge for all costs incurred by the Government in borrowing the money for RFC's use.

In response to another recommendation by the Comptroller General of the United States the bill contains a provision which would require RFC to pay the costs incurred by the Government in providing civil-service retirement fund benefits for RFC employees. There is no such requirement in the present law.

Discretion over interest rates on RFC loans is vested in the Governor by the provisions of this bill. It has been vested in the Board of Directors. To assist the Governor in determining the rates of interest which should be charged on RFC loans, there has been included in this bill a provision which lays down the general policy that interest rates on RFC loans should be sufficient to provide revenue which will cover the cost of money, the expenses of administration, and a risk factor which over all will provide for losses that may materialize on loans.

The Banking and Currency Committee on previous occasions has considered including in the RFC Act a policy statement which

like this one would indicate that the Corporation should operate on a self-sustaining basis. Its operations have not been self-sustaining in recent periods.

Certain loans and mortgages now held by RFC would be transferred to other agencies of the Government under the provision of section 10 of this bill. A loan of $60,000,000 to the Republic of the Philippines would be transferred to the Export-Import Bank of Washington because the Export-Import Bank has excellent facilities for servicing this loan and because the loan is a freak in the portfolio at RFC. The remainder of a loan of $5,000,000 to Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., of Ontario, Canada, would also be transferred to the Export-Import Bank. This transfer is proposed because the bank already has a loan to this corporation and it seems desirable that the RFC loan be combined with it so that the entire arrangement may be administered as a unit. The Export-Import Bank is better qualified than the RFC for administration of a loan to a foreign borrower.

Under section 10 (b) of the bill, the loan to the Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland would be transferred for collection to the Secretary of the Treasury. If this and the other transfers proposed by section 10 were made, the portfolio of RFC would contain only domestic loans and no foreign loans. This seems desirable since the Corporation now has no authority to make loans to other than domestic borrowers.

The provisions of section 10 (c) would transfer certain mortgages to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These mortgages are similar in every respect to the mortgages which were transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency in September 1950, under the provision of a reorganization plan. The effect of this provision would be to eliminate a duplication of activity as between the RFC and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, FOREIGN POLICY, AND THE WAR IN KOREA

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the comprehensive discussions of international affairs, of what we term "foreign policy," and of the war in Korea, now taking place in this body, are unquestionably appropriate and timely. In fact, such discussions are long overdue.

This debate may well prove to be prophetic and historic. It holds promise of producing wholesome and beneficial results. I am sure benefits will flow from it and good will come of it if those of us who participate in it will lay aside all partisan considerations.

The dangers that are inherent in and associated with the philosophy and ideology of communism and the brutal aggression now being pursued by the evil and barbaric dictators present the gravest challenge the free people of the world have even known. Our liberties, our freedom, and every vestige of our priceless heritage are in peril. If we fail to measure up to our responsibilities and opportunities, as a Government and as a free people, to meet it and defeat it, and destroy the monstrous forces that have fomented and created this danger, we cannot expect to long survive. The ultimate is: We shall live, or we shall perish.

With reliance upon Divine Providence for wisdom and guidance, with the application of sober, intelligent thought and deliberation, and with a spirit and willingness to make every sacrifice the exigencies of this crisis may demand, I have a profound faith that we can and will come through the dark era of the present and the bloody and soul-rending days, and maybe years, ahead of us, strong, undefeated, and with a crushing victory over the abominable forces of slavery and conquest.

To survive, to maintain our independence, to remain free, to preserve our traditional liberties, and to win through to victory, by peaceful means if possible, but by mortal military combat if we must, transcend in values and in importance all of the material possessions of our Nation and of all the peoples of the earth, including life itself. It is our profound and solemn duty as Members of this Senate, Mr. President, just as it is that of the President of the United States and of every public servant of our Government, to strive with all of our intellect and all of our moral and spiritual strength during this crisis to ascend to the fullest heights of patriotism and statesmanship of which we are capable.

Mr. President, it is in that spirit, and with that hope and purpose that I undertake to discuss briefly some of the grave problems that confront us, to offer some suggestions, and to propose that certain actions be taken by this body.

I was very much heartened, Mr. President, by that part of the President's message January 8, on the state of the Union, in which he appealed for unity. The President made it perfectly clear that he did not mean unity in the sense of unanimity—in that everyone should agree with everyone else about everything, but rather that, with an abiding sense of individual responsibility and effort, and with free and open debate in which we weigh our words and actions, we arrive at and make decisions that represent the collective will and judgment of the Congress and of the American people. To that end then we must work together in unity and strength by the means decided upon and that are determined should be employed to achieve our common goal.

In a democracy, under our form of government, proposals, policies, and programs of our Government when presented should be, and as a matter of right are, not only subject to scrutiny and debate, but should be exposed to fair and proper criticism—preferably, of course, constructive criticism that may be helpful rather than harmful, but harmful, at least temporarily, if it must be, and if that is necessary, to prevent tragic or fatal mistakes.

Therefore, I propose, at this time, and at all appropriate times hereafter, to express my views on vital issues, make what I believe and hope will be constructive suggestions, and make, if proper, such criticisms as, in my humble judgment, the occasion and the circumstances warrant.

First, Mr. President, why are we now fighting in Korea? There are still many Americans who do not clearly understand our mission there or just what we are fighting for. I think it may be said that we are primarily there because we are members of the United Nations and are undertaking to carry out our obligation and commitments under the Charter of the United Nations to oppose aggression and to preserve peace. Except for that obligation, Mr. President, and the implications of the North Korean invasion of South Korea, as an incident in international affairs that is calculated, if unchecked, to spread into a world conflagration, there could be no justification, and we should not be warranted in committing our Armed Forces to combat in that area.

Whatever may have been our appraisal of the North Korean invasion action at the time it occurred, whether that appraisal was accurate or whether we misjudged the full scope and purpose of the action, the presence and fighting of our troops in Korea has long since ceased to be what it was first termed to be—a mere police action.

Clothed as we are with the authority and sanction of the United Nations, so long as our mission and purpose was to repel the invading North Koreans and restore peace and order to Korea, the term "police action" may have had some appearance of validity. But when that mission was nearing completion and Red China openly intervened and entered the conflict on the side of the Communist Korea aggressor and attacked the United Nations troops, any remaining semblance of its being only a police action to preserve the peace completely dissolved. Such a position or contention is no longer tenable. So let us call it what it is, Mr. President. It is war—not a declared war under our constitutional processes, but it is in truth war in every concept of the word.

The United States is now—today—at war with Red China. To attempt to name or call it something else, or to treat it as something else, will be a snare and a delusion. Such an attempt at self-deception will be of no comfort to the fathers and mothers of sons and wives whose husbands are now fighting and dying over there under the American flag and the flag of the United Nations. They know differently. And if we so act and conduct ourselves as to lend credence to such false pretense, we shall be committing an unpardonable betrayal of every soldier in Korea.

Although we know it is war, there are those who still insist that a peaceful or negotiated settlement of this conflict is still possible of achievement by and through the framework and authority of the United Nations. Any prospect or hope of an honorable solution and a cease-fire order with a restoration of peace through the efforts of the United Nations, if any at all, grows dimmer day by day. To entertain any hope that permanent solution can or will be found through that process requires a microscopic inspection with a long stretch of the imagination.

I do not mean to imply that we should not continue to explore and to follow to the end of the road all honorable means available to us through the United Nations, or otherwise, to bring about a stop to this conflagration. We should and we will do so. But we cannot long continue some of our present policies without inviting disaster. We are at war. We must be governed accordingly and square our conduct and actions in Congress and as a government with that stark reality.

Since we are at war with Red China, I can see no rational justification for our fighting a limited war against this powerful foe. And, Mr. President we are doing just that.

Many of our allies, members of the United Nations who supported and acquiesced in this intervention in Korea, still continue to do business as usual with the Red Chinese Government. They accord full diplomatic recognition of her government and continue to supply her, through channels of trade, with many vital materials and supplies that serve and strengthen her war effort. Such action, Mr. President, gives vital aid to the enemy and enables her armed hordes to kill more and more American boys. Such a course is a dishonor to the purposes for which the United Nations was created, and our Government should not only protest this double dealing of those who are offenders but we should demand of the United Nations that all-out sanctions be invoked under the authority of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, we should fight this war with other things besides bullets and American boys. Every economic measure and weapon at the disposal of, and available to, the United Nations and our allies should be employed and applied in all their force and power without further quibbling or delay.

The hands of our own Government are not clean on that score. We have refused and still refuse to let our forces fight on Chinese soil. We will not permit our planes to pursue enemy combat planes across the Korea-Manchuria border after they have invaded Korea and attacked us. We have not permitted, and still do not permit, our planes to attack and bomb heavy concentrations of troops, supply depots, and military installations in China. Why are these so sacred and untouchable? The lives of our boys and the worthiness of our objectives forbid and repudiate this character of base timidity which either clearly indicates a lack of courage and vision on the part of our own Government, or it is convincing evidence that our Government is fighting this war half-heartedly and apologetically. This must stop, Mr. President, if we desire or expect the American people whole-heartedly to unite behind our leaders in this war effort.

We are fighting under the banner of the United Nations. On June 25, 1950, the day following the invasion of South Korea by the forces of North Korea, our Government, through our representatives on the Security Council, brought before the Council the report from the United Nations Commission on Korea which confirmed the attack. And because this assault upon the Republic of South Korea was held to be an act of aggression, the United Nations adopted a resolution, by a vote of 9 to 0, which determined that the attack upon the Republic of Korea constituted a breach of the peace and called for, first, the immediate cessation of hostilities, and second, the withdrawal of North Korean forces to the thirty-eighth parallel. Throughout June 26 the invaders continued their attack, disregarding and flouting the resolution and action of the Security Council of the United Nations.

On June 27, the United Nations Security Council met again and passed a second resolution, recommending that members of the United Nations furnish to the Republic of Korea such aid as might be necessary to meet the attacks then being made upon that nation. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 7 to 1. Pursuant to that action by the Security Council, the President of the United States announced on June 30 that he had authorized the United States Air Force to conduct missions on specific military targets in North Korea and had ordered a naval blockade of the entire Korean coast. That raises this question, Mr. President: We thought it advisable to blockade the Korean coast immediately that we undertook to give assistance to South Korea. Why are not we taking the same action against Red China, a far more powerful and dangerous foe?

Thereafter, our ground forces were dispatched to Korea. They have been fighting there ever since.

Subsequently, fifty-odd Members gave evidence of their support of the United Nations in attempting to restore peace in Korea. On July 19, the President, in his message to Congress, after detailing the events that had transpired between June 25 and that date, stated, among other things, when referring to the fighting in Korea:

> It should be made perfectly clear that the action was taken as a matter of basic moral principle.

Mr. President, I understand that is the basis upon which we are acting, namely, the basis of moral principle.

I quote further:

> The United States was going to the aid of a nation established and supported by the United Nations and unjustifiably attacked by an aggressor force.

There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that our Government has acted in accordance with the Charter obligations of the United Nations which we have assumed. The obligations of other members of the United Nations correspond with our own. It is just as much their duty to uphold and defend the principles of the United Nations as it is our duty to do so. It is just as much their duty, within the limits of their capabilities, to provide soldiers, armaments, and supplies, and to fight against any aggressor, and to do so in this immediate conflict, as it is our duty to do so.

But, Mr. President, the hard and disillusioning facts are, and the truth is, that some members of the United Nations have woefully shirked that responsibility. They have not kept faith. As I see it, they are repudiating the solemn pledge of the Charter to which they subscribed.

Partially as a result of their failure to meet their obligation, we, who have undertaken to meet ours, now find ourselves in a desperate situation. Our forces in Korea are now confronted by overwhelming numbers of Red Chinese Communist troops supplied and equipped by Red Russia, who inspired and instigated this conflict and who, without a shadow of a doubt, is today directing the military strategy and tactics of Red China and North Korea in this war. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, we have carried, and are now being compelled to carry, 90 percent of the burden of the cost, of the fighting, and of the sacrifices and suffering that present and past resistance to this aggression have entailed.

The American people are asking—at least my constituents want to know—why our Government and the United Nations do not permit the Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek to fight with us in Korea. I want to know why, Mr. President, and every soldier in Korea should be told why, if it is at all possible for any plausible excuse to be given.

I know that prior to Red China's entering the conflict openly, the argument was made that Red China would resent the use of Nationalist Chinese forces by the United Nations, and might thus be provoked to support and fight with the North Koreans. Mr. President, without any such provocation, the Red Chinese Communists now are fighting with the North Koreans. So such an argument no longer is tenable. Red China is now in the fray and is slaughtering American sons by the hundreds and thousands day by day.

Another question the American people are asking, Mr. President—a question my constituents are asking—is why we are fighting a limited or restricted war against Red China. Why is our Air Force shackled? Why is it not permitted to bomb the military installations, the supply lines, and depots in Manchuria? Why is Chinese soil so sacred that it should be immune from attack, while our Government demands and exacts the supreme sacrifice of American sons on the soil of Korea while fighting against the Communist hordes of an aggressor Red China? Mr. President, I protest our fighting a limited war against Red China. We owe it to our fighting men in Korea and to our people here at home to fight China with everything we have, by using every weapon of war at our command, and by striking and destroying all military targets and installations on her soil that are within reach of our striking powers.

Mr. President, I make bold to suggest that if our Government, the commander in chief of our Armed Forces, and the United Nations shall longer persist in our fighting a limited war against China, and in refusing to permit the Nationalist Chinese, whose government is a member of the United Nations, to fight with us; and if they continue to insist on our fighting a limited war by shackling our Air Force and refusing its permission to strike at, bomb, and destroy the military targets, installations, and supply depots in China, then we should remove our troops from Korea in the quickest and safest way possible. As I see it, this is either war that calls for fighting with all we have, with all the power and force the United Nations can command, or what we have done is to commit a vain and stupendous blunder; and history will so record it.

Mr. President, debate and an exchange of views on vital issues is an important

factor in our democratic processes. But prolonged discussions without reaching any decisions and taking actions to implement and carry out the will of this body and that of the Congress, will not suffice in this crisis. It will avail but little. If the United States Senate really wants to meet and discharge its constitutional responsibilities and bring its influence to bear on foreign policy and international affairs, we must do more than merely debate and talk. We must also act within our constitutional prerogatives and authority.

I therefore propose that the Senate begin taking affirmative action on some of these vital issues which are directly related to the war in Korea and involved in the foreign policy of our Government.

To that end, and for that purpose, at the close of my remarks I shall submit three Senate resolutions which will, if adopted, give emphatic expression to the will and judgment of this body.

The first of these resolutions will declare that it is the sense of the United States Senate that Red China is an aggressor in the war in Korea. The second will declare that it is the sense of the United States Senate that the Government of Red China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations. The third will declare that it is the sense of the United States Senate that the United Nations should immediately invoke and exercise all its powers under chapter VII, articles 41, 42, and 43 of the United Nations Charter, including economic sanctions and a complete blockade of all communications with, and transportation to, Red China.

Regarding my first proposal that Red China shall be declared an aggressor, I only wish to say that if she is not an aggressor and should not be declared to be such by the United Nations, then we have no business being at war with her and should immediately withdraw our forces from Korea. If Red China is not an aggressor under the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, then neither is North Korea, and we have no business fighting either of them.

Regarding my second proposal, if Red China is an aggressor, she is not eligible for membership in the United Nations. The Charter provides in chapter II, article 4, that only peace-loving states are eligible for membership. Is an aggressor nation with whom we and the United Nations are now at war a peace-loving nation under the terms of the Charter? Not even a fool would answer that in the affirmative. The day that the Communist government of China is granted membership in the United Nations—that will be another day of infamy in world history. Such action would be a prostitution of every ideal inherent in the basic purposes and principles of this international organization, which is dedicated to peace and justice among the nations of the world. When Red China walks in, common decency, integrity, and self-respect should compel us to walk out.

My third proposal with reference to economic sanctions and blockade speaks for itself. We have committed to battle in this conflict hundreds of thousands of American boys. Thousands have already made the supreme sacrifice; others are dying while I speak. Mr. President, if we and the United Nations do not employ and make full use of every power and weapon available to us to support and protect our soldiers in this war effort, in my judgment we shall be guilty of betraying the valiancy, the heroism, and the sacrifices of our troops in Korea. Not to use all means available to us, including economic sanctions, blockade, and every weapon at our disposal, constitutes an international crime against freedom and justice, whose cause we espouse, and under whose banner we are fighting in Korea today.

I earnestly hope the Senate will give immediate consideration to these resolutions, and that they will receive the enthusiastic support of every Member of this body.

I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolutions to which I have referred, and I ask that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. MCCLELLAN and ordered to lie on the table are as follows:

Senate Resolution 35

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

Senate Resolution 36

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Senate Resolution 37

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately take such measures against Communist China under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations as will be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, including the application by members of the United Nations of measures for the complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, the severance of diplomatic relations, and operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

ATLANTIC UNION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have listened to the thoughtful and eloquent address of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. We recall that yesterday the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] submitted the Atlantic Union concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) in which the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and I joined, along with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. President, I should like at this time to address myself to the Atlantic Union resolution and state what I conceive to be cogent reasons for its adoption.

I am sure we have all noted with satisfaction the enthusiastic reception accorded by the Atlantic Treaty nations to General Eisenhower as he enters upon the responsibilities of his historic mission.

The general is looked upon by these democratic peoples with whom we have stood side by side in former perils as a true and trusted friend, and they welcome him as such. They see him come across the ocean to give again of his genius and the buoyancy of his humanitarian spirit to the preparation against another great danger. As the representative of the United States, he symbolizes to these peoples who share with us a common heritage, the humanity, the courage, the strength, and the fundamental unity of the American people. He personifies their own aspirations for peace and contentment in a free world.

The renewed confidence which this great soldier-statesman and his mission have inspired in the hearts of our friends of the western democracies is of signal value to the ultimate success of the enterprise in which we are jointly engaged. The President's restatement of our country's determination to stand with all free nations in the common fight against Communist aggression has further bolstered this confidence and strengthened General Eisenhower in his task. The circumstances augur well for the attainment of the goals which we have set for ourselves.

History will record the magnificence of the adventures of the United Nations, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact. Whatever the degree of their success they will take their place with the other great advancements in the uncertain course of human progress, and God will bless us for the effort.

I attribute the success thus far achieved in the pursuit of these experiments as much as anything else to the requisite bringing together of nations with their sheafs of troubles around the council table. Nations that have maintained an age-old aloofness and preserved old rivalries have under the leavening of common peril, discovered their interdependence. Around these council tables they have for the first time displayed a real willingness and desire constructively to advance their problems and sympathetically to hear those of their neighbor. Some of the problems have been common to all, but many have been individual ones. The economic questions

have been at least equal in number and complexity with the military questions.

The records of the ECA tell us that these discussions have turned much light on many fundamental ills that have contributed to unrest and insecurity. Doubtless many thorns have been removed from the path of peace.

The Atlantic Pact, according to its original concept, at least, concerns itself essentially with armed forces and munitions. The ECA is the program that has thus far dealt with the underlying economic questions. I am not proposing that the program be continued beyond its scheduled expiration date next year. I simply want to recognize that aside from the tremendous concrete financial assistance that the program has given the participating nations, it has provided the only effective forum for the democracies of the Atlantic Treaty to discuss and seek to iron out their economic problems and a variety of conflicting interests. I make special reference to the nations of the Atlantic Treaty, the members of the Atlantic community as we commonly know it, because they have more characteristics in common—allied by origin, geography, and vital necessity—and, more importantly, they have proven themselves foremost in the successful establishment of freely chosen elective government.

Expert observers tell us that the Marshall plan countries see the end of the program with considerable misgivings, as if to say, "Will our economic conferences end? Will there be no effective forum wherein we can continue to work at a solution of such questions as trade barriers, promotion of sound trade relations, boundary and monetary differences, and the like?" They know that military strength depends upon economic strength. History records for them the tendency of alliance founded upon military considerations alone to weaken as conditions change.

With such a favorable beginning and the disposition of our Democratic friends to want to work out their age-old differences, it seems to me that every opportunity should be provided for the continuance of such free and wholesome conferences. I see a new challenge to the courageous leadership of the United States that has brought the world thus far along the road to peace. The United States presents to the world the finest example of union of free self-governing people. Perhaps something approaching a union of free nations can be established.

The resolution before the Senate implies no commitment, but simply would have the United States again take the leadership in calling democratic nations together in convention. Not all such nations would be called at the outset. The resolution follows the pattern of the Atlantic Pact resolution and would call, first, the sponsoring nations of the pact. These are the nations that have advanced the furthest in the successful establishment of representative self-government. These nations meeting in convention with the United States and with such other democracies as the convention may invite would explore how far their people can apply among them within the framework of the United Nations the principles of a federal union.

The convention would in nowise conflict with the Atlantic Pact but rather would serve to buttress it. If successful, the union would incorporate and replace the pact.

The calling of the convention will reemphasize the seriousness with which we assume our Atlantic Pact obligations. Passage of the resolution will serve to quiet European fears of our return to isolationism by proving that we are willing to explore the possibility of going beyond the pact and the ECA.

When formed, the Union always will keep the door open to any nation which guarantees individual liberty and popular self-government.

No one knows better than Members of the Senate the rewards of council. Free discussion among the nations of Western Europe has yielded spiritual as well as material rewards. We who believe in the benefits to be derived from free discussion among men of good will see that representative governments have been brought more closely together. New meaning has been given to their separate problems; their relationships are clothed with a new morality. If we look closely, we may see at long last a tendency to union.

I urge the Senate to adopt the Atlantic Union resolution, that, with the concurrence of the House, we may rededicate ourselves to that high purpose and magnificent leadership of which Woodrow Wilson spoke when he said:

> To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they (the people of the United States) sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their Government, ever since the days when they set up a new Nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty.

CRITICISM OF EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER BY PAUL HENRI SPAAK

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, today's press carries statements by Paul Henri Spaak, the former Prime Minister of Belgium, who is now on a lecture tour in this country, making an unprecedented attack on former President Hoover.

Some serious questions arise from this shocking incident.

Herbert Hoover is a beloved American citizen whether we agree with his views or not. Pertinent to this issue is the fact that Congress a short time ago did a unique thing in its history by passing a unanimous resolution in tribute to Mr. Hoover for his many services.

It is highly unbecoming for any Belgian in particular to make such a personal attack upon Mr. Hoover. Herbert Hoover spent 5 years of his life in saving the Belgian people from starvation and German tyranny; and for the 30 years that have followed he has conducted various agencies to aid the Belgian people. These agencies have expended large sums on education, scientific research, and on the general welfare of the Belgian people.

The Belgian Government should make an immediate apology to our former President.

Beyond this immediate incident I wish to raise the whole question of an active European official engaging in speaking tours in the United States to influence our foreign policy. What Mr. Spaak says in his own country to his own people is his own affair; but what he says to the American people while in this country is quite another matter.

So far as I am aware, no American official or former official has ever so misused European hospitality. Certainly the American people will not take kindly to this interference by foreigners in momentous decisions which now must be made by the American people themselves. I fear that if Mr. Spaak does not realize the impropriety of his attack on Mr. Hoover and the impropriety of any outside interference in American affairs, his audiences here may pointedly remind him.

FEDERAL THOUGHT CONTROL

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Reader's Digest recently published an article condensed from Forbes Magazine on the subject What Taxpayers Pay for Federal Thought Control. This article points up the fact that the executive department has been spending approximately $9,000,000 a month on so-called information service which when analyzed proves to be nothing but propaganda carried on by old-fashioned press agents operating under the more euphonious title mentioned.

Seldom, if ever, do the Washington columnists utter any criticism about these expenditures in the executive department, but the same columnists frequently criticize Members of Congress who use the franking privilege in an effort to furnish the people of the United States with information about the Government and how it operates.

Members of Congress are severely criticized, although they have to pay out of their own pockets for the cost of printing reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These printing costs include paper, ink, and all labor which is connected with the printing. The only thing that comes without cost to the Congressmen is the postage.

In the executive department the salaries of expert press agents and all cost of printing and distribution are paid by the taxpayers.

So far as I am concerned personally, I should be glad to do away with all of these expenditures, both on the part of the executive department and the Congress, but, since it seems impossible to stop the heavy output of press releases by the executive department in which the executive department is lavishly extoled for obviously political purposes, it seems to me that Members of Congress are entitled to get their reports and their views and information about the conduct of Government to their constituents without having to pay postage. All other costs, as I have said before, for this service are borne by the Members of Congress.

The article I have just mentioned in the Reader's Digest is a good example of information that ought to be given out to the taxpayers. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the body of the RECORD the article which was published in the January 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT TAXPAYERS PAY FOR FEDERAL THOUGHT CONTROL

(Condensed from Forbes)

The total campaign expenditures of both Republicans and Democrats during the year 1949 probably did not exceed $12,000,000. But the propaganda efforts of Uncle Sam in the same period amounted to more than $100,000,000. To pay the salaries of Federal publicity men, not to mention others who are camouflaged under various titles in the hundreds of bureaus, the Treasury shells out about $1,500,000 each month; it costs at least $4,000,000 a month to print the releases of these propaganda experts and another $3,500,000 a month for mailing. That is a total of $9,000,000 a month.

The manifestations of Federal propaganda run the gamut of all the tricks used by Hollywood press agents. Some departments maintain congressional liaison officers in the House and Senate Office Buildings. Others stage cocktail parties for Congressmen and private bigwigs who can help sway newspaper, radio, or other audiences. Some actually pay plain Americans to come to staged meetings, at which, in carefully camouflaged programs, a political line is foisted on those who attend.

One such meeting was held last April in St. Paul, Minn., at taxpayer expense estimated at $50,000 by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN. This meeting of from 5,000 to 6,000 Production and Marketing Administration committeemen, plus community committeemen (those who serve in more or less honorary capacity on various agricultural boards in each county), was promoted by the Department of Agriculture and financed by Federal funds. All were invited with the guaranty of $8 per day plus traveling expenses at 5 cents a mile.

These "bought" listeners heard the Brannan plan extolled by its author, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and by Minnesota's Fair Deal Senator, HUBERT HUMPHREY. Many of those who attended refused to put in claims for payment; they said that it obviously was a political meeting and had no relation to the problems of administering the farm program. But more than 2,000 did put in such claims.

Congressional committees have attempted at times to find out just how extensive are the Government's propaganda activities. Most have given up either through failure to obtain enough money to finance an adequate study or through lack of time to cover the tremendously broad subject.

Some individual Congressmen have been unremitting in their criticism. One such is Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, who in 1938 revealed the foundation of the enormous Federal propaganda structure then a-building. At that time the Department of Agriculture admitted having 45 persons in publicity activities; today it has 600, at salaries ranging up to $12,500 a year.

"Nobody knows the precise extent and organization of this publicity work," the Congressman added. "Why? Because Congress passed a law prohibiting the use of public money to pay salaries to any 'publicity expert' unless specifically appropriated for that purpose. Therefore, those who carry on such functions are hidden behind such titles as 'special assistant,' 'administrative assistant' or 'director of information.' Another legal requirement—that allotments of funds to agencies for printing be not exceeded—is often circumvented by the use of 'duplicating' processes such as multilithing."

Congressmen who criticize Federal propaganda make it clear they are not objecting to legitimate information functions of the Federal Government. Administrators must give their opinions to Congress when requested to do so, but this provision of the law has been subverted to mean that they have the right to send batches of master telegrams to bureaucrats through the country, who in turn persuade citizens to sign the telegrams and send them to Congressmen to pressure the legislators to pass this or that act or appropriation.

What are some of these Federal agencies trying to sell the American public? The principal amounts spent are for the purpose of promoting socialization projects. Department of the Interior concentrates on promoting public power. If there are no big dams in New England, its planners attempt to persuade New Englanders that they need more dams.

Federal experts go into the area and make weighty statements about the necessity for expanding our power resources and taking care of our water resources, and claim that it is the Federal Government's job to build the dams, transmission lines, and so forth. And from then on they take you straight into public ownership.

The Social Security Administration is spending millions of dollars annually on publicity. It and other agencies under Federal Security concentrate on promoting socialized medicine. Men from these agencies fly abroad at public expense to study how socialized medicine was put across in other nations and gather arguments to persuade Congress and the American public to adopt it.

In the Department of Agriculture busy bureaucrats concentrate on selling the Brannan plan. The potentialities of an illegal campaign by this Department are suggested by the agency's size and scope. There are 3,029 county agricultural associations in the country; there are 9,087 county committeemen, and 97,529 community committeemen. More than $200,000,000 is appropriated by Congress for Agriculture personnel each year. Travel and other expenses run close to $5,000,000.

In a 9-month period studied by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Department of Agriculture alone ground out 1,998 press clippings, 837 radio scripts, 17 films, and 120,000 copies of its weekly clip sheets.

A survey by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures, Eightieth Congress, showed that 100 pages of the New York Times would be required to print all the handout material received by that newspaper from Federal agencies during a single week. Much of it was sheer propaganda, designed to influence public thinking and to bring pressure on Congress. This committee found that at least five agencies: United States Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Education, Department of Agriculture, and Social Security Administration, were using Federal funds illegally to promote socialized medicine.

Extraordinary pressure, said the committee, was exerted on the staffs of the United States Public Health Service to promote compulsory health insurance, and it called attention to a letter sent out on December 10, 1945, to all field men and staff operatives by Thomas Parran, then Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. This letter referred to President Truman's message to Congress of November 19, 1945, urging enactment of a national health program. It stated: "The appropriate executive agencies of the Government have been specifically instructed by the President to assist in carrying out this legislative program as presented to Congress."

The Surgeon General then continued: "Every officer of the Public Health Service will wish to familiarize himself with the President's message and will be guided by its provisions when making any public statements likely to be interpreted as representing the official views of the Public Health Service."

After its lobby investigation the House committee concluded that "the greatest and most effective lobby in the Nation is that conducted by Federal administrative agencies. The more than 2,000,000 employees on the Federal payroll, strategically assigned throughout the 48 States, comprise a very effective field army."

An investigation revealed that public-information costs of Federal-Government agencies in fiscal 1946 were $74,829,476—nearly three times what they had been 5 years earlier. The present estimate of $100,000,000 is considered conservative. Some 45,000 Federal employees in 1946 devoted their time, wholly or in part, to "information activities." The number is much greater today.

Yet the tangible cost, large as it is, may not be the greatest concern. The danger is that the directors of the bureaucratic publicity machine can use it to impose unsound ideas upon the people.

CAREER OF DR. EUGENE GARDNER

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, early in December a brilliant young nuclear physicist, Dr. Eugene Gardner, died as a result of beryllium poisoning which was contracted while he was working on the atomic bomb. He was without doubt one of this generation's outstanding scientists.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Dorothy Johnson Gardner, and a 2-year-old daughter, Claire.

He was a native son of Utah, having been born at Logan, where he obtained his education. He was a graduate of the Utah State Agricultural College of the class of 1935.

On December 11, Time magazine published a brief article on the activities of Dr. Gardner. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Eugene Gardner, a brilliant young nuclear physicist, was working in 1942 at Berkeley, Calif., with the Manhattan atomic-bomb project. His secret work required him to drill a hole in an electrode made of beryllium oxide. Out of the hole a fine dust rose and 29-year-old Gardner inhaled it. He did not know, nor did anyone know at the time, that the beryllium in the dust was a slow, implacable poison.

All through the critical years of the bomb project, Gardner worked at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos. As one colleague put it, his brain was "one of the Nation's great natural resources." When he returned to Berkeley in 1945, his disease was well advanced. He complained of fatigue and shortness of breath. X-ray examination of his chest showed fibrosis in both lungs. But no one could tell the cause; no treatment did any good. He had hardly enough strength for laboratory desk work.

But his scientist's brain was as good as ever. In 1948 he became nationally known as codiscoverer (with Dr. Giulio Lattes) of the man-made meson, a basic atomic particle produced by the 184-inch cyclotron at the University of California (Time, March 15, 1948). About the same time his disease was finally diagnosed correctly as berylliosis (beryllium poisoning).

Fame does not cure berylliosis. Tuberculosis attacked Dr. Gardner's poisoned lungs. He spent most of his time in Vallejo Community Hospital, often under an oxygen tent. Even when feeling his best, he was forbidden by the doctors to lift his newborn daughter Claire, now 2 years old. But he kept a micro-

scope near his bed and worked on his meson research whenever he had strength enough. During final hours under the oxygen tent, knowing that death would no longer be denied, he worked with pencil and notebook, painfully gleaning his brain while he still had time for last bits of knowledge to pass along to the living. Last week at Vallejo, his work all but done, Dr. Gardner laid down his notebook and died.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

United Nations

Leroy D. Stinebower, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

United States Marshal

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam, to fill a new position.

United States Public Health Service

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to physical qualifications:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Glen E. Ogden
George F. Ellinger
John F. Oesterle
James L. Southworth
Roderick Murray
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Thomas L. Shinnick

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Willie G. Simpson
David S. Citron
Leonard T. Kurland
Thomas A. Burch
Gordon B. Wheeler
Robert B. Shelby
Alan D. Miller
Louis B. Thomas
Leon T. Atlas
Harry E. Halden III
Robert B. Dorsen
John C. Wrye III
Albert V. Myatt
Frederic D. Regan
Gove Hambidge, Jr.

Senior assistant dental surgeon to be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Charles P. White

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Ralph Porges
Hayse H. Black

Assistant sanitary engineers to be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Charles E. Sponagle
Donald A. Pecsok

Senior assistant sanitarian to be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Richard F. Clapp

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Anna B. Barnes
Ardyth M. Buchanan
Hilda A. Nivala

In the Army

Lt. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther, O12242 (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment as corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. John William Leonard, O3840, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. John Breitling Coulter, O3488, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Edward Mallory Almond, O4666, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, O6908, United States Army, for appointment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Lawrence Carmel Jaynes, O10540, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, O12269, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, O12353, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Howell Collier, O12388, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, O15123, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Brooks Bradford, O6661, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Wayne Cliffton Zimmerman, O12436, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, O14905, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, O12376, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Homer Case, O7090, United States Army.

Col. John Charles Macdonald, O8402, United States Army.

Col. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472, United States Army.

Col. Onslow Sherburne Rolfe, O8637, United States Army.

Col. Horace Harding, O9530, United States Army.

Col. Frank Camm, O9902, United States Army.

Col. Charles Wilbur Pence, O10283, United States Army.

Col. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384, United States Army.

Col. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Joseph Cross, O11431, United States Army.

Col. William Thrower Fitts, Jr., O11917, United States Army.

Col. Arthur William Pence, O12042, United States Army.

Col. Joseph Jones Twitty, O12079, United States Army.

Col. Claude Henry Chorpening, O12088, United States Army.

Col. Orville Ernest Walsh, O12094, United States Army.

Col. Eric Spencer Molitor, O12115, United States Army.

Col. Hammond McDougal Monroe, O12132, United States Army.

Col. Francis Andrew March, O12138, United States Army.

Col. Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg, O12206, United States Army.

Col. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Aaron Bixby, O12273, United States Army.

Col. John Joseph Burns, O12299, United States Army.

Col. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338, United States Army.

Col. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Edward Lewis, O15020, United States Army.

Col. John Joseph Binns, O15207, United States Army.

Col. Kenneth Shearer Sweany, O15251, United States Army.

Col. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777, United States Army.

Col. Howard Everett Kessinger, O15692, United States Army.

Col. Samuel Glenn Conley, O15707, United States Army.

Col. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055, United States Army.

Col. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, United States Army.

Col. John Albert Dabney, O16602, United States Army.

Col. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

In the Navy

The following-named enlisted men of the Navy for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy in the grades indicated:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Adair
Irving M. Applebaum
Carrol F. Bell
John E. Buchanan
Elmer "J" "B" Carr
John B. Copeland
Roy E. Curtis
Edward C. Czopek
George H. Doolittle
"R" "H" Dorman
John V. Draggie
Leon J. Drelicharz
Jack M. Farwell
Lyle F. Flick
Robert L. Gill
Walter J. Gregg
Reaves S. Heflin
Clarence H. Hutchinson, Jr.
Harold Jennings
Ralph R. Johnson
Joseph F. Kakol
Raymond G. Lair
Dean W. Larrick
Charles H. Long
Richard J. Long
Richard M. Manders
Cecil Manship
Joseph W. Mross
Clyde S. Newton
Gilbert H. Orr
Irving L. Patterson
John V. Patterson, Jr.
David S. Rotchstein
William G. Schaufler
James N. Scofield, Jr.
Edward O. Sentar
Henry G. Smith
Hiram E. Smith, Jr.
Julian M. Steadman
Raymond O. Thuftedal
Cyril L. Touchette
Evan K. Williams
William L. Williams
George C. Willis
Charles H. Wittman, Jr.
Joseph J. Yakich
Frederick J. Young

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald L. Arvidson	George E. Kenison
David T. Avery	David V. Kyrklund
Bertram E. Barker	George L. Lamere
Robert O. Barnes	William H. Larson
Emzer H. Bizzell, Jr.	Walter G. Leon, Jr.
Victor E. Blitz	Francis G. McEnaney
Billie J. Bobek	"G" "L" Marona
Frank B. Bowen	Paul A. Montgomery
Carl D. Brown	Frank "E" Moy
Donald B. F. Brown	Charles E. Nester
James L. Chandler	Walter E. Newell
Eugene C. Chase	Jay J. Niemann
Alvin L. Clark	Williard V. Noble
Stuart W. Cochrane	Lawrence E. O'Donnell
Frank A. Dandrea	Harry E. Patterson
Earl S. Dickson	Seymour J. Premselaar
Jerome M. Dowling	Thomas B. Pugh
William A. Doyle, Jr.	John M. Richardson
Edward A. Duff	Carl Sergun
Joseph Dugger	Wilson W. Sheehan
William W. Evans	Willard M. Shepard
Carl Everson	Bert H. Smith
Floyd A. Faircloth	Boney T. Smith, Jr.
Howard D. Fields, Jr.	Robert W. Smith
William M. Foster	Harvey G. Speed
Arnold J. Fransen	Charles E. Spoerri
Bill B. Frink	Gorman L. Strunk
James E. Goodman	Russell J. Timm
Thomas J. Guilday, Jr.	Harold R. Truesdale
Donald C. Hamilton	William W. Vaughn, Jr.
Robert C. Harris	Quinton O. Walters
"S" "J" Harris	George V. Warren
Thomas G. Harty	Donald F. Watson
Harlan J. Hays	Gerald M. Watson
Leo C. Hester	William H. Watson, Jr.
Delois V. Holloway	David T. Williams
Wilton F. Johnson	Walter T. Zebrowski
Richard F. Johnston	
Philip H. Jones	

ENSIGN

Francis D. Furey

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Donald E. Adams	Arthur V. Kane
Corky J. W. Hedges	Robert P. LaMontagne
John T. Higgins	James M. Russ

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Charles E. Axtheim	Thomas J. Peterson, Jr.
Elmer A. Bloomquist, Jr.	Claude R. Stamey, Jr.
Forrest A. Miller	Donnell VanNoppen, Jr.
William H. Payne	
Clifford L. Peacock	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John R. Wassell

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Edwin N. Leach
Charles H. Ward

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Howard A. Baker
John R. Wassell

Harold A. Davis (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Betty L. Dunnam
Abbie C. Sheehan

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Anderson	William M. Hunter
Ralph G. Caldwell	Joseph C. O'Brien
Henry C. Duncan	Edward O'N. Riley
Paul C. Hammerl	George B. Riley
Martin J. Hoar	Alla W. Robertson

Harold F. Wimp (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

Will F. Graham (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Albert E. Brown	David O. Hamrick
George P. Douglas	Roger L. Hiatt
Seaborn C. Early	James D. McIlraith
Martin Gellman	Henry B. Murphree, Jr.
Neil E. Goodrich, Jr.	
Paul "D" Grossnickle	

Nancy M. Murtagh, woman (civilian college graduate), to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth D. Betzinger	Margaret Kantor
Louise A. Buckingham	Mary A. Kelly
Patricia P. Crowe	Mary E. Kirkland
Mary R. Easter	Lillian D. Leutz
Ruth E. Eldridge	Catherine F. McCarville
Joan M. Engle	Frances P. Maguire
Vera L. Foster	Anna Sganga
Regina A. Graney	Norma A. Sullivan
Elizabeth L. Jaeger	Marian J. Ulrich
Barbara E. Jago	

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Odell M. Conoley	Andrew B. Galatian, Jr.
Louie C. Reinberg	Frederick R. Dowsett
William W. Buchanan	Elby D. Martin, Jr.
Jack Tabor	Richard W. Wallace
Joseph N. Renner	John H. Masters
William R. Collins	Harrison Brent, Jr.
Norman Van Dam	William F. Kramer
Herbert H. Williamson	Louis B. Robertshaw
John C. Miller, Jr.	William D. Roberson
Charles S. Todd	Maynard M. Nohrden
Thomas S. Ivey	Richard Rothwell
Joseph L. Winecoff	Herbert R. Nusbaum
James S. O'Halloran	DeWolf Schatzel
William G. Robb	John H. Earle, Jr.
Ralph L. Houser	Bryghte D. Godbold
Robert C. Burns	Glenn C. Funk
Arthur A. Chidester	Robert C. McGlashan
Reed M. Fawell, Jr.	Harold J. Mitchener
Arthur J. Davis	Leonard M. Mason
Wendell H. Duplantis	Joseph P. Sayers
Joseph R. Little, Jr.	Max C. Chapman
Lawrence H. McCulley	John D. Harshberger
Fenwick N. Reeve	John L. Smith
Alexander A. Vandegrift, Jr.	James S. Blais
George W. Hays	Robert E. Galer
"A" "E" Dubber	Cliff Atkinson, Jr.
Paul R. Tyler	Henry H. Crockett
Edmund M. Williams	David W. Stonecliffe
Philip W. John	Milo G. Haines
Harold B. Meek	Malcolm O. Donohoo
Rathvon M. Tompkins	Stuart M. Charlesworth
Charles M. Nees	Walter N. Flournoy
Glenn D. Morgan	Robert F. Scott
George B. Bell	Thomas C. Moore, Jr.
Kenneth A. King	James C. Murray, Jr.
Paul J. Fontana	William H. Barba
Allen B. Geiger	George F. Britt
George S. Bowman, Jr.	Robert W. Boyd
James G. Bishop, Jr.	Spencer S. Berger
Thornton M. Hinkle	Marion M. Magruder
Ronald K. Miller	August F. Penzold, Jr.
Edward W. Johnston	George W. Killen
Louis A. Ennis	Noah P. Wood, Jr.
Charles L. Banks	Jean H. Buckner
James L. Neefus	John S. Twitchell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harvey M. Miller	Grant S. Baze
John R. Barreiro, Jr.	William T. Bray
William McReynolds	Quintin A. Bradley
John E. Sundholm	George D. Webster
Robert W. Glickert	Carl M. Johnson
John L. Hopkins	George F. Vaughan
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.	Henry S. Campbell
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.	David M. Danser
	James G. Brady
James G. Kelly	Robert T. Barrett, Jr.
William C. Ward, Jr.	Harry W. Edwards
John T. Bradshaw	James P. Rathbun
Robert E. Collier	Arthur J. Rauchle
Alexander A. Elder	Edward J. Doyle
Ward K. Schaub	Wilbur R. Helmer
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.	Paul H. Millichap
	Bernard T. Kafka
Alvis H. Allen	Edward P. Dupras, Jr.
Robert K. McClelland	Louis C. Griffin
Clifford F. Quilici	Houston Stiff
Rufus D. Sams, Jr.	James E. Herbold, Jr.
Thomas M. Burton	John S. Hudson
Victor R. Bisceglia	James K. Eagan
James H. Tatsch	Meryl F. Kurr
Robert Y. Stratton	Webb D. Sawyer
Amedeo Rea	Samuel L. Grigsby
Nathaniel Morgenthal	Winston E. Jewson
Louis G. Ditta	Robert A. Campbell
Gerald F. Russell	George E. Moore
John T. O'Neill	Donald E. Noll
Tom N. Hasperis	Edward R. Gilbert
Ernest L. Medford, Jr.	William P. Oliver, Jr.
Frederick J. Mix, Jr.	Maxie R. Williams
Ralph H. Currin	Peter I. Olsen
Arthur H. Haake	Harry D. Pratt
Oscar F. Peatross	Theodore A. Demosthenes
Frank E. Garretson	
Norman R. Nickerson	Sherman W. Parry
George A. Rickert	Frank A. Long
Norman Pozinsky	Robert T. Neal
Fraser E. West	Richard G. Warga
Quinton R. Johns	Kenneth N. Hilton
Donald G. H. Jaeckels	Joseph C. Missar
Stanley S. Nicolay	Charles E. Dobson, Jr.
Darrel D. Irwin	Raymond C. Portillo
James K. Dill	Edward G. Roff, Jr.
Stephen J. Zsiga	Walter M. Caulfield
Vernice S. Calvert	Arnold W. Harris
Robert E. A. Lillie	Stanley M. Adams
Anthony J. Dowdle	John P. Wilbern
Granville Mitchell	Raymond G. Coyne
Paul B. McNicol	Leonard D. Reid
Charles C. Campbell	Milton G. Cokin
Marvin L. Ross	Howard E. Wertman
George C. Axtell, Jr.	Sidney J. Altman
Harold B. Penne	Harry O. Buxhardt
Walter J. Carr, Jr.	James A. Feeley, Jr.
Charles Kimak	John R. Spooner
Wallace G. Fleisner	Joseph H. Elliott, Jr.
Robert H. Gray	James T. McDaniel
Eugene V. Boro	Robert P. Keller
Louie N. Casey	Donald H. Sapp
John J. Wade, Jr.	Richard M. Caldwell
Karl N. Smith	Alan J. Armstrong
Horace C. Parks	Robert E. Cameron
Bernard W. McLean	Donald S. Bush
Olin W. Jones, Jr.	Frank R. Porter, Jr.
John L. Frothingham	Walter E. Gregory
Chester L. Christenson	Charles P. Weiland
Horace E. Knapp, Jr.	John S. Payne
Stephen C. Munson, Jr.	John P. Newlands
Henry H. Reichner, Jr.	Albert W. Campbell
Edwin B. Wheeler	Fenton J. Mee
John B. Sweeney	Spencer H. Pratt

Elwyn M. Stimson	Richard J. Ofstad
Albert Arsenault	Julius W. Ireland
Frank A. Gunner, Jr.	Harold E. Allen
David A. Van Evera	Harold G. Schlendering
John V. Kelsey	
John F. Corbett	Charles E. Hinsdale
Robert B. Farrelly	Clay A. Boyd
James H. Clark	William J. Howatt
Kenneth R. Chamberlain	William G. Shoop
	David S. Randall
Philip L. Crawford	James W. Sperry
Clifton N. Harvel	James A. Michener
Leslie T. Bryan, Jr.	George G. Pafford
James W. Poindexter	Edwin G. Winstead
Wilbur A. Free	William C. Esterline
Robley E. West	William H. Marsh
John H. King, Jr.	James R. Blackwell
Robert J. Bear	Leo J. Dulacki
Arthur K. Bourret	George W. E. Daughtry
James R. Wallace	Raymond M. Hogue
Hoyle R. Barr	Bruce B. Hammond
Donald P. Frame	Stanley J. Nelson
Douglas A. Bangert	John H. Brickley
Thomas G. Bronleewe, Jr.	David R. Griffin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Coady	Irving Schechter
John A. Hefti	Leonard G. Hicks
Ernest E. Codere	Warren S. Siverstsen
William R. Watson, Jr.	John E. Gorman
Joseph H. Griffith	George M. Chinn
George L. Shead	Henry W. Bransom
William H. Kennedy, Jr.	Blaine H. Baesler
	Edward J. McGee
Harold L. Oppenheimer	Charles D. Gray
	Paul E. Bardet
Foster C. LaHue	Fred W. Haxton
John J. Padley	Clarence C. Gordon
James M. Joyner	James W. Dodson
Leo B. Case	John A. Reeder
William J. Dickinson	Glen E. Martin

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Kennard F. Bubier

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Helen J. McGraw
Barbara J. Bishop
Emma H. Hendrickson

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James B. Seaton

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert J. Assad
James L. McGuire

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James H. Harrington	Ralph E. Johnson
Daryl G. Sheehan	Charles W. Keeton
George C. Hunter	Charles D. Pierce, Jr.
Ray W. Patterson	

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 16 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATOR

Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., of Florida, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, clouds and darkness are around Thee, yet righteousness and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne which is established forever upon the moral pillars of the world. In times heavy with crisis Thou hast called us to play our part in one of the creative hours in human history.

In the midst of the startling changes of our day, may we be delivered from the paralysis of pessimism and cynicism. We thank Thee that in the name of a free people ours is now the high privilege of signing anew, with our own sacrifice, the immortal declaration, crimsoned with the devotion of the founding fathers: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In this age on ages telling, may we fail not man nor Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 16, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Benton	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Connally	Langer	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarran	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	McClellan	Tobey
Flanders	McFarland	Watkins
Frear	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Martin	Young
Hayden	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills, and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 15. A bill to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code (Rept. No. 3);

S. 34. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter (Rept. No. 4);

S. 35. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations (Rept. No. 5);

S. 44. A bill for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri (Rept. No. 6);

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet (Rept. No. 7);

S. 48. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi (Rept. No. 8);

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen (Rept. No. 9);

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Delfo Giorgi (Rept. No. 10);

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Quilici (Rept. No. 11);

S. 54. A bill for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou (Rept. No. 12);

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu (Rept. No. 21);

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin (Rept. No. 13);

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow (Rept. No. 14);

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Vernon Crudge (Rept. No. 15);

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou (Rept. No. 16);

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 6. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from February 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, and increasing the limit of expenditures; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 27. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce (Rept. No 18);

S. 32. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile (Rept. No. 19);

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche (Rept No. 20); and

S. Res. 7. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States (Rept. No. 24); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-4494764, Abbattista, Argelo.

A-6649984, Allen, Marie (nee Marie Elkaim).

A-9702578, Andersen, Juel Fridolf.

A-5960218, Angemi, Spartaco Bruno.

A-5919641, Assimakopoulos, Nicholas Zaferes.

A-6879549, Azar, Michel Joseph, or Michel J. Azar.

A-1620703, Baffetti, Domenico, or Dominick Baffetti.

A-4561458, Beckley, Marianne, or Marianne Schmiddt or Marianne Hummer (nee Novak).

A-6571866, Berg, Zisel, or Zisel Berger or Zisel Weisberg.

A-7096076, Berzins, Edgars.

A-6149421, Bodenstein, Shika Ichimaru (nee Shika Ichimaru).

A-1680171, Camilleri, Anthony, or Tony Camilleri.

A-6933111, Casperson, Laura Nathalie (nee Norve).

A-3624427, Castiglione, Lorenzo, or Lorenzo Castiglome.

A-5044552, Cecchettini, John, or Giovanni Cecchettini.

A-6919958, Cha, Sang Dal.

A-6414162, Chieu, Nellie Ho (nee Lam Qu Ho or Nellie Ho Cuang).

A-3259491, Coffey, Else Frieda (nee Finke); Else Bruse; Else Scheuer.

A-5224398, Cohen, Abraham.

A-9619532, Connolly, Martin William.

A-6953537, Corsini, Renato.

A-6765891, Daoud, Shafic Said.

A-6498462, De Espina, Hilaria Lopez, or Hilaria Lopez-Navarro.

A-7264814, De Guzman, Rizalina Lacson.

A-2925042, Diamantis, Dionisios, or Dennis Diamandes.

A-5942495, Dias, Raul Pereira.

A-5304087, Di Meglio, Vincenzo.

A-1167701, Dollah, Osman, or Osman Bin Abdullah.

A-6432327, Donovan, Mary Louise, formerly Parliament, formerly Hosey, (nee Campbell).

A-5002249, Dum, Philip (alias Philip Dunn).

A-3726963, Durloff, Svetko Tomasoff, or Steve Tomoff.

A-5697769, Echevarria, Doroteo Julian.

A-3528948, Eddir, Kader Hassen.

A-7112643, Escobar, Alejandro.

A-3370128, Esses, Solomon, or Selim Esses.

A-6029718, Evans, Bella (nee Grayston).

A-7145083, Farruggia, Rosario.

A-7092042, Feniquito, Elisea Gan (nee Elisea Baiza Gan).

A-7222054, Ferreira, Antonio Jose Fernandez.

A-4312604, Fiegenheimer, Fritz Simon.

A-5744395, Fogel, Isidore (alias Isaack Fogel).

A-5764688, Frese, Paul Arthur, or Paul Arthur Freese (alias Paul Purps).

A-4690590, Fulop, Fred, or Frank Fulop or Ferenc Fulop.

A-4591964, Garcia, Jose, or Joseph Garcia.

A-4927109, Giannopoulos, George, or Georgios Demitrios Giannopoulos or George Poulos or Papas or Georgios Nikalau or Nikolaou.

A-4951906, Gill, Kehar Singh.

A-3235095, Giustetti, Alessandro.

A-7180884, Glob, Alec or Alex, or Alec Thomas.

A-6245601, Glucksman, Marlies Ursula (nee Marlies Ursula Justo).

A-4799562, Gray, John Bashford.

A-6146891, Haas, Erich J., or Erich Jindrich Haas.

A-6811553, Heller, Brigitta Anna.

A-5240152, Helmer, David.

A-4879697, Hilbig, Carl Erich.

A-7209285, Hjalmarson, Katrin, or Katrin Olefsdottir.

A-3070145, Horvath, John Ivan.

A-5214251, Hovland, Robert Bernhard.

A-9529388, Isaksen, Gunner Dyvald Peter.

A-1075286, Johansen, Sanrof, or Sanrof Haakon Eugen Johansen.

A-7183631, Kalmoutis, Panayotis Gregory.

A-6910241, Kampakis, Dimitra R.

A-3351960, Kawazoe, Takeru, or Tony Kawazoe.

A-7779912, Kazerooni, Atta.

A-4468413, Kelter, Teofila, or Tola Kelter.

A-5818461, Kluender, Gustav August or Klunder (alias "Painter Gus").

A-5668279, Kobayashi, Mitsuye Mary, or Mitsu Kobayashi or Misuye Kobayashi.

A-7240155, Korkala, Pekka Vilhelm.

A-6712035, Kuh, William Shing Zung.

A-6712034, Kuh, Frances Siu-Fong (nee Weigh).

A-7286269, Langner, Rosemary.

A-4859725, Lindstrom, Alfred Waldemar.

A-4081171, Lissi, Anna, or Anna Hafer (maiden name).

A-3715068, Liano, Jose, or Jose Liano or Jose Maria Liano Liano.

A-1314199, Luciani, Giovannantonio, or John Luciani.

A-6743629, Lupich, Giorgio.

A-7083636, Luzio, Jose Simoes.

A-6723349, Lyras, Angelici Marcou, or Angelici Lemos Lyras.

A-6709422, Madamba, Antonio Quezada, Sr.

A-6719051, Madamba, Antonio, Jr.

A-1345411, Madura, Julius.

A-5165335, Madussi, Rolando.

A-5217072, Malara, Tina, or Gleta Pizzi.

A-5027817, Manrique, Manuel.

A-5633420, Masciantonio, Ilarione, or Nick Palmer or Pietro Paolillo or Pedro Paulilio.

A-5755532, Mastroianni, Giuseppe, or Joseph Mastroianni or Joe Mannella or Jose Di Leva or De Leva.

A-6541438, Mendelsohn, Bernard Edward.

A-5954825, Mereu, Mario Leonida.

A-3283859, Monasch, Jenny (nee Fiedler or Jennie Monasch).

A-4865080, Moussouris, Spiros, or Spiridon Alexander Moussouris.

A-3487088, Oberg, John Eric, or John Erik Oberg.

A-6717821, Ochoa-Flores, Jose, or Jose Flores or Domingo Rosales Camacho.

A-5445858, Oi, Hisao or Hissao Ohi.

A-1830007, Olas, Joseph, or Jozsef Olasz.

A-3091879, Onofrow, Emil A.

A-2401745, Palij, Mikolaj Miroslaw, or Nicholas M. Paley or Nicholas Miroslaw Paley.

A-2894362, Palty, Esther, or Esther Palti (alias Esther Behar).

A-1761010, Panagiotatos, Peter, or Panagiotes Rautopoulos.

A-2342133, Pantazopoulos, Vasilios.

A-4145970, Papadopoulos, Ioannis, or John Macos Pappas or John Pappas.

A-4145952, Parkin, Isidore Thomas, or Thomas Parkin.

A-6600188, Patnode, Margaret Isahel (nee Mullan).

A-5867753, Pavani, Joseph Angelo, or Giuseppe Angelo Pavani.

A-4703493, Paw, Chang, or Chang Poow.

A-6217770, Pena, Bianca.

A-7048361, Pernetzky, Elfriede, or Elfriede Pernetsky or Elfriede Pernetzky.

A-9533370, Petrakis, Constantino.

A-1887297, Piccardo, Gerolamo, or Geralamo Piccardo.

A-1032804, Psilos, Georgios Konstantinos.

A-7044122, Quan, Raymond, or Quan Chung.

A-6930030, Rativo-Padilla, Silby, or Silby Padilla.

A-5166772, Reid, Lawrence Edward.

A-5166771, Reid, Engusina Mary (Maria) (nee MacDonald or Ina M. Reid).

A-4597393, Rempelos, George Athanasios.

A-3725754, Rubinich, Joseph.

A-3869904, Saldida, Tomas Da Silva, or Tomazda Da Silva Tavares or Thomas Daldito.

A-5053444, Sandgren, Frans Gustav Adolf.

A-5648038, Santina, Amerigo Della, or Amerigo Santina.

A-5117774, Schleicher, David, or Adolf Teofil Schleischer.

A-4507409, Selunske, Josephine (nee Josephine Rosnowska).

A-5258420, Shonbron, Anne, or Anne Schoenbrun.

A-5543701, Siepiola, Antoni Wladyslaw.

A-6965416, Speelmans, Elizabeth, or Elizabeth Weeda Speelmans.

A-6580473, Stadelman, Mildred Nancy, or Nancy Mildred Stadelman formerly Price nee Morris.

A-4372508, Svendsen, Hjalmar Edmond, or Elmer Svendsen.

A-6756313, Sulich, Sonia (nee De Rossi).

A-6431929, Szor, Szmul Majer, or Sam Ezor or Johan Stefansky.

A-2681150, Tages, Jesus Gonzales, or Jesus Gonzales Tager or Jesus G. Tages or Tager or Jesus Tager or Jesus Gonzales.

A-5714435, Tampases, Serafem George, or Charles G. Tampases or Serafim Tambassis.

A-3269632, Tart, Sarah, or Sarah Katz.

A-5801016, Tomiak, Ivan, or Ivan or John Tomiak.
A-9777004, Trataros, Ioannis Stamatiou.
A-5060613, Tsotsos, John Kyriakos.
A-9510722, Vahtrik, Herman.
A-1700534, VanNuland, Anton Cornelius, or Thomas Cornelius Van Nuland or Thomas Van Nuland.
A-6094784, Varian, Luz Garcia Panganiban.
A-4301526, Vassallo, Domenico.
A-7019104, Vassura, Rudolph Gaspare.
A-2300625, Verhas, Gustav Joseph Jan, or Gus Verhas.
A-1260632, Wollhandler, Sol Zoltan.
A-6987214, Woo, John Edward, or John E. Woo.
A-6937215, Wu, Jessie (alias Jessie Woo, Chi San Wu).
A-4761538, Wright, Frances Julia, or Frances Julia Long Caton (nee Rose).
A-7297128, Wysor, Frances Marie (formerly Frances Marie Chong).
A-5465927, Yunus, Syed Muhammad, or Ayed Mohammed Yunus or Sirdar Yunnus or Sirdar Mohammed Yunus Kahn or Mohammed Yunus Hattliffe.
A-7083047, Zaharas, Peggy C., or Pigi C. Zaharas.
A-9776764, Zervos, Iphigenia (nee Papademetriou).

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, also from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 23) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-7092601, Abouab, Ariane Phedre.
A-5978374, Achilles, Gerhardt August.
A-9810844, Albretsen, Marthon.
A-5048385, Alexander, Catherine De Solminihac.
A-4193719, Alias, Giovanni, or John Alias.
A-5671895, Aloisio, Giuseppe, or Giuseppe Aloisio.
A-6570463, Alvarez, Luicia Rosa Bignotti, or Louise Bignotti Alvarez.
A-6260600, Amanatides, Eleni, or Helen Sampsonidore.
A-4093060, Andersen, Chris or Christen or Kristeh.
A-9501239, Andersen, Karl August.
A-5372680, Anderson, Esther Amelia.
A-2009231, Andersen, Rolf.
A-9148555, Andersson, Vaino Armas.
A-1662197, Andersen, Theodor Martin, or Theodore Martin Andersen.
A-6953538, Antonelli, Dario Luigi.
A-6608350, Aquino, Esperanza Diaz.
A-1423084, Ardelea, Pantilimon, or Mike Ardela.
A-5630715, Arrieta, Sebastian San Vincente.
A-5830721, Arrieta, Maria Justina Esteban Diaz de Durana de Arrieta.
A-5362306, Artune, Frederick Schwarn.
A-2551993, Arvanitakis, Christos Efthimios.
A-2799961, Asimenios, Ioannis Spyros, or John Spiros Asimenios.
A-9782901, Avgoustatos, George.
A-4918655, Backer, Theophiel Louis.
A-4918721, Backer, Irma Marie (nee Vanhooren).
A-2641976, Badurova, Valeria or Badur or Badura.
A-2244801, Bdlias, Maximos or Max or Max Dimitrios.

A-4062431, Ballas, John N., or Ioannis N. Ballas.
A-3331609, Balsiger, Karl.
A-4503246, Balzano, Raffaele.
A-6191301, Barron, Jane Ann.
A-6191300, Barron, Frances Virginia.
A-6491811, Bathori, Bela Gal.
A-6091747, Beerbohm, Lea Delia.
A-6764209, Bell, Katherine (nee Williams).
A-6507004, Beniawski, Izrael.
A-6361238, Benito, Amable Angel Agtral Pe.
A-6592469, Beredjik, Albert Zaharia, or Albert (Avram) Zaharia, Beredjik or Albert Berejik, or A. Berejik.
A-5948492, Berg, Roar.
A-6682339, Bertolani, Antonia Guglielmo.
A-6264272, Bileca, Vasil.
A-6264274, Bileca, Ion Traian Bileca.
A-5025807, Bistis, Stamati, or Stamatios Bistis.
A-7188170, Blanton, Helga Malwine Roedig, or Helga Maline Roedig.
A-4514510, Blocksidge, Henry.
A-5466239, Blodgett, Eva Louise (nee Eva Louise Dale Bonter).
A-5274949, Boyd, Sarah Mary, or Sally Boyd.
A-6536455, Brach, Salomon.
A-6537764, Brach, Ilona (nee Krause).
A-5507579, Braendle, Paul Ludwig.
A-2657075, Brancalione or Fiorvante, or Frank Brancalione.
A-6860348, Breck, Berte, or Berte Lomeland.
A-5408492, Bruckert, Joseph, or Joe Bruckert.
A-6404500, Bryant, Olga Greigonieva.
A-4992392, Brett, Otto Hugo.
A-4821944, Brody, Henry, or Cheskiel Berkowitz.
A-4478252, Bromberg, Henry Irving.
A-1703937, Bubader, Joseph.
A-5618465, Burack, Charles.
A-1299737, Calomeros, Nicolaos or Nicholas A.
A-9776754, Canapini, Filiberto.
A-5344853, Carlsen, Manfred Rust.
A-5344854, Carlsen, Ida Caroline Elizabeth (nee Nielsen).
A-3471034, Casa, Maria Luisa De La, or Maria Luisa Garzon Carrico.
A-6424250, Casa, Enrique Carlos Dela.
A-6042732, Castellanos, Eucaris (nee Eucaris Dominguez Carrasquero).
A-6366055, Castro, Victorina.
A-2687455, Castro, Jose Marie De.
A-1089405, Ccolaras, Antonios, or Tony Colaras or Tony Caloras or Antonios Kollaros.
A-3281573, Cerrati, Tito.
A-6171537, Christensen, Ragahild Dorthea Glumsoe.
A-6171538, Christensen, Jorgen Glumsoe.
A-4693663, Christensen, Deolinda Yvonne, or Deolinda y P. S. de Brangante or Deolinda y Quininha (nee Deolinda Pereira Silva).
A-5097998, Christodoulou, Constantinos, or Gus Christ.
A-2173685, Coffaro, Salvatore.
A-3837058, Cohen, Morris, or Moise Cohen.
A-4395617, Connolly, Kathleen Anne, or Kathleen Anne Conley (nee Kathleen Anne Clancy).
A-5987249, Constantinou, Peter, or Peter Stavros.
A-6097035, Crooke, Cecelia Ruiz (nee Cecelia Ruiz).
A-6097034, Crooke, Elvira Ruiz.
A-6097033, Crooke, Charles Ruiz.
A-6097032, Crooke, Gabriel Ruiz.
A-9722091, Cruise, Neville Theodore.
A-5880436, Dahl, Kaaj Valdemar, or Jack Dahl.
A-6172687, Danos, Helen John or Danou (nee Contozoglou).
A-6898176, DaSilva, Antonio Pedro.
A-5327462, Deinzer, Willi Egidius.
A-6491768, Deirmendjian, Vahakn Navasart, or Vachac Navasart Deirmendjian.
A-1879418, Dejana, Marcello Gaetano, or Marcello Gaetano Dejana or Mac Dejana.
A-8724192, Demchuk, John.
A-5678819, Devonetsky, Chaia (nee Glazer or Ida Dworetsky or Clara Dworetsky.

A-4421828, Diaz, Santiago James, or Santiago Diaz.
A-2005887, Dieleman, Jacob.
A-4654864, Dietl, Fritz Anton, or Friedrich Dietl.
A-7578425, Do, Da Van, or Do Van Da.
A-5035584, Doherty, Margaret.
A-5830749, Dolden, John Steen, or John Benjamin Dolden.
A-5433754, Downey, Bertha (nee Isenberg or Innis).
A-4932079, Drew, Emily Mary Ellen (nee Russell or Emily Mary Ellen Seliman).
A-4932078, Drew, John, or Patrick Galvin.
A-4893541, Dumych, John, or Jan Dumych.
A-5307350, Dykman, Magdalena Dabster.
A-6353862, Eerikainen, Raimo Jaakko, or Raymond James Kaymen.
A-6354814, Emerson, Isabel Barbosa.
A-6920031, Emery, Valma Lorraine.
A-6553890, Englert, Vilma Aileen.
A-9280869, Eriksson, Bjorn Bertel, or Bjorn Bert Eriksson.
A-3594324, Eskenazi, Zelda, or Zelda Barouh (nee Zelda Funess).
A-5800076, Evrepiotis, Ioannis Georgiou, or John George Evrepiotis.
A-1233853, Faggio, Peter, or Pierino Faggio.
A-5256571, Faria, Francisco Da Silva, or Frank Faria.
A-5982013, Farkas, Mihial (alias Michail Farkas alias Michael or Mike Wolfe).
A-4796651, Feldman, William, or Wolf Weissbraun.
A-4901763, Ferentinos, Mehael, or Michael Ferentinos or Mike Dinos.
A-4784249, Fernandes, Joao Pedro.
A-4935465, Ferreira, Laurindo Vieira, or Albino Castro.
A-5337577, Figueiredo, Arlindo Neves, or Arlindo Neves.
A-7575726, Fong, Howard Y. T., or Fong York Tom or Howard T. Fohg or Howard Took Tom Fong or Howard Tork Tom Fong.
A-2252607, Fong, Florence Hoh, or Hoh Mei Hum or Florence H. Fong or Florence Fong Hoh.
A-2533217, Fong, Helen, or Jew Fook Fung.
A-1207715, Franco, Antonio Augusto Pereira.
A-5278268, Frangos, Constantinos, or Kostas or Gus Frangos Konstantinos Jon Frangos.
A-4697254, Freire, Ildefonso Henrique.
A-4219910, French, Edward James.
A-5776825, Friedman, Louis, or Lejb Fremderman.
A-2751509, Fukunaga, Tohachi.
A-2064030, Fumisetto, Teodoro.
A-9521532, Furevik, Ragnar John Kristoffer, or Ragnar Furevik.
A-9706362, Furnes, Helge, or Helge Helland.
A-5817515, Galati, Pietro, or Peter Galati.
A-5070201, Gallucci, Francesco.
A-6320094, Galvan, Manuela.
A-6320093, Galvan, Crescencia.
A-3875141, Gambardella, Aniello.
A-6972813, Gazurian, Araksi (nee Oras).
A-4158764, Garcia, Serafin, or Serafin Garcia Alboniga.
A-4421076, Garran s, Francisco Maria Pinto, or Francisco Maria Pinto.
A-6246454, Garris, Maria Katsores, or Mary Tsingaris Garris.
A-6246453, Gavalas, Mary.
A-6905403, Georgakarakos, Theodoros.
A-6606278, Geraketis, Alithia Ignatios (nee Sarafoglou).
A-1631048, Gerow, Nicholas or Nick.
A-4623895, Ghirardi, Maria or Mary (nee Morbiani or Luicia or Louise Morbiant).
A-4359638, Giliberto, Francesco, or Frank Giliberto.
A-5154624, Ginis, Stamatios Angelos, or Dimetrios Panatazis or Tantazis Stamatius Ginis.
A-9767507, Gomes, Manuel.
A-1101998, Gonzalez, Eduardo Argibay y.
A-6697442, Graff, Yann.
A-6697443, Graf, Meriadec.

A-5018222, Gray, Alice Maud (nee Alice Maud James).
A-5097612, Gregorakos, Nicholas Theodore, or Nick Gregory.
A-2767118, Gregoriou, Nicholas, or Nicholas or Nick Pappas.
A-9782910, Grubissa, Mario.
A-9006008, Glyptis, Nickolaos Stefanou.
A-4162602, Gunn, Robert, or Robert Grant Gunn or Robert G. Gunn.
A-9825171, Gustavsen, Olav Kristoffer.
A-6200475, Hai, Ng Yeun.
A-6173609, Fong, Wong Sui.
A-6246464, Halkia, Calliope (nee Kouraouglou).
A-5204137, Hamada, Shigeichi.
A-2637851, Hashim, Abdul, or Muzafor Ali.
A-1499939, Hazanas, Paulina M. De.
A-1789616, Hazanas, Eduardo De.
A-2147387, Hazanas, Baldomero De.
A-2147386, Hazanas, Maria M. De.
A-3862141, Heiligenberg, Fred, or Fred George Heiligenberg.
A-2474613, Hermann, Marie Louise.
A-6505855, Hermann, Mary (nee Barabas).
A-7267730, Herrbach, Conrad Albert.
A-6936029, Hevia, Maria Temorio, or Maria Bolanos Perez (nee Marie Jimenez).
A-6227108, Hoare, Benjamin.
A-6208971, Hoffknecht, Mary Angela Garay.
A-1704667, Holtz-Nett, Charles Waldemar, or Charles Waldemar Holtz Sur Nett or Charles Holtz or Karl Wl Holtz or Karl Holts or Charles Waldemar Holtz Sarnet.
A-2871224, Horaites, Constantine Nicholas, or Gus Nick Horaitis.
A-1540387, Horan, William Joseph.
A-5925333, Horne, Jane Lillian, or Jeannette Lillian Le Roy.
A-4455137, Horowitz, Abraham.
A-4454944, Horowitz, Neche Rose (nee Lerner or Rose Horowitz or Nacha Lerner).
A-7021316, Horowitz, Nathan Harry, or Naftaly or Naftoly Harry Horowitz.
A-7021317, Horowitz, Helen Phyllis, or Hellen Phillis Horowitz.
A-7021315, Horowitz, Sina Lea, or Cina Lea Horowitz or Lea Sina Horowitz.
A-1909726, Hsiang, Paul S., or Shih-Tao Hsiang or Hsiang Pao Loh.
A-1813029, Hunter, Stanley.
A-6989748, Hutton, Sidney Merth or "Edwards."
A-4592404, Hvizd, Helen, or Helena Hoizt.
A-5516523, Iglesias, Manuel Afonso Redondo, or Alfonso Redondo or Alfonso Redondo Iglesias or Jaime Mora Mora.
A-6837928, Iglio, Delores Marsillo.
A-9825146, Igrejas, Frenando Cipreste.
A-4063513, Ireland, Jenny Tanner, or Jenny Besser Von Tanner.
A-5390788, Irmejs, Juliana (formerly Karlkin).
A-4157749, Irrera, Giuseppe.
A-7112351, Jacobsen, Syvert Tobias, or San Jacobsen.
A-6669589, Jacobson, Chiena (nee Ewrebin).
A-5342450, Jacobson, Morris, or Morris Jakobson.
A-4409024, Jacono, Ameride Alberto, or Albert Aberide Jacono.
A-4685526, Jaeger, Fritz Johannes, or John Frank.
A-4815913, Jaremiszin, Michal.
A-2048810, Johansen, Konrad Leonard.
A-6802646, Johnsen, Berge Visdal, or Berge Reinart Visdal Johnsen.
A-5178341, Josey, Eva Falco (nee Shulkin).
A-6014710, Juliao, Nicholas Augusto.
A-5866836, Juretich, Frank John, or Frano Ivan or Franya Juretic.
A-4475580, Kadak, Felix Heinrich.
A-4640829, Kalfas, Nick, or Nicholas Topalogiou.
A-6836357, Kalisz, Stefan.
A-5752363, Kantrimas, Mary (nee Liaudonas).
A-1274913, Kao, Thomas (Chinese name Kao Tien Mine).
A-6357991, Kapranopoulos, Evdokia N.
A-2391816, Karamanos, John.
A-6625649, Karantzalis, Telemachos.
A-9767526, Kasidonis, Perikles or Perikles, or Pericles John Kasidonis.
A-5295609, Kasten, Emil.
A-5295608, Kasten, Martha (nee Wustenhain).
A-5060162, Kasprak, Pauline.
A-5627633, Kastening, Rudolph Wilhelm August Alexander, or Frank Carlton.
A-5933191, Katsura, Sukeichi, or Sam Katsura.
A-1821748, Katsuras, Sterios Konstantine, or Stanley K. Katsuras.
A-6444660, Kohn, Aron Binam.
A-3839553, Kokalis, Sotirios, or Sam Kokalis or John Pappas.
A-4105167, Konig, Kate, or Kate Schaffner or Katy.
A-3086901, Konig, Matthias or Matei, or Steve Konig.
A-2386263, Kontorousis, Vasilios Demetrios, or William Kontis or William Contis.
A-2602187, Koteff, Stavro, or Steve Kote or Stavro Kote or Steve Koteff.
A-3814642, Koteff, Dimitar Vasil, or James Vasil or Dimitrios Vassiliou Secoulidis or Dimitar Kotes or Kotos or James Vasiloff.
A-2933713, Koumpis, Evangelos Demetrios, or Angelos Koumpis or Copis.
A-1747916, Kozak, Max.
A-3994328, Kernohan, Alexander.
A-5520891, Khan, Wazir Dean.
A-6269694, King, Wu Ah.
A-2019372, Kissel, Susanne Lorenz.
A-2328573, Kwak, David Chungsum, or David Chung Sun Kwak.
A-6661487, Kwock, Wing Kin.
A-5112182, Kleines, Frieda (nee Brauner).
A-4476488, Kleines, Julius.
A-4666321, Kloc, Wasyl.
A-5524348, Kripfgans, Oswald Oscar, or Oswald Oscar Gans.
A-3772096, Kroussoratis, Evangelos, or Vangel Toneff or Vasili Ioannis.
A-4580732, Krushevski, Alexander Maron.
A-7028309, Krushevski, Samuel.
A-4125637, Kurpiewski, Edward.
A-1410927, Lantsas, Ioannis Achilles, or John Lantsas or John Achilles Lantsas or Ioannis or John Achilleys Lantsas or John or Ioannis or Ionnis A. Lantsas.
A-4585443, Lange, Johann Wilhelm, or John William Lange.
A-5034191, Larsen, Nils, or Niels Ehlert Plith or Edward Larsen.
A-2378014, Latella, Philip Vincent, or Filippo Vincenzo Latella or Philip V. Latello.
A-4399743, Latif, Abdul, or Jack Latif or Moranut Azim.
A-4741749, Lavin, Domingo Lavin y.
A-6445720, Lee, Beatrice Kan, or Shiu Ying Kan or Beatrice Shiu Ying Kan.
A-6008446, Lee, William Han-Chu.
A-6009174, Lee, Anna Yung-Hsin.
A-2809544, Lei, Pooi Tuen, or Beatrice Lee.
A-6207468, Lei, Wai Paak.
A-6480122, Leibell, Sane.
A-9571986, Lemonidis, Chrisostomos A., or Chris A. Lemonidis.
A-4271116, Leo, Candeloro Rosario De, or Rosario De Leo.
A-3555382, Lerman, Max.
A-6590138, Lewik, Szmul Nuchim, or Sam Lewik.
A-4513034, Lian, Hwang Yung.
A-7627950, Loh, Elsie Wan, or Elsie Wan Joe or Chou Tai Wan.
A-2989906, Loh, Roger Tse-Yee, or Loh Sse-Yse.
A-5816816, Looft, Claus Teodor, or George Christiansen.
A-6707537, Lourenco, Joao Do Jesus, or John Jesus Lourenco.
A-6707536, Lourenco, Maria Rodrigues, or Marie Lawrence.
A-6707535, Lourenco, Rosalio Do Espirito Santo.
A-5811818, Lynch, Hannah or Hannah, or Johanna Buannell.
A-5451487, Lynch, Gregory William, or William Lynch.
A-1031598, Macharko, Vassil, or Vassil Macharko or Charles Marcharko or Marcharko.
A-4416525, Macklin, Mary Zelma, or Mary Zelma Spivack.
A-7137577, Macris, Michael.
A-9669914, Madsen, Johannes Frederik Vilhelm (alias Johannes Madsen or John Madsen).
A-6779529, Malan, Ivo Roberto.
A-5234565, Mandalas, Denis, or Dionisios Mandalas.
A-4855350, Mandalas, Eva (nee Euridika Ayan).
A-2919145, Manolis, George, or George Lamprakis.
A-1615511, Marangas, Theodoros Nicolaos.
A-6524210, Margaronis, Pandelis Anast, or Pandelis A. Margaranis.
A-5375898, Margelli, Maria.
A-6063643, Martinez, Clemencio Moneo.
A-4650509, Martins, Joaquin, or Jack Martins.
A-5126203, Martrian, Heinrich Friedrich, or Henry Matrian.
A-4684907, Matsumoto, Yoneji.
A-6688804, Mcewan, Valerie Yvonne.
A-6688805, Mcewan, Pamela Ann.
A-6302135, McGrath, Bianca Luling.
A-6923990, McLaren, Hazel Mignonette, or Hazel M. McLaren (nee Delapenha).
A-2782901, Mellis, George Dimitrios, or Georgios Melis.
A-3211338, Medina, Andre Luiz, or Andrew Medina.
A-6214170, Mendoza Raul.
A-4094634, Menis, Constantinos, or Constantinos Diamantis Menis or Gust Menis or Kostis or Kostas Menis.
A-5963364, Miah, Barik.
A-4783888, Migliorati, Stella.
A-2588887, Milanese, Ernesto.
A-3114167, Millonas, John George, or Ioannis George Millonas.
A-3820458, Milicia, Giuseppe (alias Joseph Milicia).
A-4860743, Mitrovich, Andria N., or Andy Mitroff or Andrea Nanchoff.
A-6092928, Mitchell, Mary Gertrude.
A-2574785, Mitsialis, Socrates Pericles.
A-4376963, Mochevitch, Simon, or Sam Mochevitch.
A-3960871, Mock, Lum, or Lum Mow or Lum Moo or Lum Mack or Lum Mak.
A-5231944, Moeller, Walter.
A-4823759, Montes-Gonzalez, Luis, or Luis Montes.
A-6354372, Moral, Francisco Garcia.
A-5895779, Morkvenas, Ona, or Anna Mary Markvenas.
A-6624514, Moore, Dorothy Charoline.
A-6624039, Moore, William Francis.
A-7210469, Moskowitz, Marie Helen, or Maria Helena Moskowitz (formerly Maria Helena Crucenowicz, alias Monique Patricia Bohne said Terret).
A-6249439, Moutsanas, Maria.
A-5564653, Moy, Ah, or Chin Ah Moy.
A-9578213, Mpimplis, Konstantinos, or Costas Biblis.
A-2573233, Neamtu, Pavel (alias Pete Neamtu or Matri).
A-3893624, Nemaric, Sime, or Sam Nemaric or Nemerich or Anton Paholovic.
A-6236255, Newman, Helen Gertrude Doris Fry.
A-7203805, Ngow, Chin, or Fred Chin or Fred Chinn.
A-7115625, Nicolaides, Dominica.
A-5525401, Nielsen, Niels Christian, or Niels Charles Nielsen.
A-9702104, Nielsen, Knud Hemmershoj.
A-4768735, Niforatos, Haralambos, or Babe Nifos.
A-6707075, Nocera, Vincenzo Raffaele.
A-6754802, Noel, Alice Josephine, or Alice Mcivor or Alice J. Noel.
A-4492831, Norregaard, Arthur Peter.
A-3455236, Nowak, Ted J.

A-5016134, Nunes, Arturo Goncalves.
A-2491080, Nuorteva, Verner Albinus or Anderson.
A-7112907, Nussbaum, Alfonz Armand, or Alfonz (Alfonse) a Nussbaum.
A-5067950, Ohlgren, Odd Trygve Grasmo, or Ted Grasmo Ohlgren.
A-3607750, Okawauchi, Kingo.
A-3882686, Okauchi, Shizuye Kurata, or Shizue Okawauchi or Shizue Kurata.
A-2875529, Olexyncer, Sonia (Sonya), or Sonia Alex.
A-2875530, Olexyncer Isaak, or Irving Alex.
A-3120552, Olexyncer, Gussie (nee Siegel or Gussie Alex).
A-5796454, O'Neill, Joseph Anthony.
A-7276040, Oreschkina, Tamara.
A-2516852, Orfanos, Basilios, or Basilios George Orfanos.
A-5930783, Padilla, Dolores Toscano Cortada de, or Dolores Angela Toscano.
A-3151067, Pagos, Mike Christos, or Mike Christos Pecos or Pezos.
A-6249449, Paleologus, Chrysanthy, or Chrysanthi Paleologou.
A-5893010, Panilagao, Emiliana Baring, or Emiliana Antipolo or Emiliana Salaber.
A-6171964, Papasotiriou, Charilaos.
A-6171966, Papasotiriou, Eleni, or Helen Charilaos.
A-4159490, Papazian, Benjamin.
A-1223538, Paraskeva, Paraskevas, or Nick Parros.
A-5225529, Pascaris, George, or Giorgios Pasharis.
A-1451943, Penezic, John, or Ivan or Giovanni Pinezic or Pinezick.
A-6920615, Pennacchia, Vinxenzo (or Vincent).
A-6213092, Perez, Maria De Diego.
A-4767778, Perez, Maria Dolores (nee Pardo).
A-5638913, Pericao, Joao Da Cruz.
A-4917347, Peroulas, George Athanasios, or Gerog Peroulis or Peroulos.
A-9635859, Philipoom, Jacobus, or Jacobus Philipoon.
A-4128148, Pina, Sebastiano Lobo, or Leo Lobo Pina.
A-2654505, Pioli, Pietro, or Guido Taglioni.
A-9690823, Pires, Jose, or Joseph Pires.
A-3113558, Pittas, Antonios J.
A-5920208, Portolos, Alexandros, or Alex Portolos.
A-3416094, Postma, Tjibbe, or Ted Postma.
A-1327390, Potulski, Bruno Hans or Polukski.
A-2991322, Pous, Francisco Liso, or Francisco Pous.
A-5139014, Pejak, Dusas, or Dane Payock.
A-7009346, Previto, Joseph, or Joseph John Previto or Giuseppe Previto.
A-1096841, Privitera, Santo.
A-6373166, Profus, Aaron, or Aron Profus.
A-5127776, Puhar, Andre, or Andy Puhar or Andre Puhar.
A-5694835, Puzo, Carmine Filippo, or Carmine Puzo.
A-1340505, Ramnath, Lola, or Lala Rammath Jain.
A-7581989, Rapeports, Heinrich Chaikel, or Heinrich Rapeports.
A-2866349, Ratti, Ignio.
A-1944224, Rey, Daniel Tome, or Daniel Tome Raz.
A-6145160, Rey, Lucio Lopez.
A-2648624, Ribuffi, Francesco, or Frank Ribuffi.
A-3074394, Rigas, Emanuel Ioannis, or Mike Rigas.
A-7140844, Ritter, Frank, or Frank Harold Theodor Ritter or Frank Theodor Ritter.
A-3843498, Roncevic, Anti Yakov, or Tony Roneevich on Ante Roncevic or Tony Jack Roncevic or Ante Yakov Roncevic.
A-1019866, Rotase, Shaleb, or Shaleb Lahaer.
A-2522951, Roussos, Loucas Alexandros.
A-4341666, Ryecroft, Leslie (formerly William Leslie Bennett).
A-5841824, Said, Ali Mohamed, or Moahsen Furhan Said.
A-2534720, Saiki, Chika, or Chika Kasamatsu Saiki (formerly Chika Kasamatsu).
A-3497888, Sakamoto, Bunnosuke.
A-6275839, Sanz, Rosario Lourdes.
A-6275840, Sanz, Maria de los Angeles.
A-3631495, Sangadi, Christian, or Hendrik Amos or Christopher Sangadi.
A-4196785, Santos, Joao Ferreira Dos or Joas Ferreira Dos Santos, or Jose Ferreira Dos Santos or Joao Bantos.
A-4027624, Saraco, Giuseppe Antonio, or Joseph Saraco.
A-4012287, Sasaki, Takeo, or Walter T. Sasaki.
A-6268891, Sasz, Magdalena Elena, or Lena Sasz.
A-9578162, Savar, Miho, or Mike Savar or Michael Herman Savar.
A-1180778, Schatz, Olga.
A-1180777, Schatz, Zahara.
A-5909601, Schoenemann, Helmut Otto Friedrich, or Herman Schoenemann.
A-6507283, Schreiber, Estera, or Schreiberova or Ester Schreiber or E. Schreiber.
A-3865517, Schuch, Joseph.
A-4121694, Schultz, Peter.
A-2490849, Seculopulos, Atanasios Poti, or Atanas Sikuloff.
A-6665954, Seitzmeir, Ella Magdalena (nee Fehrenback).
A-6888287, Sernaque, Leonardo Aquiles, or Leonardo Aquiles Sernaque Verdesoto.
A-4771412, Severin, Richard.
A-4641680, Shapiro, Mary Libby.
A-2286082, Shee, Lo Chin, or Chun Mui Kwai.
A-5450997, Sheiko, Bazyl, or Vasily Sheiko or Bazyl or Vasily Szajko.
A-9657748, Shun, Sung.
A-1462315, Simkus, Anton, or Antonas Szimkus.
A-4164096, Simon, John Ottmar Behrendt Probst, or John Ottmar Simons.
A-4586164, Singelmann, Emma Catharina.
A-2978714, Singh, Banta, or Banta Singh Sandhu.
A-6799539, Singh, Agapita Vera de, or Agapita Vera-Mesa de Singh.
A-1662520, Sissea, John Pantilimon, or John P. Sissea or Ioan P. Sissea.
A-5046679, Skimos, John Konstantinos, or Ioannis or John Skembos.
A-9825182, Skorstad, Harold Norman, or Harald Skarstad.
A-4876899, Snoo, Johannes De, or Robert Desmew.
A-4719578, Sofariu, Alexander Dionise, or Alex Sofar.
A-3959194, Soichinoff, Sotir, or Sotirios Doichinis Carulos (alias Sotiris Doichins Coralos).
A-7203566, Soyum, Jesus, or Jesus Edmondson.
A-7203567, Soyum, Pascual, or Pascual Edmondson.
A-7203568, Soyum, Gregorio, or Gregorio Edmondson.
A-5518362, Spiers, Annie.
A-5280366, Spiers, Colman, or Colman Spierer.
A-3416037, Sprude, Edward Jakos.
A-6577001, Slawinski, Anna Jadwica.
A-6577000, Slawinski, Eugenjuz Stanislaw, or Eugene S. Slawinski.
A-6975360, Stathis, Helene Theodorou (nee Helene Theodorou Gapsanis).
A-5467398, Struck, Ferdinand Fritz, or Friedrich Steen.
A-2718405, Sullivan, Tatiana (nee Yarema or Tatiana Solovay).
A-3228816, Sze, Agnes Chi Chen (nee Lin).
PR-909850, Sze, Morgan Chuan-Yuan.
A-1188912, Tagliamonte, Ginnaro, or Gennaro Tagliamonte.
A-3457399, Tomerias, Bernard John, or Bernhard John Tomerias.
A-3739861, Tanaka, Michiko (nee Ikeda).
A-3496620, Tanaka, Tsunezo.
A-5137137, Tarino, Romeo, or Remeo Moggio Tarino.
A-1738959, Taiarkis or Michail Taxiarkis or Michael Taxiarkis.
A-6936802, Tchertafian, Agop.
A-4647207, Terrell, Sybil Elaine (nee Paterson).
A-5744001, Theodorakis, Konstantinos, or Kust Theoderakis or Gus Theodorakis.
A-6840802, Thomassen, Jacobus Johannes, or Jack Thomassen.
A-4865982, Thorstenson, Oagee.
A-4160343, Tom, Chiu-Faat Joseph.
A-6583470, Tormet, Att.
A-6542512, Tormet, Helene (nee Purits).
A-4206394, Torode, William George, or Francis Elliott Howard.
A-4159140, Toth, George.
A-1920736, Touma, Mary, or Mary Toro or Mary Tourian.
A-6713683, Touris, Georgia Nic Vardaiou.
A-7044239, Trapletti, Edea (nee Billiani).
A-6508490, Tsaouse, Thomais Panajiotou, or Thomais Panajiotou Bourlessis.
A-3733189, Tsikozidos, Lazaros, or Lazaros Tzikotzidis.
A-6815412, Tsouris, Sarandos Nicolaon.
A-6445668, Valdes, Consuelo.
A-6567556, Valdes, Vicente, or Vicente Valdes y Genato.
A-6567561, Valdes, Luis Francisco, or Luis Valdec.
A-5071008, Varlomos, Antoneos Nick, or Antonios Varlomos (alias John Pappas).
A-6919963, Vartanian, Aghavni Lily (nee Melikian).
A-7083033, Ventresca, Guiseppe Ercold.
A-6169079, Ver, Anastacio Quevedo, Junior.
A-2464148, Verone, Alexis Sadi Lobel, alias Alexis S. L. Verome, alias Sade Lobel, alias Alexis Verone).
A-6660379, Vidad, Elise Bolante.
A-6934710, Villanueva, Feliciano Idioma, or Felix Villaneuva.
A-6849913, Vezer, Emil, or Emil Weisz.
A-9025392, Voiantzi, Ioannis, or Ioannis Vogiatzis or John or Jwannov Bogiantje.
A-6514877, Volodkin, John George.
A-1782036, Vukic, Mate Yerolin, or Mate Y. Vukik.
A-5821738, Walter, Andrey.
A-7092906, Ways, Israle, or Israel Wais.
A-4793441, Weber, Boris, or Boris Rodwivitch or Boris Rodsenwitsch.
A-4089854, Wehby, Malababa, or Mabel Wehby (nee Jarishe).
A-3799015, Wehby, Farhat, or Fred Wehby
A-6725069, Westfall, Forest Elgin.
A-1417320, Wever, Joseph, or Joseph Weaver.
A-3567493, Whiteman, James Carlile.
A-5008544, Wicknig, Willy Arthur, or William Wicking.
A-5621809, Wilhelm, Otto Bernhard, or Otto Williams.
A-2486388, Wilson, William Barton.
A-4421512, Wing, Lee.
A-3130290, Wood, Kerttu Pohja.
A-2130263, Workun, Anton, or Tony or Anthony Workin or Workman.
A-5353860, Wright, Arthur Smedley.
A-5022006, Yaago, Anton.
A-4261547, Yip, Mary, or Yip Lum Mui.
A-2533619, Young, Mrs. Hung Sum, or Ng Ye Muj.
A-5434778, Yovanovich, Tomelco, or Temelco Yvanoff Gorgis or Tom Evans (alias Tomelco Yovanoff Corgis alias Tomerkon Georgiou).
A-3982915, Yun, Eung Pal Yun, or Eung Pal Yoon.
A-3416158, Yun, Sang Soon, or Sang Soon Kum.
A-5535882, Zabala, Rafael Basteguieta, or Rafael B. Zabala or Rafael Zabela or Ralph Zabala.
A-2701568, Zaharia, Dumitru.
A-3906860, Zampas, Charles, or Kyriakos Orolicolou Zampas.
A-3243888, Zampas, Laura, or Doviad Gregory Kovouk.
A-5333950, Zanikos, Demetrios, or James George.
A-2653930, Zannakis, Demetrius, or James Zanakis.
A-6394967, Zervos, Dionisios Anthony.

A-1706871, Zimmerman, John.

A-4978968, Zisimos, Sotirios, or Demetrios or James Carras.

A-4546677, Zopoulos, George.

A-2074345, Zoumpoulakas, Ioannis Paulo, or John Paul Zoompoulakis or John Zoumpoulakis.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 4, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 4) submitted by Mr. HAYDEN on January 8, 1951, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-second Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

EVA MALENA THOMAS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 9, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 9) submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND on January 8, 1951, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Eva Malena Thomas, mother of Mark Poulton Thomas, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF SENATE TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 38) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. BENTON, of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. STENNIS, of Mississippi.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 15, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bobo, Virginia, assistant chief clerk	$4,849.61	$2,424.80
Brawley, H. W., staff director	10,846.00	5,423.00
Chrissos, Costas D., clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55
Faucette, Andrew McC. (1 month, Dec. 1-31, 1950), professional staff member	10,846.00	903.85
Homan, Colette, clerical assistant	4,415.10	2,207.55
House, Linda (Mrs.), clerical assistant	3,980.59	1,990.29
Irwin, Mary, staff member (professional)	10,846.00	5,423.00
Latimer, J. Austin, chief clerk and counsel	10,846.00	5,423.00
Morgan, Ethel, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.19
Shawn, E. Luise, clerical assistant	4,154.38	2,077.19

Unexpended balance S. Res. 179 (Oct. 13, 1949) and S. Res. 275 (May 13, 1950)	$3,285.53
Amount expended July 1, to Dec. 31, 1950	2,207.52
Balance unexpended returned to the contingent fund of the Senate	1,078.01
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure including S. Res. 167, Oct. 13, 1949	12,718.60
Amount previously reported	2,395.03
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,781.65
Balance unexpended returned to the contingent fund of the Senate	8,541.92

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 516. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate bill 517, to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isac C. Goldstein;

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Wilma M. Stiehl;

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Jacob Issahar Zadeh, and Bluma Issahar Zadeh;

S. 522. A bill for the relief of Spyrodon Vlassopoulos and his wife, Theresa; and

S. 523. A bill for the relief of Walter Duschinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 524. A bill or the relief of Clorinda Ceretani; and

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Jacob Gitlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. VANDENBERG):

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 527. A bill for the relief of Youichi Nobori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON):

S. 528. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 529. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter, Lucy Dildilian; and

S. 530. A bill for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 531. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 532. A bill to authorize the cancellation or settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the estates of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate bill 533, to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 534. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 535, to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 536. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) introduced Senate bill 537, to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 538. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 539. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; and

S. 540. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Tulana Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 542. A bill to authorize the construction of a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Oar Creek, Douglas County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash., as Lake Umatilla; to the Committee on Public Works.

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1951" and I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill, prepared jointly by myself and Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr., of New York, who is introducing the same bill in the House, be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a brief memorandum pointing out the differences between the Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950 and the proposed bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from New York. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 517) to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement and memorandum presented by Mr. LEHMAN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

We are today introducing a bill for the redevelopment of the waters of the Niagara River for public power purposes.

This bill differs only in some technical aspects from the measure we drafted and introduced last year and on which hearings were held before the House Public Works Committee. The differences between last year's bill and the present one are described in an attached memorandum.

The present budget contains an item of $2,000,000 for a preliminary survey and for the preparation of engineering designs for this project. It is to be assumed that funds will be requested from the Congress in the appropriations bill for this purpose.

Before these funds are voted, it would be highly desirable to have formal authorization for this project on the statute books.

The needs of the national defense program and of the mobilization of our full industrial potential for the critical period ahead call for vastly expanded power. The availability of 8,000,000,000 kilowatts of power annually from the Niagara redevelopment—power which can be developed at low cost and marketed at low cost—is a mandate in itself for speedy congressional action on our bill. The Senate, in its reservation to the Niagara Treaty, specified that this power was to be developed for public use and benefit in such a manner as Congress might direct. I believe that our bill fulfills all the requisites for protecting all the interests of New York State, of the Federal Government, and of national defense. It provides against all exigencies, placing the chief emphasis on the earliest possible completion of the project and the most prompt availability of the power from this project to meet the public and national need.

If the project work is rushed by the Corps of Engineers, the first power can be coming off generators by the end of 1952, if not before. This will be at a time when national mobilization will be at its peak and when the power from the Niagara will be desperately needed.

This power will save the consumers of New York and of the surrounding area $65,000,000 annually. There will be a saving to the taxpayers, too, because the low cost of this power will be immediately reflected in the decreased cost of the defense items that must be purchased by the Government. In the case of such products as aluminum, the cost of power is the chief component of the total cost of production.

The record of last year's hearings before the House Public Works Committee furnishes a good start. We shall urge the chairman of the appropriate House and Senate committees to begin hearings on this bill at the earliest possible date.

COMPARISON BETWEEN NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1951 AND S. 3526 (H. R. 8343)

1. Language changes have been made in recognition of the fact that the Niagara Treaty has already been ratified and is now the law of the land.

2. Provision is made for submission of the plans for the remedial works (to preserve the beauty of Niagara Falls) to the International Joint Commission and for the carrying out of the remedial works under the supervision of the International Joint Commission.

3. The primary rights and interests of national defense are spelled out in terms of section 16 of the Federal Power Act, and the Department of Defense is included among the entities to be given preference in the distribution of the power from the Niagara project.

4. There has been a comprehensive change in the legislative format of section 3 for purposes of simplification. This did not involve a change in substance.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by myself and Representative PATMAN be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alabama. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 533) to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN

In this period of national emergency, it has become imperative for Congress to create an agency with the power to make small business a full partner in the mobilization effort and to solve the special problems which small enterprises will face in the months ahead.

It is for this purpose that we, as chairmen of the Senate and House Small Business Committees, today have introduced legislation known as the Small Defense Plants Act of 1951. We have the unanimous backing of our committees in presenting this legislation; all the members of the Senate Small Business Committee are acting as cosponsors of the bill—Senators HERBERT R. O'CONOR, RUSSELL B. LONG, GUY M. GILLETTE, LESTER C. HUNT, WILLIAM BENTON, CHARLES W. TOBEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EDWARD J. THYE, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL. The bill has also been endorsed unanimously by the House Small Fusiness Committee members—Eugene J. Keogh, Mike Mansfield, Joe L. Evins, Clarence G. Burton, Charles A. Halleck, William S. Hill, R. Walter Riehlman, Franklin H. Lichtenwalter.

This legislation is similar to the Small Defense Plants Act of 1950, introduced on July 26, 1950. We cannot emphasize too strongly that its passage during this session of Congress is more urgently needed than ever before.

The necessity for the passage of such legislation arises from the critical conditions now faced by the Nation. There is no question but that small businesses could make a major contribution to the mobilization effort. Located in towns and cities of every State, our smaller industrial facilities represent great productive capacity, are flexible and capable of manufacturing hundreds of types of articles urgently needed for the defense effort.

In addition, small business is the prime source of our strength, the system of competitive free enterprise which has made us the preeminent industrial Nation of the world. It is the fount of initiative, growth, and development in the economic life of the Nation. Big business grows from small business.

Failure to give small business its adequate place during the present mobilization is fully as serious as failure to protect the Nation from foreign aggressors. Injury to small business is the equivalent of letting our system of free, competitive enterprise be riddled beyond repair.

SPECIAL SMALL-BUSINESS LEGISLATION URGENTLY NEEDED IN THE PRESENT DEFENSE PROGRAM

Small firms were facing handicaps even before the present mobilization period. Since the Korean outbreak, small-business problems have intensified, and they will increase manyfold as we enter full mobilization, unless Congress and the executive agencies are alert to preserve small business as a vital portion of our economy.

During the months ahead, the small-business man inevitably will face curtailment of civilian production. Materials will be scarce and more costly. Additional controls and restrictions on production will be imposed. The small-business man cannot face these curtailments as easily as can big business, with its backlog of materials and financial reserves.

Unless immediate action is taken, large producers almost certainly will allocate the

bulk of materials to affiliate or subsidiary fabricators, and the small, independent companies will be forced to take what, if anything, is left. The small-business man will find it almost impossible to compete with large manufacturers for defense contracts unless specific action is taken to aid him.

Small enterprises have learned through bitter experience that legislative action on their behalf is essential in periods of mobilization.

During the early years of World War II, the larger corporations were successful in mobilizing the resources of their own companies, but they made no real attempt to tap the productive reservoir of small enterprises.

Although small business could have made invaluable contributions to the war effort during the period from 1940 through 1942, for these 2 years the small-business man was forgotten and ignored. His plants lay idle. His markets vanished. His supply of materials dried up. His industrial skills were unused. His labor drifted away to other plants. During these 2 years, 16 percent of the small businesses in the United States closed their doors.

CREATION OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION IN 1942 WAS RECOGNITION OF SMALL-BUSINESS CRISIS

Congress finally recognized this critical situation in 1942, and remedied it by creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. But SWPC did not really begin to function effectively until 1944, when the peak of war production had passed. Nevertheless, Smaller War Plants assisted small firms in obtaining nearly a billion dollars in subcontracts and more than $5,500,000,000 in prime contracts. It loaned more than $550,000,000 to small business, with insignificant losses. It stimulated a recognition of the importance of small business in the national economy.

Creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation came almost too late to save small business during World War II. The Eighty-second Congress now has the opportunity to act in time to prevent a repetition of the conditions which proved so disastrous to small business from 1940 through 1942.

The Defense Production Act (Public Law 774, 81st Cong., September 8, 1950) included small-business provisions which did not contain standards to utilize effectively the facilities of small-business enterprise in the mobilization program. No assurance was offered that small business would participate in supplying essential civilian requirements. In essence, the Defense Production Act provided no more than a declaration of policy insofar as small business was concerned.

Experience with the administration of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was set up as a part of the War Production Board, has convinced us of the need for a separate and distinct agency to mobilize all small business. We also are convinced that certain permissive clauses in the Smaller War Plants Act were ineffective.

These defects are rectified in the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951, which we have introduced today. This legislation will establish a separate agency for small business, with the permissive clauses replaced by mandatory provisions assuring that positive action will be taken in behalf of the Nation's small enterprises.

In broad terms, the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951 provides that small business be assisted—

1. To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;

2. To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;

3. To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;

4. To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and

5. To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

SMALL-BUSINESS DEFENSE PLANTS ACT WILL PROVIDE A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESS

To accomplish these objectives, the bill provides a revolving fund of a maximum of $500,000,000 to allow the Small Defense Plants Corporation to make loans and acquire property. It allows the Small Defense Plants Corporation to enter into contracts with the United States Government and to let subcontracts to small-business concerns.

Other Government agencies would be required to consult with the Corporation in determining the means by which small business can be brought most fully and effectively into the effort to produce goods for defense and for essential civilian use. The Corporation also would be empowered to make or have made a complete inventory of productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for such production.

The Corporation would be authorized to take appropriate action to insure that small-business subcontractors receive fair and equitable prices, conditions, and terms from prime contractors.

The bill also would provide assurance that small enterprises receive a fair share of scarce materials, equipment, and supplies which may be allocated by the Government. In addition, there are provisions assuring that small businesses shall receive a fair proportion of Government contracts.

Response of small-business men throughout the Nation to the Small Business Defense Plants Act has been enthusiastic.

Since the act first was introduced last July, the Senate and House Small Business Committees have received many communications from small-business men urging that the bill be given prompt consideration and passage.

UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS IS ESSENTIAL TO FULL MOBILIZATION PROGRAM

When the Defense Production Act first was made law there was some ground for hope that partial mobilization of our resources would be sufficient for an indefinite period.

Unfortunately for the peace and happiness of the people of the world, this has not proved to be the case. In the late fall the human pawns in the vast movement for communistic domination advanced from the inner recesses of Red China. This horde came in such numbers that the modest forces of the United Nations on the Korean Peninsula found it necessary to retire.

It was apparent instantly that partial mobilization would not suffice. It was necessary for the President of the United States on December 16 to declare a national emergency. This meant the full mobilization of the military and economic resources of the Nation.

It also means that, if we are to mobilize completely, every single unit in our industrial family must be put to work, as every man and woman is expected to share in the responsibility for a total defense. Small-business concerns cannot be neglected or unused.

Strangely enough, it is well-nigh impossible to obtain more than recognition of this necessity under present defense laws. Recognition and savory phrases will not do the job. We must have new legislation if all of the component parts of business and industry are to bear their full share of the responsibility for strengthening our Military Establishment and providing for the necessities of life for the civilian population.

SEPARATION OF MAIL PAY FROM SUBSIDIES IN CASE OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation.

For some time past, considerable attention has been given to the question of separating airline subsidies from air-mail pay.

An investigation with respect to the domestic aspect of this problem has been made by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and the report is current that a new bill on this subject, concerned with only domestic air transportation, has been agreed upon by airline representatives and others.

The further report is that the airlines are asking for another year of study, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, concerning the problem involved in separation of subsidies from mail pay in the field of international air transportation.

I have been much interested in this question of the separation of subsidies from mail pay, as I am interested in all questions having to do with the growth and development of air transportation; and I have worked out a method of separation of mail pay from subsidies in the field of international air transportation which I believe is sound and fair and will, after study, have rather wide acceptance.

I do not wish at this time to claim for my bill any virtues which it may not have, or to enter into prolonged argument with respect to it. Therefore, I do not propose to summarize its provisions nor generalize with regard to them. I simply offer the bill for introduction, and I urge members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and others who are interested in this subject, to give it their careful study. I hope the bill may also have most serious and critical consideration by the air carriers whom it would affect, and by all others who are interested in this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 535) to provide for the separation of mail pay from subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SECURITY AND DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ATTACK

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, signed by Marx Leva, dated January 16, 1951, explaining the purpose of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Colorado. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 537) to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation, "To provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes." This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1951, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress at an early date.

Purpose of the legislation: The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide the necessary Executive authority to control electromagnetic radiation, not only during hostilities or a proclaimed emergency, but also during time of strained international relationships when a surprise attack on the United States is a possibility.

Current concepts of warfare and recent experience demonstrate the necessity to control electromagnetic radiation in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, during periods of critical international relationships, for the purpose of denying their use to a potential enemy for navigation of piloted or pilotless aircraft or missiles directed toward targets in the United States. The authority of this proposed legislation must be provided now in order that further planning and preparations may be completed so that air defense plans may be implemented without delay in the event of an air attack. It is requested that further justification for the urgent necessity of this legislation be given to you in secret session.

Legislative references: Some executive authority is provided by section 606 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. However, it is believed that that authority is inadequate for the purpose stated above.

Cost and budget data: Section 3 provides for just compensation to the owner for use by a department or agency of the United States of any instrument, device, apparatus, or thing. It is impossible to estimate the extent of such compensation and the resulting cost to the Government.

Department of Defense action agency: The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

In accordance with a long-established custom, the Department of Defense submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services a proposal identical with this proposal for consideration by the Eighty-first Congress. We have been informed that that earlier proposal was referred by the Committee on Armed Services to your committee. In view of the referral of that earlier proposal to your committee and in view of the urgency of this proposal, we are forwarding this proposal directly to your committee for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MARX LEVA.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY AND SURVEY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 273, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950 (providing for study and survey of health insurance plans in the United States, the activities of State and local governments in the field of health services, and related matters), is hereby continued until March 31, 1951.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "SELLING TO YOUR GOVERNMENT"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 30,000 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government," such additional copies to be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

A PLAN FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Plan for Peace," delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at the meeting of the Senate breakfast group on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE, OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, on January 16, 1951, at Harrisburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOPE: AN AMERICAN EXPORT—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Hope: An American Export, delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in Washington November 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENT POLITICAL TRENDS—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various editorial comments regarding an address by Hon. James A. Farley on present political trends, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE—STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding universal military service, issued by the Committee on the Present Danger, which appears in the Appendix.]

TACTICS—NOT A STRATEGY—OF FREEDOM—ARTICLE BY PROF. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tactics—Not a Strategy—of Freedom," written by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, and published in the January 1, 1951, issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATIONS ON INDIAN COUNSEL—LETTER FROM ALDEN STEVENS

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of regulations on Indian counsel, written by Alden Stevens, secretary, Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc., of New York, and printed in a recent publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Veto on Troops Could Cripple United States Policy," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of January 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE SHALL WE LOOK FOR LEADERSHIP?—EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Shall We Look for Leadership?" written by David Lawrence, and published in the United States News and World Report December 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROAD TO BIPARTISANSHIP—ARTICLE BY HOLMES ALEXANDER

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Bipartisanship," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in his column entitled "Washington Affairs" in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTHLY BENEFITS ASSUMING BASIC PENSION RATE OF $50 PER MONTH

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation prepared by him showing the monthly benefits which would be paid to those aged 65 or over under the proposal for a universal-eligibility social security, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST-DOMINATED AREAS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recently there has been discussion regarding the shipping of strategic materials to Communist-dominated areas, and the Secretary of Commerce has given his version in regard to the matter. I have prepared a detailed statement based upon the findings and investigations of the Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

I would have preferred not to make this statement, particularly when it had been our intention to concentrate our future efforts upon a different phase of foreign trade, namely, continued shipping of strategic materials by Western European nations to Communist-dominated areas.

In fact, I had hoped that the discussion had ended about shipments from the United States to our Communist foes in China. But in the past few days the Secretary of Commerce has seen fit to reopen the controversy. In a Boston speech he invited further debate about the matter.

The Secretary charged falsification and misrepresentation to those of us who had felt obliged to reveal facts about shipments to Red China of critical materials. He further alleged unfairness in the accusations and indicated, in a thinly disguised reference, that the Senate subcommittee's statements were concocted or misinterpreted in order to create a sensation.

Under the circumstances, and in order that the record be clear and unmistakable, I think a discussion of the points raised by the Secretary is required.

COPPER SHIPMENTS

After denying that exports of copper from the United States occurred during 1950, the Secretary admitted that one transshipment of copper took place in February 1950 from Japan through this country and around the world to the Communists in China. He declares, however, that no copper has been shipped since that date.

The facts concerning the copper transshipped through the United States to Red China are as follows: (1) 658,142 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Cloud* on January 5, 1950; (2) 440,923 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Arrow* on March 14, 1950; (3) 731,523 pounds; left New York on the Steamship *Flying Arrow* on March 14, 1950; (4) 618,163 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Flying Arrow* on April 3, 1950; (6) 354,954 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Brooklyn Heights* on April 3, 1950; (6) 354,954 pounds, left New York on the steamship *Brooklyn Heights* on April 3, 1950; (7) 1,120,000 pounds; left New York on the steamship *Empire Glencoe* after April 3, 1950.

SILICON STEEL SHEETS

But confining attention to the Secretary's assertion that there have been no shipments of anything, strategic or otherwise, to Communist China since they entered the war in Korea, let me remind him that as late as November 16, 1950, a shipment of 24,672 pounds of silicon steel sheets was allowed to leave New York on the steamship *Igadi* destined for Taku Bar, Red China.

The Secretary stresses the fact that last February his Department learned of the subterfuge of transshipping from a foreign port to New York and thence to Communist China. Well, the fact is that other transshipments occurred after his Department was on notice of this evasion of our export control regulations. Here are the facts regarding these transshipments of steel sheets through the United States to Red China: 368,642 pounds left New York on or about July 19, 1950, on the steamship *Cape Race* destined for Taku Bar, North China; 53,635 pounds left New York on or about August 4, 1950, on the steamship *Flying Arrow* destined for Taku Bar, North China; 42,282 pounds left New York on or about July 31, 1950, on the steamship *Berghold* destined for Taku Bar, North China.

In addition, one company imported two further shipments, amounting to 55,115 pounds and 44,890 pounds, respectively, which arrived in the port of New York on November 3, 1950. However, by this time the president of the company had been served with a subpena to appear before the Senate subcommittee. He thereupon changed his plans for shipping these silicon steel sheets to China and disposed of them on the United States market. Ascertaining that the steamship *Igadi* was to touch at a Pacific port, we telegraphed the Secretary of Commerce requesting that these steel sheets and other shipments of strategic importance be removed from ships before they left United States shores, which was done.

We further called attention to the loophole in the OIT regulations which permitted transshipments of strategic materials through United States ports and by means of United States vessels, and it was not until after this complaint was made that the Department of Commerce, on December 3, 1950, established new regulations prohibiting transshipments of any goods of foreign origin through the ports of the United States or by use of American vessels.

This belated action was taken 5 months after hostilities began in Korea and after China had entered the war against us.

This was followed by additional regulations issued on December 6, revoking all licenses on shipments to Red China, Manchuria, Hong Kong, and Macao. It was not until December 8, 1950, that the Department of Commerce finally issued an order which barred the transportation or discharge by American ships and aircraft of strategic and critical materials destined for countries in the Soviet bloc, China, Hong Kong, and Macao.

PETROLATUM

The Secretary in his address claims that he stopped shipments of lubricating oil to China in 1949, and he observed that "about 2 months ago we noticed an increase in mineral-oil shipments which we had assumed would be used internally by human beings. When it appeared that this mineral oil might be used as a substitute—though a very poor substitute—for lubricating oil, we shut that off, too. He added that he personally ordered 1,250 drums taken off the docks in New York when they were about to be loaded.

Here it is pertinent to note that, at the very time a portion of the petrolatum shipment was being removed, the Federal officials gave formal consent for the remaining portion to go to China, and that shipment was delivered to our Communist foes. If it was dangerous to have allowed one portion of the load to go, why was permission given to transport the remaining drums on the very same vessel, the steamship *Flying Cloud?* This authorization was given by the Office of International Trade after we had protested and submitted data in support of our demands.

The facts are that the subcommittee called these unusually large shipments of petrolatum to the attention of the Secretary of Commerce after our staff had examined export declarations and ship manifests of boats leaving United States ports. Attention had been drawn to the fact that more than 50,000 gallons were being loaded for China on one vessel alone. When the chairman called these facts to the attention of the Department of Commerce, the Department issued a notice on November 1, 1950, effective at 10 a. m. putting petrolatum and petrolatum jelly on the positive list and prohibiting their export without a license.

It is clear that it was the Senate subcommittee which took the initiative in this matter, and it is further clear that if the Senate subcommittee had not issued its protest, all of this petrolatum would have been shipped to our enemies. It is pertinent to point out that the Department of Commerce had been very slow to perceive the enormous increase in the shipments of petrolatum, because 2,254,311 pounds of this product had been shipped since the onset of the Korean war from the port of New York alone between the months of June and October, 1950.

TIN PLATE

With reference to tin plate the Secretary of Commerce points to the fact that tin plate rejects had not been placed on the positive list, requiring license, stating that these rejects are of such low grade that the interagency committee responsible for deciding which exports are strategic saw no reason to give them such a classification. Incidentally, this interagency committee includes representatives of the defense agencies.

A review of the shipping documents filed between August and October 1950, at the port of New York alone, revealed that more than 19,381,014 pounds of tin mill waste waste had been shipped from the port of New York in this 3-month period, together with more than 4,000,000 pounds of other steel products, 2,500,000 pounds of galvanized pipe, 167,774 pounds of boiler tube, 419,171 pounds of aluminum, 669,000 pounds of silicon steel, 2,250,000 pounds of petrolatum, and 709,000 pounds of lubricating oil and grease, among other products.

Testimony given to us in executive session by experts was to the effect that the waste waste tin plate could readily be used for strategic purposes, such as making ammunition containers, and so forth. The subcommitee likewise was reliably informed by officials in the National Defense Agency that after they learned of the extremely large shipments they had taken the position that tin plate waste waste should be placed on the positive list.

Again, however, it was only after hearings were held and the enormous shipments were publicly revealed that the Secretary of Commerce announced, on December 3, 1950, that all shipments from the United States to mainland China, Hong Kong, and Macao were subject to license.

PENICILLIN

In the matter of important "miracle drugs" the Secretary has this to say in his statement regarding the shipment from this country to the Communists of antibiotics: "About the time the Chinese Communists came into the war in Korea it appeared that these drugs were being purchased in abnormal quantities for shipment to China. These shipments were thereupon stopped. We even stopped shipments on the high seas."

The facts are that in 1949 China imported 37,012,300,000 oxford units of penicillin. For the 9-month period from January to September 1950, the importations of penicillin practically tripled, to the figure of 98,092,800,000 oxford units. It is even more important to note that the imports to Hong Kong in the year 1949 from the United States totaled 3,139,607,100,060 penicillin oxford units; that in the 9-month period from January to September 1950, the amount of penicillin imported was more than doubled, and there were shipped to Hong Kong from the United States 6,735,390,400,000 oxford units.

It must be pointed out that there is no doubt in the minds of any of the experts that almost all imports to Hong Kong are virtually absorbed by China. It can safely be assumed that this enormous amount of penicillin was shipped inland to China. The fact is that it was not until mid-November 1950, after Communist China had openly entered the Korean war, that Commerce placed penicillin on the positive list.

Again the question must be raised as to why the Department of Commerce had to wait until this committee initiated its investigation and started to examine the figures on the shipments of penicillin before taking action to stop the export of this commodity. There can be no doubt that the excessive amount of penicillin exported to China was to be devoted to Communist warfare in Korea. We have been advised that military intelligence became alarmed at this large quantity going to Hong Kong and China. Here again it seems evident that our Office of International Trade was slow to take action to prevent these shipments from reaching China.

COTTON

In a statement on the Senate floor on December 21, 1950, it was pointed out that since the outbreak of the Korean war on June 25, 1950, six shipments involving almost 50,000,000 pounds of cotton are known to have been exported to Manchuria and Red China direct. These shipments from this country have been made with the full knowledge and consent of Federal officials. They were shipped from New Orleans as follows: On July 13, 1950, 13,000 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on July 13, 1950, 1,857 bales to Darien, Manchuria: on July 17, 1950, 7,520 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 7, 1950, 10,127 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 7, 1950, 3,946 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 21, 1950, 3,615 bales to Taku Bar, China; on August 24, 1950, 800 bales to Taku Bar, China; on August 24, 1950, 2,839 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; on August 28, 1950, 4,859 bales to Dairen, Manchuria; total, 48,563 bales.

It is extremely difficult to understand why this vast amount of highly strategic material was permitted to go to Red China and Manchuria after the outbreak of the Korean

war, particularly in view of the fact that cotton is one of the items in short supply in the United States and was put under export control on September 8, 1950.

The astounding fact is that as late as a few weeks ago shipments of highly useful materials were on the high seas being transported on United States flag ships to Communist China. The Office of International Trade had not prevented these shipments leaving our ports, as should have been done.

It is true that the Department clamped down the lid in December after recognizing the fact that these materials were susceptible of military or industrial use by the Reds. But if there was necessity for stopping them in December, why were they allowed to be shipped to the Communists over a period of months even after the war had been launched by our enemies?

It is unfortunate that the Secretary of Commerce by not too veiled an implication felt called upon to accuse the subcommittee of unfairness in its investigation and in its conclusions and statements. The documented facts quoted above speak for themselves. The successive dates on which items were added to the positive list, and other steps taken to prevent just the type of shipments which the subcommittee criticized, certainly bear out the assertion that the Office of International Trade did not act with reasonable promptness in discharging its responsibility. In fact, it had to be prodded continuingly by the subcommittee before remedial action was taken.

It must be remembered that the Congress is charged with the duty of seeing that the laws of the country are being properly administered. It is regrettable that at times it is necessary to bring the force of public opinion to bear before indicated action is taken by some of the executive departments. The facts developed by the subcommittee with regard to the shipments in question were intended to have—and, it is believed, did have—a constructive effect and did bring about—belatedly, let it be again emphasized—action to prevent shipment to our enemies of materials which they needed badly and some of which we could ill afford to spare.

I repeat, thousands of pounds of strategic materials and thousands of gallons of petroleum and other products were shipped from this country, destined for our enemies, and these practices were not stopped, in most cases, until we had developed shocking facts and had made urgent demands upon the Office of International Trade for action.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into regarding the hour at which the Senate will proceed to vote on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, Senate Resolution 8, be modified to the extent of changing the hour from 3 o'clock p. m. to 2 o'clock p. m., on Tuesday, January 23, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is changed accordingly.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes on the subject of Benjamin Franklin, the two hundred forty-fifth anniversary of whose birth falls on today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, today is the two hundred forty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, America's greatest master of statecraft and diplomacy, foremost champion of freedom and self-government and mighty genius of our Nation's beginnings.

We honor his memory as a patriot of American independence, as the first citizen of Pennsylvania, and as a great benefactor of mankind.

Many volumes have been written in praise of his illustrious career. His brilliant achievements as an author, philosopher, scientist, statesman, and diplomat mark him as one of the giant intellects of all time.

It is impossible to measure his vast contribution to the glory of our Republic and to the progress of humanity.

Franklin was a man of peace but he recognized the necessity of a strong defense. He was one of the earliest advocates of disciplined military training for the protection of the frontier settlements against the Indians. He organized a militia company in 1746, and through his efforts the General Assembly of Pennsylvania adopted a bill creating a volunteer militia on a permanent basis in 1755.

In the Albany Congress of 1754, called to unite the colonies against the French and Indians, he presented a Plan of Union which has been acclaimed as the forerunner of the Federal Union.

Three years later he was in England, launched upon a career in diplomacy which was to be crowned by his brilliant success in winning an alliance with France that hastened American victory in the struggle for independence.

He was the only man of the founding fathers who had the distinction of signing all four documents of our freedom: the Declaration of Independence, the treaty of alliance with France, the treaty of peace with England, and the Constitution of the United States.

In 1783 he wrote:

> At length we are in peace. God be praised, and long, very long may it continue! All wars are follies, very expensive and very mischievous ones. When will mankind be convinced of this, and agree to settle their differences by arbitration? Were they to do this, even by the cast of a die, it would be better than by destroying each other.

Another impressive quotation from Franklin, written a year later, appears on the cover of the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

> Let us beware—

Franklin wrote—

> of being lulled into dangerous security; and of being * * * weakened by internal contentions and divisions; * * * and of neglect in military exercises and discipline, and in providing stores of arms and munitions of war; for * * * the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be necessary to maintain it.

Commenting on that sound advice from Benjamin Franklin, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post points out that it "is sort of hard to tell whether he is talking to the Continental Congress or the United States Eighty-second Congress."

Twenty-seven years ago in an address at a dinner of the International Benjamin Franklin Society of New York, the Honorable James M. Beck, a distinguished Pennsylvanian who was then Solicitor General of the United States, paid tribute to the memory of Dr. Franklin. Mr. Beck's remarks were eloquent and scholarly, and I should like to read a brief excerpt from them because the thoughts expressed are applicable to the problems we face today.

Referring to Benjamin Franklin, Mr. Beck said:

> Some of the acute problems of the present day could be readily solved if this generation had his spirit of toleration, his love of constructive achievement, and his genius of common sense.
>
> How wise would be his counsels in this hysterical generation when the whole world seems topsy-turvy; when many classes are in revolt against the institutions which make for stability; when the counsels of men are darkened with vain misgivings and legislators and administrators too often flee in abject cowardice before the rising dust of an advancing windstorm.
>
> To all the causes of our present discontent he would apply, if again in our midst, his well-poised judgment and unfailing humor. He would urge that many of our problems could be solved by more working and less talking.

Mr. President, every American can find patriotic inspiration in the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin. His career should be studied for guidance in these days of perplexity and confusion in world affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a compilation of the principal events in the life of Benjamin Franklin, taken from the Harvard Classics.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN HIS LIFE

Ending, as it does, with the year 1757, the autobiography leaves important facts unrecorded. It has seemed advisable, therefore, to detail the chief events in Franklin's life, from the beginning, in the following list:

1706: He is born, in Boston, and baptized in the Old South Church.

1714: At the age of 8 enters the grammar school.

1716: Becomes his father's assistant in the tallow-chandlery business.

1718: Apprenticed to his brother James, printer.

1721: Writes ballads and peddles them, in printed form in the streets; contributes, anonymously, to the New England Courant and temporarily edits that paper; becomes a free-thinker and a vegetarian.

1723: Breaks his indenture and removes to Philadelphia; obtains employment in Keimer's printing office; abandons vegetarianism.

1724: Is persuaded by Governor Keith to establish himself independently and goes to London to buy type; works at his trade there, and publishes Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity, Pleasure and Pain.

1726: Returns to Philadelphia; after serving as clerk in a drygoods store, becomes manager of Keimer's printing house.

1727: Founds the Junto, or Leathern Apron Club.

1728: With Hugh Meredith, opens a printing office.

1729: Becomes proprietor and editor of the Pennsylvania Gazette; prints, anonymously, Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency; opens a stationer's shop.

1730: Marries Rebecca Read.

1731: Founds the Philadelphia Library.

1732: Publishes the first number of Poor Richard's Almanac under the pseudonym of "Richard Saunders." The Almanac, which continued for 25 years to contain his witty, worldlywise sayings, played a very large part in bringing together and molding the American character which was at that time made up of so many diverse and scattered types.

1733: Begins to study French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin.

1736: Chosen clerk of the general assembly; forms the Union Fire Company of Philadelphia.

1737: Elected to the assembly; appointed Deputy Postmaster General; plans a city police.

1742: Invents the open, or "Franklin," stove.

1743: Proposes a plan for an academy, which is adopted 1749 and develops into the University of Pennsylvania.

1744: Establishes the American Philosophical Society.

1746: Publishes a pamphlet, Plain Truth, on the necessity for disciplined defense, and forms a military company; begins electrical experiments.

1748: Sells out his printing business; is appointed on the Commission of the Peace, chosen to the common council, and to the assembly.

1749: Appointed a commissioner to trade with the Indians.

1751: Aids in founding a hospital.

1752: Experiments with a kite and discovers that lightning is an electrical discharge.

1753: Awarded the Copley medal for this discovery, and elected a member of the Royal Society; receives the degree of M. A. from Yale and Harvard. Appointed joint Postmaster General.

1754: Appointed one of the commissioners from Pennsylvania to the Colonial Congress at Albany; proposes a plan for the union of the colonies.

1755: Pledges his personal property in order that supplies may be raised for Braddock's army; obtains a grant from the assembly in aid of the Crown Point expedition; carries through a bill establishing a voluntary militia; is appointed colonel, and takes the field.

1757: Introduces a bill in the assembly for paving the streets of Philadelphia; publishes his famous Way to Wealth; goes to England to plead the cause of the assembly against the proprietaries; remains as agent for Pennsylvania; enjoys the friendship of the scientific and literary men of the kingdom.

1760: Secures from the Privy Council, by a compromise, a decision obliging the proprietary estates to contribute to the public revenue.

1762: Receives the degree of LL. D. from Oxford and Edinburgh; returns to America.

1763: Makes a 5 months' tour of the northern Colonies for the purpose of inspecting the post offices.

1764: Defeated by the Penn faction for reelection to the assembly; sent to England as agent for Pennsylvania.

1765: Endeavors to prevent the passage of the Stamp Act.

1766: Examined before the House of Commons relative to the passage of the Stamp Act; appointed agent of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Georgia; visits Gottingen University.

1767: Travels in France and is presented at court.

1769: Procures a telescope for Harvard College.

1772. Elected associe etranger of the French academy.

1774: Dismissed from the office of Postmaster General; influences Thomas Paine to emigrate to America.

1775: Returns to America; chosen a delegate to the Second Continental Congress; placed on the committee of secret correspondence; appointed one of the commissioners to secure the cooperation of Canada.

1776: Placed on the committee to draft a Declaration of Independence; chosen president of the constitutional committee of Pennsylvania; sent to France as agent of the Colonies.

1778: Concludes treaties of defensive alliance, and of unity and commerce; is received at court.

1779: Appointed Minister Plenipotentiary to France.

1780: Appoints Paul Jones commander of the *Alliance*.

1782: Signs the preliminary articles of peace.

1783: Signs the definite treaty of peace.

1785: Returns to America; is chosen President of Pennsylvania; reelected 1786.

1787: Reelected President; sent as delegate to the convention for framing a Federal Constitution.

1788: Retires from public life.

1790: April 17, dies. His grave is in the churchyard at Fifth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me appropriately call attention to the fact that a half century after the death of Benjamin Franklin, the Congress of the United States was preparing the decoration of this Capitol, and for the Presidential Room selected for one of the murals a portrait of Benjamin Franklin as the emblem of the master of statecraft and diplomacy, exactly as the Senator from Pennsylvania today has so happily pointed out. The fact that that generation recognized Franklin's great talents, a half century after his passing, may well come home to us in the troubles of the present day.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his very fine and pertinent comment and suggestion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the entire Senate should thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the remarks he has made. We should also appreciate that his remarks are most appropriate at the present time. The Senator from Pennsylvania holds a commission as a major general, and has spent most of his life in the Army of the United States. Now he comes onto the floor of the Senate to remind us that all of our ends cannot be attained merely by having arms, and that we must have other means in order to arrive at peace. I think it is very timely that at this hour the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who speaks with such great authority because he has spent the greater part of his life in intimate association with the armed services, should bring us this message.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his very kind remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during those difficult days of our Nation's early history, while Benjamin Franklin was serving as this country's representative abroad, the citizens of a small American community wrote to him asking him to donate a bell for the tower of their newly constructed town hall. Franklin replied, "Sense is better than sound. I am sending you a gift of books from London."

Born in Boston on January 17, 1706, but claimed equally and properly by the great city of Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin stands today, as he will surely stand throughout recorded time, as the symbol of all that is good and great and wise in American history. May we today in the solving of the problems which now confront us demonstrate that same common sense, courage, and abiding faith in freedom that characterized Benjamin Franklin during all the 84 years of his illustrious life.

EDITORIAL AND OTHER RESPONSE TO FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a communication which I received yesterday from Mr. John Foster Dulles, in answer to an inquiry I addressed to him, relative to the response he has had from his recent radio address.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 16, 1951.*

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of January 12 in which you ask what the editorial and other response has been to my foreign policy address of December 29. The short answer is that that speech attracted far more public attention and approval than any speech I have ever made. Many reprints have been made. One printing, I am told, is of 100,000 copies.

In New York City, where I spoke, the New York Times and Herald Tribune made my speech the subject of leading and favorable editorials, the Herald Tribune stating, "Mr. Dulles' address will rank with the great expressions of American statesmanship." In Washington, both the Post and the Star had leading and favorable editorials.

I do not patronize any clipping bureau, nor is any such service available to me, so I have no comprehensive, Nation-wide report. However, samplings which have come to my attention indicate that my speech was commented upon editorially by most of the press of the Nation and that the editorial comment has been generally favorable. See, for example, the Louisville Courier-Journal, St. Louis Post Dispatch, Dayton News, Toledo Blade, Kansas City Star, Arizona Daily Star, Wilmington Morning News, the State (Columbia, S. C.), Dallas Morning News, Winston-Salem Journal Sentinel, Boston Herald, Nashville Tennessean, St. Paul Pioneer Press, Des Moines Register, etc.

Unfavorable editorial comment, so far as I am aware, was largely confined to such persistent critics as the Chicago Tribune and affiliated newspapers.

Columnist approval, so far as has come to my attention, has been overwhelmingly favorable. Mr. Walter Lippmann, for example, called the speech "the most broadly conceived and the most penetrating which has

been made in this country since the Armistice."

The personal reaction in terms of mail, telegrams, telephone calls, etc., has been favorable in a ratio of about 2 to 1. Most of the disapproving letters, however, seem to have been prompted by the unauthorized and incorrect advance news report that I planned a verbal attack on former President Hoover. A considerable number of the disapproving letters were written before I spoke or merely voiced criticism of what they wrongly assumed was my intention. The unfavorable letters quickly dropped off, as the positive and constructive aspect of my address became evident. The approving letters continue to flow in.

From the political field, the indications of approval have included both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress, Senate and House, and State governors.

From the religious field approval came from many leaders. One high Protestant official, who speaks with unique authority, said, "I think I am well within my rights when I say that the leadership of our churches would go along with you 100 percent." I had strong approval from leading dignitaries of the Catholic Church. Several Jewish leaders identified with the Conference of Christians and Jews have written me in enthusiastic support.

From the educational field, I have had letters and telegrams of approval from presidents of several of our universities and colleges. The president of one leading university, for example, wrote: "I read the text with great approval and appreciation that mounted as I read. Your paragraph about a nation that sheds its allies was a masterpiece. You have driven a path that we all can follow."

Diplomats of friendly countries here told me that my address constituted an indispensable contribution to continuing unity and confidence within the free world.

Broadly speaking, those who have personally communicated with me seem to divide as they believe in:

1. Enlightened long-term interest versus immediate material satisfaction.

2. Security to be found collectively versus security to be sought in isolation.

My speech deliberately raised these issues and on the basis of responses, in terms of numbers and of influence, I would say that it is certain that the great majority of our people are willing to make present sacrifices to secure the future, and that they recognize that security cannot be had except collectively.

In this connection the National Opinion Research Center made a public-opinion survey during the first week of January immediately following my address of December 20. It showed that 65 percent of the people thought it would be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs as against 26 percent who favored our staying out of world affairs. Seventy-one percent indicated approval of sending military supplies to the countries of Western Europe now in order to strengthen them against any future attack, and 20 percent disapproved.

I sense an honest difference of opinion and some confusion as to how to apply these principles. But I have no doubt as to the direction in which our people are prepared to go under competent leadership that they trust.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

EDITORIAL AND OTHER RESPONSE TO FOREIGN-POLICY ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a communication which I received a few days ago from former President Herbert Hoover in answer to an inquiry I addressed to him relative to the response he has had from his recent radio address.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 11, 1951.*

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your request for the figures on daily press editorial attitude on the speech I made on December 20.

As you know, I gave orders to a clipping agency to send me all daily newspaper editorials, both good and bad. They have now been classified into those who gave full support, those who gave partial support, and those opposed. The following shows the results received up to last night as measured by circulation:

Total daily press circulation covered by sample: Circulation, 46,228,000, 100 percent; full-support circulation, 31,014,000, 68 percent; part-support circulation, 3,718,000, 8 percent; opposed circulation, 11,496,000, 24 percent.

Subdivided by geographical regions, measured by circulation:

New England and Middle Atlantic: Full support, 67 percent; part support, 7 percent; opposed, 26 percent.

South and South Atlantic: Full support, 32 percent; part support, 16 percent; opposed, 52 percent.

Middle West: Full support, 71 percent; part support, 10 percent; opposed, 19 percent.

Southwest, Mountain, and Pacific: Full support, 85 percent; part support, 2 percent; opposed, 13 percent.

Of the 11,496,000 opposed, 5,279,000, or 46 percent of the total opposition, came from Atlantic seaboard cities. If we deduct this number from the opposed, the remainder would show:

Full support, 75 percent; part support, 10 percent; opposed, 15 percent.

This is an indication of the voice of hinterland America. It is noticeable from these clippings that the campaign of name calling and misrepresentation is having the opposite effect from the purpose of such people. Apparently, in consequence of it, several papers have reversed their position from opposition and part support over to full support.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further routine matters? If not, morning business is concluded.

POLICY AND FAITH FOR WORLD CONFLICT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there is not a Senator on this floor whose mail is not full of letters from anxious, perplexed mothers and wives. Their sons and husbands are being drafted into the Armed Forces of our country for purposes which are not always clear to the writers. Or if these purposes seem to be clear they are not thought to be of sufficient gravity to warrant the disruption of daily lives, the hardships of separation and loss of bread winners, the interruption of education, and the prospect of active warfare, wounds, and death. It would seem that there rests on the Senate of the United States a necessity to determine whether the course we are pursuing is well advised in purpose and, if so, a responsibility for seeing to it that it is carried out quickly and effectively.

A number of important statements have recently been made by men high in public life who seek to give an answer to this question, which is disturbing the hearts and minds of our citizens. Of these statements, I would refer to only two—that made by ex-President Hoover, on December 20, 1950, and that offered on this floor by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on January 5.

Mr. Hoover was deeply concerned with the heavy load which this Government and its citizens have taken on their shoulders in an effort to protect the whole world from Russian communism and despotism. He feels that this load is too great for us to bear. He says in brief that if we cannot get the major support in this undertaking from other countries, we must be prepared to retire within our own Gibraltar of the American hemisphere and let the rest of the world be overrun by the power of the Soviet Union.

He would include Great Britain in the Gibraltar, but without any clear indication as to how she is to escape conquest if she is surrounded by Soviet power on the other side of her narrow seas. He seems to suppose that South America would escape, though I feel that he underestimates the existing threat of infiltration in the Latin American Republics and the certainty of this infiltration bursting to active conquest. The prospect, therefore, that he offers is that of a fortified North American Continent, with no certainty that all the countries to the south of us, even on this continent, will remain free.

It is true that such a continent can subsist from its own resources, though only with trouble and sacrifice. Tin for our canned foods and kitchen pots and pans, uranium for atomic bombs, tea for our comfort are not easily dispensed with. Our standard of living would be lower than it is today. There would be, however, two catastrophes to which we could not easily accustom ourselves. The first would be a spiritual adjustment to the fact that we have been defeated in our hopes and actions in support of a free world. Defeat does not rest easily on a proud and once powerful people. It would affect us individually and governmentally in ways which cannot be foreseen, but all of these ways would be for the worse.

The other factor to which we would have difficulty in adjusting ourselves is that of being driven from the seas. Our respected ex-President expressed the belief that we could retain superiority in the air and on the sea. Except for the destruction of civilian populations by long-range bombing, our air superiority, unsupported by land bases, would have little meaning. As to the sea, we would be faced with scores of submarine nests lining the shores of Western Europe, Africa, and Asia. Most of our merchant marine would be sunk. The remainder would have nowhere to go. Again, our fresh-water estuaries would be filled with unused vessels. It would scarcely be worth while even to put them in "mothballs."

It seems clear to me, Mr. President, that we shall have to rule out the suggestions of our loved and respected ex-President, based though they are on a far clearer picture of the difficulties than is officially presented to us.

The other voice raised in constructive criticism was that of the senior Senator from Ohio on this floor. He plainly recognized the difficulties which Mr. Hoover saw so clearly, but he placed them in a broader frame. He was seeking the means of retaining a free world and retaining our own freedom in it. He did not appear to me to be hopeless of the possibility of maintaining that freedom. He was deeply concerned that the means we employ for that purpose should be effective and within the ability of our Nation to perform. What follows, Mr. President, is therefcre less a criticism of the proposals made by the Senator from Ohio than it is a suggested extension of them going into more detail and pointing out hopeful lines of policy and action.

The purpose to be served is that the American people shall live as a free people and preferably in a free world, for only as we live in a free world can we be entirely free ourselves.

The purpose is one to which every patriotic American citizen will subscribe. It is the purpose of every one of us as individuals. It is a purpose sufficiently high to warrant the support and sacrifices of our people. In this purpose we are at one with our Government. It is in regard to the means of carrying out this purpose that some confusion and dissension have arisen.

The means so far have been almost entirely military, though there has been some action in the field of propaganda, particularly with reference to the Voice of America. There has been some political activity as well, though, for the most part it has been in support of the military means.

Militarily, our policy sums up in the two doctrines of "containment" and "getting tough."

As a strictly military undertaking, containment is proving to be impractical, as might have been predicted from the start. It is 20,000-odd miles around the perimeter of the homeland and the adjacent activated regions within which the Soviet Government operates. This perimeter extends from Bering Straits around to the North Cape. At any point in this 20,000 miles the interior government can at will foment discord or start military action. It can keep us rushing from one threatened point to another. It can exhaust our manpower and our resources in carrying out this unsupported policy of military containment. It not only can do so, it is doing so; and in so doing it is not as yet seriously committing its own manpower and material strength. It has us at a tremendous disadvantage. It knows how to exploit that disadvantage. We are being run ragged and know that on this basis the future holds in store nothing except an indefinite extension and expansion of this exhausting process. Containment as a military undertaking is bound to ruin us.

Getting tough is related to our policy of containment. The theory was that the Soviet Government respects only power and that a determined display of power would cause the Soviet Government to recede wherever and whenever we made our display.

This childlike faith has not worked out in practice. Not only are we limited in our physical capacity to get tough but we are restrained by moral scruples which have no effect on our Soviet opponents. For them, there is no criterion of morality except a judgment as to whether a given procedure will support the expansion of the power of the Politburo. Getting tough has its limitations, and for us the limitations are quickly reached.

Mr. President, all this is rather gloomy and would seem to indicate that we face disaster with no hope of escape. I feel, however, that that is by no means the case. There is an escape, and the route of escape has been shown us by our foes. The root lies through the use of every available means, not the military alone. A study of Soviet policy and practice also leads to the conclusion that they have developed an economy of means permitting them to carry on vast operations without corresponding commitments of their own manpower and resources. This we would do well to study and improve upon.

Our task, then, is to move in on the Politburo on all fronts at once—military, political, diplomatic, economic, spiritual, and by propaganda. We are to take the initiative. The Politburo is to be forced to the defensive. Furthermore, the full use of these associated fronts will effect that economy of means which the Soviet has devised and applied, and thus save us from the economic ruin and social disintegration on which it is counting so confidently.

Let us look first at the Asiatic sphere, in which the conflict is raging at the moment. Our criticism of the administration for its handling of this problem has been pretty severe. I think it would be well, however, if we remember that there is scarcely a Senator on this floor, on either side of the aisle, who did not applaud the decision to support by military means the people of South Korea against the aggression from the north. That decision was not primarily a military one but a political one in the broadest sense of the term "political." It was in support of the primary purpose of the United Nations, which was and is to resist aggression. We were bound to resist the invasion of South Korea. We may or may not have been wise in carrying out our obligation, but the obligation was clear to all of us if the United Nations was to survive and carry out the purposes for which it was established. It was on these grounds that the great majority of Senators, and in fact a majority of the citizens of the country, approved the action taken.

Having met with at least temporary military defeat in this undertaking, we are now faced with a decision as to whether or not we and our United Nations associates shall withdraw our forces from Korea as best we can. The considerations which rule here are the reverse of those which drew us into the conflict. The decision as to remaining or retiring is primarily a military decision and not a political one. There must be no political considerations whatsoever raised in any retirement. We must not retire for the sake of any agreement with Communist China as to membership in the United Nations, or for any other political advantage. The purity of purpose of the great undertaking incorporated in the United Nations can only be served if the question of remaining or retiring is kept completely free from political bargaining.

Korea is the Pearl Harbor of the United Nations. It represents the time and the place in which the Communist government declares itself to the world as the enemy of the principle of nonaggression. It declares itself, therefore, to be the enemy of the United Nations and of the free nations of the world which support the United Nations. That this declaration of hostility to the purposes and principles of the United Nations has so far failed of clear recognition in that body, is an astonishing fact. Day by day, week by week, we must pound home to the representatives of vacillating and self-deluded nations the significance of the attack made upon the United Nations by Communist China. The continued usefulness, the continued existence of the United Nations depends upon our doing so.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was very much disturbed when one of the leading columnists of United States journalism, on Monday, I believe, made the assertion that the United Nations should never expect to be an organization for resisting aggression, but should, on the contrary, be considered as a debating society, a forum, a place where people could talk and talk and talk. If that is all it is to be, I think we might as well decide to get out of it.

This self-revelation and self-declaration of Communist China requires action on the part of the other nations of the world. That action should come through the United Nations. It involves certainly the blockading of the coast of China. This in itself will bring no great hardship to the people of China who have always depended on their own land for the necessities of life. It can make continued aggression by Communist China much more difficult than it is at the present time. It will not be so easy to carry on large-scale aggression if the only available supplies have to come in through Russia. An active blockade will perceptibly slow down military activity in any direction—north, east, west, or south.

But the United Nations may vacillate. It may not promptly authorize a blockade. It certainly will not do so through the Council and may not do so through the Assembly. In this case, agreement must be made with the other powers principally involved, namely, England and France. England must decide whether to serve the cause of freedom or the cause of tyranny and aggression. She must decide whether to repeat her disastrous policy when faced by the Japanese invasion and seizure of Manchuria in 1931. Her commercial relations with Japan then stayed her hand and blinded her mind and her conscience. Having

submitted in that instance she was in no position effectively to protest the conquering of Ethiopia by Mussolini in 1935. She was in no position to protest the conquering of the Rhineland by Hitler and the subsequent conquering of Austria. She weakly submitted to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 and only resisted the invasion of Poland too late to stop the Second World War.

The conscience and judgment of the British people must be focused on the high issues involved in Great Britain's possession and use of the island of Hong Kong. The public opinion of the world must be focused upon and support the pressure from conscientious and intelligent citizens of Great Britain on their irresolute government. This issue must be so sharply drawn that her government shall have no alternative but to serve its own interests and the interests of its people in sacrificing the paltry millions or billions of the Hong Kong trade to the great purpose of maintaining the free world.

The next problem which has to be faced in the Asiatic area is as to whether or not use shall be made of the Nationalist forces in Formosa. This problem is not a simple one. Against a recollection of corruption in the past we have to balance a confession of misguided attempts by us to form a coalition with the Communists. We have to consider likewise the well-nigh universal report from Formosa that the Nationalist army is high in morale, reasonably well cleared of graft and that the government of the island is to a reasonable degree acceptable to its inhabitants. This seems to add up to the conclusion that the leader has learned his lesson and is able to apply it. We must not expect perfection, but it seems reasonable to expect very greatly improved performance by the Nationalists, both militarily and governmentally.

The question before us is as to whether they shall have our support in activating and supplying the guerrilla forces in mainland China, and whether as a further step we shall assist in the landing of Nationalist forces in bodies small or large on the shore of the mainland.

As a political question this would seem to be technically allowable so long as the Nationalist Government is recognized as a member of the United Nations. They should properly remain members so long as Communist China is not admitted; and Communist China cannot be admitted without destroying the United Nations so long as it maintains its aggressive status, whether recognized or unrecognized as such.

In all this we must be governed by the reactions of the Chinese people themselves. This relates not merely to willingness to make a new trial of the Nationalist Government, but particularly as to whether such action would tend to consolidate opposition to the Communist government. Most of the information coming out of China seems to indicate growing opposition to the Communist government. Should that turn out to be the case, the ground is already prepared for useful intervention on the mainland by the Nationalist armies.

But these are not the only things to be considered. To the extent that there has been real agrarian reform we must have assurances that any programs for splitting up large land holdings into peasant ownership will be maintained. We must be sure that the return of the Nationalist armies does not bring a return of the great feudal estates. The army must be one of true liberation. This must be clearly understood beforehand.

The great objection to this program is that we may find ourselves at war with Communist China. That government might conceivably declare war on us were we to support the program just described. If that meant we would have to invade them and set out for a conquest of the great Chinese Empire, by ourselves or with what allies we could scrape together, the undertaking would be ruinous. We must not make the attempt.

We must in fact make it clear that we have no designs of our own on Chinese territory or resources. We can blockade their government against outside supplies. We can support a return of Nationalist Chinese to China. But we do not have to engage in an attack of our own. In fact, we must not do so no matter how badly the Nationalist project may be going. Here we have an opportunity to firmly maintain a policy of economy of means. We will permit and will supply some of the necessary resources for an occupation of China by the Chinese. We will not waste our own manpower on the hopeless undertaking of conquering China.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Vermont is now discussing. Assume that we liberated the Nationalist Chinese from Formosa and put them on the mainland. I think it is generally conceded that we would have to support them with naval and air forces, and would have to supply them.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is doubtless true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Supposing it became difficult for us, under developing circumstances in other directions, either to maintain the blockade or to provide the supplies, thus leaving the Nationalist forces on the mainland of China in a rather precarious position, would we not be accused throughout Asia of having deserted an ally? That is the first point.

The corollary is that if the Nationalist Chinese troops landed on the mainland of China and ran into disaster, would there not be an enormous moral pressure, at least, on this country to supplement the Nationalist Chinese forces with forces of our own? If we refused to furnish such forces, would we not be accused of having run out on an ally? I should appreciate the Senator's observations on that point very much.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is much wisdom in the questions raised by the Senator from Colorado. He states certain contingencies which we must consider. In the first place, it would seem to me that our relationship to the Nationalist Government of China would have to be, not of inciting them to activity, but of supporting them on their own strong pleas. In other words, we must be in the position of having been urged to support them, instead of being in the position of urging them to move. That point must be clear on the record, and it must be clear in fact. Unless the Nationalist Government is prepared to move and is prepared to take the initiative in such an undertaking, we must stand clear of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Even assuming that the Nationalist Chinese said, "We want only so much help from you, and not more," and supposing that fact were publicized to the ends of the earth, would the mass feeling in Asia be changed by that fact? I mean would it not be simple to point out that in our own self-interest we had stimulated the Nationalist Chinese into going to the mainland of China, but that when they had run into disaster, out of supplies, or had run out of our embargo, because we might not be able to continue it, would not the word be passed all over Asia that the United States had pushed the Nationalist Chinese into a war on the mainland and then had run out on them? I mean as a practical matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. The practical questions, it seems to me, largely hinge on whether we can make the case publicly and honestly that we are being asked and urged, instead of doing the asking and urging ourselves. There is one other thought I should like to express at this point, and that is that we must have the assurance, as I mentioned a little while ago, that the return of the Nationalists to the mainland of China will not involve a back-tracking on any agrarian reform which has been going on in China, but that the Nationalist Government will be committed to a continuance of it. That puts the question in a little different aspect than would be the case if we urged the Nationalist Chinese to return to the mainland. At least it seems so to me.

One other point is that in this respect we find ourselves sensitive in a way in which the members of the Politburo do not have to be sensitive. The Politburo has established principles which permit it to try in one place, for example, and if the effort does not succeed, to withdraw; then to try at another place, and if that effort does not succeed, to withdraw again. One of our problems is to establish the waging of the contest for freedom on something of the same basis. I must say that, because of our sensitivity and the wrong position in which we find ourselves with Asiatic nations, it is rather difficult for us to do so. However, that is one of the problems to which we must address ourselves.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia after the Senator from Colorado has concluded his series of observations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to register disagreement with the proposition that, as a quid pro quo for our assistance of the type that we have been discussing we should lay down conditions as to the kind of government that should be established in China. However, that is a large subject, and I shall not plague the Senator with it at the present time.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I shall address myself further in support of the idea in the remaining portion of my address, not with specific reference to China, but with specific reference to the part that we play in the politics of the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may be permitted to make the observation, I would rather have a corrupt and inefficient ally on our Pacific flank than a murderous, honest, and efficient enemy on our flank. However, be that as it may, that was not the reason why I intervened. Certain difficulties present themselves in our being half in and half out of a war, or in starting a war and then pulling out of it before it is finished. Our premise assumes that we are doing something which would clearly authorize Communist China to declare war on us, to wit, that we are giving naval support and air support, and furnishing supplies.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That makes us a coadventurer with Nationalist China. Therefore I go back to my original question: Can we speculate? Can we, while maintaining our prestige, go in with Nationalist Chinese, and withdraw at will, without doing the very thing that we do not want to do, to wit, lose the respect of all of Asia and perhaps a considerable part of the rest of the world?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the problem seems to me to be finding the means of placing ourselves in the position of doing the most effective things, whatever they may be, so long as they are not dishonorable, in support of the major undertaking of a free America in a free world. It would seem to me to be largely a matter of presenting our purposes and our means before the bar of the world, rather than trying to save face on each element of a given situation. This will involve, as I suggest and shall continue to suggest, pressure on Soviet Russia from every imaginable direction, by every imaginable means, continuously, day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, and year in and year out. In other words, it is an all-out contest by every possible means. My guess is that we should be able to justify ourselves in this pragmatic approach to the problem if the total purpose is completely revealed and completely understood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask one more question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator has placed himself on record on what I think is a very inspiring theme, to wit, the necessity for the United Nations to act with honor, which is contrary to the way it has been acting so far as the aggression in Korea is concerned. Would we be acting in good honor, knowing in advance that the Nationalist Chinese forces in Formosa are most likely unable to wage successful war on the mainland of China out of their own strength, and knowing in advance that for them to wage a successful war on the mainland they must have our naval help, our air support, and the help of our supplies, could we, in good honor, after committing them to that kind of an adventure, pull out and say, "Well, boys, it did not work; we are going back home"?

I am not taking a position. I am trying to work this out in my own mind. Where would we be? Suppose there were a disaster on the mainland of China. Suppose they were driven back again. What would be our position of honor? What would be our moral position, so far as sustaining those troops is concerned? Could we wash our hands of the matter and say, "It is too bad. We made it clear when we went in that we might run out on you, and we are running out on you"? Where would we stand with ourselves? I am talking about saving our own face. Where would we stand with ourselves if we got into that kind of a situation? What is the criticism that we are leveling at our partners in the United Nations for doing the same sort of thing so far as our action in Korea is concerned?

Mr. FLANDERS. That, however, is a question of principles, and not of tactics or strategy. It seems to me that we can maintain our position on the basis of principles, that we can clearly state our relationship to the desire on the part of the Nationalist forces to have their chance, and clear ourselves on that score, as a practical matter, in advance.

I do not know whether that answer will satisfy the Senator from Colorado, but I am strongly of the feeling that the Russians have developed a technique which they are able to use effectively, and it seems to me that we must develop the same possibilities in our own technique, stopping short only at the barrier raised at the question of deceit or honesty. That is where we stop in following the Russians.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may well be, I respectfully suggest, that we may have to adopt some of the tactics of our enemies. At the same time, we cannot talk about honor and morality for one part of our endeavor, and forsake honor and morality in other parts of our endeavor. Oh, we can, and we do; but I am still wondering whether we should.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Vermont seems to me to be as to whether we can make our position clear in advance, so that our honor and morality cannot be questioned, and apply ourselves to the purely practical and pragmatic task of trying to make as much trouble for Russia as possible, with the hope and expectation that in the long run it will be good for the people of China as well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would we be in a defensible position if we were to encourage someone to get into a fight which he would be bound to lose without our continued help, and then withdrew our continued help? Would we be in a position of high honor and morals if we were to withdraw? What would be the effect on the one whom we had encouraged to open the fight, and whom we had forsaken; and what would be the effect on the world in general—particularly those parts of the world whose minds and hearts we wish to conquer?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there is a great difference in my own mind between the words "help" and "encourage." We must keep that distinction in mind in connection with the Chinese Nationalist possibility.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the Chinese Nationalists would, of course, want to go on the mainland if they knew that they had our help and encouragement. I am quite sure that they would ask us for help and encouragement. Thus we might say, "We have gone into this only because you have asked us to do so." But we also come down to the hard reality of having gone along with this plan for our own benefit. Where do we stand when we forsake our allies?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the question between the Senator and myself. As I have previously stated, I am taking a little from the book of the Politburo, always stopping short of deceit. That involves a real understanding, both on the part of the Nationalists and on the part of the rest of the world, as to what is going on.

I wonder if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to yield to other Senators. Then, refreshed—he may even use my glass of water—he can return to the discussion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not yet tired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont is making an exceptionally fine speech, to which I have listened with great interest. I wish to express my approval of the striking way in which he posed the issue confronting the United Nations, when he said that Korea was the Pearl Harbor of the United Nations.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I interrupt for a moment to say that my speech gets better from here on? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall make my observations very brief in order to hear the best part of the Senator's speech.

There is only one suggestion to which I wish to lead up. We all know—and I was a supporter of Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations—that the League of Nations failed when confronted with the aggression of Mussolini in Ethiopia and the aggression of the Japanese war lords in Manchuria, and when Hitler violated the Versailles Treaty by fortifying the Rhine. Three times an organization formed to stay the hand of the aggressor ran out on the problem. We said, "We are not going to make the same mistake twice." The distinguished Senator from Vermont has very clearly stated that if the United Nations had run out on this problem it would have been only a debating society.

I agree with him that it was a political decision. I agree with him that the question of whether or not we should now withdrawn from Korea is a military decision. The Senator from Vermont did not see fit to discuss—and I shall not inject it into his speech—the question of whether or not, as intimated by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], our allies provided the measure of help which we anticipated when they voted for us to make a stand under the United Nations flag. In my opinion, many of them gave us only token help.

This is the point I am coming to: If I correctly understood the distinguished Senator from Vermont, he was proceeding to analyze the pros and cons of our giving active support to the Nationalists in Formosa in making an attack upon the mainland of China. I did not understand him to say that after reviewing all the pros and cons he is now advocating that step, but he has mentioned it. At that point the distinguished Senator from Colorado referred to some hazards which would be involved. Has the distinguished Senator from Vermont fully reflected upon those hazards?

I did not understand the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Colorado to mention another hazard which I think would be involved, and that is what I understand to be the defensive alliance between the Soviet Union and the Chinese Government, in accordance with the terms of which the Soviet Union would render military support to China if attacked. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont, therefore, before he comes to the very fine part of his speech, which I await with great interest, if he will not include a discussion of the question whether or not we would be then and there at war with Russia, not only in China, but on the continent of Europe, or wherever she might see fit to wage such a war. If we send our Navy and our Air Force in support of the Nationalists of China against the Reds of China, and the Russians come in with their air force, their submarines, and whatever else they may choose to send into the conflict, are we not then at war with Russia?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two in response to the question of the Senator from Virginia. What he suggests is, of course, one of the possibilities which we face. There is one axiom which I think we can have reason to believe is firmly fixed in the minds of the Politburo, that is, not to wage war on two fronts. Their interior position perhaps gives them advantages in doing that. But I think we can be quite sure that they will not wage serious war both in Asia and in Europe. If they are going to war, they will take those fronts seriatim instead of together.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, because I think there should be mentioned a bit of information which has come over the wires since the able Senator from Vermont started his address, to which we have been listening with great interest. According to both the Associated Press and the United Press, the Peking radio is at the present time or was at the time they picked it up, broadcasting Communist China's answer to the latest UN cease-fire proposal, and according to the two wire services, as it appears on the ticker in the anteroom, Chou en-Lai, Chinese Foreign Ambassador, has rejected the proposal. Whether they have offered counterproposals or not has not come in over the wire.

I might merely point out to the able Senator, who in his discussion with the Senator from Colorado has raised some very pertinent points, that there are certain things to be considered. Number one: It seems to me that in connection with any policy which the Government of the United States might develop we should have as much factual information as is possible. It was for that reason that the Senator from California some time ago suggested that it would be wise if a competent American mission—and I merely suggested a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer, who is thoroughly familiar with the Far East and is, I think, one of the ablest strategists in the American Army—were sent to Formosa personally to go over the condition of the troops there, and to secure accurate information which I think we should always have before embarking upon a policy. I can say without fear of contradiction that I am sure the government of the Republic of China on Formosa would welcome such a mission; would throw open to him all the facilities so that he could get not only the information as to the morale and the training of their more than 500,000 troops on that island, but also the condition of their supplies and their munitions and so forth, which means help to answer some of the questions raised by the Senator from Colorado.

The second thing it seems to me we should constantly keep in mind is that, as of today at least, the government of the Republic of China is a member of the United Nations—this point has been brought out by the Senator from Vermont—it is a permanent member of the Security Council, and of the 60 members of the United Nations, all but 17 recognize it as the legal government of the country. So that it would appear to me that in international law and otherwise, in view of the fact that the Chinese Communist regime is making war upon the United Nations in Korea by an act of aggression, we would be on sound ground if we furnished supplies to the legal government of the country, not only for the defense of Formosa but also for such raids upon the Chinese coast as the quality and quantity of their troops would permit. That would furnish diversionary action, and would not permit the concentration of Chinese troops for the purpose of throwing the United States Eighth Army and the United Nations forces in Korea back into the sea.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from California for his observation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]——

Mr. FLANDERS. Physically he has run out on the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What happened to him? As I started to say, I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Virginia in his praise of the Senator's remarks regarding the attitude of the United Nations toward the cease-fire proposition. I think it represents an act of degradation, and I feel that it may be the beginning of the end of the United Nations. It does not help the case any to say that we figured the proposal would not be accepted. The boys who are dying in Korea deserve better than that kind of a silly diplomatic minuet.

Mr. FLANDERS. I associate myself with the Senator from Colorado in that sentiment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that I am not arguing any position here, but I am very much concerned about the possible benefits and dangers of intervention of Nationalist China, and I am trying to get the facts upon which to reach a conclusion.

I wish also to congratulate the Senator from Vermont upon being willing to engage in debate upon the subject. We talk about this as "a great debate." In the main part, this consists of a series of great affirmations undisturbed and uninfluenced by debate. May I congratulate the Senator on his being willing to interrupt the consecutive quality of his speech for the sake of throwing light around this Chamber?

Mr. FLANDERS. I express my appreciation both of the sentiments of the Senator from Colorado and of the language in which he expresses them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may give some information to the Senate, and also, perhaps, throw more light on the debate and discussion which is taking place?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have in my hand some matter which came over the ticker subsequent to the earlier dispatch which I mentioned. It says:

Chou—

The Chinese Foreign Minister—

offered a counterproposal. He said he would take part in a seven-nation conference to discuss Korea and all far eastern problems. He stipulated that the conference should be held in China. Participating would be Communist China, Russia, Britain, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

But first, he said, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korea.

Chou made these demands:

1. Withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and settlement of the problem of Korea's international administration by the Korean people as the premise upon which the countries concerned would confer and endeavor to bring an early end to the Korean war.

2. That withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Formosa and the Straits of Formosa and problems concerning the Far East will be included in the conference.

3. The countries to take part in the conference will be the Peoples Republic of China, Soviet Russia, England, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

I might say parenthetically at that point, my recollection is, of course, that the Soviet Union has constantly urged that Red China be seated in the United Nations, and that Formosa be turned over to Red China. Of course, Communist China itself subscribes to that point of view. Great Britain has already urged that the Chinese Communists be seated in the United Nations, and, as a matter of fact, has been one of the leading nations that has prevented the United Nations from declaring Communist China to be the aggressor. India has constantly not only recognized but also urged that Red China be admitted into the United Nations. Accordingly, so far as I can see on the face of it, of the seven nations mentioned, four of them have definitely stated in advance that practically all the demands which Communist China has been making should be acceded to before she even enters the conference. That is the end of the parenthetical discussion on that point.

4. That the legal status of the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations will be decided by the seven-nation conference.

Again going back to the fact that of the seven nations at least four are already committed, and perhaps they have some secret understandings with some of the others.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator did not mention Egypt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Pardon me. The Peoples Republic of China, Soviet Russia, England, the United States, France, India, and Egypt.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think we can count Egypt in.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. So at least four, and possibly five, of the seven already are fairly well determined as to their position in regard to Communist China's admission into the United Nations and, probably, the turning over of the 7,500,000 free people of Formosa to the tender mercies of the Chinese Communists.

I already have read, I believe, this portion of the dispatch:

4. That the legal status of the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations will be decided by the seven-nation conference.

In other words, it will be taken out of the hands of the 60 members of the United Nations, and will be decided by a conference of seven nations, at least a majority of whom already have expressed their opinion on the subject. So the "jury" will be "packed," even before the conference begins.

The dispatch concludes with the following:

5. That the seven-nation conference will be held in China.

So the representatives of those nations will, in an abject way, with their hats in their hands, go to that conference, and will wish to give the Communist China aggressors all they have sought for; and they want those assurances before they will consider the latest United Nation's proposal.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from California that it would seem that that proposal is so preposterous that our representative in the United Nations would not touch it at all, not even with a 10-foot pole.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that up until the time when the representative of the United States in the United Nations voted recently, I would have agreed with the Senator from Vermont. However, it seems to me the proposal then agreed to is so preposterous and such a great weakening of our moral position, that I greatly fear the later proposal may also be agreed to. I join with the Senator from Vermont in hoping that that will not be so; but I say to him that if these proposals were accepted, they would, in fact, be an instrument of surrender which the government of the Communist regime in China had presented to the nations of the free world, so that they could make an abject surrender, at gun's point, to the aggression which the Communist regime already has conducted.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we have had debate. I hope we shall continue to have debate, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado, because on this question what we need is debate, rather than simple oratory. I am grateful to the Senator from Colorado for having introduced a real element which has to be considered.

Mr. President, I am not quite clear in my mind just where I stopped reading my prepared manuscript, so I shall ask the Official Reporter to correct any hiatus or any overlapping, as the case may be, when I resume with the presentation of my prepared remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Vermont was just about to come to the gems which he had thus far withheld from us.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; my presentation becomes "gemier" as it proceeds.

Mr. President, a few words more may be said with regard to other threatened areas in Asia.

While the fortunes of guerrilla warfare go up and down in Indochina, for the moment the Communist forces there seem to be in retreat. Militarily speaking, those forces can be weakened by the engagement of the forces of Communist China with Nationalist infiltration. The engagement of those forces will help the situation there, as well as the situation in Korea.

We must recognize that in Indochina, as in other parts of Asia, the great desire of the people is for freedom. We must not oppose this idea; we must support it. In Indochina, as in Indonesia, there is needed the same recognition of the aspirations of the people which was brought about by the mediation between the Netherlands Government and the Indonesians which was carried to so successful a conclusion by our own former associate on this floor, Senator Frank Graham, of North Carolina. In the establishment of the Indonesian Republic he has a living monument to his devotion. There is needed a similar undertaking as between the French and the people of Indochina.

While I am not familiar with all that is going on politically in that disturbed area, there are many indications that recent successes of the French may be due to a decision on their part that freedom for their former colony is desirable and necessary. Economically there will never be any hope that France can draw a net profit from its possession of Indochina. As a free nation trading with a free nation, there is every hope that their long experience may lead to commercial relationships which are mutually profitable. The dealings of free people with each other benefit all. That is one of the ideals toward which our world policy must persist in leading the world.

To assist in the stabilizing of a free Asia, we have the resources of a point-4 program available to them and to us. This program, wisely carried out, can lead to satisfied social conditions in southeast Asia and retain that great area, rich in natural resources, within the boundaries of the free world. Economic and spiritual forces can pay off where military expenditures alone and unsupported are hopeless. This is the dollars-and-cents balance-sheet expression of the advantages of morally right policies. Our self-interest, if of sufficiently long range, will be found to be in parallel with, rather than in opposition to, policies determined on a profound moral basis.

In this brief résumé of the problems of the Pacific area, Mr. President, they have been treated as though they were self-contained and could be considered without reference to the threatening aspects of Soviet policy in other parts of the world. This is only partly true. It is true only to the extent that certain special problems which have to be specially considered are involved here. The relationships with threatened aggression in southern and western Asia and in Europe are real and they are clear. They relate, first of all, to the status and usefulness of the United Nations. This point has already been covered. They relate almost as obviously to making sure that the Soviet Government cannot stir up trouble anywhere in the world without herself becoming involved. She has been starting trouble and getting away with it. She must not be allowed to set fires without getting scorched. If we can make sure that this is done, we can make sure that her own involvement may be at least as embarrassing to her as it is to the rest of us. That is the advantage of the general policy I am suggesting, namely, of moving in on her on all fronts, leaving the military front as a last resource in case of open war. We can put continuous and exhausting pressure on her before final military attack, as I shall endeavor further to show.

Trouble has really broken out in Eastern Asia. We see it. We feel it. We know it. There are a large number of other places in which it may break out, as the judgment of the Politburo may decide. These men determine the program. We respond to their call. There are some signs that the next point of attack may be in Iran. There certainly is uncertainty at the present moment in our relations with that country. The foreign experts sent to help them, with their 5-year plan have resigned and are coming home. A trade treaty, which has

been negotiated by Iran with the Soviet Republic, may be harmless in itself, but more probably contains the seeds of future strife and disaffection.

Mr. President, I am not going to prescribe for this trouble in Iran. I make no claim to omniscience. I do not have access to the same amount of information, nor have I thought as long on that information, in the case of Iran as I have in the case of China and the Far East.

Only one thing seems clear, and that is that we must not permit the oil of Iran, Iraq, or any other part of the Near East to go to Russia. This is not because in times of peace we should deny to anyone access on equal commercial terms to any source of supply the world over. It is only that Russia is a determined aggressor; and, as such, it should be the object of all peace-loving nations, including ourselves, to handicap her in her military operations. A peaceful Russia would have quite other treatment at our hands.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I take the great liberty of asking the Senator from Vermont to yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It might be helpful to point out that in Iran, any opposition that might come would be directly against the arms of Russia, and the satellite process would not be involved there.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. So far as it was done by military pressure, it would come directly from Russia. I think that might lead us to expect that it would be done by other means. Unless Russia is ready to start a major armed conflict, a peaceful Russia would have quite other treatment at our hands.

As to Europe, Mr. Hoover and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] sounded a much needed warning. We cannot carry on our own shoulders the burden of protecting the cradle and seat of western civilization. The countries of Europe must really want to be protected from invasion and tyranny and must be willing to do their utmost. When they are doing their part, our part can assure them of safety which neither they nor we, working alone, would be able to provide.

But let us not cry over milk which has not yet been spilled. Particularly, let us not neglect the several other things which can be done while the nations of Europe go through the political and economic throes which must be endured as they are building up their forces of defense.

Take, for instance, the question of German rearmament. That is a question difficult to solve in an effective way without arousing the fears of nations like France, who have been more than once conquered and overrun by that warlike nation. If, however, we remember that Hitler in the years subsequent to World War I made his great conquests by infiltration and used his armies mainly as the visible symbol of a conquest already made—if we remember these things, we can find a useful service for Western Germany to perform, while the knotty problem of rearming her is being worked out.

For hundreds of miles stretches the barrier and boundary between free West Germany and subjugated East Germany. The peoples on the two sides of that boundary speak the same language. They have a common history. They have, or had until modified by the Russians, common social and political institutions.

On the other hand, some of these same Germans or their predecessors were exceedingly adept under the Hitler regime in crossing boundary lines, infiltrating populations, making the position of the rulers of the countries, particularly Austria and Czechoslovakia, very difficult to maintain, and ultimately arriving at the time when these areas could be occupied by the triumphant armies of Hitler.

Have the Germans lost all knowledge of the art of infiltration? Can they revive it? If so, without masses of arms and years of training for her soldiers, the West Germans can make the position of the Russians in East Germany quite untenable. Without a mighty army, the Germans themselves can unite Germany if the impulse to do so comes from West Germany. This is the task to which these words of ours must address themselves. For this undertaking they should have complete freedom. They should have such necessary backing of funds and equipment as may be necessary. The cost will not be large. Here, indeed, is an opportunity for economy of means. Let the Germans reunite Germany, and in so doing push the area of combat far to the east of the Rhine.

Since writing this address, Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article in the February Reader's Digest, by Mr. O. K. ARMSTRONG, who is a newly elected Representative from Missouri, and who had the very valuable experience of spending some months in Germany. He came into intimate contact with the Bundestag, and even addressed it. In this copy of the Reader's Digest, there is a condensation from the New Leader of an article entitled, "The Man the Russians Fear Most in Germany." It is a description of the work done by a certain Rainer Hildebrandt, leader of an organization which calls itself The Fighters for Humanity. I shall not undertake to describe what he was doing, but I ask that every Senator obtain a copy of the latest issue of the Reader's Digest and read the article. I may say that Mr. Hildebrandt appeared in my office a few days ago, and that I was tremendously impressed with the possibilities of what he is doing. It is exactly along the lines which I had already suggested in my manuscript. I see no reason why it cannot be multiplied and intensified, and I feel very strongly indeed that it should be a major undertaking of our State Department in Western Germany.

Again, while complaining that our allies do not build up their armed strength, suppose we cast our eyes on the hundreds of thousands of displaced people in West Germany whose numbers are being augmented daily by those who escape across the boundary from the captured countries. I understand, by the way, that there has been, for some reason, a little thinning of that stream of escapees. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has endeavored to get these possibilities explored and exploited. Why not do so? Instead of moaning and complaining about the inadequacy of the armies of Western Europe let us free this great mass of unemployed men to positions of trust and responsibility in guarding western civilization. We can furnish the arms and equipment.

Here again we have an economy of means by using a great human asset which we are now disregarding.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Some time ago, I believe there occurred on the Senate floor a discussion regarding the possibility of bringing into our own Army acceptable material from displaced persons. There was much talk at the time, which certainly had a great deal of surface appeal. Does the Senator know what has happened to that suggestion?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have tried to find out from the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I do not want to quote him, but I came to the conclusion that he was as much puzzled as the Senator from Colorado and I are.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I recall, as of that time there were large numbers of Poles who had demonstrated fighting ability. There were large numbers of displaced Germans who, in return for admission into our military forces and the ultimate reward of citizenship, might make very fine soldiers and, ultimately, very fine citizens for us. I have been wondering what happened to the suggestion regarding them. Perhaps there might be 150,000 or 200,000 available recruits in those categories, and thus our own manpower burdens here at home would be lessened, while aiding our own military strength.

Mr. FLANDERS. I say to the Senator from Colorado that I join him in wonder, and I hope that we can find out something about that proposal.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There may be some good reason why action along that line has not been taken, but no one, so far as I know, has come forth with the reason or at least exposed it publicly.

Mr. FLANDERS. There is, of course, the question as to whether these men should be incorporated into the United States Army, which raises the question of standards of pay, and so on, and without citizenship. There could be, however, an agreement among members of the Northern Atlantic Pact that such might be used in an army, not a national army, but one directly under the command of the Commander in Chief. That is another possibility.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was not thinking so much of the latter type of army, because that involves some very deep questions. So far as Germany is concerned, it involves military participation without Germany at the same time securing full sovereignty. That is a very distasteful thing to many Germans. I am thinking of holding out citizenship, the high-pay and American standards of living for recruiting acceptable material from displaced persons in Europe.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Senator reject the notion of an army which is a volunteer army—not an armed force in any way—which has not been promised citizenship and which is directly under the command of the commanding general of the western forces?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not reject it. I would want to do some thinking about it. But I already know in advance that there would be a great deal of opposition to it. The Germans have already indicated very clearly that they do not favor that kind of a scheme. They want to trade, and it is very natural for them to want to do so, and they want the restoration of full sovereignty.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would they feel the same way about the enlistment of Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, and Russians?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That I do not know.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to me there is an area there to be explored and considered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The real basis of my question is my wonderment that we have not been given more information pro or con on the subject.

Mr. FLANDERS. Proposals such as these die a death from mysterious causes, and there is no coroner's jury that sits on the cause of the death. I think the Senate may as well constitute itself a coroner's jury on this project. Of course, we are in a new Congress, and if the Senator from Massachusetts will reintroduce his measure, perhaps we can have it considered under more favorable conditions than was the case in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not prepared to advocate it. I simply want to know what is the matter with it, if there is anything the matter with it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Perhaps we can get a real debate on that subject.

Mr. President, I am now referring to a matter which has already been touched on in the colloquy with the Senator from Colorado.

Here again we have an "economy of means" by using a great human asset which we are not disregarding. That economy goes further than simple numbers of men because these soldiers can be well equipped and well paid on the basis of European standards without having to have the money spent on them that we spend on our American soldiers. The standards are different. The colloquy we have just had indicates that the subject is one to which further thought may well be given.

I mention only one other recourse for getting manpower. Both Sweden and Switzerland should be approached and reasoned with continuously, with the hope of persuading them to join with the other nations of Western Europe. They will ultimately have to join or be destroyed should there be a third world war. There can be no neutrals in that war as there have been in the past.

Many hundreds of thousands of effective forces would be added if these two nations would join their neighbors in this matter. There are problems of detail in the case of Switzerland since in peacetime that country has no national army—only a series of provincial armies. But this problem could be overcome by specific legislation.

So here we have a reactivated and finally, perhaps, a rearmed Germany, a displaced-persons army, and new allies. While we are getting these things going, our older associates in the North Atlantic Pact should have worked out their fiscal and personnel problems.

Yugoslavia presents another problem. I suppose we could pay too high a price for arming Yugoslavia's resistance to attack from the satellites or from Russia itself. We certainly do not pay too high a price when we appropriate money for feeding the famished inhabitants of that region. Anything we do which brings us into favorable contact with people we will find to be worth doing. Wisdom in negotiation will keep the price of maintaining resistance in Yugoslavia within the limits of an economy of means, particularly since she will furnish her own manpower.

The results to be accomplished are exceedingly great. It needs but a glance at the map of the Mediterranean to see what free access to the shore line of Yugoslavia would do in providing the Soviet with submarine nests to harry and destroy the sea traffic of the Mediterranean. It must not have this shore. We have kept the Soviet from Greece. We are keeping it from Yugoslavia. It is true that there are already installations in Albania, but that country, surrounded as it is by Yugoslavia and Greece, cannot be effectively used so long as these two nations remain within the orbit of the Western World.

As to ourselves, the indications are clear from what has been said earlier. We should send a limited force to Western Europe to maintain the principle of our unity with them, at least in the 6-to-1 ratio suggested by Senators LODGE and KNOWLAND. We should send them a profusion of planes and other ordnance and equipment. So much for military plans.

An economic offensive offers many advantages. We should agree with our European allies that the blockade of the countries behind the curtain shall be absolute so far as anything we may send them is useful in preparing for or waging war. We can consider a normal peacetime interchange, such as of food from the Danube Valley, in exchange for purely consumer goods such as textiles and bicycles, for example. But nothing must get through the curtain that is applicable to the manufacture of wartime goods.

During the Second World War we developed the term and practiced preclusive buying to prevent goods of strategic value from falling into the hands of the enemy. This means that we outbid the enemy for the world supply of such things as industrial diamonds. It may be necessary to reinstitute this procedure on our part to a more complete extent than it is now operated. Nothing which supports warfare must get through the curtain. When we say nothing we must mean nothing. Our North Atlantic allies clear down the line must be as firm as we are in this matter, for it is a matter of life and death from the military standpoint. A Germany engaged in reuniting itself and recovering its old sources of food supply will understand the necessity for this. The two historically neutral countries must be dealt with continuously and strongly.

With them we may perhaps have to invent a new practice, that of preclusive selling. We may, for instance, have to offer them as good terms on fuel and on coarse grains as they can get from the Soviet sphere. We must not permit the Soviet to demand in trade agreements goods which will have military use.

This economic offensive offers great returns for moderate expenditures. In keeping Italy and France to date out of the orbit of the Politburo, the Marshall plan produced results which 10 to 20 times the expenditure for military offense or defense would not have accomplished. The Marshall plan principle must still be maintained. It is a prime factor in the maintenance of peace with an economy of means.

All of this deals with measures to be taken on this side of the curtain. On the other side there are indications that the Soviet colossus may have feet of clay. She is weaker in her western satellites than in Asia, for they have felt the full force of her tyranny. Even in Russia itself the power of the Politburo comes by compulsion, not consent. Should the Red army start to hove westward, even that mighty force might show seams and cracks.

These weaknesses we must exploit by every means—as the war is in progress if it comes, while it is in preparation if it is delayed. We must reach satellites and Russians by every means—over, under, and through the iron curtain. Let us not forget that balloons can go where men cannot. Let us make sure that that westward march will be no summer's day picnic.

Let us now, Mr. President, see what can be done in the United Nations. In this forum, in this arena, we must not for a moment let down our attack on aggressors. However much the peoples of some misinformed or uninformed or timid nations may accept the belief that we are the aggressors, those who sit in the Council and the Assembly of the United Nations know that this is not so. They know that North Korea was the unprovoked aggressor on June 25, 1950. They know that that aggression was followed up by a massive aggression on the part of Communist China. They know that these aggressions were organized by the Soviet Government. We must never for a moment allow them to forget that we know this, that they know it, and that we know that they know it.

At the same time, Mr. President, we must continuously display the shining side of this dark shield. The United Nations has peacetime possibilities which we should be earnestly working to develop and which we hope will in time prevail. Some of these peacetime possibilities relate to the very questions which are at issue in the world-wide conflict which the Soviet Government has reinitiated. One of them is access to oil.

It is true that Russia lacks a supply of oil adequate to the size of its population and its requirements for industrial growth. It is true that there are within easy reach of its borders such abundant supplies of this precious substance as are found in Saudi Arabia, in Iran, and in Iraq. It is true that we will endeavor to cut them off from these supplies. But it is also true that should a Russian Government join the peace-loving nations, it will be possible to work out arrangements whereby commercial access to these supplies is available to the people of Russia on the same terms that it is available to the peoples of Western Europe and America. We must be tireless in presenting these possibilities. We must make it seem foolish to other nations that any nation would fight for opportunities which could be granted freely in a free world.

Another of the ancient grievances of the Russian people has been the fact that they have been completely hemmed in on their whole perimeter from access to the sea by ice on the north and by the narrow seas on the east, west, and south, which were and are in the hands of nations which seek to prevent Russian control of these valuable passages.

Here again, should we not enunciate the principle that in a peaceful world and in a United Nations made up of nations who are truly peace loving, it should be possible to solve this age-old problem? It should be possible to put the Dardanelles, the narrow passages of Scandanavia, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, and even the Panama Canal under the protection and control of a United Nations force and a United Nations administration, so that all the nations of the world had equality and freedom of access. Of course this could be done only with a United Nations made up of peace-loving nations. It is another shining hope to be held out through good times and bad, through sun and cloud, by ourselves and other peace-loving members of that organization.

There must also be held out the possibility of disarmament. This would mean disarmament not merely in atomic or hydrogen bombs, but in all the categories of heavy armament and high-powered explosives. It is necessarily only that the nations agree to do this and willingly submit to inspection and control by United Nations officials. To refuse such inspection and control is plainly to indicate to the rest of the world that things are going on which one does not wish the rest of the world to see. Our Nation and the other nations of the western world can open themselves freely, frankly, and fully on this matter. The same freedom, frankness, and fullness of inspection and control on the part of Russia can free her people from any fear of destruction and sudden death by military action from the skies above, the land beneath, or the waters which surround the earth. Peace is here for the asking and for the responsible acceptance of it. This must be said over and over and over.

This offer of peace involves the establishment of United Nations forces and of a freedom of communication which is one of the essentials of freedom in life and institutions. To attain this freedom of communication and freedom from fear is, after all, a simple thing to do. We must always be ready to discuss it and to negotiate for it. The United Nations must be an institution of doors open at all times and under all circumstances for the discussion of the means for attaining peaceful relations between its members.

Along with this must go a continued and intense campaign, world-wide, for getting people in communication with people. Such communication, honestly established, would reveal to each nation that there are no people of its sister nations who desire to make war upon it, who desire to seize territory or natural wealth which properly belongs to it. The great desire in the hearts of all men is to do away with war and fighting. If men can get in contact with men, the forces which drive us toward war will be weakened and diminished.

We need a great movement among the peoples not for peace alone, for real peace cannot exist in the presence of slavery and injustice; we need a movement of all the peoples of the earth for a peace which is based on freedom and justice.

To say all this is not to deal in abstractions. The Russians were not dealing in abstractions when they sold Communist ideals to the people of China. They had ideas to sell and they sold them. It mattered not that they had never practiced those ideals themselves. It mattered not that in the countries which they rule those ideals were betrayed. Ideals were set up which were attractive to the people, and the people followed them as the children followed the Pied Piper of Hamelin into the cave of oblivion.

We have something more powerful to sell. We have to sell a real appreciation of and reliance upon the brotherhood of man under the fatherland of God. If we can display the spirit of this doctrine in practice, if we can keep it in the forefront of our thoughts and actions, we will find the ultimate in the "economy of means." That ultimate is the continuous preaching and practice not of the "big lie" but of the great truth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very able presentation. I listened to a portion of his address, and I have read the rest of it. I congratulate him on his commonsense approach, and on the idealism and spiritual faith with which he speaks.

PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 8, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of the Standard Oil Co. versus the Federal Trade Commission. The Court divided five to three, with Mr. Justice Minton taking no part in the consideration or decision of the case, in view of the fact that he had written the opinion in the court below, when he was a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Mr. Justice Reed wrote the dissent for the three-judge minority, being joined by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Black.

The opinion of the Court was delivered by Mr. Justice Burton.

This decision is a matter of interest, I am sure, to many of my colleagues, particularly those who participated in the so-called basing-point pricing controversy.

Actually, of course, the point at issue was not basing-point pricing at all; the real question was whether it was lawful to sell at a reduced price to a particular buyer in order to meet in good faith the legal price of a competitor.

The Supreme Court has decided that it is lawful.

Also involved, of course, was the question of whether a seller might quote and sell at delivered prices or absorb freight, acting independently and in good faith, for the purpose of meeting competition.

This is the decision of the Supreme Court which we were told Congress must await before it could take any action to clarify the confusion and uncertainty existing with respect to the interpretation of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

We were told that if Congress acted in the way proposed we should be coercing the Supreme Court.

Congress did act; and the President vetoed the bill. Now we have a decision of the Supreme Court which follows the view taken by those of us who supported the bill which Congress passed.

But, Mr. President, the fact that the Court divided five to three, and that the Justice who did not participate would undoubtedly have joined the minority if he had participated, making the decision five to four in that instance, is the most convincing evidence possible, if any evidence is needed, that there is still confusion and uncertainty and difference of opinion with respect to the proper interpretation of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act.

I repeat, therefore, Mr. President, what I said on this floor more than a year ago: The record is so clear with regard to this confusion that I cannot see how there can be any doubt of the obligation of the Congress to speak on this question.

If Congress acts now to affirm and by statute confirm this decision of the Supreme Court, then uncertainty will be ended and there need be no fear that a change of one Justice, or a change in the mind of one Justice, might change the law. I earnestly hope, therefore, that Congress will, at this session, again grapple with this question, and again take appropriate action with the hope that this time the action which the Congress takes will not be nullified by a veto.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss in any great detail the opinion of the court in the Standard Oil case; but, since I am referring to it at all, I believe it is only right I should express here my opinion that this is a well-seasoned decision, a well-written decision, a sound and salutary decision from all standpoints. We would expect no less from our former colleague, Mr. Justice Burton. We

learned while he was yet among us, to have the highest regard for the clarity of his mind and the depth of his legal knowledge; and his record on the Supreme Court bench has added new luster to his reputation.

I have said I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss this decision in great detail; but if I may be permitted just a few moments more, there are one or two comments which I feel should be made.

The whole effect of the Court's decision is summed up by Mr. Justice Burton in one paragraph, which is so cogent that I wish to read it.

Speaking of subsection 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, the Court says:

> The defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price in the same or different communities * * * and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the lower price of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price. Actual competition, at least in this elemental form, is thus preserved.

I was extremely glad that the Court pointed out that in both the Corn Products case and the Staley case the right of a seller, under section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended, to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor, was considered.

As the Court said:

> While this Court did not sustain the seller's defense in either case, it did unquestionably recognize the relevance of the evidence in support of that defense. The decision in each case was based upon the insufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense, not upon the inadequacy of its defense as a matter of law.

That statement should dispose of a great deal of loose thinking and general foolishness with regard to the decisions in question, such as found considerable currency hereabout during the first half of 1950, and which even crept, all too often, into debate on the floor of the Senate.

This decision of the Court, and the minority opinion, serve to bring very sharply into focus the basic policy question which was at the heart of all the controversy over the so-called basing-point pricing legislation. The Court—that is, the majority of the Court, in the decision delivered by Mr. Justice Burton—takes the same position taken by those of us who supported the bill S. 1008 in the Eightieth Congress, and phrases that position, I think, more clearly perhaps than any of us did here on the Senate floor. The Court says:

> It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor * * * There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.
>
> In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers.

The opposite view is clearly stated in Mr. Justice Reed's dissent, as follows:

> We believe that good faith meeting of a competitor's price only rebuts the prima facie case of violation established by showing the price discrimination. Whether the proven price discrimination is of a character that violates section 2 (a) then becomes a matter for the determination of the commission on a showing that there may be injury to competition.

Borrowing once more from the language of the court, in the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Burton, we see that the defense contained in the proviso in section 2 (b), if so interpreted, "Would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted, the proviso would have such little, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless."

That is the controversy which, unless the Congress acts to settle it once and for all, will remain in doubt, probably for many years, and, at least, so long as there is a possibility that what is presently the minority of the Court may become the majority through the change in mind or in person of a single Justice.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete text of the decision to which I have referred, together with the minority opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Reed, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the majority and dissenting opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 1, OCTOBER TERM, 1950—STANDARD OIL CO., PETITIONER, VERSUS FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(January 8, 1951)

Mr. Justice Burton delivered the opinion of the Court.

In this case the Federal Trade Commission challenged the right of the Standard Oil Co., under the Robinson-Patman Act,[1] to sell gasoline to four comparatively large jobber customers in Detroit at a less price per gallon than it sold like gasoline to many comparatively small service-station customers in the same area. The company's defenses were that (1) the sales involved were not in interstate commerce and (2) its lower price to the jobbers was justified because they were made to retain them as customers and in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.[2] The Commission, with one member dissenting, ordered the company to cease and desist from making such a price differential (43 FTC 56). The court of appeals slightly modified the order and required its enforcement as modified (178 F. 2d 210). We granted certiorari on petition of the company because the case presents an important issue under the Robinson-Patman Act, which has not been settled by this Court (338 U. S. 865). The case was argued at our October term, 1949, and reargued at this term (339 U. S. 975).

For the reasons hereinafter stated, we agree with the court below that the sales were made in interstate commerce but we agree with petitioner that, under the act, the lower price to the jobbers was justified if it was made to retain each of them as a customer and in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

I. FACTS

Reserving for separate consideration the facts determining the issue of interstate commerce, the other material facts are summarized here on the basis of the Commission's findings. The sales described are those of Red Crown gasoline because those sales raise all of the material issues and constitute about 90 percent of petitioner's sales in the Detroit area.

Since the effective date of the Robinson-Patman Act, June 19, 1936, petitioner has sold its Red Crown gasoline to its jobber customers at its tank-car prices. Those prices have been 1½ cents per gallon less than its tank-wagon prices to service station customers for identical gasoline in the same area. In practice, the service stations have resold the gasoline at the pervailing retail service station prices.[3] Each of petitioner's so-called jobber customers has been free to resell its gasoline at retail or wholesale. Each, at some time, has resold some of it at retail. One now resells it only at retail. The others now resell it largely at wholesale As to resale prices, two of the jobbers have resold their gasoline only at the prevailing wholesale or retail rates. The other two, however, have reflected, in varying degrees, petitioner's reductions in the cost of the gasoline to them by reducing their resale prices of that gasoline below the prevailing rates.

The effect of these reductions has thus reached competing retail service stations in part through retail stations operated by the jobbers and in part through retail stations which purchased gasoline from the jobbers at less than the prevailing tank-wagon prices. The Commission found that such reduced resale prices have resulted in injuring, destroying, and preventing competition between said favored dealers and retail dealers in respondent's (petitioner's) gasoline and other major brands of gasoline" (41 FTC 263, 283). The distinctive characteristics of these jobbers are that each (1) maintains sufficient bulk storage to take delivery of gasoline in tank-car quantities (of 8,000 to 12,000 gallons) rather than in tank-wagon quantities (of 700 to 800 gallons) as is customary for service stations; (2) owns and operates tank wagons and other facilities for delivery of gasoline to service stations; (3) has an established business sufficient to in-

[1] Specifically under sec. 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13). For the material text of sec. 2 (a) and (b) see pp. 9–10, infra.

[2] The company contended before the Commission that the price differential allowed by it to the jobbers made only due allowance for differences in the cost of sale and delivery of gasoline to them. It did not, however, pursue this defense in the court below and does not do so here.

[3] About 150 of these stations are owned or leased by the customer independently of petitioner. Their operators buy all of their gasoline from petitioner under short-term agreements. Its other 208 stations are leased or subleased from petitioner for short terms.

sure purchases of from one to two million gallons a year; and (4) has adequate credit responsibility.[4] While the cost of petitioner's sales and deliveries of gasoline to each of these four jobbers is no doubt less, per gallon, than the cost of its sales and deliveries of like gasoline to its service station customers in the same area, there is no finding that such difference accounts for the entire reduction in price made by petitioner to these jobbers, and we proceed on the assumption that it does not entirely account for that difference.

Petitioner placed its reliance upon evidence offered to show that its lower price to each jobber was made in order to retain that jobber as a customer and in good faith to meet an equally low price offered by one or more competitors. The Commission, however, treated such evidence as not relevant.

II. THE SALES WERE MADE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

In order for the sales here involved to come under the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, they must have been made in interstate commerce.[5] The Commission and the court below agree that the sales were so made. (41 F. T. C. 263, 271, 173 F. 2d 210, 213–214.)

Facts determining this were found by the Commission as follows: Petitioner is an Indiana corporation, whose principal office is in Chicago. Its gasoline is obtained from fields in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. Its refining plant is at Whiting, Ind. It distributes its products in 14 middle western States, including Michigan. The gasoline sold by it in the Detroit, Mich., area, and involved in this case, is carried for petitioner by tankers on the Great Lakes from Indiana to petitioner's marine terminal at River Rouge, Mich. Enough gasoline is accumulated there during each navigation season so that a winter's supply is available from the terminal. The gasoline remains for varying periods at the terminal or in nearby bulk storage stations, and while there it is under the ownership of petitioner and en route from petit oner's refinery in Indiana to its market in Michigan. "Although the gasoline was not brought to River Rouge pursuant to orders already taken, the demands of the Michigan territory are fairly constant, and petitioner's customers' demands could be accurately estimated, so the flow of the stream of commerce kept surging from Whiting to Detroit" (173 F. 2d at 213–214). Gasoline delivered to customers in Detroit, upon individual orders for it, is taken from the gasoline at the terminal in interstate commerce en route for delivery in that area. Such sales are well within the jurisdictional requirements of the act. Any other conclusion would fall short of the recognized purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act to reach the operations of large interstate businesses in competition with small local concerns. Such temporary storage of the gasoline as occurs within the Detroit area does not deprive the gasoline of its interstate character (*Stafford* v. *Wallace* (258 U. S. 495). Compare *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Co.* (317 U. S. 564 570), with *Atlantic Coast Line R. Co.* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (275 U. S. 257, 268)).[6]

III. THERE SHOULD BE A FINDING AS TO WHETHER OR NOT PETITIONER'S PRICE REDUCTION WAS MADE IN GOOD FAITH TO MEET A LAWFUL, EQUALLY LOW PRICE OF A COMPETITOR

Petitioner presented evidence tending to prove that its tank-car price was made to each jobber in order to retain that jobber as a customer and in good faith to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. Petitioner sought to show that it succeeded in retaining these customers, although the tank-car price which it offered them merely approached or matched, and did not undercut, the lower prices offered them by several competitors of petitioner. The trial examiner made findings on the point,[7] but the Commission declined to do so, saying:

"Based on the record in this case the Commission concludes as a matter of law that it is not material whether the discriminations in price granted by the respondent to the said four dealers were made to meet equally low prices of competitors. The Commission further concludes as a matter of law that it is unnecessary for the Commission to determine whether the alleged competitive prices were in fact available or involved gasoline of like grade or quality or of equal public acceptance. Accordingly the Commission does not attempt to find the facts regarding those matters because, even though the lower prices in question may have been made by respondent in good faith to meet the lower prices of competitors, this does not constitute a defense in the face of affirmative proof that the effect of the discrimination was to injure, destroy, and prevent competition with the retail stations operated by the said named dealers and with stations operated by their retailer-customers" (41 FTC 263, 281–282).

The court below affirmed the Commission's position.[8]

There is no doubt that under the Clayton Act, before its amendment by the Robinson-Patman Act, this evidence would have been material and, if accepted, would have established a complete defense to the charge of unlawful discrimination. At that time the material provisions of section 2 were as follows:

"SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to cr...te a monopoly in any line of commerce: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price between purchasers of commodities on account of differences in the grade, quality, or quantity of the commodity sold, or that makes only due allowance for difference in the cost of selling or transportation, or discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent persons engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise in commerce from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade" (38 Stat. 730–731, 15 U. S. C. (1934 ed.), sec. 13).

The question before us, therefore, is whether the amendments made by the Robinson-Patman Act deprived those facts of their previously recognized effectiveness as a defense. The material provisions of section 2, as amended, are quoted below, showing in brackets those clauses which bear upon the proviso before us. The modified provisions are distributed between the newly created subsections (a) and (b). These must be read together and in relation to the provisions they supersede. The original phrase "that nothing herein contained shall prevent" is still used to introduce each of the defenses. The defense relating to the meeting of the price of a competitor appears only in subsection (b). There it is applied to discriminations in services or facilities as well as to discriminations in price, which alone are expressly condemned in subsection (a). In its opinion in the instant case, the Commission recognizes that it is an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination for a seller to prove, under section 2 (a), that its price differential makes only due allowances for differences in cost or for price changes made in response to changing market conditions (41 F. T. C. at 283). Each of these three defenses is introduced by the same phrase "nothing * * * shall prevent," and all are embraced in the same word "justification" in the first sentence of section 2 (b). It is natural, therefore, to conclude that each of these defenses is entitled to the same effect, without regard to whether there also appears an affirmative showing of actual or potential injury to competition at the same or a lower level traceable to the

[4] Not denying the established industry practice of recognizing such dealers as a distinctive group for operational convenience, the Commission held that petitioner's classification of these four dealers as jobbers was arbitrary because it made no requirement that said jobbers should sell only at wholesale" (41 FTC at 273). We use the term "jobber" in this opinion merely as one of convenience and identification, because the result here is the same whether these four dealers are wholesalers or retailers.

[5] Sec. 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended, relates only to persons "engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce * * * where either or any of the purchases involved * * * are in commerce" (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13 (a)). "Commerce" is defined in sec. 1 of the Clayton Act as including "trade or commerce among the several states" (38 Stat. 730, 15 U. S. C., sec. 12).

[6] The Fair Labor Standards Act cases relied on by petitioner are not inconsistent with this result. They hold that, for the purposes of that statute, interstate commerce ceased on delivery to a local distributor (*Higgins* v. *Carr Bros.* (317 U. S. 572); *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Co.*, supra. The sales involved here, on the other hand, are those of an interstate producer and refiner to a local distributor.

[7] The trial examiner concluded: "The recognition by respondent [petitioner] of Ned's Auto Supply Co. as a jobber or wholesaler [which carried with it the tank-car price for gasoline] was a forced recognition given to retain that company's business. Ned's Co. at the time of recognition, and ever since, has possessed all qualifications required by respondent [petitioner] for recognition as a jobber and the recognition was given and has ever since been continued in transactions between the parties, believed by them to be bona fide in all respects." Conclusion of Fact 2, under sec. IX, R. 5098–5099.) "The differentials on its branded gasolines respondent [petitioner] granted Ned's Auto Supply Co., at all times subsequent to March 7, 1936, and Stikeman Oil Co., Citrin-Kolb Oil Co., and the Wayne Co. [the four jobbers], at all times subsequent to June 19, 1936, were granted to meet equally low prices offered by competitors on branded gasolines of comparable grade and quality." (Conclusion of fact, under sec. X, R. 5104.)

[8] "Now as to the contention that the discriminatory prices here complained of were made in good faith to meet a lower price of a competitor. While the Commission made no finding on this point, it assumed its existence but held, contrary to the petitioner's contention, that this was not a defense. * * * We agree with the Commission that the showing of the petitioner that it made the discriminatory price in good faith to meet competition is not controlling in view of the very substantial evidence that its discrimination was used to affect and lessen competition at the retail level" (173 F. (2d) at 214, 217).

price differential made by the seller. The Commission says, however, that the proviso in section 2 (b) as to a seller meeting in good faith a lower competitive price is not an absolute defense if an injury to competition may result from such price reduction. We find no basis for such a distinction between the defenses in sections 2 (a) and (b).

The defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price "in the same or different communities * * *" and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the lower price of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price. Actual competition, at least in this elemental form, is thus preserved.

Subsections 2 (a) and (b), as amended, are as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) That is shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them: *Provided,* [That nothing herein contained shall prevent] differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered: * * * And *provided further,* [That nothing herein containe i shall prevent] price changes from time to time * * * in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned. * * *

"(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, [the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justification] shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and [unless justification shall be affirmatively shown,] the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* [That nothing herein contained shall prevent] a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by [showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor]" (49 Stat. 1526, 15 U. S. C., secs. 13 (a) and (b)).

This right of a seller, under section 2 (b), to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor has been considered here before. Both in *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726) and in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Staley Manufacturing Co.* (324 U. S. 746) evidence in support of this defense was reviewed at length. There would have been no occasion thus to review it under the theory now contended for by the Commission. While this court did not sustain the seller's defense in either case, it did unquestionably recognize the relevance of the evidence in support of that defense. The decision in each case was based upon the insufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense, not upon the inadequacy of its defense as a matter of law.[9]

In the Corn Products case, supra, after recognizing that the seller had allowed differentials in price in favor of certain customers, this court examined the evidence presented by the seller to show that such differentials were justified because made in good faith to meet equally low prices of a competitor. It then said:

"Examination of the testimony satisfies us, as it did the court below, that it was insufficient to sustain a finding that the lower prices allowed to favored customers were in fact made to meet competition. Hence petitioners failed to sustained the burden of showing that the price discriminations were granted for the purpose of meeting competition" (324 U. S. at 741).[10]

In the Staley case, supra, most of the Court's opinion is devoted to the consideration of the evidence introduced in support of the seller's defense under section 2 (b). The discussion proceeds upon the assumption, applicable here, that if a competitor's lower price is a lawful individual price offered to any of the seller's customers, then the seller is protected, under section 2 (b), in making a counteroffer, provided the seller proves that its counteroffer is made to meet in good faith its competitor's equally low price. On the record in the Staley case, a majority of the court of appeals, in fact, declined to accept the findings of the Commission and decided in favor of the accused seller.[11] This court, on review, reversed that judgment but emphatically recognized the availability of the seller's defense under section 2 (b) and the obligation of the Commission to make findings upon issues material to that defense. It said:

"Congress has left to the Commission the determination of fact in each case whether the person, charged with making discriminatory prices, acted in good faith to meet a competitor's equally low prices. The determination of this fact from the evidence is for the Commission. (See *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Pacific States Paper Trade Assn.* (273 U. S. 52, 63); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Algoma Lumber Co.* (291 U. S. 67, 73).) In the present case, the Commission's finding that respondents' price discriminations were not made to meet a lower price and consequently were not in good faith, is amply supported by the record, and we think the court of appeals erred in setting aside this portion of the Commission's order to cease and desist.

* * * * *

"In appraising the evidence, the Commission recognized that the statute does not place an impossible burden upon sellers, but it emphasized the good faith requirement of the statute, which places the burden of proving good faith on the seller, who has made the discriminatory prices. * * *

"We agree with the Commission that the statute at least requires the seller, who has knowingly discriminated in price, to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor. Nor was the Commission wrong in holding that respondents failed to meet this burden" (324 U. S. at 758, 759–760).

See also, *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683, 721–726); *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Morton Salt Co.* (334 U. S. 37, 43); and *United States* v. *United States Gypsum Co.* (340 U. S. 76, 92). All that petitioner asks in the instant case is that its evidence be considered and that findings be made by the Commission as to the sufficiency of that evidence to support petitioner's defense under section 2 (b).

In addition, there has been widespread understanding that under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made a good faith to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. This understanding is reflected in actions and statements of members and counsel of the Federal Trade Commission.[12] Representa-

[9] In contrast to that factual situation, the trial examiner for the Commission in the instant case has found the necessary facts to sustain the seller's defense (see note 7, supra), and yet the Commission refuses, as a matter of law, to give them consideration.

[10] In the Corn Products case, the same point of view was expressed by the court of appeals below: "We think the evidence is insufficient to sustain this affirmative defense" (144 F. 2d 211, 217 (C. A. 7th Cir.)). The court of appeals also indicated that, to sustain this defense, it must appear not only that the competitor's lower price was met in good faith but that such price was lawful.

[11] The Staley case was twice before the court of appeals for the seventh circuit. In 1943 the case was remanded by that court to the Commission for findings as to wherein the discriminations occurred and how they substantially lessened competition and promoted monopoly and also "for consideration of the defense [under sec. 2 (b)] urged by the petitioners, and for findings in relation thereto" (135 F. 2d 453, 456). In 1944, a majority of the court decided in favor of the seller (144 F. 2d 221). One judge held that the complaint was insufficient under sec. 2 (a) and that, therefore, he need not reach the seller's defense under sec. 2 (b). He expressly stated, however, that he did not take issue with the basis for the conclusion that the seller's price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor (Id., at 227–231). His colleague held squarely that the seller's defense of meeting competition in good faith under section 2 (b) had been established (Id., at 221–225). The third judge found against the seller both under sec. 2 (a) and (b) (Id., at 225–227). The important point for us is that the court of appeals, as well as this court, unanimously recognized in that case the materiality of the seller's evidence in support of its defense under sec. 2 (b), even though the "discriminations 'have resulted, and do result, in substantial injury to competition among purchasers'" (Id., at 222).

[12] In cease-and-desist orders, issued both before and after the order in the instant case, the Commission has inserted saving clauses which recognize the propriety of a seller making a price reduction in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, even though the seller's discrimination may have the effect of injuring competition at a lower level. (See *In re Ferro-Enamel Corp.* (42 F. T. C. 36); *In re Anheuser-Busch, Inc.* (31 F. T. C. 986); *In re Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* (28 F. T. C. 186).) See also, the statement filed by Walter B. Wooden, Assistant Chief Counsel, and by Hugh E. White, examiner for the Commission, with the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941: "The amended act now safeguards the right of a seller to discriminate in price in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, but he has the burden of proof on that question. This right is guaranteed by statute and could not be curtailed by any mandate or order of the Commission * * * The right of self-defense against competitive price attack is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self-defense against personal attack." The Basing Point Problem 139 (TNEC Monograph 42, 1941). In regard to the Commission's position on sec. 2 (b), urged in the instant case, Allen C. Phelps, assistant chief trial counsel and Chief of the Export Trade Division of the Commission, testified before the Subcommittee on Trade Policies of the Sen-

tives of the Department of Justice have testified to the effectiveness and value of the defense under the Robinson-Patman Act.[13] We see no reason to depart now from that interpretation.[14]

---

ate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in June 1949, that "This position, if upheld in the courts, in my judgment will effectively and completely erase sec. 2 (b) from the Robinson-Patman Act." Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 236, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 66 (see also, pp. 274–275).

[13] Herbert A. Bergson, then Assistant Attorney General, testifying for the Department, January 25, 1949, said: "The section [2 (b)] presently permits sellers to justify otherwise forbidden price discriminations on the ground that the lower prices to one set of buyers were made in good faith to meet the equally low prices of a competitor. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 236, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 77. (See also, report on S. 236 by Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Id., at 320).) Mr. Bergson added the following in June 1949: "While we recognize the competitive problem which arises when one purchaser obtains advantages denied to other purchasers, we do not believe the solution to this problem lies in denying to sellers the opportunity to make sales in good faith competition with other sellers." Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 12.

[14] Attention has been directed again to the legislative history of the proviso. This was considered in the Corn Products and Staley cases. (See especially, 324 U. S. at 722–753.) We find that the legislative history, at best, is inconclusive. It indicates that it was the purpose of Congress to limit, but not to abolish, the essence of the defense recognized as absolute in sec. 2 of the original Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730) where a seller's reduction in price had been made "in good faith to meet competition." For example, the legislative history recognizes that the Robinson-Patman Act limits that defense to price differentials that do not undercut the competitor's price, and the amendments fail to protect differentials between prices in different communities where those prices are not actually competitive. There is also a suggestion in the debates, as well as in the remarks of this Court in the Staley case, supra, that a competitor's lower price, which may be met by a seller under the protection of sec. 2 (b), must be a lawful price. And see, S. Res. 224, 70th Cong., 1st sess., directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to it on chain-store operators and FTC final report on the chain-store investigation (S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). In the report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, which drafted the clause which became sec. 2 (b), there appears the following explanation of it: "This proviso represents a contraction of an exemption now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act which permits discriminations without limit where made in good faith to meet competition. It should be noted that while the seller is permitted to meet local competition, it does not permit him to cut local prices until his competitor has first offered lower prices, and then he can go no further than to meet those prices. If he goes further, he must do so likewise with all his other customers, or make himself liable to all of the penalties of the act, including treble damages. In other words, the proviso permits the seller to meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor. It permits him to go no further." H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 16.

The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition. In the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as in the Robinson-Patman Act, "Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent" (*Staley Mfg. Co. v. Federal Trade Comm'n* (135 F. 2d 453, 455)). We need not now reconcile, in its entirety, the economic theory which underlies the Robinson-Patman Act with that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.[15] It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor. For example, if a large customer requests his seller to meet a temptingly lower price offered to him by one of his seller's competitors, the seller may well find it essential, as a matter of business survival, to meet that price rather than to lose the customer. It might be that this customer is the seller's only available market for the major portion of the seller's product, and that the loss of this customer would result in forcing a much higher unit cost and higher sales price upon the seller's other customers. There is nothing to show a congressional purpose, in such a situation, to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one, or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs. There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.

In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, re-

---

(See also, 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6426, 6431–6436, 8229, 8235.) Somewhat changing this emphasis, there was a statement made by the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, accompanying the conference report, which said that the new clause was a "provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission" (H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 7). The chairman of the House conferees also received permission to print in the RECORD an explanation of the proviso (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418). This explanation emphasizes the same interpretation as that put on the proviso in the *Staley* case to the effect that the lower price which lawfully may be met by a seller must be a lawful price. That statement, however, neither justifies disregarding the proviso nor failing to make findings of fact where evidence is offered that the prices met by the seller are lawful prices and that the meeting of them is in good faith.

[15] It has been suggested that, in theory, the Robinson-Patman Act as a whole is inconsistent with the Sherman and Clayton Acts. See Adelman, Effective Competition and the Antitrust Laws (61 Harv. L. Rev. 1289, 1327–1350); Burns, the Anti-Trust Laws and the Regulation of Pric Competition (4 Law & Contemp. Prob. 301); Learned & Isaacs, the Robinson-Patman Law: Some Assumptions and Expectations (15 Harv. Bus. Rev. 137); McAllister, Price Control by Law in the United States: a Survey (4 Law & Contemp. Prob. 273).

duce their own resale prices to their customers. It must have been obvious to Congress that any price reduction to any dealer may always affect competition at that dealer's level as well as at the dealer's resale level, whether or not the reduction to the dealer is discriminatory. Likewise, it must have been obvious to Congress that any price reductions initiated by a seller's competitor would, if not met by the seller, affect competition at the beneficiary's level or among the beneficiary's customers just as much as if those reductions had been met by the seller. The proviso in section 2 (b), as interpreted by the Commission, would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted, the proviso would have such title, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless. We may, therefore, conclude that Congress meant to permit the natural consequences to follow the seller's action in meeting in good faith a lawful and equally low price of its competitor.

In its argument here, the Commission suggests that there may be some situations in which it might recognize the proviso in section 2 (b) as a complete defense, even though the seller's differential in price did injure competition. In support of this, the Commission indicates that in each case it must weigh the potentially injurious effect of a seller's price reduction upon competition at all lower levels against its beneficial effect in permitting the seller to meet competition at its own level. In the absence of more explicit requirements and more specific standards of comparison than we have here, it is difficult to see how an injury to competition at a level below that of the seller can thus be balanced fairly against a justification for meeting the competition at the seller's level. We hesitate to accept section 2 (b) as establishing such a dubious defense. On the other hand, the proviso is readily understandable as simply continuing in effect a defense which is equally absolute, but more limited in scope than that which existed under section 2 of the original Clayton Act.

The judgment of the court of appeals, accordingly, is reversed and the case is remanded to that court with instructions to remand it to the Federal Trade Commission to make findings in conformity with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Mr. Justice Minton took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 1, OCTOBER TERM, 1950—STANDARD OIL COMPANY, PETITIONER, VERSUS FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(January 8, 1951)

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting.

The Federal Trade Commission investigated practices of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana in selling its gasoline in the Detroit area at different prices to competing local distributors, in alleged violation of the Robinson-Patman (antiprice discrimination) Act. Standard's defense is not a denial of that discriminatory practice but a complete justification, said to be allowed by the Robinson-Patman Act, on the ground of trade necessity in order to meet an equally low price in Detroit of other gasoline refiners. On concluding the practice violated Federal prohibitions against discriminatory sale prices, the Commission entered a cease-and-desist order against Standard's sale system. The order was enforced by the court of appeals after a minor modification (43 F. T. C. 56; 173 F. 2d 210).

The need to allow sellers to meet competition in price from other sellers while protecting the competitors of the buyers against

the buyers' advantages gained from the price discrimination was a major cause of the enactment of the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act. The Clayton Act of 1914 had failed to solve the problem. The impossibility of drafting fixed words of a statute so as to allow sufficient flexibility to meet the myriad situations of national commerce, we think led Congress in the Robinson-Patman Act to put authority in the Federal Trade Commission to determine when a seller's discriminatory sales price violated the prohibitions of the antimonopoly statute, section 2 (a), 49 Stat. 1526, and when it was justified by a competitor's legal price.[1] The disadvantage to business of this choice was that the seller could not be positive before the Commission acted as to precisely how far he might go in price discrimination to meet and beat his competition. The Commission acted on its interpretation of the act.[2] Believing it important to support the purpose of Congress and the Commission's interpretation of the act, with which we agree, we state our reasons.

The Court first condemns the Commission's position that meeting in good faith a competitor's price merely rebuts the prima facie establishment of discrimination based on forbidden differences in sales price, so as to require an affirmative finding by the Commission that nevertheless there may be enjoinable injury under the Robinson-Patman Act to the favored buyer's competitors. The Court then decides that good faith in meeting competition was an absolute defense for price discrimination, saying:

"On the other hand, the proviso is readily understandable as simply continuing in effect an equally absolute, but more limited defense than that which existed under section 2 of the original Clayton Act."

Such a conclusion seems erroneous. What follows in this dissent demonstrates, we think, that Congress intended so to amend the Clayton Act that the avenue of escape given price discriminators by its meeting competition clause should be narrowed. The Court's interpretation leaves what the seller can do almost as wide open as before (see p. 12 et seq., infra). It seems clear to us that the interpretation put upon the clause of the Robinson-Patman Act by the Court means that no real change has been brought about by the amendment.

The public policy of the United States fosters the free-enterprise system of unfettered competition among producers and distributors of goods as the accepted method to put those goods into the hands of all consumers at the least expense.[3] There are, however, statutory exceptions to such unlimited competition.[4] Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer. But Congress obviously concluded that the greater advantage would acrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants or other purchasers in the course of business.[5]

The first enactment to put limits on discriminatory selling prices was the Clayton Act in 1914 (38 Stat. 730, sec. 2). Section 11 enabled the Commission to use its investigatory and regulatory authority to handle price discrimination. Section 2 provided for the maintenance of competition by protecting the ability of business rivals to obtain commodities on equal terms. The Robinson-Patman Act moved further toward this objective. In the margin appear the applicable words of the Clayton Act followed by those of the Robinson-Patman Act. Phrased summarily for this case, it may be said that the italicized words in the Clayton Act were the source of the difficulties in enforcement that Congress undertook to avoid by the italicized words of the Robinson-Patman Act.[6]

It will be noted that unless the effect is given the Robinson-Patman amendment contended for by the Federal Trade Commission, there is little done to overcome the difficulties arising from the meeting competition clause of the Clayton Act. Formerly "discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition" was allowed as a complete defense.

Now it is "made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor." The Court says:

"It thus eliminates certain difficulties which arose under the original Clayton Act. For example, it omits reference to discriminations in price 'in the same or different communities' and it thus restricts the proviso to price differentials occurring in actual competition. It also excludes reductions which undercut the 'lower price' of a competitor. None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price."

We see little difference. The seller still, under the Court's interpretation, discriminate in sales of goods of like quantity and quality between buyers on opposite corners, so long as one gets a lower delivered-price offer from another seller, no matter where located. The "actual core of the defense" remains intact.

I

Legislative history: Upon the interpretation of the words and purpose of this last addition by the Robinson-Patman Act to curbs on discrimination in trade, the narrow statutory issues in this case turn. Though narrow, they are important if trade is to have the benefit of careful investigation before regulation, attainable under the Federal Trade Commission Act but so difficult when attempted by prosecutions in courts with the limitations of judicial procedure. As an aid to the interpretation of section 2 (b), we set out applicable parts of its legislative history.

The Clayton Act created a broad exception from control for prices made in good faith to meet competition. This raised problems of which Congress was aware. In reporting on a redrafted version of S. 3154, the Senate's companion bill to the House bill that became the Robinson-Patman Act, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, February 3, 1936, pointed out the weakness of section 2 of the Clayton Act in permitting discrimination to meet competition, and suggested a harsh remedy, the elimination of its italicized proviso in note 6 supra, without the mollifying words of section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act.[7]

---

[1] The difficulties of any other approach are illustrated by the attempt of Congress to clarify the Robinson-Patman Act. See President's veto message on S. 1008, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1950, pp. 8721–8723, and conference reports, House of Representatives, 81st Cong., 1st sess, No. 1422, October 13, 1949, and 2d sess., No. 1730, March 3, 1950.

[2] Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., June 8 and 14, 1949; p. 61.

[3] *Associated Press* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 1, 13); *United States* v. *Line Material Co.* (333 U. S. 287, 309).

[4] *E. g.*, Interstate Commerce Act (sec. 5, 49 U. S. C., sec. 5); Communications Act of 1934 (sec. 221, 47 U. S. C. sec. 221); Miller-Tydings Act (15 U. S. C. sec. 1). And see Mason, The Curent Status of the Monopoly Problem in the United States (62 Harv. L. Rev. 1265).

[5] For a discussion of the merits of the legislation, see Adelman, Effective Competition and the Antitrust Laws (61 Harv. L. Rev. 1289).

[6] Clayton Act: "SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities, * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent * * * discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition * * *." Robinston-Patman Act: "SEC. 2. (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them. * * * (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination. *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

[7] S. Rept. No. 1502, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4: "The weakness of present section 2 lies principally in the fact that: (1) It places no limit upon differentials permissible on account of differences in quantity; and (2) it permits discriminations to meet competition, and thus tends to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill. Liberty to meet competition which can be met only by price cuts at the expense of customers elsewhere, is in its unmasked effect the liberty to destroy competition by selling locally below cost, a weapon progressively the more destructive in the hands of the more powerful, and most deadly to the competitor of limited resources, whatever his merit and efficiency. While the bill as now reported closes these dangerous loopholes, it leaves the fields of competition free and open to the most efficient, and thus in fact protects them the more securely against inundations of mere power and size. Specific phrases of section 2 (a), as now reported, may be noted as follows: One: '* * * where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce.' Section 2 (a) attaches to competitive relations between a given seller and his several customers, and this clause is designed to extend its scope to discriminations between interstate and intrastate customers, as well as between those purely interstate. Discriminations in excess of sound economic differences involve generally an element of loss, whether only of the necessary minimum of profits or of actual costs, that must be recouped from the business of customers not granted them. When granted by a given seller to his customers in other States, and denied to those within the State, they involve the use of that interstate commerce to the burden and injury of the latter. When granted to those within the State and denied to those beyond, they involve conversely a directly resulting burden upon interstate commerce with the latter. Both are within the proper and well-recognized power of Congress to suppress."

In March the House Committee on the Judiciary made its report on the bill that became the act. Section 2 (b) was then in substantially its present form. The report pointed out the draftsmen's purpose to strengthen the laws against price discrimination, directly or indirectly, through brokerage or other allowances, services, or absorptions of costs.[8] It commented that the subsection that became section 2 (b) let a seller "meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor."[9]

The language used in regard to competition in the bills and in the act seems to have been based on a recommendation of the Federal Trade Commission.[10] The Commission had been unable to restore the desired competition under the Clayton Act, and Congress evidently sought to open the way for effective action.[11]

Events in the course of the proposed legislation in the Senate and House have pertinence. The Senate inserted the original ineffective language of the Clayton Act in its exact form in the Senate bill. In the same draft it adopted an amendment similar to the proviso ultimately enacted (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6426, 6435). In the House, Representative PATMAN explained his view of the dangers in the original proviso.[12]

It was taken out in conference.[13] The chairman of the House managers, Mr. Utterback, before the conference report was agreed to by the House, received permission to print an explanation of his understanding of the proviso. He explained that the proviso "does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. * * * It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given." The pertinent parts of the statement appear in the margin.[14]

---

[8] H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3: "The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore, so far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade and commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination, and also against restraint and monopoly for the better protection of consumers, workers, and independent producers, manufacturers, merchants, and other businessmen. To accomplish its purpose, the bill amends and strengthens the Clayton Act by prohibiting discriminations in price between purchasers where such discriminations cannot be shown to be justified by differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from different methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold and delivered. It also prohibits brokerage allowances except for services actually rendered, and advertising and other service allowances unless such allowances or services are made available to all purchasers on proportionally equal terms. It strikes at the basing-point method of sale, which lessens competition and tends to create a monopoly."

[9] Id., p. 16: "This proviso represents a contraction of an exemption now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act which permits discriminations without limit where made in good faith to meet competition. It should be noted that while the seller is permitted to meet local competition it does not permit him to cut local prices until his competitor has first offered lower prices, and then he can go no further than to meet those prices. If he goes further he must do so likewise with all his other customers, or make himself liable to all of the penalties of the act, including treble damages. In other words, the proviso permits the seller to meet the price actually previously offered by a local competitor. It permits him to go no further."

[10] Final Report on the Chain-Store Investigation, S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 96: "A simple solution for the uncertainties and difficulties of enforcement would be to prohibit unfair and unjust discrimination in price and leave it to the enforcement agency, subject to review by the courts, to apply that principle to particular cases and situations. The soundness of and extent to which the present provisos would constitute valid defenses would thus become a judicial and not a legislative matter. The Commission therefore recommends that section 2 of the Clayton Act be amended to read as follows: 'It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in any transaction in or affecting such commerce, either directly or indirectly to discriminate unfairly or unjustly in price between different purchasers of commodities, which commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States.'" This report was utilized by the House committee dealing with the proposed Robinson-Patman legislation. H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3, 7.

[11] Id., p. 64: "If the discrimination is 'on account of differences in the grade, quality, or quantity of the commodity sold,' or makes 'only due allowance for difference in the cost of selling or transportation,' or is 'made in good faith to meet competition,' it is not unlawful, even though the effect 'may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.' Discriminatory price concessions given to prevent the loss of a chain-store's business to a competing manufacturer, to prevent it manufacturing its own goods, or to prevent it from discouraging in its stores the sale of a given manufacturer's goods, may be strongly urged by the manufacturer as 'made in good faith to meet competition'" (see p. 90, id.). Attention was called to this need. H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 7: "Some of the difficulties of enforcement of this section as it stands are pointed out in the [final report] of the Federal Trade Commission above referred to, at pages 63 and following."

[12] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8235: "Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. A great many of the industries in Ohio were very much in favor of the proviso in the Senate bill, appearing on page 4, and reading as follows: *'And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different commodities made in good faith to meet competition.' I find that on page 9 of the Patman bill, beginning in line 14, there appear these words: *'Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.' Will the gentleman explain the difference between these two proposals?

"Mr. PATMAN. If the Senate amendment should be adopted it would really destroy the bill. It would permit the corporate chains to go into a local market, cut the price down so low that it would destroy local competitors and make up for their losses in other places where they had already destroyed their competitors. One of the objects of the bill is to get around that phrase and prevent the large corporate chains from selling below cost in certain localities, thus destroying the independent merchants, and making it up at other places where their competitors have already been destroyed. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment, because it would be very destructive of the bill. The phrase 'equally low price' means the corporate chain will have the right to compete with the local merchants. They may meet competition, which is all right, but they cannot cut down the price below cost for the purpose of destroying the local man.

"Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What does the gentleman's proviso mean?

"Mr. PATMAN. It means they may meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price but not below that. It permits competition, but it does not permit them to cut the price below cost in order to destroy their competitors. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment." (But see pp. 15 and 16, infra).

[13] H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6–7: "The Senate bill contained a further proviso 'That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition.' This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded, and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b) in the conference text as follows: *'Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilites furnished by a competitor.'"

[14] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418: "In connection with the above rule as to burden of proof, it is also provided that a seller may show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or that his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet those furnished by a competitor. It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations. This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill. * * * If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. One violation of law cannot be permitted to justify another. As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack. A discrimination in violation of this bill is in practical effect a commercial bribe to lure the business of the favored customer away from the competitor, and if one bribe were permitted to justify another the bill would be futile to achieve its plainly intended purposes."

II

Statutory interpretation: This résumé of the origin and purpose of the original section 2 of the Clayton Act and the amendments of the Robinson-Patman Act gives a basis for determining the effect of this section in a hearing before the Commission where the charge, as here, that a seller during the same period of time has sold the same commodities to various purchasers at different prices, is admitted and the defense, the elements of which are likewise admitted, is that the discrimination was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. Does meeting in good faith a competitor's price constitute a complete defense under the proviso to section 2 (b)? Or does the fact of good faith reduction in price to a purchaser to meet a competitor's price merely rebut the prima facie establishment of discrimination, arising under the statute from proof of forbidden differences in price,[15] so as to require under section 2 (a) affirmative finding by the Commission that there may be injury to competition? Petitioner asserts that good faith meeing of a competitor's price is a complete defense. The Commission and the Court of Appeals take the opposite position, with which we concur.

This is our reason. The statutory development and the information before Congress concerning the need for strengthening the competitive price provision of the Clayton Act, make clear that the evil dealt with by the proviso of section 2 (b) was the easy avoidance of the prohibition against price-discrimination. The control of that evil was an important objective of the Robinson-Patman Act. The debates, the Commission's report and recommendation and statutory changes show this. The conference report and the explanation by one of the managers, Mr. Utterback, are quite definitive upon the point. Because of experience under the Clayton Act, Congress refused to continue its competitive price proviso. Yet adoption of petitioner's position would permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers, for the seller could give to the large retailer a price lower than that charged to small retailers, and could then completely justify its discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods. This is the very type of competition that Congress sought to remedy. To permit this would not seem consonant with the other provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, strengthening regulatory powers of the Commission in quantity sales, special allowances, and changing economic conditions.

The structure and wording of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act also conduce to our conclusion. In the original Clayton Act, section 2 was not divided into subsections. In that statute, section 2 stated the body of the substantive offense, and then listed, in a series of provisos, various circumstances under which discriminations in price were permissible. Thus, the statute provided that discriminations were not illegal if made on account of differences in the grade of the commodity sold or differences in selling or transportation costs. Listed among these absolute justifications of the Clayton Act appeared the provision that "nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price * * * made in good faith to meet competition." The Robinson-Patman Act, however, made two changes in respect of the meeting-competition provision—one as to its location, the other in the phrasing. Unlike the original statute, section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act is divided into two subsections. The first, section 2 (a), retained the statement of substantive offense and the series of provisos treated by the Commission as affording full justifications for price discriminations; section 2 (b) was created to deal with procedural problems in Federal Trade Commission proceedings—specifically to treat the question of burden of proof. In the process of this division, the meeting-competition provision was separated from the other provisos, set off from the substantive provisions of section 2 (a), and relegated to the position of a proviso to the procedural subsection, section 2 (b). Unless it is believed that this change of position was fortuitous, it can be inferred that Congress meant to curtail the defense of meeting competition when it banished this proviso from the substantive division to the procedural. In the same way, the language changes made by section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act reflect an intent to diminish the effectiveness of the sweeping defense offered by the Clayton Act's meeting-of-competition proviso. The original provisos in the Clayton Act, and the provisos now appearing in section 2 (a), are worded to make it clear that nothing shall prevent certain price practices, such as "price differentials * * * [making] * * * due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture," or "price changes * * * in response to changing conditions affecting the market for * * * the goods concerned." But in contrast to these provisions, the proviso to section 2 (b) does not provide that nothing "shall prevent" a certain price practice; it provides only that "nothing shall prevent a seller rebutting * * * [a] * * * prima facie case by showing" a certain price practice—meeting a competitive price. The language thus shifts the focus of the proviso from a matter of substantive defense to a matter of proof. Consistent with each other, these modifications made by the Robinson-Patman Act are also consistent with the intent of Congress expressed in the legislative history.

The Court suggests that former Federal Trade Commission cases decided here have treated the meeting-competition clause of the Robinson-Patman Act as being an absolute defense, not merely a rebuttal of the discrimination charge requiring further finding by the Commission. Reference is made to *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Comm'n* (324 U. S. 726) and *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Staley Mfg. Co.* (324 U. S. 746). In the Corn Products case, dealing with a basing-point scheme for delivered prices, this Court merely said at page 741:

"The only evidence said to rebut the prima facie case made by proof of the price discriminations was given by witnesses who had no personal knowledge of the transactions, and was limited to statements of each witness' assumption or conclusion that the price discriminations were justified by competition."

And then went on to use the language quoted at page 12 of the Court's opinion. There was no occasion to consider the effect of a successful rebuttal. As authority for its statement, we there cited the Staley case (at 324 U. S. 746).

That citation included these words at pages 752–753:

"Prior to the Robinson-Patman amendments, section 2 of the Clayton Act provided that nothing contained in it 'shall prevent' discrimination in price 'made in good faith to meet competition.' The change in language of this exception was for the purpose of making the defense a matter of evidence in each case, raising a question of fact as to whether the competition justified the discrimination. See the conference report, House Report No. 2951, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, pages 6–7; see also the statement of Representative Utterback, the chairman of the House conference committee, 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418."

After that statement, which it should be noted relies upon Mr. Utterback's interpretation quoted at note 14 of this opinion, the Court in the *Staley* case goes on to say that there was no evidence to show that Staley adopted a lower price to meet an equally low price of a competitor. Again there was no occasion for this court to meet the present issue. We think our citation in Staley quoted above, shows the then position of this Court.[16]

There are aguments available to support the contrary position. No definite statement appears in the committee reports that meeting competition is henceforth to be only a rebuttal of a prima facie case and not a full justification for discrimination in price. The proviso of section 2 (b) can be read as having the same substantive effect as the provisos of section 2 (a). The earlier provisos are treated by the Commission as complete defenses. Perhaps there is an implication favorable to the petitioner's position in Representative PATMAN'S omission to state the Federal Trade Commission interpretation on the floor. See note 12, supra.

The underlying congressional purpose to curtail methods of avoiding limitations on price discriminations, however, considered with the more specific matters discussed herein, satisfies us that we should adopt the conclusion of the Commission and the court of appeals.[17] We believe that good faith meeting of a competitor's price only rebuts the prima facie case of violation established by showing the price discrimination. Whether the proven price discrimination is of a character that violates section 2 (a) then becomes a matter for the determination of the Commission on a showing that there may be injury to competition.

III

Conclusion: In view of the Court's ruling, we will not enlarge this dissent by discussing other problems raised by the case. We have said enough to show that we would affirm the decree below in principle, even though we should conclude some amendment might be required in the wording of the order.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Black join in this dissent.

---

[15] See note 6, supra.

[16] The Court's opinion in this case refers, page 12, notes 12 and 13, to the opinions of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *Staley* and *Corn Products* (144 F. 2d and 221). But that court reversed its position in the opinion below (173 F. 2d 210, 216). It is fair to assume that reversal was because of our opinions in Corn Products and Staley.

[17] It is hardly necessary to note that the wisdom of the enactment is not for the Commission nor the courts in enforcing the act. The Commission recently has advised Congress that while "on balance it would be preferable to make the good faith meeting of competition a complete defense," it "does not strongly urge either view upon the Congress." Hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1008, 81st Cong., 1st sess., June 8 and 14, 1949, p. 61. Compare *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 293, 311). This statement confirmed the Commission's position taken in this case. There were other officials of the Commission who have taken the view adopted by the Court.

PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITION OF WOOL AND INCREASING GROWTH OF THE GUAYULE SHRUB

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services I want my colleagues to know that we are as ready to commend as we are to criticize. When we find something in the defense mobilization program that deserves praise we are as willing and anxious to point out that fact as we are to comment upon deficiencies in that program.

Vigorous action to correct deficiencies and omissions in defense mobilization as soon as they have been ascertained is praiseworthy indeed.

The new Chairman of the Munitions Board, Mr. John D. Small, has shown that the Board can and will take prompt action. As the committee has recently recommended, wool and guayule seed and seedlings have now been placed on the strategic and critical materials' list for stockpiling. This action is definitely a substantial step in the right direction. By taking this step Chairman Small has corrected serious omissions of his predecessors, and I hope that aggresive programs for acquiring wool and preparing to grow natural rubber in the United States will finally repair the damage resulting from inaction over the past 3 years.

The Preparedness Subcommittee's first and second reports stressed the need for growing, or preparing to grow, natural rubber from guayule within the boundaries of the United States. The President's rubber program as reported to the subcommittee by Mr. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, included the planning and studies on preliminary actions that should be taken to grow natural rubber in this country. I am happy to report that an active program to increase the available seed needed to grow guayule shrub is under way. In addition, test acreages of guayule shrub will be set out in various parts of the country believed adapted to its growth in order to give farmers experience in growing this crop and to make certain what areas and what soils are best suited for large production should our supplies of natural rubber from the Far East be curtailed or cut off.

My esteemed and hard-working fellow committee member, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] developed for the Senate Armed Services Committee, long before formation of the Preparedness Subcommittee, the lamentable and distressing shortage of wool. His early efforts, along with the recent study by the Preparedness Subcommittee set forth in the third report, have been notable contributions which have finally moved the defense agencies.

I hope we have time to obtain the wool we need. I am sure we are on the right road in actively planning to grow natural rubber in this country if we have to. The actions announced recently by Chairman Small of the Munitions Board are definitely steps in the right direction. He deserves commendation for it. Other agencies could learn from his example.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

IMPRACTICABILITY OF VOLUNTARY PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 12 of last year, I pointed out that it would be useless to increase taxes if prices were permitted to rise to such a point that the tax gain would be erased through the necessity of paying continually advancing prices for war materials.

On September 12, I placed in the RECORD a tabulation showing how prices had advanced out of all proportion on hundreds of essential items.

On September 22, I cited in the RECORD a few of the more flagrant instances: The increase by 111 percent in the price of crude rubber since the attack on Korea; the increase by more than 30 percent, over a period of only a few months, in the price of aviation gasoline; an increase from 22 to 42 percent, between April and September, in the price of the cloth from which uniforms are made.

On December 12, I asked the Senate once more "What are we waiting for?" and pointed out the alarming fact that on November 28 the wholesale price index reached an all-time record high of 171.7.

At that time I quoted certain figures demonstrating that since April 1950 the price of burlap had increased 75.6 percent; the price of copper was up 32.6 percent; the price of hides was up 50.8 percent; the price of wool had been boosted 67.6 percent; and the price of crude rubber had increased an unbelievable 209.5 percent.

In line with my promise to show again and again, through facts and figures, the impracticability of voluntary controls during wartime, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "Military Procurement Price Trends," and a tabulation of "Military Procurement Prices Before and After the Attack on Korea," both prepared by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the statement and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRICE TRENDS

Since the spring of 1950, prices have risen markedly, particularly after the start of the conflict in Korea. The Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale-price index is now at an all-time high, reaching a level of 171.7 on November 28, a rise of 12.3 percent since April 1950 and an increase of 2.5 percent during the past 2 months. Many basic raw materials have increased in price to an even greater extent than have finished commodities, including a number of key commodities used in the manufacture of items required by the armed services, as shown by the following table:

Commodity	Unit	Price			Percent increase		
		April 1950	Sept. 8, 1950	Dec. 4, 1950	April to September	April to December	September to December
Burlap	Yard	$0.172	$0.242	$0.302	40.7	75.6	24.8
Copper	Pound	.184	.234	.244	27.2	32.6	4.3
Cotton	do	.320	.407	.412	27.2	28.8	1.2
Crude rubber	do	.210	.550	.650	161.9	209.5	18.2
Hides	do	.242	.330	.365	36.4	50.8	10.6
Lead	do	.105	.160	.170	52.4	61.9	6.2
Print cloth, cotton	Yard	.140	.210	.225	50.0	60.7	7.1
Steel scrap (Philadelphia)	Ton	24.000	38.000	38.500	58.3	60.4	1.3
Tin	Pound	.750	.990	1.390	32.0	85.3	40.4
Wool tops	do	1.870	3.020	3.135	61.5	67.6	3.8
Zinc	do	.112	.182	.182	62.5	62.5	

Due to the existence of fixed price contracts for many items, the rise in basic commodity prices was not fully and immediately reflected in procurement prices paid by the armed services. However, the increase in general price level is being felt more and more by the armed services. With the exception of meats, the price of which has dropped seasonally during the past 2 months, and a few other scattered items, higher prices are being encountered in an ever increasing number of items. These price rises are becoming increasingly widespread despite efforts to reduce costs wherever feasible by simplification of specifications and substitution of materials. The recent steel industry wage and price increases will undoubtedly lead to further increases in the prices of many military procurement items.

One of the key commodities affected by the Korean conflict has been aviation gasoline. Preliminary screening of offers for delivery of aviation gasoline starting in January 1951 indicates the following price increases per gallon for normal production:

	July 1, 1950, average	November 1950 average quotation for January 1951 delivery	Percent increase
Grade 115/145 Avgas:			
United States Gulf	$0.1675	$0.1725	3.0
West coast	.1565	.1775	13.4
Grade 100/130 Avgas:			
United States Gulf	.155	.16	3.2
West coast	.144	.165	14.6

However, normal production is not adequate to meet current armed services' needs for aviation gasoline. Consequently, part of the aviation gasoline supplies of the armed services are being derived from marginal

production, utilizing materials, plant facilities, and transportation practices that are not economical under normal conditions. As a result, premiums of varying amounts are being paid for the supply increments furnished from marginal sources, ranging from 5 to 45 percent, depending upon the particular circumstances involved.

It must be recognized that it is difficult to compare prices at different times for much of the matériel procured by the armed services because of changes in quantities involved, changes in specifications, changes in manufacturing methods and processing techniques, resort to marginal producers or methods, existence of price redetermination clauses in contracts, etc. Direct price comparisons can best be made on relatively standard-type items that are subject to little change in specifications. Such a list of representative items, indicating procurement prices applicable to each of the services and to the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, is contained in the attached table:

Military procurement prices before and after the attack on Korea (April 1950, August–September 1950, and October–November 1950)

Commodity	Unit	Price			Percent increase or decrease (−)		
		April 1950	August–September 1950	October–November 1950	April to August–September	April to October–November	August–September to October–November
A. S. P. P. A.:							
Fuel oil, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	Barrel	$0.99	$1.83	[1] $2.10	84.5	112.1	37.3
Caribbean	do	1.70	1.83	[1] 1.92	7.6	12.9	4.9
Motor gasoline, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	do	3.90	4.38	[1] 4.59	12.3	17.7	4.8
United States Gulf	do	3.59	3.82	[1] 4.30	6.4	19.8	12.6
Diesel fuel, f. o. b. tanker:							
West coast	do	3.33	3.28	[1] 3.65	−1.5	9.6	11.3
United States Gulf	do	2.92	3.36	[1] 3.36	15.1	15.1	
Army:							
Ambulance, metropolitan, ¾-ton, 4 by 2	Each	3,774.20	(2)	4,224.20		11.9	
Automobile, sedan, light	do	1,132.00	1,284.00	(2)	13.4		
Truck, pick-up, ½-ton, 4 by 2	do	952.62	(2)	1,014.87		6.5	
Truck, stake and platform, 1½-ton, 4 by 2	do	1,471.77	(2)	1,697.13		15.3	
Water tank trailer, 1-ton	do	793.17	914.76	(2)	15.3		
Battery:							
2F	do	9.15	11.53	(2)	26.0		
2H	do	12.55	14.58	(2)	16.2		
3H	do	11.21	15.84	(2)	14.3		
Tire:							
6.50 by 20, 8-ply	do	16.14	20.46	(2)	26.8		
7.50 by 20	do	23.99	28.93	33.18	20.6	38.3	14.7
Bearing bushing	do	.79	1.38	(2)	74.7		
Gasket set	do	.0849	.12757	(2)	50.3		
Wiring harness	do	3.12	4.14	(2)	32.7		
Fuel tank	do	9.15	12.75	(2)	39.3		
Sprocket	do	15.00	18.45	(2)	23.0		
Nut	do	.01265	.0146	(2)	15.4		
Battery assembly hanger	do	2.95	3.43	(2)	16.3		
Flange transfer brace drum	do	1.72	1.99	(2)	15.7		
Filter oil breather	do	1.80	1.95	(2)	8.3		
Carriage bolts	do	.0135	.01533	(2)	13.6		
Steering knuckle assembly	do	15.84	19.9368	(2)	25.9		
Shaft (automotive)	do	22.77	24.74	(2)	8.7		
Hood support	do	.77	.83	(2)	7.8		
Roller bearing	do	11.80	12.39	(2)	5.0		
Carburetor assembly	do	22.709	23.7115	(2)	4.4		
Steering arm	do	7.8178	8.316	(2)	6.4		
Generator	do	52.63	55.75	(2)	5.9		
Lumber:							
Southern pine, No. 2 common	M board feet	66.00	97.00	72.00	47.0	9.1	−25.8
Douglas fir	do	67.50	82.50	[3] 82.50	22.2	22.2	
Bailey bridges	Each	37,796.00	51,792.00	[3] 51,792.00	37.0	37.0	
Fire hose, cotton, rubber-lined	50 feet	20.64	23.10	[3] 23.10	11.9	11.9	
Astrolabe	Each	1,200.00	1,311.00	[3] 1,311.00	9.2	9.2	
Beach tractor	do	10,188.00	10,840.00	[3] 10,840.00	6.4	6.4	
Storage battery	do	9.07	10.74	[3] 10.74	18.4	18.4	
Wire rope	Foot	.1329	.164	[3] .164	23.4	23.4	
20-ton trailer	Each	3,287.00	3,540.00	[3] 3,540.00	8.0	8.0	
Shop bench	do	215.00	270.00	[3] 270.00	25.6	25.6	
Road roller	do	5,345.00	5,735.00	[3] 5,735.00	7.3	7.3	
Motor lead cable	Foot	.044	.057	[3] .057	29.5	29.5	
Barbed wire	Spool	6.39	7.25	[3] 7.25	13.4	13.4	
Sisal rope	Foot	.03841	.0456	[3] .0456	18.7	18.7	
Cable, 3-conductor	do	.0355	(2)	.053		77.7	
Chest drafting set No. 8	Each	68.50	(2)	95.00		38.7	
Wire, magnet:							
No. 28 AWG	Pound	.47	(2)	.625		33.0	
No. 27 AWG	do	.45	(2)	.63		40.0	
No. 25 AWG	do	.42	(2)	.57		35.8	
Fire extinguisher	Each	36.86	37.98	[3] 37.98	3.0	3.0	
Antenna equipment, RC-292	do	134.88	144.88	(2)	7.4		
Switchbox, BC-658	do	10.95	12.04	(2)	10.8		
Field wire, WD-1/TT	Mile	58.02	68.17	74.03	17.5	27.6	8.6
Communications equipment, AN/GRC-26	Each	11,353.91	(2)	12,364.03			8.9
Radio set:							
AN/PRC-10	do	263.88	(2)	382.50		45.0	
SCR-399	do	5,080.92	(2)	5,901.66		16.2	
Battery, BA-70	do	5.01	(2)	5.66		13.0	
Broom, corn	Dozen	11.25	12.53	12.53	11.4	11.4	
Steel wool	Pound	.218	.265	.3407	21.6	56.3	28.6
Soap powder, hand scouring	do	.090	.1201	.1235	33.4	37.2	2.8
Mop, cotton	Each	.4675	.5875	[3] .750	25.7	60.4	27.7
Burlap, jute, 40-inch	Yard	.1711	.2325	[3] .310	35.9	81.2	33.3
Sack, burlap, 57 by 30 inches	Each	.4170	.5833	[3] .756	39.6	81.3	29.8
Dishwashing, machine model 180DA	do	1,454.52	1,554.00	[1] 1,629.06	6.8	12.0	4.8
Paper, typewriter, bond	Ream	6.435	8.36	[3] 9.65	29.9	50.0	15.4
Barrier, waterproof:							
Type C-1	Roll	4.16	4.90	[3] 5.22	17.8	25.5	6.5
Type L-2	do	11.06	11.80	[3] 13.88	6.7	25.5	17.6
Type M	do	7.45	8.53	[3] 9.35	14.5	25.5	9.6
Box, fiber, shipping	Each	.82771	1.241	[3] 1.283	49.9	55.0	33.4
Drawers, cotton, shorts, white	Pair	.4233	.5246	[3] .555	23.9	31.1	5.8
Cut, make, and trim:							
Trousers, cotton, khaki	do	.740	.860	[3] .908	16.2	30.8	12.6
Shirt, stand-up collar	Each	.588	(2)	.769		30.8	
Socks, wool, cushion sole	Pair	[3] .573	.635	.681	10.4	18.6	7.2

Military procurement prices before and after the attack on Korea (April 1950, August–September 1950, and October–November 1950)—Con.

Commodity	Unit	Price			Percent increase or decrease (−)		
		April 1950	August–September 1950	October–November 1950	April to August–September	April to October–November	August–September to October–November
Army—Continued							
Cloth:							
Cotton, twill, 5-ounce	Yard	$1.27	$1.555	$1.64222	22.4	29.3	5.6
Cotton, chambray, 3-ounce	do	.39	.44	.4697	12.8	20.4	6.8
Wool, lining, 12-ounce	do	1.65	2.05	[3] 2.307	24.2	39.8	12.5
Wool, serge, 15-ounce	do	3.595	4.555	[3] 5.026	26.7	39.8	10.3
Wool, serge, 12-ounce	do	3.63	4.463	[3] 5.075	22.9	39.8	13.7
Wool, lining, 15-ounce	do	1.78	2.247	[3] 2.488	26.2	39.8	10.7
Wool, serge, 18-ounce	do	3.8176	4.890	[3] 5.337	28.1	39.8	10.0
Wool, pile	do	4.90	6.274	[3] 6.850	28.0	39.8	9.2
Webbing, cotton, 1-inch	do	.0413	.059	.0598	42.9	44.8	1.4
Shoes, low quarter	Pair	3.7364	[2]	4.910		31.4	
Boots, service, combat	do	5.720	[2]	8.148		42.4	
Drawers, winter, M–40	do	3.020	[2]	3.577		18.4	
Undershirts, winter, M–50	Each	2.740	[2]	3.291		20.1	
Box & Sleeve, shipping, fiber	Set	1.5996	1.6794	[3] 1.90	13.3	18.8	13.1
Gasoline drum, 5-gallon	Each	1.7891	1.9791	[4] 1.79	10.6	0.1	−9.6
Bacon, smoked	Pound	.38	.4875	[5] .4352	28.3	14.5	−10.7
Beef, boneless	do	.6438	.6718	[5] .6209	4.3	−3.6	−7.6
Beef, carcass	do	.4602	.4741	[5] .4651	3.0	1.1	−1.9
Ham, smoked	do	.5367	.5323	[5] .4734	−.8	−11.8	−11.1
Lard	do	.1329	.1802	[5] .1581	35.6	19.0	−12.3
Sausage	do	.3650	.4738	[5] .4152	29.8	13.8	−12.4
Pork	do	.4245	.5523	[5] .4350	30.1	2.5	−21.2
Chicken, dressed	do	.3835	.4150	[5] .3942	8.2	2.8	−5.0
Eggs, shell	Dozen	.3746	.5163	[5] .5715	37.8	52.6	10.7
Milk, frozen	Quart	.1357	.1765	[5] .1909	30.1	40.7	8.2
Navy:							
Space heater, 50,000 B. t. u	Each	38.00	45.00	53.00	18.4	39.5	17.8
Steam tables, MC std	do	2,800.00	3,200.00	3,547.00	14.3	26.7	10.8
Briggs & Stratton carburetor	do	2.64	[2]	4.40		66.7	
Dorman kit exp. plug	do	6.25	[2]	9.94		59.0	
Grease-fitting kits	do	6.40	[2]	21.80		240.6	
Crane, T/A–8121	do	244.00	[2]	426.00		74.6	
Connector, cable 17–C–20865–500	do	.195	.2539		30.2		
Tester, voltage 17–T–5555	do	.275	.35		27.3		
Rope, wire, 9/16-inch 22–R–2268–135	Foot	.119	[2]	.238		100.0	
Crane, truck, ½-yard 78–C–33600	Each	18,380.00	[2]	21,000.00		14.3	
Differential shaft 4–B2007	do	36.41	[2]	58.02		59.4	
Dry battery:							
BA–44	do	1.7572	[2]	2.30		30.9	
BA–202/U	do	.0704	[2]	.125		77.6	
BA–205/U	do	.3360	[2]	.50		48.8	
BA–37	do	.1575	[2]	.334		109.5	
BA–152	do	.2730	[2]	.48		75.8	
Lights, timing 41–L–1440	do	2.42	[3] 2.42	3.87		59.9	59.9
Mattresses	do	[1]	8.00	13.23			65.4
Sheets	do	[1]	1.50	2.26			50.7
Enamel, semigloss	Gallon	1.68	2.75	[3] 2.75	63.7	63.7	
Mount, trailer, multiple MG, M55	Each	5,000.00	9,500.00	9,500.00	90.0	90.0	
Shell, smoke, M313, w/f PD, M57	do	23.89	37.22	37.22	55.8	55.8	
Actuator	do	.28	.70	.70	150.0	150.0	
Bearing, flash hider	do	.92	2.30	2.30	150.0	150.0	
Screw, forearm	do	.15	.38	.38	153.3	153.3	
Sight, rear assembly	do	6.00	15.00	15.00	150.0	150.0	
Adhesive tape, 3 inches by 5 yards	Roll	.26	.30	.314	15.4	20.8	4.7
Surgical gloves, rubber	Pair	.178	.22	.256	23.6	43.8	16.4
Glycerin	Pound	.35	.75	.85	114.3	142.9	13.3
Instrument and medicine cabinet	Each	195.00	220.00	210.00	12.8	7.7	−4.5
Vitamin A in oil	50 cubic centimeters.	.364	.436	.470	19.8	29.1	7.8
Sedan, 5-passenger	Each	1,128.00	[2]	1,284.00		13.8	
Crane:							
10-ton, truck mounted	do	15,390.00	16,884.00	21,392.00	9.7	39.0	26.7
15-ton, truck mounted	do	16,000.00	17,529.00	24,500.00	9.6	53.1	39.8
20-ton, truck mounted	do	19,700.00	22,500.00	28,250.00	14.2	43.4	25.6
¾ cubic yard, crawler	do	17,940.00	18,559.00	23,000.00	3.4	28.2	23.9
1½ cubic yard, crawler	do	32,855.00	42,945.00	46,345.00	30.7	41.1	9.2
Tractors, 130 to 160 design brake horsepower	do	15,363.00	15,579.00	16,500.00	1.4	7.4	5.9
Oscilloscope OS–8/U	do	139.00	219.00	219.00	57.6	57.6	
Air Force:							
Height finder:							
AN/TPS–10D	do	35,880.00	43,587.00	[3] 49,822.00	21.5	38.9	14.3
AN/MPS–4	do	67,000.00	77,050.00	[2]	15.0		
Compound carbon removal	Gallon	1.07	[2]	1.50		40.2	
Paint remover	do	1.29	[2]	1.55		20.2	
Aluminum alloy sheet	Pound	.369	[2]	.384		4.1	
A–5 inspection light	Each	3.20	[2]	4.75		48.4	
Electric cable	Foot	.072	[2]	.080		11.1	
Jacket, flying type B–15B	Each	16.50	[2]	25.00		51.5	
Suit, flying nylon K–2	do	9.47	[2]	14.00		47.8	
Shirt, flying wool type A–1	do	7.84	[2]	10.00		27.6	
Protective helmet	do	20.20	[2]	26.84		32.9	
Sun glasses	Pair	2.29	[2]	3.00		31.0	
T–7A parachute assembly with reserve canopy	Each	198.30	[2]	300.77		51.7	
G–11 100-foot cargo chute	do	1,287.00	[2]	1,798.66		39.8	

[1] Represents estimated average of offers received in November for deliveries to start January 1951.
[2] No procurement during this period.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Gasoline, drum, 5-gallon procurement during November 1950 was for large quantity (1,000,000 units), awarded to a single company.
[5] October 1950 prices.

Source: Progress Reports and Statistics, Office of Secretary of Defense, Dec. 4, 1950.

LEAKAGE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY MESSAGES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to compliment the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] for the patriotic service he has rendered the Nation in exposing the leakage of Department of Defense military messages.

For some time administration apologists have been searching for a way to escape responsibility for the disaster in Korea. The administration and its apologists seem to have settled on Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the scapegoat.

In reference to that campaign, I wish to point out that Gen. Douglas MacArthur was not present at Tehran,

Yalta, or Potsdam when the foundations for the present disaster in Asia were laid. Douglas MacArthur had no part in pulling the rug from under Nationalist China and in setting the stage for Russian domination of Asia.

Douglas MacArthur went into Korea, not on his own initiative, but on orders of the President of the United States. It was on orders from the President that Douglas MacArthur went into Korea with inadequately armed and green troops.

When Douglas MacArthur and his fighting men had the Communists on the run, and could have destroyed them, he stopped his troops at the thirty-eighth parallel, on orders from Washington. This gave the Reds time to catch their breath and reform their disorganized forces.

Douglas MacArthur refrained from ordering his airmen to bomb enemy troop concentrations at the Korean border, on orders from Washington. This allowed the enemy to marshal its forces and build up its strength without annoyance.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has not been allowed to accept the proffered assistance of several hundred thousand Chinese Nationalist fighting men who are willing and anxious to go into battle against communism. This, too, is on orders from Washington.

All these things have been done by Washington, from which originates the campaign to shift to General MacArthur the blame for the military disaster in Korea.

General MacArthur is a field commander whose hands are tied by political strings reaching from his headquarters to the White House, in Washington, to Lake Success.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin, in his exposure of the source of the information which has formed the principal basis for the MacArthur smear, is pulling up and exposing the very taproot of the campaign to discredit MacArthur. In doing this, the junior Senator from Wisconsin has had the courage to go to the mat with one of the Nation's most powerful columnists. He has found that this columnist had access to, and quoted excerpts from, classified military communications from our commander in the field to his superiors at the Pentagon. Those messages concern the strength of the forces now overwhelming our troops in Korea. After their leakage those classified military messages were largely used as the basis for the smear campaign against MacArthur.

Both General MacArthur and his staff were held up to ridicule and censure on the allegation that their intelligence services were inaccurate and otherwise faulty.

Thus it was insinuated that General MacArthur and many of his closest advisers were uninformed and incompetent. It was insidiously hinted that MacArthur and his aides were confused as to the exact number of the opposing forces, and that because of this confusion our troops were led into defeat in Korea.

I have information to the effect that it is standard practice to attach to classified documents the following or similar warning, which is notice of the consequences of violations of security:

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, title 18, United States Code, sections 793 and 794. Transmission or revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law; it is imperative that the material contained in it be treated with the utmost discretion. Under no circumstances shall possession thereof, or the information therein, be given to any personnel other than those whose duties specifically require knowledge thereof. When not in use this document is chargeable to the custody of an officer.

Along with other Members of the United States Senate, I am anxiously awaiting the outcome of the active investigation the Army says it is conducting. It is my hope that the inquiry will lead to a court martial and the subsequent punishment of such military personnel as may have had a hand in the affair, if a violation of the law has occurred. If it should develop that the information leak was perpetrated by a civilian employee of the Defense Department, that civilian should be punished to the full extent of the law.

I also hope that this incident will tend to bring into disrepute the kind of "inside story" reporting which is all too prevalent these days. That kind of reporting too often finds origin in the privileged status of certain types of writers, who in reality are not reporters, but propagandists.

These alleged reporters have access in many of our Federal Government buildings, to private dining rooms, and other hide-aways which are not generally accessible to the working press. In return for this privileged status they too often lend themselves to opinion peddling, rather than news reporting.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this episode is a proper subject of investigation by either the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction of espionage matters, or by the Armed Services Committee.

I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the Associated Press story about this matter. The account is taken from the Saturday, January 13, 1951, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY INQUIRES INTO SOURCE OF PEARSON'S DATA—PACE, ANSWERING MCCARTHY, SAYS COLUMNIST QUOTED FROM SECRET MESSAGES

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The Army said today the Drew Pearson column of December 30 contained "quoted excerpts from classified (secret) messages," and an investigation is being made.

In a letter to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, Secretary of the Army Frank Pace also said the matter is being submitted to the Judge Advocate General, the Army's top legal officer.

Mr. Pace made the letter public. It was in response to a demand from Senator MCCARTHY to know whether material in the Pearson column was in fact quoted from secret messages, as Mr. Pearson said. Senator MCCARTHY said in a Senate speech last week that if Mr. Pearson had quoted secret messages he had given aid to foreign countries in efforts to break United States codes.

SAID HE HAD PERMISSION

Mr. Pearson replied in a statement at the time that he had been told by the Pentagon that it was all right for him to use the messages if he changed dates and altered a few words.

Mr. Pace told the Senator the whole matter is being actively investigated. He said the Army had not given Mr. Pearson any secret messages or any messages at all from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's headquarters.

Mr. Pace said the Army "did not give Mr. Pearson permission to publish the secret military messages you referred to nor any other classified information."

Mr. Pearson's December 30 column said in effect that reports from General MacArthur's headquarters and his intelligence chief showed the Chinese Red strength in Korea was considerably weaker than the general's published statements indicated.

Mr. Pace's letter was in reply to one Senator MCCARTHY sent him Monday. One question Senator MCCARTHY asked was whether publication of the texts of coded messages, even with the change of a few words and the date, would not "materially help enemy experts to break United States military codes."

SAYS CODE IS NOT BROKEN

Mr. Pace told Senator MCCARTHY that "in this instance it has been established that cryptographic security has not been violated," but said he was unable for security reasons to explain why.

Mr. Pace said the specific matter submitted to the Judge Advocate General was this question from Senator MCCARTHY: "Was not whoever handed Pearson those messages guilty of a violation of our espionage laws?"

After Mr. Pace released his letter Mr. Pearson issued a statement which said the basic fact is that General MacArthur's press communiques in early December reported the Chinese to be 1,000,000 strong, but his cables to the Pentagon gave the Chinese strength as only about 100,000. He added:

"Publication 3 weeks after the retreat obviously could violate no security nor endanger American forces.

"Senator MCCARTHY seems much more interested in getting at me than in getting the true facts to the country."

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO DEPLOY TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall today detain the Senate but briefly, but I should like to call attention to the fact that while we are engaged in what the country generally considers and accepts as a great debate on foreign policy, it is unfortunately true that considerable amounts of time and attention and study have had to be devoted in the United States Senate to a collateral issue not directly connected with foreign policy; that is, the determination of a constitutional question concerning the right or propriety of the President, as Commander in Chief, to send forces abroad without consultation with Congress and consent by Congress.

It occurs to me, since we hear almost every day impassioned appeals from the Democratic side of the aisle and from the officers uptown that we should have national unity and national cooperation, that the one man in the United States who is prepared today and equipped to strike a tremendous blow for unity is President Harry S. Truman, in his posi-

tion as Commander in Chief. He alone can put an end to this collateral debate, which is consuming so much time that actually we have had very little opportunity as yet to get down to the very important matter of building a constructive, positive foreign policy.

Most of our time has been devoted to a determination of what we are going to fight with, rather than what we are going to fight for. It seems to me that until and unless we determine what we are going to fight for and what our outline of foreign policy might properly be, we cannot very well determine what is going to be required to fight with. One precedes the other and, once we have determined what we are going to fight for, we then come to the problem of how we are going to raise and equip the army, and of how it is to be commanded.

Only the President, I submit, Mr. President, has the power to put an end to this debate. I think it could be argued rather persuasively from the President's point of view, as some of his friends are endeavoring to argue, that the Commander in Chief under the Constitution of the United States has a considerable degree of power to order the troops of the country to serve where he thinks their service is important and necessary. That constitutional reference or right has been argued almost since the beginning of time in the United States; and some Presidents, having been a little more high-handed and headstrong than others, have taken more advantage of it than others. Some Presidents, more interested in national unity and considering the position of Congress more adequately, have refrained from acting in any way that might be construed as a defiance of Congress.

I submit that it can also be argued very persuasively from the congressional point of view that the Constitution imposes upon us, as a Congress, certain very significant controls as to where troops are to be sent and as to how they are to be deployed, because we, and we alone, are charged by the Constitution with the right to raise and equip and supply the military forces and to appropriate the essential money. So if we have on the one hand a high-handed, headstrong President, looking constantly for increasing personal power and trying to decrease steadily the importance of the Congress, it is possible, of course, to stymie and stalemate the entire foreign policy debate, while the constitutional question is argued till the cows come home, or to the end of the congressional session.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has already touched on it in part. The powers of Congress are not limited to a single control over the subject matter. There are four or five specific controls over our military establishments provided by the Constitution. One is the power to provide for the common defense. That has no limits. It is our responsibility. It is our grant of unlimited power.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It says so in exact words. We do not have to draw implications. It also says we have the power to declare war. This carries its own implications of very wide scope, inclusive and exclusive. We also have the power to raise and support armies. We also have the power to provide and maintain a navy, and we also have the power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such parts of it as may be employed in the service of the United States. While the President has a vast field of implied power, arising out of the fact that the Constitution makes him our Chief Executive and our Commander in Chief, the Congress also by the express terms and implication of the Constitution, which I have mentioned, is not without armor in this debate or in action to be proposed or taken.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution, and I think it should be clear to all students of the Constitution that the constitutional founders were much more meticulous and much more comprehensive in reposing in the Congress those specific controls we have in connection with the Army and our military forces than they were in regard to the implications they made in the direction of the power of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I note the Senator said the Congress would have power to curtail these operations, by the control of the purse in providing for the Army. Is it not a fact, however, that such control means very little, if the President goes ahead and orders our troops into situations in a manner which brings on a war?

Mr. MUNDT. That certainly is true, of course, because in such situations as the one we have now in Korea, it is unthinkable that any Congress will refuse to appropriate the money required to complete the task in which we are engaged and to protect our troops in the fighting theater.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, if our troops are actually engaged in combat, if our boys are on the battlefield fighting, or even our Navy and our Air Force, it is unlikely then that the Congress would reverse itself and try to control the President in his actions by denying appropriations to furnish our troops, our Air Force, and our Navy with necessary equipment for the fighting, and the additional troops to support them in whatever action they are undertaking or are compelled to undertake in order to save their lives, and to save, so to speak, the face of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Under such conditions, I would say it is not only unlikely, but unthinkable that Congress would take such action.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the framers of the Constitution had in mind that both Houses of the Congress were to have something to say about the use of the Army and the size of the Army when they included the 2-year limitation upon appropriations for the Army of the United States? By that provision the chief executive, who is the Commander in Chief and treated really as a part of the Army, was precluded from obtaining sufficient funds in advance to enable him to use the Army in any way he desired.

Mr. MUNDT. The junior Senator from Michigan has put his finger on a very pertinent point. Unquestionably that was one of the facts which motivated our constitutional father in establishing that provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I take a rather liberal view of the President's powers. I would not for a moment try to circumscribe them. But, by the same token, we are also entitled to a rather liberal view as to our express and implied powers under the Constitution. I have made a rather careful study of the Constitution and have found nothing in it which contains any prohibition against the use of common sense or of constructive cooperation between the so-called independent branches of the Government. I thought it was a shocking and a very foolish thing when the President said that he was willing to go to the people on this issue. The issue went to the people last November. But if he wishes it that way, he may go again to the people, but I think the result will be the same, or even worse for him. I hope the President will come to realize that there is no prohibition against his acting in honest cooperation with the Congress, so that we can work these things out without any conflict of constitutional jurisdiction, or assuming——

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is anticipating precisely why I took the floor this afternoon. That is exactly the thing I am recommending to the President, that instead of taking this headstrong attitude, this royal and superior attitude of utterly defying the Congress, of registering his contempt therefor and saying that he will carry the issue to the people, there is a simple, respectable, logical, and persuasive course he can take by employing the rule of common sense and saying, "We are working together as a Government comprised of coordinate branches, and the President and the Congress must move forward together, rather than fighting and quibbling about constitutional powers."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan did not have in mind that Congress had the power to designate where the Armed Forces would fight and exactly when they would fight. Rather, in view of these provisions of the Constitution relative to the limitation upon the term of appropriations for the military, he had in mind that certain limitations do exist in this field which apply to both the Congress and the Executive.

As a result of those limitations the President and Congress, in effect, would have to work as a team in using the Armed Forces of the Nation. Such cooperation overcomes any inherent danger of any one man, connected with the military, as the President is by reason of his status as Commander in Chief, obtaining from the people large appropriations in order that he might use the military in the future in any way he saw fit.

By placing these provisions in the Constitution, the framers were reminding the President and the Congress of their accountability to the people of America in whom the sovereign power actually resides. Neither the President nor Congress has the right to take from the people the powers bestowed upon them in recognition of certain inalienable rights. When both the Congress and the President recognize those rights as the keystone of our liberties in America, there will be no trouble between Congress and the President. We will do the things that are morally right for the people of America and we will take the advice of the people in connection with what the people think is actually morally right.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I rather think that if we could bring out of the archives of the past, spokesmen from the days of the writing of the Constitution they would be amazed and appalled to find this country, in this hazardous time, concentrating on a debate as to whether the President or Congress alone is to have the control of the armies of the United States. I think, by the very manner in which the framers of the Constitution approached the problem, they expected Congress and the President to work, in the words of the junior Senator from Michigan, as a team. Certainly I see no basis for the White House and the State Department calling upon the Nation for unity and upon Congress for cooperation, in one breath, if, in the next breath, the President at a press conference says, "We propose to defy Congress. We have the power to send troops anywhere we want to, and at any time, and we are going to exercise that power. If Congress tries to exercise any power to the contrary I will carry the issue to the country."

I think that would be an amazing spectacle to the men who wrote the Constitution.

If the President proposes to adhere to that viewpoint, we can continue such a debate throughout the session of the Congress. We in Congress have certain inalienable rights, and we would be derelict in our responsibility to the people who sent us here unless we maintain control over the purse strings and unless we maintain the right to declare war, and the right we possess in connection with the recruiting and supplying of troops.

So I suggest an easy answer to the predicament in which we find ourselves. I propose that President Truman, between now and the time we intend to vote upon this issue next week, proclaim to the country that the constitutional debate is over, that he, as the President, is not going to involve the United States and its troops in foreign actions abroad without conferring with Congress and securing its prior consent; that before making commitment to send American troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact or to patrol the boundaries of Europe he will seek and secure approval by Congress.

Then there would be no cause for this constitutional debate, Mr. President. Then we can move forward as a team. Then we can move forward, each trusting the other.

If, on the other hand, by the verdict to be recorded in the Senate next week the President's side wins—suppose that by cracking the whiplash over the backs of Democratic Members he should have enough votes to send the Wherry measure to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it will be as dead as Banquo—is that going to satisfy the country? Is that going to satisfy those of us who vote in opposition? Is that going to allay any fear or dissipate any suspicion? Or will it be simply a red warning sign to the country that here is a man who is determined to rule by Executive fiat, that here is a man who wants to defy Congress, who was able to pigeonhole the resolution so that we cannot move forward, and so he can send the boys now being recruited any place, anywhere, at any time, by Executive fiat, and with a royal wave of his hand? Is that going to give us national unity? I think not, Mr. President.

Suppose, on the other hand, those of us who support the resolution win; suppose we are able to influence enough supporters from the other side and among reluctant associates on our side, to win by a narrow margin. What does that accomplish? Where does that leave us in the public viewpoint? We have the satisfaction, I suppose, of defeating the President in a proposal which he should never have made. We have cautioned him that the Congress is still on the job, and even more on the job than it was 2 years ago at this time. But I think that is not a very happy answer, either, because we do not know whether he is going to follow that resolution. Suppose he should ignore it? Then what would happen?

Does anyone think the Congress of the United States is going to impeach the President while Congress is comprised of a majority of his own party members? If we should, would that strengthen us in the eyes of foreign nations? I think not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that I think the President will be duty bound to maintain his own constitutional powers and that he would not, and I think he should not, make any kind of a statement that would perpetually limit his own constitutional powers. But he certainly could say that so far as implementation of the North Atlantic Pact is concerned, in connection with which we were told, in debate, that there would be congressional control over the subject, he could certainly go so far as to say that, as a matter of policy if not of constitutional law, he would not move without the instructions of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. That is the point at issue today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I voted for the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. MUNDT. So did I.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I never would have dreamed of voting for it had we not received assurance that Congress would retain control over the size and general use of the forces.

Mr. MUNDT. We sought and received clear-cut assurances then that we would be consulted now.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we should be careful not to press the President to where he can rightfully take the position that "I, as the trustee of Presidential powers, have no right to yield my own powers, and you should not ask me to do so, while at the same time asking that I respect your constitutional powers." But if we limit it to the North Atlantic Pact we are on sound ground, and he should be the first to recognize it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. If he initiates that kind of move toward national harmony and unity and the restoration of public confidence, it is much better than being compelled to do it by some kind of congressional resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the Senator has made a very valuable contribution to the debate.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I conclude with the statement that under present conditions the only court of competent jurisdiction for rendering a satisfactory and enduring verdict as to whether or not the President's position with regard to troops and their movement is correct, or whether the congressional position is correct, is the court of public opinion. That court does not convene until November 1952. In the meantime we have conditions to meet and we have problems to solve. We should be debating in all sincerity the formulation and proclamation of a foreign policy which our fellow citizens and our friends abroad can understand. Certainly we have no such policy as of today. We have no such proclamation. I venture to say that no Senator could stand on the floor of the Senate and explain in a 1-minute speech or in a 10-hour speech what our American foreign policy is toward Asia. We do not have any policy toward over half the people in the world. We have a day-to-day, catch-as-catch-can series of frightened and frightening reactions to something that the Russians are saying or that the Russians are doing. What the world needs and what America needs is a clear American foreign policy, brought about by a meeting of minds in honest debate, which foreign policy, when it is proclaimed, will be as easily understood as the Monroe Doctrine was understood in its day. It should be as clear, precise, cogent, positive, and courageous. We should have such a foreign policy, instead of continually and perpetually being bound by the kind of policy we have today, which is little more than a series

of belated reactions to something which the Kremlin initiates, what Pravda or Izvestia says, or what the Communist conspirators and transgressors do or say.

Certainly somewhere in the world there is an American position. We ought to be able to arrive at an American foreign policy. As Americans we have responsibilities. We have a responsibility in this world as Americans, as members of a global community, and as believers in freedom, which we should be willing to develop, and to the development of which we should be willing to devote our time and talents, free from the controversy of whether the President of the United States can get by with defying Congress, or whether Congress, on the other hand, can get by with defying the President through its hold on the purse strings.

If the President will speak out and remove the problem from present consideration by making a plain and definite declaration that he will not move into this Atlantic community with any proposal with respect to American troops without consultation with Congress in advance, and without first securing approval of Congress for his actions, we can devote ourselves to these tremendous and urgent problems of writing, preparing, developing, and supporting a foreign policy which the world, the people at home, and the boys fighting in Korea can understand.

Then we can start talking about how to raise an army, at what age boys shall be called up for service, under what methods they are to be called up, how to train them, where to send them, and how to equip them. Then we can start talking about the problem of financing our effort, how to get the money, and how to raise the taxes. Then we can start talking about the immediately important problems of how to mobilize our economy, and how to get ready. That is what we should be doing, instead of constantly acting as though the President were waging war on Congress, or Congress waging war on the President. It is a situation for which the President must assume full responsibility, having told the country, "I will defy the Congress, if need be, and send troops to any place at any time I choose." Having declared this forensic war, he is the man to call it off. We would then be able to settle down to a consideration of much more urgent business if the President were to make the declaration I suggest. Then the public would have confidence that we are moving forward as a team, and that we are moving forward as a government of coordinate branches, instead of competitive branches. Were we to do so, certainly we would present a stronger front to the enemies of freedom, regardless of what foreign policy we eventually decided upon.

PRECEPTS OF OTHER DAYS AS A GUIDE FOR ACTION—LETTER FROM JAMES T. WYATT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, under date of December 13, 1950, I received a letter from Mr. James T. Wyatt, who is associated with radio station KOIN in Portland, Oreg. Because the letter is clear in its statements, because it is cogent, because it is analytical, because it is objective, because it is exactly in line with the remarks just made by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and because it brings back to our minds the necessity of reverting to history and to the precepts of others in days gone by, I desire to read the letter into the Record at this time:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
December 13, 1950.

The Honorable GUY CORDON,
Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: It is frequently stated that our Senators and Representatives in Congress welcome individual views of the citizenry. With this in mind, I take the liberty of writing you about the serious dilemma facing our Nation.

The first half of this twentieth century presents a strange contrast. It witnessed great attainments by the United States in material well-being and also in that spiritual stature which overcomes racial hatreds, and gives succor to the oppressed and respect to the minority.

But on a global scale, the half century has been one of the most violent and destructive in the history of man. Our Nation became engulfed in two world wars, and on both occasions emerged victorious but lacked the statecraft to win the peace.

We are now being drawn into another vortex of global violence. Our competent generals have in recent weeks been assigned well-nigh impossible tasks; and our gallant troops have ridden into the Valley of Death, as did the Light Brigade at Balaklava, because "someone has blundered".

There is talk of bipartisan policy or the lack of it. Let me pose a simile. A ship is steered by its captain, upon whose competency rests the fate of passengers and crew. But the captain does not guess at the stars nor make emotional judgments on navigation. He must operate on proven principles.

In our American captaincy on foreign seas there are two outstanding and historic principles of navigation in United States statecraft. These were set down and proven by George Washington and Theodore Roosevelt. Sound and solid today as when originated, they are:

1. Avoid foreign entanglements.
2. Speak softly and carry a big stick.

There is plenty of latitude in these precepts to cover the changes of time and history and to meet new responsibilities. Washington's precept does not adjure against foreign dealings or interests, but against entanglement. Theodore Roosevelt believed in a strong voice in international affairs, but he adjured against a loud mouth and too little power.

These precepts remain the wise formula upon which our Nation achieved its sound position in the world.

As a citizen of Oregon, I urge you to do your utmost to reestablish these proven principles as a guide to our bewildered statecraft, to the end that America may again earn the admiration of the world.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES T. WYATT.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of infinite love and mercy, who art always seeking to guide and direct us into the nobler ways of life, help us to interpret all Thy righteous commands and judgments as gracious invitations to follow the paths which Thou hast marked out for us.

Grant that we may see more clearly that Thou art not commanding or expecting our finite minds to comprehend fully Thy divine will and Thy dealings with us, but that Thou art calling us to trust and obey Thee faithfully.

We pray that Thou wilt help us to understand that the measure of our faith and obedience is the measure of our wisdom and strength and peace.

Inspire us daily with a larger faith and a deepening assurance that there is no crisis which we cannot face, and no hardship which we cannot endure when our minds and hearts are stayed on Thee and when we place our hands in Thine.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1951, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CHAPTER 26 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to have all this legislation coming up by unanimous consent, particularly when there has been no opportunity to consider these measures. Therefore, it not having been brought to my attention that unanimous consent would be asked today to bring up this bill, I shall be obliged to object, until that rule has been complied with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This bill has the support of all the departments concerned. It has the unanimous approval of our committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know, but we have not had an opportunity to examine it. I feel that it is my duty to the Members of the House at

least to have examined it personally before any legislation comes up. We are liable to put a lot of legislation through otherwise that might be objected to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I can understand the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to have the gentleman withdraw his request until I have had an opportunity to examine the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is all right to withdraw it, but this bill is identical with one that passed the House in the last Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not care whether or not it was passed, I do not know that, and I feel that in justice to the Members on this side of the House I ought to be fully informed about it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws the request.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation to serve on the Public Works Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

EARL CHUDOFF,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1001, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is now before you for consideration embraces the immediate program of the Navy for the construction and conversion of naval vessels.

At the outset I want to emphasize one point. Under normal conditions this program, which involves the expenditure of approximately $2,000,000,000, would not be requested in its entirety, but would be phased over a number of years into the future, at least through 1954. However, the critical state of world affairs demands that we accelerate the Navy preparedness program in the same manner that we have already accelerated corresponding programs for the Army and the Air Force. As a result, the Navy preparedness programs for the next 3 years have been telescoped in the interest of national security. I also want to emphasize that the acceleration of this program is not a unilateral idea on the part of the Navy. It has the full concurrence of the entire Military Establisment and the President.

We must recognize the fact that there are categories of ships in which the Navy suffers from numerical deficiencies—it has too few for its needs. Some of the antisubmarine warfare types and some of the mine-sweeping types are examples of deficiency.

There are other categories in which the Navy suffers from obsolescence. Improvements in Navy weapons or enhanced capabilities of a prospective enemy require the construction of new ships. The Navy proposes to do all it can to meet its needs in these categories by converting ships already in being. Conversions, however, valuable as they are, cannot entirely meet that need. The Navy has greatly strengthened its war potential by conversions of conventional submarines to snorkel submarines and by placing modern antisubmarine weapons in existing destroyer types. Conversion of *Essex*-type carriers has helped, will continue to help, and must be continued, but the time has come to construct a new carrier—a successor to, and an improvement upon, the *Essex* and *Midway* types. This bill would authorize the construction of such a ship.

Generally speaking, this program is divided into two phases: First, new construction, which emphasizes antisubmarine vessels and mine sweepers; and, second, conversion of existing vessels, which emphasizes carriers and antisubmarine vessels.

New construction, the first phase of the program, consists of 500,000 tons of naval vessels. This would permit the construction of 173 new vessels as follows: 1 aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons, 22 mine sweepers, 30 mine-sweeper boats, 7 submarines, 2 ocean escorts, 12 fleet tankers, 2 rocket ships, 1 ice breaker, 66 landing ships, 30 smaller vessels of various types.

These vessels, with the exception of the aircraft carrier, can be completed in a period of 2 years. The completion of the aircraft carrier will require 3½ years.

For security reasons the characteristics, capabilities, and improvements which will be embodied in these new vessels are omitted.

The second phase of this program consists of the conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing naval vessels. This would permit the conversion of 291 existing vessels as follows: Six *Essex*-type carriers to accommodate improved jet aircraft, 12 cruisers, 2 guided missile cruisers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, 34 smaller vessels of various types.

As in the case of new construction, the characteristics, capabilities, and types of improvements in these converted vessels are omitted for security reasons.

It should be noted that the new construction program, in addition to providing for the construction of a carrier, places emphasis upon mine sweeping craft and upon amphibious and landing ships; while the conversion program emphasizes the carrier and antisubmarine ships.

The carrier force continues to be the backbone of naval offensive power. The Navy has long been conscious of the submarine menace, but the mine threat is one that has been brought closely home as recently as the Korean campaign. And, in like manner, Korea has demonstrated the great desirability of proficiency in amphibious operations. Naval shore bombardment from surface ships has also proved its continued usefulness in recent months and days. We are fortunate, however, in having a reserve of battleships and cruisers and thus nothing is proposed in this field, at present, beyond modernizing the antiaircraft batteries of some of our cruisers.

In view of past controversies over the construction of a larger aircraft carrier, I want to briefly review the background of events which has led to the favorable decision to construct such a carrier.

During the late phases of the past war, carrier task force commanders reported an ever increasing need for larger, heavier, carrier-based aircraft to accomplish war missions. To accommodate these larger aircraft, they strongly recommended construction of an aircraft carrier larger than either the 27,000-ton *Essex* class or the 45,000-ton *Midway* class. The late Admiral Mark Mitscher, commander of the famed Task Force 58, instituted the original studies which resulted in the Navy recommendation for the construction of a 65,000-ton flush-deck aircraft carrier. Planning was undertaken in January 1946. By October 1947 plans had become sufficiently firm to justify a budget request for the construction of this carrier. Such a request was accordingly submitted in the Navy budget for 1949. That request was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense—the late James Forrestal—the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and by the President, and funds to undertake construction of the carrier were contained in the appropriation act of 1949.

The contract for the construction of the 65,000-ton carrier *United States* was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. on April 10, 1948. The keel was laid at Newport News on April 18, 1949. Construction of the carrier was canceled by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson on April 23, 1949. At the time of cancellation, the estimated cost of constructing the carrier was $189,000,000. The termination settlement agreement between the Government and the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. was concluded on December 21, 1950, at a cost to the Government of $2,718,672.

On three specific occasions the House of Representatives approved the construction of the aircraft carrier *United States*. The enactment of H. R. 6049, Eightieth Congress, was an implied authorization since it suspended work on

13 vessels in order to make the funds available for the carrier. Appropriation of the first increment of funds in the fiscal 1949 budget constituted the second approval. Appropriation of the second increment of funds was included in the fiscal 1950 Appropriation Act, which was passed by the House prior to the cancellation of the carrier.

The carrier which is proposed in H. R. 1001 is a further development of the *Midway* class. It will be of approximately 57,000 standard displacement tons and of flush deck design. Therefore, it is approximately 12,000 tons larger than the *Midway* class and approximately 10,000 tons smaller than the U. S. S. *United States*, which was canceled. It is intended as a base from which modern carrier aircraft may be operated, and it will accommodate bombers which are capable of waging atomic warfare. It is not a revolutionary weapon, but is an improved conventional carrier into which the lessons of World War II and thereafter will be built.

The ship will have increased catapult and arresting capacity, larger elevators, and higher hangar decks overhead in order to accommodate larger and faster planes. There will be added armor protection and improved underwater protection. Fire-fighting and electronic capabilities will be improved. The construction of this ship will not render the *Midway*-type or the modernized *Essex*-type of carriers obsolete. Its construction will place the Navy in a position of having at least a prototype for the test and operation of new carrier planes, the development of which may now reasonably be foreseen. The cost, under current dollar values, is estimated to be $235,000,000, approximately $45,000,000 more than the carrier *United States*. The principal reason for the increase in cost lies in the inflation which has occurred in the past 2 years.

In giving this statement on the background of the construction of a larger aircraft carrier, I hope that I have not renewed any of the antagonism which has heretofore existed because of this matter. There is no longer cause for controversy, since the construction of the proposed carrier now has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. So let us leave that controversy behind as we go forward in our preparations for national defense.

Now I want to call the committee's attention to section 4 of the bill. This section has not been previously submitted to any agency of the executive branch for approval. However, it represents the unanimous conviction of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services. You will note that it provides that no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy register, or any interest of the United States in any such vessel, shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of unless hereafter authorized by the Congress.

This action by the House Committee on Armed Services came about as the result of information which we received in local newspapers that a number of United States naval vessels were being sold to certain friendly countries in South America. We learned that the principal disposals consisted of two cruisers to Argentina, two cruisers to Brazil, and two cruisers to Chile. Further investigation revealed that these disposals were being made under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

Section 408 (e) of that act, as amended, provides that the President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of, equipment, materials, or services to certain classes of friendly nations. The section further provides the manner in which the consideration for such transfer was to be determined. I do not deem the money consideration to be a very important factor. However, since the words "equipment, materials, or services," as used in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, have been interpreted to include ships in the active fleet of the Navy, I deem it of the highest importance that we should take some immediate clarifying action. I do not know whether any Members of the House realized that our Government could dispose of almost anything it wished to, except merchant vessels, under the terms of that act. Neither the committee hearings nor the committee report clarify this point, as to ships, and I want to frankly admit that I did not have the slightest idea that combatant ships of the active fleet of the Navy could be disposed of under the terms of the act. During the entire period that I have been concerned with the affairs of the Navy, I have always insisted that all authorizations for naval ship construction contain a prohibition against the disposal of any such ship unless specifically authorized by the Congress. Those prohibitions which were written into previous ship authorization bills were nullified by the wording of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. So the net effect of section 4 of the proposed legislation is to restore to the Congress the same rights which it has heretofore enjoyed in the disposal of combatant ships of the Navy.

I want to say that the intent of the House Committee on Armed Services, as expressed in section 4 of the proposed legislation, is not intended to cast the slightest reflection on anyone, either in or out of the Congress. Transfers which have already been effected under the act have all been made to friendly countries, and I am certain that they were made in the best of faith by all parties concerned. I do insist, however, that it is far more appropriate to have such matters considered by the Congress in the normal legislative manner when all of the facts are subjected to the light of public scrutiny. It is entirely possible that additional transfers may be made, but I am confident that all of you join me in the feeling that it is better to do it in a manner which experience has proved to be sound.

The total cost of the program contained in the proposed legislation is approximately $2,000,000,000, based upon current dollar value. The first increment of funds for this program will be contained in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act. That is the best evidence that time is of the essence in this program.

With the exception of section 4, which I have just explained, the program has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President—and is unanimously approved by the House Committee on Armed Services. I trust that this series of favorable actions will remove any doubts which may have existed in the minds of any members of this committee, and that you will forthwith approve this legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I notice section 4 of the proposed legislation provides that no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy register or any interest of the United States in any such vessel shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of, unless authorized hereafter by the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. I thought that I would first deal with the other sections and then take up section 4.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to any Member for any question in regard to the construction program at this point. I feel that if the subject is developed in this way, it will enable us more intelligently to understand everything in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman advise the House and the country whether any effort has been made to obtain the return of some 500 vessels which I understand we loaned to Russia during World War II?

Has the Government asked Russia for the return of those vessels?

Mr. VINSON. I will say that all I know about it is what I have read in the newspapers. I do not know whether a formal request in diplomatic manner has been made by Russia to return any of the vessels that were given to her under lend-lease during the last war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman is going to touch on the whole subject later in his remarks.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman explain why it is that we justify an aircraft carrier at this time, in view of the controversy which preceded this authorization——

Mr. VINSON. All of you recall that some time in the fiscal 1949 the Appropriations Act made money available to commence the construction of a large airplane carrier which was to be of 65,000 tons. This carrier will be of 57,000 tons. That carrier was approved

by the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal. The House again made money available in the fiscal 1950 Appropriation Act. Then on April 23, 1949, Mr. Johnson canceled the contract after the keel had been laid. When that contract was canceled, the Government had to pay the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. $2,718,632 for the work that had been done up to the cancellation of the contract.

A controversy arose between the Department of the Air and of the Navy as to the carrier. The Armed Services Committee held long hearings in 1949, and the Armed Services Committee unanimously concluded that each military department should be permitted, authorized, and justified to determine what kind of weapons it needed to carry out its military missions. So after that conclusion on the part of the Armed Services Committee, a restudy was made of the advisability of building an airplane carrier larger than what is known as the *Midway* or *Essex* class. Modern naval aviation has so developed that it has need for a larger deck from which to fly. Now, if the committee will visualize, an airplane carrier is nothing more than a mobile, floating landing field. That is all it is. With the development of jet aviation, it became necessary to strengthen the decks of various airplane carriers. So we are already on a program to do that, enabling carriers to carry larger airplanes which have a greater flight radius.

This, therefore, caused the Department to conclude, and rightly so, that to carry on the steady progress of advancement in the art of aircraft you must have a larger deck from which to fly. So, therefore, they have recommended that we expand the airplane carrier into a larger class than that of the *Midway* type. That is what this bill does. It does not conflict in the slightest degree with the roles and missions of the Air Force. It may be possible, and in all probability will be possible, that the airplanes that fly off of the *Midway* and fly off of the *Essex* type, and fly off of this type of carrier will carry planes which can deliver the atomic bomb. Now, that is not an encroachment on the function of the Air Department. It is simply an addition to and an augmenting of the striking force of the Air Force.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think I am in full agreement with the gentleman, as most Members are, that we do need such a supercarrier.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And as the gentleman recalls on the occasion last week when he submitted his consent request to bring this bill up I reminded him of the fact that we had appropriated in the past for one of these carriers and then that the will of the Congress had been thwarted and the carrier's construction had been canceled. I want to ask the gentleman this morning if there is any provision in this bill which would prevent the President or some new Secretary of National Defense whom he may decide to appoint in the future from deciding in his inordinate and great wisdom that the Congress did not know what they were doing and cancel the construction again after the ship is half built at the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. VINSON. There is nothing in this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think we should strengthen the bill by writing such a provision in it?

Mr. VINSON. No. I may say in this connection that I feel confident this ship will be built, for this reason: There is no controversy between the Navy and the Department of Air about it; it is approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; it is recommended by the Secretary of National Defense, and approved by the President. All we are saying in this bill is that the President is authorized to do these things.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman is absolutely convinced that the President will not change his mind?

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied now that the ships referred to in this bill are going to be built, and we are asking for money in the third supplementary to commence them. We are going to get them under construction right away. Of course, the cancellation of the carrier cost about three million dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was not $20,000,000?

Mr. VINSON. No; the gentleman is in error; it was $2,718,000. The settlement was made with the Newport News Co. and closed out on the 21st of December 1950.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the information that the committee gave me was incorrect?

Mr. VINSON. The correct amount is $2,718,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman to yield just at this point for one further statement?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The House has great confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Georgia; we have followed his leadership on military and naval matters for a great many years. Can he assure the House that he personally will follow up on this matter and make sure that they do not decide to change their minds?

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied that when we have a roll call here on this bill and when this bill, which involves an expenditure of some $2,000,000,000, is passed, there will be no hesitancy on the part of the Executive to carry out the wishes of the Congress as reflected in this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman's committee will do its usual good job of checking

Mr. VINSON. We will do our best.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I hear the gentleman correctly when I understood that he said that in 1949 it was decided that each department of the armed services would determine its own kind of weapons?

Mr. VINSON. That was the report of the Armed Services Committee growing out of the fact that we had a controversy between the Department of Air and the Department of the Navy. The Armed Services Committee unanimously reported, and rightly so, that each service should have the right to determine the type and character and the characteristics of the weapons it must use to meet its mission; that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to leave it that way, that each service is the master of its own decision as to what type of weapon they shall have? What about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if they should be in disagreement?

Mr. VINSON. I believe my statement is absolutely correct; at least, that is the way I want to leave it. But in my opinion the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be trespassing upon dangerous ground if when the Navy said they needed a certain type of submarine they said they could not have that type because the Joint Chiefs knew best. I think the Navy knows best the type of ship it needs; I think the Department of Air knows best what kind of planes it needs for strategic bombing; I think the Army knows best what kind of weapons it needs to use with its ground forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman leaves it that way, that each department determines its own weapons without regard to consultation or the views of the others?

Mr. VINSON. It may consult with them, but a wise Joint Chiefs of Staff would not override their decision. Each service must develop its own weapon. Then the Joint Weapons Systems Evaluation Board determines the capabilities by those weapons.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with that, but that is different from the gentleman's original statement. I am very much concerned if each department determines absolutely its own weapons.

Mr. VINSON. Each department must determine what kind of uniform it will have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, now, that is a different proposition.

Mr. VINSON. Each department must determine this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree they should have original jurisdiction, but I am concerned with this absolutism.

Mr. VINSON. That was the conclusion of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Armed Services Committee does not leave it up to themselves. You disagree with the services, and you should.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; but we give weight to what the services say.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is different. It is entirely different giving weight than to have the right of absolute decision.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I must proceed because there are some other matters here I wish to deal with.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. At the outset of the gentleman's remarks he said the program would cost an estimated $1,000,000,000.

Mr. VINSON. The construction program will cost a billion dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Is it one or two?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Was there pointed out before the committee the issue of very large aircraft for strategic bombing as a mission versus the Navy undertaking this same mission?

Mr. VINSON. There is no duplication, as far as I know, of the types of airplanes that are going to be used on carriers, and those of the Air Force that are used for strategic bombing.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman would then modify his answer by saying that the mission is to be determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. VINSON. The second phase of this bill deals with conversion. We propose to convert some 291 ships into various modifications. We are already converting certain airplane carriers. We propose to convert 6 of them; we propose to convert 12 cruisers, 2 guided missile cruisers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, and 44 smaller vessels of various types. That conversion program involves ships that are taken out of mothballs, ships that are already in the fleet. They are making certain conversions. I cannot discuss the type of these conversions because that, in a great many instances, is secret. It will cost in the neighborhood of a billion dollars to convert these 291 ships.

Mr. Chairman, the next phase of the bill is a very important one. We wrote in this bill that no ships could be transferred without the permission of the Congress. I want to invite everyone's attention to this because I know every Member of Congress is deeply concerned about it.

That came about in this way: We read in the newspapers where two cruisers were going to be given to Argentina or sold to Argentina, two cruisers to Brazil, two cruisers to Chile, and then on January 15, two destroyers were transferred to Italy. We knew in times past that the old Naval Affairs Committee had written into every ship-construction bill a proviso that nothing built under that bill could be given away, transferred, or put under other flags except by direct permission of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. What I am concerned about is how anyone can give property of the United States away?

Mr. VINSON. I am going to tell the gentleman right now.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree that the legislation should make sure they do not.

Mr. VINSON. I will tell the gentleman right now that this whole House sat here and permitted it to be done. Few, if any of us, knew anything about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, who slipped that over on the House?

Mr. VINSON. Well, listen to this: Let me read it so that the record will be straight. Section 408 of this act as amended provides:

Section 408 (e) (1): The President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of equipment, matériels—

Now, that was part of a section that was put in the bill that came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, as amended on July 25. That section authorized the President to transfer combatant vessels and many other things. I was dumfounded when I found out what was going on, and I said, "Why, you cannot do it." I said, "Where is your authority?" I said, "Mr. COLE and I for 20 years have been putting provisions like this in Navy ship authorization bills, and those ships cannot be transferred unless Congress says so." "Well," he said, "you are not familiar with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act." We then read the act, and we found that it gave the President the authority to transfer combatant ships of the Navy, but excluded commercial vessels. So, the sum and substance was that you cannot give away or you cannot sell any of these ships of the Maritime Commission; but, lo and behold, you can sell airplane carriers, battleships, cruisers, and all. So we wrote a provision in the bill that you could not do it until you got permission from the Congress. Now we have corrected it. It was all right, probably, for them to have done it, but let Congress do it instead of the departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman on correcting this error, and I hope that he will be vigilant in the future to see that no one can give the Navy away.

Mr. VINSON. We will watch them, if you gentlemen will just back us up. In that connection, the other day when we had up the billion dollar construction bill we wrote a provision in there that all the real property that was acquired under that bill or any previous act for the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force could not be sold without permission of Congress. But, lo and behold, I saw in the RECORD this morning that the President has sent up a special message requesting the repeal of that provision. Of course, I hate to differ with the Commander in Chief, the Executive, but I think that when the Government acquires these military stations, or when the Government acquires these ships, Congress, speaking for the American people, are the ones to dispose of them, and not the Executive.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman that he is entirely correct in the position he has taken. I want to ask him this question. Does his action in this bill, or the action of his committee in this bill correct the situation so that they cannot sell ships already built under the law; bills brought out by the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. Well, they have already made some transfers which are beyond recall. But if we are to make any more, let the executive department come here with a request as it did for Greece, and we will have a hearing and let the Congress determine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Commercial ships can be transferred under the law.

Mr. VINSON. If you pass this bill, the Committee on Armed Services will get back in the saddle again.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I inquire of the gentleman whether or not he will instruct the counsel of the Committee on Armed Services to carefully check and read all bills that come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the future to be sure that none of us are caught in the future?

Mr. VINSON. I trust the gentleman from Ohio and all of us will be at least cautious and try to know what is in all of these bills, but it is impossible to do so. I am not criticizing them. It is probably all right. But we did not know it until 6 months later.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I know the gentleman wants to be fair with all the Members of the House, and with that in mind I want to remind him during the debate on the mutual assistance bill some of us pointed out that under the provisions of the mutual assistance bill the Government could give away anything belonging to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps. Some of us voted against the bill, and were criticized for it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the Congress today must consider in this legislation providing for construction of naval vessels the authorization of an airplane carrier.

I have no doubt in my mind as to the necessity for the carrier. Hearings before our committee have validated the necessity. It is ridiculous, however, to consider that a vessel of this type was authorized by the Eightieth Congress and the money appropriated for construction. A large carrier was then contemplated and the cost to the Government was much less. The order by the Department of Defense scuttling the carrier is an instance of the false economy often practiced by the military authorities. We now find that the carrier authorized in this bill is 8,000 tons less in weight yet costing forty-five millions more than the other. The cancellation order alone cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of two millions. These amounts may be "small potatoes" to the present administration—but to individual citizens the sum is a considerable one.

Beyond the money consideration, we have the grave question as to time lost in preparing for proper defense. It may well be that the carrier authorized in this bill will not be constructed for use in the present emergency. Had the work

gone ahead on the previous carrier as envisioned by the Republican Congress of 1947–48 the Navy would be better prepared to play its role in the preparedness program.

I well remember the administration ousting of Admiral Denfeld for his insistence upon going ahead with the proper naval program despite political expediency. This legislation is a vindication of the views he expressed at that time.

I shall support this authorization, but feel impelled to make known the background of fumbling and inconsistency on the part of the executive department. Day after day it becomes more evident that the Republican Congress elected in 1946 was of great service to our people.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only a few words with respect to the pending bill.

This bill authorizes the construction of 500,000 tons of naval vessels and the conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels. The approximate cost of the program as proposed by the bill will be $2,000,000,000.

This is part of our national defense program. It is one of the many steps to be taken to meet the existing threat to our national security. Your Committee on Armed Services is determind that we have a strong, efficient, well-balanced defense establishment, that we be strong on land, in the air, and on the seas. In striving to attain this objective at the earliest possible date, for time is of the essence, those of us who serve on the Committee on Armed Services have not, and will not, permit any partisan or political considerations to influence our decisions.

The bill we have before us today was reported to you unanimously. I hope that it will pass this House unanimously.

During this session we will be called upon to consider many more bills pertaining to our national defense. No one expects that there will be unanimous agreement, in committee or in the House as a whole, on each and every one of them. Each of us may have his opinion as to what should or should not be done for building up the proper kind of a defense. The mere fact that some one of us may not agree with what is recommended, whether by the administration or by our committee, and has the courage to express his disagreement as he should, does not mean that he is against our achieving a strong national defense.

It must be understood that there can be honest differences of opinion on defense measures. Unity of purpose does not require that we refrain from expressing these differences.

I have taken the time to stress this fact because too many people, some occupying high places of leadership, promptly question the motives of anyone who may disagree. One who may honestly disagree is invariably accused of playing politics or partisanship if he should be of a different political party affiliation. There is altogether too much of this questioning of motives and name-calling.

We have had our differences in the Armed Services Committee. But I am pleased to say that not once have the motives, the good faith, or honest purpose of a single member of the committee ever been questioned. I hope that in this same spirit each and every defense bill that comes before us will be debated on the floor of the House.

The point which I believe should be emphasized in connection with the pending bill is that by this program we seek to build up the naval offensive power. You will note that the bill authorizes the construction of a new aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons. It will take about 3½ years to build this carrier.

Prior to the Korean conflict we had the tragic experience of having construction stopped on a supercarrier which the Congress authorized and for which we appropriated funds. We also had the tragic experience of seeing our naval air arm drastically reduced. What was once the greatest naval power in the world was practically scuttled. The Marine Corps in June of last year, when we entered the Korean War, had been whittled down to only 74,000 men, as compared to 472,000 in September of 1945.

In other words, the administration had virtually destroyed the offensive power of our Navy. Our Committee on Armed Services has been endeavoring to correct this tragic mistake. We now realize how much damage the faulty policies followed by our national leaders has done to our state of preparedness. And we are indeed paying a dear price for these inexcusable errors.

You will also recall that in the Eightieth Congress we initiated a program for a 70-group Air Force. We appropriated funds to carry out the program, but the money we appropriated was impounded.

The point I wish to emphasize is that our present state of unpreparedness is not the fault of our Committee on Armed Services, nor of the Congress. It is the fault of those in charge of our national defense. They refused to carry out the wishes of the Congress.

And there is this further point I wish to emphasize: Whatever the President may conceive to be his duties and responsibilities as Commander in Chief, the primary responsibility for our national defense rests with the Congress. We are the representatives of the people. We decide the size, nature, and character of the defense we shall have. When we make that decision it is the duty of the President to see that it is carried out.

When we pass this bill to carry out a certain naval-construction program, and we appropriate funds for that purpose, it becomes the duty of the Executive to see that the will of the Congress is fulfilled. We will cooperate with the Executive for seeing that we have a strong national defense, and we have the right to expect that he will cooperate with us. That is the only possible way that unity can be attained in meeting the difficult problems now confronting us.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise to support this legislation which is designed to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, for the conversion of existing vessels, and for other purposes. One of the vessels to be constructed is a 57,000-ton carrier for the United States Navy.

I would like to use the time allotted to me to discuss the arbitrary cancellation on April 23, 1949, of the 65,000-ton carrier, the U. S. S. *United States*, by the then Secretary of Defense after the Congress of the United States had not only authorized its construction but had actually appropriated the money.

It is not my intention to revive any old controversies, but to review what took place and to point out that the will of Congress was completely ignored when the construction of the carrier was canceled.

Briefly, here is the situation.

Carrying out his responsibility and after an intensive study based on years of experience with carrier-based aviation, the Chief of Naval Operations, speaking for the Navy Department, proposed a 65,000-ton carrier. It was not a super carrier as some tagged it, but a logical development of an existing one.

The recommendation to build the U. S. S. *United States* was concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress, and by the President of the United States.

The difference in size between the proposed 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States* and the 45,000-ton *Midway*-class carrier was that the *United States* would have been 1,090 feet in length and 135 feet in width compared with the *Midway* class of 990 feet in length and 105 feet wide. In other words, the *United States* would have been 100 feet longer and 30 feet wider.

With a flush deck and little or no superstructure the 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States* would have permitted various types of planes, some equipped to carry A-weapons to fly 1,700 miles out and 1,700 miles back whereas the planes of our existing carriers had a range of around a thousand miles.

The cost of the *United States* was estimated at $189,000,000, and at the time of its cancellation the keel had actually been laid and the ship was under construction at the Newport News shipyards, Newport News, Va. In addition, at least a half dozen special types of aircraft to operate from the *United States* were under construction in the plants of several aircraft manufacturers.

At that time the Navy Department had obligated itself in the form of intent to contractors in the amount of $150,000,000 and spent $7,500,000 in cash. The shipbuilder had contracted for between 90 and 100 thousand tons of steel, all of which had been fabricated and 3,000 tons of it had been delivered. Commitments had been made by the Newport News shipyards to contractors for boilers, auxiliaries, and so forth, in the amount of $10,000,000. Ordnance in the amount of $3,000,000 had been contracted for by the Navy Department, while several additional millions of dollars were tied up in the initial cost of new types of air-

craft. Thousands of man-hours had been expended by officers and civilians of the Navy Department, not to forget travel expenditures, and so forth.

As the result of the cancellation of the carrier, the taxpayers of this country suffered the following estimated loss:

(a) Nearly $20,000,000 in material and labor.

(b) Another $45,000,000 in construction costs when taking into consideration the higher cost of materials today needed to build the new 57,000-ton carrier which will cost about $235,000,000.

(c) Two and one-half to three years in time from the standpoint of having the carrier available for immediate use.

Laying aside for the moment the loss in money, materials, time, and labor, the American people were stunned in the spring of 1949 when they learned that the Secretary of Defense had acted without consulting the Congress, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chief of Naval Operations in canceling the carrier.

At this point I want to insert for the RECORD, the letter written by Secretary of the Navy John Sullivan to the Secretary of Defense dated April 26, 1949, together with another letter to the President on the same date tendering his resignation as Secretary of the Navy.

Time will not permit me to read these letters, but I hope that every Member of Congress will refresh his memory as to what actually took place and which resulted in the resignation of a very popular and able Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan.

APRIL 26, 1949.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Saturday, April 23, without discussion with the Chief of Naval Operations, without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, you directed the discontinuance of the construction of the U. S. S. *United States*, the construction of which had twice been approved by the President.

This carrier had been the subject of intensive study in the Navy Department since it was first proposed early in 1945 by the late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher whose combat experience had convinced him of its necessity. In a hearing with the Director of the Budget on December 16, 1947, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I volunteered to surrender $307,000,000 which was the cost to complete the approved construction of other vessels, to insure that funds would be available for the U. S. S. *United States*. Its construction was explicitly approved by the reports of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House on June 2, 1948, and June 9, 1948, respectively. In the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949 the appropriation for the first year of construction of the U. S. S. *United States* was approved by the Congress. Again on December 17, 1948, in a conference with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I abandoned construction of other vessels in the amount of $57,000,000 to insure the continuance of the carrier and other vessels. Additional funds for the continuing construction of this vessel in the fiscal year 1950 were included in the budget message which the President sent to the Congress on January 3, 1949, and were included in the National Military Establishment appropriation bill passed by the House on April 13, 1949.

Professional Navy men, charged with the task of planning for a navy adequate to the defense of America believe that the construction of the U. S. S. *United States* is so indispensable to the continuing development of American sea power that they have twice sacrificed other substantial construction because of the carrier's highest naval priority.

On Monday, April 18, while discussing a variety of subjects with you, the question of the continuance of work on the U. S. S. *United States* was raised, and my opinion was asked. I started to give my opinion, but before I had talked more than a minute you advised me that you had another appointment and would discuss this matter with me at a later date. The following day I sent you a very brief memorandum touching on only one phase of the justification of this carrier. In this memorandum I referred to my desire to resume the discussions that had been interrupted the previous day.

I heard nothing about this again until Saturday, April 23, when in Corpus Christi, Tex., I was advised by long distance telephone that you had sent me a memorandum directing the discontinuance of construction.

I am, of course, very deeply disturbed by your action which so far as I know represents the first attempt ever made in this country to prevent the development of a powerful weapon. The conviction that this will result in a renewed effort to abolish the Marine Corps and to transfer all naval and marine aviation elsewhere adds to my anxiety.

However, even of greater significance is the unprecedented action on the part of a Secretary of Defense in so drastically and arbitrarily changing and restricting the operational plans of an armed service without consultation with that service. The consequences of such a procedure are far-reaching and can be tragic.

In view of the foregoing I am sure you will agree with me that no useful purpose can now be served by my remaining as Secretary of the Navy. I have accordingly submitted my resignation to the President.

I deeply regret the circumstances that lead to my departure from the National Military Establishment at such an interesting and crucial period of its development.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

APRIL 26, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with profound regret that I submit to you my resignation as Secretary of the Navy, effective at the earliest date convenient to you.

It is almost 4 years since you called me back into Federal service. For the three appointments you have conferred upon me and, even more, for the day-to-day consideration, kindness, and friendliness you have manifested toward me, I shall always be grateful.

I send you my very best wishes for your continuing good health and the success of your administration. More deeply than words can express, I regret the circumstances that prevent me from continuing in my present post to help you in your magnificent efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

I am sure that the average person will agree that while the time and money lost in the scrapping of the carrier *United States* in a series of blunders that cannot be redeemed, there is none of us that will ignore that it was not the halting of the work on the carrier, but the basic principle, that was at stake. The principle is simply that by a stroke of the pen the Secretary of Defense ignored the wishes of Congress, who represents the American people, and thus weakened the defenses of the United States.

Since Korea events prove many of the arbitrary decisions by the Secretary of Defense similar to the cancellation of the carrier *United States* were made in defiance of the statutes of Congress and without doubt tended to weaken the defenses of this Nation.

I may add that the 57,000-ton carrier contained in the bill before us—yes; even all the ships provided for in this legislation—could be canceled by the present Secretary of Defense in the same manner as by his predecessor.

As I said in the beginning of my statement, it is not my intention to revive old controversies, but in my opinion as we approve this bill that provides for the construction of a 57,000-ton carrier, we should keep in mind the cancellation of the carrier *United States* by the arbitrary action of the Secretary of Defense in the spring of 1949. With this experience in mind, we should proceed immediately to amend the Unification Act so that the will of the Congress cannot be ignored. After all, we are the elected representatives of the people and charged with the responsibility of providing this Nation with an adequate national defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is one to enlarge the Navy, and a part of that Navy will be used in the Mediterranean. In fact, some units of our Navy are there now and have been for a number of years.

What I wish to talk to you about today during this 5 minutes is the incidental problem of trying to make some arrangement with Spain to get American bases in that area.

Last summer it was my privilege to go to Europe, under the direction of our chairman, to study the military defense assistance program. I think the program is sound, and if we do not overdraw manpower from America, it is a very good way to protect ourselves. It is much better to fight our battle for freedom on the perimeter of freedom than on the Atlantic coast, in the event another great war should befall the earth.

I went out of my way to go down to Spain to see what the obstacle was preventing cooperation between our country and Spain in the particular critical situation that we find ourselves today. I found that the main trouble at that time was that we did not have an ambassador to Spain, and therefore there was no man of sufficiently high rank to talk to Franco, the head man of Spain. I understand that we have corrected that situation. We are going to have an ambassador to that country. But here we have the same sort of objections and arbitrary conduct by a statement of the President that, irrespective of whether we have an ambassador, there will be no dealings with Spain in relation to the military defense assistance program in Europe, which we are now trying to implement.

The last Congress of the United States appropriated $62,500,000 for the purpose of aiding Spain. It was only a loan. It will be guaranteed so we will recover every dollar. Why we should turn down a chance to work with that country is more than I can understand. Everyone here knows that there is not a single piece of land in the entire world today, in the light of the modern situation and the terrible thing facing the world, that is more important to the security of the world than the Iberian Peninsula. Spain is the most strategic piece of property in the entire world today. From there, if we had bases we could fan out with our aircraft over all of industrial Europe almost to the Arctic Circle; we could fly out over the Mediterranean where we have friends around the entire basin, except Albania, and perhaps Spain—and we want to make the Spaniards our friends—we could patrol and protect North Africa, we could dominate the great Arabian oil fields in every way. For the security of ourselves and posterity we ought to find some way to work with Spain.

They are anxious to work with us. I had the pleasure of talking with what they call the grand staff of the army in Spain and I found them anxious to cooperate with America. The ranking Republican member of our committee went to Europe several years ago. He also visited Spain and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] wrote a very wonderful and convincing article showing the tremendous advantages that we could have by cooperating with this country. This article was published in the Reader's Digest. The bugbear to our cooperation with Spain seems to be that their social system and their political system are not like ours. There is not a Member of Congress who believes in their social system; there is not a Member of Congress who believes in their governmental system; but for goodness' sake, if they can help us in the distress in which we find ourselves, we ought to accept their help. The very fact of having troops in the area and the spending of American money might help their poverty. That is only an incidental matter and we would not want to do it for that purpose alone, but we should make friends and have a space to locate air, Army, and naval bases. The Pyrenees are a barricade in which a very small army in numbers could withstand the onslaught of an army 10 times as big coming from the north or from the east.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it conceivable to the gentleman that we might be able to cooperate with Tito and then refuse cooperation with Franco?

Mr. JOHNSON. I was coming to that point. We have worked with the Soviets; we have worked with Tito; Portugal, which signed the Atlantic Pact has a dictator; yet in Spain, for some reason, in the area which means most for our security and for the protection of our children, we just coldly turn our backs to those people. Every Member of Congress that I know who has visited Spain believes as I do, that we should have a working agreement with Spain. At this time we can ill afford to turn a cold shoulder to a country of 22,000,000 people who could be so helpful to us, if the military storm should break over Europe.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at long last we can rejoice that this Government is beginning to exercise a little hard common sense by sending an ambassador to Madrid.

I did write an article for the Reader's Digest about 2 years ago which also was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1949, pointing out the great advantages it would be to us from a strategic and military point of view to recognize Spain and deal with her. I think any military man will tell you whether he is in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, that from a strategic and military point of vantage there is no spot more valuable to the United States, so far as helping continental Europe is concerned, than the Iberian Peninsula. It is not only a beachhead affording us excellent airdromes, but it is also a barrier due to the fact that the Pyrenees Mountains are almost impassable. By aiding Greece and Turkey we protect the east Mediterranean and keep open Suez Canal. By helping Spain we protect the west Mediterranean and keep open the Strait of Gibraltar. One is rather useless without the other.

We must also bear in mind that there is perhaps no country on earth that is more anti-Communist than Spain, or which would contribute more to the stability of present-day Europe than that proud country. Furthermore, Spain has minerals and raw materials that we sorely need.

One does not, Mr. Chairman, have to sanction the political, social, or economic system of any country before recognizing it. In fact, we are dealing now with Soviet Russia. We recognize Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and many of the other nations back of the iron curtain. Certainly we have more in common with Spain than we have with these satellite Communist countries. When we recognize these countries we do so because they have a stable form of government and regardless of what one might think of the Franco regime you will have to admit that it has brought order and stability out of chaos. Do not overlook the fact that they have between 400,000 and 500,000 fighting men. In my honest and humble opinion Spain is the one nation in Western Europe we could depend upon and rest assured would fight in case of a global conflict.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I now want to add a few more observations or views to those I have expressed. My only reason for mentioning Spain is that my able colleague and very dear friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] a member of the Armed Services Committee, brought up the matter. It may be a bit extraneous to this particular debate on this specific bill, but it certainly is most worthy of consideration.

Because of our limited debate I have yielded most of our time to other Members who desired to speak on the legislation now under consideration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] stated a moment ago that aircraft carriers are very vulnerable. Of course, every weapon of war is vulnerable, but the truth of the matter is, not one single major aircraft carrier in World War II was sunk by submarines, aircraft, or any other weapon. Pray tell me, sir, where would we have been in World War II in our long trek from Guadalcanal, Leyte, Guam, Tinian, Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa to Tokio without our aircraft carriers?

The Pacific Ocean is a very big pond, and only those of us who have flown over it or sailed over it will appreciate the vast distances and the complex and difficult problems which that ocean offers. It was our aircraft carriers, supported by battleships, cruisers, destroyers, minesweepers and escort vessels that brought about victory to us in the Pacific war.

Recent events in Korea prove more than ever before the necessity for aircraft carriers capable of mobility and surprise attack. The function of carriers is to gain and retain complete control of the seas. It is to attack enemy shipping and to prevent the delivery of weapons, most of all oil, to supply the enemy. At the same time it is to make possible the delivery of all these supplies to our ground forces in foreign and distant lands and to supply our Air Force on land based fields. Never was a strong and versatile Navy so much needed as in modern mechanized warfare.

We all know that we must have a well balanced defense force. We cannot get along without any branch of our armed services. We must have a fighting team on land, sea, and in the air. Each branch of the service is indispensable for our own survival. Certainly, I would not minimize the necessity of having all three branches of our services built to their maximum strength.

This is no time for petty jealousies, nasty bickerings, and destructive recriminations but it is pleasing and reassuring to know that the Navy was not "sunk" and that the Marine Corps was not "liquidated" as some bitter partisans would have done as late as October 1949.

Naturally, all branches of the services should be represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff but we do not want a land-locked psychology to determine the course that we shall pursue. I would not want the Navy and the Air Force to tell the Army that it should not build a bigger and better tank than the Sherman or the improved Patton. I would not want the Navy and the Army to tell the Air Force that it could not build a bigger and better plane than the B–29, the B–36, or the B–47. Likewise, I do not want the Air Force and the Army to tell the Navy that it cannot build a bigger and better carrier than the *Midway* or *Essex* type.

Mr. Chairman, the improvement and development of all the weapons of war from the super-bomber, super-carrier, the Garand rifle, the snorkel submarine, the improved radio and radar equipment, guided missiles, rocketfire, the atom bomb, bacteriological warfare, and perhaps the hydrogen bomb under develop-

ment, must go on. It must not be forgotten that our improved aircraft in World War II on the drawing board at the time of Pearl Harbor, never actually got into combat before the close of World War II.

In this age of scientific research and technological development the weapons of war like the automobile, radio, and television become obsolete almost overnight.

For the benefit of Members, and specially the new Members, I would like to give briefly the background of the battle for the larger and more effective aircraft carrier.

During the late phases of the Pacific war, carrier task force commanders reported an ever-increasing need for larger, heavier, carrier-based aircraft to accomplish war missions. To accommodate these larger aircraft, they strongly recommended construction of an aircraft carrier larger than either the 27,000-ton *Essex* class or the 45,000-ton *Midway* class carriers.

Studies of the need for such a carrier were originally instituted in the Navy Department by the late Admiral Marc Mitscher, commander of the famed Task Force 58. Construction of a 65,000-ton flush deck aircraft carrier was approved by the Navy Department for planning purposes in January 1946.

By October 1947, detailed designs and plans became sufficiently firm to justify a budget request for the construction of this carrier. Such a request was accordingly submitted in the Navy's budget for 1949. The budget request was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and by the President, and funds to undertake construction of the carrier were contained in the Department of the Navy Appropriation Act, 1949.

The contract for the construction of the 65,000-ton carrier *United States* was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., on August 10, 1948. The keel was laid at Newport News on April 18, 1949. Construction of the carrier was cancelled by the Secretary of Defense on April 23, 1949. At the time of cancellation, the estimated cost of constructing the *United States* was $189,000,000. The termination settlement agreement between the Government and the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., was concluded on December 21, 1950, at a cost to the Government of $2,718,672.12.

In addition to congressional approval of this carrier in the Naval Appropriation Act of 1949, it had congressional authorization through the enactment of H. R. 6049, Eightieth Congress, which bill was reported by the House Committee on Armed Services and subsequently passed by both the House and the Senate. The 1950 Appropriation Act carried an additional increment of funds for the construction of this large carrier which had already been started. This constituted the third approval of this carrier by the House of Representatives. It is pertinent to note that the House Armed Services Committee in its report of March 1, 1950, on unification and strategy, took the position that—

> In the case of the modern aircraft carrier and its relation to seapower, those best qualified to pass judgment are very evidently our Nation's professional Navy leaders.

The Navy leaders, of course, were unanimous in their approval of a large carrier.

The large carrier proposed in H. R. 1001 is a further development of the *Midway* class. It will be of approximately 57,000 standard displacement tons and of flush deck design. It is intended as a base from which modern carrier aircraft may be operated. The Navy points out that it is not a revolutionary weapon, but it is an improved conventional carrier into which the lessons of World War II and thereafter will be built. The ship will have increased catapult and arresting capacity, larger elevators and higher hangar decks overhead in order to accommodate larger and faster planes. There will be added armor protection and improved underwater protection. Fire fighting and electronic capabilities will be improved. The construction of this ship will not render the *Midway* type or the modernized *Essex* type obsolete. Its construction will place the Navy in a position of having at least a prototype for the test and operation of any carrier planes, the development of which may now reasonably be foreseen. The cost, under existing conditions, is estimated to be approximately $200,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those of us on the Armed Services Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, welcome the most careful scrutiny, thorough examination, and any criticism that might be offered by any Member on this body. We do not claim to possess all wisdom and virtue and we know that other Members of this House are just as patriotic and concerned over the welfare of our Nation as are members of the Armed Services Committee.

Most assuredly I share the grave concern expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] over these vast expenditures even for our Armed Forces. Planes, carriers, submarines, and all the weapons of war are not the only phase of our national defense. Often I have said and I repeat it now: That the first line of defense of any nation is its financial solvency, a sound economy, and a productive industry. There is, of course, a limit to what an individual or a nation might do—but let me say to the gentlemen from Indiana and New York that this bill was not hastily considered and that our report is anything but scanty. This matter was considered thoroughly, after long, exhausive hearings in the Eightieth Congress which both the hearings and the report of our committee will show. It is painful to all of us to vote for a bill that calls for an expenditure of approximately $2,000,000,000 to build up our Navy, but there is no alternative.

Because of our geographical position, recent events, and the painful experience that we have gained in combat, I believe that any fair-minded, informed, and intelligent person will agree that we must at all times maintain a superior Navy. Without it the other two branches of our services will be impotent, and I trust that some men in high places in the Pentagon now realize it. None of us is infallible.

Mr. Chairman, recently on our retreat—or withdrawal—if that is a more comforting term—from the Chongjin Reservoir in North Korea, the Seventh United States Infantry Division on the east and the First United States Marine Division on the west marched from Hagaru and Koto down to Hamhung and then to Hungnam. Pray tell me, sir, where would we have been then without the United States Navy? Scores of naval craft of every description were out in that harbor and due to the support of the Third Infantry Division our fleet—because of its mighty fire power, was able to evacuate 105,000 United Nations' troops—mostly American, of course—and more than 95,000 Korean civilians. Without our Navy that would have been a mass massacre—the most devastating and ignominious defeat in all our history. We accomplished almost the impossible. Without detracting one bit from the splendid job done by our Air Force in that maneuver, I think most informed men will agree that it was the tactical support offered by carrier-based planes that saved the day—not only at Hungnam but also at Inchon.

Now, our forces evacuated from North Korea, have joined the southern forces in the Pusan area. Bitter fighting is now going on in the vicinity of Wonson, north of Pusan and southeast of Seoul.

None of us should be too critical about the reverses we have suffered, and far be it from me to assess the blame upon any particular individual or branch of our services. I would be the last person to want us to surrender. Certainly, I do not believe in capitulation, but when it comes to evacuation or annihilation, I shall choose evacuation. We can lose a battle without losing a war. This whole Korean campaign is an ill-fated one, as much as that of Gallipoli in World War I—the biggest mistake Winston Churchill ever made—and I still consider him the greatest man of our century.

Whether or not we shall remain in Korea will be largely determined by Stalin and Mao. It may be that we are driven out of Korea, but that does not spell defeat for us. We should draw a hard and fast line from Japan through Okinawa, Formosa, to the Philippines, and put forth all our strength to hold it. However, I am not the expert to make the decision.

Mr. Chairman, let us serve notice upon Russia, Red China, and the whole world that much as we might differ in the United States upon various issues, we are, after all, one people with one language and one interest. We have no desire to annex an acre of territory or to collect a dollar of indemnity. We will, as we have in the past, continue to help to the best of our ability, all those people in distress and those less fortunate than ourselves. We shall carry on in spite of

all hardships and through every diversity to fight, and if need be die, in order that a just and lasting peace might be established and that all men everywhere shall enjoy the blessings of freedom and opportunity such as we have happily enjoyed in the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it was originally my intention to offer an amendment to this bill providing that the new 57,500-ton aircraft carrier be named the U. S. S. *Forrestal;* however, there is some question about the germaneness of such an amendment to this bill. Perhaps we would be setting a bad precedent by naming naval vessels on the floor of the House. I have introduced a joint resolution providing that this new carrier be named the U. S. S. *Forrestal,* a fitting tribute, in my opinion, to a great American, a great patriot, a man who gave his life for his country.

When the resolution comes back from the Department I trust that the Armed Services Committee and the House of Representatives will join me in paying this fine tribute to former Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, present world conditions make it imperative that our Navy shall be built up to meet any emergency that presents itself. We cannot delay this important matter any longer. To do so is to take chances that may prove disastrous. Our national security should take precedence over any other Government activity. The Committee on Armed Services, under the able leadership of its chairman, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and with the full cooperation of the ranking Republican member, DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, is to be congratulated that it recognizes the necessity of providing new construction and modernization of existing ships to meet any challenge we may be called upon to face.

The bill, H R. 1001, reported by the Armed Services Committee, and now before us for consideration, provides a construction program for the remainder of fiscal 1951 and for fiscal 1952 consisting of 173 new ships and 291 conversions. Each particular ship or type of ship is important primarily insofar as it contributes to a balance within the fleet in which it is intended to serve.

The bill involves an authorization to construct 500,000 tons of new naval vessels and to convert 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels. The construction program includes, as previously stated, 173 new vessels, as follows: 1 aircraft carrier of approximately 57,000 tons; 22 mine sweepers, 30 mine sweeper boats; 7 submarines; 2 ocean escorts; 12 fleet tankers; 2 rocket ships; 1 ice breaker; 66 landing ships; and 30 smaller vessels of various types. It is estimated that it will require 3½ years to complete the proposed aircraft carrier and that the remainder of the program can be completed in a period of 2 years.

The conversion program to modernize 291 presently existing vessels includes the following: 6 *Essex*-type carriers to accommodate improved jet aircraft; 12 cruisers, 2 guided-missile carriers, 194 destroyers, 12 radar picket destroyers, 31 landing craft, and 34 smaller vessels of various types.

The program will cost approximately $2,000,000,000 and is made necessary if our fleet is to be brought up to that state of efficiency that present improved methods of warfare require.

It is also appropriate to mention and emphasize that the proposed construction and modernization program will go far in stabilizing and restoring the shipbuilding industry. As I have heretofore pointed out on many occasions, the countenance of this industry in a strong, healthy condition is absolutely necessary as an arm of our national defense. Too often, through the years, it has been permitted to develop into a "feast or famine" existence. If the industry is to remain strong and be a constant source of strength, then the working organization must be kept together. Without work the workers must necessarily find other means of employment. It is, therefore, imperative that continuity of work be provided or the industry languishes into a state of weakness and unpreparedness for any emergency that may suddenly arise. This program presented by the Armed Services Committee will go far in strengthening our Navy and reviving our shipbuilding industry that has been fast dwindling into a state of weakness due to lack of work. I trust the bill will have unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the 3,000-year-old tactics of Cyrus, of Attila, and of Genghis Khan have been employed to advantage by the Chinese Reds against the 150,000 Americans and their 25,000 United Nations allies in Korea. The Mongol horsemen have hit and run with singular efficiency against our extended lines of communication.

Horses gave the enemy forces speed and mobility where our highly mechanized troops were bogged down in snow and ice. The hardy ponies of the Chinese Reds were not halted by snow-clogged mountain passes. In fact, both weather and terrain fought with them, rather than against them.

The only military strategy which could have checkmated such strategy under such conditions would have been more and better horses and horsemen. The military axiom of that great southern battlemaster, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest still holds true, "Get there fustest with the mostest."

The United States once was the greatest cavalry nation in all history. Nebraska boys, Georgia boys, Wyoming boys, Texas boys, learned to ride almost as soon as they learned to walk. From Rough Rider "Teddy" Roosevelt back through Jeb Stuart, "Swamp Fox" Francis Marion and "Light Horse Harry" Lee there had been heroes on horseback. Then what happened? At the end of World War II, with the atom bomb in sight, our cavalry was put out of business. It joined American economy as a historical curiosity.

Let us act before it is too late. Let us be ready—not for just one set of emergencies—but for all emergencies. In the defense bill, soon to come before this House, it is our duty as Americans to provide a place—an honored place—for that organization which has so valiantly and so successfully defended the lives and liberties of generations of our countrymen, the United States Cavalry.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well to bring out in this debate that the program we are now asked to endorse is, in part at least, the same naval preparedness program ordered by the Republican Eightieth Congress, which was subsequently cut back by executive order on recommendation by Louis Johnson, when he was Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Johnson, in what has proven a very unwise economy move, cancelled out the supercarrier authorized in this bill along with many other naval projects contained herein. In a so-called economy program, which he insisted upon, Secretary Johnson cancelled out this carrier along with a congressional program of a 70-group Air Force and other defense projects which Congress voted.

For the benefit of the new Members of this Eighty-second Congress, there is nothing new in the present program. It was authorized by the Republican Eightieth Congress which, in spite of misrepresentations of the 1948 presidential campaign oratory, had voted.

This naval expansion program should have the support of every Member of the Congress. It is a program that would have been well under way to completion today if it had not been for the shortsightedness of the politically minded appointees of the Truman administration 2, 3, and 4 years ago.

Shades of Admiral Denfeld. Remember it was he who was fired as chief of naval operations because he told Congress, in the so-called B-36 hearings, that we should always maintain a great and powerful Navy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

FLOODS AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, recent floods in the great Central Valley of California have caused the people of that area to be even more concerned than ever before with the rapid completion of flood control projects.

I am sure that a knowledge of the facts will convince both Chambers of the Congress that the earliest possible completion of the presently authorized flood-control projects in that area is necessary and urgent in the light of national defense. I am sure the Members will also be inclined to give special consideration to those projects which have been long authorized, but whose delay has been the result of an attempt to grant a small portion of available

money to projects scattered all over 30 States and Alaska.

The new population going to California has relied upon the recommendations of the Army engineers and estimated early completion dates. Thousands of families have settled and invested their life savings on small farms in areas threatened with flood. It seems unbelievable to the people of California living in these areas threatened with flood that the first flood-control project to control the streams of this Nation was recommended for that area by the Corps of Army Engineers as early as 1913 and is still uncompleted.

One month after I entered upon my duties as Congressman for the Tenth District of California, in February 1949, I appeared before the Appropriations Committees of this Chamber of the Congress in support of flood control in California. They had recommended sufficient funds to complete flood control facilities on four rivers in the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley. At that time, I stated as follows:

The Tenth Congressional District of California, which I represent, embraces all of Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties, the greater portion of which counties lies within the territory to be served by the Central Valley project, and the south 125 miles of the San Joaquin Valley lies within the Tenth Congressional District.

Those three counties now have a population of about 450,000, which is almost double the population of the same area 10 years ago. The area has over 14,000 farms, consisting of approximately 1,000,000 acres of harvested cropland, with an investment in farm land and buildings of over $200,000,000. The basic economy of the area is agriculture, where over 200 different crops are produced commercially. This cropland is now irrigated in some instances by diverting water from valley streams, but in most cases by pumping water from underground supplies. The tremendous burden placed on the area during the war for increase in production of agricultural crops to feed our allies, as well as ourselves, resulted in an increased area being placed under cultivation and intense cultivation of the land already farmed. Prewar water deficiency has been aggravated by the increased cultivation, together with a tremendous population growth. The water table is falling rapidly, so that the farmers must continually deepen their wells and use heavier pumping equipment.

The above-mentioned facts in connection with the San Joaquin Valley have been known for many years, and the Central Valley project was conceived to furnish supplemental water. The people in the area had high hopes when the Friant Dam was commenced on the San Joaquin River in November of 1939 that the water supply would be supplemented within a year or two. Today, 10 years after the Friant Dam was started, the area has received no additional water from the project except for a small area in Madera County.

The water shortage in the area makes the farmers' position critical.

The present status of the project is as follows:

Friant Dam, 98 percent complete.
Madera canal, 100 percent complete.
Shasta Dam, 99 percent complete.
Friant-Kern canal, 43 percent complete.
Delta Mendota canal, 20 percent complete.
Tracy pumping plant, 12 percent complete.

The Friant-Kern canal, the Delta Mendota canal, and the Tracy pumping plant should be completed at the earliest possible date in order that our farmers may receive the real benefits of water in the Friant-Kern canal.

The Delta Mendota canal and the Tracy pumping plant must be completed before a large part of the water to be used in the Friant-Kern canal may be diverted from the San Joaquin River.

I, therefore, want to emphasize the importance of using all appropriations possible in the Central Valley project for the completion of the said Friant-Kern canal, the Delta Mendota canal, and the Tracy pumping plant, and that the total appropriation be not less than a sum sufficient to complete these canals and pumps in the fiscal year 1950. This will require $40,000,000 for the Delta Mendota canal and Tracy pumping plant, and $21,000,000 for the completion of the Friant-Kern canal. I assure you that every person in the district desires the earliest possible completion date of the water facilities in connection with the Central Valley project, so that the real benefits of that project will not be denied to farmers who so urgently need the water. I sincerely believe that the people of the area are entitled to know that appropriations in connection with the above mentioned three vital parts of the Central Valley project will not be delayed for another period of years.

It is my understanding that the engineering studies for the canals mentioned have been completed and that it is possible, if the amount of money necessary were appropriated for these two canals and pumping system, that contracts could be awarded along the whole canal to different contractors, so that the work could be carried on simultaneously over the entire length of the canals.

An additional $12,000,000 should be designated for completion of the Delta cross channel, which is required to bring the water released from Shasta Dam to pumps at Tracy. It will be necessary that that channel be completed so that Sacramento River water may be pumped into the Mendota area so that the water may be diverted from the San Joaquin River into the Friant-Kern canal. This matter should also be completed in the year 1950. It seems a bit ridiculous to those of us in the area that the Friant and Shasta Dams, which have been practically completed for over 5 years, have been giving no practical benefit to water users as evidence of Government inefficiency. The real need in the area is water and the appropriations possible this year should be confined to the completion of the above mentioned units of the project.

To accomplish the desired purpose in the year 1950, which is over 10 years after the Friant Dam was commenced, will only require a designation of $72,000,000 to be applied toward the above mentioned work.

As a result of the above completion, supplemental surface and underground water would be made available, and the use of electric power for pumping would greatly decrease, with a resultant saving of thousands of dollars to the farmers of the area. There seems to be no possible argument against the request that all possible funds be appropriated to complete the irrigation facilities.

I know that all requests for appropriations to your committee are accompanied by statements of dire need, but I want to assure you that it is literally true that unless water is available by the year 1950, much of the acreage of farmers in the area will be forced out of production because of depleted underground water supply and recurring additional expense in deepening wells and installation of costly heavy pumping equipment. These farmers have been compelled to do progressively more expensive pumping during the 10 years that they have waited for the completion of the project. They should not be asked to wait longer.

The area to receive supplemental water from the Central Valley project has a rural population larger than the State of Oregon or the State of Washington or the combined population of the States of Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, and Utah. It is a highly developed area with a rural population dependent upon its continued agricultural prosperity. It has all the other resources which will make it possible for it to continue to grow.

The supplemental water to be supplied will be furnished to lands already highly developed agriculturally; that is, lands that have been cultivated for over 25 years.

The lands to receive the water are small acreages and in almost every instance, the farmers in these areas have banded together and have formed water service districts under the laws of the State of California, which will purchase the water from the project and distribute it to the farmers in their respective districts. Most of those districts already have canal systems available to accept immediate delivery of water.

I want to repeat that the problem is very serious and needs immediate attention. It must be admitted that even the completion of the above request will not solve all of the water problems of the San Joaquin Valley, nor will it furnish supplemental water to all lands under irrigation in that area, but it will provide the immediate relief necessary.

I, therefore, again urge that funds for the completion of the Delta Mendota canal, Friant-Kern canal, Delta cross channel, and the Tracy pumping system be given immediate recognition and priority, so that the water features of the project will be immediately completed.

Mr. Chairman, in 1949 the Appropriations Committee of the House and the committee of similar jurisdiction of the other body recommended substantially less money than the Corps of Army Engineers requested. The respective Houses accepted the recommendations of their committees. Presumably, this action was taken for economy reasons.

It is also understandable that flood-control projects heretofore authorized based upon the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers in 30 States and Alaska are each entitled to sufficient appropriations for their completion at a reasonable date. However, if total moneys available are limited, it becomes the duty of this Congress to determine which of the projects should be given special attention in the national interest.

On another occasion, in March of 1949, I advised the committee of this body as follows:

My name is THOMAS H. WERDEL, Congressman of the Tenth District of California. I desire to file this written statement on behalf of the Isabella project on Kern River in California, and I will make additional oral remarks in regard to the Isabella project, together with the projects known as Success, Terminus, and Pine Flat, all of which are treated as a unit.

The Congress appropriated $1,250,000 to be expended during the 1948 fiscal year on the Isabella project, and Congress finally appropriated $2,500,000 for that project during the fiscal year 1949. The present estimated cost of this project is in excess of $14,000,000.

During the 2 years for which funds have been appropriated, work has been commenced upon the construction of this project involving the construction of an auxiliary dam, the relocation of State highways and provision for the relocation of a water conduit, which is an element of a hydroelectric power development in the reservoir area.

I am appearing here today in support of the recommendation made by the Water Resources Board of the State of California that an appropriation be made for this project,

to be expended during the fiscal year 1950, in the amount of $6,000,000. The Presidential Budget has recommended one-half this amount.

I do not feel that it is sound economy for projects of this magnitude to be developed over an extended period of time, due to greater costs not only of supervision and planning but likewise of construction.

The character of the floods produced by the Kern River watershed has created an extreme hazard in the past and, with the rapid growth and development of the exposed area continuing at the same rate as in the past decade, these hazards will assume greater proportions as time goes by. The report of the Army engineers was completed 9 years ago and the subsequent delay in the construction of this project has caused great property losses, as evidenced by the information contained in the written statement I have submitted in which, for the year 1943, it is shown that with three other streams, the Kings, Keweah and Tule Rivers, emptying into Tulare Lake Basin in addition to the Kern, an estimated damage of $10,000,000 for that year alone was caused. These losses were all to agricultural crops of great value to the general public, as well as the producer, consisting of cotton, alfalfa, grain, sugar beets and other similar crops.

The control of these four streams is essential for the final protection of this great productive area of over 250,000 acres, in addition to the local areas existing along the stream channels themselves. Kern River threatens the city of Bakersfield, a community having a metropolitan population estimated, at the present time, to consist of 120,000 persons. Bakersfield lies many miles upstream along the river from the Tulare Lake Basin. During flood stages the water surface in the river channel has stood 17 feet above the developed business district of Bakersfield. From this, it is restrained by levees constructed of poor materials, which seep dangerously at such times. It has been estimated by the Army Engineers that one flood alone which occurred during February 1937, could have caused property loss in excess of $5,000,000, if the levee had failed to hold. The embankment was practically over-topped by that particular flood.

After the river leaves Bakersfield, it passes through and either floods or exposes to flooding a great area devoted to agriculture and the production of oil. Several large oilfields, having great productive capacity, are adjacent to or directly in the path of floods. Great damage could be caused to the oilfields, which are a nonreplenishing resource of the area. Exclusive of the values of oil, real property values in the areas threatened by flooding have increased approximately 65 percent in the past 8 years.

The report of the Army engineers shows not only that protection from floods, the dominant reason for the creation of the reservoir, is adequately taken care of, but also that the proposed storage of 550,000 acre-feet will provide a nominal betterment to the existing irrigation rights on the river. As an indication of the dominance of flood protection, the report also shows that the ratio of value of average annual flood benefit to irrigation benefit is 5 to 1. As a matter of fact, the average amount of additional useful water provided to the existing users is only 8 percent of the full requirement, with no useful supply available for the irrigation of any new lands not now irrigated from the river.

This average is not indicative of the fact that in actuality, the useful new water may vary from nothing in some years, to several times the mean in other years, so that its usefulnes cannot be fully depended upon.

The irrigation interests have stated they are willing to contribute a reasonable sum to the cost of the project, the amount of which will be determined by negotiations between the Army and the interested parties, as provided for in the authorization act of 1944, Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The service area receiving surface water from Kern River is one in which no water is required from any outside source, having an adequate supply within its own rights.

Besides the support of the State of California, the project has been consistently supported by the governing bodies of both the city of Bakersfield and the county of Kern.

This project is also shown by the report of the Army engineers to be one of outstanding merit in that the ratio of total benefits to cost is 2.8 to 1. On the basis of the facts as disclosed by the thorough investigations of the War Department and local agencies, it is unanimously agreed that the early completion of the Isabella Dam is a matter of great urgency. It is our earnest hope that Congress will recognize this fact by granting an appropriation of an amount sufficient to continue this work at an accelerated and more efficient rate.

When the same subject was under consideration before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, House Appropriations Committee, on January 18 of last year, I again appeared before that committee and advised them as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, I believe it would be helpful to point out that the area of California being considered when we discuss the Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern Rivers, is geographically constituted as follows:

The crest of the Sierra Nevada Mountains is approximately 100 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and the prevailing cyclonic winds from off the Pacific and Aleutian Islands are forced to rise to the altitude of 14,000 feet in the course of traveling that 100 miles. Mount Whitney is in that group. The range of mountains itself is probably 50 miles wide with hanging canyons of great altitude and steep slopes to the valley below. The mountains drop off very abruptly to the foothills and then to the San Joaquin Valley, the floor of which has an altitude of about 300 feet in the area constituting the delta country of the four streams which also constitutes the areas where floods occur. We should bear in mind that heavy water deposits are on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains due to the fact that the prevailing winds from the northwest are cyclonic in nature.

The flood control problem is different each year. Some years there is very little flood water. However, on one occasion not too long ago a high-school teacher in Bakersfield took a group of boys by boat on the flood waters of these four streams a distance of 300 miles to San Francisco Bay.

Nearly all of the lands constituting the area threatened with floods by these four streams is valuable agricultural land, if it is properly protected. In addition to the agricultural values, there is a comparable degree of loss threatened each year due to the fact that the lower reaches of the Kern River, in the area threatened by floods, are now producing oil in large quantities.

The area between the Sierra Nevada and Coast Ranges to San Francisco constitutes the San Joaquin Valley. The Sacramento Valley extends about 250 miles north of the San Joaquin Valley.

The projects we are talking about are between the two mountain ranges: The Isabella Reservoir is on the Kern River; Pine Flat Reservoir is on the Kings River, and each of these rivers empties into what is known as Tulare Lake, which is the area, in excess of 200,000 acres, which has been previously mentioned by the witnesses today. The Tulare Lake Basin has been intermittently flooded in the past, even with relatively nominal amounts of snow in the high mountains.

The Success and Terminus Dams are on the two streams lying between the Kings River to the north and the Kern River to the south, the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, respectively.

It is my understanding that when this problem was first presented by my predecessor, Mr. A. J. Elliott, there was some small opposition in regard to the Success and Terminus Dams. I believe all of that opposition has now been removed and that the construction of the Success and Terminus Dams is now desired by all of the communities threatened by those streams, as well as by the people who have the agricultural developments, including those in the Tulare Lake Basin.

The reason I have mentioned the rivers—Kings, Kaweah, Tule, and Kern—collectively is that this project has from its inception been considered as a unit, for the very good reason that floods should be controlled on all four streams or a large part of the efficiency of flood control on the Kings and Kern Rivers will be lost. The reason for that loss is that all four streams, in years of excess water, flood the Tulare Lake Basin.

I am advised that the Bureau of the Budget, although it has heretofore recommended and this committee has appropriated moneys for engineering studies, has this year failed to recommend funds for the commencement of construction on either the Kaweah or Tule Rivers.

I want to point out to the committee that it is still a fact that the four streams involved, necessarily should be treated as a unit, even though most of the threat of flood comes from the larger streams, which are the Kings and the Kern. I also want to remind the committee that much of the area threatened with flood by the Kings and Kern Rivers has been developed by people who rely upon the express belief that this committee would appropriate the funds and that the Army engineers would complete the construction of flood-control developments on those rivers as expeditiously as possible. At the present time we are having one of the largest snowfalls in recent history on the high elevations of those rivers, and before the winter is out we may well expect so much water above the normal flow of the rivers as to wipe out a large part of the developments made in the threatened areas. Much of that development has been made by people who were forced to leave the Dust Bowl area, and who cannot afford such losses. I make mention of this subject for the reason that I now find that the Bureau of the Budget has not recommended that this Congress appropriate even 50 percent of the money heretofore not appropriated but still needed to complete the construction of the Isabella Dam. The result of such action is twofold—the threat of floods will be continued probably beyond the year 1952 and the cost of the project will be increased an unknown percentage due to the fact that continuing contracts cannot be let.

Mr. Elliott, who preceded me here, was advised in his last year that this matter, including the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, would be given the "go" signal by the Bureau of the Budget for the year 1949. The fact is that the people in the area would like to see those projects move along and get into the construction stage together.

It is a fact that the Army engineers have recommended a small appropriation for both Terminus Reservoir and Success Reservoir, but again this year, the Bureau of the Budget has not seen fit to include those items.

I am filing the resolution of the Terminus Dam Project Committee, which was unanimously passed at their meeting held in Tu-

lare, Calif., on January 13, 1950; also a telegram, dated January 17, 1950, addressed to me by Mayor Jack Davis, of the city of Visalia; likewise one on the Terminus Dam project. I ask that they be inserted to immediately follow my remarks in the RECORD.

In conclusion, I want the record to show that practically all of the areas threatened with flood by any one of the four streams that I have mentioned lie in the Tenth Congressional District of California, the district that I represent, which area is included in the counties of Kings, Tulare, and Kern in that State.

I believe that this committee should conclusively presume that all of the construction projects that it has considered can receive a substantial saving in the over-all cost, by the setting of a definite time when completion will be accomplished, so that firm contracts can be let.

I respectfully request, in the interest of the areas threatened with floods by the four streams that I have mentioned, that this committee pay particularly close attention to the statements heretofore made today by Mr. Chas. L. Kaupke, engineer for Kings River Water Association, and Mr. George L. Henderson, engineer for Kern River area.

Mr. Chairman, in 1949, President Truman, through the Bureau of the Budget, recommended only $3,500,000 of the sum of approximately $7,500,000 estimated as necessary to complete the Isabella Reservoir project. The House cut the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget almost in half and allowed only $2,000,000. I followed the matter into the committee of the other body, where I appeared with other witnesses in an effort to increase the recommended appropriation in the other Chamber.

In connection with Isabella Reservoir, the committee of the other body did increase the amount appropriated by the House from $2,000,000 to $3,250,000. The increase allowed by the other body and finally agreed to by the House for last year was sufficient to permit the Corps of Army Engineers to announce that the Isabella Dam can be completed by the 1st of January 1953.

Speaking for the people of California, residing in that area threatened by flood during the spring run-off of the Kern River, I want to tell you that I am grateful for that increase, which was agreed to by this body.

During the fiscal year 1951 there were over 195 projects theretofore authorized on which partial appropriations had theretofore been made spreading over 39 States and Alaska as part of the civil functions recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers. These projects involve a total cost when completed in excess of $4,000,000,000, on which only one-fourth has been appropriated to date. The Bureau of the Budget recommended only $460,000,000 on all of those projects for last year. The Appropriations Committee of this House cut $130,000,000 from the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. However, action by the other body resulted in total appropriations of about $419,000,000.

I am sure it will be of interest to the House to know that the original estimated cost of Isabella Dam on the Kern River made in 1939 was $6,800,000. The 1950 estimated cost is $14,300,000, and although the reports of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of this House for the year 1951 show estimates of the civil functions of the Department of the Army indicating that the 1951 estimated cost of Isabella Dam is still only $14,300,000, I believe that spokesmen for the Corps of Army Engineers will now estimate that cost as being at least $5,000,000 higher, or a total of over $19,000,000. Similar increases in cost of construction can be shown for Pine Flat Reservoir. I have to admit, of course, that increasing construction costs are probably similar for all of the other 195 projects or more heretofore authorized and on which appriations for construction have heretofore been made.

It is my purpose to bring to the attention of the House at this time, as I intend to do again before the proper committees of this House and the proper committees of the other body, that economy in Government as well as efficiency, require appropriations to be made so that firm contracts can be let to responsible contractors for the completion of those projects which necessarily must be completed for the security of the country even when we are considering curtailment of expenditures for a military effort.

I am sure that spokesmen for the Corps of Army Engineers will recommend such appropriations for the completion of Isabella and Pine Flat Dams at the earliest date that they can be completed from a construction standpoint. In this connection, I want to quote the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the year 1949, in regard to the four rivers—Kern, Kings, Kaweah, and Tule—each of which threatens the highly productive lands of the southern San Joaquin Valley with annual floods:

ISABELLA RESERVOIR, KERN RIVER, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watershed of Kern River and Poso and Caliente Creeks, their valley alluvial fans, the Kern and Buena Vista Lake areas, and that portion of the San Joaquin Valley south of Tulare Lake Basin. Kern River is the most southerly of the major streams flowing into the San Joaquin Valley and drains an area of some 2,400 square miles in the Sierra Nevada. North Fork and South Fork, headwaters of Kern River, have their sources in the high Sierra Nevada, flow south 83 and 67 miles, respectively, and join near the town of Isabella to form Kern River, which flows thence southwest 72 miles past the city of Bakersfield to a point in the valley through just north of Buena Vista Lake. River flows at this point are either diverted into the Buena Vista Lake Basin for temporary storage or are carried northwest along the trough of the valley toward Tulare Lake Basin by improved flood and irrigation channels. Under normal conditions of run-off the flow of Kern River below Bakersfield is gradually dissipated by irrigation diversions so that Kern River water reaches Tulare Lake Basin only during large floods. Poso Creek drains an area of 290 square miles lying west of Isabella and north of Kern River. Its flows are usually dissipated before reaching the valley trough. Caliente Creek drains an area of 470 square miles adjoining the lower Kern Basin to the south. Its flows are dissipated in the valley floor south of Bakersfield. The valley area dependent for water supply on Kern River and Poso and Caliente Creeks, commonly called the service area, is approximately 1,560 square miles in extent.

Existing project: This provides for construction of Isabella Reservoir on Kern River, Calif., for flood control and other purposes, at an estimated first cost (1949) of $14,300,000 and $71,000 annually for maintenance and operation. The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. Doc. 513, 78th Cong., 2d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: Preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications for construction was continued. Construction by contract of an earthfill auxiliary dam was begun in March 1948, and was completed in November 1948. Construction by contract of a core storage warehouse was begun in June 1948, and was completed late in July 1948. State Highway Routes 57 and 142, were relocated. Temporary housing facilities were acquired and operated, an auto mechanics' shop building erected, and educational facilities secured. By contract, a test fill was started April 22, 1949. Land acquisition (including improvements, disposals, and damages) was continued. Construction of main outlet gates by contract was started. Total cost of new work was $1,277,587.31; total expenditures were $1,394,699.62.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Final contract plans are being prepared; construction work on this project was started in March 1948. The total cost to date was $1,984,195.35 for new work, total expenditures were $2,016,024.28.

Proposed operations: The balance unexpended on June 30, 1949, amounting to $1,841,975.72, plus accounts receivable of $267,110.56, and an alotment of $2,350,000 made in fiscal year 1950, a total of $4,460,086.28 will be applied as follows:

Accounts payable	$246,281.63
New work:	
Continuation of preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications, by hired labor, including hydraulic model studies and main dam test fill, July 1949 to June 1950	250,000.00
Construction of main dam outlet works, by contract July 1949 to January 1950	393,060.00
Acquisition (partial) of land and improvements, entire fiscal year	620,000.00
Furnishing slide gates for diversion tunnel, by supply contract, September 1949 to June 1950	160,000.00
Provision of educational facilities, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	7,000.00
Operation of Government housing, July 1949 to June 1950	6,000.00
Relocation of electric transmission line, by contract, work completed in fiscal year 1949, deferred costs	6,006.45
Construction of administration and service buildings, and lookout, by contract, March to June 1950	120,000.00
Initiation of construction of main dam, spillway, auxiliary dam, etc., by continuing contract, commencing in April 1950	850,000.00

New work—Continued	
Payment to Southern California Edison Co., for relocation of Borel Canal and appurtenances, by continuing contract during fiscal year	$525,000.00
Initiation of relocation of county road between Kernville and Fairview, by continuing contract, March to June 1950	90,000.00
Initiation of relocation of Greenhorn Mountain Highway, State Highway No. 142, by continuing contract, September 1949 to June 1950	460,000.00
Concreting of outlet tunnel, by contract, February to June 1950	500,000.00
Furnishing Borel Canal slide gates, by supply contract, January 1949 to June 1950	130,000.00
Relocation of telephone line, by contract, March 1950 to June 1950	53,000.00
Engineering services for Borel Canal relocation, by contract, February to June 1950	20,000.00
Miscellaneous minor activities incidental to orderly prosecution of work, including fencing, firebreaks, minor buildings, etc., July 1949 to June 1950	23,738.20
Total for new work	4,213,804.65
Total for all work	4,460,086.28

The additional sum of $4,000,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of construction of Greenhorn Mountain Highway, State Highway No. 142	$300,000
Continuation of construction of main dam, spillway, auxiliary dam	1,820,000
Utility revisions and miscellaneous items	300,000
Acquisition of lands and improvements	750,000
Payment to Southern California Edison Co., for relocation of Borel Canal and appurtenances	500,000
Completion of relocation of county road between Kernville and Fairview	300,000
Total for new work	4,000,000

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$3,858,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	1,984,195.35
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	2,016,024.28
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	1,841,975.72
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	633,937.11
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	2,350,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	2,983,937.11
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	8,092,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$203,000.00	$55,000.00	$1,020,000.00	$2,500,000.00
Cost of new work	5,005.30	176,330.80	60,935.02	454,736.92	1,277,587.31
Total expended	5,400.48	167,398.57	71,582.92	376,942.69	1,394,699.62

KINGS RIVER AND TULARE LAKE, INCLUDING PINE FLAT RESERVOIR, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watershed of Kings River, its valley, alluvial fan or delta, and the lake bed known as Tulare Lake. The upper basin above the town of Piedra is rugged and mountainous. Below Piedra the river enters the relatively flat alluvial valley where the river divides, one branch known as Fresno slough flowing north to join the San Joaquin River, and the second south to Tulare Lake, an area which in its unreclaimed state varied from a completely dry condition to a body of water some 750 square miles in extent. There is no natural outlet from this lake as it is separated from the San Joaquin Basin by a low ridge, but lake waters have escaped over this ridge at least once since settlement of the region. Tulare Lake also receives floodwaters of Tule, Kaweah, and Kern Rivers in some years. The area below Piedra, including Tulare Lake, is known as the Kings River service area.

Existing project: This provides for construction of the Pine Flat Reservoir with a gross storage capacity of 1,000,000 acre-feet and of the supplemental channel improvement work, at an estimated total first cost (1949) of $51,121,000, and $112,000 annually for maintenance and operation.

The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. Doc. 630, 76th Cong., 3d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements, when an equitable allocation of charges is made. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: New work: Preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications was continued. Excavation of the right abutment of main dam was begun February 1948 and was completed in September 1948. Twenty-four portable houses complete with roads and utilities were furnished and erected. Telephone lines were relocated, cattle guards, trash racks, and a core storage warehouse were constructed, and educational facilities furnished. Land acquisition (including improvements, disposals, and damages) was continued. Relocation of the Hughes Creek Road from Sunnyside Summit to Trimmer, by contract, was begun in February 1948 and was 92 percent completed at the end of the fiscal year. It is estimated to be completed August 5, 1949. Total cost for new work was $2,942,074.87, and total expenditures, $3,273,370.81.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Final contract plans are being prepared; construction work on this project was started in April 1947; and to date the following features of the work have been accomplished: Partial relocation of the Hughes Creek Road from Sunnyside Summit to Trimmer, and erection of fencing along the road; construction and fencing of Hughes Creek-Pine Flat detour road; excavation for right and left abutments for the dam; erection of 24 portable housing units complete with all utilities and roads, etc. The total cost for new work to date was $5,380,918.85, and the total expenditures were $5,333,688.24.

Proposed operations: The balance unexpended on June 30, 1949, amounting to $1,366,311.76, and an allotment of $7,000,000, made in fiscal year 1950, a total of $8,366,311.76, will be applied as follows:

Accounts payable	$260,230.61
New work:	
Continuation of preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications, including hydraulic model studies, and additional core drilling, by hired labor, and by contract, entire fiscal year	660,000.00
Completion of relocated Hughes Creek Road, by contract, July to September 1949	127,000.00
Construction of bridge and measuring weir, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	166,000.00
Construction of permanent Government housing, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	170,000.00
Revision of educational facilities, by contract, July 1949 to June 1950	40,000.00
Paving and utilities for portable housing, by contract, July to August 1949	32,000.00
Operation of Government housing, July 1949 to June 1950	18,000.00
Acquisition of land and improvements, July 1949 to June 1950	365,000.00
Relocation of Vincent power line, by contract, Southern California Edison Co.	240,000.00
Construction of main dam and appurtenances, by continuing contract, commencing November 1949	5,400,000.00
Main dam sluice gates, by continuing contract, commencing August 1949	674,000.00
Construction of look-out and access roads, by contract, November 1949 to February 1950	106,000.00
Construction of grammar school, by contract, January to June 1950	78,000.00
Miscellaneous minor activities incidental to orderly prosecution of work, including fencing, minor relocations, sidewalks, landscaping, etc	30,081.15
Total for new work	8,106,081.15
Grand total	8,366,311.76

The additional sum of $17,500,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of advance planning	$250,000
Continuation of construction of main dam and appurtenances	16,200,000
Spillway gates and miscellaneous operating equipment, by contract	300,000
Continuation of acquisition of lands and improvements	300,000
Continuation of utility modifications	450,000
Total for new work	17,500,000

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$6,700,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	5,380,918.85
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	5,333,688.24
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	1,366,311.76
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	452,728.59
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	7,000,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	7,452,728.59
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	37,421,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$335,000.00	$1,065,000.00	$1,750,000.00	$3,500,000.00
Cost of new work	4,860.57	181,867.74	431,763.14	1,820,352.53	2,942,074.87
Total expended	4,107.81	149,566.93	397,715.66	1,506,927.03	3,273,370.81

Construction of administration building, service buildings, permanent housing, and look-out, by contract, entire fiscal year $175,000.00
Relocation of Folsom-Auburn County Road, by contract, February to June 1950 210,000.00
Construction of right end of dam, by contract, July 1949 to January 1950 200,000.00
Fencing along north boundary of prison, by contract, November to December 1949 15,000.00
Construction of right wing dam, by contract, February to June 1950 440,000.00
Construction of Natoma Canal bypass tunnel, by contract, March to June 1950 230,000.00
Construction of right end dykes, by contract, February to June 1950 400,000.00
Construction of North Fork Ditch Co. Reservoir, March to June 1950 130,000.00
Miscellaneous minor work incidental to prosecution of work, including fencing, firebreaks, small buildings, etc. 14,248.74
Total 3,224,248.74
Total for new work 3,346,567.96

The additional sum of $7,500,000 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Acquisition of lands and improvements	$400,000.00
Utility relocation, by contract	780,000.00
Construction of concrete gravity spillway section	5,320,000.00
Construction of outlet works and appurtenances	1,000,000.00
Total	7,500,000.00

Cost and financial summary

Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$1,582,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	1,445,751.26
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	1,335,432.04
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	246,567.96
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	5,101.87
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	3,100,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	3,105,101.87
Estimated additional amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	46,110,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated	$50,000.00	$462,000.00		$70,000.00	$1,000,000.00
Cost of new work	29,152.08	298,701.65	$103,724.76	148,777.63	865,395.14
Cost of maintenance					
Total expended	25,041.79	282,877.40	113,685.00	141,929.12	771,298.73

KAWEAH AND TULE RIVERS, INCLUDING TERMINUS AND SUCCESS RESERVOIRS, CALIF.

Location: The area covered by this project comprises the upper watersheds of Kaweah and Tule Rivers, their valley alluvial fans and the reclaimed Tulare Lake Basin, their common terminus. Kaweah River, which drains an area of 1,250 square miles, is formed by the junction of its North, Middle, and South Forks near Three Rivers, flows southwest 10 miles through low foothills and emerges on the valley floor near the town of Lemon Cove. At this point the river divides into two channels, the flow to each being divided equally by control weirs. The northerly channel, known as St. Johns River, flows west 23 miles and unites with Cottonwood Creek to form Cross Creek, which flows thence southwest 35 miles to Tulare Lake Basin. The southerly channel, which continues as Kaweah River, flows southwest 4 miles and then divides into numerous distributary channels. Flows in these channels not diverted for irrigation or lost by seepage cross the delta region and unite with Tule River or Cross Creek to enter Tulare Lake Basin. Tule River, which drains an area of 630 square miles adjoining the Kaweah Basin on the south, is formed by the junction of its North and Middle Forks near Springville, flows southwest 13 miles and emerges on the valley floor near the city of Porterville. From this point the river continues west 39 miles across the alluvial fan to Tulare Lake Basin.

Existing project: This provides for construction of the Terminus and Success Reservoir projects, including supplemental spreading works, at an estimated first cost (1949) of $24,539,000 (including $13,395,000 for Terminus and $11,144,000 for Success), and $13,000 annually for maintenance and operation of the reservoirs. The existing project was adopted by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. (See H. R. Flood Control Committee Doc. 1, 78th Cong., 2d sess., and H. Doc. 559, 78th Cong., 2d sess., which contains the latest published map.)

Local cooperation: Payment, as determined by the Secretary of the Army upon the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Army, and local organizations, is to be made to the United States by the State or other responsible agency for the conservation storage when used. Local interests state they will meet these requirements. The State of California has officially adopted the project.

Operations and results during fiscal year: (a) Terminus Reservoir on Kaweah River: The cost of new work during the year was $60,288.72 and the expenditures were $65,165.14, for work on detailed plans and contract plans and specifications.

(b) Success Reservoir: The cost of new work during the year was $57,286.45 and the expenditures were $61,191.30 for continuing preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications.

Total project new work cost was $117,575.17, and total expenditures were $126,356.44.

Condition at end of fiscal year: Detailed plans and contract plans and specifications are in preparation for test fills for Terminus and Success Reservoirs. Construction work on this project has not been started. Total new work cost to date for the project was $415,385.07 and total expenditures were $396,854.14.

Proposed operations: The unexpended balances on June 30, 1949, of $85,541.72 for Terminus Reservoir, and $87,604.14 for Success Reservoir, and allotments of $120,000, made in September 1949, will be applied to payment of accounts payable amounting to $13,664.56 and $4,866.37, respectively, and for new work in continuing the preparation of detailed plans and contract plans and specifications for these reservoirs, $131,877.16 and $142,737.77, respectively, July 1949 through June 1950.

The additional sum of $1,000,00 is needed to be appropriated for the following schedule of work during the fiscal year 1951:

New work:	
Continuation of preparation of plans and specifications for Terminus Reservoir	$200,000
Acquistion of lands and improvements, and relocation of utilities, Terminus Reservoir	300,000
Total for Terminus Reservoir	500,000

New work—Continued	
Continuation of preparation of plans and specifications for Success Reservoir	$150,000
Relocation of utilities and roads, acquisition of lands and improvements, Success Reservoir	350,000
Total for Success Reservoir	500,000
Total for new work	1,000,000
Cost and financial summary	
Total amount appropriated to June 30, 1949	$570,000.00
Cost of new work to June 30, 1949	415,385.07
Total net expenditures to June 30, 1949	$396,854.14
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1949	173,145.86
Unobligated balance available, June 30, 1949	154,614.93
Amount appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950	120,000.00
Total unobligated balance available for fiscal year 1950	274,614.93
Estimated additonal amount required to be appropriated for completion of existing project	23,849,000.00

	Fiscal year ending June 30—				
	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Appropriated		$240,000.00	$80,000.00	$50,000.00	$200,000.00
Cost of new work		93,048.26	142,428.25	62,333.39	117,575.17
Total expended		71,056.21	161,150.84	38,290.65	126,356.44

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that it is unnecessary to point out that the protection of Kern, Tulare, and Kings Counties in California, which were always at the top of the list of counties producing for the last war effort, is necessary to properly prepare for the national security in these difficult days of military preparedness.

I have no hesitancy in telling you that I have discussed this subject with Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, and that he will advise you through the proper committees of this House that he considers expenditures for the control of floods in valuable agricultural areas as necessary expenditures even while we are considering a wartime budget.

Only 6 weeks ago, all four of the streams that I have mentioned were at flood stage. Normally, the flood season arrives during the spring runoff when the snows at the high elevations of the Sierra Nevada Mountains are melting. Last fall, that area had an early snow followed by rain. The damage to public and private property on the Kern River alone exceeded $3,000,000. The damage on the other rivers hereinabove mentioned was relatively even greater. Due to the heavy population and development of the threatened area which, as I have heretofore mentioned, was the result of reliance upon completion of these projects within a reasonable time following the year 1938, the damage could have been a hundredfold greater had there been a very small amount of additional water in the flood crest or had the local authorities been less diligent in the performance of their duties.

In conclusion, I want to again thank the Members of the House and the other body for the consideration that they have given to me and other people of the area in presenting this subject during the last 2 years, and for the action that they have taken to date. I discussed this subject with Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, last Saturday morning and he advises me that they are going to support recommendations for the completion of the Isabella Dam on Kern River under firm contracts with responsible contractors capable of completing the project as soon as it is physically possible for the construction work to be completed. He has fixed that date as January 1, 1953, which means that this threat to national security and the war effort must be borne by the people of the area and the Nation as a whole through the flood seasons of 1951 and 1952.

Both in the interest of national security and in behalf of the thousands of innocent people who have settled in the threatened areas in reliance upon previous action of Congress, I want to point out to you the threat to national security is greatest in the areas of the four streams I have mentioned. I believe it must also be admitted by this House that the increase in estimated cost from $6,500,000 to over $19,000,000, and the threat to thousands of small families in lives and property is largely the responsibility of this Congress as a result of its prior action and the delay through "pork barrel" tactics in the completion of projects heretofore authorized and on which construction has heretofore commenced.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the sum of $8,695,000 to continue construction of the Pine Flat Dam, and $4,975,000 for the Isabella Dam and Reservoir. It is felt that these amounts are in line with appropriations that will be needed in the present session. However, if it is deemed necessary, General Pick may appear before the committee later this year and request additional funds. Appropriations for continuing the planning studies for the proposed Success and Terminus Dams have not been requested by the Corps of Army Engineers for this year, nor was any money appropriated for that purpose in the last fiscal year. The Corps of Army Engineers explained that in making their recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget, they were restricted by Presidential directive in requesting appropriations for new projects not already under construction.

It is also inequitable and unjust for this Government to delay in the payment of fair values for the properties taken by this Government for construction of the Isabella Reservoir. You all know that these values fixed by the Government are always low, and displaced people must make investments elsewhere so as to be able to move from their property when the Government advises them that it plans to complete the project or require their removal. All of those people need the moneys due from the Government for their condemned property to make their new investments. There is no justification in law or equity for delay in this regard.

I respectfully and sincerely again ask your consideration in connection with these projects and call to your special attention that the threatened damage in the agricultural area involved is special and peculiar to the security of the country and the projects must be considered as part of the national defense effort.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, in considering this $2,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill for naval construction, one can hardly question the need for a build-up of the Navy within the limits of its prescribed mission. As part of the present mobilization program the Navy's obligations under its mission obviously will be greatly expanded. Under such circumstances it will become increasingly difficult to question any Navy appropriation requests of this or any type. The real problem centers in our long-range strategic plan which is still undetermined, or, if so, still unannounced.

Further, in the current frantic haste to do immediately what should have been done long since in the interests of national security, it is quite obviously the order of the day to give the military what it wants, with few questions asked, and without demanding the normal justification for efficient and economic utilization of resources and manpower. Under these unfortunate circumstances, one must be content these days to isolate from the multibillion dollar security program only the obvious misadventures in military financing.

The projected 60,000 ton carrier constitutes, it is understood, some 60 percent of the total warship tonnage covered in the request. I am inclined to believe, despite the cautiously worded description of the reporting committee, that this is substantially the same supercarrier project. It is difficult, even in the frenzy of the moment, to understand why it now rates only an hour's discussion on the floor of the House, a sketchy explanation from the reporting committee, unprecedented security classification, and virtually no coverage in the public press.

It is possible, though not probable, that this is not the same supercarrier project that was canceled once before. The projected vessel is reported to be lighter than the other, though, if newspaper reports are correct, it will cost even more. The newly projected supercarrier will carry, it is also reported, planes capable of delivering the atomic bomb. If true, this brings up the ob-

vious question of the mission. The atomic bomb is generally conceded to be a strategic weapon. If strategic atomic bombing is to take place from shipboard, other questions arise which should be of interest to the Congress. Our atomic stockpile is generally conceded to be our most precious military possession. If a portion of that stockpile is to be put to sea, Congress is being asked to make a far-reaching decision.

In the past, Congress has heard evidence that far more than one vessel is involved. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—volume 95, part 15, pages A4537–A4538—contains a report by one of our colleagues, the Honorable Mr. BOYKIN, of Alabama, that the now canceled supercarrier would entail a task force of 140 supporting vessels of different types and 45,000 personnel and would cost some one and a half billion dollars, a figure which we must assume would be considerably higher today, and that this huge force would function so that only 28 bombers could operate off the decks of the supercarrier; and, further, that the Navy's long-range plan envisaged no less than seven of these supercarriers, and, of course, seven supporting task forces. Congress at least should know whether the bill now under consideration is the start of such a program, or any part of it, and if further supplemental appropriations will be necessary to complete the supercarrier or a supporting task force. Only then can Congress weigh the project in proper perspective.

Should Congress satisfy itself regarding the related subjects outlined above, it deserves to hear further evidence on other basic questions which must always be raised in connection with the supercarrier project, namely, the vulnerability of the supercarrier to new-type snorkel submarines in light of the Navy's own post-World War II exercises off Newfoundland and in the Caribbean, and the vessel's vulnerability to land-based aircraft; the supercarrier's production time in relation to the programed development of other weapons; the supercarrier's cost in critical resources and critical manpower in relation to over-all defense needs; the supercarrier's ability, or lack of it, to function in certain key areas such as the Mediterranean, and to utilize the Panama Canal; the supercarrier's effectiveness and recuperative ability under full-scale combat conditions rather than in a Korean-type conflict where enemy submarine and aerial opposition is completely lacking.

In the prolonged discussions of the past over the supercarrier, such questions as these were never satisfactorily answered. Perhaps they have since been resolved. If so, Congress and the people deserve to know something more than is now known about it.

Congress does not wish, it is evident, to hold up any priority projects of the military. But the supercarrier, by description of the reporting committee, is a long-range research and development project. Further discussion on the subject obviously will not jeopardize any immediate security needs. And even in this clouded "give the military what it wants" atmosphere which seems to prevail Congress cannot forget its obligations to the people regarding military expenditures.

Therefore, if the remainder of this bill bears a priority stamp, let it be considered in that light. And let the supercarrier request be considered, not in frantic haste but in proper perspective and in the light of the many unanswered questions regarding it. Let that portion of the bill containing the supercarrier request be considered apart, so Congress and the people can get these questions answered.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

LONG BEACH NAVY SHIPYARD REACTIVATED

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, being again a member of the important Armed Services Committee of this House and having heard all the discussion before the committee membership with reference to this bill, H. R. 1001, I voted in committee for it, and I now again happily do the same thing. I urge its passage by unanimous approval of the House membership.

Within the hour you have heard the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee explain the bill and answer fully and frankly all the questions directed to him. In addition thereto, you have a committee report accompanying this bill for your attention in which the justification—yes, the absolute need of this bill becoming effective at the earliest possible date is more fully explained. On pages 4, 5, and 6 of the committee report is found the explanation of the changes to be made in the existing laws by virtue of the passage of H. R. 1001. I recommend that each of you take time to read the same to observe these changes.

I take this occasion also, and it is a very happy occasion to me to be able to announce to you that last week our distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Matthews, personally notified me to announce that the Navy Department had that day issued an order immediately reactiviating the great Long Beach Naval Shipyard which is located in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

That great and modern facility was inactivated as part of the so-called economy program by the former Secretary of Defense, taking into consideration the fact that there was a physical condition there with reference to the earth which the then Secretary of Defense felt chiefly justified his order. I know you will recall my active, vigorous opposition thereto on that ground at that time; and you will further recall that many members of the California delegation in the House cordially supported me in my opposition to the inactivation program.

The Long Beach Naval Shipyard was constructed as a necessary and essential World War II facility at a cost in excess of $75,000,000, and its wartime peak work force reached the substantial figure of at least 16,000 employees. The deactivation of this yard was commenced late in 1949 and was completely in mothballs by late June 1950. There remained in charge thereof merely a custodial force of about 500 employees, and at this time there is in command at the Long Beach Naval Base a distinguished naval captain, J. Y. Dannenberg. Just this week there has been directed to take charge of the shipyard unit of the great Long Beach Naval Base distinguished naval captain, Emmett E. Sprung.

Already hundreds upon hundreds of the former skilled and other workers are happily trending their way to the reemployment at this great naval facility which meant so much in the total national defense and national production of ships' program during World War II.

The world-famous Roosevelt drydock is located there and reputedly the most powerful ship crane is located there, it having been taken over from Germany as one of the war trophies and placed at the dockside of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Secretary Matthews personally told me that full use would be made of the navy yard at the earliest possible date with an estimated employment by midsummer of at least 3,500 and that all departments of the yard would get under way at the earliest possible date. He stated that the present world conditions made the modern and valuable available facilities of this great Long Beach Naval Shipyard and Naval Base necessary at the earliest possible date.

During the last war and until the inactivation commenced, the yard was the chief repair base for the Pacific battleship fleet and is still the home base of that fleet. At the time of the order of inactivation in late 1949 it was generally conceded Nation-wide that because the Long Beach Naval Shipyard was the last great naval shipyard facility to be constructed prior to the war, it contained the very latest and best of work machinery and facilities to suit all modern needs and that there had been put into that yard the benefit of the considered experiences and opinions of the best authorities of our great Naval Establishment.

Furthermore, it would appear that this opinion was justified by reason of the magnificent achievements of the yard at all times and upon all assignments and missions. Not only has the city of Long Beach and its rapidly increasing population and all of its varied segments of commerce, trade, shipping, and oil always cordially welcomed what Long Beach terms the "Navy family"; but, needless to say, the personnel of the United States Navy and their families and all their connections who have found it necessary to live at Long Beach and in the Long Beach area on account of being assigned to work or services or duties at the Long Beach Naval Base have made and earned for themselves a place of utmost respect and real and warm welcome by all the civilian population of that whole area in which they have resided and worked. Too, from the greatest to the least, in terms of rank, they have contributed much to the prosperity and happiness and progress of Long Beach and to the other communities close by in which they have resided with their families.

In my frequent visits to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, before it was inactivated, and also since, and by mail and by personal calls upon me and otherwise, I have been greatly inspired by the stories

of self-sacrifice and of unselfish service and of most excellent attitudes held and activities rendered by the employed civilian population at the Long Beach naval facility at all times.

So, as it was from the beginning at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, it is again anticipated with happy and confident outlook that by teamwork and mutual understanding and common objective the Navy personnel and the civilian personnel are beginning to team up to again so reactivate and carry on the necessary work and mission to be done at the great Long Beach Naval Shipyard that it again will make known records to be envied and respected by all.

And right here may I just say that I hope and trust that you, my colleagues from the Eastern, Midwestern, Central, and Southern States, have by this time learned or begun to learn and appreciate the ever-increasing importance and strategic location and relationship of the shipyards of the Pacific coast and all the installations and problems of the Pacific coast to the total problems of our beloved Nation. Increasingly, this Congress, the executive departments and the administrative departments of Government must familiarize themselves more than ever with the fact that never yet has either the naval or the civilian shipyard problem and national defense problem of the Nation been adequately met and provided for as relates to the increasing necessity of recognizing and providing for the necessity of these naval and privately owned and commercial shipyards of my native State of California and the other Pacific Coast States. Does not this present world emergency and the Korean War and the increasing importance of Asia and India and Africa, as far as marine geography is concerned teach us this lesson?

In closing may I say that, when the newspaper representative asked me to make a brief statement about the reopening of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard recently, I said:

I feel that the reactivation is not only timely, but it is tangible evidence of the strategic value and the necessity of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard as a permanent naval operating facility. This present order of earliest possible reactivation justifies my vigorous opposition from the beginning to the order of inactivation on the grounds stated at that time and to my continuing vigorous presentation of the need of keeping the yard ready to reopen at the earliest possible date with the least possible delay.

I compliment the Navy Department and its distinguished Secretary and the Chiefs of Staff and all the top officials of our Government in our beloved Nation who, again, have demonstrated their good judgment and common sense in this order of reactivation of this great naval shipyard facility. And I deem it a great honor and privilege to again publicly state, on behalf of my home city of Long Beach and the great Eighteenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent for this third term, that the total Navy family will again be cordially welcomed and that the total civilian citizenry will again do its dead-level best to cooperate to the utmost in all mutual problems in this emergency hour for our Nation and for the world.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to congratulate warmly a great chairman and a great committee on this continuing evidence of their sound leadership in the field of American military preparedness.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the presentation of this legislation brings to light one of the shabbiest performances by the executive branch of the Government in the history of this Nation. The President and his advisors, including the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, canceled the construction of the supercarrier in April 1949. The blame rests solely on the doorstep of the White House. Congress originally authorized the ship and appropriated the necessary funds on the specific recommendations of our military leaders.

Because of this grievous error the cancellation of the carrier, the American taxpayers lost $20,000,000 in material and labor plus forty-five million in cost differential between the original supercarrier and the one proposed in this bill. In addition, Mr. Truman's concurrence in the cancellation of the supercarrier in 1949 has cost 2½ to 3 years in time.

With these facts unquestioned, can there be faith, past or present, in the preparedness decisions by the President? It is high time that the Congress cease being a rubber stamp to the dictatorial demands of the President and his advisers. The Eighty-first Congress made a horrible record simply because in most instances it bowed weakly to the requests of Mr. Truman. That Congress did not truly represent the people but rather submitted to the dictates of the executive branch of the Government. One of the few courageous stands taken by the Eighty-first Congress was the report of the House Committee on Armed Services condemning the action taken by Mr. Truman in canceling the supercarrier and firing Admiral Denfeld.

Our citizens are not so naive that they will believe there is any difference between the orginal supercarrier and the one proposed by this bill. The public would admire our President and his own military advisers if an honest statement were made admitting that an error had been made in 1949. No, that procedure is not followed. Instead, there is an attempt to justify the new carrier on the basis that it is really a different ship. Such subterfuge is reprehensible and should be exposed. A careful analysis of the blueprints of the two ships by qualified engineers would reveal, I am sure, no material difference between them. This is no time for "face saving." The administration would get public confidence by straightforward admissions of past errors.

The need of aircraft carriers is best evidenced by their use in the Korean War. Without carriers in that part of the world our land forces would be in even worse condition than we now find them.

In conclusion, I emphasize that this Congress must assert itself and not rubber stamp the demands of the President and his advisers. The people elected the Eighty-second Congress to participate jointly in military and foreign affairs decisions and the President for the benefit of our Nation had better cooperate or Congress will take over to better strengthen our Nation and restore the confidence of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, not to exceed 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels in the following categories and subcategories:

(a) Combatant vessels, 315,000 tons, divided into:

1. Warships, 100,000 tons, including one aircraft carrier of not to exceed 60,000 tons.
2. Amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft, 175,000 tons.
3. Mine warfare vessels, 25,000 tons.
4. Patrol vessels, 15,000 tons.

(b) Auxiliary vessels, 175,000 tons.

(c) Service craft, 9,000 tons.

(d) Experimental types, 1,000 tons.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions. This measure provides for the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 for construction and conversion, as I understand it, but I see no limitation in the bill as to the amount of expenditure. Is there any limitation in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. There is no limitation. It all depends upon what it will cost. The Committee on Appropriations will be called upon to furnish the money to finish these vessels. It is now estimated it will cost in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000 to carry out the program.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any way that a limitation can be put in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. If a limitation is placed in the bill, it might turn out not to be the proper limitation because conditions may warrant the spending of more money.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that we do not know how much longer this Truman inflation is going on, do we?

Mr. VINSON. May I point out to the gentleman I have for a long time been of the opinion that there should have been ceilings and controls on prices, and so forth. The gentleman is not making any point so far as I am concerned by calling that to my attention. I think we should have had controls a long time ago. I think the longer you put it off, the more inflation we will have.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. May I ask him a further question? Is this construction and conversion program to be carried on under cost-plus contracts?

Mr. VINSON. It will be carried on under whatever authority the Navy has to make contracts; which in a great many instances is through negotiated

contracts. It will probably all be by negotiated contracts.

Mr. GROSS. And on the basis of cost-plus?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know about that. But may I point out that in connection with the profits which were made during the war on ship construction they ran less than 2 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Less than cost-plus?

Mr. VINSON. There was less than 2 percent of profit on ship construction during the last war.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask if we have any surplus cruisers in the United States Navy.

Mr. VINSON. I would not call them surplus. We have a great many cruisers still in the mothball stage. But we want to keep them there, because we need them, and the security of the country requires them.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we have surplus cruisers to turn over to South America at this time?

Mr. VINSON. It was felt that those cruisers should be turned over to South America in furtherance of some idea of standardization of equipment and the good-neighbor policy. I am finding no fault with it. Of course we would have to spend a great deal of money to keep those cruisers modernized and bring them up to date. Those cruisers are about 14 or 15 years old.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that we have used cruisers and other combat vessels in the Pacific during World War II which were over 20 years old?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And they performed good service, did they not?

Mr. VINSON. They certainly did.

Mr. GROSS. And yet we propose in this bill today to provide for conversion and construction to the tune of $2,000,000,000 and we are practically giving away warships to South America?

Mr. VINSON. No. We are prohibiting the giving away of any cruisers which belong to the fleet or anything else which belongs to the fleet.

Mr. GROSS. That is with reference to the terms of this bill. But they have already been given away.

Mr. VINSON. And the gentleman sat here and voted for it just like everybody else.

Mr. GROSS. I do not on the spur of the moment know whether I did or not. I do not remember when the act was passed.

Mr. VINSON. I have looked up the gentleman's record, and I do not find where he opposed it—and none of us did oppose it. We did not know what we were doing. We know now what we are doing. They cannot be given away in the future.

Mr. GROSS. When was that act passed?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman was right here. It was on the 25th day of July. The gentleman and all of us here gave this authority. None of us knew what we were doing.

Mr. GROSS. I think both of us will scrutinize much more carefully the activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs henceforth, will we not?

Mr. VINSON. I have always been doing that, and I want the gentleman to get in the same frame of mind as I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has brought up a question which I think we could well spend 5 minutes thinking about. I think the gentleman from Georgia, in answering the question that there was no limitation was on safe ground provided you want these goods delivered. I wish somebody would show me how to go out and make a firm commitment of sale or purchase for goods to be delivered over a long period of time—over a period of 6 months or 1½ years or 2 years or 3½ years, such as is provided for here. We cannot do it because there is no stability to the buying power of the great American monetary exchange which we call the dollar. That is what we are up against. Beefsteak may be $4 a pound within the next 4½ years. This conversion job and this new ship we have been discussing may cost us $20,000,000,000 before we are through. That is something for all of us to think about and to act upon if we get a chance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And yet we expect private business to form firm contracts; do we not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I do not, any more.

Mr. GROSS. We pay out billions of dollars under the cost-plus contract system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not expect them to do it any more, because it would be expecting the impossible, because of these continually advancing costs, in both wages and materials.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. This cost-plus contract worries Members very much, and it used to worry me a great deal, but I heard some testimony by some admirals who had charge of construction work during the last war, and they testified, under oath, that the cost-plus cost of vessels and other things was cheaper in the net amount than the fixed, firm contract.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As long as you have negotiated contracts and the renegotiation procedure, I do not worry so much about the cost-plus contract, because you are supposed to pick those things up when you recheck the figures. Anyone familiar with accounting understands that procedure.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I am very glad the gentleman raised that point. The Ways and Means Committee will report to the House within a few days a new renegotiation bill. Of course, the uncertainty in the cost of material and labor, the failure to have any ceilings, and the failure to have any limitation just makes it out of the question to say what these ships are going to cost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. We hope it will be $2,000,000,000, but we have a renegotiation bill to fix the price whenever they are fixed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope when that bill is reported by the Ways and Means Committee that the House will support it, because we need it.

Now we are up against this proposition on another score: We are trying to make up our minds whether or not we are going to support nine billion or sixteen billion additional taxes, or whether or not we are going to finance this program through deficit financing. As far as I am concerned—and I want to get this on the RECORD, so that my people will understand my position—as far as I am concerned personally, I am solidly in favor of cutting this budget to the irreducible minimum, and then enacting whatever Federal taxes are necessary to cover that budget. Now, that is right straight from the shoulder, and nobody has to guess about my position on that. I do not mean to say by that I am in favor of the budget that was submitted by the President, because I think there are a lot of unnecessary social do-goods, expansion of present social security, and other things in this budget that we can get along without. I am in favor of reducing some five or six or seven billion dollars from that budget, and then putting our people on a straight 48 hours per week base time; no overtime over 40 hours. Put them on a 48-hour week, and get out here and produce the stuff at today's price level, and run our national economy up to $330,000,000,000 or $350,000,000,000 per annum, which we can do; and assess the $62,000,000,000 of taxes, and you will have about 18 percent of the take out of that national income as you have about 18 percent when you were taking $38,000,000,000 out of the $225,000,000,000 national income. We can do the job if we make up our minds to do it. Otherwise, we can let the hounds of inflation devour us. That, I do not want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of propounding a couple of questions to the chairman of the committee. They have regard to section 4. No doubt this has been considered by the committee, but I would appreciate it if the chairman would explain the reason for eliminating amphibious-warfare vessels, landing craft, and mine-warfare vessels from the list of those which this section prohibits being transferred without the consent of Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is the auxiliary end, and they do not want auxiliaries.

Mr. KEATING. It is not clear to me—perhaps there is evidence before the committee to that effect—that other countries are not requesting amphibious-warfare vessels and these landing craft and mine-warfare vessels. I wonder whether those should not also be included in the prohibition against transfer.

Mr. VINSON. In the first place, no country wants that type of auxiliary ship and does not need them. Should they make request for them, in view of our position in regard to combatant types of vessels, no doubt they will come before the committee and say they have a request for auxiliaries and ask us what we think about it. We would probably have a hearing and probably, if the facts warranted, approve it. They could give away or sell auxiliaries, but not combatant types.

Mr. KEATING. We have, of course, great confidence in the gentleman and his committee. By that does the gentleman mean he feels he can assure the House that no such vessels, amphibious-warfare vessels, landing craft, and mine-warfare vessels will be given away or transferred or sold to foreign governments without the matter first being brought before the Congress

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied that if any auxiliary ships were in process of being transferred they would consult the Committees on Armed Services of the House and the Senate, especially in view of the prohibition we are writing in the present bill.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman that the nature of the construction of auxiliary and amphibious craft is such that their life is very limited.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman also feels that if foreign governments should request that such ships be turned over to them the matter would be brought before the committee before definite action was taken?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If this bill is enacted into law, yes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I feel sure the House will understand that in view of this proviso we put in the bill there will be no danger of the auxiliary ships or any other kind of ships being given away without specific act of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for this assurance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member [Mr. SHORT], and all the members of the Committee on Armed Services in bringing out this bill for the construction of naval craft. I congratulate them especially on the authorization of the building of the big airplane carrier which had it been proceeded with 18 months ago would have been completed today.

Mr. Chairman, we are working and fighting for the survival of our country; we are working and fighting for the protection of these youngsters who are in Korea. The construction of that great aircraft carrier would have meant fewer boys killed in Korea, fewer boys lying in the hospitals today.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in my thinking, because I have the opinion of naval experts that sufficient mobile bases in the form of aircraft carriers would mean that Russia and China or any other country would never dare strike us. If we have enough of these mobile aircraft carriers in the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf or wherever needed, this country will be superbly protected. I would gladly have voted for more aircraft carriers—a dozen if necessary.

Reference has been made to the death of Mr. Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense, and the giving of his life for his country. May I again remind the Members of the House of the sacrifice of Admiral Louis Denfeld because he dared tell the Congress and the country of the need for aircraft carriers in our naval construction, and for the construction of other seacraft under the sea and otherwise. He is not an unsung hero, because his praises are sung everywhere. Everyone in the Navy should get down on his knees and thank God for Louis Denfeld. The country as a whole should feel the same way.

Many men have difficult tasks to perform, but when they know in their hearts they are fighting for the survival of our country, no sacrifice is too great for them. The expenditure of money is insignificant, because the people of the country want the money spent in every necessary way to protect our Nation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The state of preparedness that the Navy enjoyed in the beginning of the present Korean conflict was due in a large part to Admiral Denfeld because he was farsighted during his tenure of office as Chief of Naval Operations. I do not want to detract from Admiral Sherman when I make this assertion because he is also doing a good job.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, he is doing a fine job but Admiral Denfeld paved the way for him. Many members of the Navy did not dare speak. The country was thoroughly aroused when Admiral Denfeld did speak, so therefore a great deal of good was accomplished. I shall vote, as I always have, for every wise measure involving our national defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, this is not the place or time to open old sores, but if ever in our history a committee of Congress was justified in a fearless comprehensive report that it wrote, it was the Committee on Armed Services of the House in the B-36 hearings more than a year and a half ago. I think recent events in Korea have fully substantiated and corroborated the sound, solid, common-sense view that our committee took in those hearings in the report that it made. It is too bad that Louis Denfeld was permitted to sacrifice, you might say, his career, but he did the Navy and the country a great service. We can thank God that we had a Navy in this Korean conflict because the evacuation at Hungnam will go down as one of the greatest achievements in our military annals. The gallantry and the resourcefulness shown there are without parallel. We need a Navy more today than we ever have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri in his statement about the great work that the Armed Services Commitee has done. The gentleman knows and I know what a tremendously great country we have and of the great people we have in it. Our people are ready to make any sacrifice for the survival of the country. All they need is to be told the facts and they are with you 100 percent.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, like every Member of the House I am glad today to see this legislation which restores the Navy, and rightfully so, back to the place it formerly occupied. Anyone who has followed our military history knows that a balanced defense made up of three strong arms is vital to the safety of this Nation. In 1949 many of us were alarmed and some of us protested against the planned and attempted demolition of naval aviation and the Marine Corps under the guise of unification. Our old Committee on Naval Affairs, under the able chairmanship of our present distinguished chairman, built up a strong Navy which in the last war contributed momentously to the bringing about of peace and the cessation of hostilities. We witnessed a period in which there was an effort made to relegate that Navy to a role in which its offensive potential was to be stripped from it, and it was to be merely a convoy Navy. The report of the committee, to which the able ranking minority member just referred, called to the attention of the country the danger of that course. With the force of public opinion, the activity of our Committee on Armed Services, and with the importance of our Navy in view of its activities in Korea, still strongly impressed in the minds of the American people today, we are again on the road to reestablishing a strong, aggressive Navy, with an air arm of proven effectiveness—the type of Navy that is vital to the safety of this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that the gentleman from Indiana, a brand new Member making his first speech, emphasized that we do not want to forget—and with all of our desire, in which I join and I know all of the other Members join, to fully fortify our defenses we just cannot put our own judgment aside for everything just because it is put up to us in the Congress on a defense basis. We have to ask some questions and we ought to have a complete record on what we are trying to do. What the gentleman from Indiana emphasized is that this business is not just a matter of building an aircraft carried. That is perhaps the lesser expense. It is like lots of things in life; it is not the

original cost but it is the maintenance that comes high. What he pointed out was that a carrier needs protection; a carrier needs continuous supply; it needs aircraft and this is very important, that carriers are vulnerable. We heard great debate about that fact, and let us again emphasize what he said, which is very true, that this operation in Korea demonstrates that where we fill a world role we have to perform many military responsibilities like those in Korea, which do not represent the kind of full-scale war which we would have to wage if we took on a first-class military power like the only one that is threatening today, the Soviet Union. We are waging a very different kind of war in Korea than we otherwise would if we were in a world war. The primary question of enemy capability in the air alone would make a significant difference.

The question that I would like to address to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is this—and I join with all my colleagues in my deep respect for him—Can the chairman tell us what the strategic mission of the Navy is insofar as it can be made public that justifies this carrier? May I just amplify that question in this way: We always understood and like other Members in the House I went to the Command and General Staff School at Leavenworth, and I have a certain amount of military knowledge, that the classical role of the aircraft carrier was attack on enemy ships and support of aviation in connection with amphibious missions. The question I want to ask is: What is the role of the Navy in strategic bombing which justifies this enormous expense for a new supercarrier which the gentleman from Indiana has properly emphasized, and which justifies us in passing this bill in this fashion?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from New York that one of the justifications is to always have an airplane carrier that can accommodate the expansion and the development in aviation. As naval aviation, particularly jet aviation, develops, we have need for longer and stronger carrier decks. Progress in one demands comparable progress in the other. The construction of this carrier will give the Navy a prototype which will enable it to thoroughly service test any aircraft which will be available to it in the foreseeable future.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell us what has been told to the committee, what the committee can tell the public, as to the role of the Navy in strategic bombing? Does the Navy have a strategic bombing role and, if so, what is it?

Mr. VINSON. The Navy does not have the primary role of strategic bombing. That primary role is assigned, by agreement, to the Air Force. The construction of this ship does not in the slightest degree interfere with the primary roles and missions of the Department of the Air.

Mr. JAVITS. We are then to understand, and the chairman will correct me if I am incorrect, that this is a secondary bombing role which the Air Force agrees, which the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree, and which our military authorities agree, it is necessary to vest in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. I do not think that any one branch of the armed services should have a monopoly of the use of any particular weapon. I think, that if we can develop atomic weapons that the artillery can use, that the Army should have the privilege of using them.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman does agree with me, though, that both the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have agreed that the effort this supercarrier has the capability of mounting shall be part of the Navy mission?

Mr. VINSON. They have agreed that this ship shall be built, and this ship will be used to take care of the development of the aircraft.

Mr. JAVITS. So that when we pass the bill we pass it in response to a completely agreed upon armed services need?

Mr. VINSON. Approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Was the gentleman aware when the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 was passed that there was slipped into that act a provision by which the President of the United States could peddle our combat warships all over the world?

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I did not recall that anything was slipped into the act. The act was very carefully analyzed and very carefully drawn. When the gentleman from Georgia alluded to this act I called a page and sent for a copy of the act to study it in order to determine just exactly what it did do. I did not have it fresh in my mind. I will go to the gentleman's table and read it. But I am confident—and I can say this as a responsible person in the Congress, regardless of what committee one belongs to—there was nothing in the act that was slipped in or slipped by. It was analyzed, it was discussed on the floor, and it was debated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has just said that he himself raised the question with respect to this provision.

An analysis of title IV of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act shows by section 401 that the President could transfer no naval vessel out of military stocks if—

The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such transfer would be detrimental to the national security of the United States, or—

The equipment—

is needed by the Reserve components of the Armed Forces to meet their training requirements.

Considering the character of the Defense Secretary and his experience, considering also the confidence of the Congress in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I can certainly understand the acceptability of this provision within the context of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. I do not see that this should prevent the House from now recalling this power with respect to naval vessels, but I certainly do not see how it can be called a provision slipped by when the power is provided to be so carefully checked.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat puzzled as to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who seems to be speaking for the Air Force, was trying to get at, no doubt because of my ignorance of military procedure. I just want to ask the gentleman from Georgia, in a situation such as they have over there in Korea, such as we had a few days ago when these men were fighting with their backs to the sea, does it make any practical difference, at least to them, whether the Navy or the Air Corps comes to their rescue?

Mr. VINSON. It does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think it did.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman has not forgotten that last summer our ground forces in Korea begged for tactical air support which in plain words is nothing more than close air support for ground troops.

It was the Navy and the Marines who furnished this close air support and the reason they did not furnish more was because they were short of carriers, due to the fact the carriers were in moth balls. Now, air support for the ground troops is being furnished by the Air Force as well as the Navy and Marines. But the fact remains that last summer we were short of carriers, which is one of the many reasons why the 57,000-ton carrier in this bill is urgently needed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to convert not to exceed 1,000,000 tons of existing naval vessels, from among those vessels on the Navy list determined to be best fitted for conversion, to modern naval vessels, of the following categories and subcategories:

(a) Combatant vessels, 980,000 tons, divided into:

1. Warships, 990,000 tons.

2. Mine-warfare vessels, 10,000 tons.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "980,000" and insert "1,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of the foregoing vessels.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an article from the January 16 issue of the New York Times in which I have found shocking statements attributed to one of our leading Air Force generals, and which jars my faith in our military leadership.

This article is based on a purported interview with Maj. Gen. Emmett (Rosie) O'Donnell, commander of our Far East Air Force Bombing Command, who is being transferred to the Strategic 15th Air Force at March Field, Calif.

General O'Donnell is quoted as having said:

> The Air Force now is worried about some of the opinions held on the effect of bombs on limited targets, especially troop concentrations. We would kill a hell of a lot of them (Chinese Communists) if they would concentrate * * * the trouble is that they don't concentrate and I don't blame them.

For the past 5 years the Congress and the people of the United States have been propagandized into a false sense of security relative to our Air Force power and how our strategic planners would strike with lightning and devastating blows on any enemy. Our military men have told us that they had it all planned the way they wanted to fight and where they wanted to fight, but something happened in Korea that they apparently just did not think of. The enemy, according to General O'Donnell, wanted to use other methods of fighting and also determine where they wanted to fight. This caught our planners and propagandists off base and now they have the audacity to say that the enemy will not concentrate so we can kill them.

This reminds me of the statement of a southern general during the Civil War to the effect that "We can lick those damn Yankees with cornstalks but they won't fight with cornstalks."

Another quotation from General O'Donnell's interview, which to me is the most tragic and sickening of all, was:

> We have not learned a single important lesson in this war. We picked up a few small pointers or minor techniques and it was excellent training, but that is all.

Now, mind you, Mr. Chairman, that is the statement of one of our leading generals in the United States Air Force, and if it represents the kind of thinking that persists in the Pentagon today, Heaven help us.

Thousands of our boys have died in the blood-stained rice paddies in Korea and General O'Donnell declares that we have not learned a single important lesson in this war. Does General O'Donnell mean to say that unpreparedness and the lack of a properly trained Air Force to support our troops has not been a lesson from which to profit?

The claims by the Pentagon in October and November of 1950 of complete annihilation of the North Korean Army by tree-top bombing, which was followed the next day by an attack by 30,000 Red troops on our forces from the exact spot where the Air Force claimed to have done such staggering damage, apparently did not teach any lesson. To me such an incident in the Korean War was proof that our planning over there was way off base.

It seems imperative to me that this Congress should demand an explanation of such interviews as was given by General O'Donnell. Any high-ranking officers making such stupid statements as are found in General O'Donnell's interview should be brought to an accounting. They should be brought before the Armed Services Committees of the Congress so that we can ascertain why their strategy has proved so unsound militarily in Korea.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, many of our military leaders have become almost untouchables to criticism. They consider criticism by Members of Congress very unpatriotic and their attitude has had the effect of intimidating Members of Congress. Consequently, this seemingly untouchable group has been able to build up a gigantic political machine, backed by huge sums of money, with never a fear that their bungling and grab for power would ever be contested.

The sad part of it all is that the rank and file of the Air Force and Army, from the privates to the sergeants, have had to take the punishment caused by questionable leadership of the generals. These men in the ranks have courageously fought their hearts out, with death always knocking, yet their leaders refuse to learn from their costly mistakes.

We are paying in blood for the errors, the half-baked thinking, the misconceptions, the inaccuracy and half-truths, and, in many cases, the arrogant disregard of sound military planning. Many military errors have been committed in Korea and they should be thoroughly reviewed. Congress should insist on honest and complete answers to the debacle in Korea. If the reputations of some individuals are dulled by an investigation, so be it. It is more important to have ability and efficiency in command of our fighting forces than it is to have high positions occupied by military politicians. Precious blood and lives and our treasured principles are at stake.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that constructive criticism is always a good thing. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I agreed fully last year with the report of the committee when we stated that Admiral Denfeld had been treated improperly. There is a great deal of criticism that can be made today. I have listened to the remarks that have been made. Many of those remarks were justified, because they were made by members of this committee. This committee works as a whole from both sides of the aisle. Something was said a moment ago about our military leadership, about some lack of resourceful action on the part of our Air Force, I want to say that I am very much concerned that this apparent lack of confidence that is spreading throughout the country may be a terrible handicap to us in our coordinated effort to get prepared for what we are facing in the future. We cannot change the things that have happened in the past, but we must go forward as a body to help correct those mistakes; to take advantage of these mistakes in the future, to let the Red menace that faces us know that the United States of America is advancing to the defense of freedom, liberty, and civilization as a unit. We need cooperation today more that ever in this country. I say to you I do have confidence in our military leaders today. I disliked very much to see Admiral Denfeld go, but I have been impressed with the ability of Admiral Sherman who has taken his place. Taking into consideration the intense cold and the condition of the weather in Korea, our Air Force and our Air Force leaders have given a very fine account of themselves.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. General O'Donnell was commanding a strategic group of airplanes and they did learn nothing about that particular type of warfare.

As you know from the hearings, we had them use B–29's to support ground troops. They are not built for that use. We were caught unprepared in this way, that we had no adequate tactical air force in being which could go there and support the infantry; that is the situation we were caught in. I think the General meant that they learned no important warfare combat lesson because of the fact that they had the wrong kind of planes for the job they were supposed to do. He is a very fine officer in my opinion.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED.. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman that Admiral Sherman is doing a superlatively good job as Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The bill now under consideration provides for the construction of a large aircraft carrier and the construction and conversion of other ships. We need this aircraft carrier and the fact that the will of Congress was heretofore frustrated by the cancellation of the construction of the aircraft carrier *United States* should not prevent us from authorizing today, and later appropriating funds for a large aircraft carrier when we know it is badly needed and we are even more convinced of this need today than when we passed the former bill.

The passage of this bill authorizing the construction of this aircraft carrier is one step forward in the correction of a past mistake, and in the passage of this bill by a unanimous vote, we will give Russia and the world evidence of the fact that we intend to continue to have the greatest Navy in the world, and I predict that in the immediate future we will pass other bills increasing the armed might of the other branches of our Armed Forces sufficiently to where we will be able to successfully resist aggression in those areas which we determine are tenable and which are necessary to be held to preserve our freedom and our liberty.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to query the chairman or some members of the committee. First, as I read the bill, there is no dollar limitation upon this authorization; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As we have talked of the 56,000-ton carrier some figure has been used. What is the figure contemplated as the cost of this carrier?

Mr. VINSON. It is estimated that it will cost $235,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what point of construction of the carrier does the $235,000,000 take us?

Mr. VINSON. That takes care of the machinery and the hull, but it does not include the aircraft.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It does not include the aircraft and many other accessories?

Mr. VINSON. It at least does not include the aircraft.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So we can expect a greater cost than the figure the gentleman gave us. In addition to that and when this carrier is completed and finally goes to sea, how many auxiliary craft is it expected will be needed to accompany this one vessel?

Mr. VINSON. The same number of ships that are used in a task force now of the types of the *Midway* or the *Essex*. The ship will be 1,000 feet long and 225 feet wide. It will have the same screening and the same protection that any of the airplane carriers in the task force have; it will be part and parcel of a task force which oftentimes has three or four airplane carriers in it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I understand that, but it has not been made clear to many of the members of the committee. Do we have in being those auxiliary accompanying craft?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; we have.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am interested in this and I am trying to get some definite information.

Mr. VINSON. We have in reserve enough different categories, cruisers, destroyers, mine sweepers, and so forth, to meet the requirements if this ship goes into action.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We hope, of course, that in the event anything breaks out and we need this carrier it will be in the right ocean. In other words, this carrier cannot go through the canal.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; it will have to go around Cape Horn.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In the use of this carrier would our forces be limited by the same type of order that MacArthur is limited by now? Namely, that if they knew of some particular target that should be bombed the Navy would have to wait for some orders of some supreme power such as the United Nations to give them permission?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. He will realize that that is not a question that would come before the Committee on the Armed Services. He must ask someone else to answer it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is a question which comes to everybody's mind, because with hands tied the way MacArthur's have been, no air force could do a real job anywhere.

Mr. VINSON. According to that argument there is no use having aircraft over there at all. I do not agree with that concept.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course we should have aircraft there. Perhaps at some time in the future the order will be changed. I understand that England has just completed the construction of a flush-deck carrier. I am wondering if in the consideration of this authorization any information has as yet been received by the committee as to the usability and feasibility of this particular type of carrier?

Mr. VINSON. We have not any information to answer that question.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Are our naval officials all now in complete accord on the feasibility of a flush-deck carrier without any superstructure at all?

Mr. VINSON. There would necessarily have to be a certain type of island on this flush-deck carrier. It will be a small island. It will not be a flush deck in the broad sense that you would say this table is a flush-top table.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There has been some modification in the original plans calling for flush deck?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. They will have a small island.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They are satisfied that the planned island will be sufficient to give them the needed operational ability and there will be no interference with landing or taking off?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit disappointed to hear inserted in the RECORD by my good friend and able colleague from Michigan who spoke a while ago a quotation by an Air Force general indicating that we have learned no lessons from Korea and also quoting him to indicate that our Air Force had done less than a magnificent job over there in Korea.

I want to say that I support the present bill wholeheartedly, as I recognize, like anyone else who believes in a well-balanced national defense, that we must have a strong and versatile Navy. I think the Navy has done a magnificent job in Korea and off the coast of Korea. It performed a magnificent job in evacuating troops from the northern part of Korea, then landing them down in the southern part of Korea. It had a real problem to contend with when they carried out that difficult operation.

I have talked to the men who came back from Korea and they uniformly agree that the Air Force likewise has been doing a magnificent job over there. It has done a great job. At times I do not believe we could have kept men in Korea without the backing of our Air Force working 24 hours a day. If I have any thought I want to get over today to this House it is that unification is working in Korea. We have three great branches of service over there, the Army, Navy, the Air Force and, of course, the fighting marines, which are under the Navy. They are all working together as a great team and they are all doing a magnificent job.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I hope the gentleman did not construe my remarks as a criticism of the Air Corps. My remarks were to criticize a lot of stupid statements being made by generals in interviews and so forth, and also, if I had been permitted to finish my remarks, I would have pointed out that some promotions that are being made should be based on merit rather than upon politics down in the Pentagon Building. That is what I mean to bring out.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I felt sure that the gentleman wanted to praise the armed services in the Far East as a unit. I am critical however of the remarks made by the general officer to whom the gentleman from Michigan referred; I am very critical of that fact because I think unification is working over there in Korea today, and I think all branches of the service are doing a fine job under most adverse conditions. I know that the Navy and Air Force have a different type of role to perform than that of the Ground Forces. I know that we have no opposition from the enemy in the air and we have no opposition on the high seas, that the opposition is on the land, and the Ground Forces have done the real job of carrying the heavy burden of the load, supported by the Navy and the Air Force at the present time. In the supporting roles, the Navy and the Air Force are doing equally a great job and are entitled to recognition likewise with the Army for a magnificent role in Korea today.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or the provisions of any other law, no battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the United States which has not been stricken from the Navy Register as provided by section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296), as amended, or any interest of the United States in any such vessel, shall hereafter be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of unless authorized hereafter by the Congress.

SEC. 5. The balance of tonnage authorizations remaining in the following acts are hereby rescinded:

(a) The act of December 17, 1943 (Public Law 204, 78th Cong.).

(b) The act of July 9, 1942 (Public Law 665, 77th Cong.).

(c) The act of May 24, 1941 (Public Law 72, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of December 17, 1941 (Public Law 353, 77th Cong.).

(d) The act of May 26, 1943 (Public Law 61, 78th Cong.).

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MILLS] having assumed the Chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 0, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—366

Aandahl	Burton	Frazier
Abbitt	Busbey	Fugate
Abernethy	Bush	Furcolo
Adair	Butler	Gamble
Addonizio	Byrne, N. Y.	Garmatz
Albert	Byrnes, Wis.	Gary
Allen, Calif.	Camp	Gathings
Allen, La.	Canfield	Gavin
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon	George
Anderson, Calif.	Carlyle	Golden
Andresen, August H.	Carnahan	Goodwin
Andrews	Case	Gordon
Anfuso	Chatham	Gore
Arends	Chelf	Gossett
Armstrong	Chenoweth	Graham
Aspinall	Chiperfield	Granahan
Auchincloss	Chudoff	Granger
Ayres	Church	Green
Bailey	Clevenger	Greenwood
Baker	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Barden	Cole, N. Y.	Gross
Baring	Combs	Hagen
Barrett	Cooper	Hale
Bates, Ky.	Corbett	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bates, Mass.	Cotton	Hall, Leonard W.
Battle	Cox	Hand
Beamer	Crawford	Harden
Beckworth	Cunningham	Hardy
Belcher	Curtis, Mo.	Harris
Bender	Curtis, Nebr.	Harrison, Va.
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Harrison, Wyo.
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Hart
Bentsen	Davis, Wis.	Harvey
Berry	Dawson	Havenner
Betts	Deane	Hays, Ark.
Bishop	DeGraffenried	Hébert
Blackney	Delaney	Heriong
Blatnik	Dempsey	Heselton
Boggs, Del.	Denton	Hess
Bolling	Devereux	Hill
Bolton	D'Ewart	Hillings
Bonner	Dolliver	Hinshaw
Bosone	Dondero	Hoeven
Bow	Donovan	Hoffman, Ill.
Boykin	Doughton	Hoffman, Mich.
Bramblett	Doyle	Holifield
Bray	Eberharter	Holmes
Brehm	Elliott	Hope
Brooks	Engle	Horan
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Howell
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Hull
Brownson	Feighan	Hunter
Bryson	Fellows	Irving
Buchanan	Fenton	Jackson, Calif.
Buckley	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.
Budge	Fine	James
Buffett	Flood	Jarman
Burdick	Fogarty	Javits
Burleson	Forand	Jenison
Burnside	Ford	Jensen
Burton	Forrester	Johnson
Busbey	Fugate	Jones, Ala.
Bush	Furcolo	Jones, Mo.
Butler	Gamble	Jones, Hamilton C.
Byrne, N. Y.	Garmatz	Jones, Woodrow W.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gary	Judd
Camp	Gathings	Karsten, Mo.
Canfield	Gavin	Kean
Cannon	George	Kearney
Carlyle	Golden	Kearns
Carnahan	Goodwin	Keating
Case	Gordon	Kelley, Pa.
Chatham	Gore	Kelly, N. Y.
Chelf	Gossett	Keogh
Chenoweth	Graham	Kerr
Chiperfield	Granahan	Kersten, Wis.
Chudoff	Granger	Kilday
Church	Green	King
Clevenger	Greenwood	Kirwan
Cole, Kans.	Gregory	Klein
Cole, N. Y.	Gross	Kluczynski
Combs	Hagen	Lanham
Cooper	Hale	Lantaff
Corbett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Latham
Cotton	Hall, Leonard W.	LeCompte
Cox	Hand	Lesinski
Crawford	Harden	Lind
Cunningham	Hardy	Lovre
Curtis, Mo.	Harris	Lucas
Curtis, Nebr.	Harrison, Va.	Lyle
Dague	Harrison, Wyo.	McCarthy
Davis, Ga.	Hart	McConnell
Davis, Wis.	Harvey	McCormack
Dawson	Havenner	McCulloch
Deane	Hays, Ark.	McDonough
DeGraffenried	Hébert	McGregor
Delaney	Heriong	McGuire
Dempsey	Heselton	McKinnon
Denton	Hess	McMullen
Devereux	Hill	McVey
D'Ewart	Hillings	Machrowicz
Dolliver	Hinshaw	Mack, Wash.
Dondero	Hoeven	Madden
Donovan	Hoffman, Ill.	Magee
Doughton	Hoffman, Mich.	Mahon
Doyle	Holifield	Mansfield
Eberharter	Holmes	Marshall
Elliott	Hope	Martin, Iowa
Engle	Horan	Martin, Mass.
Evins	Howell	Mason
Fallon	Hull	Meader
Feighan	Hunter	Merrow
Fellows	Irving	Miller, Calif.
Fenton	Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.
Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.	Miller, Nebr.
Fine	James	Mills
Flood	Jarman	Mitchell
Fogarty	Javits	Morgan
Forand	Jenison	Morris
Ford	Jensen	Morton
Forrester	Johnson	Moulder
Frazier	Jones, Ala.	Mumma
	Jones, Mo.	Murdock
	Jones, Hamilton C.	Murphy
	Jones, Woodrow W.	Murray, Tenn.
	Judd	Murray, Wis.
	Karsten, Mo.	Nelson
	Kean	Nicholson
	Kearney	Norblad
	Kearns	Norrell
	Keating	O'Brien, Ill.
	Kelley, Pa.	O'Brien, Mich.
	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Hara
	Keogh	O'Konski
	Kerr	Ostertag
	Kersten, Wis.	Passman
	Kilday	Patman
	King	Patterson
	Kirwan	Perkins
	Klein	Pickett
	Kluczynski	Poage
	Lanham	Polk
	Lantaff	Potter
	Latham	Poulson
	LeCompte	Powell
	Lesinski	Preston
	Lind	Price
	Lovre	Priest
	Lucas	Prouty
	Lyle	Quinn
	McCarthy	Radwan
	McConnell	Rains
	McCormack	Ramsay
	McCulloch	Rankin
	McDonough	Redden
	McGregor	Reece, Tenn.
	McGuire	Reed, Ill.
	McKinnon	Reed, N. Y.
	McMullen	Rees, Kans.
	McVey	Regan
	Machrowicz	Rhodes
	Mack, Wash.	Ribicoff
	Madden	Riehlman
	Magee	Riley
	Mahon	Roberts
	Mansfield	Robeson
	Marshall	Rodino
	Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Colo.
	Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.
	Mason	Rogers, Mass.
	Meader	Rogers, Tex.
	Merrow	Rooney
	Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt
	Miller, Md.	Sadlak
	Miller, Nebr.	St. George
	Mills	Sasscer
	Mitchell	Schwabe
	Morgan	Scott, Hardie
	Morris	Scrivner
	Morton	Scudder
	Moulder	Secrest
		Seely-Brown
		Shafer
		Shelley
		Sheppard
		Short
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Sittler
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Miss.
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Spence
		Springer
		Staggers
		Stanley
		Steed
		Stefan
		Stigler
		Sullivan
		Taber
		Tackett
		Talle
		Taylor
		Teague
		Thomas
		Thompson, Mich.
		Thompson, Tex.
		Thornberry
		Tollefson
		Towe
		Trimble
		Vail
		Van Pelt
		Van Zandt
		Vaughn
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Walter
		Weichel
		Werdel
		Wheeler
		Whitaker
		Whitten
		Wickersham
		Widnall
		Wier
		Wigglesworth
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N. Y.
		Willis
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wolverton
		Wood, Ga.
		Wood, Idaho
		Woodruff
		Yates
		Yorty
		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—68

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	O'Neill
Angell	Grant	O'Toole
Beall	Gwinn	Patten
Boggs, La.	Halleck	Philbin
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Phillips
Celler	Hedrick	Rabaut
Clemente	Heffernan	Reams
Colmer	Heller	Richards
Cooley	Herter	Rivers
Coudert	Jenkins	Sabath
Crosser	Jonas	Saylor
Crumpacker	Kee	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Sheehan
Dingell	Kilburn	Sieminski
Dollinger	Lane	Stockman
Donohue	Larcade	Sutton
Dorn	McGrath	Underwood
Durham	McMillan	Velde
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.	Wharton
Elston	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Morrison	Wolcott
Fulton	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walcott.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Velde.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Kilburn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RABAUT, Michigan; Mr. MCGREGOR, Ohio.

AMENDING CHAPTER 26 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 73, amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end of subchapter E a new section designated 3183 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3183. National emergency transfers of distilled spirits.

"(a) Transfers permitted: under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, distilled spirits of any proof including alcohol (the term 'distilled spirits' or 'spirits' as hereinafter used in this section shall include alcohol) may be removed in bond in approved containers and pipelines from any registered distillery including a registered fruit distillery (such registered distillery and registered fruit distillery hereinafter referred to as 'distillery'), internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse to any distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse for redistillation, or storage, or any other purpose deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense: *Provided*, That any such distilled spirits may be stored in approved tanks in, or constituting a part of, any internal revenue bonded warehouse or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse: *Provided further*, That any such distilled spirits removed to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse may be withdrawn therefrom if of a proof of 160 degrees or more for any tax-free purpose, or upon payment of tax for any purpose, authorized by part II of subchapter C; and any such distilled spirits removed to a distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse may be withdrawn therefrom if of a proof of 160 degrees or more for any tax-free purpose authorized by part II of subchapter C or for any purpose authorized in the case of like spirits produced at a distillery: *Provided further*, That any such distilled spirits, upon removal from a distil-

lery or internal revenue bonded warehouse for transfer to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse or for any tax-free purpose authorized by part II of subchapter C, shall be subject to the provisions of part II of subchapter C: *Provided further*, That when any distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of this section to a distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, the tax liability of the proprietor of the distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse from which the spirits are removed, and the liens on such distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse, shall cease; and at and from the time the distilled spirits leave the distillery, internal revenue bonded warehouse, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse the tax shall be the liability of the proprietor of, and the liens shall be transferred to the premises of, the distillery, industrial alcohol plant, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse to which the distilled spirits are transferred: *Provided further*, That when any distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of this section to an internal revenue bonded warehouse the proprietor of such warehouse shall be primarily liable for the tax on the spirits at and from the time the spirits leave the premises from which transferred: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 2901 of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred, or removed for transfer, under this section to a distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse; and the provisions of section 3113 of the code shall apply in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred, or removed for transfer, under this section to an industrial alcohol plant or industrial alcohol bonded warehouse: *And provided further*, That sections 2836, 2800 (a) (5), and 3250 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the redistillation of such spirits at a distillery nor shall section 2780 of the code apply to the removal of such spirits from any distillery or internal revenue bonded warehouse.

"(b) Exemption from statutory requirements: The Secretary may temporarily exempt proprietors of distilleries, internal revenue bonded warehouses, industrial alcohol plants, or industrial alcohol bonded warehouses from any provision of the internal revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, except those requiring payment of the tax thereon, whenever in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so to meet the requirements of the national defense. Whenever the Secretary shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection he may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose which caused him to grant the exemption.

"(c) Termination of section: The authority conferred upon the Secretary by this section shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of this section."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 73 would permit the use of beverage spirits in the synthetic rubber program and other phases of the National Preparedness Program, and would provide for appropriate safeguards and controls for the withdrawal and movement of such alcohol under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The authority conferred is similar to emergency legislation in effect during World War II.

The legislation has the support of all interested departments in the executive branch of the Government and received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. Identical legislation was passed unanimously by the House late in the Eighty-first Congress but failed of passage in the Senate because of insufficient time for its consideration.

DETAILED EXPLANATION

The emergency provisions of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code (sec. 2883 (c), (d), and (e)), which were enacted early in 1942 and which permitted, during World War II, the utilization for industrial purposes of distilled spirits produced at beverage distilleries, were repealed by Public Law No. 448, approved February 21, 1950. It is again necessary to make available distilled spirits produced at beverage distilleries for industrial use in the defense effort, under internal-revenue safeguard.

Under section 3331 of the Internal Revenue Code, the Government may withdraw and is presently withdrawing beverage distilled spirits for emergency industrial use. However, this section of the law makes no provision for the transportation in bond, storage, denaturization, or distillation of such spirits under internal-revenue supervision, after withdrawal free of tax for governmental purposes. This joint resolution would restore, with minor modifications found desirable as a result of experience during World War II, the emergency provisions formerly contained in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Subsection (a) of this joint resolution would accomplish the following:

First. Permit the removal of distilled spirits from registered distilleries, internal-revenue bonded warehouses, industrial-alcohol plants, and industrial-alcohol bonded warehouses, to any other such facility for any purpose deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense;

Second. Permit the storage of distilled spirits in approved tanks in any bonded warehouse;

Third. Permit the withdrawal of distilled spirits of 160 degrees of proof or more from a distillery, industrial-alcohol plant, or bonded warehouse for any tax-free purpose authorized by sections 3100 to 3126, inclusive, of chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code;

Fourth. Permit the transfer of tax liability and tax liens where distilled spirits are removed under the provisions of the section from one plant or warehouse to another plant or warehouse;

Fifth. Make applicable the provisions of sections 2901 and 3113 (relating to losses and tax refunds for leakage or evaporation) in respect of losses of any distilled spirits transferred or removed for transfer under the subsection; and

Sixth. Make inapplicable section 2836, which restricts hours for distilling, and sections 2800 (a) (5) and 3250 (f), relating to the rectification of spirits, in respect of redistillation of such spirits at a distillery. It would also make inapplicable section 2870, which prohibits the removal of spirits from any distillery or bonded warehouse at any time except during daylight hours.

Subsection (b) of the proposed new section 3183 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury temporarily to exempt proprietors of distilleries, internal-revenue bonded warehouses, industrial-alcohol plants, or industrial-alcohol bonded warehouses from any provision of the internal-revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, except to require the payment of tax thereon, whenever in his judgment it is deemed necessary to do so to meet the requirements of the national defense. This subsection (b) is the only significant difference between this joint resolution and the provisions of former section 2883 (c), (d), and (e). The only other difference which may be noted is that this joint resolution would permit the transfer to, and storage of, alcohol on distillery or internal-revenue bonded warehouse premises.

Subsection (c) provides that the authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the proposed new section shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of such section.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN TEXTILE MACHINES AND PARTS FROM DUTY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1012) to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina as to the extent of the importations that will come in under this bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this will permit the importation of certain textile machinery by educational, religious, or charitable organizations for their own use only. They will not be imported for any other use or for resale or anything of that kind. A similar bill was passed by the House in the last Congress but failed in the Senate on account of lack of time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a pretty broad bill. As I understand it, there is only one special type of machine not manufactured in this country that will be brought in, is that right?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1012 would permit the free entry of textile machinery imported by an educational, religious, or charitable organization "for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use." Free entry is now provided under existing law for similar articles used for instruction purposes. The legislation is identical with a bill which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent late in the Eighty-first Congress. This measure, H. R. 1012, has also been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title II (the free list) thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"PAR. 1817. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GASOLINE TAX DEDUCTION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deduction of retail sales taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) Gasoline and retail sales taxes: In the case of a tax imposed by any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, upon persons engaged in selling tangible personal property at retail, or upon persons selling gasoline or other motor vehicle fuels either at wholesale or retail, which is measured by the gross sales price or the gross receipts from the sale or which is a stated sum per unit of such property sold, or upon persons engaged in furnishing services at retail, which is measured by the gross receipts for furnishing such services, if the amount of such tax is separately stated, then to the extent that the amount so stated is paid by the consumer (otherwise than in connection with the consumer's trade or business) to his vendor such amount shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of such consumer as if such amount constituted a tax imposed upon and paid by such consumer."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "December 31, 1948" and insert "December 31, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 136 would allow consumers of gasoline a deduction for income-tax purposes for State taxes on gasoline or motor-vehicle fuels imposed at the wholesale level but passed on to consumers. Most States impose taxes on gasoline and other motor fuel at the retail level. Six or seven States, however, impose taxes at the wholesale level which, nevertheless, appear as a separate item in the price paid by the consumer. This bill would merely allow consumers in such States to receive the same deduction for income-tax purposes as consumers in other States.

Identical legislation was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means late in the Eighty-first Congress, at which time the Treasury Department stated it would have no objection to enactment of legislation to accomplish this purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next, and that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week, if possible?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. There is no further legislative program for the remainder of the week. Our purpose in going over until Friday is simply that the Committee on Ways and Means might report the renegotiation bill, and it will not be ready until Friday. That is the reason for going over. There will be no legislative business at all on Friday, so the Members can govern themselves accordingly.

On Tuesday next the renegotiation bill will come up, assuming a rule is reported, which I think probably will. Then I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that a bill relating to the reorganization of the Air Force is about nearing its completion in committee, and they expect it to be reported out and a rule obtained. That bill will be assigned for Wednesday.

Any other program for next week I am unable to state now, but if any does develop I shall advise the House as far in advance as I possibly can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the information the gentleman has given us.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ACT INTRODUCED—VITAL TO EXISTENCE OF SMALL BUSINESS DURING MOBILIZATION PERIOD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation of the greatest importance to small businessmen throughout the Nation was introduced simultaneously in the Senate and House today by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and myself, as chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House.

This legislation is the Small Defense Plants Act of 1951. It is H. R. 1600. Its urgency, as well as its nonpartisan nature, is demonstrated by the fact that every member of both the Senate and House Small Business Committees has given it his endorsement. In the Senate, I understand that all the members of the committee are joining Chairman SPARKMAN as cosponsors of the bill. Several members of the House committee plan to introduce the bill, and all members endorsed it in the committee's final report.

FATE OF SMALL BUSINESS DEPENDS ON THE CONGRESS

It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of thousands of small businesses throughout the Nation hangs on the passage of the Small Defense Plants Act.

At present, the small businessman is holding the short end of the stick when it comes to obtaining scarce materials or equipment, since the large producers are taking care of their own affiliate or subsidiary fabricators first. The small businessman also is handicapped in obtaining defense contracts, since he cannot afford to station representatives at the doors of the Government procurement agencies.

In addition, the small-business man has been placed at a disadvantage by the broad authority given the military departments to negotiate contracts, rather than to advertise for bids. Small business has proved that it can compete with big business on a public-bid basis, but the bulk of negotiated defense contracts has been given to large companies rather than small ones.

I am sure that most of the Members have heard of these problems from small-business men in their own districts. Every day, small-business men from various parts of the Nation have come to the House Small Business Committee, or have been referred there by their Representatives, in search of assistance to enable them to continue in operation.

PRESENT LAWS ARE NOT ADEQUATE

The committee has done what it can, as have the small-business offices which have been set up in the procurement agencies. The unvarnished fact, however, is that under present law, no one has any real authority to give small business an equal opportunity to compete for defense contracts or to obtain scarce materials. The job will not be done unless new legislation is passed.

After extensive study and investigation, the House Small Business Committee has come to the conclusion that the Small Defense Plants Act is the answer to the pressing problems now confronting small business. It is based on the Smaller War Plants Act of World War II, but it embodies a more positive approach. Where the Smaller War Plants Act included permissive clauses, the Small Defense Plants Act has mandatory provisions which assure that action will be taken.

Prompt action by the present Congress will save the day for small-business men throughout the Nation. No more important action can be taken for the preservation of our system of free, competitive enterprise.

The Small Defense Plants Act is discussed in further detail in a joint statement by Senator SPARKMAN and myself which will be inserted in today's RECORD by Senator SPARKMAN. In addition, the final report of the House Small Business Committee includes an analysis of the bill, as introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, and the compelling reasons for its passage. This analysis is part of the section, Small Business and the Mobilization Program, beginning on page 11 of the report. The material on the Small Defense Plants Act runs from page 26 through page 35.

Without objection, I should like to insert this material at this point in the RECORD for the further information of Members:

PROPOSED SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION (H. R. 9243 AND S. 3978)

Under the joint sponsorship of the chairman of this committee and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, a bill was introduced to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise. The enacting clause provides that the legislation may be cited as the "Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1950." This bill as introduced follows the general pattern of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act but with sufficient change in language to make it a more positive instrumentality. Many of the provisions of the SWPC Act were permissive, whereas the proposed Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1950 contains many mandatory provisions designed to more affirmatively aid small business in its participation in the national defense program and to make certain that small business also retains its fair share of essential civilian production.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION—EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION IN WORLD WAR II

The proposed legislation is the result of experience in World War II. This experience is a warning, because the Smaller War Plants Corporation was not set up during the defense period but came at a time when we were in a full-scale and devastating war. The bill was introduced by the present chairman of the committee after all other efforts to effectively mobilize small business had failed and after it had become apparent that small business must have an agency within the Government which could speak and act for all small business. This experience also demonstrated that during a period in which policies are determined and plans inaugurated small business cannot make itself heard at the council tables. This experience justifies the conclusion that the only way to fully mobilize small business is to provide an agency for that purpose. Such an agency provides a rallying point for all small business and enables the Government to utilize our industrial capacity to the fullest extent.

Experience has also taught us that during periods of emergency when the greatest emphasis is on defense mobilization civilian supplies normally furnished by small business cannot be had because of the inequitable distribution of raw materials. There is ample proof that it is necessary to establish an agency within our national defense structure with adequate powers to solve the problems of small business, not only to fully mobilize for the national defense but to safeguard the segment of our economy which, more than any other, exemplifies our free enterprise system. The committee does not take the position that the present bill is the complete answer to all small-business problems in a defense economy, but it is of the opinion that passage of this or similar legislation will be a long step forward.

It was the extreme imbalance of the economic scales in the production program of World War II that finally forced Congress to act. The Smaller War Plants Corporation Act became law on June 11, 1942. This action in behalf of small business was slow in coming and was almost too late. The agency could not really begin to function effectively until early 1944, after the peak years of war production had passed. By this time the pattern of war production had been set. Big business had converted early and extensively from peacetime to wartime production, and small business had played little or no part. With these handicaps the Smaller War Plants Corporation began the job of mobilizing the full potential strength of the Nation's small-business institutions for the war effort.

Once given the chance, small business showed what it could do. Despite every conceivable obstacle, small business manufactured some 30 percent of World War II production. Had there been an effective Smaller War Plants Corporation in the early days of the war, the achievement of small business would have been even more impressive.

The most valuable single activity of the Smaller War Plants Corporation seems to have been the liaison work between small-business men, and procurement agencies for the awarding of prime contracts. The Corporation was able to act effectively as a Washington representative for thousands of small-business men who, on their own, could not afford to maintain a 5- or 10-percenter in residence. The last available figures on number and value of prime contracts awarded with the assistance of the Smaller War Plants Corporation carry through July 1945. These figures are set forth in graphic form in chart III.

A study of chart III readily shows that SWPC got its prime-contracts assistance program under way slowly. Beginning in early 1944, the trend of prime-contract assistance shows increasing momentum until, in 1945, it reached its peak. In the bimonthly period April to May 1945 some 600 prime contracts, valued at $750,000,000 were awarded with SWPC assistance. SWPC actively assisted small plants in obtaining reconversion contracts in addition to war contracts.

The Corporation succeeded to a lesser extent in procuring for small-business men subcontracts from cooperating large prime contractors. When a large prime contractor found that he had to subcontract part of his work, he could contact SWPC and through its offices be put in touch with qualified small manufacturers who had available productive capacity. Chart IV, which follows, is self-explanatory.

The Corporation was also empowered to make direct loans to small business to finance plant and equipment improvement and to supply capital to be used in the manufacture of war or essential civilian supplies. The Corporation could also purchase capital equipment and lease it to small plants holding war contracts. The record of loans to small business is shown on chart V.

The achievement of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is measurable in concrete terms. Despite its slow start, the Corporation succeeded in loaning more than $550,000,000. Losses were insignificant. Almost a billion dollars in subcontracts was obtained by small business through the direct assistance of the Corporation. More than $5,500,000,000 worth of prime contracts was awarded to small business with the assistance of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. These figures show anything but an insignificant achievement. It is clearly indicated by the record that the Smaller War Plants Act and the Corporation created under this act did much to advance the knowledge and understanding of the position of small business in the American economy.

This act also had the effect of focusing attention on our antitrust laws and antitrust law enforcement. In the postwar period the accumulated evidence of the concentration of economic power and the misuse of that power served to illustrate the necessity and the desirability of more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws for the protection of small-business enterprise. The provisions in the Defense Production Act with respect to abrogation of these laws during the present period of mobilization are recent evidence of the desire on the part of the Congress to keep our antitrust laws intact during periods of emergency.

ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS

No attempt will be made in this analysis to interpret precisely each section and subsection of the proposed Small Business Defense Plants Act; rather, the analysis is intended to delineate the broad objectives intended to be accomplished. Essentially, the bill provides for positive means for small business:

(1) To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;

(2) To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;

(3) To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;

(4) To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and

(5) To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

In order to accomplish these major objectives, provision is made for:

(1) The integration of this legislation with the basic legislation: The Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 2 (a)).

(2) A revolving fund in the Treasury for the purpose of making loans and acquiring property (sec. 2 (b)).

(3) The appointment of a board of directors to exercise the managerial functions of the Corporation (sec. 2 (c)). This provision is of particular interest to small business because of the qualifications of the members of the board. The board, which is to be composed of 5 directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, is to be composed of 2 members who have been engaged exclusively in private small-business enterprise, in industry, or commerce for at least 10 years. The three other directors are to be chosen, one from the ranks of labor, one from the ranks of farmers, and one from the public at large. The foregoing managerial plan should bring together appointees from four groups having the basic small-business-consumer philosophy of free, competitive enterprise at its best.

(4) Banking powers vested in the Corporation to enable it to adequately finance small-business concerns for defense and essential civilian production (sec. 3 (a) and (b)).

(5) The Corporation's entry into contracts with the United States Government for the purpose of furnishing equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government and to arrange for the performance of such contracts through the letting of subcontracts to small-business concerns. This would enable the Small Defense Plants Corporation to act as a Government prime contractor and to sublet to small-business concerns who would act as subcontractors to the Corporation. This very important provision was added to the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act after its original passage and proved to be extremely beneficial to small business. Actually, the SWPC took over very few contracts, but the power was there to do so if necessary and was, in effect, notice to the procuring agencies to award small business a fair proportion of the prime contracts. It is an effective provision by which the end result can be obtained without its being utilized to any appreciable extent (sec. 3).

(6) Authority to coordinate and to determine the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production. To that end the Corporation would be empowered to consult and cooperate with the appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting production. Likewise, the bill imposes upon other governmental agencies the duty and responsibility of consulting and cooperating with the Corporation for the accomplishment of the same objectives (sec. 6).

(7) Full mobilization and integration of small business in the national defense program by empowering the Corporation to make or arrange for a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production. This is a very important provision particularly during a period of partial mobilization. An inventory of small-business concerns has long been on the agenda of the committees and agencies dealing with proposed programs of plant dispersal. The committee is of the opinion that, if a complete inventory of the productive capacity of small business could be made promptly and expeditiously, it would be found that much of our potential productive strength and manpower is already widely dispersed. In many lines of productivity, our strength may possibly be found already adequately dispersed throughout the country, while in other lines the nucleus for expansion away from the concentrated areas would be found existent.

The committee believes that it is of paramount importance to have such an inventory made, not only in order that we may have proper dispersal of our productive capacity but in order that our villages, towns, and cities may retain their full importance in the national community. It is uneconomic and impractical for us as a Nation to draw manpower and materials into highly concentrated areas to the detriment of other geographic areas of our country. We should, and must, have plant dispersal, and it may best be accomplished, and can be accomplished, by the utilization and expansion of existing facilities in every part in our country. The committee is of the opinion that a most constructive approach to the plant-dispersal problem is a complete inventory of small-business productive capacity of all types throughout the United States (sec. 7 (1)).

(8) Obtaining detailed information on subcontracting and the treatment received by subcontractors from Government prime contractors. Provision is also made enabling the Corporation to take appropriate action to insure that subcontractors who are small-business concerns receive fair and equitable prices, conditions, and terms from prime contractors.

This is an important provision for small business because of the concentration of prime contracts in the hands of a relatively few concerns as compared with the total number which could be employed in production for national defense. One of the greatest sources of complaint during and following World War II was the subcontractors who claimed inequitable and unfair treatment at the hands of the prime contractors. Instances of prime contractors' renegotiating and receiving a higher price with no adjustment of subcontract prices were brought to the attention of the committee. If small businesses are to be utilized principally as subcontractors in our national defense program, the committee is of the opinion that it is the duty of the Congress and the Government to insure fair and equitable treatment in the making and performance of subcontracts (sec. 7 (3)).

(9) Necessary action to be taken by the Corporation to provide incentive for small-business concerns to engage in work in the interest of the national defense or in vital civilian production. This incentive may be provided through loans to facilitate conversion of existing plants or by equipping such plants and giving equal opportunity in every respect (sec. 7 (4)).

(10) Determination by the Corporation of which business enterprises within any industry are to be designated "small-business concerns." The committee recognizes that a small concern in the steel industry is vastly different in capitalization, number of persons employed, sales volume, and so forth, than a small concern, for instance, in the tool and die industry. This determination is for the purpose of qualifying small-business concerns for the benefits to be derived under the proposed legislation. This type of determination would be a long step forward in removing the cause of general dissatisfaction with the definitions of small business currently incorporated in the various procurement acts. The procurement agencies presently use that part of the definition pertaining to number of employees in a single business enterprise, including affiliates and subsidiaries, but do not use the other two standards incorporated in the definition. These standards are that the business enterprise must be independently owned and operated and that it is not dominant in an industry (sec. 7 (6)).

(11) Examination by the Corporation of the method of filling orders and the bases for allocating materials when small-business concerns are unable to obtain scarce materials either for national defense or for essential civilian supply. Equipment, materials, and supplies are the lifeblood of small business and are as necessary to their existence, whether in the manufacturing or the distributing trades, as they are to that of big business. The difference is in the arteries of supply.

If allocation of materials, equipment, and supplies is undertaken by the Government under the Defense Production Act, the Corporation is empowered to make studies and recommendations which other agencies must accept. This plan of operation would assure small-business concerns a fair and equitable share of such supplies both for national defense and for essential civilian goods.

(12) A specific course of action rather than a mere policy declaration that a "fair proportion" of all Government purchases shall be placed with small-business concerns. The bill provides that small-business concerns shall receive prime contracts if it is determined by the Corporation and the contracting procurement agency "(1) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (2) to be in the interest of the national defense program" (sec. 8 (a) and (b)).

Sections which have not been mentioned are principally procedural and administrative.

SMALL-BUSINESS MOBILIZATION IMPERILED

The lack of integration of small business in mobilization plans imperils not only small business but mobilization itself. Logistics is defined as "that branch of the military art which embraces the details of the transport, quartering, and supply of troops." A modern military establishment cannot live on the countryside nor set up a forge here and there to mold bullets or to sharpen sabers. The operation of a modern military establishment is the most exacting and skilled business operation in the world today. In the support of our military requirements, every man, woman, and child in the United States is expected to accept his share of the duty and responsibility involved in the mobilization of our total resources. No patriotic citizen questions for a moment the inherent duty freely accepted by the young men and women of our country who serve in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. No one questions for a moment the right of our Government of the people, through their duly elected representatives, to set up agencies and do those things which are necessary to take care of the problem of logistics for our Armed Forces. No one questions the necessity for sacrifice and denial, oftentimes even the necessities of life, on the part of our civilian population in the maintenance of our basic freedoms.

If these things be true, why then is it necessary for this committee or any other committee of the Congress to fight for the rights of small business in the mobilization program? The policy of the Congress with regard to small business has been plainly expressed in procurement and other legislation and more recently in the Defense Production Act. The executive department has accepted that policy as being fundamentally sound and has taken steps to make it effective. In view of these two salient facts, why is it necessary to provide for an additional agency specifically charged with the duty and responsibility of providing an equal opportunity for small business in the mobilization program.

INFORMATION CANNOT SUPPLANT POSITIVE ACTION

The fundamental difficulties lie in two general areas: First, the apparent lack of comprehension on the part of administrative officials in carrying out congressional policy and, secondly, the need for more definite standards by which the policy of Congress may be carried out. The services rendered to small business by the administrative departments and agencies is largely informational in character. Information does not, in and of itself, provide an equal opportunity for small business to participate in the national-defense program or in the supplying of essential civilian needs. It cannot take the place of positive action such as would be provided by the establishment of an

agency specifically charged with the responsibility of solving small-business problems.

SMALL-BUSINESS SUPPORT

The committee has received numerous expressions from small-business men all over the country in support of legislation to establish a Small Defense Plants Corporation. Many small-business organizations representing all types of industry and commerce have indicated their interest. The Small Business-Antimonopoly Conference, composed of national organizations representing small business, farmers, labor, and consumers, has urged the passage of the bill to "create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise."

UNANIMOUS ENDORSEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

The committee is fully cognizant of the situation which prevailed prior to passage of the Smaller War Plants Act of 1942. Members of the committee recall the well-nigh impossible situation in which small business found itself during the 2 years prior to Pearl Harbor. The committee realizes that the continued work of the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate during the past 9 years has greatly improved the relationship between the Government and small business and that sincere efforts are being made to solve small-business problems under existing legislation. However, the committee is of the firm opinion that these problems cannot be wholly solved without the establishment of a separate agency with sufficient power and authority to mobilize all small business. It is also essential that small-business concerns do not lose their place in manufacturing and distributing products for civilian use.

The committee concedes that the failure to give adequate consideration to the problems of small business in our present circumstances is not willful neglect. It is due to the fact that many of the problems pressing for a decision must be considered in their entirety. The collateral issues involved must often be brushed aside if the end result is to be obtained. In the absence of the proper tools, equipment, and necessary materials, no manufacturer or processor can make delivery of his products or services. Likewise, the executive departments, without acts of Congress, cannot be expected to carry out the will of the people; therefore, the committee is unanimous in its endorsement of the intent and purpose of the bill introduced by the chairman of this committee to create a Small Defense Plants Corporation.

THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS—A RECORD OF SERVICE TO SMALL BUSINESS—NINE YEARS OF EFFORT TO ACHIEVE LASTING RESULTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, completion of 9 years of service to small business and the public was marked recently by the House Small Business Committee with publication of its final report of activities during the Eighty-first Congress.

The final report, which describes the accomplishments of the committee during the Eighty-first Congress and makes a number of recommendations for future action, demonstrates a continuation of the policies which have motivated the committee since its inception.

The House Small Business Committee was created by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. This resolution was introduced on August 12, 1941, and was approved on December 4, 1941—just 3 days before the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor.

The committee began its activity during the tumultuous period of mobilization for World War II. It was a period during which small business, harassed by materials and manpower shortages and handicapped in the obtaining of war contracts, was desperately in need of assistance. Many thousands of small businesses were forced to close their doors during the early World War II years.

The first major task of the Small Business Committee was to attempt to alleviate the critical situation in which small business has been placed. Hearings were held in all sections of the Nation, and more than 400 witnesses testified or submitted statements. Interest in the committee's work was so great that 174 Members of Congress attended the hearings.

As a result of these hearings the Murray-Patman bill, providing for the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation as a part of the War Production Board, was drafted and enacted into law. The Smaller War Plants Corporation materially assisted small business in assuming its rightful place in the war effort, and despite initial handicaps, small businesses manufactured approximately 30 percent of World War II production.

SMALL BUSINESS AGAIN FACES CRISIS

Once again, as in the early World War II period during which the House Small Business Committee was created, American small business is facing a crisis. The months ahead will determine whether small business will be given full opportunity to participate in the mobilization effort, or whether it will be neglected.

The challenge is as great today as it was when the House Small Business Committee was created in 1941. During the present mobilization, civilian production will be curtailed, and materials will be scarce and more costly. Almost certainly, additional restrictions on production will be imposed. As never before, small business needs an advocate in the House—not to obtain special privileges, but to provide the small businessman with equality of opportunity to produce and sell defense articles and essential civilian goods.

These problems are discussed in detail in the final report of the committee. The report discloses that throughout the Eighty-first Congress the committee has made considerable strides in obtaining action of benefit to small business.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED

An impressive list of committee recommendations has been adopted in whole or in part by the Congress and the executive agencies. These recommendations include:

LEGISLATIVE

First. The amendment to the Economic Cooperation Act to assure small business a fair and proportionate share of procurement in the United States from funds expended for the European recovery program and allied programs.

Second. The passage by the House of a bill increasing fines for violations of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000.

Third. The passage by the House of a bill to provide for a uniform statute of limitations in treble-damage suits under the antitrust laws and to permit the United States—as a person—to sue for damages because of violations of the antitrust laws.

Fourth. The passage by the Congress of a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act, forbidding acquisition of the assets of a corporation when such acquisition tends to substantially lessen competition and create a monopoly.

Fifth. The elimination of premium payments on contracts for the purchase of Government royalty oil—Public Law 280, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED

First. The establishment within the Munitions Board of an Office of Small Business. A Small Business Office was established.

Second. The appointment of a civilian with a small-business background as the directing head of the Munitions Board's Small Business Office.

Third. The establishment of a Board of Review by the General Services Administration.

Fourth. Extension of the average time between advertisement of invitations to bid and closing of bids by the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration.

Fifth. The initiation of a program to standardize specifications on items in common use throughout the Government.

Sixth. More prompt notification to successful bidders and more expeditious handling of the ensuing contracts.

Seventh. The program of wide publicity on advertised bid procurement.

Eighth. The initiation of a survey designed to reduce procurement through negotiation, with a corresponding increase in advertised-bid procurement.

Ninth. The program to assure consideration of transportation costs and charges in estimating low bids.

Tenth. The program to assure small business greater participation in negotiated contracts with the Department of Defense.

Eleventh. The successful opposition of the committee to regulation W—Federal Reserve Board—resulting in the reduction of down payments and the lengthening of maximum maturity dates—March 7, 1949—and, finally, abolishment of regulation W on June 30, 1949.

Twelfth. The elimination of unfair competition in the operation of post exchanges and ships' stores, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee.

Thirteenth. The elimination, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee, of unfair competition in the procurement of officers' uniforms.

Fourteenth. The elimination, through cooperation with the House Armed Services Committee, of unfair competition by the Army in the operation of laundry and dry-cleaning facilities.

Fifteenth. The elimination of unfair competition to small metal-working manufacturers through procurement by certain Government agencies from the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

Adoption of these recommendations represents real progress in maintaining the vigor of the free enterprise system. Nevertheless, the most crucial period for

small business still lies ahead. The committee has made a number of recommendations for further action in the small-business field. They are:

PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

First. The passage of legislation to establish a Small Defense Plants Corporation.

Second. The reappointment of a special assistant for small business to the Secretary of Defense.

Third. The reappointment of a special adviser to the Chairman of the Munitions Board who will also act as the directing head of the Office of Small Business.

Fourth. The establishment of an Office of Small Business in the Munitions Board as distinguished from a "Small Business Office."

Fifth. The appointment of a special assistant for small business to the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Sixth. The establishement of an Office of Small Business—or Small Business Service—in the General Services Administration.

Seventh. The establishment of an Office of Small Business within the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Eighth. The establishement of an Office of Small Business within the National Security Resources Board.

Ninth. The appointment of a special assistant for small business to the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Tenth. A continuing investigation, by future House Small Business Committees, of the functional operation of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Eleventh. A realistic revision of the present definition of small business in order that all small business may be included in a meaningful definition.

Twelfth. Refusal of procurement agencies to allow bids to be revised after opening in order to preserve the integrity of competitive bidding.

Thirteenth. A broadened scope of investigation of Government procurement operations by successor House Small Business Committees.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

Outstanding among these recommendations is the proposal that a Small Defense Plants Corporation be established by legislation.

This recommendation initially was embodied in the Small Defense Plants Act, introduced by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, in the Senate and by myself in the House last July.

The Small Defense Plants Act will be reintroduced during the present Congress. It has been endorsed by the entire membership of the Senate and House Small Business Committees, and has received wide approval among small-business men throughout the Nation.

The bill would set up an independent agency, the Small Defense Plants Corporation, with broader and more positive powers than the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II.

The unanimous opinion of the members of the Senate and House Small Business Committees is that present statutes are not adequate to assure small business a square deal in the mobilization period. New legislation must be passed to accomplish this objective. For this reason, the proposal for the creation of a Small Defense Plants Corporation is one of the most important recommendations in the committee's history.

THE PRESERVATION OF RELIGIOUS AND CIVIC LIFE IN OUR NATION

Since its formation, the House Small Business Committee has been working for one fundamental objective—the preservation of the family and civil life of our Nation through the maintenance of a healthy small-business economy. Our smaller towns and cities inevitably will suffer great dislocations if the lion's share of defense and essential civilian production is channeled into large enterprises. On the other hand, if this production is equitably distributed to small as well as big business, our traditional family, civic, and religious values will be preserved in the smaller communities of the Nation.

The problems which brought about the creation of the committee during the World War II mobilization period have returned in full force today.

Their solution will require a positive, intelligent program of action on the part of Congress and the executive agencies. I am confident the challenge will be met.

FTC, ANTITRUST DIVISION INVESTIGATION

In addition to the Final Report the committee also has just issued a study entitled "Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report." The latter report, an outgrowth of an investigation launched by the committee in the fall of 1949, is an attempt to determine the operational weaknesses of the FTC and the Antitrust Division and to make constructive suggestions for improvement. Already this investigation has produced information which should lead to more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. The investigation is far from complete, and the committee has recommended continuance of the investigation during the present Congress.

It is impossible to give a brief summary of these two reports, since they cover extremely broad fields. However, I should like to list the table of contents of the final report as an illustration of its scope and as an aid to those who may wish to consult it:

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT

	Page
Introduction	1
Acts affecting small business passed in Eighty-first Congress	2
Part I. Recommendations of the committee	3
Previous recommendations adopted in whole or in part, Eighty-first Congress	3
Legislation	3
Other recommended action	3
Present recommendations of the committee	4
Part II. Small-business difficulties prior to mobilization	5
Competitive handicaps	5
Part II. Small-business difficulties prior to mobilization—Continued	Page
The credit problems of small business	6
Business financing by the Government	6
The Small Business Act of 1950	7
Small business and Federal taxes	8
Revision of the tax structure	8
Government contracts	9
Materials in short supply	10
Part III. Small business and the mobilization program	11
Events leading to mobilization	11
Korea and its economic aftermath	11
A growing national budget	11
Prices, wages, and profits	11
Pressure of growing demand	12
Prospect for producers	12
The President's call for legislative action	13
Submission of the Defense Production Act	13
Need for positive legislation for small business	15
Economic concentration and World War II	15
Control by prime contractors	15
Distribution of new facilities	17
Weakness of the Defense Production Act	20
A small share of contracts and materials for small business	20
A subordinate role for small business	20
Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774)	21
Small-business provisions [title VII, secs. 701 and 708 (e)]	22
Loans and guaranties	22
General provisions	22
Delegation of Presidential powers	23
Creation of the National Production Authority	23
Office of Small Business	23
Defense mobilization under NPA	25
The declaration of a national emergency	25
Proposed Small Defense Plants Corporation (H. R. 9243, S. 3978)	26
Background of legislation—Effectiveness of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in World War II	26
Analysis of provisions	30
Small-business mobilization imperiled	33
Information cannot supplant positive action	34
Small-business support	34
Unanimous endorsement of the committee	34
Part IV. Small business participation in procurement	36
Government a principal purchaser	36
Number of procuring activities	36
Small-business efforts to participate	37
The committee's program of assistance	38
Limitations to investigation	39
Previous suggestions and criticisms	39
Types of contracts—Competitive and negotiated	41
Contracts in defense agency procurement	41
Contracts in civilian agency procurement	42
Criticism of negotiated contracts	43
Expansion of procurement information to the public	46
Government procurement manual	46
Central Procurement Information Office	46
Inauguration of a broad and positive program	47
Small-business clinics	47
The Federal catalog system	48
Specifications and standardization	49
Time factor in bidding	50
Revision of bids	51
Transportation costs and charges	52
Definition of small business	53
Definition in current use by Government agencies	53
Definition industry by industry	54

Part IV. Small business participation in procurement—Continued Page
Department of Defense 54
Special Assistant on Small Business to the Secretary of Defense 55
Munitions Board 55
Small Business Office 55
Executive meeting 56
General Services Administration 57
Policy-maker for civilian procurement 57
Board of review 58
Office of Small Business for GSA 58
A small-business procurement mandate 59
Economic Cooperation Administration 59
Legislative action 59
ECA counsels small business 60
Other informational aids to small business 61
Facts for foreign purchasers 62
"Contact clearinghouse" 62
Small-business share of ECA payments 63
Cooperation with the committee 64
Department of Commerce 64
Procurement facts for small business 64
General assistance to small business 65
Clearinghouse for technical information 65
Part V. Studies and investigations 66
Identical bid prices 66
Special study 66
Equal low bids 66
Consumer-credit controls 67
Oil imports 69
The outlook in steel 76
Expansion in capacity of the steel industry 77
Structure of the steel industry 81
Steel distribution 83
Steel prices 84
Normal position of the independent fabricator 85
Steel distribution and the defense agencies 85
Cement distribution 86
Pricing practices 86
Production records still falling 87
Increases in plant capacity 88
Problems of independent fur farmers 90
Part VI. Antimonopoly activities 97
Antitrust legislation, 81st Cong 97
H. R. 5139, increasing fines to $50,000 97
H. R. 8763, uniform statute of limitations and suit by United States for "actual damages" 98
H. R. 2734, antimerger bill 99
H. R. 4402 100
Investigation of antitrust-law-enforcement agencies 101
The Federal Trade Commission 101
History of investigation 101
Scope of investigation 102
Conclusions and recommendations (preliminary) 103
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice 105
History of investigation 105
Scope of investigation 105
Conclusions and recommendations (preliminary) 106
Small Business—Antimonopoly Conference 108
Committee issues 50-year antitrust history (H. Doc. 599) 109
Supplement, 1950 109
List of committee hearings and reports 110

HEARINGS AND REPORTS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Finally, I include a list of hearings and reports issued by the committee:

HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

HEARINGS

Effects of Foreign Oil Imports on Independent Domestic Producers:

Part 1: Dallas, Tex., May 25 and 26; Washington, D. C., June 9 and 15; New York, N. Y., July 14; and Wichita, Kans., August 17, 1949.

Part 2: New York, N. Y., November 15 and 16; and Washington, D. C., November 30, 1949.

Part 3: Washington, D. C., April 16; Jackson, Miss., April 24; New Orleans, La., April 25; Lake Charles, La., April 26; Shreveport, La., April 26; Little Rock, Ark., April 27; Oklahoma City, Okla., April 28; and Santa Fe, N. Mex., May 2, 1950.

Pattern of Steel Distribution in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; Dallas, Tex.; May 27, 1949.

Small Business Objections on Basing Point Legislation, Particulary S. 1008; Washington, D. C.; June 28, 29, 30, July 1 and 5, 1949.

Small Business Organizations; Washington, D. C.; August 22, 1949.

Steel—Acquisitions, Mergers, and Expansion of 12 Major Companies, 1900 to 1950; March 10, 1950; Washington, D. C.

Problems of Independent Fur Farmers; Denver, Colo.; May 27, 1950.

Small Business Program of the Department of Defense (Executive Meeting); Washington, D. C.; June 8, 1950.

Functional Operation of the Federal Trade Commission; Washington, D. C.; June 26, 27, and 28, 1950.

REPORTS

Progress Report—First Session; House Report No. 1576; February 2, 1950.

Small Business Organizations—Four Case Studies of Organizations Purporting to Represent Small Business; House Report No. 1675; February 21, 1950.

Effects of Foreign Oil Imports on Independent Domestic Producers; House Report No. 2344; June 27, 1950.

Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950; House Document No. 599.

Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report.

Identical Bid Prices to Federal and State Governments by Four Major Industries (Staff Report).

Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950 (Supplement, 1950).

Final report.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE—WEEKLY STAFF REPORT TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, each week a report is rendered to committee members by the staff on current problems and activities. This is a short one-page report which usually includes five or six succinct paragraphs concerning complaints of small-business men on a variety of subjects, as well as information of general or specific interest to the committee. The weekly report serves to keep the committee aware of the progress of the work and of the problems constantly arising in our economy which affect small business.

These weekly reports to the committee have also been made available to other interested Members of the House and to the press. For the future information of the Members, I include as a part of my remarks copies of the weekly reports for the weeks ending January 6 and January 13, 1951, which follow:

WEEKLY REPORT OF STAFF ACTIVITIES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS, JANUARY 6, 1951

Committee reports: On January 1 Chairman PATMAN filed the committee's final report (H. Rept. 3237), as required by House Resolution 22, and a report entitled "Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice—A Preliminary Report" (H. Rept. 3236). These reports were released to the public on January 4. Requests to date approximate 3,000 for each document. The final report (110 pages) recounts the committee's activities during the Eighty-first Congress, with particular emphasis on the effect of mobilization on small-business institutions during the past 6 months. The preliminary report on the antitrust law enforcement agencies is best described by quoting a passage from the introduction: "The committee does not present the material in this report as its final conclusions on the monopoly problem. All findings should be viewed as preliminary and tentative. Many important witnesses are still to be heard. Several areas of antitrust administration need considerable additional exploration." The report recommends continued study of the functional operations of these agencies during the Eighty-second Congress.

NPA Office of Small Business: Creation of the Defense Production Administration (DPA) and appointment of NPA Administrator Harrison to head it pose a problem for NPA's OSB. Close contact with OSB since its establishment has convinced the staff that NPA's industry divisions view OSB as an impediment rather than a help. Evidence is plentiful that the OSB is doing its best but lacks authority to make its recommendations effective. Despite these handicaps, E. H. Lane, Special Assistant to the Administrator for Small Business, and his assistants have performed outstanding service, and it is regrettable that cooperation at the industry division level has not been more apparent. The departure of General Harrison probably will further reduce OSB's effectiveness.

Cement: The Big Three have again upped prices in the Lehigh Valley area (10 cents per barrel, bulk; 12 cents per barrel, paper). Philadelphia carlot buyers now pay $3.37 in bulk and $3.68 in paper.

Replacement parts: A representative of the automotive replacement parts rebuilding industry urges prompt action in listing units of this industry for materials for essential civilian production, stating: "Whether or not we have new cars we must still have transportation. America rolls on wheels. Hundreds of thousands of our people depend on the automobile for transportation. These people are the key to our survival and ultimate victory. Transportation must be maintained."

Antitrust: The Supreme Court this week, in ruling on a treble damage case involving maximum resale prices, declared in effect that agreements to fix maximum prices, "no less than those to fix minimum prices, cripple the freedom of traders and thereby restrain their ability to sell in accordance with their own judgment." The Court's decision was unanimous.

WEEKLY REPORT OF STAFF ACTIVITIES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS, JANUARY 13, 1951

Defense procurement: The Armed Services Procurement Act (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.) contains 17 exemptions under which "contracts may be negotiated * * * without advertising." The most important of these since the declaration of a state of national emergency on December 16 permits negotiation if it is "determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress." The directive of the Secretary of Defense issued on December 18 stressed the intent "to spread contracts across industry as widely as possible in order to broaden the scope of the military procurement program," with the comment that "broadening the base will require a wider use of negotiation." In the

fiscal year 1950 dollar value of defense purchases under advertised-bid procedure was 27.3 percent of the whole, while negotiated contracts amounted to 72.7 percent. Small business was able to secure approximately 52 percent of defense contracts let by competitive bidding. The picture with respect to negotiated contracts was vastly different. Small business was awarded only 14 percent of the total dollar value of these contracts. Figures for the last half of 1950 undoubtedly will show a sharp decline in advertised-bid purchases with a corresponding increase in negotiated contracts.

Small business: Inquiries from small-business men have greatly increased. Their letters indicate growing scarcity of materials for the manufacture of civilian supplies, particularly metal products. Inability to secure scarce materials has caused small business to seek defense contracts in greater number than at any time since Korea. Rated (DO) orders, small-business men assert, would enable them to keep their plants going.

Subcontracts: Complaints from subcontractors plagued by scarcity of materials bring to light a point which apparently is not generally understood. That is, a subcontractor, in order to secure materials for defense orders, must have a firm contract with a prime contractor. NPA informs the committee it now has representatives at each Commerce Department field office whose sole duty is to secure scarce materials for defense orders. No action is taken by these representatives unless the prime or subcontractor submits authoritative evidence of proper contractual relationships with the Government.

Scrap (iron and steel): NPA Order M-20 governs inventories of iron and steel scrap held by all handlers and producers. Records of receipt, deliveries, inventories, and use are required. All ferrous metals are included, either alloyed or unalloyed, in order to conserve and utilize every possible bit of scrap metal containing iron or steel. Order M-20 should tend to prevent coercive tie-in contracts (weekly report November 25).

Technical training program: The scientific Manpower Advisory Committee of NSRB, composed of 12 men prominent in education, industry, and science, has recommended a policy to insure the training of young scientists, engineers, and others with special skills.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

USE OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed by unanimous vote, a bill that will require a substantial number of American boys to man the ships which we have authorized. The number of boys that are used in the naval forces of the United States must be deducted from the total number who might otherwise be available for service in our ground forces as it is impossible to use these same boys in the land forces and in the Navy at the same time. This bill must, therefore, make it even more difficult to supply our Army with all the American boys it would like to have. Our supply of manpower for our land forces is desperately short. If we do nothing to relieve that shortage, this very bill, for which we have all voted, will but make the drafting of 18-year-old boys and of fathers the more likely. There are relatively few Members of this House who want to face either of these alternatives. Nor is it necessary until we have exhausted every other source of manpower.

It seems clear to me that our first step should be to open enlistments in our Army to citizens of other countries, particularly of Germany and of Japan, to serve in their own areas of the world in the defense of their own homes against communism. Why should we not be relieving the strain on American manpower by using the manpower that is available in parts of the world where the greatest military threat is posed? Why should we not give those people a chance to enlist in the American Army? I am not talking about drafting them; I am just suggesting that we should let them enlist in our army—that we should not wait on the creation of any German Army, Japanese Army, or United Nations Army. We need men now in our Army. There are hundreds of thousands of men in Germany and in Japan who want to enlist. Let us take them in.

Surely there is no other way whereby we can get so much help so cheaply or so quickly. Hundreds of thousands of these men are well-trained veterans of past wars who would make the soundest kind of fighting men right now. They do not have to be drafted. They want to eat United States Army food. Let us give them the chance. We do not have to bribe them by giving them American citizenship as we have foolishly assumed in the past. I propose that we use Germans in the defense of Germany and Japanese in the defense of Japan. I do not propose that any of these troops be brought to the United States either now or later. On the other hand, I do propose to make it unnecessary to send so many American boys to Europe and to Japan, and at the same time I propose to strengthen our position in both Europe and Asia.

RESIST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens of this country, including myself, are shocked and embittered by the fact that several of the countries to whom we are now, and have been, extending both military and economic aid to resist Communist aggression are still actively trading with the enemy by exporting strategic war materials to Russia, the Chinese Communists, and the satellite countries.

Some have attempted to rationalize this trade by saying that our allies must stockpile strategic materials which can be imported from the Communist bloc.

It hardly makes sense, however, to trade strategic materials with our enemies so that we are better equipped to kill each other. I recognize that much has been done by the United States to curb the export of strategic materials to Russia and China but our attempts to persuade our allies to follow the same action have met with little success.

The Belgians, for example, will export, this year, 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals to Russia, even though such metals are sorely needed in Western Europe. Steel, copper, brass products, tires, and much machinery were exported, during 1960, from Britain to both Hong Kong and Chinese ports. Even today, Britain is transshipping Malayan rubber to Soviet ports.

Recently we were informed of a transaction whereby the French steel industry had negotiated to furnish 450 miles of steel rail to China, which in all probability, would have been used to construct rail lines from the interior of China to Indochina where valiant French forces are bitterly engaged with the Communists. The French Government is to be commended for taking steps to stop this shipment.

In the past year the countries of Western Europe have exported almost a billion dollars' worth of machinery and materials to the Soviet war potential. Numerous reports indicate that extensive trade with the Communist bloc is still being carried on, notwithstanding the provisions of the supplemental appropriation bill adopted by the Eighty-first Congress.

This active trading with the enemy becomes even more shocking when we realize that through our economic aid—through American taxpayers' dollars—we have helped rehabilitate the industrial potential of these same countries. If we expect the American public to fully support the effort of adequately preparing ourselves, and of helping other freedom-loving people resist communism, then we must put a stop to this unscrupulous trade.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced into the House a bill to provide that no economic or financial assistance of any kind whatsoever shall be furnished to any foreign country which permits the exportation of strategic war materials to the Communist bloc.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress on January 3, 1949, I have been intensely interested in the construction of hospitals and health centers in rural America, and particularly in the Seventh District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here, under the terms of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

I am happy to have voted for the Hospital Construction Act amendments of 1949, which greatly liberalized the pro-

gram. I have supported every appropriation designed to breathe life into this program, and shared the disappointment which many Members of the Congress felt, and which was more widely felt by those areas which had perfected plans for building hospitals and health centers under the terms of the program, when the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951—July 1, 1950, through June 30, 1951—was cut by 50 percent.

When the Hospital Construction Act amendments of 1949 were passed, it was generally agreed that beginning with the fiscal year 1951 that the Congress would appropriate $150,000,000 as the Federal contribution to the hospital building program.

Congress did appropriate $150,000,000 for this purpose for the fiscal year 1951, but shortly before the appropriation bill was passed the Korean war broke out on June 25, 1950, and it then became immediately apparent that the general expenses of our Government would have to be cut in order to build up our defenses and expand our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Consequently, the Congress, as a part of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, gave to the Bureau of the Budget the right to cut nondefense appropriations by a total of $550,000,000. When I voted to give the Bureau of the Budget the right to cut nondefense appropriations by a total of $550,000,000, it never occurred to me that the Bureau of the Budget would cut the appropriation for hospital construction by more than a small percentage. Instead, the Bureau of the Budget slashed the appropriation for hospital construction by 50 percent, from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000, thereby making up 13½ percent of its total savings of $550,000,000 from the hospital construction appropriation alone.

When I learned that the Bureau of the Budget contemplated cutting the hospital and health center construction funds by 50 percent, I wrote the President of the United States as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was extremely disappointed when I learned that the Bureau of the Budget had slashed 50 percent, or $75,000,000, off of the appropriation for rural hospital construction during this fiscal year.

The question of whether or not this appropriation would be $75,000,000 or $150,000,000 was fought out on the floor of the House, where the Representatives of the American people made it abundantly clear that it was their desire to proceed with the hospital construction program as originally planned in 1949 when the Hospital Construction Act was amended.

In my judgment there is no activity of the Federal Government of more direct benefit to the health of rural America than the hospital-construction program. Local communities were led to believe a year ago when Congress authorized the $150,000,000 for hospital construction this year that the money would be forthcoming, and they in good faith made their plans accordingly.

Now with the danger of another world war facing us, rural hospitals become even more important. In the event of all-out war we can reasonably expect attacks on our large cities, and the surrounding rural hospitals may become the treatment centers for injured persons from our cities.

I sincerely hope that you may see fit to request the Bureau of the Budget to reverse its decision in this matter, and if not, I trust that you may request a supplemental appropriation for rural hospital construction when Congress reconvenes on November 27, 1950.

Thanking you, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARL ELLIOTT.

The President's reply to my letter was as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 2, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: This will acknowledge your letter of September 29, requesting information about a proposed reduction in the 1951 Federal apportionment for grants-in-aid for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act.

As you know, the Congress, in section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, directed that:

"Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and reauthorizations made by this act, for departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, shall, without impairing national defense, be reduced in the amount of not less than $550,000,000 through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 1211 of this act."

The budgetary programs of all departments and agencies are now being thoroughly reviewed within the executive branch in order that the reductions required in section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act may be effected.

Prior to the enactment of section 1214, I had already taken steps to review all Federal programs in the construction field which require materials, supplies, and manpower with a view to curtailing or cutting back those projects which do not contribute directly to the national defense or essential civilian requirements. I originally announced this program in my message of July 19 to the Congress on the Korean situation.

In order to meet the reductions directed by the Congress and to save materials, supplies, and manpower for the defense effort, agencies of the executive branch have recently been given target figures to assist them in the execution of their 1951 budgets. The figures furnished agencies are tentative ones only, and no final decisions have been reached on the amount of curtailment for any individual program.

With respect to Hill-Burton Act funds, the Federal Security Agency for planning purposes has been supplied a target figure of $75,000,000 out of the $150,000,000 provided in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, for allotment to the States during the current fiscal year. This amount together with the $91,000,000 still available from 1950 funds would make a total of $166,000,000 available during the current fiscal year, an amount of $49,000,000 in excess of requirements for this program during fiscal year 1950. Approval of this tentative proposal would limit the number of new hospital projects which could be accepted during the current fiscal year but would not necessitate delay or cancellation of any projects which have received final approval of the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, up to this time. You may feel assured that before a final decision is reached every consideration will be given to the importance of this program in relation to other current urgent requirments of the Government.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The 50-percent reduction was made.

In the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, we were able to obtain an additional appropriation of $10,000,000 for hospital and health center construction, making a total of $85,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. Alabama's share of this appropriation amounts to approximately $2,900,000.

Acting under the impression that the total appropriation of $150,000,000 would be made for the fiscal year 1951, hundreds of communities throughout this country made their plans to construct their hospitals.

These plans consisted of obtaining expensive architects' drawings and specifications, the acquisition of building sites, the levy of a 4-mill tax with which to raise the local share of the costs of the project.

When the Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations to meet these plans, the entire program was thrown out of gear, projects were delayed, and many projects were discontinued altogether.

I realize that now while we are faced with the prospects of an all-out war, and while terrible, bloody, hard, cold fighting is going on in Korea that we must do everything within our power to hurriedly build up our Armed Forces, and that we must provide our fighting men with every tool which they need to discharge the obligation which history has placed on their shoulders.

To this end, I personally am willing to make every sacrifice that I may be called upon to make as an individual, and as a Member of Congress, during this emergency. I will vote only for those programs that I feel are justified in the light of the war effort which we must make.

In the over-all picture of building our defenses in preparation for a war, which I fear that Russia and her satellites will shortly force upon us, it seems to me that we can reasonably expect air attacks on our large cities and particularly on those cities which contribute heavily to the manufacture and processing of the necessities of war, such as steel, oil, shipbuilding, aircraft construction, aluminum, and several others.

At least, it seems to me that we must bear in mind that such attacks are a real possibility.

In the event of such attacks then the rural hospitals that surround such areas may well become the treatment centers for the injured persons from our cities. Thus, it is highly desirable, from a defense standpoint, that we continue, at full speed, the hospital-construction program for rural areas, not presently served by hospital facilities. The continued and improved health and medical care of our civilian population is a vital factor in national defense. The construction of badly needed hospitals and health centers is a major factor in maintaining health.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama a 35-bed general hospital is presently under construction at Hamilton, Ala. A 30-bed general hospital will shortly go under construction at Vernon, Ala. A health center is under construction at Cullman, Ala.

Had appropriations for this program not been reduced, as I have outlined, the Blount County Hospital at Oneonta, Ala., the South Pickens County Hospital at

Aliceville, the North Pickens County Hospital at Reform, Ala., and the Franklin County Health Center at Russellville would now be under construction.

As it is, these hospitals and this health center have been postponed until the fiscal year 1952, which will begin July 1, 1951, to the great inconvenience of the communities involved, and in the meantime planning expenses have increased and inflation has taken its toll on the value of such construction moneys as the Congress may, in the future, provide.

As a part of my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. Clay H. Dean, director, hospital planning division, department of public health, Montgomery, Ala., addressed to me on November 8, 1950, together with tables showing the status of the various hospital and health-center construction in Alabama, together with a narrative report dealing with some of those projects:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Montgomery, Ala., November 8, 1950.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
United States Congressman,
Jasper, Ala.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLIOTT: Being aware of your interest in the Hill-Burton hospital-construction program here in Alabama and elsewhere in the Nation, we are taking this opportunity to forward you our latest summary of projects. This summary outlines in detail the current status of each project and the effect of the recent 50-percent cut in Hill-Burton funds. Copies of this information have been forwarded to the Public Health Service at their request. We sincerely hope that this data, together with other data furnished by this office, will be of some assistance to you in your efforts to achieve a restoration of these badly needed funds.

Respectfully,

CLAY H. DEAN,
Director, Hospital Planning Division.

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—Revised program for 1950 and 1951—List of all projects for which funds are to be charged to allotments for 1950 and 1951

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Priority	Percent complete	Federal share by fiscal years— 1950	1951	1952
	PROJECTS FINALLY APPROVED (PT. 4)						
5	Mobile, Martin de Porres Hospital	35	A	100	$9,075.01		
6	Birmingham, Crippled Children's Clinic	128	A	80	26,017.78		
7	Birmingham, St. Vincents Hospital	90	C	95	24,998.04		
14	Montgomery, St. Judes Hospital	152	A	95	12,663.33		
21	Gadsden, Etowah County Health Center		A	70	14,880.09		
12	Mobile, Mobile Infirmary	274	A	65	505,498.50	$500,000.00	$481,508.60
13	Mobile, Providence	200	A	40	1,000,000.00	300,000.00	300,000.00
15	Tuscaloosa, Druid City Hospital	241	A	15	1,000,000.00	300,000.00	624,231.54
16	Fort Payne, De Kalb County Hospital	50	A	65	213,186.67		
20	Ashland, Clay County Hospital	20	A	75	75,033.29		
22	Athens, Athens-Limestone Hospital	50	A	75	239,241.20		
25	Marion, Perry County Hospital	20	A	98	3,438.17		
27	Ozark, Dale County Hospital	50	A	55	200,000.00	86,204.00	
37	Livingston, Sumter County Health Center		A	75	48,575.13		
38	Decatur, District I Tuberculosis Sanatorium	161	A	20	300,000.00	455,479.82	
24	Hamilton, Marion County Hospital	35	A	10	250,000.00	36,362.60	
33	Union Springs, Bullock County Hospital	29	A	30	150,000.00	56,142.66	
35	Cullman, Cullman County Health Center		A	10	66,016.00		
54	Tuskegee, Macon County Hospital	32	A	100	23,780.24		
18	Sylacauga, Sylacauga Hospital Nurses Home		A	15	180,000.00	39,770.00	
17	Opelika, Lee County Hospital	70	A	5	395,000.00	258,339.70	
201	Tuscaloosa, Bryce Hospital	92	A	10	200,000.00	32,260.00	
301	Birmingham, University of Alabama Dental Clinic		A	35	200,000.00	220,810.66	
	PROJECTS INITIALLY APPROVED (PT. 1)						
28	Vernon, Lamar County Hospital	30	A	XX		254,760.00	
	Total revised program (24 projects)	1,759			5,137,403.45	2,540,129.44	1,405,740.14

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—Projects postponed from 1950 or 1951 program—List of all projects originally programed for 1950 or 1951 but postponed or abandoned by reason of curtailment of 1951 contract authorization

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Total	Federal share	Priority	Federal fiscal year of project approval: Originally planned	Now anticipated	Site acquisition	Drawings	Local funds[1]
	PROJECTS APPROVED BY PHS (PT. D									
23	Oneonta, Blount County Hospital	30	$365,000	$240,000.00	A	1950	1952	Owned	Working	4-mill tax,[2]
51	Huntsville, Madison County Health Center		120,000	80,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	Appropriation.
31	Aliceville, South Pickens County Hospital	20	265,000	174,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	4-mill tax.
44	Reform, North Pickens County Hospital	20	265,000	174,000.00	A	1950	1952	do	do	Do.
47	Montgomery, St. Margarets Hospital	262	3,000,000	2,000,000.00	A	1950	1953	do	do	Cash.
	5 projects	332	4,015,000	2,668,000.00						
	PENDING PROJECTS (PROGRAMED BY STATE AGENCY BUT NOT YET APPROVED BY PHS)									
30	Chatom, Washington County Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	Schematic	Appropriation.
46	Demopolis, Brian-Whitfield Memorial Hospital	24	280,000	186,666.00	A	1951	1952	do	Working	Do.
50	Moulton, Lawrence County Hospital	40	488,000	320,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	do	4-mill tax.
32	Evergreen, Conecuh County Hospital	30	335,000	220,000.00	A	1951	1952	do	Schematic	Do.
52	Tarrant City, Tarrant City Health Center		42,000	28,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Appropriation.
81	Roanoke, Randolph County Hospital	35	420,000	280,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	4-mill tax.
86	Florence, Lauderdale County Public Health Clinic		114,000	76,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Appropriation.
96	Russellville, Franklin County Public Health Clinic		108,000	72,000.00	A	1951	1953	do	do	Do.
	8 projects	149	2,037,000	1,342,666.00						
	13 projects, total projects postponed	481	6,052,000	4,010,666.00						

[1] Money is now available for each project on this sheet.
[2] County has passed and is collecting a 4-mill hospital tax. This applies in every place where "4-mill tax" is stated.

National hospital program (Alabama) under the Public Health Service Act (title VI), as amended—revised program for 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955—list of all projects now on file in the State agency and scheduled for construction in 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955

Project No.	Location and name	Beds added	Estimated cost		Priority	Federal fiscal year of project approval	Current status		
			Total	Federal share			Site acquisition	Drawings	Local funds
	PENDING PROJECTS (PROGRAMED BY STATE AGENCY BUT NOT YET APPROVED BY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE)								
41	Brewton, Escambia County Hospital	55	$470,000	$280,000.00	B	1952 1955	Owned	Schematic	4-mill tax.
36	Gadsden, district IV tuberculosis sanatorium	100	1,200,000	800,000.00	A	1952 1953	Option	do	Current drive.
60	Ensley, Holy Family Hospital	60	750,000	500,000.00	A	1952 1953	Owned	do	Cash.
94	Mobile, Mobile County Public Health Clinic		421,000	280,666.66	A	1952 1953	Option		Appropriation.
97	Birmingham, Eastern Health Center		52,000	34,666.66	A	1952 1953	Owned	Schematic	Do.
100	Geneva, Geneva County Public Health Clinic		60,000	40,000.00	A	1952 1953			Do.
92	Geneva, Geneva County Hospital	40	420,000	280,000.00	A	1952 1953	Owned	Schematic	4-mill tax.
114	Fayette, Fayette County Public Health Clinic		75,000	50,000.00	A	1952 1954	do	do	Appropriation.
63	Centerville, Centerville Clinic	10	120,000	80,000.00	A	1952 1954			
56	Clanton, Chilton County Public Health Clinic		57,000	38,000.00	A	1952 1954	Owned	Schematic	Do.
116	Enterprise, Enterprise Health Center		75,000	50,000.00	A	1952 1954	do		Do.
85	Tuscaloosa, Tuscaloosa County Public Health Clinic		261,500	160,000.00	A	1952 1954	do		Sales tax.
49	Butler, Choctaw County Public Health Clinic		68,600	42,400.00	A	1952 1954	do		
45	Linden, Marengo County Public Health Clinic		92,700	61,800.00	A	1952 1954			
39	Eufaula, Barbour County Hospital	45	585,000	390,000.00	A	1952 1954			4-mill tax.
53	Dothan, Houston County Hospital	50	600,000	400,000.00	B	1952 1955	Owned	Schematic	Do.
19	Decatur, Decatur General Hospital	60	775,000	500,000.00	B	1952 1955	do		1 mill tax.
26	Mobile, district VI tuberculosis sanatorium	100	1,300,000	866,666.66	A	1952 (?)			
55	Tuskegee, Macon County Hospital		40,000	40,000.00	Hardship	1951 (?)	Owned		Hardship.
74	Mobile, Mobile Infirmary NH		670,000	446,666.66	A	1952 (?)	do	Schematic	Cash.
88	Montgomery, St. Margarets Hospital NH		135,000	90,000.00	A	1953 (?)	do		
79	Tuscaloosa, Druid City Hospital NH		463,000	294,000.00	A	1953 (?)	do	Schematic	Sales tax.
29	Cullman, Cullman County Hospital	50	600,000	400,000.00	B	1952 (?)	do		
64	Henegar, Beatty Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	Option	Schematic	4-mill tax.
65	Crossville, Crossville Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	Owned		
50	Columbia, Columbia Clinic	12	125,000	80,000.00	B	1953 (?)	do		
87	Piedmont, Piedmont Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	B	1953 (?)	do		
99	Sheffield, Colbert County Hospital	75	900,000	600,000.00	C	1953 (?)	do		
42	Jackson, Jackson Hospital	20	265,000	167,200.00	C	1953 (?)			
43	Thomasville, Thomasville Hospital	20	265,000	167,200.00	C	1953 (?)			
48	Berry, Berry Clinic	12	120,000	80,000.00	C	1953 (?)			
93	Rogersville, Rogersville Hospital	20	240,000	160,000.00	C	1953 (?)			
82	Wedowee, Wedowee Clinic	16	180,000	120,000.00	D	1953 (?)			Do.
83	Wadley, Wadley Clinic	8	60,000	40,000.00	D	1953 (?)			Do.
78	Courtland, Courtland Clinic	12	155,000	102,333.33	D	1954 (?)	Option	Schematic	Do.
84	Woodland, Woodland Clinic	8	60,000	40,000.00	D	1954 (?)			
40	Clayton, Clayton Clinic	12	141,000	96,000.00	D	1954 (?)			
68	Red Bay, Red Bay Clinic	9	126,000	84,000.00	E	1954 (?)	Owned	Schematic	Appropriation.
110	Selma, Vaughn Memorial Hospital	100	1,200,000	800,000.00	E	1954 (?)	do		
111	Decatur, district I tuberculosis sanatorium NH		180,000	120,000.00	E	1954 (?)	do		
112	Clio, Clio Clinic	6	60,000	40,000.00	E	1954 (?)			
113	Louisville, Louisville Clinic	6	60,000	40,000.00	E	1954 (?)			
80	Langdale, George H. Lanier Memorial Annex	32	360,000	240,000.00	E	1954 (?)	Owned		
	43 projects	977	14,510,800	9,581,599.97					
	PROJECTS RECEIVED AFTER SEPT. 18, 1950								
75	Montgomery, St. Judes Hospital, NH and Orthopedic	50	1,200,000	800,000.00	A	1954 (?)	do		
58	Mobile, City Hospital (X-ray)		69,000	46,000.00	C	1953 (?)	do	Schematic	Do.
91	Anniston, Anniston Memorial (Annex)	160	750,000	500,000.00	B	1954 (?)	do	do	
69	Arab, Arab Hospital	20	276,000	184,000.00	C	1954 (?)			4-mill tax.
61	Guntersville, Marshall County Public Health Clinic		126,000	84,000.00	A	1953 (?)			Do.
62	Grant, Grant Health Center		30,000	20,000.00	A	1953 (?)			Do.
87	Albertville, Albertville-Boaz Hospital	40	480,000	320,000.00	C	1954 (?)			Do.
	Projects (7)	277	2,931,000	1,954,000.00					
	Total (50) projects in category	1,247	17,441,800	11,535,599.97					

NATIONAL HOSPITAL PROGRAM UNDER THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT (TITLE VI) AS AMENDED—NARRATIVE REPORT OF PROJECTS ORIGINALLY PROGRAMED FOR 1950 OR 1951 BUT POSTPONED OR ABANDONED BY REASON OF CURTAILMENT OF 1951 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

GENERAL

All anticipated approval dates are based on the 50 percent contract authorization for the fiscal year 1951 and similar reductions in future fiscal years. Should the 1951 appropriation be restored and/or full appropriations maintained in the future, individual projects will be moved forward on the construction schedule insofar as funds permit.

The greater percentage of the general hospitals scheduled for current and future construction in Alabama are to be located in counties with no existing facilities and with few physicians. It is the belief of all, that, with the construction of hospital facilities, physicians will be attracted to the communities, thereby insuring adequate medical attention for the people. This has already been the case in communities where hospital facilities have been constructed.

I. Projects approved by Public Health Service (part 1)

Alabama, 23—Blount County Hospital, Oneonta, Ala.:

This facility is to be owned and operated by the Blount County Hospital Board, a public corporation under the laws of Alabama, and an agency of Blount County. Application for Federal assistance was filed with the State agency December 12, 1947. Blount County has an A priority under the State hospital plan first approved in 1947 and in subsequent revisions. The proposed facility is to be a 30-bed general hospital.

The site is owned by the county hospital board. The city of Oneonta and Blount County have agreed to install all off-site improvements such as water extensions, sewer extensions, and paved streets.

The working drawings have been completed and the final architectural review secured. The architect is now complying with the Public Health Service and State agency comments. The project could be advertised for bids at any time.

It is estimated that the project will cost $360,000, of which $240,000 is to come from Federal funds. Of the remaining funds needed, $60,000 has been allocated by the Alabama State Board of Health. The local funds in the amount of $80,000 are now available from a special 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters of Blount County last year. The proceeds from this tax can only be used to build and maintain public hospitals in the county.

This project was scheduled for construction from the 1950 fiscal year funds and could start immediately. Due to the cut this project must be delayed until the 1952 fiscal year.

Alabama, 31—South Pickens County Hospital, Aliceville, Ala.; Alabama, 44; North Pickens County Hospital, Reform, Ala.:

These facilities are to be owned and operated by the Pickens County Hospital Association, an agency of Pickens County and incorporated under the laws of Alabama. Applications for Federal assistance were filed with the State agency on October 6, 1949. Pickens County has an "A" priority on Federal funds in that there are no hospital beds within the county. The nearest hospitals are in Tuscaloosa, Ala., and Columbus, Miss., both about 40 miles from the center of the county. The proposed facilities are 20-bed

general hospitals and will be jointly operated by the hospital association. In an effort to secure both good design and administration the association has employed an experienced hospital administrator to assist in the design and to manage the hospitals upon completion.

Both sites are now owned by the hospital association and cost $6,500. The towns of Aliceville and Reform and Pickens County have agreed to provide all necessary off-site improvements and some grading on the site proper. In several instances contracts have been awarded for this work.

The working drawings for both projects have been completed and approved by the Public Health Service and the State agency. These projects could be advertised for bids at any time.

It is estimated that each project will cost $265,000 for a total of $530,000. Of this $348,000 will come from Federal funds, $60,000 from State funds and $122,000 from a special four-mill hospital approved by the voters of Pickens County last year.

These projects were scheduled for construction from 1950 funds and could start immediately. Due to the cut in 1951 funds these projects must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama 51, Madison County Public Health Center, Huntsville, Ala.: This facility is jointly sponsored by the city of Huntsville and Madison County. The application for Federal assistance was filed on April 15, 1949. This project has an A priority, as is true of all public-health centers in Alabama. The existing health center is on the second and third floors of an old, nonfireproof theater building. Its facilities are grossly inadequate for the service that is, and could be, performed in Madison County. In addition to the normal population of the county the Redstone Arsenal has been activated thus bringing additional people to the area and increasing the workload of the county health department. Only by the construction of the new health center can both the normal and additional workload be adequately handled.

The site is now owned by the sponsors and is valued at $20,000.

The architect has carried the working drawings to about 95 percent completion. The State agency has made an informal review and the drawings should be ready for presentation to the Public Health Service within a few weeks. The project could be advertised for bids within a month.

The estimated cost of the project is $120,000. Of this amount $80,000 is needed from Federal funds. The State has allocated $20,000 and the city of Huntsville and Madison County have appropriated $10,000 each.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1950 funds. It is now delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 47—St. Margaret's Hospital, Montgomery, Ala.:

This project is for a 262-bed general hospital to replace a nonacceptable, dangerous facility in Montgomery. The existing facility is a definite fire hazard. The Sisters of Charity are the project sponsors. This facility is vital to the planned coordinate hospital system as it has been designated as the base hospital for the central Alabama area. It will provide all types of medical, surgical, and hospital care as well as training facilities for nurses and medical interns. For these reasons it has been given an "A" priority on Federal funds.

The site is now owned by the sponsors and is valued at $150,000.

The working drawings are well over half completed. This project could be advertised for bids within 3 months.

The estimated cost of the project is $3,000,000, of which the sponsors now have their funds in cash. No State funds can be allocated to this project.

This project was scheduled for construction from the 1950 appropriation. It now must be delayed until the 1953 fiscal year. The fact that the Federal share will closely approximate the 50-percent Federal allocation to Alabama complicates this project. It may be that, to avoid disastrous criticism of the hospital program, it will be necessary to postpone even further this project and to allocate the available Federal funds to tax-supported facilities. However, with the full appropriation, St. Margaret's and a number of smaller facilities could be constructed concurrently.

II. Pending projects (programed by State but not yet approved by the Public Health Service)

Alabama, 30—Washington County Hospital, Chatom, Ala.:

This facility is to be owned and operated by the Washington County Hospital Association. The application for Federal assistance was filed April 8, 1948. Washington County has been given an "A" priority on Federal funds since there are no hospital beds in the county. The nearest hospital beds are in Mobile, 60 miles away, and Grove Hill, 35 miles from Chatom.

This site is now owned by the Washington County Hospital Association and is valued at $5,000. The town of Chatom has spent considerable funds extending the water mains to the hospital site.

The architect is now working on the schematic drawings which could be submitted for approval within a few weeks. The project could be advertised for bids within 5 months.

Of the $240,000 the project is estimated to cost, $160,000 is to come from Federal funds, $40,000 from State funds and $40,000 from local sources. Washington County has appropriated this latter amount and now has the funds in cash.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 32—Conecuh County Hospital, Evergreen, Ala.:

This 30-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the Conecuh County Hospital Association. The application for Federal assistance was filed December 14, 1948. The county has an "A" priority since there are no acceptable beds in the county.

The site is now owned by the hospital association and was purchased at a cost of $5,000. The city of Evergreen has agreed to perform the off-site improvements as extending water mains and paving adjacent streets.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed within 4 months.

Of the non-Federal share of $110,000, one-half is to come from State and local sources. The voters of Conecuh County approved a 4-mill hospital tax last year. This tax is now being collected for hospital construction and operation. The total project cost is estimated to be $330,000.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 46—Brian Whitfield Memorial Hospital, Demopolis, Ala.:

This 24-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the city of Demopolis. Application for Federal assistance was filed with the State agency March 2, 1949. This project has an "A" priority since there are no acceptable hospital beds in Marengo County.

The site is now owned by the city of Demopolis and was purchased for $10,000. The city of Demopolis has employed consulting engineers to plan extension of utilities to the site. An addition access street is also planned.

Schematic drawings have been completed and approved by the Public Health Service. The architect has begun working drawings and could complete them in 2 months.

The total estimated cost is $290,000 with $46,667 from State funds and $186,636 from Federal funds. The city of Demopolis has in cash their funds in the amount of $56,667.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 50—Lawrence County Hospital, Moulton, Ala.:

This facility is to be a 40-bed general hospital and is located in a county which now has no hospital facilities. The nearest hospitals are in Decatur and Sheffield, 23 and 40 miles from Moulton. The county has an "A" priority and the facility is to be owned and operated by the Lawrence County Hospital Association. Application for Federal funds was filed with the State agency on September 1, 1949.

The site is now owned by the hospital association and is valued at $3,000. The town of Moulton and Lawrence County have agreed to provide the required utilities.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed and the project advertised for bids within 5 months.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $488,000. Of this amount, the Federal share is $320,000, with the State providing $60,000 and the sponsor $108,000. The local share is now being raised by a 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters last year. Bonds have been sold and the construction funds are now in a local bank. Operation funds will be provided from the tax and from hospital receipts.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It now must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 53—Tarrant City Health Center, Tarrant City, Ala.:

This project is to be a public health center to house branch offices and clinics of the Jefferson County Health Department. The present facility is located in an old converted and inadequate frame residence. Application for this "A" priority project was filed by the city of Tarrant City with the State agency on October 27, 1949.

The site, valued at $6,000, has been acquired by the city of Tarrant City. Necessary utilities are now available to the site.

Schematic drawings have ben completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings could be completed and placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $42,000, with $28,000 from Federal funds and $7,000 from both the State and Tarrant City. The sponsor now has his funds in cash.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds but now must be delayed until 1952.

Alabama, 81—Randolph County Hospital, Roanoke, Ala.:

This 35-bed general hospital is to be owned and operated by the Randolph County Hospital Association. It is to be the central unit in a proposed county hospital system including three smaller units which will be supplementary to the county hospital. Randolph County has an A priority, since there are no acceptable hospital beds in the county. Application for Federal assistance was filed on November 10, 1949.

The site was purchased by the hospital association for $3,000. Utilities are to be provided by the city of Roanoke, which is now making a study of the necessary work.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. Working drawings

could be completed and the project advertised for bids within 5 months.

It is estimated that this project will cost $423,000, with a Federal share of $230,000. State aid in the amount of $60,000 has been approved for this project. The local share of $83,000 is provided from revenue collected from the 4-mill hospital tax approved by the voters of Randolph County last year. Proceeds from this tax will also be used to supplement hospital revenues for operation funds.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds, but now must be delayed until 1953.

Alabama, 86—Lauderdale County Health Center, Florence, Ala.:

This public health center is to be owned by Lauderdale County, and will house the Lauderdale County Health Department. It will replace the present inadequate facilities utilized by this county agency. This project has an A priority. The recent rapid growth of this area makes adequate public health facilities of this area an urgent necessity. Application for Federal assistance was made to the State agency on December 27, 1949.

The site is owned by Lauderdale County and is valued at $20,000. It is located in the downtown area where public utilities are now available.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. The working drawings could be completed and the project placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

It is estimated that the total cost of the facility will be $114,000, not including site costs. The Federal share will be $76,000 and $19,000 has been allocated by the State board of health. The local share of $39,000 is composed of $19,000 in cash and the site.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds but now must be delayed until 1953.

Alabama, 96—Franklin County Health Center, Russellville, Ala.:

This public-health center is to be owned by Franklin County and will house the Franklin County Health Department. It will replace the present inadequate facilities now used by this county agency. This project has an A priority. Application for Federal funds was filed with the State agency on December 30, 1949.

The site has been purchased by Franklin County for $12,000. Utilities are available.

Schematic drawings have been completed and submitted to the Public Health Service for informal review. The working drawings could be completed and the project placed on the market for bids within 4 months.

The total cost of this facility is estimated to be $108,000. The Federal share is $72,000 and the State is providing $18,000. Franklin County has in cash their share of $18,000.

This project was scheduled for construction from 1951 funds. It must now be delayed until 1953.

NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Viking Division of National Guardsmen from Minnesota and North Dakota was inducted into Federal service and will leave Sunday for Camp Rucker, Ala. Twice in 10 years Minnesota Guardsmen are leaving their homes, families, and jobs to serve this Nation in time of crisis.

It is not easy for them, nor for their families, but they do so proudly in the tradition of American men, wearing the insignia of the Forty-seventh Viking Division—a Viking helmet on the field of Thor, the mythical god of strength, the great defender and victor in battle. This patch symbolizes the Scandinavian ancestry of many Minnesotans but it is worn by men of all ancestries—the sons and grandsons of the men who built our great State.

We are particularly proud of the men of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry Regiment of Minnesota. This regiment carries on the tradition of the famous First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry whose charge in the Battle of Gettysburg is still regarded as the most heroic in our military history. This First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry became the first group of volunteers in the Civil War and came from the then youngest State in the Union.

The young volunteers were frontiersmen who had banded together in local militias and their first camp was made only a short distance from this Chamber, on the Capitol Grounds. From here they went on to a brilliant record that reached its peak in the charge of July 2, 1863. This charge bought the time Hancock needed to reinforce his wavering line and saved the Union forces from defeat.

Other units of what is now the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry have existed since territorial days in Minnesota and served in the Civil War, Spanish American War, on the Mexican border, and in both World Wars in France, Africa, and Italy.

This week the men of Minnesota are again reminding us that the strength of a democracy is in its citizen soldiers, in the men who in our hometowns form the heart of our armies in crisis. This is a point we can well recall today.

As Americans we have been rightfully reluctant to build huge military machines. Our aim has been peace and security and a society in which free men can work and raise their families. We have fought and fought well when this goal was threatened. It is again threatened and again we must build our defenses.

But as we begin this grave task, we should remember the service of our citizen soldiers—the men who have gone in time of danger to defend our homes. They are not professional soldiers in the strict sense of that term. But they have defeated the professional armies of those who would destroy the freedom of mankind.

This should be a warning to those who think we must adopt an armed camp mentality in our time and build an enormous military machine to be maintained in peace and war as a kind of professional army. They would have us sacrifice our homes and our freedoms in the very effort to save them. To those, the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry and its history should be a lesson worth remembering.

The citizen soldiers of Minnesota have carried their share of the burden in these times and many of them are leaving their homes for the second time in 10 years. In our district they have trained at Brainerd, Long Prairie, Aitkin, Milaca, Camp Ripley, St. Cloud, Sauk Centre, Princeton, Litchfield, and Park Rapids and have given faithfully of their time as citizens.

We are intensely proud of these men from our district. I know many of them and regret to see them leave but know that in going they will acquit themselves in the best traditions of the Guard. They deserve our support and we express to them our best wishes for an early return to their homes and families.

My reason for calling the attention of the House to the induction of the Forty-seventh Division, gentlemen, is to remind all of us of our responsibility to these men and to their families. Let their going not be taken lightly for they are going in our cause—the cause of the American people.

To those who go we have a grave obligation—an obligation to them both as soldiers and as citizens. As soldiers we owe them every honest effort that we can make to achieve a just peace without the terrible suffering of war. We owe them the best of our resources so that they will be the best trained and equipped men in the world.

As citizens, we owe them fair treatment of their families. To emphasize this obligation in plain terms, I want to include here an editorial by Chuck Rathe, editor of the Sauk Centre Herald:

The call-up of the National Guard here into Federal service has rekindled fire again under an old problem when democratic armies fight, for democratic armies are citizen soldiers—at least as they go in. They have obligations of citizenship and family quite beyond those of the professional soldier.

What is pointed up here is that dependence allotments for men with families are too low. In some cases this will create hardships. Fortunately, at the moment in the Guard most of the men with families are in the upper pay grades where they'll be able to implement the incomes for their families.

Total payment to a wife of a serviceman is $85 per month, including the contribution made by the husband from his Army pay. This might be sufficient for young working wives, but the $105 available to a family with one child and the $125 a month to a wife with two children is way out of line. No extra payments are made for more than three dependents.

Wives with children can't hold down good paying jobs without upsetting routines at home and running into actually more costs of home management. Besides that, if the Army is really interested in the morale of its fighting men—and if in that group it is going to include family heads—then Congress and the rest of us had better see to it that the family left behind is adequately taken care of. A soldier can't fight intelligently worrying about whether his wife and kids are getting along on pittances.

The people of the United States might just as well begin now digging down into their pockets to maintain a fighting force of men, and one of the places to dig is to sustain their families adequately enough so that family life doesn't disintegrate under the stress of things.

We could win wars until doomsday, but we will have lost everything if we are to break family morale and ultimately the American home with parsimony.

These are some of the obligations that must be met. We are proud of our National Guard men and we are grateful to them. This means we must fulfill the responsibility we have to citizens who in time of danger become our soldiers. We owe them these things and we owe them more—we owe them our prayers for guidance to peace based upon principles of Christian justice. We must bow humbly and ask for divine guidance in the task before us. We must seek the way in the only place man has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

RICE PRODUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our struggle against the forces of communism throughout the world involves many aspects of our own economic policy. We cannot afford to overlook a single one of these policies which might conceivably improve our position of influence as arrayed against the Communists.

Rice is the major food crop for most of Asia. If we can assure the Asiatic people of a sufficient supply of this food, we have established a tremendous bargaining power. We will have a valuable weapon for economic rehabilitation in these areas where empty stomachs have become a persuasive weapon of communism.

The countries which in the recent past have been furnishing virtually all of the Asiatic rice imports are Thailand, Burma, and Indochina. Can we take the gamble that the present tide of totalitarianism will leave them undisturbed, continuing to contribute a normal supply of rice to the world market? It would be folly to entertain such complacency. I am informed that intelligence reports continue to point up the imminent possibility of advances by the Chinese Communists into the Malay Peninsula. Even if these countries are not openly attacked, we have no assurance that internal disturbances will not violently disrupt agricultural production. This has already been the case in Indochina.

What can we do to assure ourselves of a sufficient supply of rice to meet our needs at home, the demands of our occupation in Japan, the needs of a reserve supply for the peoples of India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the other areas hungry for rice?

The one sure answer is sharply increased American production. This can be achieved only by completely removing acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1951 crop. Removal must be at an early date, before the end of this month, in order that potential producers can increase their planting program.

The Department of Agriculture has the important decision to make in regard to the continuation of planting restrictions. Prudence dictates that the choice be in favor of expanded production of this important food crop.

America needs a rice reserve primarily to use as a weapon for democracy in Asia, but there is no need for a scarcity of production at home during a time we are attempting to put a brake on all inflationary price trends. Continued restriction of rice production will result in a price mounting considerably higher than parity, more than the consumer should be asked to pay.

I have been informed that the Department of State and the Defense Department have had occasion to check into the status of our rice supply, and that both Departments are concerned over the possibility of shortages developing in the non-Communist world. This foresight is to be commended. I hope the concern will be felt by those who make the decision as to the future of rice production in this country. We must rid ourselves of the concept of normal supply during this period of dire abnormality.

Only four Asiatic countries exported rice to the other countries of Asia in 1949—Burma, Thailand, Indochina, and Formosa. Their total exports were 2,900,000 tons. This country cannot afford to take action the success of which is dependent on the possibility of this normal export continuing in the face of the threat to the peace of southeast Asia. If we fail to prepare ourselves against this eventuality, we will have fallen again into the error of lack of proper foresight which has permeated so much of our Asiatic policy.

I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to take advantage of the authority accorded him under the law and remove all restrictions from rice production.

THE LATE COLONEL HENRY W. STIMSON

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is not a Member of the House who is not familiar with the life and work of the late Colonel Henry W. Stimson.

It is my privilege to announce that memorial services in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of Colonel Stimson, who died on the 22d of October, 1950, at Huntington, Long Island, N. Y., which is in the district which I represent, will be held at the National Presbyterian Church, Connecticut Avenue at N and Eighteenth Streets NW., Washington, D. C., on Sunday afternoon, January 21, at 5 o'clock.

Tribute will be paid by the Honorable George C. Marshall and the Reverend Dr. Albert J. McCartney. A bronze tablet in honor of Colonel Stimson will be unveiled by Mr. Charles W. Albers, vice moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church. All Congressman are invited to these memorial services.

INCREASE RAILWAY RETIREMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for the consideration of the Members of the House, H. R. 1313, the purpose of which is to increase the retirement benefits of all railway employees, carrying a relative increase for the widows of railway employees. Because of the high cost of living, present retirement benefits fall far short of what they should be at the present time.

The Railroad Retirement Fund for the payment of such benefits has continued to grow until it has reached almost the $3,000,000,000 mark. Railroad men and their dependents now facing the high cost of living are entitled to relief, and it is my hope that the Congress will give them such relief by passing my bill or similar legislation in this session of the Congress.

The trust fund now reaching nearly three billion dollars is sufficient to carry a very substantial increase to the employees without any additional cost on their part or any additional contributions from the railroad companies.

Mr. Speaker, because of the present high cost of living and the increase the Congress has made in social-security benefits for other workers, many railroad workers in my district have written to me asking that action be taken in Congress to increase their retirement benefits.

After considerable study and work with the best authority I could find here in Washington, I introduced in the last session H. R. 9161 in an effort to secure greater retirement benefits for railroad workers.

This new bill, H. R. 1313, carries the same provisions as the previous bill, H. R. 9161.

Mr. Speaker, we have kept in mind in drafting this legislation that the retirement benefits must not be raised to the point where it would bankrupt or endanger the retirement fund. I feel that the increases provided in this bill are as high as it is safe to go.

The consideration of this bill will bring this urgent problem before the Congress so that hearings may be held, allowing all parties interested to be heard in its consideration, and it may be necessary to modify the proposed legislation under the light of facts developed from the testimony.

Briefly this bill will give the retired workers an increase of from 30 to 33⅓ percent. It will affect the widows in about the same ratio. It does not increase the contributions made by the employees or by railway management. It would give the same increase to those who were retired prior to the passage of the bill.

I hope it may be considered and passed by the House and sent to the Senate early in this session.

Because of the urgent necessity of the benefits so needed by the hundreds of thousands of railway employees, I hope that the proper committee of the House will give serious consideration to such legislation and that it will be favorably reported by such committee at an early

date, so that it may be considered and passed by the House and sent to the Senate early in this session.

EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stop, look, and listen. America is heading for danger. Washington needs a shake-up the likes of which has never been experienced before. I propose the following eight-point program for survival:

First. Get the boys out of Korea. This Congress has not declared war. The United Nations is guilty of indecision, vacillation, and pro-Russian action. Other United Nations members have made no sizeable contribution to our fighting forces.

Second. Accept former President Hoover's proposals in reference to arming Western Europe—require European nations to first undertake to defend themselves. At the present time the administration is proposing to spend $8,000,000,000 in Europe and send thousands of our boys there when to date they only have a pledge for one European division from all of Western Europe.

Third. Replace not only Secretary of State Acheson but all top echelon policy-makers and near policy-makers who have supported the pro-Russian policies evidenced in the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam as well as other pro-Russian programs carried on by the State Department such as encouragement to the Chinese Communists on the grounds that they were merely agrarian reformers, supporting the Russian viewpoint in reference to Japan and the resistance to the discharge of such men as Alger Hiss.

Fourth. Replace our delegates in the United Nations.

Fifth. Take out the waste, extravagance, and unnecessary spending of the Truman budget. Much of this has no relation to our defense.

Sixth. Halt expansion of the Federal Government by refusing to enact the Fair Deal as urged by President Truman, including Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and other pet Truman schemes.

Seventh. Evidence a spirit of sacrifice on the part of everyone connected with the Government before our citizens are called upon for extreme sacrifices. Increase the work output on the part of every Government employee. Unless we save this country from financial collapse our boys will be defending a hollow mockery.

Eighth. Speed up defense production—contract-letting is lagging. Bungling and inefficiency must end.

UNITED NATIONS, KOREA, AND WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the proposition for peace made to China by the United Nations in order to stop the war is the most abject surrender of anything known in history. To cease fire the Communist Government of China is to be admitted to the UN and Formosa is to be given over to them.

That is all the Communists of China asked in the first place and when we make such an offer, we admit an abject surrender. The Nationalists of China are to be sold out bag and baggage, and turned over for the Communists to execute. Japan is left helpless, the Philippines are without protection. In other words we get in our boats and pull out. If that is done, the United Nations might just as well pay their hotel bills and go home, for the first attempt of the debating society has ended in a surrender dictated by Communist China.

If this plan is followed we should immediately withdraw from the United Nations and we will endeavor to run our own affairs. Russia is now in the United Nations, and we can't come to an understanding with her—Communist China now comes in. Is there any reason to believe that the peace of the world can be established with two obstructionists when we had only one before?

If this is done, the United Nations will be a cringing creature, ready and willing to bargain away any other government at any time. The whole purpose of the UN will thus be destroyed and it will lose the confidence of all nations when a question of policy is applied to that nation. One by one, the UN will transfer all countries to the dictation of Russia.

While I will do everything I can to aid and assist the Government in its joint attempt with the United Nations to prevent aggression in Korea, I will do it because we are already in. The men on the battlefield are not to blame for being there. I am not going to tell the defense forces how to run the Army, Navy, and Air Force for two reasons:

First, I do not know what should be done; and secondly, I am willing to rely on the good sense and military capacity of our own generals and war administrators.

That does not mean, however, that I, as a Member of Congress, will not raise my voice against sending troops to other sections, where we are not engaged in war. I oppose sending troops to Europe because:

First. The western countries of Europe should first show a desire to have us assist them.

Second. They should be alert to their own danger if there is any.

Third. They must do what it is possible for them to do in the way of furnishing materials and men.

Reading in the press that General Eisenhower has found that western Europe has only six divisions ready for action, makes it quite evident that no country is threatening western Europe. Russia alone has 300 divisions and 100 more among her satellites. If there was such a danger, the whole of western Europe could have been overrun since the end of the fighting in World War II. Now if western Europe feels that without further armament, they can proceed without fear of invasion, why should we be so concerned in western Europe?

To stop further entrance of this country into the affairs of the world and embroil us in costly wars, is a right and duty I have to perform, but when our men are actually in a battle, no matter how they got there, I will support them, for in doing so I am supporting my country. My criticism of further embroilment does not constitute a sabotage of our present war effort.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, every thoughtful American is alarmed by what has happened and by what is happening in the field of foreign affairs. He demands, and very properly so, nonpartisan and realistic action from those in authority, in order to insure the security of our country and to bring about peace with honor in the world.

As a Representative from the Second District of Connecticut, I have and shall continue to analyze and consider the problems presently facing all of us on a nonpartisan basis. With the survival of our country at stake, this is clearly the time for all of us to place country ahead of party.

I have come to the conclusion that neither the President of the United States, nor our great and respected former President, Mr. Hoover, is completely realistic in his respective summation of where we are going and what we must do.

There is one point, however, in which I thoroughly agree with both of them. We must take every possible step at once to insure that this Nation shall be as strong as possible, as quickly as possible. All of us must be in agreement and united in this respect.

I certainly concur with those who believe that we cannot expect to defend the entire free world, by ourselves, against Soviet imperialism. If the other free nations wish to survive, they must do their full share of arming and defending and fighting.

The failure to date of the United Nations to recognize and denounce Communist Chinese aggression in Korea; the bloody battles being fought nearly singlehanded by our boys in Korea makes me question seriously the use of the term "United Nations Forces."

I certainly concur with those who say that the United States of America cannot wrap two oceans around it and stay secure, safe, and free. It is the inescapable truth that we are part of this world and must remain that. For us, this must mean that no longer can we say that our first line of defense is on the

Atlantic, or on the Rhine, or on any one base or boundary or bastion. My own service in the United States Navy during World War II convinces me that our own defense must comprehend the entire world.

I have some sense of reassurance in the recent comments made to the press by General Eisenhower before taking up his duties as Supreme Commander in Europe. He spoke concerning the prospects for obtaining more effective cooperation from our allies, and for providing through all the nations jointly a military machine strong enough to meet the requirements of the situation in that part of the world.

I regret that while all of the partners in the Atlantic Pact are supposedly preparing to build up a unified defense system against the many and varied threats of Russian aggression, some of the partners are still supplying Russia and Communist China with rubber, tin, wool, and various other materials listed as strategic and critical of our united defense effort.

This policy of business as usual handicaps the efforts of the free nations themselves to build up their own defenses while all the time increasing the military power of our potential enemies.

In my opinion the free nations of the world should unite in a complete embargo against the Communist world. Let us put a stop to doing this kind of business with our enemies.

The North Atlantic Council has created a Defense Production Board to supervise the buying and distribution of strategic materials. This Board should immediately start to direct and control the preclusive buying of strategic materials. It must prevent sales of war-making materials to Russia and her satellites. It must prevent the partners in the North Atlantic Pact from competing with each other for scarce materials. This competitive buying of scarce and critical materials has added billions of dollars to the cost of government.

I share with General Eisenhower in the conviction that unless every sacrifice made by America is matched by equal sacrifice and equal sincerity of purpose in the other nations, our efforts for peace with honor cannot succeeed.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I will do everything that I can—

First. To strengthen the United States militarily, morally, and spiritually.

Second. To mobilize all of the resources of this Nation to meet fully and swiftly the requirements of the emergency and to see to it that the burden of such mobilization falls as equitably as can be upon all our people.

Third. To oppose any secret commitments to any other nation.

Our unfortunate policies of the past have brought us now to the brink of world-wide disaster. We are entering a long period in which we must subject ourselves to many restrictions which we as a people would not tolerate in more peaceful times.

All of us in every walk of life, in every profession or calling, must ask this question: "Am I going to lead in the scramble for the self-protection of my own special interest, or shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

Stern policies lie ahead. As a legislator it is my responsibility to insist that these policies be considered carefully in committee and the issues debated freely, fully, and without partisanship on the floor of the House.

Stern policies can be effective only if the public understands fully the reasons why these policies are needed. The people of our Republic have never been afraid of the truth.

The time is now. Our very survival is at stake.

SIDNEY RECORD-ENTERPRISE FURNISHES NEWSPAPER BY AIR MAIL TO GI'S

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an air-mail edition of the Sidney Record-Enterprise. This newspaper, I believe, is the only weekly newspaper in the country which is now being printed and sent out by air mail to the boys at the front. I think this is a very fine patriotic undertaking. I also received a letter from Mr. McLaughlin, the editor, in which he said:

> I am enclosing the second issue of the regular weekly air-mail edition of the Record-Enterprise. So far as I know, this is the only weekly newspaper anywhere publishing an air-mail edition. This edition is limited to those in the service. It is published by this newspaper free and postage is paid from a fund supported by community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this enterprise and I feel it would be well if other small-town local newspapers would follow this patriotic example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I introduced a bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States. The bill provides for total exemption for all enlisted personnel and $200 per month for commissioned officers.

There is no reason why the men who are now serving our country overseas should not be given certain tax exemptions somewhat similar to those of the last war. Basically, the same reasons which prompted such legislation then, demand it now.

Members of the House will agree that legislation of this type is the least that a grateful nation can do for those gallant and courageous men who are defending our country in places far removed from their homes and those they love dearly.

I strongly urge the House to take quick action on this measure. It will boost the morale of those who are battling the godless forces of communism for the preservation of our freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and our basic American way of life.

THE SINGLE ITEM VETO OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented us this week with a budget of staggering proportions for the next fiscal year. A tremendous deficit will result, unless drastic steps are taken.

It is imperative that we close the dollar gap between our Federal income and our current expenditures or we shall have an inflation of such magnitude that no amount of Federal regulation will be able to control it.

The dollar is our first line of defense. Unless we have the courage and the self-control to protect its value and its buying power, we shall have lost the very economic system which we are fighting to save. Our power to resist the Communist forces abroad will be fatally undermined, if we fail to preserve a basically sound economy here at home.

To do this will require great sacrifices on the part of each one of us. Unwelcome as new and heavier taxes are, inflation is the worst and most unfair tax of all, since it eats into the spending power of widows and pensioners trying to live on modest, fixed incomes and hits most severely the very people who are least able to afford it.

To give the President another weapon with which to fight inflation by effecting economy in our nondefense spending, I have introduced two bills, H. R. 492 and House Joint Resolution No. 24, which would permit a separate veto of specific items included in an omnibus appropriation bill. H. R. 492 would permit each item in an omnibus funds bill to be treated as a separate measure for the purpose of Presidential consideration. House Joint Resolution No. 24 proposes an amendment to the Constitution to grant specific power to the President to veto a separate item in an omnibus appropriation bill. Whether the necessary approach to this problem is by the constitutional amendment route is a debatable point. There can be little dispute, however, it seems to me, over the proposition that we should set out at once down one or the other of these alternative roads toward fiscal reform.

Although as a general principle, I am opposed to the grant of more power to the executive branch of our Government, I think that a realistic solution, such as an item veto, is perhaps the only practical way of preventing or minimizing logrolling for pet projects.

The amount of stern self-control which the Congress should use this year with respect to such traditionally larded portions of our appropriation bills as the rivers and harbors and flood-control sections may be comprehended if the figures for the lean years of World War II are used as a comparison. In 1944, only $36,800,000 was granted for flood control, and in 1945, only $50,500,000. In the same years $48,000,000 and $54,600,000, respectively, were allowed for rivers and harbors construction and improvement. Compare this with the total of $582,200,000 for these two items in last year's omnibus bill.

To accomplish real economy in Government operation requires the full cooperation of both the executive and the legislative branches of our Government. If the President is sincere in the plea he has voiced for strict economy, certainly Congress should not deny him any weapon he can employ to bring about drastic reductions in nondefense, nonessential spending. Let us open up our anti-inflation arsenal by prompt enactment of legislation to enable the President to disapprove individual expenditures in appropriation bills.

STOP SALE OF INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the 5-percenters made untold thousands of dollars of the people's money in charging illegal fees.

These fees were mythical considerations and the purchase of influence by naive businessmen who came to Washington cold turkey and had trouble finding their way around.

The 5-percenters were a disgrace to the country and a menace to legitimate business. Yet, it is my understanding that they are returning to the Washington scene even more venomously for they have raised their ante. They are now demanding tribute of 10 percent and higher.

The time has come to stop these highwaymen before they do the damage which they did during the last war. Too much of the taxpayers' money went into their cavernous pockets for imaginary services. The commodity they pretend to sell is influence but only the sucker will fall for them. Nevertheless, they are making hay.

The bill which I am introducing today, if passed by Congress, will take care of these crooks. It is my hope that the House will act soon on this measure for the welfare of the entire country and for the benefit of our home defense program. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to outlaw the sale of influence by false representatives in the matter of defense orders to private business

PREAMBLE

During World War II unscrupulous men accepted 5 percent, 10 percent, and other substantial rewards from business concerns out of total amounts of contracts they were successful in negotiating with certain defense agencies within the Government.

The unscrupulous men accepting percentages of total contract sums are being replaced by even more unscrupulous men who have succeeded in some instances in inducing private business concerns to retain them as their representatives in Washington.

These unscrupulous men claim to have considerable prestige and influence with various Government officials and agree to obtain defense orders for private business concerns in return for generous drawing accounts, sumptuous lodgings and office space in Washington, and countless other endearments. They are often engaged by more than one business firm, whose officers through gullibility are victims of such false representation.

Be it enacted, etc., That—

1. Contracts with the Government for all defense orders shall be negotiated directly between a responsible officer or officers of a corporation on the one hand and a bona fide employee or executive of the United States on the other.

2. It shall be unlawful to retain, hire, or engage the services, either on a percentage basis or drawing account arrangement, of any middleman whose sole function seems to be the employing of special influence which he may profess to have with various governmental agencies or departments or individuals therein.

3. Wherever it can be proved that a middleman received pay or compensation in return for obtaining a defense contract from any agency of the Government through the use of pressure or influence, such contract shall be declared null and void.

4. It shall be unlawful to accept any sum of money as reward for influence rendered in the consummation of a Government contract or defense order.

HAZARD PAY BILL FOR COMBAT GROUND TROOPS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, in the press of yesterday Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, was quoted as saying that the Department of Defense will soon be requesting Congress to act on a hazardous pay bill for combat ground troops. July 19 of last year I introduced a bill for hazard pay for ground troops and reintroduced it again January 3 in the Eighty-second Congress. The bill provides $5 a day for each day a man is in a combat area. This is a bill for which a precedent has already been established. We give hazard pay in the Air Corps and in the Submarine Service.

I understand the plan of the Department of Defense is to give $50 hazard pay to enlisted men and $100 to officers. Let me say that I will oppose any effort to distinguish between officers and enlisted men when it comes to a hazard pay bonus.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. McVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Friday, January 19, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

HEROIC TENNESSEE STEWARDESS DIES SAVING LIVES IN BURNING PLANE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a short article from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, it is not unusual for men to rise on this floor and pay deserving tributes to our brave heroes who are now dying on foreign soil; but it is not often that a Member has the opportunity of paying deserving tribute to such an immortal heroine as Miss Mary Frances Housley, of Fountain City, Tenn., who gave her life in the flaming wreck of an airplane at the International Airport, Philadelphia, Pa., on last Sunday in attempting to save the life of a child whose charred remains were found in the arms of her dead body when the flames were finally subdued.

Someone has said that when it comes to the field of battle—

There is something of pride in the perilous hour,
Whatever be the form which death may lower,
For fame is there to tell who bleeds,
And honor's eye on daring deeds.

The soldier goes to his death trained for the conflict and steeled for the emergency by the presence and bravery of his heroic comrades.

But in this instance, a young girl, only 24 years of age, found herself involved in a horrible disaster, in which a crashed airplane burst into flames, killing 6 of the 25 passengers, and went to her death trying to save them from a horrible death.

She succeeded in leading 10 persons to safety, and then rushed back into the burning plane to try to recover two small children, when she was overcome and perished with one of the little fellows in her arms.

I am sure that every Member of this House, as well as the people of the entire country, will agree with me that a greater act of heroism was never recorded in all the annals of our country.

She deserves the highest praise and the greatest honor our Christian civilization can bestow.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has sent to the Congress his budget message calling for a staggering $71,600,000,000 to be spent in the fiscal year 1952. That, according to the President's message, is an increase of 78 percent over expenditures for the year ended June 30.

The President expects the new defense costs to cause a deficit of 16.5 billion dollars in 1952, if no further taxes are added. He proposes to ask new tax legislation to balance this deficit.

We have already been put on notice that this latest extraction of funds from the taxpayer's wallet is going to be a painful one. There is going to be a general "belt-tightening," and we are all going to be "taxed until it hurts."

We expected the financial burden of this defense effort to be terrific. But there will be little or no controversy over any spending that is necessary to safeguard our freedom, or the freedom of peoples, eager like ourselves, to remain free. There can be no quibbling over dollars and cents, if the cost is essential to saving this country from communism.

In view of all this, it seems that the course of wisdom demands that we consider these matters carefully and thoughtfully. The easy way would be for us to approve any appropriations which the administration seeks, and then forget about the whole matter. That would be the easy way, but history might also show it to be the disastrous way.

We have been told, for example, that certain backward areas in the world need help in raising their standards of living in order to save them from communism. To the extent that this is desirable and can be done without lowering the standard of living here, I have very little objection.

But the proposal brings up a question. If raising the standard of living is necessary in these areas to save them from communism, how will lowering the standard of living here affect the United States?

And we certainly do face a lowering of the living standard here. New and painful taxes, coupled with our present inflationary trend, are hitting the American family in the pocketbook. The President says the taxes are necessary, but no one has said or even implied that the inflation is necessary. But it is here, and how great it becomes will depend upon our management of our Government.

Some of the Government's economic master minds have an answer for this inflationary problem.

These people believe the cure-all for inflation is to tax away the money of the men and women who have the ability to earn it. After all, they cannot be trusted with it. So these Government officials would take this money and then give it away. Now is not that simple? And it is just as stupid as it is simple. I, for one, do not subscribe to any such program.

The spot for some real spadework in inflation control is in cutting down on unnecessary Government expenditures. The time has come when the taxpayers' dollar, expended by the Government, must get its full value in purchases.

It is not my desire to cry about water that has already passed over the dam. What is past is past, and there is not anything we can do about it. But we can do better in the future. And I do believe that our responsibility as Members of Congress and as Representatives of the people of the United States should not end merely with the voting of moneys.

I believe that this responsibility extends to a watchdog role on where these funds go and whether or not they are wisely spent. In this connection, it should not be too difficult for the various committees to keep track of these matters.

Here daily we see examples of the biggest business in the world today—the United States Government—engaging in practices that would ruin any private corporation. If a purchasing agent in a private corporation made an error that cost his company several million dollars, he would be fired before the sun went down. But when it happens in Government, the administration simply asks Congress for more taxes.

It is my personal experience and observation that there is too great a gap between the procurement officers of the various agencies and those disposing of so-called surplus property. If a procurement agent is in the market for a certain item, it seems ridiculous that the General Services Administration should be disposing of the same type item at the same time.

I certainly urge that this thing be approached with a sensible and restrained attitude. This is no time for irresponsible shouting and sensationalism. One of the greatest needs is for checking into suspected waste and getting factual information, then using this information constructively.

We should strenuously avoid partisan statements, without foundation, which may cause more disunity within the country, because there is certainly too much disunity existing now. Never in my memory have people been so confused or been so eager for information and facts as they are today.

These are all matters which I believe the Congress should carefully consider, as they may seriously affect the economy of this Nation for years to come. There are so many aspects to be considered that any hasty, ill-advised action might well prove disastrous.

In working out the new tax measures it would be well for the Ways and Means Committee to remember that practically all the States depend upon certain sales taxes to support their schools, their aged, their dependent children, and other such vital services. Any crushing tax program that would seriously cut purchasing power will either curtail these vital agencies or force State legislatures to seek new sources of revenue, thereby increasing the already heavy tax burden.

In this same connection, I might call attention to the civil-defense program. We are appropriating a billion dollars a year for this purpose and we are asking the States to match the Federal help, dollar for dollar. With the people already drained until it hurts, where are the States going to raise this extra revenue?

I hope my remarks in these matters will not be construed as an effort to hamper vital defense spending. I want to put myself on record here and now that I have the utmost faith in the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. VINSON. I will vote for every dollar that Chairman VINSON and his committee believe is necessary for the defense of this Nation.

But I do not believe our obligation as Members of Congress ends when this money is appropriated. I believe it should go further, and we should know what happens to it after these departments get hold of it.

I believe the committee chairmen should keep us informed of any wastefulness or irregularities of monies appropriated. It behooves us to learn how this money is being spent, and how these supplies are being used. It doesn't seem sensible for Congress to sign a blank check for waste and stupidity.

Nor does it seem sensible that one Government agency should be giving away surplus commodities while another agency is buying those self-same items on the open market at inflated prices. Some of these people should wake up and look around outside of their own little agency's world; they might find a lot of interesting things.

There should be a closer integration between agencies. They should begin to realize that they are not separate entities. They are all a part of the Government of the United States. And if they don't realize this and start pulling together, there may be no jobs, no Government, and no United States.

This country can be ruined more surely by waste, extravagance, resultant inflation, and financial bankruptcy than by any armed assault of Soviet Russia. It is our obligation, as Representatives of the people of these United States, to see that this does not occur.

The American people realize the danger to this country. They realize that defense will cost money and blood, and they are ready to pay that price. But, if my mail is an indication, they are getting sick and tired of seeing millions and billions tossed around by irresponsible people here in Washington as though it is small change.

Our President has told us that the cost of rearmament will be high, and that the people must be "taxed until it hurts." If the people know that this money, due to be so painfully extracted, is being well and wisely spent, it might serve to alleviate some of the pain.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. My distinguished colleague has made a very forceful statement motivated by a genuine concern on his part, a concern which I am sure stems from his long experience as wartime Governor of our fair State during the last war. May I say to the gentleman that I think his statement is very appropriate at this time and it is worthy of our most careful consideration. It reflects quite accurately what the people are thinking about and what they are talking about.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, during roll call No. 5 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at this hour when fate interposes a serious challenge to America's destiny we have the obligation, each in his own way, of proving up the democratic processes and validating our democratic values.

For upon what we do and say here, upon how America acts in this era of crisis, largely depends the survival of that which history records as Western Civilization, a span of centuries in the annals of humankind that has brought the world its greatest progress, enlightenment and spiritual enrichment.

In our approach to a discussion of the international situation, which has brought America and the Free World sharply up with the realization that its very existence as such is jeopardized, we would do well not to lose sight of several vital and simple fundamentals, and to dwell upon them despite all the complexities which surround them. We must not be lured by the temptations of obstructionism, no matter how beguiling, away from the central issues at stake.

Perhaps it will assist us in our discussion if we attempt to set forth, at the beginning, the more imperative of the questions requiring debate and solution. And quickly before I undertake this task of orientation, I wish to avail myself of the privilege of paying tribute to the members of this House and the other body for the profound and serious and sincere way in which they have embraced the subject of debate on our foreign policy. All of us as servants and as citizens can well be proud, I feel, of the honesty of purpose, the patriotic motivation and intellectual honesty which have characterized the continuing discussion of the great issues which demand our attention, and are equally insistent of constructive solution.

Those who do not understand America—and what dictator ever did?—will be quick to sense in these discussions an imagined gain through what they erroneously believe to be a tragic disunity in the American front, all the time never realizing that what really is at work is the alchemy of democratic action: clarifying, solidifying, catelyzing until the articulated American conscience makes itself felt in action—devastating to tyrants.

The whole tone and temper of this debate has been admirably established on a high plane by the President, who in his state of the Union message eloquently reaffirmed for all the world to read—even those who run on the road that leads to disaster—America's total dedication to freedom and to peace—and of this Nation's firm intent never to abandon those goals even should their pursuit carry us through the carnage and ruin and agonies of war. Similarly, as I have said before, all the discussants have spoken in the same vein and by their conduct and contributions have strengthened the resolve of America to fulfill the role which destiny has alloted to her.

There is no disagreement as to purpose—the pursuit of peace in a free world—there is no disunity on the need of stern and decisive action to achieve our ends. There exists only differences on the methods to be adopted and steps to be taken best calculated to meet the situation. And therein, I submit, is a considerable area for wide and honest differences of opinion. It remains our task to resolve the differences in ways that will not vitiate our purpose, weaken our resolve, dissipate our strength, or invite failure.

Accordingly, I proceed to the heart of the matter.

This is not the first time in history that a nation, an alliance, a civilization, has been challenged by threatening forces.

Of those challenged, some nations and civilizations survived, others fell as wheat before the sickle.

The test stone in all cases was the response the nation or civilization made to the challenge.

In all too many instances decay had set in and ruin was a guest in the house long before the threat knocked at the door.

I know it is not necessary to illustrate this with a long list of examples. Grade-school histories are replete with one example after another.

So we would do well, in the present situation, to consult the historic parallels. I will return to this later on, but now I would like to press on to the immediate problem at hand.

Much of our difficulty and that of the democratic world derives from the fact that we have not truly understood the nature of the enemy. We have not comprehended that Soviet Russia is not just another state, a foreign power, rather it is the seat of a revolution of nihilism, a godless state, conceived in atheistic revolt against the democratic world, and dedicated to the enslavement of the peoples of the world on the one hand and the utter destruction of everything of Judeo-Christian civilization extant.

Now these are not idle phrases spoken for rhetorical effect. These are not something conjured up to make an impressive looking indictment. These are not words to be utilized upon a privileged forum. No, they are a factual representation of the spirit, arms, and avowed objectives of Soviet imperialism, and in a hundred different ways and words—the Soviets' own words—we have proof. We will never be wholly prepared to deal with the threat posed to our survival as a free and independent people until we truly understand the menace of the communistic revolution in all its diabolical assault on western civilization. When we know it for what it is we can meet it and counter it in its every phase, in its manifold and insidious war against the democratic world.

One of our first and most costly mistakes was the belief that in the war against Hitler the Soviets were our allies. That brief partnership in arms, a partnership, incidentally, in which American aid accounted for approximately 70 percent of Russian war matériel, was instead only an arrangement in which America and her allies and Russia had a common enemy. We thought we had an ally in Russia, but she never validated that contract because all the time she had a mental reservation and there was no marriage. This became all too apparent even before the fighting was over. Stalin went into one of his famous about-faces when it became apparent the fury of the Nazi war machine was broken and spent. Do not take my estimate of this. Instead I give you the official Soviet documentation on this development in the Soviet revolution against western civilization:

> The fact that the Soviet Union and the greatly shaken capitalist countries showed themselves to be in one powerful camp, ranged against the Fascist aggressors, showed that the struggle of two systems within democratic camp was temporarily alleviated, suspended, but this of course does not mean the end of this struggle.

These are Varga's words found in Features of Internal and Foreign Policies of Capitalists Countries in Epoch of General Crisis of Capitalism, World Economy and Politics, No. 6, June 1946, page 11. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the early postwar manifestations of a revival of the doctrine of impossibility of peaceful coexistence of the USSR with capitalism.

The writings and official documents of communism are replete with declarations of war against the capitalist world. Take the words of Lenin in his paper entitled "Tactics of the Russian Communist Party," report to the Third Congress of Communist Internaticnal, July 5, 1921. Lenin at that time said:

> Dictatorship is a state of war. We are precisely in such a state. There is no military invasion at present; but we are isolated. * * * Until the final issue is decided, the state of awful war will continue.

Now to those who may say that all of this was uttered some 30 years ago, I hasten to reply that such source material is constantly being issued and reissued down to the present day as advice and guidance for Communists everywhere. This particular gem was published in Selected Works, International Publishers, New York, 1943, volume IX, page 242. As you can readily see it advises party workers that the struggle against the opposition would continue with violence until the latter was destroyed. No relaxation of the dictatorship could be expected until security was attained.

So that we may be on guard and alert in any dealings with the Soviets it is well to have this slant, which again, is from their own official writings: "The time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party systematically to combine legal with illegal work." Here is the policy of planned deceit, the official sanctioning of illegality as an instrument of Soviet aggrandizement. Again, let us take the subject of truth. Here I quote:

> The idea that the truth remains the truth is admissible in a philosophical club, but in the party, the decisions of the Congress are obligatory also upon those who doubt the correctness of a decision. Our party is strong through the fact that the decisions of the majority are obligatory upon all not only in form, but in substance.

Here we have the key of the performances of Communist spokesmen throughout the world who speak the pieces dictated by Moscow no matter what the object situation. It is the source and origin of the big lie technique. Through its adoption, the Soviets have been able to bring about, for many practical purposes, a debasement of language, a convenient dodge which enables them to create and spread confusion, arm their propaganda guns to the full and carry on the great sham at the United Nations.

All of this is very important, for Red propagandists understand that once an impression is established it remains in the mind long after the reason for its formation has been forgotten. The Soviet propagandists know that most people seldom revise attitudes once accepted on the basis of apparent evidence even when they later learn that the evidence was false. The victim has been attitudinalized.

In this respect much harm has been done in America by Communist sympathizers who used places of influence and strategic placement to poison the fountain-springs of our intellectual and cultural life, to shape and mould public opinion in ways that have proved detrimental to our own best interests.

It is worthy of note in this connection that although a considerable section of American public opinion was encouraged to the belief that the Communist movement in China was purely of national origin and represented not a Moscow-inspired revolt, but rather the instinctive groupings of Chinese "agrarians," the Soviets as far back as 1928 had outlined a nine-point program to win over the Chinese. The nine points, as published in Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies in 1928 and representing the Theses and Resolutions of VI Congress of Communist International, 1928, were as follows:

First. Overthrow of imperialist domination.

Second. Confiscation of foreign enterprises and banks.

Third. Unity of the country, with recognition of the right of each nationality to self-determination.

Fourth. Overthrow of the power of the militarists and the Kuomintang.

Fifth. Establishment of the power of Soviets', of workers', peasants', and soldiers' representatives.

Sixth. The 8-hour working day, increase of wages, assistance to the unemployed, and social insurance.

Seventh. Confiscation of all lands of big landlords, land for peasants and soldiers.

Eighth. The abolition of all governmental, militarist, and local taxes; a single progressively graduated income tax.

Ninth. Alliance with the USSR and the world proletarian movement.

Yes, these are the means through which Moscow sought for years to gain control of China. It is not too far a step from that crafty beginning to the shooting in Korea where American boys are dying from Chinese Communist arms, while Chiang remains a virtual prisoner in Formosa.

I would ask that you consider carefully for a moment that nine-point program which Moscow used as the catch-all for suckers in the Soviet's planned program to gain control of China. Sprinkled in with the outright Soviet pitches are some attractive social-economic devices which were calculated to attract the confused and frustrated youth of China. In the manipulation of such a situation, the Soviets have shown themselves able practitioners. The sad and sorry part of the whole business, however, is that such promises are only a snare and delusion, for once the tenacles of Soviet imperialism get into a nation's economy and the agents of Moscow come into political control of a state, the pledges for peace, democracy, and equity become a cruel hoax and all the horror apparatus of the police state goes into operation.

As a matter of fact, one of the most grievous crimes of Soviet imperialism is what the Soviet aristocracy has done and is doing to the Russian people and the various nationals of the captive states. The record of inhumanities, deprivations, torture, mental cruelties, and vicious exploitation of the little people of Russia and the satellites under Stalin's regime is something which virtually defies comprehension. Think for a moment of the famines in the liquidation of the Kulaks, the ever-recurring purges which wipe out whole rows in the Soviet hierarchy, the pilloring and persecution of intellectuals and scientists, the lamentable fate of deviationists. In all the history of mankind, there is nothing to equal this record of brutality and mass murder. I would urge each and everyone of you to read Suzanne Labin's Stalin's Russia, wherein this gifted French writer gives you an appraisal of Russia by taking the Soviets at their own words, using official documents, publications, and utterances to put together the dark picture.

Never let us be deceived by the false-faces and the fronts the Soviets may put on. We would do well to hearken well to the words of Benjamin Gitlow, one time highly placed American Communist, who later "did time," when he warns in his book, The Whole of Their Lives:

> The Communists took Marxism out of the realm of utopian idealism and political abstraction to build a powerful world revolution movement so fluid and flexible, so devoid of illusions, moral scruples and ideals, that often the erroneous conclusion was reached that the Communist movement had departed from its basic principles and abandoned communism altogether.

No, we must never forget that the men in charge of Soviet imperialism, the masters of the Kremlin are true sons of revolution who arrived at their present position of Soviet eminence through intrigue, treachery, and violence.

Bear in mind constantly that the members of the Politburo obviously possess in high degree four fateful traits of character:

In the first place they are able and vigorous.

In the second place they are devoted singlemindedly to the cause of communism. They are fanatics.

In the third place, they are ruthless. Their fanaticism is matched only by their ruthlessness.

In the fourth place, they are realistic. Being what they are explains what they have done.

They have tightened their control on the so-called heartland of Eurasia. They have stimulated and encouraged and directed their counterparts in Korea and China. They have carefully timed an offensive against Indochina and all of this fits into a pattern just as does their move against Tibet. On the one hand, America is committed heavily of her total military strength in Korea, leaving Japan for the moment without any substantial strength military-wise. In such vacuums, Communist propagandists have an ideal field for operations. The aggressions in Korea and against Tibet have not been lost upon India, while the action in Indochina has kept the French well occupied, placing a strain upon France's military manpower and treasury. England of course has been kept apprehensive by the exposed condition of Hong Kong, and the peoples of the Philippines and the nations of southeast Asia, in the throes of movements sparked by nationalistic stirrings, are being subjected to the raw fundamentals of grim power politics.

Before getting down to a consideration of specifics to meet this growing threat and expanding menace, I would like to stress that it is the worst kind of superficial thinking for any of us or any nation to proceed on the assumption and base policy on the belief that Asia is divisible from Europe or that the enveloping global struggle can be segmented, cut in parts and pieces, and one continent closed off in our thinking or in the life processes while we devote ourselves to what we may consider a more urgent section of the globe. No it is all one big struggle, there are many theaters but they are all part of the one contest. What happens here in Washington today has its effect in Formosa as it does in London. Science has made a neighborhood of the world. Time and space are being destroyed in many aspects by the onward rush of scientific achievement. The sensitive fabric of the modern world is such that a development in one place may have profound reaction somewhere thousands of miles away. Just remember the slogan of the aviation industry: "No spot on earth is more han 48 hours away from your local airport." Radio, television, wireless, all the marvels of modern communication, have helped knit up the world into a community of interest.

So in the development of a foreign policy and in shaping up of military forces for its implementaion we must not make the serious mistake of separationist thinking. When we have thought this out thoroughly and completely and traced out all its ramifications then we will be self-convinced of the utter futility and mistakenness of anything that savors of isolationism.

It would help us in this debate if we forthrightly admit that ours is to be a policy of enlightened self interest. Certainly it is to our self interest to fight to defend Europe just as it is to our

interest to attempt to stem the tide of Red aggression in Asia, or wherever it breaks out violently.

Now the cry will come back that we cannot be everywhere at all times in strength and rather than dissipate our substance in ill-considered military actions we should husband our resources and wait until the day when we are better fortified. We or our allies are not ready, we are told, and therefore we should do nothing whatsoever that might get the Kremlin mad at us.

This is merely a modified form of appeasement. What are we and the free world to do—crawl on our bellies like reptiles because the Kremlin commands more divisions and has more tanks ready to commit to action? The one thing that Soviet imperialism despises above everything else is weakness and a cringing spirit. Man has come to a sad estate, indeed, if at the price of saving his carcass he is ready to sacrifice his honor, his dignity and his freedom. Now the fact of the matter is that his love of liberty and devotion to freedom are truly his greatest weapons and in the long run, no matter what the odds, the human spirit will win out over tyranny.

We have had and are having our reverses in Korea and we daily hear the question asked: Why are we fighting there? We had no business there. Well I for one, and in saying this I am mindful of the great sacrifices that America has put into that military campaign, I for one say, though the way may be bloody and heartbreaking, time will bear out the wisdom and efficacy of the decision to have endeavored to call a halt to communism expansion then and there. The free world must have the will to survive or it will perish.

Before we become overwhelmed with contemplations of reverses, we would do well to go back a few pages in history and remember the days when Hitler was taking countries without firing a shot, and later how his mechanized hordes swept to the channel and the odds on him were long, indeed—but there he met an opponent who never entertained even a notion of defeat, who forged armament from his very spirit, who was prepared to fight to the death but never surrender—and then you know how the fight to hold on developed until the democratic world rose in its might as the moral opinion of liberty-loving people everywhere swelled the forces of righteousness and Hitler's chance had passed.

How well I recall the dismal prophets of the pre-Munich days who warned against taking on the arms of the Reich, for the Luftwaffe, we were told, constituted an armada that would wipe its opponents off the face of the earth. These are things to remember at this hour whenever so many are prone to summon the counsels of despair.

There is a tendency, and it is a serious error, I feel, in casting up an appraisal of the global situation, to place too much stress upon the strength and resources of the enemy while at the same time marking down our own assets and those of our allies. I say this in face of the evidence that I have recounted at length as to the nature of the enemy, but I am convinced that we are doing our cause a gross disservice when we develop and foster the myth of invincibility of the enemy, when we fail to point up positively our own strengths.

In the first place we and our allies have great superiority in those technological facilities and skills which go into the massing of economic power for armament to conduct a war successfully. We are better fortified in materials and resources. We have greater productivity per capita, considerably higher standards of living, stronger incentives, and a long, magnificent tradition of freedom.

Of course, I am well aware that this kind of emphasis without critical study of the situation can easily lead us into error, for while we and our allies greatly outstrip the Soviets in the matter, say, of steel production, the fact remains that Russia is putting much more of its lesser steel output into armament than are we. So we have the task of quickly and efficiently making the most of what we have both as to manpower and material goods so that the potentials of the free world will be realized speedily and the threat confronting it diminished.

There is another consideration, however, that is the nub of the matter: If the Soviets move against Western Europe and overpower it, then the factors which made for the advantages of the Atlantic Pact nations will be decisively and dangerously reversed, and the edge will be Russia's by an impressive margin. This is what we must not lose sight of for an instant as we proceed through the days in a discussion of the situation.

The prize in Western Europe:

Population:	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	216,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	285,000,000
United States and Canada	164,000,000
Armies (manpower):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	900,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	3,700,000
United States and Canada	1,132,000
Navies (tonnage):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	1,500,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	450,000
United States and Canada	1,800,000
Air Forces (aircraft):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	8,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	28,000
United States and Canada	28,500
Steel (tons per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	46,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	28,000,000
United States and Canada	93,000,000
Coal (tons per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	420,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	400,000,000
United States and Canada	500,000,000
Crude oil (barrels per year):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	7,400,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	316,000,000
United States and Canada	2,525,000,000
Electricity (kilowatt-hours):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	178,000,000,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	100,000,000,000
United States and Canada	352,000,000,000
Motor vehicles (annual output):	
Atlantic Pact nations plus West Germany	1,500,000
Soviet Union and European satellites	465,000
United States and Canada	8,000,000

—From Pathfinder, January 10, 1950.

Properly considered the debate on foreign policy should not be primarily concerned with military strategy or tactics but others have seen fit to introduce this aspect as a prime subject so we must of necessity meet their arguments head-on.

Considering the military policy suggestions of the retreatists, we might well invoke Pareto's dictum:

> Let us have theoretical theories and practical practices for practical theories and theoretical practices are an abomination.

It is generally taken for granted by the people of the United States and the world that America's superiority in A-bombs is the element in the international situation which may be best calculated to serve as a deterrent to Russia launching an all-out war. Winston Churchill has given this as his strong belief. It is a logical assumption. There are other handles to the question, however: One is that the Russians are generally supposed to be making rapid strides in the manufacture of A-bombs. Another is that whereas the United States would never use the bomb first, there is no such moral deterrent in the Soviet ethic, so that brings us to the point that with a disproportionately smaller number of A-bombs, Russia, striking first, could do much to nullify our advantage of a larger A-bomb stock. Our military people generally impute to the Russians the military capability of delivering the bomb against prime targets in the United States.

Our answer to this threat is the Strategic Air Command. We have built this service well. We will build it bigger and better. We have the means and the capacity to strike devastating blows against an enemy that hits America's homeland.

Students of military science should ponder well before taking any action which will compel the United States to use this retaliatory force. Fortunately we have the strongest Navy afloat. And we do not propose to leave it in a static state; it is being added to; there is room for improvement in the submarine field, and this matter is not being neglected. Together with our allies, and even allowing for the supposedly vast extension of Russia's undersea components, we have and should be able to maintain control of the seas. In a war of continents this would be a marked advantage, although

we are not going to forget that the enemy would be working along interior lines.

In our projections, giving ourselves the best of it in the air and on the seas, I do not for the life of me understand how men versed in statecraft, history, and even possessing a smattering of military knowledge would propound the proposition that we can seek refuge in those elements and practically dissolve ground forces. As a matter of fact, military history points up one moral, and that is that all arms are essentially accessories to the main element of decisiveness: the battlefield. Wars only progress and are won as men on the battlefield move forward, take enemy territory, destroy enemy forces, ultimately break the will of civil populations to persist in fruitless conflict, until eventually the victor's ground forces occupy and control the enemy's homeland. This is a classic and fundamental military concept.

Because I regard this aspect of the debate of such over-riding importance, I am going to impose upon your indulgence and quote at some length on this point in the hope that there may be punctured finally and completely the fallacious notion that because a power is strong in the air and the seas ground forces are dispensable.

A recognized military historian, Col. S. L. A. Marshall, now editor of the Detroit News, writing on the subject, Battle Command in Future War, had this to say:

The battlefield is the epitome of war. All else in war, when war is perfectly conducted, exists but to serve the forces of the battlefield and to assure final success on the field.

It is on the battlefield that the issues of war are decided. Yet it may well occur in the struggle between nations that such a preponderance of power will be achieved by one side or the other, or such destruction will be worked on one body or the other either by weapons of the air or by a naval blockade, as to virtually predetermine the results of the battlefield.

Even so, the contests between land armies will continue to be the concluding act in war. Without this conclusion military victory will not be achieved.

The greater becomes the emphasis on weapons whose destructive power is aimed at the civil society, the more certain it is that the battlefield will continue as the area of final decision in war. This trend cannot be reversed. It can be ended only when the mortal dangers to all civil populations are so universally recognized, and that recognition is so directly reflected in the policies of the various states and the attitudes of their peoples, as to end war itself.

The mobilizing of all national forces and resources in war does not lessen the decisive importance of all that occurs on the battlefield. Nor can the evolution of new weapons establish a form of war in which military decision is foreseeable and the danger of stalemate can be reckoned avertable, without full preparation to engage the land forces of the enemy with forces of the same sort.

The over-all effect of the changing pattern of war, as it is superinduced by the character of the new weapons, is to promote an ever increasing involvement of national forces and national prestige. This in turn makes more critical the events of the battlefield. For it should be noted that all military power is dependent of the civil will. It is the nation, and not its army, that makes war. But when all the forces of a society are directed toward the shaping of a decisive instrument in war and the cutting edge of the instrument falls on the field of battle, the result is not alone the defeat of an army, but the envelopment or dissolution of a society.

And then this pertinent discourse on the subject of decision:

What is decision? It cannot be a matter of counting the totals of dead on the contending sides, nor yet of measuring how the preponderance of force is weighted within the victorious side. It implies a final determination of the issue. Decision is obtained by those who survive and not by those who die in striving for it. It is an act which enables the establishment of tranquility and the restoration of political action. It is an advance on Richmond, not a Gettysburg, a bold stroke across a bridge at Remagen, not a landing on the coast of Normandy.

In total war, decision recedes farther and farther into distance until one final act brings about quick collapse and submission of the force protecting the enemy interior. Be the chaos of the defending civilization ever so great, as long as there remains an organized will to resist, defeat is not insured. The final act will always be an act of the battlefield, whether the ground forces which achieve it move by overland transport, or by sea or by air.

Air power is essential to national survival. But air power, unsupported by the forces of the battlefield, is a military means without an end.

And so, in my humble judgment, it would be tragic short-sightedness for us to short-change the very decisive element of ground forces just because we were strong in other branches of the military. And by the same token it would be monumental folly and akin to courting disaster to endeavor by legislative fiat to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief and our military leaders from placing those ground forces in those parts of the world where they are best calculated to meet the threat of Soviet expansionism.

Inasmuch as this subject was the spark which set off this debate in the first place, I am sure you will abide with me until I have thoroughly and I hope, effectively, dealt with this phase of the question.

There can be no fundamental objection to the approval of a resolution having to do with the use of troops overseas if this resolution would not seek to order or direct the President in any particular way, but would express the belief of the Congress that the dispatch of troops to foreign soil would be desirable. Such an action would give congressional participation in the decision, but would not give the Congress any veto power, either assumed or actual. The President clearly has a constitutional right to send troops for these purposes without consultation. I cannot agree with the argument that the Congress has the right to flatly direct the President to make no troop commitments until and unless Congress has given its explicit consent. The United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Treaty, by due constitutional process, are now the law of the land. There is merit to the position that in view of the fact that the other body was assured that the United States would not be called upon to provide soldiers in advance of an actual attack that the Executive should consult with the Congress before sending troops overseas whether or not he had a legal right to act alone, at least as such action implements these treaties.

The House has time and again stated its willingness to listen to the advice of the chiefs of the Armed Forces on all matters of troop disposition for the national defense. I believe the Executive has done and will do so. That being the case, the Executive would hardly act under implied power unless after the advice of the defense chiefs in the interest of the national security; and, if that is so, very few Members of Congress would care to superimpose their contrary opinion. Why then, other than for academic reasons, select this hour for a vitriolic and tumultous debate as to which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

In view of the long series of precedents of the implied power of the President with reference to the dispatch of troops to foreign soil, the Coudert resolution amounts to a request for a vote of lack of confidence in the Executive during a period of grave national emergency—and if that is the purpose—I challenge the gentleman to unmask his attack and introduce a resolution which asks such a vote and let that issue be met head-on.

There is no basis for the assumption that in advance of aggression the President would not ask the approval of Congress to send additional troops to Europe.

In the face of world events there is no margin for error. All doubts must be resolved against the creation of a constitutional crisis at this time.

Down through our history there is precedent after precedent for the Chief Executive acting quickly and directly in committing our Armed Forces to action in the national interest. In this connection, Edward S. Corwin, the recognized expert in this field, in his volume The President: Office and Powers, dealing with the Presidency from 1787 to 1948 has this to say on this subject:

But the President may also make himself the direct administrator of the international rights and duties of the United States, or of what are adjudged by him to be such, without awaiting action either by the treaty-making power or by Congress, or by the courts.

One President after another has availed himself of this prerogative.

Upwards of 140 separate instances of such direct Presidential action are cited in James Grafton Rogers' volume entitled "World Politics and the Constitution." They start with the undeclared naval war with France from 1798 to 1800, down through Caribbean engagements from 1814 to 1825, including the Barbary wars, various landing of marines in numbers in many countries, military encounters with Mexico, naval demonstrations of Commodore Perry against Japan, military action against China in 1854, again in 1855 and 1856, numerous actions against South American countries, incidents in Korea in 1871, and again in 1888, and so on down to the

action taken in connection with the Philippine Insurrection in 1899–1901.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century at least a score of such direct military engagements were taken in the protection of American interests in the international field by direct authority vested in the Presidential office. Similarly in the years from 1940 through 1941 this country undertook a series of vital steps, geared to foreign policy and in the national interest, upon Presidential initiative, including the exchange of destroyers for British bases, the United States occupation of Greenland, the occupation of Iceland. Not the least of such steps was the Presidential order to the Navy to patrol ship lanes to Europe in an effort to check the Nazi submarine menace.

Let it be noted that all actions taken in regard to commitment of our Armed Forces abroad are not done arbitrarily or capriciously but only after the most serious and profound consideration and upon the advice of our military and congressional leaders and in consultation with the State Department.

I see nothing reflecting upon the proper exercise of proper Executive power, by having the President go before a joint session of the Congress and tell them that a certain set of circumstances demands a troop movement. It is interesting to observe that down through the pages of American history the action of the Congress with reference to war has always been to declare that a state of war exists and never to actually declare war. This undoubtedly has resulted in the fact that the Congress was presented with a fait accompli at the moment of its action, but, nevertheless, this legal fact does exist. In this debate I am concerned deeply with avoiding acrimonious debate which will show the world that the forces of democracy are divided and permit the world to conclude that the forces of communism are united.

It must not be forgotten that the President has certain constitutional duties and prerogatives which he has sworn to uphold to meet such a crisis that exists.

I do not argue against debate. The debate in itself may be desirable, but all of the facts pertinent to the issue should be made known and available to all factions and all views on all sides of the debate by the President, and with particular reference to the European situation, by General Eisenhower when he returns from Europe. I think this vital to the course of the debate and to the tone of the debate in order to prevent any participant from alarming the country by saying that facts have been concealed and that information has been withheld. I believe that at this point everything is being done to advise all concerned.

To underestimate the danger existing at this time to our way of life would be tragic, but I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, in this debate we must show the world that we will not have a violent, bitter division. That we are not engaged in personalities and that this great debate will be held, by the debaters, at the level of the great decision that must be made.

Pertinent to this discussion, especially in the matter of committing American military strength to the defense of Europe, are the following remarks by the distinguished French journalist, Bertrand De Jouvenel, now visiting in the United States—what I quote is part of a letter he recently wrote to the editor of the Wall Street Journal:

As of today, the potential force of the non-Soviet world is very superior to that of the Soviet world, while the actualized force of the Soviets is the greater. Now the main interest of the Soviets is to get into a position where the potential force of the non-Soviet world shall have so dwindled and that of the Soviet world so waxed that it shall have become impossible to challenge them. And the value of the Soviets' actual ready-to-march forces lies precisely in their ability to discourage resistance on the several points which are the objectives of their political offensive.

May I say, with all respect to the personalities of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT, that the policy they advocate is precisely that which serves the purpose of Soviet expansion, since it would clear the way for the Russian advance, estopped only by the risk of war with the United States.

If I understand the Senator's statement aright, he would not put troops into Europe but he would go to war in the case of invasion by Russia. This position was at one time that of the American Government. It had to be abandoned because the Europeans said they were unwilling that American support should manifest itself in the shape of bombing as soon as the Russians were in. Indeed this form of protection is apt to throw the Europeans into the arms of Russia. The policy advocated tends to dishearten the Europeans—"The United States is not going to defend us, therefore all that if left is to make a deal with Stalin"—and to pave the way for the political conquest of Western Europe. And a political conquest of Western Europe, that is with the consent of governments, also delivers to the enemy the vast resources of the African colonies and dependencies.

And on my own, may I add that the greatest deposits of uranium and cobalt are said to be in Africa.

Well, the logical question is, Where do we go from here?

First and foremost we should at every turn and in every way possible make known to the Soviet imperialists and to our friends in the world that we will have no part of appeasement in any shape, way, or form. The President has bravely and wisely and in a statesmanlike way taken the lead in this respect, and all Members of Congress should sustain him in this regard no matter in what other political areas they may have differences with him.

Secondly, we know we are confronted with a dangerous menace in the form of Soviet imperialism, which is committed to the enslavement of the free world and the destruction of the very foundations of western civilization.

Knowing this, we must say without any reservations that we will take any and all such steps necessary to thwart this conspiracy against humanity no matter what the costs, and furthermore, once we have marshaled our strengths, we will move out in ways to make our program one of positiveness, so that all peoples no matter how small in the global scheme may have a chance to pursue their destinies in peace.

Naturally in this grand offensive we want the moral support and such aid as they can give of our democratic friends in the world, and they can be assured that on our part there will be no turning back, no hedging, and no mean bookkeeping. We will do our part; they in turn must do theirs. And no amount of sophistical equivocation is going to substitute for earnest, all-out compliance with the grand strategy of the free world.

So we should, as I see it, take adequate measures to fortify Western Europe, including the rearming of Germany as an independent state—all or any part of her that will agree, so as to prevent the prize of the industrial Ruhr falling into Soviet hands. Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Greece shall be invited to join. We should, without any further delay, take steps looking to putting arms into the hands of Spain so that the west may have the comfort and practical advantage of a bastion behind the Pyrenees in the event the Russians move out upon Western Europe. At the same time every step should be taken to insure the solidity and democratic strength of Central and South America. Our outposts in Alaska must be readied without delay and not a single moment lost in rushing to completion the vital radar screen. At home, civil defense should have a high priority. We face a generation of partial national mobilization.

Getting around to the Pacific, we must proceed with a program for Japan that will bring that country back into the family of nations as an independent power, and thus have a people able to protect their homeland in this day of brutal aggression. We should make it possible for the Japanese leaders to facilitate rearmament.

Not the very least of the things which need to be done in this enveloping global conflict is the further strengthening and expanding of our propaganda arm. Already we have been treated to notable improvement in this vital campaign. Nothing should be left undone that will enable us to bring America's story to the world, especially to those captive people who are behind the iron curtain.

Never let us forget that the American record in the attempted conquest of peace is a proud and a luminous one. We have crusaded for the objective of a just and equitable peace. We should not forget and we should not let the world forget that when we offered the Marshal plan for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Europe we barred no nation—Russia itself was offered the chance to participate in its benefits. Neither should we forget or allow the world to forget that Molotov marched out of the meeting taking the representatives of Poland and Czechoslovakia with him.

And in the reckoning on the assets and liabilities of the European scene we would do well to remember that in many captive countries there are strong underground movements, the members of which have never accepted the yoke of the foreign dictator, and in the event of

a general war the Soviets would have to deal with this inspired army. Poland does not forget the slaughter of Warsaw, made possible by Soviet trickery. In one country after another in Central and Eastern Europe the fires of freedom may be banked but they have not expired. It is to this audience that we must continue to get our message across. So propaganda becomes a major instrument for us, just as the Russians have long employed it. Walter Winchell was right when in his broadcast of Sunday, January 12, 1950, he said:

Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia will join any invasion army against Russia.

The advancement of such a program on the international front naturally imposes certain heavy strains upon the home front, and I am well aware that our military effort can only be as effective as our national economy is sound. I, for one, do not subscribe to the proposition that what is here proposed is going to bankrupt the Nation. I am convinced that we can meet this threat and rise to this occasion—no, I say that the American economy has in it such dynamic potentials that, if we set our sights high enough and our efforts are sparked by genuine patriotism, we cannot only astonish the world once again but we can equally surprise ourselves. And by so doing, by applying ourselves diligently, unselfishly, and earnestly to the task at hand we will be spiking the Communists' guns by demonstrating to the world that not only is capitalistic democracy not decadent but on the contrary is virile, competent, productive, and offers man the best chance of happiness and security here on earth.

Now I have spoken at considerable length here today and I am deeply in your debt for the favor of the time allotted me and for your generous attention. I know the world is weary of dialectics—it hungers for simple truths and a chance for life in surroundings of true peace.

I want to say that the thing we must avoid above everything else is a mean retreat into negative escapism. That way lies disaster. The United States has never flinched in the face of threats. And America is not now going to sell its soul to the devil.

If I do nothing else here today, I hope I can impart to you the conviction that despite our shortcomings and in the face of human mistakes, and no matter how deadly the crisis, the American Republic and its democratic colleagues throughout the world were never better fortified to carry their principles forward into genuine achievement, no matter what the threat, what the obstacles, or what the opposition.

And finally, I will raise this point before others among you do: in all that I have said I have spoken in a way and tone that would seem to imply the inevitability of war—and to this and to you I make answer.

That it is only by a true understanding of the enemy and a knowledge of what he is up to and a quick moving on our part and by our friends to fill the vacuums in the international field that we stand any chance of achieving a condition worthy of the name of peace, and of winning the war if all decent efforts fail.

So I end with the note that we are engaged in a fight for all that is good and we will succeed in that great endeavor with God's help.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my absence from the Chamber during the roll call on the bill, H. R. 1001. I was present during the debate and was called from the Chamber. I was in the Capitol, but did not hear the bells ring for the roll call.

I wish to state, had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFEAT IN DETAIL

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on military affairs but have common sense and try to use it to the best of my ability for the good of our country and the American way of life. So this is my analysis of the present situation we find ourselves in.

The phrase "defeat in detail" is very well known to every student of military science. Before I go further into the text of this speech, I should like to place myself clearly and unequivocally on record as being in favor of appropriating and expending every dollar needed to properly prepare this country and its people for any eventuality. By this I mean not only our military expenditures for the Army, Navy, and Air Corps but also for civil defense.

If one studies the campaigns that were carried out by the Maccabeeans, Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Caesar, or in more modern times, Napoleon, in each instance, when faced by a coalition of his enemies, each one of these leaders, by properly maneuvering his forces, before his enemies joined forces, was able to decisively defeat his opponent, "in detail."

It is time for us to face the facts and to realize that Russia and our enemy, world communism, intends to defeat us in the same pattern, and up to this point they have succeeded. We have committed ourselves in Korea with "too little," and now the administration is again asking us to commit ourselves in Europe with "too little."

I want to contain and fight communism wherever it may rear its ugly head, but I am opposed to the dissipation of our strength in a series of actions which can lead to only disastrous results.

Before committing a single additional American boy to the European area I wish to ask our Secretary of Defense the question: "How many divisions must we have in Europe in order to contain the Russians?" And when the answer is given to us, I state here and now, that I am opposed to committing one single soldier of our country until such a time that we know that, if necessary, we can commit the power needed to bring us a decisive victory. If we cannot place such forces and resources in the field, then all the fighting and dying by our heroic forces will surely have been in vain, as it has been in Korea.

I feel that we are entitled to know how many troops our allies will put in the field, and I also want to know that they will put them in the field NOW. It would be very unfortunate for our commanders to depend upon the help of 40, 50, or 100 divisions of our allies in Europe and find that when they are needed they exist only as "paper divisions." Until such a time that this situation is clarified I believe it is improper on the part of anyone to send any further troops abroad.

Since the close of hostilities, we have expended billions upon billions to aid the nations of Europe, and what have we in return? Government after government which have failed or refused to bring their people face to face with reality. Many of these governments seem to feel that our purse is bottomless. As practical men we know that is not so.

If we are to continue spending these fabulous amounts of money let us get back something—some value received.

I have great confidence in General Eisenhower. But I also believe our staff should have something to say about the method of training the forces of our allies—I know our staff officers can greatly help in the proper organization of these forces.

Gentlemen, we know our enemy is morally bankrupt. All we have to do is listen to the rantings of the representatives of Russia and its satellites in the United Nations, and we know that they twist all facts to suit their purpose. The policy of "the big lie" is staring us in the face again, and all for the same vicious purpose.

If we must fight this cancer in the world body alone, then let us face the fact squarely. If we are going to have help from our allies, let us make certain that this help is sincere and effective, and can actually be given.

These are facts which we must discover today—a year from today it may be too late.

Winston Churchill, in his book, Their Finest Hour, reports the conversation with General Gamelin, Commander in Chief of the French Armies, on May 15, 1941. The general had reported the breakthrough north and south of Sedan and the rush of German armor toward the coast of Abbeville. When the General stopped talking Winston Churchill asked:

"Where is the strategic reserve?"

General Gamelin turned and with a shake of the head, and a shrug, said:

"Aucune"—None.

"I was dumbfounded. It had never occurred to me that any commanders having to defend 500 miles of engaged front would have left themselves unprovided with a mass of maneuver."

Gentlemen, we can take heed of Mr. Churchill's words. We are engaged on a global front, and we are expending our strategic reserve in a series of local actions. We cannot permit this to go on.

I have great confidence in our American soldiers, and in our great industrial machine behind them. I should like to point out that our great plants are doing a magnificent job, turning out the finished products we need to reequip our

armed services. I should like to pay special tribute to men like Larry Bell, who have lived with this situation night and day, to expedite the entire program. People like Mr. Bell have given more of their nerve and sinew than it seems that the human body can stand—but thanks to great men like him we shall succeed.

Gentlemen, the decisions which we are making in these grave days shall not affect only ourselves or a portion of our people. These decisions will affect freedom-loving people throughout the world, and our posterity.

God grant that we make these decisions right, conserve our strength, strengthen our sinews, and then if we must, strike decisively.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig, of Quincy, Ill.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some price trend tables.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. McMULLEN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a communication from the Library of Congress giving an outline of the relief portraits in the redecorated Chamber of the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $270.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CLEMENTE (at the request of Mr. DELANEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "The Air-Ground Program," notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $287.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in connection with the letter he received from Maj. William P. McCahill, national executive director of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short letter from a farmer in North Dakota about the high cost of bread.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the Chinese Red Army by Father Raymond J. DeJaegher.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. MURPHY), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. WHARTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, January 17 to 20, 1951 on account of illness.

To Mr. RABAUT, for the balance of this week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. MURPHY), for January 17, 1951, on account of illness.

To Mr. CHELF, for 2 weeks, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

81. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the Government Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

82. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the Government Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

83. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States against attack, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. A letter from the vice admiral, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing contracts negotiated by the Coast Guard for experimental, development, or research work or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c) (11) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

85. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

86. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, on findings and recommendations relative to localities which would be most suitable for the establishment of additional fish hatcheries and rearing ponds in the Great Lakes area, pursuant to Public Law 249, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

87. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the laws relating to mineral entry on the tribal lands on the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

88. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

89. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Four Pole Creek, W. Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors

of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1600. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1601. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1602. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1603. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1604. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 1605. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1606. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide increased retirement benefits for post-office inspectors and those who have been transferred to a supervisory or administrative position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1607. A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1608. A bill authorizing transmission in the United States mails of personal mail addressed by individuals in the military and naval service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1609. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1610. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the Federal courts of the United States and its Territories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1611. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend section 2863 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1614. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that receivers and trustees in proceedings under chapter XI shall receive compensation on the same basis as those in proceedings under chapter X; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1615. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1616. A bill to amend subsection (f) of section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 1617. A bill to stabilize prices, prevent inflation, and control production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1618. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1619. A bill to amend section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to special taxes on the sale of liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1620. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1621. A bill to provide that no economic or financial assistance shall be furnished to foreign countries which permit the exportation of strategic war materials to Russia and Russia's satellites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1622. A bill relating to the computation of the income-tax deduction for depreciation of farm machinery acquired for seasonal use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1623. A bill to advance in grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation certain postal employees of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from military areas during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1624. A bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations in and around Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1625. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River in the vicinity of Belton, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1626. A bill to provide for the installation of improvements and facilities needed for the protection, development, and utilization of Federal resources affected by dam and water reservoir projects constructed by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1627. A bill to provide lump-sum life indemnity payments for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die while on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1628. A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1629. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the landless Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1630. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining research station in the vicinity of Missoula, Mont., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 1631. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1632. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1633. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 1185; 43 U. S. C. sec. 871a), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to the numbered school sections in place, granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, by the act approved January 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1026), and by any other act of Congress"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1634. A bill designating Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1635. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Indians of western Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1636. A bill to provide an accelerated program for surveying and mapping of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1637. A bill to provide a comprehensive and adequate water resources basic-data program; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1638. A bill to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1639. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732-b to permit the photographing, microfilming, or photostating of original business records and the introduction of the same in evidence after the destruction of the originals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1640. A bill to authorize the upper Marias unit as a part of the Marias division of the Missouri River Basin project, Montana, all-American tunnel route, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1641. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the Federal Government of prison-made goods which compete with goods made by free labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 1642. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1643. A bill to provide for the greater security and defense of the United States

against attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1644. A bill to provide additional incentives for the discovery of a cure for cancer, heart disease, and poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1645. A bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 1646. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1647. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1648. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State, and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1649. A bill authorizing the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to acquire and improve a town site in Zapata County, Tex., for the relocation of communities in said county to be inundated by the waters of the Falcon Dam and Reservoir, being constructed in cooperation with Mexico under the water treaty of February 3, 1944; providing for the construction of a water and sewer system for such town site, for the relocation and construction of certain public buildings, and for the relocation of cemeteries; and providing for the exchange and conveyance of such properties in full or part payment for property to be acquired in connection with such reservoir; authorizing appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1650. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1651. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 1652. A bill to raise revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1653. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Queens County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1655. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1656. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1657. A bill to outlaw the sale of influence by false representatives in the matter of defense orders to private business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1658. A bill to provide for a Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia; for a Board of Education of the District of Columbia to be elected; and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 1659. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1660. A bill to provide for the receipt and adjudication of the claims of survivors of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who, as prisoners of war, were illegally killed in the Korean theater; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1661. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1662. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1663. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1664. A bill to amend section 3672 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to requirement of filing notice of lien for taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1665. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and depenent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1666. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1667. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that certain service rendered by disabled retired officers be computed as double time for retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1668. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to establish the job objective of certain veterans serving as apprentice barbers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1669. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to confectioneries containing alcohol; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1671. A bill to provide identification buttons for persons rejected for service in the Armed Forces by reason of physical defects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to study the need for simplification, modernization, and consolidation of the public-land laws, to make appropriate recommendations for an effective public-land-law system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first Monday in February of each year as National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President exercise now powers granted him by section 402 of Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Con. Res. 39. Authorizing the Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products to have printed for its use additional copies of certain hearings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 73. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to

matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (g) of the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to continue the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. Res. 75. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine an appropriate design for the flag of the United States should the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii, or both, be admitted to the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 76. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 75; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Carmela Malinconico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Giacinta Traversa Usellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Renato Usellini, Giuseppina B. Usellini, Chiara Usellini, and Ildebrando Usellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Sabow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Lester M. Scott and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Harriman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Ai-Ming Cheng, Lilly Chen, and Yao Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary,

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Speros Psaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Mariana de Rojas (nee Mariana Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Teruko Okuaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Ramakant Pandurang Patil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1686. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Grace Lydia Anderson Clark; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1687. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Arthur Bravo, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of James J. Lieberman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Poeschel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 1690. A bill for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Sylvio Latino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Macomber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Luigi Galzerano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1694. A bill for the relief of Emile Druyts, also known as Augustinus Julius Emile Druyts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Ceslawa Druyts nee Plichta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1696. A bill for the relief of Jack Warner and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of John Tzanavaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Catherine B. Molostvoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 1699. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of S. Francis Liu and Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Whitford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1702. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of the national service life insurance granted the late Alfred G. Semsack to the designated beneficiaries thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 1703. A bill for the relief of J. L. Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Jack Stuckey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1705. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of individuals against the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1706. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Frederick George Boughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Togo S. Furumura; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1709. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Emi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Andrew Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Maria Schianca Lanterna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Agostino Carnevale Schianca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Hayashi Kimoto and Shirley Mariko Kimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Paul I. Courtright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Dibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1719. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Erika Hecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Hertha Catharina Schriefer and Gerda Schriefer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Coffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1723. A bill for the relief of George Economos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11. By Mr. FINE: Petition of the Civil Service Leader, a weekly of New York, N. Y., urging Congress to provide by statute that pensioners under public retirement systems be given the same exemption as is granted now, or may be granted in the future, either by law or ruling, to retired members and survivors under social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

12. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Metropolitan Detroit Association of School Administrators to go on record urging Congress of the United States to place building materials for school facilities high in the priority list in event that it becomes necessary for the Congress or the administration to establish priorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

13. Also, resolution of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor urging its Representatives and Senators in Congress and the President of the United States to reinstitute the same type and form of insurance given to the servicemen of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

14. Also, resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Wyandotte, Mich., praying relief for service men and women from the burden of paying excise taxes on transportation tickets purchased by them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

15. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of Metropolitan Detroit Association of School Administrators, Detroit, Mich., urging the Congress to place building materials for school facilities high on the priority list should it become necessary for the Government to establish such priorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whom we seek in vain without unless we first find Thee within, at this noontide altar of prayer may the hush of Thy presence fall upon our souls. Quiet our minds of their fretting, allay the unhappy irritations and resentments of our spirits, and hallow our lives with the grace of contrition and humility. Strengthen our hearts and minds that we may worthily measure up to the role Thou hast called us to play in these solemn days.

We cry, O Lord, in the night of the world's darkness that Thy light may rise in glory for all the earth. By the sorrows of the uprooted refugees, by the long agony of battlefield and hospital, by the woes of mothers, the needs of desolate children, and the starvation of millions, we pray that this archenemy of man, this most blasphemous denier of all that is good and just, the curse of aggressive war, may be driven from the earth. As those who work for reconciliation and brotherhood, give us a place among the peacemakers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer;

H. R. 1001. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for all of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Committee on Small Business was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Benton	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hennings	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Conor
Byrd	Holland	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Humphrey	Robertson
Carlson	Hunt	Russell
Case	Ives	Saltonstall
Chapman	Jenner	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ecton	McCarran	Welker
Ellender	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	Williams
Frear	Magnuson	Young
George	Martin	
Gillette	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Senator-elect from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES H. DUFF, is present and ready to take the oath of office. His certificate of election has already been presented to the Senate and spread on the minutes thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will come forward, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. DUFF, escorted by Mr. MARTIN, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

GREETINGS FROM THE SENATE TO GOVERNOR FINE AND OTHER PENNSYLVANIANS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a group of Pennsylvanians in the galleries be permitted to rise, and that I may have the privilege of presenting the new Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. John H. Fine.

Pennsylvania is very proud to be known as the arsenal of democracy. These people represent the 4,000,000 men and women required in Pennsylvania to man our factories, and mines, our forests, our farms, and our methods of transportation. I ask the privilege of presenting Governor Fine, and having Pennsylvanians in the galleries rise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So far as the Chair knows, it has never been customary or necessary to give unanimous consent for Pennsylvanians to rise anywhere they are. [Laughter.] Without objection, Pennsylvanians in the galleries and the Governor will rise and be greeted by the Senate.

[The Pennsylvanians in the galleries, together with Governor Fine, rose and were greeted by the Senate with prolonged applause.]

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order. I ask that it be read, and that the Senate proceed immediately to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed order, as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. DUFF be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that the name of Mr. DUFF be placed on the list of assignments to the Committee on the District of Columbia following the name of Mr. BENNETT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reappoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to fill an existing vacancy.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to fill an existing vacancy.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD without debate and without making speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC., SALEM, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Junior Eckley, secretary of the Blue Lake Packers, Inc., of Salem, Oreg., enclosing two resolutions adopted by that cooperative, which, in my opinion, deserve reading by Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the resolutions be appropriately referred, and that the letter and resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.,
Salem, Oreg., December 20, 1950.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing herewith copy of a resolution which was passed by our membership at their annual membership meeting held here in Salem, Oreg., on Monday, December 18, and which pertains to the matter of war-risk insurance.

There is enclosed also copy of a second resolution which was adopted by our membership and which pertains to the matter of farm labor.

We are confident that you, as a member of Oregon's congressional delegation, will assist in whatever way possible to formulate and expedite passage of equitable legislation dealing with both of these subjects. We, as representatives of a farmers' cooperative, can assure the Congress of the fullest cooperation in this time of national emergency.

Yours sincerely,

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.,
JUNIOR ECKLEY, *Secretary.*

The first resolution presented by Mr. MORSE was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas the members of this cooperative association, who are engaged in the production, processing, and marketing of canned, frozen, and dehydrated vegetables and fruits, in the central Willamette Valley of the State of Oregon, own plant buildings and equipment valued conservatively at $2,500,000 and located in Salem, Polk County, Oreg.; and

Whereas the war risk exclusion clause presently incorporated in each of the current insurance policies protecting the facility investment of this association automatically eliminates protection upon, and eliminates liability for, loss caused directly or indirectly, by hostile or warlike action in time of peace or war; and

Whereas the international situation presently involves the United States of America with immediate and continuing risk of destructive attack upon the continental United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of this association, in annual meeting assembled, does hereby respectfully solicit the individual and collective efforts and support of Oregon's congressional delegation, to exercise every means within their power to secure immediate passage of War Damage Corporation Act—H. R. 9130, or similar act which, in its effect, shall adequately protect the interest of this association, and all other businesses, for the duration of this peril.

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.
AMMON GRICE, *President.*
JUNIOR ECKLEY, *Secretary.*

The second resolution presented by Mr. MORSE was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the national emergency portends the enactment of more stringent requirements in relation to the drafting of young men into the Armed Forces of the United States of America; and

Whereas farmers and farm production and marketing associations are dependent, in a major degree, on the services of young men within the present draft age brackets, in the planting, growing, harvesting, and processing of vitally important food crops and products; and

Whereas unrestricted drafting of these young men would, without question, imperil orderly and adequate production of all agricultural commodities, by withdrawing countless thousands of much needed manpower from the farm labor pool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of Blue Lake Packers, Inc., Salem, Oreg., and in annual meeting assembled, That we do hereby respectfully solicit the assistance and support of the Oregon congressional delegation, to exercise their good influences to bring about enactment of such manpower legislation as shall incorporate reasonable and just consideration of the importance of adequate farm labor, and that such legislation shall further incorporate reasonable and flexible deferments where it is made apparent and obvious that nondeferment would work a hardship on the agricultural industry.

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.
AMMON GRICE, *President.*
JUNIOR ECKLEY, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON RECLAMATION CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the secretary of the Oregon Reclamation Congress together with resolutions adopted by that congress at its thirty-eighth annual meeting held in Klamath Falls on November 8, 9, and 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON RECLAMATION CONGRESS,
Portland, Oreg., December 19, 1950.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing herewith copies of resolutions passed at the thirty-eighth annual meeting of the Oregon Reclamation Congress held in Klamath Falls, November 8, 9, and 10, 1950.

I am certain that all of these resolutions will be of interest to you as they express the views and thinking of Oregon irrigation leaders on numerous questions of interest. However, I want to particularly call your attention to resolutions Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9, as they relate specifically to matters on the national level.

With very best regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

K. W. SAWYER,
Secretary.

Resolution 1

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DEVELOPMENTS

Whereas the comprehensive, multiple-purpose development of our major river basins logically falls into four phases—planning, financing, construction, and operation; and

Whereas development of such comprehensive programs, necessary to serve the public interest by enhancing the well-being of the people through development and conservation of all land and water resources, results in innumerable problems; and

Whereas adequate consideration of all resource potentials has not always been given in the planning phase of multiple-purpose projects: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Reclamation Congress endorse the principle of multiple-purpose development but urge that they be planned and put into effect by joint and coordinated action of existing agencies of government in accordance with a prompt and practical time schedule and in such a way as to insure: (1) Adequate consideration of all resource potentials in each basin such as irrigation, drainage, power, flood control, fish and wildlife, recreation, navigation, soil conservation, watershed protection, and other related purposes as they contribute to the development of industry, agriculture, forestry, and (2) the proper participation of all local, State, and Federal interests in the planning and consummation of such developments; be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association is hereby requested to adopt a resolution in conformity herewith.

Resolution 2

INTERSTATE DIVERSION OF WATER

Whereas Oregon is a State having great potentials for future logical development; and

Whereas much of this future development is dependent upon the supply of water now existing within the watercourses and watersheds of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas there have been statements on various occasions by high governmental officials indicating the possibility of diversion of Oregon waters to other watercourses or watersheds; and

Whereas it is conceivable that such diversion would interfere with the logical development of the areas of the State of Oregon lying within or adjacent to the watercourses or watersheds from which waters were diverted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following statement of belief be adopted as the position of the Oregon Reclamation Congress and the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts:

"We believe that the water resources of a watercourse or watershed, where populations have become settled and where the potentials for future logical development are substantial, should be developed within and for the benefit of the inhabitants of such watershed and should not be diverted into other watersheds except by compact of the States involved.

"We believe that neither the Federal Government nor any of its agency elements should promote, encourage, suggest, or speculate in, nor should populations in present water-problem areas speculate with the possibility of diverting through huge Federal projects, waters from other watercourses in other States or regions, and we believe it to be important to the sound and orderly development of the water resources of the country, to the domestic tranquility of the people, and to the peace and security of the Nation, that it be basic in any national water resource policy that there shall be no diversion of waters from any watercourse or watershed in one State to another watercourse or watershed in another State except by compact of the States involved."

Resolution 3

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has heretofore submitted to Congress for approval an over-all plan for the development of the irrigable lands in the Columbia River Basin and has proposed the establishment of a so-called basin account to make possible the fullest development of irrigable lands in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the Bureau has listed for immediate construction only four small projects in Oregon, viz: Canby, Crooked River, The Dalles, and Bully Creek, and from present attitude of the residents in these proposed projects it is quite possible that only one or two of them will materialize; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation for the past many years has made a study of the entire Crooked River basin and has set up three potential irrigation projects in the Crooked River watershed, viz: Paulina, 5,200 acres; Post, 14,500 acres; and Crooked River, 20,210 acres, but has only included one of these projects (Crooked River) in its proposal for immediate construction; and

Whereas it appears to be to the best interest of the people of the Crooked River Basin and of the State of Oregon as a whole, to have the entire Crooked River Basin project included for authorization by Congress at one time, so that a comprehensive plan for the development of the entire watershed can be worked out and the first units built so that when the plan is completed all of the waters of Crooked River will be conserved and put to the most beneficial use; and

Whereas this would require no additional appropriation at this time, as only the first unit (Crooked River) would be immediately constructed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Oregon Reclamation Congress, meeting at Klamath Falls, Oreg., this 9th day of November, 1950, go on record favoring the immediate authorization of the Crooked River Basin project, including the Paulina, Post, and Crooked River units, and urge the Bureau of Reclamation to substitute such a basin-wide project for the one heretofore submitted to Congress asking approval of the Crooked River project only; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded at once to the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, regional director of the Reclamation Bureau, and to members of the Oregon delegation in Congress, with the request that each take the necessary action to bring about this authorization by Congress of the Crooked River Basin project in its entirety with construction to follow in due course.

Resolution 4

GROUND WATER CODE

Whereas the rapid growth of population and of industrial or other development in Oregon is causing a greatly increased pressure on water supplies, both in the streams or lakes and in underground bodies; and

Whereas ground water bodies in the State can meet a substantial part of the ultimate water supply requirement and can be controlled by public administration under the principle of beneficial use; and

Whereas, in the absence of administrative control, the use of ground water bodies can become ruthlessly competitive with the result that the supply is seriously depleted for all; and

Whereas the existing ground water code in Oregon applies only to the part of the State which is east of the Cascade Range, and does not provide for its effective administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Reclamation Congress in session at its thirty-eighth annual meeting, That steps be taken to prepare a draft of legislation defining an adequate and comprehensive ground water code applicable to all the State and based on the principles that such waters are public, and a right to them is limited by the extent of beneficial use, and that priority of such right is determined by priority of such use; and be it further

Resolved, That such draft of legislation be prepared for submittal to the Oregon State Legislature that will convene in January 1953.

Resolution 5

EXTENSION OF WILLAMETTE BASIN COMMISSION LAW

Be it resolved, That the Oregon Reclamation Congress is in favor of the following changes in existing Oregon laws and requests that its legislative committee attempt to secure passage of the same at the next legislature.

1. The amendment of the Willamette Basin Commission law so that it shall apply to other watersheds in the State wherever interest therein is indicated.

2. The amendment of the irrigation district law to provide for five directors for such districts as desire the increased number.

Resolution 6

STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Whereas a proposed bill has been prepared to create a State board of natural resources of nine divisions, which proposal would abolish the office of State engineer, the Oregon Reclamation Commission and State hydroelectric commission and substitute in lieu thereof a large unwieldly board with nine advisory boards and nine paid directors; and

Whereas said proposed bill will endanger our water code and all reclamation efforts in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the thirty-eighth annual reclamation congress in regular session convened at Klamath Falls, Oreg., That we oppose the proposed Natural Resources Board for Oregon.

Resolution 7

PRESERVATION OF STATES' RIGHTS

Be it resolved, That the Oregon Reclamation Congress expresses as a statement of principle that established water rights must be protected and respected as they exist under the laws and traditions of the areas affected; that the administration of policies and objectives relating to sound land and water use can be best accomplished through existing units of government; that acreage limitations should be based on the economical farm units and the productivity of the land; and that there should be a maximum of local autonomy in the administration of all reclamation projects.

Resolution 8

SNOW SURVEY

Whereas irrigation agriculture in Oregon is dependent for its water supply upon surface streams and ground-water basins; and

Whereas the principal source of water for irrigation in Oregon is precipitation which falls on the mountain watersheds in the form of snow; and

Whereas advance knowledge of the flow of streams enables preparation for most effective use of stream flow and enables water users better to plan their seasonal operations; and

Whereas water-supply forecasts based on snow surveys, measurements of stream flow, and evaluation of ground-water sources have been used effectively for many years by Oregon water users and have demonstrated their value to members of this organization; and

Whereas the Federal Congress has supported stream-gaging and ground-water programs for many years, but is not supporting such programs sufficiently to meet the present needs or to meet unit costs of conducting the necessary surveys and water measurements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Reclamation Congress, That we recommend and urge the National Congress to increase the Federal support to the snow-survey program of the Division of Irrigation and Water Conservation, Soil Conservation Service, to the necessary degree, and urge similar increase of support to the Water Resources Division of the United States Geological Survey; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegates of Oregon, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Director of the Budget, and to the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, and to the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

Resolution 9

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Whereas since restrictions are placed upon privately owned lending institutions prohibiting them from making loans to settlers on Bureau of Reclamation projects during the period of construction; and

Whereas it is the principle of Federal Reclamation that lands be made available to reliable people who have not otherwise been able to become landowners and it is generally true that these settlers have not the means to equip a farm at present prices and are urgently in need of credit for the first few years; and

Whereas the Farmers Home Administration has the authority to make loans to settlers on reclamation projects who cannot obtain such credit from other sources; and

Whereas funds available for distribution by the Farmers Home Administration are inadequate for the needs of settlers on these projects, many of whom are veterans; and

Whereas irrigation project settlers have built an enviable reputation for repayment of credit advanced and in no sense are asking for charity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Reclamation Congress, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appropriate sufficient funds and these be specifically allotted to provide loan funds for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Resolution 10

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS

Resolved, That the officers of the Oregon Reclamation Congress are directed to call the resolutions adopted this thirty-eighth annual meeting to the attention of the appropriate Federal agencies, to the Members of the Congress, the Governor of Oregon, and to all others concerned therewith and that the officers and directors of the Oregon Reclamation Congress shall carry out the policies declared in said resolutions.

Resolution 11

INSTRUCTIONS TO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Be it resolved, That the Oregon Reclamation Congress hereby delegates to its legislative committee and its executive officers the authority to approve and disapprove for and on behalf of the congress such bills as may be presented to the 1951 session of the Oregon Legislature as may affect the members of the congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke;

S. 544. A bill for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi;

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Moise Chammah;

S. 546. A bill for the relief of Khodarahm Sourshian;

S. 547. A bill to extend the time within which proceedings may be commenced, or appeal may be taken, to determine the claims of Louis W. Schaaff for a patent;

S. 548. A bill for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer;

S. 549. A bill for the relief of Szewel and Dwojra Tukaczynski; and

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Sadako Kawamura Lawton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. LODGE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. DUFF, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 551, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 552, to amend Public Law 717 of the Eighty-first Congress to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Dr. Szu'tai Tsou;

S. 554. A bill for the relief of Boutros Mouallem; and

S. 555. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 556. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 557. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 558. A bill to amend section 284 of the United States Code relating to disqualifications of former officers and employees in matters connected with their former duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Edward Aibisu; and

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 561, to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 562. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 563. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; and

S. 564. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 565, to increase by $50 per month the allowances provided for dependents of enlisted personnel in active service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 566. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; and

S. 567. A bill for the relief of Habibollah Farahnik and Nona Yaaghoub Zadeh Vijeh Farahnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 568. A bill for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 569. A bill for the relief of May Hosken; and

S. 570. A bill for the relief of George Kedzieraki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 21, to provide for placing a suitable plaque on the base of the statue of Edward Dickinson Baker in the rotunda of the Capitol, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF RACE, RELIGION, COLOR, ETC.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement in connection with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

The bill (S. 551) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, this bill is identical with S. 984 in the Eightieth Congress and S. 174 in the Eighty-first Congress. Both of those bills had bipartisan sponsorship, consisting of four Republicans and four Democrats. I firmly believe that the question of civil rights, and especially discrimination in employment, should never be allowed to become a partisan issue. Even though all of the sponsors of the bill I am now introducing are Republicans, I am sure that I speak for every one of them when I state that they feel as I do about this matter.

However, it will be recalled by those who were Members of the Eighty-first Congress that S. 174, even though with bipartisan sponsorship, was not the bill which was reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and which subsequently was the issue in two cloture votes in efforts to have it taken up for consideration by the Senate. The bill in question, S. 1728, in the Eighty-first Congress, was introduced and sponsored by a member of the Democratic Party and differed to some extent from S. 174. Insofar as I am aware, in the formulation and drafting of S. 1728, Republicans were not consulted. Moreover, it would appear that this bill was not offered in the name of bipartisanship, but rather as an administration measure calculated to carry out administration policy and a pledge in the Democratic platform of 1948.

Be all this as it may, I was very glad to support S. 1728. Although I was not in full agreement on all of its provisions, it nevertheless was based on the fundamental principles inherent in S. 174. These are the principles that (1) discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is in violation of our American creed, and (2) that no statute to combat this type of discrimination can be effective unless it contains at least a minimum of enforcement provisions.

The bill I am now offering for introduction meets the requirements of these two basic principles. It is based wholly on the New York law against discrimination which has worked so successfully in New York State; in fact, it constitutes the translation of this New York law and similar State laws into the Federal pattern.

We who are sponsoring it do not do so in any spirit of partisanship. We cannot regard it as the Republican bill. We do consider it an answer by some Republicans to one of America's most serious domestic problems. We offer it in the desire that it will be considered by the committee to whom it is referred equally with other proposals of this nature which may be submitted.

Also, I would point out that this bill should not be regarded in any sense as a substitute or alternative for any Executive directive or order dealing with this matter, which may be issued by the President. Personally, I strongly favor the issuance of such an order, and I feel that this action should be taken with the least possibly delay. At the same time, I would caution those who may be responsible for its administration, if and when such an Executive order is issued, to make sure that no conflict occurs with respect to those States which have enacted permanent laws against discrimination in employment. Working arrangements between a Federal agency thus established and the agencies dealing with this matter in the several States should be adopt-

ed in the first instance, and nothing should be permitted to occur which in any way will undermine or handicap the efforts of these States to combat discrimination in employment.

There may be some who will question the advisability or expediency of urging this type of legislation at this time. They may feel that action of this kind will be detrimental to the defense program.

I do not agree with this viewpoint. Just as the fair-employment practices order contributed so much to national unity and all-out effort in the last war, so is a similar order now most appropriate. Just as there is thorough justification for the adoption of a policy or plan of this nature temporarily, so there is equal justification for such a program on a permanent basis.

If we and our allies have been fighting for anything in Korea, we have been fighting to defend and preserve freedom and justice in the world. If freedom and justice mean anything, they mean the right of everyone to equal opportunity to earn a living according to his ability and regardless of his parentage or religious faith.

Freedom and justice are part and parcel of our American creed. Those of us who are sponsoring this bill seek thereby to help make our American creed a living reality and thus more fully to establish at home observance of the ideals and principles for which we profess to stand among the nations of the world.

ADMISSION OF ALIEN SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN OF CITIZEN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the Armed Forces and I ask unanimous consent to make a 1-minute statement in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

The bill (S. 552) to amend Public Law 717 of the Eighty-first Congress to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the course of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced and there was enacted a bill (S. 1858) which waived the exclusion provisions of our immigration laws relating to inadmissibility because of race in the case of alien spouses and minor children of United States citizens serving in or having been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States.

Under the provisions of this law which was passed by the Eighty-first Congress, the marriage between the United States citizen and the alien spouse must occur prior to February 19, 1951, in order for the alien spouse and minor children to benefit from the provisions of the law. The purpose of the bill which I have just introduced is to extend the operative effect of the act so that the provisions of the original law may be available in cases in which the marriage occurs before 12 months after the enactment of the instant bill. The provisions of the law would thus be available to alien spouses and minor children of our soldiers who are engaged in the Korean conflict.

INCREASED ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that the pay of the soldiers serving in Korea and in other parts of the globe be increased by $50 a month. At the present time, a soldier who has a wife and two children receives the sum of $107 a month. Manifestly, with the increased cost of living, with the rise in price of bread, butter, coffee, food of all kinds, and other things the average family needs, such a family cannot live decently on $107 a month. I therefore ask in this bill that the pay be increased by $50 additional, to be paid entirely by the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared explaining the measure, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 565) to increase by $50 per month the allowances provided for dependents of enlisted personnel in active service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) for the duration of section 3 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 771, 81st Cong.), the table of monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E–1 to E–7, inclusive, prescribed by such section is amended to read as follows:

	Not over 2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E–7	$117.50	$135
E–6	117.50	135
E–5	117.50	135
E–4	117.50	135

	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E–3	$95	$117.50	$135
E–2	95	117.50	135
E–1	95	117.50	135

(b) For the duration of section 9 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, the fourth proviso of section 515 (b) of such act of October 12, 1949, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That when a member is furnished Government quarters adequate for himself and his dependents, the total sum saved for him by this subsection shall be reduced at the rate of $95 per month for members in pay grades E–1, E–2, E–3, and E–4 (less than 7 years' service) and $117.50 per month for members in pay grades E–4 (7 or more years' service), E–5, E–6, and E–7."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be effective on the first day of the first calendar month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The purpose of the bill is to assist dependents of enlisted personnel in active service in the Armed Forces in meeting increased costs of living by increasing by $50 a month the allowances provided for such dependents. As increased by the bill, the amounts payable for enlisted men in the first three grades would be $95 where there is only one dependent, $117.50 where there are two dependents, and $135 where there are more than two dependents. Dependents of enlisted men in grades 4 to 7, inclusive, would receive $117.50 a month where there are not more than two dependents and $135 a month where there are more than two dependents. These amounts are furnished by the Government in addition to any amounts furnished by the serviceman himself.

OPERATIONS UNDER CERTAIN MINERAL LEASES COVERING SUBMERGED LANDS OF CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this measure is a modification of a joint resolution which I introduced during the last session of Congress. Hearings upon the joint resolution were held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but it was impossible to secure action because the Supreme Court had not then acted upon the case United States against Texas and the case of the United States against Louisiana. Those cases were determined on the fifth of June by a decision of the Supreme Court which was in harmony with the decision rendered in the prior case of the United States against the State of California. In all three of these cases the paramount authority of the United States over the submerged lands was asserted by the Supreme Court.

Operations off the California coast have been continued under stipulation between the Federal Government and the State of California. No stipulation

has been made with Texas and Louisiana. With respect to oil operations off their coasts the Secretary of the Interior has issued a 60-day operating permit so that producers would not have to shut-in their wells. These arrangements, however, are only temporary in character, and the Secretary of the Interior has held that he is without authority to administer the submerged oil lands except under the inherent authority invested in his office to prevent waste of Federal property.

Petroleum is one of the two basic strategic materials for both industry and war—the other being steel. Approximately two-thirds of the world's petroleum reserves are outside the boundaries of the United States. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to the Nation that in the present international emergency, authority be speedily granted to the Government to administer these lands.

The controversy which has existed between the States and the Federal Government over the control of the submerged lands should not be permitted, in the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, to prevent continued development and exploration in these areas. The purpose of our resolution, therefore, is to provide interim authority for exploration and development while Congress is considering permanent legislation.

It would be unwise to await the enactment of such permanent legislation because the companies which have received and have been operating valid leases on submerged lands under the authority of the States are now unable to risk the investment of the large sums necessary to explore for and produce petroleum from deposits under the seas. These operating companies have already invested over $250,000,000 in operations in the Gulf of Mexico, and additional millions have been invested in operations off the coast of California.

Production amounting to 1,300,000 barrels a month in the case of California, and 480,000 barrels a month in the Gulf of Mexico, has already been developed by the operators. With no rule of law governing payment of rents and royalties, and only a temporary arrangement for production, there can be little argument against the need for immediate enactment of interim legislation so that the oil may continue to be produced and exploration undertaken in those submerged areas which have not yet been tested.

Under the Supreme Court decree in the Texas and Louisiana cases the States are not accountable for rents and royalties received prior to June 5, 1950. Without interim legislation, uncertainty as to payments subsequent to that date would necessarily mean an end to operation. Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the States, nor, indeed, the companies operating under State leases, should be allowed to remain in the present legal vacuum in which only one thing is certain, namely, that Federal authority is paramount in the submerged lands.

The resolution provides that oil and gas leases issued by the States prior to December 21, 1948, which were in force and effect on June 5, 1950, may continue to be operated, except that all such leases will terminate within 5 years in the absence of production or drilling operations.

The resolution has no application to navigable inland waters within the boundary of any State. It therefore does not apply to any of the lands covered by the claims of the city of Long Beach, Calif., which are landward of the line established in the stipulation between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California. The resolution, however, does not attempt to determine what submerged lands on the seaward side of this line are in fact navigable inland waters to which the Federal Government has no title.

In order to cover the conditions which might arise in the event of a controversy as to whether a particular area of submerged lands is inside or outside the jurisdiction of a State, this resolution authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make special agreements with the States or the lessee of the States for oil and gas operations, and for the payment and the handling of rents and royalties.

In view of the urgent need for the exploration of oil and gas, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pending the enactment of permanent legislation, to issue leases on areas of the Continental Shelf not now under lease. These leases are to be issued at competitive bidding for a period of 5 years and as long as oil and gas is produced at a royalty of not less than 12½ percent.

Bonuses, rents, royalties, and other funds payable in connection with the issuance and operation of all leases, except as to moneys received under an agreement authorized to be made with any State with respect to whether disputed lands are beneath navigable inland waters, would be deposited by the Secretary of the Interior in a special fund in the United States Treasury. Payments out of this fund would be made to the States on the basis of 37½ percent on all the receipts from areas within their seaward boundaries. Although the Supreme Court decision held that the paramount rights of the Federal Government cover all the lands seaward of the low-tide mark, State boundaries of the coastal States have traditionally extended 3 miles seaward. This provision for the payment of 37½ percent of the receipts to the States from operations within the State boundaries goes, therefore, beyond the holding of the Supreme Court. The balance of all receipts would be held in a special fund to await the enactment of permanent legislation.

Submerged lands of the Continental Shelf seaward of the State boundaries may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior. The resolution contains no provision for any payment of royalty to the coastal States from production in this area. This is because the lands seaward of the boundaries were never claimed by the States prior to the controversy, and the Federal claim to the resources of this area was established only as recently as September 28, 1945, by the proclamation of President Harry S. Truman. In international law, national sovereignty traditionally did not extend beyond the 3-mile limit, a boundary fixed in the days of sailing ships when the range of a cannon was 3 miles.

In view of the national emergency, it is also provided that the President may withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security. In time of war, or when the President so prescribes, the United States shall have a prior right to purchase at the market price the oil and gas produced from the lands affected by the act. It is also provided that upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense during war or national emergency, operations under any lease may be suspended or any lease terminated provided that the lessee shall be compensated according to law.

Inasmuch as many applications have been made to the Federal Government in the past for leases under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, the resolution also contains a section providing that it shall not affect whatever rights, if any, such a prior applicant may have acquired under the law at the time of application.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the joint resolution I have introduced be printed at length in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection the text of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certain mineral leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf were issued by coastal States under claim of ownership by such issuing States, and lessees have expended large sums of money in conducting operations under such leases; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1947, rendered an opinion in the case of *United States* v. *California* and on June 5, 1950, rendered opinions in the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* and *United States* v. *Texas*, holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and that the respective States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their boundaries; and

Whereas it is in the national interest and important to national defense in the present emergency that the orderly development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf should continue without interruption, and in view of the time required for consideration and enactment of permanent legislation covering the exploration, development, production, and conservation of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, thus making it essential that this resolution be enacted in order to protect the interests of the United States pending the enactment of permanent legislation by the Congress respecting the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any

extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the law of such State) provided—

(1) That such lease or a true copy thereof shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this resolution;

(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this resolution.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any person holding a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State or a lessee of the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State respecting the issuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he had not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this resolution.

(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover such area as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section:

(1) 37½ percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year;

(2) all other moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress concerning the disposition thereof.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of the act and covering submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty so taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a)(1) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto 37½ percent of the value of such royalty.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this resolution.

SEC. 7. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenances and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated of an amount determined by due process of law.

SEC. 8. Nothing herein contained shall affect any rights that may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this resolution

and any such rights shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired.

SEC. 9. When used in this resolution, (a) the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (b) the term "seaward boundary of a State" shall mean a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands begin; (c) the term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; (d) the term "tidelands" means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and the ebb of the tides; and (e) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (by request) (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. FLANDERS) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ECONOMICS CLUB OF NEW YORK

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Country's Role in the World Crisis," delivered by him before the Economics Club of New York, on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

IT'S TIME TO REEXAMINE FOREIGN COMMITMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "It's Time To Reexamine Foreign Commitments That Threaten United States," delivered by former Senator Capper, of Kansas, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREAT OF COMMUNISM—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Responsibility," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J., before the members of Rameses Temple, Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, at Toronto, Ontario, Canada, on December 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST CHINA AN AGGRESSOR—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the naming of Communist China as an aggressor, written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of January 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO?—ARTICLE BY LOUIS BROMFIELD

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Are We Trying To Do?" written by Louis Bromfield and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICIES—EDITORIAL COMMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where's Our Leadership?" published in the January 11 issue of the Cedar County News, at Hartington, Nebr.; and a telegram from Mrs. Edwin S. Towle, of Falls City, Nebr., which appear in the Appendix.]

TAX EXEMPTION FOR PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED—EDITORIAL FROM THE WINCHESTER (VA.) EVENING STAR

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Exemption for President and Congress Should be Eliminated," published in the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star of January 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO LT. HARRY E. SUTTON AND HIS PLATOON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Negro Unit Hailed on Hungnam Stand," published in the New York Times of December 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE MANCHESTER (ENGLAND) GUARDIAN WEEKLY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Marshall Plan," published in the Manchester Guardian Weekly of December 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM JESSE H. BOND TO SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Jesse H. Bond, of Eugene, Oreg., under date of December 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRENDS SHOW BIG INCREASE IN OREGON INCOME BY 1960—ARTICLE BY PAUL W. ELLIS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Trends Show Big Increase in Oregon Income by 1960," written by Paul W. Ellis, associate professor of economics, University of Oregon, and published in the November 1950 issue of Oregon Business Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARNING TO THE NORTHWEST—EDITORIAL FROM THE McMINNVILLE (OREG.) TELEPHONE REGISTER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warning to the Northwest," published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) Telephone Register of December 28, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANOTHER MUNICH?—LETTER TO THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Another Munich?" written by Clarence E. Singleton, of Astoria, Oreg., to the editor, and published in a December 1950 issue of the Portland Oregonian, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer;

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1001. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William H. Harrison, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator.

IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Bernard DeVoto, entitled "Letter to a Family Doctor," which appeared in the January issue of Harper's magazine, be set forth in the RECORD following the conclusion of these remarks.

I know I need not remind my colleagues of the continuing importance of the problem of assuring adequate medical care to all the American people. The President of the United States has just stressed the great role it plays in this critical period. The international situation in which we now find ourselves makes it perhaps more important than ever before. I know, too, that everyone in the Congress is aware of the excellent character of Harper's magazine and of Mr. DeVoto's reputation for perspicacity, clarity, and intellectual integrity. The combination of these factors has resulted in an article which, I believe, should be read with care, not only by Members of the Congress, but by every doctor in the country. Mr. DeVoto has pointed out in no uncertain terms the altogether indefensible position into which members of one of America's most noble professions are being led as a result of entrusting the determination of their public relations, their legislative activities, and their political thinking to a team of hucksters whose outstanding characteristic seems to be a complete disregard of their obligations as citizens or as purveyors of truth. Unless the doctors of America quickly awaken to what is being done in their name, they will inevitably find themselves regarded, not

as members of a profession deserving of respect and trust, but as members of a blindly selfish, socially irresponsible, politically unsavory pressure group. I know that as individuals our men of medicine do not deserve any such classification. Nonetheless, as a group they are rapidly earning it because of the activities carried out in their names by Clem Whitaker and his wife. Because of my continued faith in the integrity of our physicians as individuals, I sincerely hope that they will not only read Mr. DeVoto's article with care, but will so act as to put an immediate halt to the processes he so justifiably indicts.

In closing, I should like to reiterate my oft-repeated plea to the doctors of America that they eschew the irrational distrust of their own government which their leaders are attempting to thrust upon them. I urge that, instead, they sit down with those of us who are concerned with the economics of medicine and in good faith attempt to work out with us means whereby the great benefits which they have to offer may be made available to all of our people, through measures which will be in keeping with the self-respect that characterizes the citizens of our country, and which will, at the same time, guarantee the preservation of all the rights and privileges of the profession.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO A FAMILY DOCTOR

(By Bernard DeVoto)

DEAR DOCTOR JAY: My check for $14.45 accompanies this letter. I have taken two deductions from the $15 for which you billed me. The first one, 30 cents, is the 2 percent for current payment customary in commercial transactions; business ethics, I gather, now govern our relationship. I will explain the remaining 25 cents in a moment.

I fully understand why you have been forced to raise your fee for house calls from $10 to $15, though I am not able to adjust my own professional fees so readily to the rise in living costs. I am still being paid for the easy chair just what I was getting in June 1946 when I wrote a piece attacking the antivivisectionists for which you and about a thousand other medical men wrote me letters of approval. (Many of them phrased so similarly as to suggest that someone had sent out word to give me a hand.) Still, though my income is not large enough to enable me to pay for my children's education this year without dipping into savings, I realize that it is large enough to put me, statistically, in the topmost 5 percent of Americans. I am therefore glad to send you the $15, less deductions, as payment for your treatment of my son's cold plus my share of your treatment of others who cannot afford your full fee or perhaps any of it. The 95 percent of my fellow-countrymen who are less able than I to afford medical treatment thrust themselves on my attention. I will help American medicine take care of them—as long as I can.

I do not know how long that will be. This month the hospital to whose staff you belong asked me to contribute to its endowment drive. The last time it did so I sent what was for me a thumping big check, much larger than I could really afford. I would be glad to contribute now, all the more glad because of the magnificent care I received during the 3 weeks I spent there last April. But this year I cannot afford to give the hospital a dime. One reason, besides taxes and the inflation, is that the cost of those 3 weeks, the fee of the surgeon who operated on me, and the loss of income while I was convalescing used up all my margin. The chairman of the drive tells me that it is going to fall far short of its goal; many people on whom it could once depend for contributions can no longer afford them. He, you, and I all know how grave a danger this is to the hospital, to your profession, and to the public. Who is going to pay the hospitals' deficits and who is going to support its medical research now that we of the middle class no longer can? I understand your trade association, the AMA, to say that though it cannot answer that question it will not permit the Government to pay for them.

I thank you for the publicity matter which you enclosed with your statement. I am especially glad to have the copy of Dr. Elmer L. Henderson's inaugural address, Medical Progress Versus Political Medicine. I understand that in sending me this material you were helping in the crusade which Messrs. Whitaker and Baxter outlined for you in A Simplified Blueprint of the Campaign Against Compulsory Health Insurance. You must, they tell you there, "do double duty until this issue is resolved." You must, they say, "help in treating the ills of the body politic." But I must tell you that as part of the body politic I do not think you are qualified either to diagnose or to treat such illnesses, and I know that advertising agencies will make any diagnosis asked for on a fee-for-service basis.

Your proprietary advertising reached me opportunely. I was following the ads which you were running in the Boston newspapers. I found them dishonest, and they further annoyed me by the copywriter's assumption that I am a fool. But they harmonized well with the ads on the opposite page, which were trying to sell me water from a radium spring that is guaranteed to cure everything from impotence to cancer. They set out to rouse the same fears to the same ends. Your radio commercials interested me too. Little dramatic sketches presented you as the old family doctor, with the nobility and self-sacrifice which copywriters now have you wearing like a streetwalker's smile, and assured me that you were guarding my health (without fee, the implication was) and simultaneously protecting me from political enslavement. I observed that as soon as you signed off, another little drama came on. There was a woman who was very, very tired. She was so exhausted and suffered so much from backache that she could not greet her husband with the loving eagerness which alone could save their marriage. It turned out that she needed the dollar economy-size of a cathartic which acts painlessly, and I rejoiced that the advertising agencies were saving freedom, monogamy, and peristalsis in the same half-hour.

You and a tobacco company will relieve throat irritation; you and Seneca snake oil will get rid of gallstones. Your advertising has already cost you a very great deal of the prestige which the advertising agency told you would put your campaign over. And it has radically changed the relationship between you and me. Your ads speak of the trust between physician and patient, so noble it says here, so sacred, so certain to be destroyed by what the propaganda calls socialism. But I do not like any kind of solicitation that trades on prestige or on such fears and hopes as illness necessarily involves, and I will not tolerate political solicitation in a relationship of trust. Solicitors who call at my house must use the back door.

My second deduction, the 25 cents, signifies that I will not help pay for the $25 assessment you sent to the AMA to run these ads and print these pamphlets. I will not help you finance distortion and demagoguery. In an envelope that has your name and degree on it you tell me by way of Dr. Henderson that all infectious diseases have been brought under effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment. I am to have no more colds, then, and my friend's daughter need not have died of poliomyelitis last summer. Cure guaranteed, Dr. Henderson's ad says in effect, and it was only through inadvertence that he did not mention the great increase in chronic diseases, especially among the elderly, and that he did not point out how our increased longevity makes more medical service necessary, not less. There is much further disingenuousness in his anthem of self-praise but let us pass over it. I am willing to grant him that on the whole the history of American medicine is a vibrant, continuing story of human progress. But when you follow him into a political agitation that is at once arrogant, insolent, and dishonest, someone has got to call you.

"It is," the two of you say, "the administrative arm of our Government in Washington which has failed us in this generation—a government which is sick with intellectual dishonesty, with avarice, with moral laxity, and with reckless excesses." You say that to me when you send me his speech, Doctor. You sound like Mr. Vishinsky, and that eloquent rabble-rouser was surely pleased by your allusion to "the totalitarian plan which Washington directs and the people pay for." You and Dr. Henderson are to be highlighted in your nobility against the Government's viciousness, and I am to rejoice that, all other moral heroisms having been defeated, yours will keep us free. And the conspiracy, though so powerful, is so small. You tell me that the people who do not stand on the AMA's party line are "a comparatively small group of little men—little men whose lust for power is far out of proportion to their intellectual capacity, their spiritual understanding, their economic realism, or their political honesty." Expert hysterical rabble-rousing, Doctor, and you add, "Their real objective is to gain control over all fields of human endeavor. Their real objective is to strip the American people of self-determination and self-government and make them a Socialist state in the pathetic pattern of the socially and economically bankrupt nations of Europe which we, the American people, are seeking to rescue from poverty and oppression." You go on to say that the issue is "whether we are to become a Socialist state, under the yoke of a government bureaucracy, dominated by selfish, cynical men who believe the American people are no longer competent to care for themselves." You and Dr. Henderson and his publicity adviser, from your advertising agency I suppose, appear to believe that the American people are no longer competent to think for themselves. But you make me wonder how competent you are.

Much might be said about this delirious rant, which would have landed Dr. Henderson before the Un-American Activities Committee if it had been circulated by a group of excited college boys who had just heard of Marx. One thing is this: You and Dr. Henderson are saying what is not so. Another is this: Dr. Henderson acquires no immunity by wrapping the flag round the vested interest of the AMA's bureaucracy and trustees. Your acquiescence in his claptrap withdraws you from my respect but I take it to be a consequence of the fact that you have not done much thinking about the subject he is misrepresenting. Medicine is your field, not economics, sociology, or government. You come innocent and virginal to social thinking. It is a fair bet that, like thousands of other physicians whose rage Dr. Henderson is whipping up, you have not even read the bills for compulsory payroll deductions for medical insurance which,

after all, are what he is talking about. You probably do not know what the bills say, and you had to work so hard on biochemistry at college that you did not learn to detect the propaganda in such phrases as "socialized medicine," "statism," "socialism," and "totalitarianism." With what valorous stupidity you charge head down at those red rags—and all they are concealing is certain bills which would require some people to take out medical insurance. Bills that are an admittedly clumsy attempt to remedy an intolerable situation which your trade association refuses to face realistically and which, it makes clear, must be solved without its help.

You are a busy man, I know. You have not got time to find out for yourself, though every day you see some of the conditions that the bills are trying to alleviate. So you check your intelligence with the AMA, whose refusal to do anything grows more reactionary as conditions grow more alarming. And with your intelligence and your $25 in its pocket, the AMA systematically distorts the facts and misrepresents the conditions to you. You docilely swallow the cure-guaranteed elixir which your propagandists prescribe. And, docile to them but truculent to me, you send me Dr. Henderson's nonsense and forfeit your status.

A friend of mine, a Vermonter, has a useful locution. He does not say, "Joe is a damned fool." Knowing the mixed nature of the human being and the fallibility of human judgment, he says instead, "Joe puts me in mind of a damned fool." What you put me in mind of, Doctor, is a sap.

You had better stop acting like a sap. Our constitutionally elected Government, which has to do something about an increasingly alarming social situation that the AMA refuses to deal with at all except on its own long-obsolete terms—do you really think it is what Dr. Henderson says it is? You had better think again, fast and hard. And this pamphlet called "Old Doc Truman's Pink Pills." Have you read it, Doctor? Take the passage that begins on page 27. It equates the Democrats, the party which a majority of our citizens have maintained in power, with Communists, and in doing so it makes some of the most scabrous and feculent statements I have ever seen in print. Its distributors have learned a little caution, but not much, from the public outrage that followed the notorious "Dear Christian Colleague" letter which one of your propaganda organizations sent out. As it describes the plot of various committees and learned foundations to deliver medicine and the United States over to Stalin, it insistently repeats Jewish names. It never quite says right out that the Democrat-Communist plot is a Jewish plot but it is so written as to make many a reader believe that it is. Thus it arrives at a standard technique of totalitarianism: Anti-Semitism. Do you accept responsibility for this? You will be held responsible. I got the pamphlet from the office of your State medical society and the girl there said that it was for distribution to patients. You paid the $25 assessment. The noble old family friend has corrupted the relationship of trust with anti-Semitism.

I know that you, personally, do not approve of this, but there it is. Thousands of your colleagues do not, either, and still there it is. Take a tumble to yourself.

And take a tumble to your leaders. Dr. Henderson says that in three more years 90,000,000 people will be enrolled in voluntary health-insurance plans and that "when that number has been reached the problem will be largely resolved." Even if his wild guess should prove accurate, and even if all those voluntary plans should prove adequate, will the problem be "largely resolved"? Dr. Henderson will be satisfied if the remaining 40 percent of the population are without insurance; will you be satisfied? And are you sure that the AMA will support the voluntary plans which it is now praising? For years it opposed voluntary health insurance as violently as it now opposes pay-roll deductions. Twenty-six State medical societies, I make it, have sponsored legislation which limits such plans to those that are controlled wholly by physicians. That is, plans in which neither the public nor the subscriber has effective power. Many medical societies have threatened disciplinary action—up to measures which would make practice impossible—against any of their members who participate in any other kind of plan. Some have been convicted of conspiracy in restraint of trade—which is a crime, Doctor—and others are under indictment for such interference with voluntary prepayment plans. The AMA has fought hard against comprehensive prepayment plans. It has tried to kill those that have succeeded. On the showing so far is it honest about voluntary insurance or is it throwing dust in my eyes and yours?

Like a lot of physicians, a lot of us laymen are fed to the teeth with the AMA's methods. With its persistently negative approach to everything. With its unvarying misrepresentation of the efforts other countries are making to solve the problem. With its "crusade" and its "battle" and its vilification of the Government, the public, and its own members who speak out. With its uniformly misleading attack on "Government medicine." Everyone in the military services is under a system of "Government medicine"; so is everyone in a veterans' hospital or receiving out-patient treatment from one. The Public Health Service is "Government medicine." Several thousand of your colleagues who have had the best training available are practicing "Government medicine." Are they venal, inferior, and suppressed?

One of your ads listed "damage to research" among the ills certain to follow Government domination of the people's affairs under compulsory health insurance. What about that? The hospital which asked me for a contribution is carrying out fundamentally important researches that are being paid for by the Government. They are entirely in the hospital's hands. How have they been damaged? As a member of a committee of the National Research Council, you regularly go to Washington to appraise projects in medical research for which the Government is to pay. Your committee is composed exclusively of medical men who are not in the Government service. You decide whether a project is valuable and how much ought to be spent on it; the project then passes to representatives of the Government just long enough for them to allocate the money for it; it then passes entirely out of their hands and the Government has no more to do with it till private medicine has finished the job. Why do you submit to a patent misrepresentation? Why do you try to deceive me?

The advertising, propaganda, and vilification which the AMA conducts is steadily, and now seriously, undermining your professional standing and prestige. The public very much needs both. The traditional system of medical practice has burst its seams; it is now inadequate and outworn. We are going to have something different. No matter what your propagandists say, it is certain to be not a single system but multiple and mixed. And there is no chance whatever that the AMA will get what it demands—no chance that the mixed system will be developed and administered solely by doctors. This is a public matter, a community and national matter. It requires innumerable skills which medical men simply have not got, and it must be under the unremitting scrutiny of representatives of the public with power to act. Medical knowledge is only one of many kinds of knowledge that are required for social action.

But you and your colleagues can shape the future of American medicine if you will accept the responsibility. If you study the problem and act to solve it, not to prevent its being solved. If you turn back the AMA's headlong opposition to every change not approved by the extremely small group of men who enforce its reactionary policy on its whole membership. (Is there no lust for power on the top level of the AMA? And how much of this policy is designed to secure to a very few men the largest possible incomes while the average income of medical men is smaller than it would be if people could afford to pay their doctors' bills?) If you stop acting like a sap, then you can count on shaping the solution. But time passes, the problem grows more desperate all the time, and a solution will be worked out somehow—with, without, or in spite of you. It had better be with your help.

Desperate social problems have to be solved, Doctor; they are solved as needs must, if it comes to that. Even if we accept Dr. Henderson's figures, 40 percent of the population will have no insurance protection against medical expense. Of his 60 percent, only a part will have adequate insurance. Ward service in the hospital that is trying to raise funds now costs $10 a day, the cheapest room $18 a day. Last week in the out-patient department I saw a patient getting a prescription filled at a drug window. It called for six capsules of aureomycin a day for 10 days. The hospital was selling him the capsules at cost, 40 cents apiece, $24. If his job paid him $40 a week, he could not afford them. In that case the hospital would give them to him, but the hospital had to pay $24 for them—and it can no longer get its deficits paid by contribution. Yet aureomycin is cheap compared to certain other remedies which medical research—in part supported by Government appropriation—has developed. How could he afford ACTH, or the hospital afford it for him?

There are other considerations, too. You know that, in spite of what your advertising says, the only places where American medicine can fully live up to its possibilities are the teaching hospitals. You know that elsewhere it is not doing as well as it wants to and must. You know that there are many areas inadequately provided with doctors, hospitals, and the proper equipment for tests, treatment, and research. You know that some doctors are not well enough trained—with the cost of training climbing before your eyes—and that some hospitals are not good enough—with the cost of making them better steadily mounting.

You know, too, that thousands of physicians disapprove of the AMA policy, are alarmed by it, and want to substitute for it one which will enable the profession to grapple successfully with all these problems. And you know that the hard facts of a rapidly changing world are forcing thousands of other physicians into activities—contract practice is one of them—which the AMA condemns. You know that many thousands of your colleagues agree with Dr. James Howard Means, who is not a Communist, who I think is not a Democrat, either, but who is chief of medicine at a great hospital and professor of clinical medicine at a great medical school. "A learned profession has sunk, or been dragged, in its political sphere, to a distressingly low level," Dr. Means wrote, and he went on: "What organized medicine needs * * * is a new and more enlightened leadership."

That puts it up to you, Doctor. For the campaign of what the AMA calls "public education," run by an advertising agency, you had better substitute one of self-education. You had better adopt the scientific attitude and find out what the facts are and what, besides propaganda, can be done about them. You might begin by reminding Dr. Henderson of his oath: "I shall strive constantly to maintain the ethics of the medical profession and to promote the pub-

lic health and welfare." The public does not consider misrepresentation ethical. The AMA is not promoting public health and welfare by intimidating its members, trying to frighten laymen, lapsing into anti-Semitism, and accusing a Government which has also sworn to promote the public welfare of conspiring with Communists to stamp out freedom in the United States.

You can hold your leadership to proper ends, Doctor, or you can repudiate it. You have that option. But if you are to retain the public respect that has been yours, or if you are to do your part in guiding the future of medicine in the United States, you have no other choice.

QUICK GOVERNMENTAL ACTION IN CONNECTION WITH ATOMIC ENERGY PLANT NEAR PADUCAH, KY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a gratifying example of how a Government agency can act with speed in the interests of our preparedness effort needs to be more generally known. When it is known, I believe it will be applauded.

By now it is generally known that the Atomic Energy Commission is locating a new plant near Paducah, Ky. The plant is one of the important steps in America's awakened preparedness.

The plant will require electric capacity of about 1,000,000 kilowatts. The capacity will be supplied by public and private utility interests. TVA will supply one-half million kilowatts, and a group of five private utility companies have cooperated to build a plant to supply the remaining one-half million.

The cooperation of our privately managed utility companies to construct this giant power source is heartening evidence that industrial America is ready to stand behind America's preparedness.

But there is more to the story. Several of the cooperating private utility companies are subject to the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission. When they applied to the SEC to undertake that venture, the SEC, in view of the critical defense needs of the country, acted with speed appropriate to the necessity.

I should like to quote from the SEC's opinion approving the cooperative project. It is worth recording, as evidence that an awakened Government can cut red tape to accelerate our preparedness. The SEC said:

> Speed is of the essence. We have held no hearings and have created no formal record, other than the data contained in the application itself, as a basis for our interim order of approval. The statutes we administer are flexible enough and our philosophy of administration is sufficiently enlightened to permit us to handle first things first. Our first problem today is the speedy building of national defense. Projects such as electric energy are not business as usual, and merit postponement of regulation as usual until the more normal times which should follow the current emergency. Accordingly we have expedited this proceeding and have shelved for the present certain of the problems the application raises.

UTILIZATION OF NATION'S ENERGIES AND ASSETS TO MEET NATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there are a good many ways of saying this, but it can do no harm to say it once as simply as possible: We, as a nation, are in a tough spot. Each passing day emphasizes, with new crises and foreboding, the deadly seriousness of the situation which confronts the Government and the people of the United States of America. Daily our leaders call upon the people to prepare for greater sacrifices. That is right and proper. We face a precarious future. We must be prepared for every eventuality.

As we gird ourselves for what may well be the decisive test as to whether representative government and individual freedom can survive, it is imperative that we take stock of our resources and consider what can be done both to conserve them and to expend them wisely. The fact that such consideration necessitates some reexamination of policy does not make it any less imperative.

We cannot afford to scatter our shots haphazardly. I make that statement, and to it everyone agrees; there is no dissent; and yet if we examine our record to date, even hastily, I am afraid we shall find we have scattered our shots over the entire globe without hitting many targets. When we look at the record, we find it stuffed with question marks, and the two most important questions are: Do we know where we are going? And if so, do we want to go there?

At a time when all-out mobilization is plainly requested and when time is of the essence in all our endeavors, it would be suicide to let bureaucratic inertia hamstring our efforts. Yet, Mr. President, I fear that is exactly what may be happening.

Now, if ever, it is proper for the Senate to inquire whether, as a nation, we are effectively and efficiently utilizing our entire energies and all our assets in meeting our national needs.

Early last September, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, I addressed similar letters to the Honorable Averell Harriman, assistant to the President, to the Secretaries of State and Defense, and to the Administrator of the ECA, in which I pointed out in some detail what I believed to be certain fundamental reasons why our economic-assistance program should be reexamined in the light of conditions existing at that time. I stressed the fact that if we continued certain types of ECA expenditure, which had been justified on the old basis of a peacetime economy, we might soon find ourselves in a position where we would wish that certain funds and certain materials had not been committed so that we might be free to inaugurate new projects, not previously foreseen but essential to our defense program.

Today the situation is even more critical than it was in September. Already we are feeling the pinch of material shortages. Our requirement of funds has far exceeded what we estimated would be needed at the time funds were made available for the operation of ECA.

Each day it becomes more apparent that we should direct our foreign aid toward providing only such materials as are needed by each recipient of such aid in maintaining an economy designed to produce the essentials of defense. No longer can we be guided chiefly by what our foreign friends need in order to increase their standards of living. The standard of living of the American people is being reduced daily. It must not be the only one sacrificed for defense. Other countries affected must also be willing to sacrifice their standards of living.

Time and again it has been said—I have said it myself, and it is painfully true—that a defense program cannot be imposed upon a broken-down economy. Much concern has been expressed by our European friends about the danger of defense to their economic recovery. It is time that someone expressed concern about the economy of the United States. I do not fear for our economy, if we plan realistically. I do fear for our economy, if we extend our commitments everywhere for all things. Our economy cannot survive a policy of our left hand not knowing what our right hand is doing. We must face the fact that we cannot give away what we do not have, unless we are at least sure where we are going to get it.

As it becomes necessary for our Government to restrict its citizens in the use of certain materials, such as copper and aluminum, it is our duty to inquire into the use of such materials which we supply, through the ECA, to our friends abroad.

It is altogether foolish to act as if the ECA is not supposed to know what items are on the critical list. Materials which are denied to our own producers and consumers should not be sent abroad, unless they are essentially needed for the defense of Europe. And it is manifestly unjust to allow the export of such materials, if they are to be used in Europe for purposes which are prohibited here at home. Such a course would only encourage the reexport of the end product back to the United States at increased prices for the American consumer. Such a course could only breed suspicion and dissatisfaction and lead toward an inevitable breakdown in our own economy.

In this connection, recent reports indicate that certain United States fabricators of aluminum have paid as much as 33 cents a pound for aluminum, whereas the American aluminum producer's price is only 18 cents a pound. When we see the Economic Cooperation Administration authorizing large sums for aluminum for the European countries, and then find from our examination of Commerce Department records that considerable quantities of raw aluminum, as well as aluminum sheets and bars, are being imported into the United States from some of the same European countries, it raises the basic question as to the proper screening of such programs.

The authorization by ECA of materials in such a category can no longer be justified by the old criteria of relative value in the export earnings of the countries of Europe. Such a situation, while it may be valuable to the foreign exchange condition of the importing and exporting country, results in a prohibitive cost to the American taxpayers and consumers who must pay the initial as well as the increased cost of such transactions.

Although our Government has rather rigidly allocated and controlled the domestic use of aluminum, ECA is still providing vast quantities of aluminum to Marshall-plan countries. Such authorizations can be justified only if the materials are necessary to our joint defense effort.

Numerous general statements have been made by various officials concerning the necessity for reviewing our recovery objectives and programs; but I can find little, if any, evidence that such review has actually occurred. Certainly there is no mobilization of European industry designed for defense production. Rather, there is generally "business as usual," with a growing reluctance to have anything interfere with the profit trend which has affected all European business since the beginning of the Korean war.

Mr. President, during a 6-month period ending last September, Western Europe's exports to the United States doubled in value. At the same time, exports of the participating countries' overseas dependent territories showed a trade surplus with the United States of $30,000,000 a month.

The lack of realism in our policy is emphasized by the news stories of a week or so ago indicating the reluctance of the French Government to prohibit the shipment of steel rails from France to Red China. An aroused public opinion, resulting from the news stories on this situation, may have accomplished what our officials were unable to secure; that is, the prohibition of such shipments in the future. The anomaly of such a situation, Mr. President, lies not so much in the shameful fact that the French would enter into such contracts with a barbaric aggressor, who even now threatens France's own overseas territory, but in the better evidence that our Government officials were unable to secure the cooperation of the French Government in such a situation, involving the mutual interests and the defense of both the United States and France.

It is ludicrous, but surely not laughable, that after our ECA officials learned they could not secure the cooperation necessary to stop the execution of these contracts, they have continued to provide economic assistance to France, even to the extent of approving a new project for increasing the French steel plate production at a cost to the United States of $4,500,000.

It is stated that this new project will aid France's rearmament program, and enable her to export larger quantities of steel plate to other Atlantic Pact nations. The accomplishment of that objective may well be the desire and intention of our ECA officials in approving the program; but—the point is, Mr. President, our officials seem to have demonstrated their inability to deal realistically with such a situation.

Having just failed to secure cooperation in a most reasonable request, to proceed on the assumption that everything in the future will be all right, if we only furnish more money and aid, seems to me to be either very stupid or unbelievably naive.

Mr. President, the path of cooperation envisioned by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 was a two-way street. The Congress in passing that act contemplated cooperation on the part of the recipients of Marshall-plan aid, as well as by the United States. The very word "cooperation" implies mutuality.

When sacrifices are necessary for a common purpose, they must be shared by all. Europe's standard of living may not be equal to America's; but that gives Europe no exemption from the necessity of sacrificing some of that which she has. On the contrary, Europe must bear her fair share of the burden, for this struggle is just as important to Europe as it is to the United States. Surely, no one will claim it is not fair to ask that Europe accept, with respect to these items for the procurement of which she asks our assistance, the same restrictions we enforce upon our own people.

The resources of the United States are not limitless, although we have tended to use them in the past as if they were. The Treasury of the United States is not a bottomless well, although our European friends continue to make calls upon it as if it were. Every dollar, every ounce of material, that the United States furnishes either for Europe or for our own use, must be provided, in the last analysis, by the American taxpayer and consumer. The time has come when we must avoid waste in every transaction.

The security and interest of the United States must be given a top priority in our aid programs, lest we come to the final test of our strength and be found wanting because we have frittered away our riches without knowing the road we traveled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, a copy of my letter of September 12, 1950, to the Honorable Averell Harriman, together with the reply of the Economic Cooperation Administration thereto, under date of October 3, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1950.

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: In my present position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and in my former capacity as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, I have felt concern that our expenditures for economic aid for Europe, since the fighting in Korea began, may not have been redirected so as to meet the new situation which has confronted the United States since June 25.

I refer this letter to you since the issue presented seems to me to be somewhat broader than the ECA program encompasses.

The action of the ECA on August 25, in approving the expenditure of $1,297,000 to provide American machinery for a pulp and paper mill to be built in Austria, seems to me to indicate the danger to which I refer.

The ECA has informed the staff of the subcommittee that this particular project is the fourth pulp and paper mill project approved this year for Austria and that it was approved for the same reasons that those projects approved prior to June 25 were accepted, this is, because expanding this industry would improve Austria's export position and help her balance of payments.

The ECA indicates that this particular project has not been examined by any military agency to determine whether the expenditure is justified because it will contribute to the defense of Western Europe, nor has there been any specific screening of this project to determine whether an investment of this kind, which will take at least 2 years to get into production, is desirable in view of its vulnerability to Russian aggression.

The ECA indicates that until United States export controls make necessary a new set of priorities for European industrial expansion, or until a general program for converting the industries of our European allies to defense production, the ECA will continue to furnish aid for the purpose of strengthening the economy of Europe, using the same standards for approval as have been used in the past.

This, it seems to me, raises a very fundamental issue on which the policy of the United States should be very clearly defined. The question is whether or not, in view of the distortion which we are causing in the American economy involving sacrifices by American consumers, in order to meet the requirements of our new defense effort, we should supply money and equipment to build or improve European industries which have not been adjusted or integrated to conform to a corresponding defense program on the other side of the Atlantic.

I am well aware that it is more difficult to prepare an economic and industrial program for the contribution of Western Europe to our common defense than it is to prepare such a program for our own country and that several months may elapse before such a program is ready. My point is that in order to conserve our resources in view of the enormous demands now being made upon them, we should postpone expenditures for industrial construction in Europe until we know exactly what is necessary to meet the demands on the European economy for defense production.

I recognize that we cannot cut off all economic assistance to Europe pending the development of a comprehensive defense program for that area. There are certain essential supplies which must flow continuously if hardship is to be avoided and, furthermore, we want our friends in Europe to know that we are still behind them and will do our best for them in spite of the new obligations which confront us. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that if we continue certain types of ECA expenditures, particularly for expansion and development, on the old basis we will find ourselves in a position a year from now when we will wish that certain funds and certain materials had not been committed, that we were free to inaugurate certain projects essential to the defense program not previously foreseen, and that we had held our fire until our target was much more clearly in view.

In the case of Austria specifically, I am convinced that we should continue to assist the Austrian people and we should give them tangible evidence of our continued backing. We should do what is necessary to combat unemployment and to prevent popular unrest. I cannot believe that the erection of a pulp mill to be completed in 2 years is essential to attain these relatively short-run objectives. We could spend our money for more spectacular projects employing larger numbers of people. Before we undertake to construct a pulp mill to accomplish longer range objectives than those I have outlined, we should have a complete reorientation of our long-range industrial plans for Austria, taking into account our own defense program.

I am sending copies of this to Mr. Hoffman, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense for their information.

I would appreciate getting your views on this matter.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This is in further reference to your letter to Mr. Harriman of September 12, 1950, copy of which you were kind enough to send to us, and my letter of September 18, 1950, in which I promised you a more detailed reply to the questions raised therein.

During this summer ECA, like other agencies in Washington, has been thoroughly reexamining the basic policies and procedures guiding the European recovery program in an effort to put its resources fully behind the defense effort without sacrificing the basic objectives of European recovery. Under the auspices of the National Security Council, the FMACC and numerous less formal working arrangements ECA has participated with the Departments of Defense and State in formulating plans for the defense of Western Europe and southeast Asia, and more specifically in the current proceedings under the North Atlantic Pact, and has at the same time received the active cooperation and necessary guidance of the defense agencies in the revision and implementation of our basic policies and procedures.

The consensus is that the military strength of Western Europe must rest on a firm economic foundation strong enough to support a high level of defense expenditures by the Europeans during the next few years and probably for many years to come. To implement such a defense program, a continuing increase in the productive capacity of the western European countries is necessary, and this growth should, if possible, be accelerated. As bitter experience has shown us, however, the physical means of defense are of little use if popular morale is low. Consequently, we cannot permit the increased defense expenditures in Western Europe to cause large inroads on standards of living for any long period of time; the people of Western Europe must not be deprived of the hope that by building up their economy they will some day find an end to their period of austerity.

With regard to the specific issue of the investment program for Austria raised in your letter, ECA has two primary objectives: First, we have to supply the food and raw materials which are required for Austria's immediate needs and which it is unable to buy itself, while at the same time helping Austria to combat its unemployment to prevent popular unrest. Secondly, as a longer-range objective, Austria, which now depends to a large extent for its needed imports upon the generosity not only of the American taxpayer but also of its European neighbors in the west, must strengthen its export potential. ECA therefore is helping Austria to develop those products which other countries wish to buy from it in order to enable it to balance its trials with Western Europe as well as with the Western Hemisphere. Without basic investment in export industries Austria would have no hope but to remain the pensioner of the west. Stop-gap measures, even if they were spectacular, would probably not prevent public opinion from falling easy prey to Communist propaganda. It might also be pointed out that the present crisis will in all probability be with us for many years; it would, therefore, be less costly to us and involve a smaller drain on the resources of Austria's western neighbors if some of our aid were used to build up Austria's investments in her export industries rather than merely financing her current food and raw-material needs.

In appraising the defense potential of Western Europe, Austria's special position has always been recognized. About half of the country is administered by the Soviet Union and the other half is vulnerable to active Soviet aggression. Consequently, there is little point in developing the direct military potential of Austria. From the very beginning of the ERP program, no Austrian industry whose products could be used directly for military purposes has received any ERP assistance. The Vienna screening committee of the United States Government has carefully reviewed all requests for procurement of goods and equipment which might be useful to the Soviet military machine. The Defense Department has had equal representation with the Department of State and ECA on this committee.

Investment in Austrian pulp, paper, and related timber projects has been considered as a most desirable means for implementing ECA policy in Austria. Their products which traditionally have been large export items could not be important to the Russian munitions requirements. By the investment of about $5,000,000, Austria should be able to improve its balance of payments by the equivalent of about $20,000,000 a year or about 10 percent. Not only will this reduce the burden upon the American taxpayer but it will also decrease the drain of scarce resources from other participating countries, resources which these countries sorely need in the years to come. Further, ECA's participation in these projects does not involve the procurement of American goods currently in short supply. If these goods should become scarce because of our own defense effort before the completion of these projects, we would, of course, reconsider our decision.

I trust that these comments satisfactorily answer the questions raised in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada for his remarks. I have listened to them with deep interest, and, with his permission, I wish to associate myself with the sentiments which he has expressed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the able Senator from Arkansas.

STATEMENT OF INCOME BY MEMBERS OF CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is identical with a bill I have introduced in the two preceding Congresses. I have not thus far been able to get a hearing on it, but I am one who believes in persevering. It is a bill which provides that each Member of the Senate shall file at the beginning of each year, for a public record, all sources of his income for the preceding year and the amounts thereof.

As I have said in the past, and as I repeat today, I happen to believe that if one wishes to seek and hold public office, such as a seat in the Senate of the United States, his financial life should be an open book. I think the public is entitled to know the sources and the amounts of his income, so that the public can be the judge of whether or not there exists any relationship between the voting record of a Senator and the sources and the amounts of his income. I believe that if one does not have anything to conceal with respect to a possible relationship between his voting record in the Senate and the sources and the amount of his income, he should certainly have no objection to the bill which the junior Senator from Oregon once again introduces. He hopes that in this session of Congress he will at least get a hearing before an appropriate committee of the Senate. I assure my colleagues that if they want to meet me in debate on a referendum vote across the country as to the soundness of my bill, I shall be very happy to accommodate them, and I know that I will give them a good licking. I say that because I am satisfied that the overwhelming majority of the American people would put their stamp of approval on the bill which I have once again introduced. I am satisfied that the overwhelming public opinion is that there should be a full disclosure of the sources and amount of income of any Member of the Senate.

The bill (S. 561) to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I now submit a resolution to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate. I am very realistic about these matters. I ask that the resolution again be considered by the appropriate committee. Perhaps in this instance the resolution would go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, I shall accommodate myself to whatever reference is made of it.

It is a resolution which concerns itself with the cloture problem of the Senate. It is a resolution which is aimed at the great need, as the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Minnesota see it—and I speak most respectfully of the differences of opinion on this subject—for the establishment of the principle of majority rule in the Senate of the United States.

With democratic ideals and principles at stake all over the world, I believe we had best proceed more rapidly than we are proceeding in America to practice such principles and ideals at home. I would have the American people keep in mind the fact that the procedures in the Senate have a very direct bearing upon and relationship to their substantive rights in this body. I happen to be one who believes that the putting into practice of the great civil rights guaranties of our system of government, as I see those rights, will forever be stymied until the procedures of the Senate are changed.

Again I want to say that I wish to be very realistic about these matters. I happen to be one who does not believe that there is a very good chance of passing very much needed civil rights legislation in the Senate so long as we have in the Senate the rule which requires that 64 Senators vote affirmatively on the question of limiting debate in the Senate. In my opinion, it is an undemocratic rule. It is not in keeping with the spirit of our democracy, which I think is bottomed primarily on the principle of majority rule.

My resolution has been discussed at great length on the floor of the Senate, and I do not intend to take a great deal of time discussing it further today, Mr. President, other than to point out that minorities would be adequately safeguarded under my resolution, in that its provisions continue the requirement that 16 signatures would be required for filing a cloture petition.

Furthermore, it guarantees what I believe any fair-minded person must agree is reasonable and adequate debate after the filing of a cloture petition. In addition, it would continue the principle, which was also contained in the resolution I submitted last year, of providing for the farming out of time after a cloture petition has been filed.

It must be taken for granted, I believe—and I consider the historical cases in the Senate to sustain me on this point—that under the provisions of this resolution a cloture petition would not be filed until it was clearly demonstrated that a filibuster had started in the Senate. With the additional provision in the resolution which would make it possible to debate an issue for 1 week after the filing of the petition, I say most frankly that, in my judgment, there is not much to the argument that the resolution would jeopardize any minority rights.

It is true that the adoption of my resolution would put to an end the control of the floor of the Senate by a minority of the Senate. That is true. Of course, I also admit that it is impossible to reconcile the provisions of my resolution with the Calhoun theory of ambassadorship in the Senate. My resolution does not agree with the philosophy of Calhoun, which I think was pretty well put to rest by the War Between the States. The Calhoun theory was that a man sits in the Senate as an ambassador from his State for his State. On the contrary, my resolution is based upon what I think is a much more sound principle of representation. It is the principle that Senators sit here from their States for the Nation, which is quite a different concept of representation. It is based on the principle of majority rule. It is also based on the sound principle that, after all, in the long run what is best for the Nation is best for each State within the Nation. In any event, it is not in keeping with democratic processes to have a rule which permits a Senator or a small group of Senators to block the will of the majority through a filibuster.

Let me hasten to say, as some will say if I do not say it, that the junior Senator from Oregon has been known to filibuster on the floor of the Senate, under existing rules. But that does not make it right. That does not make it a sound procedure. But whenever I have spoken at length—and I spoke at great length only once, Mr. President, for some 10 hours on the floor of the Senate—it was to protect another rule, namely, the unanimous-consent rule, which was being violated by a Senate steam roller on that day, the operators of which would not permit those of us who wanted a postponement of a vote for a period of time not in excess of the period we would be entitled to if the then existing cloture rule were applied, to have such postponement.

I recognize how difficult it is to get the general public to understand these procedural distinctions, but the record is perfectly clear as to the position the junior Senator from Oregon took. I have never filibustered, and I have no intention of ever filibustering in the Senate of the United States to prevent a vote on an issue taking place within a reasonable period of time. The one time I spoke at great length I sought only to have the postponement of a vote from Friday until Monday, which, of course, under the then existing cloture rule, we would have been entitled to, had the Senate been willing to respect its own unanimous-consent rule, which on that day it trampled under foot.

Those of us who held out against that kind of treatment finally caused the majority of the Senate to recognize an unsound policy on their part, and they then yielded to our request for a postponement of the vote until Monday.

Having said that about my record, I should like to say a word further about the filibuster. I believe that in times of great national emergency it is exceedingly dangerous and unwise to have a rule in the Senate which permits a small minority to tie this body up in a filibuster, making it necessary either to break the filibuster by all the physical effort required—and we all know how difficult it is to obtain a consensus of opinion to pursue that course of action—or yield to the minority, or agree to some unwise compromise with the minority in order to clear the floor of the Senate for business on the issues which represent the people's business.

So, Mr. President, I hope that on the basis of the experience we have had with the filibuster in recent years, and on the basis of the experience we have had with the 64-vote rule requirement, the Senate will give favorable consideration to the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from Oregon submit at this time, which goes back to the principle for which we have fought in the past, the principle of majority-vote rule in the handling of cloture problems in the United States Senate.

I submit the resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) submitted by Mr. MORSE, for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

MEMORIAL PLAQUE FOR STATUE OF FORMER SENATOR EDWARD DICKINSON BAKER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for an appropriate plaque to be forged and attached to the statue of a great former Member of this body, one of the early Senators from my State, Col. Edward Dickinson Baker. I introduced a similar joint resolution in the last session of Congress, but because of the great amount of work which the Committee on Rules and Administration had to perform it was not able to reach the joint resolution. However, I have been advised by the committee that it would like to have me reintroduce it so that it may be given early consideration I thank the committee for that courtesy. I am very happy to reintroduce the joint resolution. I think it is one which speaks for itself on its merits, and one which ought to be passed at an early date.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to provide for placing a suitable plaque on the base of the statue of Edward Dickinson Baker in the rotunda of the Capitol, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AWARD TO DR. STEPHEN K. BAILEY FOR BOOK ENTITLED "CONGRESS MAKES A LAW: THE STORY BEHIND THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or two to make a brief comment upon a book which I think is deserving of commendation.

For many years the Woodrow Wilson Foundation has been giving an annual award to the best publication in the field of government and democracy.

The award for 1950 has recently been presented to Dr. Stephen K. Bailey for a book entitled "Congress Makes a Law: The Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946." It is such an excellent account of the legislative process as it is practiced that it is worthy of these favorable comments which I make with respect to it on the floor of the Senate today.

The reasons why Dr. Bailey's book was chosen were well stated in the citation that was made by Prof. Charles Fairman, of Stanford University, at the Political Science Association convention here in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, December 28, 1950. As the citation suggests, Dr. Bailey's book is a fascinating combination of political analysis and good literature.

I rise to mention this book, however, not to pay any further tributes to its author, but to point out to the Members of this body that the award to Dr. Bailey is in a very meaningful sense a tribute to one of our most distinguished colleagues. I am referring, of course, to the very distinguished senior Senator from Montana, who contributed more than any other single person to the development of the Employment Act of 1946, whose "spark of will," to use one of Bailey's phrases, "transformed an idea into a specific legislative proposal" whose youthful energy, unflagging courage, and warm personality have endeared him to even those who may not agree with his ideas.

Too often, after a bill has been enacted into law, the great contributions made by its congressional sponsors are forgotten. Too often, Members of Congress labor long and tirelessly on weighty matters of state and not until they have passed from the scene is their stature appreciated—even by their closest colleagues.

It is, therefore, a source of deep gratification to me that Dr. Bailey's book has been paid such a signal compliment, for through it and the attention it will receive more and more people will come to understand the great contribution to the work of this body and the future of this country that has been made by the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Professor Fairman's citation of Dr. Bailey's book, to which I referred earlier, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION THAT WENT WITH THE WOODROW WILSON FOUNDATION AWARD WHICH WAS PRESENTED TO DR. STEPHEN BAILEY THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1950, AT THE POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

The citation was read by Charles Fairman, Stanford University.

"The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award of 1950 for the best publication in the field of government and democracy is made to Dr. Stephen Kemp Bailey for his book entitled 'Congress Makes a Law: The Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946.' Columbia University Press is the publisher.

"Mr. Bailey chose a significant task of manageable proportions, and executed it with imagination and entire adequacy. Lawmaking in the midst of concerted efforts to convince and even covertly to impose upon the human mind is a major aspect of our democracy. The quest for security in employment at useful work reflects a universal aspiration that taxes the present capacity of free government. The Employment Act of 1946 is notable as a datum point in this current democratic movement. Mr. Bailey has traced the impulses that promoted and shaped this legislation—carefully, wisely, luminously. His work discloses initiative and persistence in the pursuit of his inquiry, and measur- 1 judgment in the formulation of conclusions. There is a freshness in presentation and a tidiness in execution that are particularly worthy of emulation.

"The book falls within the Wilsonian tradition. This congeniality is suggested by the fact that at the head of each chapter Mr. Bailey has set a pertinent quotation from Wilson's Congressional Government. As with Wilson, the author would 'make self-government among us a straightforward thing of simple method, single, unstinted power, and clear responsibility.' It is evident that Mr. Bailey took pains in organizing his account, in penning tight sentences and coherent paragraphs, in revising until clear thought found expression in efficient language. Even by Woodrow Wilson's severe standard, this essay is sound politics and good literature."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to take advantage of a lull in the Senate proceedings to take care of matters which have accumulated on my desk for quite some time.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Calvin E. Wright, of Rupert, Idaho, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

V. Allan Hubbard, of Chaffee, Mo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. Hubbard is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the one abiding certainty in the midst of all the mutations of time and the only ultimate source of our confidence as we face perplexing circumstances, Thou knowest how often fear and doubt rob us of peace and make us apprehensive of the future.

Grant that our baffled minds and fear-strickened hearts may be inspired with the cardinal virtues of faith and hope as we wait upon Thee and continue faithfully and heroically to champion the cause of righteousness and justice.

We pray that our devotion and moral courage may be kindled and strengthened with a clear vision of that blessed time when, through our trust in Thee and our own best endeavors, we shall achieve life's noblest goals of peace and good will.

May the day soon dawn when the selfish ambitions, which enslave the souls of men and nations, shall be forever supplanted by the Christlike and magnanimous spirit of brotherhood and friendship.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 17, 1951, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to use today the special order granted to him for yesterday, following the other special orders.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present inflationary picture is a sorry one indeed. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Administration to handle and to cope with inflation and price gouging have been very weak and ineffectual. It has been in operation 3 months—3 months marked by timidity, confusion, muddled words, and frenzied inaction.

Run-away prices have been a national scandal since June 25, 1950. At that time, I advocated a wage and price freeze across the board, but was unable to get any action. The Congress, the administration, and the officials selected to supervise the Defense Production Act of 1950 have all fallen down on the job to control inflation.

Mike Di Salle, Price Director, was reported last week to have been ready to impose a 30-day price-wage freeze, but Mr. Alan Valentine, Director of Economic Stabilization Administration, said, "We have come to the conclusion that we do not plan any present across-the-board freeze of prices." What does he mean and who is he trying to help—or to shield? Certainly not the people of this country who are being harassed by the constant increases in everything they have to buy.

Mr. Speaker, the ineptitude of the ESA is such that it should either be abandoned or a new and strong group of officials named to administer the program. How are you going to collect taxes if this inflationary spiral keeps up, and how are you going to impose new taxes if inflation continues?

This is no time for voluntary price controls or vague talk. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that an over-all price-profit-wage control be imposed before another week of profiteering passes by. The people are demanding action and have been since June 25, 1950. The price scandal means cruel and inhuman punishment for thousands of our citizens and imperils our defense effort. The period of inaction in the price-control field has created confusion, bitterness, and frustration.

Big business can—and has—increased prices; organized labor can—and will—demand wage increases; the farmer is protected by support prices; but the great middle group—people living on servicemen's allowances—unorganized white-collar workers—school teachers, State, county, and municipal employees—older persons living on pensions and annuities—all are having trouble making their savings stretch and warding off inflation. Furthermore, redemption of E bonds for the past 9 months have exceeded sales which indicates that people are being forced to spend beyond their incomes and that inflation is our No. 1 and most serious domestic problem.

The times call for equality of sacrifice in the payment of taxes, the granting by Congress to the Department of Agriculture the right to sell stored commodities to force down prices and the imposition of direct controls and price ceilings to keep down prices to stop inflation.

We need:

First. A real excess-profits tax of 100 percent above normal peacetime profits—average profits run 51 percent over last year and some corporations' profits as high as 286 percent.

Second. Elimination of existing tax loopholes so that our economy can be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Third. A roll-back on prices to halt inflation.

Fourth. Legislation to end commodity market speculative profiteering.

Fifth. A halt to nonessential Government expenditures.

The picture of inflation is a very dangerous one. The need for drastic action is now and I urge that we enact legislation to roll back prices to October 1, 1950, although I would personally prefer to have the date set at June 25, 1950. The people want action and they are looking to this Congress for leadership and results in the fight against inflation.

GOVERNOR BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 16, accompanied by many distinguished Members of Congress, representing both Houses, I attended the inaugural ceremonies of South Carolina's seventy-eighth Governor—one of my constituents—James F. Byrnes. Assembled in Columbia was the largest crowd of people ever to witness such an event in our State. As the Representative in Congress of our State's most distinguished first citizen, I rise to express our deep gratitude for the honored presence of so many representatives of the Federal and State Governments. During the crisp noon hour thousands of eager people listened to the words of our esteemed fellow citizen to whom has come more public honors than any other South Carolinian. This great statesman, who enjoys the confidence of the vast majority of our people, spoke not only as the new chief magistrate of our Commonwealth but as a world statesman. Those who expected bitter words of criticism were disappointed. In clear, understandable language, he issued a clarion call to all Americans to rally to the support of our great Nation during these, the most trying hours of history.

Thus, in presenting our new Governor, South Carolina again joins hands with her sister States in pledging her all to the end that our free way of life may be continued, and that other sons, regardless as to circumstances, through work and prayer, may achieve the highest distinctions within the gift of our people. I am sure the people of South Carolina will give Governor Byrnes their wholehearted support as he discharges his duties in the office of chief executive of our State.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, January 20, to file a report on the bill H. R. 1724, and that if anyone desires to file a minority report on that bill he may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CHARLES E. WILSON

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I hope every citizen heard, or has the opportunity to read, the speech made by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, our Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in Philadelphia on January 17.

The speech had a logical and confident tone. Without minimizing our difficulties and the dangers of our situation, the speaker emphasized factually our full capability to meet and discharge, without fear or confusion, the duties that have devolved upon this generation of Americans. The approach of the speaker was that of a man who is working diligently to reduce our complex problems to manageable proportions, and to solve them.

In the process of actively doing and seeing what can be done, Mr. Wilson obviously suffers none of the frustrations which afflict so many who seem able to do little more than to daily lament our weaknesses in an ignoble spirit of defeatism. We need more confident, lucid explanations like that of Mr. Wilson, and we owe him our thanks for his splendid talk, and also for the service he is performing for the Nation.

I join with him in believing that our best hope for peace is through full mobilization of our power and that to accomplish this mandatory controls will be required. I am sure most people will be glad to know that any doubts within the ODM relative to the need for legal controls have apparently been resolved. We all dislike controls, but rapid price increases have made them necessary.

ENLISTMENT OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the hope that I may clear up certain misunderstandings which seem to have arisen in regard to legislation I have proposed, authorizing the enlistment of German and Japanese nationals in the Armed Forces of the United States. Some Members have stated that they understand that my bill would mean the establishment of a German army under a German chief of staff, and subject to German political control, and a similar Japanese army under Japanese command. This is not the intention of the bill. In fact, I have specifically provided against any outside or foreign control. The bill proposes that we deal directly with the individual in Germany, and in Japan just as we deal with the individual recruit at home. It simply provides for recruiting offices in these countries, not embassies. It proposes no dealing with any foreign government.

My bill would simply allow German nationals and Japanese nationals to enlist as soldiers in the Army of the United States, where they would be directly accountable to their American officers, with absolutely no diplomatic interference.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call particular attention to the cost of such a program. We have spent approximately a billion dollars in Germany last year in order to give the German people dollar buying power. We have spent hundreds of millions for similar purposes in Japan. These expenditures amount to nothing more than gifts. My bill provides that foreign nationals shall be paid in their own currency. If we were to use the same number of dollars to pay the salaries of German nationals in the United States Army, which we have contributed to the German economy, it would create exactly the same buying power in Germany, and we would be getting something for it, rather than giving our

money away. The bill contemplates that we should pay German nationals who serve in our Army, in marks, and pay Japanese in yen. The marks would be purchased from the German Government for dollars, and the yen from the Japanese Government. Each country would still get dollars, and they would be just as good dollars as if we had given them to these people.

I cannot understand why we should object to letting the money we give foreign countries purchase something for us, particularly when it could help us as well as the foreign nation. I cannot understand why some of our diplomats want the United States to always pay and never receive. I cannot understand why some of our military people want American boys to do all the fighting and dying, and object to any program which would even allow foreign nationals to carry part of the load.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bills H. R. 1080 and H. R. 1085, and that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ROBERT E. LEE AND EDGAR ALLAN POE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the outstanding birthdays in America.

January 19 is the birthday of Robert E. Lee, acknowledged by leaders everywhere to be the outstanding commander of the English-speaking race. Teddy Roosevelt said that of him and General Maurice of the British Army, in his recent book on Lee the Soldier, placed him above Wellington as the greatest commander of the English-speaking race.

Today is also the birthday of America's greatest poet, Edgar Allan Poe, who was born on January 19, 1809. The one outstanding American poem in which critics have never been able to find a flaw is Poe's Raven.

I sometimes think of that raven as sitting above the door of the House of Representatives of the American Congress and representing the specter of international inexpediency, which threatens our destruction.

SOCIALISTIC LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the three messages recently sent to the Congress by the President are definite proof to me that the freedom of the American people is threatened almost as much at home as from our foes abroad.

The financial solvency of our Nation is our first line of defense, and the first duty of the Congress is to protect it.

In his never-ending call for more spending and higher taxes, in his recent budget request for $71,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, President Truman, if the Congress approves, will slug the taxpayers of Illinois alone for $5,376,000,000 as its part in taxes for his hysterical program of tax till it hurts everyone.

Mr. Speaker, his messages again call for the enactment of his political Fair Deal socialistic legislation, including millions of dollars for socialized medicine, the Brannan farm plan, socialized housing, and other similar schemes all of which were rejected and defeated in the recent election.

The people of my State of Illinois, and the Nation as well, will support us Members of Congress who will oppose such unnecessary expenses, and who know that with the cooperation of the President we could and should cut his budget request by over $7,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress will support extraordinary appropriations for preparedness and national defense which is the all-important problem now, but I, and many of my colleagues, shall oppose the President's attempt to incorporate his socialistic schemes in our rearmament program.

FAIR DEAL AS USUAL

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1951, the Chicago Daily News published an editorial, entitled "Fair Deal as Usual." It is startling indeed to note the comments about the Fair Deal "hitching a ride on the war machine." If I can judge the temperament of the people today by the expressions contained in the many letters that I am receiving, I venture a guess that a resurrection of the Truman welfare program will meet with decided opposition from within Congress as well as outside of that august body. If the welfare state program is to be resurrected and exploited as a Fair Deal measure, it is indeed an impropitious time to do so when lives and property are being seized in preparation for war. It is apparent that the people are definitely alerted to the dangers of having the socialistic schemes embodied in the welfare program revived and promoted at a time when the resources of the country are being mobilized to fend off the attacks of our enemies both at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including as part of my remarks, the editorial to which I have referred and which is as follows:

FAIR DEAL AS USUAL

The Truman Fair Deal has hitched a ride on the war machine. In his budget message, the President made it clear that while lives and property are being seized in preparation for war, his shopworn socialistic schemes are to be promoted under the guise of aid to mobilization.

The Brannan plan of farm subsidies, for example, is trotted out as a "redirection of the farm program to provide a greater contribution to the defense effort." The idea is to pay farmers from the Treasury the difference between a "fair" price and what they receive for certain commodities. The effect is to transfer to the taxpayers part of the cost of the Nation's food bill.

He wants more social security, more unemployment compensation, more public works, health insurance, more grants to the States, Federal money for schools. He wants more money to finance the white-elephant International Wheat Agreement, and more money for foreign economic aid to "stop communism"—some of it for Tito.

In his state of the Union message, the President advised that the country "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense spending." His budget reveals the insincerity of those words. No wonder that Senator HARRY BYRD, who really believes in economy, terms the proposed budget "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

In the projected spending of $71.59 billion, only some $20 billion was accounted for in detail. The rest is subject to military and foreign-aid planning, still too vague to permit estimates of allocations.

There is, for example, no agreement on the size of the Army we are to have. Senator DOUGLAS is advocating Armed Forces of 6,000,000 by the end of the year. The Pentagon has set 3,500,000. But with nobody yet certain what kind of a war we are preparing to fight, the ultimate figure might be anywhere in between.

But for the Voice of America, the overseas information broadcasts that are supposed to be making converts to our side—although with indifferent success, so far—Mr. Truman is quite definite. He wants to triple the appropriation, and spend $166,000,000.

Point 4, the celebrated plan for bringing more prosperity to neglected corners of the earth, is lumped in with other foreign aid. But the Marshall plan is to continue after 1952, and Greco-Turkish aid will go on, all labeled as increasing our ability to resist Russian aggression.

The projected tax bill will be the heaviest in history, higher even than those of wartime. That is necessitated by the necessity to prevent inflation while we spend a proposed $60,000,000,000 on our defense program. It might be noted also that nearly $9,000,000,000 in trust funds, from social-security taxes and the like, will also be spent, but will not be included in the estimates of income.

We are probably to have rationing—and maybe short rations. It is certain that millions of young men will be snatched from their families and careers, and put into uniforms, some for the rest of their lives.

Under these circumstances, it is appalling that the President should have been unwilling to forego a single item in his box of vote lures. Coat them as he may with defense arguments, they remain the political stock by which the Fair Dealers hope to perpetuate themselves in office.

It is Congress which will have to impose priorities on the uses to which taxes shall be put in time of grave national danger. Mr. Truman is as unconcerned about waste as he is about unprecedented taxes. His budget places Congress on notice that the danger is internal, as well as external.

FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a 30-minute special order for Monday, during which time I shall orate on Federal taxes. My theme is going to be, "Where are we going to get the money?" I expect to give a thumbnail sketch of the Federal tax system and point out what we can do and should do and what we cannot do and should not do. After my statement I will invite questions and any challenging of the figures I use.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AND ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Mobile Press and Register of Mobile, Ala., in commendation of a statement by our distinguished colleague, CLARENCE J. BROWN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend from Massachusetts and the House that, in addition to the program for next week that I announced yesterday, consisting of two bills, if a rule is reported out on the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, that will be programed for Wednesday after the armed services bill. I have reserved the right to object to this request simply to make this announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUCCESSFUL LANDING AND TAKE-OFF OF AN AIRPLANE FROM THE DECK OF A NAVY SHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two news articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I had occasion to visit the Navy Building at Eighteenth and Constitution Avenue and there to view a very impressive display commemorating the first successful landing and take-off of an airplane from the deck of a Navy ship 40 years ago yesterday. The display is most interesting and impressive. It includes pictures of the historic event taken at the time and it includes the original motor of the plane and the propeller which was slightly damaged at the take-off when the plane struck the water.

I was especially proud to witness the recognition extended by the Navy to the pilot of that plane. He was Eugene B. Ely, an Iowa farm boy, who was born and raised on a farm just east of Williamsburg in Iowa County, Iowa. He was a test pilot for the Curtiss aircraft firm at the time of the historic flight.

The Washington Daily News of Thursday afternoon, January 18, and the Washington Post of Friday morning, January 19, carried news items announcing the commemoration of this historic event by the Navy and I am including the news articles herewith:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of January 18, 1951]

NAVY RECOLLECTS AN IOWA FARM BOY STARTED IT ALL

NEW YORK, January 18.—The Navy quietly observed today the fortieth anniversary of a historic event that started a revolution in modern warfare.

On January 18, 1911, an Iowa farm boy named Eugene Ely made a bumpy landing in a Curtiss biplane on a crudely erected platform aboard the armored cruiser U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay.

Ely's plane was the first to make a successful flight from shore to ship, and for a few hair-raising moments, the daring young pilot thought he would crash.

His flying machine roared toward the 119-foot-long wooden platform at about 60 miles an hour. Ely slowed down to 40 miles per hour as he approached the cruiser.

Three pairs of landing hooks built into his plane missed the first 11 lines which connected sandbags aboard the platform. But the hooks grabbed the next 11 lines and Ely's two-wing machine came to a stop only 30 feet from the ship's stern.

After an hour of hand-shaking with officers and crew members of the *Pennsylvania*, Ely climbed back into his plane and flew back to the airfield at Tanforan, 10 miles away. Thus he completed the first round trip between shore and ship.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 19, 1951]

FORTY YEARS AGO, PILOT LANDED ON A SHIP

Forty years ago yesterday, an airplane made history when it made the first successful landing and take-off from the deck of a Navy ship.

Yesterday, the Navy celebrated the day by placing a display of equipment and photographs in the lobby of the Navy Department building at Eighteenth Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Included in the display are photographs made of the flight and of the pilot, Eugene Ely. Naval aviation began in September 1910 when Capt. W. I. Chambers began a study of aircraft for use with the fleet.

He persuaded Ely, a test pilot for the Curtiss aircraft firm, to find out whether a plane could be launched from the deck of a ship. Ely flew off the U. S. S. *Birmingham* as it lay moored at Hampton Roads, Va.

Then, on January 18, 1911, Ely landed a plane on a platform aboard the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* at San Francisco and took off for a land base. Small boats were placed near the *Pennsylvania* to aid Ely if anything went wrong with his flight. Sandbags lined the runway, attached to taut lines across the deck, slowing the plane as it landed.

The Navy's display also includes the engine and propeller used in the old Curtiss plane and a series of pictures showing the development of naval aviation through the years.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OUR FAR-EASTERN POLICY

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the UN has a solemn obligation to brand the Chinese Communist regime as aggressors in Korea. Our State Department has finally faced the facts by the introduction of such a resolution. There can be no equivocation on this move, but will that be enough? Obviously no. I strongly urge that the following steps be taken by us and our allies in the Far East. If not, our troops should be evacuated from Korea immediately.

First and foremost we must bomb the Chinese Communist supply bases in China itself. The White House, the Department of State, and some in the Pentagon have for some unknown reason withheld such badly needed aid to our land forces in Korea. How can the Commander in Chief justify a ban against Air Force bombing of vital targets in China proper? With our valiant troops pressed to the breaking point, such a restriction on our Air Force is totally unwarranted.

The following information has recently come to my attention and illustrates how unwise some of our top policy decisions can be. The Chinese Communists have at Mukden the largest and most efficient arsenal in the Far East. Reports indicate that this arsenal now supplies, and has for some time supplied, the Chinese Communist ground troops with practically all of their weapons. One all-out bombing raid by our vastly superior air strength would destroy this arsenal. The benefits to our hard-pressed GI's in Korea would be tremendous. Why will not the President, the State Department, and the Pentagon give General MacArthur the right to strike at the very heart of the Chinese Communist strength? There is no satisfactory answer from the President and his advisers. While the casualty lists steadily mount, our diplomats talk by the hour. Congress and the American public should not tolerate this situation any longer. Give General MacArthur the "go signal" and destroy this arsenal and other Communist supply bases.

In addition to all-out bombing of the Chinese Communist strategic targets such as the Mukden arsenal, the United States Navy and other UN naval units should impose a blockade on the coast of China. The Chinese Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek should be sup-

plied with military equipment and from bases in Formosa should be permitted to attack and invade the Chinese mainland. This "second front" in China is long overdue.

The fallacy of fighting the hordes of Asia on the ground is obvious. We are bleeding ourselves to death, which is just what Stalin wants us to do. It is utter stupidity to continue such a policy when we are not fighting with both fists. For too long a time our State Department has pursued a policy toward the Chinese Communists of "an olive branch in one hand and a half-loaded pistol in the other."

A long overdue show-down is imminent in the United Nations. The fate of the UN may hang in the balance on the vote on this resolution by the United States which seeks to brand Red China as ruthless aggressors. If our alleged allies fail to support the United States in this crucial hour, we should forthwith withdraw from the organization. The facts are clear-cut, and if the members in the UN run out now, any hope for the free world in that organization must be abandoned.

THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the Medal of Honor, which is more commonly termed "The Congressional Medal of Honor," was originally authorized by an act of the Congress in 1861, during the Civil War period. This legislation was revised in 1916, to establish the Army and Navy Roll of Honor, and to further provide, upon application, a monthly pension in the sum of $10 to these signally honored veterans for the balance of their natural lives, after they had reached the age of 65 years and were completely separated from the armed services.

The legislation I have introduced in the House today will repeal this statute of 1916, and will provide a special monthly pension for these outstanding veterans in the amount of $250 for the balance their natural lives, payable from the date of their application for admission to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force Roll of Honor.

You will note that my bill provides for the establishment of an Air Force Roll of Honor, as it should be under the unification system of the armed services, and it removes the 65-year-old qualification provision. The bill retains the provision of complete separation from the armed services, thereby withholding payment of this special monthly pension to officers or enlisted men who are drawing regular retirement pay, since veterans in this category are still considered a part of the armed services.

This bill I have introduced is specifically intended to increase the special monthly pension benefits, and to pay such benefits to these veterans during their period of life when they can enjoy them and use them to practical advantage. Such would not be the case after they have reached the age of 65 years, since the majority of these veterans are deceased before that age is reached.

The Medal of Honor is the greatest decoration and highest honor than can be conferred upon members of the armed services, in the name of the people of the United States, through their duly elected representatives in the Congress. It is awarded to these veterans in conjunction with the following citation, "for having in action involving actual conflict with an enemy distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry or intrepidity, at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty."

Since 1861, some 3,000 of these awards have been made and today there is slightly over 400 of these thusly honored veterans living and registered on the Army and Navy Rolls of Honor. I doubt that we will ever have more than that number on these rolls at one time, in fact it is reasonable to assume that we shall have less since only 531 of these medals were awarded during the World Wars I and II, some of them posthumously. Today their ranks are fast diminishing, particularly those so honored during World War I.

Rather than give the men of these fast fading ranks the paltry sum of $10 monthly, as a practical reward for their gallant and outstanding military service in the defense of this Nation, it would be better to forget them entirely. When these veterans were so signally honored, and the memories of their conspicuous deeds were so fresh in our minds, we eulogized them, publicized and wined and dined them upon their return to their homes, and then promptly forgot them.

It is known that there are current instances of medalists in straitened financial circumstances to whom an allotment of a fair and reasonable pension could represent freedom from want, an objective to which the Nation should stand committed.

I, for one, believe the time has come for correction of our thoughtlessness. I do not believe the rank and file of the American people ever intended or believed that these veterans should have been forgotten in a practical sense.

I have, therefore, introduced this bill in the House today to insure economic security to these gallant men and hope and believe that I shall have the support of the majority of the Members of this Congress in support of the enactment of this legislation.

Surely this is the very least a grateful country can do to evidence its ever-continuing interest in its outstanding war heroes.

I submit the following table showing the total of these awards to date:

Total of awards for the Congressional Medal of Honor

Army:	
Total awards since 1863	2,119
Awards prior to World War I	1,723
Awards during World Wars I and II	396
Navy:	
Total awards since 1863	916
Awards during World Wars I and II	629
Awards during World Wars I and II	78

Total of awards for the Congressional Medal of Honor—Continued

Marine Corps:	
Total awards since 1863	193
Awards prior to World War I	98
Awards during World Wars I and II	86
Coast Guard: Total of awards since 1863	1

NOTE.—The Army records include the Army Air Force during World Wars I and II.

Available statistics from the Army and Navy Departments indicate that approximately 400 recipients of these awards are still living.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday and Thursday next for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, not since the birth of this Nation have its people experienced such a feeling of frustration and uncertainty as seems to be in evidence everywhere today. The fight for our independence was an inspired struggle sustained by a burning ambition and love for freedom. The great civil conflict in which passion met passion brought forth cohesion and greater love of country. Then two great world wars were determined by the might and patriotic action of our people who charted a course and set sail with a confidence and sureness which must attend ultimate victory.

These same Americans, all a part of this generation, who have made possible these last two victories, and who so earnestly hoped for an era of peace and understanding between nations, now find themselves involved in a political and military quagmire from which there seems to be no release obtainable. Hence the predominant feeling of frustration.

It is more than passing strange that this feeling should be abroad in America—a country well known and famous for its unstinted support of its fighting men wherever they have been committed. From some quarters doubt is expressed about the sureness of the leadership of our Nation. Others would blame our Military Establishment, while Congress comes in for its share of the criticism. But, Mr. Speaker, I have my own ideas about the underlying cause for this strange and almost unbecoming attitude of the American people. I lay it directly at the door of a timid and vacillating United Nations organization. What was once hoped to be a great forum for world peace seems to have turned into a great arena where the most vicious international politics are being played at the expense of American blood and prestige. While the United States awaits

the pleasure of the UN to act on the all-important question of declaring Red China the aggressor in Korea, our troops continue to bear the brunt of overpowering attacks by the Red hordes. The American people have been patient and Congress has been more than patient, hoping that the UN would meet its responsibility in a forthright and courageous manner. It is obvious now that good faith on the part of some of our allies in the UN is sorely lacking, and that these timid nations are plunging a dagger into the heart of the UN. That it is dying of its own nonfeasance is tragically true. The failure of the UN to declare the Red Chinese as aggressors has had a far-reaching effect throughout the world. It has not only hurt American prestige, but it has shaken world faith in the integrity of the UN. It has also revealed to Russia a weakness in the UN which is gratifying to them, to say the least. What are our fighting men and those from other nations in Korea saying about this weak-kneed attitude in the UN? Does this tend to stimulate their will to endure the frigid conditions of Korea while they fight an almost hopeless holding war?

While our delegates to the UN have demanded action, I doubt that they have employed language and unveiled threats of sufficient consequence to jolt the UN into action.

As one who has steadfastly supported the United Nations, I have reached the point in my thinking where I am ready to issue an ultimatum to the UN saying without reservation that you either proceed forthwith to brand Red China as an aggressor, or the United States will withdraw from the UN.

This may seem to be a harsh declaration, but timid approaches to this question have failed. It may be said by some that our withdrawal would result in the death of the UN, and perhaps it will, but its collapse is assured anyway if it continues to play politics with this China question. China is in the role of a traitor in her aggression in Korea. China has become an international ingrate in her sell-out to Russia. Whatever her good reasons for civil revolt may have been, there is nothing to justify her attack on the United States in Korea. Our Nation has been a benefactor to China's people and for the UN to refuse to take cognizance of these facts renders it unfit as a forum to determine international problems.

Great Britain has certainly contributed nothing toward securing favorable action in the UN on the China question. She again weighs her position in international trade against loyalty to her one dependable ally in the world. Britain's fear of Russian aggression toward the west has dimmed her view of the tragic situation in the Far East. Britain's and America's interest are inseparable and it ill becomes Britain to drag her feet in the UN while we suffer for her failures.

Although I firmly believe that the ultimate showdown between communism and democracy will come in Western Europe and we, as a nation, must contribute a large share toward Western European defenses, we cannot in good conscience write off Asia to communism. Should the Reds drive the UN forces out of Korea, we could expect them to continue their drive until Japan was completely conquered. The Philippines would be next in their march of aggression.

It has been suggested that we have only two alternatives in Korea—one to make all-out war, and the other to get out. This seems to be true at this time. It is quite clear that China will not settle this issue except on her own terms—terms utterly reprehensible to us. First of all, they would have us withdraw all UN troops, thus putting South Korea in the same danger she was on June 25, 1950. How ironic this would be when we pause to consider our dead and wounded, as well as the total havoc and destruction of the cities and villages of South Korea.

The pages of American history will never become too yellowed with age as to blot out the record of our cowardice if we bow down to those heathen Reds or leave Korea anyway except by force. America is a sleeping giant today while her sons glorify themselves in combat under the most adverse conditions ever known to American fighting men. There is no place for defeatism in our far-eastern effort. This conflict is but a forerunner to others of greater intensity. China should be warned by the United States that unles she shows a willingness to truly compromise the issues involved that the weight of our power—full force—and that of Chiang will be released against her. We are shackled now by the United Nations in a fashion heretofore unknown to this Government. It has placed us at a disadvantage from a military standpoint. Too much reliance has been placed in the UN by the people, and especially by our national leaders, for a diplomatic settlement of this conflict. Too many of us have expected the UN to come up with a magic formula to suddenly halt the war in Korea. What has been the net result? Nothing more than a dangerous cease-fire order which would ultimately mean, if accepted by the Reds, sacrificing Formosa to the Chinese and admitting Red China to the UN.

Congress has a very special responsibility in this grave crisis. As the sounding board of American sentiment it should give some expression of its views to the executive department and to those representing us in the United Nations. I believe strongly that Congress should give prior approval to the commitment of troops in foreign soil and I am convinced that the entire Asiatic situation should be debated to the end that a more positive and definite policy may be established. Is there anyone today who can accurately say what our aims are in Asia? How long are we going to fight China with one hand tied? Are we going to defend Japan if routed out of Korea? Are we going to utilize the army of Chiang? Are we going to wait another 12 months to arm Japan? These are the questions deserving an early answer. It will be too late if we defer positive decisions much longer. Our vitality is being sapped by this freakish war, while our prestige in the world sinks lower and lower. To those who say that the answer is to withdraw from Korea, I would reply that to haul down the flag of our country is an insult to our traditions. Let it be shot down if it must, but hauled down, never.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, in my opinion, has rendered a very important patriotic service in making vocal the smoldering wrath of the American people.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has made a most courageous speech for which I commend him heartily. I just placed in the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar which I commend to the reading of all Members.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also commend the gentleman on a very fine speech. He has given a true picture of the current international situation. I join with the gentleman in expressing the hope that the United States will withdraw its allegiance from the United Nations and reaffirm its allegiance to the United States.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENTS

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of world events and uncertainties in our domestic economy make it incumbent upon us to reexamine our international policies, from time to time. They should be studied in an effort to determine whether our objectives, for which we have given so much blood and treasure, have been achieved.

We entered World War I with the slogan "to make the world safe for democracy," and now there is less democracy in the world than has been seen for generations. We fought a second war to rid us of the menace of dictatorship, only to find a decided increase in the number of dictators, and one at least more menacing than before. In the attainment of these two primary objectives we have failed miserably.

A third objective is founded upon the belief that if we pour our billions into England, France, and the Low Countries, we shall find them standing by us as allies in a third world war. The failure of this objective will bring us the greatest disillusionment and the most humiliating disappointment of all. If anyone believes that England and France, for example, will stand by our side in a third world war, he is indulging in wishful thinking.

The governments in those countries are much more in tune today with Russia than they are with our free-enterprise system. For confirmation, we have

only to look at England with a former Communist as War Minister, and France with one-third of her Parliament claiming membership in the Communist Party. The Communist Party in France is now the largest single influence in that republic. It is larger than any other political party. The armies of France were paralyzed at the start of World War II by turmoil in the government—there is no reason to expect more favorable conditions should we engage in a third world war.

Anyone who understands the Governments of England and France as they exist today, and who believes that those countries will lay their cities open to the attack of atomic or hydrogen bombs by Russia, is just not facing situations realistically. Their attitude toward and their lack of cooperation in the Korean conflict give rise to the belief that their policies will be to drift gradually into neutral corners in the hope that when the blows fall they may escape. If America fights a third world war, there is every reason to believe we shall stand alone.

Some of our leaders in government have tried to be great internationalists—a stage of action for which, by previous traditions and experience, they were ill-prepared. During this indulgence in internationalism we have piled up a Federal debt that threatens to undermine our domestic economy; we see the threat of a third world war which if continued for any length of time will break us financially; we see the loss of many liberties at home, and a threat to a free-enterprise system which has furnished us the means whereby we can keep the lifeblood flowing in Britain's Socialist Government.

These things we have achieved under the banner of internationalism, but they were not our stated objectives. In those we have failed notably. I am primarily an educator. I am in politics in the hope that I may serve our Nation's welfare and for no other reason. But I submit to you, if an educator, after setting up a group of objectives and spending huge sums of money, should miss his mark so widely, that educator would be out of a job.

The time has come when we shall have to think seriously of America first of all. If it is true, as many believe, that we cannot expect much help from European nations in the event of conflict with an aggressor, then let us make this country strong enough to fight its battles alone if need be. This will not be the case if we continue to distribute our manpower and our remaining wealth to the four corners of the earth. We had best keep our guns and ammunition at home because there is not complete assurance that those guns will be pointed eastward in the event of a third world war.

Let us try with every means at hand to preserve the peace and prevent another struggle with the calamitous effect that would follow in the wake of modern warfare, but let us not delude ourselves in the thought that other powers will fight those battles for us. That objective will fail as the others have failed. It is my judgment we shall stand alone, and we must build our strength and conserve our wealth, because as a Nation in that struggle, if it comes, our very existence may be at stake. God forbid that it should come, but there are ideologies on the march in the world today which may compel us to take militant issue.

Some men who are prominent in the field of education and in politics support the theory of a world government as a solution to international problems. A world government is a visionary dream that is bereft of practicality. There is no way in which the various concepts of governments can be reconciled. We even have divisions in opinions here at home. The scheme of gathering all of the ideologies of the world under one government is an undertaking beyond the scope of human effort. Russia has the solution for a world federation in which everyone should be a Communist. We certainly do not wish to live in that type of society. On what basis may we assume that all nations would agree to any proposals we might offer for a world government?

Our duty, it seems to me, is clearly laid out. We must begin to think of saving America first of all. We must conserve our resources. We must keep our people not only militarily strong but strong in the faith in our American way of life that has set us apart from other peoples in so many accomplishments. We must be able to cut through the ideologies of the Old World and awaken new hope in the perpetuation of those freedoms which have made it possible for our country to shoulder such a large share of the burdens of the world today.

A Russian leader by the name of Lenin said a quarter of a century ago:

> Russia will not have to fight America because America will spend itself into destruction.

On another occasion he said:

> The easiest way to promote a bloodless revolution is for the currency of a nation to commit suicide.

We must not permit those dreadful prophecies to come true.

Our President has said:

> We shall resist aggression in any part of the world.

I submit to you we have neither the manpower nor the means to shoulder a responsibility of that magnitude. The highways of the world are strewn with the wreckage of nations and empires that have indulged in ambitious programs of this character. If the pages of history are not sufficiently revealing, let us take a lesson from what is happening in Korea today.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to commend the gentleman, this schoolmaster from Illinois, a State of great school masters, on his intelligent and courageous discussion.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I wish to commend the splendid address of my colleague from Illinois. May I ask, buttressing his thought, is it not a fact that England and France have wrecked themselves in two world wars, and we have had to help them get them back on their feet? After having spent $60,000,000,000 in the First World War and $400,000,000,000 in the Second World War, if we continue to try to carry that load on our back is it not beyond peradventure of a doubt that if we go into a third world war we will wreck this country financially and lose our own liberty?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

DECLARING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 77) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know this resolution will be overwhelmingly adopted by the Members of the House. It is a very short resolution, but one that has been very carefully worked out by responsible Members on both sides. In offering this resolution, I am happy and proud to say, and I want the record to show, that it constitutes the joint action of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself, I as majority leader of the House of Representatives, leader of the Democratic Party in this body, to make the record more specific, and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] as minority leader, leader of the Republican Party in the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not a similar resolution has been introduced in the other body?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand a resolution the substance of which is similar has been introduced in the other body.

Mr. STEFAN. Have similar resolutions been passed by the House of Representatives on other international questions such as this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that now.

Mr. STEFAN. Does this set some kind of precedent?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no precedent on this, because the United Nations is something of recent origin.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is not the present situation utterly unprecedented in the history of the Republic or the history of civilization?

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. My friend was asking me if there was a precedent for this. I assume there are precedents involving important matters in the past, but certainly this is an unprecedented time. The resolution is offered under the conditions it is because of the fact this is an unprecedented time.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that our delegation to the United Nations have already made such a request of the United Nations, that the United Nations as a whole declare the Chinese Communists aggressors?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. It is my understanding that the request has been made of the General Assembly as distinguished from the Security Council, because in the General Assembly the veto cannot operate, whereas it could operate in the Security Council. My understanding is that this is a matter which is now being debated before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. When was this resolution introduced—just this morning?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution is introduced now.

Mr. GROSS. With no other notice of it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman the matter has been very carefully looked into and carefully screened and cleared by responsible members of both parties.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman intend to ask for a roll-call vote on this resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope there will be no request for a roll-call vote on the resolution. There will be no necessity for that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I happen to have some knowledge of the background of this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I want to say that the gentleman has plenty of knowledge about the resolution. I want the record to show that, because the gentleman from Ohio was one of those Members who very kindly and courteously discussed the matter with me. Therefore, I know the gentleman knows a great deal about the history of the resolution.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, the agreement between the leadership is that the program today should be noncontroversial. I wish to say I can imagine nothing more noncontroversial, and nothing on which there could possibly be less controversy in the House of Representatives and among the American people than the pending resolution. I am sure it will not be necessary to have anything but a voice vote on the resolution, because the action of the House, so far as that is concerned, will be unanimous.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman because this resolution shows clearly, not only to the country but to the world, the bipartisan unity of sentiment—the unity of sentiment which exists among all of us as Americans—and many people abroad, particularly those in totalitarian dominated countries or their regimes had better not fail to understand and appreciate the significance of the spirit of America.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman, one of the ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I certainly will support the resolution. However, I think it is rather unusual for the resolution to be presented at this time when it was announced there would be no business. I, for one, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, never knew a thing about it. I am wondering if the matter ever was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state to my friend the reason for bringing it up today is because of the exigency of the moment. I appreciate the fact, of course, that this is an unusual procedure, but this is quite different from the general legislative business which we all want to have referred to the legislative committees. But unusual circumstances call for action today, if we are going to take any action on the resolution at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I believe most of the members of the committee were in town and it would have taken 10 minutes to get together. I think we ought to have known something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot challenge the gentleman's statement in all sincerity and honesty; but so far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, I exhausted all means in my power to ascertain the views of all persons and agencies who might be interested in this, both officially and unofficially, and to see whether or not the necessary screening could be made and clearance obtained for the consideration of the resolution. I can assure my friend that it is only as a result of my feeling that the Members of the House, fully realizing the responsibilities falling upon them as legislators, and particularly the leadership of the gentleman's party, especially with relation to this particular question, would act upon the resolution after it has been screened that I offered the resolution having in mind the importance of the timing. Who can tell what will happen in 48 hours? It was felt that it was very important that this matter be acted upon today. With that I think my friend will not feel disturbed about not having been consulted.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield. I was going to yield time to the gentleman in his own right.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the majority leader. Like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], I am very jealous of the rights and prerogatives of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Ordinarily I would insist that the resolution be referred to our committee. But this is no ordinary occasion. Time is so short, the issue so great, and the necessity for action by this House is so impelling that after talking with the majority leader, the minority leader, and a number of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I feel that it is in the national interest to pass this resolution today.

The first meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been set for next Tuesday and that may be too late for effective action. I believe every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee agrees with the purport of this resolution. I believe every Member of the House who seriously considers the issue involved will be for it, and I hope that it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I merely wish to make the observation that the acceptance of this resolution without protest will evidence that on matters affecting the security of the Nation unity is an actuality.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I presume this resolution will be passed, but I do not want it construed, as far as I am individually concerned, as indicating a willingness on my part to turn over to the so-called United Nations the right to declare war for the United States or to tell us where to go and fight whose battles.

Everyone knows that while the so-called United Nations declared this emergency, they have called on the United States to do practically all the fighting, called on our boys to do practically all the suffering and dying, and now the United States will be called upon to pay the bill.

I do not want this action construed as expressing a willingness to send our boys into China to bog down and lose a million more American men. As far as I am concerned, I am for getting out of the United Nations and having American affairs run as the Constitution requires.

I am not for surrendering our prerogatives to any foreign power or group of foreign powers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you going to yield any time to other Members to discuss this matter?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I told the gentleman I would yield him time in his own right, and I try to keep my word.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's resolution. I was interested to know whether the gentleman feels the same revulsion that I have for the cease-fire order which would oblige us to consult with Soviet Russia and Red China and the British Government about

Formosa and similar matters of that kind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that that is water over the dam now. We know of the action taken by the United Nations General Assembly. We know of the action taken by those in control of the Chinese people on the mainland of Asia. That is water over the dam, so my opinion on it at this time would be more or less irrelevant. This is another issue and another question and another proposition.

Mr. HALE. If the water is over the dam, well and good. I hope it is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know that our distinguished majority leader, before introducing this legislation, discussed it thoroughly with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], with the ranking minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and with the acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], as well as other members of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fortunately I met our friend the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, a few minutes ago and showed it to the gentleman. There is a lot of work in connection with it, you can understand, and I can assure you that as far as I am concerned everything was done from my angle to contact the Members who have a responsibility in this House on this question; but, again, these are all matters which come to a head very quickly if they do; they either do or do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure every Member of the House recognizes that insofar as this particular resolution is concerned, time is of the essence.

I hope that this action expressing the sense of this great body will be a matter of evidence and will receive the deepest consideration by the representatives of all the countries that comprise the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says that time is of the essence in this matter. I remind him that time is of the essence in a number of matters, including doing something about these abnormal prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but I wish now to confine myself to this issue.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I understand. Now I wish to ask the gentleman a question: Is it possible to have this resolution read at this time by the Clerk so that we may know what we are discussing?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may again be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the resolution.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time the United Nations is really on trial. The New York Times carried an editorial this morning headed "UN on trial." I agree with this. This resolution is a matter of paramount importance and it should make a powerful contribution toward the efforts of the representatives of those countries who are members of the United Nations, particularly those representing countries outside of a certain group, in doing the things they should do not only for today but for countless years to come, if the United Nations is to have even the possibility of becoming a powerful instrument internationally for good.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cooperate with my friend, the distinguished majority leader, in support of this resolution. If I had any regret it is that the resolution had not been submitted several weeks ago. Particularly, I wished the resolution could have been submitted befor the so-called appeasement ceasefire vote of several days ago. But be that as it may, the resolution is here, and I hope it is the beginning of a new, of a different course in the Orient than we have followed in the past. Surely the majority leader can be forgiven for not having the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That apparently would have been impossible under the time-limit needs. I understand the United Nations will vote on Monday. We are therefore justified in taking it up by unanimous consent. And I do hope that it will be a precedent in one way. The people of the United States can speak only through their membership in Congress; and the people of the United States are vitally concerned not only with what goes on in the Orient but in Europe as well. We have had far too little real consultation in the past. Congress has had little if any influence in directing our foreign policy. I am somewhat surprised that the present resolution has come to us and I do hope it is the beginning of a departure from secret diplomacy. I join in this resolution and I hope it will be passed unanimously so that the people of the world will know how the United States feels about Communist China.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we can get a resolution through this fast invoking the price and wage controls that we passed last summer?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not a crystal-ball gazer and cannot answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering how much notice the distinguished minority leader had on this proposed resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say in all frankness that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] spoke to me about it yesterday. I told him I was in favor of the resolution. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] just before the legislation was offered today spoke to me and asked me if I was in favor of it. I told him that I would support it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It seems to me, then, if some members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House had 24 hours' notice there is no good reason why all of the members of the committee should not have been on notice.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would not say that is necessarily a fact. When I discussed this subject with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] yesterday none of us thought it would come up today. It was my belief it would just be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, I can realize the urgency of the resolution to be acted upon now if it is to have any effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that what the gentleman says in reference to this resolution coming up today is absolutely correct. However, there are so many things to do it is one of those things that comes to a point with suddenness. The gentleman's statement, though, is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Things like this come up unexpectedly and change a legislative program. All understandings are subject to change, should anything out of the ordinary develop, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has proceeded in good faith.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have no objection to the resolution. It is probably a step that should be taken. But I wonder what the effect will be when word goes out over the country that it was adopted unanimously and only a handful of Members present, and that word will go out. If we want this resolution to have effect, should there not be present here a quorum? I am not asking necessarily for a record vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that there is a substantial number about, and if it is adopted unanimously, that would indicate unquestionably that there is little objection to it among the full membership.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Is it not a fact that passage of this resolution by the House of Representatives here today practically declares war against Communist China? Is it not tantamount to that? Is it not a fact also it is immaterial to precedence and what Members were notified and who were not, it is a matter that this country in general will consider a declaration of war by this

body against Communist China? I shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What we are going through in Korea is pretty close to that.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if it would not be well to direct this at Communist Russia rather than China?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think the Congress of the United States should have been consulted before the United Nations plunged us into this war or before our troops were sent there without our consent? Does not the gentleman think that the Congress of the United States that is charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of declaring war should be consulted before our troops are sent to foreign countries to fight anybody's war?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think I made myself clear upon that point. I stated that I hope that this will be a precedent for continued consultation with Congress when all great questions of policy are involved. Congress represents the people.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want this to go down as a precedent or as an indication that the Congress is surrendering its power to this so-called United Nations, this Towel of Babel in New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support this resolution. I regret it comes so late. I can well understand why it needs prompt action. This sort of House action should have been taken before this.

Ten days ago, on January 9, I made a speech on this subject stating that the United Nations, unless it took the action recommended in this resolution on Red Chinese aggressors, was headed for its last roundup. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] made a speech the same day to the same effect; my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had made a similar speech the day before. A number of Members discussed the advisability of having some sort of resolution, and we contacted the majority leader. We Republicans did not want to have any resolution introduced which would, because of inaction on it, give anybody the idea that the Congress was not interested. Therefore, those who have been interested in this matter did not want a resolution introduced unless we felt fairly certain that it could have support on both sides of the Chamber, and a chance to have it cleared for floor action by the House leadership. I brought up the question of this type of resolution and this sort of action in the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East, which was meeting informally in our committee room, and there was some discussion of it there. All members of the committee were invited to that meeting but, as has been already stated, our committee is not yet formally organized for this session.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. That is one reason I think we should adjourn right now and get this thing off the board, because the gentleman does not speak for the Republican Party.

Mr. VORYS. That is right. I have not been attempting to speak for the party or for the minority on the committee. I am merely saying that I am familiar with a great deal of consultation on this subject with members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but there was no resolution for the committee to act upon formally. Now, I think the trouble with this resolution is that it was not introduced some time before, so it could have been referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee. But our delegation in the United Nations is pressing for action there, and unless action is taken today by the House, it may well be that our delegation in the United Nations will not have the moral support that might come from this resolution. I am, therefore, willing, reluctantly and regretfully, to have our committee bypassed.

Let me say this in answer to some things that have been said:

The UN, despite its weaknesses, has been at least a symbol for the expression of the collective moral judgments of mankind on international questions. If it fails to say soon and overwhelmingly that Communist China is an aggressor in Korea, it will have failed of its purpose, reduced to its lowest common denominator. What the free world can do about aggression, how to do it, involves questions upon which there can be honest differences of opinion. What civilization can do about crime is always a question, but whenever civilization fails to recognize and denounce crime for fear of the consequences of its own moral judgment, civilization is gone. I do not think that civilization has failed in this crisis. If, however, the United Nations fails to record the moral judgment of civilization by recognizing and denouncing this aggression in Korea, it is headed for its last roundup. I hope that, in this grave crisis, the representatives of the free nations of the world act wisely, rightly, bravely, and soon.

With Red China slaughtering Americans every day, I cannot understand those who fear that this action may provoke them. They seem rather thoroughly provoked now. United action by the United Nations will be more likely to calm them down and sober them up than to provoke them.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman on the Committee on Foreign Affairs if they have had a full meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. No; I do not believe there has been a full meeting of that committee. The chairman of the committee has been ill. However, some of the subcommittees have been meeting, not to consider legislation, but to obtain background material and to discuss informally the various and vexing questions that face us in our international relations.

Mr. BUSBEY. Could not the Committee on Foreign Affairs report this resolution out in 24 hours?

Mr. VORYS. I certainly think they would if they got the chance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who has so graciously granted me this 3 minutes that the time was not requested because of any desire to obtain publicity. Permit me also to congratulate the gentleman upon the superb strategy, the outstanding generalship he has shown in presenting this resolution at this time in its present form. Few leaders of a majority party have the ability to obtain from a minority party, which for weeks and months has been vigorously criticizing and condemning a major policy of the majority, an all-out endorsement. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman have jacked this country into a position where they can get world war III without a declaration of war by Congress. The gentleman gets an endorsement of that policy by the opposition.

Just how, when, and by what method the Republican leadership was taken into camp is not known to the minority membership. From the debate so far it appears that but one member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] had knowledge of the intention to take up this resolution today, after we were earlier assured that no controversial business would be brought up today.

The statement of the next-to-the-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the minority side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has assured us that, until the resolution was introduced, he had no knowledge of it. It did not come to the House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, nor with the approval of that committee. Nevertheless, it is here.

The resolution itself is a tricky, weasel-worded, double-talk proposal. It is so worded that no one can vote against it without voting contrary to well-known facts.

The resolution calls upon the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors in the present situation. Everyone knows that the North Koreans were the aggressors when they crossed the thirty-eighth parallel.

Everyone knows that at the present time the Chinese Communists are the

aggressors. Unfortunately now, and for some weeks past, successful aggressors.

The resolution is tricky because if one votes in accordance with the fact, he must vote for the the resolution. But on the other hand, a vote for the resolution will be construed as a vote in favor of United Nations. I want none of United Nations.

Tomorrow the papers will be saying, as will the New Deal internationalist editors, columnists, and radio commentators, that the House—Republicans included—notwithstanding the November vote of the people to the contrary, gave all-out endorsement to United Nations. That the Congress of the United States, notwithstanding the sentiment expressed in the Midwest against surrendering our sovereignty to the United Nations, putting our trust, our confidence, our destiny in the hands of United Nations, is endorsing United Nations with all its blunders, is calling for all-out war by asking United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors. Having declared the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors, the next, the only logical step which will be to ask United Nations to declare war against China. Who will fight that war? The United States.

In the days to come Republicans are going to hear a great deal about the action of the House which will soon be taken. In the days to come we will be told that we have committed ourselves to two things:

First. That we have endorsed and placed our future course of action in the hands of the United Nations.

Second. That by our action today, having requested the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be aggressors, we have, by implication, asked the United Nations to declare war against China.

Added up, the adoption of this resolution is an endorsement of the policy of Acheson, of Truman, of involving us in world war III. It will be cited as a commitment to any war which United Nations may declare.

Bitter, disastrous experience in Korea tells us that the burden of carrying on this war, no matter where it may be fought, will fall upon the United States.

This declaration adopted today is a commitment, we will be told, to the sacrificing of the lives of perhaps a million or more young Americans in what I consider to be a hopeless effort to, with land armies, win a war in Asia—another one in Europe.

Humbly, may I ask, is it not cowardly, is it not a confession of incompetency, of a lack of ability, of statesmanship, for the Congress to ask a powerless, quarrelsome debating society like United Nations to determine the foreign policy of the United States?

In November the people expressed dissatisfaction with the foreign policy of the Achesons, of Mr. Truman. The people do not want war. They certainly do not want a war which is to be fought by foot soldiers in China, in Asia, in Europe, against overwhelming numbers for the salvation of so-called allies who will not do their share of the fighting.

If the internationalists in Congress, if those who are determined to involve us in an all-out world war III, want that issue decided by the Congress, why not bring it up by a plain declaration which all can understand?

Parliamentary procedure prohibits an accurate, adequate expression of opinion as to the method which has been followed in connection with this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not possible that the adoption of this resolution will be construed to mean an endorsement of what the President has done in Korea?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, and worse than that, it is an endorsement of Acheson's incompetency. I am not so much concerned about that, for that is in the past, as I am about the construction of the resolution as it will be applied to future action. I think it is an entirely wrong procedure for any one member or two members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ignore the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], who speaks for the Midwest. I do not see how the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] could do it; I do not see where he gets the nerve; I do not see how he can presume to come in here with that kind of thing, then try to put us on record in favor of the UN, when he knows the people of his State are disgusted with the UN.

The Republican whip was not consulted; the policy committee of the Republican Party was not consulted, so I am advised; certainly the membership as a whole knew nothing of it—there is barely a majority of the Members here.

It is a back-door endorsement of UN, of the Truman-Acheson policy, of getting us into world war III. Talk about democracy in action. Here is a procedure with but a bare majority of the House present by which, without adequate debate, we go on record endorsing UN, asking its aid, when we know it has none to give and no disposition to give it if it had. Our action today may hereafter be construed as a commitment to send thousands of our men to the slaughter grounds. I want no part of or in UN; nor am I endorsing the Acheson or Truman foreign policy.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I think this is entirely too serious a subject to continue without a quorum, and I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Aandahl	Beall	Buckley
Abbitt	Bentsen	Budge
Addonizio	Bolling	Burnside
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Burton
Anfuso	Breen	Byrne, N. Y.
Angell	Brehm	Canfield
Barrett	Brooks	Case
Celler	Hébert	Patterson
Chatham	Hedrick	Perkins
Chelf	Heffernan	Philbin
Chudoff	Heller	Potter
Clemente	Herlong	Powell
Cole, N. Y.	Hillings	Quinn
Colmer	Hoffman, Ill.	Rabaut
Combs	Holifield	Ramsay
Cooley	Howell	Reams
Corbett	Hunter	Rivers
Cotton	Irving	Robeson
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Rodino
Crawford	James	Rogers, Mass.
Crosser	Jarman	Rooney
Curtis, Mo.	Javits	Roosevelt
Dague	Jenkins	Sabath
Davis, Ga.	Jensen	Sadlak
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Hamilton C.	St. George
Dawson	Judd	Saylor
Delaney	Kee	Scott, Hardie
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Denny	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Dingell	Keogh	Sheehan
Dollinger	Kersten	Sikes
Dondero	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Donohue	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	Lane	Stanley
Durham	Larcade	Sutton
Ellsworth	Latham	Taber
Elston	McConnell	Taylor
Fallon	McCulloch	Underwood
Fine	McGrath	Velde
Fisher	McGuire	Weichel
Fulton	McMillan, S. C.	Wharton
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Whitten
Gamble	Mahon	Widnall
Garmatz	Mason	Wier
Gary	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Gillette	Morgan	Willis
Gore	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Granahan	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Green	Multer	Withrow
Greenwood	Mumma	Wolcott
Gwinn	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff
Halleck	O'Konski	Yates
Hart	O'Toole	Zablocki
Hays, Ark.	Passman	
Hays, Ohio	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 268 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DECLARING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the serious situation in the world is uppermost in all of our minds. We have all lost patience with diplomatic niceties when our loved ones are being killed in Korea. Our people back home are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they are expecting our Government to act realistically. My people, and I am sure the people all over the country, want hard-hitting, intelligent leadership not only from the military, not only from the Executive, but also from the Congress of the United States. In my judgment, this is a good opportunity for the House of Representatives to demonstrate the leadership that is expected of it by the people throughout our country. It is unfortunate that the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, Judge KEE, has been in the hospital, and that our committee has not been organized to date. However, this cannot be helped. Normally such a resolution would go to our committee before coming to the floor for debate, but there is not time for this action now.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in backing the resolution that has been introduced jointly by the gentleman from

Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], which says that it is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should brand Red China as a world aggressor. I think it is important to take this action. The firm stand that the United Nations took last summer gave great hope for an enforced peace throughout the world.

It is very disappointing that the UN has not been stronger in implementing the action which it started. It is impossible for the United States to bring about peace in the world by ourselves so we cannot afford to let the United Nations degenerate into a mere debating society. I think we should join the executive department of our Government and our representatives in the United Nations in saying that Red China should be branded a world aggressor. I personally think we should go further and put an economic embargo on Russia and Red China. But that is not the issue here.

The issue before us today is whether or not the Congress is willing to act, to go on record and to show some leadership in strengthening the UN and in bringing about peace in the world. I hope this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there was such a small handful in the House at the time this question came up for debate, I wonder if it would not be possible to have the resolution again read to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible for a Member to offer a substitute or an amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Massachusetts yields for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFER. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood in relation to the Members who are absent today, and in order that their constituents may thoroughly understand the situation, that such Members were justified in assuming that no business would come up today. However, this is a matter of such urgency that it is an exception to the rule. As to those Members who are not here today, I want the RECORD clearly to show that their absence is justifiable and, whether they are Republican Members or Democratic Members, in accordance with the announcement which I made as to the program they were justified in governing themselves accordingly not expecting that any roll call would come up today.

I am anxious that that statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I appreciate the statement that the majority leader has just made for the benefit of those Members who are not here today after some of us had told them that they could be absent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman join in the unanimous-consent request that all Members may extend their remarks, let us say at this point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS CANNOT UNITE ITS OWN MEMBERS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we were saved from an abject surrender in the Korean area by our enemies—not by the action of the United Nations. The United Nations offered to surrender on the terms first proposed by the Communist government of China. Had this been accepted, the United Nations would have forfeited the right to further existence.

Those who are supposed to know now claim this offer to surrender to Communist China was a diplomatic act—that when the offer was made the UN knew it would not be accepted, and when refused by China, the United States could put through a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor. Is this the kind of body the United Nations is? Do we have to go to such extremes in order to get the United Nations to act? It is obvious to everyone that when China troops invaded South Korea, China was guilty of aggression—if the United Nations does not know that much, what useful purpose is it serving? If we are to abjectly bow before the Communist invaders of Korea in order to get this body to see what is going on, and in branding it accordingly, it shows the United Nations is not able to agree on even simple things. The sooner we begin to follow our own direction and refrain from following such an impotent and useless body, the better it will be for us. Who gave the United Nations power over the sovereign United States to move as the United Nations directs in this war? If any such power was given by anyone, it was an unconstitutional transfer of the sovereign power of the people of the United States.

No unity of action can hope to be secured from this body. India wants us to clasp the Chinese Communists to our bosom like a long-lost brother, but what is India contributing to the fighting effort? Rhee, President of South Korea, says that if we permit the Japanese to rearm and enter the war, his army will fight the Japanese, yet he wants us to remain and fight against the hordes of Communist China.

The Japanese should be rearmed. They should enter the war. Nationalist China should be rearmed, and they should enter the war. Both want to fight—are anxious to fight. And what logic is the United Nations exercising in preventing this? India does not want that to happen. England does not want that to happen. First, because India will have to show her hand—either be for us or against us. England does not want war with China; second, because she will lose her trade with the Communists, which she has already recognized. England does not want to lose Hong Kong, the center of her trade. If the wars should spread to an all-out war with Communist China, England will have to fish or cut bait. She is either with us or against us. There can be no half-hearted action taken if we intend to stop the invasion of South Korea. That is what the United Nations is up against—there can be no agreement among nations with such diversity of interests.

The purpose of the organic act of the United Nations was to stop aggression; an attack on one nation would be considered an attack against all nations in the United Nations.

How can aggression be stopped? If it could be stopped by reason and argument, then the United Nations was unnecessary. The United Nations was set up to stop aggression by force if necessary, and when force has to be used, the United Nations suddenly discovers that the available force is the United States; that other nations in the United Nations, like India, do not want to use force. England shies away from it. Western Europe has only eight divisions. South America—all the nations there—do not have a man on the battlefields. Yet they are strong in debate. Not one of these nations has stood up to the problem. They have side-stepped and let us take the brunt of the defense of their security, as well as our own.

All nations owe us money and are maneuvering to get more, and, to get right down to talking common sense, most of these nations hate us—or will if we do not give them more money.

It was a grave mistake to start loaning to these countries in the first place; it would be a bigger mistake to keep it up. If the United Nations will just fold up for a while and keep still, I think it possible for us to rearm Japan and Nationalist China and clear the Chinese Reds out of Korea. Stop that aggression. Finish our job. And then obey no more orders from an incompetent, unaccountable body named the United Nations.

Following that, we should make no move to wade into Europe to defend lukewarm nations who apparently do not want to defend themselves. We can, if we do not change our course, so deplete ourselves in resources and manpower that we shall be unable to defend ourselves.

Until the other members of the United Nations show signs of wanting to stay united and fighting in one common cause, we should not depend upon them

in the slightest degree. The United Nations got us into this war in Korea, but we cannot depend upon it to get us out.

Debate, procrastination, unlimited policy of the United Nations has clearly demonstrated that we ought never to transfer any of the sovereignty of the United States to the United Nations or any other body under the sun. The members of the United Nations will have to realize one thing clearly—that we do not need their help nearly as much as they will need ours, and that we absolutely cannot prepare for our own defense and, at the same time, prepare the defenses for every member of the body. I think it is evident that we have the spirit to defend democracy; and if our partners cannot be moved to a spirit of self-defense, it is just as certain as night follows day that the purpose and objects of the United Nations has utterly failed.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been some pretty wild remarks made here. This is certainly not a declaration of war against Red China nor is it an endorsement or ratification of President Truman's action in sending troops into Korea without consultation with Congress. The resolution merely says it is the sense of the House that the United Nations declare that the Chinese Reds are aggressors. If they are not aggressors, I do not know the meaning of the word. The United Nations should have taken this action a long time ago. If they do not do so now, they might as well pack up and go home. The American people will have no further confidence in the organization.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for some of us to understand why this resolution should come to the floor without notice to the membership or even to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to which it should have been referred. It has been suggested that it is an emergency matter. I ask the question: Where has the leadership been in recent weeks? In what respect has the situation changed by which all at once and without notice the leadership brings this resolution to the floor?

It appears that not more than a half dozen of the 435 Members of the House even knew it would be submitted today.

It is not the resolution that I criticize, but it is the manner in which the leadership of this House and the administration it represents is handling legislation and is guiding the affairs of this country. The least you could have done is to have let this resolution go over for 2 or 3 days. If it were so important, as you now indicate, then you should have brought it before the House 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe the resolution offered jointly by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the Democratic leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican leader, expressing that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should vote affirmatively branding Communist Red China as an aggressor in Korea, is timely and should be adopted.

There can be no logical argument against the fact that Red China is the aggressor in Korea, and there should be no hesitation on the part of the United Nations to adopt a resolution to make this a fact and removing all doubt as to the aggressive position Red China has assumed.

In my opinion the resolution should also be adopted to uphold the hands and give support to the capable and courageous United States representative at the United Nations, Warren Austin, as well as to give support and encouragement to some of the doubtful nations that will soon be called upon to vote on the resolution at Lake Success.

It is time, and I trust not too late, for the United States to take a clear-cut and undeniable position on the Korean crisis in order to remove any doubt of appeasement or lack of courage on the part of this Nation in declaring that Red China has taken a wanton and aggressive position in Korea for which they, with the help of Soviet Russia, shall stand responsible before the peoples of the world.

All of the red tape and dilatory debate at the United Nations should be limited to a minimum in coming to a conclusion on this resolution and by the adoption of the resolution before us by the House of Representatives, we will have, in my opinion, expressed the desire and intention of the vast majority of the American people.

Those member nations of the United Nations who, for one reason or another, may vote against the adoption of a resolution branding Red China the aggressor in Korea will, in my opinion, thereby place themselves in the position of being unfriendly to the United States and unwilling to fight Communist aggression with the only effective weapons Red China and Russia will respect, namely, strength, courage, and force. Time is of the essence in this instance, and it is my hope that this resolution will be speedily adopted and that consequent effective action will be taken by the United Nations at once.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the principle of this resolution. There is no question, in my mind, that the Chinese Communists are aggressors.

However, I am sorry it came before the House in the manner in which it came, namely by unanimous consent obtained, when there were only a few Members present on the floor.

We all know from our experience that sometimes there are lurking dangers in matters submitted to the House for its consideration. We do not know what the ramification of the present proposal may be. I am not charging bad faith on the part of anyone. However, I saw a statement the other day which I could not keep out of my mind as I was listening to the discussion of this resolution and when I voted for the resolution. It was made by Mr. Nehru, of India. It was to the effect that if we declare the Chinese Reds aggressors that may shut the door to further negotiations and it might start a world war.

By our vote today we have not gained one vote in the United Nations. We have a representative there, and a very capable one, in Senator Austin. Why not leave the handling of the matter to him who has been on the firing line for us ever since the United Nations was organized. He will know how to handle it to the best advantage to ourselves and to the free world.

Impulsive actions frequently bring bad results. The world is so explosive today that we must weigh our words and weigh the consequences of our conduct as a Congress. Individual Members may make irresponsible and sometimes audacious statements. But the Congress, before it acts, should proceed with caution, with full knowledge of the implications of its conduct, and, with the background of exhaustive and intelligent investigation by one of its committees. That was not had in this case. And since our expression was not required to get the necessary votes to pass this resolution through the United Nations and since our State Department has already expressed itself as being desirous of getting such action I do not see why we should rush through Congress a bill, that in a way, strait-jackets the conduct and the efforts of our own representative in the United Nations.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally the charge is made that Congress abuses its responsibility as a legislative body. And occasionally, in the past, hasty and ill-advised action by the House has made that charge understandable.

Today, however, the Eighty-second Congress of the United States recklessly and irresponsibly abdicated its duty by adopting without serious consideration and under shotgun procedure a resolution that is fraught with unlimited perilous possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, America can probably survive a weak Congress or even a stupid one, but it cannot survive a Congress that abdicates its deliberative responsibilities.

On Wednesday, January 17, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], made the following categorical pledge to the House membership:

> There will be no legislative business at all on Friday.

But at 1:30 Friday afternoon we are suddenly called to vote on a resolution of unlimited implications.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled and ashamed to be part of such a travesty on our system of parliamentary government. I protest this betrayal of our duty.

If this affair is a sample of what the American people are to expect from now on from Congress, we are already lost to totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that the procedural tactics of this afternoon will never be repeated in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in the war in Korea. I voted for this resolution because I have long felt that Communist China is the tool of the Soviet Union, carrying out the aims of the Kremlin to destroy all freedom-loving nations. Certainly our boys in Korea recognize that the Chinese Communists are evil aggressors, and the American public has long been

of the same mind, despite the failure of our State Department to come to the same conclusion until a few weeks ago.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the resolution did not go far enough. The resolution should also have pointed out that the United Nations has been derelict in its duty in not taking unified action against the Chinese Communists when the first hordes from Red China crossed the Yalu River last October and invaded Korea. It has been a great tragedy that the UN has failed to awaken to the realities of the situation, instead of degenerating into a debating society over the vital and obvious fact that Red China is an aggressor. It is my sincere hope that the UN will act immediately to officially take the same stand made today by the representatives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that as this resolution is passed by the House the same Secretary of State is still in office who fostered and developed the policy which enabled Communist China to send its forces into Korea. It was Mr. Acheson who told the American people that we could do business with the Chinese Communists and that we must force the government of Chiang Kai-shek to submit to the atheistic and totalitarian policies of the Kremlin. It was Mr. Acheson who said, "We must let the dust settle in China," and who abandoned the Nationalist Government, our wartime ally in the struggle against the Japanese, thus allowing the Red hordes to sweep across Asia.

To carry out the full intent of this resolution, which implies that we must abandon the false concept of appeasement of communism so long favored by the present Secretary of State, I urge the President to remove Mr. Acheson from his high office and replace him with a man in whom we can have real confidence at this grave hour. It is essential that this action be taken if our people are to develop a unified and affirmative American foreign policy to meet the challenge of Communist aggression at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, now that the House has taken this positive position in opposition to the aggression of the forces of Red China, I call upon the President to enlist immediately the active support of Nationalist China in the Korean War. The help of the 500,000 troops of Chiang Kai-shek now on the island of Formosa would greatly relieve the pressure on our American boys now holding the line against a numerically superior Communist enemy in Korea. It would help to return more of our boys home alive. There is no sensible reason for continuing to refuse the offer to help extended to the UN by Chiang, and I urge that we welcome the active support of Nationalist China, the only anti-Communist force in China which has offered to come to the aid of the free world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and I addressed the House on the subject of the crisis faced by the United Nations. We asked at that time that this world organization realistically face up to its obligation to declare the Chinese Communists aggressors. I shall, of course, support this resolution and only regret that the action was not taken earlier. It is conceivable that, if we had acted last week, our representatives in the United Nations would not have bowed to the demands of other members for further appeasement in the Far East.

Fortunately, the rejection of the so-called cease-fire resolution by the Peiping regime has relieved this country from the necessity of sitting down at a council table with the murderous brigands who have been slaughtering United Nations troops, consisting primarily of our own American boys.

If the United Nations now lacks the moral integrity to denounce the big aggression by Communist China as they did the little aggression by North Korea, it will undoubtedly mark the end of any usefulness of that agency for the maintenance of peace.

When the United Nations took action last June at the time the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, we assumed 90 percent of the burden of resisting aggression so far as manpower is concerned and 100 percent of the burden in financial expense, of what was designated as a police action.

In dollars we are in the red as a result to the extent of more than $14,000,000,000. But that is only a relatively minor incident when one looks at the casualty figures and sees that our announced casualties to date are over 45,000. Of these, 8,000 have been killed. No dollar sign can describe that loss. Only the families and loved ones of these heroes can sense the true significance of our Nation's sacrifice.

If the decision taken by the United Nations in June is now to be compromised and its moral effect set at naught either because member nations are unwilling to sacrifice economic or financial advantage, or because they fear the military power of the Chinese Communists or their Russian masters, certainly it will be our obligation to reexamine our unwavering adherence to the cooperative spirit which constitutes the very lifeblood of an organization dedicated to international cooperation. While we have again and again demonstrated our willingness to make concessions for the sake of achieving unity, there is a point beyond which we cannot go in permitting our own hands to be tied and our decisions coerced. We have already passed this point. This resolution will serve notice that we in Congress realize this fact, as do those whom we represent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Idaho moves that the resolution now pending before the House be committed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 30, noes 161.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DR. GORDON S. SEAGRAVE

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the unprecedented resolution a few moments ago, and which I have been advocating, and considering the world-shaking events that are taking place, it is rather difficult to resolve our thinking down to a human individual. However, I want to bring to the attention of the House today a very brief story of a great American who at this very minute is languishing in a prison cell in a foreign country thousands of miles from our beautiful city of Washington.

Briefly, I would like to submit this statement:

THE WORTH OF A HUMAN INDIVIDUAL

Mr. Speaker, the world is passing through a period of great confusion and uncertainty. It is a time when thoughts of war and the threat of war weigh heavily upon us all. This Congress once again is being called upon to consider measures of far-reaching consequence to the future of the Nation and, indeed, to the future of all mankind.

Because the problems with which we must deal are of such an enormous stature we may hesitate to concern ourselves with matters of lesser dimension. Because war is a tragedy of such incalculable proportions, we may be less inclined to dwell upon a tragedy which threatens a mere individual and his family—especially when it is being enacted in a land remote from these shores, in a setting unknown to most of the Members of this House.

But it is in the nature of our way of life that we do not ignore the individual no matter how pressing may be the tempo of the times, no matter how manifold the difficulties which confront us.

It is in the nature of our way of life to do all we can to right a wrong done to any man, and to alleviate his suffering if that be possible.

Because I believe with all my heart in this way of life, Mr. Speaker, I venture to bring before the House, the tragic story of one man. I speak of Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave. That name is vaguely familiar to most of us. The men who fought the early campaign in Burma during World War II would know it well. Countless native physicians and nurses who were trained by him would recognize it. And those of us who followed Stilwell's epic retreat into India during 1942 will remember the equally heroic story of the Burma Surgeon, who likewise authored the Burma Surgeon Returns.

Mr. Speaker, for a quarter of a century, Dr. Seagrave lived and toiled in Burma. He went abroad as a medical missionary with a dream, a basketful of salvaged surgical instruments, and a faithful wife. He went back to the land in which he was born, for generations of his family before him had lived and served as missionaries in Burma.

Dr. Seagrave did not settle into the ease and luxury of the foreign colony in Rangoon. Carried along by a driving spirit and a determination to serve humanity, he went north into the country of the Karens, a large ethnic group, which had shown much inclination to embrace the Christian faith. Among these people, in the village of Namkham, some 500 miles north of Rangoon, Dr. Seagrave and his family finally settled down. During the years that followed, he labored with these people to establish a modern hospital. He tended the sick. He trained nurses, doctors, and public-health workers. Thousands of people lived better and healthier lives because of his inspiration.

Then came the war. His hospital lay in the path of the early Japanese invasion of Burma and Seagrave was forced to leave it. He joined General Stilwell as a medical officer and throughout the conflict served with Stilwell's Chinese soldiers, receiving for his devotion to duty several decorations and the plaudits of the allied world.

With the defeat of Japan, Dr. Seagrave returned to his beloved hospital service. The willing hands of neighbors joined with his in rebuilding that remarkable center of healing in the wilderness of northern Burma.

This good man wanted nothing more than to carry on with his vital work. He had no mission, no aim, except as a service to humanity to heal the sick and to train native doctors and nurses to do the same.

Events in Burma, however, were to rule otherwise. Scarcely had that country become independent in 1948 when revolts flared in many areas. Among those who rose in armed rebellion against the Government were the Karens who believed that their group was entitled to a greater degree of autonomy than the Burmese Government was willing to grant.

Dr. Seagrave's hospital once again lay in the line of fire. This time, however, he did not leave. He felt, as he had every right to feel, that both sides would understand his position, that they would recognize, notwithstanding the unfortunate civil conflict, that his work was for the good of their country as a whole.

The town of Namkham changed hands several times in the course of rebellion and Dr. Seagrave found himself first under one jurisdiction then under another. In these circumstances his position became increasingly precarious. He sought to do the right thing and in view of his experience this right thing was to preserve the hospital for the benefit of all Burma and to aid the sick and the hurt.

Suddenly, on August 18, 1950, Dr. Seagrave was arrested by officials of the Government of Burma who were then in possession of the town. He was flown to Rangoon and charged with treason. For weeks he languished in jail, where he suffered from serious illnesses.

His long trial began on October 12, 1950. This week, on January 17, he was convicted of treason in helping the Karen rebels and was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment. That sentence, I am given to understand, is now being appealed to the high court in Rangoon. I do not wish, therefore, to say anything here on the floor that may prejudice the ultimate decision in any fashion whatever.

I may state, however, that I have followed this developing tragedy from its inception. Dr. Seagrave's experience is but the misfortune of one man and his family—the shattering of a noble dream of service to humanity. It is, at the same time, a part of a far larger misfortune—the grave internal difficulty which confronts the new nation of Burma and the possible deterioration of relations between the Burmese and ourselves.

CONGRESSIONAL MISSION TO BURMA

Mr. Speaker, I was in Rangoon on September 20 and 21 in 1949. I was there as a member of a mission sponsored by this House. On my return, I reported to the President and to the Speaker on my observations. I had found a country—a beautiful country, highly endowed by nature—wasting away its blood and treasure in civil strife. Conditions of life were so insecure that the principal government officials found it necessary to work behind guarded barbwire barricades.

Mr. Speaker, in these circumstances, the people of Burma—Karen and Kachin and Burmese alike—were unable to enjoy the fruits of their newly won independence. So far as I am able to determine the situation has not changed to this day. Real peace still eludes those unhappy people.

INTERNAL PROBLEMS OF BURMA

I well know, Mr. Speaker, that the internal problems of Burma must be solved primarily by the people of that country themselves. But it is the duty of all peoples, no matter where they may live, to work for peace and to speak out for peace whenever there is an opportunity to obtain it without the sacrifice of principle. In 1949, I urged that Burma seek to find peaceful solutions for its internal problems and I do so again today. I do so, in part, because I believe such a solution to be in the best interests of that land and, in part, because I realize that if there had been peace Dr. Seagrave would be going on now with his noble work instead of languishing in confinement in Rangoon.

I repeat that I believe the internal problems of Burma must be solved by the Burmese themselves. Dr. Seagrave's case, however, appears to me to be not exclusively an internal problem. It is rather, one which has grave implications for the future of our own relations with Burma. I do not refer merely to the fact that he is an American citizen. I have in mind an observation which I made during my stay in Rangoon and which I duly reported on my return. It was my opinion then, and nothing has since occurred to change it, that American missionaries were being subjected to undue pressure and harassment in carrying on their work.

ADONIRAM JUDSON AND JUDSON COLLEGE

I refer particularly to the Judson College question which came to my attention at the time. Judson College is an institution of higher learning in Rangoon which was established some hundred years ago by Adoniram Judson and which was operated by the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society until it was closed by the Burmese Nationalist Government. Throughout its existence this school has sought to serve Christianity by serving the people of Burma. Many of the present Burmese leaders received their education at Judson. In spite of its record, however, that school has been taken over by the Burmese Government, and this Government has so far failed to pay any compensation for its occupancy, or the payment to the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society of New York City of its claim which represents a one-half undivided interest in the college.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Seagrave's ordeal and the Judson College affair may seem unimportant in a world which is already at war in Korea and totters on the brink of a much greater catastrophe. But it is precisely in such matters—seemingly local and isolated in themselves—that friendship or enmity between nations very frequently begins.

Our country desires to maintain friendly relations with Burma. I think we have already given some evidence of our intention in this respect. When the Union of Burma obtained its independence, we were among the first nations to extend recognition. Since that time we have instituted a number of measures of cooperation. Out of funds obtained from the sale of United States surplus property in Burma, we have established a Fulbright program with that country. Under this program, it has been possible to send American teachers to Rangoon and under Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act, Burmese have been brought to this country to study and to teach.

We are now prepared to go ahead with a well-rounded program under ECA which will provide assistance to Burma in agriculture, public health, industry and national economic development. Projects are under consideration which should help the Burmese to help themselves in building a more stable, a more fruitful, and more progressive nation.

Mr. Speaker, all these arrangements represent cooperation between the people of Burma and the people of the United States. They can have a real, a lasting meaning, however, only if they are conducted in an atmosphere of trust and tolerance and respect on both sides.

DEEP CONCERN BEING EXPRESSED BY OUTSTANDING AMERICANS

It is for this reason that I particularly deplore the tragedy which has overtaken Dr. Seagrave. In a very real sense, he represented a major link in the relationship between our two countries. He is an American, a fine American who has devoted his life to serving the people of Burma. Here is a telegram which came to my office yesterday from Dr. Theodore Adams, outstanding theologian and church leader, and minister of the First Baptist Church of Richmond, Va.:

Deeply deplore action against Seagrave. Have known him for years as personal friend, able missionary, and loyal American.

This is typical of the many wires and letters which I have received. When I was in Rangoon, I had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Seagrave, who is a noble and courageous woman. For years she worked by the side of the doctor in Burma, managing to help him in his work while at the same time raising a fine American family. She has since returned to this country and is now living in Baltimore and I have been in constant touch with her concerning her husband's plight.

THE URGENCY OF THE RELEASE OF DR. SEAGRAVE

Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to understand all the circumstances surrounding the arrest, trial, and conviction of Dr. Seagrave. I do know that the conditions of unrest which prevail in Burma and which I have described were a major factor. I do know, too, that his permanent removal from the service of the Burmese people would be a genuine loss to them and to Burmese-American friendship. It is for this reason that I am contemplating introducing a resolution in this House calling on the President to urge the Government of Burma to release the doctor and to restore him to the service of humanity.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As a member of the Baptist denomination I want to thank the gentleman for the speech he has made here today in behalf of Dr. Seagrave. I have known of the Judson missionary movement in Burma for many, many years. It has made a valuable contribution to the life of the Burmese community. I share with the gentleman my deep concern over the arrest and conviction of Dr. Seagrave and I am hopeful that the appellate court will reverse the lower court in its findings.

Mr. DEANE. They should. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As the gentleman perhaps knows, I served for 3 years during the war in the China-Burma-India theater and am personally familiar with the remarkable work which Dr. Seagrave did in Burma. I have been at his hospital and know of the untiring devotion which he gave to his work there. Although there may have been personality differences which caused some differences of opinion regarding his service at the time, I feel certain that I can speak for the hundreds of thousands of men who served in that theater in saying that we certainly hope there will be a different issue of the present trial in Burma than the one which has happened today. I feel sure that all of the world hopes and rather confidently expects that the appellate court will, as I would put it, see the light in this case.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman.

THE NEED OF MAINTAINING FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN BURMA AND THE UNITED STATES

In closing, Mr. Speaker, my motive in this respect, I repeat, would not be to intrude upon the internal affairs of Burma. I would do so only because I believe that the cause of friendship between our countries would be strengthened by such a course and because I believe with all my heart that Dr. Seagrave, who already has given so much to Burma, can still be of service to the people of that land. I therefore respectfully request the officials of the Burmese Government, in behalf of my colleagues and myself, and the great number of outstanding Americans who know, love, and highly respect Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave, to effectuate his release and thus avoid the strained relations that are developing in this country toward the Burmese Government because of the unjust treatment toward this great American, Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave.

ANOTHER COSTLY BUREAUCRATIC ERROR

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a source of never-ending amazement to me is the working of the bureaucratic mind, as it may be observed here in Washington.

For the most part the bureaucrat performs a dull task, over and over, until even the reason for it is forgotten.

Small wonder, then, that he falls into a mental state wherein the task itself, rather than its purpose, becomes all-important.

Only too often, as a result, when he is faced with the necessity of a change, even in some small detail of his routine, he becomes so confused as to make the most ridiculous errors.

We see it happen almost every day.

But this tendency toward bureaucratic absurdities is not confined to Washington alone. Wherever bureaucrats operate, sooner or later, one of these horrendous asininities crops up.

The latest to be called to my attention is described in a letter from one of my Michigan constituents.

He is one of those farmers who spends his winter evenings nowadays in poring over the complexities of an agricultural income-tax report, instead of hustling through with the chores so he may drive into town for the movies, the church supper, or the dance in the Odd Fellows hall.

Now it appears that he, and all his fellow agriculturists in the State, have been left dangling as the income-tax deadline approaches.

Uncle Sam demands, under severe penalties, that income-tax returns shall be made promptly. But the tax forms—the proper ones at least—have not arrived.

It seems that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is seeking to get away from use of the short form, 1040A, and to require that everyone possible shall use the longer form, 1040.

The purpose, of course, is to keep a closer check on individual returns, and thus discourage chiseling under the prospectively higher tax rates.

One can easily picture some bureaucratic underling, in the offices of the Michigan collector of internal revenue, deciding that here was a chance to get after those farmers who fail to report as income foodstuffs consumed off the farm.

So Michigan farmers last month received four copies each of tax return form 1040, instead of the long and complicated agricultural income-tax return.

I gather from the letter that most Michigan farmers, of recent weeks, have spent many of their daylight hours driving frantically from one village post office to another in their sections of the State, waving useless 1040 forms and demanding the proper agricultural forms.

Their evenings, it may be surmised, have been spent in worrying about the whole thing, because the agricultural forms were not at once available.

No doubt the Michigan collector of internal revenue, when the error was discovered, moved at once to correct it. But it seems to me pretty silly; this business of vainly trying to plug one tax money leak at the expense of an even greater one.

I wonder whether this kind of thing is happening all over the country.

One letter of several I have received concerning this matter follows:

HOMER, MICH., *January 16, 1951.*

DEAR MR. SHAFER: I wonder if anyone has tipped you off in regard to the very costly error made in regard to farmers receiving the wrong forms and being forced to chase from one post office to the other to obtain farm returns for income tax.

Last week the branch county farm bureau in a radio program explained a very con-

fusing and bothersome error had been made and farmers were receiving the wrong blanks, etc.

Then Monday along came ours and therein were four 1040 forms which, as you know, cannot be used in agriculture. If this is prevalent in Michigan, what a costly error for we tax burdened public. What an expense this is as those blanks, which no doubt cost a plenty, are thrown to the wind. To me this is gross inefficiency and in such an agency as this, should be curtailed. This probably does not come within your jurisdiction. However, it being in your district it probably is of some interest.

You need not answer this communication as it is not necessary. Far from a fair deal, it's a rotten deal to have to chase your legs off over such a mess and then listen to economy. Everywhere one meets his neighbor looking for blanks.

Yours truly.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, while I am looking forward to the possibility of serving on the great Committee on Agriculture in the House with anticipation, it is also with considerable reluctance that I am leaving the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee has served, I think, a very, very useful function, not only within the Congress but to the people of the United States.

When I first came to Congress after a special election I was assigned to the Committee on Executive Expenditures. My first subcommittee activity was that of the Rizley subcommittee charged with investigating the disposal of war surplus. That chapter in the history of our country, as most of you recognize and appreciate, was not a very happy one. Millions, yes, billions of dollars' worth of physical assets of our country were dissipated in the disposal program. This disposition, of course, at the time our investigation was taking place, had largely been accomplished, so that in essence we were more or less locking the stable door after the horse had been stolen.

The great challenge that came to me out of that experience, however, was why such an occasion should happen and what could be done in the future to prevent its recurrence. It developed during the course of our investigation that the armed services had no uniform cataloging, nor did the supply agency or the disposal agency that was charged with disposing of this material have a cataloging system whereby they could know what they had to sell and dispose of it in an orderly, efficient, and economical fashion. For this reason, as I previously stated, billions of dollars worth of material were sold more or less on a pig-in-a-poke basis and a great loss was sustained by our Government and the taxpayers.

There is a way that this can be corrected, and I think largely as a result of the investigation of our committee the armed services through the War Munitions Board established a project designed to correct the situation. They called this the Federal cataloging program. It was designed to bring into the armed services, having been joined together as a common unit of defense, a common unit of cataloging, so that the armed services could better distribute their procurement, could make their procurement more economical, and in the event of the declaration of material as surplus such material could be disposed of by a civilian agency economically and efficiently.

The subcommittee upon which I served in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments passed during the Eighty-first Congress a bill establishing the General Services Administration. This was a counterpart attempt on the part of the Congress to set up a logical, clear-cut, and efficient agency to take care of the procurement needs for the civilian branches of our Government. It was also charged with the responsibility of distributing or disposing of surpluses generated even by the armed services. This surplus material could not, as I have previously stated, be disposed of efficiently unless the civilian disposal agency knew what they had to sell. The armed services, in embarking upon a Federal cataloging program through the agency of the War Munitions Board, estimated when it was inaugurated in 1948 that it would take 4 years to complete this project involving many hundreds of technical employees so that the job could be done efficiently and effectively.

The subcommittee of which I am a member has conscientiously followed the progress of this project. A year ago, or less than a year ago we called Admiral Ring up for a conference before our subcommittee and we asked him to give us a statement of the progress of this Federal cataloging program, which he did. At that time we urged him to step up the progress of this program so that it could be completed because even then it was evident we were going to embark upon an enormously increased procurement program for the armed services, and it was highly important that the job of cataloging, and the catalog itself, be established thoroughly before our agencies were charged with receiving vast quantities of material. They have assured us that this program will be completed during the year of 1951. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is chairman of the subcommittee that has been following the progress of this project, and just before the adjournment of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress we made a trip to the naval depot at Mechanicsburg, Pa. At that time we were impressed with the progress being made, but likewise were we impressed with the tremendous tasks involved. I would like to give you just one simple little illustration, if I might, which will, I think, show the vastness of the project and how complicated it can become. We were told up there, during the course of our inspection, that as simple a thing as a cotter pin, the same identical cotter pin, had 1,108 different listings within the naval depot at Mechanicsburg. That says nothing about the listing of the same particular commodity in the other branches of the service, or even other divisions of the Navy. That meant there had to be 1,108 receptacles for this cotter pin at the depot. There was no way of knowing when the cotter pins were exhausted from one of those 1,108 compartments; there were 1,107 other compartments from which the same identical article may have been secured. So you go all through the whole series of procurement possibilities. As a matter of fact, when we totalized the items of use within the three branches of the armed services we found they totaled more than 12,000,000, and it was estimated that by eliminating duplications, and near-duplications and overlapping, the total number could be reduced to approximately 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 items.

The saving, Mr. Speaker, for the taxpayers, to say nothing of the increased efficiency of the armed services, will be tremendous. The taxes for the coming mobilization program are going to be very high; of that we can be assured. So I would say that the greatest possibility for actually saving money, to say nothing of increasing the efficiency of the armed services, can be accomplished if the Congress and the agencies which are carrying out this program coordinate their activities and insist that it not be a paper project but that it actually become a reality.

There is one other factor which I want to discuss briefly in conclusion, because it involves more than just merely a uniform cataloging system of common-use items. It involves the procurement of matériel. Let us take the subject of clothing for the armed services. There are just so many companies in this country that are capable of making and which will make clothing for the armed services. In the past we have found a great scrambling on the part of the procurement agencies of the various components of the armed services competing with one another for these production facilities. As a consequence, many times one branch of the armed services would tie up unneeded proportions of our production facilities. As a result, other branches would either have to insist upon new establishments being set up or would have to do without. So this involves a coordination of the purchasing program.

Here is another factor that I think deserves your consideration: For example, suppose there are six companies that are making clothing for the armed services. In normal times they have been producers of civilian clothing. We will say the armed services are going to require the production of about one-third of the total output. I suppose we could demand

that two of those companies convert entirely to the making of armed services clothing. In order to do that they would have to give up their civilian market, which they would be loath to do. But you could take one-third of the production of all six of those companies and they would give you a better price, because two-thirds of their production facilities would be left for the maintenance of their civilian market. So the Federal cataloging program involves more than just getting material. It involves a coordinated procurement program that will enable the various branches of the armed services to achieve their goal, and do it in an orderly fashion; and to see that each branch of the service gets its requisites, and that it does not pile up unnecessary supplies. In that way they will be assured that next year they will get their equitable proportion of the production facilities.

I particularly wanted to make this statement to the House because I think the whole idea and the whole goal is important, not only to the Armed Services Committee and to the Appropriations Committee but it is important to the Ways and Means Committee from the standpoint of taxes. Certainly it is of great importance to all Members of the House. It is my fond hope that the House will continue to support this Federal catalog program and to insist that the armed services make of it a reality, and that the civilian component of our purchasing program also coordinate its activities and adopt the same catalog, which they are prepared to do, by the way, so that any surplus generated by the war will follow in smooth, logical fashion to the channels of disposal, and the tremendous waste that was entailed after World War II in the disposal program will not be repeated at the conclusion of this great struggle in which we are presently embarked.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I completely agree with what the gentleman has said with respect to the importance of the program, and the importance of bringing this information to the attention of Members of the House. I think the gentleman has performed a real service in calling it, not only to the attention of the House but to the attention of the general public as well, because only from that source can we get the emphasis needed to put these reforms into effect.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has given us a very interesting account of his work on this committee. I feel sure that we all share his view, that the study which he has advocated should be continued. As the gentleman leaves the Committee on Expenditures to go to the Committee on Agriculture, I feel personally, and I know a great many others share the same view, that I would like to express to the gentleman our thanks for the great aid which he has given us in resolving the questions that have come out of his committee. I personally have always turned to the gentleman from Indiana, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] for advice in connection with the problems that have come from his committee. I am personally grateful to the gentleman from Indiana for the distinguished service which he has performed.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that I express my very best wishes and hopes for the continued success of the great Committee on Expenditures of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

A REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, JANUARY 19, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House, it is my privilege to again report to the Congress the views and feelings of the people of my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama. This report from my people is tremendously important, in my opinion, because of the deep feelings they have expressed to me in this grave hour.

The serious world situation is uppermost in their minds, and let me tell you they have no patience with diplomatic niceties when their sons, husbands, and loved ones are being sent to war, some of them for the second time in the last decade, and many parents are receiving that dreaded telegram from the Adjutant General saying "I regret to inform you—." The people are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they expect our Government to act realistically.

The Ninth Congressional District of Alabama wants two-fisted, hard-hitting, intelligent leadership from the Executive, from the military, from the Congress, and from everybody in a place of public trust. Let no one forget this important fact as our people are being rallied to make greater sacrifices and greater efforts which are necessary for the protection of our country.

The people of my district have been ready to go all out for some time. They are willing and able to do whatever is needed to protect our country if given a reasonable plan of action and the fighting leadership which we must have to be successful.

My people know that Korea is worse than the Pearl Harbor of World War II which left no doubt in anybody's mind about the job we had to do. They also know that our direction and objectives have not been clarified in this crisis and that the necessary measures to protect our country have not been put into effect. They want bold leadership, with a positive course of action toward a definite goal. They want the best brains in this country drafted to help the executive branch of our Government steer that course. This includes the decision on when and where to use the atomic bomb.

Although the President has the chief responsibility for foreign affairs, my people feel that Congress should not just sit back and rubber stamp the plans and programs of the executive department. Charting the destinies of 151,000,000 American people in this shrinking, explosive world is too grave a responsibility for the Executive alone and my people expect Congress to take an active part in the formation of our foreign policy. The world's greatest deliberative body should deliberate on the world's greatest question—the question of bringing about peace—and come up with some realistic solutions to our dilemma.

The people of my district and Alabama have always been foremost in rising to the defense of our country in time of crisis when the danger and course of action were fully understood. They will not follow blindly. They want to know the whole truth about the dangers we face, the odds that are against us, and the reasons for the course we take.

The fact is—and we might as well face it—that we are at war with Russia although the fighting at the present time is taking place in the Far East. We are already in a war for our freedom here at home, if not for our very existence. The odds against us are greater than at any time in the history of our country. Nothing short of an intelligent plan of action to fight the Communists inside and outside our country, backed by the full force of the people, will prevent our destruction.

It has been next to impossible for my people to reconcile the bitter reverses in a far-off land with what they have seen here at home. On the one hand they have suffered the loss of loved ones in Korea, the drafting of young boys, the rising spiral of inflation, the call for greater sacrifices, and an instinctive realization of the gravity of the world situation. On the other hand they have seen inadequately trained troops sent into combat without proper reinforcements, the publication of secret military data, enactment of half-way control measures, the lack of cooperation among the two political parties and the Executive in cleaning out the Communists in Government, talk about police action in Korea, the small amount of support from members of the United Nations, failure of the UN to brand Communist China as an aggressor, the insistence by England on UN recognition of Red China, and continued war shipments by the allies to Russia and her war-making satellites.

Is it any wonder that great hope of a simple, easy solution was aroused in so many minds by the speeches of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT? They said much that I agree with, but they also left out some impelling facts about the world situation that must be taken into account.

It has been suggested that small United States garrison forces could hold out in different parts of the world while friendly nations rearm. This is impossible. The slaughter of our troops and the capture of friendly nations would be a certainty in an open military conflict. Who can trust the Soviets to stop military aggression of their own accord? It has been inferred that America can

stand alone. The facts do not give much support to this theory. We may be forced into such an undesirable position but it would be a short-sighted policy indeed to fail to help the development of economic, religious, and military resistance wherever we can find it. How else can atheistic aggression be stopped before it reaches our own shores? Our task will be increased a hundredfold if we try to go it alone.

All of us agree, however, that first priority should be given to building up our own defense. We demand it. We must also demand greater effort on the part of our allies, if they are to expect continued assistance from us. Not one of these countries, with the exception of Turkey, has waked up to its own peril to the extent of taking adequate military action.

Withdrawal of our troops from Korea may be a military necessity and it may be the wisest policy in view of the prospects of being thrown into an all-out war with China. So far China, with 450,000,000 people, has unleashed only a small part of her military forces. She has millions more in reserve. Russia is using Korea as a proving ground for tactics and equipment in preparation for bigger things to come. The solution depends upon our over-all policy regarding whether or not to abandon the entire Far East.

If we do not abandon the entire Far East, then all available forces must be used to stop Russia in that general area wherever and however it is militarily possible. The wraps must come off. Our fighting men and their families deserve this consideration. This would include strategic bombing wherever it is to our advantage. It would include the use of Korean guerrillas and troops, the estimated 1,500,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, the 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa who must be rearmed, the Japanese, and other friendly nations. All must be used in a way that is most advantageous to our cause. Among the objectives of this course of action would be to prevent Russia from getting added industrial power and to keep her from being able to concentrate entirely in Europe.

To abandon the entire Far East will mean the immediate collapse of Japan, a country that has no arms at this time but has great industrial power. Another result of such a policy would be to leave Formosa and the friendly guerrillas in Korea and China helpless. The Philippines and Alaska would be seriously threatened so that the direct effect would be to move the war zone closer home and destroy the morale of our allies in Europe.

The same policy of withdrawal applied to Europe would mean the inevitable collapse of such industrial powers as Germany and England, along with the entire European Continent. This would hand over to Russia control of about 90 percent of the world's manpower, and a combined industrial capacity comparable to ours, backed up by the world's largest army—an army which is ready to go into action now.

In case we withdraw from Europe and the Far East either voluntarily or involuntarily, we could not count on anything but war coming to our own shores very quickly in the most devastating form yet known to man.

The greatest deterrent to a world war now is the temporary advantage we hold in the quantity and quality of the atomic bomb. However, we must bear in mind that Russia can send over one-way, suicide, sneak A-bomb attackers and level some of our cities at this very time. The power of our A-bomb is not great enough to win a war alone and our superiority in this field is fast diminishing. We must strengthen ourselves immediately to make up for this loss. The second greatest deterrent to a world war now is our long-range advantage in production which must be thrown into high gear before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, our people in the ninth district are representative of America in that they have too much faith in our way of life, too much character, vitality, and independence to bow to Russia. My people know down deep in their hearts that the forces of evil are not going to conquer the world ultimately. Atheistic communism cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot dominate the souls of men very long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. The religious and freedom-loving peoples of the world are slowly but surely lining up solidly against Russia for a showdown. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, who will be living to enjoy freedom again, is in direct proportion to the speed, vigor, and intelligence with which we tackle this task together.

The freedom of America was not easily won and it will not be easily defended. The safest course, Mr. Speaker, is bold, common-sense action. I submit the following programs for immediate consideration and urge their inclusion in our emergency policies:

First. Bring in top leadership for Government service and set up a permanent advisory commission to the President, on foreign affairs.

Second. Initiate a full-scale debate in the House of Representatives on foreign policy, adopting programs that have the backing of our people which is so necessary for success.

Third. Mobilize all industry; catalog every citizen according to his capabilities for emergency national service; step up production; work to keep production lines rolling.

Fourth. Stop publicity and leaks of secret military information which have caused unnecessary loss of lives.

Fifth. Concentrate on the improvement of our military intelligence.

Sixth. Place a complete embargo on Russia, Red China, and Soviet-dominated countries. Put more pressure on all countries who are sending war materials to Russia to prevent future shipments.

Seventh. Enact a plan for the Government to finance the war on a pay-as-you-go basis in the fairest possible manner. Cut out unnecessary nonmilitary spending.

Eighth. Effect across-the-board controls, including price and wage controls, to stop run-away inflation which threatens to wreck our economy.

Ninth. Mobilize and fully train the necessary Armed Forces as quickly as possible, with particular emphasis on a permanent training program.

Tenth. Utilize the Japanese and Chinese Nationalists to the best possible advantage in the far-eastern war.

Eleventh. Speed up the mobilization of the army of Europe, pressing into service German, Spanish, French, and Yugoslavian troops.

Twelfth. Let Russia know we will use the atomic bomb when and where it will do the most good.

Thirteenth. Improve our counterspy and espionage system and make use of DP's in this connection as much as possible.

Fourteenth. Develop a strong civilian defense program.

Fifteenth. Take the initiative of world leadership away from atheistic Russia.

Sixteenth. Ask for divine guidance as our country is being called upon to lead the free world in the most crucial period of our history.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, January 19, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress), I hereby appoint the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: PAUL BROWN, WRIGHT PATMAN, ALBERT RAINS, RALPH A. GAMBLE, HENRY O. TALLE.

Respectfully,

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and include in one a telegram and in the other extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a bill he is introducing today on unification of Ireland.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. KELLEY of Pensylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post by J. A. Livingston.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Dr. M. J. Horsch.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include quotations and other extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. TOWE) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include resolutions by a group of American Legion posts and a statement by the Association of American Colleges.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a newspaper story.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial in each instance.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. D. Hayes Murphy.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he delivered today.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BREEN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

90. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter recommending a change in the proposed universal military service bill submitted by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

92. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

93. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the report of the American National Red Cross and the retirement system of the corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat., p. 599), entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross", as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 1, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

95. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

96. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

97. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

98. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

99. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to regulate the interception of communications in the interest of national security and the safety of human life"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the third annual report of claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1950 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1725. A bill to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1726. A bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1727. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school-construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1728. A bill to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1729. A bill to amend section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to cooperation with State commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1730. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1731. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1733. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1734. A bill providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1735. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under the Organic Act of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1736. A bill relating to the excise tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1737. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1950, to provide a definition of the term "State"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1738. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1739. A bill authorizing an annual appropriation to provide more adequate facilities for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1740. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1741. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of a circuit court of the Territory of Hawaii after 10 years of service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1742. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1743. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1744. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1746. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1747. A bill to amend the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1748. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1749. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1750. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 1751. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1752. A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1753. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1754. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1755. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1756. A bill to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings, instituted by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1757. A bill to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1759. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1760. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1761. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1762. A bill for the safety of life and property by making all commercial fishing vessels subject to the rules and regulations of the United States Coast Guard marine inspection; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1763. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1764. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1765. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces in the Philippine Islands during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1766. A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1767. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1768. A bill to establish the requirement that political statements concerning certain candidates for public office shall contain information relating to sponsorship and cost of publication or transmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1769. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing a domestic supply of soft fibers from kenaf and ramie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1770. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism while serving with the Armed Forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend section 131 of title 4 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1773. A bill to create a commission to enable the qualified voters of each State to register their opinions as to the national foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1774. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1776. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1777. A bill to permit candidates in all services to qualify as aviation cadets without a college degree by abolishing present advanced educational requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1778. A bill to amend section 402 of title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1779. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships

for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1782. bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under 17 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1783. A bill making an appropriation for the preservation and repair of the Tower of Victory at Washington's Headquarters and Museum, Newburgh, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 1784. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1785. A bill to provide certain benefits with respect to disability or death suffered by a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces from an injury incurred while training under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1786. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1787. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1788. A bill to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts for professional legal services with approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution relating to peanut acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 78. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 79. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Alleged Abuses in the Education and Training Program of World War II veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing an increase in salary for an employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to a photostatic copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into and ratified by the Governor on behalf of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Zirkelbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Guiseppe Veic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Maria Benkiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Bella and Archie Kennison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Chin Hien Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Kuraichi Honke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Mokutaro Murakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1803. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Oseto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Yoichi and Uto Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takino Kajikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1806. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ichi Yoshioka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1807. A bill for the relief of Sumie Kira Sakamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1808. A bill for the relief of Yonekichi Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1809. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masa Izumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1810. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Setsu Takamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo Ishizuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shizu Takamura Asami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumi Tanimitsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1814. A bill to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Hideo Ishida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Shoemon Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Eiichi Kishida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Hego Fuchino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1819. A bill for the relief of Hisamitsu Kodani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1820. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Anastasios Theofilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1821. A bill for the relief of Izumi Makiyoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1823. A bill for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1824. A bill for the relief of Andrew M. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1825. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1827. A bill for the relief of Laurance Anthony Warnock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1829. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Remzi Gurcay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 1831. A bill to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 1832. A bill for the relief of the Old King Coal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 1833. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of J. Ellis Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carla Mulligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russi Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1839. A bill to restore and continue in full force and effect patents Nos. 4,750, 16,436, 21,258, 17,679, and 23,984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H. R. 1840. A bill for the relief of Bernard Spielmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of Capt. William Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Sam Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of James Zaloba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Margaret Frankell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of the aliens Nicholas Partheniades, Catherine Partheniades, and their son, Constantine Partheniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Thomas O'Hare, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of the alien Hanna Florian Sulner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1853. A bill to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Maria Roza Tarnowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Papavasiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Antonio Luciano Musacchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of James Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of sundry Australians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to render judgment on certain claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW (by request):

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Arthur DeWitt Janes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

16. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Tioga County Pomona Grange, No. 30, urging a United Nations police force of volunteers trained and equipped under the direction of the UN and ready to serve anywhere in the world a crisis may arise, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, in the abundance of Thy goodness another day is added to the record of life.

"Lord, for tomorrow and its needs we do not pray,
Keep us, our God, just for today."

For a day which now possesses great prospects, set Thou a seal upon our lips that no fault or error might mar its record. Grant unto us the clear shining light of truth for our minds as we seek in Thy will the best for those whom we have been called to serve. May Thy servants make daily the choice of spiritual integrity above the corruption of the world, and have clarity of insight amid the confusion of the present hour. "Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it." In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until January 29.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 2 weeks, beginning Wednesday.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Hunt	O'Conor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions and present matters for insertion in the RECORD and in the Appendix of the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 48)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended,

establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 22, 1951.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PORT ASHTON PACKING CO., SEATTLE, WASH.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the claim of the Port Ashton Packing Co., of Seattle, Wash., said claim being in excess of $3,000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases, for the calendar year 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-fourth annual report of the Commission, dated November 1, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the final valuations of certain properties (with accompanying pamphlets); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, submitting, pursuant to law, additional reports on Federal civilian employment for 1950 and Federal office space for 1950, which, with the accompanying reports, was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to aid to our enemy

"Whereas through the medium of the American press, the people of America have had their attention directed to the fact that for many months immense quantities of rubber have been consigned to Soviet Russia, mainly from British Malaya, thence to the Chinese Red Government, and that some cargoes have even been transshipped from England under licenses of the Board of Trade, which is a section of the British Government; and

"Whereas these shipments are being made in the hours of our bleakest and blackest critical moments during our war in Asia with the full knowledge of the British Government, and especially at a time when natural rubber is becoming scarce and costly in America, and while we at this very moment are reactivating our synthetic rubber plants in order to stockpile for national defense; and

"Whereas recognition of the Chinese Red Government by any nation currently a member of the United Nations, in supplying war materials to our foes, either directly or indirectly, is a betrayal of America, which on all other occasions has made the sacrifice of life, limb, and property to make this world a peaceful place in which to live; and

"Whereas while over 50,000 members of our Armed Forces are already listed out of Washington as being casualties of this dreadful aggression in North Korea, we find that Great Britain, although a member of the United Nations, is still supplying rubber to the ruthless enemy which, given the opportunity, would take over their country in the same manner that they have already succeeded in conquering and taking over other small nations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (joint), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes President Truman and the Congress of the United States to petition the British Government to refrain from supplying rubber to the Chinese Red Government, and also petitions the United Nations to go on record to refrain from giving aid of any nature whatsoever to the Chinese Red Government, or to any nation which supplies help to the Chinese Red Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of these United States, Harry S. Truman, to the United States Senate, to the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the congressional delegation from California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D. C., signed by Charles W. Holman, secretary, enclosing a pamphlet entitled "A Dairy Policy, 1951" (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Advisory Council to the Employment Security Commission of Wyoming, at Casper, Wyo., relating to the earmarking of all moneys collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for use as funds for Federal and State costs of administering the employment security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., favoring the granting of citizenship to alien mothers and fathers of sons who lost their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Whereas it has long been apparent that the fighting in Korea is and has been far more serious and consequential than any mere police action; and

"Whereas American forces are being murdered daily by the combined armies of Asiatic communism; and

"Whereas the United Nations, although it embarked in this momentous action as a collective action, continues to hesitate regarding sufficient measures for conclusive success in Korea and refuses to declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea: be it

"Resolved by the Eighty-seventh Indiana General Assembly, That we unmistakably assert that we oppose any further delay in bringing about a showdown in the United Nations;

"That we call on the delegates of the United States at the United Nations to obtain immediate and unequivocal condemnation by the United Nations of all aggressors in the Far East or else resign;

"That our State Department demand of the other members of the United Nations that they send to Korea immediately sufficient ground forces to enable American troops now there to continue the fighting there or else that we evacuate our men from Korea;

"That the President and the Congress of the United States proceed to enforce a military and economic blockade of Communist China;

"That the President and the Congress of the United States announce and enforce a military defense of Formosa;

"That the President and the Congress of the United States proceed to support with adequate arms and with dollars military opposition by the Chinese Nationalist Government against the Chinese Communist revolutionists;

"That the President and the Congress of the United States proceed immediately to assist in the arming of Japan and accept Japanese help in the common and combined opposition to Communist aggression in the Far East; and

"That the President and the Congress of the United States immediately shut off all further military and economic aid to any nation which indulges in traitorous trading with Communist Russia and with the satellites of Communist Russia; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the considered and unqualified recommendation of the Eighty-seventh Indiana General Assembly that the President and the Congress of the United States should enforce a vigorous and conclusive policy or "all out or get out" in Korea, and that this Nation obtain from the other members of the United Nations effective support of all collective action against Communist aggressors or else develop and initiate its own national program of home security and assistance for those threatened or attacked by aggressors."

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM KOREA—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA SENATE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Senate calling upon Congress and the President to withdraw our troops from Korea, develop a strong home defense and unify American views on foreign policy.

The resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolution calling upon Congress and the President to withdraw our troops from Korea, develop a strong home defense, and unify American views on foreign policy

Be it Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That the Congress and the President of the United States are respectfully urged to take immediate action for the following purposes:

1. To withdraw all troops and military personnel from Korea;

2. To recognize the principle that no political or military commitment with respect to foreign policy that may involve the lives of Americans is binding upon the people of the United States unless it is first approved by the Congress;

3. To strengthen our continental defenses and prepare for effective action when the safety of our Nation is imperiled;

4. To provide leadership on foreign policy in which the people may have the utmost confidence; and

5. To provide the people of the United States with realistic information so that public opinion may crystallize in the form of a unified and unselfish foreign policy that history will applaud.

6. To disassociate ourselves from the Korean policy, a policy which has brought to our youth the tragedies of war without a candid recognition of the existence of a state of war, a policy which has made us the policeman of the United Nations without the United Nations assuming full responsibility for the eventualities of police action, a policy which risks war without first determining whether the objects sought are worth the risk, or a willingness to accept the risk when encountered.

That a copy of this resolution be signed by the president and secretary of the senate and sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to each Congressman and Senator from North Dakota.

RAY SCHNELL,
President of the Senate.
W. J. TROUT,
Secretary of the Senate.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF STOCKHOLDERS' MEETING OF FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the thirteenth annual stockholders' meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., favoring the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 3

Resolution on St. Lawrence waterway

We believe that the Nation would be far ahead in meeting the present emergency if the St. Lawrence waterway had been made reality, as was possible, many years ago. We continue strongly to favor this development as being in the interest of the whole Nation. We urge that the administration and Congress put new energy behind this project to hasten its realization.

We continue to favor regional development along the lines of TVA, to insure full use of resources. A Missouri Valley Authority is long overdue. Recent blunders in Pick-Sloan procedure illustrate the point.

We also favor the expansion of barge line transportation on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

These developments are justified, whether we shall enjoy peace or are forced to mobilize.

WORLD PEACE—LETTER AND STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter received from Msgr. Luigi Ligutti of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, conveying to me a statement adopted by the executive committee of that distinguished organization at a recent meeting held in Milwaukee. The statement pertains to specific ways and means of promoting world peace by removing causes of social injustice and economic disorders. I know that the statement will be of interest to my colleagues. I know, too, that all groups in our population, particularly farmers, realize how vital will be the role of food in trying to prevent world war III by removing hunger, malnutrition, and so forth.

I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of Monsignor Ligutti's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD to be followed thereafter by the text of the statement of the executive committee.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, January 19, 1951.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing herewith copy of official statement issued recently by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference at the executive committee meeting held in Milwaukee, Wis. The committee felt that it would be of interest to you as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The following Catholic bishops are members of our executive committee, were present and collaborated in the formulation of the statement: The Most Rev. A. R. Zuroweste, D. D., bishop of Belleville, Ill.; the Most Rev. William T. Mulloy, D. D., bishop of Covington, Ky.; the Most Rev. J. H. Schlarman, D. D., bishop of Peoria, Ill.; and the Most Rev. Vincent J. Ryan, D. D., bishop of Bismarck, N. Dak.

The committee felt that it was expressing not only the prevalent sentiment of the Catholic Church in the United States, but of the Catholic Church throughout the world.

We commend the statement to your thoughtful consideration.

With every good wish and the deepest sentiments of esteem, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

L. G. LIGUTTI,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT FORMULATED AND APPROVED AT THE SEMIANNUAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE, HELD IN MILWAUKEE, WIS., JANUARY 9–10, 1951

Christian men have a duty in conscience to help their neighbor in grave need so far as they are able without serious harm to themselves. Duties which individuals cannot perform devolve upon nations and international bodies. It is important that the obligation be not lost sight of at a time of crisis when we in this country are naturally concerned about our own safety and defense. Both morally and strategically our position becomes weaker if we abandon aid to world neighbors while still in a position to help them economically or otherwise.

Russian communism is a political and military force attempting to bring all freemen under its domination. But it is also a social and ideological force which seeks to convert men to a way of life alien to Christian and democratic tradition. It subverts nations and individuals by vain promises of security and improvement of their social and economic lot. In combating this world-power drive the United States must not trust in arms alone, but must do its utmost to improve the conditions of spiritual and material welfare of men everywhere still within the reach of our aid. To neglect assistance of this type would be to shirk our duty.

The foreign policy of the United States should aim at removing the causes of social injustice and economic disorder. It ought to do what is possible to help men help themselves to a better life, so that they will be happier individually, and as nations more ready to resist Communist promises and aggressions. Since the end of World War II our economic assistance has done much to preserve the freedom of Western Europe, which is the source of our culture and religious beliefs. That experience should be a lesson to us as we enter into a new period of resistance to aggression.

The misery, poverty, and social instability which are too prevalent in some parts of the world must be remedied to the best of our ability at the same time as we put arms in the hands of men to defend themselves against aggression. The United States must direct its economic assistance toward improvement of living conditions in Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America. In social justice and Christian charity we must not neglect the needs of our world neighbors, especially at a time when this would decidedly weaken their ability and will to defend themselves.

Specifically we urge:

1. That the technical assistance program, both through the UN specialized agencies and bilaterally, be strengthened and expanded. Our dollars for peace must bear some proportion to our expenditures for defense.

2. That economic aid to western Europe be maintained to the extent necessary and be integrated into the defense program.

3. That in underdeveloped areas, where conditions of land tenure may be both unjust and unproductive, the little man be given a stake in land ownership and farm management. The United States should do what it can to promote legitimate and efficient capitalistic land reform programs.

4. That in the United States our own farmers put forth their best efforts to meet domestic and international food needs, within price levels consistent with the general level of living costs. A defense period should not become an occasion of profiteering on the part of any group, farmers included.

AID TO COUNTRIES IN COMMUNIST SPHERE OF INFLUENCE—RESOLUTION OF WOOD COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from J. A. Schindler, county clerk of Wood County, Wis., a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of that county in protest to the policy of the United States of giving aid to those countries which are still furnishing supplies to the Soviet area. I believe that the Wood County resolution expresses the views of countless Americans throughout our country because it is obvious that our American people will not tolerate the supplying of

the very men who are killing American boys in Korea.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 19

Whereas certain nations receiving aid and assistance from the United States of America, have transferred and furnished to countries under the Communist sphere of influence materials which may and have been used in warfare; and

Whereas certain countries under the Communist sphere of influence are now engaged in open warfare against the forces of the United Nations; and

Whereas the youth of the United States in the forces of the United Nations are engaged in mortal combat in the battlegrounds of Asia against the armies of certain countries under the Communist sphere of influence: Be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Wood County, Wis., in regular session assembled go on record in protest to the policy of the United States of America in giving aid to foreign nations, which are furnishing countries under the Communist sphere of influence, materials which may be used directly or indirectly in the waging of warfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk of the county of Wood, Wis., be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Alexander Wiley and Hon. Joseph McCarthy, United States Senators; Hon. Reid F. Murray, Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin; Hon. Melvin R. Laird, Jr., State senator; Hon. W. W. Clark, member of the assembly; the Wisconsin County Boards Association; and the clerks of the various counties of the State of Wisconsin.

THE KOREAN SITUATION—LETTER FROM R. A. MARTINSON—PETITION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, many of my constituents are wrought up and terribly disturbed over our military reverses and heavy casualties in Korea. They are unable to understand our failure to use the atomic bomb and our other lethal weapons against the hordes who are annihilating our much smaller fighting forces in that very cold, very rough, and very distant land.

I agree with my Colorado folks that we should either give our men our full support or get them out of Korea.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a letter from R. A. Martinson, Jr., and the petition to the Government adopted by a mass meeting at Boulder, Colo., pleading for more support for our troops, signed by Mr. Martinson and 135 other citizens of Boulder, Denver, Littleton, Mitchell, Lafayette, Longmont, Eldorado Springs, and Berthoud, all in the State of Colorado.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures, as follows:

BOULDER, COLO., *January 8, 1951.*

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are enclosing copies of the Denver Post and Boulder Daily Camera concerning the meeting held here in Boulder by the Committee for Decision in Korea. Although the meeting was called on very short notice, a group of almost 200 persons responded and an overwhelming majority supported our program.

We are also enclosing a copy of the petition we are circulating with a typewritten list of names of those who signed the petition at the meeting.

We appreciated very much your appropriate remarks during the telephone call in which you participated, and wish to thank you for your cooperation.

If possible, we would like to have the petition embodied in a resolution and presented before the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

COMMITTEE FOR DECISION IN KOREA.
R. A. MARTINSON, Jr.

Senator, we have suggested to Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN and to Representative WILLIAM HILL that the petition be embodied in a resolution as suggested above. If it can be accomplished, we sincerely hope that you three will work as a group to draw up the resolution.

PETITION

1. We, the undersigned, believe that an immediate decision must be made by our Government in the Korean situation.

2. We believe that our Government must either grant to our military leaders the authority to use every weapon and to strike the Chinese Communists at any target necessary to successfully carry out the Korean operation, or that all American troops in Korea should be withdrawn immediately.

3. We believe that the needless loss of life in this conflict which is due to our refusal to give complete support to our troops is morally wrong.

4. We believe that if there is a reason for the present policy of fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our back, that the American people deserve to know that reason.

REUBEN A. MARTINSON, Jr.
(And 135 other citizens).

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 18) to increase the limit of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, reported it with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 571. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 573 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 574. A bill to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 575. A bill for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 576. A bill providing for disposition of Indian tribal funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Taro Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 578. A bill to provide that the absence of any individual for 20 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 579. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Jean Marie Newell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Toshiki Ishigo and his children, Kiyoko and Chiyiko Ishigo;

S. 582. A bill for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 583. A bill for the relief of Emiko Ono;

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Kue Hin Wong;

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Suenori Fujii; and

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Solyman G. Hamlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Christos Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 588. A bill for the relief of Juan Sustarsic;

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer; and

S. 590. A bill for the relief of Francesco Gaber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 591. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Karl-August Wagner, Magdalena Wagner, Klaus Peter Wagner, and Kathrin Margarete Wagner; and

S. 593. A bill for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 594. A bill for the relief of Kaj Ivan Winther and Ingeborg M. Winther;

S. 595. A bill for the relief of Bedrich Donath, Vera Donath, and Brigitta Graetzer;

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Spyridon V. Karavitis;

S. 597. A bill for the relief of Matei Ghica-Cantacuzino;

S. 598. A bill for the relief of Titus Radulesco-Pogoneano;

S. 599. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos; and

S. 600. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 601. A bill for the relief of Robert Stokvis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 602. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Wanda Charwat and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat;

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Enrico Barsotti;

S. 605. A bill for the relief of Constance Chin Hung; and

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka; and

S. 608. A bill for the relief of certain natives of the Dodecanese Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 609, to provide for the enlistment in the Regular Army of certain aliens, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 610. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 611. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 612. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; and

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 614. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 615. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 616. A bill to raise the limit placed on the monthly disability compensation payable to veterans suffering from service-connected quadraplegia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 618. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes;

S. 619. A bill to amend the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes;

S. 620. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; and

S. 621. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. ECTON):

S. 622. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 623. A bill for the relief of Eva Ruttkay;

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Hajna Sepsi; and

S. 625. A bill for the relief of Ilona Lindelof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co., a Nevada corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That in performing the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, agreed to February 20, 1950, the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to employ on a temporary basis during the Eighty-second Congress such technical, clerical, and other assistance as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of Senate Resolution 8, and ask that it be read, and that it be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 8), as modified, was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are authorized and directed to meet jointly to consider and report recommendations on whether or not the Senate should declare it to be the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress. Such report, which shall be approved by a majority of the combined membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, shall be limited to the subject matter of this resolution, shall not contain any recommendation on any matter which is not germane thereto or which is in substantial contravention thereof or any recommendation either approving or disapproving the assignment of ground forces of the United States to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty, and shall be made on or before February 2, 1951."

REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN ALCOHOLICS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the leaders on both sides. There was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary Senate bill 265, to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics. It is the same as S. 692 of the Eighty-first Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 265) and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMISSIONS AND GRIEVANCES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAR ASSOCIATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 15 speaks of the Committee on Admissions and Grievances of the United States District Court, but in fact refers to the Committee on Admissions and Grievances of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. It has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is our opinion that the committee should be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Edgar P. Caffrey, of Reno, Nev., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada, vice Robert L. Douglass, resigned.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Albert Schrage, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Glen E. Ogden, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

AMERICAN GROUND TROOPS IN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding the sending of ground troops to Western Europe delivered by Senator BUTLER of Maryland before the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator CAIN regarding the contribution of industry in the Pacific Northwest to the defense effort, together with a letter from

Jack Hickman, president of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CEASE-FIRE ORDER IN KOREA—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PRESS

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Vote To Pay Blackmail," relating to the proposed cease-fire order in Korea, published in the Cleveland Press on Monday, January 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEASURES FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMATHERS

[Mr. HOLLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator SMATHERS before the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Alexandria, Va., on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW MUCH ARE YOU WILLING TO SACRIFICE FOR PEACE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PETERSBURG TIMES

[Mr. HOLLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Are You Willing To Sacrifice for Peace?" published in the St. Petersburg Times of January 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. HOLLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials and an article commenting on an address by Hon. James A. Farley to the State Chamber of Commerce of Florida in November 1950, the first entitled "Farley Looks at November 7," from the Bridgeport Post of November 24, 1950; the second entitled "Mr. Farley Woos the South," from the New York Herald Tribune of November 23, 1950; and an article headed "Heffernan says Farley makes a diagnosis," published in the Brooklyn Eagle November 30, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials commenting on a recent address by Hon. James A. Farley, one written by David Lawrence, and published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat November 23, 1950, one published in the Charleston (S. C.) Post on November 23, 1950, and the third in the Savannah Evening Press on November 22, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF FARMERS TO THE DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual convention of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, in St. Paul, Minn., January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

COURAGE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "We Are Americans; Let Us Act Now as Americans Should," published in the Saturday Evening Post last week, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN-CONGRESS AMITY NEAR—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Truman-Congress Amity Near," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star January 19, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL—ARTICLE BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Omnibus Budget Bill Is Blessing to the Taxpayer," written by Senator SMITH of Maine, and published in the Washington Daily News of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DRAFT OF AMERICAN YOUTH—EDITORIAL AND REPLY BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "We Agree—But," published in the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 13, 1951, together with a reply by Senator MARTIN, dated January 17, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

STOP THAT LEAK—ARTICLE BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Stop That Leak," written by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, and published in the January 1951 issue of the DAR magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WELFARE AND SAFETY OF OUR COUNTRY—ADDRESS BY J. CARROLL CONE

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. J. Carroll Cone before the Woman's National Democratic Club, on January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM—LETTER FROM GEN. LUCIUS D. CLAY

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, regarding the work of the organization, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARLES E. WILSON, DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the testimony of Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, before the Committee on Small Business, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING WORLD WAR III—ARTICLE BY HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Hon. Frank P. Graham containing recommendations for preventing World War III, which appears in the Appendix.]

A DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE ON ALMIGHTY GOD—BY DR. ALBERT P. SHIRKEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Declaration of Dependence on Almighty God, prepared and delivered by Dr. Albert P. Shikey, pastor of Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROLE OF LABOR IN THE WAR EMERGENCY—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. HARRISON

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Economic Club of New York, on January 17, 1951, at the Astor Hotel in the city of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide," published in the January 22 issue of Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE PROGRAM SEEN BACK DOOR TO FAIR DEAL—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Program Seen Back Door to Fair Deal," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Star of January 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF THE 1950 GUBERNATORIAL VOTE IN CALIFORNIA

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the vote in the gubernatorial election in California in 1950 between Governor Warren and James Roosevelt, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO ARE THE ISOLATIONISTS?—EDITORIAL BY A. Q. MILLER

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Are the Isolationists?" written by A. Q. Miller, publisher of the Bellville Telescope, Bellville, Kans., which appears in the Appendix.]

LACKING IN BUSINESS SENSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE ELDORADO (KANS.) TIMES

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lacking in Business Sense," published in the Eldorado (Kans.) Times of January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. BENNETT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's Strict Economy Budget Begs for Congress' Knife," published in the January 16, 1951, edition of the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

BANK OF NORTH DAKOTA SETS OPERATIONS RECORD—ARTICLE FROM THE GRAND FORKS (N. DAK.) HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bank of North Dakota Sets Operations Record," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald, of December 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORTH DAKOTA MILL OPERATION PRAISED—ARTICLE IN THE GRAND FORKS (N. DAK.) HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "North Dakota Mill Operation Praised," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD SITUATION AND AMERICA'S PART—EDITORIAL FROM THE WYOMING STATE JOURNAL

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "If You Agree, Write Your Senator," published in the Wyoming State Journal, Lander, Wyo., of January 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

COST OF AMERICAN ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM THE CONCORD DAILY MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sanity Gets the Brush-Off," published in the January 11, 1951, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor, of Concord, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIA STARVES HERSELF—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "India Starves Herself," published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPORT FOR THE TROOPS IN KOREA—EDITORIAL FROM THE MANCHESTER (N. H.) EVENING LEADER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Back Up Our Boys, BRIDGES Demands," published in the January 6, 1951, edition of the Evening Leader of Manchester, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARCH OF DIMES CAMPAIGN—TRIBUTE BY MILFORD E. SHIELDS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute in verse to the March of Dimes campaign, written by Milford E. Shields, of Durango, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

WORK ACCOMPLISHED BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE DURING EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement coming from myself, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, with reference to the work accomplished by that committee during the Eighty-first Congress itself. It gives not only the number of measures dealt with but also the percentage dealt with as regards those that came from both Houses of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on the Judiciary—Data on legislative activity

	Senate	Judiciary Committee	Percentage of total
Bills enacted into law	1,986	1,063	53.5
Public	905	101	11.1
Senate	324	49	
House	581	52	
Private	1,081	962	88.9
Senate	339	296	
House	742	666	
Bills in conference	7	2	
Bills through conference	154	18	
Measures passed, total	2,699	1,240	45.9
Senate bills	913	441	48.3
House bills	1,331	744	55.8
Senate joint resolutions	45	14	
House joint resolutions	74	6	
Senate concurrent resolutions	61	28	
House concurrent resolutions	45	3	
Senate resolutions	230	4	
Measures reported, total	2,956	1,430	55.8
Senate bills	1,100	590	53.6
House bills	1,377	773	56.1
Senate joint resolutions	52	15	
House joint resolutions	75	6	
Senate concurrent resolutions	65	32	
House concurrent resolutions	46	4	
Senate resolutions	241	10	
Special reports	60	[1] 1	
Measures received, total	6,794	2,908	44.1
Senate measures, total	4,975	2,039	40.9
House measures, total	1,819	959	52.7
Senate bills	4,275	1,910	
House bills	1,687	947	
Senate joint resolutions	211	86	
House joint resolutions	82	8	
Senate concurrent resolutions	108	41	
House concurrent resolutions	50	4	
Senate resolutions	381	82	

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE CIVILIAN NOMINATIONS OTHER THAN POSTMASTERS

Confirmed	1,581	216	13.6
Withdrawn	1	1	
Rejected	4	3	
Unconfirmed	70	11	

[1] On Apr. 20, 1950, there was filed by the Committee on the Judiciary with the Senate, Rept. No. 1515, which is a comprehensive report of approximately 1,000 pages on the immigration and naturalization systems. The report was the result of an investigation and study authorized by the Senate and conducted over the course of approximately 2½ years.

PROPOSED DRAFTING OF 18-YEAR-OLD BOYS FOR MILITARY SERVICE—LETTER FROM M. J. HORSCH

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Prof. M. J. Horsch, of the West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, W. Va., written to me on the 2d day of January, relative to the proposal to draft 18-year-old boys.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Montgomery, W. Va., January 2, 1951.

The Honorable MATTHEW M. NEELY.
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I believe that I voice the conviction of a great many thinking Americans when I say that I trust that when Congress finally reaches the point where it deems the emergency so acute as to force upon immature 18-year-olds the moral shock of combat training and combat, it will first have forced upon us—every one of us—an equivalent sacrifice. To permit business as usual, profits as usual, wages as usual, working hours as usual, luxuries as usual, riotous living, and all the rest of our current souped-up ways of life as usual—and at the same time risk the destruction of the moral fiber of our 18-year-olds by exposing them, en masse, to a shock to which they have not the maturity to adjust themselves—would be a travesty upon American democracy.

When it becomes necessary, then let it come; but let us not call it necessary in the face of what is currently asked of the rest of us.

Whoever contemplates coming out of the present emergency one nickel richer than when entering—whether corporation, worker, management, merchant, or professional man—either doesn't understand the situation confronting us or doesn't deserve to be called American. Let's keep our values straight, and put priorities where they belong.

Respectfully,

M. J. HORSCH.

A SOLDIER'S VIEW OF THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a clipping from the Walsh County Record of January 15, 1951, entitled "A Soldier's View."

I am sure that every Member of Congress will be as interested and concerned as I am about the observations of this combat officer, direct from the battlefields of Korea. His observations are very similar to those contained in all of my mail from servicemen, and is the best evidence I know as to why we should get out of Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLDIER'S VIEW

From time to time, as the bad news from Korea fills the newspapers and air waves, the question of our foreign policy—or the lack of it—comes up for discussion.

Most of the comments, however, come from the armchair generals at home. It is interesting, therefore, to gain the impression of a soldier who has been right in the middle of things. Sgt. Joe Kouba, Grafton, who is now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., forwarded to this newspaper the views of such a man. The writer of the letter is a divisional headquarters commander stationed in Korea. His letter was apparently written during a lull in operations. A part of it follows in the next few paragraphs:

"A soldier finds much relief from boredom in action—even dangerous action. It's not a very good thing to say, but actually everyone's thoughts are directed toward getting home. We are setting ourselves up for a good clobbering by thinking that way, but I guess it can't be helped.

"All the fine words being spoken back home about this 'gallant' cause we are fighting for no longer makes much of an impression on these boys. Oh, I guess when the chips are down we will fight hard enough, but it won't be fighting for the good of the world primarily. Under such conditions and such state of morale a man fights to save his fanny and don't ever let anyone tell you any differently. That means that we won't do our best fighting until our fannies are in danger of being lopped off from the rest of us. The incentive to fight, which makes the difference between a good or bad showing, is just not here. We don't have it.

"You look at these miserable, beaten little people and you can't help but wonder what possible good you can bring to them by making ruins of their hovels and tearing up their land trying to whip a monster 20 times your size. And no amount of fine talk about principles and freedom and liberation from evil can possibly make an impression on you. The world-toppling mistakes our foreign policy makers made in this part of the world are not going to be rectified in Korea and we might as well resign ourselves to that fact.

"Our only chance of survival against communism is to get out of this involvement, go back home and start building our armed might like mad for the showdown with Russia, the core of the whole rotten menace, which is bound to come. That is not only my opinion, that is the opinion of every clear and realistic thinking person over here. That is why I say we are not prepared, mentally, for a showdown fight with Russia's stooge, China. And that is why we stand in a fair way of being knocked stiff if we are called upon to make a stand here. We just are not in this business wholeheartedly and an army without willingness to stand by its convictions is lost.

"No one has to tell me that the cause is a worthy one. God knows I will gladly give my life to know that you can live in a world of peace. Every man over here would be willing to make that sacrifice. I can't help believe that the sacrifice of our field army at this time would be worthless. Let's face it. There's a h—— of a lot of Chinks in this part of the world and they don't like us."

Not a very pretty picture, is it?

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. ROBERT H. SOULE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of this morning quoting Maj. Gen. Robert H. Soule, who is the commander of the United States Third Division in Korea, and who was formerly United States attaché to China. He, as Senators may recall, was held as a virtual prisoner of the Communists for 6 months before being permitted to leave. The general tenor of his article is that the UN Army can hold the Chinese. It is refreshing, in view of the faint hearts at Lake Success, to find someone showing some intestinal fortitude.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SAYS UN ARMY CAN HALT CHINESE—THIRD DIVISION'S COMMANDER DECLARES ALLIES CAN HOLD OR ADVANCE

WESTERN FRONT, KOREA, January 21 (AP).—Maj. Gen. Robert H. Soule, fighting front line commander (of the United States Third Division), said today:

"We can stop the Chinese on this line or any other line they tell us to hold.

"And if they order us," the Wyoming-born general added, "we will go back and take Seoul. We can stop any damn thing they can throw at us."

Soule knows his Chinese. He was military attaché of the United States Embassy to the Nationalist Chinese Government from 1946 to 1950.

HELD FOR 6 MONTHS

He also had a chance to learn Red Chinese fighting methods. The Communists kept him under house arrest for 6 months—until he returned to America last June, just before the Korean war started.

The general granted that the Chinese have overwhelming numbers. But he said the United Nations force, with its superior weapons, can defeat even the cream of the Chinese Red army, which he estimates at 500,000, and he said the "cream" already has been committed to the battle.

"We have hurt his best troops in many spots," said Soule. "Behind them is the riffraff."

SUPPLY LINES CALLED WEAK

"The Chinese are weak on maintaining supply lines, and very few of their top commanders understand modern warfare. They have few planes and little artillery, and they don't know how to use them as well as we do. All they have is hordes," he added with a grin. "And how many hordes are there in a battalion?"

The general urged optimistic thinking and good propaganda.

"We need to get over this awe of numbers," he said, "and get used to the idea that we can whip them, because we can."

"Not only can we beat them militarily, but we can lick them politically as well, if we get a good propaganda program started.

"They're sick of communism in China already. The Reds offered them land, and many Chinese believed it and sent their sons to fight for the Communists.

"They got the land, all right, but each man got such a small portion he wasn't even able to feed his family—and then the Government took half of his crop away to feed the army.

"The Chinese now know they made a bad bargain. If we can get across these facts of how communism really operates to the rest of the people of the Far East, we can defeat the Reds in a war of ideas just as we can lick them in the military battle.

"WHAT TO TELL THE PEOPLE

"We should tell the people of Asia that half of everything produced in Manchuria and Mongolia goes straight to Russia. We should tell them that thousands are starving, and that the Russians are letting them starve because they believe China has too many people to live off the land.

"We should tell them that Mao (Red Chairman Mao Tse-tung) has sold out China to Russia. When other peoples know these things, they won't be so anxious to embrace communism.

"Look at all the refugees coming away from the Reds here in Korea," Soule continued. "These people have seen communism, and they don't like it. They'd rather starve than stay in the north under the Reds.

"Meanwhile, if we are told to stand and fight, we can hold here or any place, or we can go forward," the general concluded.

FORMOSA AND MILITARY AID FOR CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 17, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] delivered a very interesting address on the subject of our foreign policy. In the course of his address he engaged in exchange of questions and answers with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on the question of Formosa and the so-called neutrality of Formosa.

I find in the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, January 19, a very interesting and enlightening editorial entitled "Formosa and Chiang," and in the same issue of the New York Herald Tribune an article by the correspondent Miss Marguerite Higgins, from Taipei, Formosa, entitled "Military Aid for Chiang Kai-shek."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two items, the editorial and the article in the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, January 19, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as an important contribution to the discussion of our foreign policy as it is being carried on at the present time.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMOSA AND CHIANG

The collapse of the latest effort to attain a cease-fire in Korea has demonstrated to all who still needed to be convinced that Red China will continue to wage war on the peninsula until its forces have either been fought to a standstill or have achieved their objectives. In addition to the conquest of Korea, these goals involve the seating of Mao's men in the United Nations and the withdrawal of the American Navy from the waters around Formosa—in other words, a free hand for the Reds to attack the last Chinese Nationalist stronghold.

The United States has officially stated that Formosa is to be neutralized so long as the Korean situation threatens the peace of the Far East and the island's status is then to be settled by international agreement. Therefore, while Red China insists on reversing this order, using its armed forces to blackmail the UN into a settlement of the Formosa problem which is favorable to itself, the United States is under no diplomatic obligation to elaborate its position concerning the island. It cannot offer to trade the Nationalists of Formosa for some agreement with Mao over Korea. That would be immoral and foolish in the extreme. The Communist aggression in Korea is an offense in itself, one which must be atoned for, or at the very least, ended, before there can be any discussion of other Asiatic issues.

If Formosa is one of the goals which Mao is striving to attain through his attack in Korea, it also has great importance for the free nations of Asia. In the hands of the Communists, it is a grave threat; in the hands of a government independent of Communist control, it offers a hope that China may be regained for freedom. Elsewhere on this page, Miss Marguerite Higgins discusses the reasoning of American officials on the island, who admit the past mistakes of the Kuomintang, but who are confident that the reforms which have been introduced since the retreat to Formosa as well as the vast disillusionment with communism which has swept over the Chinese mainland make a favorable atmosphere for positive support of Chiang Kai-shek.

Chiang and his army on Formosa are facts. They cannot be ignored nor can the 6,000,000 Formosans be sold down the Yangtse. What, then, should be the role of Chiang's forces in the present crisis? It is obvious that they cannot simply be turned loose on the mainland, as some Americans suggest, in the hope that this would somehow enable the United States to fight a continental war without using American troops. Chiang's return to China under American auspices would constitute a very heavy commitment in Asia, which would have to be studied as carefully by American strategists

as if United States divisions were going ashore in the first wave. This country could not wash its hands of Chiang, if, by any chance, he suffered a defeat in such circumstances.

In any case, the Nationalists still need arms to make Formosa secure. This is America's first responsibility toward the island and its defenders. The mere existence of the Nationalist Government on Formosa is a beacon light to the growing anti-Communist groups within China, which must not be put out by appeasement, by Red invasion, or by a premature military adventure from Formosa. The United States has no territorial designs on Formosa nor any desire to expand the war in Asia. But before the many-fisted Communist thrust that threatens the world, it cannot see a spot of such high strategic and political importance as Formosa in Red hands. Neither—while Mao makes war on the UN and his Russian masters growl threats from Moscow—can it exclude the possibility of encouraging the Nationalists to strike for their own freedom whenever and wherever it is militarily feasible.

MILITARY AID FOR CHIANG KAI-SHEK—WHY AMERICAN OFFICIALS IN FAR EAST BELIEVE IN CONDITIONAL HELP FOR GENERALISSIMO

(By Marguerite Higgins)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—Conditions in the Far East have changed to the point where immediate and extensive military aid for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is now necessary. But America should take this step only if prepared to expend sufficient time and personnel to control this aid and thus hold out hope for a new deal for China.

These are the views of America's top economic, diplomatic, and military officials on this disputed and strategic island 100 miles off the Chinese mainland. Far-eastern experts here have warned Washington that Chiang's 500,000 troops hold out the only realistic hope of preventing Communist conquest of all Asia.

American officials have asked themselves this question: Despite the errors of the past, could aid to Chiang Kai-shek be managed in the future so as to advance the cause of the non-Communist world? The answer is: Yes—on condition that this aid is handled in the right manner.

These conclusions have not been lightly arrrived at. Many of the top men here have been in China more than 25 years. They were on hand in the days of the Kuomintang's (Nationalist Party's) disintegration on the mainland. It is important, in this writer's opinion, that some of the people who watched this disintegration take the lead in arguing that both the Chiang regime and America have learned from the past and that, therefore, there is hope for the future—if help arrives in time.

The blunt truth—and this is no secret from the Communists—is that without American help Chiang could not hold out for any long period against a Soviet-supplied Chinese Communist assault on Formosa. The Nationalist troops might put up a whale of a fight for a time, but eventually they would be defeated because, among other reasons, they would run out of ammunition. The shortage of ammunition and other vital supplies on Formosa is one of the bases for the increasingly urgent messages to Washington urging that a decision be reached soon about help for this island.

A high American official told me: "It is my personal view that we have about 2 months' grace in which to make up our minds. Unless supplies start pouring in some time in this period I think Formosa's obvious weakness will be such as to tempt the Communists to attack, especially if the Seventh Fleet is occupied elsewhere [meaning Korea]."

Here are some of the reasons why American officials in the Far East believe Chiang should be supported militarily and, when possible, helped to stage a second front against the Chinese Communists on the mainland:

1. Whereas a year ago the mainland Chinese were indifferent toward the Nationalists, Chiang's troops would now be welcomed by many, including guerrillas who would actively flock to his support. Previous indifference was partly due to the fact that the nature of Chinese communism was not any more clear to the average Chinese than to the average American. The Reds themselves have clarified matters. Their stringent economic and political tactics are drawing ever closer to the pattern of the Soviet police state. The new Red terrorism, exemplified by widespread arrests, especially of the middle class, has turned millions of once-neutral Chinese into enemies of the Communists. The popular misconception of the Chinese Communists as mild agrarian reformers is one reason why resistance to Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary army was so weak, veteran observers say. This does not excuse the corruption and inefficiency of the Nationalists. But the Nationalists, in seeking to restore order to their war-torn country, were not helped any, either, by our vacillating policy toward the Red regime, these officials state.

2. Before the Chinese Reds began warring on the United Nations there were sound reasons for holding back aid to Chiang, lest this prove a provocation. But despite neutralization of Formosa, the Reds attacked anyway. Thus, there is no further reason against using the invaluable reservoir of trained manpower afforded by Chiang's forces.

3. Chinese dictator Mao Tse-tung has announced on the Peking radio that it is his purpose to liberate all of Asia, even as he is now liberating Korea. Although the free world traditionally refuses to believe the words of dictators when the meaning is unpleasant, it is the view of the China experts that Mao means what he says. For tactical reasons the Reds may retrench and there may be a halt of several years in their expansion. But the liberation will never be abandoned. The lesson of Korea is that the Reds will strike whenever they feel their power sufficient to insure victory. If we give in to aggression anywhere in Asia, the Communists will thereby be strengthened and their increased strength will encourage them to strike again. That is why it is better, in the opinion of officials here, to recognize that the Chinese have started a war against us and to retaliate in every way available.

Officials who have watched Chiang in operation on Formosa for the past year believe there is a reasonable chance that the Kuomintang of tomorrow can be better than the Kuomintang of yesterday. These officials state that Chiang has not only announced his willingness, but his desire that future aid be regulated by American technicians and advisers. In this way the Americans, in a sense, would share the responsibility for what happens in the future. It is believed that if diplomatic means are used, Chiang wou'd be amenable to many reforms asked by the Americans.

It is felt that in the past some American representatives in China, notably the late Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, had the highest ideals but got the Kuomintang's back up by using what are bluntly referred to as hammer-on-the-head methods. America's present representative in Formosa, Minister Karl L. Rankin, an able, hard-working diplomat, is just the person, if given authority, to promote a policy of friendly firmness toward the Kuomintang, officials here think.

On the encouraging side is the fact that in the past year Chiang's officials have been completely cooperative with the Economic Cooperation Administration mission. They have followed through, for example, on suggestions for tax and land reform. The ECA has poured some $33,000,000 worth of aid into Formosa since June 1950 and is currently programing an investment of about $50,000,000 a year. This investment would have to be increased if sufficient equipment were provided to give Chiang a first-class fighting machine, including a substantial air force and navy.

At the moment, the Formosa Government is beset by gold crises, but, otherwise, it has achieved considerable stability, ECA officials say. A rational system of taxation has been introduced for the first time, power plants and fertilizer plants are under construction, the price of rice has been held down and fertilizer provided by ECA grants has been used to push rice production far above the record set by the Japanese.

Also on the plus side are the Kuomintang's elections establishing self-government on the communal level. The Formosan elections are to be followed by general elections on this island, which was returned to China in 1945 after many years of occupation by the Japanese. The Japanese used it as one of their main war bases.

Chiang's army is undergoing intensive training. The soldiers seem in good physical condition. But no one can predict with certainty how they will perform in combat. One way of finding out is to accept Chiang's offer to send 33,000 troops to the Korean front.

On the discouraging side is the continuing tendency in the Kuomintang to use the old divide-and-rule system. A number of Chinese generals have recently been kicked upstairs and the American observers feel they would be better in their old jobs. The generals were promoted, it is reported because Chiang was not sure of their loyalty to him.

Americans have no authority to even speak out in these matters at the moment. But should we grant extensive aid our views would be an important factor officials say.

Another sore point in Formosa is Chiang's secret police. The Kuomintang insists that the police are essential to curbing communism. The opposition states that the police are used to quell any one against the government. Chiang's regime clearly has a considerable way to go before the rule of law and not of men is established. This correspondent has been in six police states, including North Korea. It is my view that Chiang has a long way to go before he can be lumped in the same category as the Communist regimes.

In summing up, an important official here stated: "There are many risks in the battle against communism. Despite the risks we must not cease trying. When I look around the world at the people willing to fight on our side I say that Chiang is a better risk than most."

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

Mr. McMAHON. I rise in the Senate this afternoon to speak for the dictates of conscience—not alone for my own conscience, but in such measure as I may for the conscience of my country. I see blunt truths that need to be said. If they are left unsaid, they may remain buried until the wreckage of our civilization closes over them.

The issue before this Congress is survival.

The deliberations now occupying the Senate are being called the great debate—a term at once both apt and misleading. Great questions are assuredly being considered, and our discussions

take place at a time of the greatest peril our Nation has even known. But this does not mean that great differences of opinion divide the Members of this body. This Senate includes neither men of craven instincts nor warmongers.

Free men know this—they will understand and appreciate our discussions. In this searching of our consciences, in this scrutiny of the fundamentals of our international conduct, free men will see underscored our abiding belief in the wisdom of frank and open debate. They will take heart from watching a great Nation charting its future course by reasoned discourse and persuasion.

Yet there are dangers in this debate, and we must not minimize them. In the eyes of rulers of slave states, debate means division of purpose; honest differences of opinion betoken weakness, instead of strength; dissent spells disloyalty.

I think it imperative that we set the record straight on this point—history will not be indulgent if we do less. Our bearing and demeanor must make amply clear what is in fact true—that this Senate unanimously desires to defend the United States with every power at its command, that this Senate unanimously desires to bring all the world's peoples a just and lasting peace.

We must set the record straight on another point. These walls properly resound with demands for increasing America's material strength — the strength of tanks, ships, planes, and atomic bombs. Such demands are fully justified; we must generate military might. I shall, of course, vigorously support—as I have unswervingly supported in the past—every item of legislation which enhances our armed power.

Yet this Senate must not make the world think that America is reaching for the sword of steel as though it alone will save her. Our actions must positively demonstrate that we regard our moral position in the world as of transcendent importance—as our strongest line of defense. I believe that the massive danger now confronting our Nation stems primarily from our failure to recognize the sword of the spirit as the only absolute weapon.

No sensible man will dispute the magnitude of our peril. Present-day Russia already controls one-third of the world. She is already at the summit which Hitler and Tojo reached only after a long chain of conquests. The men in the Kremlin are stockpiling atomic weapons; and we must presume that they are working on the development of hydrogen bombs as well. Their expanding air force includes long-range bombers; their fleet contains submarines potentially capable of launching guided missiles against our shores.

We find ourselves locked with the masters of Russia in an accelerating armaments competition. A year ago, when many members of this body worked toward the altogether desirable goal of balancing the budget, I ventured to predict that our military expenditures would mock at such hopes—that they would force our budget up and up and up. I predicted also that the regimentation necessarily accompanying the nation-in-arms would force our freedoms down and down and down.

Today we face a military budget of $70,000,000,000—and even this sum will prove sadly inadequate if the arms race rushes onward. We confront the grim prospect of price controls, allocations, rationing, increased requirements for military service—and a thousand and one other growing encroachments upon our cherished liberties.

We are building our defenses against the Soviet armies and against their atomic weapons.

Yet one supreme danger we are largely ignoring. Without firing a single shot, the Soviet Union is depriving us of our weapon prized above all others—our reputation as a nation ardently desiring peace with justice. Without sending into battle a single Russian soldier, the Kremlin threatens to win the truly decisive battle—the struggle for the minds and souls of men. Without engaging a solitary Red division, the Soviets may destroy America's moral position before the free world.

We have taken a severe propaganda beating from the Communists over the past several years, both in Europe and the Orient. The Communists have done an excellent job of selling the idea that the United States is war-minded and seeks conquest.

They have tagged America with the epithet "warmonger" and sold it to an alarming extent. While this fraudulent campaign has been going on, they have maintained their internal strength through the Iron Curtain.

The tremendous power of the Soviet conspiracy throughout the world today is due in large part to the Iron Curtain. This barrier against truth may be the Soviet's strongest weapon. But I am convinced that if we focus world opinion on the Iron Curtain and expose it as a fraud and a menace to world peace, we may convert this barrier against truth into a Soviet liability.

Perhaps we cannot convince the Kremlin rulers to open up the curtain, but I am absolutely certain that we can cripple and perhaps silence the Soviet propaganda guns in the Western world. People can see through a fraud very easily when it is exposed to them.

I suggest we have a moral duty and a right to talk to the Russian people and the Senate of the United States is the proper body to express that right. If the Soviet government refuses to permit its people to listen, then the world will know that the Soviet leaders fear the Russian people more than they fear us.

Every observer who returns from overseas describes the profound and ominous skepticism concerning America's intentions in the world. In Western Europe—the nurturing place of the doctrines that undergird our conduct as a religious nation—countless people profane their fathers' beliefs and incline toward Godless Communism. Others, who should be combating the onrush of Red power with all their minds and hearts, are faint-hearted in their resistance. Still others seek refuge in indifference; they aspire toward ethical and political neutralism. In the Far East—where the populations experiencing rebirth should cherish our historic support of national self-determination—leaders instead take their bearings from Moscow, the arch enemy of every state which presumes to remain sovereign.

It is deeply paradoxical that matters should be thus. The truth is that our conduct during these past five years need give none of us cause for apology. It has been marked by great valor and fortitude and by unparalleled generosity. We have exerted immense physical labors to reinvigorate a war-torn world—and these great physical exertions have been complemented by heartfelt adherence to principles no less great.

This is the country that has wisely strengthened potential victims of aggression through the North Atlantic Pact and military aid program. This is the country whose stockpile of atomic weapons, together with the Marshall Plan, has kept the Red armies from marching to the English Channel and enslaving all Europe.

This is the same country that has succored millions with the Marshall Plan—that mighty expression of our historic willingness to help other peoples work their way toward self-respect and self-support. This is the same country that offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, and asked in return only those safeguards which would keep the evil in the atom from being used to destroy us. This is the same country that has instituted the Point Four program to relieve crushing poverty and disease in the under-developed areas of the world. This is the country which is bearing the chief burden of the fighting in Korea—not as an aggressor—but to sustain the principle of collective resistance of the United Nations of the world against imperialist aggression.

In good part, we have done these things to help ourselves. We know we cannot remain an island of prosperity amidst a world-wide slum. We recognize that our allies need the aid of our unrivaled resources if they are to become stalwart partners in successfully resisting our common foe. But we have also done these things because we are by nature and tradition a generous people—it is not like us to remain indifferent while others are denied the most elementary decencies of life.

Our noble efforts have yielded noble dividends. Western Europe, the decisive area of world politics, still remains in the camp of freedom. Our European friends have so far contained the threat from within. Protected by our shield of atomic weapons, they are building armies capable of emphatically answering a threat from without. But, above all, our accomplishments have won for us precious time—and the chance to dedicate ourselves afresh to forwarding those moral principles which alone bring dignity and meaning to man's existence.

I am proud to have supported all these great measures, and I am especially proud of the opportunity afforded me—as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—to help make our atomic

stockpile the bulwark of the world's liberties.

During the same years that our nation has fought this good fight for freedom and decency, the Soviet Union has compiled its own record of achievements. It has extinguished the freedoms of 700,000,000 people. It has flatly rejected the international atomic control plan regarded as wise and just by all the free world. It has operated a reverse Marshall Plan—stripping its satellites of their industries and draining them of their resources.

Despite all this, untold millions still gravitate toward Moscow's cause—untold millions suspect us of aggressive imperialism and remain blind to the terrifying advance of Soviet power. Our country rearms solely for self-defense and with immeasurable reluctance—yet many truly believe that we are the warmongers. We give of our substance to help those ravaged by war and poverty—yet many still regard us as selfish and soulless materialists.

Why have so many put this topsy-turvy interpretation on our record? Why are the tides in the ideological conflict still running so strongly against us? Why are we losing ground in the battle for the allegiance of men?

Why have we failed?

Mr. President, I think we have failed because we have not sufficiently put first things first. We have failed because we have not completely rallied the moral and spiritual strength of the free world as a mighty force for peace.

We have rightfully worked at invigorating the free world's economic strength—but in the process many of us have forgotten that men's souls need filling no less than their stomachs. We have properly worked at reconstituting the free world's military strength—but in the meanwhile some of us have not realized that weapons are worthless unless the men behind them passionately believe in the rightness of their cause.

All our national history is proof that a fighting faith comes from more than the cold metal of armaments or the cement of factory walls. Some of us have nonetheless supposed that global situations of strength could be created solely with guns and goods. Too many, I fear, have overlooked what all military leaders hold axiomatic—that even cold military power ultimately rests upon morale, and that morale, in turn, rests upon a surety of conviction that one's cause is the cause of decent men. By failing to go all-out in augmenting the free world's moral strength, some of us have in practice denied what the darkest cynic concedes—that human beings are incorrigibly moral and that they will stand up for a cause only if convinced of its nobility and justice.

Our failure in this respect does not lie at the doorstep of any individual or any department of the Government. The Voice of America, let us never forget, merely transmits policy; it does not make it. If we lay down a moral program of splendid and compelling dimensions, the Voice will do its part. Our failure to proclaim such a program is a national failure. The Congress shares in the blame; there are no scapegoats; this is not the fault of the Republicans or the Democrats. It is a fault common to all of us.

I suggest that the root cause of our failing may have eluded us precisely because it is so simple. I suggest that our failure may be a failure to tell the world the obvious.

The obvious truths—the truths which, if universally accepted, could change the course of history—are these: First, that the supreme menace to world peace is not American war-mongering but the Soviet Iron Curtain. Second, that the United States does in fact have a positive program for achieving a just and lasting peace.

If these statements are true—and I am sure no one in this Senate will quarrel with them—why in heaven's name are we not proclaiming them with every means at our command? Why are we not now declaring these truths with such directness and power that nobody could mistake their meaning?

It is solely the Iron Curtain that keeps the people of Russia from knowing the true and desperate nature of the international crisis. It is solely this curtain that keeps them from learning how eagerly we wish to extend our hand in friendship. It is solely this curtain that enables the Kremlin to twist and distort any world happening to fit the party line. Save for the Iron Curtain, I am sure that ordinary Russians would invoke their wrath on rulers who deny them life's barest necessities and who saddle them with crushing armaments expenditures.

If this is the case—as certainly it is—why have we not asked the United Nations to act accordingly? I have strongly supported the United Nations—peace cannot be achieved without a functioning parliament of man. But the United Nations should be the town meeting of the world. Instead, it has served largely as a one-way channel for spreading Soviet propaganda. In the UN forums, the Russian spokesmen pour forth their invective and divide the free world. At the same time, they use their Iron Curtain to avoid an accounting to the Russian people.

It is high time that we ask the United Nations to state in forthright terms its right to have its deliberations made known behind the Iron Curtain. I believe that as a minimum the United Nations should assert its right to operate its own radio station in the Soviet Union. The right to know is a sacred human right, and we are moral shirkers if we refrain from saying so.

I am not naive enough to suppose that Stalin will rush to accept such a proposal. However, it is eminently just—and fair-minded men will realize this. We would ask only that the free peoples' views are circulated among the Russians—just as the Soviets' views are circulated among us. We would advance a legitimate request, and people would quickly grasp the significance of the Kremlin's refusal to honor it. Here is the one proposal to which no Communist could advance even a propaganda answer. Here is the one proposal which—if rejected—can glaringly expose the sham and duplicity of Mr. Vishinsky's utterances. Why, then, has the UN not already made such a request?

Before we charge the United Nations with sins of omission, however, let us examine our own record—let us be sure that we are ourselves straining to the utmost our ingenuity and exploring every conceivable approach in responding to the challenge of the Iron Curtain. I fear that we have much room for improvement on this score.

One example suffices. While our eyes were on Korea during this last summer we overlooked a tremendous Communist victory in Western Europe. I refer to the spurious peace movement that operated under the guise of the Stockholm petition. The campaign was disarmingly simple—and its real purpose was equally simple—to disarm the free world of the one thing that prevents all-out Soviet aggression—its atomic superiority. The petition asked that the nations agree not to use atomic weapons, and demanded that the first party to break this pledge be branded an aggressor. It cunningly ignored the fact that the real crime against world peace is international aggression—of the kind the Soviets have abetted in Korea. It carefully did not mention that only Soviet opposition has prevented world-wide adoption of a plan that would truly end the threat of atomic war by effectively regulating the manufacture of these weapons. It avoided saying what all of us know—that if we are ever forced to employ these weapons, it will only be in answer to Red aggression.

The Communist zealots spread this petition—of whose existence many of us were hardly aware, with their customary fervor. They requested signatures at union meetings; bicycle riders carried it to farmers; priests and ministers were asked to circulate it among their congregations.

Everyday Europeans, who had known five years of total war, flocked to sign this cunning document. Their hearts were open to anything—no matter how deceitful—that promised them peace. Is it any wonder that the Stockholm Appeal mightily strengthened the cause of European neutrality?

Once again, however, we must refrain from calling the kettle black. Our European friends, true, have been gullible. But are we sure that we have as yet offered them a satisfactory answer to the Communist peace campaign?

The Europeans have fought and heroically died for freedom—and they are willing to do it again. We should in turn fortify their resolve by a bold proclamation of those principles to which free men everywhere will pledge their all.

I think they have a right to expect from us a forthright declaration of where we stand.

I believe that this Senate should immediately undertake a ringing declaration of America's intentions. I believe that such a declaration would more than undo the disastrous effects of the Stockholm Appeal. I believe that it would find responsive hearers wherever men yearn

for peace and security. I believe it would immeasurably strengthen us in our struggle with the few men who control Russia's destinies.

We are about to appropriate huge sums for our common defense. It is inevitable that we do this. In fact, I do not believe that our mobilization plans go fast enough or far enough. I stand—as I have always stood in the past—for all the tanks and planes and atomic weapons we need to frustrate Stalin's designs.

Nonetheless, the peoples of the earth, and the Russian people especially, must know why we are rearming. They must learn that we do this only with heavy heart; they must understand that we would prefer—far prefer—to use our skills and monies for human enrichment. They must understand that we will never close the door on peace—and that there is no malice in our hearts or in our actions.

I therefore propose that this Senate pass a resolution expressing friendship for the people of Russia by the people of the United States. I propose that we simultaneously ask the Soviet government to make this resolution known to the Russian people.

I further propose that if such a resolution is adopted, it be circulated in every American city and hamlet, and that it be signed by every American who would welcome the friendship of the people of Moscow and Odessa and Vladivostok.

You will not mistake my meaning. Not for an instant do I suggest that we embrace the men who run concentration camps, pervert truth, and withhold basic human rights from one-third of the world. As men of conscience, we cannot condone those frightful practices. But I am convinced that the rank and file Russians desire global conquest no more than we do. I am convinced that if they believe the calumnies of their government, it is only because they have not the slightest inkling of the kind of world we Americans really want.

The resolution might embody in plain language these plain truths:

1. That—despite what the Russian people have been told to the contrary—there are no warmongers in the United States Senate.

2. That there is not a member of the United States Senate who desires the death of a single Russian soldier or citizen.

3. That while we are resolutely determined to appropriate billions for defense, this Senate and the people of the United States ardently desire a just peace.

4. That the United States government stands ready at all times to compose its differences with the Soviet government through honorable negotiations.

5. That we ask the Soviet Government—which controls all sources of information within Russia—to publicize these facts in their newspapers and over their radio networks.

In no manner would this declaration constitute a hostile act. It is not a propaganda trick; it asks no more than the rights we accord to all other nations; it expresses a legitimate request; it is intended in good faith.

This manifesto would serve to do more than express our friendship for the Russian people. It would tell all the world—the French, the Italians, the Indians, the Chinese, the Egyptians, the Czechs, the Poles—that we Americans want a just peace with all our hearts, and that we arm only because our lives and honor are desperately imperiled.

Some will, of course, charge that the Kremlin would ignore such a resolution. But truth has a dynamic quality. I believe, in fact, that this resolution might dramatically change for the better the course of the ideological war, which now flows so strongly in the Soviets' favor.

But standing by itself, the resolution is insufficient. I regard it as altogether imperative that we so express our desire to live in friendship with all the world's peoples. But we must go even further. We must demonstrate that we are willing to do our share and more in bringing about such a fraternity of mankind—and that we have a program that can lead men toward the final enshrinement of human brotherhood.

Last October, President Truman set forth a program capable of achieving this mighty end. Speaking before the United Nations, in one of the greatest addresses known to American history, Mr. Truman defined the basic goals of our foreign policy.

He laid down what I like to call the two imperatives of peace—first, foolproof disarmament and, second, use of the money thus saved for human betterment.

If real disarmament were achieved—

Mr. Truman said—and I quote—

the nations of the world, acting through the United Nations, could join in a greatly enlarged program of mutual aid. As the cost of maintaining armaments decreased, every nation could greatly increase its contributions to advancing human welfare. All of us could then pool even greater resources to support the United Nations in its war against want. In this way, our armaments would be transformed into foods, medicines, tools for use in underdeveloped areas, and into other aids for human advancement. * * * Thus we could give real meaning to the old promise that swords shall be beaten into plowshares, and that the nations shall not learn war any more.

Peace instead of war, bread instead of bombs, life instead of death—here is the terminus of our foreign policy, the end point of our strivings. "This is the goal," as our President put it, "which we must keep before us—and the vision in which we must never lose faith."

It is one of the tragedies of our time that we in the Congress have so far failed to act affirmatively for peace by putting ourselves four-square behind the ultimate foreign policy objectives the President announced before the United Nations. Why is this Congress not now proclaiming and raising on high these identical aims as the crux of our moral plan for peace? Why are we not now declaring, in no uncertain terms, that the official policy of the United States Congress rests upon the two imperatives of peace: foolproof control of weapons and use of the money saved for human betterment? Why are we still waiting to tell the world, "Here is our defense money—join us in a secure system to regulate all weapons and the money you save, along with the money we save, can be pooled through a common United Nations fund to buy bread and tractors"?

Such a proposal would say to the peoples of the East, passionately revolting against the Colonialism of the past two hundred years, that we sympathize with their aspirations for equality with the Western World.

The era of Colonialism is dead—let us recognize that, and welcome the new movement toward political and economic freedom which has taken its place.

Their needs are not only material but of the spirit, which seeks the freedom and the equality that for so many generations men of the West have denied to their brothers in the Orient—in India, in China, in Africa.

Here is a proposal which the peasant and the nomad will understand. Here is a proposal which might gather to itself such support that not all the opposition on earth could stop its march to fulfillment.

Early last February I pointed out that if a safe system of weapons control went into effect and if our military expenses were therefore reduced two-thirds, we would save some $50,000,000,000 over a period of five years. I suggested that we offer to take such a sum as this $50,000,000,000—once the control system were proved to be airtight—and use it for Point Four programs and technical assistance to backward areas and splitting the atom for peace.

Today, ten months later, we know that $50,000,000,000 will be spent—not in five years, but in less than one year: all for engines of war, none for engines of peace. And the end is not yet.

These stark facts were obvious last spring to those distinguished colleagues of both parties who joined me in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 94. Through that resolution, we asked that the Congress of the United States formally advocate and support the two imperatives of peace as the supreme moral goal of our nation's policy.

I believe that my cosponsors on Senate Concurrent Resolution 94 combine idealism with practical hard-headedness. The offer which we propose would not cost the United States one cent to make—and nothing but good could come from that offer. If it were rejected, the American people would lose nothing in material terms and they would gain in moral stature. If the offer were accepted, not one penny of the taxpayers' money would be spent that would not have been spent in any event—that would not have gone for armaments if a foolproof system of world-wide control had failed to take effect. Neither do the sponsors of the resolution ask that our people repose one modicum of trust in Russia—or that Russia repose one modicum of trust in America. Inspectors from each country would make absolutely certain, with their own eyes and ears, that the other had truly kept its agreement.

Some skeptics will no doubt brand this resolution as impractical and idealistic. I declare that the United States owes its greatness to idealism. I say we had better hope this program can work. I say that if we can get the ear of the Russian people, it will work. I say we had better start striving to see that it does work. I say there must be a positive alternative to all-out war. I challenge the skeptics to produce a superior program.

I believe that the resolution which my colleagues and I introduced last session—and which I shall reintroduce—informs the world that we have an affirmative program for justice and peace and human enrichment. I shall therefore press for formal action by the elected representatives of the people—showing that Congress is ready and eager to back a plan which can banish fear and want.

There is again talk of a Big Four meeting to compose international differences. The recent conference of British Commonwealth Prime Ministers called for a frank exchange of views with Stalin. I am all in favor of honorable negotiations.

If the Senate does its part—if it declares our friendship toward the ordinary people of Russia—if it puts its weight behind an audacious program for bread instead of bombs—the free world could enter upon meetings possessing a moral strength such as it has never before known. We could act to fill the giant vacuum of yearning across the world—yearning for a program adequate to establish peace and worthy of decent and free men.

In essence, the resolutions I commend to this Senate do no more than bring out from hiding what we Americans deeply believe. There is not a member of this Senate who wishes the needless death of a Russian soldier. Peace with justice has always been—and is now—the overriding objective of our citizens. Their hands have always been—and are now—outstretched in friendliness toward the ordinary Russian. They would like nothing better than a pooling of resources to lift the world toward a new city of man. These are the simple truths that will shine forth in the resolutions I advocate.

Senators, I am tired of being called a warmonger by propagandists whose sole purpose is to divide us from our allies. I am tired of having my colleagues denounced as warmongers. Many men have spoken in this debate whose views differ sharply from my own. But these men are not warmongers, whether they happen to occupy desks on the Democratic side of the aisle or the Republican side. On this issue of peace and good will toward other peoples, we stand united.

I want people everywhere to know this.

We are all of us fond of repeating that war is not inevitable. I fear that some of us take false refuge in such reiteration. We act almost as if we believe that merely wishing will make it so. We almost appear to think that verbal incantations will somehow repeal the inexorable laws of an accelerating arms race. Arguing against any such comforting notion is 5,000 years of history, which teaches over and over and over that arms races always lead to war—under today's conditions, atomic war.

Mr. President, unless we act boldly and immediately to wrench history from its present course, war is inevitable. It is still within our power, thank God, to confute this sombre prophecy—but we must act valiantly and we must act now.

This Senate has a responsibility that cannot be evaded. I think it is now incumbent upon this body to state in formal resolutions our profound desire to do anything and everything in our power to find an honorable and just alternative to otherwise inevitable war.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at some later date I expect to discuss at greater length some general aspects of the foreign policy of the United States. Today I shall confine my remarks to an important issue that is raised by the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Shall Congress recover its constitutional functions in the field of foreign relations? This is really what is involved in the Wherry resolution. Shall the Republic continue in the pattern intended by the founding fathers, or shall it go down the road to a military dictatorship?

Perhaps the most important duty of the Congress, as set forth in the Constitution, is to do what unfortunately President Truman seems to resent. That duty is to act as a check on the President, and to define the channels through which his power is to flow. As a part of a wise and far-seeing plan of checks and balances, the Constitution places in the Congress certain responsibilities in connection with foreign affairs.

None of us here have any illusions about the superior wisdom of Members of Congress. But when an important issue comes up on the floor of the Senate or the House it is discussed pro and con. What is said is reported in the newspapers and on the radio. Editors and commentators get into action. Then the people back home write to Washington. The result is that when a decision is reached, it is in a real sense a considered judgment of the American people.

This is why it is so important that the Congress act as a check or balance on the arbitrary power of the Chief Executive. Compare the President at his executive desk, sometimes alone, with the Congress carrying on the legislative process in a goldfish bowl before the public gaze. The wisdom of one department acting as a check or balance on the other becomes readily apparent.

I. CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. President, article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides:

> He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Clearly, all Senators, regardless of committee assignments, are expected to interest themselves in proposed agreements between the United States and foreign nations. All Senators have an equal voice in deciding whether or not treaties submitted to them by the President shall be ratified or rejected.

Under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, it is the further duty of the Congress "to define offenses against the law of nations," and "to declare war."

By giving the Congress the sole authority to declare war, it is made clear that no one man shall be permitted to say when and where the blood of American manhood is to be shed.

II. CONGRESS IN RECENT YEARS HAS FAILED TO CARRY OUT ITS CONSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

Cynics have been heard to say that the last 18 years may mark the beginning of the decline of the American Republic.

Whether we like it or not the trend away from constitutional government has set in. Blank checks were the beginning. During the last 10 years we have begun to observe the lengthening shadow of a military dictatorship.

The question then is, Shall the Congress abdicate to the President its constitutional responsibility in the field of foreign relations? Here are two examples of what I mean:

A. SECRET AGREEMENTS, SECRETLY ARRIVED AT

Mr. President, on Monday, January 8, President Truman delivered his state-of-the-Union message to the Congress.

Thirty-three years before to a day, another American President delivered an address to a joint session of the Congress. On January 8, 1918, President Woodrow Wilson announced his famous 14-point peace program.

President Wilson's first point was:

> Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

Mr. Wilson later amplified the point:

> For my own part, I am not willing to trust to the counsel of diplomats the working out of any salvation of the world from the things which it has suffered.

It is unfortunate that some of Mr. Wilson's successors in the White House, including the present incumbent, have not seen fit to follow this principle.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very much interested in what the Senator has to say; but I think it is a well-known fact that President Wilson was worried by his war powers and wanted to get rid of them, and looked forward to the day when he could get rid of them, which is in striking contrast to things that have happened since then.

Mr. KEM. I thank the eminent Senator from Colorado for his very interesting comment, with which I quite agree.

Most of the difficulties in which we find ourselves today are due directly to secret covenants, secretly arrived at. I refer of course to Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Have we learned anything from this experience? I do not know. No longer than a month ago the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain held a widely heralded but top-secret conference here in Washington. Upon its conclusion, a so-called communique was released, which communicated nothing. Reports carried in the British newspapers, indicated that Mr. Truman made important concessions to Mr. Attlee. It was said in the British press that Mr. Truman agreed, for example, not to take any action which would interfere with the flow of British trade with Red China through Hong Kong to the Chinese Communists.

On December 6, 1950, while the Truman-Attlee conference was still under way, I submitted, on behalf of myself and 23 other Senators, a resolution designed to accomplish two things:

First, to obtain a full report from the President on the results of his conference with the British Prime Minister.

Second, to prevent the President from making agreements with the Prime Minister affecting in any important way the course of action of this country, except by treaty entered into with the advice and consent of the Senate, as provided by the Constitution.

After some discussion, this resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, where it was pigeonholed, interred without the benefit of clergy—or whatever else the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] does to measures which do not happen to coincide with his own views.

It is commonplace to say that one's judgment is no better than one's information. How can the Senate expect to reach an intelligent decision on foreign policy unless it has access to all the facts? The President speaks glibly of a bipartisan foreign policy. We are asked to cooperate, while he operates in his own way, and makes available to Congress only such information as he thinks it is good for us to have.

American fingers have been burned quite enough by secret deals. I hope the Senate from this point on will demand that there be an end, to use President Wilson's language, to "private international understandings," and will insist—to use his language again—that our "diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

As President Wilson said:

> The theory of government which I decline to subscribe to is that the vitality of the Nation comes out of the closeted councils where a few men determine the policy of the country.

President Wilson, at a National Democratic Club Jefferson Dinner in 1908, also said:

> Must we fall back on discretionary Executive power? The Government of the United States was established to get rid of it.

A good deal of water has run over the dam since President Wilson used that language.

B. THE UNDECLARED WAR IN KOREA

A second example of the President arrogating to himself powers that are not constitutionally his, is the undeclared war in Korea, one of the most tragic episodes in American history. Last June 27 a major step was taken by the President of the United States toward the establishment of a military dictatorship.

On that day Mr. Truman ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. Neither branch of the Congress was consulted. The first the Senate knew of it was when there was made available on the floor of the Senate a copy of a press release issued from the White House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. At that time did the Senator from Missouri protest?

Mr. KEM. Yes; I did, as vigorously as I could.

Mr. CONNALLY. Where?

Mr. KEM. In a few minutes I shall invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to the exact language I used. I am sorry that the Senator from Texas, whose memory, as I have observed it, is usually like a steel trap, does not recall the incident. If the Senator will bear with me for a few moments I shall give the exact language I used on the occasion about which he inquires.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, but I cannot remember everything the Senator has said on the floor of the Senate and that other Senators have said on the floor of the Senate. If I were to try to bring to mind everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate, I would need an encyclopedia.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator has in mind the high lights of the discussion of our foreign policy. I regret his memory has played him a trick in this case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I asked a polite question of the Senator.

Mr. KEM. What is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The one the Senator just answered. I do not see any harm in that.

Mr. KEM. No; there is no harm in it. I am glad the Senator asked it, and I shall be glad to answer any further questions the Senator desires to ask.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator, however, seemed to take umbrage, and seemed to feel surprised that I did not know everything about his speeches.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator from Texas had followed some of the things I have said on the floor in the past, I think the history of the United States would be somewhat different than it is today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know all who protested, but no one on the floor, as I recall, did anything to stop the sending of troops to Korea. As a matter of fact, when the troops went into Korea nearly all threw up their hats and shouted "Hurrah"; and now a great many of those "hurrahers" are complaining and objecting and denouncing and hair pulling, and so on.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will be patient, I shall invite his attention to the exact language I used on that occasion.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will put it in the RECORD, will he not? I must leave the Senate in a moment.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I am proceeding to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that the Senate had no chance to act on the policy of the President; that it was a fait accompli?

Mr. KEM. Yes; that is quite true.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that the Congress had no chance to determine about the matter of going into Korea? The boys were there and we had to support them. That was all that was left to do. Is that not true?

Mr. KEM. Yes, unfortunately.

Mr. WHERRY. Will not the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska result in preventing another Korea, and in permitting the Congress of the United States to determine whether or not we are going to have happen in Europe exactly what happened in Korea? Is that not true?

Mr. KEM. Yes. There was nothing the Senators in the minority could do about it. But one Senator, at least—and I think there were others—protested at the time respecting the unconstitutionality of the act the President had committed. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. President, as I was saying, when Mr. Truman ordered our Armed Forces into Korea neither branch of the Congress was consulted. The first the Senate knew of it was when there was made available on the floor of the Senate a copy of the press release issued from the White House. We then had a fait accompli, as the Senator from Nebraska has said.

How well I remember the then majority leader, the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas, reading to the Senate the release, since only one copy was available.

The President said:

> I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and air support.
>
> I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa.

Not once in his 407-word statement did the President refer to the Congress of the United States, which has the authority—the sole and exclusive authority—under our Constitution to declare war. Yes, the President, as they say in our—his and my—native State of Missouri, was riding high that day. When the Senator from Illinois had finished reading the White House press release, I raised the question as to whether the President had arrogated to himself the power to declare war. Mr. President, that is the answer to the inquiry just made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Let me repeat that when the Senator from Illinois had finished reading the press release, I raised the question of whether the President had arrogated to himself the power to declare war. The answer was the pretense that our participation in Korea was only a

police action. We know differently now. American casualties already number nearly 50,000. Fourteen billion dollars of the public money has been spent. Some 50,000 young Americans have been killed or wounded. Yet the Congress, 7 months after the President's order, has not recognized what must be apparent to everyone—that a state of war exists. This is government by a man, not by the Constitution.

I hope and pray that Congress will act promptly to prevent the possibility of the making of any further secret deals selling our friends down the river, or to avoid further undeclared wars.

How many sons of American mothers must die before we act to curb resolutely the threat of what President Wilson described as "discretionary Executive power"?

III. CONGRESS SHOULD DECIDE WHETHER TROOPS SHOULD BE SENT TO EUROPE

The President now proposes to embark on a new military venture—this time in Western Europe. He has apparently decided to go through with it, regardless of the judgment of the Congress or the wishes of the American people.

Mr. Truman made his plans quite clear at his news conference on January 11.

The New York Herald Tribune of January 12 carried the following story on Mr. Truman's remarks at the conference:

President Truman declared today he will consult with Congress before sending American troops to Europe, but made it clear he will not seek congressional permission to do so. * * *

With vigor he accepted the challenge of those in Congress who would seek to exercise control over such troop commitments by tying up military appropriation. If they want to go to the country on that, Mr. Truman said, he would go with them. He added that he had gone to the country once before and licked his congressional critics.

An argument has been made along this line against the adoption of the pending resolution: "Let's not take any action until General Eisenhower returns from Europe and presents his views as to whether it is advisable to send troops on a large scale to Europe. When he returns, we shall know then whether it is desirable to send troops to Europe—whether on a large scale or on a small scale or not at all."

However, Mr. President, what General Eisenhower has to say may have little effect on the plans of the President. Mr. Truman seems to have already made up his mind—and this, regardless of whether General Eisenhower agrees with the President's preconceived views.

The Baltimore Sun of January 12 carried the following report of the President's news conference on the preceding day:

"And do you expect to send more troops to Europe" a reporter asked.

"Certainly," said the President, adding that he saw no point in going to all of the trouble of making the Atlantic Treaty arrangements and sending General Eisenhower over to take charge of Western European defense unless we meant to go through with the project.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has no constitutional authority to carry out this dazzling military adventure.

He has no such authority under the terms of the Atlantic Treaty or under the MAP—the military aid program.

In April 1949, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the North Atlantic Pact. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was present. During Secretary of State Acheson's testimony, he was asked the following question by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and made the following answer:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?

Secretary ACHESON. The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "No."

Mr. President, the question arises, will Congress acquiesce in the President's grab for power? Or will Congress make it clear that from now on it intends to carry on as a coordinate—not a subordinate—branch of the Government?

Let us begin by asserting the authority to say when and where American boys are to be called upon to fight, suffer, and die.

IV. SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO PIGEONHOLE WHERRY RESOLUTION

Mr. President, I wish to discuss one more point, and then I shall be through. It has been indicated that a motion may be made to refer the Wherry resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have great respect for the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. They, and their predecessors, have rendered valiant service to their country. I am confident they will continue to do so.

They will readily agree, I know, that the primary purpose of the committee is to expedite the Senate's business. Its existence in no way lessens the solemn responsibility of every Member of the Senate in matters pertaining to our foreign policy.

The Constitution makes no provision for congressional committees. In fact, the Congress managed to get along fairly well without them for a number of years after the Constitution went into effect. It was not until 1816 that a Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was established. Previous to that time, questions relating to foreign affairs either were dealt with directly on the floor of the Senate, or were referred to a select temporary committee appointed to consider a particular subject.

I hope the Senate will reject any motion to send the pending resolution to a waiting committee pigeonhole. This is the first test during the present session as to whether the Senate is determined to reaffirm its constitutional role in the conduct of our foreign policy. It is its first opportunity to prove that the Senate has no intention to relinquish to the President its constitutional responsibility to say when and where American sons are to be called on to fight and die.

V. WE WANT NO MILITARY DICTATOR IN THE UNITED STATES

We want no military dictator in this country. There is no room for one on America's free soil. Congress must not permit itself to be thwarted. Its lawful functions must not be further undermined by the executive branch.

As I have warned on a previous occasion, the Congress must not permit itself to be relegated to the status of the Roman Senate under Diocletian, to the condition of the Estates General under Louis XIV, or to the position of the Reichstag under Hitler.

The separation of the powers of government provided in the Constitution must be asserted. The Congress must continue to operate as a coordinate branch of the Government.

I hope the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be promptly approved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the very forceful argument he has presented in setting forth that it is for the Congress to determine what the character of the aid shall be in implementing agreements made under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact; and, whether the President has the constitutional power or not, that high policy shall be determined by the Congress as the representatives of the people, and that the people shall be permitted to speak. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the kind remarks of the able minority leader.

THE NICKEL SITUATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as we stand at the beginning of a new year, and in the early stages of a new war-preparedness program, I think I voice the sentiments of many of my colleagues when I say I hope that, in the months ahead, we may be able to avoid many of the mistakes which were made during the period of World War II. Anything which any of us can do to help in avoiding such mistakes, it is our duty to do.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services, has recently brought to the attention of the Senate and of the country the report of his subcommittee on the situation with respect to one of the most important strategic metals, namely, nickel.

The Senator from Texas and his subcommittee are to be greatly complimented for their fine work; and their accomplishment, in focusing attention on the nickel situation, as they have done, deserves commendation.

The Senator from Texas did not, in his report on the nickel situation, touch upon a phase of that situation which was extremely serious during the recent war. I venture to mention that phase because it is one which might well become extremely serious in the months ahead, if the kind of mistakes which

were made once should be allowed to be repeated.

The situation to which I refer is not, in my opinion, confined to the nickel industry, or to those who are interested in the production of nickel. It is a situation which, in the past, has arisen many times with respect to many items of production. Similar situations are bound to arise many times more, and it is possible that mistakes might be made which could do inestimable harm, unless prevented by extreme watchfulness and prompt and vigorous action where necessary.

What I refer to—and I speak now, purposely, in general terms—is the situation in which representatives or former representatives of a particular industry or other special interest, brought into positions of power and influence in the Government, are tempted to use that power and influence for the benefit of the particular industry or interest with which they are or formerly were associated, even though the best interests of the United States may lie in another direction.

In 1944 the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization, of which I had the honor to be chairman, went at length into one situation such as I have described; and it happened to be a situation which involved nickel. It also involved chromium and iron ore.

Some of the hearings which we held in that matter were presided over by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who did very fine work on that special committee, as he always does on any committee to which he is assigned.

In that particular series of hearings, we were concerned with a small company, the Cascade Alloy Co., which wanted to produce chrome nickel steel—armor-plate steel—in the United States, from ores mined in the United States. That was a somewhat revolutionary proposal, because, as those familiar with the industry know, we traditionally get our nickel and our chrome from outside the United States. This proposal for developing our own resources to produce a type of steel which was extremely critical, and of which there was a serious shortage, might have been expected to meet with a prompt welcome in Washington; but that was not the case. As a matter of fact, the proposal stepped on some very sensitive toes, in effect; and the result was to set off a chain reaction which operated very effectively to prevent that plan for producing chrome nickel steel in the United States from United States ores from ever getting started.

How the proposal was sidetracked, time after time; how it was shunted from one Government agency to another; how obstacles, both real and imaginary, were located or created and thrown in the path of this proposal; how evidence in support of the plan was misinterpreted, or buried, or misplaced; all this makes an extremely interesting story. The part played in all this by representatives or former representatives of the International Nickel Co., and representatives or former representatives of corporations friendly to or associated with the International Nickel Co., also makes an extremely interesting story. The details are too long to recount here; but Senators who are interested will find them developed in the hearings of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization, in the Cascade Alloy case. I can assure my colleagues those hearings make extremely interesting reading. It is just like reading a book.

I have mentioned this matter today, Mr. President, because I do not feel that what happened in the case of the Cascade Alloy Corp. was an isolated instance. I think it was substantially the same thing that happened in other cases; and I think it is the same thing that might happen in the future, unless steps are taken to prevent it from happening.

What happened in the Cascade Alloy case, speaking very bluntly, is that the development of an American resource, and the production, in America, of urgently needed defense materials, was prevented because the success of the proposed undertaking would have been contrary to the commercial interests of certain large corporations, not all of which were even United States corporations.

I know that similar situations existed; and it was the intention of the Senate Special Committee on Industrial Centralization to have gone into some of those other situations. Unfortunately, as Senators may remember—and to the mind of the senior Senator from Nevada, it was extremely unfortunate—the Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization was not continued beyond the end of 1944; and so its work was not completed.

I am sorry to say that result was brought about on a purely political basis, and for purely political reasons. Nevertheless, the special committee was dissolved, its work was halted in midflight, and it was not even permitted to file a final report.

All that, of course, is water over the dam, and what we are interested in is looking ahead to the future.

I have sent to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] a copy of the hearings in the Cascade Alloy case, for his information; and I earnestly hope his subcommittee, which is concerning itself with the defense effort, will give special attention, in the months ahead, to the type of activity we uncovered in those hearings back in 1944.

The new defense agencies—I almost said "war" agencies, and I do not think I would have made any great mistake if I had said that—are filling up with men who have left their desks in private industry to come to Washington to do their part in the defense effort. There will be an increasing number of such men stepping into high places—and into places which, while not high, are nevertheless important from the standpoint of both policy making and day-to-day operations—in the weeks and months just ahead of us. I do not want it understood that I think that is bad. On the whole, it is good. We need such men in Government; and many of these men will be making very substantial personal sacrifices, financial and otherwise, in order to serve their country.

But there are two factors in this situation which we must watch. One is the factor of conditioned thinking, if I may call it that; the simple fact that a man who has been trained through the years to think in terms of the welfare of a particular corporation or a particular industry or a particular segment of our economy is likely to go on thinking that way unless he makes a conscious mental effort to jar himself into a new thinking pattern. Second, the fact that even though the vast majority of these new civil servants may be as high-minded and patriotic as any group of Federal employees can be, yet the effectiveness of their collective effort can be greatly diminished by even a small minority who will be willing to serve their old masters where they think they can get away with it, or in cases where they cannot see how helping their old employer will hurt the Government.

Right there, I think I have made reference to a situation which involves a bit of twisted thinking that is getting to be very common in our Government, and which needs to be straightened out. What I am referring to is the concept that it is all right for a Government employee to help a former employer, if he does not do anything contrary to the interests of the Government.

In private industry, perhaps that viewpoint is entirely acceptable. If a man is working for corporation A, having formerly worked for corporation B, why should he not do anything he can for corporation B so long as he does not do anything against the best interests of corporation A, his present employer? I am willing to leave the answering of that question to those who are working in private industry; but I submit that when a man leaves private industry to go to work for the Government of the United States, the case is entirely different. It is contrary to the best interests of the United States for any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government to do anything in his official capacity or in the course of his official duties which will help or favor one private corporation, or one private industry, over another.

Government, to be successful, must be impartial; and the bare fact that one private interest is being helped because of its connections or former connections with a Government official or employee is a bad situation even though no one else is being hurt.

Mr. President, I shall not press this subject further, except that I do want to express the hope, at this time, that the Senator from Texas and his subcommittee will be especially vigilant with respect to this situation which I have been discussing, and will undertake to try, as best they may, to prevent the occurrence, in the period that lies ahead of us, of anything like what happened in the Cascade Alloy case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make a short statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to yield if I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there ob-

jection to the Senator from Colorado yielding to the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS TO THE COLVILLE INDIANS, WASHINGTON

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, it will be recalled that in the Eighty-first Congress, House bill 2432, providing for the transfer of the title to 818,000 acres of land from the United States to the Colville Indians in the State of Washington, passed the House of Representatives and was reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A similar bill, Senate bill 1022, was introduced in the Senate. I filed a minority report on House bill 2432, which minority report sets forth the reasons why this bill should not pass. The bill died on the Senate Calendar with the Eighty-first Congress.

Senate bill 378 has now been introduced in the present session of Congress, which is identical with that of House bill 2432 and Senate bill 1022 of the Eighty-first Congress.

This proposed legislation, if enacted into law, would deprive the United States of many millions of dollars; it would tend to retard the Indians in the free exercise of their American way of life; it would tend to communize the Indians; it would aid in the perpetuation of the Indian Bureau and forever relegate these Indians and their property to a status of supervision and control by the Indian Bureau; it would permit a puppet Indian tribal council to dissipate the funds of the tribe; and it would give to certain attorneys and conspiring persons the right to share in the loot of the puppet council.

It appears that practically all the Colville Indians, the residents of Ferry and Okanogan Counties, the Tri-County Mining Association, the Northwest Mining Association, other mining and prospectors associations, and individual miners and prospectors are opposed to this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Hiram B. Runnels, Marcel Arcasa, and Jim O'Brien, three Colville Indians, who testified before a Senate subcommittee hearing at Spokane, Wash., on November 21, 1950, concerning these bills, be inserted at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. It is my belief that the reading of these statements will tend to inform those who are interested in this important program.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HIRAM B. RUNNELS

Mr. RUNNELS. We in particular are indebted to the Honorable Senator BUTLER of Nebraska. We have been in correspondence with him for several months. We feel very grateful for what he has done for us. I wish it would have been possible for him to have been here. There are many Indians present who would like to have met him.

We can assure Senator BUTLER that he is appreciated by every Indian on the Colville Indian Reservation, except perhaps Frank George and his Bureau stooges.

We are also grateful to Senator O'MAHONEY, the chairman of this committee, for his part in having this hearing here, and to Senator MURRAY, who has sacrified his time to come out to this hearing.

We are very grateful.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. Runnels, and I am sure that Mr. BUTLER, although he is not able to attend, will study the record very thoroughly and will give it the same consideration as if he was here present.

Mr. RUNNELS. Honorable Senator MURRAY, chairman, we are sorry that WALTER HORAN is not here. We wanted to tell him personally how much we opposed his bill H. R. 2432.

We are also sorry, we wanted to tell Senator MAGNUSON the same thing.

At the beginning, I wanted to state I speak for practically 100 percent of the Colville Indians, and we are absolutely opposed to the Horan-Magnuson bills. Of course, I do not represent Frank George's stooges.

We want to be understood that the Northwest Mining Association should not agree to any compromise on these bills for us. We have seen in the papers, and otherwise, that Hoagland effected a compromise, and it had been agreed to by the Northwest Mining Association. We want no part of it.

The Northwest Mining Association is a fine organization. We hope that they will not sell us down the river by this compromise.

In 1891–92 a commission was appointed. This agreement was fulfilled for the north half of the Colville Indians, in which the Indians received $1,500,000. Congress substantially ratified the agreement accepting the payment of $1,500,000.

The Indians were dissatisfied and hired lawyers to secure the $1,500,000 as per agreement. The contract with the lawyers was for 10 years, the contract expiring in 1904. In 1904, at the expiration of the contract, other attorneys agreed to collect the $1,500,000, leaving the amount of the attorneys' fees to be fixed by the Court of Claims, which the court fixed at $60,000.

In 1905 James McLaughlin negotiated an agreement with the Indians, opening the south half of the reservation, which agreement included the payment of $1,500,000, which the Government had failed to pay pursuant to the agreement of 1891. The Congress again failed to ratify this agreement. Instead Congress enacted a law following the terms of the McLaughlin agreement, except the payment of the $1,500,000. The $1,500,000 was paid under a separate act, less attorneys' fees of $60,000.

The act of March 22, 1906, which is a substitute of the McLaughlin agreement, provided for the opening of the south half of the Colville Reservation for the allotment of land to the Indians, and the Indians were to receive the proceeds of the homestead entries. Where did this money go?

By the agreements of 1892 and 1905, the Indians relinquished title to all their lands on the Colville Indian Reservation.

If the Indians were deceived in making these agreements, the Indians now have the Indian Claims Commission to present their claims against the Government. The Indians have tried for years to get an opportunity to present their claims to the Court of Claims. But now we have the Indian Claims Commission, so suit can be brought against the Government without a special bill.

The members of the Colville Confederated Tribes were never allowed to vote on any attorney, but the tribal council, without the consent of the tribe, entered into a contract with James E. Curry, of Washington, D. C., and Lyle Keith, of Spokane, Wash. They have done nothing, and time is running out.

The Indians are anxious that suit be commenced, but the Indians want the opportunity to select their own attorney. The members of the tribe have never authorized the council to select their attorneys. Frank George really appointed James E. Curry, without the tribe's consent. Mr. Curry is attorney or legal counsel for the National Congress of American Indians.

Mr. Frank George is vice president of this organization, who has been instrumental in taking money out of tribal funds to pay dues to the Congress of American Indians. In other words, he has taken upon himself to make every enrolled Indian a member of this organization without their consent.

In the present budget set-up, which is found on page 28 of the minutes of April 13–14, 1950, it appears there that $3,000 is taken for this purpose.

Mr. Frank George's position with the tribal council is tribal relations official. How he got this position we do not know. However, the members of the tribe were not consulted. He travels to all parts of the United States and we have not been furnished an accounting of his expenditures.

Senator, we would like to have Mr. George furnish us with a statement of his expenditures and place it in the records.

In connection with Frank George's employment, I wish to place the following letter in the record.

Senator MURRAY. The letter referred to by the witness will be marked exhibit 4 and carried in the records at this point.

INCHELIUM, WASH., *September 26, 1950.*
COLVILLE INDIAN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Nespelem, Wash.:

We, the undersigned, do declare that the Colville Indian business council met at Nespelem Indian council hall on January 8 and 9 in 1948. At this meeting Frank George, tribal council clerk, carrying the rating of CAF 5, asked for an increased rating of CAF 6, to which the council agreed to give. Then, in the minutes, after Frank George types up the minutes of the meeting, he inserts for himself the title of tribal relations clerk, which is an entirely different rating and different salary than what the business council approved for him. Then in the resolution he types up for himself, the blanket authority which covers all the business on the reservation, and also the intertribal relations clerk, and then on top of all this he takes upon himself the title of Colville tribal treasurer, giving him the sole authority to spend our money, however he sees fit. And then in April, 1948, when the January 1948 minutes were read, several of the councilmen were intoxicated and some asleep, and then that is when the minutes were read and passed on—but the resolutions were never read.

We feel that Frank George has assumed all this authority fraudulently and to the detriment of all the Colville Indians. Because too, the resolution was signed and approved by Mr. Towle, who was not at the agency at that time, since W. W. Head was the superintendent in charge at that time.

We now feel that Frank George should reimburse the tribe all the money he has spent under this false title.

We are ready, with the support of the whole tribe behind us to remove him from his present over-all position.

The signatures below are of a member of the present council, and a former councilman who was serving on the council in 1948.

FLORENCE QUILL.
HELEN TOULOU.
PETER J. GUNN.
JOE MONAGHAN.
LOUIE CAMILLE.
JOE ADOLPH.

Congressman HORAN states, on page 61 of the House hearing, he quotes a statement which is supposed to have been made by the tribal council, reading as follows:

"Present-day Colville Indian leaders feel that their forefathers were betrayed by the Government probably through erroneous interpretation when Mr. James McLaughlin negotiated the agreement of December 1,

1905, when it was stipulated that payment for the north half was contingent on the Indians signing away additional portions of their diminished land base."

This statement is absolutely untrue as there are 350 signers to the contract besides the Indian chiefs, and many of them are still living, of whom I am personally acquainted with. I did not sign it myself because I was at school at Haskell Institute, Kansas. If I would have been here on the reservation, I would have signed it.

In talking with a person who signed the McLaughlin agreement at that time, and since, it was the unanimous opinion that the promise of the payment of the $1,500,000 was what prompted the Indians to sign the agreement for the relinquishment of the south half of the Colville Indian Reservation.

The Indians before that time, for many years, had tried to make the Government pay the $1,500,000, so they were very happy to make a settlement.

On February 20, 1896, the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation was opened to mineral location under the United States mineral laws of 1872.

And on July 1, 1898, the south half was opened to mineral, relating to entry and location of mineral land.

We, the members of the Colville Tribe, feel that since that existed in 1898, we want the mining locations to continue. We want it strictly understood that we have never authorized the Northwest Mining Association to compromise in any way, shape, or form, which would disturb the location of mining claims according to mining laws of the United States. Nor have we ever authorized the county commissioners of Ferry and Okanogan Counties to compromise this mineral entry proposition. Nor do we approve of Mr. Hoagland's activities in this respect. He apparently is working for the county commissioners and is being paid out of our tribal funds.

I want to refer you to the April council minutes of April 13–14, 1950, and from pages 1 and 2 I want to read the following:

"Mr. Hoagland was to be complimented on the interest he has taken and for all he has accomplished. He had been doing his utmost to put things across, and had been able to reach people who could not have been contacted without him. His enthusiasm and interest in assisting the Colvilles had been very sincere.

"Mr. Keith had had a different part to play and was in a position to do what neither Mr. Hoagland nor others could have done and he surely has done everything possible to help, and he was able to unlock doors making it possible to get this matter to people who were needed."

Senator MURRAY. I understand that this statement has already been printed in the minority report, which is now in the Senate. If that is true, then it won't be necessary to repeat it here.

Mr. RUNNELS. In Senator BUTLER's report, on page 30, it is stated that Mr. Hoagland did not register as a lobbyist. If he had registered we would have known who had paid his expenses and how much Ferry County and Okanogan County and tribal funds was used in connection with Mr. Hoagland's trips to Washington, D. C.

Mr. Senator, did Mr. Hoagland violate any law when he failed to register? If he did violate the law, who is going to prosecute him?

Many letters have been written to Senators. Here is one written to Senator MAGNUSON, which I wish to submit for the record.

Senator MURRAY. It will be carried in the record as exhibit 5.

NESPELEM, WASH., *February 8, 1950.*

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I respectfully ask that H. R. 2432 and Senate bill 1021 be referred back to a subcommittee of your committee to be a hearing in or near Spokane, Wash., soon, for the following reasons:

I am a mining claim owner on the Colville Indian Reservation for the past 41 years. I, with my copartner, have options with eastern people, now we are informed that they could not and would not put any money into a set-up like this because they may not get title to the claims. I have talked to a good many people and they all agree that no one will put up money to develop mining claims here under the present set-up.

It is common knowledge that the Interior or Indian Bureau cannot give any information or data on this land as to its mineral value for leasing for mining purposes. If the Bureau insists on leasing mineral lands now, then we never had any rights on this land at any time; now in fairness to us, if we cannot own these claims then tell us to get off or compensate us for our years of effort.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK OSTROWSKI.

The proposed budget of the tribal council provides a consultant mining engineer.

There has been no prospecting or mining upon the reservation since the illegal withdrawal order of Mr. Ickes in 1934, which was rescinded in 1935 (p. 23 of H. R. 2432 shows a letter from Collier to the Secretary of the Interior).

Our tribal council, as it is now constituted, is nothing but a puppet for the Indian Bureau. Some of the members are employees of the Indian Bureau. Others have loans which are granted by the council themselves. Great favoritism is practiced so that only the favored few are benefited by the council's action.

The council members are dissipating the tribal funds, as will be seen by the proposed budget found on page 28 of the minutes of the tribal council meeting of April 13–14, 1950. I respectfully ask that this page of the items of the expenditures be copied and inserted in the record of this hearing.

"Whereas the finance committee of the Colville Business Council recommended the proposed budget to be paid from Colville tribal funds for the fiscal year 1952 as follows:

"1. Per diem and mileage for council members, regular and special committee members, members of special investigating committee, members of tribal election boards, credit committee or loan board members, and all other tribal groups or individuals as authorized by council action	$4,500
2. Salaries, inclusive of within-grade salary increases	25,443
3. Miscellaneous expenses	8,600
4. Burial of deceased members of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	4,500
5. Tuition for Indian children to be paid St. Mary's Mission, Omak, Wash., and Sacred Heart Mission, De Smet, Idaho	8,000
6. Tribal attorneys	3,500
7. Claims attorneys	5,000
8. Consultant mining engineer	4,000
9. General wildlife management and propagation	2,000
10. Operation and maintenance charges	500
11. Range improvement and maintenance of structures	2,000
12. Fire suppression and presuppression activities	15,000
13. Expenses connected with membership in intertribal organizations	3,000
Total	86,043"

I direct particular attention to a few items in the said proposed budget:

"Item 1. Provides for tribal council expenses	$4,500
Item 3. Miscellaneous expenses	8,600
Item 6. Tribal attorneys (Messrs. Keith and Winston, Spokane, Wash.)	3,500
Item 7. Claims attorney (James E. Curry and associates, Washington, D. C.)	5,000
Item 8. Consulting mining engineer (Everett Hoagland)	4,000
Item 13. Membership in intertribal organizations (membership dues, Congress of American Indians)	3,000"

The tribal council has employed Frank George as tribal relations official at a very large salary. We have no need of such an official. In addition, his wife is also employed at the agency and drawing a large salary, paid out of our tribal funds. There are many other wives and husbands employed at the agency office. This practice should not be tolerated as there are many competent young people who would like to be employed here.

Here is a list of the names of wives and husbands for the record: Mr. Richard and wife, Mr. Ed Hall and wife, Mr. Lightfoot and wife, Mr. Williams and wife, Mr. Jack Condon and wife, Mr. Frank George and wife, Mr. Jack Clark and wife.

And one party transferred from the Spokane Indian Reservation, Wash. He and his wife are employed.

Very few are qualified voters who go to the polls to vote. I would make it in my judgment less than 25 percent. This lack of interest is due to the fact that these elections are Bureau controlled.

Attempts have been made to correct the voting system, but the Bureau officials have always vetoed them. Any suggestion in the improvements of the elections receives the adverse rulings of the Superintendent.

A fair example to show how the council operates: At the meeting that the council held on April 13–14, 1950, Mr. Graves, Superintendent, and Mr. Keith, attorney for the council, when the matter of the Horan-Magnuson bill was under discussion, both Mr. Graves and Mr. Keith very strongly admonished the members of the council not to reveal any of the statements made regarding these bills because they stated that a single Senator in opposition could stop the passage of the bill and, furthermore, they asked the council and members of the tribe not to reveal a thing what was said or had taken place. Yet nothing concerning these statements appear in the minutes of April 13–14, 1950.

It would appear that the record shows whatever, in their judgment, should be recorded, and nothing else. Such seems to be the general practice.

Indian Bureau has used every effort possible to stop this Senate investigation. To cite you one of many instances: Last July Joe Kohler, chairman of the Ferry County commissioners, drove 65 miles to contact me. He said he had a wire from Congressman HORAN to contact me and asked me to wire my withdrawal of my objections to H. R. 2432, the Horan bill providing for the restoration of the 818,000 acres to the Indians.

I told him I am no backslider, and it was a damn poor time for me to crawfish. He told me that if I would withdraw my objections, he would see me later.

I further told him what we need is a senatorial investigation of the whole agency group, that matters were getting worse.

At that time I contacted about 15 or 20 young Indians who are veterans of World War II. I asked them, "What do you boys want, land or money?" They all said, "Give us money and give us full citizenship. We gain nothing by being under the authority of the Indian Agency."

I will cite you another case, just to show you the power and influence the Indian Bureau has. One William Derickson has a 160-acre allotment. A white man leases his allotment for $300 per year. The white man pays him $150 down. They go to the agency to have a lease drawn up. The extension agent tells him, "You cannot lease your land for dry farming. Your land is grazing land, which we are leasing for 10 cents per acre."

Every Indian who has received his allotment and received a patent that I have talked with does not want the 818,000 acres. They want the money so they can be on their own. They do not want to prolong the Indian Office here any longer.

Some of the councilmen are independent and want to do the right thing. At least five of the council members have tried to work for the best interests of the tribe.

The council was tricked into authorizing him to act for them. This authority now which Frank George claims was made at the meeting of the council January 9, 1948, when the council had adjourned and many of the councilmen were on their way home.

John Cleveland called a few of the councilmen together, supposed to be a quorum, the members that George controlled. Cleveland told them that something had been overlooked at the meeting. He suggested that a tribal relations officer has not been taken up. These members which Cleveland called together voted to adopt his suggestion of appointing a tribal relations officer. No formal resolution was offered in writing to vote upon, but George thereafter prepared the resolution, which was inserted in the minutes as having been voted upon and adopted. The minutes contained a resolution authorizing the establishment of the position of tribal relations officer. These minutes were not made available to the council for 6 months.

By such trickery all the authority of the council was transferred to Frank George, so if such authority is conferred in Frank George, there is no more need of a tribal council. Subsequent action of Frank George will so show.

These bills—the Horan-Magnuson bills, were instigated and prepared by Frank George, the superintendent and other Bureau officials, without the knowledge or consent of members of the tribe or tribal council.

The so-called program which is tied in with these bills was concocted by Frank George and his fellow stooges. On such a radical change in policy the members of the tribe should have a voice. The tribe at least should have a referendum vote to either accept or reject the proposition.

It goes to show that the Indian Agency at Nespelem is no benefit to the Indians. It only serves to figure out a program on paper, and Frank George, in his capacity as acting in his full authority of the council, votes himself money out of tribal funds to travel about the country, representing himself or assuming to represent the Colville Indians.

We, the Colville Tribe, whom we represent, ask for a full and complete statement of how much tribal money has been spent by Frank George and his assistant, Mrs. Lightfoot, since January 1948.

Frank George some time ago had the nerve to ask for an increase in his salary. I think he asked for $4,900 a year. Mr. Pryse, the area director of Portland, turned it down, and he has gone about the country and vilified Mr. Pryse. Among other things, he is advocating the abolishment of Mr. Pryse's office.

Such views of Frank George have been widely published in newspapers.

Frank George has an underling in a man by the name of Pete Lemery, who does whatever George tells him. This man Lemery is one of the present Indian councilmen. He is employed by the agency. The balance of the time he is employed by the agency under the direction of Frank George, so Frank George sees to it that Pete Lemery has full employment all year around. Pete Lemery lives in a Government-owned house at the agency, so he is well taken care of by Frank George. This is the same Pete Lemery who is on the council and is a puppet for Frank George on the council.

Frank George also provides periodical employment for other council members who are subservient to him, so one can see what this council amounts to.

Pete Lemery was declared elected in the 1949 election by the superintendent, Graves, by absentee votes. By the unofficial count two candidates were ahead of Lemery. I was 9 votes ahead of him, but 14 absentee votes came in. Lemery beat me by five votes.

I then wrote a letter to Superintendent Graves asking him to furnish me the names and addresses of the 14 absentee voters who were supposed to have voted for Lemery, copies of letters requesting absentee ballots, and permission to see the envelopes and postmarks containing the absentee ballots. I never received any reply from Mr. Graves. I know he received my letter marked "personal."

Several months after the time of mailing the letter to Mr. Graves, I asked Graves why he never answered my letter about Pete Lemery's absentee votes. He told me he never did receive my letter. He stated he never received the letter. I told him I had addressed the letter to him properly and placed the return address on the left-hand corner of the envelope and that he must have received it. He then told me I was a liar. I said if anyone was a liar he was, because the letter would have been returned to me.

The absentee voting is very seldom used in our elections. Many of the candidates did not receive any absentee votes.

Pete Lemery, being a Government employee and hanging around the agency a great deal of the time, buttonholes Indians coming in from Idaho and other places to transact business with the agency and contacts them for absentee votes. He seems to get them. I do not know whether these 14 voters voted in that manner or not, but I am quite sure no one else received any votes at that election.

Also all the absentee ballots have to come through Frank George, so anyone can judge for himself how a man like Pete Lemery is elected.

Pete Lemery has been an employee of the agency for many years, including that of policeman some years ago. He was relieved of his duties on account of drunkenness. He then was employed by the Indian roads division, and finally was reinstated by Superintendent Graves. So the agency always keeps him, no matter what he may do in regard to breaking the rules and regulations.

Pete Lemery, while employed by the Government in some capacity not too long ago, induced a man to make his will in his favor. This man lives around Inchelium. He is an old man, has no relatives, in ill health, received old-age pension. Pete Lemery went to him and told him to make a will leaving all property to him. This man owns an allotment of considerable value. The man has continuously asked that the land be sold so that he can use the proceeds of such sale so he could care for himself during the last days of his life.

The agency approved of this will. I presume Mr. Lemery will acquire this estate when, in all honesty and decency, this man should be permitted to sell his allotment so he can live in comfort during the balance of his life. The man has tuberculosis and he cannot live very much longer, if he is not already dead.

By this kind of dealings by Pete Lemery, and approved by the Indian Bureau, they will deprive this old man of a few happy days and defraud the State of Washington of considerable money. This man lives in despair and poverty, yet the Indian Bureau is responsible for this situation.

In 1948 we had a referendum vote on the proposition of a general election system to apply to the Colville Reservation. This proposition carried by a large majority but the Indian Bureau vetoed it, so we now have election laws suitable to the Indian Bureau, but not to us.

Frank George has made every Colville Indian a member of the Congress of American Indians, assessing each member 5 cents, each taking the money out of tribal funds without the knowledge or consent of the tribe. At our meeting with Indians from the Umatilla, Yakima, and the Coast Indians, we were to vote on our membership by general election, but we never did.

Petitions have been and now are being circulated asking that the $1,600,000 now in the United States Treasury be distributed to the members of the Colville Tribe and that the Indians be given their freedom from Bureau control and be given their rights and privileges as citizens.

These petitions are addressed to Senator HUGH BUTLER and are being circulated and are being signed by members of the tribe, and I believe that 95 percent of the members of the tribe will sign these petitions, and many hundreds have signed these petitions.

I ask that these petitions be placed in the records of these hearings, and we be permitted to send in additional signed petitions for the record:

PETITION

To HON. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas $1,600,000 of Colville Indian funds is now in the hands of the United States Government from the sale of timber and the leasing of grazing lands; and

Whereas the Colville Indian Council is a generally uneducated body and easily led by the Indian agent and individuals working with him, and as a result the only liberal and free expenditures made to date have been for surplus administrative personnel and equipment and attorneys and lobbyists; and

Whereas the attorneys for the tribe are presently lobbying to attempt to turn over our funds for more unrestricted and consequently inefficient spending to perpetuate themselves and the bureaucracy governing the tribe; and

Whereas no constructive program has been developed for the general welfare of the rank and file of the Colville Tribe and the council under the benevolent gloved hand of steel of the agency has favored the few well-to-do Indians; and

Whereas the people have requested the council to obtain a per capita payment, and they have failed to take action, and the superintendent has refused to approve such a payment;

It is therefore necessary for the undersigned to take action by this petition for the purpose of distributing the above funds for the general benefit and welfare of the whole tribe; and therefore the undersigned hereby petition Congress to authorize the distribution of said fund by a per capita payment to the Colville Indian Tribe.

CHRISTINE WILLIAMS
(And 598 others).

PETITION

To Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

More people are living in poverty today than when the Colville Indian Reservation was established. Hunting and fishing are negligible toward support of our people. Our economic life has been revolutionized and yet we are not allowed to buy and sell our own property. Business principles are

completely ignored. Our capital resources cannot be sold and developed. People who own large tracts of timber live in a hovel but cannot sell their timber. They are forced to wait until one of the big favored lumber companies systematically cuts large tracts of timber and reaches the individual's land. Red tape and a desire to perpetuate themselves in office by members of the Indian service have not been conducive to economic development of our Indian resources.

People will not establish industry or businesses when they cannot give a long-term lease let alone a deed. We cannot develop capitalistic enterprise under Soviet-type control.

Why should we be ruled by individuals who know nothing about business?

Why are we protected by a system of theoretical benevolent paternalism?

Are we not any more capable of running our affairs than a colored or white man?

When are we going to be treated on terms of equality? When can we order a glass of beer the same as any other citizen?

It is time we were given our freedom to live unrestricted as ordinary individuals instead of living under the thumbs of small-minded souls who cannot see further than their monthly pay check.

Therefore, the undersigned respectfully petition that we be freed, given the rights, duties, and privileges of a citizen.

HARVEY ST. PAUL
(And 570 others).

Senator MURRAY. The petitions will be filed with the papers in the record for the use of the committee.

Mr. RUNNELS. We have also another petition for the rescinding of a resolution passed on the 9th day of January 1948, No. 1948-6. An additional petition is in the hands of the chairman. We ask that these petitions be made a part of the record. More petitions will be coming in also for the record. There are over 125 signatures so far on the two petitions spoken of, and this is one of them:

"PETITION TO THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION

"We, the undersigned members of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians do hereby petition the General Tribal Council for an order and resolution repealing and rescinding resolution No. 1948-6, passed by the business council on the 9th day of January 1948.

"Under such resolution entirely too much authority and too much compensation is given the tribal clerk. We therefore further petition that all resolutions and orders whereby the tribal clerk or any other officer working under the direction of the tribe are given blanket or general authority to make or create claims or expenditures against the tribal funds, be rescinded, repealed and set aside.

"GEORGE LOUIE
"(And 33 others)."

Senator MURRAY. That may also be filed in the record.

Mr. RUNNELS. The Colville Indians want to be free from Government interference. They get along with their white neighbors and want to continue. Intermarriage is the rule rather than the exception. The result is there are more mixed-blood Indians than full-bloods. The Indian children attend public schools. In fact, we have never had an Indian school on the south half of the Colville Indian Reservation. However, they did have an Indian boarding school on the north half, at Tonasket, which burned down in 1895. There has been no Indian school on the reservation since. There is one Catholic Indian Boarding Mission at Omak, or on the Omak Creek.

On January 31, 1916, Congressman C. C. Dill, from this congressional district, had this to say:

"How long shall we continue the reservation system? We began herding Indians on reservations about 100 years ago, and are keeping them there still. Shall it never end? Those who know the Indians best condemn it. The Indians themselves, that is, those who have once gotten away from it, object to it and urge its abolition, and the others are wards and have no opportunity to know of any other system than the reservation system.

"I am informed that during the last 35 years we have appropriated $265,000,000 to carry on the present system. Are the Indians the better for it? No. Only those who have been able to get free from it have really profited by it.

"Why do we not get rid of it? I'll tell you why. There are now in the Federal Treasury between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 of Indian trust funds. The Indian lands are worth more than a billion. As long as these funds and this property remain to be administered by Government officials who make a living by the administering, and Congress obeys the recommendations of these officials, we shall not get rid of it. The system will end only when Congress acts in the true interests of the Indian, regardless of the official recommendations which the Indian Department may make."

I am a taxpayer and many other Indians are doing the same as I am. They do not oppose to pay taxes. They feel as though they should share the burden with other citizens.

All Indians who are 65 years or over receive pensions under the laws of the State of Washington. The State welfare department is taking care of the needy, and I personally know if it had not been for this department of welfare there would be great suffering because the agency office will not do a thing for the welfare of the Indians.

Many old Indians who are receiving welfare and pensions and who own large tracts of land desire to sell their holdings so they may live properly and relieve the State from these payments, but the Indian Bureau absolutely refuses to approve of any sale, thereby cheating the State of Washington of large sums of money.

According to the last census of enrollment of the Colville Indian Reservation, the records show that there are over 3,400 Indians enrolled and the Bureau figures show that over 1,000 families live on the Colville Reservation. These figures are misleading and incorrect. I personally know every Indian family on the reservation. So do other members of the tribe who are present.

The actual number of families living within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation is 248. This figure includes men with families, as well as old men and women receiving State aid and State pensions, as well as other single persons. All of these families—it includes a large portion of this number who are farming and taking care of their own affairs without Indian Bureau supervision.

The same is true in regard to those on relief and receiving State pensions.

The Indian Bureau does nothing for these people and are not even in touch with them.

In Nespelem there are approximately 63 families. These are also independent of the Indian Bureau. They work at Coulee Dam, the lumber mills, and other gainful employment, many of whom are taxpayers and own their own homes.

There are 10 families living on the north half of the reservation, consisting of 47 persons.

In representing about 100 percent of the people living on the Colville Reservation, except Frank George and his stooges, I respectfully ask that the Indian Agency furnish a copy of the latest rolls of Indians belonging to the Colville Indian Reservation, indicating who they are and where they live.

In the enrollment of the 3,400 Indians on the Colville Indian Reservation, there are 600 or more Indians living in Canada and belonging to reservations there.

There are a large number of Indians living in Idaho who are enrolled on the Colville Reservation, as well as Indians living in other parts of the State of Washington and the world, who have no connection with the Colville Agency. My family, I have two daughters, one living in Oakland and one in Eureka, Calif., and one son in Fairbanks, Alaska. The same situation no doubt is true in other families.

In my judgment there is an Indian population on the Colville Reservation now far less than 1,500. The total number of families would be less than 325.

I notice in the hearings on Indian appropriations bill, the total population on the Colville Indian Reservation is given as 3,400, which number is misleading and inaccurate. No doubt such testimony is made to obtain large appropriations to run the Indian Agency.

We are absolutely against the so-called land purchase. We do not believe in this Communist form of ownership. We are an independent people and we want to own our property without any strings on it.

Frank George's tribal council is attempting to buy individual Indian allotments for tribal ownership, and he has bought a few. The Indian Bureau will not permit any Indian to sell his land or timber to anyone but the tribe, for large lumber companies.

The Bureau is buying up land from individuals, the Bureau making the appraisals. They pay the owner generally about half the value of the property. In addition, they charge the Indian a 10-percent commission for the sale of the lands to the Indian Bureau.

I can cite you one example. Mrs. Delia O. Lawrence, now living at Omak, Wash., about 4 months ago sold her 120-acre timber allotment to the tribe for $3,000, which price is about one-half of its value. The Indian Bureau deducted 10 percent from the purchase price, so that left Mrs. Lawrence $2,700. She signed the deed over 4 months ago and the $2,700 has not been paid yet. Not only that, the Indian Bureau advised her to borrow $700 from the bank at 8½ percent interest.

Mrs. Lawrence needed the $700 to put her children in school, and she is badly in need of the $2,700 to maintain herself and keep her children in school, but after 4 months Mrs. Lawrence is still demanding her $2,700 and is still paying the bank 8½ percent interest on the loan of $700.

No doubt there are many cases like it.

Where the 10-percent commission goes, we do not know. We respectfully ask that a statement be furnished for the record of this hearing how much land has been purchased, at what price, and the amount of commission collected from the sellers of the land; also what becomes of the commissions collected and what disposition is made of the commissions.

There are many Indians, particularly old Indians who are on old-age pensions, who are very anxious to sell their lands and timber to better their conditions but the Indian Bureau refuses to allow them to sell or issue patent in fee for their lands.

These old pensioners generally have large tracts of land and a lot of salable timber, but they live in poverty in old tumble-down shacks which are a disgrace to any civilized community. The Indian Bureau refuses to let them cut their timber for the building of homes so that they may live decently. I will cite a few cases which will demonstrate the policy which the Indian Bureau pursues.

Abraham Edwards, 74 years old, drawing old-age pension, has seven inherited allotments, each allotment containing 80 acres or more. He has tried for a long time to sell

at least some of the allotments and some of the timber but the Indian Bureau refuses to sell the timber or the land. In the meantime, Mr. Edwards is living in an old shack by himself, in poverty.

Mrs. Juanita Gallaher owns a timber allotment approximately 155 acres on the San Poil River, just off State Highway No. 4. Her husband is a sawmill operator and wishes to cut the timber on this allotment but the Indian Bureau refuses. They have a family of six children. They need this timber to better their conditions.

Nespelem Charley, 75 or 80 years old, died about 2 years ago. When he died he had seven allotments lying in a block. He left only two heirs, a daughter and a grandson. He was on old-age pension when he died about 2 years ago. A long time prior to his death he tried to sell some of his timber and land but the Indian Bureau refused and made this Indian live in poverty, even though he owned property to the value of thousands of dollars. His daughter, Adeline Charley Perkins, now lives in a dilapidated shack. She has requested the Bureau to sell some of the property but the Indian Bureau has refused to loan her $500.

The estate which she has inherited from her father is easily worth more than $50,000. Yet her father died like a pauper.

Albert Jerred, about 41 years old, lives near Kewa, Wash. He has a timber allotment of about 120 to 140 acres. He works off his allotment to support his four children. The Indian Bureau will not allow him to cut his own timber to help support his children.

Cashmere Joseph, a widower, a cripple, has living with him three grandchildren. He supports himself by cutting wood and posts. He owns one allotment of 160 acres, all under cultivation, at Bridgeport, about 50 miles from where he lives. He used to receive $150 per year as rent; now he receives only $40. He wants to sell this allotment but the Indian Bureau refuses. He has four other timber allotments also, which he would like to sell so that he could make his home on lands which he owns, but the Indian Bureau refuses to be of any help to him.

Mary Gusta, 95 years old, Louie Gusta, 90 years old—both blind—and Pierre Gusta, 80 years old, are all brothers and sisters, all living together. Mary and Pierre receive State pensions. Louie did receive a pension but he sold his timber on his allotment and the proceeds from the sale were deposited in the Agency office, which is now paying $50 per month out of this fund to him. Pierre and Mary own two allotments with good timber and a little farming land. They also own a section of land in the northern half of the reservation. They have tried to sell in order that they may live decently, but the Indian Bureau refuses. These people live all together in a dilapidated house. Pierre does the shopping at Kewa about 3 miles away. The two blind people cannot take care of the stove to keep them warm so they go to bed until Pierre returns.

Madeline Timinto, 65 years of age or more, owns her own allotment and an additional two inherited allotments. She now lives in Nespelem and has built a home from proceeds received from old-age pension and insurance left by her deceased son. She cannot use the three allotments she owns and she wants to sell them so she can live comfortably at Nespelem.

Johnnie Alex Jack, Willie Quilaskin, half brothers, both receive old-age pensions. John Alex Jack is an invalid and cannot work. They live any place where they can find work. Both have valuable timber allotments but the Indian Bureau refuses to permit them to sell.

Paul Peters, 55 years old, crippled hand, blinded in one eye and the sight in the other is affected—he and his wife have allotments with timber. His wife has 200 acres of inherited land on the Flathead Reservation, Mont. The Indian Bureau will not permit them to sell their lands on the Colville Reservation or the Flathead Reservation. He has tried to get a permit to cut his own timber. The Indian office has refused him a permit. They have also tried to sell land to the tribe. This also failed. They now live in poverty and not sufficient income to live on. Their neighbors and friends help them by giving them food in order to keep them from starving.

Mary Abraham, more than 70 years old and living on a pension—she owns her husband's allotment of 140 acres in the 9-mile timber unit, which can be logged at any time as her timber land adjoins the highway. She has asked for a permit to sell her timber but the Indian Bureau has refused to give her a permit to sell her timber. She also owns land on the Spokane Reservation which she inherited from her father. This land she is renting to a white man, receiving very little rent money. She also owns an allotment inherited from her second husband, located at Nespelem. This allotment is perhaps worth $6,000. Some years ago she sold her allotment that was allotted to her to the tribe. The tribe only paid $1,200. The timber on this allotment was worth more than $1,200.

Johnnie George, about 68 years old, lives on old-age pension but owns about 800 acres of good yellow pine timber. He would like to sell some timber to live on. He is in ill health and is too old to work. The Indian Bureau refuses to allow him to sell land or timber.

William Burke, about 63 years old, is in ill health and not able to work. He also owns 80 acres on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation. He receives State aid. The Indian Bureau refuses him permission to sell any of this land on the Colville or Coeur d'Alene Reservations.

Louie David, 44 years old, single, crippled, cannot work and is receiving a GI pension. He lives at Worley, Idaho. He has three allotments of good standing timber. He is anxious to sell the timber and allotments. The Indian Bureau refuses.

Robert Bauine, living near Kewa—his wife is ill and he has four children. He owns a timber and grazing allotment of 120 acres near Twin Lakes. He is now leasing or share cropping on land belonging to the tribe. He would like to sell his own allotment, which is of no value to him. With the proceeds derived from the sale of his allotment, he would like to buy the land which he is now leasing from the tribe, but the Indian Bureau will not agree to such a deal.

Charles E. Williams has a timber allotment of 160 acres. He has made application to cut timber on his own allotment to build himself a home on a lot owned by him in Nespelem. The Bureau refuses his request. He has a wife and five children, now living in a two-room shack. He works at a sawmill at Belvidere. He also owns three allotments, in addition to the timber allotment. These three allotments are farm land, two of which are leased. His wife also owns a grazing allotment and a one-half interest in her mother's and a one-sixth interest in her father's. The Indian Bureau refuses to permit them to sell.

Joe Red Thunder owns six allotments of land, has 200 acres of good timber and also owns two allotments in Idaho or near Genesee, Idaho, and one near Craig, Idaho. Mrs. Red Thunder owns an allotment of 160 acres and 40 acres inherited from her mother, and a one-sixth interest in her father's allotment. She also owns 2.5 acres adjoining Nespelem. They have seven children, five of them now going to school. They are now living in a shack needing repair. The shack is being ruined because he cannot get lumber to build an addition or make repairs. They now are compelled to drink water from an open creek which runs by their house. The Indian Bureau refused them the privilege to cut or sell timber or sell any of their lands.

Mrs. Annie Pamolks, a widow about 80 years old, has four or more allotments. She is living alone in a two-room shack. She owns a lot of fine timber and farming land. She wants to sell at least some of her holdings in order that she may build herself a home in Nespelem. The Indian Bureau refuses to do anything about it.

Our extension agent, Earl Stinson, and his three assistants are of no value to the Colville Indians. They show favoritism to members of the tribe in issuance of the reimbursable cattle and the handling of loans. I will submit an example of Mr. Stinson's dealing with members of the tribe in 1946.

Earl Stinson called upon Joseph Nicholson, who lives near Oroville and who owns 130 acres of land which he is farming, and proposed that Nicholson sell his land to D. E. W. Neil, a white man. Nicholson did not want to sell his land. When Nicholson refused to sell his land to D. E. W. Neil, Stinson then told Nicholson that no loans would be approved and he would not get any reimbursable cattle. An application for a loan of the tribal fund was pending, and he did not receive his loan until May 1949, and through the influence of the Veterans' Bureau. But up to this time he has not received any reimbursable cattle although his application was pending for years. The agency also has refused him permission to cut lodgepoles on his own allotment. The agency also informed him that if permission is given him to cut poles on his own allotment, the proceeds from sale of the same would have to be deposited with the agency and disbursed with their approval. Mr. Nicholson is 37, is married, has a wife and two children, served in World War II, and has always handled his own affairs.

The Indian Bureau is leasing grazing lands at 10 cents per acre. We feel that in some instances the rate should be increased.

We also feel the allottee should have the privilege of leasing his own land without the supervision of the Indian Bureau.

One Parm Dixon, a sheepman, said he paid 90 cents a head for grazing on the Colville Indian Reservation for his sheep.

We, the members of the Colville Reservation, feel we should adopt the State laws. Our hunting and fishing regulations should be reserved to the Indians.

The Federal liquor laws should be repealed.

We are paying our police officers out of our tribal funds. The only arrests made are for liquor violations. One Indian alone, while he had 70 head of cattle, lost 19 head by cattle thieves. This was when William H. Head was superintendent. This is one reason why our sheriff's office could do a better job to protect our Indians.

We have been operating our own wildlife accounts since 1940, selling fishing and hunting licenses to non-Indians residing on and off the reservation. We have never had a report on this matter. This is handled by Mr. Frank George.

We are now asking that a report be made to this committee by Mr. Frank George.

We believe roads and highways should be constructed by the State. The State is doing a much better job and gets it done.

We insist that the tribe should select its attorneys instead of being selected by Frank George. The present attorney for the Tribal Council was selected by Frank George.

Our claims attorney should be selected by the tribe and not by Frank George. Time is running out and we should be working on our cases.

The contract for the cutting of timber provides for the employment of Indians. In some instances this is not complied.

In our contract with lumbering companies, they were to hire and give labor to at least 50 percent of their personnel. Upon a check

of the labor personnel, it showed they hired only 4 percent.

The employment of Everett Hoagland by Frank George is done without authority from the tribe. There is not need of such an engineer, nor does the tribe need him as a lobbyist. There hasn't been any mining by the tribe at any time, nor is there any prospect of there ever being at any time.

Why don't Ferry County and Okanogan County hire him for their mining engineer? Who found all the big paying mines that were located in our United States? Certainly Mr. Mining Engineer did not discover them.

We opposed taking over by the tribe of mining leasing under Bureau control. We favor that the United States laws pertaining to mineral locations should apply.

This reservation was opened up in the year 1898 under the mining laws of 1872. We feel that there will never be any discord between Mr. Indian and Mr. White Man who may prospect for minerals on the reservation.

Why start a mining bureau on the reservation when we have a Mining Bureau in the Department of the Interior? We do not favor the leasing system. We ask that the 110,000 acres opened to mining continue as in 1893, unmolested to miners and prospectors. We ask the Northwest Mining Association and the Tri-County Mining Association to provide every effort of support to accomplish this.

We oppose the large lumber unit system. There is an abundance of ripe and overripe timber, and the timber area should be cut up into small units, and that the Indian allottee should be allowed to sell his own timber, without Indian Bureau restriction.

Any Indian logging units do not have enough timber to run them 12 months in the year. Our matured and overripe timber could cure this mistake. The sustained-yield basis was concocted by our Indian Bureau for the purpose of logging this overripe timber for the next hundred years, so we will be subject to and controlled by the Indian Bureau, who only allows the Indian loggers 10,000,000 board feet per year.

There should be a recruise of our timber to give us more employment for our Indian loggers.

All Indians who have been fortunate enough to receive a patent to their lands are now self-supporting.

We urge many more Indians should receive patents in fee to their lands so that they may make use of their assets.

We have three small irrigation projects on the reservation. They are failures. One irrigation project on the San Poil is used by one man, who irrigates about 35 acres. I doubt that his operations have justified the cost.

This project, which has only one farmer irrigating from the ditch, was supposed to be built for all the Indians that live below this project, as all the Indians living in and below this project had to sign a petition to have the Indian Bureau build the same. This project cost the Indian Bureau about $12,000 to serve one patentee Indian.

The members of the Colville Indians have a grievance against the council. In 1948 a resolution was passed for the purpose of providing a pint of milk and a sandwich for the needy Indian children. This resolution was vetoed. In its place they passed a resolution to provide $3,000 for travel expenses for one Frank George, who has bestowed on himself the rank of tribal relations officer, for the benefit of the Congress of American Indians.

While we want to be fair to all Indian children, whether they are Protestant or Catholic, if the Council can extend financial aid to the St. Mary's Mission, Wash., and Desmet, Idaho, why not practice a little gratitude at home here in Nespelem? There are about 150 Indian pupils attending school, whose parents are very much in need.

There is appropriated $8,000 to missions at Omak, Wash., and Desmet, Idaho, which is off the reservation.

The doctor at the agency is very negligent. Many Indians complain at the hospital service. The doctors change frequently; also the nurses change frequently.

Indians are permitted to visit the sick. They visit from 2 to 4 p. m., and from 7 to 8 p. m. Clinic hours are from 9 to 11:30, 5 days a week. No clinic hours on Saturday or Sunday. So, no matter how sick an Indian is, he cannot visit the clinic from Saturday to Monday, at 9 a. m.

No surgical operations are performed at the hospital. This is a 48-bed hospital.

We believe that the Indians would be better served by local medical doctors and surgeons, and the hospital should be operated in conjunction with the white people in the community.

Senator MAGNUSON, who introduced Senate bill 1021 in the Senate, to our knowledge, has never been on the Colville Reservation to consult with the tribe so we feel that he does not know enough about our reservation and our problems to be a good judge as to what our needs are, or as to what bills should be introduced, or to correct the abuses of the Indian Bureau or better our economic and social problems.

Congressman HORAN, who is urging the passage of H. R. 2432, restoring the 818,000 acres of land to the Colville Indians, has not consulted with members of the tribe as to this bill. He has, however, visited the agency and consulted with Frank George and has had his picture taken, feather-bedecked Nez Perce Indians. The Colville Indians do not dress up in feathers.

TESTIMONY OF MARCEL ARCASA

Mr. ARCASA. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman; I have a statement here. We are not in favor of Horan and Magnuson bill, H. R. 2432, for that would put us right back into the hands of the Indian Bureau. We will not be any better off than we are at the present time. We would still be under the control of the Indian Bureau. What we are fighting for is to get away from the Indian Bureau and their steam-roller tactics. Sure, the Indian Bureau is putting up a fight to have this 818,000 acres restored to the tribe so that they can get full control of the reservation. The majority of the tribe wants their civil liberty and to be decontrolled from the Indian Bureau so that they can progress. There has not been any progress made on the Colville Reservation within the last 15 or 20 years. It is about time we are doing something about it.

A large number of Colville Indians live in old shacks, and a lot of them have land and timber but cannot sell the timber so they can build themselves good comfortable homes.

The Indian Bureau restrictions will not allow them to sell their land or timber, and a good many of the Colville Indians are getting old-age pensions from the State and relief from the county, and many of them have large timber holdings and lands. If they would let the Indians sell their timber or lands, they would take the care off the State and county, and save them a lot of money and help the Indians to be independent.

I would like to put the officials in the place of the Indian and see how they would like it. It would not be long until they would be asking for someone to help them out. That is what we are fighting for today, to better the condition of the Colville Indians.

We would like to have legislation passed so the allottee could sell the timber individually and get a good price for their timber and not have to sell it at a small price just because the Indian Bureau says so.

And about the mines, when did the Indian Bureau go into the mining business? They have made a failure in the past to induce capital to develop our mineral resources. Their job is to take care of the Indian and they have done a poor job of that, and it will be the same on the mining business.

I am in favor of the old United States mining laws to go back into effect.

We have asked Senator BUTLER for a per capita payment. The petition speaks for itself. We are not asking for a loan or appropriation. We are asking for money that belongs to the tribe, revenue derived from resources, from timber sales, and from leases. That is the only solution whereby each and every one will share and share alike.

TESTIMONY OF JIM O'BRIEN

Mr. O'BRIEN. We believe practically 100 percent of the Colville Indians are in full accord with the statement of Mr. Hiram Runnels. Our petitions with about 500 names on goes to show how the Indians are backing his statement. Also four petitions have not been collected as yet.

Senator MURRAY. And you say 100 percent of them are backing the opposition to this bill?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Practically 100 percent. I believe there was less than 1,000 Indians on the reservation and around 500 or 498 have signed it.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs stinks.

We wish to thank this committee for making it possible for penetrating the iron curtain of the Indian Bureau. In the past the officials from Washington who come out to learn our conditions come to the Indian Agency and gets all information there, and goes no further, and tells the people everything is lovely with the Indians.

Our mineral resources lie dormant on account of Indian Bureau restrictions. We have a lot of timber and land-poor Indians on account of Indian Bureau restrictions. Business principles are ignored in handling our affairs. We don't want the Indian Bureau to handle our mining resources.

The Indian Bureau's handling of our mineral resources is a complete failure. If the white man can progress under United States mining laws, we can progress too.

As to our timber resources, large companies have been favored and the small Indian loggers have been ignored. My information is that prices paid for Indian timber is much less than prices paid for national forest timber.

European dictators have compared our Indian reservations to concentration camps. Stalin, the greatest dictator of all time, has nothing on our Indian Bureau. I wonder what Patrick Henry, the famous patriot, would think or say if he were alive today and saw the Colville Indians living under a dictatorship and trying to get their liberty. Our Indian boys fought two world wars for the liberty of the white man, I guess. We wonder how many more world wars the Indians will have to fight in order to get their own liberty.

The white man has beer parlors and clubs for recreation, but the Indians have the bootleg system which was a failure among the white people.

Congress should abolish the Indian Bureau with its dictatorial powers and police-state tactics and incompetent business methods.

A lot of us Indians are taxpayers. We protest to Congress appropriating our tax money for a needless Indian Bureau.

We fail to see where Frank George and his Congress of American Indians have helped the Colville Indians. Only Frank George has helped himself to our tribal funds.

As to per capita payment, the petition speaks for itself. We can put this money to

better use by all the people rather than being dissipated by Frank George and his stooges.

The Colville Indians want to be free from the Indian Bureau. The State pays the Indians old-age pensions as well as the needy.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO SOLUTION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in this Chamber within recent days on the proposition of attaining a foreign policy which can be widely supported by a united America. A broad variety of opinion has been disclosed, and we are all sifting the many alternatives which are the product of profound deliberations. We are all deeply sincere in a desire for peace, yet we are honestly compelled to the view that the Russian Empire desires armed conflict with the free world. The Politburo will apparently not feel secure until Russian imperialism dominates the world. We will have no real security until the war machine of Communist imperialism is overwhelmingly exceeded by the might of the free nations.

I am not endeavoring to reach a solution today to the problem of a workable foreign policy for this country. Instead, I want to urge upon my colleagues convictions of mine which I earnestly hope will be some of the elements on which that solution will be based.

First, I should like to speak of the spirit in which we will approach the development of an ultimate policy. In my opinion, there has never been a period within our history in which it has been more necessary for our public servants, both civil and military, to be utterly frank and realistic. We are in conflict with a godless horde that knows no honor, a horde that is brutal and vicious. We have witnessed the operation of Russian imperialism in the conquering of many nations, an operation that has displayed all the cunning devices which take advantage of human nature—broken promises, deceit, class hatred, suspicion, all these allied with application of brute force on weakened peoples. Any vestige of Victorian diplomacy which exists today must be abandoned in our dealings with the Russians and their satellites. We must depart from the policy of the striped pants and the soft gray gloves, and face up to the fact that the Marquis of Queensbury rules are a handicap when the Russians are in the ring. The intelligence experts of the free world should be fully supported in programs to encourage resistance to Russian domination, and supplies useful to organized resistance must be slipped into the hands of the oppressed. We must strike the soft under belly of communism at every point open to attack.

Another factor in the development of a foreign policy requires a positive indication that the nations whom we regard as allies are ready and willing to extend themselves to the fullest of their abilities. All nations desiring to remain free from Communist domination must act quickly to train armies and to obligate their economies to the maximum in the production of munitions and supplies. The other free nations will have to maintain control over the Communists within their borders, and all within the free orbit must, as of this moment, abandon trading in any markets which supply or aid the Russian imperialists. Honesty compels us to write off any nation which fails to achieve these prerequisites.

Today we are heavily in debt from a war which, it was hoped, would bring to the world a long and prosperous peace. We are daily becoming more heavily indebted, and the Eighty-second Congress is obligated to achieve maximum efficiency out of every dollar spent on our military and domestic programs. The magnitude of defense preparations can never be allowed to make economies, however small, appear trifling, and the succeeding generations who inherit the burdens of these costly times deserve every dollar we can save them. I intend, at a later time, to call attention to specific items which I believe we can erase from the President's budget.

For the present, I believe our best military minds should be devoted to the proposition of effectively utilizing the armed strength that can be obtained from the Chinese Nationalists, the Japanese, and the western Germans. We deserve whatever allies are capable and willing to meet the common enemy. It is pitiful that we have not been properly supported in Korea by the other members of the United Nations, and it seems apparent that the Korean incident was a carefully calculated trap to employ American military strength far from home and farther from Europe. I sincerely believe we should abandon the Korean excursion.

While there has been much discussion about the power of the President to send troops to Western Europe, I will strongly support the resolution recently introduced in the Senate which proposes consent of the Congress prior to sending our troops abroad. Regardless of the legal aspect of this issue, the President's desire for unity in the Congress will be handsomely served if he seeks congressional approval for such a move. We all desire unity of purpose, but members of the minority are mindful of the fact that cooperation is a two-way road. The memory of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam is too firmly fixed in our minds to accept the thesis that the President's prerogatives cannot be exercised erroneously.

I am deeply sincere when I state that I believe the unity of purpose which must be achieved in developing a foreign policy suited to these times will be materially benefitted by the resignation of Secretary Acheson. While there have been many attempts to designate any disapproval of Secretary Acheson as mere politics, I am convinced that the vast majority of our people do not hold him in the esteem and respect which his highly important office deserves in this critical period. Secretary Acheson is flavored with a reputation for fuzzy thinking which he rightfully earned in recent years in supporting policies which are now almost universally repudiated. Any loyalty which Secretary Acheson deserves from the President is less to be regarded than the convictions of those people whom I believe to be in the vast majority.

While I have commented specifically on some of the issues which I believe are important to the formulation of foreign policy, my main purpose has been to urge my colleagues to consider matters relating to foreign policy with absolute realism. I am sure all of us realize that Stalin is not "good old Joe," and that what he represents is a crafty and godless force bent upon subjugation of the free world. I am firmly convinced that our relations with other free nations call for the application of a frank and honest appraisal of their conduct in whatever alliance comes into being. Our friends will soon have to stand up and be counted, and our efforts in their behalf must be measured by their own efforts.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY POLICIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the time is at hand for epochal decisions by the Government of the United States which may change the whole course of civilization. It is not surprising, then, that the President has urged Members of Congress to debate fully the impending questions which soon must be settled. Neither is it surprising that each succeeding mail from Colorado and all other States is loaded with more and more pertinent inquiries as to just what is planned. These letters reflect not only great anxiety and concern at the grass roots, but considerable feeling and solid convictions for or against proposed diplomatic and military policies which may or may not be adopted. Distrust and disunity are the order of the day.

I am not an economist, a constitutional lawyer, a diplomat, or a military expert. This is not going to be that kind of a speech. But I have seen our country drift into two World Wars, and I have followed every move on every front in our ever-increasing drift into world war III. Therefore, I shall discuss the present situations which face the United States and the diplomatic and military proposals that are being considered or advocated by our duly elected and selected officials, as a Senator without commitment or obligation of any nature to any one other than what I deem to be best for the American people. Others may know much more about these questions than I, but no one has worried more about them or tried harder to evaluate them.

I have listened to many suggestions that national unity is the most important consideration. I disagree. The important thing is that we adopt the right policy. Already there has been too much "me-too-ism," flag-waving, and blind, slavish, rubber-stamp acquiescence.

Korea today represents the focal point of our whole international and military policy and, therefore, the situation there is naturally the first to be explored. This far-away and relatively unimportant little country will teach us many vital lessons if we give heed. Certainly it points up a whole multitude of errors in both the diplomatic and military fields. Out of our bitter experience in Korea I pray may come forth a plan for our

survival in this mixed-up world. To us, it has no other military value in any degree. Nor has it any economic significance to us. Always we have held its people in the highest regard. Traditionally, our sympathy has been with them in their long, hard struggles for economic and political freedom.

In the closing days of World War II, we invited our ally, Russia, to assist us in Manchuria and Korea. When the war ended, we recognized Russia's interest in Korea by arbitrarily dividing this unfortunate country at the thirty-eighth parallel into Northern and Southern Korea. I do not think we consulted the Koreans, or anyone else, for that matter, about this very ill-considered and arbitrary action. We just did it as a cheap and easy way to indicate our wholehearted spirit of cooperation in the Orient with Joseph Stalin. Russia assumed a sort of trusteeship over the northern section, while we did the same thing for that portion of the peninsula lying south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

North Korea is blessed with a wealth of natural resources, especially minerals, timber, and hydroelectric power, while South Korea is almost entirely agricultural. Nearly all of the industrial plants are in North Korea. One-third of the Koreans live in the north and two-thirds in the south. The economic independence and prosperity of these people depend upon the unification of the two zones and the elimination of the imaginary barrier plucked out of the ozone by us. The Koreans, both north and south, are a mild, friendly, industrious, patient, and hopeful people, accustomed through the centuries to cruel oppression by their neighbors.

Russia indoctrinated her section with communism, coupled with military training, and we sold our kind of democracy to South Korea without teaching them how to defend their ideals against possible aggression. They, being peaceable people, were not particularly interested in military education, and we did not bother to insist on its necessity. We were forewarned repeatedly that the Communists in the north were planning a military attack on South Korea, but apparently disdainfully ignored such reports. In due course, Russia and the United States withdrew their respective armies of occupation. Shortly thereafter, civil war broke out in Korea. The North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel into South Korea on June 25, 1950, in an effort to unite by force all Korea under the Communist banner. Their well-trained armies, splendidly equipped with World War II guns and tanks, made steady advances against the weak and helpless and poorly equipped South Koreans.

On June 27 at 12 noon the President ordered United States sea and air forces to "give Korean Government troops cover and support." June 30 the President stated that he had authorized General MacArthur to use land forces. Congress was in session at the time, but was not asked to declare war or authorize troop movement to Korea. On June 27 at 10:45 p. m., nearly 11 hours after we had entered the war, the Security Council of the United Nations requested its members to supply the Republic of Korea with assistance to repel the invasion. The Associated Press reported, July 1, 1950, that United States troops were being flown to Korea in numbers.

Thus we entered the war in Korea. This worst diplomatic and military disaster in American history was conceived in cockiness and born in recklessness. Aside from the hocus-pocus about the thirty-eighth parallel, we had the identical provocation to get into the civil war in China. There, as in Korea, northern Communist forces were invading southern territory. But we stayed out. I think we were prudent to do so. I rejoice that we did so. But the point is, the principles involved in the civil war in China and civil war in Korea were identical. We were wise enough to keep out of one, but jumped into the other lightning quick. The only real difference in the two wars was the respective military strength of each conflagration. Millions of men were involved in China and only thousands—so we thought—in Korea. Are there two kinds of aggression—big aggression and little aggression? And is little aggression more offensive to our sense of international rectitude? What other explanation is there for the inconsistency of our policies in these two instances?

We have made Korean soil the battleground for our quarrel with communism. South Korea as a part of the free world is one thing, but as a battlefield is something else. We stated that it was our purpose to liberate the South Koreans, but our efforts on their behalf have almost obliterated them instead. Three times already the United Nations and Communist fighting forces have engaged in a running battle across the Korean peninsula, and another bloody and devastating campaign is now under way. Both sides have indulged the scorched-earth technique. The flight of South Korean refugees, in snow and sleet and storm, pushing their hand carts along the highways and carrying their worldly possessions on their heads and backs, fleeing for their very lives from their homes, is one of the most tragic migrations in history. Regardless of our good intentions, this is what our military intervention has done to these unfortunate human beings. Their misery cannot be measured or described. How many casualties they have suffered will never be known.

Our intervention in Korea is fanning the fires of race hatred in the Far East, too. Nothing could be worse for world peace on a long-range basis than that. Nothing carries a greater danger potential to future world understanding than this tricky factor of race hatred. Our enemies would like to set the orientals against us. We must see to it that they do not succeed in their program of inciting bitter race hatred which one day may develop into the most terrible world war of all times. Historically and actually, the United States has been friendly to oriental people, but not all white men have earned that reputation. It is very easy in these circumstances to kindle race hatred against the United States. For some years, there has been a movement to drive the white man out of Asia. That is one of the most serious aspects of our present war. That is one of the very good reasons why we should not intervene in China. That is one of the most realistic reasons why we should have kept out of Korea.

If Korea has not taught the United States an extraordinary lesson in the supreme importance of military intelligence, then our days as a mighty world power are numbered. In this time of perfected espionage and scouting from the sky, there is no excuse for the lack of information or the erroneous information which was dished up to our troops who were engaged there. Fatal surprise after fatal surprise has embarrassed our generals and added unnecessarily to our casualty lists. It is difficult to believe that military intelligence could have deteriorated to such an alarming extent in five short years. Perhaps it took a Korea to demonstrate how pitifully weak is the status of this all-important branch of our national defense.

The first rule of military action is not to underestimate the power of the enemy. The second rule is to equip one's own fighters with the best and most lethal weapons an alert science can provide. We have been waving an empty pistol in Korea too much of the time. Science developed a big bazooka many months ago which could have destroyed the powerful North Korean tanks without trouble, but our first troops who were ordered to repel these tanks had none of these superior weapons. These soldiers had to use hand grenades to stop the deadly Russian tanks; and that kind of hand-combat warfare cost many precious American lives.

The United States spent many billions developing an atomic bomb. This celebrated weapon is supposed to be effective in the superlative degree against heavy concentration of troops, but it was not tried out in Korea, even though we are supposed to have quantities of them in cold storage. Leading with weakness has never won recognition as good battle strategy. American soldiers should never be sent into battle with one arm tied behind them. Whether to use or not to use an atomic bomb in Korea ought to be a military problem, but we have delegated this decision to the politicians in the United Nations organization. That is pretty sad.

Press reports from the Korean war front have indicated that American soldiers have been outnumbered 5 or 10 or even 20 to 1 in almost every battle. Perhaps that could not be helped in the first few weeks, when we were trying to put backbone in the South Korean Army overnight, but the war is now in its seventh month. Today the United States has 2,300,000 men in uniform. Why is it necessary for a handful of men to do all the fighting in Korea? And if we cannot get more men there, why do we not do our fighting in a locale of our own choosing, with a shortened perimeter in keeping with our strength? These are some of the unanswered questions which cause so much feeling of frustration in America today.

We call our forces in Korea the United Nations forces. Perhaps they are United

Nations forces. In the west we have a legendary character who boasts about his 50-50 horse and rabbit sausage—1 horse and 1 rabbit. United Nations officials did call on all its members to send troops to MacArthur, but few of them responded. Those who did, excepting the United States, sent merely a token force. I do not criticize any nation for using discretion in deploying its military men in this manner. I think they were far wiser than we. But they have effectively exploded the idea that the United Nations can conduct a war.

Collective security is a wonderful theory, but Korea has demonstrated that collective security cannot be turned off and on like a spigot by the United Nations. If nations are vitally interested in the particular war which is raging they will participate; otherwise they will not. Most of them have been too smart to be sucked into the quicksands of Asiatic intrigue in Korea and China. The United Nations, as well as the United States, ought to learn much from the experience in Korea.

We have one of two choices: Either we should put a huge force in Korea, fully equipped and supplied with the most modern and the most lethal weapons science can device, and give them full air and sea support, or we should get our forces out and charge our dismal failure there to bitter experience. Halfway military measures cost lives and do not win wars. Three weeks ago, in a telephone message to a mass meeting in Boulder, Colo., I coined the phrase "all out or get out." These five short words express what I think our policy should be.

Our policy makers say we must remain in Korea to save face. To me, it is more important for us to save the lives of our GI's than the red faces of our discredited policy makers. Unless we are prepared to carry on a full-scale war in Korea, we must extricate ourselves from the struggle as best we can, or continue to dribble away the precious lives of American youth without any military achievement. When our troops departed from the Hungnam beachhead some days ago, a GI spoke for America when he wrote these immortal words on a billboard at the point of debarkation, "We didn't want the damn place anyhow."

The people of the United States did hope that Japan might adopt pacifism as its way of life, but in Asia such a role is extremely dangerous today for any people. I am loath to say this, but in my opinion conversion to military strength cannot proceed too rapidly in Japan. The whole Far East is becoming more warlike by the hour, and wars and rumors of wars are breaking out all over the place, so it behooves Japan to rearm for its own protection. It is up to us, therefore, to reverse our attitude toward our former enemies and assist them to get in position to protect and defend their own firesides. All Communists there should be rounded up and placed in concentration camps. In due course, they might be deported to China, Korea, or Siberia for close communion with their beloved fellow Reds. In that case, methinks something which is not pretty would soon happen to them.

Formosa does form an important link in our Far East line of defense, and the Communists must be kept out. Whether Chiang could launch a successful military offensive against the Chinese mainland from Formosa is a serious question, but I am speaking of Formosa as a defense bastion only, and not as a base for continental invasion.

Personally, I should like nothing better than to keep the United States out of world war III, but bitter experience has taught me that it cannot be done. The day the Russian aggressor crosses the line into Western Germany on his way to Western Europe, he will be at war with the United States. Make no mistake about that. It is as certain as that there will be a tomorrow. The American Government and the American people will never tolerate aggression into these areas. Neither Wilhelm nor Hitler thought the United States would fight in Europe, or, if they would fight, that they could be effective. That was their major military blunder. No such illusion should prevail in Moscow, or even in any segment of our own population. If Russian military forces move against Western Europe, the United States will be at her throat instantly. I am not advocating this, nor am I urging it. I am merely stating what every well-informed American in his heart knows will happen. I pray that the Politburo comprehends this fact thoroughly. I doubt that America and her allies can successfully invade and conquer Russia with a huge land army, but I do know that we can destroy every city in Russia and set her progress back 100 years. The American people and the American Government do not want such an unspeakable catastrophe to happen to any city or any people. They have rejected and will continue to reject a preventive war, but they will not run from any military violation of Western Europe.

Field Marshal Stalin has seen, as have I, the devastation and ruins of Berlin. The stacks of rubble and twisted steel stand there a mute but eloquent monument to the wrath of war. If the generalissimo contemplates a program of military conquest of the west, I hope he does not think for one split second that any city in Russia will suffer less than did Berlin. To appease Russia is as dangerous as waving a red flag at a bull, but tirades of abuse and name calling are almost as bad since everyone identifies such antics as evidence of frustration and an inferiority complex. But we ought to make it plain at what point we will fight.

It is only sanity, therefore, that the United States assist Western Europe to defend itself. I did not say that the United States should defend Europe; I said, "Assist Western Europe to defend itself." There is a vast difference between the two. I hope General Eisenhower may be given wide discretionary authority and power to plan for the defense of Western Europe. We do not want him to build a Maginot Line or permit a Maginot Line psychology to develop. We want General Eisenhower to build a modern, integrated army of well-trained, well-equipped men, mobile and supported by the greatest armada of fighting airships the world has ever seen, ready to strike at a moment's notice.

It would be the most tragic mistake in history if the United States undertook even the major part of such a defense alone. America cannot guarantee every European and Asiatic principality against aggression. Insofar as we are able, keeping paramount our own legitimate interests and American security, we ought to assist those who wage wars on aggressors. But all such self-serving propaganda expressions as "in our own enlightened self-interest," "global responsibility," "peace-loving nations," and other similar high-powered indoctrination shibboleths, should be left to our enemies to utter critically.

Western Europe cannot be defended unless deep in its heart it wants to defend itself. From what I have seen first hand and from what I have been able to learn from other first-hand observers, the people in Western Europe do not think war is imminent, and thus are very calm and complacent about the whole thing. The French are far more afraid of the military resurgence of Germany than they are of an attack by Russia. France and Italy are teeming with communism, but even non-Communists in those countries do not seem to worry much about Russia. The working classes and the poor are having a difficult time balancing their family budgets, with prices high and wages low. Capital is scarce and at a destructive premium. In France and Italy the rich are growing richer, and the poor, poorer. Little wonder that capitalism is on the defensive.

Western Germany is the most pacifist country in the world today. Eking out a miserable existence amid the ruins of demolished cities is very depressing. Switzerland is looking after her internal defenses most effectively. She could and would whip her weight in wildcats, in acting against any invader; but I do not believe she would send one man across her borders to fight for the defense of any other country. Belgium and Holland are dragging their feet in military matters. Norway did not like German occupation in World War II, and will make a fight of it, and can be depended upon to do everything in her power to defend all Western Europe against totalitarian aggressors.

Sweden is building her defense methodically, has some capacity to wage war, and will fight if her neutrality is violated. Denmark will do what she can. Spain is very hard up, but she will make a dependable contribution against communism if assisted, and the same is true of Portugal. Greece has a small army, but a good one; and Turkey is very well prepared to defend her own country. Great Britain will do her fair share, as will her far-flung commonwealth of nations. It is noticeable that these nations want strength, not to wage war, but for diplomatic negotiations on behalf of peace. It is reassuring that these prudent, sincere, and rational people, who are as much devoted to the essential freedoms as are we, are not bombastic and are not defying anyone to knock the chip off their

shoulder in this gloomy moment in history.

There are extreme poverty, hardships of every description, and much unemployment in both Eastern and Western Germany. I am absolutely certain that if General Eisenhower were authorized to do so, he could raise an army of a million carefully screened volunteer recruits in Germany and Austria. Making it a strictly volunteer enlistment would obviate approval by the governments of Eastern or Western Germany. Since it would not be official German Government action, France should not object. After all, there is no better soldier than the German—except, of course, the American GI. Such a program would relieve the manpower shortage in the United States, and would do more toward defending and unifying Western Europe than anything else that has been proposed heretofore.

Several have suggested that the ratio of American strength in Europe be held to 1 to 6. That would be a most generous contribution on our part; and anyone who complains about it could not have in mind the best interest of the United States or of the world, in my opinion. Should America contribute more than 1 to 6, the reaction at home would be very bad, and the effect on the morale of Europe would be disastrous. Europe does not want to be placed in the contemptible position of a kept mistress.

Let us keep this fact constantly before us: Unless the countries of Western Europe show more enthusiasm for their own defenses than appears on the surface today, they will be a push-over for Russia, in spite of all that the United States can do. It is up to them. We had better not have any more of the brand of collective security which was demonstrated in Korea.

It is good military strategy to have a second line of defense ready to fall back to. Former President Hoover presented a sound one recently, except that he should have included Spain and Portugal in it. We could defend that line against communism for 100 years, and we should proceed to do so unless Western Europe assumes a more realistic and energetic interest in its own defenses. If the world wants our military and economic leadership, we ought to accept the challenge. But if the other countries want us to provide both the leadership and the "followship" and pay the whole bill ourselves, we ought to tell them to go jump in the lake. No self-respecting people will continue to respect us if we furnish everything. Equal sacrifice and equal interest must be the objective. There is just as much danger in doing too much as in doing too little. Taking part without taking over should be our aim.

Western Europe has the most cultured, enlightened, and talented people on earth. It is the cradle and the domicile of civilization. For most Americans it is the fatherland. We must not forget that the people in Europe are proud people, who understand far better than we what constitutes decent equities as between sovereign powers. We ruined the American Indian by making him our ward. Let us stop now our ward concept for Europe. If we demand that they do their full share, they will respect us; if we assume too much in their behalf, they will hold us in utter contempt. That is human nature.

America's eagerness to bleed for all the world is looked upon with suspicion and disgust everywhere. There are "sucker" nations, just as there are "suckers" in private life. Uncle Sam will deserve to have no friends if he continues to play the role of "Uncle Sap." Does anyone on this earth have the slightest particle of respect for a "sap"?

When I was in Europe last fall, many little people with whom I visited expressed the hope that the United States and Russia would compose their differences, and would not drag them into war as the result of our running quarrel. The situation is not quite that simple, but they are wise in not wanting their countries to become the battleground in the impending titanic struggle between these two great powers. They have seen the misery in Korea, and they do not want to be driven in the night from their homes and see the torch set to their proud cities. They know that modern war calls for a policy of scorched earth, and that it would be a heartbreaking ordeal for them. In Georgia Sherman is still the symbol of ruthless destruction.

I wish to say one word about the United Nations. I am stronger for this organization today than ever, but my concept of the way it should function has undergone a complete about-face since our experience in Korea. Once I thought the United Nations had to have police power and a police force to make every nation toe the mark. I no longer think it can be made the custodian of collective security or can wage war. If it attempts to exercise such a power, I am convinced it will destroy itself, and thereby will endanger the peace of the world.

The United Nations must remain a world forum where Austin and Vishinsky may sit across the table and glare and bellow at each other on behalf of their respective nations to meet afterward in social functions the best of personal friends. The world needs that sort of things desperately. Somehow I feel that the steam let off at Lake Success and in New York has brought the whole world much closer together. To see ourselves as others see us is bitter but potent medicine. The time is almost here when no nation will want to be singled out by its neighbors as a violator of decent conduct. Not the fear of sanctions, reparations, reprisals, and military action, but the regard for the good opinion of one's fellows will tend to keep bad international conduct in check. Nations, as in the case of individuals crave good and honored names.

The United States has three very dangerous enemies—communistic aggression, inflation, and militarism. The three are closely related. Stalin's greatest ally in the present crisis is our rapid progress toward inflation. Most of the suffering in Western Europe today is the result of pernicious and uncontrolled inflation and of bad monetary practices. Inflation is growing by leaps and bounds, day by day in America. Every dollar of deficit spending increases its intensity and its threat to the American capitalistic system. Controls can be invoked and will act as palliatives to hold the line temporarily, but they are not a cure. Soon the black market and the gray market will become organized and under way, and the law of supply and demand will operate under the counter again. An arms race is thoroughly bad, largely because it promotes inflation, but in a period of world-wide nervous frustration, such as we are passing through, we must have rearmament. The point I desire to make is that we should be as moderate and as sensible as possible in the present crisis. We should undertake only those things we can do well, and restrain our over-zealous countrymen who want to build Rome in a day. We can mobilize 3,500,000 men, and train, arm, and equip them as no army has ever been trained and equipped before; we can provide a sizable lend-lease program to other nations who are ready to oppose aggression, and still have economic conditions only 25 percent off normal. For a long-range program, such sensible moderation is absolutely essential.

We should strive strenuously, therefore, to keep the impact of the mobilization on our economy as moderate as possible, so that we may keep our program continuous for 100 years, if that length of time be necessary. In the present crisis, I suppose we must open the money bags in the Treasury to the military leaders of the Republic, and try diligently to replenish those bags out of current taxes. At the same time, let us restrain all Government agencies, including the military, against reckless waste and domestic improvements which can be postponed, and urge them to demand only their barest necessities. This cold war may well last a century. We had better conserve our wind, so that we may remain in this race to the tape. Falling in battle is little worse than falling by the roadside exhausted from trying to do too much too soon.

Summing up my views in this historic debate, I suggest that we get out of Korea as soon as it is feasible to do so; that we rearm Japan; that we keep our powder dry in Formosa; and that we review carefully and deliberate long and seriously our long-range policy in Asia.

I stand ready to vote to authorize the President to dispatch a limited number of troops to Western Europe. I would hold the ratio of our contribution to not over 1 to 6 for the present.

My most important proposal, however, is to enlist in our Army a million volunteer and carefully screened fighting men from Austria, East and West Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. I would pay these soldiers well and after 5 years of satisfactory military service make them eligible for migration to the United States.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill for this purpose, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 609) to provide for the enlistment in the

Regular Army of certain aliens, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized until June 30, 1955, to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army, for periods of not less than 5 years, of not more than 1,000,000 qualified male aliens who are nationals of East or West Germany, Poland, or Czechoslovakia and who are not less than 18, or more than 35, years of age at the time of their original enlistments. No person shall be enlisted or reenlisted pursuant to this section until it has been determined after careful investigation that such person will render loyal service to the United States and will not constitute a questionable risk from the standpoint of the national security of the United States and its Armed Forces.

(b) Persons enlisted in the Regular Army pursuant to this section—

(1) shall receive, while so serving, the pay and allowances provided by law for other enlisted members of the Regular Army, except that they shall not be entitled to receive the additional pay provided by section 206 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) for persons on duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; and

(2) shall not by reason of such service become eligible for retirement under any provision of law, to receive any benefit under any of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or to qualify for any other benefit provided by law for citizens of the United States on account of their performance of service in the Army of the United States.

(c) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to prescribe such regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, as he shall deem necessary to carry its provisions into effect.

SEC. 2. (a) No provision of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall apply to any person enlisted in the Regular Army pursuant to this act, or to any dependent or beneficiary of any such person with respect to any payment to which such dependent or beneficiary may become entitled by reason of the service of such enlisted person.

(b) That portion of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. 216, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 625) which reads "; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1955, with respect to enlistments made under this act.

SEC. 3. (a) Each person who has completed 5 years of satisfactory service under an enlistment contracted pursuant to this act and who has been honorably discharged from such enlistment, and the wife and each unmarried minor child of such person shall—

(1) upon his application made therefor within 1 year after the termination of his service under such enlistment, be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence; and

(2) may be naturalized as citizens of the United States upon compliance with the requirements therefor prescribed by law.

(b) The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Army shall, after consultation, promulgate jointly or severally such regulations as they may deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section.

CITATION OF JOSEPH DOTO FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, by direction of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a privileged report (S. Rept. No. 25) and a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The report will be received, and printed, and the resolution will be read by the clerk.

The resolution (S. Res. 43) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Doto to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Joseph Doto may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think perhaps there should be a quorum call at this point, in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to hear what the Senator from Tennessee has to say. In fact, a quorum call may be required. I do not wish to suggest the absence of a quorum unless it is agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee. I do not object to the Senator from Tennessee proceeding. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the matter brought up at this time.

Mr. O'CONOR. Reserving the right to object, I should like to say, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit, that I agree with the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska, and, realizing the importance of the question which is about to be presented by the Senator from Tennessee, I think it would be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Hunt	O'Conor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think we should have an explanation of what we are being asked to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was seeking recognition to explain the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am wondering whether I could ask the Senator from Tennesseee how long he expects to take in his presentation of the resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So far as I am concerned, it should not take more than 5 minutes.

On December 12, pursuant to a subpena which was duly served, Joe Doto, alias Joe Adonis, of New Jersey, appeared before the Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. The hearing was held at Washington, and a quorum of the committee was present. Joe Doto, alias Joe Adonis, was asked certain questions. He refused to answer a great many of the questions. It is on his refusal to answer the questions that the citation for contempt is asked. I should like to read some of the questions which the witness refused to answer:

Mr. HALLEY. Were you in the bootlegging business before the repeal of prohibition?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer.

Mr. DOTO. On the ground that it might incriminate me, I decline to answer.

He was asked what business he was in.

Mr. DOTO. None at the present.

Mr. HALLEY. None at the present? What was your last business?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. What was your last legitimate business?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Are you still connected with the Automotive Conveying Co., of New Jersey?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know what the Automotive Conveying Co., of New Jersey, is?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. I refer to a company located at 208 Gorge Road, Cliffside Park, N. J., known as the Automotive Conveying Co.; have you ever heard of it?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Is not the business of that company the conveying of Ford automobiles from the Ford plant in Edgewater, N. J., to various places throughout the East?

Mr. DOTO. Are you finished?

Mr. HALLEY. That is the question.

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Frank Costello?

Mr. DOTO. Yes.

* * * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever done any business with him?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

He was asked about Saratoga Springs and whether he had ever been to the Piping Rock Casino there. He said he had been there.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever see gambling in progress at the Piping Rock Casino?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever see any people other than yourself gambling at Piping Rock Casino?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business connection or affiliation with the Arrowhead Inn?

The Arrowhead Inn is a place at Saratoga Springs.

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

Mr. HALLEY. Is it not a fact that you, during the years 1947, 1948, were affiliated with the Arrowhead Inn in Saratoga Springs?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

He was asked about his income.

Senator WILEY. Does any of it come from dope peddling?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

* * * * *

Senator WILEY. Does any of it come from organized prostitution?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the witness at any time prior to his refusal to answer specific questions state the reason for his refusal to answer by claiming his constitutional privilege?

Mr. KEFAUVER. He claimed the constitutional privilege that to answer the questions would tend to incriminate him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did he claim the privilege before the Senator from Tennessee asked the questions? In other words, did he rely on his constitutional privilege to cover all questions?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The way it came about was that he declined to answer the first few questions which were asked of him. His attorney was present. The record shows that his attorney was present at the hearing. However, his attorney declined to sit with the witness, and the witness did not want his attorney to sit with him. Approximately in the middle of the questioning of the witness he read a statement. He said:

I wish to state clearly why I feel I should assert and rely upon my constitutional privileges to refuse to be a witness against myself.

Thereupon, he read a statement in which he claimed his constitutional privilege to decline to answer all questions about anyone he knew, whether he had done any business with any person, whether he had been to certain places, whether he had heard about certain companies, and so forth. I can go on for many pages to show the type of questions he refused to answer.

Some of the questions related to transactions which had occurred from 10 to 15 years ago, and whether he knew of the existence of certain companies.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the purpose of the present resolution to cite the witness for contempt of the Senate and to punish him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Its purpose is to refer the matter to the district attorney for the purpose of prosecuting the witness for contempt.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not for the purpose of having the Senate itself punish the witness. Its purpose is merely to refer the matter to the district attorney?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator from Tennessee conferred with the Attorney General with respect to this subject in order to ascertain whether the witness could be prosecuted under recent decisions of the Supreme Court dealing with the refusal of a witness to answer certain questions?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator refer to the other section of the code under which the Attorney General can proceed by presenting the case to the grand jury without the Senate first taking action?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator believe that there is any difference, so far as the constitutional provision is concerned, between answering questions before a Senate committee and answering questions before a court or a grand jury? Has the Senator from Tennessee gone into the law, and will he give to the Senate the legal decisions and the distinctions, if there are any, before we pass on the resolution? I desire to aid in every way I can to assure that answers will be given to the questions, and I want the Senator to have full hearing of the subject, but I feel that we ought to be fully advised as to whether or not a constitutional privilege exists in this case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The law provides that such a matter may be referred to the Senate, which can vote contempt proceedings and pass the matter on to the district attorney, who would then do the prosecuting. Under another provision of the law when the Senate is not in session such a matter can be referred to the President of the Senate, who, without action by the Senate, can refer it to the district attorney in the district in which the refusal to answer took place.

There is, of course, also another section, under which the district attorney himself, upon information, can refer the matter to the grand jury without coming to the Senate at all. Most of these witnesses testified in Washington. So we thought it better to refer the question to the Senate and have the Senate act upon the contempt proceeding before passing it on to the district attorney.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator a legal opinion from the committee counsel that these witnesses should have answered and had no right under the constitutional privilege to refuse to answer?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that we have a full legal opinion on the matter. I did not bring it to the Chamber with me. Of course, the latest case on the fifth amendment is the so-called Communist case, United States against Blau, in which it was stated that a person was not called upon to testify as to one of the two links in connection with a violation of the Smith Act. The question of refusal to answer these particular questions has been studied by the legal staff of the committee, and the questions do not come within the terms of the Communist case.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the committee counsel, Mr. Halley, has given the Senator an opinion that there is no right of the witness to claim his constitutional privileges with respect to the particular questions which were propounded to him, and which he has refused to answer or has evaded answering. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have an opinion on the general matter of the constitutional privilege, as to the type of things which he would not be required to answer; and on the basis of this general brief we have had a full discussion as to the particular cases under consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator place that legal opinion in the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I shall be glad to place the opinion in the RECORD. The opinion is not directly on the questions involved here. It is on the general subject matter of the right under the fifth amendment to refuse to answer certain questions. If I may proceed and read a few additional questions—I do not want to read them all—the distinguished Senator from Michigan will see that the questions would not come under the terms of the Communist decision, or under the right of a witness to protection under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think the question might very well be cleared up by saying that in each individual case there has been consultation in the committee, and formal action by a majority of the committee, that each individual be cited for contempt. That is the judgment of the committee. The committee has had the advice of counsel. It seems to me that that fact should largely determine the action of the Senate. This is a committee constituted by the Senate. It has devoted a great deal of time to this subject. It has discovered a great deal which I think will be of benefit to the country. After hearing the questions and seeing the conduct, and knowing what the law is, motions were made in each case that the parties be cited for contempt. I trust that it will not be necessary to go into a long discussion in each case. After all, a duly organized committee of the Senate has taken action, and its judgment should have the support of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. I may add also that the action by the committee in these cases was unanimous.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has left the Chamber. However, I wish to say that in matters of this kind, even though action has been taken by a duly

authorized committee, I believe that when the Senate is called upon to pass upon the question it should have the advice of the committee, and should feel that the action proposed to be taken can actually be carried out within the law and within the Constitution. That was the reason for asking whether or not the committee had acted after receiving legal advice from its counsel, so that we might properly take up the subject summarily, as we are now taking it up, and pass upon it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the statement from the Senator. I think he is exactly right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. I notice, upon examining the original resolution, that it was agreed to on May 3 last. It is now the 22d of January. In section 3 of the original resolution there is the following provision:

> All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951.

That is a little more than 2 months from now. Does the Senator feel that proceedings such as he now asks can be determined, at this late date, before March 31?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say in answer to the question that the offense took place on December 12, 1950, when the witness was called upon to testify. If the Senate votes to bring a contempt proceeding, the matter will then be with the district attorney for the District of Columbia; so I do not know of any further proceedings the Senate would be called upon to take with respect to this particular matter. As to the date of May 3, I do not know what the Senator refers to.

Mr. McKELLAR. The resolution was agreed to on May 3.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the original resolution, Senate Resolution 202, which created the committee. This is a proceeding under that resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the committee seems not to have acted for some time in regard to taking testimony. I am wondering whether or not, under the circumstances, the proceedings under this resolution can be completed by the district attorney for the District of Columbia in time to proceed further under the original resolution, Senate Resolution 202. Why was there such a long delay, until December, before anything was done?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator should understand that we have to take the witnesses as we get to them. The committee started——

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the senior Senator from Tennessee understands that situation without having his attention called to it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator asked me what was the reason for the delay.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I want to know why something was not done with this resolution prior to this day. Why wait all this time and, at the last moment, so to speak, come before the Senate and seek to obtain an order of this sort?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The committee started its hearings in Miami, Fla., shortly after the resolution was adopted. Since that time the committee has been holding hearings very frequently—as often as it has been possible to get away from Washington. It so happens, with respect to this particular witness, Joe Adonis, that an effort was made to serve a subpena upon him in August 1950. He evaded service of the subpena for quite a long time, and it was only after prolonged efforts that it was possible to serve the subpena on him. As soon as it was possible to serve it on him, he was brought to Washington to testify. But I imagine that before Adonis was brought to Washington to testify the committee had probably heard three or four hundred other witnesses. The record of the committee's hearings runs to nearly 10,000 pages. Inevitably the testimony of these other witnesses came before that of this witness. Anyway, a hearing was held on December 12, and the committee had a meeting shortly after that, in which, joined in by all the members of the committee, the contempt citations were voted.

Mr. President, there are some twenty-odd pages of questions and answers set out in the report. I shall read some discussing Adonis' relationship with Charlie "Lucky" Luciano. Adonis said he had known him about 20 years.

> When did you last talk to him?
>
> I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.
>
> Did you see Charlie "Lucky" Luciano in Habana, Cuba?
>
> I decline to answer.

The same response was given to questions if he ever had any business with or when he last talked with a bunch of known racketeers whose names are set forth in the record.

Mr. President, there is also the matter of Max Stark. Max Stark, it has been proved, deposited a bunch of checks taken by a gambling gang in New York. He took the checks and set up a special account with them. The gambling was done in New Jersey. The checks were cashed by him in New York. Adonis was asked about his relationship to Max Stark and he refused to answer. He refused to give the committee any information about any illegal transactions and about his legal connections with certain businesses.

It was shown that the Automotive Conveying Co. is a corporation in which Adonis is an officer and in which he has a large interest. That corporation had contracts for conveying automobiles from the Edgewater, N. J., Ford plant. It is a very large corporation. We were interested in knowing how he, an officer of that corporation and its founder, could have obtained such a contract. I might say by way of explanation that the contract was entered into back in the 1930's, and that the present management of the Ford Motor Co. has been trying to do something about it in an effort to get Adonis out of the picture. That is one of the prime things in which the committee is interested. The committee is interested in learning how people who have long criminal records, such as Adonis has, are able to get into business of that kind; what sort of influences they use.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator seek to have the Senate take action on the question whether or not this particular individual is in contempt of the Senate, or is it merely an official reference by the Senate to the district attorney for such action as the district attorney may see fit to take.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This resolution follows exactly the same pattern——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not familiar with the pattern.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution provides:

> That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee * * * as to the refusal of (this man) to answer a series of questions * * * together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said (person) may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

That carries with it the suggestion that the Senate wants him to be prosecuted for contempt of the Senate committee and of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not get the last statement of the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say that carries with it the obvious inference that the Senate wishes that, if the district attorney can find a legal offense in connection with the question involved, Adonis be prosecuted for his contempt.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point, Mr. President. Has the committee taken the position that this is contempt, or is it being referred to the district attorney's office?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The committee has taken the position that this is contempt, and the committee asks the Senate to refer the matter to the district attorney with the request that Adonis be proceeded against according to law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in sympathy with what the Senator is trying to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate that statement. I know the Senator is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The only thing that concerns me is whether or not either the committee of the Senate or the Senate are taking formal action or making formal determination when it does not have a legal opinion as to the probable guilt or innocence of this man. In other words, I should not like to see the committee or the Senate be placed in a difficult or embarrassing position for lack of information in this case on the part of the committee's counsel. I am not asking for the opinion of the district attorney.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is exactly the same form of resolution that is used to refer all contempt citations to the district attorney. It provides that the

record in the matter shall be certified by the Senate to the district attorney to the end that the person involved be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that as to form the citation and the reference are the customary ones. I cannot say it is done in every case, but I believe frequently the committee has the benefit of the formal opinion of its counsel directed to the specific case at issue and the facts involved, advising the committee that in this particular case there is ground to believe that a contempt has been committed. I think it is merely a protection for the committee. That is the only point I am trying to make.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The committee has a brief or memorandum on the general subject involved. The particular questions and answers in this case have been studied by the counsel, Mr. Halley, and other counsel, for the committee. They have advised the committee that in their judgment they feel the individuals concerned are guilty of contempt.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, has that advice been inserted into the RECORD in connection with this resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I said in answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] a short while ago that our memorandum does not deal with each particular case, but deals with the general subject. The testimony in each particular case has been studied by counsel for the committee, and counsel have orally assured us that the individuals are guilty of violations of the statute.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Was this resolution reported from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, it is from the special committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator say that he is now asking the Senate to find these individuals guilty of contempt, and that his reference is merely to have them prosecuted for such contempt?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is asking the Senate now to pass on the question of contempt, and if the Senate should find, by adopting the resolution, that contempt exists, the Senate will rule that the individuals are guilty of contempt, and the Senate then merely asks the district attorney to prosecute for such contempt?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. That is, to have the district attorney proceed against them according to law.

Mr. FERGUSON. For the contempt respecting which the Senate is now asked to take action by means of a resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, that is correct. For the contempt of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Tennessee is a lawyer. Does he believe that the failure to answer these questions constitutes a contempt of the Senate, in view of the constitutional provision permitting a man to refuse to answer any question that would tend to incriminate him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that there is no doubt about it in my mind. I think the questions which the committee asked could not possibly have anything to do with incriminating the individual of any Federal offense. They were merely questions about whether he ever had any business with a certain man or not. The questions did not extend to what the business was. They were as to whether he had had any interest in what appeared to be a legitimate enterprise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that the provision of the Constitution of the United States applying to answering questions tending to incriminate the individual means incrimination so far as a Federal statute is concerned, and not so far as a State criminal statute is concerned?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The decisions of the Supreme Court as they now stand are to the effect that in such a case as this the individual has the right to refuse to testify, under the fifth amendment, as to some matter that would incriminate him of a Federal offense. He may not refuse to testify if the answer would incriminate him of a State offense. That is the present status of the decisions of the Supreme Court. I might refer, for example, to *United States* v. *Murdock* (284 U. S. 141).

Mr. FERGUSON. So the Senator contends that if, under a State law, an answer to such a question would incriminate a witness, the witness still must answer. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct; that is our position.

However, if even on that basis the witness had a right to refuse to answer, by saying that an answer to the question would incriminate him under any law, this witness still was refusing to testify about his connection with an apparently legitimate business, and certainly he has no right to refuse to testify about that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. There appears to be some question about this matter. I had no objection to having it taken up, because I do not wish to appear to be in the position of trying to protect anyone who is attempting to violate the law. However, I had thought that the Judiciary Committee, whose membership is made up of lawyers, had studied this question.

Would the Senator object to letting the resolution go over, so as to provide an opportunity to study the record in regard to it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, the resolution is up for consideration at the present time. We must have these questions acted upon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, the resolution could be brought before the Senate for consideration at this time only by unanimous consent. I stepped out of the Chamber for a moment, and was not here when the resolution was brought up; but it could be brought up only by unanimous consent, because the unfinished business is, as I understand, Senate Resolution 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Arizona that this is a privileged matter, and would not permanently displace the unfinished business in any event. Unanimous consent was given for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, it may be privileged. However, the unanimous-consent agreement provided that Senate Resolution 8 would remain the unfinished business until it was disposed of. That was a part of the unanimous-consent agreement I propounded.

I have no objection to having this other matter considered and disposed of. However, inasmuch as there are in the minds of some Senators questions as to whether the procedure now proposed is the correct one, and as to whether the Senate is asked to pass upon the matter of holding certain persons in contempt without having the evidence before it, I think that in fairness to the Senate the Senator from Tennessee should be willing to let the resolution go over until we have an opportunity to study it.

When the Senator from Tennessee spoke to me about this matter, I was under the impression that it was reported by the Judiciary Committee and that that committee had given careful study to the legal questions involved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator should know that when any committee brings forth a matter of this sort, it comes to the floor of the Senate, not to a committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I understand that. However, evidently the Senator from Tennessee misunderstood the question I asked him. I asked whether the Judiciary Committee had reported the resolution. Evidently the Senator from Tennessee thought I was referring to his special committee when I asked that question.

Of course the Senator's special committee had a right to report as it did; but on the other hand, in fairness to Senators who have asked questions, I think an opportunity for studying this matter should be afforded.

So far as I am concerned, I am inclined to follow the recommendations of the Senator's committee, unless there is a showing that such action should not be taken. Nevertheless, I feel that if any Senators want to have an opportunity to study the matter further, such an opportunity should be provided.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have read a great many of the questions and answers, and I really cannot see how any Senate committee could operate if it were not entitled to have answers to such questions.

For instance, this question was asked:

Did you conduct any business in New Jersey?

The answer was:

I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

I read further from the testimony:

Did you ever have any business in Habana?
I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

* * * * *

Did you ever hear of the L. & C. Amusement Co.?
I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. President, the L. & C. Amusement Co. was a gambling outfit in northern New Jersey, as shown by other evidence.

Another question was as follows:

Did you ever hear of the Pal Trading Co.?

That was another gambling outfit.

The answer is as follows:

I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Another question and answer are as follows:

Did you ever hear of the L. & L. Trading Co.?
I decline to answer on the ground it might incriminate me.

So, Mr. President, I think the situation is very clear. This man, Joe Adonis, is one of the big-time racketeers and criminals in the country. For my part, I am unwilling to agree to defer taking action on this resolution, because the witness should be brought to justice for refusing to answer these questions, which necessarily have to be asked in connection with this investigation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question, but I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have a statement to make, not really a question to ask.

However, Mr. President, I question, first of all, the right of the special committee to make a report. Reports are made by standing committees. That is the first question which comes to my mind.

Secondly, almost all the questions read by the Senator from Tennessee could very properly be answered by the witness by saying that answers to the questions might incriminate him. One of the questions which has been read to us would not appear to come in that category without stretching the point a great deal; but the others might properly be answered by the witness by saying that answers to them would tend to incriminate him.

However, it seems to me that this matter should not be rushed through the Senate in this way, but should go to a standing committee.

I respectfully suggest that the matter go to the Judiciary Committee. A similar matter was referred to the Judiciary Committee at the last session. The Senator from Tennessee is a member of that committee, and was present when that matter was considered.

This matter comes up on a somewhat different basis. So far as I am concerned, I do not care to vote one way or the other regarding this matter. I should prefer to have it go to the standing committee which is charged with the consideration of such questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senate has voted on another contempt situation, that involving the man Russell, a Chicago racketeer, who was brought before the committee, and who now has been indicted by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia on, I think, 60 counts. If any Member of the Senate wishes to refer to the work we are trying to do, of course, that is the prerogative of every Senator. However, we have been trying very hard to follow the mandate of the Senate in carrying on this investigation.

When a committee in the course of its inquiry makes a very clear presentation, if a witness then can refuse to say whether he ever heard of anything, whether he ever was in business in New Jersey, whether he ever had any business transactions with someone else, or whether he was interested in what appears to be a legitimate business, then, of course, it is manifestly impossible for the committee to carry on the investigation. Such an investigation cannot be conducted properly unless the committee can do something with witnesses who refuse to answer such questions.

We think we are developing a picture which will be of considerable assistance to the Senate in considering the passage of certain legislation. As an indirect result, it has certainly been of assistance to local prosecutors and other officers in their efforts at least to put some blocks in the way of organized crime, which has reached tremendous proportions, and about which something must be done if we are to prevent its eating at the very heart of our democratic process.

This is an important matter, and, unless the Senate is going to back us up in citing for contempt one of the most notorious gangsters in the United States, who, in our inquiry, refused to answer almost every question that was asked him, then, of course, it will manifestly be impossible for us to proceed. I think it would certainly be very discouraging to the good law-enforcement officers of the country who have been cooperating so fully with our committee during the past few months.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that the request made by the Senator from Tennessee is a very reasonable one. I am not a lawyer, but I know something of the individual who is cited. I know that he has tried to avoid examination and has sought to evade the law in the State of New York for a great many years. The committee of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is chairman was created by the Senate of the United States, and it would appear to me that if a duly constituted committee of the Senate could report to the Senate and ask for action by the Senate only through the good offices of another committee, as, for example, a standing committee of the Senate, it would be bound to retard action; it would make the activities and work of the committee far more burdensome, and in due course would possibly lead to complete impotency on the part of the committee. It seems to me it is a very proper thing for the committee, of which the Senator from Tennessee is chairman, to report directly to the Senate, and to expect the Senate to take action upon the request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move, as a substitute, that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be required to report back within 1 week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Conor
Capehart	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Ives	Pastore
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smathers
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Welker
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Young
Green	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary is not made for the purpose of delay. It seems to me that the arrest of an individual is a matter which should be given serious thought, for it is of serious moment. It does not seem to me that any individual, however low he may have descended, should be subject to arrest by a committee of the Senate without first receiving the dignified and serious thought of the body against which the alleged contempt has been committed. If the individual involved—and I do not know him from Adam's off ox, and I care not who he is—has been guilty of contempt, he has been guilty of contempt against the Senate of the United States. Therefore the Senate of the United States should give the matter serious and at least momentary consideration. The motion pending is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so that the committee may report it back to the Senate within 1 week.

Let me say to the able Senator from Tennessee that, whatever his thoughts may be in the matter, the chairman of

the Committee on the Judiciary proposes, if the motion is carried, to call the Committee on the Judiciary into special session on Wednesday, so that it may consider the subject matter and report back promptly. In all seriousness, I think the matter of the promiscuous arrest of individuals by special committees of the Senate should be looked into with the greatest of care. I submit the motion to the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I may be heard briefly, every committee—and the Committee on Crime Investigation has been constituted by the Senate—reports its own recommendations and findings as to whether a witness has been in contempt of that committee. Ever since I have been in Congress, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of this body, I have never heard of an instance when the Committee on the Judiciary wanted to pass on a matter involving contempt after another committee of the Senate had passed on the subject and reported its findings to the Senate.

It was not done when the Foreign Relations Committee reported the refusal of certain witnesses to testify in a recent investigation before it. I cannot recall that it was ever done in the case of any other committee. It was not done in the case of this committee when a contempt citation was brought against Harry Russell, who is just about one-tenth as vicious a racketeer as Joe Adonis. Russell was indicted for refusing to answer 60 questions. I dare say that on this record, in the case of Joe Adonis, there are more than 100 questions which he refused to answer. He thwarted the work of the committee and was very contemptuous of the committee.

The report is before the Senate. Anyone can read it and see the questions which the witness refused to answer—questions as to whether he had ever heard of a certain company or person; whether he had ever been in any business in New Jersey; whether someone had ever bought race horses for him; whether he had ever heard of the L. & L., and certain other companies and so forth. How a committee can be expected to carry on an investigation if its activities must then be reviewed by the Judiciary Committee, is beyond me. I believe that this is an effort to delay and thwart the work of the committee. The recommendation of the committee is unanimous. The testimony is before us. The work of the committee must soon terminate. I hope that the Senate will not delay the work of the committee by having the resolution referred to some other committee for review.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said a few minutes ago, that this man Adonis is one of the most sinister and dangerous residents of New York State. He has for a long time evaded public or judicial scrutiny of his activities.

The special committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is chairman, has reported to the Senate that Adonis has refused to answer questions which would not incriminate him under the Federal law, and therefore the committee recommends that he be cited by the Senate.

It is now proposed to refer the entire matter to the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of letting the Judiciary Committee pass on the accuracy of the report of the special committee, of which the Senator from Tennessee is chairman. While I have the greatest respect for the distinguished Judiciary Committee, it does not seem to me that there is any indication that it is any better equipped to pass upon the legal aspects of the proposed citation than are the distinguished lawyers who compose the special committee which is making the report. It seems to me that it is a most unusual procedure to refer the report of a special committee to a standing committee, rather than to submit it directly to the Senate for its determination. If that policy is to be pursued, delay in the business of the Senate is inevitable, and the purpose of our special committees, set up to avoid burdening the standing committees, will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise as a peacemaker in this matter. I ask if the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee would not be satisfied if the Senator from Tennessee were willing to have this question go over until Thursday. Tomorrow, by unanimous consent, we are to have a vote on another matter. As I understand, there will be no session on Wednesday. If we could vote on the motion at a certain hour on a certain day, would not that be satisfactory?

It seems to the Senator from Michigan that we are now being called upon as Senators to vote as to whether or not certain conduct constitutes contempt of the Senate when, in fact, it involves contempt of a committee. Each Senator's conscience must dictate how he shall vote upon that question. It is a very important question. We have been asked today, without hearing each and every question, to make up our minds whether or not there has been contempt of the Senate, or whether or not the persons involved are guilty of contempt of the Senate, no matter who they are, or how guilty they may be of any other crime. The question is, Are they guilty of the offense of contempt of the Senate by reason of failure to answer these questions?

There are legal and constitutional questions involved. I wonder whether the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee cannot agree to a vote on Thursday. Would not that be a proper time, and would not that allow each Senator an opportunity to make up his mind on this very important question? I hope to hear from both Senators on that proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, no one knows better than do members of the committee headed by the Senator from Tennessee, whether this man was contemptuous of the committee and insolent in his attitude before it. No one will know any better than do the members of this committee whether he is guilty of contempt and whether he should be cited. I see nothing to be gained by delay. I see everything to be lost. If we do not act upon the request of the Senator from Tennessee at this time, or if we delay his request, it seems to me that the United States Senate is likely to fall in the estimation of the public.

I hope we can have a vote on the motion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that the request of the Senator from Michigan will be granted, not entirely for the reason stated, however, by the Senator from Michigan. It seems to me that the questions involved here are such questions as might much better be passed upon by the Senate if a little more specific procedure were followed by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope that such procedure will be followed in other cases. As I understand, other similar cases are yet to be reported. A letter from counsel to the committee—and the committee has excellent counsel—stating in black and white that the record has been examined, that the committee was properly constituted, that it met at such a time and under such conditions and took such action as to justify the bringing of contempt proceedings, that the questions are pertinent questions in the judgment of counsel, and questions with respect to which the witness had no right to claim his constitutional immunity by claiming the right to refuse to answer would, it seems to the Senator from Florida, leave a completely clear and specific situation under which the Senate could promptly and properly approve the action of the committee.

If the question is to come to a vote today, the Senator from Florida will vote with the special committee, because he had the opportunity to sit, as did only four or five other Senators, throughout all the argument. The Senator from Florida happened to be presiding during a great part of the time, and he heard, in the various elements of the discussion, enough to satisfy him that the full and proper course suggested has been followed by counsel for the special committee. It seems to the Senator from Florida that it would be easy to obviate the bringing up of a question of this kind if there were a specific request from the committee coupled with a specific report and recommendation of counsel, upon which the Senate could feel assured that it was doing the right thing in voting for such a resolution.

To conclude: The Senator from Florida will vote with the committee if the Senator from Tennessee wishes the matter to be proceeded with today, because he did happen to hear the various necessary technical elements come out in the verbal statements of the Senator from Tennessee which will appear in the RECORD tomorrow. But he thoroughly agrees with the position taken by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] that a much clearer, more specific, more succinct practice is preferable, and if agreement is given to this matter to be

laid over until Thursday, and to come up then with a preferred setting, and particularly if the suggested specific showing shall be incorporated in the RECORD that there can then be no question about the propriety of the action requested to be taken by the whole Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that I resent the implication that there is any effort to delay. I have no intention of delaying. Neither do I want to burden the Committee on the Judiciary with an additional load. That committee has a heavy load to carry now. So far as I am concerned, the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan is entirely satisfactory. I do want the Senate to have an opportunity to look at a serious subject, because the arrest of an individual, regardless of how low he may have fallen, or what kind of racketeer he may be, is a serious matter. When this body sets itself up as a body to police the country, and go into States and investigate their laws with the idea of effecting somewhat of a police power, it seems to me that in this serious hour and day we are getting into rather small business.

But, Mr. President, I am entirely in accord with the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan that the matter rest before the Senate, to be considered by the whole Senate and voted on on Thursday. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to thank the Senator for his attitude. I join with the Senator from Michigan in pleading with the Senator from Tennessee. I think it is no more than due under senatorial courtesy to accede to the suggestion which has been made. The report was filed only today. I realize that the Senator from Tennessee has given careful study to these matters. I have no doubt in my mind that the Senate will follow his suggestions if the Senate is given time to study the subject. But, after all, every Senator's vote has to be his own vote, not the vote of the Senator from Tennessee, and finally the votes of the respective Senators become the decision of the Senate itself.

Inasmuch as the report has been on file only 1 day it is no more than fair, and it is usually customary if Senators make the request, that a couple of days be given so they may study the matter Senators should be extended that courtesy. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will be willing to let Senators have that much time to study the subject. I believe time will be gained thereby. That is why I previously asked if the Senator was not willing to let the resolution go over. I think that in a spirit of courtesy the Senator should be willing to have it go over so as to give Senators an opportunity to study the questions which are involved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not think Senators who have heard the questions read and answers given should have any question about whether the witnesses are in contempt of the committee or not. If any Senator is not satisfied on that score here the record is, and I shall be glad to read some of the questions and the answers.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will admit, I am sure, that there are involved serious legal questions which he has probably spent some time in studying and which other Senators may want to spend just a little time in studying. I am sure the Senator does not want to deprive other Senators of that privilege. No one can make up his mind on legal questions such as these in a few moments. I hope the Senator will agree to extend to other Senators the same privilege he has had.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is a rather strange situation. I have seen a good many contempt citations brought before the two Houses of Congress. The situation has been explained to the Members of the Senate. Some questions have been put which the witnesses refused to answer. The question of what action should be taken has been voted on by the committee. The report sets forth many, many pages of testimony of the witness embodying questions about which he literally refused to tell the committee anything. He openly defied the committee about any business relations he had had; whether he had even heard of certain companies or not. If any Senator has any question as to the interrogatories and answers, they are here in the report and I shall be happy to read them. But I cannot interpret the proposal now made in any way except as an effort to thwart the work of the committee.

Mr. President, I want to say that I made no reflection on the distinguished Senator from Nevada. The committee has carried out, to the best of its ability, the task assigned it. At least most of those with whom we have been in touch have felt we have helped them in getting the over-all picture so that Congress might legislate. Certainly the law enforcement officers of the United States, as a general matter, have been very cooperative.

Mr. President, to say that we are dealing in small-time business is not, I think, recognizing the sinister and the ruthless character of some of the operations which are going on in interstate commerce. It so happens that later in the week it is necessary that I be away, so I shall have to ask that the matter be taken up at this time.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question, if the Senator from Utah does not mind.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not know whether I am recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Utah, but the Chair did not know that the Senator from Florida wished to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from Tennessee knows that I have been interested in the inquiry. I have complimented him specifically upon the work of his committee in Miami, in my State. The Senator from Florida has already said that he expects to vote with the Senator from Tennessee if he insists upon a vote being had today.

With that as a predicate, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he does not recognize the fact that beyond question the matter of pertinence of the committee questions which were declined to be answered by the witness is a matter which has to do vitally with whether or not the failure to answer is contempt; and the Senator from Florida merely calls to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee that without some chance being given to look further into the matter, the only way a Senator attending here and listening eagerly to everything that has been said could come to any decision at all as to the pertinence of such questions and answers as have been incorporated in this debate would be from the statement of the Senator from Tennessee.

Does not the Senator agree that a written opinion from counsel for his committee stating affirmatively the elements which must be present before contempt can be committed, including particularly the matter of pertinence to the subject matter under investigation, and the question of whether or not refusal to answer could properly have been predicated upon constitutional grounds would set at rest this situation, and allow Senators to vote promptly, with some assurance that the votes they were casting were in accord with the sound requirements of law? Would the Senator have objection to filing such a written statement of his able counsel giving the specific affirmative ruling of counsel that the necessary elements are present in the refusal of a particular witness to testify when interrogated by his committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can only say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I have previously stated that counsel have considered the matter and have advised the entire committee that the refusal to answer certain questions and to follow the direction of the chairman in these cases constitutes a contempt, and that the matter has been fully briefed by our counsel. They have carefully considered the transcript of the record.

Of course, I would have no objection to securing a letter and filing it. However, now that the testimony is before the Senate, I cannot understand why the Senate should in this instance follow a procedure different from that followed in all the other contempt cases about which I have known, before either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

As to the pertinency of the questions which have been asked, and which the witness has declined to answer, let me

say that their pertinency is obvious from the questions themselves. Let me read some of them. The witness was asked whether he had been in business with Frank Costello, and he answered by saying:

I decline to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Subsequently he was asked:

Have you had any business dealings with Luciano?

Referring to "Lucky" Luciano.
The answer was:

I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

He was also asked:

Did you conduct any business in New Jersey?

He replied:

I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

There were also the following question and answer:

Are you not still connected with the Automotive Conveying Co., of New Jersey?
I decline to answer.
The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer.
Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Explanation was made in regard to the nature of the Automotive Conveying Co.

Other questions were asked about many other companies, some of which were explained as being gambling partnerships. The witness even refused to say whether he had ever heard of them. If that does not constitute contempt of a committee, then I do not know what contempt is.

Unfortunately, I am going to have to ask to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate later this week. I cannot understand why this matter should be postponed. I think to postpone it would be to give encouragement to Joe Adonis..

I have similar requests to make in regard to certain other persons. I think it would be violating the recognized procedure of the Senate if we were to postpone action on these matters. The subpenas in these cases have been issued. Some suggestion has been made that in these cases a procedure different from the usual procedure should be followed. Personally I cannot agree to a procedure which would result in giving such persons that kind of encouragement.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Judiciary Committee. I stand with the chairman of that committee regarding this matter. I think it should be referred to the committee for study, because there are a number of questions in regard to the legality of such procedures. Therefore, I think this matter should be thoroughly studied and investigated.

I dare say that perhaps there are only nine Members of the Senate who know what the charges are or what this matter involves. Therefore, if all Senators were compelled to vote now, most of them would be obliged to vote blindly. Consequently, a request for a postponement for 1 week seems to be a fair one.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is an agreement that the Senate will vote tomorrow at 2 o'clock on a very important matter. I had understood that, under the agreement reached in regard to that vote, we would debate that matter today and also tomorrow, with the time tomorrow, immediately prior to the vote, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

If we are to take much time on this other matter, there will be that much less time available for us to debate the resolution on which we are to vote tomorrow at 2 p. m.

Therefore, I should like to have an opportunity to discuss the question which was pending before the resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee came before the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before he proceeds will the Senator from Utah permit me to submit several more reports and resolutions relative to citations for contempt growing out of the hearings before the Special Crime Investigating Committee?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

CITATION OF ANTHONY J. ACCARDO FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 26), together with a resolution citing Anthony J. Accardo for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Anthony J. Accardo to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Anthony J. Accardo may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JAMES LYNCH FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 27), together with a resolution citing James Lynch for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 45) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of James Lynch to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said James Lynch may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ARTHUR LONGANO FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 28) together with a resolution citing Arthur Longano for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 46) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Arthur Longano to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Arthur Longano may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF SALVATORE MORETTI FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 29) together with a resolution citing Salvatore Moretti for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 47) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Salvatore Moretti to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Salvatore Moretti may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF WALTER M. PECHART FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 30) together with a resolution citing Walter M. Pechart for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Walter M. Pechart to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United

States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Walter M. Pechart may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF PAT MANNO, ALIAS PATRICK J. MANNING, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 31) together with a resolution citing Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JACK DRAGNA FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit a report (No. 32) together with a resolution citing Jack Dragna for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 50) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Jack Dragna to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Jack Dragna may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

AMERICAN BASEBALL AND THE BASEBALL COMMISSIONER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah may yield to me without losing the floor, in order that I may make insertions in the RECORD and may speak briefly in regard to another matter.

Mr. WATKINS. I am willing to yield for that purpose, if consent is given that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, one million American boys played baseball in 1950. Approximately 200,000 American boys are playing baseball on high school teams, and many boys in the Boy Scouts of America are playing baseball. As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Nevada had the great pleasure of organizing the first junior American Legion baseball—that was in my State of Nevada. Hundreds of thousands of boys are playing baseball on the playgrounds and the grass lots throughout the United States. The parents of those boys are willing to have their sons play baseball as a wholesome means of developing stamina and character.

During these days of big-money games, baseball must be above suspicion. It would be sad indeed to permit anything to occur which would disillusion the hundreds of thousands of boys who believe implicitly in the integrity of baseball as our national sport.

A former Member of this body, "Happy" Chandler, followed the late Judge Landis as commissioner of baseball. Not a breath of scandal ever touched either one of them.

All of us remember the scandal connected with the Chicago Black Sox baseball team, and we have read about the recent scandal in connection with certain basketball games, where it was shown that bribes were paid to certain players.

However, during the long reign of Judge Landis and during the 5 years in which "Happy" Chandler has served as commissioner of baseball, not a breath of scandal or a word suggesting crookedness has occurred.

The sudden ouster of Commissioner Chandler could have serious repercussions with the wholesome young people of this country. That action has the earmarks of a personal grudge.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the sports section of the Washington Post for December 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FANS SHOULD BE TOLD WHY "HAPPY" FIRED

(By Jack Walsh)

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, said yesterday he was "deeply concerned" over baseball's ouster of Commissioner Chandler—and not just because "Happy's" a good friend of his.

"This thing could have serious repercussions," Senator MALONE said. "I think baseball has a duty to the American people to show where Chandler has done a bad job.

"There may be details I know nothing about. Certainly no one wants a man continued in a job if he can't handle it. But the big thing to me is to find out if he's being fired for incompetence or because of a personal grudge.

"If the latter is true, then baseball is plowing up its own reputation. It means that baseball does not want a czar. It wants someone to pose as a czar while stockholders control him at their whim."

PEOPLE WATCH CLOSELY

"That's what I believe a lot of people are watching closely. And they're not all in the United States Senate."

Elsewhere in the Senate two "candidates" popped up for the job as commissioner of baseball. Actually it means that the names of Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado) and Senator Scott Lucas (Democrat, Illinois) merely were mentioned.

Asked about the report, Senator JOHNSON said: "It won't amount to much. I'm for 'Happy' Chandler and wouldn't even consider it under these circumstances."

Senator JOHNSON, nonsalaried president of the Western League for the past 4 years, just returned from the minor-league meeting at St. Petersburg, Fla.

HE'S STUNNED, TOO

He said: "I'm stunned by what has happened. There was nothing in the wind down there, and I thought Chandler was riding high, wide, and handsome."

Lucas, outgoing Senate majority leader, who was defeated for reelection by Republican EVERETT DIRKSEN, was chatting with newsmen about Chandler's ouster.

"That might be a spot for you," a reporter said to him.

Lucas, presumably joking, replied: "Say, it might be at that. Why don't you fellows go out and promote me?"

Lucas is a former minor-league ballplayer. He played from 1913 to 1916 for Pekin in the old Illinois-Missouri League, and led the batters with a .350 average. He moved to Peoria and Bloomington in the Three-I League. He quit baseball at the age of 22 to practice law.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on December 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR., DECEMBER 18, 1950

Baseball seems to call for a little general news attention at the moment, with the famous Happy Chandler—one time Governor and Senator of Kentucky and now high commissioner for the national sport as the apparent target of some very unsavory and undesirable elements in the sports world who are trying to get rid of him. He has a contract that expires in 1952 and when the question arose at the recent big league get-together in Florida, he was two votes shy of enough to get that renewal. One of the two votes has since swung his way, that of Mrs. Charles Comisky, who controls the Chicago White Sox, but there still is one vote shy, and the back-stage information is that the tinhorn gambling rackets, which have long tried to get in on baseball, but have been blocked at every turn by Happy Chandler, are behind the efforts to oust him. Actually, Happy Chandler has done a top-flight job for the national sport, since he went in as baseball czar in 1945, and the old-line figures in the game—the old reliables—are loud in their praise of the accomplishments he has achieved. Not the least of those accomplishments is what he has done to encourage and revivify baseball in high schools, and to restore its popularity of olden days, among the youth of the country. He has maintained a hard-and-fast policy against allowing any gambling or horse-racing interests to get into the ownership or control of any of the major league clubs, which probably is the basic reason for the attempt to get rid of him.

He is fighting the battle out, however, and he has a chance of winning. If he fails, it's bad news for the national sport, because the forces behind the attack on him are not likely to do much for the prestige of the game, in the future.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by

Shirley Povich, published in the Washington Post sports section on December 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING WITH SHIRLEY POVICH

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., December 13.—That was a shoddy piece of business by the major league club owners this week—the sacking of Commissioner Happy Chandler.

They didn't want a baseball commissioner, they wanted a puppet, a role that Chandler rejected at the cost of his $65,000-a-year job.

And the way they got rid of him, prodded by a willful little group who weren't even a majority, huddling in a smoke-filled room, was a throw-back to the ward heel politics that was supposed to have gone out of the game.

They didn't name a single reason why they fired Chandler. Either they had none, or reasoned that it is none of the public's business. If the latter, it was the same kind of reasoning that all but killed the game before the late Judge Landis took a hold as commissioner and restored public confidence.

Chandler could have stayed in his job if he had wanted to please all the club owners. But he had the notion that he had a duty to the people as well, the folks who paid the game's way. He cracked down on his employers for violating the rules and rubbed enough of them the wrong way to get himself unhorsed.

He had them panicked when he commented a week ago that, come total mobilization, baseball perhaps would have to fold. He was trying honestly to alert the big audience a baseball commissioner always has, to the gravity of the world situation. The owners didn't want him to say anything like that. They wanted business as usual, peace or no.

Their action in getting rid of Chandler could have sorry repercussions. The next man to take the job will have to be a lion-hearted citizen indeed, or suspect as a man who will leap to the owner's bidding when they crack the whip. They tore the stature from the commissioner's office.

If Chandler was no Landis, he was at least a respected commissioner unafraid to call the turn as he saw it. There was not the vaguest suspicion of scandal during his term. The game had its greatest era of prosperity. He gave the ballplayers the greatest breaks they ever had—their pension fund, more barnstorming time, more expense money.

His zeal for the game was unquestioned. He incurred the wrath of the owners when he insisted they keep their scouts away from high-school boys before they graduated. When they abrogated that rule of his last week, he was flooded with protests from parents and parent-teacher groups throughout the Nation, and was genuinely sad about it.

Schoolboy baseball had been one of his pet projects. He demanded that the owners contribute financially to the build-up of the game in the high schools when he took office in 1945.

Only 60,000 high-school boys were playing what the owners were always pleased to call the national game. In 1950, under Chandler's ceaseless prodding for schoolboys to get into the act, 200,000 high-school players were in the field.

The unkindest cut of all was the desertion of Chandler by the owners who at first resisted his ouster. Finally they killed him off by a unanimous 16-to-0 vote, to his shocking dismay. In the show-down they lost their nerve and became lambs in the stampeding of votes by the anti-Chandlers.

Where does baseball go from here? Sure, they'll get another commissioner. The salary is big, and there will always be applicants. But it doesn't follow that the people will be happy with the state of the game.

The public rallied behind Landis and later liked Chandler. It has been apparent for years that the baseball fans like their commissioners tough. That's the rub. The club owners don't. They want a figurehead. Maybe it's because rich men like to be yessed. They're not used to being crossed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from an article appearing in the Washington Daily News on December 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANDLER GETS SIX MILLION

CINCINNATI, OHIO, December 27.—Baseball Commissioner Happy Chandler has sold television rights for the world series and all-star games for the next 6 years to the Gillette Safety Razor Co. and the Mutual Broadcasting System for $6,000,000.

Chandler previously had concluded a contract with the same two firms for exclusive radio broadcast games for $1,370,000 covering the period from 1950–56. This includes $125,000 paid for this year's world series game.

The Commissioner, fighting to retain his job after the big leagues refusal to renew his contract in the meetings this month at St. Petersburg, Fla., said virtually all of the money would go into the players' pension fund.

He hailed yesterday's deal as the answer to any of the fund's monetary difficulties.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, within our generation baseball, football, and basketball have become big money games. Baseball had its Chicago Black Sox scandal. Now basketball has its scandal. The people like both games, but are very sensitive about them. The people want honest games played.

Mr. President, if a few managers or owners of baseball teams, some of whom have entered the game comparatively recently, believe that the public has forgotten the dangers of corruption of personnel playing their favorite games, they may be due for a great shock.

Let me repeat that there has never been a breath of suspicion against Commissioner Chandler. Neither have any accusations of incompetence been made against him. Yet we find that arbitrarily and suddenly baseball team owners have sought to end Commissioner Chandler's regime. The real objective on their part, or what is believed by a large segment of the public to be the real objective—would seem to be to maintain in the office of Commissioner of Baseball someone who can be controlled by owners of baseball teams, rather than someone who, like Happy Chandler, will be true to the public in filling that important office in connection with the great American game of baseball.

ALLEGED LEAKAGE OF INFORMATION FROM DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah may yield to me for not more than 2½ minutes, so that I may make a brief insertion in the RECORD and may comment upon it.

Mr. WATKINS. I am willing to have that done, provided it is understood that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, several days ago I called the attention of the Senate, and especially the attention of the members of the Armed Services Committee, to a serious breach in our security rules, a breach which may very seriously endanger our secret codes.

The Secretary of the Army has shown an interest in this matter, and apparently he is conducting an honest and an intelligent investigation, for which I congratulate him.

However, for the benefit of the Armed Services Committee and for the benefit of the Secretary of the Army, I wish today to give some additional information about this secret document which was made public. It was Document No. 3019, dated December 15, 1950. It was a daily intelligence summary prepared by the General Headquarters, United Nations Far Eastern Command. It was stamped "Secret." The Senate will understand that I am speaking now of the decoded message which appeared in Drew Pearson's column.

The Senate will recall that at that time he said, "I got permission from the Army to publish these secret messages." The Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, answered and said, "No, that is not true. Pearson is again lying. We gave no such permission to Pearson." The Secretary of the Army said, "We have submitted this matter to the Judge Advocate General, to find out the extent to which our espionage laws have been violated."

For the benefit of the Armed Services Committee and the Secretary of the Army, I quote this further information: On the inside cover of this document, No. 3019, dated December 15, 1950, stamped in red lettering, "Secret," the following security ruling is found:

WARNING

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws (title 18, U. S. C., secs. 793 and 794). Transmission or revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

It is intended for eyes only, and it is imperative that the material contained in it be treated with the utmost discretion. Under no circumstances shall possession thereof, or the information therein, be given to any personnel other than those whose duties specifically require knowledge thereof.

When not in use, this document—

I am still quoting, Mr. President, from the red lettering stamped on the secret document—

When not in use, this document is chargeable to the custody of an officer. See paragraphs 11, 27, 29, 33, Army Regulations 380–5.

Reproduction of the intelligence in this publication is prohibited without special authority of the A. C. of S., G–2, General Headquarters, Far Eastern Command. This document shall be destroyed within 15 days of receipt, and a copy of a certification of destruction prescribed by section 33–A, Army Regulations 380–5, shall be furnished to the A. C. of S., G–2, General Headquarters, Far Eastern Command.

That is the remainder of the warning contained on the cover of this secret document. Mr. Pearson has since then claimed that he paraphrased this decoded document; which in effect is saying

that he had the document in his possession before it was paraphrased. Now, if he did—if he had that document in his possession—that secret decoded document in his possession—without any paraphrasing, with David Karr, a man who has written for the Daily Worker and for the Party Organizer, and labeled by the FBI as a Communist, then this follows the pattern in the Hiss case too dangerously close. You will recall that when Hiss was accused he claimed that he delivered State Department secrets to Chambers, thinking he was merely helping out a newspaperman. In this case someone is delivering secrets to David Karr, a named Communist, and Drew Pearson, who has long been doing the smear work for the Communist Party.

But to show that Pearson did not paraphrase this report—that this was made public in its original form, let me again quote:

The quotes from Pearson's column are accurate to the point that not one word or punctuation mark is at variance with the original text of the secret document.

Now, I call this to the attention not only of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. President, but I also call it to the attention of the Justice Department. We now have the unquestioned proof that someone is stealing secret documents and handing them over to Drew Pearson and David Karr. How many other tens or hundreds of secret documents are being stolen in like fashion we do not know, but certainly this was not the only one. In the Amerasia case, it will be recalled that thousands of classified documents were stolen and photostated and that this theft of State Department and other Government secrets came to light only when the magazine made the mistake of publishing one of them. Pearson has made the same mistake.

It is not so much the question of damage done by the publication of this one document, the danger lies in the fact that a known Communist such as David Karr and a party line smear artist such as Pearson have a pipeline to the Army's top-secret documents.

I call upon the Justice Department to act. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Communist Daily Worker, which editorial very vigorously defends Drew Pearson and condemns McCARTHY for having exposed his machinations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IT'S DREW PEARSON

The witchhunt has reached Drew Pearson now. This reactionary radio commentator is going to lose his contract with the Adam Hat Co., because Senator McCARTHY threatened a boycott against the company, saying Pearson "follows the Communist or fellow-traveler line." When McCARTHY points the finger, the ax starts to fall. The State Department trembles. It issues hurried memos to prove to the angry witchhunter that they deserve his confidence, since they follow his disastrous line. Big corporations hastily knife their hired actors, actresses, or commentators.

Pearson and McCARTHY are brothers-in-arms when it comes to whooping it up for war. But Pearson has made the fatal error of refusing to admire McCARTHY. He has dared to note one or two minor scandals in the war machine. He has had the gall even to mention that our casualties in Korea were running very high.

Could this "subversive" allusion to our ghastly casualty lists in Korea be tolerated by a McCARTHY or an Adam Hat Co.?

So Pearson joins the list that the Un-American Committee launched with the Hollywood 10, with John Howard Lawson and Albert Maltz and their courageous colleagues. He joins the list that includes Paul Robeson, knifed for refusing to be thrilled by MacArthur's war in Korea. He joins the victim of the General Foods crack-down, Jean Muir, and scores of other victims of the notorious "Red channels" and "counter-attack" blacklists.

The Daily News TV station will not televise Charlie Chaplin because a professional tough guy with a letterhead in New Jersey ordered them not to.

The list of victims grows all the time. It includes conservative professors teaching at the University of California for 40 years who won't sign a "pledge" never to criticize the pro-Fascist California banker Giannini's board of regents.

Certain liberals sigh with relief that Anna Rosenberg—denounced by Representative RANKIN on the floor of Congress as "that Yiddish woman" without a word of rebuke from any of the knights of freedom assembled there—has been cleared by Senator McCARTHY.

They are willing to let this imitation-Nazi determine the political and moral standards of America. If McCARTHY O. K.'s you, you are "loyal."

This is where the "anti-Communist" witchhunt and thought control are dragging America. You can't have a "little anti-Communist witchhunt" that will stop halfway and not murder the Bill of Rights. When a Communist or any progressive is fired for his antiwar views, no one else is safe from this economic purge, which has no limits until all liberty is dead.

Masking its crack-down on the antiwar views of its staffs, Columbia Broadcasting System demands "loyalty oaths" of its employees, and stages comical "armed guards" at its radio machinery to make it look good. If we wear Adam hats, is McCARTHY to dictate what goes on in our heads?

The Red scare turns America over to its worst enemies, of whom a McCARTHY is a good specimen.

There is a unity of interest among all Americans, regardless of their views, in the defense of our free speech from the rampant thought controllers. There should be unity of protest too.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement entitled "These Days" by George E. Sokolsky, released on Thursday, January 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

SPEECH-WRITING

Drew Pearson had this in his column:

"Friends of Herbert Hoover are telling how he cleared his recent keep-out-of-Europe speech with four four-star generals in the Pentagon * * * George Sokolsky is given credit for ghosting most of the Hoover sermon."

I do not know who does me the honor to suggest that I ghosted most or any of Mr. Hoover's recent or any other speech. Certainly, it was not Herbert Hoover. He rolls his own.

If the most that can be said against Herbert Hoover's speech is that he invited my assistance, then nothing has been said against his ideas and proposals. As for the four-star generals, I know nothing about that, but it can only mean that he consulted experts and that they gave him expert counsel.

Actually, Herbert Hoover's method of writing a speech or an article is appallingly unprofessional. If columnists and other professional writers employed the same techniques, there would be fewer mistakes and the public would not so often be misled by inaccuracies, but there would be too little time left for anything else.

This is how it is done. Mr. Hoover writes a draft in longhand, which always is the best version of the speech. But he is an engineer, not an author. He discovers weaknesses, stresses, and strains under which the entire structure could crumble. He finds that he has written a sentence which sounds good but is faulty logic. He has stated something as a fact which, upon investigation, is only an assumption. He becomes cantankerous when it is suggested that the slight distortion sounds better than the rigidly stated fact. He says that he is not an orator, but needs to speak up for the citizens.

So, he works the thing all over, word by word, sentence by sentence. His recent speech was worked over 19 times, each draft being almost a complete rewriting, and all kept on file.

Not being a professional writer, he is not enamored with his own verbiage. So, he sends the document to a printer, who sets it up for him in newspaper type. Mr. Hoover finds it easier to read that way. The recent speech was sent to the printer a dozen times for revision before its author found it satisfactory.

Sometimes, Hoover sends copies of drafts to friends or experts for criticism. I have often received such drafts and have been critical, but I have never written a speech for him or any part of one. I know that Mark Sullivan has often received such drafts. I am quite sure that none were ever sent to Drew Pearson. I saw the eighteenth draft of this speech, but not any earlier ones.

Mr. Hoover has never employed a crew of speech writers. He has had no Sam Rosenman or Robert Sherwood or Clark Clifford in his entourage. Rather, he sits and fumes over it himself.

The process is trying, expensive, and can only be employed by one who takes his speeches as seriously as he hopes the public will. It is a reflex to Mr. Hoover's modesty. He does not impose his ideas on others unless and until he is sure of them himself. Lesser men are not so punctilious.

I write this about Herbert Hoover only because Mr. Pearson has involved me in this process. Frankly, I do not claim for myself the distinction of telling Mr. Hoover what to say. Neither my experience nor my intellect is equal to his nor have I grown so impudent or imprudent as to place myself on his level.

Happy in and honored by his friendship, I often consult him and find his correction of errors invaluable to myself and to my readers. I do not correct Herbert Hoover.

Unfortunately, some of us who write for newspapers have lost all sense of proportion. Because editors give us space to express ourselves and pay us for it, we fail to realize that we are reporters who have the obligation of accuracy and, if it is views that we write, honesty of purpose. A proper sense of proportion requires that we recognize that we are not the doers but the recorders, not the leaders but the interpreters. No American columnist is expected to make national policy. We leave that to Congress.

We owe it to our readers not to write what we have not investigated. Drew Pearson questioned neither Mr. Hoover nor myself on this matter of speech writing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Drew Pearson—Keyhole Reporter"—published in the Maynard (Minn.) News, December 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREW PEARSON—KEYHOLE REPORTER

The little episode between Senator McCARTHY and Drew Pearson has focused attention on the keyhole columnist who has done more damage to democracy than any single journalist, including the editor of the Communist Daily Worker.

For a long time, this editor has had nothing but contempt for Drew Pearson and his tactics.

On May 20, 1949 (a year ago last May), we had an editorial in the Maynard News on Pearson in which we outlined his shortcomings.

On several occasions we wrote letters to President John Cowles of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, urging him to discontinue publishing the Drew Pearson column on his editorial pages.

On May 19 of this year, we had lunch with Mr. Cowles and left with him a seven-page report on Drew Pearson which should have convinced even the most skeptical that he was not a responsible journalist, but on the contrary, was irresponsible, vicious, and devious in his reporting.

Mr. Pearson's column still appears in the Minneapolis Star, but they did explain that they watch it closely and blue pencil many of the more objectionable paragraphs.

For the benefit of our readers, we would like to publish the report we handed to Mr. Cowles last May:

Drew Pearson has rattled more skeletons in private closets than any other columnist in the business. He has a key hole personality, and he makes his scandal mongering pay off in political currency. His timing of exposés leaves the conviction in the minds of observers that he smears for a purpose. Almost invariably that purpose coincides with the wishes of the left wing, powers that be in the Nation's Capital.

When Russia was our ally, back in the days of 1943, he went overboard in his praise of all things Russian. He sided with the Communists more often than against them, and was unduly critical of the anti-Communists. Even though most Americans were aware of the totalitarian makeup of the ruthless Soviet government, he ignored the menace.

When it became less popular to be pro-Russian and pro-Communist he made occasional and hypocritical attempts to convince his readers that he was anti-Communist. He has always been most vociferous in his fight against the Franco brand of fascism, but he praises Communist dictator Tito.

When efforts to rout Communists out of Government threaten the continuity of the radicals in the administration, Drew Pearson uncorks his smear pot, sets his leg men in motion, and comes up with an effective, devastating smear of the anti-Communists. When he isn't doing a job of character assassination, he is number one apologist for the pinkos in Government. He is particularly responsive to the dictates of the Frankfurter protégé and he took a prominent part in the efforts of the CIO-PAC and left-wing administration forces to reelect Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida. He used his phony predictions as propaganda to help Mr. Pepper, who was later repudiated at the polls by the people of Florida.

Drew Pearson, like a few other smear artists, has done more to discredit Congress than any other propagandist. His attacks on anti-Communist Senators and Representatives are well known.

He smeared Congressman Martin Dies, and it is common knowledge that Dies was frightened out of public life.

He exposed Congressman Parnell Thomas at a time when Thomas was exposing communism in Hollywood—even though it is said that Pearson had the goods on Thomas long before the exposé.

He smeared Senator HOMER FERGUSON when the Senator was fighting communism in the Senate, and failed to retract when the Senator and his wife proved his accusations false.

He smeared Senator JOE MCCARTHY during the current Red hunt by implying that McCARTHY criminally evaded taxes. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 5, page 5869.) When Senator McCARTHY told the true facts on the floor of the Senate, Pearson did not make amends.

Early in April 1950 Pearson smeared Fulton Lewis, Jr., by accusing him of dishonesty, and subsequently failed to retract when Lewis proved him to be a liar.

Newspapermen, columnists, and Members of Congress blamed Drew Pearson for driving Secretary Forrestal to suicide by his hounding tactics and false accusations.

As a journalist, Pearson is not a credit to the profession. He has "leg men" in many strategic spots. One of them haunts the hallways and cafeteria of Capitol Hill, pumping information from disgruntled employees about the bosses, and using these rumors to develop files for future use—if he finds it politically expedient to smear the Congressman so as to make him ineffective.

The files in the Committee on Un-American Activities contain a great deal of information which shows how his sympathy for Reds has extended back to 1943. Following are a few excerpts:

On March 12, 1948, President Harry Truman denounced Drew Pearson as a liar and as the author of vicious statements. Truman said of Pearson:

"Pearson is one columnist in Washington who wouldn't have room on his breast if he got a ribbon for every time he's been called a liar."

He was regarded by the late President Roosevelt as a chronic liar. Ex-Secretary of State Cordell Hull referred to him as follows: "The truth is not in him; he is a pathological liar."

It is interesting to note that the chief "leg man" for Drew Pearson and his personal emissary to Europe in 1947 was one now known under the name of David Karr, formerly a writer for the (Communist) Daily Worker and for such party-line publications as Fight (magazine), the Hour and Equality.

Mr. Pearson has an illuminating record of his own. On June 26, 1947, the (Communist) Daily Worker announced that Drew Pearson testified as a character witness in the case of 16 leaders of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which was instrumental in bringing to this country, Gerhard Eisler, agent of the Communist International and notorious terrorist. The 16 leaders of this organization, which has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, were convicted for contempt of Congress in a Federal court on June 27, 1947. Drew Pearson used the proceedings to launch an attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

According to the Washington Post of June 23, 1947, Drew Pearson attacked the House Civil Service Committee's loyalty program for ridding the Federal Government of subversive elements.

In his column of November 27, 1943, Drew Pearson assailed Lt. Comdr. Harold A. Burch of naval intelligence for taking Communists off the crews of merchant ships going to Murmansk, Russia.

On October 23, 1943, he praised Andrei Vishinsky, the author of numerous recent diatribes against the United States, as "the famous prosecutor" and "a man of national stature," equivalent to "the most outstanding member of the United States Supreme Court."

On October 21, 1943, Pearson published a long and enthusiastic euology of Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, who was then high in the good graces of Joseph Stalin.

On October 18, 1943, he attacked Secretary of State Hull on the ground that he "does not understand Russian temperament" and that he "has already aroused Russian suspicions." On August 28, 1943, he again criticized Mr. Hull for his anti-Russian attitude. On August 27, 1943, he condemned the removal of Sumner Welles on thhe ground that Russia would be left without a champion in the State Department. He decried the influence of those in the Department who "have established long records as hat ers of the Soviet Russia."

On October 12, 1943, Mr. Pearson praised Assistant Secretary of War, John McCloy, for granting a commission and a citation to Robert Thompson, presently a member of the national committee of the Communist Party.

On September 18, 1943, Pearson took to task Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, for stopping shipments of oil to Russia on the ground that they were needed at home, for granting of passports to anti-Communists and for his associations with anti-Communists.

On September 9, 1943 he deplored the fact that the State Department refused to issue passports for CIO leaders to visit Russia.

On September 13, 1943, Pearson who recently garnered much publicity with his so-called Freedom Train to Italy, press agented by David Karr (Katz), predicted that "the political pendulum normally swings from fascism to communism and will probably do so in both Germany and Italy."

On July 7, 1943, Drew Pearson featured the visit to the White House of Joseph Curran, who at that time was in cahoots with the Communists, and a delegation from the National Maritime Union, then completely under Communist control.

On July 23, 1943, he praised the diplomacy of Joseph Davies and his ability to get along with Joseph Stalin, simultaneously calling attention to the "sour note" struck by the "blunt" Admiral Standley in Moscow.

On June 11, 1943, he referred to Hon. Martin Dies, former chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, as one who is looking for new bogeymen to keep his committee going since Stalin dissolved the Comintern.

On June 1, 1943, Pearson published a strong defense of Malcolm C. Dobbs, who was expelled from the Birmingham CIO Council in December 1947 as a Red, criticizing the War Department for alleged discrimination against Dobbs.

On May 1, 1943, he again criticized the War Department for its alleged ill treatment of Milton Wolff, a well-known member of the Communist Party.

On April 29, 1943, Drew Pearson defended William E. Dodd, Jr. who was removed from the Federal payroll because of his subversive record. He also defended in this article, Frederick L. Schuman, a notorious Soviet apologist.

On April 14, 1943, he sang another song of praise for Herman Bottcher, a member of the Communist Party, John Gates, now editor of the Communist Daily Worker and a group of others of the same stripe, formerly members of the so-called Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

On December 9, 1942, he praised the film, Mission to Moscow, explaining that it would analyze the Moscow treason trials, regarding which Stalin was right after all.

At one time Mr. Pearson proposed that Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, who is, of course, anathema to the Kremlin, receive a medal

which would have a ribbon with a streak of yellow and a piece of baloney on the end.

On September 12, 1943, Drew Pearson answered President Roosevelt's charge that he is a chronic liar. The statement is important because it explains the reason for animus toward men like MacArthur, Standley, Berle, and Hull, and it may cast some light on the attitude of an administration which has from its inception been wedded to a policy of appeasement toward the Communists. Perhaps it explains why some of these men have been relegated to the background in the past and why men like Robert C. Alexander and Admiral William D. Leahy are being hounded today. The statement follows:

"In this difficult mosaic of peace the boys (in the Armed Forces) also know that the most delicate problem is Russia * * * I have long contended—in columns which the President brands as chronically lying—that there is no use constantly pin-pricking Russia.

"Russia is already irked and angry over the fact that we have started no second front in Western Europe * * * However, civilians are entitled to express the commonsense opinion that being unable to give Russia the main thing she wants, we should lean over backward to give her everything else within reason.

"Especially we should give her surcease from needling. * * * The men upon whom Mr. Hull relies most for advice on Russia are Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle and Leo Pasvolsky. Berle has a long record of anti-Russian activity * * * Pasvolsky was secretary to the last anti-Soviet Ambassador in Washington."

MINORITY VIEWS ON WIRE-TAPPING INVESTIGATION — REFUTATION OF STATEMENT BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, seldom in my public life have I ever responded to either baseless or ill-tempered attacks upon me, nor do I intend to dignify one now. However, lest complete silence be misinterpreted, and as an assurance to my colleagues that the very faulty conclusions which appeared in a column of the Washington Post of yesterday, insofar as they pertain to the junior Senator from New Jersey, are completely without foundation in fact, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a statement already released by me to the press which clearly indicates my position.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I did not know he was going to touch on this today, but the Senator is touching upon an article which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post, Washington's Daily Worker, which gives the Senator from Wisconsin credit for having prepared a report, which was in fact prepared by the Senator from New Jersey. Let me ask the Senator whether I am correct in saying that the only contact I had with this report was to sign it, having confidence in the Senator from New Jersey who prepared it—and I think he did an excellent job—that I had nothing to do with the preparation of it; that the first time I saw it was when it was brought to my office for signing, and that then, as the senior member of the committee, Senator WILLIAMS being absent, I merely ordered it transmitted to the committee as a whole.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct. I ask that the statement already released by me to the press be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

I was highly amused at Mr. Drew Pearson's deductions in respect to my sponsorship of the minority views on the recent wire-tapping investigation, particularly that figment of his imagination which led him to severely indict every single member of the Republican minority committee on committees. One has but to read the names of that distinguished group of Senators to know that they would not be parties to such a cheap and tawdry trade as that with which Mr. Pearson charges me—and without their complete accord I could never have enjoyed a place on the Judiciary Committee nor would I have wanted it. Had Mr. Pearson attended those last meetings of the Pepper subcommittee he would have heard me say there substantially the things which I incorporated in the minority views. I still feel very strongly that a congressional committee is not a grand jury in any sense, and that any action taken on the Pepper report should proceed with the utmost care and caution in the interest of simple decency and justice.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter from the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the committee on committees of the Republican conference, which I hope will serve to put to ridicule the deductions arrived at in the column to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 22, 1951.

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: Referring to the article that appeared in yesterday's paper, I just want to assure you that Senator TAFT or no other Member of the Senate influenced your appointment to the Judiciary Committee by speaking to me or any other member of the Committee on Committees in advance of our final session. There are 15 members on the Committee on Committees. All but two were present when the final report was prepared for the Republican conference. Our report to the conference was unanimous.

As you are not a member of the Committee on Committees, it might be interesting for you to know something about how the committee works. Every Senator is contacted in advance of any meetings with the request that he list any committee changes or committee assignments that he desires. Then we have two work sheets, one of them listing the Members in the order of their seniority with a notation as to their letter if their committees are satisfactory of if they want to change, also showing the committees on which they are serving at the present time. The other list gives us the information on each committee, indicating the vacancies as well as the names of those who are on the committees. In an adjoining column we list the requests for any vacancy on each committee. With this information at hand, the task of making the committee assignments is purely mechanical except in cases where two or more Members with the same seniority ask for the same committee assignment. In that case the appointment is finally determined by drawing lots, but no situation of that kind arose at our last meeting.

Working down the list in order of seniority, the first Member we came to for a committee assignment was Senator TOBEY, who requested Foreign Relations in place of Banking and Currency. We had several other requests, but since Senator TOBEY had seniority, he was given the assignment. We moved on down the list in this manner and when we came to your name we found that your first request was for Armed Services. Your second request was Judiciary, and that is what you got in place of District of Columbia. There were two vacancies to fill on the Judiciary Committee. Senator WATKINS was at the top of the list, and your name came second. That is the reason you were given the assignment, not because of any deals or trades that were made as was inferred by the article appearing in yesterday's paper.

I am glad to give you this report for your own record.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Chairman, Committee on Committees, Republican Conference.

ASSIGNMENT OF AMERICAN TROOPS TO DUTY IN EUROPE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Wherry resolution now before the Senate declares it to be the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty, pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress.

The resolution seeks to do two things: First, to advise the President that no forces should be sent to Europe by the President to implement the Atlantic Pact until Congress has adopted a policy with respect thereto; and second, it implies that Congress does have the right to declare a policy with respect to the sending of troops to aid in the implementation of the Atlantic Pact.

The President apparently has taken the position that he has full power to send additional troops to Europe in effect to garrison that area against the threat of an attack by Communist Russia or other enemies without the approval of Congress.

So far as I have been able to determine, he has not indicated whether he is depending on his general powers as the so-called Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, or on the powers granted in the Atlantic Pact.

In my discussion today I am not going into the question of what is wise or unwise strategy in preparing our defenses against Communist Russia and her satellites and their program of expansion. That discussion I intend to make later, following the Senate action on the Wherry resolution.

The President's power to send additional occupation forces to Germany and Austria for the purposes of the occupation is likewise excluded from this discussion.

Since the Wherry resolution has been pending, I have spent some time reading the debate on the Atlantic Pact, including the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee. It seems clear to me that the question now raised, that of sending armed forces to garrison Europe prior to an armed aggression, was not in any sense considered a part of the pact.

The question was raised directly at the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, categorically denied that the pact had for its purpose or its intent the sending of American troops to garrison Europe to meet any possible defense prior to an armed aggression. That was the generally accepted interpretation of the pact during the entire debate.

Article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact reads as follows:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

When article 3 was under discussion, there was no intimation by any of the proponents of the treaty that it included authority for the sending of armed forces to Europe prior to armed aggression. In fact, the entire discussion revolved around the question of whether or not it bound us to furnish arms and armaments.

A reservation to article 3 was presented and was thoroughly discussed. So far as I can recall, there was no intimation whatever that the article had for its intention and included any authority for the sending of Armed Forces prior to aggression. It was limited strictly to the question of furnishing armaments to our allies, or they, on their part, to us.

It seems to me that the proponents of the treaty and the administration of this country and other countries involved are limited by that interpretation and that legislative construction as shown by its history.

I have checked the pact again to ascertain if there is any possibility that the authority to send troops to Europe to implement the pact prior to an armed aggression is contained in article 5. Again the answer is "No."

The debate on article 5 indicates clearly that it was not intended as an authorization for the sending of troops to Europe. Article 5 is a pledge of mutual assistance in the event of armed attack in Europe or North America on one or more of the signatory powers.

The reservation I offered with respect to this article attempted to make it clear that the United States assumed no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any other party or parties in said area by Armed Forces, or to employ the military, air, or naval forces of the United States under article 5 or any article of the treaty for any purpose unless the Congress shall by act or joint resolution so provide and authorize. This reservation, it will be noted, not only contained a reservation to article 5 but to any other article of the treaty which might in any way tend to give or actually give any power to declare war or to authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States without congressional authorization.

During the debate it was said by the proponents of the treaty that this reservation was absolutely unnecessary. It was contended that our constitutional processes which included the right of the Congress to declare war and authorize the employment of our Armed Forces in the preparation for, or in the prosecution of a war, were unimpaired and in nowise affected by the treaty.

I took the opposite position. I felt that the treaty was a commitment which placed us in a position where a declaration of war was no longer a matter of debate, but merely a question of the fulfillment of a treaty obligation.

I felt by interpretation of the treaty the time might come when action would be taken under the treaty and in reliance on its terms without allowing the Congress to exercise its constitutional right in determining whether the Nation should be taken into war or not.

My suggested reservations were rejected, and, by that rejection, my construction of the meaning of article 5 and other articles of the treaty was also rejected. The debate, however, made it clear that the theory on which the treaty was presented to the Senate implied that our Armed Forces were not to be involved in Europe by reason of obligations contained in the treaty until armed aggression had happened against one of the signatory powers and until Congress had been consulted. That was the sense of the Congress when the treaty was ratified.

The argument that additional war-making powers were given to the President by the Congress when it ratified the North Atlantic Pact has no validity. If the President has any power whatsoever to send American troops to Europe in anticipation of an attack against our Atlantic Pact allies and without congressional authorization, that power must be derived from a construction of the Constitution of the United States and not from the provisions of the Atlantic Pact or any other treaty.

I concede that promises of such assistance have been made. They were made at Brussels by Dean Acheson, speaking for the United States. At Brussels, Dean Acheson sat down and worked out the structure of a European Defense Army. The conferees as Brussels decided how this army should be composed, where the troops should come from, and how its commander should be selected and appointed.

Earlier, at the time of the conferences in Washington, the President himself assured the representatives of the North Atlantic nations gathered there that American troops would be committed to the proposed European army. In reply to queries as to whether he had this authority and could make such commitments without first consulting the Congress, the President, in statements which were given wide press publicity, took the position that he possessed this power in himself and that the fears that Congress might not agree to the dispatch of American troops to Europe therefore need not greatly concern the conference.

At some future time I intend to analyze the legislative history of the Atlantic Pact in greater detail. Its meaning and its purposes no doubt will be discussed if the majority of this body, acting under instructions from the President, attempts to secure passage of a resolution to authorize the President to send American ground forces to Europe to meet a threat of war prior to an actual armed attack.

Editorial writers and columnists and some Members of Congress are taking the position that the question as to the power of the President to send our Armed Forces anywhere in the world with the intention of being there to engage in war, is largely academic. They also take that position with respect to the intervention in Korea. They take the position that since such action has already been taken by the President, the question is of no further importance, and that discussion of the question at this time, therefore, can do little good.

I totally disagree with this view. The question is one of usurpation of power by the President. The fact that he has usurped the powers of Congress and committed the Nation to war in Korea does not make his action right. Unless it is challenged, however, it will be regarded as a precedent and will form the basis for further similar usurpations in the future.

The entire question is of vital importance to the people of the country. It should be openly and freely debated and the people should be made aware of the terrible implications of the grasp for absolute power in respect to the Armed Forces of the United States which is represented by the President's action in regard to intervention in Korea and his proposal to send troops to Europe without consulting Congress.

The contention that the President has absolute and unlimited powers in respect to the use and control of the Armed Forces of the United States to enlarge upon the North Atlantic Pact is an example of the development of the executive agreement as a substitute for treaties and as a means of getting around the right of Congress to participate in the making of treaties.

The bypassing of the United States Senate in the making of treaties by use of the so-called executive agreement has positively endangered the very existence of this Nation. I cite for the Senate's attention the executive agreements made by the President of the United States at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

If the Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam agreements had been submitted to the Senate for approval, as they should have been under the Constitution, their flaws, their weaknesses, and their outright surrender to the Soviet Union would have been recognized and brought to attention. The sell-out of the great principles of the Atlantic Charter objectives would have been discovered in time and our Nation would not have committed itself to the fulfillment of the imperialistic objectives of Russia. It is my belief that if the Senate had been consulted in respect to the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements, there would have been no sell-out of Asia and that the history of the past 5 years would have been vastly different.

The war in Korea is the most tragic chapter in American history. It is a chapter which is being written by executive action of the President without consultation with the Congress. It is my

belief that the Korean disaster would not have fallen upon the world if the Congress had been consulted before the intervention in Korea was ordered.

I do not say that the Congress might not have ordered our troops into Korea. I do say, however, that sober minds and native hardheadedness might have prevailed over the impetuous and spur-of-the-moment way of doing things.

The Congress would have wanted knowledge of the facts and would have required an estimate of the probable consequences.

The United States withdrew its troops from Korea on June 30, 1949. This was done in pursuance of a United Nations General Assembly request of December 12, 1948. The withdrawal was ordered by the President without consulting the Congress.

On June 9, 1949—not 1950—Maj. Gen. Charles B. Helmick, a former deputy military governor of Korea, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that if Russia decided she wanted to take over in South Korea, she could do so without any military difficulty. General Helmick said:

> They are right there with large armies. Any troops there would suffer another Bataan.

General Helmick's testimony represented the generally accepted military viewpoint.

This is a matter of record. On June 21, Brig. Gen. P. M. Hamilton, Chief of the Policy Division, Directorate of Plans and Operations, United States Air Forces, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and stated that it would not be wise to keep troops in Korea. Rear Adm. E. T. Woolridge, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, told the committee that he concurred in that testimony. General Hamilton then went on to inform the committee that the view expressed by him was the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and that that position was unanimous.

It was on the basis of testimony of that type that the minority members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee concluded that the extension of vast amounts of economic aid to Korea was pouring money down a rat hole unless Korea could be defended. It was their feeling that by extending economic aid with no assurance that Korea could be defended, we were merely fattening the prize for the Communists. In a minority report, the five Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated as follows:

> Every authority who has testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to the Korean situation has acknowledged the fact that there would be no effective defense against an armed aggression originating in the northern half of the country * * * our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation.

The withdrawal from Korea was a matter of Executive decision. The Congress was not consulted, and had no part in that decision.

Some 6 months later the Secretary of State informed the world that Korea was outside the defense perimeter of the United States. That decision was taken by the executive department. The Congress was not consulted.

As recent history has shown, this decision announced by Dean Acheson was the engraved invitation which the Communists accepted and translated into action within 6 months. The record will show that many Members of the Congress of the United States and many of our citizens who are acquainted with foreign affairs, raised questions regarding every one of the three actions which I have mentioned. As far back as November 1947, Thomas E. Dewey declared that the Russians "anticipated that immediately upon the withdrawal of American and Soviet occupation troops, the armed forces of the north will engulf all of Korea." Mr. Dewey was not alone. Many other Americans felt as he did.

It is my feeling that the question of the withdrawal of our occupation forces from Korea should have been submitted to the Congress. The decision that Korea was outside the defense perimeter of the United States should likewise have been submitted to the Congress. The question as to whether or not our forces should have been sent to intervene in the Korean civil war should likewise have been submitted to the Congress.

I interpolate to say that I so declared at the time, on June 27, when the President had taken action without referring the subject to Congress.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Earlier in the afternoon the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made reference to the time when the press release from the White House was read to the Senate. I refer to the press release in which the Senate was advised that the President had ordered the Armed Forces of the United States into Korea. The Senator from Texas made the observation that most people threw up their hats and applauded the action of the President. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he applauded the action of the President on that occasion.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the RECORD will show that on that occasion I interrogated the majority leader during his reading of the press release—not a message to Congress, but a press release—as to the authority of the President under which he was taking the action at that time. The majority leader responded by saying that the statement would have to speak for itself. Then I went on to make some further observations, for which I was criticized by some people in Utah. Some columnists took me to task for my observations. Apparently some columnists are the kind of strange animal that believes the Constitution should not be mentioned in the Senate or in other decent company, and therefore they immediately said I was an isolationist.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Utah whether he in any way approved of or applauded the action of the President of the United States on that occasion.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not. On the contrary, I felt that certain questions should have been asked of the President, and that the matter should have been considered by Congress.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Utah if his views in regard to the Korean episode today are the same as those he entertained on June 27, 1950.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the necessity of submitting the question to Congress, yes. I may say that I have received literally hundreds of letters from my constituents in Utah who have approved my stand. Incidentally, some of those who are now demanding that Congress take an interest in the decision as to where our troops are to be sent are the same ones who were condemning me at the time I asked the question of the majority leader, and indicated that Congress should have been given some consideration in the matter before the President sent our Armed Forces to intervene in a war between North Korea and South Korea.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Utah whether the position he took on hearing of the President's action in ordering our troops into Korea was made the subject of a cartoon published in the Washington Evening Star a day or so afterwards.

Mr. WATKINS. As I recall, it was. As I remember the cartoon, it portrayed the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], as marching at the head of an army, with the senior Senator from Ohio turning around to see where the followers were. Apparently there were only three of us, and no one else was following us in taking the stand that the matter should have been submitted to Congress before troops were ordered into Korea.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if the number of followers has not been augmented since that time.

Mr. WATKINS. I would say that Senators will probably find that letters from their constituents are very numerous on this subject, and that the letters will be found to be close to 100 to 1 in favor of insisting that from now on the question of sending American troops into positions where they will be engaging in war should be submitted to Congress. There will be found to be almost unanimous approval of the action for which we were condemned at that time.

The Senator from Missouri raises substantially the same question which I raised. The next day the Senator from Ohio made a speech on the subject, pointing out that in his judgment the President had violated the Constitution, and that the entire matter should first

have been submitted to Congress for approval.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for asking the questions, and I have a rather keen memory of what occurred. In my own State some of the leading citizens bought space in the daily newspapers, quoted from columnists who did not know what they were talking about, and who had never read the RECORD, and stated, in effect, that I had held the State of Utah up to shame and disgrace by taking such a stand. I felt it rather keenly, because all I had done was to raise the constitutional question as to the authority under which the President was acting, pointing out that in my judgment, in response to a request from the majority leader, former Senator Lucas, of Illinois, the President should have sent a message to the Congress giving the Congress the facts and asking Congress for authority to do whatever was necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

Mr. KEM. I gather from what the Senator says that, judging from the present state of his mail from Utah, he is not now a prophet without honor in his own country.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not been home since this subject became so torrid, but I believe that I would be received with a little more grace by a good many persons, some of whom probably thought that I had disgraced the State by mentioning the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate, and calling the attention of the country to the duty which I thought was incumbent upon the President, and to what he had done, which, in effect, it seemed to me was in violation of his responsibility, by ordering American troops, without congressional approval, into not merely a police action, but a full-fledged war in which we have suffered more casualties to date than in all the other wars of the United States put together, with the exception of the Civil War and the two World Wars.

I now resume my prepared text.

Had the decision of the Congress with respect to Korea been the same as that made by the President alone, at least it could be said that the action taken was taken by the President in cooperation with the Congress of the United States. Thus would have been avoided the present confusion and the people of the United States would at least have known that the action represented the will of their Government, not merely the impulsiveness of the President.

Mr. President, having pointed out that the question of the powers of the President and the powers of Congress with relation to war and foreign policy are matters of vital concern to our present and future existence as a nation, I believe further discussion of the constitutional questions is fully justified.

The great men who presided at the birth of our Republic had had their fill of absolutism in government. They were determined that the new government which they helped to bring into being should not fall into the hands of any individual or group of individuals.

In pursuit of that they set up a government of three branches and contrived and wrote into the Constitution a system of checks and balances designed to prevent any one of these branches from assuming too much power.

In recent years, behind the screen of one national emergency after another, more and more power has been concentrated in the hands of the Executive at the expense of the legislative branch. This has gone so far that the present Executive now does not hesitate to claim that he has indisputable and sole authority over the Armed Forces of the United States and that his powers are so absolute in that respect that he can order our Armed Forces into an all-out war in Asia or to the European continent in anticipation of large-scale war without consulting Congress or anyone else.

My opposition to such a usurpation of power dates back many years. The most recent manifestation of it was my statement to the Senate on June 27, 1950, the day the President ordered our Armed Forces to intervene in Korea.

That is the statement which has just been the subject of colloquy with my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

I do not know on whose advice the President suddenly decided last June to reverse his previous policy and to plunge us into war in Korea. I do know that he did not consult the Congress; he merely told the Congress, at the same time he told the rest of the world, what he had done, after he had ordered United States troops into the Korean war. He told Congress by reason of the same press release, which did not even have the dignity of an address to the Congress.

In a colloquy on this floor on January 17, 1951, between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and myself, certain constitutional points were reemphasized. The Senator from Colorado pointed out that the Congress has the power to declare war and that that power carries its own implications of very wide scope, inclusive and exclusive. He pointed out, too, that under the Constitution the Congress has the power to raise and support armies. It was brought out that while the President has a vast field of implied power arising out of his status of Commander in Chief, the Congress, too, has large powers in respect to the Armed Forces, both by expressed terms of the Constitution and by implication flowing from the express grants of power.

It was brought out in the colloquy of January 17 that if the role of the Congress in determining whether our Armed Forces should be used in war were derived solely from Congress' power of the purse, such role would amount to very little. It is obvious that if the President by unilateral action had taken us into war or into a situation where war could not be avoided, the Congress thereafter could not refuse the funds necessary to extricate us from a situation of national peril.

Last June, when our forces were ordered into action in Korea, the Congress was in session here in Washington. As will be recalled, the President called members of the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees of Congress to the White House and read to them the announcement that our sea and air forces had been ordered into action in Korea. He did not consult them. He told them what he had already done. That is the nearest he ever came to telling Congress, in a dignified and official way, what action he had taken. Thereafter the announcement was read on the floor of the Senate, as I have already related.

The President asked for no advice, nor did he ask for the consent of the Congress. No resolution was introduced requesting congressional approval and endorsement of his action. The Congress was merely told by the majority leader that the Armed Forces of the United States had been ordered into action in Korea by the President. There it stopped—no more, no less.

As will be recalled, I took the floor that day to suggest that the President's action in committing the Armed Forces of the United States into Korea without consulting the Congress was illegal and unconstitutional.

Events are such that today the whole Nation is asking the questions I asked on this floor last June. In the face of rising public opinion it now appears that the President himself is wavering in his determination that he need not consult the Congress in respect to the waging of war on foreign soil. Even he seems reluctantly to be coming to the conclusion that he went too far in his action last June. Aroused public opinion seems to be having its effect.

(At this point Mr. WATKINS yielded to Mr. FERGUSON, and debate ensued regarding the postponement of action on the resolution submitted to Mr. KEFAUVER, citing certain persons for contempt, which, on request of Mr. WATKINS, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in order to avoid misunderstanding, I want to point out that I am not disputing the validity of the basic doctrine of intervention which has been relied upon by the United States on many occasions when the lives and the property of American citizens were under grave threat in foreign lands. That doctrine is well established in international law. I want to emphasize, however, that from the earliest days of our Republic the guiding principle in our foreign relations has been the doctrine of nonintervention rather than its opposite, the doctrine of intervention.

Prof. Charles E. Martin, in his treatise entitled "The Policy of the United States as Regards Intervention," which was published in 1921, states that European and American foreign policies in relation to intervention differ both historically and theoretically. He points out that intervention is a definite and well-established principle in the European political system and that it finds its origin in the theories of the balance of power. Thus he says at page 20:

> The idea of state-interest extended to a group of states, by means of alliances designed to preserve the balance of power, furnishes the key generally, to the history of the principle of intervention.

Professor Martin goes on to say—and I quote from page 23 of his work:

Opposed to the theory of intervention was the doctrine of nonintervention. It did not, however, gain much approval, except among the smaller states. It is obvious how difficult it was for such a principle to flourish in Europe. No sovereign state would agree not to intervene in the internal affairs of another state, when such abstinence might seem directly to involve its own existence; and nonintervention might have meant the ruin even of a large European state, so long as the system of alliances continued.

The idea of state-interest extended to a group of states, by means of alliances designed to preserve the balance of power, furnishes the key, generally, to the history of the principle of intervention.

The adoption of nonintervention as a deliberate and consistent policy was reserved to the United States; the wisdom of which became very real after an instructive experience with a European alliance and a narrow escape from being drawn into the European conflict during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.

Professor Martin then says at page 68 of the work I have cited:

Some foreign policies develop casually without conscious direction. Others are the result of the discerning and guiding will of statesmen. The policy of nonintervention, while lacking an orderly plan of development, enjoyed the conscious and deliberate attention and direction of our ablest leaders. Its origin and adoption, then, is attributed to a conscious purpose, and not to circumstance or accident.

The principles of the doctrine of nonintervention have had wide popular approval as the proper cornerstone of our foreign policies. It has only been in the more recent years of our national history that our leadership has forsaken those principles. The consequences of that tendency can be reckoned in terms of billions of dollars of national indebtedness and ever lengthening rows of tombstones in our national cemeteries.

It has been in respect to our relations with the smaller nations in the Americas that the United States has most often departed from strict adherence to the doctrine of nonintervention. This started early in our history and developed into the so-called Monroe Doctrine which, today, is the cornerstone of the conduct of our foreign relations in relation to the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The most significant of our interventions in the affair of nations in the Western Hemisphere was the intervention in Cuba.

It should be noted, however, that even that intervention followed passage of a joint resolution by the Congress. That resolution specifically authorized the President to use our Armed Forces in Cuba. Section 3 of the joint resolution stated:

That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

It was passed by Congress on April 19, 1898, and was signed into law by President McKinley on April 20, 1898. It was followed on April 25 by a formal declaration of war on Spain.

American intervention in Cuba, which, as I have said, was the most striking departure from our policy of nonintervention, was based on authority from Congress. President McKinley asked and received that authority prior to ordering the Armed Forces of the United States into what was then the territory of Spain.

J. Reuben Clark, Jr., former solicitor of the Department of State, and, incidentally, I might say, a very distinguished citizen of the State of Utah, in a memorandum dated August 1912 to the Secretary of State, points out that from the time of President Jefferson the Executive has consistently declared that it possessed the right to protect with forces of the United States the lives and property of American citizens in foreign countries. Mr. Clark's memorandum points out, however, that there is a difference between intervention for the protection of American citizens and the taking of the Nation into war. Thus the memorandum opinion quotes the following from a statement by President Jefferson in 1805 in discussing Spanish depradations on our territory:

Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided. I have barely instructed the officers stationed in the neighborhood of the aggressions, to protect our citizens from violence, to patrol within the borders actually delivered to us, and not to go out of them, but when necessary to repel an inroad, or to rescue a citizen, or his property.

There is also quoted in the memorandum I have cited the following paragraphs from a note written by Secretary of State Lewis Cass to Lord Napier, British Minister to Washington, regarding the proposed American participation in an intervention in China:

This proposition, looking to a participation by the United States in the existing hostilities against China, makes it proper to remind Your Lordship that, under the Constitution of the United States, the executive branch of the Government is not the war-making power. This exercise of that great attribute of sovereignty is vested in Congress, and the President has no authority to order aggressive hostilities to be undertaken.

Our naval officers have the right—it is their duty, indeed—to employ the forces under their command, not only in self-defense, but for the protection of the persons and property of our citizens when exposed to acts of lawless outrage, and this they have done both in China and elsewhere, and will do again when necessary. But military expeditions into the Chinese territory cannot be undertaken without the authority of the National Legislature.

The administration and its friends and apologists have gone to ridiculous extremes in their attempts to give a color of legal propriety to the President's usurpation of power in connection with the commitment of American Armed Forces in the war in Korea. In their efforts to find historical precedent to support the President's action they have indiscriminately cited many events in American history which in some way involved the use of armed force beyond the territorial limits of the United States. It is claimed that these events are precedents establishing a recognized and well-established practice now recognized as legitimate and proper.

A Department of State memorandum, dated July 3, 1950, on the subject of the authority of the President to repel the attack on Korea contains such a list. It is pointed out in this memorandum that the United States has throughout its history, upon orders of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and without congressional authorization, intervened to prevent violent and unlawful acts in other states from depriving the United States and its nationals of the benefits of international peace and security. Reference is then made to a tabulation of 85 instances of the use of American Armed Forces without a declaration of war which was incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 10, 1941, at pages 5930–5931. The State Department's memorandum also invites attention to the appendix to a pamphlet by James Grafton Rogers entitled "World Policing and the Constitution; an Inquiry Into the Powers of the President and Congress, Nine Wars and a Hundred Military Operations, 1789–1945," published in 1945 by the World Peace Foundation.

The Department of State memorandum of July 3, 1950, also contains certain quotations from a speech by former United States Senator Warren Austin which is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, volume 91, July 26, 1945, pages 8064–8065. In that speech Senator Austin pointed out that he had seen three different compilations of occasions on which the Chief Executive had used the Armed Forces beyond the territory of the United States without any prior act of Congress. The Senator stated that one of these compilations listed no less than 150 such occasions.

On July 5, 1950, my colleague, the then junior Senator from Illinois, now the senior Senator [Mr. DOUGLAS], made a speech on this floor in which he attempted to justify the President in his action in ordering our Armed Forces into the Korean war without consulting Congress. The then junior Senator from Illinois condensed the various listings I have referred to and came up with a reduced list totaling 15.

I have taken the trouble to examine each one of the incidents in the various lists. In the majority they amounted to nothing more than the sending ashore of American seamen and marines to prevent injury to American citizens and their property, or to pursue and punish pirates or other lawless elements, or to exact reparations for wrongs committed against American commerce or the dignity and honor of the United States. On many occasions the landing forces amounted to little more than a dozen or so seamen or marines. On other occasions the landing force amounted to hundreds. In the case of the landings in China during the Boxer Rebellion, several thousand troops were sent ashore.

I have examined the historical events cited in several of these listings. Admittedly there is a general sort of similarity between many of the events cited

from our historical past and the present intervention in Korea. Careful examination and study will bring out the fact, however, that practically without exception each one of the incidents cited in the various lists is clearly distinguishable from, and not in point with, the elements of fact and law surrounding the Korean intervention. As we say in the law: The cases which have been cited are not in point.

I have prepared a concise review of the 15 incidents cited by the Senator from Illinois, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, an examination of that list and the remarks appearing therein will show how farfetched is the reasoning which seeks to regard them as legitimate precedents to support the President's claim to the power to order our Armed Forces to carry the burden of the war in Korea.

Let me interpolate that in many of these instances it seems there was a plain violation on the part of the President of the United States. No one called him to task. Congress did not do anything about the matter, and the incidents turned out all right for the United States.

Today, when situations which might result in great danger to our country are developing, it seems to me that it is dangerous to reason that simply because so many of these unauthorized actions have been committed, we should be governed by them as precedents.

Article II of the Constitution of the United States establishes the Executive Department of the Government of the United States. Section 2 of that article gives the President command over the Armed Forces of the United States. There is no language in article II or elsewhere in the Constitution which specifically confers on the President the power to declare or to make war.

Section 8 of article I, on the other hand, says:

> The Congress shall have the power * * * to declare war.

That provision of the Constitution of the United States is generally accepted and referred to as the war-making clause of the Constitution. As will be noted, it specifically and unequivocably reserves to the Congress the power "to declare war." Elsewhere in my statement today I have indicated four or five other places in the Constitution where Congress is given additional power to make war and to conduct the affairs of the country in case of war.

The Journal of Debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 as kept by James Madison, indicates that the war-making clause as originally presented to the Convention sought to empower the Congress to make war. After debate, however, the word "make" was changed to "declare" and the clause was adopted with that substitution. Thus this provision of the Constitution was made to read "The Congress shall have the power * * * to declare war."

The exchange of views in the Constitutional Convention which led to this change is both interesting and pertinent. The following is a quotation of that debate as reported by Mr. Madison:

> Mr. Pinckney opposed the vesting this power in the Legislature. Its proceedings were too slow. It would meet but once a year. The House of Representatives would be too numerous for such deliberations. The Senate would be the best depository, being more acquainted with foreign affairs and most capable of proper resolutions. If the States are equally represented in the Senate, so as to give no advantage to the large States, the power will notwithstanding be safe, as the small have their all at stake in such cases as well as the large States. It would be singular for one authority to make war and another peace.
>
> Mr. BUTLER. The objections against the Legislature lie in a vast degree against the Senate. He was for vesting the power in the President, who will have all the requisite qualities, and will not make war but when the Nation will support it.
>
> Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry moved to insert "declare," striking out "make" war; leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks.
>
> Mr. Sharman thought it stood very well. The Executive should be able to repel and not commence war. "Make" is better than "declare," the latter narrowing the power too much.
>
> Mr. Gerry never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war.
>
> Mr. ELSWORTH. There is a material difference between the cases of making war and making peace. It should be more easy to get out of war than into it. War also is a simple and overt declaration; peace attended with intricate and secret negotiations.
>
> Mr. Mason was against giving the power of war to the Executive because not safely to be trusted with it, or to the Senate because not so constructed as to be entitled to it. He was for clogging rather than facilitating war; but for facilitating peace. He preferred "declare" to "make."
>
> On the motion to insert "declare," in place of "make," it was agreed to.

In light of the legislative history of the war-making power in the Constitution of the United States as it was drafted in Convention and later adopted and ratified by the States, it is plain that the founding fathers were aware of the fact that legislative processes are sometimes slow in a republican form of government. It was largely for that reason that they proposed to empower the Executive to take action necessary to the immediate self-defense of the Nation in the event of sudden attack. It was not their intention, however, to empower the Executive to declare war; nor was it their intention to empower the Executive to make war except in self-defense of the Nation in cases of sudden and unanticipated attack.

On the afternoon of January 15, 1951, in the speech which the senior Senator from Illinois made on this floor, he sought to give a color of propriety to the President's claim to the authority to send our Army, Navy, and Air Force into action anywhere in the world without consulting the Congress. In an effort to bolster his thesis, the Senator from Illinois quoted from a book entitled "Our Chief Magistrate and His Power," by William Howard Taft, former President and Chief Justice of the United States, and father of our colleague, the Senior Senator from Ohio.

The Senator from Illinois lifted one sentence and a portion of another sentence from a paragraph on page 99 of William Howard Taft's work and quoted them out of context with the remainder of the paragraph in which they appeared. It was implied that thus the writings of the father of the senior Senator from Ohio were a refutation of the position now being taken by his son to the effect that the President did not have the constitutional power to order our Armies, our Navy, and our Air Force into war in Korea without consulting Congress.

The lead sentence of the paragraph quoted by the senior Senator from Illinois reads as follows:

> The President is the Commander and Chief of the Army and Navy and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation.

The remainder of the paragraph in which that sentence appears reads as follows:

> Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence. This was the charge made against President Polk in beginning the Mexican War. War as a legal fact, it was decided by the Supreme Court in prize cases, can exist by invasion of this country by a foreign enemy or by such an insurrection as occurred during the Civil War, without any declaration of war by Congress at all, and it is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.

It will be noted that the quotation I have read includes the two fragments quoted by the senior Senator from Illinois. It will be noted, too, that William Howard Taft said in part in that paragraph that the President apparently can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence, and that thus the President is given an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect.

I may say at this point that that power should certainly be construed against the right of the Executive, under the circumstances of today, to take us into a war, or issue orders which would have the ultimate effect of putting us into war, without any declaration of war by Congress. It is a dangerous power, one which should never be allowed in this country. If it should finally be construed by a court of last resort that the President has the powers which he claims he has, we should then do something about limiting those powers for the sake of the future of the United States.

For the benefit of the RECORD, the paragraph from William Howard Taft's statement, which follows the paragraph I have just quoted, reads:

What constitutes an act of war by the land or naval forces of the United States is sometimes a nice question of law and fact. It really seems to differ with the character of the nation whose relations with the United States are affected. The unstable condition as to law and order of some of the Central American republics seems to create different rules of international law from those that obtain in governments that can be depended upon to maintain their own peace and order. It has been frequently necessary for the President to direct the landing of naval marines from United States vessels in Central America to protect the American consulate and American citizens and their property. He has done this under his general power as Commander in Chief. It grows not out of any specific act of Congress but out of that obligation, inferable from the Constitution, of the Government to protect the rights of an American citizen against foreign aggression, as in the Kotza incident, cited by Mr. Justice Miller in the Neagle case. In practice the use of the naval marines for such a purpose has become so common that their landing is treated as a mere local police measure, whereas if troops of the Regular Army are used for such a purpose, it seems to take on the color of an act of war.

The action in Korea is not a mere landing of American forces to protect the rights and property of American citizens. The action in Korea is war. It is terrible and bloody war on a large scale.

The Americans who are engaged in the fighting in Korea are soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen numbering in the neighborhood of 200,000. The weapons they use are cannon and tanks and ships and planes and all of the other weapons of modern all-out warfare.

The President is waging war in Korea. It is an undeclared war into which the United States has been taken by the unilateral action of the President without consulting the Congress. The President's action in waging war in Korea without consulting Congress is an outright violation of the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

I say to the Senate in all seriousness that if the President is now permitted to order American armies into Europe without consulting Congress, we will wake up one of these days and find that we have again been taken into all-out large-scale war on the order of the President in violation of the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution.

EXHIBIT I

LIST OF 15 INTERVENTIONS BY THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR STATUS AS PRECEDENTS TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S CLAIM TO AUTHORITY TO SEND THE ARMED FORCES INTO FOREIGN COUNTRIES WITHOUT CONSULTING THE CONGRESS

NAVAL HOSTILITIES WITH FRANCE, 1798

On February 1, 1793, France declared war on England. The Republic of France claimed, according to the Franco-American Convention of 1778 and the 1778 Treaties of Alliance, Amity, and Commerce which had been negotiated with France prior to the overthrow of the monarchy, that the United States should assist them. However, on April 22, 1793, President Washington, on the advice of his Cabinet, which included Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, issued his neutrality proclamation. When Citizen Edmond Genet, France's Minister to the United States, later organized privateering enterprises in America against England, he was forced to retire by President Washington.

On November 19, 1794, the Jay Treaty was signed between the United States and England. The French angrily vented their feelings by seizing American ships and manhandling their crews. Secretary of State Pickering, on June 21, 1797, reported that 316 vessels flying the American flag had been captured by French cruisers.

After John Adams became President in 1797, hoping to avoid war, he sent a commission of three men to France, Charles C. Pinckney, Elbridge Gerry, and John Marshall. The French Foreign Minister, Talleyrand, and his puppets insisted on a huge bribe and loan. When the news of this insult reached America and President Adams lay the dispatches from the American Envoys before Congress, designating the French go-betweens as X, Y, and Z, Americans angrily shouted:

"Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

In May and July of 1798 Congress authorized the capture of the armed ships of France. On June 13, 1798, commercial intercourse with France was suspended, and on July 7, 1798, Congress declared the treaties with France void, contending that the French Government had already violated their various provisions.

Acting on congressional authority, the small but courageous American Navy, assisted by privately owned vessels, launched an undeclared naval war against France, which lasted over 2 years and resulted in the capture of more than 80 armed French ships. General Washington was asked to command the American Army, anticipating an invasion of the United States.

Meanwhile, President Adams, with congressional concurrence, sent a commission consisting of William Vans Murray, William R. Davie, and Oliver Ellsworth to France. The United States insisted on $20,000,000 for damages done to American commerce. For 7 months the discussion was deadlocked. Ultimately, in September 1800, Napoleon agreed to forget the American obligations in the Treaty of 1778 if America would forget its claims against France. This was a small amount to pay in order to be released from the only formal treaty of alliance to which the United States was a party until the North Atlantic Pact was signed.

JEFFERSON'S EXPEDITION AGAINST THE BARBARY PIRATES, 1804

During the administration of Washington and John Adams America had been forced in humiliation to purchase treaties with three north African states.

Soon after Thomas Jefferson took the oath of office the Pasha of Tripoli, head of one of the three states, charged that he was not receiving his share of the tribute money. He chopped down the flag pole of the American consulate in Tripoli and made war on the United States. This insult to the Stars and Stripes was the culmination of many insulting incidents of pirate brutality against American seamen. President Jefferson sent warships into the Mediterranean Sea. In 1805, after several engagements in which our infant Navy made a brilliant account of itself, the United States compelled Tripoli to sign the most favorable treaty yet secured from her by any power. Our struggle with England, resulting in the embargo and the War of 1812, delayed further punishment of the other Barbary States. But in 1816 the United States dictated a treaty to Algiers at the mouth of cannon.

Meanwhile Jefferson had relied heavily on Congress. In his message to Congress on November 4, 1803, while referring to the capture of an American vessel by an armed ship of Morocco, he stated:

"It is for Congress to consider the provisional authorities that may be necessary to restrain the depredations of this power should they be continued."

The actions against the Barbary pirates were exactly what their name implies: They were expeditious to suppress piracy. They were taken by President Jefferson in full consultation with Congress.

Some years later, in the administration of President Monroe, the United States found it advisable to take action against pirates in the Caribbean area who had their havens on the islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico. This action, like that in Tripoli, was an action to suppress piracy.

On March 3, 1819, Congress passed an act entitled "An act to protect the commerce of the United States and punish the crime of piracy." This act provided:

"That the President of the United States be * * * authorized and requested to employ so many of the public armed vessels, as, in his judgment, the service may require, with suitable instructions to the commanders thereof, in protecting the merchant vessels of the United States and their crews from piratical aggressions and depradation."

Another act of December 1822, authorized an additional naval force for the suppression of piracy and for affording effectual protection to the citizens and commerce of the United States.

In a special message to the Senate on January 13, 1825, President Monroe informed the Senate that it would be impossible to suppress piracy in the Caribbean with naval action alone. He suggested that our forces be authorized either to pursue the escaping pirates into the settled as well as the unsettled parts of the island from whence they issue, or take reprisal on the property of the inhabitants of the islands on which the pirates found hiding and shelter, or blockade the ports of those islands.

In his request for this authority the President said in part—and I quote from his message to the Senate:

"It will be obvious that neither of these measures can be resorted to in a spirit of amity with Spain otherwise than in a firm belief that neither the Government of Spain nor the government of either of the islands has the power to suppress that atrocious practice, and that the United States interposed their aid for the accomplishment of an object which is of equal importance to them as well as to us.

"Acting on this principle, the facts which justify the proceeding being universally known and felt by all engaged in commerce in that sea, it may fairly be presumed that neither will the Government of Spain nor the government of either of those islands complain of a resort to either of those measures or to all of them, should such resort be necessary. It is therefore suggested that a power commensurate with either resource be granted to the Executive, to be exercised according to his discretion and as circumstances may imperiously require."

Neither the expeditions against the Barbary pirates in 1804, nor the expeditions against the pirates in the Caribbean a few years later, are proper precedents for the President's action in ordering our troops into the Korean war or onto the European Continent without consulting Congress.

THE SEMINOLE WAR, 1817

In December 1817, President Monroe commissioned Gen. Andrew Jackson to command American troops in chastising the Seminole Indians.

Jackson advanced into the Spanish possessions of Florida and in a few weeks fighting defeated the Indians, executed two renegade British subjects on charges of inciting the Indians, seized every important post in Florida except St. Augustine, and depossessed

the Spanish Governor. Had not Spain been then engaged in the wars of independence with her Latin-American colonies, it is very likely that war would have resulted from this incident.

Although Jackson may have gone beyond the needs of the occasion, the expedition itself was legally justifiable under international law as an act of self-preservation grounded on imminent and clear and present danger. In that respect, let me quote the following paragraph from pages 24 and 25 of the Doctrine of Intervention by Henry G. Hodges:

"It was the preservation of our people and our institutions that prompted Jackson's interventions in Florida. The Spanish authorities in that country were either unable or unwilling to prevent the semicivilized Indians from crossing into the United States on marauding expeditions, and then returning to Spanish territory where they felt safe from pursuit on the part of American troops.

"Although it is very probable that the intervention was justified in this instance, nevertheless a State cannot intervene forcibly where the Central Government is making decided efforts to put down the threatening conditions, but due to great difficulties is momentarily unsuccessful. Self-preservation in all these cases must be imminent and clear from the fact. It cannot be regarded as a just principle when its results are remote or indirect."

At first the entire Cabinet agreed with President Monroe, with the exception of one, that Jackson had committed an unauthorized and unjustifiable act of war against Spain. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams held out, however, for a defiant course toward Spain. Adams induced the President not to discipline the general.

The Florida raid was critically viewed in Congress. A Senate committee conducted an investigation. It reported that some of the Members began to carry arms after Jackson allegedly threatened to cut off the ears of anyone who reported against him. However, after a 27-day debate in Congress, four resolutions condemning him were defeated.

Jackson's expedition into Florida was a measure to put a stop to the depredations of Indians and desperados.

POLK'S OCCUPATION OF DISPUTED TEXAS-MEXICAN BORDER TERRITORY, 1846

In reference to "Polk's occupation in 1846 of disputed Texas-Mexican territory," historians tell us that President Polk sent Gen. Zachary Taylor with American troops into the disputed territory within a provokingly short distance of Mexican troops. The Mexican troops attacked the American soldiers, and Polk, on March 11, 1846, urged the Congress to recognize the existence of hostility and take steps for the prosecution of the war. Two days later, on March 13, 1846, Congress formally declared war on Mexico. Several months later, during the Mexican War, Congressman Abraham Lincoln introduced his famous "spot resolutions," which questioned the assertion of the President that hostilities had begun on American territory.

The wars between Mexico and its rebelling State of Texas placed a very serious strain on the theretofore friendly relations between Mexico and the United States. Relations between the two countries did not improve during the period of the Texas Republic, and anti-American feeling really became acute in Mexico when, on December 29, 1845, Texas was admitted to the Union as a State. The squabble over the border between Texas and Mexico was but one aspect of the whole situation incident to the fixing of the southern borders of the United States.

The occupation of the disputed Texas-Mexican border territory in 1846 was not, in my view, a sound precedent on which to lay the President's claim to the right to wage war in Korea and send troops to Europe without consulting Congress.

INTERVENTION IN SAMOA, 1840–41, 1888, 1899

In 1841 when visiting one of the Samoan Islands, Lieutenant Commander Hudson of the U. S. S. *Peacock* demanded the surrender of the native who had killed a white man. The native chief not only refused to give up the offender but also defied the American military power. A landing party was sent in protected by the ship's guns. The natives scattered inland and their towns and villages were burned without opposition. Apparently this was meant as a lesson to the natives to preserve the lives of the white men and impress upon them that America was a world power with military strength.

In 1888–89, following a native revolt, a German commander landed forces to protect, it was claimed, German plantations. American ships were present in Samoan waters to protect American interests. For several days both German, American, and BBritish seamen in the Apia Harbor were glaring at each other over their guns. A disasterous hurricane in December 1889, wrecked most of the ships and thereby helped to terminate possible hostilities between the rival powers.

In February 1899, 80 American officers and men were landed from the U. S. S. *Philadelphia*, in Samoa, where an insurrection had arisen as to the succession to the throne. This trouble arose in the vicinity of Vailele, Samoa. The Americans were joined by British troops and a short skirmish was had with the natives. The primary reason for the landing was to protect American citizens and interests.

USE ON NAVAL FORCES IN CHINA, 1891

In August 1891 in the midst of a civil war in Chile between the supporters of President Balmaceda and the liberal faction, known as the Congressional Party, Rear Admiral George Brown, commander of the United States South Pacific station, ordered a landing force of 67 seamen and 37 marines from the U. S. S. *San Francisco* and the U. S. S. *Baltimore* to protect the United States Consulate at Valparaiso, and the women and children who had taken refuge in it. The landing force remained on shore 3 days, August 28, 29, and 30, 1891.

This incident cannot be compared with the intervention in Korea nor can it properly be cited as precedent to support the ordering of American armies to Europe without the consent of Congress.

BOXER REBELLION IN CHINA, 1900

During and after the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900, American troops were sent to the various parts of the Chinese Empire to protect American lives and property. In addition to having two Marine detachments protecting the American Legation, the United States furnished 2,500 soldiers to the International Rescue Expedition which on August 14, 1900, relieved the besieged legations at Peking.

John W. Foster in his book entitled "American Diplomacy in the Orient," published in 1903, sets the intervention in China in its proper perspective.

Thus he says at pages 419 and 420:

"Events that startled the world followed swiftly. A column of naval troops marched overland to open up communications with the legations, and military forces were hurried forward from the American Army in the Philippines and by the other treaty powers from the nearest foreign post. The Taku forts were occupied by the allied forces after a few hours' bombardment, the American admiral declining, however, to take part in it, as he held it to be an act of war, and his instructions were to use his forces only for the protection of American interests; but it proved to be a wise military precaution, as the Chinese Government was then under control of the Boxers, and its forces were cooperating with them against the foreigner. Tientsin was attacked by the Chinese troops in large numbers, and the foreign residents were saved from slaughter only by the timely arrival of the allied forces. News from Peking told of the murder of the German minister and the siege of the legations, succeeded by the frightful rumors of the extermination of the diplomatic corps and all foreigners in the capital."

I want to quote further from Mr. Foster's book. Thus he says on page 422:

"In 1900 the American forces were sent to China to protect American citizens and their interest in extreme peril at a time when the authority of the Chinese Government was suspended and unable to give them protection."

Even after finding such justification for the intervention in China in 1900, Mr. Foster nevertheless says, and I quote from pages 421 and 422:

"The dispatch of a division of the American Army, composed of all arms of the service and fully equipped for a campaign was one of the most extreme acts of Executive authority in the history of the United States. It has been seen that when the Secretary of State was requested by the representatives of Great Britain and France in 1857 to cooperate with them in an expedition to Tientsin, he replied that, although the objects sought to be gained by the United States were the same as those entertained by the allies, the executive branch of the Government was not the war-making power, and that military expeditions into Chinese territory could not be undertaken without the authority of Congress. Doubtless that body would have been consulted by the President had it been in session when the crisis came in 1900; but emergency was great, and if the Government of the United States was to participate in the relief of its minister and citizens besieged at Peking, no time was to be lost."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S INTERVENTION IN PANAMA, 1903

When Theodore Roosevelt intervened in Panama in 1903 it was alleged that the obvious reason was to permit the Panamanian forces to successfully revolt against Colombia in order for the United States to acquire a right-of-way for the Panama Canal.

During the uprising from November 4 to 6, 1903, landing parties were sent ashore from the U. S. S. *Nashville* and U. S. S. *Dixie* to protect American interests, citizens, and property; but no shots were fired. It was a bloodless revolution, and American troops did not engage in military action.

The first of many American landings of Armed Forces in Panama occurred in 1856. This and subsequent landings were made, however, under the terms of article 35 of the treaty of 1846 between the United States and the Republic of New Granada. Through that treaty the United States undertook to—and I quote from article 35:

"Guarantee, positively and efficaciously, to New Granada, by the present stipulation the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this treaty exists."

President Polk, in transmitting the treaty of 1846 to the Senate, pointed out that the guaranties contained in article 35 were necessary in order to secure for the world a passage across the Isthmus which would be free of wars and revolutions. It was under this specific treaty authority that the United States undertook on many occasions to maintain order and peace in the Isthmus of Panama.

Theodore Roosevelt's action in Panama, even though it may have been motivated by the desire to secure a way for the Panama Canal, is not a proper precedent for Korea.

It is the slenderest kind of thread on which to try to justify the President's claim to the right to order troops to Europe in large numbers without consulting the Congress.

SANTO DOMINGO, 1904

In January 1904 a revolution was going on in the Dominican Republic. The U. S. S. *Detroit* was sent to the north coast to protect American lives and property. The American commander, A. C. Dillingham, joined with the British commander, who was sent there for the same purpose and established a cordon on the outside of, and around, the entire town of Puerto Plata. The American troops also protected the interests of British nationals in Sosua and Santo Domingo City during the revolutionary fighting.

The intervention in Santo Domingo was another instance where American landing forces were used in North America to enforce a prohibition of fighting in the districts containing American citizens and property.

NICARAGUA, 1899, 1910, 1912, 1926

There were several landings during these dates by American forces in Nicaragua in order to, it was claimed, protect the lives and property of the American citizens. Landings were made at Bluefields, Corinto, San Juan del Sur, and other places where Americans had interests.

The landing in 1899, during the Reyes insurrection, was a joint British-American operation, for the purpose of protecting life and property. Troops were landed on the petition of foreign merchants whose property and lives were in danger.

President Taft, in his lectures on Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, had this to say regarding the intervention in Nicaragua during his administration:

"In Nicaragua in my administration an insurrection had led to the immurement of American citizens by insurrectos and the threatened destruction of American property. The President of Nicaragua, whom we had recognized and whose minister we had received, called upon us to protect our own citizens and their property because he was unable to render them the protection which their treaty rights gave them. This led to the landing of marines, and quite a campaign, which resulted in the maintenance of law and order and the elimination of the insurrectos. This was not an act of war because it was done at the request and with the consent of the lawful authorities of the territory where it took place."

In that and other cases where United States troops intervened in Nicaragua by executive action, it was invariably done to protect Americans and their property during revolutionary activities. It can hardly be said that those actions are precedent upon which to justify the President's usurpation of the war-making power of Congress to the extent of involving the United States in all-out war in Asia. Nor can it be said with intellectual honesty that the interventions in Nicaragua are precedents for the President's claim to power to send armies to Europe in anticipation of possible future war in Europe.

HAITI, 1914

In 1914, during an outbreak of revolutionary forces under Oreste Zamor against President Oreste of Haiti, American seamen and Marines were called to guard the American Legation and protect American interests. There was several months of guerrilla warfare. Zamor was overthrown later in the year. However, while the American forces were there, they did not take either side. They were there only to guard the American Legation and protect American interests.

WILSON'S INTERVENTION AT VERACRUZ, 1914

In 1914, General Huerta overthrew the Madero regime in Mexico. President Wilson refused to recognize the de facto president, charging that he was responsible for the murder of Madero. Huerta retaliated with acts of reprisal on American citizens, which culminated in the arrest on April 9, 1914, of the Navy Paymaster and seven seamen, who had just bought some cases of gasoline from a German merchant and were loading them into the whaleboat of the U. S. S. *Dolphin* at Tampico, Mexico. The unpleasantness of the situation was increased on April 11 when a mail orderly of the U. S. S. *Minnesota* at Vera Cruz was arrested in the post office of that port and publicly marched to jail.

Eventually matters grew worse, until on April 20, 1914, President Wilson referred the matter to Congress in a special message reviewing the Tampico and Veracruz insults along with others. He asked the approval of Congress for his intended course in using the Armed Forces of the country, "in such a way and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain from General Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and integrity of the United States."

Congress gave its sanction by a large majority of both Houses. Immediately the President directed the commanders in Mexican waters to take action and on April 21st forces were landed. Hostilities began immediately and continued until April 23rd, when Veracruz was in the hands of the Americans. It looked as if there would be another war with Mexico. However, the three great powers of South America, Argentina, Brazil and Chile, offered their good services to the American Government in an effort at mediation and on May 20, a peace conference was assembled. Immediately after Huerta resigned as President of Mexico, on July 15, the emergency passed over.

SANTO DOMINGO, 1916

On March 30th and during June and July of 1916 a revolution against the Government of Jose Burdas Valdes, President of the Dominican Republic began at Lavega, Santiago. In June 1916, Capt. Russell of the U. S. S. *South Carolina* lying at Puerto Plata, notified the President of San Domingo that a bombardment of Puerto Plata would be answered by forces under his orders. Nine days later Government troops began a careful bombardment of the town. Soon afterward the United States ships opened fire on the Valdes batteries. The shelling of the city stopped. Secretary of State Bryan approved the action of Captain Russell and the Americans informed the Dominican Governor that the city must be a neutral zone. This entire action was taken in order to protect American lives and property in San Domingo.

THE PURSUIT OF PANCHO VILLA, 1916

Early in 1916, General Carranza, having seized power in Mexico, gave promise of establishing an orderly government. President Wilson gave the new regime a de facto recognition. However, Carranza failed to control the outlaw Pancho Villa who persecuted Americans and destroyed American property in Mexico. Finally he led a raid across the border into Columbus, New Mexico. President Wilson, with Carranza's permission, sent an American expeditionary force, under Gen. John J. Pershing into Mexico. Pershing and his men failed to capture Villa. The American Army was withdrawn as World War I loomed, in 1917.

INTERVENTION IN RUSSIA—ARCHANGEL, SIBERIA, 1919

During the latter part of World War I, in 1918, in order to protect American and Allied interests from the Bolshevists, American troops to the number of 5,100 were dispatched to Archangel, Siberia, where they were based until July 1919. Again, on July 30, 1919, American marines were landed at Tyutuke Bay, a short distance from Vladivostok, Siberia, to protect American interests. The landing party was returned aboard ship the following day.

Professors Harley Farnsworth MacNair and Donald F. Lach, in their excellent textbook, Modern Far Eastern International Relations, published in 1950, point out that the allied interventions in Siberia in the period 1918–20 grew out of the Russian revolutions of March and November 1917 which had brought about the collapse of the eastern front against Germany and the fear that Austrian and German prisoners of war then in Siberia might be used in Russia on behalf of the Central Powers. The Allies hoped to restore the eastern front and were anxious to help an army of about 50,000 Czechoslovaks who were in Siberia and anxious to get into the fight against Germany and Austria, their old enemies. On June 29, 1918, they seized Vladivostok.

Certain patriotic elements in Russia refused to accept the Bolshevik usurpation of power. The largest anti-Bolshevik force collected around Admiral Kolchak in Siberia and established a far-eastern republic. The Allied Supreme War Council decided to send troops to Siberia to cooperate with these anti-Bolshevik Russians. The American troops which participated in this venture sailed from England on August 26, 1918. They were withdrawn from Siberia in August 1919, leaving behind only a small detachment of graves registration troops.

Professors MacNair and Lach note that President Wilson was hesitant about American participation in the Siberian expedition. Thus they say on page 207 of their book.

"On July 6, after it had become clear that, with or without the cooperation of the United States, intervention was practically certain, President Wilson agreed to carefully limited participation. Over the date of the 17th he personally wrote an aide-memoire which Secretary Lansing made known to the Allied Ambassadors in Washington."

Professors MacNair and Lach then go on to say:

"President Wilson's friendship for Russia; his doubts of the value, and fears of the dangers, of intervention; and his determination to safeguard Russian interests to the best of his ability were frankly stated. Analysis of the Wilson aide-memoire, of the correspondence which followed, and of the actions of Maj. Gen. Wilson S. Graves, commander of the American forces which were sent to Siberia in August and September following, leads to the conclusion that the President, personally, was unalterably opposed to a military occupation of that area by any of the Allied Powers and that he hoped American forces might in part serve as a brake upon the chariots of war which were being sent thither."

CITATION OF JOSEPH DOTO AND OTHERS FOR CONTEMPT

During the delivery of Mr. WATKINS' speech,

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator would allow the Senator from Michigan to ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] if he would consent to put over until tomorrow the vote on the pending motion, which was to have been voted upon this afternoon. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he would object to putting it over until tomorrow, following the vote already set for tomorrow on the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WATKINS. If I may yield without losing the floor, I am glad to yield for that purpose, with the further understanding that this discussion may be

placed at the end of my remarks, in order to preserve the unbroken continuity of my speech.

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly. The Senator understands, of course, that the resolution to be voted upon tomorrow involves the question now being debated. As I understand, there are two more speeches to follow, which would make the vote on the pending motion late. Neither the Senator from Michigan nor other Senators are anxious to have a delay. However, it is felt that Senators ought to have an opportunity to read the RECORD. A day's delay is just as good as 2 or 3. The only reason why the Senator from Michigan mentioned Thursday in the earlier discussion was that he felt there would be no session on Wednesday, and therefore he suggested Thursday, the following day. Would the Senator consent to the matter being put over until after the vote is had on the Wherry resolution tomorrow, which action has been unanimously agreed upon?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a number of speeches are to be made today, so I do not know whether we can get to a vote on the matter tonight anyway. I would be willing to have my matter put over with the understanding that it be voted upon immediately following the vote on the Wherry resolution tomorrow; and also that the Tony Acardo and other contempt citations which have been voted upon by the committee this afternoon, be voted on at the same time tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands all the citations will come up at the same time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for an observation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I want it to be clearly understood that in making the statement I made this afternoon I am not opposed to the citing of the individual mentioned for contempt and for prosecution. I do not know enough about the facts really to make a sound decision. Inasmuch as we had the unanimous-consent agreement for a vote to be had tomorrow at 2 o'clock, I felt that Senators who were in the same position I am in, who have not given an expression on this vital problem which is now before the country, and the world, would be practically cut off without any opportunity whatever to speak on the floor of the Senate, unless we use the opportunity we now have today to take part in the discussion.

I think the matter submitted by the Senator from Tennessee should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and as a member of that committee I certainly agree with the chairman that it will be reported out promptly—at least that we will make a quick decision and get the question back to the Senate. I take that position particularly in view of the fact that several legal questions have been raised. The statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] also inclined me to look upon the matter in that way, when he said that the special committee know all the facts, and they know whether these individuals are guilty of contempt or not. The committee heard the facts, and they are in very much the position of a prosecutor. That is why I thought the matter should go to the Committee on the Judiciary for decision.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If it were not for the fact that several speeches are to be made tonight I would not agree to delaying action on the resolutions until tomorrow. But it is now perfectly apparent that they cannot be taken up until tomorrow anyway. So, if it is agreed that the vote on the Joe Adonis resolution and resolutions dealing with other witnesses shall follow the vote on the Wherry resolution tomorrow, that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I will say that course is perfectly agreeable to me. But I have asked the clerk to see if he can secure the immediate presence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], so we may secure his ideas on the matter, as he seemed to be the one who felt that a delay was necessary. If the Senator from Tennessee will withhold his request for unanimous consent until we can hear from the Senator from Nevada, I shall not ask for a quorum.

Mr. President, I am now advised that the Senator from Nevada is agreeable to the suggestion which is made that this first resolution which has been before the Senate today, and which was reported by the Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Special Crime Investigating Committee, may be acted upon immediately after the action of the Senate on the Wherry resolution tomorrow pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement now in force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say that the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary has preference. It comes first. He is so advised by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HOLLAND. The acting majority leader will also communicate to the Senator from Nevada the information that it is the expectation of the Senator from Tennessee immediately after the vote on the Adonis resolution to call up other similar resolutions which he has filed and which he had intended to take up today if possible. I ask that the Senator from Tennessee supplement this statement if there is anything further he wishes to say.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. I had understood that the unanimous-consent request would include the other resolutions; that they would also be acted upon following the one with respect to Adonis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no unanimous-consent agreement pending now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida understood, a unanimous-consent request is going to be made, and the Senator from Florida will say that he would have no objection to it in the form stated by the Senator from Michigan provided it were approved by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and he now understands the Senator from Nevada has agreed as to the Adonis resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution referred to by the Senator from Tennessee be considered by a vote immediately following the disposal of the Wherry resolution and all incidental motions to that resolution tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair correctly understands the request of the Senator from Michigan, it is that the matter of the contempt proceedings will follow the disposal of the Wherry resolution tomorrow; and the question will recur on the McCarran motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, as now pending.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is all it is; yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, by agreement with the minority leader, it has been suggested, provided there is no objection, that the Senate consider the Executive Calendar, as in executive session, and confirm the nomination of William H. Harrison, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator. I move, therefore, that the Senate proceed as in executive session——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator referring to the Harrison nomination?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have it go over.

Mr. HOLLAND. I withdraw my motion, Mr. President.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the debate on foreign policy which has been in progress now for some time has, I believe, been beneficial to all concerned. Its particular merit has been to lift our foreign policy out of the realm of personalities into the field of issues and real progress has been made.

One important issue has been quite clearly defined. That issue is whether the President should seek the advice of Congress on the question of sending troops to Europe now, or whether his discretion should be subject to the consent of Congress. Apparently the President is agreeable to the idea that it is proper for Congress to give him its advice about this question, leaving to him the full responsibility for making the final decision. He is not willing, however, to accept the principle that the consent of the Congress is necessary to validate his decision. In other words, he does not agree that his decision in this matter must be subject to the approval of Congress.

Personally, I agree with the position of the President. I do not agree with the proposal of the minority leader. The Congress has the right and power to raise the Armed Forces, but the President has the responsibility for the command of those forces. If in the exercise of his best judgment the defense of this country requires the sending of troops to Europe, he has the power and the duty to do so. Congress, of course, can refuse to appropriate the money for the troops but that is a decision for which Congress must take the responsibility. In the long

run decisions on military strategy are best left to the Executive. That is the plain intent of our constitutional system. It would be dangerous for our future welfare to change the underlying principle simply because a strong minority or even a majority of the Congress may lack confidence in the wisdom of the Executive in some particular instance such as the present one.

Mr. President, aside from the question of the proper relations of the Executive and the Congress there is, of course, the question of the substantive decision itself. In other words, regardless of who makes the decision and what procedure is followed, the important question is what is the best policy for us to follow. There have been marked differences of views expressed in the Senate as well as by private individuals in recent weeks.

We have heard the only living ex-President of our country advocates a policy directly contrary to the present official policy of our Government. Other prominent men have disagreed with both policies and the rest of us are left to choose among them or to try to invent some new solution. It is this apparent babel of voices which almost persuaded me not to add to the confusion by making another speech on the subject, but yet, under the circumstances as we find them, it would seem to be our duty to try to clarify the issues and to find, as best we can, a course of action which at least a clear majority of us can support.

Another observation that I wish to make, relative to the nervousness that presently afflicts us, especially in Washington, is that we should remember that we and our democratic allies have had reverses before. In fact, it is characteristic of free self-governing peoples that they suffer reverses in the initial stages of every war. That is because we hate war and are always reluctant to prepare for war until forced to do so by an attack. Let us not forget that on December 7, 1941, we thought Pearl Harbor was the blackest day in our history. In 1914, as well as in 1940, the British and the French suffered disastrous reverses and yet they have survived. The initial advantage in all wars is with the aggressor, and yet the free peoples have prevailed in the last two world conflicts in spite of their initial reverses.

I do not by any means wish to leave the impression that we should be complacent, or that our success is inevitable, in the present struggle. I merely suggest that we should not, in a panic of despair and an atmosphere of recrimination, make ill-considered and hasty decisions. On the contrary, we must approach the problems with a calm, unemotional, and objective attitude, and with the most serious consideration of our long-term interests.

At the outset there is one matter which I believe we can agree upon and which I think may clear away one tiny corner of the confusion. We should recognize in the beginning that we are matching with and strategy with an adversary who accepts no rules, and has no honor, no moral code, no respect for word or contract; who ridicules religion and believes that any means justifies the end. With such an adversary, any agreement or policy adopted today may look foolish a month from today. In other words, by bitter experience we have learned that promisory agreements with the masters of the Kremlin cannot be relied upon. Agreements which we made in good faith with Russia during and after the war, had they been carried out in good faith as intended, would have resulted in a very different world from that which we have today. Our leaders who made those agreements, however, now look improvident and foolish and are condemned from every side.

The objective of our foreign policy is, in a few words, the maintenance of peace and the freedom and security of our people. The difficult question is what measures or policies are most likely to assure this objective. Broadly speaking, there may be said to be three policies that have been advanced in recent weeks of debate in the Senate and by private citizens. First, the limitation of our commitments to the defense of the Western Hemisphere with emphasis upon air and sea power. Second, the so-called Truman doctrine of opposing aggression in every area where it appears. Third, participation in the creation of a land army in western Europe, in addition to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. One may perhaps call this the Truman doctrine with limitations.

A foreign policy, of course, cannot be adequately described in so few words, but I think these brief descriptions are sufficient to give us a basis for discussion. One mistake that we are often prone to make, in dealing with matters of the greatest complexity, is to oversimplify the proposed solution. It is human nature to want to find quickly a simple, clear answer to the most difficult problem so that we can stop worrying about what we should do and get about doing it. We Americans are an impatient people and we cannot understand why our leaders do not tell us right off just exactly, in detail, what we should do and quit arguing about it. With a little reflection, I believe it becomes apparent that, in a matter as difficult as combating the imperialism of the Russian Politburo, there is no simple blueprint for action, and it is a dangerous illusion to accept one even if it is offered.

In dealing with an enemy as ruthless, as resourceful, and as unpredictable as the Politburo, we must be prepared on the one hand to meet wholly unexpected moves and at the same time to agree upon certain positive objectives of our own from which we must not allow ourselves to be diverted. This means that, although we agree upon broad policy objectives, we cannot follow blindly and stubbornly a preconceived pattern, but, on the contrary, we should be able to adapt ourselves promptly to changing circumstances. There must be an element of flexibility in any policy.

An example of what I have in mind is the situation that developed in Korea. So long as the objective was to resist the aggression of North Korea and to restore the integrity of the Republic of South Korea, we were carrying out a program of the United Nations which was consistent with the Truman doctrine. At the time President Truman ordered troops to Korea, there was general approval of his actions in the Congress and among the people. The current outspoken critics of the situation were not so outspoken then. However, when Red China entered the war, the entire character of the struggle changed. Purely as a military matter, the undertaking in Korea at that moment became untenable. We should not undertake at this time a major land war with China. If this is the beginning of world war III, we must not forget that the Kremlin is the primary enemy and China merely a satellite. It is far wiser to recognize the hard military facts of the situation and to withdraw from Korea than to persist in an undertaking which is now quite a different one from that which we began in June. In spite of the valid principle which we sought to support, we should not jeopardize the military security of the free world by pursuing an impracticable undertaking.

Before discussing the three broad policies mentioned a moment ago, we should recall for a moment the background of the present conflict. In the war with Hitler's Nazi Germany, we and our western allies not only did a large part of the fighting, but we also generously and wholeheartedly furnished enormous quantities of war material to Russia; thousands of tanks, planes, trucks, guns, ships, and tons of food. At one point even Stalin acknowledged the decisive importance of our contribution to Russian survival.

During and after the war we made agreements with Russia, in good faith, designed to reestablish peace and freedom in the war-torn world. We assumed that after such a long and devastating struggle, the masters of the Kremlin would be anxious to lighten the crushing burdens of the Russian people. We expected that the Kremlin would want to give the tired, long-suffering Russian masses shoes, warm clothes, good housing, and nourishing food; not only because it would be the humane thing to do, but as a reward for their sacrifices during the war.

However, we all know that instead of seeking to give the Russian people some of the good things of life the Kremlin tightened the screws and lashed the defenseless people into ever-increasing efforts and sacrifices for the creation of a monstrous war machine. At the same time, a vicious and relentless campaign of sabotage, subversion, and threats was directed against Russia's former allies.

Our leaders have been severely criticized for misjudging the character and intentions of the Politburo during and immediately after the war. Our hindsight, of course, tells us that we should not have trusted the Russians. However, in America we are accustomed to taking men at their word, and I submit that it is almost beyond the capacity of civilized people to understand, even now, let alone anticipate then, the savage and relentless attack of the Russians upon allies who so recently had saved them from annihilation.

It seems to me that the only logical alternative to the course of action we did follow—that is, of trusting the Russians—was, in distrust of them, to assume and maintain a position of military strength from which to deal with them. In other words, even had our leaders correctly judged the character and intentions of the Politburo in 1945, would we have been willing to make the sacrifices necessary to meet that challenge? How long would our people have been willing to keep the boys in uniform in foreign lands and pay the taxes required to support them, even though our leaders may have thought it the wise thing to do? We now find ourselves, belatedly, preparing our defenses, creating a military potential by which we hope to deter the Russians. But this is only after a disastrous military reversal.

Regardless of what might have been, we are now confronted with ever bolder aggression by the Communists, and we must agree upon a course of action. The first of the proposed policies, which I mentioned a moment ago, calls for the limitation of our commitments to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, with emphasis upon air and sea power, and was advocated recently by ex-President Hoover and former Ambassador Kennedy. More recently, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] advocated a program quite similar, with some extensions of our responsibilities to what he called island bases and to such key places as the Suez Canal and certain strategic airfields. The all-important distinction between the position of these gentlemen and the third policy mentioned above, is the policy toward Western Europe. The Hoover-Kennedy view would prevent the supplying of ground troops to a European army for the defense of Western Europe. This view, in short, would abandon Western Europe to the tender mercies of the Kremlin. Although some of the advocates of this position seek to deny that this is the intention or would be the result, I am unable to agree with their reasoning. It seems clear to me that if we refuse not only to make an equitable and fair contribution to the ground forces of a European army, but also fail to take the leadership in organizing it, we will, in effect, have abandoned those people to domination by the Kremlin. I believe that such a course is dangerous to our security and is morally dishonorable. It is dangerous to our security because the great industrial potential of Europe would fall to the Russians. It is dishonorable because it repudiates obligations to friends and allies and denies our debt to all those generations of Europeans who struggled through the centuries to bring liberty and justice to mankind.

I believe that our foreign policy should revolve around the basic assumption that the preservation of Western Europe from domination by Moscow is essential to our security and to the long-term objective of establishing, eventually, a peaceful world of freemen. We must help protect Europe, but not for sentimental reasons. We must help protect Western Europe because the best military brains we have believe that our own physical defense would be gravely jeopardized if the industrial power of Europe should be merged with the manpower of Russia and her satellites. This reason should be decisive even to those among us who regard themselves as being hard-headed, practical realists. Furthermore, and of equal importance to me, we are morally bound to protect Europe by all reasonable means at our disposal. We are morally bound not only by such formal agreements as the Atlantic Treaty, duly ratified by the Senate, but also by our historical relationship to the peoples of Western Europe. These nations—England, France, Germany, Italy, to mention only a few—are the source, the fountain head of our civilization. All our forebears came from these lands. Our institutions of government, our religious principles, our system of law, our sense of justice, our regard for the dignity of man, our sense of fair play, all derived from the peoples of these lands. To abandon them without a struggle would be final proof to the world of the moral bankruptcy of our Nation.

To return for a moment to the question of military and industrial potential, today the steel production capacity of the United States is approximately 95,000,000 tons; of Western Europe, including Great Britain, about 60,000,000 tons; and of Russia and her satellites nearly 35,000,000 tons, although the latter is an estimate. In any case, at present we and our allies have an enormous advantage in the production of this basic all-important war material. However, if the 60,000,000-ton capacity of Western Europe is transferred to Russia, we would have a bare equality in this strategic material, but since Russia would then have an overwhelming manpower, we would be at a dangerous disadvantage in the ultimate contest. If Western Europe should fall, Russia would have the skilled manpower of the Germans, the French, and the Belgians to make the machines of war—guns, tanks, ships, rockets, and guided missiles—in addition to virtually an unlimited supply of expendable human beings. If anyone doubts that they would be generously expended, he should recall the use of masses of Russian infantry against the Germans or the recent slaughter of the Chinese in Korea under Russian direction.

One of the arguments upon which Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy rely very heavily is that it is our primary duty, not only to ourselves but also to the free world, to withdraw to the Western Hemisphere and build up impregnable military strength in order that we may be the bastion of freedom. The idea seems to be that when the Communist world begins to crumble in the distant future, we will sally forth to reestablish freedom and civilization. This thought seems to me to be a rationalization of a desired course of action rather than a serious and genuine argument. It is too obviously an attempt to justify saving oneself at the expense of others to be acceptable by any of our friends across the seas. If we accept this reasoning and voluntarily follow this course, I believe that, for the foreseeable future, we will be regarded by civilized people as unworthy of trust and confidence.

I am quite willing to concede that something needed to be done to awaken the Europeans to the deadly peril of their position and to induce them to bear their full share of the burden of rearming. If the speeches advocating withdrawal into our shell had this objective in mind, they may have had some merit, but, as an expression of sound policy for us to follow, I cannot agree with them.

The argument is also made that Europe has lost the will to resist and, therefore, it is useless to try to assist her. It is an insidious argument, and I believe it is unsound and misleading. Europeans may well be confused, as we are, and they may be hesitant to assume a belligerant attitude toward Russia—at least until some progress is made toward developing a respectable army. I do not believe that basically the people of Western Europe have lost their spirit of independence or their desire to remain freemen. The fact is that few people realize how much the Europeans have already done in increasing their industrial production and in putting their house in order so that they can support increased armed forces. General Eisenhower will advise us about this aspect of the matter upon his return, but I am confident that the situation is not nearly as hopeless as some would lead us to believe. On Monday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] presented to the Senate facts showing a very substantial war effort by the countries of Western Europe.

The Europeans need assurance, not that we will furnish all, or even a major fraction, of the ground troops for their defense, but assurance that the shifting political scene in our own country will not expose them to sudden death in a futile undertaking. In other words, they want to feel that we are in this struggle with them, that we will not repudiate our Atlantic Treaty obligations nor by legalistic interpretation nullify the treaty's meaning. I quite agree that our troops should not be exposed to danger in Europe unless and until the Europeans give convincing evidence that they are willing to go the limit in their own defense. This is very different, however, from Mr. Hoover's idea that a "sure dam" against Russian aggression must first be built by the Europeans alone. We must not jockey about, each waiting on the other to take the first step. We should proceed simultaneously, in good faith, to do what needs to be done.

When influential public men like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] insist that we should not assume the leadership or the initiative in organizing the defenses of Europe, in effect they are saying there can be no leadership of the western allies. Whether we like it or not, ours is the only country with the prestige and power necessary to organize and lead the free peoples in opposition to the Kremlin. To refuse to accept the leadership and to provide the initiative, when it is obvious that we alone among the free peoples have the power to provide both, seems to me to be tantamount to ultimate surrender. I believe the most powerful influence toward fatalistic defeatism in free Europe is the doubt they entertain about our willingness to lead

them vigorously and confidently in this struggle. We and the Europeans possess sufficient resources and manpower to restrain or, if we must, to defeat the Russians, but as yet we have neither unity of purpose nor strong leadership. The masters of the Kremlin lead their slave world in no uncertain manner. Unless we can do likewise for the free world, a return to the Dark Ages is no idle fantasy.

To sum up this phase of our discussion, I believe we should plan to help defend Western Europe from Russian invasion as best we can in accordance with our obligations under the Atlantic Treaty. The broad question of policy, as to whether or not the best interests of this country require that we help Europe defend itself with troops as well as guns, is properly a question for Congress to decide. But the question of the precise number of men and machines needed to achieve the objective should be left to the judgment of our military leaders. Such decisions are inherently executive in character. With regard to other critical strategic areas such as Turkey and Greece and Japan, we should, within the limit of our available resources, give assistance to their efforts to resist Russian aggression. In these areas the need is for materials rather than manpower, and, if we can possibly spare the weapons, these areas should be assisted. The Turks in particular have demonstrated in Korea a superb courage and fighting spirit. They should be helped.

As to China, frankly I do not see how we can do anything effective, other than the encouragement of guerrilla warfare and sabotage of a clandestine nature. The basic situation in China was, and is, I believe, quite different from that in Europe. Even before the First World War China was experiencing a revolution inspired by the desire of the people to throw off the shackles of a decadent, feudalistic social and political order. Unfortunately for us, the Kremlin, quick to recognize the possibilities of the situation, stepped in and took charge of the revolt against the old order.

The impulse of the Chinese masses to revolt against the exploitation and oppression and chaos following the breakup of the old imperial Manchu dynasty probably could have been directed along democratic lines had we understood clearly what was going on. However, the fact is that the Communists, directed by Moscow, did move in and usurp the control of the revolutionary movement. Instead of freedom and self-government, China now has a stern dictator subject to the domination of Moscow. It is a major tragedy. Nevertheless I am unable to see what we can do about it at this late date other than as I have indicated.

It is my view that the safest and wisest policy for us to follow is neither the Hoover-Kennedy-Taft policy nor the Truman policy. The former is dangerous to our security and is morally wrong. The latter is beyond our capacity to carry out. I firmly believe, however, that by limiting our commitments to Europe and certain additional strategic areas as I have indicated, we can bring about the unity of the free world and with wisdom lay the foundation for a lasting peace founded upon freedom and justice.

It is high time that some of our public men—and I do not exclude Senators—stop wringing their hands, stop searching for scapegoats, stop bemoaning our fate, and stop condemning our allies. What a spectacle we must be to little Finland, or Turkey, or Sweden, calm and determined as they are, and yet confronted at their very doors by the Russian bear. We are a great Nation, a rich, powerful, productive people capable of accomplishments beyond our imagination. We should not act like spoiled, hysterical children just because we have suffered a temporary though bitter defeat. I say "temporary" because our people still have a deep respect for and faith in the Christian virtues which made this country great and which will pull us through this crisis. They are hard-working, honest, tolerant human beings, and above all, our people still have personal freedom.

Freedom of the individual is our nonsecret weapon which in the long run will out-produce and out-maneuver the serfs of the Kremlin. The imagination, the initiative, the ingenuity of genuinely free people have no limits. When necessity prods and the leaders wisely direct them, free people will always prevail over slaves.

THE KOREAN CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a news dispatch taken from the ticker in the cloakroom. It deals with the latest proposal made by the Chinese Communist regime. I wish to point out that on the face of it under the proposed cease-fire agreement, which would set up a 7-nation conference, four of the nations mentioned have already expressed themselves as favoring the seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations, and have already expressed their willingness to barter Formosa to the Chinese Communists. Therefore I believe that in that respect the latest proposal has not changed the situation in any regard.

In the past I have been critical of the State Department when I felt criticism of it was justified. At this time I wish to commend the recent statement of Mr. Gross, which very clearly indicated that the United States would not barter Formosa, and that no discussions would be had in relation to Formosa without the participation of the Government of the Republic of China in such discussions.

Mr. President, based on press dispatches which have been received today it seems to me that the latest maneuver on the part of the Government of India in calling for another 48-hour delay is purely an obstructive tactic. In the final analysis, what the UN must do, if it is not to lose the confidence of the people of the world, is clearly and frankly to brand Communist China as the aggressor that she is. If the United Nations fails to do so, it will lose the right to the moral support of the people of the world. Failure to designate Communist China as an aggressor will in fact be saying that a small aggressor is an aggressor, but a large aggressor is not an aggressor, and that, frankly stated, the doctrine of might makes right. I do not believe that the United Nations can continue to enjoy the confidence of the people of the world if it fails to face up to that issue.

There being no objection, the press dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sir Benegal Rau told the UN that Communist China has agreed to a cease-fire in Korea for a limited-time period that would be established at the start of a proposed seven-nation conference on far-eastern problems.

Rau told the General Assembly's main political committee that the Chinese Communist Government had given such assurance to Sardar Pannikar, the Indian Ambassador in Peking, in reply to a request for clarification of the Peking regime's position as outlined in an earlier statement rejecting a UN peace program.

The Chinese Communists, however, insist that the seven-nation conference—to include the Peking Government, the United States, Russia, Britain, France, India, and Egypt—must discuss the withdrawal of American forces from Formosa and the ousting of Nationalist China from the UN in favor of Mao Tze-tung's regime.

Ambassador Ernest A. Gross, deputy chief of the United States delegation to the UN, declared in a statement last night that this country would not agree to discuss the future of Formosa unless the Chinese Nationalists were represented, and said the question must be "handled in a way completely consistent with our national interests and security."

Rau's announcement led immediately to suggestions that the political committee adjourn to study it. Rau himself suggested a 48-hour adjournment and Antonio Quevedo, of Ecuador, supported the proposal.

Rau told the committee that the Indian Ambassador had submitted certain points on which doubts were entertained in various quarters to the Chinese Communist Foreign Office and received the following reply:

"1. If the principle that all foreign troops should be withdrawn from Korea has been accepted and put into practice, the Chinese People's Government assume the responsibility to advise its volunteers to return to China.

"2. Regarding the conclusion of the war in Korea and a peaceful settlement of the Korean problems, we think we can proceed in two steps:

"The first step: A cease-fire for a limited-time period can be agreed upon at the first meeting of the seven-nation conference and put into effect so that negotiations may proceed further.

"The second step: In order that the war in Korea may be concluded completely and peace in Asia be assured, all conditions for the conclusion of the war must be discussed in connection with political problems in order that there may be agreement on the following:

"A. Steps and measures for the withdrawal of all foreign troops.

"B. Proposals to the Korean people for settling internal affairs by the Korean people.

"C. Withdrawal of United States forces from Formosa and the Straits of Formosa in accordance with the Cairo and Potsdam declarations.

"D. Other problems of the Far East.

"3. A definite affirmation of the legitimate status of the Chinese People's Republic in the UN must be insured."

Informed sources said the questions submitted by Pannikar to the Peking government originated with Canadian Premier

Louis St. Laurent who communicated them to Indian Prime Minister Jawharlal Nehru, who relayed them, in turn, to his ambassador.

Opposition to the Chinese plan, as relayed by India, was immediately voiced by Alexis Kyrou, of Greece, who said UN prestige would suffer by submitting to the counterplan put forward by the Chinese Communists in reply to the world organization's five-point offer of peace.

The new communication marked the first time that Communist China has retreated from its adamant demand for negotiations first and cease fire afterward. The Chinese appeared also to have backed down from their demand for immediate seating in the UN as a prelude to peace.

POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND TROOPS ABROAD WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION BY CONGRESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in my remarks on the pending question I shall make extensive use of numerous reference works, and I ask unanimous consent that citations to such reference works be printed in the RECORD in the form of footnotes. I feel that because of the lateness of the hour I should not take the time of the Senate to read the footnotes into the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that certain extracts from the Constitution of the United States be set forth in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there are two great issues before the Nation and the Congress at this moment. They are distinct issues, but somehow they appear to be blurred in the public mind. That confusion is also reflected in some of the recent Senate debate.

The first issue goes to the policy determination on the nature and scope of our participation in European defense.

The second issue goes solely to the question of authority for that ultimate decision, and the relative responsibilities of the Executive and the Congress in making it.

The pending resolution is related to the second issue alone.

As such, the pending resolution seriously raises the question of the President's power to send troops abroad without specific authorization from Congress in circumstances short of a declaration of war.

It is to this question that I wish to address myself by reference to some of the historical and legal precedents on the subject.

Conflicting concepts of executive power have struggled for dominance in American governmental practice and theory since 1789. According to the one concept, the legislative power was and should remain supreme, with the executive power subordinate. Another viewpoint conceives of the Presidency as cloaked with the prerogatives of sovereignty and presidential powers as almost autonomous and self-directing. Under yet another theory the legislative and executive—along with the judicial—powers are coordinate and supposed to be in balance.

The discussion to follow does not deal with the issue between the President and Congress with regard to the making of treaties or executive agreements. This would require a lengthy study by itself.

Whatever the merits of these basic concepts, taken by and large, the history of the Presidency, as one modern authority phrases it, has been "a history of aggrandizement."[1] While the growth of the powers of the President was evidenced throughout the nineteenth century, this increase in power was greatly accelerated in the twentieth century. With the replacement of the laissez faire theory of Government and the active participation of the United States in international politics the executive department has expanded greatly in size and influence.

In the field of foreign relations, in particular, the increase of Presidential power has become obvious. In 1936 this increase was upheld by the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corp. At that time the Court stated that the President's power in the field of international relations was "plenary and exclusive" and did not require the sanction of Congress. Since 1936 the President has acted in a number of occasions—most notably in the case of the destroyer deal in 1940—in clear violation of statutory law, if not in violation of the Constitution as well, but the Court has had no occasion to expand or modify the 1936 decision.

It is questionable, however, whether the power of the President in the role of Commander in Chief has grown to the same extent as his power in the field of diplomacy. Although Presidents have frequently taken action as Commander in Chief, asserting the title "to eke out a paucity of statutory authority," it is generally recognized that being Commander in Chief is one of the incidents inseparable from the office of President.[2] It is useful, nevertheless, to discuss the power of the President as Commander in Chief as a separate category particularly in regard to the employment of the Armed Forces where Congress, under the Constitution, has also been given powers and more specific powers than those of the President. Despite the number of occasions on which the President has sent American forces overseas without a declaration of war or other specific congressional authority, the Supreme Court has never ruled as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of any of such actions. In the face of charges of usurpation of power made by Congressmen and constitutional authorities when the President has so acted, the legality of such acts in time of peace remains open to question.

I. THE INTENTIONS OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS

One of the major struggles in the evolution of both modern and ancient democracy has been to popularize control of the decision on war or peace and to restrict the freedom of the head of the nation to use the armed forces at his discretion. For centuries kings, at whim, sent armies to fight in foreign lands where thousands of voiceless subjects paid the price of their lives. Memories of these evils left strong fears in the minds of western democratic and constitutional thinkers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The American colonists inherited these fears, strengthened by forced participation in colonial wars which were the result of decisions over which the colonists had no control. The colonists also feared the very existence of a large army and navy as a temptation to engage in international conflicts. As one student of the Constitution has said:

> Judging by the hot debates that occurred over the popular ratification of the Constitution, nothing was more feared by the American people at the time than a standing army.[3]

It was with these traditional fears that the founding fathers set out in framing the Constitution to control the power to involve the new Nation in war. It was to Congress that the Constitution specifically entrusted not only the sole power to declare war, but also the authority to "provide for the common defense," to "raise and support armies," and to "make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." It limited appropriations of money to raise and support armies to a term of 2 years, so that Congress would have to review the use of such money at least that frequently.

As Thomas Jefferson commented on these decisions of the founding fathers, the Constitution had "muzzled the dog of war" by transferring the power of "letting him loose from the executive to the legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay." Some decades later, Senator Charles Sumner pointed out on the floor of Congress the significance of the decision of the Constitutional Convention in regard to the question of war and peace:

> This is a peculiar principle of our Government by which it is distinguished from monarchical governments, where power to declare war, and also the treaty-making power, is in the Executive alone.[4]

The makers of the Constitution recognized that the President must have the power to use the Armed Forces to repel a sudden attack without a declaration of war by Congress. In the days when it took weeks for Congress to be called and assembled such a contingency had to be met by Presidential action. There were, however, obvious limitations on the President's power to use the Armed Forces. Every 2 years, at least, the President was at the mercy of Congress for a new appropriation for the Army. The makers of the Constitution also thought of the standing army as a relatively small volunteer force since standing

[1] Edward S. Corwin, the Presidency in Perspective, The Journal of Politics, II (February 1949), p. 8.

[2] Charles Fairmen, the President as Commander in Chief, the Journal of Politics, II (February 1949), p. 145.

[3] Charles A. Beard, the Republic (1944), pp. 98–99.

[4] Congressional Globe, 42d Cong., 1st sess., part 1, p. 294.

armies were at best a necessary evil.[5] They placed major reliance upon the militia which each State was to provide and to train.[6] But Congress could call for the militia and the Commander in Chief could use the militia only in three contingencies: First, in case of an insurrection against the Federal authority; second, in case a State, threatened by internal disorder, called for aid; and, third, in case of invasion by a foreign foe.

When in 1812 it was suggested that the militia be used for the invasion and occupation of Canada, Congress rejected the idea as unconstitutional. Congressional action in 1846, giving President Polk authority to employ militia against Mexican forces in what was expected to be a foreign war, has been generally regarded as unconstitutional.[7] It was not until the Spanish-American War when the President planned the dispatch of militia to Cuba that the constitutional limitation was circumvented by mustering all militia out of the service of their respective States and into that of the United States. And it was not until the Selective Service Act of 1917 that Congress authorized the draft of men for service abroad. Since this action broke with an Anglo-American legal tradition which had remained intact since the latter half of the fourteenth century, charges of unconstitutionality were brought before the Supreme Court.[8] The Court, however, unanimously upheld the Selective Service Act.

The Constitutional Convention not only gave thought to the contingencies in which the President could employ a conscript army but held some fear over the President's role as Commander in Chief. A desire was expressed by one delegate to prevent the President from assuming personal command of the troops, but no action was taken. An example of the fear of Presidential misuse of the army is also found in the New York State convention called to ratify the Constitution where there was a debate over an amendment to forbid the President to command the army without special consent of Congress. Even such a strong proponent of the executive power as Alexander Hamilton wrote in Federalist 69 that the President's power as Commander in Chief was "in substance much inferior" to that of the King of England and would amount to "nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy." This appears to mean that the President was to be top general and top admiral but to have no powers other than those of any high military or naval commander.[9] This view was reinforced by an outstanding nineteenth century student of the American Constitution who believed that the President was "simply Commander in Chief and not at all the lord of peace and war."[10]

II. STATEMENTS BY PRESIDENTS ON THE WAR-MAKING POWER

Although the President, by the nature of his position is given often to the broadest interpretation of the powers of the Presidency, many Presidents have publicly recognized the supremacy of the legislative power in situations involving the use of military force in such a way as to threaten war. John Adams, confronted by a series of depredations against American ships on the high seas, sent a message to Congress on May 16, 1797, in which he said:

> It remains for Congress to prescribe such regulations as will enable our seafaring citizens to defend themselves against violations of the law of nations and at the same time restrain them from committing acts of hostility against the powers at war.[11]

Before assuming the Presidency himself, Thomas Jefferson viewed even a Presidential declaration of neutrality as unconstitutional. Referring to the action of Washington, Jefferson said that it was "a declaration there should be no war, to which the Executive was not competent."[12] In his first annual message to Congress as President, Jefferson reported an American naval attack on a marauding Tripolitan cruiser which was bent on raiding American shipping in the Mediterranean:

> Unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense, the [Tripolitan] vessel, being disabled from committing further hostilities, was liberated with its crew. The legislature will doubtlessly consider whether, by authorizing measures of offense also, they will place our forces on equal footing with that of its adversaries.[13]

Even President Jackson, who so vigorously advanced the powers of the Presidency, took occasion to refer the question of Texas to Congress as one "probably leading to war" and therefore a proper subject for "a previous understanding with that body by whom war can alone be declared and by whom all the provisions for sustaining its perils must be furnished."[14] Again in 1831 after ordering an armed vessel to the South Atlantic to protect American shipping against raiders from Buenos Aires, Jackson went to Congress.

> I submit the case to the consideration of Congress, to the end that they may clothe the Executive with such authority and means as they deem necessary for providing a force adequate to the complete protection of our fellow citizens fishing and trading in these seas.[15]

President Buchanan was also clear in his recognition of the constitutional authority of Congress in the use of armed force for an offensive purpose outside the territory of the United States.

The first occasion was in his annual message of December 8, 1857, when he asked Congress to implement the treaty with Colombia by which the United States guaranteed the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama.

> Under these circumstances I recommend to Congress the passage of an act authorizing the President, in case of necessity, to employ the land and naval forces of the United States to carry into effect this guaranty of neutrality and protection.

On December 6, 1858, Buchanan went further to say:

> The Executive Government of this country in its intercourse with foreign nations is limited to the employment of diplomacy alone.

I repeat "is limited to the employment of diplomacy alone."

When this fails it can proceed no further. It cannot legitimately resort to force without the direct authority of Congress, except in resisting and repelling hostile attacks.

Buchanan was also careful to disavow Presidential power to act in the shadowland area between open war and peace.

> It will not be denied that the general "power to declare war" is without limitation and embraces within itself not only what writers on the law of nations term a public or perfect war, but also an imperfect war, and, in short, every species of hostility, however confined or limited. Without the authority of Congress the President cannot fire a hostile gun in any case except to repel the attacks of an enemy.[16]

He said:

> Without the authority of Congress the President cannot fire a hostile gun in any case except to repel the attacks of an enemy.

Although Abraham Lincoln as President was responsible for the greatest expansion to that date in the powers of the Presidency by wedding the role of Commander in Chief with the clause that makes it the duty of the President to see that "the laws be faithfully executed," he was also clear in his understanding of the intent of the makers of the Constitution. In a letter written in February 1848 he said:

> Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretend[ing] generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our [Constitutional] Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

But in the first decade of the twentieth century President Theodore Roosevelt set a number of radical precedents by his action in Panama and the Caribbean, using American forces in an offensive capacity without seeking authorization from Congress. It remained for Woodrow Wilson, both a believer in a strong Executive and a student of the Constitution, again to appear before Congress for

---

[5] Madison and three other members of the Constitutional Convention went on record as opposing any standing army in peacetime.

[6] For a study of the Convention's thinking on this subject, see Howard White, Executive Influence in Determining Military Policy in the United States (1924), pp. 16–21.

[7] White, op. cit., p. 21.

[8] Edward S. Corwin, Total War and the Constitution (1947), pp. 87–88.

[9] Ibid., p. 14.

[10] Hermann von Holst, The Constitutional Law of the United States of America (1887), pp. 192–193.

[11] Quoted by Albert H. Putney, "Executive Assumption of the War-Making Power," S. Doc. No. 39, 70th Cong., 1st sess. This article, appearing originally in the National University Law Review, May 1927, collects the most significant Presidential statements bearing on this subject.

[12] Letter to Madison, June 23, 1793.

[13] Quoted in Putney, op. cit., p. 4.

[14] Ibid., p. 7.

[15] Ibid., p. 7.

[16] This and the above quotations from Buchanan are cited in Putney, op. cit., p. 9.

authorization to use American forces outside the country.

On April 20, 1914, after a serious clash of authority between American and Mexican forces in the port of Tampico, Wilson sent a message to a joint session of Congress which is of particular significance since it presents Wilson's view as a student of the Constitution in its opening sentences and his belief in Executive supremacy in its closing. Wilson opened his request by saying:

> It is my duty—

I underscore and emphasize the words, "It is my duty"—

> to call your attention to a situation * * * which calls for action and to ask your advice and cooperation in acting upon it. * * * I have come to ask your approval and support in the course I now propose to pursue.[17]

After explaining the situation, Wilson went on to say:

> No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our Government without recourse to the Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President, but I do not wish to act in a matter of so grave consequence except in close conference and cooperation with both Senate and House. I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the Armed Forces of the United States in such ways and to such an extent as may be necessary to obtain * * * the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States.

The House on the same day of the President's message voted him the authority to use troops by 337 to 37, with 56 Members not voting. The Senate referred the resolution to committee and debated it on the 21st of April. It was on that day that an army of 6,000 men were landed in Mexico, capturing Veracruz and holding possession of that city for 7 months. The Senate debated the resolution until early on the morning of the 22d when it was passed by a vote of 72 to 13 before news of the military action reached Washington.

In March 1916 the executive department again sought authority from Congress to use troops, this time to cross the Mexican border in pursuit of Pancho Villa who had been raiding American border towns. Congress was given to understand that full agreement had been reached with Mexico for the border crossing and on March 17 a concurrent resolution was passed approving the use of the Armed Forces "for the sole purpose of apprehending and punishing. . . ."

III. DECISIONS OF THE COURTS

Court decisions on the powers of the President in the use of the Armed Forces without a declaration of war have been almost completely lacking. Recognition has been given to two instances where the President can employ troops without a declaration of war—rebellion and invasion—but actions taken outside of those categories have not been subject to judicial review. In 1853 American naval forces bombarded the port of San Juan del Norte on the coast of Nicaragua in default of reparation which the naval commander had demanded for a mob attack on the United States consul.

President Pierce in his annual message to Congress defended the action as necessary to protect the lives and property of American citizens from future attacks. Some years later the American officer in charge of the bombardment was sued in a lower Federal court for the value of some property destroyed in the course of the naval action. Justice Nelson in his decision said:

> As respects the interposition of the Executive abroad for the protection of the lives or property of the citizen, the duty must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President.[18]

But in 1863 the Supreme Court in the Prize cases reaffirmed the supremacy of the legislative power in war-making. The President, said the Court, has "no power to initiate or declare a war." Yet as late as 1945, a former Assistant Secretary of State, after studying the decisions of the courts, said:

> The final authority on constitutional law has not yet spoken on the use of the Army and Navy for violence abroad in times of nominal peace.[19]

IV. PRESIDENTIAL PRACTICE

It is customary for the proponents of wide Executive power to cite the numerous cases in which the armed forces of the United States have been used abroad without declarations of war and often without any congressional sanction other than that given indirectly through the appropriation of funds for the Armed Forces. A number of compilations have been made of the landing of American forces on foreign soil which range upwards from a hundred or more cases.[20]

Most of these incidents, however, were efforts to protect definite rights of persons and property against impending violence, and were claimed not to be acts of war. Many of them took place in the Caribbean, and can be considered as special cases because of the Monroe Doctrine. But these actions are discredited today with the commitments of the United States to treat the Monroe Doctrine as a multilateral declaration, rather than a unilateral justification for political intervention.

More significant are the recent actions of President Franklin Roosevelt in the period prior to Pearl Harbor. While claiming the immunities of a neutral in time of war, troops were sent not only to bases in the Western Hemisphere leased from one of the belligerents, but also to advanced posts such as Iceland, while American naval vessels were convoying materials of war to one of the belligerents in a war zone and unofficially were attacking the submarine forces of the other belligerent—all without prior consultation or authorization from Congress.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan was one of the members of the select committee which held hearings in regard to the attack on Pearl Harbor. The evidence showed clearly that at one time the President of the United States had in contemplation—and had prepared plans accordingly—the sending of an American force to an island in the Atlantic, which it was expected would be taken over from Portugal. There is nothing in that particular record to show that the President contemplated doing that without obtaining the consent of the Congress. Therefore that incident cannot be cited as one involving a belief on the part of the President of the United States that he had authority to send a United States armed force to foreign soil without obtaining the consent of Congress.

If none of these actions has been challenged in the Supreme Court—as appears to be the case—it is largely because the issue was a public one and not in form suitable for judicial determination. Such grave questions as the ones we are now discussing hardly constitute the subject matter of cases which could be taken to the Supreme Court, for under the circumstances there would be no way by which a man serving in the Armed Forces could obtain a hearing of such a question in a lower court. By the time he was sent abroad, for service in the Armed Forces, he would not even be able to use our courts, to get a writ of habeas corpus. I mention that point because some persons will wonder why these matters have not been reviewed by the courts. They involve grave public questions which nevertheless are simply not suitable for judicial determination by the courts.

There is no question, however, that such an interpretation of the powers of the Presidency conflicts not only with the intent of the makers of the Constitution but also with most of the precedents and interpretations of the past.

The authority for such actions has been challenged from time to time by eminent Members of the Congress and by outstanding publicists. However, we find that on repeated occasions the issue has been foreclosed when the President confronted the Congress with the facts of the action taken, which, however unauthorized, left Congress with no alternative but to accept it.

At the same time when President Roosevelt was taking unilateral action, he did seek to find a legal basis for some of his actions—such as the opinion of Attorney General Jackson on June 5, 1940, in regard to the sale of arms to Britain as "surplus," and the Attorney General's opinion in September of the same year in regard to the legality of the transfer of American destroyers to Britain.

In 1942 the President made an interesting exception to his previous assumptions about Presidential power over the use of American troops, in appealing to Congress for authority to send military missions to friendly nations. The executive branch asked Congress to amend the act of May 19, 1926, and the act of May 14, 1935, which had given

---

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6908–6909.

[18] *Durand* v. *Hollins* (4 Blatchford 451 (1859)).

[19] James Grafton Rogers, World Policing and the Constitution (1945), p. 42.

[20] See, for example, Rogers, op. cit., pp. 92–123; and Right To Protect Citizens in Foreign Countries by Landing Forces, memorandum of the Solicitor for the Department of State (third revised edition, 1934), passim.

the President authority to detail military and naval missions at his discretion to assist governments of Latin American countries and the Government of the Philippines. The amendment requested gave the President authority "during war or a declared national emergency" to detail missions to other countries as he deemed it in the national interest. Congress so authorized the President by an act of October 1, 1942.

The military mission authorization not only involved the congressional power over the military forces, but also the need for congressional authorization for an officer of the United States to accept any remuneration or office from a foreign government, under article I, section 9, of the Constitution.

Recently, Mr. President, when it was suggested by the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa that they could use certain American officers in connection with the training of their troops and in the preparation of their men for the use of arms which they had obtained from the United States, the President of the United States and the executive branch of the Government gave as one of the reasons why that could not be done, that it was not authorized, and could not be done because of the act of Congress which made it illegal for an officer of the United States to accept any remuneration from a foreign government. Mr. President, if that law was constitutional and if it was recognized as the law of the land, it was because of the legislative authority to make that law; and if it was legal then, it is legal all the time. The President cannot use the law in one way, as a political weapon, on one occasion, and on a subsequent occasion use it in an opposite way. Certainly the President should abide by the law on all occasions.

In the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, President Truman unsuccessfully renewed a request for authority to dispatch missions to any countries in time of peace. Although the bill was amended in the Eightieth Congress so as to exclude any possible authorization of combat troops, it died in the Senate committee to which it was referred.

V. CONCLUSIONS

On these precedents, historical and judicial, the question of constitutionality as it relates to the power of the President to send American forces overseas, without a declaration of war or other congressional authorization, must remain open in 1951.

Opinions of constitutional authorities fall on either side.

There can be no question, however, of the original intent of the Constitution, regardless of contemporary interpretations of that document.

The makers of the Constitution did not conceive of the President's powers as Commander in Chief to be unlimited.

They did not contemplate the use of conscript forces outside the territory of the United States.

They clearly intended that the dangers of an irresponsible sovereign were to be avoided in the United States. To that end they concentrated the power to raise, finance, and govern the Armed Forces as well as the power to declare war in the hands of Congress.

A long line of distinguished Presidents, reaching down into the twentieth century, thought these decisions wise and abided by them.

And despite the tremendous growth in the power of the Presidency, the employment of American forces under the sole authority of the Commander in Chief in such a way as to create a threat of war must still be looked upon as a deviation from the main stream of American Presidential and constitutional tradition.

Mr. President, what I have discussed thus far deals mainly with the legal and historical relations between the President and Congress.

It does not touch upon or dispose of the policy question. Statecraft operates more in the area of conscience than in strict legality. Even if it were constitutional, legal, and proper for the President to assert a personal power against the Congress, he ought not do it in a matter involving the lives and fortunes of all our people. That is what hangs in the balance in the present proposal to implement the Atlantic Pact.

In the House there has been placed a series of plaques depicting the long line of great statesmen and jurists. One of these presents Edward I, King of England, in whose reign the people of England gained important rights over their sovereign.

The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of Edward's convocation of the model Parliament of 1295. In his writ of summons, Edward incorporated these words:

What touches all should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common.

Mr. President, this is wise policy and marks a tremendous forward step in the development of representative government. It is no less applicable to our problem today.

The idea of sending American troops overseas as something of a permanent garrison in Europe is new in American history. It is a tremendous decision to make. It should not be made as the result of a dispute on powers between the President and Congress. It should be made by the President and Congress working in the closest teamwork. In no other way can the confidence, strength, and support of the people be mobilized in these times when the spirit of a nation is the essential breath of life to a nation's foreign policy, and even its survival.

EXHIBIT 1

The following are provisions of the Constitution containing specific delegations of power to the Congress and to the President, respectively, which bear on the question of the authority to use troops abroad.

Article I, section 8, states:

"The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defense * * *; to declare war * * *; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; * * * [to provide] for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

Article II, section 2, states:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States."

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATOR

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator.

UNITED STATES JUDGE

Paul D. Shriver, of Colorado, to be United States judge for the district court of Guam. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Dalton T. Pierson, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana, vice John B. Tansil, deceased.

James G. Mackey, of New York, to be United States attorney for Guam. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Powless W. Lanier, of North Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 4, 1950.

Arthur A. Maguire, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 7, 1950.

George Morris Fay, of the District of Columbia, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 22, 1951.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Herbert I. Hinds, of Tahlequah, Okla., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oklahoma, in place of Henry Clifford Jones, resigned.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Gilbert J. Fortier, of New Orleans, La., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New Orleans, La., to fill an existing vacancy.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public

Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, USAF (medical)

James G. Espey, Jr., AO322380.
Livingston P. Noell, Jr., AO381472.
John A. Norcross, O413505.

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Peter H. Dillard, AO364979.
Tom W. Duke, AO1735739.
Paul W. Myers, AO975797.

To be captain, USAF (dental)

Benjamin C. Gore, O397865.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical)

Samuel E. Neely, 487967 USNR

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Robert W. Bergmann, AO965220.
James H. Dirlam, AO1906179.
Lee W. Helm, Jr., AO2059042.
Raymond C. Morris, AO1906201.
Charles T. Schwatka, Jr., AO1906266.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighteth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 2, Public Law 775, Eighteth Congress (act of June 25, 1948):

To be first lieutenants

Samuel E. Birdsong, Jr., AO861999.
David A. Botte, AO583665.
William A. Crawford, Jr., AO2060477.
James S. Dale, Jr., AO792807.
John V. Davies, AO671240.
Cornell DeGrothy, AO687999.
John J. Ensley, AO1796943.
Nicholas E. Gasaway, AO1643573.
Carl Goldschlager, AO730720.
Morris A. Hale, AO401620.
Fred Hamblen, 163837 USNR.
Billy S. Holland, AO377615.
LeRoy Kahn, AO1573315.
William J. Keeler, AO805844.
James J. Keough, AO1856948.
Francis G. McDonald, O387161.
William H. Packer, AO666984.
Carl R. Pearson, AO800759.
Robert A. Prince, AO575953.
John M. Rankin, AO583483.
Albert M. Scruton, AO2046402.
William E. Shannon, AO737273.
Everett S. Van Matre, AO560436.
Robert L. Vickers, AO676180.
Charlie Y. Wier, AO725117.
John E. Wilcox, O1331899.
John C. Wiley, AO666109.
George M. Wilson, AO576730.

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighteth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Robert P. Adams
Conrad F. Ahrens
Dale R. Anderson
Richard M. Anderson
Gerard J. Andeskie
William O. Armstrong
Robert B. Artz
Earl L. Babcock
Billy N. Baker
John W. Baker
Robert E. Baker
Melville R. Barlow
Warren S. Barnes
Lee N. Barnett
Herbert E. Bell
Schuyler P. Berry, Jr.
Herman M. Blagg, Jr.
Charles H. Blanchard
Robert G. Blanchard
John M. Blount, Jr.
Waldemar E. Bode
Stanley Braun
Edmond J. Bronner
James H. Broussard
Edward A. Brown
Howard J. Browning
Gerald B. Bunker, AO1856376
George M. Burgess
Duane C. Burton
Robert P. Cady
Charles R. Campbell
Albert M. Card
William E. Carr
John L. Carson
Robert D. Carter
John E. Catlin, Jr.
Joe L. Church
Ralph A. Clack
Billy M. Collins
William J. Collins
Thomas P. Connelly
Vernon L. Connor
Fred D. Courtney
Francis G. Crawford, Jr.
Clifford D. Crompton
Walter R. Danielson, Jr.
Hubert P. Davis
Thomas B. Deen
Charles G. Deese
Randolph L. Dodd
Henry A. Domian
Cloyd J. Dowling, Jr.
Hans H. Driessnack
Charles H. Dudley
Richard E. Dussault
Richard A. Dutton
William C. Eagle
Gordon C. Edgar
William E. Elmore
Merle W. Emmert
Robert B. English, AO1856141
William C. Evans
Donald M. Fehlings
Bruce H. Ferguson
John A. Fiebelkorn
Bruce M. Fisher
Stephen M. Flanagan
Harold L. Fox
Frank D. Frazier
Francis W. Freeman, Jr., AO1863655
Donald F. Fryauf
David L. Gasser
Allison G. Glover
Paul F. Goodwin
Vernon D. Gores
Carl K. Greene, AO1854346
Kenneth W. Grubaugh
Leo W. Hall
Edward D. Hallett
Lawrence C. Harrington
William E. Harris, Jr.
James B. Harrison
John T. Hart
Joseph L. Hart
Edmund H. T. Hay, Jr.
Daymond E. Helton
John R. Higson
Lawrence W. Hitchins
Anthony E. Holland
Lemuel D. Horton
David R. Howard
William F. Hoyer
John D. Hunt
Evan E. Huston
Delmar G. Jacobs
John H. James, Jr.
Arthur L. Jarvela
Nathan L. Joel
Thomas H. Johns
Eugene A. Johnson
Harlan W. Johnson
William T. Johnson, Jr.
Richard A. Johnston
Frank G. Jones
Jacob N. Jones, Jr.
Nolan T. Jones
Richard M. Joppa
Leonard I. Kaplan
Evangelis H. Karalis
Arthur Karma
Edward W. Kassor, Jr.
Francis M. Kavanagh
Dare K. Keelan
Philip E. Kelgard
Robert J. Kiker
Paul E. Killion, AO1862339
William M. King
Dennett H. Kinnard
Philip E. Klein
John S. Knowles
Frederick G. Koehler
Edward F. Kramer, Jr.
Raymond A. Kucharchuk
Thomas J. Kuchera
Gladstone S. Lewis, Jr.
James P. Lindberg, Jr.
John T. Lindsay
Robert G. Little, Jr.
Curtis C. Love
Robert M. Lucas
John H. Ludwig
William G. MacLaren, Jr.
Solomon L. Madison
Hughie M. Maples, Jr.
Gerald E. Marsh
Don L. Marshall
James H. Marshall
Fernand F. Martin
Daniel P. Maxfield
Edward P. Mazak, Jr., AO1862545
John P. McConnell
David R. McDonald
Joseph H. Mendenhall
John Miller
Frank A. Modic
Marshall W. Moore
Guy L. Morrison, Jr.
Jimmy W. Mullins
Robert B. Murray, AO1853360
Roger R. Neel
Earle E. Nelson
Crawford Nevins
William L. Nichols
Joseph W. Noah
Paul L. Norris
Waymond C. Nutt
William C. O'Brien, AO1853471
Robert L. O'Connell
James J. Odom, Jr.
David J. Ottensmeyer
Henry W. Parlett
Francis W. Penney
George Penovich
Donald K. Percival
Donald C. Peterson
Harold E. Pfeifer
George K. Pickett
Joseph T. Pilcher, Jr.
Francis S. Pionowski
Jackson L. Raley
John W. Ray
Donald L. Reinertson
Charles R. Renfro, AO1864288
William H. Risteen, AO1863663
Samuel M. Robinson
Samuel Romano
John J. Ross, III
B. W. Ryan
James H. Scharff
Alden A. Scott
William S. Selers
James R. Selig
Robert B. Shaw
Hugh W. Shoults, AO1857757
Henry W. Simpson
Chadwick B. Smith
Lowell J. Smith, AO1863665
Roy W. Smith, Jr.
William E. Smurro
William G. Solomon
William R. Sommer
Orval C. Sorensen
John M. Staab
Richard R. Stanton, AO1853017
Gerald E. Starkey
James G. Steger
Spencer Struble
Emil Sturmthal, AO1853530
George E. Swick, Jr.
Shoji Takasugi
Henry L. Thomas
Ralph W. Thomas
James C. Thompson
Robert P. Tiel
John O. Tinius
George P. Tynan
John N. Van Dusen
William P. Venable, Jr.
William A. Volk
Charles W. Wallace
White M. Wallenborn
Frank A. Wallington
Marvin L. Walters
Eugene R. R. Warner
Robert W. Ward
Walter R. Weck
Burton L. Weller
Jerry D. Wethington
B. D. White, AO1904746
Clarence W. White, Jr.
John W. White
Simon S. White, Jr.
James L. Whitlaw
Edmund M. Whitmeyer
Richard B. Whittington
Richard J. Wieland
John C. Wilkerson
Bernard R. Williams, Jr., AO2061545
Henry N. Williams
James C. Williams III
Robert K. Wolf
Edward J. Woodhouse
Howard E. Wright
Benjamin F. Yancey, Jr.
Samuel D. Young, Jr.
Clarence E. Youngman

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eighteth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Alfred S. Allen
Vernon H. Carter, Jr.
Lynwood E. Clark
Robert E. Darlington
William E. Dudley, Jr.
Leland R. Kirk
Allen D. LeBaron
Gilbert F. Libby
Vincent P. Luchsinger, Jr.
William H. Martin
William J. Pollock
Eugene Raunikar
Eugene R. Starke
Virgil P. Swim
William W. Yary, O2000415

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. John J. Ballentine, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy Spirit of the Eternal God, may this moment of prayer be one of reverence and sincerity, of gladness and gratitude, of humility and penitence, as we unburden our souls to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

Thou knowest that daily we need the blessings of insight and inspiration, of hope and courage, which Thou alone canst give. Fill our minds with wisdom, our hearts with love, and our hands with usefulness.

Grant that for our war-torn and divided world we may discover those unities which underlie all diversities.

Enable us by Thy grace to have a clearer vision and a more vivid sense of

the high and helpful things which we may do together in the building of a nobler civilization.

We pray that, above all, our spirits may be brought into harmony with Thy spirit and may we walk in Thy counsel and may we delight ourselves in the law of the Lord.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 19, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had—

Ordered, That the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] be appointed a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report vice former Senator Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania.

Ordered, That the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. ANDERSON, be appointed a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy vice former Senator Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–12.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–11.

RESOLUTION BRANDING COMMUNIST CHINA AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], aided and abetted by another gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], rammed through the House a resolution which called on the United Nations to brand Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

Those who initiated this action, without previous notice and when only a handful of Members were on the floor, claimed action on Friday was urgent although they never adequately explained why.

The RECORD shows that the other body of Congress found no reason for stampeding its Members into such action, and neither did the UN.

I am sure every Member of Congress agrees that Communist China is an aggressor in Korea, but I am still protesting emphatically against the twentieth century Tower of Babel, known as the United Nations, using the House of Representatives as a tool.

Let the House speak out, in all matters, with its own voice and in its own right. And let it be called upon to speak when all Members have been properly and decently notified.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REPORT OF HON. LEON H. GAVIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, during the period November 18–December 16, 1950, I visited occupied areas in Germany and Austria, and other countries in Europe, pursuant to the request of the chairman of this committee and invitational orders issued by the Department of the Army. While the time spent in each country was necessarily brief, every effort was made to confer with responsible officials, both American and foreign, and to observe, at first hand, the general circumstances, conditions, and attitudes prevalent in the areas visited. I could also, as the result of prior visits made to Europe during the past 3 years, gauge current conditions somewhat more accurately than would otherwise have been possible. While the principal purpose of my trip was, of course, the inspection of military installations and units in the European theater, and the evaluation of efforts being made by our allied powers in the North Atlantic Pact, an effort was also made to determine, within the limited time available, the general economic situation prevailing in the several countries. It is my hope that the following comments and observations may be of some value to the committee during the present session of the Eighty-second Congress, and may also be of general assistance to individual members of the committee, particularly those whose schedules and engagements during the past 2 years have not permitted visits to Europe.

On November 18, the undersigned visited Westover Air Force Base, Mass., and Lagens, Azores. At the former station there has been some slight amount of construction, including some housing built under the provisions of the Wherry Act—Public Law 211, Eighty-first Congress—as amended. However, the main portion of this large station, which serves as the principal Atlantic base, or terminal for the Military Air Transport Service, is of temporary frame construction. Most of the buildings were erected some 8 years ago, and have already outlasted their designed life. While it is probably not feasible during the current national emergency to replace these structures with permanent buildings, the attention of the committee is invited to two considerations: First, the continued use of temporary frame structures involves high costs for heating and maintenance; second, if the Department of Defense is to continue utilizing this base, some start should be made on a permanent building program as soon as conditions will permit.

The situation with respect to the facilities at Lagens, Azores, is even less satisfactory. There is still little or no permanent construction at this base, which must serve a major portion of our trans-Atlantic military aircraft. I do not know the reasons for the protracted delay in modernizing and improving this base; but I am convinced that such improvement should be commenced at the earliest practicable date.

The situation at Harmon Air Force Base, Newfoundland, is likewise unsatisfactory, with regard to facilities. A major construction program for this base was included in the authorization legislation enacted by the Congress and funds were provided in appropriation bills; but due to the economy campaign instituted by a former Secretary of Defense in 1949–50, the program was drastically curtailed. I personally inspected the base hospital consisting of a group of ramshackle tar-paper shacks and can assure the committee that replacement is needed at a very early date. While this is only one example, I am convinced that adequate facilities must be provided shortly—even though the cost now will probably be more than double what it would have been under the original contract.

I. WESTERN GERMANY

During the period November 19–24, the undersigned was in the northern portion of the United States zone of Germany, principally Frankfurt, Heidelberg, and Wiesbaden. At Frankfurt, I conferred with Mr. John J. McCloy, United State High Commissioner for Germany, and certain of his staff advisers, particularly Mr. Horace Gilbert, economic consultant on leave of absence from the faculty of the California Institute of Technology. In Heidelberg, I conferred with the commanding general, United States forces in Europe, Gen. Thomas T. Handy, and members of his staff, particularly Major General Noce. In Wiesbaden I had the opportunity of conferring with Lieutenant General Cannon, Chief of the United States Air Forces in Europe, and Major General Douglass and Brig. Gen. Millard Lewis of his staff. I was also, during this period, able to travel about this portion of the United States

zone, and make certain observations, which are summarized below:

(a) Economic: The signs of economic recovery are everywhere apparent in the United States zone of Germany. Substantial progress has been made not only in cleaning up rubble and removing damaged buildings, but in replacing commercial structures and restoring public utility and transport systems. While the standard of living is lower than in the United States, it compares favorably with most of Europe, and is in heartening contrast with the desperate conditions which prevailed in 1946–47. Since the reformation of the currency in Western Germany, there has been a steady improvement in trade and industry. Stores at present are amply stocked with food and merchandise of all kinds, and there is no rationing. The prices, while generally reasonable by United States standards, are often high compared to the wages and income of German consumers. However, most of the people appeared well clothed, adequately fed, and well shod. The chief economic problem in Western Germany today is unemployment, which stems from two unfortunate decisions or policies adopted during the last stages of World War II. The first of these was the agreement for the expulsion of German ethnic groups from Poland and Czechoslovakia. Millions of these people, whose properties were expropriated by the Communist regimes of the two countries mentioned, have been dumped on Western Germany, a region already heavily populated. Aggravating this condition was the deindustrialization policy, particularly the dismantling of factories and industrial plants capable of producing civilian goods. The folly of this latter program, and the harmful effects resulting therefrom have already been pointed out to the Congress, and it is understood that the program has been substantially terminated in the United States zone. However, the British Government in whose zone major steel and metallurgical industries are located, has continued the program for a much longer period. It is understandable that the British should fear the competition of a revived German industry; but it makes very little sense for the United States to seek the improvement of economic conditions in Germany by ECA loans and grants, while the British Government adheres to a program of dismantling and destroying industrial plants.

(b) Military: As far as the general military picture in Germany is concerned, the situation remains basically unchanged from a year ago. There is no substantial defense in Western Germany able to meet a major Russian offensive. It is reliably estimated that at any time the Russians could commit over 25 of their own divisions which are now west of their borders and able to move at will. This is exclusive of the troops raised and maintained by the satellite regimes of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. In addition, since the close of hostilities against Germany the Russians have augmented the air strength in their zone of Germany and are estimated to have over 2,000 combat aircraft in Germany alone. This figure has, of course, only limited significance, because they could also move an overwhelming number of additional aircraft into that the theater if they desired.

To counter this force, the Western Powers have in Germany only the equivalent of about seven divisions. The strength of the United States forces in Germany has not changed greatly during the past year. So far as can be judged, the United States Army and Air Force personnel are more efficiently employed, better trained, and have a higher combat effectiveness than at any time since the end of World War II. The suspension of normal rotation to and from Europe has resulted in more experienced personnel. Combat forces have been increasingly relieved of occupation or "housekeeping" duties, and greater emphasis has been placed upon training, including more field maneuvers. I am convinced that our forces in Germany are well led, and that, if necessity arose, the responsible commanders would achieve the utmost results within their power. However, with a Russian numerical superiority of at least four to one—and more likely seven or eight to one—plus overwhelming tactical air superiority, we could not expect that the small allied forces in Germany could long hold out against a major Russian offensive. Efforts are now being made by the Department of the Defense to augment the strength of our forces in Germany; and it is presumed that those of the other Western Powers will likewise be increased. In my opinion, however, no such augmentation program can be fully effective, and, as I shall discuss later, we must at the earliest practicable moment rearm Germany itself.

So far as dependent housing for the troops in Germany is concerned, I found a somewhat anomalous situation. In 1949 our Armed Forces in Germany had under their jurisdiction some 16,000 units of family housing, almost all requisitioned from the German owners. Many of these quarters were poorly located for our purposes, and the general state of maintenance and repair was not good. During the past year some 6,000 units of family housing for occupation forces have been built to American standards by the German Government and its subordinate agencies. The cost of construction has been a charge on the German economy, but the buildings remain the property of the German Government or local housing authorities, and at such time as they are no longer needed by occupation forces will revert to German control. These projects appear to have been well planned and skillfully executed. I visited one unit at Heidelberg and was greatly impressed with the good design and high standards of construction. It is estimated by our military officials in Europe that the current program would by April of this year have provided dependent housing sufficient for the need of our occupation troops garrisoned in Germany. However, the augmentation program now under way for that country will again create a severe shortage. The movement of large numbers of military personnel to Germany will create serious problems in this field. I personally doubt whether it will be possible to provide sufficient family housing in that country to take care of the families and dependents of our service personnel there. From a security standpoint it is questionable whether dependents of military personnel should be transported to Germany. There are, however, other factors to consider, particularly the morale aspect, and the very serious social problems which must be faced if dependents are not permitted to accompany military personnel required to serve in that country for extended periods. I do not pretend to have a solution for this problem, but I earnestly commend it to your attention and suggest that the committee seek necessary information from the Department of Defense in order to evolve a well considered and consistent policy.

As far as the United States Air Forces in Europe are concerned, the chief need at present appears to be additional bases, better located for the purposes required in the event of war. Most of our existing bases were simply taken over from the Luftwaffe at the end of World War II. While the facilities have generally been rendered adequate, the bases themselves are not, in many cases, well sited for use in the event of hostilities. If our Air Force is to be effective in event of a war, it must have secure bases from which it can continue to operate.

So far as equipment is concerned, the United States Air Force in Europe is in much better condition than it was a year ago. Most of the propeller type of fighter craft, which served well enough in World War II but which are now obsolete, have been replaced by modern jet fighters. The provision of other necessary facilities and equipment to improve combat readiness must in many instances depend upon the location and activation of suitably located bases, as noted above. I recommend that the committee obtain, at an early date, a comprehensive evaluation and report from the Air Force staff of the air situation in Europe.

(c) Political: The major political question facing Western Germany today is the rearmament issue. I addressed myself to this matter during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—in February 1950—and called attention to the urgent need of providing some military force capable of deterring, if not withstanding, a Communist drive across Western Europe. Unfortunately little was done about the matter before we became involved in hostilities in Korea, and the problem is now much more difficult. Whether we can, in the limited time remaining, create and train an effective German force is questionable. I regret to state that much of the thinking on this matter, both in Washington and Frankfurt, appears to me to be sadly out of date. The basic question is not whether we shall allow the Germans to participate in the defense of their country, or upon what terms our permission will be granted; it is whether and how such action can be taken in the available time. At my conference with Mr. McCloy he expressed the view that the German Government would cooperate on defense matters but could not be forced to do so. It is very clear that

the Germans want two major conditions met before they undertake such a program. The first of these, and the easier to provide, is full equality for Germany. Practically, this means that the Germans would not be limited in the size of the units they would organize, and that their staff officers would participate equally with those of other nations, in formulating plans for the defense of Western Europe.

Further, it would mean that most of the present program for the reeducation or reorientation of Germany must be discontinued, and that they would run their own civil and political affairs. It would also, in my opinion, lead inevitably to the termination or drastic revision of the remaining economic controls. The second factor which the Germans seek is the assurance of a sound, workable defense plan. They must be convinced that the Western Powers have the will, and the capacity, to organize a successful defense force. For the Germans rearmament must be done speedily and on a large scale, or it will constitute merely a provocation to the Russians, and an invitation to national suicide. The proposals which have been recently discussed for the formation of German regimental combat teams do not meet the conditions and cannot, in my opinion, be acceptable to the Germans. One other consideration deserves mention here. This is that there must be some substantial military force or screen provided during the time rearmament is occurring. Specifically, it means the provision of sufficient mechanized forces in Germany and sufficient tactical aircraft in that theater to deter any attack from Eastern Germany or the Soviet satellites. How this can be provided under present conditions is a question upon which the committee should, in my judgment, seek the views of our best informed military leaders at an early date.

During the time I was in Germany, local elections for the land legislatures were held in Hesse and Bavaria. In each instance they resulted in major gains for the Socialist Party, which opposes rearmament. The results may have been due in part to local issues involved and the comparatively small turn-out, but the result is unmistakable. We must embark upon an entirely new program for Western Germany and speedily adopt measures designed to create conditions under which rearmament can take place.

My general conclusion in this regard is that the problems of German rearmament are broader in scope, and more difficult of solution, than is generally recognized by the American people. They present a serious challenge to our leadership, particularly those officials in the Department of State responsible for advising the President on matters of foreign policy, and in implementing that policy in day-to-day negotiations with other powers. We must have a complete new basis and entirely new program in Germany. Most of the changes needed will come about eventually anyway, but if they are delayed, we shall get no credit with the German people and little cooperation from them. In view of our record to date, in which we have had far more success in achieving the aims of military government and restoring economic health than in getting across our ideas to the German people, I cannot urge too strongly that we press for a speedy reorientation of our existing program in that area.

II. BERLIN

From the 26th to the 28th of November 1950, I was in Berlin, where I had the opportunity of conferring with several officials and observing conditions. Mr. Clark Denney, of the State Department, who is director of the Intelligence Division, Berlin Element, HICOG, gave an excellent report on the political and economic situation. Capt. James T. Babbitt, of the Berlin military post, gave a concise summary of the military situation; and Mr. Herbert Fales, of the State Department, who is in charge of the ECA program for Berlin was most helpful in explaining that program. At the outset, it may be well to state that because of its history and long preeminence among German cities, Berlin possesses an importance in the European picture quite beyond its size and economic importance. The average German regards Bonn as only a temporary capital, and I believe, looks to the restoration of a unified government in Berlin as a symbol of national unity. Ever since General Clay established his headquarters in that city in 1945, and more particularly since the airlift in 1948, the maintenance of our position in Berlin has been regarded as an expression of our determination to aid and support the free peoples of Europe. The conditions now prevailing in that city are summarized below.

(a) Economic: Berlin has not enjoyed the same measure of economic recovery as Western Germany. While business activity in the western zone is now at a level above that prevailing in 1936, the industries of Western Berlin are operating at only about 40 percent of that level. In part, this is due to the much greater destruction which the Russians were permitted to inflict upon that city; in part to the isolation of Berlin after the repudiation of the Potsdam agreement by the Russian government, and the later division of the city into two separate zones. Another major factor was, however, the blockade instituted by the Russians, coincident with the currency reform in July 1948. While Berlin was kept alive through the airlift, business life in the city came almost to a standstill, and has not yet entirely recovered. However, during the past few months there has been a marked upturn in business activity; and if this continues, conditions may be much improved by this summer. Two major obstacles to the economy of Berlin have been the reluctance of buyers, in the western zone and foreign countries, to place orders for goods, where delivery was subject to interruption by the Soviet authorities, and the shortage of credit. Some alleviation of the former condition has been achieved by the provision of an indemnity fund by the Federal Republic—Western German Government.

The work of the ECA in Berlin has been of marked assistance in providing credits, as well as in the alleviation of distress due to unemployment. I cannot praise too highly the work of our officials in charge of the latter program in that city, particularly Mr. Herbert Fales. As an example of constructive economic rehabilitation, I wish to cite the rebuilding of the Siemens-Schukert electrical plant in western Berlin. This factory, formerly one of the largest European manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment, was largely destroyed by Allied bombing, and the Russians removed most of the available machinery in 1945. During my visit to Berlin I went through this plant, which is now being rebuilt, step by step, partly with ECA funds. Many sections of the plant are in operation and others are being added from time to time. This factory, and its affiliated plant, Siemens-Halske, currently employ some 18,000 to 20,000 workers, including a substantial number of war casualties, in productive enterprise. No doubt the current rearmament effort in Western Europe has made it easier for this plant to procure orders, but I was greatly impressed with the spirit, determination, and energy, both of the management and the workers, in rebuilding and restoring the factory.

There is, of course, serious unemployment in Berlin—currently some 20 percent of the available working force. The current improvement in business, mentioned above, has alleviated this to some degree, and some relief has extended through work relief projects, of a WPA type, paid for by the Federal Republic and the ECA. No permanent solution, though, can be expected so long as Berlin is cut off from the western zone, and large numbers of political refugees from behind the iron curtain come into the city.

(b) Military: The military organization in Berlin has been simplified, and our forces strengthened during the past year. In place of three or four separate battalions of different types, we now have an infantry regiment under a unified command, which is responsible for the defense of the United States zone. While this force could not withstand a major Russian offensive, it is, I believe, capable of dealing with anything of less magnitude. The lesson of last May, when the Communist-inspired youth movement threatened to overrun the western portions of the city and was repulsed by the stern and determined opposition of the Allied commanders, particularly Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, was not lost on either side.

The establishment of local German labor service units in Berlin is an interesting development during the last year. These units, composed of young Germans, have been recruited as civilian employees and organized into a paramilitary unit, with the mission of taking over a substantial portion of the guard and security work from our combat troops. In conjunction with the unified military command mentioned above, such a change will greatly enhance the combat efficiency of our forces in that city. These German elements have their

own noncommissioned officers and are equipped with only light weapons—carbines and pistols—for the performance of guard duty. Nevertheless they constitute a valuable auxiliary force, and could serve as a nucleus of a genuine military organization. I watched a group of them training at their barracks, and was much impressed with their high quality and evident spirit.

(c) Political: The political situation in western Berlin has been relatively stable during the past year. While the recent elections in Western Germany showed a trend toward the Socialist Party, which opposes rearmament, the local elections in Berlin did not indicate any such trend. The people of that city have seen too much of the Red Army and suffered too much during and since the war to believe in any easy solutions. They naturally favor the prompt rearmament of Western Germany as the only means by which they can be rescued from their present precarious position and restored to genuine economic health.

III. AUSTRIA

In Austria, which I visited during the period November 29–December 2, 1950, the situation is generally similar to that prevailing in Germany. The country itself is divided into four occupation zones—of which the largest and most productive is the Russian—and Vienna, in which all four powers are represented, constitutes an island in the Russian zone. There is, however, a unified Austrian Government which exercises some powers and authority in all zones. While in Vienna, I had the pleasure of conferring with Federal Chancellor Leopold Figl, leader of the Austrian Government. Chancellor Figl expressed the hope that Austria could continue its recovery, and his interest in a United States of Europe or other federation in which Austria could participate. Relations between the United States Ambassador, Mr. Donrally, and Chancellor Figl appear to be excellent and I believe that our representatives in Austria, both diplomatic and military, are making the best of the situation in which they find themselves. A summary of current conditions, so far as I have observed, follows:

(a) Economic: While much of the war damage has been repaired, Austria is not yet solvent. Her trade with Central Europe, particularly via the Danube River, is cut off by Russian obstruction; and much of the country's resources are exploited by the Russian occupation forces for their own benefit. The Russians have claimed, as reparations, all external assets in Austria, meaning those owned or operated by Germans at any time between 1938 and 1945. These plants and industries are operated by the Russians on an extraterritorial basis, pay no taxes to the Austrian economy, and comply with only such Austrian laws and regulations as suits their convenience. This continued drain on Austrian resources, particularly oil, together with the cost of maintaining the Russian occupation force of over 40,000 troops, constitutes an impossible burden. In an effort to maintain the integrity and solvency of the Austrian Government, the United States has adopted a pay-as-you-go policy for occupation costs, and has made sizable grants to Austria, directly and indirectly, over the past 5 years. This economic aid has prevented the situation from deteriorating further, and has resulted in some reconstruction, particularly in the field of public utilities, railroads, and public buildings, but it has not solved the basic problem. The ECA hoped to render Austria self-supporting by 1952, but I doubt whether, under the conditions outlined above, this can be attained. Only the termination of occupation costs, and some freedom of trade, will permit Austria to recover.

(b) Military: The strength of the United States forces in Austria the past 3 years has been approximately 10,000 officers and men. In addition to the administrative elements, and a considerable number of military police, this comprises a combat force of only one regimental combat team. Against the vastly stronger Russian forces already in Austria, and those which could be speedily deployed there, this garrison could not hold out very long. The degree to which it is feasible, under present conditions, to augment our forces in Austria is a difficult question.

(c) Political: The political situation in Austria remains relatively unchanged from 1949, or even 1948. The Treaty of Peace appears more distant now than it did 2 years ago; and without it there can be no genuine recovery. The United States Information Service and other propaganda media carry on a constant and vigorous campaign in that country in favor of Western ideas and United States policies. How effective this is, in comparison with the counter efforts of the Soviets, I am not in a position to evaluate. However, in my opinion, if given a free choice, Austria would welcome the opportunity to join a federation of West European nations. Meanwhile, we can only maintain our forces in as high state of readiness as possible, and strive to create situations in which a genuine settlement can be achieved. Fortunately or otherwise, the solution of the German problem—one way or the other—will probably carry with it Austria.

IV. GREAT BRITAIN

During the period November 24 to 26, 1950, I visited London. Due to the brief time available, and the fact that it was on a week end, my contacts there were limited to discussions with responsible American officials on the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the progress being made under the mutual defense assistance program. I also had the opportunity, on my return journey from Europe, to stop briefly at Burtonwood Air Base, where our Air Force has a major establishment, and talked with Brigadier General Oliver, the commanding officer of that station.

London serves as the European headquarters for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the regional headquarters for the mutual defense assistance program. These two groups which are in addition to the military attaché offices, have very sizable numbers of our officers engaged on staff planning incident to these activities. The staff organization and procedure impressed me as highly complicated and much too complex for any effective military operations. While there are seemingly innumerable committees engaged on a great number of staff studies and conferences there was at the time of my visit little or no clear-cut means for obtaining any decisions with respect to the issues involved, which simply progressed from one level to another. If this vast and complicated organization is to constitute or organize our defense in Western Europe, the Russians would be very close to the channel before any orders are issued. It may be hoped that General Eisenhower, as supreme commander of the Allied powers in Europe, will be able to bring some order and responsibility into this complex group; but it will require drastic action on his part. The principal achievement to date appears to have been familiarization of the officers of the armed forces of all nations with the attitudes, and procedures of the Allied services and the explorations of the problems involved.

As far as the general attitude of the British is concerned, there was no such sense of urgency in London as one encounters in Washington. The British are interested in rearmament, provided it does not interfere with their export trade, and provided further that a substantial share of the cost is borne by the United States. The British people have, of course, as much right to socialistic government and economy as we have to maintain a democratic capitalistic form of society; and their preference for one instead of the other is in itself no concern of ours. There are though two aspects in which we are concerned. Beginning with the British loan in 1946 and continuing through other credits and ECA funds and now with Military Aid Program, we have pumped over $5,000,000,000 into the British economy. In addition, Britain constitutes our strongest and most valuable ally in Europe. At the present time, under their Socialist direction, that country is unable even to provide sufficient coal to meet its own needs, and there seems to be no incentive for increased effort or output, on the part of either management or labor. I am regretfully forced to the conclusion that, under the present socialist government, Britain is unable to feed and support itself, let alone prepare for a major defense effort.

As far as the United States forces now stationed in Britain are concerned, our Air Force occupies and uses a substantial number of bases, the largest of which is at Burtonwood. The aircraft and crews which we have furnished are of modern types, personnel are rotated after short periods, and the commanders with whom I talked impressed me as vigorous and realistic. Our forces are not, however, I am convinced, receiving from the British Government that degree of assistance and support which should be furnished under a truly mutual-defense effort. I am afraid that the British take the view that we are using their country, in the form of an "unsinkable carrier," as a base from which to carry on our contest with

the Russians, rather than contributing our forces toward the defense of their country. Specifically, provision of radar defenses around Britain has been very slow and is not yet fully satisfactory. Further, there has been no provision adequate for anti-aircraft forces to protect the bases against low- or medium-level attacks, and very few fighter or tactical aircraft to assist in such defense. These are elements of the defense program which should be provided much more readily, and at less cost, by the British than by ourselves. So far as our offensive mission is concerned, I feel that our air forces in Britain are in good shape. From a defensive viewpoint, I am much concerned. I believe that our committee should seek information upon this point at an early date.

V. FRANCE

Due to adverse weather and flying conditions, I was able to spend only 2 days in France. During that time I conferred with our Ambassador, Mr. James Bruce; the special ECA ambassador for Europe, Mr. Milton Katz; and the chief adviser to the ambassador, for the mutual defense assistance program, Mr. Bohlen; and the latter's two principal assistants, Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, who is supervising military aid, and Mr. Trueblood, who is in charge of the augmented military production, or industrial phase of the program. This organization illustrates what is, in my opinion, a major weakness in the MDAP, namely that the adviser to the Ambassador on military problems is not a senior officer of our Armed Forces, experienced in the organization, equipment, and training of military forces, but a State Department official, with little or no background in military matters. The result is, I feel, that in the Military Aid Program, which looks essentially toward strengthening our mutual defenses, our military personnel and advisers have too little effective voice; and decisions are too likely to be made on the basis of political or economic considerations. I do not mean to minimize these latter factors; but the Congress has approved the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, and appropriated vast sums of money to assist the European countries in building up their defenses. I feel that our Ambassadors, in the administration of such a program, should be advised directly by experienced, senior military officers, if we are to obtain results commensurate with the expenditures.

So far as the Mutual Defense Assistance Program in France is concerned, it should be noted that that country has received, and is receiving very large amounts of aid, both in the form of military equipment and in funds for raw materials, and so forth, for additional production. As to the military equipment furnished directly, or what are called "end items," shipments seem to be proceeding at a very satisfactory rate, after some initial delay in getting the program under way. The French have increased their military budget to some extent, and have plans for further increases. However, so far as their expenditures are concerned, it appears that a major portion will go toward the costs of the campaign in Indochina, plus routine operating expenses such as clothing, rations, and so forth, and that the United States is expected to furnish the major portion of the new equipment required for the additional divisions, both in the form of "end items," referred to above, and in grants to France for the production of military equipment in that country. We seem to have undertaken a very large program in this connection, the justification for which is not entirely apparent. The French now appear to look to us to bear the major share of their equipment costs, for reasons with which I am not familiar. The combat value of these divisions is a matter which I am not in a position to determine—even if they are fully organized, equipped and trained; but it must be noted that they will be made up almost entirely of conscripts—with many men drawn from areas and families of Communist sympathies, and particularly in the urban and northern areas of France, and that the north African native populace has become increasingly restive under French rule.

Furthermore, with respect to the equipment, I am unable to see why the United States must continue to bear such a large portion of the cost. France is a rich and productive country—probably the richest in Europe—and the war damage has been largely restored with the aid of ECA loans and grants. That nation was able, for the past 150 years, to raise and equip armies, and I see no reason why it cannot do so at this time. Since 1943 the United States has been called upon, or has assumed the burden of equipping French forces; until now the French seem to demand such aid as the price of their participation in the Mutual Defense Program. It is true that the French face budgetary difficulties, and have heavy expenditures due to the war in Indochina. However, our own budget is badly out of balance, and we face continuing heavy costs in Korea, as well as those due to our own mobilization.

My conclusions from all this are that in our defense planning, we have placed an undue emphasis upon French rearmament, and have assumed a disproportionate share of the cost, as compared to the probable results which will be obtained. Another major weakness in these plans has been the assumption that we had several years in which to build up defenses against Russia. If that were true, we could perhaps afford to commit ourselves to the re-equipping of 15 additional French divisions, over a 3 or 4 year period, and thereafter, possibly institute a small-scale rearmament of the Germans. However, I am convinced that we have no such amount of time, and that our defenses must be in order, long before 1954. To that end, I recommend that the committee scrutinize carefully all estimates of French participation and obtain from the administration a definite report as to the extent to which arms shipments to France are retarding our own rearmament.

VI. ITALY

I was in Rome from the 4th to 7th of December 1950, during which period I conferred with our Ambassador to Italy, Mr. James Dunn, his principal advisor on Mutual Defense Assistance Program matters, Mr. Jacobs, and the latter's chief assistants; also Mr. Leon Dayton, in charge of the ECA mission in Italy, and our senior military attaché, Col. John Harmony. My principal impressions are set forth below.

(a) Economic: With the help of very generous American assistance since the latter part of World War II, Italy has substantially recovered economically. The railroads have been rebuilt, roads and bridges repaired, and the drainage system of the Pontine marshes restored, as well as numerous other projects looking toward the rehabilitation of that country. As a result, I am convinced that Italy is in substantially as good condition, physically, as it was before the war. The chief economic problems of that country are, of course, those resulting from overpopulation and unemployment. I was advised that the ECA program in Italy during the current year was approximately one hundred and seventy to two hundred million dollars.

The director of ECA activities, Mr. Dayton, stated that emphasis was now being placed upon the encouragement of export programs which would have a long-range or permanent market, and readjustment to meet Mutual Defense Assistance Program needs, and supplement United States military production. It was his view that any cessation of United States aid would cause the collapse of the present Italian Government within a period of a year to 18 months.

So far as basic internal reforms in Italy are concerned, there has been very little actual progress. The ECA and the Italian Government have made a start on land reformation, but no large-scale results have been achieved to date. One of the chief obstacles to increased economic activity in Italy is the obsolete tax system, under which most of the burden falls upon production and consumption, and large numbers of wealthy people escape with little or no taxes. I was advised 2 years ago by Mr. Zellerbach, then ECA administrator, that tax reform was high on the program of the Italian Government. Last year, I was told by Mr. Dayton that it was imminent. This year, I am advised that an income tax is expected to commence—if the Italian Parliament approves—some time early in 1951. My own belief is that the Italian Parliament, like some other bodies, finds the overhauling of the tax structure and the imposition of adequate taxes for rearmament to be a burdensome and unpleasant task, which it will delay as long as the United States taxpayer will continue to furnish millions of dollars without return. I think the time has come to have a definite understanding on this matter, and the termination, not later than June 30 of 1951, of economic assistance to Italy.

(b) Military: Under the Treaty of Peace wtih Italy, which was concluded in 1947, the Italian Government is limited to an army of 250,000 men, and a navy and air force of 25,000 each. These numbers are small for a country of the size and population of Italy; but they do

not yet, in my opinion, constitute a severe limitation, because the Italian Government has not thus far been in a position, to raise and equip even that number of troops. As far as the army is concerned the most effective units are the Alpine brigades, recruited in the extreme north of Italy and deployed in that area. There are also in the north of Italy two infantry divisions.

Most of the men in the Italian Army, other than the Alpine brigades mentioned above, are conscripts called up for relatively brief service and paid only a few cents a day. These factors and the shortage of equipment seriously limit the value of Italian troops. There is serious unemployment in Italy, and if conditions of service were made attractive, there is no reason why voluntary personnel in sufficient numbers could not be recruited. However, under present conditions, it would appear that reliance upon Italian troops can be only for the defense of their own country; and I do not believe that they could make any effective contribution to a European army deployed in other areas of the Continent. In addition to the regular army, there are in Italy two or three paramilitary organizations the best known being the Carabinieri, which constitute a state police force in time of peace, and the military police for the Italian Army in time of war. There are also several thousand finance guards, basically organized for the security of the frontiers against smugglers, and so forth, and a large number of security guards under the Ministry of the Interior, to handle local or internal disturbances. The Italian Navy consists of a number of sound but obsolete vessels, none of which is equipped with modern devices such as radar, or sonar. Under the MDAP we are endeavoring to modernize their equipment, at least to the extent that it could be used for coastal defense and anti-submarine control in the Mediterranean.

The Italian Air Force, which was fairly numerous before World War II, was almost completely disrupted following the war. It is now being rebuilt with our aid in the form of aircraft and equipment and should be able to give a reasonably good account of itself. Whether it is feasible for the Italians, with their limited resources, to attempt the manufacture of modern combat aircraft is questionable. They can, however, materially aid in the air defense of Europe with equipment furnished by this country and possibly Britain.

Italy possesses a considerable reserve of unused industrial capacity and labor force which could be utilized for the production of weapons and military supplies not only for its own armed forces but for other Western European nations. This is particularly true in the field of small arms and motor vehicles, both of which the Italians produced in large numbers before World War II. One difficulty in this line has been that of standardization, and the inordinate delay in agreeing upon a design. For example, I was informed that the Italians desired to manufacture the M–1 [Garand] rifle, provided we would furnish the raw materials and certain machine tools. It was stated that such rifles could be produced in Italy at a cost of approximately $20 each instead of approximately $100 each for manufacture here. While this seems attractive, there are several practical difficulties. In the first place, it would require some weeks, if not months, to translate the working drawings from English to metric units, and considerably longer to set up production lines and inspection systems at the factories. There is also the matter of training troops of the quality mentioned above in the use of a weapon more complicated than they are accustomed to handle. In short, I doubt the feasibility of embarking upon such a long-range program at this time. I believe it would be better to utilize existing Italian designs, possibly modified to take American ammunition.

Other examples of proposals for augmenting the military production in Italy might be cited. Some of them may be more feasible than that noted above, especially the matter of light motor vehicles in which the Italians have considerable experience. My general conclusion, though, is that if such production is to be available in time to meet our needs, the emphasis, at least at the present stage, must be upon types and items of proved serviceability, which can be produced in quantity without the necessity of redesigning, retooling, and retraining personnel. If we are permitted enough time, we may subsequently seek to shift over part of the production to more advanced types; but we should not delay the rearmament program in order to do so.

VII. SPAIN

During the period December 10 to 12, inclusive, I was able to visit Spain, where I had the opportunity of talking to several Spanish military leaders, as well as our Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Paul Culbertson, and our military attachés. This was perhaps the most interesting portion of my trip and probably the most encouraging.

The Spanish are a proud and independent people, numbering some 28,000,000, and living, for the most part in a semi-arid land. Their country does not appear to be rich and their standard of living is not high. Nonetheless, they have an army of approximately 400,000 officers and men, plus a small navy and air force. Much of their equipment is of pre-World War II types, left over from their civil war. I found more respect and friendliness for the United States in Spain than in most other countries of Europe; I believe this is because we have not put them on our relief rolls, or promised them large-scale aid.

So far as the economic condition of Spain is concerned, that country suffers from shortages of many essential raw materials, sparse rainfall, and during the past year a serious drought, which has not only reduced the food supply but curtailed hydroelectric power production.

From a military standpoint, however, Spain offers a much more favorable picture. They have several major air bases, well disposed around the country, which could be used as secure bases for the air defense of Europe. Their army of 400,000 is, I believe, well led, and is certainly the largest anti-Communist force in Europe. Their navy, while somewhat obsolete, could be equipped for coastal patrol and antisubmarine duty.

I had an interesting conversation with Lt. Gen. Fernando Barron, Chief, Central General Staff; Major General Barroso, Deputy Chief of the Spanish Central General Staff; and certain other Spanish staff officers during the time I was there, particularly Lt. Col. Gonzales Camino, who was military attaché in Washington from 1944 to 1947. These officers expressed to me a friendliness toward the United States and Spain's willingness to assist, within its means, in strengthening the defenses of Western Europe, as follows: They made it quite clear, that under present conditions they are concerned with the security of their own country. Spanish air bases would be more secure against enemy attack than those which we are now using in Britain, and would, in my opinion, be of major value in case the British bases should be rendered untenable. We would need, of course, to install certain additional equipment and protective equipment, and to expand certain of these fields or bases. We would also need to assist in the modernization and strengthening of the Spanish Army. This, however, can be done at relatively modest cost and with little delay. At the present time they have the facilities for manufacturing additional small arms and ammunition, but lack raw materials. In the event that armored elements were required we should have to furnish them, along with any anti-tank defenses and some artillery. There is no question as to the anti-Communist position of the Spanish Government, nor the political reliability of the troops.

Numerous factors, which have been debated in the Congress over the past 5 years, have until recently prevented normal diplomatic relations with Spain, and prevented us from including that country in the defensive plan for Western Europe. However, the last Congress enacted legislation for certain economic assistance to Spain, and the President has recently appointed an ambassador to that country. I am thoroughly convinced that the defense of Western Europe requires the immediate participation of Spain, and the utilization of strategic air bases in that country. From a military standpoint we cannot afford longer to neglect so valuable a potential ally as Spain. I hope that the exchange of ambassadors between the two countries will be followed, in the near future, by the inclusion of Spain within the defense organization of Western Europe; and I am convinced that by such action we can obtain a much greater return, in military terms, for our expenditures than we are receiving in certain of the countries which I have discussed above.

VIII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

As a result of my recent trip, I reached certain general conclusions set forth below:

First. The economic rehabilitation of France, Italy, Germany, and Britain has largely been accomplished; and, with a few exceptions, the ECA program should be terminated at an early date.

Second. There is less time remaining for rebuilding the defense of Western Europe against Russian imperialism, than we believed a year or 2 years ago.

Third. The defense of Western European nations must be accomplished chiefly by those countries. We can only aid and assist.

Fourth. We must counteract, the unfortunate impression, created in certain European countries, when we superseded the defensive efforts of the Western Union with the larger North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and so forth, that it was primarily the defense of the United States which was involved, rather than the defense of Europe.

Fifth. We must build on strength, and not on weakness, and must find some means of utilizing, in the near future, the military potential of Western Germany and the military strength of Spain.

Sixth. The extent to which the United States should or can undertake to strengthen Western Europe, by means of American troops, must be carefully weighed in the light of our capacities, and our requirements elsewhere. There is nothing to prevent the Russians, if they desire, from creating another Korean situation in Germany, Italy, Austria, or several other places. We cannot achieve a strong military posture by deploying all our troops around a vast perimeter. Our principal concern must be the defense of the United States; and, unless we remain strong, we can neither assist other nations nor protect our own freedom.

AUDIT OF OFFICES OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, DOORKEEPER, SERGEANT AT ARMS, AND FOLDING ROOM

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution to have the Comptroller General audit the records of the Chief Clerk, the Doorkeeper, the Sergeant at Arms, and the folding room, at the beginning of every new Congress.

It is evident from what has happened with shortages in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the stationery room, and the folding room that such action is necessary. Surely we should practice what we preach. We demand this of other agencies of Government and we have not proven that we are immune from such an audit. I would like to call your attention to a resolution that went through this House on December 20, presented by the majority leader, and on which no one asked a question because of their confidence in the leader. This resolution was a very simple one, and I quote:

Resolved, That appropriations under the heading "Contingent expenses of the House, 1951" shall be available for such additional numbers of books, pamphlets, and documents as the Doorkeeper may find necessary to complete allotments to Members.

We were not told that this cost, to make up these missing inventory items, would amount to more than $100,000. Also, this bill did not go before the House Administration Committee having jurisdiction of such matters.

JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS TO HEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the question whether American ground troops are to be sent to Europe and in what numbers is one of the most vital decisions of our day. It is my hope that we, the people's Representatives in Congress, will be given the opportunity to pass upon this matter. I regret that the President would prefer to make this decision himself without giving the people any voice in what course we take. Entirely aside from any constitutional argument whether the President has or has not such authority as Commander in Chief, it seems to me that he should be willing to take the Congress and the people into confidence, rather than simply standing stubbornly on his constitutional rights.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that when Gen. Dwight Eisenhower returns from abroad to report to the President, that he be asked to appear before a joint session of Congress to report to us, and through us to the people we represent. If permitted by the Commander in Chief, I feel certain he would give us a full report on his findings and would make straightforward replies to any questions asked of him.

And there are indeed many questions that need to be answered before we embark upon a program of maintaining an American Army on foreign soil. It is one thing to send a contingent of American troops overseas to protect American citizens and property, and for that purpose alone. It is quite another to send a whole Army abroad to fight for people who may not even have the will, determination, and courage to fight for themselves.

It has been suggested that General Eisenhower simply appear before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I have no objection to that procedure, except that I feel the entire membership of the Congress should have opportunity to ask him questions. There are military, as well as foreign policy questions involved in this program. There are questions that affect the lives of all our people, and all of us should have opportunity to get the facts. The American people are entitled to truth and facts. They are the ones who make the sacrifices.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I do earnestly propose two things: First, that the Congress be given the opportunity to pass upon the question of sending American troops abroad; second, that the Congress as a whole, meeting in an unofficial joint session, be given the opportunity to learn the actual facts from General Eisenhower himself.

A PLAN TO PREVENT WAR PROFITS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I find in my visits home to my district that people are growing alarmed and worried at the possibility that large contractors will make profits out of the present war situation and emergency. I have a very distinguished constituent in my district, Mr. Anthony Cucolo, who was written up in the Reader's Digest as one of the most unforgettable characters. This man came from Italy as a boy and has made his way and is now a successful contractor. He has a plan which to be sure is a little idealistic which would prevent profits being made on war contracts. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this plan be put in the RECORD at this time. I would like to see some of us turn more to idealism and try to make it work. None of us would be here today had it not been for the idealism of our fathers.

The plan to which I refer is as follows:

SUFFERN, N. Y., *September 18, 1950.*

This plan would set up a special Army Constructors Service that would be composed of experienced contractors and construction men. These men would voluntarily join this service and be given a commission within the Army. In turn, the contractor can render service to his country by making his experience available to the Government. Further, he can save the taxpayers money by being allowed to operate any job as he would his own business. Army engineers would draw all plans for such contracts and see that the work is constructed accordingly.

The size of the project given one of these men would determine the rank of the individual. A contract for $1,000,000 or less could be handled by men ranking from captain to colonel. Above a million dollars the rank could be from colonel to a brigadier general. Anyone who joins this Army Constructors Service would receive his present salary if his services are acceptable, his pay and rank not to exceed his top-ranking officer.

Officers who are selected for this special service should be allowed to perform a job close to their home, if possible. This would mean more efficient and economical operation as the contractor already knows the people with whom he must deal and is familiar with the ground rules of the area.

Through this plan, the machinery on a given job would also represent a saving to the Government. Any officer who has machinery would rent it to the Government, if the Government wishes to do so. A market value would be set on the machinery and rental price would be according to the Rental Compilation by Associated Equipment Distributors, or as set by a Government agency. When the total rent paid equaled the value as set on the machinery, the rent would stop, and the machinery would become the property of the Government. At the end of the emergency, the former owner should be given the opportunity to buy back his machinery at a fair percentage of the value set. If he does not wish to purchase it, he

should be given priority to buy new machinery of the same size and type if he so desires.

This plan would contribute the following:

1. It is an honor to wear the uniform of our country. This plan would give the older, more experienced men the chance to render service to his country and be proud that he has done his share along with the younger man at the front.

2. Eliminate the necessity to use influence to get a Government contract.

3. Not let the returning GI feel that while he fought, people back home got rich.

4. Give the Government a group of trained, experienced men to carry out necessary construction at lower cost.

5. Eliminate and save tremendous amount of manpower used to check the present system by checking costs, quantities, renegotiation, etc.

6. Give the Government a pool of on-the-spot equipment to carry on a job in any area.

7. By using the machinery available, it would mean a saving to the Government in purchases of new machinery.

8. Eliminate a surplus of machinery at the end of the emergency which would otherwise be almost a total loss to the Government of the investment.

A uniform makes a citizen proud. Gives him a feeling of responsibility not to waste money and be proud of his ability to serve and save.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INFORMAL MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. I might say that an informal meeting of the House and Senate will take place some time next week. I am glad to advise the Members of the House that after General Eisenhower returns there will be an informal meeting of the House and Senate in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

SERVICEMEN AND VOTING

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of this Congress to see that all servicemen have the right to vote, regardless of age.

As we enter into this defense effort, no one knows exactly where it will all end. No one knows how much armament we are going to build and no one knows how many men will be inducted into our Armed Forces.

One thing everybody is certain of—millions of our young men will eventually find themselves in uniform. It is up to Congress to decide what age groups will be drafted but we are certain many will be under the legal voting age of 21.

If a man is old enough to undergo the hardships and dangers of military life, he is capable of voting. In fact, he is all the more qualified to vote for the very reason of the sacrifice he is making.

Our country's future will be made safe if Congress grants the sacred privilege of voting to our young men in all the services no matter what age they happen to be.

Given the franchise of the ballot, our American fighting men will have a higher degree of patriotism and a realization that they are the policymakers of our country as well as the ones who carry out the policy.

While I am discussing the ballot, I wish to point out how unsatisfactory was the soldier voting in World War II. It was unsatisfactory because it was incomplete. Not enough servicemen voted.

Our duty, then, is not only to extend the vote to all military personnel regardless of age, but also to make it possible, through setting up proper methods of implementing a nearly total voting strength in all branches of the service.

This can be done if we profit by the mistakes made during the last war, the lack of coordination, and the failure on the part of many to take this all-important matter seriously.

Let us hope that Congress will pass my bill quickly to enable all our military forces regardless of age, regardless of rank, regardless of race, color or creed, to vote in National, State, and local elections while they are in service.

MEXICO

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I had an opportunity to spend some time in Mexico and to observe the operations of the American Embassy and of our foreign officers there. In our great neighbor to the south where we need the warmth and friendliness and support of a powerful and influential ally I believe, as the world situation grows more tense, we are going to have the kind of support from Mexico which we will need and which we will welcome for our mutual security and benefit. We have in Ambassador O'Dwyer a man who, through his tact, diplomacy, his friendliness, and I may say through his beautiful wife, has done a great deal to convince the Mexicans that these two friendly North Americans are indeed simpático, and representative of the cordial feelings of their neighbors above the Rio Grande. Bill O'Dwyer is doing a good job, and I am glad to have an opportunity to say so to the Members of this House. He is a good Ambassador. Let him alone. Let him keep on with the good work he is doing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of manpower and agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders previously entered.

THE SUN NEVER SETS ON AMERICAN DEAD

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Friday last, January 19, the House adopted a resolution calling upon United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors in Korea. We all know they and the Russians were aggressors. Was the resolution adopted to breathe life into the dying UN, to keep it alive by a blood transfusion?

Why call upon the UN to tell the Chinese Communists they are aggressors when we, the United States, have Communists on our staff working for us in United Nations? Call on Communists to fight a Communist?

Apparently a Truman asked Congress to tell the Communists who are on the United States payroll in UN to slap the Chinese Communists in Asia on the wrist with a mild reproof.

For years it was Britain's proud boast that the sun never went down on the British flag—meaning that no matter wherever in the world the sun was sinking below the horizon, its last rays fell on the flag of the Empire.

Today the flag of the Empire and its people hide behind the flag of United Nations. Even Old Glory—the Stars and Stripes—the symbol throughout the world of liberty and freedom—is obscured by the flag of United Nations.

If we as a nation continue to follow the Achesons, the one-worlders, the internationalists, the women of America may well say that the setting sun never goes down on the grave of an American boy; that as the morning sun begins to lighten the world, it will never fail to shine on the cross which marks the grave of an American boy who gave his life needlessly, fruitlessly, following the internationalist impractical dream.

Would that the internationalists, whether they sit here in the House, serve in the executive branch of the Government, or loll in their stuffed chairs, in the swank clubs throughout

the world, would hesitate and count the cost because in every land, in every ocean throughout the wide, wide world lies the body of an American young man.

TERMINATING UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to withdraw the United States from the so-called United Nations, which has proved to be the greatest farce and the greatest failure, if not the greatest fraud, in all the history of mankind.

It is out to destroy the Government of the United States and to subordinate us to the domination of foreign elements that do not seem to have enough sense to govern their own countries.

It is trying to destroy our State laws, such as the alien land laws in various States, and to interfere with school laws and marriage laws.

Through its so-called genocide law, it attempts to punish individual citizens of the United States for committing "physical or mental injury" against certain racial elements; and would have those Americans charged with committing such "physical or mental injury," tried in foreign countries if necessary.

If all the American people realized what that means, there would be such a roar of demand for getting out of that Tower of Babel, known as the United Nations, that the Congress could not possibly withstand the pressure.

Not only that, but it proposes to declare wars throughout the world for the American people to fight; yet when the time comes, they expect us to do all the fighting and then pay all the bills.

Look at our boys now dying by the tens of thousands in Korea, as a result of the action of this so-called United Nations, without consulting the Congress of the United States.

Oh, I know the President called it a police action; but it has already cost us more casualties than this country suffered in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War, all combined. Now they want to send our 18-year-old boys to Europe, and possibly to Iran, and other sections of the world, to fight whatever wars this organization may be able to stir up.

It is honeycombed with Communists, and is literally flooding this country with Communist spies. Unless we get out of it, bring our boys home, and restore our Government to the American people, they are going to wreck this Republic and destroy this country physically and economically.

God save America from such a fate.

Resolution terminating United States participating in the activities of the United Nations

Resolved, etc., That (1) membership of the United States in the United Nations shall be held and considered to be terminated, (2) no person may represent the United States on or in any of the organs, agencies, or activities of the United Nations, and (3) no funds appropriated by any law of the United States may be used to share in the expenses of, or otherwise to support, the United Nations or any of its organs, agencies, or activities.

SEC. 2. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed: (1) The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 264, 79th Cong.), and (2) all other laws or parts thereof to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect on the day after the date of its enactment.

NO NECESSITY TO OFFER CITIZENSHIP TO FOREIGN NATIONALS WHO ENLIST IN OUR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that were we to enlist Germans or Japanese in the United States Army, it would be necessary to confer upon them American citizenship. There is no justification for such a statement. Nobody can acquire American citizenship except those who are extended that privilege under the laws enacted by this Congress. There is no reason compelling us to give American citizenship to boys of foreign nationality who want to serve in our Army and eat army chow and wear army uniforms and who might carry part of the load of mutual defense in distant areas of the world. There is no reason why we should not enlist Germans to help carry the load in Europe and Japanese to help carry the load in Asia. In each case their own homes are more directly involved than are ours.

There is no reason why we cannot make an outright trade with individual Germans and individual Japanese agreeing just what they should be paid and what, if any, other advantages they should acquire. There is no more reason why we should include American citizenship in the payment than there is why we should include a Ford car unless we want to include it. I do not propose to sell American citizenship that cheaply. The bill I have introduced, H. R. 1295, expressly provides that service under its terms shall confer no preference toward the acquirement of American citizenship. We do not propose to draft foreign nationals; we propose simply to hold out to them the opportunity of enlistment and say that if they want to serve under stated conditions, "all right," but if they do not like the conditions we offer, they do not have to serve. I do not make preferment for American citizenship one of these conditions. There is absolutely no justification for the statements that we must make citizens out of everyone we employ to do a job—unless the one raising this objection plans himself to support such an amendment to my bill. The bill provides exactly the contrary.

ARMY SEGREGATION POLICIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this week, the famous Thirty-first National Guard Division, better known as the Dixie Division, is being mustered into the Federal Service at Fort Jackson, S. C.

The men who make up the Thirty-first Division are all southerners, and both willing and anxious to defend their country at any cost, as they did in World War II. Most of these men left wives and children to go into the service, and all of them are making personal sacrifices to answer the call of duty.

Now there are rumors that Negroes will be integrated into these southern white units under the shameful order of former Secretary Johnson, still in effect. These men and their families are not only disturbed by these rumors, but they are also indignant. The forcing of Negroes into the units of this white division would virtually destroy the effectiveness of one of the best fighting groups ever assembled.

If we are at war—and there is every indication that we are—the time has come when politics as usual should be recognized for what it is, and abandoned in the interest of our national security. The disgraceful and ill-conceived order abolishing segregation in our Armed Forces should be immediately revoked. It was born of politics, and was opposed publicly before congressional committees by military men of no less stature than Generals Eisenhower and Bradley. There is no doubt but that this order has contributed materially to lowering morale in our armed services, as well as reducing their effectiveness. I believe that our Negroes generally resent the order, and prefer to serve in units of their own race. Gambling with our security for political stakes should immediately cease, and this shameful order should be rescinded.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in, and congratulate him on, his vigorous protest against the mistreatment of the white boys of this country, and especially of the Southern States.

That order wiping out segregation was a Presidential order, and could be, and should be, revoked by the President at once.

Our white boys in the service from the South are being treated like dogs under this crazy order.

I have before me a letter from a group of white boys from Mississippi down in Camp Chaffee, Ark. They say:

> We are being mistreated by a group of Negroes who are in charge of us.

They call that treatment "harsh and atrocious," and appeal to the administration for relief.

When that Presidential order was issued wiping out segregation in the armed

services, I said it was one of the greatest victories that Stalin had won since Yalta. My fears are being borne out; yet, instead of revoking this order, the administration continues to permit the perpetration of these outrages against those patriotic white boys from the South who are called upon to fight the Nation's battles throughout the world.

That order should be revoked at once.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last this House of Representatives adopted a resolution urging the United Nations, now meeting in New York, to brand the Chinese Communists as aggressors in the Korean War.

For a number of reasons, I do not think this action was well taken or proper under the circumstances. It looked to me very much like an attempt to take President Truman off the hook, so to speak, for his impulsive and ill-advised move into Korea.

The President knew, or should have known, that we were unprepared for the kind of ground warfare he started when he sent our forces to combat the North Korean Communists.

The President's own Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, earlier had said that Korea was indefensible, and that it was not included within our defense perimeter in the Far East.

But the rights or wrongs, the advisability or the inadvisability, of the resolution passed by the House last Friday are not germane to the matter I want to discuss at this time.

The subject of interest to me at this moment, is the circumstances under which the resolution was brought up in the House. If it is not, it should be of interest—of real concern—to all of you.

Members of this body were told by the Democratic leadership that no business of importance would be taken up last Friday. In fact, it was indicated that the sole business would be to receive and refer to the proper committee, a bill providing for future renegotiation of war contracts.

In view of the fact that customarily Congress is forced to mark time at the beginning of a session, while legislative committees get new bills ready for the floor, many Members of the House accepted the statement by the Democratic leadership at face value.

Particularly was this true of Republican Members, who had no way of knowing what was in the minds of the Democratic leaders. Although, I should add, they might well have suspected.

Thus it appears, to me at least, that the way was deliberately prepared for an unheralded introduction of the resolution, at a time when most of those who might have opposed it were absent.

That this unprecedented subterfuge was employed deliberately, it seems to me, is indicated by a statement made to the press by President Truman. He told the newsmen that he had been aware of the plan to introduce the resolution in the House.

Let me ask you if this is not plain evidence that the plan for such a resolution was discussed in advance by Democratic leaders and the White House? Was it not planned to bring up the resolution at a time when those who might oppose it had been gotten out of the way?

In view of these things, I was sorry to hear a statement on the floor, by a Republican leader, which appeared to condone this quite unpardonable resort to trickery by the Democratic leadership of the House.

Had there been the slightest chance of doing so, I would have presented my reasons for believing the resolution uncalled for and inadvisable.

Who thinks for an instant that a resolution by the American House of Representatives will sway a single vote, outside of our own delegation, in the United Nations. Those votes will be cast by representatives of sovereign nations. They will be cast strictly in accordance with what those nations consider their own best interests.

And let me add this. If any among you believes that gratitude for past or present economic and military favors, granted by the United States, will bear any weight in the decision as to Chinese Communist aggression, he is much mistaken. The record to date shows that.

No. As I have said, if opportunity had been granted, I would have taken the floor to oppose the resolution passed on Friday. I would have done so, not only for the reasons I have given, but also because I believed then, as I do now.

The resolution was intended solely to create in the minds of the American people, an illusion that Congress stands unanimously in support of the ill-considered and tragically mistaken policies of the Truman administration.

Furthermore, if there had been the ghost of a chance, I would have introduced from the floor a resolution, which I have since offered through the usual channels. A resolution, may I say, which is far more to the point than the one adopted last Friday.

This resolution proposes simply that the House shall go on record as unalterably opposing any change in Chinese representation on the Security Council. It would instruct our United Nations delegates to use any and all honorable means to prevent the seating of Red China. And it would provide that in the event Red China is seated on the Security Council, the United States shall withdraw at once from membership in the United Nations.

It is needless for me to rehearse for you here in detail the manner in which we have been betrayed by those who owe us the greatest debt of gratitude, to say nothing of billions in American money and American goods.

You know how we have been left to fight virtually alone in Korea. You know how the Security Council's failure promptly to brand Red China as the aggressor hamstrung our military forces, by preventing them from bombing strategic targets beyond the Manchurian border. You know how this has cost the lives of thousands of American boys, who otherwise would be living today.

You know how our West European allies have continued to trade with the enemy; how they have supplied Russia and Red China with aircraft jet engines, steel rails, and vast quantities of strategic materials. You know how this helped to guarantee our defeat, and to bring about the awful suffering of our young men in the icy mountains and swamps of Korea.

You know how our West European allies of the North Atlantic Pact have shown thus far small willingness to arm themselves at home against Communist aggression. How they have, in fact, apparently assumed that we shall defend their homes for them, while we still bear the brunt of the war in Asia.

You understand, too, without my telling you, the base venality of those nations which have refused, even to this hour, to admit aggression by North Korean or Chinese Communists, or by Russia through the Korean and Chinese stooge governments.

You know how those nations would reward the Chinese Reds, and through them the Kremlin, with a seat on the Security Council; another seat added to those Russia now controls. Reward them after they have thumbed their noses at the United Nations and all it is supposed to stand for. Reward them for breaking all the laws of God and man.

You know only too well, as I do, that a reward for wrongdoing, in the form of a coveted seat on the Security Council, would destroy the United Nations.

It would destroy the United Nations for all time, as a moral and political force in this troubled world. It would make of the United Nations nothing at all but a political and propaganda arm of Soviet Russian imperialism.

In that event, our position in the United Nations would become untenable. From a practical standpoint, we no longer could afford to remain a party to such an organization. We could not, with honor, retain our United Nations membership.

In view of these things, let me ask you: Are we going to let this program of craven appeasement run its full course? Are we going to lose honor, and the prestige so necessary in dealing with Asiatics, beyond all possibility of recall?

I think you will agree with me that this United States of America, this Nation of free people, must not, cannot, and will not, let such things come to pass.

CONCENTRATION OF INDUSTRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, according to press releases, the Democratic administration has decided

to concentrate industry in several parts of the country instead of dividing it throughout the Nation, giving the industries of your district and my district a chance to manufacture the various needs of our country. We have marvelous and capable workmen at Lowell, Woburn, Watertown, and other cities and towns in the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts as I know you have in your various districts. To concentrate industry in perhaps four places, as I am told has been decided, would, in my opinion, be very dangerous insofar as enemy bombings are concerned. This would completely disrupt the communities where the industries are going to be located, also would disrupt the cities and towns that you represent. I understand also they are going to transplant labor from one community to another. You can imagine the suffering that will be caused by such a move.

I sincerely hope that will not be done.

GRATUITOUS INDEMNITY TO SURVIVORS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 83, Rept. No. 8), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRICE CONTROL AND ROLL-BACK

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be question today in the minds of some about the wisdom of the House in adopting a resolution on Friday last condemning Chinese aggression. I do not think many of us would object to having a roll call on that proposition right now and, in my opinion, there would be no change in the position the House took on last Friday. I consider the House acted with courage and with good judgment.

But I asked for time to talk about something else. To me it appears that the most important thing before us and the Nation right now is the prospect that controls are going to be clamped on runaway prices. It is my earnest hope that without further delay we can stop this frightening thing call inflation and bring order out of the threat of chaos. I think the administration deserves every bit of support it needs in this matter and, for my part, I ask that prices be rolled all the way back to June 25, 1950.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 48)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the thirty-sixth annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 22, 1951.*

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his budget message asked for a total tax increase of at least $16,000,000,000 in order to initiate a pay-as-you-go or balanced budget. If the President's recommendation is adopted, this would mean a 33⅓ percent increase in the Federal tax load. We increased the Federal tax load $8,000,000,000 during the Eighty-first Congress. Now we are asked to add $16,000,000,000 more on top of that. The question facing the Ways and Means Committee as a result of that budget request is the well-known question that Congressman Rich asked almost daily, "Where are we going to get the money?"

The over-all tax problem is "to get the most feathers with the least squawk." Translated into modern language that means "to get the most billions with the least damage to American economy." We face that problem today.

The old saying, "The power to tax is the power to destroy," is both pertinent and true. It is pertinent today because we have already reached the point where destruction has started. What will happen if $16,000,000,000 more taxes are levied?

In the last 33 years we have had two hot wars and a cold war. As a result, our taxes have skyrocketed to unprecedented heights, and our economy now staggers under the load. How much higher can taxes go before our economy collapses?

People have always grumbled about the payment of taxes. When taxes rise too high people do not find it worth while to work hard or to work overtime; in fact, they take time off from work because what they earn above a certain amount is taken in taxes. This condition actually exists in Great Britain today. When taxes are too high production slacks off, a shortage of goods develops, prices rise, and then the Government slaps on price controls, wage controls, and rationing to check or suppress inflation. We have already arrived at that point in our economy. What will happen when we add $16,000,000,000 more to our tax load?

History records that in every instance where a nation has exceeded a tax load of 25 percent of the national income, that nation has had serious economic and financial troubles. Our total tax load today—Federal, State, and local—amounts to 25 percent of our total national income. If we follow the President's budget recommendations our total tax load will be 35 percent of the national income. Dare we place such a heavy tax load upon our people?

Mr. Speaker, before levying heavier taxes, or even before we look for new sources from which to get the additional billions we need to balance the budget, we should give serious consideration to reducing nonessential Federal expenditures. Both the Hoover Commission and Senator BYRD have pointed out where $7,000,000,000 of Federal spending can be lopped off from nonessential Federal expenditures. Senator BYRD in his recent letter to the President offered his complete cooperation in any move to reduce the expenditures of the Government; and in that letter he spelled out in minute detail just where and how the reductions could be made without in any way hampering or hindering the national defense.

Should we not insist that these reductions in the nonessential items of the budget be made before we consider adding additional taxes upon our already overtaxed people? A reduction of $7,000,000,000 in Federal spending would go a long way to make our task of trying to balance the budget less difficult, and at the same time it would be much easier upon the overburdened American taxpayer. We should give the proposed $7,000,000,000 reduction in Federal spending priority over any new or additional taxes in our effort to obtain a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, the four main sources of Federal income, given in the order of the amount of revenue they now produce, are: First, individual income taxes, $22,000,000,000 per year; second, corporation income taxes, $20,000,000,000 per year; third, Federal excise taxes, $8,000,000,000 per year, and fourth, customs and miscellaneous receipts, $2,000,000,000 per year; a total of $52,000,000,000 per year.

Can we increase the revenue received from these four sources without doing too much damage to our economy, and, if so, how much? Is there a better or easier way to get the revenue we need from an already heavily overtaxed people? Are there revenue sources as yet untapped? We must find answers to these questions; and the answers must be the correct ones—otherwise our already tottering American economy will be destroyed.

Tax experts have estimated that if we increase the tax rates of our three main tax sources—personal income taxes, corporation taxes, and excise taxes—we can, temporarily, under the stimulus of a war economy, raise an additional $8,000,000,000. They propose the following increases:

First. Increase individual income surtax rates 2 percent all across the board, and lower the exemption from $600 to $500, thus adding 7,000,000 more people to the tax rolls and bringing in $4,800,000,000 additional.

Second. Increase corporation surtax rates from 47 percent to 50 percent, and raise the over-all ceiling on corporation taxes from 62 percent to 65 percent. This would bring in $1,200,000,000.

Third. Increase present excise taxes and levy new excise taxes to bring in $2,000,000,000 additional.

If these tax increases are passed as temporary war measures only, with a definite understanding that they are only temporary tax increases for the duration of the emergency, these three fields of taxation can be made to produce an additional tax take of $8,000,000,000 without doing too much permanent damage to our economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, President Truman has asked for at least $16,000,000,000 additional in taxes, and we have only pointed out where we might raise $8,000,000,000 additional. From what source or sources not already tapped can we get the other $8,000,000,000 needed? The answer to that question, as I see it, is as follows:

First. Tax the presently untaxed cooperatives, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, and Government corporations, all of which are now competing with taxpaying privately owned businesses. This would bring in $1,000,000,000 additional revenue from sources now escaping taxation. This action, taxing the untaxed, should be taken on a permanent basis, and not as a temporary expedient.

The Revenue Act of 1950 imposed an income tax on the business earnings of educational and charitable institutions—the macaroni factories, race tracks and lease-back deals that were becoming such a scandal. I have introduced in this Congress a new bill, H. R. 240, proposing to tax the business income of the rest of the tax avoiders which are exempt under section 101 of the Internal Code.

I fully realize that taxation of the earnings of cooperative associations has been a moot question before the Congress for several years. But I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, an article just published in the December issue of the Michigan Law Review by Mr. Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury. His opinion as to the tax status of cooperatives, based on a recent independent and impartial investigation, should therefore be given weight by the Eighty-second Congress. Mr. Magill says, and I quote:

> Tax gratuities, or subsidies, in favor of worthwhile social experiments, such as cooperatives, may have been sound and desirable under the low tax rates prevailing during the first two decades of the income tax. They cannot be justified, however, in the political, economic and tax climate of the 1950's.

Second. Reduce nonessential Government spending, as specifically pointed out by Senator BYRD in his recent letter to the President, and thus save $7,000,000,000.

If the President is correct in his estimates, these two items taken together would provide the $8,000,000,000 needed to balance the budget after increasing the three main sources of taxation as previously suggested. If the Congress lacks the courage to reduce the nonessential expenditures to the full extent that Senator BYRD recommends, then there is no alternative but to levy a manufacturers' sales tax in order to pick up the billions needed to balance the budget. It is estimated that a manufacturers' sales tax of 5 percent would raise $7,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, a manufacturers' sales tax is a tax applied on production at the source, a tax that will be added to the cost of production and become a part of the selling price of the goods produced. This tax, in my opinion, should be used only as a last recourse. This tax is a hidden tax and bears heaviest upon the people least able to pay. It is, in effect, an upside down graduated income tax, taking more from the taxpayer in the lower income tax brackets in proportion to income than it takes from the taxpayer in the upper income tax brackets. This is true because the man earning $2,500 to $3,000 a year must spend every penny he earns for food, clothes, and shelter for his family, and thus under a general sales tax he is taxed upon every penny he earns. But the man in the upper tax brackets, $5,000 per year and up, usually does not spend his entire income. He saves some of it and under a general sales tax he is taxed only on that part of his income that he spends.

Mr. Speaker, a manufacturers' sales tax or a general sales tax violates the well-known principle of taxation—tax on the basis of ability to pay. How then can anyone justify such a tax The answer to that question is that it can be justified only if it is applied as a last resort, and if it is used in connection with or alongside a steeply graduated income tax. The justification offered is about as follows:

A graduated income tax touches or affects the man at the bottom of the tax heap not at all, but it gradually presses heavier and heavier upon the taxpayer as he goes up the tax ladder until at the top it takes away 90 percent of his income and leaves him only 10 percent to spend himself. A general sales tax or a manufacturers' sales tax works just the opposite to a graduated income tax. It presses hardest upon the man at the bottom of the tax heap because under it he is taxed upon every penny of his income—because he has to spend it all—while the man at the top of the tax heap is taxed, under a general sales tax, only upon a small part of his income—because he spends only a small part of it.

The only justification for a manufacturers' sales tax, therefore, is the fact that when placed alongside of a graduated income tax it makes what might be called a balanced-tax system. It can be likened to two similar triangles placed together to form a well-balanced rectangle. The graduated income tax triangle when placed alongside the general sales tax triangle forms a well-balanced rectangle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present to the House, in simple language, an understandable thumbnail sketch of our Federal tax system. I have tried to show how the President's budget recommendations can be carried out without too much harm to our economy; and to point out the problems that must be faced and solved if we want to balance the Federal budget and initiate a pay-as-you-go basis for Federal spending. It will take plenty of courage to do the job, but it must be done if this Nation is to survive. The soundness of our fiscal and economic policies is our first line of defense. It is also the point where we are most vulnerable today. It must be strengthened and reestablished upon a solid foundation. Nothing short of a balanced budget will do that. May we have the wisdom and courage to do what must be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. As a matter of fact, what you propose will be absolutely ineffective unless we reduce nonessential and nondefense expenditures?

Mr. MASON. That is correct. I pointed that out. That is the first thing we should do before we tackle this job of finding new taxes and imposing heavier taxes.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. GWINN. Instead of taking this war as an excuse for further socializing us, why should we not make it an excuse for reducing the civilian side of Government within constitutional limitations, fixing constitutional limitations on that side of Government? Then we would not have the question of the timidity and the courage of Congress to contend with. How about that?

Mr. MASON. But it takes courage to do that very thing, and that is approximately the very thing that Senator BYRD has been urging during the last 10 or 15 years that I know of, and we have not had the courage to do it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman mentioned that it would take courage to do certain things in connection with tax legislation. Does not the gentleman think it would be possible to approach the passage of an equitable, fair, tax bill increasing the present heavy taxes without a great deal of courage?

Mr. MASON. I do not. I am afraid that we have not the necessary amount of courage to do the job as we know it ought to be done.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If I may I will ask the gentleman one more question: We all realize that we are going to have a heavy load to raise the amount of revenue that will be necessary in our na-

tional defense. Would not our load be made—I will not say smoother—less difficult and the load not so heavy if first of all before we increased the heavy taxes we stopped all the loopholes there are in existing tax laws? Would not that lighten our load and lessen the heavy burden of increasing the present high taxes? Could we not do it that way with less difficulty than if we do not close the loopholes and stop the leaks?

Mr. MASON. I agree entirely with my chairman, and that is what I have suggested in my statement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. To what extent have we attempted to plug those loopholes?

Mr. MASON. To a very, very small extent. We have not even made a serious attempt to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman's committee considered it very extensively?

Mr. MASON. Not extensively at all; they have considered it and brushed it aside so far. We did, however, in the 1950 tax bill, close up one or two small loopholes on educational and charitable organizations which compete with taxpaying organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Assuming that the program that has been suggested of trying to meet the terrible burden that will confront the people, will there still be a deficiency, and, if so, how much?

Mr. MASON. There will be a deficiency unless we do as Senator BYRD suggests, reduce the expenditures, nonfinancial expenditures by $7,000,000,000; and we are not going to do it, and we all know it, because we have not the courage to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And there is less likelihood of doing it if we take the so-called one-package appropriation bill; is not that right?

Mr. MASON. I will illustrate that this way: I can take an old Ford and get a certain amount of efficiency out of it; I can take a Cadillac, one of the best cars made, and if I am a poor operator, I cannot get very good results out of it either. A poor operator could not get results out of either the one-package bill or a dozen separate bills.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman has emphasized the importance of knowing what the probable expenditures are going to be before legislating on new revenue. Does the gentleman know that the House Committee on Appropriations is not yet formally organized?

Mr. MASON. I did not know that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think we can effectuate quite a considerable saving by limiting the franking privilege of Members of Congress?

Mr. MASON. No, I do not; and I have explained that in a weekly letter to my people. I have said that the Executive Department of the Government is spending each year some $150,000,000 to propagandize our people, while the Congress in toto has not spent a million and a half.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. One million two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MASON. I am just using rough figures.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Whenever we begin to talk about increasing taxes there invariably arises the question that we could make up some of these needed taxes by having a national lottery. What would be the gentleman's reaction to that?

Mr. MASON. I am opposed to lotteries.

ARMED FORCES PROCUREMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion that the staffs of the more than 500 active chambers of commerce in the United States be designated as voluntary area procurement offices for the Armed Forces, thus eliminating so-called 10 percenters and traffic costs, has been advanced to me in a letter I have received from Mr. Edwin MacEwan, executive vice president of the Greater Paterson, N. J., Chamber of Commerce.

It will be recalled that when we debated here in the House the $20,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress there was a discussion of 5 percenters and 10 percenters, and I reported to the House that these men were active in my congressional district. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] reported also that they were active in his congressional district, and there was other comment from the floor of the House.

I believe the proposal advanced by my constituent is one worthy of serious consideration. I am sending copies of Mr. MacEwan's letter to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. William H. Harrison, Director of the National Production Authority, Defense Secretary George Marshall, and Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer.

The letter from Mr. MacEwan is as follows:

GREATER PATERSON
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Paterson, N. J., January 15, 1951.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you again about another phase of the subject of civil and national defense. You and I have always seen eye to eye on the problems involved in activating our civil-defense organization as well as activating the procurement of goods and personnel for national defense. Therefore, I feel free to present to you and to all of the other Members of the Congress, if you desire to make this letter public, a plan making available totally unused resources in this country for the purpose of speeding up, in a most practical way, our national-defense program.

Very shortly the offices of our Armed Forces and all other governmental agencies, including the offices of our Congressmen and Senators, will be besieged by thousands of representatives of industrial plants, each looking for a share of defense production. Many of these men were 5-percenters in this last war but in this war we understand they will become 10-percenters.

Many of these so-called 10-percenters will be completely useless to the industries they represent but nevertheless will take much valuable time from you and other Members of the Congress, and also will unnecessarily take up millions of man-hours from the heads of our governmental departments, whose problems, even without these interruptions, will stagger the imagination of most of us.

Our plan would eliminate much of this, but in addition would provide voluntary area-procurement offices for Armed Forces procurement that would greatly minimize the difficulties while at the same time effectuating the program for defense procurement. We are proposing, therefore, that the active chambers of commerce throughout the country with paid staffs, which number between 500 and 750, be voluntarily drafted to cover specific areas and that these chambers designate a representative from their area to establish and maintain contacts with the various Federal procurement agencies, having available at all times complete facilities surveys, full knowledge of the products that might be manufactured, and other pertinent information referring to all industries in their community. All of this could be done on a purely voluntary basis by chamber of commerce executives, who are skilled both in the science of industry and in public relations.

I am quite sure that most of the chambers of commerce in the United States would immediately respond with all the alacrity at their command to a call of this type from the Department of Defense or by resolution from the Congress or a request from the President.

Many of these chambers have been actively cooperating with the Department of Commerce since its inception of the procurement services represented by the daily information on bids and the weekly service of contracts awarded. Some of us have even gone to the added administration problems and expense of putting men with engineering background into the field to call on industrial firms in the area in order to sell these Department of Commerce services to our industries.

We, in Paterson, through our Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, which covers an area including nine cities and towns, have probably developed this service to a far greater extent than have most chambers, but certainly many of us feel that the United States Department of Commerce, with the cooperation, of course, of the various branches of our armed services, are to be highly commended for making this service available to us and our industries.

Although there are probably nearly 3,000 chambers of commerce in the United States, many are quite inactive and would be unable to serve on the basis which we have suggested; hence I feel that 500 to 750 chambers would be a more reasonable minimum on which to place our estimates. Our larger chambers, for example, could very readily service the communities in which the smaller chambers were located in order to get complete coverage throughout the United States.

In our own case, we might very readily arrange to service approximately 3,000 industries that would make up the area comparable to area 1 of civil defense and comprising Passaic and Bergen Counties. However, I think it would be necessary, if such

a plan were decided upon, to have it approved by the board of directors, but I think all of this could be accomplished in not more than a month's time with the proper leadership.

I understand, from having attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces field economic mobilization course in New York last June, that we will be short a million and a half men and women to man our industries in case of an all-out war. This is another reason for the suggested plan described above.

If you think well of this idea, I should be very happy to work with any governmental departments in calling a preliminary and exploratory meeting of several of the top key chamber executives to discuss the possibilities of utilizing the chamber of commerce manpower to follow the lines which I have suggested above.

I think we could eliminate the need for using thousands of unnecessary "10 percenters," thereby reducing the cost to the manufacturers and our Government, greatly reduce traffic congestion on railroads and planes to and from Washington, and to procurement offices in all parts of the country, reduce hotel congestion in Washington, permit the staffs of our Armed Forces and governmental agencies to materially increase their value without increasing their staffs beyond a minimum, thereby making more people available for the actual work on national defense production.

We respectfully submit this suggestion for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN J. MACEWAN,
Executive Vice President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by a former colleague, Bruce Barton.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain petitions and other matter.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made on Friday and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include an editorial and in the other to include some other matter.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article written by a prominent Democrat from Akron.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject, The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Should Be Abandoned, and include an address, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $191.34.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Mobile Register, Mobile, Ala.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the National Republican Bulletin.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the London Economist.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Cincinnati Enquirer by its Washington Representative, Mr. Glenn Thompson.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the United States News.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution by an organization in Greenwood, S. C.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at the conclusion of the 1-minute speech made by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. RABAUT, for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

101. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, in the amount of $50,000, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

102. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations of the Administration for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

103. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft and sectional analysis of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations made under the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847; 16 U. S. C., sec. 471; 43 U. S. C., sec. 141), for the period from January 1 through December 31, 1950; to the Committee on Public Lands.

105. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a letter recommending legislation similar to House bill 7827, Eighty-first Congress, entitled "A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of an amendment recommending amendment of sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, entitled "A bill to amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit attempts to commit the offenses therein proscribed"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

107. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter reporting the settlement of the claim of the Port Ashton Packing Co., of Seattle, Wash., as owner of the fishing-tender type vessel *Decorah*, for damage sustained as the result of collision with the Coast Guard cutter *White Holly* in Georgia Strait, British Columbia, on or about August 27, 1949, the amount of payment being $3,333.07, pursuant to Public Law 207, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

108. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a letter recommending passage of legislation to increase the existing limitations on the amount of funds which may be expended for the purpose of providing facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws, where no other suitable facilities exist (a bill, H. R. 9854, 81st Cong., was introduced to effectuate this recommendation, and a bill, S. 24, has been introduced in the 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 83. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1726. A bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 87. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1724, a bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 88. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1726, a bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; thout amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resclutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1862. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1863. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1864. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1865. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1866. A bill to authorize the remodeling and extension of the existing main post-office building and to construct a new post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1867. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1868. A bill to amend Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, cited as the Agricult ral Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1869. A bill to provide a correctional system for juvenile delinquents proceeded against in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1870. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the bald eagle," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1871. A bill to provide additional time for presenting certain tort claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Piedmont district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1873. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Montavilla district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1874. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Rose City Park district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1875. A bill to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income-tax treatment of sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1876. A bill relating to the prevention of unreasonable and unconscionable speculation and profiteering in coffee, and relating to stabilization of the price of coffee to consumers at a reasonable level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1877. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 1878. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1879. A bill to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1880. A bill to amend section 1404 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the transfer of certain civil actions from one district to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1881. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1882. A bill to grant certain educational, loan, employment, and other benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1883. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1884. A bill to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of a list of all persons who died at any time after May 26, 1941, and before December 31, 1946, while serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1885. A bill to exempt admissions to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1886. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1887. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1888. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1889. A bill to give all persons serving in our Armed Forces the right to vote, regardless of age; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1890. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Coordination in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1891. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1892. A bill to reclassify postmasters, assistant postmasters, and other positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1893. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1894. A bill to assist members of the Armed Forces on furlough or leave to visit their homes by providing transportation and meals on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 1895. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1896. A bill to authorize the shipment of grade A milk into the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1897. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with joint district No. 5, towns of Almon, Barthelme, Morris, and Seneca, and the village of Bowler, Shawano County, Wis., for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of public-school buildings at Bowler, Wis., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 1898. A bill authorizing an annual appropriation to enable the Secretary of Commerce to compile and make available information and statistical data relating to travel within the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1899. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1900. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1901. A bill to provide for the disposal of the Nevius tract at public sale; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1902. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1903. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 1904. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1905. A bill to amend Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to Portland, Oreg., of certain property to be maintained by such city as an air-raid shelter during emergencies with the need therefore, and for other public and municipal purposes at all other times; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution terminating United States participation in the activities

of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 84. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the granting of a seat in the Security Council of the United Nations to the Chinese Communist regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing a biennial audit, by the office of the Comptroller General, of the offices of the Chief Clerk, the Doorkeeper, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Postmaster of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows::

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1906. A bill to exempt from customs duty the cembalo of Reed College, Portland, Oreg., and to provide for the refund of customs duty previously paid thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Giovani W. Bevilaqua and Elio Maraldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Christina Karamanos Demas and Antonia Karamanos Demas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Henry Kolish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Chikako Shishikura Kawata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aujero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Emilia Barpi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catalina Apacible Limjap and her three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Eliot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Dewey J. Crites, Jack Mayta, and James Willette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosara Cusimano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Max C. Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1923. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1924. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1925. A bill for the relief of Efstathios Papavasilopoulos (Eustace Papavas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1926. A bill for the relief of Oswald A. Dritsas-Minieris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1928. A bill for the relief of Margareta (Margaret) Klapp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Dr. Clearhos Logothetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Carannante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Orange Henrique Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1932. A bill for the relief of Cheng-Fu Wang and Funghin Liu Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

17. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Resolution of Fred Needham Post, No. 2669, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Port Orchard, Wash., regarding all-out mobilization and severance of diplomatic relations with Russia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

18. Also, resolution of the Washington State House of Representatives, commending the good citizenship of the colored people of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, all the ways of our need lead to Thee; Thou art our light and our salvation, our refuge and our strength. In this moment as we pause before Thee may these attributes stand out in bold relief. Inspire us to rise above our baser selves, with our crowded and cramped conceptions, to the place where lifted sights open to us the vaster horizons of our real place in the sun. In comprehending our own worth in Thy sight we take up the tasks of this new day. Give to us a vision of the far-off years as they may be if we, as sons of God, choose the path of righteousness for those who entrust to us the destiny of their tomorrows. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 22, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Jenner	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Flanders	McClellan	Welker
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Magnuson	Young
Green	Malone	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on January 16, 1951, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 8), as modified, submitted by Mr. WHERRY on January 8, 1951.

The resolution, as modified, is as follows:

That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are authorized and directed to meet jointly to consider and report recommendations on whether or not the Senate should declare it to be the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect

thereto by the Congress. Such report, which shall be approved by a majority of the combined membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, shall be limited to the subject matter of this resolution, shall not contain any recommendation on any matter which is not germane thereto or which is in substantial contravention thereof or any recommendation either approving or disapproving the assignment of ground forces of the United States to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty, and shall be made on or before February 2, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under unanimous-consent agreement, the time from now until 2 o'clock is equally divided, to be controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The Chair cannot recognize other Senators during that 2-hour period, unless one of the two Senators named yields.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and all amendments or substitutes proposed be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas that Senate Resolution 8 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a joint committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is that in order prior to the vote at 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A unanimous-consent request is in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas a question. Of course, that suggestion complies with one of the main provisions in the modified resolution, for which I am thankful, if the Senate will agree to it.

There are one or two more things that are necessary. If the Senator would agree to them, I think we could come to a complete agreement on the resolution. All that is left is the proposal that the resolution, in substance, be reported back within a 10-day period. I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the Senator, but if the Senator would agree to that, that would represent the modified resolution. That provision is in the resolution as modified, and if the Senator would agree to it, the resolution could be adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot agree to any requirement that it be reported back within a certain time. That should be left to the wisdom and judgment of the two committees, with the overriding authority of the Senate to discharge the committee at any time and again bring the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator once again: Is there any time the Senator would suggest within which he would bring back the resolution, which the committees will have the complete right to amend, so long as they do not destroy the subject matter? Would the Senator agree to any time when the resolution should be reported by the committee, regardless of what the Senator may do by way of bringing out a committee resolution of his own?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that whenever measures are referred to committees the Senate does not usually prescribe when they shall be reported, and so forth. I will say that we have no disposition to vary, we have no disposition to sidetrack the resolution. I do not want to tie the two committees by entering into any stipulation under which we cannot give the resolution full and complete consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator do one more thing? If he would do that one more thing, I think there could be complete agreement. Would the Senator include in his unanimous-consent request that pending the time the committees considered the resolution or any amendments thereto, no commitment be made until Congress determines the policy?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot speak for the President.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator speak as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will speak about that——

Mr. WHERRY. I mean would the Senator give that assurance as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot give it. I have no authority to give it. I cannot give that assurance.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request that the resolution be referred to the Joint Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations. That is perfectly agreeable to me. That is one of the important features of the resolution which has been submitted. I feel it would be helpful if the Senator would take the extra step now, which is not a very big step, and agree that the resolution be reported within a reasonable time. I will put it this way: Will the Senator agree that within a reasonable time, a fair time—and I think 10 days is ample time—the resolution be reported to the Senate with any amendments thereto which are germane? Certainly no one is going to object to that. If the Senator will agree to that, it will eliminate a vote, we will have a united front here, and it will be a great step forward in accomplishing one thing, which is that the President should not commit the United States Senate or the House to a policy until the Congress makes the determination of the policy. When the resolution is reported by the Senator from Texas—and I think 10 days should afford plenty of time within which to report it—then the Senate can proceed to debate it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have given the Senator from Nebraska assurances that, so far as I am concerned, the two committees, acting jointly, will have no disposition to sidetrack his resolution, to postpone it, or to take up any more time on it than necessary, but I am not going to agree that the joint committee, if it may be called such, has got to report it at a certain hour, and a certain minute, and a certain day. That is up to the committee and the Senate. If the action of the committee does not suit the Senator, he can make a motion to discharge the committee.

The Senator from Nebraska refers to taking "one more step." I have come up to the precipice on his resolution, and one more step will engulf me. So I ask action on the unanimous-consent request as I have put it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services acting as a joint committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already yielded.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder if the Senator would include in the unanimous-consent request that any other resolutions which may be offered involving the same subject matter be similarly referred during the pendency of the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President, I do not think it wise to encumber the resolution with other resolutions. Other resolutions which may be offered will be referred by the Chair to the appropriate committees. Some resolutions might be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, others to the Committee on Armed Services. We have plenty to do in attending to this particular resolution, without it being encumbered by all sorts of resolutions which might be submitted by other Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Texas will simply give me an assurance that within a reasonable time, not necessarily 10 days——

Mr. CONNALLY. Who is going to furnish the definition of "reasonable time"?

Mr. WHERRY. I suggested to the Senator what a reasonable time would be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will furnish assurance that within a reasonable time the resolution as it is in substance will be reported to the Senate, I will agree to the Senator's request. I think it would be an excellent thing to have that done.

Mr. CONNALLY. I told the Senator from Nebraska that we were not going to sidetrack his resolution; that we were going to act upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. Within a reasonable time?

Mr. CONNALLY. But we withhold any limitation as to the particular time. If the Senator wants the two committees to report it in a reasonable time I cannot give any more assurance.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Senator say about returning the resolution with amendments which are germane to it?

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator mean by "returning" it?

Mr. WHERRY. That when the resolution comes back to the Senate it will be in substance as it is with amendments which may be germane to it. The Senator surely would not object to giving such assurance, would he? Such a provision is contained in all unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to tie up the committees to that provision. I am sure such action will be taken, but I cannot give any guaranty in that respect. I cannot enter into any such agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator give definite assurance that within a reasonable time the resolution will come back to the Senate, and that whatever amendments thereto are agreed to will be germane to the subject matter? If the Senator gives such assurance, I shall be glad to go along with the unanimous-consent request. I would have full faith in the distinguished Senator that that will be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going to make any promise of that kind for the two committees, because I have not consulted them about it. I have tried to be fair with the Senator from Nebraska. All he wants me to do is to swallow his resolution. I have already swallowed it and got indigestion. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I ask for action on the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask to modify the unanimous-consent request in one respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska cannot modify a unanimous-consent request made by another Senator. The Senator who made the request alone can modify it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest a modification, if the Senator from Texas will yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, I will yield, of course, but it eats up my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Charge it all to my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be fair to split the time during this colloquy between the two sides, which will be done, if that is agreeable.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator from Texas to modify his request. I do not care how the resolution is amended, whether favorably or unfavorably. What I wish is that the resolution as it is in substance, be brought to the Senate with amendments which are germane to it, if such amendments shall be proposed. I think such a provision is carried in the request, but I should like to have that one assurance from the Senator, and I shall agree to the request.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot give that assurance because the committees may decide to kill the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. If they want to report it unfavorably, that is all right. I cannot complain about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot yield further. I have tried to be fair to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is referred to the Committee on Foreign——

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, Mr. President, that is to be done at the time the vote is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the resolution could be referred without waiting until 2 o'clock to take a vote. If it is disposed of prior to that time by unanimous consent, the Senate would save that much time between now and 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will tell the Chair what I am going to do. Under the assurance given by the Senator from Texas that the resolution will come back in the form it goes to the committees, plus amendments which are germane, I will accept the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not say that.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator cannot hear, let him turn the other ear around. I said that the committees would consider and report the resolution. But I did not say they would report it back in the form suggested by the Senator, or with any other conditions tied to it.

I specifically said——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to get this matter cleared up. As I understand, the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished Senator from Texas is that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska be referred to the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations, without any strings whatever attached, and there is no commitment that the two committees will follow the directive contained in the resolution and bring in definite recommendations, save with regard to the resolution itself. I understand that there are no strings attached to the reference of the resolution to the two committees and their acceptance of consideration of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator's understanding is very good.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Texas, if the Chair may answer the question, simply is that the resolution be referred to the two committees, acting as a joint committee.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The action now taken automatically nullifies the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to debate and voting at 2 o'clock on the resolution.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, following the reference to committee of the Wherry resolution, a portion of an address which I delivered on January 15 before the Ohio Society of New York.

There being no objection, the portion of the address referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST PASS ON AN AGREEMENT TO SEND TROOPS

The people of this country face today a constitutional crisis affecting the whole basis of government in the United States and the liberty of the people themselves. The effect of the President's claim that he can agree with foreign nations to commit American soldiers to an international force in any number and any place in the world without congressional authority is to eliminate Congress and the people themselves for all practical purposes from any part in the decision of foreign policies and the making of war and peace.

Congress has largely brought this crisis on itself by failing to assert any determined opposition to or criticism of any of the policies proposed during the past 20 years. In some cases, I think, a majority of Congress and of the people have been opposed to those policies, but when the President has made commitments, many in Congress who disagreed have voted to go along because they do not like to repudiate promises made by the President to others, because they do not like to oppose the power of those internationalist editors, columnists, commentators, and writers who have formed a close party line to support every proposal made by the State Department and smear all opponents and critics.

But in the past the Executive, even when he himself has made a complete commitment, has usually submitted the matter to Congress for approval, as in the case of the United Nations Charter and the Atlantic Pact. Now the President is asserting the right to make an agreement with foreign nations involving the gravest questions of policy which he says he will make regardless of what Congress thinks, and he defies Congress to attempt to take any action to prevent him.

This proposal to enter into an agreement to commit American troops to an international army is a completely new proposition and a departure from past policy. It is now admitted that the Atlantic Pact, while it may have committed us to provide arms for the other Atlantic Pact nations, did not in any way commit us to send troops to Europe. In his testimony upon the Atlantic Pact, Secretary Acheson was asked this question:

"Are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?

"Secretary ACHESON. The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No'."

On the floor of the Senate, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. CONNALLY, said:

"We are simply undertaking to modernize their existing armies which they themselves raise by aiding them in obtaining equipment, munitions, and supplies. But we are not sending a single soldier to any of those countries for combat purposes, nor are we insisting that they increase the size of their armed forces."

What is now proposed, therefore, is something new and changes the whole nature of our obligation. Of course the President today has power to send a few more divisions to Western Germany to increase the occupation force. But at the moment he hasn't got any divisions to send, and they are certainly not required today for any legitimate purpose of occupation—in fact, the present army is a heavy burden on the German people.

I believe that we should increase our land army regardless of European commitments to 1,250,000 at once, and so I have no difference with what the army is doing today in

building divisions as fast as we have the facilities and the equipment.

The question at the moment is whether the President can agree to bind the United States to send American divisions in any number he fixes to join in the defense of Western Europe and, of course, to engage in any action which may be taken by an international army. Furthermore, the President is proposing to commit a certain number of American divisions to the command of an international commander selected not by him as Commander in Chief of the American Army, but by a group of nations. At the moment they may choose General Eisenhower. Tomorrow they may choose a British or French commanding general. The undertaking proposed is far greater than that proposed under the United Nations Charter and much more likely to produce war. It is beyond anything contemplated by the Atlantic Pact.

In the case of the United Nations Charter we approved a somewhat similar obligation to commit American troops to an international command, but the power was carefully hedged about by Congress. Section 6 of the Implementation Act provided for the negotiation of a special agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations providing for the numbers and types of Armed Forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance to be made available to the Security Council; and it was provided that nothing in the act should be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purposes Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

With regard to the Atlantic Pact, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate said in no uncertain terms in its report:

"The treaty in no way affects the basic division of authority between the President and the Congress as defined in the Constitution. In no way does it alter the constitutional relationship between them. In particular, it does not increase, decrease, or change the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or impair the full authority of Congress to declare war."

The committee recognized that this express provision in article 11 of the treaty for the carrying out of its provisions in accordance with constitutional processes might somewhat delay the operation of the pact, and they denounced that argument:

"It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional processes of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency."

The committee recognized that the carrying out of such a treaty, even to the extent of providing arms, presents a threat of dictatorship and that no such commitment of arms aid should be made, except by the entire people through their elected representatives. How much more is this true when American boys are to be sent to Europe.

I have been shocked by the speed with which blind partisans of the Administration have rushed to the defense of the proposition that the President can make war and warlike commitments. Senator CONNALLY on the floor of the Senate makes the extraordinary assertion that "The scope of the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to send the Armed Forces to any place required by the security interests of the United States has often been questioned, but never denied by authoritative opinion." He simply makes a misstatement when he quotes my father as having expressed the view that the President had the right to send the Armed Forces to any place where, in his judgment, their presence would contribute to American security.

As soon as I made my speech, the New York Times rushed out to get Professor Commager to throw together in a day or two a superficial article published in its last Sunday Magazine in which he asserts that the President has the right to start a war whenever he sees fit to do so. Time magazine makes the off-hand statement that history books have listed more than 130 cases where United States Presidents sent United States troops into armed action "to defend the national interest."

What is most revealing in this development is that there seem to be so many responsible people in this country who follow the party line of the State Department in foreign policy with complete blindness as to where it may lead, in spite of the fact that it has led us a long way toward disaster today; and in so doing blithely dismiss all interest in the maintenance of popular government under the Constitution. They are obviously afraid of popular government, thinking the people are too dumb to understand foreign policy, and might oppose policies which seem to lead to war.

Of course the claims made for unlimited power to commit troops are based on the most superficial arguments. If they are sound the provision in the Constitution that only Congress can raise and support armies and declare war is null and void, for in this case there is not the slightest claim that Congress has authorized the President to do what he is proposing to do.

In looking at the precedents, the first obvious distinction is that between the right of the President to do something, and his power. In some cases Presidents have exercised the power when they had no right to do so, as did President Truman himself in the case of Korea. My father pointed out that the President obviously has power to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. He refers to the beginning of the Mexican War by President Polk. But regardless of the President's power, if he has no right, Congress is entitled to take every legal step to defeat the President's purpose.

In the second place, Professor Commager and others completely confuse the right of the President as Commander in Chief to run a war after it has begun and his right to make agreements with other nations as to peacetime furnishing of troops, and as to how he will run a war if it occurs. These are matters clearly in the nature of treaties and just as solemnly important. Of course Congress should not attempt, as it has at times, actually to participate in the conduct of a war, but until war is declared its right to restrain warlike actions is fully justified.

I have pointed out that the sending of troops to support the United Nations, as in Korea, was absolutely prohibited by law until Congress acted and that the President's action there was completely unauthorized. It has been incorrectly asserted, both by Time and by Professor Commager, that President McKinley sent United States soldiers into China to help quell the Boxer Rebellion. Of course, he did no such thing. He sent troops into China together with other national forces to rescue the legations in Pekin, who were threatened with extermination by the Boxers. They marched to Pekin, exacted indemnity from the legal government and they marched out again. The landing of troops in various parts of South America was always undertaken for the purpose of protecting American citizens and American property. Time cites the action of President Jefferson in sending a naval expedition to war with the Barbary pirates. In this case again, the pirates in violation of international law were attacking American ships, and the American Navy was sent after them to defend American property. With complete inaccuracy, Time says that in 1912 President Taft established an American protectorate over Nicaragua with the marines in charge. This protectorate was established under President Wilson. President Taft landed marines to protect American property threatened by insurrectionists against the established and recognized government.

As I have pointed out, there are cases like President Polk's attack on Mexico, which was wholly unauthorized and was simply a usurpation of authority by the President.

Professor Commager points out that the general power of the President to execute the laws also extends to the execution of treaties. But certainly the act of the President must be one authorized by the treaty as approved by the Senate. I cannot see why a treaty should change the distribution of powers between the President and Congress with regard to the performance of acts allotted to them respectively by the Constitution, unless there is at least an implied transfer of power from Congress to the President. There was no such transfer; in fact it is expressly denied by the Atlantic Pact. Professor Commager entirely ignores the express provisions of the law relating to the implementation of the United Nations Charter, and he ignores the express provision of the Atlantic Pact that it can only be carried out through the constitutional processes of the nation involved, the meaning of which was made clear by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the report to which I have referred.

Whatever the right of the President may be, it seems to me clear that under the Constitution it cannot extend to the deliberate making of aggressive war, and it cannot extend to the commitment of troops to an international command, or to a binding commitment as to when, how, and where we will fight a future war, unless we are prepared to set up a dictator in the United States. The basic liberties of the people of this country are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies which involve the very life and being of the American people.

The danger has been made crystal clear by the results of the abuse of the powers of the President in recent years, by the unauthorized agreements made at Yalta which set up Soviet Russia in a position where it dominates Europe and Asia today, by the beginning of a war in Korea presenting one of the most disastrous defeats in the history of the United States. Congress must reassert its constitutional rights to pass upon fundamental principles of foreign policy, or wholly fail in its obligation to the people whom it represents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered, Senate Resolution 43 is the unfinished business. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report it within 1 week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL FISH HATCHERIES AND REARING PONDS IN GREAT LAKES AREA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional fish hatcheries and rearing ponds in the Great Lakes area (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS EXECUTED, BY NEGOTIATION, FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by the Coast Guard for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the period July 1, through December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Panama Railroad Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

COMPACT ENTERED INTO BY STATES OF NEW MEXICO, TEXAS, AND OKLAHOMA REGARDING USE OF WATERS OF CANADIAN RIVER BASIN

A letter from the representatives of the United States in the Canadian River compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of the compact entered into by the States of New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma, setting forth the rights and obligations of those States in the use of the waters of the Canadian River Basin (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INTERSTATE CIVIL DEFENSE COMPACT RATIFIED BY GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

A letter from the Governor of Massachusetts, transmitting a copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into and ratified by him on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from Clara McDonald, president, United Patriotic People, United States of America, formerly Peoples' Lobby of California, and a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Peoples' Lobby of California, both of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the withdrawal of troops from Korea, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas our sons and daughters are fighting in Korea; and

"Whereas it is desirable to strengthen our defense program; and

"Whereas one Paul Robeson has publicly declared it to be his opinion that colored citizens would not fight against Russia in the event of war; and

"Whereas the colored citizens of our State are loyal to the United States and the State of Washington and are now fighting side by side with other citizens of our State in Korea and elsewhere: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house*, That we hereby commend all citizens of the State now engaged in the defense of the country and declare that the utterances of said Paul Robeson do not reflect the attitude of the colored people of the State of Washington; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Washington from the State of Washington and the Attorney General of the United States."

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 19, authorizing the temporary employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I submit a report (No. 34) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. The resolution calls for the expenditure of money. It will take no time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that under the rule the resolution must be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Under those circumstances the Chair refers the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS IN UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committe on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 39, extending the authority for a study of health insurance plans in the United States, and I submit a report (No. 33) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to employ temporary additional personnel and increase the limit of expenditures, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1951, and ending on January 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 206, Eighty-first Congress, second session, agreed to February 1, 1950, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Polly Anne Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 627. A bill for the relief of W. L. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert T. Wieland and minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 629. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes;

S. 630. A bill to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

S. 631. A bill for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Mauerer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 632. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, providing for treble-damage actions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 633. A bill relating to the compensation of employees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 634. A bill for the relief of Stela S. Ransier; and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Hans Lenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 636. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

S. 637. A bill for the relief of Takeo Osawa;

S. 638. A bill to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Southern Division, shall sit at Tacoma and one other site in the southwest portion of Washington as shall be decided by the judges of the district court;

S. 639. A bill for the relief of Motoi Kano;

S. 640. A bill for the relief of Isamu Furuta;

S. 641. A bill for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.;

S. 642. A bill for the relief of John W. Smith; and

S. 643. A bill for the relief of the Inland Petroleum Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 644. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages

for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, to extend coverage to architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians;

S. 645. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; and

S. 646. A bill to amend Public Law No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 647. A bill to provide that certain vessels shall be subject to the laws relating to steam vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 649. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 650. A bill to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year-level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance; and

S. 651. A bill to revise the requirement for award of additional compensation to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 654. A bill to authorize the payment of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service; to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 655. A bill for the relief of Lucia Mangapit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. CARLSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 656. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 657. A bill to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 658. A bill to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—BROADCAST BY SENATOR TAFT AND SENATOR BENTON

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast on January 21, 1951, on the subject A Foreign Policy—What's the Answer? on the American Forum of the Air, participated in by Senator TAFT and Senator BENTON, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Radio Net Airs China Propaganda," published in the New York Times of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF SMALL BUSINESS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Small Business To Do Its Share," written by him and published in the Daily News Record of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

GET FORCES OUT OF KOREA—ADDRESS BY JOHN COWLES

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, advocating withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea and the helping of Japan to rearm, delivered by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PHILLIPS PETROLEUM NATURAL GAS RATE CASE—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence and an editorial regarding the Phillips Petroleum natural gas rate case, which appear in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION TO UNITED STATES-KOREAN WAR—ARTICLE FROM BENSON COUNTY (N. DAK.) COURIER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Many Here Opposed to United States-Korean War," published in the Benson County (N. Dak.) Courier of January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NEW CONGRESS SITS—EDITORIAL FROM BISMARCK (N. DAK.) LEADER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Congress Sits," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of January 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GOOD FAITH SALES RULE—ARTICLE BY HAROLD FLEMING

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "'Good Faith' Sales Rule by Court Held Weighty," written by Harold Fleming and published in the January 15, 1951, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DRAFT OF YOUTHS—ARTICLE BY ROGER W. BABSON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mothers and Youths Unduly Frightened About War Outlook," written by Roger W. Babson and published in the Washington Evening Star and other afternoon papers of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

McMAHON'S PLAN TO EXPRESS AMITY TOWARD RUSSIANS HAILED—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "McMAHON'S Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed," written by David Lawrence in his column Today in Washington and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DRAFT OF 18-YEAR-OLD YOUTHS—LETTER FROM FREDERIC B. TERRY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Frederic B. Terry, of Waynesboro, Pa., having reference to the proposal to draft youths of 18 years, which appears in the Appendix.]

RED CHINA AN AGGRESSOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the aggression of Red China, published in the Pittsburgh Press, January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FAREWELL OF SCOTT LUCAS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the last day of the Eighty-first Congress Senator Scott Lucas made a farewell speech to his colleagues in the United States Senate. His address, which was free of all bitterness or political implications, was a moving plea for national unity in this time of crisis. It was one of the most patriotic and convincing addresses on this vital and compelling subject which I have heard. It has received wide and highly favorable comment in the press of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal dated January 3, 1951, entitled "The Farewell of Scott Lucas."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAREWELL OF SCOTT LUCAS

It was said around the Capitol in Washington this week that Scott Lucas, of Illinois, saved his greatest speech for a farewell from the United States Senate.

It was a plea for national unity in this time of crisis. It was so moving that the senatorial Members of the Eighty-first Congress, convened for the last time, rose in spontaneous ovation to their retiring majority floor leader.

There was no hint of bitterness at his defeat in November, no mourning about his departure from Congress after 16 years. There was no criticism of those before him, Democrats or Republicans, who had made his 2 years as majority leader such difficult ones. This was but the voice of a patriotic American, well informed of the dangers that beset his Nation and fearful of the future, calling for all citizens, and particularly those in positions of leadership, to join hands in the common cause. Here are the most pertinent phrases:

"We are passing through the most extraordinary and dangerous days since the birth of this Republic. * * * The things that have made this country the envy of the world, our cherished institutions, our respect for the dignity of the human being, our high standard of living, are in mortal danger of

destruction. * * * We can destroy all of the things that made America great if we continue to quarrel among ourselves.

"The time for idle chatter is over. * * * The hour has passed when men in high positions, for the sake of some political advantage, can, without jeopardizing their country's safety, fire the imagination of the emotional and the uninformed with reckless and irresponsible charges.

"Will it be necessary for the Kremlin to drop a bomb on Washington before we obtain the unity that we ought to have in this crisis?

"I firmly believe that the administration, through its leaders, and the leaders of the minority in Congress, should lay aside every political or other consideration and compromise their differences on foreign policy * * * the political veneer corroding our foreign policy should be removed lest the body politic suffer a national disaster. * * * We cannot win a war, nor can we win a peace, hopelessly divided."

This newspaper hopes that the leaders of our Nation will heed this warning from Mr. Lucas, and that they will heed his sound words of advice—that we put aside the senseless quarreling, the divisive arguments, the political maneuvering for a less dangerous day.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I should like to ask for confirmation of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona requests unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Harrison, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object to this nomination.

Some time ago I said there are various States which have received no major appointments relating to policy matters, among them being the great State of North Dakota.

I hold in my hand, for example, a list of the States from which the various Cabinet members have come.

So far as the Secretary of State is concerned, I find that the following States have had residents appointed to that office: Virginia, again Virginia, Massachusetts, again Massachusetts, Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, Massachusetts, Kentucky, New York, Louisiana, Delaware, Georgia, Georgia, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, South Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, New York, Illinois, New York, New York, Maine, New Jersey, Delaware, Maine, Indiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, Ohio, Ohio, Ohio, New York, New York, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, New York, New York, New York, New York, Minnesota, New York, Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

Now I come to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. We find that there have been appointed to that office men from the States of New York, Connecticut, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Hampshire, Ohio, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Kentucky, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Georgia, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Maine, Indiana, Indiana, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Maine, Ohio, Minnesota, New York, Indiana, Indiana, New York, Minnesota, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Illinois, Iowa, New York, Illinois, New York, Virginia, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, New York, New York, New York, Kentucky, and Maine.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

I now come to the office of Secretary of War. We find that there have been appointed to that office men coming from the States of Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Maine, Maine, Virginia, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, Georgia, Kentucky, Virginia, South Carolina, Virginia, New York, Tennessee, Ohio, New York, South Carolina, Tennessee, Tennessee, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, New York, Georgia, Missouri, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Ohio, Illinois, Illinois, Illinois, Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Illinois, Massachusetts, Vermont, West Virginia, New York, Michigan, New York, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, Tennessee, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, Utah, Kansas, New York, New York, and North Carolina.

Now I come to the Office of Attorney General of the United States. We find that the following States have had representation in that office: Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Virginia, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Maryland, Kentucky, Delaware, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Virginia, Georgia, Maryland, New York, New York, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Kentucky, South Carolina, Maryland, Virginia, Maine, Connecticut, Maryland, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Kentucky, Ohio, New York, Massachusetts, Georgia, Oregon, New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Indiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, California, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Ohio, New York, Vermont, Minnesota, Connecticut, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania and Texas.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. I regretfully decline to yield. I am sorry.

Mr. IVES. I shall wait.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I come now to the office of Postmaster General of the United States. We find that the following States have been represented by men who have served in that office: Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Georgia, Georgia, Georgia, Connecticut, Connecticut, Ohio, Ohio, Ohio, Ohio, Kentucky, Kentucky, Kentucky, Connecticut, New York, New York, Kentucky, Tennessee, Vermont, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Ohio, Ohio, Wisconsin, Maryland, Virginia, Connecticut, Indiana, Tennessee, Tennessee, New York, Wisconsin, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Texas, Indiana, Connecticut, Colorado, Indiana, Indiana, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Illinois.

I come now to the office of Secretary of the Navy. We find that men have been appointed to that office from the following States: Maryland, Maryland, Maryland, Massachusetts, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, New Jersey, North Carolina, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Massachusetts, Virginia, Virginia, Massachusetts, Vermont, Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, North Carolina, Connecticut, Connecticut, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, West Virginia, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New York, New York, Alabama, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Illinois, Maryland, California, Michigan, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Michigan, Michigan, California, Massachusetts, Virginia, New Jersey, Illinois, and New York.

We now come to Secretaries of the Interior. I call attention to the fact that most of our public land is in the western part of the United States. There are 45,000,000 acres of public land there. We find that, to take care of that public land, Secretaries of the Interior have been chosen from Ohio, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Michigan, Mississippi, Indiana, Indiana, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Colorado, Michigan, Mississippi, Wisconsin, Missouri, Georgia, Missouri, New York, Missouri, Missouri, Ohio, Washington, Illinois, California, Virginia, New Mexico, New Mexico, Colorado, Illinois, California, Illinois, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

We now come to the office of Secretary of Commerce, and to the men who have been appointed to that office. I call attention to the fact that, since I have been in the Senate, six men from the State of New York were in the Cabinet at the same time. For the office of Secretary of Commerce, men have been chosen

from New York, California, New York, Missouri, New York, Missouri, California, California, Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, South Carolina, Iowa, Texas, Iowa, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, Virginia, New York, and Washington.

We now come to the office of Secretary of Agriculture. We find that, since the creation of the office, under Grover Cleveland, men have been chosen for the office of Secretary of Agriculture from Missouri, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Maine, Iowa, Iowa, West Virginia, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, New Mexico, and Colorado.

We now come to the office of Secretary of Defense. The nomination shown on the Executive Calendar today of William H. Harrison of New York is for the office of Defense Production Administrator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. I am sorry I am unable to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York. Since the office of Secretary of Defense was created, there had been but one appointment, up to the time of the appointment of Mr. Marshall, and that was from New York.

Mr. President, I shall not enter upon any extended debate in regard to the nomination of William H. Harrison to be Defense Production Administrator. I shall not even object to it. But I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the record shows that there are a great many States, including North Dakota, which have not had an appointment to a Cabinet position in the entire history of the country. Whether in the arts or in the sciences, in medicine or in business, whenever North Dakota men and women have had an equal opportunity under the competitive system of the United States, they have gone to the very top. As I told the Senate on previous occasions if we suppose that today my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New York, became ill, he would probably be sent to Rochester, Minn., to the Mayo Clinic, which is perhaps the outstanding clinic in this country. If the doctors at the clinic were unable to agree upon a diagnosis, but felt that an operation was necessary, who, in that great institution, would ultimately decide the nature of the operation to be made upon my distinguished friend? It would be a doctor who was once a North Dakota boy, a boy so poor that when he attended the University of North Dakota he found it necessary to walk there from his farm near Inkster, sometimes without shoes, because his parents could not afford them. Today he is at Mayo Clinic, where he is the outstanding physician and surgeon. He is the man who today would have the ultimate say and he would decide the nature of the operation to be performed.

Today, anywhere in this country a woman who wants to buy a refrigerator may inquire in the markets in order that she may find the refrigerator which she believes is best. If she were to select a Kelvinator, she would learn perhaps that the president of that great refrigerator concern came from North Dakota, a man by the name of George Mason, born at Valley City.

Likewise, a farmer residing anywhere in the United States desiring to purchase a good truck, would probably obtain information regarding all the trucks manufactured in the country in order that he might obtain the best. If he did, he probably would go finally to General Motors. If he bought a truck there, it would be a truck known as the Fargo truck, a truck engineered and built under the direction of a man named Grant, who was born at Fargo, N. Dak. The truck, named after the city in which he was born, is called the Fargo truck.

The Pulitzer prize was awarded to a young chap by the name of Anderson, from Jamestown, N. Dak., for a play written by him.

I remember that in World War I President Wilson searched the entire country for a man who could be depended upon to eliminate corruption and graft in the buying of supplies for the Navy. The President finally selected a young man named John Hancock, from Emerado, N. Dak., a little town with a population of about 100. Mr. Hancock discharged the duties of his office so well that the Congress later delegated to him additional power to buy all the supplies for the Army. Today, in the entire United States, with its population of about 153,000,000, there is but one man who has been decorated by both the Army and the Navy, and that is this man from North Dakota, John M. Hancock.

Again, during the Spanish-American War a larger number of North Dakota boys were decorated for bravery, population considered, than from any other State of the Union. Again, during World War I and following that war, a larger number of North Dakota boys were decorated for bravery, population considered, than from any other State of the Union. Again, in World War II we had the same experience.

During World War I William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, who formerly resided in New York, but who later moved to California, when it was found impossible to sell war bonds rapidly enough in the third Liberty Loan drive, offered a prize to the county within any State of the Union which would sell the most Liberty Loan bonds. In competition with over 5,000 other counties in the United States, the little county of Traill, N. Dak., won the prize. The population of that county was about 95 percent Scandinavian, the people having come from Norway and Sweden. The people of that county of Traill, N. Dak., were so patriotic that they led all the counties in the entire United States of America, and Traill County received the prize.

At the end of World War I, when France sent to this country a committee to choose the typical American nurse, that committee visited every State in the Union, and also the District of Columbia. It finally chose a little North Dakota girl, 18 years of age, by the name of Rose Lauder. Today, in the public square in Paris, is a life-size statue of that girl who was chosen by France as the typical American nurse.

We all remember that when Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President the banks of this country were in a precarious condition. The situation was so bad that the President closed every bank in the Nation. Many said the banks should be nationalized. The persons opposed to nationalization were rallied and went to the President and said, "We want a Comptroller of the Currency who will administer the banks honestly and who will open the banks that should be opened." President Roosevelt looked all over America, and in Grand Forks, N. Dak., he chose J. F. T. O'Connor, whom he named as Comptroller of the Currency. Mr. O'Connor did such a good job that Henry Ford, of the Ford Motor Co., which had $164,000,000 on deposit in the banks of Detroit alone—a motor company which had thousands of unemployed men at that time—said that the job done by Mr. O'Connor was a magnificent one and that no one could have done it better.

So, Mr. President, whether it be in agriculture, whether it be in the sciences, whether it be in medicine, whether it be in the arts, citizens of North Dakota stand at the top. I have named only a very few of the outstanding men and women of that State.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. There are many, many more, Mr. President.

I have previously taken up this question on the floor of the Senate. I have invited the attention of the Senate to the fact that not one person from the State of North Dakota has been appointed to a position of policy making. I have the highest regard for every State in the Union. I am not criticizing any Senator. I do not blame the distinguished senior Senator from New York or any other Senator for getting whatever appointments they may be able to obtain in the line of policy making, but, in all fairness, North Dakota boys are a part of this country. They are drafted or they enlist in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Why should not someone, somewhere, in the State of North Dakota, have someone to whom they can go if they have a complaint; someone who knows the actual conditions, not only in North Dakota but in the entire Northwest?

We now come to the judiciary, Mr. President. Never has a man from the State of North Dakota been a member of the Supreme Court. Never has a man from the State of North Dakota been on any appeal court. Believe it or not, Mr. President, North Dakota became a State in 1889. The State is a part of the eighth judicial district. There has been a time when as many as three men from the State of Missouri have been on the circut court, two men from the State of Nebraska, two men from the State of

South Dakota, but North Dakota never had a representative on that court.

Someone might possibly say it is due to the fact that there is something wrong with the people of the State of North Dakota. But that is not true, because the record shows that in World War I, and again in World War II, they led the entire Nation in the sale of bonds. In the paper drive in World War II, North Dakota was first. In the steel and iron drive, as it was called, North Dakota was first. Nowhere else are there more Christian persons, population considered. Only a short time ago the Saturday Evening Post published the fact that in 12 townships in North Dakota there were more churches than there are in any other 12 rural townships anywhere in the entire United States.

This fine Christian upbringing, Mr. President, is further proved by the fact that at the end of World War I, when veterans' hospitals were established and boys went to them in order to be taken care of, there were fewer boys, population considered, from North Dakota who went to those hospitals to be treated for venereal diseases than there were from any other State in the Union. That is a great tribute to the fine upbringing by their Christian, God-fearing mothers and fathers of those young men.

Mr. President, it seems to me that every Member of the Senate should be interested in this question. Under our Constitution and the laws no man can be appointed either to the Cabinet or to certain important policy-making positions without the advice and consent of the Senate. I think it is a part of the duty of the Senate to see to it that not only North Dakota, but every other State—Arkansas, Wyoming, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and others—is properly represented when appointments are made to policy-making positions.

I now yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York may say to his distinguished colleague from North Dakota that the Senator from New York is deeply in sympathy with the position taken by the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator from New York fully recognizes the great merit of the people of North Dakota. At the same time, the Senator from New York desires to point out that New York lays no claim to the nomination of General Harrison. Very likely, in fact, undoubtedly, General Harrison has been selected for the position of Defense Production Administrator because of his preeminence and his outstanding qualifications for that position, and not because he comes from the State of New York. Rather, I would say that he has probably been selected in spite of the fact that he comes from the State of New York.

Therefore, Mr. President, I beg my colleague from North Dakota to be charitable in this instance and to recognize the situation as I have tried to indicate it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him one question.

Mr. IVES. I do not have the floor. I should like to have it, but I have not been able to obtain it yet.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the distinguished Senator from New York, I appreciate the comment he has made, and I know he has a great deal of sympathy for North Dakota. I do not know of any other Senator who is more sympathetic than is the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. He has told me upon different occasions that he believes that some of the States which have not been represented in years past should be represented.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York feels very strongly in that connection.

Mr. LANGER. I appreciate it, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am not going to object to the appointment of this man from New York. The last time I spoke on this subject there were three appointments, every blessed one of which was of a person who came from New York. I was in great hope that the distinguished majority leader, coming from the West, would use his influence with the administration. Certainly the majority leader must have the ear of the President of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Certainly the distinguished majority leader, coming, as he does, from the western section of the Nation, knows, for example, that in the case of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior a man from the West knows more about the public-land question and more about the building of dams than does a man from the New England States. I wish to make it plain that I am not preaching sectionalism. I want New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and all the other States to get their fair share of appointments, but, honestly, Mr. President, I believe that from 1889 on—it is now in the year 1951, and that is 62 years—in the course of 62 years, qualified men and women could have been found in North Dakota who would have done as good a job as has been done by some of the men and women who have been appointed.

For example, Columbia University is located in New York. It is only a few years ago that Columbia University, in its great school of medicine, looked around for a man to head the dental department. The university wanted the very best dentist in the whole world. It did not care about what it would have to pay in order to get the best man. Of course, Mr. President, I do not know how the university happened to pass over my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. However, it came to the State of North Dakota, to the little town of Larimore, a town of 1,200 people, and picked out Arthur Rowe. It came all the way to the little town of Larimore, N. Dak., to pick him to head the great Dental School of Columbia University.

I desire to make it clear that I am not criticizing any Senator on the floor, but I hope very much that Senators who come from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and the other States, from which so many appointments have been made, will be sympathetic.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not like the use of the word "sympathy." I think the Senator from North Dakota is presenting his case in a very strong light. I should like to ask the Senator one question. Did not the Senator himself go to Columbia University in New York for a good legal education, and did he not at the time find the very lovely lady, then a resident of the State of New York, who has since then been his fine wife and good mother to his three daughters?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my good friend from Massachusetts that before I went to Columbia University I went to the University of North Dakota. After I had finished my studies at the University of North Dakota I went to Columbia University for more college and postgraduate work. Certain subjects were taught at Columbia which were not taught at the University of North Dakota. Naturally, when I got to New York I was of an age when I was attracted by some very fine girls. However, I want to make it clear that at the time I met the lovely young lady who became Mrs. Langer I did not know from what State she came. The truth of the matter is that I met her when I was attending a philharmonic concert one evening at Earl Hall. While I was at the concert a friend of mine, Robert Erskine, walked into the concert with a very, very beautiful young lady. They took their seats in the sixth row, four seats in from the aisle. I arranged to send a fake telephone call to the rear of the concert hall and had Mr. Erskine paged. When Mr. Erskine left his seat, I went down and sat in his place. The young lady said, "I beg your pardon, but there must be some mistake." I liked the tone of her voice. I liked the way she acted. When she said, "This seat belongs to Mr. Erskine," I said she was mistaken and that the seat belonged to me. I kept possession of the seat. So I met the young lady and I made up my mind immediately, the first time I saw her, that if she would have me I would marry her. I did not know whether she came from New York, New Jersey, or any other State. I want to say to my good friend from Massachusetts that if all the girls in his State are as lovely as Mrs. Langer I do not blame anyone for getting married to those very, very fine young ladies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that we have

very lovely ladies in Massachusetts, but I also assure him that I still think his decision to pick a resident of the State of New York was an excellent one, and I am sure he feels the same way.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And I know that the President also has picked some very good men from New York.

Mr. LANGER. Herbert Hoover picked a girl from North Dakota to be his wife. Miss Henry came from Wahpeton, N. Dak. North Dakota yields to no other State when it comes to the beauty of its women, their intellect and their charm, or their ability to make fine wives, lovely hostesses, and excellent mothers. The nice thing about this country is that in every State we are proud of the fact that American women are at the very top of womanhood in the entire world. During my travels in Europe I never saw any women who could compare with the women of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wish to comment that, in view of the Senator's statement, there can be no question that he will get all the women's votes in North Dakota. I am in sympathy with what the Senator is saying about appointments, because when he read his list I did not hear the name of Arizona mentioned. However, Mr. Harrison is a very able and capable man. So is Mr. Johnston an able man. My only hope is that perhaps we can persuade them to come to live in Arizona, because that may be the only way we will ever get some of the fine gentlemen who hold high offices in our Government to become residents of my State. Perhaps the Senator could do the same thing.

Mr. LANGER. Let us take Arizona. It is only a few weeks ago that the Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, Mr. Douglas, resigned. He came from Arizona. He lived there for many years. The Ambassador to the Court of St. James's came from Arizona, North Dakota has never had an ambassador to any country. [Laughter.] Indeed, in all these years North Dakota has had only one consul. He was consul to Quebec. We never had any consul appointed to any other country. I appreciate that the Senators on the floor, I will not say "sympathize," but appreciate the great problem North Dakota is facing, and I hope that some day when they are talking to the President—and I say this especially to my good friends on the other side of the aisle—they will put in a good word for the appointment of a citizen of North Dakota to a policy-making position in the Government. With that statement, I will not offer any objection to any of the nominations.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in view of the vials of wrath, floods of criticism and deluges of abuse which are daily and hourly overwhelming Cabinet officers, does it not occur to the eminent Senator from North Dakota that his State's failure to obtain representation in the President's Cabinet may be a blessing in disguise?

Mr. LANGER. No; I do not agree. I do not agree with that thought at all. I think that on the whole the men and women who have been appointed to high positions have done a good job, indeed a great job. As a result of what they have done in helping the various Presidents, we have today the greatest country in the world. I am not criticizing a single Cabinet appointment. All I am asking is that when some appointments are to be made, the President of the United States, with the help, advice, and consent of the Senate, will look over the outstanding men and women of North Dakota and name one of them, even if it is only as consul or ambassador. Perhaps we will not have a citizen of North Dakota appointed to the Cabinet, although we should have had one appointed a long time ago. Nevertheless, we may get some appointments. I am particularly concerned today with some appointments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, so that when the young men of North Dakota go into the service they can feel that there is someone at the top to whom they can take their problems, someone who is fairly conversant with the situation in their home State.

I thank my distinguished friend from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator paid a richly deserved, eloquent tribute to the late Judge J. F. T. O'Connor, who made a splendid record as Comptroller of the Currency. Let me record the additional fact that Mr. O'Connor later became the judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. NEELY. The duties of that high office Judge O'Connor diligently discharged with imperishable honor to himself and unsurpassable satisfaction to the people of California.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. I may say to my distinguished friend that the State of North Dakota was unanimous, Democrats and Republicans alike, in support of the appointment of J. F. T. O'Connor to the Supreme Court of the United States. As a matter of fact, the only judicial position he ever held was that of district judge. He was never a member of any appellate court. North Dakota never had anyone on any appellate court in the judiciary of the United States.

To repeat, I have no objection to the pending nomination.

Mr. IVES obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind letting the nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed?

Mr. IVES. Certainly not, if it may be understood that the Senator from New York can retrieve the floor following confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wished to complete consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. IVES. In the circumstances stated by the Senator from New York, that is, that he may retrieve the floor following the confirmation of the nominations, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William H. Harrison to be Defense Production Administrator?

The nomination was confirmed.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eric A. Johnston to be Economic Stabilization Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar P. Caffrey to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement concerning the resolution which has been submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and which earlier today was referred by unanimous consent to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

If the purpose of the junior Senator from Nebraska in offering this resolution is to state that, barring attack by Soviet Russia itself, it is the sense of the Senate that, without consultation with and the approval of the Congress, the President should neither assign nor make a commitment to assign in the future any of the Armed Forces of the United States to duty in the European area under the terms of the North Atlantic treaty, then I might agree with him.

But this resolution would seem to call for a procedure of quite a different nature. Without imputing to its introducer other than the highest motives, I am constrained to observe that this resolution, in its effect, might tend to straitjacket and hamstring both the President and the Congress. This situation could

arise through failure of the Congress to make adequate appropriations for defense during a period of protracted debate over "the adoption of a policy" as required by the resolution.

The resolution would seem to have the effect of freezing indefinitely into immobility the Armed Forces of the United States, insofar as their use in Europe is concerned.

I fear that a condition thus produced might be a serious handicap to effective American strategy and most dangerous to American defense. In this connection I quote from an editorial entitled "Congress and the President" appearing in the January 20 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

Any decision made by Congress at this time must be flexible. The swift changes of war and foreign affairs do not permit a military policy to be fixed in advance, in all its details. Certainly the armed services should not be bound, in the event of the outbreak of war, to any firm prescription as to what forces should be employed where. Congress can and should weigh the military evidence and approve a basic plan. But it cannot put its approval in the form of a strait-jacket, binding on the administration under any and all conditions. History is studded with military disasters invited by rigid programs that did not allow for unexpected events.

At this point in my remarks, I ask to have the full text of the editorial inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

The prospects for agreement between the President and Congress over the use of American ground troops in the defense of Western Europe have been greatly improved within recent days. Both Mr. Truman and his congressional critics are shying away from the more extreme assertions of their respective prerogatives and seem inclined to get down to the real question of the day: How can the Atlantic community be made secure?

To be sure, the President made his concessions to Congress in the form of an unfair and incorrect attack upon the reporting of his press conference. Mr. TAFT, receding from his earlier position that no more American ground forces should now be sent to Europe, still insists that any reinforcements should be specifically limited by Congress. Thus there is room for argument over the degree to which the President and the Legislature have actually approached one another, and opportunity for ample discussion as to just how the final formula for congressional approval of a commitment to aid in the land defenses of Europe should be worded.

To this newspaper, the number of American divisions which could safely be dispatched to the Continent—taking into account the resources of the United States and of its allies, the objectives to be attained in Europe, and the capabilities of Russia and her satellites—has seemed primarily a military estimate, to be based on the advice of men whose experience and information permit them to speak with authority. The report of General Eisenhower, therefore, will be crucial on this point. If American and European contributions are to be apportioned in terms of some ratio—one to six, one to four, or whatever—the vital consideration is whether the total force can do the job, and that cannot be determined by spinning theories or juggling figures. It must be based on hard military facts which General Eisenhower has at his disposal.

A corollary to this truth is that any decision made by Congress at this time must be flexible. The swift changes of war and foreign affairs do not permit a military policy to be fixed in advance in all its details. Certainly the armed services should not be bound, in the event of the outbreak of war, to any firm prescription as to what forces should be employed where. Congress can and should weigh the military evidence and approve a basic plan. But it cannot put its approval in the form of a strait-jacket, binding on the administration under any and all conditions. History is studded with military disasters invited by rigid programs that did not allow for unexpected events.

Mr. IVES. Furthermore, because the resolution applies only to ground forces and ignores entirely the Navy and the Air Force, it would seem to raise considerable doubt as to the propriety of the procedure it prescribes.

As I have indicated, I believe that, regardless of constitutional or legal interpretations and as a matter of common sense and sound expediency, the President should consult with and obtain the approval of the Congress with regard to any commitment of American Armed Forces to the European area—and before such commitment is made or additional armed forces are sent. By this process he will insure for himself not only the cooperation of the Congress, but the substantial support of the American people, in any eventuality which may ensue.

Even so, I doubt the wisdom of having the Congress take at this time more than very general action of the kind I have described prior to the report and recommendations which are expected to be made in the relatively near future by General Eisenhower, in whom the American people have great confidence.

The requirements of the resolution proposed by the junior Senator from Nebraska would appear to go far beyond the action I suggest. Therefore, I am opposed to it in its present form or in any form of similar design.

RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Senator desires to call up some resolutions which he has heretofore submitted. I wonder if he will yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, Mr. President. It is my purpose to call up three Senate resolutions which I submitted a week ago today, namely, Senate Resolutions 35, 36, and 37, and ask for their consideration. If I may retain the floor following the quorum call, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

I may say to the able majority leader that I was not trying to take advantage of the small attendance at the moment. I should like to have every Member of the Senate present. I think these resolutions are important. At least they have considerable significance in expressing the views and judgment of this body. I should like to have every Member present. If I may retain the floor following the quorum call, I shall be glad to yield for the purpose of a quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's intention to take the three resolutions from the table and make a motion concerning them or ask for Senate action on them?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall bring up the resolutions in the order I have indicated, and ask for their immediate consideration. They cannot be considered en bloc. They will have to be considered one at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from Massachusetts, that I told the Senator from Arkansas I would have no objection to the first two resolutions being taken up and considered by the Senate. I said that I thought the third resolution ought to be referred to an appropriate committee. I shall so move after the first two resolutions have been disposed of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then it is the intention of the Senator from Arkansas to ask the Senate to vote on the first two resolutions without reference of them to committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that that is my intention.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think there will be any objection as to the first two, so I shall make no motion for reference as to them, but I shall move that the third resolution be referred to committee.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Jenner	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Flanders	McClellan	Welker
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Magnuson	Young
Green	Malone	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 16, 1 week ago today, I offered three Senate resolutions, which at my request were ordered to lie on the table. They were Senate Resolutions 35, 36, and 37, which were printed in the RECORD of January 16, at page 346. It is my purpose at this time, after discussing the resolutions briefly, to ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The resolution—Senate Resolution 35—simply declares—

That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

At the time I offered the resolutions, I discussed them briefly, setting forth my reason for believing that the Senate should take this action. That was last Tuesday. I did not at that time press for immediate consideration of the resolutions, because of other business then before the Senate. But I had in mind then that, as soon as the pending business was disposed of—and it has now been disposed of—I would request the Senate to act upon these resolutions.

In the meantime, there have been two developments in regard to the first of the resolutions, Senate Resolution 35. Last Friday, the House of Representatives adopted a similar resolution. In fact, the substance of the resolution adopted by the House and its force and effect are identical with this resolution—Senate Resolution 35—which I had previously offered in the Senate. When the resolution was offered in the House, the House acted on it immediately, declaring it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that the Communist Government of China should be declared an aggressor in Korea. The vote in the House on that resolution is not recorded, so it is impossible to know the exact extent of the opposition to it. However, a motion was made in the House to refer the resolution to committee, rather than to take immediate action on it; which is the normal course of procedure. On the motion to refer the resolution, a standing vote was taken, which resulted in 30 yeas, 161 nays. That is some indication of the overwhelming sentiment in the House for the resolution which it adopted.

I am very happy that the House took that action. I think it very appropriate that both Houses of the Congress should take such action. In view of the fact that the House has acted, it certainly behooves the Senate of the United States, the body which has the responsibility for the ratification of treaties dealing with international relations and international affairs, to take similar action.

In the meantime, there has been another development. Since this resolution was offered by me in the Senate I understand that a resolution has been presented in the United Nations by our delegate calling for such action by the United Nations. Since it is apparently the sentiment and will of this Government that such action be taken, I think we can do no less, and should do no less, than to place the Senate of the United States on record as expressing this sentiment, in order that it may fortify our representatives in the United Nations and our delegates there who are now pressing the United Nations to take the action which this resolution says it is the sense of the Senate the UN should take.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time to read it, but there appeared in yesterday's Washington Star an editorial entitled "The House to the UN." I should like to have that editorial printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is a forceful editorial, setting forth the strong sentiments I feel with reference to this resolution and the reasons why the Senate should take action.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSE TO THE UN

The House of Representatives has taken an unusual and highly significant step in calling upon the United Nations to stop dilly-dallying and brand Red China as an aggressor in Korea. In effect, although the Senate is not expected to act similarly, this throws powerful congressional weight behind the proposal now being pressed by our American delegation in the world organization. Of course, the UN's wavering non-Communist members—particularly the Arab-Asian bloc, which still seems eager for a Munich-like appeasement deal—may not be influenced by the development, but they would be well advised not to underestimate its importance as a measure of public opinion in this country.

For the House resolution—adopted by a virtually unanimous voice vote—undoubtedly reflects the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American people. That sentiment draws its fire and strength from two basic facts. The first fact—a fact that naturally stirs this Nation's emotions most deeply—is that the great bulk of the UN's forces in Korea is made up of young men who have left the farms and cities of the United States to fight and die for high purposes in a far-away corner of the globe. And the second fact is this: That the Chinese Communists, by criminally intervening in the situation, have grievously intensified the fighting and dying and have demonstrated—especially in their contemptuous rejection of repeated cease-fire proposals—that they are firmly committed to a black policy of aggression and open warfare against the United Nations.

In such circumstances, how can one justify failure to brand Red China as an aggressor? If 53 members of the UN voted—as they did—to put that label on the North Korean Communists after the latter struck southward across the thirty-eighth parallel last June, why should not the same label now be put on Peiping? The North Korean armed forces had been all but destroyed, their crime had been thoroughly punished and brought to a practical end, when the Mao Tse-tung regime intervened in November to prevent the establishment of peace and the rule of law. On what basis, therefore, can any country argue that that regime is not guilty of aggression? If it is not guilty, then why were the Kremlin's North Korean puppets ever adjudged guilty? And why were freemen sent over there to shed their blood for high purposes? Has it all been in vain? Have the high purposes ceased being high, have they become less real, have they been nullified or wiped out, simply because the original criminal has been replaced by a bigger criminal with greater power to mock and upend those purposes?

These are some of the questions that the American people are now asking themselves. They are what account for the House resolution. The real significance of that resolution is that it challenges the United Nations to act in keeping with the main body of public opinion in this country—an opinion founded on the commonsense proposition that no amount of diplomatic subtlety or Machiavellian maneuvering can obscure the flagrant fact that the Chinese Communists are aggressors in Korea, that they are killing men who have been sent into battle to uphold the rule of law in the world, and that they ought therefore to be labeled for what they really are. To say that this is not so, or to be afraid to say it, or to talk around it as if it were doubtful, does as much violence to what we regard as reality as to argue that the earth may not be round or that two plus two do not necessarily make four.

In short, the waverers and the faint of heart in the United Nations should look very carefully at the House resolution and realize that it speaks for the American people—an aroused people, a people accustomed to calling a spade a spade, a people who want forthrightness in this situation and who will certainly be hard put to retain their faith in the UN if it fails to stand firm against Red China. The honor and integrity of the world organization are at stake here. It cannot yield to fear or unprincipled expediency without risking the danger of an inglorious disintegration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question for the information of the Senate. Will the distinguished Senator from Arkansas ask for action on Resolution 37 this afternoon?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; it is my purpose to ask for action on all three of the resolutions. That is my purpose. Of course, I cannot assure the Senator what action will be taken.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have asked whether the three resolutions would come up this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. As to the first two resolutions I have no objection to the Senate's considering them; but as to the third resolution, I think it should be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So that there will be a vote or a unanimous-consent agreement as to Resolutions 35 and 36?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Arkansas will not move that Resolution 37 be referred to a committee. In all fairness, I think there is no justification for sending either Senate Resolution 35 or Senate Resolution 36 to a committee. We either believe in them or we do not. They simply set forth the judgment of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator from Arkansas. I know the Senate is interested in all of the resolutions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the minority leader that Resolutions 35 and

36 primarily deal with political questions, whereas, in Resolution 37, there are both military and political decisions involved. I shall not seriously oppose it if it is the sentiment of this body to refer Senate Resolution 37 to the appropriate committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator had just concluded his statement with reference to Senate Resolution 35, and I understood he was about to take up Senate Resolution 36.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought that for the purpose of expediting the matter, while I had the floor, I would discuss all three resolutions briefly, and then move to take them up in order.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to Senate Resolution 35, if the United Nations should act favorably upon it, what action would be taken under articles 41 and 42 that are not now being used in Asia?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In order to have the United Nations employ means to support its peace efforts, if we wish to use those terms, the further action it should take is contained in Senate Resolution 37. In my own judgment, I think we should not fight this war by halfway methods. We should not permit our boys to be dying and fighting against overwhelming odds while the United Nations twiddles its thumbs with reference to using weapons of economic sanctions and blockades. If we are going to fight this war, I think it should be fought with all we have. If we are not going to do that, we should take our boys out of Korea.

Mr. WHERRY. I included in my question the thought that if the United Nations should affirmatively approve the suggestion which is now being made by the Congress that it is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations declare Red China and the Communist Chinese to be aggressors, it would bring into operation article 42 which provides certain measures which could be taken but which are not now being taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Declaring Red China to be an aggressor is a preliminary step and a prerequisite before the next steps, which are proposed in Senate Resolutions 36 and 37, are taken.

Mr. WHERRY. If Resolutions 36 and 37 are adopted, then all measures would be taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the United Nations would take all measures within its power, as I interpret the UN Charter.

Mr. President, I need not dwell longer upon the necessity and the wisdom of this body going on record as favoring the United Nations declaring Red China an aggressor. That, as I have said, is a step, a prerequisite to the invoking of economic sanctions. I think it is a step, Mr. President, that is prerequisite before the Senate should express itself as opposing the admission of China to the United Nations. Therefore I am presenting these resolutions in the order of their relative importance and necessity for action.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If Resolution 35 should be adopted, the next step is the imposition by the United Nations of economic sanctions and possibly blockades and demonstrations in the air, on the land, and on the sea.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I will say to the able minority leader that I would not expect the United Nations to impose sanctions and blockades against a nation which is not an aggressor. The first step is to declare it to be an aggressor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. First, I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for offering and pushing these resolutions. I think he is to be commended, and I should be surprised if the resolutions do not receive the unanimous support of the Senate. I want to assure the Senator of my most ardent support.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, regarding Resolution 36, I pointed out in my remarks at the time I presented the resolutions that in order for any government to be admitted as a member of the United Nations, in order for it to be eligible, that government must, under the terms of the Charter, be a peace-loving state. It is wholly inconsistent that any nation could be an aggressor or that any nation could be at war with United Nations forces and be, at the same time, a peace-loving state. Therefore, Mr. President, so long as the Communist government of China is making war against United Nations forces—I would say, at any time they are making war against United States forces alone—I think the Senate and the Government of the United States should oppose its being admitted into membership in the United Nations. It is either an aggressor, a warring nation, in this conflict, or it is a peace-loving nation. If it is a peace-loving nation, it is entitled to membership. If it is not a peace-loving nation, it is not entitled to or eligible for membership in the United Nations. The Government of the United States could never look the American people in the face without blushing with shame if it ever tolerated the admission into the United Nations of a Red Communist government that is on the warpath, murdering American soldiers, killing our own sons, Mr. President, and defying at this hour and at this very moment the authority and the collective effort of the United Nations to restore peace and order in Korea.

Yes, Mr. President, we declared North Korea to be an aggressor. The United Nations treated North Korea as an aggressor. Otherwise there would have been no justification for the President to send American troops to Korea without a directive from Congress. He sent them there in response to a directive of the United Nations. He sent them there to restore peace and to repel the aggressor who had invaded South Korea. Mr. President, South Korea was set up under the supervision of the United Nations and under its trusteeship. If the North Koreans were aggressors and if that fact justified the action we took against them, how can we set back and take no action, be afraid to speak out, be afraid to be resolute, and be afraid to take an affirmative stand against the second aggressor, who is much larger, much more dangerous, and except for whom the conflict in Korea would now be over?

Mr. President, we have done a great deal of talking. I am not criticizing anyone. We should talk and think before we act. However, the time has come for us in the United States Senate, who have a major responsibility in the foreign affairs of our Nation, and who represent every soldier on the battlefield, to quit talking just as individual Senators on the floor and take action by recording our judgment and decision. We should let our judgment and decision stand for and support the high purposes for which we claim we are fighting today in Korea. If—I say if—the United Nations in this test, in this crucial test, will not respond and maintain the high purposes for which it was created in the cause of peace, if it has become so timid or has so deteriorated that it lacks courage to declare a big aggressor to be an aggressor, as it declared a little aggressor to be an aggressor, it is time for us to begin to wonder—and the American people are wondering—what we have gotten into in the United Nations. The time has come for some definite and affirmative action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I join with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in commending the Senator from Arkansas for bringing the subject to the attention of the Senate. I fully support him in his desire to bring up Resolution 35 and Resolution 36 for action by the Senate at this time. However, I agree with the majority leader that insofar as Resolution 37 is concerned, it would be more orderly procedure for it to go to the proper committee of the Senate. Insofar as the first two resolutions are concerned, I fully endorse what the Senator from Arkansas has said and assure him of my support in getting action by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the RECORD, because it was not published in the newspapers today—or at least I could not find it—I asked for a break-down of the vote in the United Nations yesterday. The vote was 27 to 23 in favor of further delay and procrastination in meeting the present issue in Korea. As the Senator has ably pointed out, for a period of more than two and a half months the Chinese Communist forces have been clearly identified as being in conflict with United Nations forces in Korea, and have become aggressors by crossing the international frontier at the Yalu River. They are in Korea in force as aggressors.

I fully agree with the Senator from Arkansas that for the United Nations to stultify itself by trembling in its boots and failing to declare the Communist Chinese aggressors, after having declared the North Koreans aggressors for

crossing the thirty-eighth parallel, is to subscribe to the doctrine that right makes might and that if one is a big enough aggressor, or a successful enough aggressor, he is welcomed into the family of nations, and the United Nations is ready to shake his bloody hand.

Because a roll call was not published in the newspapers, I called the State Department and asked for a breakdown of the vote yesterday. I thought the Senator would be interested in having it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Against postponement were the United States of America, Turkey, Greece, and the Latin American countries. I do not have a full breakdown of the Latin-American countries, but I shall insert it in the RECORD as soon as I have obtained it.

Abstaining were Australia, Belgium, and Lebanon.

For postponement and delay in declaring the Chinese Communists the aggressor they are, and who have continued over a considerable period of time in the past to obstruct the United Nations from taking any action against them were the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Israel, Yugoslavia, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Byelorussia, the Ukraine, and the Arab States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate very much the Senator's contribution, and I am very glad to have the insertion made in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall yield in a moment. Among the nations who voted in opposition to our desire to take up the resolution declaring the Chinese Communists aggressors are a number who ought to be supporting us and should be with us, in view of the protection and aid we have given them. Furthermore, some of them are charter members of the UN.

Mr. President, the time has come for members of the United Nations to place themselves on one side or the other on this issue. They should not longer dilly-dally, but should support the United Nations forces who are fighting the aggressor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that the members of the United Nations who have taken two and a half months to recognize a clear-cut case of aggression in Korea are setting a very dangerous precedent, because if the United States and the free nations of the world who have contributed to resisting aggression in Korea should take two and a half months to make up their minds if aggression should come in Europe or elsewhere, most of them would be overrun and be behind the iron curtain, and their political leaders would be liquidated or in the salt mines of Siberia, if we and the rest of the free world should wait as long as they have waited to call Communist China the aggressor that she is?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am in substantial agreement with the statement of the able Senator from California. My position is simply this: As a result of the lack of action and the conduct of the United Nations, as it has developed during the past few months, and the indecision, inaction, quibbling, and lack of courage seemingly present in the United Nations, it is becoming weaker and weaker, and the American people, who had such high hopes for its purposes and its ultimate success, are speedily losing confidence in it. They are losing confidence not only in its ability to do anything, but in its lack of will and purpose to meet its responsibilities. I am glad to yield now to the able Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to rise to identify myself with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the other Members of this body who have expressed approval of the resolutions which he has offered.

I wish merely to make one further observation. I am one of those who from the very beginning have supported the idea and purposes of the United Nations. I have shared in the hopes which we entertained with respect to that organization. We feel completely frustrated in regard to the whole matter, and the delay in recognizing what is an obvious fact to everyone else in the world—a delay in fear of a great nation which is aggressing, when the United Nations already has recognized aggression by a smaller nation.

So I commend the Senator from Arkansas for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate and the attention of the people of the United States and the people of the world. We feel that it is time for the United Nations to screw up its courage, stand together, and recognize an obvious aggression which is threatening the peace of the world. It should continue to resist it until it is dealt with forcibly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey, and I appreciate his contribution to this discussion. I wish to hurry along. Before I pass to Senate Resolution 37, let me say that in my remarks when I submitted these resolutions a few days ago I stated that the day that Communist China is admitted to membership in the United Nations the United States should walk out. I wish to repeat that statement.

Further, if the work of the United Nations during the past few months is an indication of what can be expected of it in the future, if it is to continue approaching these issues timidly, without courage, without squaring its actions with the facts and realities, there is not much hope, not much that we can look forward to by continuing our membership in such an organization.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he does not think it is a rather significant fact that the countries which have been the principal beneficiaries of the gifts of the United States under the Marshall plan are among the list of countries opposing the position of the United States on this issue, as we have just been informed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is a great disappointment to me that they are not today giving their support to us.

Having immediately declared North Korea an aggressor, and having acquiesced in and supported the directive issued by the United Nations calling upon all members of the United Nations to offer resistance to it, it amounts to an act of cowardice if they refuse to declare Communist China to be an aggressor.

As I have stated, the House of Representatives has already acted upon a resolution similar to Senate Resolution 35. I hope the Senate will agree to Senate Resolution 35, and also to Senate Resolution 36, which states that it is the sense of this body that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations. I hope the House of Representatives will immediately adopt a similar resolution to Senate Resolution 36.

Mr. President, I should like to express my views regarding Senate Resolution 37. I have discussed the resolution with the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There is some feeling on the part of the leadership that this resolution should be referred to a committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind getting a vote on Senate Resolutions 35 and 36 before he goes to Senate Resolution 37?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be through in less than 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be necessary to obtain unanimous consent for a vote on these resolutions at this time, because another resolution is still before the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In a moment I shall ask unanimous consent.

With regards to Senate Resolution 37, I think there is some justification for asking that that resolution be referred to a committee, because, as I stated, it involves not only a political decision, but a military consideration as well. I think it is appropriate that that resolution be referred to a committee, and I shall have no objection when the motion is made.

As to its merits, Mr. President, I wish to quote from an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington News. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT TO WIN OR QUIT

General MacArthur says that the American Army fighting in Korea as the agent of the United Nations awaits political decisions from the chancelleries of the world on the problem confronting it.

That problem is the intervention of Red China, dating from October.

"Considering that the entire military might of Communist China is available against this relatively small command (the UN forces)," General MacArthur warns, "only by maneuver may it avoid hazards inherent in the great odds which it now faces."

That is a clear challenge to the gentlemen representing the United Nations at Lake Success to make up their minds what they intend to do. And it must be answered.

The American resolution branding the Reds as aggressors, which has been presented to the UN, makes no provision for sanctions against Red China and carefully avoids anything that might be interpreted as authorizing General MacArthur to strike directly at Peiping's homeland and supply bases. It is from China itself, and the bases there, that the Red forces fighting our troops are being supplied. But our troops have become the forgotten men in this war.

The Defense Department is trying to muzzle Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who raised this same issue upon his recent return from Korea.

"We have been fighting distinctly under wraps since the Communists came into the war," General O'Donnell says. "I never thought I'd see the day when we would have to sit back with our hands tied. * * * If we're going to fight, let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sake. It's time people knew that this is an all-out war."

That is mild to what the boys in the frozen fox holes are saying.

They have been let down. They know it. They want to come home.

They are tired of being shot at like sitting ducks while the United Nations exchanges notes with the outlaw Chinese Government at Peiping.

The State Department seems determined to make General MacArthur the goat in this situation, just as it made former Defense Secretary Johnson the goat for the original debacle in Korea.

But it can't get away with that. The record is too clear.

The fault is not in Korea but in Washington, in London, and at Lake Success.

The weakness of American political leadership was demonstrated when it was unable to persuade any of the other great powers to join us in sponsoring the mild condemnation resolution presented to the UN.

Britain, Canada, and our other fair-weather friends will vote for this resolution on the show-down. But they'll do it with great reluctance. And they are not prepared to support any reprisal measures against the Chinese Reds. Yet this resolution would do nothing more than officially recognize a condition which has been fact for 3 months while ducking the question of what is to be done about it. So the resolution itself is an act of appeasement.

General MacArthur has been gagged and General O'Donnell has been called on the carpet, doubtless to be warned to make no more statements on the outrageous way the policy makers have bungled this whole affair. But the truth will out, despite gags and censorship. The record made at Lake Success is there for all to read.

Our Army in Korea has plenty of fight left in it, according to General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff.

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it, and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded. The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the Reds will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to quote from this editorial, because it expresses my sentiments:

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it, and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded.

Korea's ports were blockaded. I wonder why we should not blockade Red China, a much more powerful foe.

The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the Reds will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

Mr. President, those views are in line with the sentiments I expressed in my remarks at the time I introduced this resolution. I believe that that is the action which the United Nations should take.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 35.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) favoring a declaration by the United Nations that Communist China is an aggressor in Korea, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 36.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 36) opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations, was read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have consulted with Dr. Wilcox, of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, with regard to this resolution. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that China is now a member of the United Nations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to modify the resolution to say "the Chinese Communist Government."

Mr. McMAHON. That is, the Chinese Communist Government should not be admitted as the representative of China in the United Nations. China is now a member of the United Nations. It is a question of who shall represent China. The Senator's intention is to see that the Communists of China do not hold that position. Is that not true?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I so modify the resolution. I ask unanimous consent, if that is necessary. The modified resolution will then read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I would also suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that it might be well that the resolution go to the Foreign Relations Committee. I am as strongly opposed as is the Senator from Arkansas to the Mao Tse-tung crowd being admitted to the United Nations as the representatives of China. I have in mind, however, that the situation may well change in the months to come. It is true that we could by suitable resolution at that time indicate that the situation had, in our opinion, changed. But it seems to me that if Mao Tse-tung were to have a falling out with Stalin and Moscow he would probably be as fair company in the United Nations as at the present time is Tito, who has fallen out with his former master, Mr. Stalin.

I merely want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that while I am firmly against the recognition of the Mao Tse-tung crowd in the United Nations so long as the present situation persists, I still do not think we should bar the door to future representation by them if they so conduct themselves as to bring them into conflict with the Stalin Government, as Tito has now done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield, but I should like first to make a statement. I think the possibilities of the happening of any such thing as that indicated by the able Senator from Connecticut are so remote, so contingent, and so highly improbable, that we should not quibble about these things, but the Senate ought to go on record now. We are talking about present conditions. If Communist China takes a peace-loving

stand, if she repents, and we are convinced that she is sincere, there will be plenty of time and opportunity for the Senate to reverse this action, or rather to take appropriate action to indicate its willingness that she should become a member of the United Nations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has taken a very sound stand on this question. Some of those who originally tried to make the American people believe that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers came up with the idea that Mao Tse-tung is a "Tito." The fact is that he is a willing and an enthusiastic ally of the Kremlin. It has been reliably reported that he negotiated an agreement within which this aggression has taken place. He has been working hand in glove with the Kremlin in connection with the Korean situation.

The able Senator from Arkansas has pointed out that in the event conditions change in the future the Senate of the United States can meet the changed situation at that time. But I think it is equally important for the Senate of the United States today and now to go on record as saying that, in the face of the record of Mao Tse-tung and the Communist regime in China, we do not believe they should be admitted to the United Nations.

It is pertinent, because in the discussions which are now proceeding on the part of some of our so-called allies who are showing in the United Nations such a weak-kneed position, one of the bits of appeasement suggested is the seating of the Communist Chinese in the United Nations. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that if that takes place it will destroy the entire moral fabric of the United Nations. Therefore we should have an opportunity to act. Those who do not believe that Mao Tse-tung is a Communist can vote against the resolution. But it seems to me that the Senate of the United States should have an opportunity now to go on record clearly, while the matter is pertinent, that we do not believe that Mao Tse-tung and the Communist regime should be seated in the United Nations.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not think any inference ought to be drawn from what the Senator from Connecticut has said that he is under any illusion as to where Mao Tse-tung stands. If I have to call upon an authority I could call upon the Honorable Patrick Hurley, who after a talk with Mr. Stalin in Moscow, when he was there as our Ambassador, stated to the press that while Mao Tse-tung was a Communist he did not think that he had any connections with Stalin directly, and that Stalin was not interested in Mao Tse-tung. I say I could call upon Patrick Hurley as an authority. I could call upon him as a witness to what was not so, because obviously Mao Tse-tung and Stalin have been closer together than two peas in a pod. I have no doubt at all that it would be a tragic mistake to recognize this fellow Mao Tse-tung or any of his crowd, and I said so.

I should like to point out to the Senator, who is so confident of what the future will be, that if any Senator had told us at the time when Tito shot down the American fliers that we would be now looking with careful eyes upon his 30 divisions in Europe, he would have been labeled as unsound in mind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor. I shall finish my observation in a moment. I say that a situation arising because of the jealousy of the master for the servant, which would result in a gradual widening or split between Mao Tse-tung and Stalin, could mean nothing but good for honest men, because "when thieves fall out, honest men get their due."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a comment at that point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to point out to the Senator from Connecticut, insofar as the events in Yugoslavia are concerned, that in the votes in the United Nations since the Korean aggression took place, Yugoslavia has consistently either abstained or voted with the Soviet Union in the United Nations; and on the vote yesterday Yugoslavia was lined up with those nations that were not willing to declare Communist China to be an aggressor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join the Senator from California in expressing the strong hope that the Senator from Arkansas will insist upon the immediate consideration of his Senate Resolution 36. I call attention to the fact that the Senate has just by unanimous action adopted the Senator's resolution (S. Res. 35) which was:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

The Senator from Arkansas well knows and every Senator well knows that the principal purpose for that action was to assure the world, and incidentally our delegation at the United Nations who are now fighting for this very point, that the Senate of the United States does not approve the appeasement which is evidenced in the indecision, the unwillingness, the timidity of certain members of the United Nations to declare Communist China an aggressor. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that that same element of abject appeasement runs on beyond the question of declaration of aggression to the more ridiculous suggestion of immediate admission to membership in the United Nations of Communist China. It would seem to the Senator from Florida that the failure to adopt Senate Resolution 36 at this time would indicate that the Senate feels that there is less of appeasement involved in that resolution and on that subject, and that question, than there is in the other question of the declaration of Red China as an aggressor.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that if there is any difference between the two resolutions, the more complete and the more absurd appeasement is involved in the continuing effort of various nations to seat Communist China in the United Nations, when they know perfectly well that to do so would be to seat her at a time when, as an aggressor, she is fighting openly in the field against American soldiers and soldiers from other members of the United Nations, when Communist China has on her hands the blood of American soldiers and soldiers of other members of the United Nations. Still it is proposed by those appeasers that at this time and under these conditions, Red China be admitted to major membership in the United Nations, as one of the great powers, with the veto power in the Security Council.

So the Senator from Florida expresses the very strong hope that the Senator from Arkansas will insist upon the present consideration of Senate Resolution 36, not that he is unmindful of the excellent observations which have been brought into the debate by the Senator from Connecticut, but because he feels that Senators would be left in a position of having left in question and in doubt their position on the second point, as to whether appeasement is or is not involved in it; and it would leave in question what we feel as to how far we should go in backing up our delegation to the United Nations in opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, when we have just unanimously said to them, "We do not want you to fail to declare Red China an aggressor." Now to show indecision or unwillingness to bring to an immediate decision this other question of proposed membership in the United Nations, on the part of Red China, would, it seems to me, leave the Senate in a weak and most unfortunate position, in which I hope the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will not leave the Members of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able Senator from Florida. I may say it would not only leave the Senate now in an awkward position and attitude, but someone might suspect that the Senate was beginning to join the appeasers or that we lacked courage to move forward and see the thing through. I wish to see it through. I wish to see Senate Resolution 37 adopted. When Senate Resolution 36, which we are now considering, is adopted, I, myself, shall move that Senate Resolution 37 be referred to the appropriate committee. I believe there is proper justification for doing that, for the resolution involves considerations or issues in regard to which we should have the benefit of the wisdom of committee deliberation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield first to the Senator from New York, for I believe he rose first.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was very happy, indeed, to vote for Senate Resolution 35.

I shall certainly vote for Senate Resolution 36, if the decision is made not to refer the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee.

I shall oppose with all my strength the seating in the United Nations at this time of representatives of the government of Communist China. I think there may have been a time in the past when it would have been wise to admit representatives of the Communist government of China to the United Nations. I think the time may come again when it may be wise to do so. However, at this time certainly I should oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, because if we took that action we would be taking it with a gun pointed at our heads, and certainly that would be an act of appeasement.

As the able Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, I think we do not know what is going to happen in the future. We do not know what developments there may be in the relationships between the Communist Government of China and Stalin. We do not know other circumstances which may affect our action and our decision in the future.

I think I have made it clear that I am not advocating, of course, the seating of Communist China in the United Nations. I would be opposed to that with all my strength and all my power.

However, certainly, it is not an act of appeasement to refer a resolution of this importance to the Foreign Relations Committee. No one can call the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], or the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], or the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], or the other members of that committee appeasers. I think we should have the benefit of the advice, the scrutiny, and the consultation of the Foreign Relations Committee. Therefore, Mr. President, I very much hope that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will agree to have that done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I shall not agree to have this particular resolution sent to the committee.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to take 1 minute and one-half.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well; I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I simply wish to call attention to what seems to me to be a fundamentally ridiculous situation which is proposed when we are asked to refer this resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. We have already adopted Senate Resolution 35, declaring Communist China to be an aggressor. Now to refer Senate Resolution 36 to a committee would seem to indicate that there might be some doubt about the matter; such action would involve the idea that perhaps Communist China should be admitted to membership in the United Nations, and would also involve the idea that a country which we declare to be an aggressor perhaps ought to be one of the permanent members of the United Nations. That is so ridiculous, Mr. President, that I do not see how for a moment we can consider it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield. I hope the Senator will be brief, for I should like to conclude.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be brief.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the resolution. I am prepared to vote upon it, and I hope the Senate may be permitted to vote upon it at this time. I wish to ask the Senate not to send the resolution to a committee.

I think it is entirely clear that the resolution does not need further study. It has been debated. The issue is well understood.

The time has come when those who represent the United States in the United Nations should know exactly how the Senate of the United States feels and how the people of the United States feel. This resolution is one means by which we can get a positive bipartisan decision upon a very important problem.

The party representation in the Senate today is on the basis of 49 to 47. I venture to say that division will not be apparent in any vote we take at the present time. Therefore, Mr. President, when the Senate speaks—and on this question it should speak immediately—it will speak clearly and authoritatively. It should be permitted to say that Communist China, Soviet China, should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations. It is a clear proposition and we can give it a clear answer.

Mr. President, I think it is highly important that we act immediately, that we give the world our opinion today—not tomorrow or the next day, but today. We should state our conviction that Communist China has forfeited any right to become a member of the family of nations, that it cannot function in the family of nations. The Senate should advise the United States representatives in the United Nations that opinion in the United States today means just that, and expects our representatives to say it immediately in the United Nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that today there is no vacancy in the United Nations. The place referred to is held by the Nationalist Government of China. The method of the approach by which it is sought to seat representatives of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations is wholly a kangaroo-court method.

Mr. President, we should take immediate action on this resolution. Of course I have great respect for the distinguished Senator from New York. However, I, for one, do not need the benefit of the scrutiny or the advice of the Foreign Relations Committee in order to determine how I shall vote on this issue; and I do not think other Members of the Senate do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his stand upon these two resolutions.

I simply wish to say that what might be misunderstood is not what might be said here on the floor of the Senate, but the reference of this resolution to a committee. That is what might be misunderstood. I think it is time the Senate of the United States should act on conditions as they are today, and that we should take some action in an effort to put a little backbone into the members of the United Nations, so as to get them to stand for what they think is right.

For that reason, when it comes to voting on the resolution, I shall ask for the yeas and nays, in order that all nations may know where we stand upon this question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader

Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 36, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

Those in favor of agreeing to the resolution as modified will vote "yea" when their names are called; and those who are opposed to agreeing to the resolution as modified will vote "nay."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the question on the motion to refer the resolution to the committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 36 as modified.

Mr. AIKEN. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as modified; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the question is on the adoption of the resolution as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present would vote "yea."

I announce also that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Michigan would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—91

Aiken	Chapman	Ferguson
Bennett	Chavez	Flanders
Benton	Clements	Frear
Brewster	Connally	Fulbright
Bricker	Cordon	George
Bridges	Dirksen	Gillette
Butler, Md.	Douglas	Hayden
Butler, Nebr.	Duff	Hendrickson
Byrd	Dworshak	Hennings
Capehart	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Carlson	Ecton	Hill
Case	Ellender	Hoey

Holland	McClellan	Saltonstall
Humphrey	McFarland	Schoeppel
Hunt	McKellar	Smathers
Ives	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Jenner	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Johnson, Tex.	Martin	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Stennis
Kefauver	Monroney	Taft
Kem	Morse	Thye
Kerr	Mundt	Tobey
Kilgore	Murray	Watkins
Knowland	Neely	Welker
Langer	Nixon	Wherry
Lehman	O'Conor	Wiley
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Long	Pastore	Young
McCarran	Robertson	
McCarthy	Russell	

NOT VOTING—5

Anderson	Green	Vandenberg
Cain	Maybank	

So the resolution (S. Res. 36), as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up Senate Resolution 37 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 37), which is as follows:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately take such measures against Communist China under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations as will be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, including the application by members of the United Nations of measures for the complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, the severance of diplomatic relations, and operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely desired to say, that if the Senator from Arkansas does not intend to move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I so move. Referring the resolution to the committee would not mean that the Senate might not be in favor of it, but the resolution contains matters which should have the careful consideration of a committee before action is taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in the course of my remarks I have stated my willingness that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I have no objection. After giving the question some thought, I am inclined to the view that the resolution should have committee consideration. Therefore, I shall not object to the motion to refer it. I believe the resolution is of so much importance that as prompt action as is possible should be taken with reference to it. We should not keep our boys fighting in this conflict against overwhelming odds, fighting under the banner of the United Nations, if the United Nations fails to take every action within its power to protect and to support the troops who are fighting. If we expect our soldiers to fight with bullets in the face of overwhelming odds, certainly we should call upon the United Nations to fight with every economic weapon at its command and which is available to it. It simply does not make sense that UN members should continue trade and commerce with China, continue to let her have a free rein, and not try to prevent any material from reaching her that would aid her in the war.

The time has come for action, and I earnestly hope that the Foreign Relations Committee will give this resolution immediate consideration, and report it to the Senate in such form as in its wisdom it feels would best carry out its purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the Senator's resolution is an excellent one, and I should be pleased to vote for it on the floor of the Senate if I had the opportunity, but does the Senator agree that a part of our problem in connection with the resolution is the necessity of working out some understanding with some of our allies within the United Nations, and particularly Great Britain, which has already recognized Red China, and which continues to trade with Red China, and continues to let a condition exist which results in the killing of American boys, while much war material which Great Britain has is getting to Red China through Hong Kong? Does not the Senator agree that inherent in his resolution is the problem of coming to terms with Great Britain in determining whether she is on our side or on the side of Red China?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I fully agree with the able Senator from Oregon. I stated at the time I presented the resolution that the time had come to compel a decision, and to determine whether we are going to fight a war and have United Nations membership in support of it, or whether we are going to fight a limited war and permit trade as usual with aggressor nations. I said earlier this afternoon that there are military considerations in the resolution, and for that reason I feel that our military should also be consulted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like the Senator from Oregon, I wish I had an opportunity to vote for the resolution today. I have noted that the United Nations, and sometimes the Congress of the United States, adopt resolutions. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that besides adopting resolutions, such a recourse as is suggested by General O'Donnell would be rather effective in bringing about the condition which this resolution seeks to effectuate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is probably true. I expressed my views very emphatically when I presented this resolution, to the effect that we should fight an all-out war or should bring our boys home. It is not consistent with sound policy, and it is not humane, to keep our boys fighting with one hand tied behind their backs. I believe they should be doing all-out fighting or should come home.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I feel that the resolution which is now before the Senate should have been made part and parcel of Senate Resolution 35. We have recorded our opinion that the time has come to advise our representatives in the United Nations that Communist China should be branded an aggressor. The matter by no means should rest there. The Charter of the United Nations provides certain actions to be taken against it as an aggressor. If we are determined Red China is an aggressor, as we are so determined, we should also press to invoke the steps specified to be taken against an aggressor.

I hope we will not permit the world to misunderstand the meaning of our action on Senate Resolution 35 by referring this resolution to a committee at this time. The boys in Korea today know beyond any doubt that Soviet China is an aggressor. It has violated every precept of peace and it is at actual war under any definition of war. It is therefore altogether fitting and proper it should be declared an aggressor. But any such statement is reduced to a pious declaration if it is not to be followed through and made truly meaningful. Having declared Red China an aggressor, action should also be taken by the United Nations calling upon all nations to take appropriate steps to stop the aggression as specified in the Charter, and we should now declare that to be the sense of the Senate.

I think the time has come when the United Nations, after voting that a country is an aggressor, must take immediate action. I feel very certain in my mind that if proper action had been taken by the 53 nations on the first and second resolutions, with respect to the aggression by North Korea, Communist China would not be in the war today. The Communists would have known, not only by vote of the United Nations, but by action, that aggression could not continue.

I am sorry we cannot vote on the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas now. I think the time has come when we must be certain in our votes. We must be certain in our deeds to carry out our votes. We must be certain that we advise the United Nations that America will say what it means, and will mean what it says, and will not merely vote resolutions with no intention of carrying them out, or be lukewarm about carrying them out. If we take action today, we can stop aggression.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if he understands, as I understand, that the committee of the United Nations which is handling affairs so far as our Army in Korea is concerned, and which is negotiating with the Chinese Communists, is made up of personnel the

majority of whose nations have recognized Communist China? India has recognized the Communist Chinese regime. Canada's mother country has recognized the Communist regime. Is the Senator from Arkansas aware of that fact?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator from Nevada speaking of a committee of the United Nations?

Mr. MALONE. I am speaking of the committee which is handling the negotiations between the United Nations and Communist China. In other words, our Army is at the mercy of the committee, in having to wait for action from a committee which is made up of a majority of nations who have recognized Communist China. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that to be the situation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know that I fully understand that to be the situation. It may be true that a majority of the members of the United Nations have recognized Communist China.

Mr. MALONE. No. I mean the three-man committee which is handling the negotiations between the United Nations and Communist China in the matter of stopping the war in Korea. In other words, the three-man committee is made up of representatives of India, Canada, and Iran.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they all representatives of governments which have recognized Red China, or are two of them?

Mr. MALONE. Two of them, or a majority of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A majority; yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether or not it is a self-appointed committee?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator's understanding may be correct. I am not advised.

Mr. MALONE. It is a fact. I refer to the Cease-Fire Committee which is negotiating for the United Nations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know what the status of the committee is.

Mr. MALONE. I do not know what the status of it is, but a majority of the committee represents countries which have recognized Communist China. They are the ones who are negotiating, in effect, for our Army now fighting in Korea against the Communist forces.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It is a fact, is it not, that the nations of Europe have at least 100 trade treaties with Russia and other eastern iron-curtain countries under which the European countries are shipping to the iron curtain countries almost everything they need to consolidate their gains in Eastern Europe and in China, and are furnishing matériel—tool steel, locomotives, and so forth—which they need to fight a war?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know the number of such treaties is large. I cannot say how many.

Mr. MALONE. There are 96 such treaties. I put a list of them in the RECORD last year. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that both England and France have independent economic and military pacts with Russia, which are in good standing, and that they have never been questioned?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that to be the fact.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to refer Senate Resolution 37 to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point a part of an address which I delivered on January 15 before the Ohio Society of New York.

There being no objection, the portion of the address referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The election in Ohio also showed a substantial lack of confidence in the conduct of foreign policy by the present Administration. Since the election it has been claimed that this lack of confidence played no part in the result. But certainly no voter had any doubt that I was opposed to the administration's foreign policy up to that moment. In every county in Ohio, I pointed out that the present threat of Russian aggression upon which our whole present national danger is based was brought about by the secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and by our course since that time in the Far East. I pointed out that at Yalta and Potsdam, we set Russia up in a powerful position in central Europe, in Berlin, and Eastern Germany, in Prague and Czechoslovakia, in Vienna and eastern Austria, from which they dominate central Europe and threaten the safety of Western Europe and of the United States. I pointed out that these agreements had handed over Manchuria to Russia in violation of the open-door policy upon which our whole eastern policy had been based for 50 years. I pointed out that this agreement had been made without even telling Chiang Kai-shek, who had been our ally for 5 years, until months after it had been made. I pointed out that this had led to the arming of the Chinese Communists by Russia and the constant promotion of their cause, while we welcomed the Chinese Communists as agrarian reformers entitled to American support. I pointed out that General Marshall had insisted that Chiang take Communists into his cabinet and, when this fatal course was refused, cut off all arms from the Nationalist armies at the most crucial time. I pointed out that we failed to arm the South Koreans, although we said we would do so, giving them only small arms against tanks, planes, and heavy artillery furnished to North Korea by the Russians.

A war in Korea was morally justified as an international move against aggression. But the President undertook it without legal authority and in direct violation of the statute which specified that Congress must pass on the troops to be furnished the United Nations under the Charter.

The war in Korea has revealed the inherent weakness of the United Nations which I have pointed out from the beginning, and made it clear that because of the veto we cannot possibly rely on the United Nations as a weapon against Russian aggression. While it may still be a diplomatic weapon, we would only repeat the disaster resulting from the aggression of the Chinese Communists if we relied upon it in determining our military policy.

Since we can no longer rely upon the United Nations, it is obvious that we cannot for some years hope to resist Chinese aggression in Korea, and it seems to me that we should retire as we have already retired from Hungnam.

Instead of that, we are now contemplating the most complete appeasement since Munich. The acceptance by our confused State Department of the UN cease-fire plan is another tragic error in our far-eastern policy. We obtain nothing except the right to make a withdrawal, which we apparently could make ourselves if we decided to do so. Paragraph 3 of the plan provides that all non-Korean armed forces will be withdrawn by appropriate stages from Korea. In other words, we sneak away from Korea, leaving the Korean Communists in full control, by the gracious leave of the Communists. At the same time we agree to sit down with the British, the Russians, and the Chinese Communists to discuss the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, and also the disposition of Formosa.

To admit that an outrageous aggression such as that of the Chinese Communists can be the basis for admission into the United Nations is not only an abject acceptance of American defeat, but it destroys the whole moral basis of the United Nations. To discuss the surrender of Formosa to the United Nations is a weakening of our entire military position in the Far East, a betrayal of the Nationalist Government of China, and a surrender of the only considerable armed force in the Far East which remains to oppose further Communist aggression.

The proposal is even worse when we consider that the Nationalist Government is not to be represented in the conference, nor is the established Government of the Republic of Korea to be recognized, although it was set up under UN auspices and recognized by the UN. Of course, it would be far better to retire under our own power as at Hungnam to a defensible position in Japan, Okinawa, and Formosa, and retain complete freedom as to the admission of Communist China and the disposition of Formosa.

This cease-fire plan is the most complete surrender to which the United States has ever agreed. Of course, it encourages aggression, and it is only a question of time before the Communist armies, released by the cease-fire in Korea, and the hamstringing of Chiang's army, will march on down into Indochina and southeastern Asia. It has long seemed obvious to me that, if we wish to prevent the spread of communism, we must release Chiang's army from its present neutrality and furnish such arms as may be necessary for him to create a diversion against Chinese Communist advance in southeast Asia. If this brings war between the United States and the Chinese Communists, it is nothing different from what we now have—in fact, it would be a much less dangerous war to us, much less fatal to our men, and much less expensive in material.

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that farmers are getting only 30 cents a dozen for their eggs. In some cases they are getting as low as 21 cents a dozen. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter sent to me by Emil Pederson, of route 2, Berthold, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERTHOLD, N. DAK., *January 5, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I just sold a few cases of eggs yesterday. I received the magnificent sum of 30 cents a dozen, and this is in January in North Dakota. Could anything be done to stabilize the market?

What has been done to scale down or cancel the old seed loans of drought years? We are not all millionaires in North Dakota, either. This might be a good time to do something for those on the old home front, too, as well as in foreign nations. The old saying is, "Charity begins at home."

With kind personal regard and best wishes,

EMIL PEDERSON.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Speculators Rig Market—Egg Market Booms and Busts" appearing in the January 1951 issue of Facts for Farmers, which is published in New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECULATORS RIG MARKET—EGG MARKET BOOMS AND BUSTS

After sending up egg prices on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange to a 30-year high, speculators then pulled out the plug and let the prices plummet downward. Poultry farmers whose prices have fluctuated 100 percent or more in the past few weeks objected to being cast in the role of Humpty-Dumpty and consumers, struggling to make their dollars stretch as inflation sends prices higher, have also been asking questions.

Shortly after Secretary of Agriculture Brannan announced on November 22 that Government must drop its egg-support program and that retail egg prices would fall below this year's level, speculators on the Chicago and New York exchanges began to gun the prices. Instead of the usual post-Thanksgiving decline, retail prices for top quality eggs shot up to $1 and even $1.10 per dozen in some cities as wholesale prices were marked up to 72 cents on the Chicago market and 80 cents on the New York market, more than double their previous levels.

EXPLANATIONS OR EXCUSES

In reporting the record-breaking high reached on the Chicago exchange, the Wall Street Journal of December 8 offered these explanations from the traders:

"'Terrific consumption—more than anyone dreamed there would be—is the main reason for the price rise,' one egg man here said. 'Four weeks ago, I don't think there was an informed observer in the country who believed egg prices would go up. Almost everyone was looking for lower prices.'"

Other explanations blamed the tie-up of transportation facilities by the storm, and the disruption of eastern supplies as a result of hurricane damage to poultry farms. Another explanation, more important but nevertheless secondary, was current in the trade, namely, that the Army had been buying about 100 cars of shell eggs weekly.

CHICAGO MERCANTILE EXCHANGE

The chief explanation, however, is that the big egg speculators manipulated the market and made a killing. Farmers have been well aware of the fact that the market had continued to soar and dip in rapid fashion even after the scandal of last year, which led to a Government investigation of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. To avoid a repetition of the egg scandal which broke over the Chicago Mercantile Exchange a year ago, a veil of secrecy was quickly thrown over the current situation. The New York Times reported that the board of governors of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange called an emergency meeting on December 11 to discuss the crisis which had caught many of the traders short, but not a word came out of what was said or done at this meeting.

Last year, when the Chicago egg market went on a spree, the local supervisor of the Commodity Exchange Authority wired to Washington on October 11, 1949:

"Complaints are that market being manipulated. Please consult with appropriate officials or committee of Chicago Mercantile Exchange and remind them that CEA can prosecute manipulation and corners."

TRADING SUSPENDED

On the same day the board of governors of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange suspended trading in egg futures and fixed an arbitrary price of 53 cents a dozen at which "short" interests could settle with "longs." The Commodity Exchange Authority, which is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, meanwhile conducted its investigation. Not until 8 months later, in May 1950, did it make public its report, titled "Investigation of the October 1949 Futures Contract on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange." This belated report offered no conclusions and no proposals for action. It did not even reveal the identities of the big traders.

Yet the report disclosed that one of the traders, identified only as Trader A, had bought more than 300 carloads of eggs for October delivery, more than twice as many as were available for delivery. It further disclosed that two other big traders, identified only as Trader B and Trader C, had acted in collusion with Trader A and had accounts carried on the books of Trader A.

Having bought more eggs than could be delivered, this ring was able to shoot up the price and put a squeeze on the shorts, forcing them to pay as much as 55 cents a dozen for eggs that could not be sold on the cash market for 47 cents a dozen. When trading was stopped, the ring raised a loud protest and insisted that the shorts should be made to pay at lease 61 cents a dozen instead of the 53-cent price fixed as a settlement by the exchange.

A. & P. RULES ROOST

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. is the biggest egg handler in the country, and its egg-buying operations on the big exchanges as well as on the local markets usually set the pace. However, the CEA made no comment on the position of the A. & P. or other chain-store interests at the time of the October corner. Nor did it comment on the activities of the large milk companies and meat packers, whose egg operations are also considerable. In describing the A. & P.'s operations on the New York exchange, one broker said:

"They order their traders to buy up all the eggs in sight, and feverish buying continues until they give the signal to stop. Then, buying comes to a standstill and the prices drop."

In paying the poultry farmers for their eggs, the dealers in the eastern markets fix the prices according to the Tuesday and Friday quotations on the New York exchange. Farmers point out that on these days the price of eggs has often dropped as much as 5 to 6 cents a dozen and then is marked up again the very next day. Yet no attempt has been made to halt this brazen manipulation.

CEA TOOK NO ACTION

The failure of the Commodity Exchange Authority to take any effective action has only served to encourage the speculators with the result that both farmers and consumers have been the victims of continuous up-and-down manipulations.

The action taken by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan in halting egg support operations will, according to many poultrymen, put them completely at the mercy of the speculators since no floor of any sort is left under egg prices. Instead of the 90 percent of parity guarantees which prevailed in 1949, Congress made egg supports discretionary in 1950 and Brannan lowered the rate to a vague annual average of 75 percent parity for the Nation. For 1951, Brannan has announced that no more dried eggs will be bought and that the Department will not undertake to name any minimum but will explore the possibility of buying limited quantities of shell eggs in whatever local markets it deems deserving. This substitution of a pious hope for what had been a vague promise is not likely to satisfy poultry farmers.

POULTRYMEN BAND TOGETHER

Already a National Poultry Producers Association has been formed to lead the fight for "equality of treatment" and poultry groups in various States, such as New Jersey, California, Iowa, Connecticut, and New York, have joined the organization. "Should the present inequitable egg-feed ratio continue, for another year," they declared in a letter to Secretary Brannan, "many family-size egg producers will be forced off the farm."

They are urging equal treatment of eggs along with other basic crops and also subsidies, such as those proposed in the original Brannan program, to benefit consumers. Temporary cochairmen of the new association are Clarence Althouse of Fleetwood, Pa., and Mrs. Elmer A. Gustafson, of Madrid, Iowa, with Louis Slocum of Trenton, N. J., as acting secretary.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to read one paragraph from a letter which I have received from a farmer named Alex Haaven, of Langdon, N. Dak.:

A farmer was in the other day; he told me he got 21 cents a dozen for eggs and it so happened a couple from Langdon was to the city a few days ago and told me eggs are $1 a dozen there. Then the farmer gets the blame for high prices.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BUDGET FOR 1952

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the annual budget message was presented to the Congress last week by President Truman. Today I ask the President to voluntarily recall this budget. I ask him to call it back so that he can prepare and submit to the Congress a realistic budget, which can be honestly justified.

The executive branch of the Government makes use of the facilities of the Bureau of the Budget in preparing and submitting spending requests to the Congress. This Bureau comprises about 500 employees. It was created to enable the executive branch to cooperate with the Congress in achieving economy and efficiency in the Federal Government.

I believe it is fair to assume that the employees of the Budget Bureau can do a realistic, competent, honest job if they are permitted to do so. I believe it is possible to prepare a realistic budget—a budget which takes into account the national and international problems of January 1951—a budget which strives

for economy—a budget which says "No" to requests for money, no matter how meritorious, which can and should be postponed.

There are 50 members of the House Committee on Appropriations which will consider this budget. There are 21 members of the Senate committee. The professional staff of the House committee employs four persons on a part-time basis to explore this budget. I use the word "explore" because they can do little more than that. On the Senate side, there is one man assigned to the minority, from the professional staff, to act as an advance scout as we proceed through this maze of figures.

Obviously, it is unreasonable to expect the Congress to appropriate funds in an orderly and reasonable manner when the committees must start with so flimsy and incomplete a document as the President's budget. We must have a more realistic base from which to operate.

The situation has become progressively worse in the last two decades. For some years the committees tried to cope with the expanding requests for money on the theory that the Executive was making a real effort to keep our fiscal affairs on a sound basis. Then, it became apparent that our Nation was being committed to a policy of deficit spending.

I remember very well the statement made by a very distinguished Democrat when I first came to the Senate, and when we started on the road to loose fiscal policies. That man was Pat Harrison, of Mississippi. He said, "This country can no more spend its way to prosperity than a drunken man can drink himself sober." That statement was true then, and it is true today.

Congress, of necessity, has resorted to across-the-board attempts to cut Federal spending. The so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, sponsored by 35 Senators, which passed the Senate by a vote of 56–31 last year was such an attempt on a selective basis.

It was lost in conference with the House. In return we got a $550,000,000 reduction, which was a substantial cut, but it was not applied on the principle of the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

I submit, such documents as this budget must be cut in some manner. But within the limitations of time and manpower, and in the absence of genuine cooperation from the executive department, just how can the Congress attempt to impose some degree of realism in our Federal fiscal picture?

The distinguished and able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] cooperated with every group in the Congress—Republicans as well as members of his own party—whenever attempts were made to obtain economy. He helped us in the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans controlled the Congress, and for 2 years we balanced the Federal budget. The senior Senator from Virginia has a reputation for being somewhat conservative. I never knew him to use language with anything but restraint. Nevertheless, he stated that the President's budget is the "very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

I believe that the Truman budget is an invitation to disaster.

Surely, President Truman knows that America is the hard core of civilization's ability to resist Russia's communism. He should know that Stalin cannot rule the world as long as America's ability to produce is arrayed against him. President Truman should know that America will live until she decays and becomes rotten from within. This budget is a long step in the direction of decay.

If Stalin himself were given the opportunity to weaken America from within, he could scarcely produce a plan better calculated to destroy this Government. We are being asked, literally, to spend ourselves to ruin.

While President Truman's budget is bad enough on the surface, it is the hidden figures which make it such an unrealistic and deceitful document.

The press notified the American people that their President had asked for seventy-one billion five hundred million during the new fiscal year. That is what the budget appeared to say. Yet, the budget actually requests authority to spend $94,500,000,000 and another four billions to liquidate old bills. On close examination we find the President has submitted justification for about twenty and five-tenths billions. Included in this amount is his Fair Deal program, the same old socialism in a new disguise. He states the armed services will need sixty-one billion, but he is unable to say just how this will be spent, by which branch of the service it will be spent or how he arrives at this total. He asked for ten and six-tenths billions for foreign aid, but neglects to state whether this is for economic assistance or military assistance.

The President of the United States has set up an arbitrary figure and submitted it to Congress with justification for only a small percentage of that figure. In other words, he says to the departments, "Here is the figure which I have taken out of the air or somewhere else and set up as the spending figure for the next fiscal year. Now you go ahead and justify it up to that amount." So far as I know, that has never been done before.

President Truman estimates a $16,500,000,000 deficit and urges that the Congress provide this amount in new taxes. He comes out strong for a balanced budget—to be balanced by new taxes. This is the one encouraging part of his message—his desire to balance the budget, not his desire for more taxes. I only wish he had shown some concern for balancing the budget during the last 3 years instead of waiting until we got in a war situation when he knows it is next to impossible to balance the budget.

Year after year I have listened to the budget message of the President of the United States, and he has said something like this: "This year we have emergency problems so that we cannot balance the budget, but wait until next year."

That reminds me of Mark Twain. Mark Twain once made a New Year's resolution. He said in the resolution, "This year I am going to live within my income, even if I have to borrow money to do it." That is typical of the Truman approach to the budget.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true that the only time the budget was balanced in modern times was twice during the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And is it not true that the Republican majority which was then in control of Congress was denounced for balancing it?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true; yes.

Actually, sixteen and five-tenths billions will not come close to balancing our Federal books. That which the President does not mention, but which the people must realize, is that Uncle Sam must eventually pay all his bills. Last June 30 our national debt was carried by the Treasury at two hundred fifty-seven and four-tenths billions, yet there was a carry-over of thirteen and five-tenths billions in unexpended balances on the books—in other words, unpaid bills. We had contracted for goods and services which had not been delivered or had not been billed. By adding the amount of the national debt and our unpaid bills, we find we were actually two hundred and seventy and nine-tenths billions in debt as of last June 30.

A close look at this budget reveals we may have a total of fifty-five billions in these unpaid bills by next June 30. The total may be as high as eighty billions by June 30, 1952. If, in 1953 the actual disbursement of Government funds was to catch up to deliveries on Federal contracts, our deficit, in addition to the national debt, would be increased by forty or fifty billions even if we increased revenues to as much as seventy billions a year.

On the basis of President Truman's own estimate, our national debt by next June 30 will be two hundred and seventy-six and three-tenths billions unless we raise new taxes. This exceeds the statutory limit of two hundred and seventy-five billions and takes no account of our unpaid bills on that date. Our Government cannot run a gigantic check kite indefinitely.

To discuss the unpaid bill situation is not intended to be a criticism of the military or of industry. Our production machine simply is not as yet geared to produce as fast as matériel is ordered. But the day will inevitably come when the tools of war must be paid for. And I do criticize the President for not telling the American people of the terrible years which lie ahead when the impact of this spending really hits our economy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator said in one of his previous paragraphs that the President has asked for $71,500,000,000 for this fiscal year, and yet a close scrutiny will show that request is made to spend $94,500,000,000, and $4,000,000,000 more to liquidate old bills. The books of the United States Government are carried on a cash basis. Is not the Senator saying that under this year's

budget the President requests $94,500,000,000 in contract authority and appropriations of new money, even though only $71,000,000,000 can be actually spent on a cash basis in the fiscal year 1952. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. He wants to spend seventy-one and five-tenths billions in cash and he asks the authority to obligate the balance of the ninety-four and five-tenths billions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. So that when the Senator from New Hampshire states that unpaid bills are going to continue to accumulate up to forty or fifty billion dollars in the next 2 years, what he is saying is that there is authority for the departments to spend, even though the bills may be not paid within the fiscal year for which the money is appropriated?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is extremely important to realize that an appropriation and an expenditure are two different things?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Congress appropriates, but the administration spends, and unless the administration is willing to cut down its spending, the Congress can do very little about it. Is that not a fact?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a fact.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did I not also understand from what the distinguished Senator said that of the $71,500,000,000 to be spent, a very large amount of that is simply lump-summed?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that instead of coming up here with a budget itemized and justified to the total amount, the President justifies only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 out of the $71,500,000,000.' The rest is only a blank request in various lump sums.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Instead of building the budget up by justification from the ground up, the administration decides upon a sum of money as though it were a pie, and then cuts it in pieces to satisfy the various branches of the armed services. Is not that the technique which is followed?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is the technique very well explained.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the $94,500,000,000 figure include the indefinite and permanent appropriations or the money required for the interest on the national debt?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it does not include items of a permanent or indefinite nature.

Mr. CASE. Then, that might bring the figure up to $100,000,000,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. It could reach that figure, yes.

Mr. CASE. What about the obligations on the Treasury for the purchase of debentures issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation? Does the ninety-odd-billion-dollar figure make any allowance for demands on the Treasury for the purchase of such debentures?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that I first spoke of a figure of $71,500,000,000 and then I spoke of a figure of $94,500,000,000. Both figures include the interest and servicing on the national debt but do not include permanent and indefinite items.

Mr. CASE. Nor do they include the demands on the Treasury for the purchase of debentures?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not certain that they include contingent demands on the Treasury for the purchase of debentures.

Mr. CASE. Then, the actual cash demand on the Treasury in the coming year may be far greater than suggested by the President's figures.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is entirely possible. The able Senator from South Dakota has pointed to the situation as the result of his experience on the House Appropriations Committee. I think he has hit a very significant thing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Hampshire has had much more experience with matters of this kind than I have. I ask him if it is not true that it is the responsibility of the Director of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget to find justification for the requests of the various departments? But in this instance the departments have not justified their requests, and the Bureau of the Budget and the Budget Director have not justified the budget to the President, and the President has not made any justification to Congress. Therefore, there are several deficiencies in the proper presentation of the budget. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. It is a complete ring-around-the-rosy.

Perhaps the President of the United States does not care, although I hope he does. Perhaps he has his sights set on 1952. Perhaps he thinks the fiscal disaster will wait until he has gone; that it will then be possible to ask a Republican President and a Republican Congress to assume the responsibility for this fiscal farce. I do not know; perhaps that is the reason for the President's position.

The outright deceit practiced by the White House is not altogether apparent from this budget. We must also consider the press release issued by the President on January 15 coincident with his budget message. He claimed that he saved the taxpayers over $5,000,000,000 by not requesting as much he he did last year. The release lists 130 items in which savings are claimed. I ask unanimous consent that this White House press release, from the Executive Office of the President, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1951.

At the President's press seminar on the 1952 budget, it was stated that over 40 percent of the individual appropriation items showed less new obligational authority for 1952 than for 1951.

The following tabulation lists these items segregated in the same categories as those used in the "Analysis of New Obligational Authority and Budget Expenditures" distributed at the seminar. The list is made up of items for the executive branch where less authority to incur new obligations is requested for 1952 than is now available or recommended for 1951, excluding permanent and indefinite appropriations and items dependent on proposed legislation.

There are 130 such items listed, representing about 42 percent of the total number of appropriation items for the executive branch, excluding permanent and indefinite appropriations and items dependent on proposed legislation. Other items of this total require either the same amounts of new obligational authority for the 2 years or show increases for 1952.

Fifteen of these items with decreases totaling $3,679,175,285 fall in the category Major National Security Programs. The Atomic Energy Commission, stockpiling, and maritime ship construction show decreases in 1952 because of large advance financing of these continuing programs in 1951.

Appropriation items in 1952 budget reflecting decrease in new obligational authority, 1952 compared with 1951

	1951	1952	Decrease below 1951
Major national security programs:			
Atomic Energy Commission: Salaries and expenses	$1,916,241,317	$870,000,000	$1,046,241,317
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Construction and equipment	13,318,000	13,300,000	18,000
Veterans' Administration: Grants to the Republic of the Philippines for medical care and treatment of veterans	3,285,000	1,100,000	2,185,000
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials	2,909,548,370	820,000,000	2,089,548,370
Major national security programs—Continued			
Department of Commerce: Maritime activities:			
Ship construction	$350,063,950		$350,063,950
Operating differential subsidies	58,041,129	$35,000,000	23,041,129
Salaries and expenses	20,113,300	17,610,000	2,503,300
Maritime training	4,348,529	3,605,000	743,529
State marine schools	1,102,050	795,000	307,050
Department of Defense—Civil Functions: Government and relief in occupied areas	285,756,240	150,000,000	135,756,240

Appropriation items in 1952 budget reflecting decrease in new obligational authority, 1952 compared with 1951—Continued

	1951	1952	Decrease below 1951
Major national security programs—Continued			
Department of State:			
Salaries and expenses	$78,547,600	$77,400,000	$1,147,600
Contributions to international organizations	54,449,297	30,684,476	23,764,821
Missions to international organizations	1,600,000	1,570,000	30,000
International contingencies	2,900,000	2,800,000	100,000
Philippine rehabilitation	4,349,988	625,000	3,724,988
Total, major national security programs	5,703,664,761	2,024,489,476	3,679,175,285
Major fixed and continuing charges:			
Veterans' Administration:			
Readjustment benefits	2,505,600,000	1,211,640,000	1,293,960,000
Military and naval insurance	6,830,000	6,000,000	830,000
National service life insurance appropriation	75,870,000	66,795,000	9,075,000
Veterans' miscellaneous benefits	71,100,000	23,600,000	47,500,000
Department of Labor: Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	281,000	277,000	4,000
Total, major fixed and continuing charges	2,659,681,000	1,308,312,000	1,351,369,000
Other items reflecting decreases:			
American Battle Monuments Commission: Construction of memorials and cemeteries	5,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
Civil Service Commission: Annuities under special acts	3,022,677	2,955,900	66,777
Commission on renovation of the Executive Mansion	65,000	33,000	32,000
Federal Power Commission: Flood control surveys	351,700	320,000	31,700
General Accounting Office: Salaries	31,084,500	30,325,000	759,500
Interstate Commerce Commission: General expenses	9,899,600	9,823,000	76,600
Motor Carrier Claims Commission: Salaries and expenses	190,000	40,000	150,000
National Capital Housing Authority: Maintenance and operation of properties	38,000		38,000
National Mediation Board:			
Salaries and expenses	412,200	410,000	2,200
Arbitration and emergency boards	325,000	150,000	175,000
Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board	797,300	638,000	159,300
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	6,230,000	5,924,000	306,000
Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses	2,700,000	2,557,000	143,000
Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses	1,290,700	1,266,000	24,700
Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses	826,900	818,000	8,900
Federal Security Agency:			
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses	5,466,700	5,395,000	71,700
Howard University: Plans and specifications	100,000	55,500	44,500
Public Health Service:			
Control of venereal diseases	14,500,000	11,800,000	2,700,000
Control of tuberculosis	9,800,000	9,000,000	800,000
Assistance to States, general	16,915,000	16,084,000	831,000
Control of communicable diseases	6,465,000	6,050,000	415,000
Diseases and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska	1,259,000	1,234,000	25,000
Grants for hospital construction	160,000,000	75,000,000	85,000,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services	1,357,000	1,220,000	137,000
Foreign quarantine service	3,104,000	3,000,000	104,000
Operating expenses, National Cancer Institute	15,686,000	15,122,000	564,000
Dental health activities	2,090,000	1,750,000	340,000
Salaries and expenses	2,918,000	2,868,000	50,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital: Major repairs and preservation of building and grounds	406,000	136,500	269,500
Office of the Administrator: Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations	1,072,600	780,000	292,600
Salaries, Office of General Counsel	455,050	449,950	5,100
Surplus property disposal	333,300	333,000	300
Employee health service programs	50,000		50,000
Grants for plan preparation, water pollution control	750,000		750,000
Administrative expenses, water pollution control	52,285		52,285
General Services Administration: Sites and planning, public buildings outside the District of Columbia	22,000,000		22,000,000
Other items reflecting decreases—Continued			
General Services Administration—Continued			
Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia	$10,000,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator: Advance planning of non-Federal public works	32,900,000	1,100,000	31,800,000
Department of Agriculture:			
Research and Marketing Act of 1946	6,000,000	5,500,000	500,000
Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Salaries and expenses	5,504,000	5,395,000	109,000
Agricultural Research Administration:			
Office of Administrator: Salaries and expenses	600,000	587,000	13,000
Office of Experiment Stations: Salaries and expenses	412,500	400,000	12,500
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics: Salaries and expenses	1,500,000	1,482,500	17,500
Bureau of Dairy Industry: Salaries and expenses	1,617,500	1,589,000	28,500
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry: Salaries and expenses	8,100,000	7,967,000	133,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering: Salaries and expenses	10,968,950	10,785,000	183,950
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases	2,100,000	2,063,000	37,000
Control of forest pests	6,950,000	6,000,000	950,000
Forest Service: Acquisition of lands for National forests, Weeks Act	300,000	100,000	200,000
Flood control	10,312,800	8,900,000	1,412,800
Soil Conservation Service: Salaries and expenses	55,463,832	54,278,000	1,185,832
Production and Marketing Administration:			
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	6,800,000	295,000	6,505,000
Administrative expenses, sec. 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938	11,223,259	11,129,689	93,570
Local Administration, sec. 388, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938	41,203,646	39,509,000	1,694,646
Rural Electrification Administration:			
Salaries and expenses	8,550,000	8,500,000	50,000
Loans	382,500,000	109,000,000	273,500,000
Farmers Home Administration: Loans	172,000,000	153,000,000	19,000,000
Farm Credit Administration: Salaries and expenses	585,000	580,000	5,000
Extension Service: Salaries and expenses	900,000	887,500	12,500
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	2,562,500	2,463,000	99,500
Library: Salaries and expenses	713,293	700,000	13,293
Department of Commerce:			
Bureau of the Census: Seventeenth decennial census	28,500,000	8,800,000	19,700,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration:			
Construction, Washington National Airport	540,000	75,000	465,000
Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act	39,136,476	23,440,000	15,696,476
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:			
Departmental salaries and expenses	5,311,500	3,339,000	1,972,500
Field office service	2,155,000	2,130,000	25,000
National Bureau of Standards:			
Operation and administration	1,258,500	1,209,000	49,500
Radio propagation and standards	3,000,000	2,900,000	100,000
Department of Defense—civil functions:			
Quartermaster Corps: Cemeterial expenses	5,000,000	4,485,000	515,000
Corps of Engineers:			
Flood control:			
General	385,308,250	328,365,000	56,943,250
Mississippi River and tributaries	66,422,400	61,000,000	5,422,400
Sacramento River, Calif	2,524,500	1,000,000	1,524,500
Roseville, Ohio	432,000		432,000

Appropriation items in 1952 budget reflecting decrease in new obligational authority, 1952 compared with 1951—Continued

	1951	1952	Decrease below 1951
Other items reflecting decreases—Con.			
Department of the Interior:			
Office of the Secretary:			
Enforcement of the Connally Hot Oil Act	$180,000	$174,000	$6,000
Construction, Southwestern Power Administration	5,000,000	3,500,000	1,500,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Construction	23,877,651	8,875,000	15,002,651
Revolving fund for loans	2,400,000	800,000	1,600,000
Bureau of Reclamation:			
General investigations	5,875,000	5,500,000	375,000
Construction and rehabilitation	296,102,300	222,690,000	73,412,300
General administrative expenses	7,200,000	6,000,000	1,200,000
Bureau of Mines:			
Conservation and development of mineral resources	18,008,000	17,950,000	58,000
Health and safety	3,805,000	3,790,000	15,000
Construction	1,318,100	1,250,000	68,100
General administrative expenses	1,300,000	1,290,000	10,000
National Park Service:			
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	7,460,000	7,396,500	63,500
Construction	14,732,500	7,825,000	6,907,500
General administrative expenses	1,314,500	1,284,500	30,000
Fish and Wildlife Service:			
Management of resources	7,082,000	6,870,000	212,000
Investigations of resources	4,125,000	4,046,000	79,000
Construction	2,483,450	750,000	1,733,450
General administrative expense	917,500	882,000	35,500
Office of Territories:			
Construction of roads, Alaska	27,900,000	13,700,000	14,200,000
Virgin Islands public works	2,467,000	1,000,000	1,467,000
Virgin Islands Corporation, grants	474,000	130,000	344,000
Department of Justice:			
Legal activities and general administration:			
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	3,750,000	3,700,000	50,000
Other items reflecting decreases—Con.			
Department of Justice—Con.			
Legal activities and general administration—Continued			
Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry	$1,300,000	$750,000	$550,000
Federal prison system	960,000	110,000	850,000
Department of Labor:			
Office of the Secretary:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Office of the Solicitor	1,953,100	1,750,000	203,100
Bureau of Labor Standards	775,200	766,000	9,200
Bureau of Employment Security:			
Salaries and expenses	5,531,000	5,475,000	56,000
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	181,500,000	169,560,000	11,940,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics:			
Revision of Consumers' Price Index	2,000,000	1,250,000	750,000
Women's Bureau: Salaries and expenses	399,000	396,000	3,000
Wage and Hour Division: Salaries and expenses	9,396,400	8,740,000	656,400
Treasury Department:			
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	2,748,500	2,684,000	64,500
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses	2,100,000	2,095,000	5,000
Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment	100,000	----------	100,000
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	21,255,000	3,800,000	17,455,000
Coast Guard: Acquisition, construction, and improvements	24,900,000	16,000,000	8,900,000
Secret Service: Salaries and expenses, guard force	671,241	450,000	221,241
Total, other items reflecting decreases	2,339,730,869	1,616,720,539	723,010,321
Grand total	10,703,076,621	4,949,522,015	5,753,554,606

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Do I correctly understand that the President of the United States says a saving occurs when he does not ask for as much as he might have asked for? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is exactly what I mean.

For instance, Mr. President, let us consider a very small item on the list of 130 items which we are told require less funds in 1952 than were asked or made available in 1951. On page 209 of the President's budget, the item "Employee health service programs (Public Health Service)" appears. The President's press release, on page 4, shows $50,000 for this purpose for 1951, and nothing for 1952; therefore he says that on that item he has saved $50,000. However, when we look at the footnote following that $50,000 item on page 209 of the budget, we find this:

> Estimate of $75,000 for activities previously carried under this title has been transferred in the estimates to "Hospital and medical care, Public Health Service."

So we see how these claims are made. Certainly under such circumstances it is easy to understand his statement that "savings" have been made in the case of 130 items. How many such "savings" are there in a budget amounting to 1,032 pages and with approximately 600 additional pages in an appendix? So we are told that savings are made, although at the bottom of the page we find a note that the item is included elsewhere and actually is increased. That is just a sample of what we find in the President's budget.

I have selected at random some of the more obvious frauds. They remind me of a man who spent $5,000 to buy his wife a fur coat last year, and who thinks she saved him $5,000 because she did not buy another fur coat this year. Exactly the same principle is used in this case. The President lists these items, and says he has saved so many thousands of dollars; but the principle is exactly the same as that involved when a man who bought his wife a fur coat for $5,000 last year, says that this year he has saved $5,000 by not buying another fur coat for his wife.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for many years. Is it not true that in this case first the President has to set forth with the requests the justifications made by the department heads; and, of course, the President must rely upon their requests. Then the Director of the Bureau of the Budget lists the requests, and cuts them down wherever he thinks they should be decreased, in accordance with his view of what is needed to run the Government. Then the President, in turn, revises and estimates in accordance with what he thinks is necessary for the operation of the Government; and, subsequently, the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress must place great reliance upon those figures, if they think the figures have been worked out properly.

In this case there are no justifications by the departments or by the Bureau of the Budget or by the President; so if Congress, through its Appropriations Committees, is going to do a thorough job, those committees must begin on absolutely untouched ground, and must prepare the appropriations in a very short time. Is not that true?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. Mr. President, let me give a few examples of the 130 items:

First. Senators will note the item entitled "Contributions to International Organizations." President Truman, in asking for thirty and six-tenths millions, claims a savings of twenty-three and seven-tenths millions over last year. We should recall that twenty-five million was appropriated last year under this heading for the International Refugee Organization. The International Refugee Organization has completed its program, and is being liquidated. The President has claimed he saved money because he did not ask for funds for a nonexistent organization. In other words, the President claims that he has saved money because he has not asked for funds with which to carry on a nonexistent program. That is a typical example of the President's so-called savings.

Let me give other examples; the next is a good one:

Second. Another item, wherein the President claims to have saved nearly twenty millions, is under the title

"Seventeenth Decennial Census." Since the census was completed according to law, in 1950, it is no wonder that he does not include an item for the taking of another decennial census in 1951. Therefore, how is the President effectuating any great saving for the country by not including funds for another complete census in 1951?

Third. Last year we appropriated three hundred and fifty million for ship construction under the Maritime Commission. This year the President asks for no funds under this heading, and claims a savings of three hundred and fifty million. Since we appropriated funds to build 50 fast cargo ships, in the supplemental appropriation bill, passed during the last days of the Eighty-first Congress, it is small wonder that there is no immediate need for additional funds for that purpose. But it can hardly be said that money has been saved by providing it in a supplemental bill, instead of as a part of the regular budget.

Fourth. The President claims he saved two and nine one-hundredths billion under the item listed for "Stockpiling strategic and critical materials." We appropriated two and nine-tenths billion last year, and are asked for eight hundred and twenty million this year Since we have not been able to obtain the materials we tried to buy last year, and have a large unexpended balance in this fund, I cannot see how the President has made any valid saving when he has not asked for more funds for this purpose this year. Yet that is a part of the $5,000,000,000 which he loudly claims he has saved. There can be no valid savings in not asking for money we could not spend in any event.

Fifth. Another doubtful claim is that he saved one and three-tenths billion by cutting back veterans' benefits. We are well aware that veterans, for the most part, have made use of their rights under the GI bill, and that no administrative discretion is involved in a law which has become inoperative.

I have not had time to run down every item in this list of 130, but I am confident the same specious reasoning can be found throughout the list. This is the same Chief Executive who is asking Congress to pass new taxes.

However, Mr. President, considering the last item I have mentioned, if the veterans have reached the point where they have completed their studies or their work under the GI bill of rights, and if we do not have another crop of veterans coming along to take their place, it is no wonder that we do not provide funds for doing a job which is almost completed. That is just another example of the savings the President claims he has made.

Mr. President, I expect we shall have to pass some new tax legislation to get America prepared militarily. But I, for one, will refuse to vote for new taxes until an honest and comprehensive effort is made to abolish the frills of government.

The Executive, without urging from Congress, should volunteer to lead the way. The Bureau of the Budget should be authorized to prepare a budget which excludes every nonessential program. Specifically, a realistic budget would ignore every new program; for instance, such items, which are included in the budget now submitted to us, as additional subsidies to agriculture, proposals to expand Federal industrial and electric power facilities at the expense of private enterprise, socialized medicine, Federal aid to education, and plans to increase Federal control over State-administered unemployment compensation systems. All of these must be eliminated altogether. Yet the President has all of them in his budget, whereas all of them should be excluded from the appropriations to be provided for this year.

In addition, we can forego river and harbor development, civilian public works projects, and all other peacetime acivities, the relation of which to defense needs is explained only by the most tortuous reasoning.

Last September President Truman called on the American people to prepare to accept some reduction in their standards of living. He asked them to exercise patriotic self-restraint in their personal and private affairs.

It seems only fair that the American people should expect their President, rollicking in his tax exemptions, to give his departments and bureaus the same advice. Only when government has reduced its standard of living has it any right to ask its citizens to do likewise.

Remember, Mr. President, that when President Truman called on the American people to be prepared to accept a reduction in their standards of living, he asked them to exercise patriotic self-restraint in their personal and private affairs. Now, if the President of the United States is going to ask every individual citizen to reduce his standard of living and to make sacrifices, certainly the Federal Government should lead the way and should set the example. The President has done exactly the reverse in submitting this budget. A more complicated, confused, illogical budget than this was never presented to the American Congress. Let us not be fooled by it. Imagine the President coming to the Congress and asking for $71,500,000,000 in expenditures, which really exceeds $94,000,000,000 in authorizations and justifying only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 of it. Never before, during the time I have been in the Senate, which is 15 years, has anyone had the audacity to come to the American Congress and make the demands for money which we find presented at this time, and for which in most instances, we find no attempt at justification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is a law on the books that has to do with the legislative budget. Will the distinguished Senator advise us what happened to the legislative budget in the last session of the Congress, and also what happened to it in this session?

Mr. BRIDGES. My memory of what happened is that it is now a sadly forgotten piece of legislation. It was placed on the statute books, and the Republican Congress, the Eightieth Congress, tried to carry it out to the best of its ability, but it was forgotten by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is that not another way of saying that the preceding Congress and the present Congress, under the control of the administrative power, have violated the law?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is substantially correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Eightieth Congress arrive at a final decision on the budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. It certainly did.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the House and the Senate concur in it?

Mr. BRIDGES. They certainly concurred, in the final report which was a legislative budget.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the legislative-budget law merely required the Joint Legislative Committee to make a report to Congress, and that it, of course, could not guarantee action by the Congress? Is it not also a fact that in both instances, in the Eightieth Congress, the Joint Budget Committee made the report?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The succeeding committees entrusted with making the report did not even have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with the question raised by the Senator from Colorado, I should like to ask the Senator's opinion on this point: Last year, for the first time, we passed the unified appropriation bill. This year, I have read in the press that there is some discussion in the House as to whether it would be a wise procedure to continue it. Is it not the Senator's opinion in view of the requests made by the President, without justifications, that the only proper thing the Congress can do is to pass one appropriation bill, because it is only in that way that it will be possible for us to have an over-all look at the entire picture of what we are doing?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is correct. I am sorry that there is this division over the one-package appropriation bill, for that is the one way by which we can get an over-all look at the entire picture. President Truman's budget is an insult to the American people and an affront to the committees of Congress which are responsible for examining it. I believe it should be recalled. I believe it should be completed so that there is genuine justification for each and every item. I believe it should not be returned until nondefense spending has been cut substantially. Excepting fixed expenses, such as debt service, veterans' pensions, and social-security benefits, Government spending should be cut at least 10 percent, and in some cases as much as 50 or 60 percent, or eliminated.

I believe a Federal budget should be something more than a political propa-

ganda vehicle. If the President and his Budget Bureau are incapable of preparing an honest and realistic budget, I believe they should admit it.

Mr. President, we have reached a point in the conduct of the Federal Government where we are facing a very serious international crisis. It is important that we be prepared militarily; that we be strong militarily; but it is equally important that we be strong economically. It is equally important that we be sound and solvent at home. It is very important that we eliminate the frills of government at this time. I was amazed and shocked recently to pick up a newspaper—it was the Washington Daily News—and to note the summary of the article headed "No personnel cuts."

Let me cite a few examples. These are all nondefense matters. The Federal Communications Commission jobs are to be increased from 1,289 to 1,305. They are going to increase the number of employees in that agency. Let me cite another case. The Civil Service Commission proposes to increase permanent jobs from 3,990 to 4,853. That is a nondefense agency. Let us note some of the other agencies. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics proposes to increase the jobs from 7,161 to 8,961; the Interstate Commerce Commission, from 1,869 to 1,897; and so forth, all down the line, department after department. Day by day, the press publishes items about new jobs. The Federal departments do not need to worry, because there are to be no cuts. On the contrary, there are to be increases. Of course, we must have increases in the personnel in the defense agencies. Even then, it is unnecessary that the increases be made at the rate at which they are being made today. But in the nondefense agencies, in a period of national strife, how the President of the United States can say to the country, "You have got to sacrifice, you have got to lower your standards, you have got to get along with less," and then, come before the Congress asking increases in many items, and concealing other items in the guise of defense spending, is more than I know. It is a good time to remind ourselves of the story told of the Vermont legislator, to whom it was proposed that a bill authorizing the purchase of a mansion for the Governor of that State be enacted. The legislator was an old man from one of the Green Mountain towns. Vermont is a small State, and the proposal to purchase a mansion for the Governor involved the expenditure of considerable money. The old legislator rose and said, "Just a minute, Mr. Speaker, before we vote. I am against spending money we ain't got for something we don't need."

That is a very simple maxim, but something of that spirit should be injected into the thinking of the administration today. I say very frankly, Mr. President, that we are headed toward disastrous inflation today. We are faced with a grave international situation, yet we find in the budget items for socialized medicine, Federal aid to education, the Brannan plan, and all these other pet schemes which I thought, after hearing the message of the President on the state of the Union, the President had decided to eliminate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true that this excessive spending over the years has reduced the value of the dollar from 100 cents to 45 or 50 cents?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is substantially correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the same process is continued, will the dollar not come to be a no-cents dollar?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly that is a logical conclusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator see the cartoon by Jim Berryman in the Washington Evening Star a few days ago, in which he depicted national defense in a Mother Hubbard, and placed under the skirt all the different things such as socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and various other programs of the so-called welfare state? Does not the Senator think that cartoon aptly describes the budget which was sent to the Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it certainly does. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the other Senators on the floor, let us not for a moment think that the people of the country do not know what is going on. The people are angry, confused, and bewildered. They will become more confused and bewildered when they realize we are approaching a great international crisis in which, while the United States Government advocates cutting the people's standard of living, the same Government expands its own standard of living.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks, but I should like to ask what the remedy is. Is not the remedy here in the Congress, in the Appropriations Committees? We can put our foot down and say, "Nothing doing." We can check item after item and say that if the House will collaborate, we have the answer. After all, the President is not the legislature.

I should like to make another suggestion and should like to get the Senator's opinion. Under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to check up on the President. I know that in certain States of the Union when a new governor assumed office in order to promote efficiency, he asked the great industrial concerns of the State to provide efficiency experts for him. They would go into the various departments and make a report, and the governor would then suggest to the legislature where cuts could be applied. The question I should like to ask the Senator is this: We have considered the Hoover resolutions. Has the Senator seen any efficiency come out of them? Efficiency has not come out of them because the Executive has not applied the ideas contained in those resolutions.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The President selected the Hoover ideas he approved.

Mr. WILEY. But he did not efficiently apply them.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Under the Reorganization Act, would it be possible—I have been giving considerable thought to this question—for the Senate and the House, one or both, to create an efficiency committee which would check on the administrative branch and see where all the extra spending occurs? If the Senator cannot answer that question positively, I should like to have a legal answer. The thing to do is to provide for such an efficiency committee and enable it to find where savings can be made. It will be a guide to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has a very logical thought. I have long felt that the legislative branch of the Government must be more competently staffed than it is at the present time. I think that a larger staff is one of the few logical solutions we have in order to meet this terrifically complex problem.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that in the Budget Bureau there are something like 500 employees?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. In contrast the staffs of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate are exceedingly small. Therefore, to a great extent, without larger staffs at our disposal in Congress, we must rely upon the advice of the Bureau of the Budget as it is contained in the President's budget and his analyses. Is not that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. But is it not also true that we actually find in the budget evidence that contradicts all the savings that are indicated on the surface and claimed by the President? For instance, do we not find such things as transfers from trust funds? Those transfers reveal that supposed savings are not coming out of appropriations, as real savings, but are merely charges against those trust funds. Is it not possible that we shall be called upon later to make up any deficits in the trust funds by subsequent appropriations?

Does the Senator have in mind such examples of phony savings?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have several of them. But I have been trying to digest the budget. It is a terrific document.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought the Senator might have in mind an example which appears on page 234 of the budget. On that page the President compares 1951 appropriations and 1952 appropriation requests for salaries in the office of general counsel in the Federal Security Agency. The comparison indicates an apparent saving of $5,100. But when we verify the figures it is noted that in addition to 1952 appropriation requests there

is an item of advance from Federal old-age and survivor insurance trust funds. The transfer amounts to $18,055. The President claims a saving of $5,100 in direct appropriations. But he raids the trust fund for $18,055, or a net increase of about $13,000.

That trust fund consists of payroll deductions and other contributions for social-security coverage. The President's little trick is simply to take the whole of the $18,055 and the net increase of $13,000 out of that fund and use it for salaries in the office of general counsel, while claiming he has made a saving. It is a neat bit of sleight of hand, but does not the trust fund necessarily suffer and is it not possible that we may later be called upon to cover it?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is typical of the sort of thing the President included in his list of 130 items.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand the budget submitted by the President, it calls for approximately $16,000,000,000 more of expenditures this year than we will receive from the present taxation program.

Mr. BRIDGES. $16,500,000,000 more.

Mr. BRICKER. Then we are forced either to cut expenditures for the normal affairs of government, or to levy new taxes.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The only alternative to a program of that kind is the sale of bonds, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. In the Second World War, as I remember, approximately 25 percent of the cost of the war was not met by borrowings or by taxation, but came out of bank loans, which are inflationary.

I was induced to ask this question and to follow it through by the question of the Senator from Colorado a few moments ago with reference to the dollar having depreciated to approximately 55 cents. The only way to hold down inflation as I understand, and to keep from further adulterating the dollar, is to pay the cost of this war out of current taxation, as much as possible.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The sale of bonds to the banks and the financial institutions of the country would be highly inflationary.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Then, we are left with only one other recourse, and that is the sale of bonds to individual citizens. The 55-cent dollar to be received for the bonds purchased some 10 years ago is certainly not very encouraging to the public to buy bonds.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. It is a serious problem.

Mr. BRICKER. It is going to be difficult to sell bonds to the public unless there is some assurance by the Government that the dollar is not going to be further adulterated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator know of any other period when there has been such a depreciation in the value of the dollar as there has been in the past 15 years?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not know of any other similar period in modern times.

Mr. BRICKER. It has been induced by unsound Government fiscal and credit policies and by overspending on needless programs by the Federal Government. So that, as we face the present crisis, we have a dual problem, first, of meeting aggression on the part of the Communists around the world and building up our Army, Navy, and Air Force; and, second, we have a problem which is just as important to our ultimate economy, the safety of our people, and the freedom of those who come after us, in keeping down further inflation. An inflationary program even equal to that of the Second World War would do great damage and might destroy our free economy, as we see it.

Therefore I wish to emphasize the approach of the Senator from New Hampshire by bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that we must not further permit a cut in the value of the dollar or an adulteration of the dollar if we hope to raise the money through the sale of bonds to the public, which would take the money out of the channels of trade and further hold down inflation. Does the Senator know what a 1-percent sales tax would bring in by way of return to the Federal Government?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not know.

Mr. BRICKER. My understanding is that it would bring in approximately $1,000,000,000. Many municipal governments and State governments are relying on sales taxes now as a source of revenue, and it is my understanding that it would take a 10-percent sales tax, which would be levied on top of State and municipal sales taxes, to bring in $10,000,000,000 to the Federal Government. Such a tax might further depress trade, and consequently might not result in a return of $10,000,000,000 to the Federal Government. Therefore we would be $6,000,000,000 short of the budget which the President has submitted to Congress. Of course that $6,000,000,000 could be raised in only one of two ways. It could be saved by a refusal to spend the total amount, thus cutting the budget by $6,000,000,000, or it would have to be raised by increasing the rate of tax on individual incomes and corporation incomes. Perhaps we have not yet reached the point of diminishing return, but it is likely that such increases would inhibit business and perhaps destroy incentive for economy and efficiency in business.

Therefore we are faced today with the problem of cutting the budget. It is imperative to do so if we are to avoid further depreciation in the value of the dollar, and maintain free business, at the same time strengthening the backbone of our war effort, which is the productive capacity of business. Such a budget as is proposed would destroy efficiency and incentive in business, and perhaps might even then not produce the money necessary. Have I correctly analyzed the situation?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Ohio has certainly analyzed the problem and has very properly stated his conclusions, in which I concur.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has called my attention to the fact that he has received letters from people in his State asking whether or not they should sell their Government bonds and perhaps buy land or commodities as a hedge against possible inflation. Inflation would be inevitable if the proposed budget were approved by Congress. Does the Senator know whether or not in the past few months more bonds were sold by the public—not by banks—than were purchased by the public?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BRICKER. It is true, and to my mind it is a very ominous indication of the practical problem which faces the Treasury and the Government in selling bonds to the public. Bonds which go into banking institutions are highly inflationary, whereas bonds which are sold to the public are not inflationary, at least not immediately, although they may be so ultimately. If we are to sell Government bonds to the public we must give the public some assurance that there will not be a further cut in the value of the dollar, and that 10 years from now they will not be paid in 50-cent or 55-cent dollars as compared with the present value of the dollar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that in December $300,000,000 worth more bonds were sold by the public than were sold to the public?

Mr. BRIDGES. I know that during the past few months the public has sold more of its bond holdings than it has purchased. It is a very substantial amount, although I do not know the exact amount.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the figure which was mentioned was $300,000,000. I am not sure of the exact figure.

Mr. BRIDGES. That figure may be about correct. During my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin with reference to an efficiency committee, the distingushed Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] called my attention to the fact that I did not make it clear that the committee I had in mind would be an efficiency committee of the Senate, which would be appointed by the Senate, controlled by the Senate, and staffed by the Senate. I wanted to make that point perfectly clear.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has pointed up the danger in the whole picture which the able Senator from New Hampshire has been describing, namely, that whenever we reach a point at which the redemption of bonds by the public exceeds the amount of bonds which the public is buying, we are heading for disaster. It

is not a condition in which our country should find itself when it is probably facing a heavy demand for defense expenditures.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may point out to the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Ohio that we have a debt limit today of $275,000,000,000, and that with the present rate of spending we shall approach the problem of what we are to do with the debt limit. We will be faced with that problem at some time in the months ahead. It is something to which the Senate of the United States, and certainly the President, should give attention. The problem is clearly stated by the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senator from Massachusetts, and it is certainly an alarming situation.

Mr. BRICKER. If we were to appropriate the $16,000,000,000 requested by the President and not increase taxes, it would bring the debt limit to within $3,000,000,000 of the limit fixed by Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is not only correct, but my computation is that we would exceed the limit under such circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that, in addition to what the Senator from Ohio has said, if we took into consideration the obligations which were authorized, the debt limit would be exceeded?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; it would be exceeded by a very substantial amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, we could not meet such obligations under existing law unless we raised taxes or took some other action.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Simply stated, the point which the Senator from New Hampshire is making is that if he received a bill from a store for goods purchased, we will say, by a member of his family, and the bill was for $90, but it listed items for only $20, with no justification or any itemization for the remaining $70, the Senator would immediately return the bill to the store, or would ask his son, or whoever had bought the goods, what the charge of $70 was for. Congress is requested to appropriate $94,000,000,000 with only $20,000,000,000 being itemized.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Congress is asked to appropriate $94,000,000,000 without knowing in detail the items for which the $94,000,000,000 is being asked, and without any justification attached to the request for that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, the President indicated that he would send the justifications later. At the moment we are asked to do it blindly.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] raised the point earlier about an efficiency committee of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to elaborate a little on my suggestion.

Take, for example, the broad subject of procurement. There are many rumors about 5 percenters, and even 10 percenters. There is a great deal of waste. We have had what someone has called a champagne army. Of 100,000 members, only 20,000 are in the front lines. That is a matter of procurement which really should be gone into by the legislative branch, because we are living in a new period. An analysis of the taxpayer's dollar is called for. I was glad to note the other day that General Marshall claimed that he had found two or three more divisions. In other words, he is rearranging the old ratio of 20,000 to 80,000.

I trust the efficiency committee may be a permanent organization under the legislative branch. It would enable us to have year-around supervision of the Department of Agriculture. I remember that when I came to the Senate we were appropriating $1,300,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture, and I was getting about 3½ cents for the milk produced on my farm. In government we have created many unusual appendages which are not necessary, especially now, when the challenge is to our very existence.

It seems to me that what we ought to think about is putting this plan into operation immediately, so as to begin a real check on executive spending. I should like to see some members of the Appropriations Committee, as well as members of the Committee on Finance, go into the mechanics of the operation so as to have the committee legally established. It should get to work immediately. I think the country would praise such an effort. I think it would result in a saving of billions of dollars. It would not affect the efficiency of government. It would affect what I think is the opposite in government. The Senator knows that there are departments and agencies of the Government whose heads are dependent for their salaries on the number of people they employ.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a very sad state of affairs, but it is true.

Mr. WILEY. So there is a temptation to feed in new employees. Every day we hear about businessmen going to the departments and seeing folks sitting around doing nothing. This is no time for doing nothing. This is a time for action.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. He is quite correct.

This morning another Senator called my attention to the wasted manpower involved in driving the huge black limousines belonging to all the bureaucrats in town. We find them at every social gathering. We find them in front of the Senate Office Building, the Capitol Building, and other buildings, with liveried chauffeurs waiting.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator make it clear that no Senator is provided one?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. I think the only Senators who are provided with a limousine are the distinguished President pro tempore, the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader. Aside from these, other Senators drive their Fords, Plymouths, and Chevrolets themselves.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, there is pending in the House at the present time a joint resolution providing for a system of cataloging Government property, equipment, and supplies. Has the Senator given any study to that proposal?

Mr. BRIDGES. Not any detailed study; but to my mind it is one of the things which would bring about appreciable savings.

Mr. BRICKER. So that one department of the Government would know what the other departments of the Government had on hand.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. For example, at the present time we find the Navy buying things which the Army has sold. The Navy is paying about three or four times the price at which the goods were sold by the Army. I have seen instances of such things charged in the public press. They have also been brought to the attention of the Senate.

We find Mr. Brannan not taking care of all supplies under his supervision in the Surplus Commodity Corporation to the point where they are not even available, desirable, or acceptable by the Army. I believe that a system of that kind, under which each department would know about what other Government departments had, and what department to go to to get certain things without paying double prices after they had been sold at a cheap price by the other department, would be a logical step to take.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I infer from what the Senator from Ohio has said that the Secretary of Agriculture had certain commodities which were packaged in such a manner that the Department of the Army could not use them. I think it might be well for the RECORD, to point out that the Secretary of Agriculture is the one who outlines the specifications, both for his procurement agencies and for the procurement agencies of the Army. The fact that he is outlining the procurement requirements differently for his own agencies than those for the Army is the reason why the two cannot be put together. In other words, the same man is making different regulations for the several procurement agencies.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a very startling thing which the Senator from Delaware has said, but I know that the distinguished Senator from Delaware is always accurate and thorough in his statements and investigations. Therefore, his statement must be accepted as a fact. It is a shocking thing to have a member of the President's Cabinet performing in such a manner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Speaking of the waste in the appropriation bill, we are often told, as the Senator from New Hampshire knows, that the untouchables in the bill, particularly in time of war, are the items for military requirements. If a Senator speaks against such items, he is charged with speaking against the boys in Korea. But I might point out how that in the appropriation bill about $500,000,000 is to cover up the stupidity of one of our Government agencies, which, about a year ago, had on hand 250,000,000 pounds of wool. It was declared surplus, nonessential, and sold. During the past 3 or 4 weeks wool has been declared to be an essential commodity for war. The Government is now going to buy it back, and the taxpayer will lose about $550,000,000 in the transaction. This is only one of many examples.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a typical instance. I might point out that during the past 5 or 6 years, time after time in the Appropriations Committee or in the Armed Services Committee, I have raised the question with the military and civilian personnel of the Defense Establishment, as to whether or not we should declare surplus many of the things which they declared surplus. Always the reply was, in essence, "That is beyond our obvious needs." With the international situation as critical as it is, the question I asked was, "General—" or "Mr. Secretary, do you really believe that?" The reply would be, "That is true to the best of our knowledge."

Now we find that the first time the Army came to the Appropriations Committee after the Korean incident, it asked among other things, for millions of dollars for uniforms. When World War II ended we had uniforms for 15,000,000 American citizens who were serving in the armed services, and we had reserve stocks all over the country and all over the world. Yet when we got into what the President termed a "police action" in Korea, within the first few days, the Army asked for money to buy uniforms.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire know what has become of the uniforms we had?

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume that they were declared surplus and sold. I know that a young boy who is a neighbor of mine went to a so-called Army and Navy store and bought a Navy peajacket for $6. I have not looked up the figures but I would guess that it would cost the Navy somewhere between $25 and $30 to replace that fine woolen peajacket. That is something that could be stored. Underwear could be stored. Perhaps there are certain materials which might be subject to rust and deterioration if they were left standing outdoors. But why we did not have some things ready when this crisis hit us, when we had the largest, most powerful Military Establishment in the world 5 years ago, is more than I have been able to learn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that as recently as within the past 60 days we have had the spectacle of one Government agency selling as surplus certain commodities at a fraction of their cost, while at the same time the Government, through another agency, was buying identically the same commodities in the open market? For instance, a short time ago the Government was selling 100,000,000 pounds of butter as surplus to Italy at 15 cents a pound, while the Army was buying butter at around 75 cents a pound?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. And I remember what the distinguished Senator from Delaware brought out with respect to two or three other commodities. I think the Senator has rendered a very patriotic service by exposing what has taken place in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that even as of today the Government has listed as surplus and nonessential—that is the description the Government has put on it—100,000,000 bushels of wheat which is being offered in the international market with the understanding that it cannot be resold to American citizens? This is being done at a time when everyone recognizes that wheat is an essential commodity in time of war. That is, everyone recognizes that fact except Mr. Brannan. I sometimes think that the Government is deliberately trying to force the country under controls by artificially promoting higher prices. The complete failure to coordinate their procurement requirements cannot all be classified as stupidity. Is the Senator aware of these surplus sales?

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator says is not all new to me, for it is along the line of what has been occurring. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that I was interested to note the other day that now, when Nehru and India have crossed us up and done everything they could to muddy the waters, so far as the far-eastern situation is concerned, we are proposing to ship vast quantities of food to India. I am perfectly willing to help the starving people of the world, but I should like to have the people we help at least be friendly and cooperative with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the event we go through with that program, is it not more than likely that we will be buying, in the market, at high prices, some of the same commodities we are now giving away, or selling cheap under the classification of "surplus"?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is undoubtedly true. That has been the history of such transactions.

Mr. President, I think it should be clear to the Senate and also should be clear to the American people the kind of budget the President has proposed. Either this is a critical situation or it is not. Either we have a grave international crisis or we have not. Either we need to keep the national budget at the lowest possible figure in order to provide adequate national defense and retain our solvency and stability, or we do not. I think the time has come for people to stand up and be counted on these issues. As the weeks roll on I hope the Senate of the United States will give very serious attention to this rather blind, complicated budget which for the first time I know of in history has been sent to Congress without complete justification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is so expert in appropriation matters, whether he believes that it would be entirely feasible, without injuring any essential feature of the Government, military or otherwise, to reduce the size of the budget by, say, from $5,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will have to answer the Senator in this way: I have seen justification for only $20,000,000,000 of the budget estimates. If I were to undertake to answer, I would be operating in the dark, just as the President is operating in the dark in submitting the budget to Congress. But on the basis of reasonable common sense, I think a very substantial saving of several billion dollars could be made in the budget. I will say, however, that I cannot point out the specific items all down the line, because they have not been submitted or justified.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator would like to see a budget first?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], a table which shows a breakdown of the $71,500,000,000 budget of the President, which was recently submitted. The breakdown is by States, showing in one column the allocations of the proportionate part to be paid by each State, and in another column is shown the amount of taxes collected from each of the States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950. The table shows what the budget means to each of the States and how much extra taxes will be required unless something is done to reduce this waste and nonessential spending.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Total internal revenue collections for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 [1]	Proportionate part to be paid toward the $71,500,000,000 [2]
Alabama	$233,208,454	$429,000,000
Arizona	74,822,094	135,850,000
Arkansas	105,425,486	193,050,000
California	2,794,713,395	5,126,550,000
Colorado	272,505,614	500,500,000
Connecticut	562,874,470	1,096,800,000
Delaware	356,901,157	657,800,000
Florida	359,387,115	657,800,000
Georgia	392,518,088	722,150,000
Idaho	71,828,836	128,700,000
Illinois	3,396,862,658	6,234,800,000
Indiana	973,283,542	1,787,500,000
Iowa	345,223,492	636,350,000

State	Total internal revenue collections for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 [1]	Proportionate part to be paid toward the $71,500,000,000 [2]
Kansas	$307,923,529	$564,850,000
Kentucky	857,689,175	1,573,000,000
Louisiana	350,570,822	643,500,000
Maine	106,910,352	193,050,000
Maryland	1,128,476,407	2,073,500,000
Massachusetts	1,127,641,157	2,066,350,000
Michigan	2,747,570,685	5,040,750,000
Minnesota	629,726,416	1,158,300,000
Mississippi	88,306,655	164,450,000
Missouri	1,102,085,135	2,023,450,000
Montana	74,864,365	135,850,000
Nebraska	261,366,873	479,050,000
Nevada	35,446,339	64,350,000
New Hampshire	68,755,337	128,700,000
New Jersey	1,133,975,046	2,080,650,000
New Mexico	57,906,231	107,250,000
New York	7,215,466,535	13,241,800,000
North Carolina	1,131,446,603	2,073,500,000
North Dakota	52,054,181	92,950,000
Ohio	2,435,580,906	4,468,750,000
Oklahoma	413,470,362	757,900,000
Oregon	262,968,480	486,200,000
Pennsylvania	2,964,381,617	5,441,150,000
Rhode Island	183,795,663	336,050,000
South Carolina	175,019,823	321,750,000
South Dakota	56,717,659	107,250,000
Tennessee	316,035,571	579,150,000
Texas	1,290,622,384	2,366,650,000
Utah	84,012,613	157,300,000
Vermont	37,110,077	71,500,000
Virginia	744,061,228	1,365,650,000
Washington	444,759,395	815,100,000
West Virginia	203,917,245	371,800,000
Wisconsin	758,371,637	1,394,250,000
Wyoming	37,425,839	71,500,000
Alaska	17,392,930	28,600,000
Hawaii	81,400,813	150,150,000

[1] From report of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, released Aug. 23, 1950.
[2] Based on percentage of total internal revenue paid to U. S. Treasury as of June 30, 1950.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT I. HINDS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nomination of Herbert I. Hinds, of Tahlequah, Okla., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oklahoma, in place of Henry Clifford Jones, resigned, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the reason the Senator from Oklahoma is asking for immediate consideration of the nomination is that, unless confirmation is had immediately, a vacancy will result because the Senator from Oklahoma will not be present on Thursday to move that the nomination be confirmed?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. I understand the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, and my present plans will take me away from the Senate on Thursday and Friday. In order that no vacancy may be created when the resignation of the present collector takes effect and before a new collector may be qualified to take his place I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Senator's colleagues on the committee are in favor of the confirmation of the nomination and that the report which he presents is the unanimous report of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object because I know it is the policy of the minority leader—and it is a good policy, I may say—not to consent to unanimous-consent requests for immediate consideration of nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

CITATION OF JOSEPH DOTO FOR CONTEMPT

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 43), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Doto to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Joseph Doto may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NEELY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Jenner	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Flanders	McClellan	Welker
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Magnuson	Young
Green	Malone	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to refer the resolution (S. Res. 43) to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report it back to the Senate within 1 week.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have already been ordered on this question; am I correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to read all of the seven cases which have been filed by the committee. I have picked up the record in the case which was discussed yesterday, and I picked up the next record which happened to come to my hand. I desire to read to the Senate the law on the subject as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Blau against the United States, decided in December 1950. The decision is quite brief, it is by Mr. Justice Black, and I think it is to the point, as Senators will observe when they listen to the testimony of the witness as I shall read it later on.

The petitioner was adjudged guilty of contempt of court for refusing, on the ground of possible self-incrimination, to answer certain questions before a Federal grand jury and later before a Federal district court. The court of appeals affirmed—

And so forth. Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court, which is as follows:

In response to a subpena, petitioner appeared as a witness before the United States district court grand jury at Denver, Colo. There she was asked several questions concerning the Communist Party of Colorado and her employment by it. Petitioner refused to answer these questions on the ground that the answers might tend to incriminate her. She was then taken before the district judge, where the questions were again propounded, and where she again claimed her constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, and refused to testify. The district judge found the petitioner guilty of contempt of court and sentenced her to imprisonment for 1 year. The Court of Appeals of the Tenth Circuit affirmed.

We granted certiorari because the decision appeared to deny rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment. The holding below also was in conflict with the recent decisions of the fifth and ninth circuits.

At the time petitioner was called before the grand jury the Smith Act was on the statute books making it a crime, among other things, to advocate knowingly the desirability of overthrow of the Government by force and violence, to organize or help to organize any society or group which teaches, advocates, or encourages such overthrow of the Government, or to be or become a member of such a group with knowledge of its purposes.

These provisions made future prosecution of petitioner far more than a mere imaginary possibility. She reasonably could fear that criminal charges might be brought against her if she admitted employment by the Communist Party or intimate knowledge of its workings. Whether such admissions by themselves would support a conviction under a criminal statute is immaterial. Answers to the questions asked by the grand jury would have furnished a link in the chain of evidence needed in a prosecution of petitioner for violation (or conspiracy to violate) the Smith Act. Prior decisions of this court have clearly established that under such circumstances the Constitution gives a witness the privilege of remaining silent.

Mr. President, let me read the record that is made in this case. It is very interesting. I have before me the case which was presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on yesterday. Here is a witness by the name of Doto. He is put upon the stand by the committee of which the Senator from Tennessee is the chairman. Here is what he said, preliminary to everything else:

I wish to state clearly why I feel that I should assert and rely upon my constitutional privileges to refuse to be a witness against myself.

I do this to explain the circumstances of my refusal to answer certain questions and to produce certain books and records.

At the present time criminal charges and investigations are proceeding against me in the State of New Jersey. Such charges have also been presented against me in the State of New York. The Federal Government is engaged in an extensive investigation of my tax returns, and of all income I have from any source.

It has been announced that my tax returns have been made available to this committee, and in turn this committee has, according to statements in the newspapers, published and disclosed numerous figures purporting to be my income. Statements have been repeatedly made by members and representatives of the Federal Government that I am a member of a Nation-wide crime syndicate.

A few months ago the Federal Government issued a statement that every United States attorney in the country had been alerted to compile information to be used against me. The newspapers have carried statements purporting to emanate from the committee that it is the purpose of the committee to get various people by bringing them before this committee and questioning them in such a way that they would either give evidence which could be used against them or subject themselves to prosecution for perjury or contempt.

Under these circumstances, I feel that my presence and testimony here are not sought for any assistance I can give this committee in formulating legislation, but for the purpose of obtaining from me some statements which might be used against me in further prosecution.

For these reasons I respectfully claim the right not to aid the Government directly or indirectly in prosecuting me. That is my reasons.

Mr. President, I picked up another report. I had time only to go into two of the reports, and here is another one. It is before the Senate and is available to all Senators. In this case the statement is by counsel for a witness who was under subpena. The counsel is Mr. Selser, and he said:

I represent Mr. Moretti in two proceedings presently pending, one in the State of New Jersey, and one in the State of New York.

Presently, Mr. Moretti is under complaint in New Jersey awaiting action of the grand jury in that State in that county. His bail presently is $15,000, and we applied to the court in New Jersey for leave to depart the jurisdiction of the court, modifying the bail accordingly, so that we might appear before this committee today.

I take it that there are certain inquiries to be made by this committee, answers to which may tend to incriminate this defendant, and he, on my advice, will exercise the privileges which are granted him under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and refuse to answer such questions.

I anticipate, too, that there may be some interrogation with regard to income-tax returns made. These returns, as I am informed, have been made available to this committee by some act of the President.

With regard to these things or matters which were set up in such returns, I shall advise Mr. Moretti not to answer on the ground not only of self-incrimination but, perhaps, on the ground, too, that it is not the function of this committee to inquire into matters relating to income-tax returns or liabilities.

I return, Mr. President, to the last word on the subject issued by the Supreme Court of the United States in December of last year, which I read to the Senate. Mr. Justice Black said:

She reasonably could fear that criminal charges might be brought against her if she admitted employment by the Communist Party or intimate knowledge of its workings. Whether such admissions by themselves would support a conviction under a criminal statute is immaterial. Answers to the questions asked by the grand jury would have furnished a link in the chain of evidence needed in prosecution of petitioner for violation or conspiracy to violate the Smith Act.

In other words, Mr. President, a serious question is presented which I do not think should be disposed of lightly. I do not believe the Senate wants to depart from the law, and I think a question of law is raised very seriously as to whether the witness is contumacious. Whether she has been guilty of contempt seems to me to be serious in the light of the record. I think the matter should go to the Judiciary Committee for study and report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I may be heard very briefly, I should like to say, first, that the Blau case which has just been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Nevada involved a refusal to answer on the ground that the fact that the person was a Communist might incriminate the witness of violation of the Smith Act, being a Communist would probably be a direct violation of the Smith Act. The Supreme Court properly held, I think, that answers to the questions asked by the grand jury would have furnished a link in the chain of evidence needed in a prosecution of petitioner for violation of the Smith Act. It would have furnished a link.

With regard to self-incrimination, the first thing is that a Federal offense must be involved. That has, of course, been settled in the case of *United States* v. *Murdock* (284 U. S. 143). The point about the answering of this witness and the other witnesses is that this witness refused to answer merely on the ground of an arbitrary refusal. He even refused to testify whether he had ever heard of some person; whether he had ever seen anyone or not. Yesterday I read a great many of the questions and answers into the RECORD. They could have had nothing to do with any possible Federal offense. Certainly there could be no connection with any Federal offense if he admitted having been to a place or having seen certain people or having heard of certain people. Further along in the hearing he was asked about some legitimate businesses. Gambling is not an offense under a Federal statute, and, therefore, he would have no right to refuse to testify about gambling transactions. In addition to the statements which I read into the RECORD yesterday afternoon, I should like to read two or three more to prove the point. He was asked:

Have you ever heard of the Illinois Trade Association?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business dealings with the Illinois Trade Association?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever heard of the Kings County Buick Co.?

Mr. DOTO. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business dealings with them?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] asked him several questions with respect to whether or not he had kept any books or any records, and he said:

I decline to answer on the ground that it might incriminate me.

On page 12 it will be found that he was asked whether he had any business dealings with quite a number of people. He declined to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate him. It might tend to incriminate him if he were to answer whether he ever had any morphine or narcotic business relationships with certain people. However, it is presumed that a business relationship would be a legal relationship.

On page 13 he was asked:

Did you know Virginia Hill?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer.

He was asked whether he had bought a race horse, or whether anyone had bought a race horse for him. That would not be an illegal transaction. He declined to answer. He was asked whether he had had any business transactions in the State of Nevada. He declined to answer. Certainly no one would contend that having a business transaction in the State of Nevada would be something which would incriminate a witness.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What was the purpose of asking those questions?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The purpose, of course, was to find out what his associations were, whether he had infiltrated into any legitimate businesses and many of the questions were to secure answers which would fit into a large picture of interstate transactions which the committee is developing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was the Senator making inquiry into legitimate businesses?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes and we were making inquiry to find out what criminal activity in interstate commerce he had participated in.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But the Senator's purpose in asking the questions was to link him with criminal activities; was it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. To find out how criminal activities operated in interstate commerce. However, the purpose of asking the questions had nothing to do with his income tax. I have been advised by some Treasury Department officials that his income tax was not under investigation.

He was asked if he had ever known Vincent Aiello. He said: "Yes, sir."

He was asked how long he had known him. He said:

Twenty years or so.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business dealings with him?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. Now, do you know Paul Bonadio?

Mr. DOTO. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Is he not the vice president and treasurer of the Automotive Conveying Co. of New Jersey?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

* * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Has he ever worked for you?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. Is he not an officer of the Automotive Conveying Co., of New Jersey?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

He was asked whether he had ever seen certain people. He declined to answer whether he had seen some 15 or 16 people.

He was further asked whether he had heard of certain people. He refused to answer.

He was asked:

Did you conduct any business in New Jersey?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever have any business in Habana?

There had been some discussion about some business in Habana.

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

I cannot see how having had any business dealings in Cuba would be a violation of any statute of the United States.

He was asked:

Did you ever hear of the G. & R. Trading Co.?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

He declined to answer whether he had ever heard of quite a number of companies.

He was asked:

Have you ever had any investments in Las Vegas, Nev.?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

He was asked whether he knew what the numbers business was, and he declined to answer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The last part of the resolution which the Senator proposes, after stating that the record shall be certified to the United States district attorney, states "to the end that said Joseph Doto may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law." I wonder if the Senator can give us an expression as to whether or not the certification of the record to the district attorney is a mandate to him to prosecute under the contempt citation, or whether the certification puts the matter in the hands of the district attorney so that he will then have the responsibility of determining whether or not a contempt has been committed and action should be started?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The code in section 194, title II, says after providing for certification of the matter to the United States district attorney, "whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action." Therefore, if the matter is certified to him he has the duty of bringing it before the grand jury for whatever action the grand jury may wish to take upon it. Of course, if the district attorney feels that the case is not sound he can and should so advise the grand jury.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The grand jury may then either bring a charge of contempt or refuse to bring a charge.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. If the grand jury returned an indictment, it would come before a judge and jury.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My recollection is that I read in the newspapers that Joe Doto had been indicted in New Jersey on a charge of maintaining a gambling establishment. Does the Senator know whether that is correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry, but I could not hear the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was asking the Senator from Tennessee whether this man was indicted by a grand jury in New Jersey on another charge. I recall reading in one of the newspapers, although I do not know whether it was in last evening's paper or in this morning's paper, something to that effect.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not see it in the newspaper, and I do not know whether he has been indicted for gambling in New Jersey. I do know that Mr. Parsons, attorney general for the State of New Jersey, and Nelson Stamler, his assistant, have the matter under consideration and that they have been very diligent in going into their activities.

Reading further from the testimony:

Mr. HALLEY. We won't talk about your gambling now. Let us talk about gambling, in general, in New Jersey. What do you know, if anything, about gambling?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. HALLEY. What have you heard that you can tell this committee that would be of help in assisting this committee in its investigation?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

* * * * *

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know anything about the bookmaking business?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Another question was:

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever heard of a lay-off bet?

Mr. DOTO. I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. President, it is fantastic that a person called before a congressional committee, on his own statement—which should not be given too much credit by Members of the Senate, in view of this man's record—could sit there and defy the committee and refuse to answer a question as to whether he had ever even seen someone or heard of him, or whether he had ever had any business transaction in Habana, Cuba. Unless we can do something with a criminal with a notorious record, who has defied law-enforcement officers for a long time, as he admits in his own testimony, and bring him before a Senate committee and at least refer the matter to a grand jury, it is certainly going to be a great deal of encouragement and comfort to people like Joe Adonis in their further operations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. So as to clear the record, yesterday the Senator from Michigan asked the Senator from Tennessee a question, and he believed he got an answer to the effect that this resolution would, in fact, be an opinion by the Senate that the particular witness was guilty of contempt of the Senate. When the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked his question, I was not sure that the answer yesterday was as the Senator from Michigan understood it. I should like to propound a question.

If this resolution is passed by the Senate, will it be a determination by the Senate that this particular person is guilty of contempt of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. That is my interpretation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then what is left for the district attorney to do on the question of contempt of the Senate? Is there anything left for the district attorney to do?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. The district attorney then presents the matter to the grand jury, and the grand jury decides whether or not, in its opinion, there was contempt.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then can the grand jury declare that the witness is guilty of contempt without the Senate declaring that he is guilty by the action it takes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe that under the statute it may be possible for a district attorney, on the ground that the contempt is a misdemeanor, to himself present it to the grand jury and ask for an indictment for a misdemeanor. That is not entirely clear. However, there can be no question as to the propriety of the procedure we are following here today. It is a certification that we think he is guilty of contempt; and the district attorney presents it to the grand jury for its action.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, as I understand, if the Senate did not adopt this resolution, a grand jury could not indict for contempt of the Senate on the basis of these answers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct, in my opinion, in these cases. But as I said before there is a possibility of another course of action.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] suggested that we obtain a letter from the committee counsel to the effect that he had studied the matter and had advised the committee, which took unanimous action, that refusal to answer these questions was contemptuous. I have a

memorandum to that effect, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point. I want to say that in Rudolph Halley, our chief counsel and his associates that we have most excellent counsel in whom we have confidence and upon whom we can rely.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 202, 81ST CONG.), JANUARY 22, 1951

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF JOSEPH DOTO, ALIAS JOE ADONIS

I have examined the record of the testimony of Joseph Doto, alias Joe Adonis in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by Joseph Doto, alias Joe Adonis to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are, in my opinion, punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I happen to be a member of the special committee appointed to investigate interstate crime, or crime in interstate commerce, and I have attended a number of its meetings throughout the country.

No man could be a member of that committee and go through the experiences which the committee has gone through without having within him a very deep and righteous indignation because criminals in this country have played ducks and drakes with the Government, both State and National.

The committee was appointed, and it chose eminent counsel, who have done a faithful and expert job as our legal advisers. They have given their best in time and effort to uncover the facts.

These men of the underworld, these gangsters, the scum of the earth—we can name them ad seriatim, if necessary; the names, too numerous to mention, are in the record—come before us, and when examined in open session of the committee or in executive session, they decline to answer on the ground that it might incriminate them. They have refused to answer questions so simple and so far removed from anything that might interfere with the doing of justice that I simply cannot understand the plan suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

The Committee on the Judiciary is an estimable committee, and the chairman himself is highly esteemed. So is the Select Committee on Crime of the Senate highly esteemed, with an able chairman in ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who has done noble work. I will not speak of every member of the committee, save to say that I pay tribute to each one of them, and am proud to be associated with them.

I watched the witnesses in action, snapping their fingers at the Senate committee, which is a segment of the United States Senate. In my judgment, when we take action to delay this procedure, and refer the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, what we are doing, in the last analysis, is giving aid and comfort to Public Enemies Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on down the line. We are aiding and abetting in an indirect way, crooks and gangsters, the scum of the earth. Let us stand up and be counted. Let us trust the committee appointed by the Senate to investigate crime. It has been through great vicissitudes.

I have a deep conviction that justice should not be subverted and contravened. Let these men know that the righteous indignation of the Senate and of the country in general will have its day in court. I say do not delay. Trust ESTES KEFAUVER. Show Joe Doto or Joe Adonis who evaded a subpena month after month, that we mean business. Show these men, the scum of the earth, the gangsters of the country, that the Senate of the United States demands quick and speedy responses to questions from the committee. Counsel for the committee has submitted a legal opinion, which is now a part of the record.

I bespeak action, and confidence and trust in the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have great respect for the Committee on the Judiciary and for its able chairman. I do not believe that we have better lawyers in the Senate or in the United States than are to be found among its members. One of the able members is the chairman of the Kefauver special committee. It seems to me that the question which the Senate must decide is whether or not it proposes to protect the jurisdiction of the Senate and the jurisdiction of its legally established committees, authorized and directed to go into vital public matters and to see that that objective and purpose is not overturned and defeated by the refusal of persons to testify, whether those persons be of high or low estate.

Yesterday the Senator from Florida suggested to the Senator from Tennessee that he thought the proper course would be to have able counsel for the committee—and the committee has able counsel, paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate to protect the committee in its functioning—submit a certificate to be filed with the report in this case, stating that counsel have made a specific examination of the records in this particular case and have found that the conditions and details required to be present before contempt proceedings may be brought and sustained are actually present.

That suggestion was made in good faith, and I am happy that the Senator from Tennessee has received it as made in good faith, and has followed it by securing such a certificate, which is now filed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate, to the effect that the able attorneys secured to protect the Senate in the exercise of its jurisdiction have examined this particular record and have certified that in their judgment all the elements necessary to support a successful prosecution for contempt of the Senate are present.

Mr. President, the question is, it seems to me, whether or not the Senate is going to proceed so as to maintain its own jurisdiction, to protect its own functioning, to protect its own special committee set up to do a job here, which has now reported that its purpose to do a job in this field has been thwarted by the failure and refusal of sundry witnesses to answer questions; and that those witnesses—as the committee counsel has reported—were not justified in falling back on their constitutional right in their refusal and failure and declination to answer these particular questions.

If the Senate wants to send these matters up to the trial court to pass upon each of these questions as they come in, the Senate will be wasting a great deal of its time in first passing upon them in detail. I think the Senate at some time must rely on somebody to do a good job, and I think we have done that here by functioning through an able committee whose decision is now upheld and supported by the letter filed by counsel for the committee.

Mr. President, I am not in accord with the statements which have been made here that the adoption of the resolution would require the district attorney to do something if upon inspection of the record he found that part of it or all of it or any of it would fly in the face of Supreme Court opinions or decisions, or in the face of the mandate of the Constitution or the statute law of our Nation. To the contrary, as I understand it, I think this action is a necessary step to certify and get over into the hands of the prosecuting officer the record of what has been done by the committee and what was done by this witness in his refusal to answer many, many questions.

Let us assume, Mr. President, that answers to some of the questions could properly have been refused by the witness on the ground that to answer would be to furnish against himself testimony of crime. I have read the questions and answers as shown by the report. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I think some of the questions and answers are subject to that sort of a decision. There are others of the questions and answers which, as viewed by the Senator from Florida, are subject

at least to question as to whether they are pertinent, as to whether they pertain accurately to the objectives and the purposes of the investigation. Mr. President, there are many, many of these questions and answers which are not subject, at least prima facie, as read by the Senator from Florida, to either of those objections, but which do present an obstinate and willful refusal on the part of the witness to subject himself to the jurisdiction of the Senate and to make possible the fulfillment of the very worthy objectives sought to be attained by the Senate when it adopted the resolution and clothed the special committee with the authority to subpena and examine witnesses and place them under oath, to take testimony, and utilize generally the powers of the Senate given in such matters.

Mr. President, I very strongly hope that the Senate will not here lay down a precedent of having to submit such a matter to any one committee, no matter how good, because many Members of the Senate sit upon committees which are doing vital work for the Nation and which have counsel and which have the right at least, as the Senator from Florida sees it, to report to the Senate when their jurisdiction is being flouted, and when the dignity of the Senate is being flouted.

The Committee on the Judiciary is already the most overworked committee in the Senate. There is no requirement whatever that the Committee on the Judiciary shall have to go into any or all of these matters. It would, of course, be required to go into matters occurring before it or before one of its subcommittees, but not into matters which have happened before other committees of the Senate or subcommittees of other committees of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What is there to hinder the chairman of the special committee from turning the matter over to the district attorney to do as he sees fit, without putting the Senate on the spot, so to speak, by passing upon the matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to answer that question except to say that I understand that the resolution is in the form which has been adopted and followed in the past. I am advised that the resolution is in the standard form followed by the Senate in pursuance of protecting its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the two sections of the Code of the United States upon which this proceeding is based, at least as understood by the Senator from Florida, namely, section 192 and section 194 of title II. If there are other sections which incidentally are involved I shall be very happy to have them placed in the RECORD also.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 192. Refusal of witness to testify: Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months. (R. S., sec. 102; June 22, 1938, ch. 594, 52 Stat. 942.)

* * * * *

SEC. 194. Witnesses failing to testify or produce records: Whenever a witness summoned as mentioned in section 192 of this title fails to appear to testify or fails to produce any books, papers, records, or documents, as required, or whenever any witness so summoned refuses to answer any question pertinent to the subject under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee or subcommittee of either House of Congress, and the fact of such failure or failures is reported to either House while Congress is in session, or when Congress is not in session, a statement of fact constituting such failure is reported to and filed with the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, it shall be the duty of the said President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, as the case may be, to certify, and he shall so certify, the statement of facts aforesaid under the seal of the Senate or House, as the case may be, to the appropriate United States attorney, whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action. R. S. sec. 104; July 13, 1946, ch. 884, 49 Stat. 2041; June 22, 1938, ch. 594, 52 Stat. 942.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate that it is provided under these two sections of the code that not only activities before any Senate committee, but also before a subcommittee duly authorized, can fall within the purview of the law.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of asking a question of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] who just now submitted a question to the Senator from Florida. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina raised the question why the subject matter could not be turned over to the district attorney for such action as he shall see fit, instead of leaving it to the action of the Senate. In answer to that question, I would in turn ask: Is not the Senate of the United States sufficiently able and distinguished to judge of such a matter as this? Shall the dignity of the Senate of the United States be flouted? Shall the Senate turn over to the district attorney a duty which its own self-respect tells it should be performed by its own duly appointed committee? We should in no uncertain terms, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, and of which I wish him to take notice, assert our own self-respect in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire and appreciate his contribution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We who owe allegiance to the law must always be very careful to see that the law is carefully followed. No matter what other crimes a man may be guilty of, when he is accused of having committed a particular crime, we should take great care to ascertain that that crime has been committed, and that the punishment to be meted out shall be punishment for the particular crime committed, and not for a common or over-all violation of criminal law.

One thing which troubles the Senator from Michigan is the proposal that the matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That would mean that the whole question of whether or not the questions asked of the witness are material to the proceedings must be determined by that committee. A special committee has already had the whole question assigned to it. That committee knows all the testimony which has been given respecting crimes relating to interstate commerce—testimony that could be considered later by the Senate to determine whether or not legislative acts are needed to stop crimes from being committed in interstate commerce. If the matter is turned over to the Committee on the Judiciary, the entire record must be considered by that committee in a determination as to whether or not a question is material and an answer is material to the issue before the special committee.

Yesterday I said I was desirous that the matter be considered long enough so we could give it due and careful consideration. I hope the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will consider withdrawing his motion. The matter is one very peculiarly within the jurisdiction of a committee which has heard all the testimony. That committee must determine whether or not these questions are material and whether or not they are relevant and necessary in the proceedings.

That being true, I believe that the Judiciary Committee should not sit as an appellate court, as it were, to determine this question because, after all, the question eventually would have to come back to the Senate. Although there are 13 members of the Judiciary Committee and 5 members of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, even if all 18 of those Senators were to be fully satisfied as to the facts and as to the proper decision in this case, the matter still would have to return to the Senate for consideration by the remaining 78 Senators of the 96 who constitute the Senate's membership.

Therefore, Mr. President, yesterday I was anxious that at least the hearings of the special committee be printed, so that all Senators on their conscience could determine whether in fact there was contempt or was not contempt of the Senate.

If I were to have to decide about the matter today, I would have to say that I consider that some of the questions were not relevant to the issues and some were relevant to the issues as covered

by the original resolution. Of course, I do not know what the actual testimony has been. However, I would say that on the basis of the resolution by which the special committee was created, some of the questions which have been referred to were relevant to the issue and should have been answered; and as to them the witness had no right to claim, as a constitutional privilege, that he was not required to answer the questions because his answers to them would tend to incriminate him.

I realize that the courts are very zealous in protecting that constitutional privilege, because no judge wishes to have any person deprived of such a constitutional right, if there is a reasonable doubt about the matter and if there are reasonable grounds for believing that the witness is entitled to that privilege.

Under the circumstances existing in the case now under consideration by the Senate, I think there are on the record of the special committee sufficient facts to show that the refusal of the witness to answer some of those questions does constitute contempt of the Senate.

With that in mind, I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist on his motion that this matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee as an appellate body to determine whether there has actually been contempt of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to state that I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Florida in yielding to me, and I thank him for doing so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his comments, with which I am in entire accord.

In passing upon this matter, I think the Senate should be mindful of the fact that if this matter is referred to the Judiciary Committee, similar action would be required in each of the several other cases of this sort now pending, seven in all as I am advised; and then, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, it would be necessary for the Judiciary Committee to read the record in each of those cases, before making its report on them to the Senate.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation with which we are confronted goes considerably farther than the matter which has just been mentioned. It seems to me it goes to the question of whether the Senate proposes to back up all of its committees which report that they are flouted and that the jurisdiction of the Senate in such matters has been flaunted, and that they have been advised by counsel that such is the case, and that they wish the record in such case certified to the Senate, for the appropriate action by the Senate itself in laying a predicate for the taking of contempt proceedings.

Mr. President, Senators who vote in opposition to the motion to refer this matter to the Judiciary Committee, and who subsequently vote in favor of the contempt resolution, will simply be voting to have this matter go to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, for examination by him, and then to go to the grand jury for the District of Columbia. If they find that the facts in the case justify action in accordance with the contempt resolution, they will act accordingly. In such circumstances we shall not be taking away from the United States attorney for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction or relieving him of his duty to advise the grand jury as to the law as it now exists.

Furthermore, by such action we shall not be taking away from the judge in the trial court or from the other judges up the line their duty to follow the law and apply it as they understand it.

By voting "nay" on the motion now before us, we shall be registering our belief that, now that the special committee has gone to the trouble to which it has gone, and has reached the report it has made, we are entitled to have the report made to the Senate, and are entitled to have the President of the Senate as our Presiding Officer properly certify to the district attorney that this matter has been formally brought to his attention, and that he is transmitting the facts as required by law; and then the proceedings will go forward in accordance with law. It certainly seems to me that the requested action should be taken.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate in taking action on this matter. Let me say, briefly, that I hope the Senate will not approve the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

If the Members of the Senate who are not members of the special committee could have sat with it and could have observed the parade of crooks and gangsters who passed in review before the committee and said to the committee that they refused to answer questions, I do not believe any Member of the Senate would vote in favor of the motion of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I consider this matter to be very important. It seems to me that the Senate should say that it approves of the work which has been done by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. If the Senate does not say that, then it will say that it does not approve of the work done by the special committee and the methods used by it.

At this time, along with my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I should like to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who, by and large, has handled by himself the work of the special committee. The other members of the committee have helped when they could and have attended the hearings whenever they could; but, by and large, the credit for the work done by the special committee in connection with the investigation of a number of persons who formerly were public officials, and who now have been separated from the public payrolls, goes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, the special committee is about to conclude its work. Its report is due in February, and the special committee is to be discharged in March. As a member of the special committee, I shall not act in favor of a continuance of the life of the committee.

If the Senate delays this work for another week, until we have a report from the Judiciary Committee, let me say that will encourage the many crooks who are yet to appear before the special committee; such action will encourage them to act in the same way that others of their ilk have acted in the past. In other words, they refused to answer questions by the special committee. Therefore, the work of the special committee will not be completed; it will not be possible for it to complete its work under such circumstances. So the work of the special committee will be interfered with, and we who serve on the special committee will not be able to do the job we would like to do for the Senate.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will not agree to the motion of the Senator from Nevada. Believe me, Mr. President, I feel that if the motion is agreed to, such action will give the green light to every crook who is yet to appear before the special committee; it will encourage each one of them to say to the committee, "I refuse to answer any questions." Then the work of the special committee will be nullified; and it will be unable to accomplish, in connection with the matters remaining to be acted upon by it, what it has been able to accomplish thus far in the cases on which it has acted.

I cannot see the need or the justice or the right of one committee of the Senate to passing on the work of another duly appointed committee of the Senate. Permit me to say, if I may, that the Senate's Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce is a very fine committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order that the Senate may permit the special committee to present to the Senate a report which will be of great use and benefit in connection with the administration of justice in the United States, and, furthermore, in order to make it possible to put behind the bars many crooks who belong there, I sincerely hope that the Senate will not agree to the motion of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word. The question now before the Senate is not one of approval or disapproval of any person. After all, the law applies to everyone; it applies to any person, regardless of who he may be and regardless of the law which he is charged with violating. The protection of the law is afforded to both the high and the low. The law has been written by the Court of last resort. It has been written emphatically. Here is an individual who has been charged with a crime, and who says that he refuses to answer questions because to do so may tend to incriminate him. This individual is charged with a crime, now, in two States of the Union. Is there any doubt that he has a right under the Constitution to protect himself?

That, however, is not the question before the Senate. The question is: Will we sustain the law? Do we believe in the law? Do we believe in following the law as it has been laid down by the Court of last resort? That is the entire question. No delay is involved in the motion. The special committee can make its report at any time it sees fit, and we shall be glad to have it. It should make a report. But the question of whether somebody has

violated the law is not involved in the question now before the Senate. It is a question of whether the law, determining what is contumacious and what is not, as it has been written by the Court of last resort, shall be followed. If the Senate wants to vote down the motion, let Senators do so; if the Senate wants to follow the law, as I see it, then Senators will vote to refer this matter to the Judiciary Committee, where a study may be made of the entire question, and a report submitted to the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senate is a body largely governed by precedents. The Senate, itself, has created a precedent by which this motion should be voted down, for in last November, another noted criminal, yet not as conspicuous as Joe Adonis, or Joe Doto, or whatever other name he goes by, a man from Florida, named Harry Russell, was charged by the Crime Committee with contempt, and we voted a contempt proceeding in his case, willy-nilly pronto, with no reference to the Judiciary Committee. There is a precedent set by the Senate of the United States, itself, in a similar case. Let us respect it and stand by the Senate Committee on Crime.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to refer the resolution (S. Res. 43) to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the Senate within 1 week. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—12

Chapman	George	Magnuson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Malone
Eastland	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins

NAYS—59

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bennett	Hill	Morse
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Md.	Ives	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Capehart	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kem	Schoeppel
Case	Kilgore	Smathers
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Young
Hennings	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Robertson
Byrd	Humphrey	Russell
Cain	Jenner	Sparkman
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Dirksen	Kerr	Vandenberg
Duff	McMahon	Welker
Flanders	Maybank	
Fulbright	O'Conor	

So Mr. McCARRAN'S motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 43.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up Senate Resolution 44 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to considering the remaining resolutions en bloc?

There being no objection, Senate Resolutions 44 to 50, inclusive, were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

Senate Resolution 44

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Anthony J. Accardo to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Anthony J. Accardo may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 45

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of James Lynch to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said James Lynch may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 46

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Arthur Longano to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Arthur Longano may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 47

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Salvatore Moretti to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Salvatore Moretti may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 48

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Walter M. Pechart to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Walter M. Pechart may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 49

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 50

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Jack Dragna to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Jack Dragna may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have written opinions as to each one of the other cases, and I ask unanimous consent that the opinions be inserted in the RECORD following the action upon these resolutions.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF ANTHONY J. ACCARDO (S. RES. 44)

I have examined the record of the testimony of Anthony J. Accardo in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal to answer questions by Attorney J. Accardo

was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are in my opinion punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF JAMES LYNCH (S. RES. 45)

I have examined the record of the testimony of James Lynch in addition to hearing it at the time it was given, and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by James Lynch to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are, in my opinion, punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF ARTHUR LONGANO (S. RES. 46)

I have examined the record of the testimony of Arthur Longano in addition to hearing it at the time it was given, and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by Arthur Longano to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are, in my opinion, punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF SALVATORE MORETTI (S. RES. 47)

I have examined the record of the testimony of Salvatore Moretti in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal to answer questions by Salvatore Moretti was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are in my opinion punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF WALTER M. PECHART (S. RES. 48)

I have examined the record of the testimony of Walter M. Pechart in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by Walter M. Pechart to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are in my opinion punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF PAT MANNO, ALIAS PATRICK J. MANNING (S. RES. 49)

I have examined the record of the testimony of Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by Pat Manno, alias Patrick J. Manning, to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are, in my opinion, punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, CHAIRMAN, RE CONTEMPT OF JACK DRAGNA (S. RES. 50)

I have examined the record of the testimoney of Jack Dragna in addition to hearing it at the time it was given and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal to answer questions by Jack Dragna was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As chief counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are in my opinion punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the question asked and in line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

RUDOLPH HALLEY,
Chief Counsel.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, January 25, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Joseph P. Adams, of Washington, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1956.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

William H. Harrison, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ADMINISTRATOR

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be Economic Stabilization Administrator.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Edgar P. Caffrey, of Reno, Nev., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada.

Herbert I. Hinds, of Tahlequah, Okla., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oklahoma.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Albert Schrage
Charles R. Maxwell

To be senior assistant veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Robert E. Kissling
Arthur H. Wolff

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS, SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Glen E. Ogden
George F. Ellinger
John F. Oesterle
James L. Southworth
Roderick Murray
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Thomas L. Shinnick

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Willie G. Simpson
David S. Citron
Leonard T. Kurland
Thomas A. Burch
Gordon B. Wheeler
Robert B. Shelby
Alan D. Miller
Louis B. Thomas
Leon T. Atlas
Harry E. Halden III
Robert B. Dorsen
John C. Wrye III
Albert V. Myatt
Frederic D. Regan
Gove Hambidge, Jr.

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Charles P. White

To be sanitary senior engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Ralph Porges
Hayse H. Black

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Charles E. Sponagle
Donald A. Pecsok

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Richard F. Clapp

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Anna B. Barnes
Ardyth M. Buchanan
Hilda A. Nivala

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that daily we may come to the sacrament of public service with clear minds and courageous hearts and with an eager desire to perform all our tasks in ways which are well pleasing unto Thee.

When we are anxious may we find our peace in the thought of Thy love and power; when we are harassed with doubt may our faith be strengthened, and may we heed Thy voice as Thou dost say: "This is the way, walk ye therein."

Imbue us with a willing obedience to Thy laws and a joyous harmony with Thy divine purposes. May we never surrender our hope and trust in Thee.

Inspire us with the glorious faith which sees, even in the confusion of the darkest day, the foregleams of that greater and better time when the kingdoms of this earth shall become the kingdom of our Lord.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 87 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continued not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 87 provides for the consideration of H. R. 1724, to provide for the renegotiation of contracts in connection with the national defense program. It is an open rule, providing for 3 hours of general debate equally divided between the eminent chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking minority member of the committee, after which the bill is open for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and while I personally feel certain amendments should be discussed and considered on this floor, I know full well the measure is the result of the usual careful and thorough deliberations always given such major legislation by this important committee and is in the best interests of the Nation.

Under the vastly expanded defense budget the President has asked for, involving for defense alone the sum of approximately $40,000,000,000, contractors are being asked to produce many new types of equipment, armament, shells, and so forth, just as they were during the last war, when contracts were let to many manufacturers with no previous experience on such material desperately needed for the war effort. Consequently prices were extremely high initially, but as the work progressed, methods and means were found to substantially reduce these costs of production. To safeguard the interests of the taxpayers and the Government we enacted the Renegotiation Act of 1942 which became law on April 28, 1942. That act was made inapplicable to performance after December 31, 1945. Under it we were able to recover some $11,000,000,000 for the taxpayers in excess costs and there is still pending cases involving some $5,000,000,000.

In 1948 we passed another renegotiation act to cover the expanding aircraft procurement program, which became effective May 21, 1948. This act has since been extended and broadened and is still being administered. However, its provisions are wholly inadequate to meet the present situation.

After exhaustive study and careful preparation the Committee on Ways and Means has reported this bill, designed to supplement existing law as well as to cover the vast development of our procurement program now under way.

Under this bill all responsibility for renegotiation of contracts is placed in an independent agency in the executive branch, known as the Renegotiation Board. It consists of five members, three of which must be civilians, the other two being members of the procurement organization of the Defense Department familiar with its operation. The civilian members are to draw compensation of $12,500 per annum, the Chairman to be designated by the President. All appointments to the Board require the confirmation of the Senate.

The bill makes subject to renegotiation all moneys received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after January 1, 1951. Renegotiation is limited to contracts over $100,000. Subcontractors—the agents and lobbyists, the so-called 5 percenters—who derive their income from fees or commissions due to their supposed influence in securing these contracts, would be renegotiated when receiving $25,000 or more in any one year. Personally I feel that the basic limit on contractors should be reduced

to $25,000 and the limit placed on the lobbyists and 5 percenters for renegotiation should be reduced to $10,000 in any one year.

The bill excludes contractors or subcontractors who are producers of agricultural products. I wonder whether, in this connection, the committee has given full consideration to the excessive profits garnered by the giant outfits producing potatoes in Maine, the organizations, corporations, and individuals operating the vast-acreage wheat and corn fields of the Middle West and the West, and the large plantation owners in the South? I certainly favor excluding the average farmer from the provisions of this bill, but I do not favor exempting the giants in the agricultural field who so frequently take advantage of conditions to extort unconscionable profits because of their power.

Next, it excludes contractors or subcontractors engaged in the primary production of minerals, oil or natural gas, or natural deposits where the product has not been refined, processed, or treated beyond ordinary processes. From accounts continually appearing in the financial pages of our newspapers, these companies are not going bankrupt; in fact, they are making millions upon millions. I wonder why they should be exempt? It is my belief they should be included the same as other contractors in the war effort. I am not opposed to their making reasonable and fair profits, but if their returns are excessive and they are found holding up the Government during these critical times, they, too, should be required to renegotiate their contracts and return to the Government the enormous excess profits that have been found to exist from time to time.

The same applies to the large timber producers who are exempted under this bill. I do not know for certain whether they are responsible for the greatly increased price of lumber today but if they are, they should come under this bill. In addition, we have the farm implement manufacturers, whom I do not see mentioned in this measure. I have perhaps the largest implement manufacturing plant in the United States in my district. Should they be exempted from renegotiation in these times? I never heard any farmer complaining that the price he pays for his machinery is too low; in fact, I have heard universal complaint that the prices are far too high. Should they be exempted from the provisions of this bill? I have no intention of setting myself above the committee. They have held extensive hearings and I feel certain the members have exerted every effort to bring out a fair compromise which resulted in the unanimous reporting of the measure. However, I wonder whether perhaps we could prevail upon the committee to accept some changes during its forthcoming consideration which might bring in some of the elements in our productive economy to which I have referred and which I feel should be included under the provisions of this renegotiation act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In a minute if the gentleman will pardon me. The bill also excludes contracts with the several States, our Territories and possessions, and with foreign governments. Let us look into this a moment. It is all right, as I see it, to exempt the States and our Territories and possessions, but as to foreign governments, I question the wisdom of exempting them entirely. We all know how Great Britain controls the wool and tin markets of the world. Should they be permitted to overcharge us in this great emergency and make huge profits on these products so vital to our and their defense as they have done heretofore and are doing now? We are all familiar with the control over natural rubber production held by the Dutch and the French in Indochina and Malaya. Should these countries be excluded and permitted to reap the fantastic profits that now prevail on this critical material in this emergency?

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly believe some of our contracts with foreign firms controlled by foreign governments should not be excluded. With the staggering burden ahead of us, every dollar of unnecessary and unwarranted cost must be saved for our taxpayers who must bear this burden. I hope that at the conclusion of debate on this bill, when it is read under the 5-minute rule, we may inquire of the splendid chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on Ways and Means whether it is feasible and to include some or all of the industries and foreign governments to which I have alluded above under the provisions of this legislation, thus safeguarding and protecting our Government and its taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that it is a snare and delusion to think this bill is going to take the profits out of war. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and I hope he will offer amendments that will plug up the loopholes in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Yes, I wish this bill would take the profit out of war, for if we can bring about such an accomplishment I am inclined to believe the danger of wars would be greatly minimized.

Personally, I am not possessed of the vast store of information this great committee has accumulated on this proposed legislation. The members may have had definite reasons for including these exemptions, by yielding here and there in order to obtain a unanimous report, to satisfy the minority members of the committee who invariably talk economy but when it comes to practicing what they preach they fail to carry out their laudable intentions. We understand how things are done in committees. Consequently, I do not blame the committee, but I do believe some of these exemptions and exceptions are not justifiable or warranted. Would it not be in the interest of economy if we recouped all unjustifiable profits—if we provided for the refunding of excess profits from all, making no exemptions nor creating any favorites?

It may be fitting for me at this time, in mentioning the work of your committee, to call attention to the oft-repeated remarks of that great legislator and statesman, the Honorable James R. Mann, who usually would say "Hindoo do the best that he can do." I hope, as I stated before, that when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule we may arrive at some amendments which will increase the amounts refunded out of the billions we are going to expend and are obliged to expend for the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the renegotiation of defense contracts for the elimination of excessive profits. Its principal provisions, modeled generally after the World War II Renegotiation Act (U. S. C. 50 App. 1191), are summarized as follows:

GENERAL APPLICATION

The act shall apply, first, to receipts and accruals on or after January 1, 1951, from contracts and related subcontracts with the military departments, the Department of Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission; and, second, to receipts and accruals from contracts and related subcontracts with such other agencies performing defense functions as the President may designate, after such designation. But it shall not apply to receipts and accruals attributable to performance after December 31, 1953. The act shall apply to all contracts falling within its terms, but such contracts shall, nevertheless, contain stipulations consenting to renegotiation.

EXEMPTIONS

The following contracts and subcontracts thereunder are exempt from the act: First, contracts with other governmental agencies, domestic or foreign; second, contracts with agricultural producers for commodities in their raw or natural state, or in the subsequent state in which they are usually first sold or have a market; third, contracts with the owners or operators of mines and wells for the product thereof before it is processed to its first usual marketable form; fourth, contracts with timber owners or log producers for timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs; and, fifth, contracts which the Renegotiation Board has discretion to, and does, exempt, these being (a) contracts to be performed abroad; (b) contracts wherein the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established; (c) contracts for a definite period if their provisions are adequate to prevent excessive profits; (d) contracts whose renegotiation would jeopardize secrecy required in the public interest; and (e) contracts as to which it is not administratively feasible to segregate profits attributable to activities not subject to renegotiation.

MINIMUM AMOUNTS SUBJECT TO RENEGOTIATION

A specific yearly exemption is provided each contractor or subcontractor for receipts and accruals under contracts and subcontracts, first, in the nature of purchase orders, agreements to furnish materials or perform work, or patent licenses—in the aggregate amount of $100,000; and, second, in the nature of brokerage agreements—in the aggregate amount of $25,000. If the aggregate receipts and accruals are less than the amounts indicated, there is no renegotiation; and the excessive profits eliminated upon renegotiation shall in no case exceed the difference between aggregate receipts and accruals and such figures.

THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Renegotiation Board is established as an independent executive agency to consist of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, at least three of whom shall be from civilian life. Salaries of $12,500 per annum are provided. The President shall designate a chairman, and the Board shall act by majority vote of a quorum, which shall be three members. The Board is authorized to establish necessary offices, to employ necessary personnel, to establish subordinate divisions of its members for the consideration or review of different types of cases, and to delegate any function or power—except the power to make rules and regulations—to any Government agency and to authorize its redelegation.

REPORTS AND AUDITS OF CONTRACTORS

Every holder of a contract or subcontract subject to the act shall file with the Board a financial statement in such form as the Board shall by regulation determine, on or before the beginning of the fourth calendar month following the end of the contractor's fiscal year. A penalty—$10,000 fine and/or 1-year imprisonment—is provided for willful misrepresentation or failure to comply. The Board shall have the power to audit the books and records of such contractors and subcontractors.

STANDARDS FOR DETERMINATION OF EXCESSIVE PROFITS

In determining excessive profits, the Board shall give consideration to the efficiency of the contractor, reasonableness of costs and profits—with particular regard to volume of production, comparison of war and peacetime products, and so forth—reasonableness of return on net worth—with particular regard to the amount and source of public and private capital—contribution to the defense effort, the extent of risk, the character of the business, and other factors required by the public interest and fair dealing—the latter to be published by the Board. All allowable income-tax deductions and exclusions may be allocated by the contractor as part of his costs, except through carry-back and carry-over operations.

RENEGOTIATION PROCEDURE

Whenever the Board is of the opinion that receipts and accruals under contracts, and so forth, may reflect excessive profits, it shall commence a renegotiation proceeding by notifying the contractor, and so forth, of a conference to be held for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to the elimination of excessive profits. Such agreement shall be conclusive, in the absence of fraud. If no such agreement is reached, the Board shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of excessive profits, notify the contractor, and so forth, thereof, and furnish a statement of facts used as a basis therefor and its reasons for such determination. Determinations shall be based on the aggregate of receipts and accruals during the fiscal year or other agreed period under contracts held by the contractor, and so forth, except that contracts may be treated separately on request of the contractor. By agreement, renegotiation of the contracts of more than one contractor may be conducted on a consolidated basis. Unless an extension of time for payment of sums due under agreements or orders is granted by the Board, the Board, after the agreement or order is reached, shall direct the appropriate agency heads to eliminate the excessive profits by reductions in amounts payable under contracts or otherwise due the contractor, by directing Government contractors, and so forth, to withhold amounts due subcontractors, by a combination of such methods, or by suit. The contractor shall not be liable for the payment of excessive profits unless proceedings are commenced within 1 year after the filing of the contractor's financial statement, and an agreement or order is reached within 2 years after such commencement. Within 90 days appeals may be taken to the Tax Court from orders of the Board, for a proceeding de novo to determine excessive profits, if any. The filing of such a petition shall not stay the execution of the order. Interest on excessive profits shall accrue at the rate of 6 percent from the date of the Board's order to the date of repayment. Interest at the same rate shall accrue in favor of the contractor on any amounts refunded by the Tax Court. The decision of the Tax Court shall be final.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this rule should be adopted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1724, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1724, the bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, would make possible the recapture of excessive profits directly attributable to business with agencies engaged in the defense program. Renegotiation, unlike excess-profits taxation, is limited to contracts with the Government, or related subcontracts. The excess-profits tax, however, is confined to corporations, while renegotiation applies to all forms of business enterprise.

A. HEARINGS

Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Ways and Means in August of last year on the operation of prior renegotiation laws and the renegotiation statute now in effect. Contracts subject to renegotiation under the World War II statute aggregated in excess of $200,000,000,000, from which gross amounts of more than $11,000,000,000 were recaptured through renegotiation. These figures indicate the tremendous task of statutory renegotiation, and the importance of the comprehensive review of renegotiation experience which has been given by the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee carefully considered the testimony of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who introduced in the last Congress a bill very similar to the pending bill, as well as the testimony of representatives of the executive departments, and witnesses from industry, agriculture, and mining.

The Committee on Ways and Means concluded that present procurement problems are substantially as great as those which brought about the enactment of similar legislation in World War II, and that the scope of the existing renegotiation law is not broad enough to insure the uniform and effective recapture on a fair and equitable basis of excessive profits which may be derived from the expanded defense effort.

B. SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill covers contracts, and related subcontracts, with the Departments of Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, General Services Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and such other agencies exercising functions in connection with the national defense which the President may designate. It provides that if a contractor or subcontractor receives or accrues more than $100,000 in his fiscal year he may be renegotiated for the year, and that a subcontractor whose income is derived from certain fees or commissions may be renegotiated if he has received or accrued more than $25,000 in his fiscal year. This latter provision applies to the so-called 5 percenters as well as to others. The bill contains a termination date of December 31, 1953.

The bill follows the basic outline of the World War II renegotiation law in providing for mandatory exemption for agricultural commodities and the products of mines, oil or gas wells, and timber, except that the exemptions for such products in general are limited to the producers of the raw commodity and do not generally apply beyond the first commercially marketable state. In addition to the mandatory exemptions, certain

other exemptions could be provided in the discretion of the Renegotiation Board.

This bill, unlike prior renegotiation laws, would establish a five-man renegotiation board, independent of the procurement agencies, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Members would receive compensation of $12,500 per annum. At least three of the members would have to be from civilian life. The Board, of course, could delegate to the various procurement agencies the responsibility for initiating renegotiation of a contractor, but the decisions of the agency would be subject to review by the Board. In authorizing the Renegotiation Board to delegate some of its authority to conduct renegotiation proceedings it is intended that there should be no unnecessary duplication of renegotiation offices and personnel in the same area. Moreover, as stressed in the committee report, it is contemplated, in order to maintain the separation of the renegotiation and procurement functions, that renegotiation duties should not be delegated to agency personnel who are directly responsible for procurement. The determinations of the Renegotiation Board would be subject to an entirely new review by the Tax Court of the United States, the redetermination of which would be final.

Under the bill contractors and subcontractors would file a financial statement with the Renegotiation Board within 3 months after the close of their fiscal year. The Board would have 1 year thereafter in which to initiate renegotiation proceedings, which would be commenced by formal notice to the contractor or subcontractor by registered mail.

An effort would first be made to obtain the agreement of the contractor or subcontractor to the elimination of excessive profits. If this is not found possible, a determination is made unilaterally, from which the contractor or subcontractor may take an appeal to the Tax Court.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the President has submitted a budget message calling for military expenditures at the rate of $41,500,000,000 a year. This rate of expenditure for military purposes is higher than that for any year of World War II prior to 1943. The acceleration of the defense program has resulted in procurement pricing problems quite similar to those which brought about the enactment of a renegotiation law during World War II. That renegotiation statute, broadly conceived and administered with care, was found to be a desirable supplement to other methods of avoiding excessive war profits. As President Roosevelt stated in his budget message of January 10, 1944:

> The American people are united in their resolution to prevent war profiteering. Taxation alone is not enough. One of the most constructive attempts ever made to reduce profiteering at the expense of the Government in wartime was the renegotiation law enacted by the Congress in April 1942. That statute gives to the major procurement agencies the right and charges them with the duty to reexamine their war contracts and subcontracts and to recover excessive amounts paid under them, as well as to reduce inordinately high prices being charged for goods still to be delivered.
>
> The record of performance under that statute has been good. The cost of our procurement program has already been reduced by over $5,000,000,000 by contractors' agreements to refund money already paid them by the Government for war matériel and by price reductions granted the Government on goods still to be delivered. A considerable part of this amount would have escaped even wartime taxes. Many wartime profits are not subject to excess-profits taxation; moreover, even taxes paid may be refunded under various provisions of the present excess-profits-tax law. The recapture of exorbitant war profits, in my judgment, should be definitely assured by renegotiation. To measure the benefits of the renegotiation statute in terms of dollars recovered from war contractors is to understate its beneficial effect. The statute is enabling us to combine speed of procurement with fair prices for the goods the Government must buy. Without it the war procurement program would be handicapped.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this bill, based upon the foundation of our World War II experience in renegotiation and strengthened in the light of that experience, will likewise further the best interests of the Government and of all the people in the greatly expanded defense program upon which we are now engaged. I trust that the bill will be speedily enacted.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, briefly stated the bill H. R. 1724 delegates to a 5-member administrative board the power to tax 100 percent of excessive profits derived by contractors and subcontractors from contracts with the executive departments. The bill contains no definition of the term "excessive profits" other than to say that it means that portion of profits derived from contracts with the departments and subcontracts which is determined to be excessive and the bill provides only that in making the determination of excessive consideration shall be given to six general factors and to such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equitable dealing may require.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. REED of New York. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I hope the gentleman will discuss this point during his remarks. I listened with great interest to what the chairman of the committee had to say about the board of five to be set up by the President. We have more than 2,000,000 Government employees now. Did the committee not think that out of that two million the President could find five people who would be competent to make up this Board of Renegotiation without setting up a new board and going outside to appoint five more men?

Mr. REED of New York. Let me answer the question this way. There was some difference of opinion about the matter. The first bill provided for seven members to be taken practically from the defense departments. A motion was made and carried to reduce it to a board of five, three of whom should be civilians. There were some who thought that the procurement agencies of the Government, who went out and procured the contract for the things that they needed and needed quickly, and in which there had been no experience heretofore in the manufacture, therefore could not determine the costs. Some members of the committee felt that perhaps the procurement people were better prepared, having made the contracts and studied all phases of them, than perhaps a new board of civilians who had had no connection with it. However, after very careful consideration, it was determined that there should be an independent board, with three civilians.

Mr. DONDERO. That is not exactly my point. My point was, Could they not have found five people within the Government now, without setting up a new board and going outside of the Government and obtaining five members?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. That is exactly what I wanted to discuss with the gentleman.

We considered the fact that, as the gentleman from New York states, the original bill provided for a board of seven to be taken from the departments of the Government. The committee, after thorough consideration and extensive hearings and consultation with people who had been administering the law, reached the conclusion that whereas to have one agency of the Government, or employees of the Government, making the contract, it might be fairer not to have other agencies of the Government renegotiating contracts made by Government agencies, and that in the interest of fairness to the contractors of the country it would probably be better to draw these five or part of these five Board members from the businessmen of the country who have had experience in business and whose experience is not limited to governmental activities.

Mr. REED of New York. One other point that I wish to make is that there is involved, of course, the principle of being judge and jury. Some felt that those who made the first determination would stand adamant against a finding that the determination was not correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sure my distinguished friend will recall that Hon. Robert Patterson, Secretary of War, whom we all know well and favorably, and who has had much experience in renegotiation of war contracts as a result of World War II, strongly recommended this being made an independent board.

Mr. REED of New York. That is true and perhaps it had a good deal to do with changing the opinion of the committee.

My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in calling the attention of the House at the very onset to the broad, unrestricted language and the sweeping delegation of power which this legislation provides is to make it perfectly clear to the House that this legislation can and should be justified

and supported only because of the present accelerated emergency defense program. Renegotiation, like its twin brother, the excess-profits tax, has absolutely no place in a free economy under normal conditions. Unfortunately, of course, there are some who seek to use the present emergency period as a means for permanently fastening Socialist policies on our economic system, and it is of the utmost importance that the Congress be alert in preventing this insidious attack from within. I am glad to be able to say, however, that the Ways and Means Committee has been alert in this instance and that this legislation carries a termination date of December 31, 1953. This will insure that an accounting to the Congress will have to be made by those entrusted with the heavy responsibility for administering this remarkable delegation of power.

HISTORY OF RENEGOTIATION

The first Renegotiation Act was a part of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942. That act was applicable to profits made in fiscal years ending prior to June 30, 1943, and contracts awarded by the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries. In view, however, of the considerable lack of uniformity in the administration of the 1942 act as well as a lack of any specific standards to be used as the measuring rod to determine excessive profits, the Congress enacted the Renegotiation Act of 1943 on which the bill before us is patterned.

The 1943 law differed from the 1942 Renegotiation Act in four principal ways:

First. The 1943 act created a War Contracts Price Adjustment Board which included a representative from each of the named governmental agencies. This Board was to formulate renegotiation policies and to be responsible for the administration of the act.

Second. The 1943 act provided that contested renegotiation determinations could be appealed to the tax court.

Third. The 1943 act eliminated from renegotiation all contractors whose gross annual wartime business was less than $500,000.

Fourth. The 1943 act set forth seven factors which the price adjustment boards were to consider in determining whether a contractor had realized excessive profits.

In addition, the 1943 act made it mandatory for a contractor subject to the terms of the act to file a report on his wartime business rather than leaving it to the boards to locate contractors subject to renegotiation. It also exempted from renegotiation contracts for certain types of articles and permitted the exemption of certain other contracts. By subsequent amendments the 1943 act was extended until December 31, 1945.

The 1943 act expired at the end of 1945 and at the present time renegotiation authority is contained in the Renegotiation Act of 1948 which was a part of an appropriation bill for the contracts of military and naval aircraft. Although the provisions of the 1948 law have been extended to other military appropriations there is no authority at the present time to renegotiate contracts of any Government agencies other than the Department of Defense, and this limitation is one of the principal reasons for the enactment of H. R. 1724.

RENEGOTIATION PROCEEDINGS

H. R. 1724 is in general divided into two parts. The first part under title I is the substance of the bill and deals with the coverage of the new renegotiation provisions, creates a Renegotiation Board, and establishes the procedure's limitations and exemptions from coverage. The second part which is title II abolishes the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board which was created under the World War II act and provides for the transfer of certain residual functions and powers of that Board to the Administrator of General Services and to the new independent Renegotiation Board established under the bill.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be of interest to the Members of the House if I outlined briefly at this point the renegotiation proceedings and process provided for in the bill.

The renegotiation process is set in motion by the mailing of a notice, by registered mail, to the contractor or subcontractor. An effort is then made by the Board to reach an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor as to the amount of excessive profits, if any. If no agreement is reached, the Renegotiation Board issues an order determining the amount of excessive profits and so advises the contractor or subcontractor by registered mail. Unless a petition is filed by the contractor or subcontractor within the prescribed time to the Tax Court the order of the Renegotiation Board is final and is not subject to any review or redetermination by any court or other agency. If, however, a petition is filed with the Tax Court, the proceeding before the Tax Court is a proceeding de novo and the Tax Court has the exclusive jurisdiction to make a final determination of the amount, if any, of the excess profits received or accrued by the contractor or subcontractor. No further appeal is provided for in the bill.

I might say there was some sentiment on the part of certain members of the committee to provide for an appeal to the district courts, but after very full consideration it was thought that perhaps the present method is the fairer way to handle it effectively because the Tax Court has had considerable experience in these matters.

Where no agreement can be reached with the contractor or subcontractor and a determination of excessive profits has been made by the Board, the Board is required, if requested by the contractor or subcontractor, to furnish a statement of the amount of such determination, of the facts used as a basis for that determination, and the reasons for such determination. This statement may not, however, be used in the Tax Court either as proof of the facts or for the conclusions contained in the statement.

The Board is given the right to audit the books or records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to title I, and upon request of the Board and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue may be made available to the Board.

A proceeding to determine the amount of excessive profits for any fiscal year may be commenced within 1 year after the financial statement required from the contractor or subcontractor for such year is filed with the Board and the Board has 2 years within which to complete the proceeding either through agreement or by an order. The 2-year period may, however, be extended by mutual agreement and the 2-year limitation does not apply to a review by the Board of an order made within such 2 years pursuant to any delegation of authority from the Board. Every contractor or subcontractor having renegotiable business within the provisions of the bill is required to file with the Board, on or before the first day of the fourth calendar month following the close of his fiscal year, a financial statement setting forth such information, and in such form and detail as the Board may by its regulations prescribe.

THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The success of the administration of this Renegotiation process will depend primarily on the caliber of personnel appointed to the Board. This is so because in reality there are specific standards provided in the bill and the determination of what are excessive profits is in the final analysis a matter of judgment by the Board and by the Tax Court. The bill provides that the Board shall be composed of only five members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate and at least three of these members must be from civilian life. The salary provided for in the bill is $12,500, but I understand that there will be a committee amendment to increase this amount. This should be done, because it is clear that the duties of the members of this Board will be among the most important duties of any emergency defense agency.

I personally feel that the tremendous responsibility of the Board could better be executed if there were a seven-man Board instead of a five-man Board, and I feel also that all three of the military services should have a representative on the Board. As I see it, renegotiation is basically an integral part of the procurement process and it seems to me that the three services which are charged with the responsibility of spending the huge sums appropriated by the Congress should have the major responsibility to the people of seeing that the money they spend is spent prudently. To the best of my knowledge the criticism of the operation of the 1943 act did not arise because of the major role played by the services, and, on the contrary, the success of the 1943 act is attributable primarily to the high caliber of the personnel on the Board. In the executive session of the Ways and Means Committee, I argued in favor of a Board of seven, at least three of whom to be appointed from the services, and a seven-man

Board was recommended by all the interested executive departments and was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Despite this, the sentiment of the committee was for a five-man Board, and recognizing that this is a question of judgment and that progress is the result of compromise, I accept the majority decision.

COVERAGE AND EXEMPTIONS

H. R. 1724 provides that a contractor or subcontractor is not subject to renegotiation unless he has received or accrued more than $100,000 in the year, but subcontractors whose income is derived from certain fees or commissions will be subject to renegotiation for any year in which they have receipts or accruals of $25,000 or more. January 1, 1951, is the starting point and the provisions of title I are made applicable to all contracts with the departments which are specifically named in the bill and related subcontracts to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after this date. The provisions apply to such contracts and subcontracts whether they were made before January 1, 1951. In the case of contracts with departments designated by the President pursuant to section 103 (a) of the bill, the provisions of the bill apply to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after the first day of the first month beginning after the date of such designation. In this case, also, it is immaterial whether the contracts or subcontracts were made on, before, or after the date of designation.

Certain contracts and subcontracts are exempted entirely. These are set forth in section 106 and are as follows:

First. Contracts with States, possessions, Territories, or foreign governments.

Second. Contracts or subcontracts with producers of agricultural commodities for the agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state or, if the commodity is not customarily sold or does not have an established market in its raw or natural state, in the first form or state beyond the raw or natural state in which it is customarily sold or has an established market.

Third. Contracts or subcontracts for the product of mines, oil or gas wells, mineral or natural deposits where a product has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the ordinary treatment processes, normally applied in order to obtain the first commercially marketable product, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner or operator of the producing property. Ordinary treatment processes in the case of mines, wells, and deposits are defined as being those used in determining gross income from property for which a percentage depletion allowance is provided in section 114 (b) (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code. In the case of other products, the Board will prescribe regulations defining ordinary treatment processes.

Fourth. Contracts or subcontracts for timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs where the contract or subcontract is with the owner of the timber property or the producer of the logs.

Fifth. Subcontracts directly or indirectly under a contract or subcontract to which the Renegotiation Act does not apply by reason of any of the above exemptions.

In the case of integrated producers of exempted products, the Renegotiation Board by regulation will prescribe a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount at which the product could be sold in the exempted state or form.

In general these mandatory exemptions are similar to the exemptions contained in the 1943 act. Certain limitations on the exemptions have been imposed by this bill but it is my understanding that these restrictions will not prevent the application of the exemption in accordance with the policy determined by the committee.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

For the most part, Mr. Chairman, the Republican minority of the committee was in accord with the major provisions of the bill. There were, however, certain features of the bill which we opposed unanimously and certain other features which I, together with some members of the minority, disapproved.

For example, the Republican minority of the committee felt strongly that the provisions of the bill should be limited to contracts connected with the national defense in keeping with the general declaration of policy set forth at the beginning of the bill. Under the bill, however, any contract within the prescribed amount with any Government agency will come within the provisions of title II whether or not the contract is related to the defense program. This will not only impose an additional duty on the Board but is entirely unnecessary and ill-advised. I trust that when this legislation reaches the other body this point will be corrected both in the interest of lightening the burden on the Board as well as in the interest of restricting this law to its proper place.

In addition to my feeling that there should be a seven-member Board with increased salaries, I believe the bill should provide for an appeal from the Tax Court. In this connection it should be remembered that this legislation may have to remain in effect for a considerable time and that by reducing the amount of negotiable business from $500,000, as provided for in the 1943 act, to $100,000, the number of persons who feel aggrieved is bound to increase sharply. It seems to me that considering the broad authority of the Board, the lack of any specific standards in the bill, and the fact that the proceeding in the Tax Court is a proceeding de novo, some form of appeal on the record should be permitted.

Another defect in the bill is that nowhere in the legislation does the Congress express its intent that efficiency should be rewarded. If you will examine the seven factors in section 103 on pages 4 and 5 of the bill under which the determination of excessive profits is to be made by the Board, you will see that the Board does not have to reward efficiency of operation and economy in the use of materials, facilities, and manpower. I think such an expression of congressional intent should be contained in the bill, and that the contractors and subcontractors subject to renegotiation would know that the more efficiently they perform the work the greater would be the amount of profit they would be entitled to retain. I should imagine that this will be the policy of the Board, but there should be no doubt that it is the policy of the Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill because it is made necessary by the emergency defense program. At a time when fair and reasonable prices can be satisfactorily determined in advance and where firm-price buying is possible, this legislation should be repealed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. During the procurement in the last war I believe it was the Navy Department that established a policy which provided that in the procurement of certain items if efficiency was shown by the manufacturer some proportion of the profits that ensued from the efficiency might be retained by the manufacturer. That proved to be a very profitable thing for the United States. If no incentive to reduce these costs is provided in this bill, then the cost to the Government under the procurement policies is going to be very much higher than it would otherwise be, I am sure. I hope the gentleman can impress that fact on the Senate.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Does the exemption under the agricultural clause of this bill exempt cotton and tobacco?

Mr. REED of New York. In the raw state; yes.

Mr. JONAS. Does not the gentleman concede that the appeal which is provided to the Tax Court is merely a gesture, it is nugatory, because the bill provides that when you take the appeal to the Tax Court it does not stay the execution of the order entered by the Board; therefore, they could ruin a businessman before he ever got a final adjudication of his case before the Tax Court.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, he does have the advantage of going to the Tax Court de novo, and nothing that has occurred up to the time he goes there is relevant to the case.

Mr. JONAS. That is right, it is de novo, and that merely gives him the same status as in the lower court, but it does not stay the execution. It does not avail him of anything judicially.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JONAS. After the Board has entered a finding and they enter judgment he can appeal from that. He gets a trial de novo.

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. It is not a stay of execution. Assuming the judgment is for $500,000 and the Board proceeds to levy judgment and sell the man out, it may take 2 or 3 years to get a review of the case during which time the appeal is pending, and if he recovers he gets his money back plus 6 percent interest. I do not think that is right. That is exactly what the act says.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to ask the gentleman about the provision in which it is sought to do something with these 5-percenters. As I understand it if they have total fees of under $25,000 under this bill they are not subject to renegotiation; is that correct?

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Does that mean the total fees from all sources or from any one contract?

Mr. REED of New York. From all sources.

Mr. KEATING. So that they could be getting $20,000 from a number of different contractors and still not be subject to renegotiation under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Then in connection with this provision about exempting various contracts or subcontracts from the provisions of the bill as I understand the only ones which the Board has the power to examine are those specifically set up under the law? They cannot reach out and exempt any other kind of contract?

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct; except the Board does have discretion to exempt certain contracts of a secret nature, and others within a limited area.

Mr. KEATING. Are standards set up with reference to that?

Mr. REED of New York. To a certain degree; yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman explain to the Committee why the date of January 1, 1951, was fixed in view of the very large appropriations and undoubtedly contracts before that date?

Mr. REED of New York. That was a unanimous decision of the full committee. It was the sentiment of the committee that this was an appropriate date, keeping in mind the constitutional problem and the fact that no substantial amount of receipts from defense contractor from nonrenegotiable contracts.

Mr. JAVITS. That is a finding of fact by the committee and not a material question?

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. That is except as to contracts after January 1?

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. With reference to these members from civilian life that means they take them in from the outside and does not mean they could name them from civil servants now working for the Government, or does it include that?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I believe it does, although, of course, I hope that the President will appoint experienced businessmen.

Mr. KEATING. The purpose of it is to get the views of outside business?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes. They should be high-standing men familiar with business, and not political appointees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 1270, provides for the renegotiation of contracts entered into by those departments of the Government exercising functions in connection with the national defense. The purpose of this bill is to prevent the accumulation and retention of unconscionable and clearly excessive profits by contractors and subcontractors furnishing the Government with the materials and services needed for defense, and thereby to bring about on an over-all basis a fair and equitable level of prices for such materials and services. It is not a revenue measure; it is not excess profits tax legislation such as that recently enacted by the Congress, which applies on a fixed and uniform basis to all taxpayers. This legislation stands on its own feet and applies only to specified contracts and subcontracts.

As the House knows, statutory renegotiation of contracts had its origin in World War II. I have always warmly advocated and supported legislation of this type, beginning with the First Renegotiation Act passed in 1942, and I strongly urge the enactment of the present bill.

The wartime renegotiation statute expired by its terms on December 31, 1945. The history of that law is one of accomplishment. Conceived to prevent war profiteering, and notably successful in that aim, it proved of great economic and morale value to the country in time of need. When, therefore, world conditions impelled us less than 2½ years later to initiate a program of expanded aircraft construction, it was deemed essential by the Congress to reinvoke this wholesome and effective safeguard in order to protect the expenditure of some $3,000,000,000 of public funds for that purpose and certain related procurement.

The result was the Renegotiation Act of 1948, which became law on May 21, 1948. That law in its original form applied only to contracts obligating funds appropriated or consolidated by the Appropriation Act of which it was a part. Within a matter of weeks it was extended to cover the procurement of aircraft and aircraft parts when the contracts for those items obligated fiscal year 1949 funds. A year later, our military expenditures having continued to increase, the 1948 act was further broadened to cover all negotiated contracts entered into by the Department of Defense in the fiscal year 1950. Last year, we reenacted this provision to include the current fiscal year 1951.

As a result of these several extensions, the Renegotiation Act of 1948 is still actively on the statute books. It is still very much alive, indeed, and it covers large areas of procurement by the military departments. However, there are several gaps in it—until now not too important, but now very important in view of the billions of dollars which we are about to spend for defense.

What are these gaps? The 1948 act does not apply to any contracts entered into prior to May 21, 1948, although some contracts entered into prior to that date are still in production. It does not cover any contracts obligating fiscal 1949 funds for items other than aircraft or aircraft parts, although here again it is possible that some such contracts are still in production. It does not cover any contracts entered into in the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 as a result of formal advertising and competitive bidding, being limited only to negotiated contracts entered into during those years. It does not attach to any contracts for $1,000 or less, notwithstanding the tremendous dollar aggregate of such contracts. Finally, it does not cover contracts of any Government agencies other than the Department of Defense, which is a serious deficiency in the light of the steadily increasing defense procurement activity of various other Government departments.

It is obvious, then, that the existing renegotiation law is inadequate to protect our vast current and impending expenditures to a sufficient extent. A new renegotiation law, broader in scope and closing the gaps of the present law, is needed. The bill now before the House fills that need.

On the production front, with our huge national industrial plant galvanized again to capacity output, our situation today is similar to that of the early days of World War II. Once again we are faced with the necessity for hasty procurement on an immense scale, which makes close pricing impossible. We cannot delay our procurement of essential military supplies until we can complete all of the cost studies and analyses we might otherwise be inclined to make as an incident to careful purchasing. That would be business as usual, and we are in no position to conduct our business in that idyllic fashion.

Once again, too, we shall call upon industry to produce military supplies which, by reason of their specialized and peculiar nature, are not subject to accurate costing in advance. Indeed, since the close of the last war we have developed many new weapons and items of equipment and many changes and improvements in the manufacturing processes of other items. The manufacturer of jet planes or guided missiles is unable to foretell his costs with the accuracy of an established manufacturer of fountain pens or bicycles.

Once again, too, industry will be asked to deliver supplies in quantities far beyond any normal or customary level. This, of course, will have a direct and considerable effect on production costs, the full extent of which it is not possible to determine in advance with any reasonable degree of accuracy.

These are the three principal uncertainties that made it necessary to have renegotiation in World War II. It is these same factors which make it imperative now.

It is also obvious and inevitable that the enormous Government purchasing now under way will have a sharp impact upon the level of industrial prices paid throughout the country for the innumerable parts and components that go into the production of military end items. The restraints imposed by renegotiation upon prices by preventing the retention of excessive profits will go a long way toward curbing inflationary price tendencies in this large segment of our economy. This, manifestly, is salutary.

Renegotiation is not an exact science. There is no fixed formula or yardstick for the determination of excessive profits, nor is there any fixed maximum to the amount of profits which may be realized or retained by any contractor. The present bill is patterned closely after the wartime renegotiation statute, which also formed the basis for the act of 1948. In it, as in those prior acts, renegotiation remains entirely a judgment operation. It has been successful as such. The bill lays down certain factors, virtually the same as those formerly prescribed, which must be taken into consideration by the renegotiation authorities in determining in every case whether excessive profits exist, and if so, in what amount. Beyond this there are no curbs imposed in the bill upon the officials to whom are granted the authority to make final determinations of excessive profits, subject only to review in the Tax Court of the United States.

This freedom of discretionary action is the outstanding characteristic of the whole technique of renegotiation as it has been developed to this time. It provides at once its greatest virtue and its clearest warning. Its virtue is that it affords all of the flexibility that could possibly be needed to do justice in the unlimited variety of cases that will arise. The warning that it sounds, directed to the Congress, is that only to men of the highest caliber can discretion so gently restricted be safely entrusted. It is for this reason that the bill provides for a Renegotiation Board of five members, all to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is anticipated, of course, that the Board will function at the operating level through regional or departmental or other subboards or divisions, for which appropriate powers of delegation and redelegation are provided, but final authority within the administrative framework of the act is vested in the Board. The administration of renegotiation, both during the last war and currently, is distinguished for the high level of personnel who have been attracted, persuaded, or assigned to it. I am confident that many of these persons, and others of equal talents and attainments, will be found available to carry out the functions and responsibilities created by the enactment of the present bill.

I have found that very little is known about the actual operation of renegotiation except by those who have conducted it for the Government and by those executives of business and industry who have personally participated in its procedures. I do not pretend myself to know the intricacies of this complex and technical process, but I do know, and I think it important to emphasize before this body, that renegotiation is an operation which is broadly conceived and broadly administered. It is not a detailed process of audit and examination, contract by contract and dollar by dollar. And it is by no means a device to remedy or repair errors or inequities in individual procurement transactions. The renegotiation authorities do not reset the price of each contract after completion of performance and payment. This type of individual price adjustment, which was contemplated in the earliest days of renegotiation and from which the process derived its name, gave way almost immediately, out of obvious necessity, to overall review of a contractor's operations for his entire fiscal year.

This basic conception is indispensable to any understanding of what renegotiation is and the way it works. All of a contractor's receipts or accruals during his year from all of his contracts and subcontracts subject to renegotiation, including both his profitable and his nonprofitable ones, and all of his costs and expenses applicable thereto, are considered at a single time in a single proceeding together with all other facts and figures pertinent to the statutory factors, and a single over-all determination is made. If no excessive profits are found to exist, a clearance is granted to the contractor. If it is determined that excessive profits were realized, a determination of the amount thereof is made and this determination is embodied in an agreement or order.

It is evident that in this type of operation the renegotiation authorities must use, not a fine-toothed comb, but a broad brush. And it is for precisely this reason that renegotiation is not designed to be, nor can it be, a substitute for sound procurement pricing. Renegotiation does no more than prevent or eliminate profits that are clearly excessive and unreasonable on an over-all basis—profits that it would be clearly unconscionable for a contractor to retain from his dealings with his Government in circumstances which precluded proper initial pricing. The sole objective as well as the net result of a renegotiation proceeding is to make certain that the Government has paid no more to a contractor, directly or indirectly, than he should in good conscience be entitled to receive in the circumstances—in a word, that from the efforts of the Government to maintain the common defense for the common good, he has not accumulated more than a fair return or over-all price for what he has done. The purpose is not to take money away from the contractor, but rather to see that not too much money has been taken from the Government under unusual conditions lacking the controls normally exerted upon prices by the pressures of competition.

This bill is a major step, and a necessary one, in our drive to achieve impregnable strength without fatally disrupting our economy. I urge its prompt passage by the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 1724, now under consideration is here by unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill is patterned very closely after the World War II Renegotiation Act, with certain necessary changes applicable to present conditions. The first section of the pending bill, which is section 101, the declaration of policy, gives a very clear and definite statement as to the purposes of this act. The act is limited in its application to 2 years, or until December 31, 1953. This is a very important defense measure, and it should be considered in connection with the defense program. It will be remembered that we had a renegotiation law during World War II, and, as I recall the figures, some $200,000,000,000 of war contracts were awarded, and under the application of the renegotiation program about $11,000,000,000 was recaptured by the Government from contractors during that period.

Your Committee on Ways and Means has given very careful and thorough consideration to this subject over a considerable period of time. Hearings were held during the latter part of the last session of Congress. Then the committee became busily engaged with the consideration of tax legislation and had to carry this over until this session. Very thorough and careful consideration has been given to the experience had under the renegotiation program of World War II. This pending bill provides for the renegotiation of these war contracts and provides certain standards that are to be considered by the Renegotiation Board. In general, the act of 1948 only applies to contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and certain other related provisions, but this bill is more comprehensive in its scope and application and is intended to apply to all contracts entered into by the Government during this defense period.

As has been pointed out before, the bill provides for renegotiation of contracts where the contractor receives in excess of $100,000 during the year. In the case of subcontractors receiving fees and commissions, sometimes referred to as the 5-percenters, if their total aggregate amount reaches the sum of $25,000 during the year, they are subject to renegotiation.

The bill contains certain very definite exemptions which are very important, and in the light of the experience had under the World War II renegotiation program it is thought by your committee that the inclusion of these specific exemptions will greatly improve the administration of this act.

First, contracts or subcontracts are exempted with producers of agricultural products, as has been explained, in the raw or natural state.

Second, contracts or subcontracts for the products of mines, oil or gas wells, mineral or natural deposits, where the product has not been processed, refined,

or treated beyond the ordinary treatment for the first marketable process.

Third, contracts or subcontracts for timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs.

Fourth, subcontractors, directly or indirectly under a contract or subcontract, to which the Renegotiation Act does not apply by reason of these exemptions.

And fifth, contracts with States, possessions, Territories, or foreign governments.

The Board is given certain discretionary power to exempt other contracts as is necessary in the application of an act of this kind.

I would like to invite attention to a provision directly in point with one of the questions asked a few moments ago. That is with respect to the efficiency of the contractor. That is stated as one of the definite standards that must be taken into consideration. By referring to page 4 of the pending bill, it will be noted that in determining excess profits there shall—it is mandatory—there shall be taken into consideration the following factors: The first of these factors is the efficiency of the contractor, with particular regard to attainment of quantity and quality production, reduction of costs, and economy in the use of materials, facilities, and manpower.

Then there follow six other definite standards that are here provided shall be taken into consideration by the Board; and the seventh or last of these provisions is a discretionary authority to the Board to consider such other factors as they deem appropriate to arrive at the proper degree of equity and fairness in dealing with the contractor.

The committee is of the opinion that the enactment of this legislation will result in a considerable saving to the Government in the renegotiation of these contracts during this period of emergency. As I stated a moment ago, our experience under the World War II act resulted in some $11,000,000,000 being saved to the Government. All indications are that we may have contracts during this period of emergency even in excess of the $200,000,000,000 that were in effect during the period of World War II; so we may reasonably expect that even a larger amount will be recovered by the Government under the application of this act than was experienced under the World War II renegotiation program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why this was not made retroactive to the date of President Truman's launching us into war in Korea?

Mr. COOPER. That point, of course, was very carefully considered by the committee, and two considerations were borne in mind. First, we already have a renegotiation act that applies to at least some of these war contracts; and, second, it was thought that in the interest of fairness it should not be made retroactive too far back because the contractors had no notice; the business people of the country had no reason to expect that the contracts they then entered into would be renegotiated.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will agree that the boys who were drafted and sent over to Korea likewise had no indication prior to that time that they were going to be dumped into a war immediately, yet they are not being given the benefit of any renegotiation procedure.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Iowa could not be any more anxious than I to prevent excessive profits being made during a period of war.

Mr. GROSS. One further question, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Why are contracts with foreign governments exempted? These are defense contracts, are they not? This applies only to defense contracts, does it not?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, no; this is general; it applies to all contracts with the specified departments of the Government during this period of time.

Mr. GROSS. But why are contracts with foreign governments exempted?

Mr. COOPER. One reason is that under the World War II Renegotiation Act they were exempted; and, further, it was felt that we could not very well renegotiate contracts with foreign governments. How would you enforce it?

Mr. GROSS. By the same machinery you have for enforcement in the matter of any other contract. Why not?

Mr. COOPER. There was a gentleman down in my country who wanted to know why it was that some of the World War I war debts were forgiven to certain countries of the world. He said: "My goodness! Did not this Government take some security on those notes?"

After all, you are dealing with another government in these matters.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will permit, I have just a brief question: First of all, does the gentleman propose in his discourse to touch upon the right of appeal? If so, I can defer it, but that is the question I wish to ask now.

Mr. COOPER. I would be glad to hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. JONAS. I can subscribe to the provisions of this bill in all of its earlier phases and ramifications. If I interpret this right of appeal de novo correctly, and I am following the language of the report which says that the filing of a petition in the Tax Court shall not stay the execution of an order of the Board and that where the United States has collected amounts under the order of the Board greater than the amount determined by the Court the excess shall be refunded and interest at the rate of 6 percent paid thereon.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that provision appears on page 33 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. If the bill later on explains this what apparently appears on the face of it to be a very harsh provision, I am satisfied, but if it stays as I am reading it, I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will concede it is a vicious section of the bill. If a contractor appeared before a board and he is accused of having overreached himself to the extent of $500,000, the board will then enter a judgment against him. He will say, "I am appealing to the Tax Court," under a trial de novo, a trial over, but no bond is given and the board would sell him out. That would do away with his working capital. He would have to wait 2 or 3 years and in that time you would ruin the man industrially and his business. It does not make sense, does it?

Mr. COOPER. There are two points I would mention in reply to the gentleman's question, and it is an appropriate one. The first is, this identical provision was included in the World War II Renegotiation Act. No difficulty was experienced and no trouble arose as is anticipated by the gentleman from Illinois. None of those appearing at the hearing raised any question about that. So the experience was such that we are not apprehensive about that matter. The second point is that the contractor is entitled to receive 6 percent interest from the time the determination is made.

Mr. JONAS. That is true.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly he can provide ample credit to tide him over when he is receiving 6 percent interest from the Government during that time.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman, and what has transpired in the past is all very well to be used to light our footsteps in the future through experience. The fact it did not arise thus far, however, does not by any means assure us of the fact it cannot happen—that a man cannot be put out of business by this kind of provision in the law.

Mr. COOPER. With all due deference, the experience under this program in the past has been such that we are convinced the gentleman's apprehension is not necessarily well founded.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it possible under this bill for a contractor to receive more than the contract price?

Mr. COOPER. Well, certain relief is provided in cases of that kind under the War Powers Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The bill does not permit of the contractor receiving more under the terms of the bill than the original contract price. The gentleman from Michigan may have in mind a provision of the old War Powers Act which permitted a department of the Government to make a contractor whole, you might say.

Mr. COOPER. There is a provision in the War Powers Act that operates in the interest of the contractor, permitting the raising of the price or compensation, as well as reducing it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would think there should be for the reason that I recall that one or two companies were

put out of business by a decision of the Federal agency. Take the case where, after a contract is made and performance is started, there is labor trouble and an increase in wages that may make it absolutely impossible for the contractor to go ahead and comply with the contract at the price of his bid. There should be something to take care of that.

Mr. COOPER. We think that that provision of the War Powers Act is ample to take care of that. After all, this contractor is voluntarily entering into the contract.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER. Oh, yes. He does not have to sign a contract. He does not have to sign a contract unless he wants to and unless the terms of it suit him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that may be allright as a matter of law and as a matter of theory. But, where is there a big industrial plant in this country that can sit back and refuse to go into war production?

Mr. COOPER. There is no compulsion by law to enter into war production.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Unless public opinion forces him. Suppose General Motors would not enter into a contract, what would happen?

Mr. COOPER. As a matter of law they do not have to unless they want to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, as a matter of law.

Mr. COOPER. We are talking about law here.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think what is worrying us and I think what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] tried to put his finger on, is the fact that when a soldier enlists he is giving 100 percent, and what I think worries us is the statement in the bill that seems to confine it to preventing excessive profits. Is there anything in the bill to stop a company from saying to the Government, "We will do this without any profits at all, after adequate reserves. We do not want any profits on defense work any more than the soldier in Korea." Is there anything in this bill that would prevent any company—and I think this ought to be made clear generally—from saying to the Government, "We will do this job without profit"?

Mr. COOPER. No; there is nothing in the bill to prevent that. Bear this in mind. We are all opposed to excessive profits being made during wartime. Now, some have called attention to the fact that there is an excess-profits-tax law. Well now, some years ago one of the large banks in New York, I believe it was the National City Bank, certainly not a Government agency, made a very thorough investigation and they found that the application of the excess-profits-tax law only reached about 70 percent of the excess profits that were made. Therefore we have almost one-third of the excessive profits that are made during wartime that are not raeched by the excess-profits-tax law. Therefcre it is necessary to have a measure of this type to help protect the interest of the Government and prevent excessive profits being made and retained by those who entered into contracts with the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. And there is nothing to stop a feeling on the part of some firms in American business to go even further than that as far as defense production contracts are concerned; we all will understand the situation of firms that may not be able to do so and no one will doubt because of that their desire to do all they can, too, in the mobilization effort, but the door should be open to those which feel they can operate without profit after adequate reserves.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time only because of the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Some folks—the gentleman says he is not one of them—seem to think there is no patriotism in industry or in the stockholders of companies which produce. I just want to call this fact to the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that last time we were fighting a war the Ford Motor Co. had a contract but agreed to do and did the work without $1 of profit. And, in my district in Michigan quite a number of manufacturers went along just as patriotically as anyone could without any effort to get a war profit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, there has been no disposition on the part of the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means or the Republicans in the Congress that I know of to delay the passage of this legislation. In fact we are all in favor of the principle and hope that the execution of the law will be fair. But, nobody has laid claim to perfection. Nobody claims that this legislation cannot be amended and cannot be perfected. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] raises a very pertinent question and, if I may have the privilege to say what I want, I suggest to those who will carry this measure to the other body that they give full study to the proposition raised by the gentleman from Illinois, because the language on page 13 indicates clearly, at least by implication, that a contractor or subcontractor who has been disappointed and not satisfied with the decision of the Board can go immediately to the Tax Commission and indicate his desire to appeal from the decision of the Board and thereby stay the issuance of an execution to enforce the action of the Board. All execution would thereby be stopped. That is the only fair interpretation you can give that sentence on page 13, because the paragraph is intended to protect the contractor but it does not do so in view of the sentence on page 33.

The sentence on page 33, as I remember it, comes to us out of the old law. That sentence is a positive statement. Let me read it to you. "The filing of a petition under this section shall not operate to stay the execution of an order of the Board," and so forth. If the execution cannot be stayed the results might be as indicated by the gentleman from Chicago. For that reason, we ought to take consideration of this matter. While it may be that we cannot amend it today, and I know that the drafting force cannot do everything in a minute, I want Judge JONAS, if he will, to bear with us, and let us stick together and have this matter corrected in the other body if we can. It ought to be done. If it can be reached by an amendment in this body today I think it should be done and I will support such an amendment if the gentleman will offer it.

Mr. JONAS. That suits me.

Mr. JENKINS. This matter of renegotiation is a comparatively new proposition in legislation. Those of you who are lawyers know that great sanctity is given to a contract in our law. Contracts properly entered into can be enforced. The law of the land will aid in the enforcement of valid contracts in spite of this general principle, but we today will pass a law providing for renegotiation of contracts. In other words it would appear that we pass a law that will prevent the execution of a contract. However, this bill is not as harsh as it sounds, because in the preparation of the contracts the contractors are given the right and the privilege to know that they must expect renegotiation. A fair renegotiation law if fairly administered will be to the advantage of the contractor and to the Government. Renegotiation as it is applied in this bill means a recapitulation of costs and profits both. It works both ways. In the law it is specifically laid out in three or four paragraphs that the contracts will be entered into in all candor, all sincerity, realizing this one fact, that the Government is calling upon the people to produce war materials under very serious circumstances, under circumstances that require speed and require sacrifices.

Special consideration will be given to the efficiency of the contractor and his employees and special consideration will be given to any unusual risk that the contractor will be required to assume. It is not the intention of the Government to put anybody over the hotpan and take from him what he is rightfully entitled to by way of compensation. On the contrary, it is not the intention that the Government will lose by unfair and unreasonable prices and great profits, when those two situations can be reached by a meeting of the minds of both groups.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. When the gentleman speaks about renegotiation of contracts, I presume he means a contract that is entered into between the Government and a company or an individual for a specific amount for the performance of that contract?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. Any contract that has been entered into by one of the departments of the Government named

in the bill such as the Army and the Navy, and so forth.

Mr. JENSEN. We have contracts entered into by the Government with plants and individuals on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Does this bill put a limit on the fixed fees that can be paid to a contractor.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill is a bill unto itself. It provides that the contracts may be renegotiated, and gives to the contractor every advantage that comes with expertness, with skill and efficiency, and with applicability to business, and so on. If a contractor has a continuing flow of business with the Government, that will be taken into consideration, of course, as they deal day by day, in order to get material produced for the benefit of the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. But what if it is a contract on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis?

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot tell the gentleman exactly how such contracts will intermesh with this bill. My judgment is that if a contract is made positively and conclusively and independently from any continuing contract and is strictly a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee-basis contract, that it is covered and included by this bill. This bill only covers contracts made with certain departments of Government with reference to certain matters. It does not cover all Government contracts. For instance, the Post Office is not included as one of the departments to which this law will apply. It does not include contracts for the buying of stamps, paper, and things like that. Those are not included. But these military and semimilitary contracts are all included. The bill states specifically what departments are included, and then contains a provision that the President can include other departments if he so announces. That is about the best answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I wonder if this group of individuals is covered by renegotiation. Suppose a contractor in competition with other contractors bids for the manufacture of a product for our Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, I can answer the gentleman. It will be covered.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then, is that not putting a penalty upon the efficiency of that particular organization? I wonder if the Government would give him additional money should he lose.

Mr. JENKINS. The Government does not guarantee a profit to all those with which it contracts. If the Government has a continuance of similar contracts with one company and the contractor yields to the Government in some cases, then it might be that the Government could yield to the contractor if the contracts were somewhat interdependent. But, again, the language will prevail, because I know of a case which came up a few days ago. If that contractor enters into that contract with the Government he will be renegotiated. But as to just what may be done in the contract the gentleman has in mind, I do not know, because the language would cover it. Generally speaking, I am sure it would be included.

Mr. McGREGOR. What I am referring to is when the contractor goes in and in competition with other contractors meets the specifications and bids upon a unit price, and then you come along and renegotiate and say to him, "Because of your efficiency you have made a certain percentage of profit, yet we are going to force you to return to the Government that percentage." I think it is very unfair if you are going to make it applicable to those who bid and not make it applicable to those companies that have negoiated contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The bill does apply to both types of contract. But I would like to call the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] to the standards which are written in the bill beginning at line 25 on page 4 where the efficiency of the contractor must be taken into consideration in the renegotiation of contracts.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then, as I understand it, the committee determines whether or not he has been efficient.

Mr. MILLS. There is no hard and fast rule. It would have to be determined by the board, of course.

Mr. McGREGOR. In the gentleman's opinion, it will be applicable to negotiated contracts as well as bid contracts?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] completely satisfied that this bill as now written takes care of negotiated contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely. Certainly it takes care of that kind of contract.

Mr. JENSEN. You mean, then, that if the Government enters into a contract with an individual or company for manufacturing goods on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract for the construction of a building or the sale of cloth goods or anything else that you might mention, if the Government determines it is proper and feasible to negotiate that contract, they have authority under this bill to renegotiate that contract?

Mr. MILLS. That type of contract is made subject to renegotiation under the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Specifically?

Mr. MILLS. It applies to all types of contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. But it does not mention cost-plus-fixed-fee.

Mr. MILLS. No; but this is clearly within the scope of contracts subject to the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad that the able gentleman from Arkansas agrees with me. The gentleman is one of the best authorities in this House on matters relating to the laws on renegotiation of contracts. In addition to what the gentleman from Arkansas has said let me say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], let me say that a renegotiation of a contract will not be as drastic to the contractor as the law applicable to the collection of excess-profits taxes. Suppose this did not apply to the contracts to which my friends refer. Then they could be renegotiated for excess profits.

This renegotiation law is intended to take the place of the excess-profits tax in many cases. If your man could get clear outside of this law then he would be subject to the excess-profits tax.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. There still is one point, of course, which the gentleman from Iowa must understand, and that is that this does not go below the $100,000 minimum. But as far as covering the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts versus the competitive-bid contract, this legislation covers both. In World War II the competitive-bid contracts were around 75 percent of the total contracts let, with about 25 to 30 percent under cost-plus.

We have information and testimony before the committee that the percentage of cost-plus contracts will be very much less than that in the coming defense program, because they propose to put most of the contracts on competitive bids. However, regardless of whether it is cost-plus or competitive bids, this piece of legislation covers it.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank my friend, the able gentleman from Washington, for his very pertinent statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to develop one other point, if I may. I say this by way of encouragement to the Members of Congress and to the people of the country. The first renegotiation law passed and put into operation several years ago was a little short of an abomination in its enforcement. Its enforcement was ruthless and in many cases was very unfair. Many persons who were not familiar with Government contracts and Government procedure were imposed upon shamefully. I am glad that this was not a universal fact in all sections of the country but it was entirely too general. Many persons and corporations were unfairly treated. The result of this unfair enforcement was that the Congress of the United States, through the Ways and Means Committee, took the matter up a second time and we amended that law. In that consideration we adopted this new provision, which provides for a hearing before the Tax Court. I am proud to say that I had a little something to do with that, because there were many people in my district who felt terribly aggrieved. The inspectors would come out into the communities and go into the offices of small companies and some large companies and arbitrarily fix their own figures, which in many cases were unjust. The law

was not written so as to give an aggrieved person plain and adequate relief. In many cases the individual did not know how to protect himself or what to do. However, I am glad to say that the Ways and Means Committee came up with legislation that provided what I think was adequate and quick relief to every contractor. This legislation provided that where a contractor was not satisfied with the decison of the Board, he could go into the Tax Court and could go in de novo; the lawyers will understand what de novo means, but the average layman might not know. It means that he could go into the court and start all over new. He could take a fresh start. He could go in and show all the evidence he had before, and everything else that he could dig up, everything that he could get that was probative, and would tend to prove his point.

This bill presently before us provides for an appeal to the Tax Court. This is a fine provision and this guarantees the aggrieved person his day in court. But the gentleman from Illinois raises a serious question as to whether he can get into the Tax Court soon enough. If this bill is not amended as I have heretofore suggested, I would advise an aggrieved person to go in immediately to the Tax Court, and file his exception to the decision of the Board. That will stop all abuses, I think. That will give the Tax Court complete jurisdiction of the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the committee consider at any time the question of amortization in connection with this bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, the subject of amortization is not fully and completely taken up in this bill. I mean we do not try to amend the amortization law in this bill. I know that amortization will be considered, however, in making these renegotiations. I would prefer, and I think the gentleman would prefer to have amortization considered in legislation which deals exclusively with amortization. Because amortization does not deal with profits. It deals with costs. In other words a man or company that has constructed big improvements primarily to perform war contracts wants the costs of his plant amortized over 5 years. This is taken care of in a law especially drawn for that purpose. This law which we are presently considering primarily deals with profits.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] page 6, line 5, where provision is made for all allowances as deductions and exclusions under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code to be taken, as set forth here for purposes of renegotiation. That includes amortization. The gentleman from Ohio will recall that in connection with the Revenue Act of 1950 we passed a speed-up of amortization, providing for 5 years amortization.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. Of course, amortization applies to many contracts that are not covered by this bill. We should leave the amortization law as it is.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The last bill on amortization left much to be desired, because only big firms that had a staff of lawyers who could protect that firm took advantage of it and obtained their certificates of necessity. The little firms did not know how to do it, or it was not done, with the result that they went out of business or went bankrupt. That should be corrected in the new bill.

Mr. JENKINS. That is true, but that is true in life in many instances, the weak get weaker and weaker. But in the consideration of this bill our primary purpose is to encourage the production of war material of all kinds as speedily and as efficiently as possible. If to do so it is advisable to grant amortization privileges to a company that is operating under a contract that must be renegotiated then there is no reason why this privilege should not be given to him. I know that the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right when he says that in the last war many failed to get the advantages of amortization because they did not know about it and did not know how to avail themselves of its advantages.

Mr. DONDERO. And we ought to protect the weak fellow. During the course of our consideration of the last tax bill we agreed with Members of another body that this whole question of a speedy amortization would be reviewed by our committee in connection with the tax bill of this year.

Mr. GROSS. This renegotiation is on a purely speculative basis; that is the Board can renegotiate or not renegotiate at its discretion and pleasure; is that right?

Mr. JENKINS. No; that is not the purpose of the legislation. The Board is bound to renegotiate all contracts that are covered by the law. It is not bound to consider all Government contracts. It is bound to consider all Government contracts of a certain class and standard made with certain departments of the Government. Of course it might fail to reach some cases but its powers and duties are expressly set out in the bill. I do not expect any controversy on that score.

Mr. GROSS. But it is purely on a selective basis.

Mr. JENKINS. No; it treats everybody in the designated categories the same. There is no way by which any special persons will get any special favors unless some one violates his duty. The Ways and Means Committee was expressly interested in seeing that this Board acted fairly for the law provides that the board should not be packed by interested parties; and it compels the President to select three out of the five members of the Board from civilian life to prevent the Board from being packed by Army or Navy officials or by any of the big contracting companies of the country.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to what has been said heretofore except to say, in the words of the gentleman from Michigan who spoke a moment ago, that the industry of our country will accept this bill patriotically. Of course, renegotiation of contracts is as harsh a remedy as an American could imagine. Americans in their daily business lives are used to making contracts and living up to them. Here is an instance where they make a contract with their Government for a certain performance to make or manufacture a certain thing or to furnish the Government certain supplies at a certain price; but under this harsh law which we are enacting they may at any time be called into the Government office and told that they must change the price. It is not, therefore, Mr. Chairman, a tax law by any means at all; it is a price law, a price-fixing law, and it is about the only thing that we can do in these critical times to insure our people that the Government in its haste to arm itself, to build armament to defend us, in the great rush that there will be in the production of supplies of all kinds, cannot under any circumstances know just what a just and proper price will be. We could tell you instance after instance that occurred in the Second World War where contracts were made and the contractors voluntarily came to the Department and said: "Here, the price is too high; we can make this gun or this piece of airplane at a very much cheaper price"; and we have one instance where a contractor came and voluntarily returned something like a million dollars.

I have in mind an instance that occurred in my own district, an old steel fabricator, who had furnished supplies for three wars, entered into a contract to furnish parts of Liberty ships. He came to Washington and to my office. I asked him where he had been. He said: "Why, I came up here to the Renegotiation Board." I asked him if he was satisfied, and he said, "Perfectly." I asked him who represented him and he said, "I just came myself and brought my bookkeeper along. They treated me fair; I am all right."

Most of the experience of our business people were like that, although there were people who felt that they had not had a square deal and had been treated harshly. To help those cases we have provided for appeal to the Tax Court.

This bill is even more drastic than the one we had before. Under the other law we did not renegotiate contracts that were less in amount than $500,000; under this the limit is $100,000. I worry sometimes over the fact that I cannot see how they can get around to renegotiating all of them. When you get down to $100,000 you will multiply greatly the work of the Renegotiation Board.

There are certain provisions in this law that were not in the other law.

For instance, I was under the impression that the established market price of the raw material on the day the contract was made should suffice, and that you should not renegotiate beyond that. But this bill goes back to the actual producer of that raw product. However, bear in mind it cannot hurt them because the bill provides that they shall have a reasonable profit; and in times like these that is all any patriotic American should want.

There should be no crop of millionaires from contracts involving defense materials in this great emergency. The Committee on Ways and Means and this Congress will be commended for passing promptly at the beginning of the present session this Renegotiation Act. When you couple that action with the excess-profits law which we have already passed, and with the new tax law that the committee will begin hearings on next week, I believe the people will willingly bear this heavy burden of taxation which must fall upon their shoulders. But if after taxing them to the extent we are going to tax them they should wake up and find a crop of millionaires growing out of these Government contracts, I do not think we would ever get over the condemnation we would receive. So I say the Congress should pass this bill promptly.

I do not know that I have anything further to add to what has been said.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any place in the record in connection with World War II operations where any firm was maliciously mistreated by the renegotiation machinery of gover ment?

Mr. CAMP. I certainly do not, and I think the renegotiation groups were composed of some of the best and most reasonable businessmen in this country. Business and industry helped to supply the men who did the renegotiating.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was going to ask if it is not true that most of these renegotiating teams, or squads as we might call them, were taken from business and were constituted by practical businessmen?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Inside the industry in which they were working.

Mr. CAMP. Yes; and industry as a whole was satisfied. My district is an industrial one, and I have not received a single letter or word indicating any opposition to this Renegotiation Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One other question. Where industry is going out manufacturing new items the like of which have never gone over a production line whatever in any place of business, does the gentleman in his experience as a member of the Ways and Means Committee know of a more equitable way in which to arrive at a fair price for the producer and a fair price for the taxpayer, the Government, than through renegotiated contracts?

Mr. CAMP. I certainly do not, and I think that explains the situation very adroitly and very clearly. It is the only way that we can arrive at what is a fair price to the manufacturer and to the country, and this, I would like to say in my closing remarks, is not a tax law but is a pricing law—a fair pricing act.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I find that all contracts for raw materials, apparently, such as agricultural products, minerals, and timber, are exempt from the provisions of the bill. Why is that?

Mr. CAMP. They are not exempt except to the producer himself, and they are only exempt in their raw and original form.

Mr. VORYS. Why is that?

Mr. CAMP. Why are they exempt?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. CAMP. Well, the producer of raw material, cotton, for instance, or wheat or corn, does not enter into a contract with the Government. You renegotiate with the subcontractor and the contractor right down to the farmer himself.

Mr. VORYS. I do not see why you might not want to review a contract for raw materials that were overpriced as well as anything else. I just do not know why they should be exempt entirely. I can see why the Board is given this discretion and authority to exempt certain kinds of contracts, but why are they forbidden to consider raw materials?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CAMP. In the other act—and we tried to amend this act to conform to it—we fixed the raw-material price at the prevailing market price on the day the contract was entered into. But I understand that this Board will use that as a criterion in renegotiating under this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would say in answer to the international statement made by the gentleman from Ohio that experience has demonstrated that the original producer never did have an excess profit. Did you not know that? He never did have.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. In World War II we were encouraging the mining of manganese. Are the operators of those mines that are taking the chance that they need to take during the emergency exempt from this bill?

Mr. CAMP. That is considered in the general rule and in the criteria set out in the bill. That is considered, and they are allowed a profit in accordance with the risk they take.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact, manganese ore, which has not been processed, is exempt under the terms of the bill.

Mr. CAMP. That is right. All raw materials are.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman says, though, that manganese ore production comes under the general category. That was the situation in World War II, and you will recall that all the contractors were taken care of in this country except those which produced the vital metals that were needed in war production.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. There was no producer of any vital material renegotiated in the last war.

Mr. TACKETT. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. All raw materials from the mines were exempt from renegotiation in the last war.

Mr. CAMP. Well, they are under this bill.

Mr. MILLS. Exactly.

Mr. TACKETT. Well, should they be? That is the question.

Mr. CAMP. Yes; they should be.

Mr. TACKETT. Why should they be, if we are going to encourage them to mine these metals, and then they go out and produce and are unable to make a fair return? Why are they not entitled to renegotiation?

Mr. CAMP. The reason raw materials and agricultural products are exempt is because their price can be ascertained any minute of any day on stock and commodity exchanges all over the world; not only in America, but all over the world. You can go out there right now and see what cotton is worth in Liverpool, Memphis, New Orleans, or Savannah. It is ascertainable, and they can be satisfied.

Mr. TACKETT. I am in error. I was thinking that this legislation was not only for the purpose of protecting the Government but also to protect the production contractors. I now see that this is one-street legislation needed to protect the Government and that other legislation will be needed to encourage mining of vital metals.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman just developed one thing that I wanted to bring out. Supposing corporation A owns 100,000 acres of fine timber and the Government wishes to take a certain board footage off of that company's property. Also, suppose the price is set on such products at the time through the price control machinery. There would simply be no sense in renegotiating the contract, would there?

Mr. CAMP. That is right. We discussed it in committee. The law itself is as far back as you can go there. You cannot go to the price that man paid for a tract of timber 20 years ago. That is capital gain, that is not contract profit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the other hand, if a manufacturer of wood products makes a contract with the Government to build 1,000,000 cartridge cases, where he goes to that company and buys the

lumber, then the cartridge case contract is subject to renegotiation, because there is no fixed price on cartridge cases.

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important pillars in our entire private enterprise system is the right of contract, the right of people to enter into a contract and have that contract enforced and have it not nullified by any government anywhere. Renegotiation in a very real sense violates that principle. It says in effect that even though our citizens enter into a contract with the Government, if after it is over the Government feels that too much money has been made the contract can be renegotiated or rewritten. I believe that in a period of national emergency that violation, if you choose to call it that, of the principle of contract is necessary. It is a sort of necessary evil. But certainly it should be administered with care and justice and the people who administer it should be watched constantly.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What would happen if the contractor sustained a loss as a result of the contract?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. There is no relief for him.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Under the War Powers Act there is provision to take into consideration the losses experienced by these contractors under specific contracts. They are negotiated up or bailed out from their loss on a reasonable base period.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That applies to only a few. For instance, out in my State many farmers near a flood-control project have sold their land to the Government. It is very likely the Government may find oil under that land. Can those farmers come in and say, "Here, the Government got too good a bargain. Can we not renegotiate the sale price?" No, it is a one-way street running in favor of the Government.

I do not want to be misunderstood. In this time of increased national defense buying it is necessary that the Government do a lot of blind contracting. Time is important. They must go to the manufacturers and say, "We want this and we want it now." Neither the manufacturers nor the procurement agencies have any idea what would be a just price. It may be that a price may appear to be a just price now, but if the volume is increased several times or several hundred times a fair price would be much lower. So it does seem that it is proper for a sovereign government to say, "We are not going to make these contracts final. They will have to be rewritten or renegotiated in the light of all the costs."

I am going to support this bill, but I believe if there ever was a measure where they should follow established principles of law and accounting, where everyone should be treated the same, it is this law. It does offer possibilities for favoritisms. I hope the Congress under the power which it has asserted for itself in the Congressional Reorganization Act will keep a very watchful eye on the operation of this law.

This law speaks too much about profits and not enough about prices. There is a tendency in the bill to say that the contractor or manufacturer who sells something to the Government, even though the Government pays too much for it, if he does not show a profit it is O. K. In other words, in order to get proper pricing they have accepted as a measuring stick the amount of profit. Ordinarily that may be all right, but if you have a very inefficient manufacturer, one whose plant and whose management is not what it should be, and if the salaries of the officers have been high for years they probably can charge the Government too high a price for some item and not be renegotiated. If the auditors find there has been no excess profit the taxpayers have no relief even though the Government paid too much. On the other hand some small well-managed companies with modest salaries for their officers, with good officers who watch everything, who are diligent and who cut down the cost, may sell that same article to the Government for a much lower price and because they do show a substantial profit they are renegotiated. I hope in administering this law the Government will encourage efficiency and not encourage inefficiency, that they will encourage the holding down of costs and not put a premium on that contractor or manufacturer who makes his costs very high. It should be construed as a pricing law rather than as a profits law. In other words, the Government should not pay more than something is worth even if the contractor by reason of his own inefficiency does not make a profit. By the same token if a successful and careful manufacturer reduced the prices way way below all other competitors, he ought to have a little reward for that because the Government benefits. The Government buys cheaper and he will pay more taxes under our excess-profits-tax law and the ordinary tax laws.

This bill differs from our previous law in several particulars. It sets up an independent board, a five-man board, the appointment of which must be made with the advice and consent of the Senate, and not more than two of them are to be military men. They have authority to delegate and redelegate and redelegate the authority granted in this bill, so that the Government agents who go into various manufacturing plants of the country will have authority to speak for the United States Government and determine whether or not the contract should be rewritten. The old law was more or less silent on the question of interest, although interest was charged in some instances where the manufacturers doubted the propriety thereof. This law spells it out a little more. One rather small change, but yet important, is that this new bill brings within the purview of renegotiation the acts of the so-called 5-percenters, those people who are engaged in contract brokering. After all, they get their money from the taxpayers of the United States. If an honest, patriotic manufacturer seeking to produce an efficient and low-cost defense item for the Government is subject to renegotiation, certainly that group here in Washington, some of whom render service and are honest, but some of whom are merely engaged in peddling influence, should not be permitted to gain great sums from out of the defense program and not be renegotiated. This law brings the contract brokers within the purview of the renegotiation if they make in any one year in excess of $25,000.

I believe that the power vested in this bill is so great that there should be an appeal beyond the appeal provided to the Tax Court. Objection has been raised to that. We are told that it is an administrative matter; that it is a matter that calls for discretion to determine how much the Government should pay for a certain article. Nevertheless, I feel that we are on such dangerous ground in tampering with the right of contract that it should be safeguarded in every way and that anyone aggrieved should have access to the courts of the land. I regret that the bill does not so provide. My amendment for such appeals, as well as my amendment to place ECA contracts under the renegotiation law, was rejected by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I favor the enactment of H. R. 1724 which is now before us. Generally, throughout the country, business and industrial leaders recognize the need for effective legal provision for the renegotiation of defense contracts. The American people in general look to the Federal Government to provide a stronger instrument for renegotiation of defense contracts in order to eliminate excessive profits from war production. The present law and procedures are inadequate. They do not apply to all defense orders placed by the Department of Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, the General Services Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other similar agencies, and they do not reach many contractors and subcontractors who should come within the jurisdiction of the renegotiation law.

Our great task in developing H. R. 1724, to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, has been to prevent excessive profits and high costs on defense business without discouraging expansion of production and the efficient use of manpower and materials in our preparedness program. Some regard had to be given to the practical limitations of administration and enforcement. For example, it is provided that a contractor or subcontractor shall not be renegotiated for any year unless he has received or accrued more than $100,000 in

the year from such source, and subcontractors whose income is derived from certain fees or commissions will be renegotiated for any year in which they have receipts and accruals of $25,000 or more from such source. A further example is the case of production of raw materials on our farms and in our mining industry which could not be brought under renegotiation without creating such an immense load of work that it would jeopardize the success of the administration of the entire program of renegotiation. Furthermore, the importance of food and fiber and of the products of mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposits makes it necessary to encourage expansion of such production in order to build our Nation's strength to withstand the impact of war.

You will note that section 101, starting on page 1 of the bill, sets out the declaration of policy. This declaration of policy recognizes and declares that the sound execution of the national defense program requires the elimination of excessive profits from contracts made with the United States and from related subcontracts in the course of said program and that this policy of the Congress, in the interest of national defense and the general welfare of the Nation, requires that such excessive profits be eliminated as provided in the proposed legislation. This declaration of policy limits the renegotiation to contracts for the procurement of property, processes, services, and the construction of facilities necessary for the national defense. It does not contemplate the renegotiation of all contracts made by all Government departments or agencies, but only those contracts and subcontracts made in the course of the national defense program.

However, as pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the provisions of section 102 are much broader and, unless changed by amendment, may be construed to apply to all contracts with the departments and agencies named.

Broad powers are given to the Renegotiation Board to exempt contracts or subcontracts which fall within the category specified in the bill. This has been done in the interest of reducing the work load of renegotiation at some points so that the major effort of the Board and its staff can be devoted to renegotiation of contracts and subcontracts in which the need for such renegotiation is greatest.

Some changes have been made in the mandatory exemptions as compared with the mandatory exemptions in the Renegotiation Act of 1943. One of these changes is found in section 106 (a) (4) on page 26 which sets out a more exact point for determining the exemption of contracts or subcontracts for timber and limits the exemption to timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs and limits the exemption also to contracts or subcontracts made with the owner of the timber property or with the producer of the logs.

Another change is made with regard to the product of mines. At the suggestion of Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson, section 403 (i) (1) (B) of the 1943 act extended mandatory exemption to "any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use." You will note that section 106 (a) (3), which appears on page 25 of this bill, extends the mandatory exemption to "any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the ordinary treatment processes normally applied by producers in order to obtain the first commercially marketable product, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner or operator of the mine, well, or deposit from which such product is produced. The term, 'ordinary treatment processes,' means, in the case of the product of a mine, well, or deposit with respect to which an allowance for percentage depletion is provided by section 114 (b) (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code, those processes which are taken into account under such section in computing gross income from the property, and in the case of any other product such term means such similar processes as may be prescribed under regulations promulgated by the Board."

If the proposed change in this mandatory exemption does not have an adverse effect on our national defense, I have no objection to its inclusion in this legislation, but since the adoption by the committee of this change in the exemption I have not had an opportunity to discuss the change with owners or representatives of our domestic mining industries nor with our Government officials who are charged with expediting domestic mine production and acquiring mine products for our national defense preparedness program. It is my hope that this change will receive very careful study and consideration by the other body to the end that Congress may avoid enactment of this provision if such study and analysis should establish that this provision may discourage or retard domestic production of these items at the very time they are most needed in our preparedness program. I am deeply sorry that the limitation of time did not permit the Committee on Ways and Means to make a more thorough and more careful study and examination of the possible impact of the proposed change on the domestic mining industry.

I am quite sure that Congress will be willing to consider amending this legislation whenever it is shown, either before its enactment or subsequent thereto, that this provision may have an effect detrimental to our national defense.

We had extensive hearings on this legislation, but the change I have referred to regarding mines and mine products was made in the very last part of our action in developing the bill, and I know that the committee is unanimous in wanting to do the right thing in building the defense preparedness program. We just did not have time to view it thoroughly after we made the proposed change in the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. In the hearings before the committee were there present representatives of the mine operators and unions?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Oh, yes. They advocated very strongly the retention of the wording of the 1943 act.

Mr. BAILEY. Which has been changed?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Exactly; and I want to know, in fairness to our defense program, what the actual impact of this change may be. I am not qualified to speak here and now about the extent of the effect of it or what it will do. If I had the time I would like to go into a very careful review of it with the owners and operators of our mining industry, and also with the Government authorities who have the responsibility for building up our preparedness program. I know the committee has that desire also. My suggestion is not adverse to the committee's attitude in any way on this point. I only hope it will be brought up more fully in the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. What, if any, provision is made in this bill for contractors to write off part or all of their capital investment? I am thinking about a case like this: There is a shipbuilding concern in my district that operated during the last war, building ships for the Army. Since then the plant has been idle, but it is now being revamped at considerable expense to the contractor. He anticipates again entering into defense contracts. The cost of modernizing this plant will only be useful in the execution of defense contracts. There will probably be no use for the modernization for which the contractor expended money, after he has executed such war contracts as he may get. Consequently I am wondering if he will be able to recover a part or all of those costs, as obviously ordinary depreciation allowed by the revenue laws would not fit his case. All his profit would be eaten up by the capital expenditure which he had made to be able to take care of these defense contracts. Could the gentleman enlighten me on this problem and if possible point out what such a contractor might expect and specifically in what part of the law the appropriate relief, if any is due in such a case, is authorized?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman from California will find a provision in section 103 (f) applies to the situation he has outlined. It appears on page 6 of the bill as follows:

All items estimated to be allowable as deductions and exclusions under chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code (excluding taxes measured by income) shall, to the extent allocable to such contracts and subcontracts, be allowed as items of cost, except that no amount shall be allowed as an item of cost by reason of the application of a carry-over or carry-back. Such costs shall be determined in accordance with the method of cost accounting regularly employed by the contractor or subcontractor in keeping

his books, but, if no such method of cost accounting has been employed, or if the method so employed does not, in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, properly reflect such costs, such costs shall be determined in accordance with such method as in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, does properly reflect such costs.

I commend the gentleman from California for his alert watchfulness on this point because it is of far-reaching importance in our gigantic preparedness program now getting under way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we must have a renegotiation law. I agree we should have it because of the situation in which we are placed as we proceed to rearm ourselves in preparation for war or, better yet, to prepare ourselves so that we may avoid war.

Renegotiation is temporary in nature, we hope. At best it can be said to show a weakness in our taxing laws which fail to take back from the individuals the excessive earnings they may have secured; at the same time it is an admission of weakness, a necessary weakness perhaps, but nevertheless a weakness and a failing and fallacy on the part of our contracting agencies of Government, representing as it does the taxpayers, based upon a showing of their inability to arrive at a fair and an equitable contract price for the products of industry. It causes consternation so far as the contractor of the job is concerned, because he never knows until perhaps 2 years after the completion of the contract just how much money he will have resulting from the contract, money which he may need to fulfill existing obligations or which he may need to provide for necessary expansion. Yet considering all of those factors, the committee, without any serious objection anywhere, brings this bill before you because we know that haste is necessary in order to secure quick rearmament of the country. It would do no good to sit idly by and let time pass as we seek one way or the other to determine what is a fair price for a product that we have not been manufacturing in the past, a product which is essential to the war effort.

So, we give the go ahead signal to industry, and the principals of the contract get together and after certain negotiations determine upon the best price they can which would induce the manufacturer to go ahead and produce the article, he agreeing that the contract shall be renegotiated under certain circumstances. I know, and it has been pointed out to you, that there is a grave danger that the man who operates the company which is most efficient, the company which stretches every point, the company which in every modern way endeavors to produce more quickly and cheaply, may be renegotiated downward and at the same time the inefficient producer producing that same article may not have his profits cut. However, the Board, which will be headed by a group of men who are confirmed and approved by the Senate after having been named by the President, must be presumed to be men who, first of all, want the rearmament program pushed to the utmost, must be men who are presumed to have the interest of our entire national economy at heart. It is the belief of the committee that the bill will be handled in a fair and equitable manner, and consequently we come before you with that bill and ask its adoption.

There is one phase of the bill that does not please me. I shall not offer an amendment, but there is a subject deserving further consideration. That is the question of whether the bill should be amended to exempt nondefense contracts. For many years we have adopted in our Government the principle of taking bids on contracts, particularly on these items that are everyday purchases. I see no reason whatever in providing that those items should be the subject of renegotiation. I think renegotiation, an unusual and an abnormal procedure, should be confined to those instances where it can be justified on the ground that the Government has been unable to reach a firm basis for a contract. In other words, I think the items which historically have been the subject of the ordinary type of contract between the Government and the American businessman should not be renegotiated under the guise that they are a part of our national defense program.

To continue that provision in the bill would impose a burden which would be, I believe, entirely unreasonable upon those charged with administering this bill, which is a most difficult one to administer. It would, perhaps, induce a measure of carelessness on the part of the Government agencies in issuing contracts in the original instance. We should keep those men, dealing as they are now with the items they have been purchasing in the past, on the firm basis of the customary way of making contracts. They should use their best judgment, deal across the table with the manufacturer who is under no particular pressure at this time to speed up his production. Let us make a firm contract in those instances. Let us direct that the independent board under this act shall confine its efforts to bringing back into the Treasury the truly excessive earnings which are the result of poor contract making, which is necessary in this time of tension by reason of the pressure upon the Government agencies. They must remember always that those agencies are called upon to secure firm contracts for the manufacture of articles never before seen or heard of; remember that no manufacturer knows what it will cost to make that article. Let us remove from the scope of this bill those items which we have been buying for years, and permit the men who are the renegotiators to confine their efforts to the items which are a part of our national defense program. I think such an amendment would be unobjectionable to the Government agencies which are interested in this bill. I think certainly the efficiency of the bill will be greatly improved. I think the public will be more willing to accept the principle that a contract once made can be reopened and renegotiated if it is confined to the principal cause for this bill's being here, namely, that in a time of pressure due to the frailties of mankind and the lack of knowledge about the matters under contract, and because of haste in particular, a contract has to be entered into which is not final in its conception. Let us confine this bill to that type of contract. Thereby industry will have a measure of certainty it cannot have under this bill, and thereby, I am sure, the efficiency of the Renegotiation Board charged with administering this act will be greatly improved, and the return to the Treasury of money belonging there will be expedited. Let us not tie the hands of the Board by directing that on any and every contract exceeding $100,000 the Renegotiation Board shall send their investigators to determine whether the price was a fair and an equitable one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There is something in what the gentleman says, but I think the bill does give the Board discretionary power. As is stated on page 4 of the report:

> The Board is given discretionary authority to exempt contracts or subcontracts which fall within the categories specified in the bill. These include contracts to be performed outside the United States, certain contracts and subcontracts where the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established.

There are a couple of other provisions there where the Board is given discretion.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct. There is discretion in the Board to exempt any contract.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So the Board is not under the compulsion of renegotiating any contract whatsoever.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for the correction. He is right in that respect. The Board could exempt any one of these. I see no reason, however, why the statute itself should necessitate a contractor's being uncertain about his status, and I see no reason, further, why we should not simply eliminate nondefense contracts.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

"YES-MAN PSYCHOLOGY"

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, a practice which strikes at the very heart of our national defense is embodied in the recent directive of the administration which restricts officers of our Military Establishment in giving to Congress and the American people valuable information based on their years of experience.

On November 15, 1946, in a memorandum to the Director of the Budget, the President said:

> I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

The President was addressing himself to the heads of all Government agencies, including the Military Establishment.

On January 20, 1951, the following confidential directive was issued:

> Officers may, upon their own responsibility, and at their own discretion, make remarks concerning unclassified matters on foreign or military policies to selected groups for background purposes only and not for publication without obtaining prior clearance, provided that their remarks are confined to the bounds and policies which have been publicly announced by the White House, State or Defense Departments.

Mr. Chairman, in 1946 the directive said support only the President's estimates. On January 20, 1951, the directive said confine your remarks to the bounds of the policies which have been publicly announced by the administration. This is an out-and-out gag on our military spokesmen. No wonder we were unprepared for Korea.

Let us not forget the shameful treatment accorded Admiral Louis Denfeld, the transfer of Admiral Joel T. Boone, Gen. Orville Anderson, and others, simply because they spoke their minds and gave to the American people the results of their years of experience in military life.

Mr. Chairman, this "yes-man psychology" is the ruination of good government and especially of our national defense.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I take this short time for the reason that I believe a clear statement should appear in the RECORD while his bill is being considered, advising the American small-business man that there is nothing in this bill which permits renegotiation of Government contracts for his benefit. The businessman who has lost money in his contracts with the Government must still find in the War Powers Act his rights to relief if they exist. I believe there is a general false belief that the bill we are considering purports to make corrections for all inequities experienced in the last war in regard to renegotiation of contracts, including those where the contracting party lost money. This is not the case. The rules and regulations under the War Powers Act, which caused so much damage to small contractors and subcontractors because of technicalities, are still in operation and effect. As an example, the rule of the last war that executives' salaries would be considered as costs of a contractor, if his business entity was in the form of a corporation, but living expenses of a partner doing business as a partnership entity would not be considered as costs, is still in effect. The record should be clear today that businessmen seeking Government contracts or seeking a subcontract from a larger business concern, should seek advice from their attorneys in regard to their business entity and what their rights may be, in the event of loss under the War Powers Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a little while ago brought up the question of what I think about the patriotism of American industry. I made the statement I did because I wanted to show that there was in the American private economy a great area of patriotism and that many companies are, I believe, ready to give up all profits on defense contracts after providing for their reserves.

I would like to emphasize one further point: The productivity of American industry will determine whether or not we will defeat communism because, unless our private economy can produce 25 percent more in the next 5 years than it produced in the last 5 years since 1945, we are in grave danger of losing the grim struggle to defend freedom in which we are engaged. I am confident that the American private economy—workers and management alike—can do it.

It is this kind of support evidenced on the floor of the House by members of such diverse opinions as the gentleman from Michigan and myself which may indeed help American industry to accomplish this goal for our benefit and for the benefit of free peoples everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the members of the committee have already had the opportunity of reaching a fair understanding at least, of the provisions of the bill before us today. We have heard it adequately explained by those who preceded me. I do not desire to go into a detailed explanation of all the provisions of the bill within the 15 minutes allotted to me. However, I would like to take up one or two points about which there appears to be some question in the minds of some of those who have spoken.

All of us will recall that this idea of renegotiation is not a new thing. It has never been treated as a partisan matter. I remember the first suggestion for renegotiation prior to or during World War II was made by our former colleague from South Dakota, who is now in the other body, Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and I served on a subcommittee which prepared amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1943. A great deal of credit is due to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] for the method of appeal provided in the World War II law and many of the other wholesome provisions of that law.

This bill that we have before us today is based largely on the old 1943 Renegotiation Act, plus experience gained by those who renegotiated contracts during World War II. The big difference, at least in my opinion, between our World War II renegotiation law and the bill before us, is the Renegotiation Board itself. In the World War II act, because of assurance given our committee by Judge Patterson, who was then Secretary of War, that the renegotiation of contracts would be conducted in an independent manner, it was not felt necessary to make an independent agency of the Renegotiation Board. However, I felt then that it should have been independent, and I felt during the discussion of this present bill in the committee that the Renegotiation Board itself should be independent. In other words, those who renegotiated contracts should not be under the control of the same group in either the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy, who procured the articles in question in the first place.

This Board is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is to consist of five members, not less than three of whom must come from civilian life. As I understand, the President may appoint any three civilians he desires to appoint. They may come from outside Government or they may come from within Government. It is not intended by this limitation that the President shall appoint two from the armed services. He may appoint all five from civilian life, if he so desires. To me, that is an improvement over our World War II renegotiation law.

We hope that this provision will mean uniformity of decisions, uniformity of regulations, and uniformity of application of renegotiation. During World War II we heard that it was possible for one contractor to receive one kind of treatment at the hands of the Navy renegotiation and entirely different treatment at the hands of the Army and the Air Force. It is our hope that there will be uniformity as a result of this independent agency in the executive department handling the renegotiations. A question has arisen as to whether or not there should be any exceptions or exemptions whatsoever to the authority in the legislation to renegotiate contracts.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I suggest to the gentleman that in the course of the study made by the Air Policy Board a while back we found that contractors dealing with the various branches of the service and, of course, also that the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of Internal Revenue had in effect to keep five separate books because of different aspects of the situation. I am wondering if it would not save a great deal of expense to the Government if we could eventually agree upon one form of accounting?

Mr. MILLS. That is one of the things that should be carefully considered. Certainly we are endeavoring to overcome that in this bill.

There is the right, as the gentleman knows, in section 107 (d) of the bill to delegate authority; that is, the Board

may delegate its authority, its obligations, and responsibilities except that it cannot delegate its authority to make rules and regulations. The Board may delegate back to the Air Force or to the Army or to the Navy the responsibility for renegotiation of those contracts which the agency makes. But in the process of renegotiating those contracts the agencies will be controlled and they will operate under rules and regulations which are uniform; and, of course, the Board itself will have the final authority in the event it desires to review any such contract or renegotiation, or if the contractor, himself, wants to go to the Board.

Mr. HINSHAW. Could the gentleman give any assurance that those regulations will be uniform with the Internal Revenue Bureau as well as the General Accounting Office?

Mr. MILLS. I do not believe I follow the gentleman, but the Internal Revenue Bureau is not in this now.

Mr. HINSHAW. No, but the gentleman will recognize that the Internal Revenue Bureau figures out the taxes to be paid on profits on the contracts.

Mr. MILLS. There should be uniformity as far as costs are concerned that are allowed for renegotiation and costs that are allowed for tax purposes. On page 6 of the bill we suggest that all items of cost allowable under the tax laws will be allowed for renegotiation purposes. But I do not know that you can say that there would be absolute uniformity between all of the operations of the renegotiation law and the application of the internal revenue laws.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman can see how much cheaper it would be to do the accounting for all concerned if only one set of books need be kept.

Mr. MILLS. That is true, and we hope that only one set of books will be necessary for tax purposes, as well as for purposes of renegotiation; it would be much cheaper for the contractor.

When my friend from California arose I had started to say something about this question of exemptions. In the 1943 act, the old World War II law, we provided specific exemptions for raw products grown on the farm, and those produced from mines and oil and gas wells. We did that at the request of those people charged with the responsibility of renegotiating these contracts. They said then it was administratively difficult, if not impossible, to go back into all of these subcontracts involving raw materials, and to renegotiate them because the contractor himself might be producing in part for Government and in part for civilian use, and the job of allocating which raw materials went into war contracts and which went into civilian goods was such a problem that they did not at that time want to undertake it. In this bill we have not gone as far as we did in the World War II law with respect to the exemption of such products. Under this bill, the man who produces on the farm, produces from the mine, or produces oil or gas would, in general, be exempt from renegotiation up to the first commercially marketable state. In the World War II act, however, the exemption applied to anyone who sold these raw products whether he produced them or not. We have limited it now to the producer; so it is a little more restrictive in that sense. We do not permit our definition of a raw product to go as high up the scale toward the finished product as was the case in the World War II act. This is of great importance, in my opinion, for in the case of the World War II act we found that we had exempted specifically pig iron used in the manufacture of steel, but that, of course, is not what we had intended to do. I think perhaps those applying the Renegotiation Act went further in their interpretation of the language than we ever intended when we wrote the law itself.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Does not the gentleman think that he and all of us would be safe in saying that the committee has profited by all of the mistakes that were made before and that this bill is an honest effort to cure all of them and to make this program more profitable to the Government and more easily administered?

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman from Ohio has reflected the viewpoint of every man on the committee. There are certain provisions that I may disagree with or that someone else may disagree with, but on the whole the bill is greatly improved from all viewpoints and in all respects over the law which we thought was reasonably satisfactory in World War II.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to call attention to the fact that, in my opinion, this is a much better measure than was in existence during the World War II period, and one of the most important changes is the change just mentioned by the gentleman from Arkansas wherein he called attention to the restriction on the exemptions. We felt that the exemptions went a little bit too far under the World War II act. That improvement and the improvement in the board are the two main things which the membership should be interested in.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman agrees, then, that this bill should be passed by the House in its present form?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is mandatory that the House pass it promptly.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has raised a point that concerns a lot of people; that is, whether or not this legislation should refer to and include all types of Government contracts with the seven agencies mentioned in the bill or whether it should be limited to defense contracts. Let me talk just a moment on that, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania has informed me that he will not offer an amendment to prescribe such a limitation.

In the first place, I do not know, and I doubt that any Member is in a position now to properly describe what is and what is not a defense contract. We say contracts with defense establishments, the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Commerce, which is the Maritime Administration—that is what we are getting at in that Department—and with General Services Administration which does do some buying of raw materials and other things that go directly into the war effort, as I understand it. We specify certain departments of Government that deal almost exclusively in defense contracts. But if we would say in this bill that there shall be no renegotiation of any contract except a defense contract, then it is necessary, as I take it, for us to define what we mean by a defense contract. What would be a defense contract? I will ask any of you gentlemen who have worked with this a lot longer than I have on the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee where you are making appropriations for the defense, What is a defense contract?

If we thus limit the application of the bill to a defense contract without defining what we mean by "defense," have we actually accomplished anything, because the definition, unless we define it, will be left to this renegotiation board? I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania is agreeable to passage of the bill by the House in its present form applying to all contracts entered into by these specifically named departments in order to avoid any possibility of ambiguity as to what we intend or mean, and especially in view of the fact we have never defined, or we have never limited renegotiation in the past to strictly defense contracts or to war contracts. Heretofore we have always said that contracts with certain departments would be subject to renegotiation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I read this bill correctly, it really gives the Board established under the provisions of this bill two different authorities: One is to renegotiate contracts; the other duty or responsibility or right or privilege, which may be more important in the finality, is the grant of authority to the Board contained on page 17 to decide what contractors shall come under the provisions of this act and what provisions shall not. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Ohio will remember that there was some discretionary power to exempt contracts and types of contracts in the old law. This time the only additional discretionary authority we have given is in regard to contracts of a secret nature, involving the security of the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I can remember a great many war contracts made in the last war that perhaps it would have been better for some people if they had been kept secret, and I am just a little fearful of this secret contract arrangement.

Mr. MILLS. What is contemplated is a contract that involves atomic energy or the sale of uranium, or some such contract of that sort where information cannot be made public in regard to the contract. The gentleman from Ohio understands the situation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the theory behind it, but here is a Presidential board, named by the President, responsible to the President, which in one sense of the word, at least, will be the strong right arm and the representative of the President, given rather complete powers to decide regarding what agencies should be covered, giving the people discretion and authority to decide whether any or all or a portion of the contractors or contracts shall be exempt from the provisions of the bill. It is rather broad power.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right. There is a tremendous grant of power involved in this, and authority and power that could be greatly misused. Heretofore it was possible for the President, during World War II, to call into this particular activity some of the very outstanding, most honorable men in the United States. They came into Government service and devoted their time unselfishly to the job. They did a very admirable job. There has been no criticism of them by anyone. Everyone seems to be satisfied both from the viewpoint of the public, the Government, and the individual contractor. Now in this bill, we say that the President shall appoint five members by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is a new board, of course.

Mr. MILLS. Heretofore the Department could select generals or colonels or anyone they wanted to and assign them to renegotiation. But, I must say to the gentleman from Ohio I regret that the salary has been fixed at $12,500; maybe it should have been $14,000 or $15,000, but I really feel, and sincerely believe, that it will be possible for the President to obtain the services of such outstanding men for this job as was the case before; that the Senate will see fit to agree to their appointment, and when they enter Government service they will do the kind of a job that the gentleman wants done and I want done. Certainly we do not want, and it is not intended, that any individual contractor will be exempt from the provisions of this bill just simply because somebody looks with favor upon him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman will agree, though, that when the Congress of the United States delegates authority and grants such broad and far-reaching powers to any board or any group of men that we should be very careful to surround such a grant of power with every possible safeguard. And I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this particular provision which I am fearful is quite dangerous.

Mr. MILLS. It could be if not properly administered, I must agree with the gentleman from Ohio, but he and I will be watching, as we generally do, the administration of laws which are passed by the Congress. When we find some evidence of misuse or abuse or maladministration of this law, I can assure the gentleman our committee will be most anxious to enact necessary legislation to prevent a repetition of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman and to the House as I said to the Committee on Rules yesterday when we had the representatives of the gentleman's committee before us on this particular bill that at the present moment there is no provision, no overall committee, no group representing the House of Representatives—and this is where the people of America sit to legislate—to keep track of that which is going on in this great national emergency, in this great spending effort where we are going to spend, as the President says, $100,000,000,000 a year of the people's money on national defense. Somehow or other, sometime or other, this House should provide some agency of its own to know whether the laws that it passes are carried out properly and whether the money that it appropriates is expended efficiently and well.

Mr. MILLS. Let me assure my friend from Ohio that, pending the passage of such a resolution by the House establishing such a committee, he may rely upon the statement I am about to make, that the Committee on Ways and Means will be very diligent in following the administration of the Renegotiation Act, just as we have attempted in the past to be diligent in following the administration of our internal revenue laws. Our committee is usually busy, but we always find time to assist by making suggestions in regard to proper administration of the laws coming from our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I notice that in the exemption provision is included the phrase, "Any contract or subcontract for an agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state."

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true, however, that this legislation would cover any sale of cotton to textile mills?

Mr. MILLS. Any cotton sold by a farmer direct which might be part of a subcontract to an original contract with one of the specified Departments would not be included within the jurisdiction of the bill. However, if my friend from Arkansas should accumulate from farmers over his area 1,000 bales of cotton or enough cotton to equal $100,000 or more——

Mr. HARRIS. Which is unlikely.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, I do not want to give the wrong impression of my friend. I know he would not accumulate that much. My friend, in such case, who had not raised the cotton but had accumulated the cotton as a broker accumulates cotton, would not be exempt from the provisions of this bill. His contract with some cotton mill that dealt with one of the specified departments might be subjected to renegotiation. Under the old law, such a contract was not subjected to renegotiation.

Mr. HARRIS. The producers of cotton in many instances do their first processing, that is, by ginning. If a producer does his own ginning, then would he be subject to renegotiation?

Mr. MILLS. Receipts or accruals from the sale of cotton in bale form in the amount of $100,000 or less by the producer would not be subjected to renegotiation under the terms of this bill. Cotton in the bale is the form in which we are talking about as being an agricultural commodity exempt from renegotiation.

Mr. HARRIS. I mean $100,000 or more would not be exempted?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman understands there is a provision in the bill which exempts from renegotiation a contractor who has receipts or accruals of $100,000 or less during a fiscal year from otherwise renegotiable contracts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When it becomes necessary to provide facilities to train those men who are called into service, would the contract that might be entered into then be a war contract?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I presume it might. I do not know what example the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Building barracks, for instance. Suppose a contractor is called on to erect barracks on the ground, and it amounts to more than $100,000. Is that a war contract?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly, I would consider that a defense or war contract, yes. But the gentleman wants to bear in mind we are not thinking in terms of procurement here as to the purpose of a particular contract. We are thinking in terms of the renegotiation of contracts with these seven specified agencies of Government where it appears such a price has been charged for the execution of the contract that the contractor, if not renegotiated, will be left with what are termed excessive profits. The gentleman remembers as a result of the law in World War II, which I am sure the gentleman supported, there were some $200,000,000,000 subject to renegotiation and that the Government recaptured through renegotiations approximately $11,000,000,000. A large part of this sum would never have been recaptured by an excess-profits tax.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but what I had in mind was this. During the last war when we were building cantonments near here in two places those who were building them, the working men, were required to take out weekly permits for $2.50 a week to be deducted from their pay so that they might be able to work on those projects.

Mr. MILLS. I know what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I thought you would.

Mr. MILLS. Our committee deferred action on that subject because we knew of the gentleman's intense interest in it, and we knew of his great knowledge on

the subject. We wanted to leave that to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To whom?

Mr. MILLS. To you. We wanted to leave that subject to you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you left it to me I would fix it.

Mr. MILLS. And we knew the gentleman would fix it and do a better job than the Committee on Ways and Means could do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would stop that kind of practice.

Mr. MILLS. We did not legislate on that subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to know why that was not like an excess profits tax.

Mr. MILLS. I tried to explain to the gentleman that we wanted to leave that subject to the gentleman from Michigan who knows more about it than we do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not see why the gentleman is being facetious about a serious matter.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Renegotiation Act of 1951."

TITLE I—RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 101. Declaration of policy.

It is hereby recognized and declared that the Congress has made available for the execution of the national defense program extensive funds, by appropriation and otherwise, for the procurement of property, processes, and services, and the construction of facilities necessary for the national defense; that sound execution of the national defense program requires the elimination of excessive profits from contracts made with the United States, and from related subcontracts, in the course of said program; and that the considered policy of the Congress, in the interests of the national defense and the general welfare of the Nation, requires that such excessive profits be eliminated as provided in this title.

SEC. 102. Contracts subject to renegotiation.

(a) In general: The provisions of this title shall be applicable (1) to all contracts with the Departments specifically named in section 103 (a), and related subcontracts, to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after the first day of January 1951, whether such contracts or subcontracts were made on, before, or after such first day, and (2) to all contracts with the Departments designated by the President under section 103 (a), and related subcontracts, to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after the first day of the first month beginning after the date of such designation, whether such contracts or subcontracts were made on, before, or after such first day; but the provisions of this title shall not be applicable to receipts or accruals attributable to performance, under contracts or subcontracts, after December 31, 1953.

(b) Renegotiation Act of 1948: The Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not apply with respect to any receipts or accruals subject to renegotiation under this title. If a contractor or subcontractor, during the same fiscal year in which he has receipts or accruals subject to renegotiation under this title, has other receipts or accruals from contracts or subcontracts subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act of 1948, the provisions of this title shall, notwithstanding subsection (a), apply to such other receipts or accruals if the Board and such contractor or subcontractor agree to such application of this title; and in the case of such an agreement the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not apply to such other receipts or accruals of the fiscal year.

(c) Suspension of certain profit limitations: Notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the profit-limitation provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 505), as amended and supplemented, shall not apply to any contract or subcontract if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title.

SEC. 103. Definitions.

For the purposes of this title—

(a) Department: The term "Department" means the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Commerce, the General Services Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and such other agencies of the Government exercising functions in connection with the national defense as the President shall designate.

(b) Secretary: The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of General Services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the head of any other agency of the Government which the President shall designate pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Board: The term "Board" means the Renegotiation Board created by section 107 (a) of this act.

(d) Renegotiate and renegotiation: The terms "renegotiate" and "renegotiation" include a determination by agreement or order under this title of the amount of any excessive profits.

(e) Excessive profits: The term "excessive profits" means the portion of the profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts which is determined in accordance with this title to be excessive. In determining excessive profits there shall be taken into consideration the following factors:

(1) Efficiency of contractor, with particular regard to attainment of quantity and quality production, reduction of costs, and economy in the use of materials, facilities, and manpower;

(2) Reasonableness of costs and profits, with particular regard to volume of production, normal earnings, and comparison of war and peacetime products;

(3) Reasonableness of return on net worth, with particular regard to the amount and source of public and private capital employed;

(4) Extent of risk assumed, including the risk incident to reasonable pricing policies;

(5) Nature and extent of contribution to the defense effort, including inventive and developmental contribution and cooperation with the Government and other contractors in supplying technical assistance;

(6) Character of business, including source and nature of materials, complexity of manufacturing technique, character and extent of subcontracting, and rate of turn-over;

(7) Such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equitable dealing may require, which factors shall be published in the regulations of the Board from time to time as adopted.

(f) Profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts: The term "profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts" means the excess of the amount received or accrued under such contracts and subcontracts over the costs paid or incurred with respect thereto and determined to be allocable thereto. All items estimated to be allowable as deductions and exclusions under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code (excluding taxes measured by income) shall, to the extent allocable to such contracts and subcontracts, be allowed as items of cost, except that no amount shall be allowed as an item of cost by reason of the application of a carry-over or carry-back. Such costs shall be determined in accordance with the method of cost accounting regularly employed by the contractor or subcontractor in keeping his books, but if no such method of cost accounting has been employed, or if the method so employed does not, in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, properly reflect such costs, such costs shall be determined in accordance with such method as in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, does properly reflect such costs. Irrespective of the method employed or prescribed for determining such costs, no item of cost shall be charged to contracts with the Departments or subcontracts or used in any manner for the purpose of determining such costs, to the extent that, in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, such item is unreasonable or not properly chargeable to such contracts or subcontracts. In determining the amount of excessive profits to be eliminated proper adjustment shall be made on account of the taxes measured by income, other than Federal taxes, which are attributable to the portion of the profits which are not excessive.

(g) Subcontract: The term "subcontract" means—

(1) any purchase order or agreement (including purchase orders or agreements antedating the related prime contract or higher tier subcontract) to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any materials, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract;

(2) any contract or arrangement covering the right to use any patented or secret method, formula, or device for the performance of a contract or subcontract; and

(3) any contract or arrangement (other than a contract or arrangement between two contracting parties, one of whom is found by the Board to be a bona fide executive officer, partner, or full-time employee of the other contracting party) under which—

(A) any amount payable is contingent upon the procurement of a contract or contracts with a Department or of a subcontract or subcontracts; or

(B) any amount payable is determined with reference to the amount of a contract or contracts with a Department or of a subcontract or subcontracts; or

(C) any part of the services performed or to be performed consists of the soliciting, attempting to procure, or procuring a contract or contracts with a Department or a subcontract or subcontracts.

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed (i) to affect in any way the validity or construction of provisions in any contract with a Department or any subcontract, heretofore at any time or hereafter made, prohibiting the payment of contingent fees or commissions; or (ii) to restrict in any way the authority of the Board to determine the nature or amount of selling expense under subcontracts as defined in this subsection, as a proper element of the contract price or as a reimbursable item of cost, under a contract with a Department or a subcontract.

(h) Fiscal year: The term "fiscal year" means, except in the case of a partnership as defined in section 3797 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the taxable year of the contractor or subcontractor under chapter 1 of such code. In the case of a partnership as so defined the term "fiscal year"

means such period as the Board by regulations may prescribe.

(i) Received or accrued and paid or incurred: The terms "received or accrued" and "paid or incurred" shall be construed according to the method of accounting employed by the contractor or subcontractor in keeping his books, but if no such method of accounting has been employed, or if the method so employed does not, in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, properly reflect his receipts or accruals or payments or obligations, such receipts or accruals or such payments or obligations shall be determined in accordance with such method as in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination in the opinion of the Tax Court of the United States, does properly reflect such receipts or accruals or such payments or obligations.

(j) Person: The term "person" shall include an individual, firm, corporation, association, partnership, and any organized group of persons whether or not incorporated.

(k) Materials: The term "materials" shall include raw materials, articles, commodities, parts, assemblies, products, machinery, equipment, supplies, components, technical data, processes, and other personal property.

(l) Agency of the Government: The term "agency of the Government" means any part of the executive branch of the Government or any independent establishment of the Government or part thereof, including any Department (whether or not a Department as defined in subsection (a) of this section), any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, or any board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, employee, authority, administration, or other establishment of the Government which is not a part of the legislative or judicial branches.

SEC. 104. Renegotiation clause in contracts.

Subject to section 106 (a), the Secretary of each Department specifically named in section 103 (a) shall insert in each contract made by such Department 30 days or more after the date of the enactment of this act, and the Secretary of each department designated by the President under section 103 (a) shall insert in each contract made by such Department 30 days or more after the date of such designation, a provision under which the contractor agrees—

(1) to the elimination of excessive profits through renegotiation;

(2) that there may be withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due the contractor, or that he will repay to the United States, if paid to him, any excessive profits;

(3) that he will insert in each subcontract described in section 103 (g) a provision under which the subcontractor agrees—

(A) to the elimination of excessive profits through renegotiation;

(B) that there may be withheld by the contractor for the United States from amounts otherwise due to the subcontractor, or that the subcontractor will repay to the United States, if paid to him, any excessive profits;

(C) that the contractor shall be relieved of all liability to the subcontractor on account of any amount so withheld, or so repaid by the subcontractor to the United States;

(D) that he will insert in each subcontract described in section 103 (g) provisions corresponding to those of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and to those of this subparagraph;

(4) that there may be withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due the contractor, or that he will repay to the United States, as the Secretary may direct, any amounts which under section 105 (b) (1) (C) the contractor is directed to withhold from a subcontractor and which are actually unpaid at the time the contractor receives such direction.

The obligations assumed by the contractor or subcontractor under paragraph (1) or (3) (A), as the case may be, agreeing to the elimination of excessive profits through renegotiation shall be binding on him only if the contract or subcontract, as the case may be, is subject to this title. A provision inserted in a contract or subcontract, which recites in substance that the contract or subcontract shall be deemed to contain all the provisions required by this section shall be sufficient compliance with this section. Whether or not the provisions specified in this section are inserted in a contract with a department or subcontract, to which this title is applicable, such contract or subcontract, as the case may be, shall be considered as having been made subject to this title in the same manner and to the same extent as if such provisions had been inserted.

SEC. 105. Renegotiation proceedings.

(a) Proceedings before the Board: Renegotiation proceedings shall be commenced by the mailing of notice to that effect, in such form as may be prescribed by regulation, by registered mail to the contractor or subcontractor. The Board shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the elimination of excessive profits received or accrued, and with respect to such other matters relating thereto as the Board deems advisable. Any such agreement, if made, may, with the consent of the contractor or subcontractor, also include provisions with respect to the elimination of excessive profits likely to be received or accrued. If the Board does not make an agreement with respect to the elimination of excessive profits received or accrued, it shall issue and enter an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits, and forthwith give notice thereof by registered mail to the contractor or subcontractor. In the absence of the filing of a petition with the Tax Court of the United States under the provisions of and within the time limit prescribed in section 108, such order shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review or redetermination by any court or other agency. The Board shall exercise its powers with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year (or such other period as may be fixed by mutual agreement) by a contractor or subcontractor under contracts with the departments and subcontracts, and not separately with respect to amounts received or accrued under separate contracts with the deparments or subcontracts, except that the Board may exercise such powers separately with respect to amounts received or accrued by the contractor or subcontractor under any one or more separate contracts with the departments or subcontracts at the request of the contractor or subcontractor. By agreement with any contractor or subcontractor, and pursuant to regulations promulgated by it, the Board may in its discretion conduct renegotiation on a consolidated basis in order properly to reflect excessive profits of two or more related contractors or subcontractors. Whenever the Board makes a determination with respect to the amount of excessive profits, and such determination is made by order, it shall, at the request of the contractor or subcontractor, as the case may be, prepare and furnish such contractor or subcontractor with a statement of such determination, of the facts used as a basis therefor, and of its reasons for such determination. Such statement shall not be used in the Tax Court of the United States as proof of the facts or conclusions stated therein.

(b) Methods of eliminating excessive profits:

(1) In general: Upon the making of an agreement, or the entry of an order, under subsection (a) of this section by the Board, or the entry of an order under section 108 by the Tax Court of the United States, determining excessive profits, the Board shall forthwith authorize and direct the Secretaries or any of them to eliminate such excessive profits—

(A) by reductions in the amounts otherwise payable to the contractor under contracts with the departments, or by other revision of their terms;

(B) by withholding from amounts otherwise due to the contractor any amount of such excessive profits;

(C) by directing any person having a contract with any agency of the Government, or any subcontractor thereunder, to withhold for the account of the United States from any amounts otherwise due from such person or such subcontractor to a contractor, or subcontractor, having excessive profits to be eliminated, and every such person or subcontractor receiving such direction shall withhold and pay over to the United States the amounts so required to be withheld;

(D) by recovery from the contractor or subcontractor, or from any person or subcontractor directed under subparagraph (C) to withhold for the account of the United States, through payment, repayment, credit, or suit any amount of such excessive profits realized by the contractor or subcontractor or directed under subparagraph (C) to be withheld for the account of the United States; or

(E) by any combination of these methods, as is deemed desirable.

(2) Interest: Interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum shall accrue and be paid on the amount of such excessive profits from the date fixed for repayment by the order of the Board or by the agreement with the contractor or subcontractor to the date of repayment, and on amounts required to be withheld by any person or subcontractor for the account of the United States pursuant to paragraph (1) (C), from the date payment is demanded by the Secretaries or any of them to the date of payment. When the Tax Court of the United States, under section 108, redetermines the amount of excessive profits received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor, interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum shall accrue and be paid by such contractor or subcontractor as follows:

(A) When the amount of excessive profits determined by the Tax Court is greater than the amount determined by the Board, interest shall accrue and be paid on the amount determined by the Board from the date originally fixed by the Board for its repayment to the date of repayment and, in addition thereto, interest shall accrue and be paid on the additional amount determined by the Tax Court from the date of its order determining such excessive profits to the date of repayment.

(B) When the amount of excessive profits determined by the Tax Court is equal to the amount determined by the Board, interest shall accrue and be paid on such amount from the date originally fixed by the Board for its repayment to the date of repayment.

(C) When the amount of excessive profits determined by the Tax Court is less than the amount determined by the Board, interest shall accrue and be paid on such lesser amount from the date originally fixed for repayment by the Board to the date of repayment.

(3) Suits for recovery: Actions on behalf of the United States may be brought in the appropriate courts of the United States to recover, (A) from the contractor or subcontractor, any amount of such excessive profits

and accrued interest not withheld or eliminated by some other method under this subsection, and (B) from any person or subcontractor who has been directed under paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection to withhold for the account of the United States, the amounts required to be withheld under such paragraph, together with accrued interest thereon.

(4) Sureties: The surety under a contract or subcontract shall not be liable for the repayment of any excessive profits thereon.

(5) Indemnification: Each person is hereby indemnified by the United States against all claims on account of amounts withheld by such person pursuant to this subsection from a contractor or subcontractor and paid over to the United States.

(6) Treatment of recoveries: All money recovered in respect to amounts paid to a contractor from appropriations from the Treasury by way of repayment or suit under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Upon the withholding of any amount of excessive profits or the crediting of any amount of excessive profits against amounts otherwise due a contractor, the Secretary shall certify the amount thereof to the Treasury and the appropriations of his Department shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount so withheld or credited. The amount of such reductions shall be transferred to the surplus fund of the Treasury. All money recovered in respect of amounts paid to the contractor from corporate or other revolving funds (other than appropriations from the Treasury) by way of repayment, withholding, crediting, or suit under this section shall be restored to such funds. The Board is authorized to make regulations giving effect to the intent of this provision in respect of money recovered representing subcontract excessive profits not readily identifiable as to the public funds ultimately reflecting charges therefor.

(7) Credit for taxes paid: In eliminating excessive profits, the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess-profits taxes as provided in section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) Periods of limitations: No proceeding to determine the amount of excessive profits for any fiscal year shall be commenced more than 1 year after the statement required under subsection (e) (1) of this section is filed with the Board with respect to such year, and, if such proceeding is not commenced prior to the expiration of 1 year following the date upon which such statement is so filed, all liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor for excessive profits received or accrued during such fiscal year shall thereupon be discharged. If an agreement or order determining the amount of excessive profits is not made within 2 years following the commencement of the renegotiation proceeding, then upon the expiration of such 2 years all liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor for excessive profits with respect to which such proceeding was commenced shall thereupon be discharged, except that (1) if an order is made within such 2 years pursuant to a delegation of authority under subsection (d) of section 107, such 2-year limitation shall not apply to review of such order by the Board, and (2) such 2-year period may be extended by mutual agreement.

(d) Agreements to eliminate excessive profits: For the purposes of this title the Board may make final or other agreements with a contractor or subcontractor for the elimination of excessive profits and for the discharge of any liability for excessive profits under this title. Such agreements may contain such terms and conditions as the Board deems advisable. Any such agreement shall be conclusive according to its terms; and, except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact, (1) such agreement shall not for the purposes of this title be reopened as to the matters agreed upon, and shall not be modified by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States, and (2) such agreement and any determination made in accordance therewith shall not be annulled, modified, set aside, or disregarded in any suit, action, or proceeding. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, however, the Board shall have the power, pursuant to regulations promulgated by it, to modify any agreement or order for the purpose of extending the time for payment of sums due under such agreement or order.

(e) Information available to Board:

(1) Furnishing of financial statements, etc.: Every person who holds contracts or subcontracts, to which the provisions of this title are applicable, shall, in such form and detail as the Board may by regulations prescribe, file with the Board, on or before the first day of the fourth calendar month following the close of his fiscal year, a financial statement setting forth such information as the Board may by regulations prescribe as necessary to carry out this title. In addition to the statement required under the preceding sentence, every such person shall, at such time or times and in such form and detail as the Board may by regulations prescribe, furnish the Board any information, records, or data which are determined by the Board to be necessary to carry out this title. Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any statement, information, records, or data required of him under this subsection, or who knowingly furnishes any such statement, information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(2) Audit of books and records: For the purpose of this title, the Board shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this title. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Board and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this title.

(f) Minimum amounts subject to renegotiation:

(1) In general: If the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued during a fiscal year (and on or after the applicable effective date specified in section 102 (a)) by a contractor or subcontractor, and all persons under control of or controlling or under common control with the contractor or subcontractor, under contracts with the Departments and subcontracts described in section 103 (g) (1) and (2), is not more than $100,000, the receipts or accruals from such contracts and subcontracts shall not, for such fiscal year, be renegotiated under this title. If the aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year under such contracts and subcontracts is more than $100,000, no determination of excessive profits to be eliminated for such year with respect to such contracts and subcontracts shall be in an amount greater than the amount by which such aggregate exceeds $100,000.

(2) Subcontracts described in section 103 (g) (3): If the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued during a fiscal year (and on or after the applicable effective date specified in section 102 (a)) by a subcontractor, and all persons under control of or controlling or under common control with the subcontractor, under subcontracts described in section 103 (g) (3) is not more than $25,000, the receipts or accruals from such subcontracts shall not, for such fiscal year, be renegotiated under this title. If the aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year under such subcontracts is more than $25,000, no determination of excessive profits to be eliminated for such year with respect to such subcontracts shall be in an amount greater than the amount by which such aggregate exceeds $25,000.

(3) Computation: In computing the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued during any fiscal year for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, such computation shall be made without elimination of intercompany sales. If the fiscal year is a fractional part of 12 months, the $100,000 amount and the $25,000 amount shall be reduced to the same fractional part thereof for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 106. Exemptions.

(a) Mandatory exemptions: The provisions of this title shall not apply to—

(1) any contract by a department with any Territory, possession, or State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or with any foreign government or any agency thereof; or

(2) any contract or subcontract for an agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state, or if the commodity is not customarily sold or has not an established market in its raw or natural state, in the first form or state, beyond the raw or natural state, in which it is customarily sold or in which it has an established market, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the producer of such agricultural commodity. The term "agricultural commodity" as used herein shall include but shall not be limited to—

(A) commodities resulting from the cultivation of the soil such as grains of all kinds, fruits, nuts, vegetables, hay, straw, cotton, tobacco, sugarcane, and sugar beets;

(B) natural resins, saps, and gums of trees;

(C) animals, such as cattle, hogs, poultry, and sheep, fish, and other marine life, and the produce of live animals, such as wool, eggs, milk, and cream; or

(3) any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the ordinary treatment processes normally applied by producers in order to obtain the first commercially marketable product, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner or operator of the mine, well, or deposit from which such product is produced. The term "ordinary treatment processes" means, in the case of the product of a mine, well, or deposit with respect to which an allowance for percentage depletion is provided by section 114 (b) (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code, those processes which are taken into account under such section in computing gross income from the property, and in the case of any other product such term means such similar processes as may be prescribed under regulations promulgated by the Board; or

(4) any contract or subcontract for timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner of the timber property or with the producer of the logs; or

(5) any subcontract directly or indirectly under a contract or subcontract to which this title does not apply by reason of this subsection.

(b) Cost allowance: In the case of a contractor or subcontractor who produces an agricultural product and processes, refines, or treats such a product beyond the first form or state provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (a), or who produces the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, and processes, refines, or treats such a product beyond the first commercially marketable state provided

in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) or, in the case of timber, beyond the form of logs, the Board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to give the contractor or subcontractor a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount which would have been realized by such contractor or subcontractor if he had sold the product in the form or state provided in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), or, in the case of timber, in the form of logs.

(c) Permissive exemptions: The Board is authorized, in its discretion, to exempt from some or all of the provisions of this title—

(1) any contract or subcontract to be performed outside of the territorial limits of the continental United States or in Alaska;

(2) any contracts or subcontracts under which, in the opinion of the Board, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established, such as certain classes of (A) agreements for personal services or for the purchase of real property, perishable goods, or commodities the minimum price for the sale of which has been fixed by a public regulatory body, (B) leases and license agreements, and (C) agreements where the period of performance under such contract or subcontract will not be in excess of 30 days;

(3) any contract or subcontract or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods if, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits;

(4) any contract or subcontract the renegotiation of which would jeopardize secrecy required in the public interest;

(5) any subcontract or group of subcontracts not otherwise exempt from the provisions of this section if, in the opinion of the Board, it is not administratively feasible in the case of such subcontract or in the case of such group of subcontracts to determine and segregate the profits attributable to such subcontract or group of subcontracts from the profits attributable to activities not subject to renegotiation.

The Board may so exempt contracts and subcontracts both individually and by general classes or types.

SEC. 107. Renegotiation Board.

(a) Creation of Board: There is hereby created, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, a Renegotiation Board to be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not less than three members of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Each member shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per annum. No member shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as a member of the Board. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

(b) Places of meetings and quorum: The principal office of the Board shall be at such place as may be determined from time to time by the Board, but it or any division thereof may meet and exercise its powers at any other place. The Board may establish such number of offices as it deems necessary to expedite the work of the Board. Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and any power, function, or duty of the Board may be exercised or performed by a majority of the members present if the members present constitute at least a quorum.

(c) Personnel: The Board is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in carrying out its duties under this title. The Board may, with the consent of the head of the agency of the Government concerned, utilize the services of any officers or employees of the United States, and reimburse such agency for the services so utilized. Officers or employees whose services are so utilized shall not receive additional compensation for such services, but shall be allowed and paid necessary travel expenses and a per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations while away from their homes or official station on duties of the Board.

(d) Delegation of powers: The Board may delegate in whole or in part any function, power, or duty (other than its power to promulgate regulations and rules) to any agency of the Government, including any such agency established by the Board, and may authorize the successive redelegation, within limits specified by it, of any such function, power, or duty to any agency of the Government, including any such agency established by the Board.

(e) Organization and operation of Board: The Chairman of the Board may from time to time divide the Board into divisions of one or more members, assign the members of the Board thereto, and in case of a division of more than one member, designate the chief thereof. The Board may also, by regulations or otherwise, determine the character of cases to be conducted initially by the Board through an officer or officers of, or utilized by, the Board, the character of cases to be conducted initially by the various agencies of the Government authorized to exercise powers of the Board pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the character of cases to be conducted initially by the various divisions of the Board, and the character of cases to be conducted initially by the Board itself. The Board may review any determination in any case not initially conducted by it, on its own motion or, in its discretion, at the request of any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved thereby. Unless the Board upon its own motion initiates a review of such determination within 90 days from the date of such determination, or at the request of the contractor or subcontractor made within 90 days from the date of such determination initiates a review of such determination within 90 days from the date of such request, such determination shall be deemed the determination of the Board. If such determination was made by an order with respect to which notice thereof was given by registered mail pursuant to section 105 (a), the Board shall give notice by registered mail to the contractor or subcontractor of its decision not to review the case. If the Board reviews any determination in any case not initially conducted by it, it shall issue and enter an order under section 105 (a) determining the amount, if any, of excessive profits, and forthwith give notice thereof by registered mail to the contractor or subcontractor. The amount of excessive profits so determined upon review may be less than, equal to, or greater than, that determined by the agency of the Government whose action is so reviewed.

(f) Delegation of renegotiation functions to Board: The Board is hereby authorized and directed to accept and perform such renegotiation powers, duties, and functions as may be delegated to it under any other law requiring or permitting renegotiation, and the Board is further authorized to redelegate any such power, duty, or function to any agency of the Government and to authorize successive redelegations thereof, within limits specified by the Board. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to delegate to the Board, in whole or in part, the powers, functions, and duties conferred upon him by any other renegotiation law.

SEC. 108. Review by the Tax Court.

Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by an order of the Board determining the amount of excessive profits received or accrued by such contractor or subcontractor may—

(a) if the case was conducted initially by the Board itself—within 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the last day) after the mailing under section 105 (a) of the notice of such order, or

(b) if the case was not conducted initially by the Board itself—within 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the last day) after the mailing under section 107 (e) of the notice of the decision of the Board not to review the case or the notice of the order of the Board determining the amount of excessive profits,

file a petition with the Tax Court of the United States for a redetermination thereof. Upon such filing such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction, by order, to finally determine the amount, if any, of such excessive profits received or accrued by the contractor or subcontractor, and such determination shall not be reviewed or redetermined by any court or agency. The court may determine as the amount of excessive profits an amount either less than, equal to, or greater than that determined by the Board. A proceeding before the Tax Court to finally determine the amount, if any, of excessive profits shall not be treated as a proceeding to review the determination of the Board, but shall be treated as a proceeding de novo. For the purposes of this section the court shall have the same powers and duties, insofar as applicable in respect of the contractor, the subcontractor, the Board, and the Secretary, and in respect of the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, notice of hearings, hearings before divisions, review by the Tax Court of decisions of divisions, stenographic reporting, and reports of proceedings, as such court has under sections 1110, 1111, 1113, 1114, 1115 (a), 1116, 1117 (a), 1118, 1120, and 1121 of the Internal Revenue Code in the case of a proceeding to redetermine a deficiency. In the case of any witness for the Board, the fees and mileage, and the expenses of taking any deposition shall be paid out of appropriations of the Board available for that purpose, and in the case of any other witnesses shall be paid, subject to rules prescribed by the court, by the party at whose instance the witness appears or the deposition is taken. The filing of a petition under this section shall not operate to stay the execution of the order of the Board under subsection (b) of section 105. Any amount collected by the United States under an order of the Board in excess of the amount found to be due under a determination of excessive profits by the Tax Court shall be refunded to the contractor or subcontractor with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of collection by the United States to the date of refund.

SEC. 109. Rules and regulations.

The Board may make such rules, regulations, and orders as it deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 110. Compliance with regulations, etc.

No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any act or failure to act resulting directly or indirectly from his compliance with a rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this title, notwithstanding that any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

SEC 111. Application of Administrative Procedure Act.

The functions exercised under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

SEC. 112. Appropriations.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this title. Funds made available for the purposes of this title may be allocated or transferred for any of the purposes of this title, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to any agency of the Government designated to assist in carrying out this title. Funds so allocated or transferred shall remain available for such period as may be specified in the acts making such funds available.

SEC. 113. Prosecution of claims against United States by former personnel.

Nothing in title 18, United States Code, sections 281 and 283, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to prevent any person by reason of service prior to January 1, 1954, in performance of duties or functions required by this act, from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States: *Provided*, That such person shall not prosecute any claim against the United States (1) involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed, or (2) during the period such person is engaged in employment in a department or the Board.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Functions under World War II Renegotiation Act.

(a) Abolition of War Contracts Price Adjustment Board: The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, created by the Renegotiation Act, is hereby abolished.

(b) Transfer of functions in general: All powers, functions, and duties conferred upon the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board by the Renegotiation Act and not otherwise specifically dealt with in this section are transferred to the Renegotiation Board.

(c) Amendment of the Renegotiation Act: Subsection (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "A net renegotiation rebate shall not be repaid unless a claim therefor has been filed with the Board on or before the date of its abolition, or unless a claim shall have been filed with the Administrator of General Services (i) on or before June 30, 1951, or (ii) within 90 days after the making of an agreement or the entry of an order under subsection (c) (1) determining the amount of excessive profits, whichever is later. A claim shall be deemed to have been filed when received by the Board or the Administrator, whether or not accompanied by a statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue showing the amortization deduction allowed for the renegotiated year upon the recomputation made pursuant to section 124 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code."

(d) Transfer of certain functions: All powers, functions, and duties conferred upon the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board by subsection (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act, subject to the amendment thereof by subsection (c) of this section, are hereby transferred to the Administrator of General Services.

(e) Functions and records: Each Secretary of a Department is authorized and directed to eliminate the excessive profits determined under all existing renegotiation agreements or orders by the methods enumerated in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act in respect of all renegotiations conducted by his Department pursuant to delegations from the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board. The several Departments shall retain custody of the renegotiation case files covering renegotiations thus conducted for such time as the Secretary deems necessary for the purposes of this section, and thereafter they shall be made available to the Renegotiation Board for appropriate disposition. The renegotiation records of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board shall become records of the Renegotiation Board on the effective date of this section.

(f) Refunds: All refunds under subsection (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act (relating to the recomputation of the amortization deduction), all refunds under the last sentense of subsection (1) (3) of such act (relating to excess inventories), and all amounts finally adjudged or determined to have been erroneously collected by the United States pursuant to a determination of excessive profits, with interest thereon in the last mentioned case at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services or his duly authorized representative computed to the date of certification to the Treasury Department for payment, shall be certified by the Administrator of General Services or his duly authorized representative to the Treasury Department for payment from such appropriations as may be available therefor: *Provided*, That such refunds shall be based solely on the certificate of the Administrator of General Services or his duly authorized representative.

(g) Existing policies, procedures, etc., to remain in effect: All policies, procedures, directives, and delegations of authority prescribed or issued (1) by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, or (2) by any Secretary or other duly authorized officer of the Government, under the authority of the Renegotiation Act, in effect upon the effective date of this section and not inconsistent herewith, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded, or except as they may be amended, under the authority of this section or any other appropriate authority. All functions, powers, and responsibilities transferred by this section shall be accompanied by the authority to issue appropriate regulations and procedures, or to modify existing procedures, in respect of such powers, functions, and responsibilities.

(h) Savings provision: This section shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursements authorized by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board and certified pursuant to its authority prior to the effective date of this section, (2) to affect the validity or finality of any agreement or order made or issued pursuant to law by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board or pursuant to delegations of authority from it, or (3) to prejudice or to abate any action taken or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause; but any court having on its docket a case to which the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board is a party, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the effective date of this section, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the United States.

(i) Renegotiation Act not repealed: Except as by this act specifically amended or modified, all provisions of the Renegotiation Act shall remain in full force and effect.

(j) Definitions: The terms which are defined in the Renegotiation Act shall, when used in this section, have the same meaning as when used in the Renegotiation Act, except that where a renegotiation function has been transferred by or pursuant to law the terms "Secretary" or "Secretaries" and "Department" or "Departments" shall be understood to refer to the successors in function to those officers or offices specifically named in the Renegotiation Act.

(k) Effective date of section: This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 202. Period of limitations for Renegotiation Act of 1948.

No proceeding under the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to determine the amount of excessive profits for any fiscal year shall be commenced more than 1 year after the mandatory statement required by the regulations issued pursuant to such act is filed with respect to such year, or more than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this title, whichever is the later, and if such proceeding is not so commenced (in the manner provided by the regulations prescribed pursuant to such act), all liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor under such act for excessive profits received or accrued during such fiscal year shall thereupon be discharged. If an agreement or order determining the amount of excessive profits under such act is not made within 2 years following the commencement of the renegotiation proceeding, then upon the expiration of such 2 years all liabilities of the contractor or subcontractor for excessive profits with respect to which such proceeding was commenced shall thereupon be discharged, except that (1) such 2-year period may be extended by mutual agreement, and (2) if within such 2 years such an order is duly issued pursuant to such act, such 2-year limitation shall not apply to the review of such order by any renegotiation board duly authorized to undertake such review.

SEC. 203. Amendment of section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 3806 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) The term 'renegotiation' includes any transaction which is a renegotiation within the meaning of the Federal Renegotiation Act applicable to such transaction, any modification of one or more contracts with the United States or any agency thereof, and any agreement with the United States or any agency thereof in respect of one or more such contracts or subcontracts thereunder.

"(B) The term 'excessive profits' includes any amount which constitutes excessive profits within the meaning assigned to such term by the applicable Federal Renegotiation Act, any part of the contract price of a contract with the United States or any agency thereof, any part of the subcontract price of a subcontract under such a contract, and any profits derived from one or more such contracts or subcontracts.

"(C) The term 'subcontract' includes any purchase order or agreement which is a subcontract within the meaning assigned to such term by the applicable Federal Renegotiation Act.

"(D) The term 'Federal Renegotiation Act' includes section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended or supplemented, the Renegotiation Act of 1948, as amended or supplemented, and the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended or supplemented."

SEC. 204. Separability provision.

If any provision of this act or the application of any provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of its provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that points of order and amendments be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 23, line 9, strike out "(G)" and insert "(g)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 31, line 9, insert before the comma the following: "and does not make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the elimination of excessive profits."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 42, line 18, strike out "Renegotiation Act" and insert "renegotiation act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS:

On page 33, line 25, after the word "shall", strike out the word "not."

On page 34, line 1, before the period insert the following: "if within 5 days after the filing of the petition the petitioner files with the Tax Court a good and sufficient bond approved by such court in such amount as may be fixed by the court."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I have discussed the gentleman's amendment with some of the members of the committee on this side and we see no objection to it. It may be that some changes will have to be made elsewhere in the bill, but the idea of the gentleman's amendment seems to be sound. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that, although it was not contained in the law during World War II, the filing of a bond with the Department of Justice would stay the execution of an order of the Board. There was an informal arrangement worked out to accomplish the same result so the gentleman's amendment is somewhat in keeping with that past practice. We have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will assure me that whatever he proposes to do on the over-all picture will not change the substance but merely the form, I am satisfied.

Mr. MILLS. That is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we want to get through with this bill. After we get through with it the gentleman can have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. BENDER. If you want to object, that is your privilege.

Mr. COOPER. I can object, but I do not want to unless I have to. I will not object at this time, but I will object to any further request to speak out of order. We want to get through with this bill and not talk about everything else under the sun.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I think that last comment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was entirely uncalled for. I have been here during this debate and I have heard many things discussed that were not a part of this bill. The gentleman from Tennessee took no exception to any part of any Member's utterances. I merely rose to call attention to the fact that this is a bill that apparently we all agree to. There is no disagreement. I want to emphasize that, as I want to emphasize the issue that was up here last Friday when there was no disagreement of any kind. Why do I do this? Simply to call attention to the fact that during campaign time in the northern part of the United States members of the Democratic Party on every occasion charged the minority party, the Republicans with being the tail to the southern Democratic kite. They never missed an opportunity to allege that Republicans were pulling the chestnuts out of the fire daily for the South. Obviously, this is not one of those days. And I want to emphasize it. Many times we find ourselves in accord.

During the Eightieth Congress I voted for a continuation of the excise tax for a time because our Government was operated extravagantly and because our expenses were exorbitant. My opponent in the last campaign, a Member of this body last year, repeatedly asserted that I voted to make excise taxes permanent. At no time did any majority party Member rise to correct him, nor did any minority party Member rise to keep the record straight.

When a bill was considered here last year repealing the excise taxes, a few majority members of the Ways and Means Committee had a field day commending him—and he was on the tail end of the committee—commending him for his great work in having the excise taxes repealed. But the taxes were not repealed. We found ourselves in the throes of another New Deal emergency. Taxes went up instead. All the taxpayers got was conversation.

Frankly, in the interest of fair play, I simply wanted to emphasize the point that the country should have in mind, that we Republicans are not the tail to anybody's kite. When we feel that an issue deserves support, we support it, not because it comes from the North or from the South or from the East or the West. I think it is important that we Republicans who are in the minority understand that the majority party at election time, in order to control the House, to gain the forty or fifty close districts where the vote is quite even, stuff that down our throats. So I wanted to make it clear that this is a day when we are voting unanimously on an issue because we believe in it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he is one of those of whom I spoke.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that our friend the former Member from Ohio, Mr. Young, was very active and very effective in his efforts to have the excise taxes repealed. He was just as anxious as the minority membership on the committee and as the majority membership on the committee, and he worked very effectively in his efforts to repeal excise taxes, and deserves credit for it.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution about his New Deal brother. I wish the Ways and Means Committee came forward with a lot of tax repealers, but how in the world can you repeal any tax with a Government as wasteful as this odious regime that has run Washington for the last 17 years.

The only tax reductions we have had in a dozen or more years came as a result of the performance of the Eightieth Congress.

Whenever anyone tells our Federal administrators that we should start in at once to cut down on Washington spending, he is promptly asked the question, "Where?" Dozens of answers have been suggested, but none has ever found general acceptance by a Government determined to maintain its civilian personnel at the highest possible level. Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has proposed several alternative budgets in recent years. All have been commended, but not one has ever been tried by the Government.

Within the past week there has been much discussion of his plan to reduce nonmilitary expenditures by approximately $7,000,000,000. When we remember that the Federal budget for the fiscal year from June 30, 1951, to July 1, 1952, contemplates expenditures of $75,000,000,000, with estimated revenues figured at only fifty-one billions, the necessity for sharp cutting of our spending program becomes all too obvious. There is every reason to believe that the $25,000,000,000 deficit estimated for the coming year will be matched in other years to come.

Senator BYRD has suggested that we trim the postal deficit by $3,600,000,000; cut our civilian payroll in the military departments by 150,000 persons—we now have 1 civilian for every 2 men in uniform; reduce our foreign-aid program to $500,000,000 from the present four billions in view of our military assistance plans for oversea aid. These three items would achieve the $7,000,000,000 savings. The time to start on an honest effort to save these vast sums is now.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 27, line 1, strike out all of subsection (c) from line 1, page 27, to and including line 9, on page 28.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitation that I offer this amendment, but I believe that a caveat should be inserted in the RECORD and that some observations should be made concerning these permissive exemptions.

First of all, let me say that my attitude on this proposal is based upon the general principle that legislation for this country should be enacted here in the Congress and not in the departments downtown. The granting of this very broad authority to add to the exemptions which Congress has seen fit to make, in my judgment, delegates legislative authority to the Board created by this bill far beyond what is wise.

Second, let me call attention to the fact that the Board possessing this discretion will be subjected to pressures from war contractors on all sides who claim that they can come within one or the other of the five provisions of this subsection. I think the pressures might sometimes not be resisted effectively by the Board if it is a politically appointed Board.

There is a great opportunity in this particular discretion for discrimination and favoritism, and you know what human weakness is. Furthermore, these permissive exemptions are wholly unnecessary. If a contractor has no profits he will not be hurt by renegotiation; if he has profits he ought to be subjected to renegotiation under the very broad standards which the act sets up.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman want the Renegotiation Board to go through the process of renegotiation, to subject the contractor to all the problems of renegotiation, when on the face of it the contract itself indicates that there are no excessive profits? The reason I ask the question is that, if the gentleman's amendment prevails, that would be the unavoidable result, for there would be no authority whatsoever to exempt any contractor with receipts or accruals in excess of $100,000, regardless.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If I understood, there was no contract required to be negotiated under this general law. Am I wrong about it?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is wrong. All contracts with these departments amounting to $100,000 or more are subjected to the jurisdiction of this Board and to renegotiation. We are attempting here to give the Renegotiation Board the authority to eliminate certain contracts where there does not appear to be excessive profits, but if the gentleman's amendment prevails there will be no such authority in the Board.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman said that all contracts over $100,000 may be negotiated. As I understand it, no one expects that every contract over $100,000 in connection with the defense program is going to be renegotiated.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the time consumed in a preliminary audit in renegotiation is not extensive. I understand renegotiation agents do not need to go as thoroughly into some contracts as others. If it appears from a preliminary examination that there are no renegotiable profits they do not have to make a more complete examination. I want to point out further that a good deal of time and expense will be saved by the Board if it is not subjected to pressure by war contractors who want to be exempted. Let me point out further that where a contractor has an exempted contract and another contract which is not exempt, he may attempt to throw all of his costs against the contract that is not exempted and make all of his profits on the one which is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. Chairman, certainly we commend the gentleman for the laudable purpose he undoubtedly wishes to accomplish, but the effect of his amendment would go much further than he himself contemplates.

This provision of the bill contains permissive exemptions, those exemptions which are apparent on their face to the Board should be made. Regardless of how apparent it might be that it is not the type of contract that should be negotiated, under the terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan the Board would have no discretion and would have to put the contractor to all of the expense and difficulty of negotiating the contract when no useful purpose could be served for the Government and no benefit could be secured by the contractor.

Mr. Chairman, those who are in charge of this program, who appeared before the committee and who have worked with us all along step by step in the preparation of this bill, feel that these five minimum standards of permissive exemptions are vitally essential to the proper administration of this act in giving a type of fair and equitable consideration to the contractors and businessmen of this country to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion between the gentleman from Arkansas and myself a few moments ago, he called attention to subsection (f) of section 103 in the bill which begins at the bottom of page 5 and runs over to page 6.

In line 5, page 6, it is stated:

All items estimated to be allowable as deductions and exclusions under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall, to the extent allocable to such contracts and subcontracts, be allowed as items of cost, except that no amount shall be allowed as an item of cost by reason of the application of a carry-over or carry-back.

Then the paragraph goes on to its conclusion.

Section 109, page 34, authorizes the Board to make such rules, regulations, and orders as it deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas, in order that we may fully understand this, whether it is the intent of the committee that the rules, regulations, and laws governing the Internal Revenue Bureau under the Internal Revenue Code and its regulations issued pursuant thereto are intended to apply exclusively in this matter of cost determination, and whether it is his belief that by the Board making such rules and regulations we can thereby obviate the necessity that has existed in the past for contractors and subcontractors to keep as many sets of books as the number of departments they are doing business with, plus one set for the Internal Revenue people and one set of books for the General Accounting Office?

Mr. MILLS. In response to the gentleman, permit me to say it is certainly the intention of the committee that costs which are allowable for income-tax purposes shall be allowable for renegotiation purposes to the extent allocable. That is what we say here in this language on page 6 of the bill, so that there will be no need of keeping one set of cost records for tax purposes and another set of records for renegotiation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I only hope that this bill reads in such a way that the Board under its terms will have the power to order and direct that all of these agencies of government that make contracts with contractors shall follow the same cost-accounting procedure.

Mr. MILLS. May I interrupt the gentleman further?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed.

Mr. MILLS. I think I can assure the gentleman that this is the exact understanding of all of the departments which have had anything to do with the consideration of this bill, including the Bureau of the Budget, which worked with these departments in attempting to bring all of the various departments together in harmony upon this one subject. Certainly, what I have said to the gentleman is the intention of the committee, and I think I can say it is clearly understood to be the purpose of the bill in this particular language, and that there will be no argument in its administration, provided this language is retained in the final bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman and his committee have accomplished that much, if nothing else, in the course of the work done on this bill, they will have saved to the Government a very great deal of money for cost accounting. As is well known by every contractor, they have to keep innumerable sets of books, and ultimately the Government pays the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Not only have we attempted to do that, but permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we have attempted to eliminate in here, by stating our intentions in the report, the duplication of offices within the same location. Now the gentleman lives in a very populous area of California. It may have been that there were six or seven renegotiation offices in Los Angeles.

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed, there were.

Mr. MILLS. It is the hope of the committee that renegotiation under this bill may be handled in such a way as to avoid any such duplication.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, I have one final question, and that is this:

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman yield to me 1 minute before he propounds another question?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to the language on page 22, line 7, which reads:

In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the board and the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this title.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. I had noticed the paragraph, but thought that was merely a matter of transfer of personnel. At this point I think that I should include in the RECORD recommendations Nos. 62 and 63 of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress as contained in its report, same being Senate Report No. 949 of the Eightieth Congress, second session, as follows:

62. The National Military Establishment, in collaboration with the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be directed (after examining the views of organizations capable of reflecting industry's difficulties under present accounting practices) to establish a single set of rules applying to audit and determination of costs under contracts of the National Military Establishment, and in agreement with the General Accounting Office, prescribe the normal time for completing the audit and the issuance of a suitable certificate or other for ... of final clearance (except for fraud).

There exist three different Government regulations under which costs of Government contracts are determined. They emanate separately from the Army, Navy, Bureau of Internal Revenue, and General Accounting Office.

The decisions of the Comptroller General often place an entirely different interpretation on what constitutes allowable costs. No manual is available to contractors outlining basis for decisions. Such decisions are given after the cost has been incurred; disallowances are retroactive in effect, penalizing the contractor.

Resulting complications make it desirable to establish a definitive uniform policy with respect to costs and expenses allowable under Government contracts, eliminating different interpretations by three Government agencies.

Proper function of General Accounting Office should be a review of settlement procedure and final audit, rather than duplication of audit and administrative interpretation of contracts.

The cost-plus-fixed-fee contract must continue for highly technical research and long-range developments, cost of which cannot be predetermined for bid purposes under fixed-price contracts, but the contracting agency should be able to change objectives and methods of performance for such contracts to meet changes in military needs occurring as effort progresses.

All companies must subject themselves to audit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax assessment. The taxpayer can be best served if other procurement agencies of Government (Army, Navy, and Air Force) agree to accept the principles of the Internal Revenue Code for determination of allowable costs.

63. The Congress should enact legislation authorizing contract termination procedure for peacetime procurement, similar to the procedure provided for in the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

The Contract Settlement Act of 1944 permitted the Government to accomplish an outstanding task in terminating and liquidating of World War II commitments. So far as the aircraft manufacturing industry is concerned, it is believed that those commitments were thoroughly and efficiently settled. Without new legislation, industry will return to the confused legal situation which existed between World War I and World War II. In that period question prevailed as to whether any settlement by agreement could be made, or, if made, could withstand the General Accounting Office rulings.

Present joint procurement regulations of the Air Force and Army provide for a so-called formula settlement of contracts. Formula settlements were tried prior to enactment of the Contract Settlement Act and found unsatisfactory both to industry and the services. The only effect of the formula is to predetermine percentage and amount of profit to be allowed on the termination portion. This is rarely a source of disagreement. Real source of disagreement and, therefore, of delay and possible litigation is almost always the question of whether certain items of cost are applicable. Under a formula settlement, or any settlement procedure other than negotiation, there develops strong tendency to excessive detail over the many thousands of items of cost going into claims. As a result, there are often differences of opinion.

Validity of a negotiated termination agreement is comparable to that of a negotiated procurement contract. Insofar as contracts for aeronautical equipment are concerned, it is desirable that negotiation be recognized as a usual means of Government contracting and settlement of Government obligations.

Authority to negotiate final settlement is particularly important insofar as industry's subcontractor and supplier claims are concerned. Unless the prime contractor is certain the settlement he negotiates is final, he will delay settlements with subcontractors.

Provisions should be made for immediate partial payments on termination claims. This is a financial necessity to both prime and subcontractors: First, because of the large values involved in many prime contracts in relation to the contractor's working capital; second, because in the preliminary stages of preparing a termination claim, supporting material is not in shape to be readily acceptable as collateral for a commerical banking loan.

Many contractors are working with minimum floor space. There is also considerable responsibility and liability connected with storage, preservation and accounting for raw material, equipment, semifinished parts, and other inventory items supporting a termination claim. It is important that Government-owned property be removed from facilities at earliest date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that one purpose of the bill is to obtain munitions of war at the lowest possible cost, that another is to prevent the making of excess profits on war contracts. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], when I put a question to him as to the construction of facilities for training those called into the service, just sought to treat it facetiously.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thought I answered the gentleman's question by saying that that type of contract was covered by this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not understand that to be the answer at all.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will read the RECORD, he will see.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I will read it. What I am getting at is this: As we very well know, during the last war when the Government was called upon to build facilities on two camps within a few miles of Washington the carpenters, the plumbers, the mechanics, artisans, and everyone else who came down here to work on the job was required to pay a union fee of from $25 up before they could go to work on those jobs. If they did not have the $25 they had to get a work permit. Two dollars and fifty cents a week they had to pay, and I have some of the permits and receipts that were granted at that time in the office to this day. That may not seem very important, but if we are trying to save money for the Government, why should we not go after that excess profit to the union?

For example, in one case over here, and the hearings in the Senate disclosed it, they collected more than half a million dollars in work-permit fees. Just why should a patriotic American citizen who wants to help build training quarters, perhaps for his son, be required to buy from some organization which is not a Government agency a permit to work, and why should not that practice of levying tribute be stopped just as well as the excess-profits racket—and I am in favor of stopping the excess-profits racket.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I know the gentleman knows more about the subject than I do, but I think the gentleman will agree that there is a provision in the Taft-Hartley Act that applies to this very matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. The question of charging a fee before the man proceeds to work on the job is taken care of in the Taft-Hartley Act by a provision that the fee must not be excessive. They not only charge you for a work permit but under the act they can still, as it is enforced or not enforced, levy a tax or a dues payment on you for political purposes, and they do. So not only you cannot work on a defense job until you

have paid the union fee, but you must contribute to the opposition political party.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of Government contracts, I have a letter here from a rather important citizen in my home town. I am not going to divulge his name or the names of the contractors. Here is the letter, and there is nothing phony about it because I know him very personally and intimately. This man runs a big sales agency. He says, "A customer of mine received a contract from the Quartermaster Corps to supply" certain equipment, and he specifies here what it is, for a certain defense base, that I am very familiar with because it is one of our very powerful outposts. "This equipment is so vital it is being shipped by air several hundred miles," and I can say it is some thousands of miles, flown from the Tri-City airport in my home town.

He says, "However, before the contract was completed, Mr. So-and-So had to state that all employees connected with this operation were members of the Democratic Party."

I call that to the attention of the Defense Committee of this House. If that is a fact, this dictionary over here does not carry the language in which I should like to express myself. If we are still playing that kind of a game, I think the fellows who enforce it should be tarred and feathered and thrown in the river, and let them swim as best they can. That is low-down skulduggery which is almost indefinable if that is true, and I think this fellow is a pretty truthful citizen in my home town.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] a question, or any member of the committee. In establishing the cost on a contract which is renegotiated for income-tax purposes, cannot the manufacturer use the cost which is determined in the final renegotiation in ariving at his taxable income?

Mr. MILLS. I presume that would be permitted, but I must admit to the gentleman there is nothing in the bill specifically on that point. We take the reverse approach, that costs allowed for internal revenue purposes are allowable for renegotiation, but we do not take the course suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I put it this way, then. Suppose I am manufacturing for the Government and I close my tax year. Let us put it on a calendar-year basis. Suppose 2 years later the contract is renegotiated and we have a new concept of taxable income. The law protects me in going back and readjusting my tax return, does it not, to conform to the renegotiation?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes. The gentleman is correct on that point. In other words, the gentleman has paid taxes on more than the Renegotiation Board has left him in the way of profits?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly he would then be in a position to go back and recapture what he paid in to the internal revenue in excess of his actual taxes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That would be in every case?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Otherwise, the whole set-up would be inequitable. Why would it be necessary to keep two sets of books under the old scheme?

Mr. MILLS. I do not believe it is necessary to keep two sets under this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me that would be confusing to both the manufacturer and the Government.

Mr. MILLS. It certainly would, both to the manufacturer and the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If it were required to keep two sets of books, that would protect nobody in itself, would it?

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was the point I wanted to clear up with respect to income-tax liability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the committee to answer this question. Is there anything in this bill which requires all contracts over $100,000 to be renegotiated?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The bill gives the Renegotiation Board authority to renegotiate all contracts with these seven named departments.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that.

Mr. MILLS. That is, where the contractor himself has received or accrued in excess of $100,000 within a year's time. I take it that means the Renegotiation Board must look at all such contracts for the purposes of renegotiation. Under the discretionary authority given in the bill, the Board could throw out certain contracts without, shall we say, molesting the contractor, because it appears on the face of the contract that there could not have been excess profits.

Mr. VORYS. That is true. The Board does not have to renegotiate. Take, for instance, a contract for $100,000,000 with some great corporation for tanks, not within the list of permissive exemptions on pages 27 and 28. The Board might have somebody look at it and if they do not want to renegotiate it and the contractor does not want it renegotiated, there is nothing in the law which requires either party to go through the form of renegotiation when neither the Board nor the contractor think there is anything to be renegotiated. Is that not true?

Mr. MILLS. I presume the gentleman might be correct, if it is clear that the performance of the contract has not resulted in any excess profits. But I would like to ask the gentleman if he will yield further, whether he, as a member of the Board, without some discretionary authority, would feel safe in assuming that responsibility when the Congress had not given him authority to grant exemptions.

Mr. VORYS. I cannot find any limit at all on the Board's discretion to exempt. I am just trying to find out what this bill provides. I cannot find anything in the bill that provides that the Renegotiation Board is required even to review all the contracts. I cannot find anything in there that requires them to renegotiate. Therefore, the Board has the power to play favorites, if you please. It has the power to say to a great big contractor, not within the class of exempted contracts, "We do not think there is any excess profit here. We are not going to send you any notice. We are not going to do anything." The Board also has the discretion to ignore that contract altogether, and never look at it at all, never do anything at all about it. That company would be perfectly satisfied, and my guess would be there will be thousands of contracts that would never be renegotiated. I just want to find out whether I am correct in my analysis of what this bill provides.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has the bill before him. On page 2, beginning in line 9, section 102 says:

> The provisions of this title shall be applicable to all contracts within the Departments specifically named.

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Further on in the bill the Board is authorized and directed to renegotiate.

Mr. VORYS. Of course there is authority to renegotiate, but where is there any direction to renegotiate? I find on page 12 that renegotiation proceedings shall be commenced by mailing a notice, but I do not find anything in the bill that says there shall be renegotiation proceedings in the case of every contract. I do not think there should be, but I think that the Board's authority and duty ought to be made clear. Frankly, I have not been able to find it. I have asked at both committee tables and I have been unable to have the members direct me to the place in the bill where it says whether or not the Board has to review all contracts.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; I yield. I am looking for information.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Is it the gentleman's point that if the Board saw fit there would not necessarily be any renegotiation?

Mr. VORYS. That is right. I think that in the law some place somebody in the Government ought to be required at least to take a quick look over all contracts and either say he does or does not think the contract should be renegotiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think what the gentleman is contending for is

in there, in that the power of the Board to grant exceptions to the law is very definitely limited. That would imply that it applied to all other contracts unless specifically exempted in the act or exempted in the manner provided for in the power delegated to the Board.

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me that if that is all the provision there is in this bill requiring a review of all contracts, it is a poor way to go about it. I have no quarrel with the machinery set up for renegotiation, but it would appear to me that there ought to be some place in the act where a requirement for some sort of review of all contracts is put in.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In that respect it is exactly the same as the law in effect during World War II, and $200,000,000,000 worth of contracts were renegotiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is a Member entitled to be recognized twice under a pro forma amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman has another amendment, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I shall not take all the time allotted. I just want to ask the gentlemen of the committee one more question, if I may, in order to clarify my own thinking concerning this bill, and perhaps clarify it for others. That is in respect to the audits that are to be made. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] I believe referred to the procedures that were engaged in during World War II and, subsequent thereto, in connection with renegotiation. Audits were made, of course, by the establishment of the Government making the contract. Audits were again made by the renegotiation groups in those agencies at the time that the renegotiation was effected and then all papers were sent to the General Accounting Office where a new and separate audit was to be made at which time, as I understand it, the question of fraud could be brought up.

There were several audits and accountings to be made. Do I read this bill correctly, as providing in one section that after the Board finishes with its audits and after acceptance of renegotiation figures, then there would be no question of fraud brought up in connection with it unless that fraud were palpably evident or something to that effect? Is that a correct statement of the fact?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think the gentleman has made an accurate statement of the situation. Bear in mind that, as I recall, only those cases were subject to review by the General Accounting Office where fraud was alleged.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman will find that every one of them has gone to the General Accounting Office and that they have gone over them with a great deal of care.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman is right—that all these procurement contracts would ultimately go to the General Accounting Office, but that the General Accounting Office had no general authority to upset a determination that excessive profits had or had not been shown.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; but the books do go to the General Accounting Office.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct, because they have to do with procurement.

Mr. HINSHAW. And the General Accounting Office, as I understand, acts for and on behalf of the Congress and declares whether or not certain expenditures are in accordance with the laws of the United States as they interpret them. Is not that correct?

Mr. MILLS. And that the General Accounting Office has made certain declarations with regard to items of cost under the contracts, declarations with which the gentleman from California is familiar.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am just trying to eliminate as many steps as may be possible because of the great expense involved and the long delays that are necessary to accomplish audits of very complicated sets of books.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 87, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 377, nays 0, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—377

Aandahl	Addonizio	Allen, La.
Abbitt	Albert	Andersen, H. Carl
Abernethy	Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.
Adair	Allen, Ill.	Andresen, August H.
Andrews	Ford	McGuire
Anfuso	Forrester	McKinnon
Arends	Frazier	McMillan
Armstrong	Fugate	McMullen
Aspinall	Fulton	McVey
Auchincloss	Furcolo	Machrowicz
Ayres	Garmatz	Mack, Ill.
Bailey	Gary	Mack, Wash.
Baker	Gathings	Madden
Baring	Gavin	Mahon
Barrett	George	Mansfield
Bates, Ky.	Golden	Martin, Iowa
Bates, Mass.	Goodwin	Martin, Mass.
Battle	Gordon	Mason
Beall	Gore	Meader
Beamer	Gossett	Merrow
Beckworth	Graham	Miller, Calif
Belcher	Granahan	Miller, Md.
Bender	Granger	Miller, Nebr.
Bennett, Fla.	Grant	Miller, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Green	Mills
Bentsen	Greenwood	Mitchell
Berry	Gregory	Morano
Betts	Gross	Morgan
Bishop	Gwinn	Morris
Blackney	Hagen	Morton
Blatnik	Hale	Moulder
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Multer
Boggs, La.	Hall, Leonard W.	Mumma
Bolling	Halleck	Murdock
Bonner	Hand	Murphy
Bow	Harden	Murray, Tenn.
Brambiett	Hardy	Murray, Wis.
Bray	Harris	Nelson
Brehm	Harrison, Va.	Nicholson
Brown, Ga.	Harrison, Wyo.	Norblad
Brown, Ohio	Hart	Norrell
Brownson	Harvey	O'Brien, Ill.
Bryson	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Burdick	Heffernan	Ostertag
Burleson	Heller	Passman
Burnside	Herlong	Patman
Burton	Heselton	Patten
Busbey	Hess	Patterson
Bush	Hill	Perkins
Butler	Hillings	Philbin
Byrne, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Phillips
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Pickett
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Polk
Canfield	Holifield	Poulson
Cannon	Holmes	Powell
Carlyle	Hope	Preston
Carnahan	Horan	Price
Celler	Howell	Priest
Chatham	Hull	Prouty
Chenoweth	Hunter	Radwan
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Chudoff	James	Ramsay
Church	Jarman	Rankin
Clemente	Javits	Reams
Clevenger	Jenison	Redden
Cooley	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Cooper	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Johnson	Reed, N. Y.
Cotton	Jonas	Rees, Kans.
Cox	Jones, Ala.	Regan
Crawford	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes
Crumpacker	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ribicoff
Cunningham	Judd	Richards
Curtis, Mo.	Karsten, Mo.	Riehlman
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearney	Riley
Dague	Kearns	Rivers
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Roberts
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Davis, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Dawson	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Deane	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.
Dempsey	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Denny	Kilday	Roosevelt
Denton	King	Sadlak
Devereux	Kirwan	St. George
D'Ewart	Klein	Sasscer
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Saylor
Dolliver	Lane	Schwabe
Dondero	Lanham	Scott, Hugh D. Jr
Donohue	Lantaff	Scrivner
Donovan	Larcade	Scudder
Dorn	Latham	Secrest
Doughton	LeCompte	Seely-Brown
Doyle	Lesinski	Shafer
Eberharter	Lind	Sheehan
Elliott	Lovre	Shelley
Ellsworth	Lucas	Sheppard
Elston	Lyle	Short
Engle	McCarthy	Sieminski
Evins	McConnell	Sikes
Fallon	McCormack	Simpson, Ill.
Feighan	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Fellows	McDonough	Sittler
Fenton	McGregor	
Fine	McGuire	
Fogarty	McKinnon	
Forand	McMillan	

Smith, Kans.	Thompson, Mich.	Wharton
Smith, Miss.	Thompson, Tex.	Wheeler
Smith, Wis.	Thornberry	Whitaker
Spence	Tollefson	Whitten
Springer	Towe	Wickersham
Staggers	Trimble	Widnall
Stanley	Underwood	Wier
Steed	Vail	Williams, Miss.
Stefan	Van Pelt	Williams, N. Y.
Stigler	Van Zandt	Willis
Stockman	Vaughn	Wilson, Ind.
Sullivan	Vinson	Wilson, Tex.
Sutton	Vorys	Winstead
Taber	Vursell	Withrow
Taile	Weichel	Wolverton
Taylor	Welch	Wood, Idaho
Teague	Werdel	Yates
Thomas		Yorty

NOT VOTING—57

Angell	Eaton	Morrison
Barden	Fernandez	O'Konski
Bolton	Fisher	O'Toole
Bosone	Flood	Poage
Boykin	Gamble	Quinn
Breen	Gillette	Rabaut
Brooks	Hébert	Rooney
Budge	Hedrick	Sabath
Buffett	Herter	Scott, Hardie
Case	Hoffman, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Chelf	Irving	Tackett
Cole, Kans.	Jackson, Wash.	Velde
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Hamilton C.	Walter
Colmer	Kean	Wigglesworth
Combs	Kee	Wolcott
Coudert	Kennedy	Wood, Ga.
Crosser	McGrath	Woodruff
DeGraffenried	Magee	Zablocki
Dingell	Marshall	
Durham		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Durham with Mr. Kean.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Velde.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Case.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. MILLS) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I was here but unable to answer to my name on the last roll call; I did not hear my name called. I would have voted "aye" on that roll call.

THE PACIFIC PACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group of eight members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—Representatives BATTLE, JUDD, MANSFIELD, MERROW, MORGAN, RIBICOFF, ZABLOCKI, and myself—is today sponsoring a resolution seeking a Pacific pact for the Pacific Ocean area. Two members of this group—Mr. RIBICOFF and myself—are also today sponsoring a resolution favoring an organization for far eastern economic cooperation. Both programs of self-help and mutual cooperation for defense and for economic development are to be joined in by the United States. These efforts are to be considered in the context of the negotiation of the Japanese Peace Treaty for which John Foster Dulles left yesterday.

The resolutions represent together an affirmative United States foreign policy for the Far East, with the primary responsibility placed where it belongs, on the peoples affected, but with the United States backing them in their efforts. It recognizes the fact that the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean is the strategic frontier of the United States itself. This effort initiated today recognizes the adulthood of the free peoples of Asia and puts them on a parity in American consideration with the mature nations of Western Europe with whom we have developed the Atlantic Pact and the European recovery program. In such a framework of regional organization within the United Nations Charter, the development of Japanese military capabilities for the defense of the Japanese islands and of Japanese industrial production for the economic improvement so urgently needed by the free peoples of Asia, can proceed without the overhanging fear that a new aggressor "Frankenstein" might be created.

Had this action been taken a year and a half ago when we first initiated these proposals, we would not now be facing so desperate a situation with respect to the Far East. Yet it is never too late to try to correct past errors and the Dulles mission gives us a new point of departure for a Pacific pact and an opportunity for far eastern economic cooperation we should not miss.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROL

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, anti-inflation controls over prices and wages are almost with us. Naturally, we are reluctant to accept these controls, but without them, and with an administration which makes no effort to restrain this Government's spending, the great mass of people would be unfairly hurt.

The mention of controls naturally brings to mind the complicated problem of enforcement. During the last war under OPA, we saw the growth of a huge bureau of policemen, who labored to first fix, then enforce, price levels on almost every item sold in open commerce. This was extremely wasteful, in money and manpower. Simpler methods could have been devised, as they were in World War I, and I know the man in charge this time, Mr. Eric Johnston, will realize that the public will be glad to do a major part of the policing job free.

The secret, of course, is making known to the public the controlled prices of the items for sale. These prices should be posted in stores, and published in newspapers. The buying public will take care of the merchant who overcharges. Nothing registers more quickly with a merchant than a lack of customers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Vannevar Bush.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and Mr. POULSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances—and in one to include an address he delivered over Station WMEX, in another an address he delivered last Saturday night, and in the other two instances extraneous matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in regard to the use of horses and mules in Korea.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Nation's Business.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Daily News.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the inaugural address of the distinguished new Governor of the State of South Carolina, Hon. James F. Byrnes.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. PRESTON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and in-

clude an editorial from the Wisconsin Daily News, written by W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address he made on Friday.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole earlier today and include certain quotations.

Mr. GAVIN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Greenwich Times of Greenwich, Conn.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Hollywood Citizen News.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include appropriate material.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor of the House and participated in the debate on the bill just passed, but was called out of the Chamber and did not hear the bells ring announcing the roll call. For that reason I was not present at the time the roll was called. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 91, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Stanley, Virginia; Mr. Trimble, Arkansas; Mr. LeCompte, Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Stanley, Virginia; Mr. Regan, Texas; Mr. Albert, Oklahoma; Mr. LeCompte, Iowa; Mr. Bishop, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION DENYING AMERICAN AID TO COUNTRIES FURNISHING WAR MATERIALS TO RUSSIA AND COMMUNIST-DOMINATED COUNTRIES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a measure that would deny American aid to foreign countries furnishing war materials to Russia and other Communist-dominated countries.

Under my proposed legislation, war materials and other financial assistance would not be furnished any foreign country unless and until such country has executed an agreement that it will not permit the export of war materials to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or to other Communist-dominated countries.

Since the conclusion of World War II, the United States has extended economic and financial aid amounting to billions of dollars to many countries of the world under the UNRRA and the ECA.

In the past 6 months I have received many letters from people of Kansas who expressed amazement that the United States would permit countries receiving our military, economic, and financial aid to export strategic war materials to Russia, Communist China, and other Communist-dominated countries.

It is difficult to explain why we should furnish any goods to any country that would send war materials to the Communist Chinese who are presently destroying the lives of American boys.

Facts developed by congressional committees have been given widespread publicity. A local newspaper reported several months ago that the managing director of the second largest tool-manufacturing concern in Great Britain stated his organization was so taken up with orders for Russia that he could not furnish any materials, not even so much as a pin, to any British consumer for at least 2 years.

During 1949 Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Great Britain exported to Russia and her satellite nations, millions of dollars worth of arms, explosives, iron, steel, aluminum, brass, copper, lead, zinc, tin, electrical goods, machinery, motor vehicles, chemicals, and optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus.

During the first half of 1950, Great Britain exported more than $6,000,000 worth of electrical machinery to Russia, and more than $1,000,000 worth of machine tools. This is almost 10 times the amount of machine tools exported by the British Empire to Russia during the same period in 1949.

I am hopeful that developments in Korea have had the effect of diminishing such activities on the part of beneficiary countries under ECA.

I am advised the Belgians, for example, will export this year 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals to Russia.

While the people of the United States and our defense activities are feeling the shortage of rubber and rubber products, I am told that Britain today is transshipping Malayan rubber to Soviet ports. When the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1951 was under consideration in September 1950, Senator WHERRY proposed an amendment prohibiting economic or financial assistance to any country which exported to Russia or its satellites arms, armaments, or other material, metals or commodities which were useful in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military materials. This amendment was rejected for a weaker substitute which is totally ineffective.

It is ridiculous for the United States to be spending billions of dollars in foreign aid which is being transformed or exchanged for military assistance to Russia through exports from certain foreign countries. Russia receives military assistance that is passed on to Communist China, which in turn is used for the destruction of the lives of American boys.

Our State Department's policy of appeasement ought to be revised. It should be a policy of firm determination to find out how the countries of the world are using the billions of dollars in economic and financial assistance furnished them by the people of America. The time has come when the countries of the world must decide whether they stand with the American people, who have been their benefactors and have given to them so generously, or whether they are selling out to Communist countries and their satellites.

The fence-straddling position of some of our friends has caused a good many of us great concern. It is inconsistent for our friends to accept our help and then export war materials to Communist countries who seek to destroy representative government wherever they find it.

The proposal I have submitted would also make it unlawful for any person, partnership, company, corporation, cooperative, organization, or enterprise that is doing business under the laws of the United States to export any war material to Communist-dominated countries. In my study of this matter I find there is no law or administrative order which prohibits the United States Government or any person or business in the United States from shipping war materials to Communist countries or to any nation for transshipment to such countries.

I believe Congress should take the initiative with respect to this matter. It is clear the President has the authority to take this action, but he has not done so. I think it is also clear that under the State Department's policy of appeasement toward China, such action

also unwittingly extends similar appeasement to Russia through our friends and neighbors in Europe and Asia.

During the fiscal year which ends June 30, our Government will have spent almost $4,500,000,000 in military and economic assistance to foreign countries. The President's budget message on January 15 calls for $7,000,000,000 more for military and economic assistance to foreign countries.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to furnish financial assistance in this magnitude in an amount almost equivalent to the President's requested increase in taxes without sufficient control of the manner in which such funds are to be used by the countries who are the recipients of these funds. Certainly, we have a right, if we are going to spend this money, to know something about the purpose for which it is used.

If we are to believe that the international situation is as grave as it is pictured to be by the spokesmen for the administration, including the President, Secretary of State, and others, I think it is time for us to be more firm in our foreign policy. In extending our friendship, aid, and assistance to the free democracies of the world, and in helping them to rehabilitate their industries, economies, and their people following the devastation of World War II, we must not unwittingly furnish communism with the tools of war.

If the international situation is as grave as it is said to be, we cannot have free trade as usual among all the nations of the world. The United States Government must take necessary steps to salvage what little is left from the mistakes and ridiculous commitments which have been made in the past 4 years by our State Department.

If our Government approves the expenditure of approximately $12,000,000,000 for military and economic assistance abroad over a 2-year period it is extremely important that this Congress enact legislation such as I have introduced today. This proposed legislation will, in my judgment, help protect our investments in democracy at home as well as abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely wrong that the United States of America should pour billions of dollars in materials and funds into other countries who, in turn, furnish war materials to those who are destroying the lives of our boys and who would destroy our country if they could.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

109. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to repeal the first two sentences of section 9 (a) of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

110. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

112. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

113. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 1933. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of poisonous weeds, especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1934. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1935. A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 1936. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Montana control over their tribal funds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1937. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to select their form of government; to the Commmittee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1938. A bill relating to the use for Federal tax purposes of the last-in, first-out inventory method; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1939. A bill to provide that war materials, or economic or financial assistance, shall not be furnished to any foreign country which permits the export of war materials to Russia and other Communist-dominated countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1940. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 1941. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1942. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1943. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1944. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Commiittee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1945. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1946. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1947. A bill to regulate the interception of communications in the interest of national security and the safety of human life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1948. A bill to amend the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1949. A bill to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1950. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1951. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 99 years; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1952. A bill relating to cost-of-living allowances and additional compensation by reason of environment for officers and employees of the United States stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1953. A bill to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 1954. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1955. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize Congress to estab-

lish daylight-saving time for any year by concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1956. A bill to eliminate financial worry and to make easier the repayment of debts and obligations already assumed by any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1957. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1958. A bill to provide reduced fares for members of the Armed Forces traveling in uniform at their own expense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1959. A bill to amend section 1804, title 26, United States Code, to make it inapplicable when a State or political subdivision thereof is designated as the insured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution favoring an organization for far-eastern cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution favoring an organization for far-eastern cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution favoring the negotiation of a Pacific Pact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 89. Resolution to appoint a select committee to investigate the adequacy of participation by citizens in public affairs through voting in elections for Federal offices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 90. Resolution to inquire into the adequacy of fuel supplies in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 92. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 93. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the alleged abuses in the education and training and loan guaranty programs for World War II veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Colorado; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to aid to our enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Guy Christian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Hess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Bernard R. Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Rodney Eugene Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarette G. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Senta Ziegler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1970. A bill to adjust the status of Michael Kroskof-Thomas, who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Nicholas Stathatos, and Mrs. Maria Gerasimos Stathatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Sanae Iida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of John E. Paradissis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Louise Yasoye Nagano Huff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paula Slucka (Slucki) and son, Ariel Slucki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Dudley Thomas and approximately 3,000 other residents of Dubuque, Iowa, demanding that American troops be withdrawn from Korea; that no American troops be sent abroad to fight communism until Communists within the United States are deported or imprisoned; that the Congress, not the President, shall have ultimate authority in military and political matters; that the exportation of vital materials be prohibited until stockpiles are accumulated in the United States; that the United States refuse economic assistance to all countries that trade with our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

20. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chester P. Sorenson, executive director, Employment Security Commission of Wyoming, Casper, Wyo., requesting the Congress to enact suitable legislation earmarking all moneys collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for use as funds for Federal and State costs of administering the employment security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

21. Also, petition of Leovigildo N. Diapo, municipal mayor, Madalag, Philippines, requesting funds for the reconstruction of school buildings destroyed during the last war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1951

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the unshaken foundation of all our hopes and the unfailing source of all our blessings, grant that through the way of prayer we may enter into a deepening experience of Thy presence, peace, and power.

We rejoice that Thou art reminding us continually of the eternal truth that "they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint."

Inspire us during this day with a profounder sense of our individual responsibility in the building of a finer social order. Help us to feel that we never see life in the radiant splendor of its greatness and dignity until we interpret its meaning and value in terms of service for God and our fellow men.

We thank Thee for the high and holy privilege and vocation of being coworkers in establishing peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING SECTION 5012 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 87, amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to powers of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to obtain data) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied in accordance with their provisions without regard to Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 or to any other reorganization plan becoming effective on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this subsection."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 87 relates to the powers of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff to secure data and information from the executive departments in connection with tax studies for the benefit of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance. It is particularly important that this information be secured at this time because we are now engaged in an endeavor to raise additional taxes for the defense effort.

The power of the joint committee and its staff to obtain information and data from the executive departments is granted under section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code which was enacted in the Revenue Act of 1942. At the time this act was passed it was deemed particularly important that in securing the data and information the joint committee and its staff should have the benefit of any information and experience accumulated by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his officials in the enforcement of the internal revenue laws. For this reason the law provided that this information and data could be secured directly from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his officials. Some question has now arisen as to the power of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff to secure this data and information directly from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his officials because of Reorganization Plan No. 26, dated May 13, 1950.

The purpose of this resolution is merely to require the Commissioner and his officials to continue to furnish such information and data directly to the joint committee or its staff as required under section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code and without regard to the effect of Reorganization Plan No. 26 or any other reorganization plan becoming effective on, before, or after the date of the enactment of the date of this joint resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following comment on House Joint Resolution 87. We have a staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which prepares data and information relating to tax legislation. It is very important that this staff have authority to secure information and data directly from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his staff with respect to problems relating to taxation. Some of these problems arise in the field and others in the Bureau in Washington.

In 1942 Congress gave that power to the staff in section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code. However, last year, by Reorganization Plan No. 26, dated May 13, 1950, this power is jeopardized by having statutory functions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his staff transferred to the Secretary.

While the Secretary of the Treasury, in an order dated July 31, 1950, has provided that employees and agencies of the Treasury shall continue to perform the functions they were authorized to perform immediately prior to the effective date of the reorganization plan, the statutory duty to furnish this data and information no longer rests in the Bureau of Internal Revenue but is dependent upon the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury and subject to such changes and conditions as he may deem advisable. I think it vital to sound tax legislation that the staff be able to confer and secure tax data and information directly from the Commissioner and his staff without interference from the Treasury.

This resolution restores the power formerly granted to the staff to secure this data and information directly from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his staff without being hampered by Reorganization Plan No. 26 or any other reorganization plan. I heartily commend its passage.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made by me appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, 1950, also a letter, a copy of a bill, and other material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial from a newspaper in south Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LET'S GET OUT OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if anybody has any doubt but that we ought to get out of the so-called United Nations, let him read an editorial in today's Washington Daily News, which states that—

When the American resolution seeking to brand the Chinese Communists as aggressors in Korea was sidetracked by a 27-to-23 vote in the 60-member United Nations political committee the United States suffered its worst defeat in the UN's 5-year history.

The editorial goes on to say:

The defeat was sustained at the hands of the British, supported by India, France, Canada, the Asian-Arab bloc and the Scandinavian countries—nations for the most part, presumed to be our friends.

In other words, the very countries whose representatives voted the emergency and misled President Truman into sending our troops to die in Asia are now running out on us.

Let us get out of the United Nations, get out of Korea, stay out of Europe, get back to America, and look after our own affairs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RESHIPMENT OF RUBBER TO RUSSIA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, while our representations to Great Britain have brought embargoes on a long list of strategic materials, hitherto sold to Russia and her satellites by the British, I am shocked to learn that one item of utmost importance to Michigan's automotive industry appears to have been overlooked.

Statistical reports show that in 1948, Great Britain imported and then exported again to Russia something less than 400 tons of crude natural rubber. In 1949 the total was less than 500 tons. But in the first 11 months of 1950, the total jumped to 9,878 tons, valued at $6,254,000.

These figures, of course, cover only rubber that was shipped from Malaya to England and then reshipped. It has

been estimated that in the first 11 months of 1950, Soviet Russia bought about 62,600 tons directly from Malaya, as compared with 63,500 in the comparable period of the year previous.

But even yet the rubber plantations of Malaya are largely controlled by British and Dutch interests. Therefore it must have been with their knowledge and consent that this tremendous amount of crude natural rubber was shipped to Russia, presumably through Hong Kong.

There can be little doubt that the vehicles, such as tanks, trucks and mobile artillery, now being used by Chinese Communist troops against our troops in Korea, are equipped with tires and treads made from the rubber sold to Russia by our British and Dutch allies.

It is needless, I think, for me to ask if this kind of thing offers the real explanation for the soft attitude of the British and some other European countries toward the Chinese Communists. An attitude made clear by their apparent unwillingness to join in branding the Chinese Reds as Korean aggressors, and their apparent eagerness to grant the Chinese Reds a seat on the United Nations Security Council.

The net result of this policy of trading with our enemies, and thus in part keeping badly needed supplies of crude natural rubber from the United States, has adversely affected our automotive industry. Our Government has been forced this month to slash 7,650 tons of domestically manufactured synthetic rubber from the total available for civilian tires and other rubber goods.

Let me point out, however, that this cut in civilian tire output is partly the fault of our own Government. The Eightieth Congress provided that synthetic rubber plants with an annual capacity of 160,000 long tons, built during World War II, should be kept on a standby basis. These plants utilize alcohol in making synthetic rubber.

But now it develops that the Government sold or leased, without proper recapture clauses, so many alcohol producing plants, also built during World War II, that it is impossible now to get the synthetic rubber plants into capacity operation.

It seems that the Government is going to have to buy hundreds of thousands of gallons of alcohol from other countries. It is going to have to do so at war inflated prices, even to reach the standby plant capacity.

Then how are we going to reach the 850,000 tons that will have to be produced each year, if our natural crude rubber supplies from Indonesia should be cut off completely?

Meanwhile, millions of bushels of potatoes and grain, both of use in making industrial alcohol, go to waste or are used by the whisky distillers.

And let me conclude by asking: Where is the stockpile of natural rubber, authorized by Congress, and which our National Security Resources Board was supposed to build up over the past several years?

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has pointed out there are being today introduced into the House and into the other body a number of measures designed to establish a statutory strength for the United States Marine Corps and to provide for the appointment of the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This proposal is not by any means a negative move on the part of the proponents of the measure. We do not minimize in any respect the tremendous and magnificent work being accomplished by the other branches of the Armed Services. We admire their exploits. Certainly none of us has anything but respect and good will toward every other branch of the armed services. However, the 40 Members of the other body, who are today introducing a bill and the presently indeterminate number in this body, do feel that the time has arrived after more than 175 years of illustrious service to this country to insure that the United States Marine Corps on its record and by its exploits is granted the protection that this legislation would give it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

WHAT WILL GREAT BRITAIN DO FOR US?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have been saying right along that we could not count on England to aid us in the United Nations—she naturally would not because she can get all the money from us she needs and some she does not need, and in the meantime she carries on a brisk trade with Communist countries. She has officially recognized the Red regime in China. She always looks out for her trade and at the present time, she is selling critical war material to our enemies.

A vote is about to be taken in the United Nations as to whether Communist China is an aggressor in South Korea or not. Do not count on England—she will at most only make a token gesture for us, but she will not apply any sanctions against her customer—Red China.

If England takes that course in the vote today in the Security Council, it will be the best news the people of the United States have had since World War II came to an end. It means we can now look to our own security, without having to tail Great Britain up with money and men. It will remove the United States from any worry over Europe for the reason that to save England has always been our goal. What for, I do not know. This should end our preparations to establish an Army in Europe and cause a draft of 18-year-old boys. We have friends there, to be sure. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, but if we keep out of Europe, these countries will take care of themselves. The Germans do not want to fight and France could not fight if she wanted to, so with bankrupt England out of the picture, we should shout hallelujah—three cheers for the United States. It will save us a million men and two hundred billion in money. Of course, we cannot take too much credit for our sagacity, because it was the perfidy of the Attlee government that has brought this new hope and jubilation to the United States of America.

The English love to sing God Save the King, but I believe there are a few in the United States who would rather hear God save the United States.

It appears likely that the invaders will be driven out of South Korea and if that happens again, we should not pass beyond the thirty-eighth parallel. Hand the reins over to South Korea and call it a day in Korea. Our next move should be to withdraw from the United Nations and make no further attempts to obey the order of this body in taking on any more obligations to stop aggression anywhere in the world. We have seen how we have been treated by the United Nations and we should resolve right now that we will deal no further with an incompetent, unappreciative and intriguing body which will stifle all attempts at world peace in the future as it has in the past.

This supinely weak organization seems determined to let Red China enter the organization, and of course Red China will not contribute anything to world peace but will prevent it. With Russia, Red China, and back-sliding England in the United Nations, the people of the world should not repose the slightest faith in this organization.

England has rendered us a great service, in failing to support us. Their action has relieved us from a terrible obligation. The future will be interesting to watch as to England:

How long can she continue supporting her utopian ideas without our money? Can she support the peace of the world by taking Red China to her bosom? Can she retain the respect of honest men, while engaged in selling war materials paid for by this country to our enemies?

England has made a complete sucker out of this Nation—because there are many who can't imagine the human race would continue without Great Britain. She now wants to paddle her own canoe and for the love of Mike, let her do it.

OUR SO-CALLED POLICE ACTION

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of mail from my home district on the northwest side of Chicago. I spent the last week end at home, where I talked to many people, Republicans and Democrats. These good people, both by voice and by mail, are urging me to express to the Congress their views on this so-called police action and the foreign mess we are mired down in.

In the light of today's known facts the majority of my constituents want the following course of action:

First. Get out of Korea and quit "saving face" by losing lives.

Second. Send no more troops to Europe until Congress decides this matter under its constitutional powers.

Third. Build up and safeguard our own home defenses, giving serious consideration to ex-President Hoover's and Senator TAFT's recommendations.

Fourth. Give Europe only such material aid in the forms of arms and military equipment to defend themselves only if they are willing to work to protect their liberties and their homeland.

Fifth. Do not draft 18-year-old boys.

My conclusion is that the great mass of Midwest citizens know what they want. The only ones who seem to be lost, confused, and who do not know what they want are Secretary Acheson, President Truman, and their advisers.

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT FROM ALABAMA

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a request from my district, I went over to see President Truman yesterday to present to him a petition signed by approximately 12,000 people in the State of Alabama. Mr. J. Dozier P. Arnold, a Birmingham accountant, circulated this petition in Alabama and turned it over to me to present to the President and to the Congress. It reads as follows:

> We, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of the United States, do petition you to stop immediately the unnecessary spending of our money for nonessential purposes and to devote all possible financial aid to the military.

Although the petition does not spell out specific places where savings can be made, the vast majority of Alabamians would say that the item in the budget allowing for FEPC operations is entirely unnecessary and harmful. The vast majority of the people in my district at least, which includes approximately 600,000 people, would say that the budget allowance for the Brannan farm plan and socialized medicine should also be eliminated. Everyone wants to avoid the recurrence of wasteful practices such as the potato subsidy and burning of good food. Most people want the enactment of certain additional Hoover Commission reports, which are designed to eliminate the overlapping of agencies and bring about greater efficiency in government.

I believe a select committee composed of outstanding Members of the House should be established for the duration of the crisis. This committee would help determine which activities and expenditures of the Government are essential to the national security. It would help find ways to operate our Government more efficiently and economically as well as to utilize manpower more effectively for the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I know these petitioners are willing to assume increased taxes to carry on the defense activities but they want all wasteful, unessential, nonmilitary spending cut so the tax burden will not be heavier than necessary. They believe as I do that our resources must be used wisely to insure our victory.

We in the Congress must share the responsibility with the Executive in taking the necessary steps to achieve these goals.

ENLISTMENT OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that there are those who are under the impression that the legislation which I have proposed, to authorize the enlistment of foreign nations in the Army of the United States, is confined to nationals of Germany and Japan. Possibly I am somewhat at fault in connection with this misunderstanding. I have emphasized the enlistment of German and Japanese nationals because they represent the two largest pools of manpower available to us, and they are located at the two positions most important to our world-wide defense. However, the pending legislation specifically authorizes the enlistment of nationals of other countries—of all countries—of the Philippines, of Korea, of Mexico, Canada, and of all of the countries of Europe where there are men who want to enlist. It is simply an open invitation, such as the French have held out to foreigners to enlist in their Foreign Legion throughout all these years. The bill offers food, clothes, and pay to the unemployed but it also invites every friend of freedom, wherever he may be to join in the defense of a free world. I hope that everyone will understand I am not confining this invitation to any one group or nationality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

DO NOT ADMIT CHINESE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], jointly sponsored a resolution in this House which was adopted stating that it was the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the United Nations should declare Communist China the aggressor in Korea. I am glad to see that the United States Senate yesterday concurred in that action, and even went a step further, in which they declared it was the sense of that body that the Chinese Communist Government should not be admitted to the United Nations.

I am today introducing a similar resolution that it may be the sense of the House of Representatives that the Chinese Communist Government should not be admitted as members of the United Nations to represent China. I understand the Committee on Foreign Affairs is now organized, and I hope and believe, after talking with several members of that committee and others in the House, that we may get immediate action on this resolution. It is long past time for definite decision. Among others with whom I have talked to in this House are the leadership. They, too, have indicated their approval.

It is incredible to even think of admitting the Chinese Communists, as it appears that some UN members would, as the representative of China while at the same time they are aggressors in Korea.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

THE TASK THAT CONFRONTS US

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, shortly General Eisenhower will be back to advise us about certain matters, and undoubtedly most of us have some idea as to what he will say. If it is not presumptuous, may I suggest my colleagues read two books. One of them will give you an idea of the general himself. It is entitled "Eisenhower Was My Boss." The other is one written by the general himself, Crusade in Europe. If you will read this book—I just finished reading it the second time last night—you will get some idea of the magnitude of the task that confronted the general in World War II when Russia and the Communists were fighting on our side. If you will read those books you will get some idea of the general and the vital importance and the magnitude of the task which confronts us when Russia and Chinese Communists are our enemies, Japan and Ger-

many unable to give very effective help, Britain and France lukewarm in their support.

SPREADING DEFENSE ORDERS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] made a very pertinent observation here on the floor the other day when she said that it was a dangerous thing to concentrate industry in four major parts of the country. I have today introduced a bill which I believe will give all sections of the country a fair share of the defense orders. If Russia has the atomic bomb, there is only one thing that we can do, and that is to disperse and to deconcentrate industry so that every city in the country has a chance to get its fair share of defense orders. I believe that with our communication system we can do this.

We can fan out from industrial centers, into nearby villages, into surrounding territory, placing defense orders wherever competent and experienced hands are now in business.

This method of dispersal and distribution of our productive facilities will assure us of two things.

First, if we are attacked from the air, enemy planes will have a lot more territory to cover to bomb us, and even then, they cannot hope to cripple us because we will be too scattered.

Next, we will be able to sustain such attack indefinitely because our plants will be spread out so that only a few could possibly be hit during the same raid.

The bill reads as follows:

A bill to guarantee all existing industrial centers in the United States a fair share of defense industry

Be it enacted, etc., The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to supervise the awarding of defense orders on the basis of relatively equal distribution by—

(1) Utilizing all existing industrial facilities now available for conversion to defense productions;

(2) Carefully selecting plants as contractors and subcontractors with a view to spreading defense work throughout every city and locality now established for manufacturing;

(3) Making use of all possible means of transport and communication in order to disperse defense orders as remote as possible from danger areas anticipating atomic bomb attacks;

(4) Analyzing the size and population of every city and area in order to determine the amounts of defense production such locality is capable of turning out and then placing orders as nearly as possible in line with this survey.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time for the purpose of advising my colleagues of the deplorable situation that is developing in the veterans' hospitals of our Nation.

In our zeal to get ready to win a third world war we are on the verge of making the 100,000 or more disabled and otherwise ailing veterans of World Wars I and II the forgotten men of the country.

The situation is this, Mr. Speaker: Of the 140 veterans' hospitals in operation at the present time there is a shortage of 384 members of the medical staff. There are six hospitals completed that have no medical staff at all and cannot be opened for the benefit of the veterans. During the calendar year 1951, 26 more hospitals will be ready for opening, requiring an additional 460 doctors. The situation is further confused by the calling up of reserves who are members of the staffs of these hospitals. Already 119 doctors and 294 trainee doctors have been called and separated from the hospitals. Another call is in for 384 more.

I want to make the prediction that unless something is done in the draft legislation that is about to be considered by the House to exempt doctors who are on the staff of veterans' hospitals more veterans' hospitals will be closed by the end of this year.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Thursday of this week. Due to a death message received this morning, I ask unanimous consent that the order may be carried over until Monday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, can the majority leader tell us the program for the rest of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of these bills there is no further legislation that I know of. It is my intention after we dispose of these bills to adjourn until tomorrow and then go over until Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman; that is the information I wanted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and to include in one a news article and in the other an editorial.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some facts about Iowa from the Iowa Development Commission.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter by the farm editor for the St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch, in which the editor fully answers the misleading allegations in the press that the farmers are responsible for the rise in the cost of living.

Mr. WHARTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include some editorial comments.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Michigan Times.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several editorials.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] if he desires any time on the rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No. There is no objection to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule for the consideration of H. R. 1, which is a bill to give a certain amount of gratuitous insurance to members of the armed services when in combat in time of war emergency. Two hours general debate are provided, it waives points of order, and contains the usual provision for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR FORCE ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1726 to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, reported by the Armed Services Committee. I understand there is no opposition to it and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] does not desire any time.

In view of that fact and knowing that the chairman of that great committee will explain the bill more thoroughly than I am in position to do, I shall not take any time. However, I do at this time yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an announcement to the House for the benefit of the Members.

We are all aware that next week, as I stated heretofore on the floor, and it also appeared in the press, General Eisenhower will address an informal joint meeting of the two branches of Congress in the Congressional Library. The date has not been stated heretofore. I desire to announce to the House that that informal joint meeting will take place in the Coolidge Auditorium, Library of Congress, at 10:30 a. m., February 1, 1951, which is a week from tomorrow; that there will be no tickets issued to Members of either branch. They will be admitted upon recognition. The press will be assigned seats in the front row in the extreme right and the extreme left of the auditorium.

I desire to make this announcement, knowing of the great interest in the matter, so that the Members might be advised as far in advance as possible as to the time when the informal joint meeting will take place.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce, and calls the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to this fact, that there are only 510 seats in that auditorium and it will not be possible for Members of the House or the Senate to have any guests on that occasion.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Illinois does not wish any time on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. There is no objection to the adoption of the rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1, with Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a gratuitous indemnity in the amount of $10,000 to the survivors of all men who lose their lives in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, without cost to the serviceman.

In addition, the man, upon discharge, will be protected for a period of 90 days in order to permit him to readjust to civilian life and determine the sort of insurance protection he wishes to obtain from commercial sources.

Beneficiaries are limited to the immediate family of the serviceman and the indemnity is payable only in monthly installments of $92.90 over a 10-year period.

Veterans having World War I and World War II insurance may maintain such insurance if they are recalled to active duty or they may avail themselves of the gratuitous indemnity. For those having permanent type of insurance, provision is made that they may surrender the policies for cash and reinstate them at some future date with a net saving to the individual. Holders of term policies who permit their policies to lapse during service may reinstate them after discharge.

Veterans of World War I and World War II who have Government insurance may continue their insurance, and this bill does not cancel, or restrict, or in any way adversely affect any rights which the veteran has under the terms of his existing insurance contract.

The gratuity is exempt from the claims of creditors and from taxation.

Any man unable to obtain commercial insurance after discharge at standard rates because of service-connected disability, will be eligible to carry a national service life insurance policy. In addition, a man having total service-connected disability will have his premiums waived. Veterans with disability may apply for this type of insurance at any time after discharge.

The bill carries out the budget recommendation. The Bureau of the Budget has indicated that it favors the approach embodied in this bill and gives as its opinion that, had it been in effect, several hundreds of millions of dollars would have been saved during the period 1940–49. The Comptroller General estimates that the saving would have amounted to $587,000,000.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee and is substantially the same as H. R. 9911 which passed the House unanimously on December 18, 1950.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

On May 10, 1950, the committee unanimously adopted this resolution:

The staff of the committee is directed, during the recess of the Congress, to consult with the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and any other interested Government agency, and the four service organizations chartered by the Congress, with a view to presenting to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Eighty-second Congress recommendations for a new law providing insurance protection to members of the Armed Forces and veterans of such forces; the staff to utilize, to whatever extent practicable, previous surveys or investigations made of this subject.

That resolution was adopted after a subcommittee had held rather extensive hearings on amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act.

As indicated, the resolution was adopted unanimously and was an effort by the committee to study the desirability of providing uniform coverage and protection for all members of the Armed Forces whether they are in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard. At the

same time, it was the hope of the committee that such uniform coverage, if desirable and feasible, could be provided with a decreased cost of administration to the Government. Not only was it desirable in the opinion of the committee to decrease administrative costs, with a resulting saving to the Treasury, but also to provide a program in the future which would be much more workable and sharply reduce the amount of manpower necessary to operate it. In connection with this vital problem of manpower, the testimony in 1950 of the Veterans' Administration insurance administrator is pertinent and is worthy of mention here. He said:

In time of emergency, I think the manpower to operate an insurance system, projecting in the future, would probably not be available. I am thinking of an insurance system of this character—

He referred to national service life insurance—

I base that on the difficulties that we had in connection with the operation of the insurance program during the last war. Most of our difficulties, even carrying over up to today, were due to lack of personnel, space, and equipment. * * * It is likely to be worse and I do not think we ought to repeat the experience that we had in this last war.

A recent study by the General Accounting Office indicates that during the period 1940–49, the Veterans' Administration had to set up approximately 26,000,000 individual files based on that number of applications for insurance in varying amounts. Had the system embodied in this bill been in effect during that period, the total number of files which the Veterans' Administration would have had to establish with respect to an indemnity would have been reduced to 438,000, representing the total number of in-service deaths from October 1940 to December 31, 1949. This, it should be noted, would have resulted in a substantial reduction in the amount of administration actually required.

As a further indication of the administrative savings in time and money and simplicity of operation which can be expected to follow as a result of the enactment of this legislation, the committee has been informally advised that when this proposal is enacted, the Department of Defense will use the same beneficiary designation form for both the proposed indemnity and the 6-months' death gratuity. Thus, there will not be any additional paper work necessary on the part of the Department of Defense, and of course the Veterans' Administration will come into the indemnity picture only in the event of the death of the serviceman during a period of service or within 90 days thereafter.

In connection with the testimony of the Assistant Administrator on the subject of manpower, the scarcity of manpower is much more acute today than when this testimony was given some 9 months ago.

There is no doubt in the minds of the committee that unless the present insurance program is changed, great difficulty will be experienced in obtaining sufficient competent manpower to administer the present national service insurance program.

The Comptroller General has forcefully pointed out the manpower and operational savings which the enactment of this legislation will bring. In a formal report on this proposal he stated:

The major operational or manpower savings which would be achieved under these two bills include (1) the elimination of the need for establishing military insurance allotments in the Department of Defense for all future entrants into the Armed Forces; (2) the probability that a majority of the present members of the Armed Forces will discontinue their insurance allotments, thereby making it unnecessary to maintain a vast number of allotment accounts now maintained in the Department of Defense; (3) the elimination of the transmission from the Department of Defense to the Veterans' Administration of a great number of monthly insurance allotment advices; (4) the elimination of the need for a mountain of paper work in the form of applications, medical examinations and certificates, and so forth; (5) the elimination of the need for underwriting work in the Veterans' Administration for personnel in the services; and (6) the elimination of the need for establishing and maintaining individual premium record accounts in the Veterans' Administration for each insurance allotment and policy.

Enactment of this uniform indemnity coverage bill will remove what has been considered a basic inequity and inadequacy in the existing Government insurance program. Take, for example, the cases of Smith, Brown, and Jones. Smith, Brown, and Jones all were draftee privates in a combat outfit. Each was married and had two children. For reasons best known to themselves, Smith had no national service life insurance coverage; Brown had $5,000 term insurance; Jones had $10,000 term insurance. In the same combat engagement, while subject to the same war hazards, all three were killed. The United States—not national service life insurance—pays Brown's family $5,000, Jones' family $10,000, and Smith's family gets nothing. The money which Brown and Jones contributed in the form of premiums to the maintenance of this insurance will not be used to meet any part of either death claim—this by virtue of the fact that the Government under the present law properly bears the entire cost in cases of deaths traceable to the extra hazards of military service. The premiums which Brown and Jones contributed are considered to have been earned by reason of the concurrent normal risk involved. They remain in the national service life insurance fund, and, it has been forcefully argued, serve to enrich, in the form of dividends, the policyholders. Among other reasons, it is to correct conditions illustrated by this example that the committee reports this bill favorably. It is of the firm opinion that uniform benefits to all people in the service are highly desirable and where the deaths, as above, are of such character that the insurance benefit is entirely paid for by the Government, there is no logical reason why the dependents of Smith in the example above should be discriminated against because of his oversight or neglect in not applying for insurance.

So far, the Department of Defense has announced casualty figures totaling over 42,730 resulting from the fighting in Korea. Of this number 7,023 have been killed and 7,143 are missing. This bill provides uniform coverage for all men in the service, which is quite different from the situation prevailing today under national service life insurance. At the peak during World War II, 95 percent of the men in the Armed Forces had insurance coverage with policies averaging approximately $9,500, but on June 30, 1950, 18 percent of the men overseas, having dependents, did not have insurance, and 22 percent of those in the United States with dependents did not have insurance. Further, at that time, only 54 percent of those having insurance had the full $10,000 coverage. This bill protects the interests of all the dependents of all men in the service to a uniform degree, which the present program fails to do. The present emergency makes prompt action imperative.

Pursuant to the cited resolution, the committee staff immediately began a series of conferences with officials of the agencies and organizations concerned, which ultimately led to the publication of House Committee Print 299 of the Eighty-first Congress, containing insurance information pertinent to this discussion. In addition to the reports from the four Government agencies and four veterans' organizations, there is included in the publication pertinent excerpts from the so-called Hook Commission report and memoranda prepared by the National Service Life Insurance Committee of the Joint Army and Navy Personnel Board, which began its studies back in 1946. In addition, for ready reference the staff had digested each bill which had been introduced on the subject of insurance for servicemen for the period 1939–50.

After this material had been studied and conclusions drawn from recommendations contained therein, a series of conferences were started and several round-table discussions were had on the suggestions made by the agencies and veterans' organizations.

It soon developed that there were at least three avenues of approach to this problem. First was the proposal to provide a system of gratuitous insurance or gratuitous indemnity which would automatically indemnify any member of the Armed Forces against the loss of his life while in active service. Second, it was proposed that a system of group insurance be authorized requiring a nominal premium for the serviceman of approximately $2 or $3 a month with mandatory deductions from his monthly service pay. Third was the suggestion that substantial amendments be made to the present National Service Life Insurance Act to provide for the assumption of administrative costs by the policyholders with respect to new contracts; for the calculation of premiums on future policies on a more realistic mortality table, possibly the 1941 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table; and at the same time for the adoption of an up-to-date annuity table for the calculation of annuities for beneficiaries under other than lump-sum settlements.

After these three avenues of approach had been carefully considered by officials of the Government agencies and veterans' organizations, legislation was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress to accomplish each of the proposals described above. A subcommittee was appointed to hold hearings on these bills, and testimony was received from the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Defense, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and AMVETS. Officials of the commercial insurance companies and representatives of the life-insurance agents also made brief appearances and expressed their views of the approach which should be taken.

It became evident from the testimony during the 7 days of hearings that the Bureau of the Budget would favor a gratuitous indemnity program, as would the General Accounting Office. The Bureau of the Budget also suggested that a comprehensive study be undertaken to consider the possibilities of integration of the present veterans' compensation program into the social-security system.

On January 15, 1951, the President formally recommended the gratuitous approach in his budget message in which he stated:

> Government liabilities for life insurance programs for servicemen and veterans are mainly for the costs of administration and for payments on account of deaths traceable to the extra hazards of military service.
>
> In view of the Korean hostilities and the current enlargement of the Armed Forces, there is pressing need for new legislation to assure financial protection to the families of servicemen. The present national service life insurance program does not meet this need. Because it is optional, the protection is not carried by some servicemen and is held in less than adequate amounts by others. The system is complex and costly and absorbs excessive manpower, especially when the Armed Forces are large and manpower scarce.
>
> It would be more equitable, and over the last decade it would have been more economical, to provide a free and automatic $10,000 indemnity to the survivors of all who die while in military service, and to establish a special new system of voluntary insurance open only to veterans whose insurability at standard rates has been impaired by military service. I recommend that this Congress now enact such legislation and extend its benefits to the dependents of those servicemen who have died while on active duty since June 27, 1950, if they did not have a like amount of servicemen's insurance protection.

The Department of Defense advocated further study of the problem and expressed its opposition to any proposal which would in any way curtail or otherwise reduce the amount of the benefits now made available to survivors of the Armed Forces. In connection with the position of the Department of Defense, it is pertinent to point out that a Committee on National Service Life Insurance, within the Armed Forces which studied this problem for some months, came to the conclusion that—

> The basic idea of granting gratuitous insurance to all members of the Armed Forces is both sound and economical.

At the same time, the same group listed the following as among the basic objections against the present national service life insurance system:

> (1) It is inordinately expensive, particularly on a wartime basis, administratively, the more important costs being:
>
> (a) Obtaining the applications.
>
> (b) Servicing the insurance.
>
> (c) Registration and discontinuance of allotments.
>
> (d) Maintenance of allotment records in service departments, adjustments, correspondence, etc.
>
> (e) Payments of premiums by service departments to Veterans' Administration.
>
> (f) Establishment and maintenance of insurance records in Veterans' Administration, namely: Index, file jackets, establishment of premium accounts, examination and approval of applications, issuance of certificates.
>
> (g) Consideration of medical examinations to determine the insurability of applicants who have been in service more than 120 days.
>
> (h) Reinstatement of insurance.
>
> (i) Correspondence.
>
> (j) Conversion.
>
> (k) Change of beneficiary.
>
> (l) General Accounting Office, Treasury Department and Department of Justice—costs incidental to the handling of insurance matters.
>
> (m) Rental space required for storage of forms and materials.
>
> (n) Printing costs for forms, pamphlets, etc.
>
> (2) It is expensive in personnel costs to all of the services as well as the other agencies involved.
>
> (3) Emergency conditions bring additions to the armed services and the sale and administrative burden of national service life insurance to a simultaneous peak. Manpower is subjected to additional heavy drains at the very moment it is most precious.
>
> (4) The amount of a serviceman's insurance coverage is apt to reflect not his need, but rather his particular susceptibility to suasion and his degree of response to campaign pressure.
>
> (5) The enormous size of the physical task involved in establishing and maintaining complete insurance records for a modern war's millions of servicemen and its subsequent millions of veterans results in an incredible but utterly unavoidable mass of confusion and delay.

The Veterans' Administration maintained its well-known policy of neither recommending for or against any proposal.

However, in reporting on H. R. 1, the Veterans' Administration pointed out that—

> No doubt, enactment of the bill would provide automatic, gratuitous, life indemnity protection for all persons embraced by the bill and it would eliminate a great amount of administrative work which otherwise would be required under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, if that program is continued. The proposed plan would guarantee maximum ($10,000) protection to all, which is favored by many as being a great improvement over the present system under which many servicemen do not apply for any insurance and, in many instances, for less than the maximum protection. The manpower savings which eventually would result from enactment of the bill, particularly in the event of an all-out emergency, would be very desirable.

In testifying on this proposal, the representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars stated:

> We subscribe to the principle of indemnity insurance without premium payments or red tape and to making the coverage automatic on every man who goes into the armed services. We believe that a program of that kind is in keeping with the traditional functioning of our Government. National service life insurance, in its present form, the way it has been administered in the past, actually offers less protection to the serviceman, with tremendous administrative cost and red tape and the perpetuation of bureaucracy with all of the headaches attendant to the various cases of inequity that develop, and costs more money in the long run than would the indemnity form of free insurance for every serviceman.

The Disabled American Veterans' representative stated that his organization believes that—

> In time of a major national emergency, the present system would require an entirely disproportionate ratio of manpower to administer, as contrasted with a plan not requiring the payment of premiums, bookkeeping, filing, and so forth. It is impossible to estimate the economies, not only in money, but in man-hours as well that could be realized * * *. While this proposal is a departure from the recognized insurance programs of World War I and World War II, we are firmly convinced that it is a departure in the right direction, and that as our mobilization progresses, it will have a salutary effect on the efficiency and economy of administering insurance benefits for members of the Armed Forces.

The representative of AMVETS, in endorsing the bill and urging its passage, stated:

> We feel that servicemen would be better satisfied with a universal coverage. We feel that loved ones at home would be happier in the knowledge of certain security in the event of death of a serviceman. We feel that the country would save money and that the veterans' program as a whole would benefit by virtue of the fact that the people would know exactly what national benefits existed. Besides providing a universal coverage for all servicemen, equally important, it would provide to those men who had lost their insurability, a vehicle by which they might have insurance protection. We do, however, suggest that the new proposal offered can carry out the Nation's obligations to its servicemen and to the beneficiaries of these men. We believe this proposal can save the Government money and therefore urge its passage.

The American Legion proposed amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide certain coverage for persons who die, become totally disabled, or are captured after June 27, 1950, and within 120 days after such proposal's enactment. Its proposal is directed particularly to the Korea casualties and would provide gratuitous insurance in the amount of $10,000 for those who do not have that amount of insurance in force at the time of their death, disability, or capture during the stated period. In addition, it was proposed that the $10,000 amount be extended to cover the dependents of veterans of World War II who are presently limited to $5,000 gratuitous insurance. The American Legion urged that if the indemnity approach is adopted, provision be made for veterans to obtain national service life insurance after separation from service, whether disabled or not.

The National Association of Life Underwriters, representing the insurance agents, recommended the gratuitous indemnity and while the commercial insurance companies' representative was guarded in his advocacy of any program,

it is safe to say that a large segment of the commercial insurance industry believes that a gratuitous approach would be advantageous to the serviceman and to the country.

After completion of 7 days of hearings which resulted in 463 pages of printed testimony, the subcommittee unanimously recommended to the full committee H. R. 9911, Eighty-first Congress, which was reported from the committee without a dissenting vote and passed the House unanimously on December 18, 1950.

The provisions of H. R. 1 are substantially identical with H. R. 9911 with respect to its major purposes, the changes involving chiefly matters of clarification and technical improvements.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

The bill, as reported to the House, contains two parts—part I is cited as the "Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951," and part II as the "Insurance Act of 1951."

SECTION 1

Section 1 states that part I may be cited as the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

SECTION 2

Section 2 provides that on and after June 27, 1950, except as otherwise provided, any person in the active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including the National Guard under the conditions hereinafter noted, shall be automatically insured, without cost to the person, against death in active service in the amount of $10,000. Also included in this coverage are cadets and midshipmen of the United States Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies, and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey while engaged in specified types of duty. In addition, servicemen called for active service for a period exceeding 30 days will be covered after separation from the service for a short period of 90 days, so that they may have that time within which to adjust their affairs and still be protected while deciding upon the type of insurance protection they may wish to purchase from a commercial insurance company. This additional protection would not be available to a man who spends a few days each month in active-duty training as a part of some local Reserve unit.

The broad coverage of the bill would include aviation cadets who are taking training in that field in any one of the three services, as well as persons in the Reserve components, including the National Guard, while engaged in aerial flight in Government aircraft, regardless of the period of time involved in such duty, provided such flights are incident to their military or naval training. Members of the National Guard, except as noted above, are included only when they are called or ordered to active duty or active training duty for a period of 14 days or more. A man serving in the National Guard on maneuvers for 2 weeks during the summer, for example, would have the protection afforded by this legislation. On the other hand, it would not provide protection for members of the National Guard who are performing training duty in a drill hall once or twice a month. Neither would it give protection to a man injured when the Guard was acting as an agency of the State in quelling a riot or other disturbance. The committee has been advised that any such injuries are compensable under the laws of the individual States.

As amended by the committee, the indemnity would be extended as of June 27, 1950, to persons, including volunteers for enlistment and reservists called to active duty, who were or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance or for entry upon active duty and who died or shall die as the result of disability incurred while en route to such place. Similar coverage is extended to selectees who, in response to an order to report for induction and after reporting to a local draft board, died or dies as the result of disability incurred while en route from such draft board to a designated induction station. In all such cases, the death shall be deemed to have occurred in active service for the purpose of part I. This provision is similar to the coverage under Public Law No. 300, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 11, 1944, for veterans' compensation purposes.

It will be noted from this section, and it should be stressed, that this will give retroactively automatic protection to all men who have been in the service since the fighting in Korea started, and in the event of death in such service, will authorize payment to their beneficiaries of the $10,000 indemnity, subject to the provision that beneficiaries of those persons having other Government insurance in force at the time of death will receive the difference, if any, between the amount of such insurance and $10,000.

SECTION 3

Section 3 directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the indemnity, upon certification of the death by the secretary of the service department concerned, to the surviving spouse, child or children, parent, brother, or sister of the insured. This, it will be seen, limits the beneficiaries to the survivors in the immediate family of the insured. Beneficiaries within these classes may be named by the insured. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the indemnity is payable to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person. Any installments not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime are payable to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority.

SECTION 4

Section 4: The indemnity is payable in equal monthly installments of 120 in number, with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum. The committee is advised that this will amount to $92.90 per month for a 10-year period in cases in which the maximum indemnity is payable.

In the insurance programs applicable to World War I and World War II veterans, provision is made for options to be selected either by the insured or at the election of the beneficiary. In restricting the indemnity payments to equal monthly installments over a 10-year period, the committee is endeavoring to simplify administration and at the same time to assure a substantial monthly payment for a reasonable period of time. This will provide a larger sum than the monthly annuity payments under the existing Government insurance programs for widows with children during the time when a larger income will be most needed. It has not been the policy of the Congress at any time to permit lump-sum settlement of gratuitous insurance.

SECTION 5

Section 5 limits the total liability of the Government to $10,000 in any case where an indemnified person also has Government insurance in force. Thus, if a man in the service had $5,000 of national service life insurance in force at the time of his death on or after June 27, 1950, the beneficiary would receive $5,000 national service life insurance and $5,000 gratuitous indemnity.

Provision is made that any person in the active service who has national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance on a permanent plan in force may surrender such policy and receive its cash surrender value. Within 90 days after separation from active service, and without medical examination, he may upon written application be granted permanent type insurance on the same plan but not in excess of the amount surrendered, or he may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month. This provision was included in consideration of those recalled to active duty who have Government insurance on a permanent plan which they may not wish to abandon permanently but at the same time desire to be eligible for the full free indemnity while in the active service. The committee is advised that by reinstating the insurance, repayment of the cash surrender value and payment of the reserve for the time spent in the service, the policyholder would enjoy a net saving of the difference between the aggregate amount of premiums he would have paid and the reserve required to reinstate his policy.

While no rights of reinstatement under existing contracts of insurance will be impaired or denied by reason of enactment of the bill, the National Service Life Insurance Act and regulations issued thereunder provide presently that insurance surrendered for cash may not be reinstated nor may the person in such case be granted new insurance in any amount in excess of the difference between the amount of insurance surrendered and $10,000. Accordingly, section 5 is designed, among other things, to preserve the right of those who surrender their policy for cash to continue their insurance upon separation from service.

Rights under existing 5-year level premium term insurance policies of reinstatement, conversion, or renewal are likewise not impaired by the provisions of the bill. However, the committee realizes that in certain instances the 5-year term period will expire while insureds are in the active service and under conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for them to reinstate, renew, or convert their insurance prior to the expiration of the term. In order to preserve rights of policyholders in such cases, the bill has been amended to provide that any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of its enactment, shall, upon application made within 90 days after separation from service, payment of premiums and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age.

SECTION 6

Section 6 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of part I. He presently has such authority under the National Service Life Insurance Act with reference to the amendments of that act proposed under part II of the bill.

SECTION 7

Section 7 authorizes appropriations for the payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

SECTION 8

Section 8 provides that any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections refuses to perform service in the land or naval forces of the United States, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under the act; also, that no benefit shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States. However, the section contains a proviso which makes it clear that restoration to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights to an indemnity.

SECTION 9

Section 9 makes applicable to part I the provisions of Public Laws 262 and 844 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, which, among other things, would exempt the indemnity from taxation and claims of creditors; provide for the payment of benefits to minors and incompetents, with or without guardians; and regulate the recognition and fees of attorneys and agents. Provision is also made in this section that all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be assigned to any person in the permitted classes when all other such persons join in the assignment.

SECTION 10

This section and sections 11 and 12 comprise part II of the bill. Section 10 adds two new sections, 619 and 620, to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. These new sections would prohibit issue of United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance to any person after its enactment except former insureds under the mentioned permanent plans of insurance surrendered for cash and except those released from active service under other than dishonorable conditions who are found by the Administrator to be suffering from a disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree and which renders such persons uninsurable at standard rates for ordinary life insurance. Such insurance would be issued on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor and premiums and other collections hereafter received on nonparticipating insurance issued under other provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, would be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States and any payments on such insurance would be made directly from such fund. A disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree would include those which are presumptively as well as those which are directly service-incurred.

Insurance provided under the new section 620 is similar to the so-called H insurance—or health insurance—previously granted to certain World War II veterans under the National Service Life Insurance Act who were unable to meet the health requirements for issue or reinstatement of insurance. Such insurance will be issued on a nonparticipating basis with calculations based on the American experience table of mortality and interest at 3 percent per annum compounded annually, as provided in the basic act. This section provides that on and after the date of enactment all moneys collected under this provision will be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury and claims paid from this fund. Under present provisions relating to H insurance, premium and other collections are placed in the National Service Life Insurance Act appropriation and payments are made from such appropriation. Prospectively, such collections and payments would also be made to and from the revolving fund. Upon recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and with the concurrence of the General Accounting Office, this provision as to a revolving fund was included, since it was indicated that it would be desirable from the standpoint of sound accounting procedure. It should be emphasized that the amended language with respect to a revolving fund is simply a change in accounting procedure and will not in any way affect the benefits to which a veteran is entitled.

Under the existing H insurance (as shown by letter dated January 11, 1951, from the Veterans' Administration, appended to this report), there has been collected through October 31, 1950, a net of $1,496,533.38 and at the same time $648,463 has been paid on claims made against this appropriation, leaving a balance of $848,070.38. Thus, it will be seen that this fund is at least currently in a highly solvent condition, despite the fact that the group concerned is composed of impaired risks.

Section 10 also provides that waiver of premiums under the National Service Life Insurance Act shall not be denied on the ground that total service-connected disability commenced prior to the effective date of the new H insurance herein authorized. Under this type of insurance 80 waivers of premium are presently in effect on 72 lives.

The committee is of the opinion that the premiums for this nonparticipating type of insurance will be more than sufficient to meet the claims which may arise on such insurance in the future. However, provision is made that should a deficit occur, an appropriation can be made to the fund.

In connection with the revolving fund, the committee believes that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at some future time may find it desirable to review the experience under this type of insurance to determine whether this type of insurance could be maintained on a self-sustaining basis at a reduced premium.

SECTION 11

Section 11 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to cancel or restrict in any way any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of its enactment. The committee has been advised that in the absence of this specific provision the language of the bill would not preclude renewal of term insurance, if otherwise authorized, or future reinstatement or conversion of policies which have lapsed before or after the enactment of the bill. Should the question arise as a result of improper interpretation by any Government agency, it is the opinion of the committee that the courts would sustain the position that contract rights cannot be affected by subsequent legislation. In any event, section 11 will remove any doubt as to such matters.

SECTION 12

Section 12 states that part II may be cited as the Insurance Act of 1951.

SUMMARY

Thus, it will be seen that this bill provides a maximum uniform coverage for all men who entered the Armed Forces after June 27, 1950, and who will enter in the future. To the extent that it supersedes Government life insurance, it should eliminate all of the administrative costs and manpower currently required to handle applications, premium collections, records, and accounts under the National Service Life Insurance Act. It provides the same treatment to all survivors of men killed in the service of their country and authorizes insurance protection after separation from service in all cases where service-connected disabilities have impaired insurability.

ESTIMATE OF COST

In view of a number of indeterminate factors involved, it is not possible to make an accurate estimate of the cost or savings which would be effected by the bill. However, it is manifest to your

committee that its enactment, in lieu of the continuance of national service life insurance generally, will result in very substantial over-all savings to the Government. In this regard, the Comptroller General of the United States has estimated that had the indemnity program been in effect during the period from October 8, 1940, to June 30, 1949, in lieu of the national service life insurance program, the cost to the Government would have been reduced by approximately $587,000,000.

INSURANCE IN FORCE AT END OF FISCAL YEAR INDICATED

The amount of insurance in force in programs administered by the Veterans' Administration and the number of such policies is important to this discussion and I am giving this information for the record.

United States Government life insurance

Fiscal year	Number	Amount
1950	484,793	$2,116,059,828
1949	500,784	2,182,180,750
1948	513,263	2,237,324,619
1947	531,053	2,310,843,804
1946	551,823	2,390,153,960
1945	567,941	2,454,864,117
1944	578,641	2,494,900,099
1943	589,631	2,499,555,997
1942	594,806	2,507,187,116
1941	613,408	2,567,392,036
1940	600,094	2,565,327,270
1939	606,071	2,562,353,868
1938	602,963	2,560,893,373
1937	606,982	2,578,338,638
1936	563,213	2,560,921,682
1935	590,865	2,605,400,400
1934	598,226	2,666,733,150
1933	616,089	2,782,709,583
1932	641,247	2,977,329,601
1931	646,055	3,024,444,627
1930	648,248	3,042,743,415
1929	650,066	3,059,919,329
1928	660,374	3,113,649,182
1927	587,980	2,893,044,640
1926	553,600	2,781,587,008
1925	552,340	2,865,028,729
1924	562,600	2,984,573,458
1923	560,065	3,070,200,817
1922	581,778	3,348,400,474
1921	651,084	3,849,375,735

National service life insurance

Fiscal year	Number	Amount
1950	5,620,028	$35,809,439,817
1949 [1]	7,258,000	41,743,000,000
1948 [1]	6,437,000	37,675,000,000
1947 [1]	5,691,000	34,113,000,000
1946 [1]	6,997,200	45,240,000,000
1945	15,944,158	123,579,575,163
1944	14,858,838	111,575,690,856
1943	9,396,647	65,447,084,870
1942	1,460,884	6,663,895,947
1941	356,789	1,159,296,000

[1] Estimated. Because of the rapid demobilization following the cessation of hostilities and the large volume of lapses it was impossible to keep the tabulations current and in-force figures consequently were estimated.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE, WORLD WAR II

In support of the national service life insurance program in World War II as against the provisions contained in House bill 1, Eighty-second Congress, it has been pointed out that as of June 1945, approximately 96 percent of all servicemen had insurance coverage averaging $9,500 per person. It is found, however, upon analysis of these figures that they do not give a true picture of the over-all situation as it existed from the beginning to the end of the shooting war.

For example, Army casualty reports as of November 27, 1942, show that 6 percent of the officers and 25 percent of the enlisted men killed in action were without insurance coverage. In another casualty report dated January 20, 1943, it was found that 13.79 percent of the officers and 20.05 percent of the enlisted men were without insurance. Two other reports, both dated April 5, 1943, from different theaters of war, established that all the officers had insurance coverage, but 27 percent of enlisted men were without insurance from one theater, and those with insurance coverage had policies averaging $5,833. In the other theater, 22 percent of the enlisted men had no coverage and those with coverage had policies averaging $7,000. Or, to put it another way, one of nine combat casualties had no life insurance whatsoever and for those covered, the average face value of policies issued from Pearl Harbor day to VJ-day was slightly over $7,000.

The following table shows the percentage of insurance coverage for all persons in the Army and Air Force from August 1942 through December 1945:

Month:	Percent
August 1942	63.6
December 1942	73.4
June 1943	75.7
December 1943	88.7
June 1944	92.8
December 1944	94.6
June 1945	95.6
December 1945	96.2

It was estimated that the ratio for the Navy and the Marine Corps would be approximately the same as for the Army.

PRESENT NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE

It should be pointed out that as of October 31, 1950, there were 5,682,470 national service life insurance policies in force. After making deductions for those now in service, it is estimated that approximately 4,000,000 or 1 in 6 World War II veterans now have national service life insurance coverage.

Based upon Veterans' Administration statistical reports, it has also been estimated that approximately 1 in 14 World War II veterans recalled to active service would have national service life insurance coverage on a permanent plan.

There are no accurate figures available showing the percentage of men now in service covered by national service life insurance or the average amount of insurance held by those who have coverage. However, as of June 30, 1950, a survey by the Army shows the following: that 18 percent of those with dependents serving overseas and 22 percent of those with dependents serving in the United States had no insurance protection. Of those having insurance protection, 54 percent with dependents serving overseas had the full $10,000 coverage and 50 percent of those in the United States had full $10,000 coverage. Thus, it can readily be seen that a rather high percentage of our Armed Forces have no insurance protection and that the average amount of coverage for those who do have insurance is well under $10,000.

EXAMPLE OF OPERATION AND SAVINGS UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE BILL H. R. 1

Section 5 of H. R. 1 provides several advantages to present holders of national service life insurance and I offer the following examples:

ORDINARY LIFE PLAN

If a veteran converted 5-year level premium term insurance at age 25 and paid premiums on $10,000 for a period of 5 years, his cash surrender value at the end of 5 years would be $457.60. After making a cash surrender and he desires to come back into the program at the end of 3 years, he would be required to pay back the $457.60 without interest plus $309.60 required reserve.

Had he stayed in the program, he would have paid $493.20 in premiums over a period of 3 years. By getting out of the program for a period of 3 years and then coming back into the program, he saves $183.60.

TWENTY-PAYMENT LIFE PLAN

Cash surrender value at end of 5 years amounts to $954.90. After taking the cash surrender and the veteran desires to come back into the program, he would be required to repay the $954.90 without interest plus $657.25 required for reserve.

Had he remained in the program, he would have paid $762.20 in premiums over a period of 3 years. By getting out for 3 years and coming back, he saves $106.

If the veteran takes the cash surrender value and decides after serving a period of 3 years that he prefers to take out a new policy at the then attained age, instead of repaying the cash surrender value and the required reserve, the rate follows:

Age 33, ordinary life monthly premiums per $10,000	$16.90
Age 25, ordinary life monthly premiums per $10,000	13.70
Difference	3.20
Age 33, 20-payment life, monthly premiums per $10,000	24.40
Age 25, 20-payment life, monthly premiums per $10,000	21.20
Difference	3.20

In order that the record may be complete on this proposal, I am inserting at this point the report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the provisions of H. R. 1:

[No. 7]

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 22, 1951.

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are attached in further reply to your request dated December 28, 1950, for a report with respect to H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, the views of the Coast and Geodetic Survey thereon, and a letter from the Acting Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

THOS. W. S. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

To: The Secretary of Commerce.
From: Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey.
Subject: H. R. 1.

This is in reply to your request for the views of the Coast and Geodetic Survey with respect to H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey agrees with the underlying principle of the bill that the Government has a responsibility for indemnification for loss of life or disability suffered by members of the uniformed services while on active duty. Because of the small number of Coast and Geodetic Survey officers who will be affected by the bill, we do not believe that we are in a position to make recommendation regarding the plan best suited to meet this responsibility.

This bill provides a gratuitous indemnity to all members of the uniformed services while in active service except that commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Public Health Service are covered only under certain limiting conditions. These limitations, as regards Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel, present difficult problems of administration and constitute an inequity in the case of officers who, because of their value elsewhere, do not happen to be assigned to duty in the specific areas mentioned.

The bill is in accord with the recommendations of the Hook Commission as regards gratuitous indemnity except for the definition of persons in service as set forth in section 2. The Department has previously endorsed the findings of the Hook Commission, that insurance, retirement, and other benefits should be considered a part of the total emolument of members of the uniformed services. The Commission's report included recommendations as to basic pay, allowances, retirement, and severance pay, as well as a gratuitous plan of insurance for all active-duty personnel in the uniformed services, including Coast and Geodetic Survey officers without limitation. The Career Compensation Act of 1949 was a result of this study and provides uniform pay, allowances, and disability retirement for all services. The limitation imposed in section 2 of the bill has the net effect of a reduction in pay. Furthermore, the person so excluded will be forced to buy commercial insurance to provide his dependents the same protection that is given to others free of charge.

Coast and Geodetic Survey officers are commissioned, paid, and retired under the same or similar legislation as that for the Navy. It is believed that the uniformity of emoluments should be continued into the insurance program.

At the time he accepts his commission, a Coast and Geodetic Survey officer voluntarily becomes a member of a corps from which the President, under the act of May 22, 1917, at his discretion and without the officer's consent, may transfer him to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force in time of war or national emergency.

Coast and Geodetic Survey officers lose insurability with commercial companies by reason of their occupation when—

(a) Ordered to duty in foreign countries.

(b) Ordered to duty which requires flights in a capacity other than regular fare-paying passengers in scheduled commercial airplanes.

(c) By virtue of the fact that they are subject to transfer to the Armed Forces, some insurance companies classify our officers as members of those forces or under orders for induction.

Approximately 5 percent of the corps has been or is now on foreign duty. Additional assignments of this type will probably be made in the near future.

Operations in Alaska have been expanded in recent years at the request of the Defense Department. The only available transportation in most of Alaska is the bush plane. Consequently, a large number of our officers are required to make flights which render them uninsurable except at high rates. Nor does this work entitle them to flight pay.

Furthermore, there is no provision of law, except under special conditions, which offers any continuing benefits to the dependents of deceased Coast and Geodetic Survey officers. The gratuity proposed in this bill is a survivor benefit which should accrue to the dependents of all uniformed service personnel without limitation because of rank or assignment of the person in service.

For these reasons it is recommended that the definition of "persons in service" be rewritten to conform with the language of the Career Compensation Act and include all members of all uniformed services while on active duty, and that the term "Armed Forces" be changed to read "uniformed services" wherever it appears in the bill.

If we can be of further assistance, please call upon us.

R. F. A. STUDDS,
Rear Admiral, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
January, 17 1951.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in reply to Mr. Davis' letter of January 15, 1951, enclosing four copies of a proposed report to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on H. R. 1 and H. R. 3, bills to authorize payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1 and 3 would extend gratuitous indemnity protection to the Coast and Geodetic Survey employees under the same conditions as national service life insurance protection is extended by the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 786, Seventy-seventh Congress. While it is true that Public Law 786 provides eligibility only during "the period of the present war" World War II has not been terminated for purposes of this law. Commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are therefore eligible for national service life insurance and would be eligible for indemnity protection under H. R. 1 or 3 if serving outside the continental United States, in Alaska, or (under some circumstances) in the coastal waters of the United States.

Your report recommends that H. R. 1 and 3 be revised to extend their benefits to Coast and Geodetic Survey employees under any and all circumstances. This would mean that an agency which under ordinary circumstances has been considered a civilian agency would for the purposes of these bills be classified as a military agency. It is the view of the Bureau of the Budget that this would represent a basic change in the status of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and therefore should not be considered in the context of H. R. 1 or 3. Moreover, since World War II has not been terminated for the purposes of Public Law 786, Seventy-seventh Congress, it would seem unnecessary to consider such a basic change at this time.

Your attention is also called to the fact that certain of the Coast and Geodetic Survey employees eligible for survivor protection under H. R. 1 or 3, would also be eligible for survivor protection under the terms of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act 1916, as amended. Section 7 of this act provides that any individual entitled to receive gratuitous benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall elect whether to receive such benefits or those provided under other provisions of law. There appears to be some doubt that the benefits provided by H. R. 1 and 3 would be covered by section 7. The Bureau of the Budget is, therefore, recommending that the language in H. R. 1 and 3 be clarified to eliminate any possibility of duplicate benefits in this respect.

While there is no objection to the submission of your report to the committee, it is requested that a copy of this letter be transmitted therewith for the committee's information.

Very truly yours,
DONALD B. MACPHAIL,
Acting Assistant Director, Legislative Reference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], a member of the subcommittee that held the hearings and reported the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, as we apparently race headlong into another world war, due largely to conditions that we have no control over, it becomes necessary that we again look into the proposition of providing a system of insurance for the servicemen who are now being called in large numbers into the service. The system of national service life insurance which came into effect in October 1940 has been criticized very roundly by many people, by some veterans and some veterans' organizations. The Veterans' Administration, charged with the administration of that act, has been roundly criticized from time to time but I say to you as one who has tried to look into this proposition very carefully over a period of the last several months, as one who served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House that held hearings and unanimously reported this bill, that I am convinced that the wonder of it is that the Veterans' Administration has been able to do as well in the administration of the national service life insurance system as they have been able to do. It is generally recognized among commercial insurance companies that a company can actually put insurance on the books too rapidly. They tell us that it costs about $1.10 to $1.15 for each first year premium dollar to put the business on the books. The national service life insurance necessarily has operated in such a way that, beginning in October 1940 with no policies, in a period of about 5 years it wrote some 16,000,000 policies on the servicemen of this country. Immediately following World War II it was faced with the proposition that those policies, along with the demobilization, were dropped very rapidly, with the result that today we have in force only about one out of six of those policies.

The Veterans' Administration has had to operate under extremely difficult conditions. The changing insurance picture, changing needs for personnel to administer the system, and all those things, have made it not only extremely difficult but extremely costly.

I was very much surprised to learn as a result of the hearings we held that if we had had the bill H. R. 1, which we propose here today, in force from October 1940 to June 30, 1949, we could have administered that law at a saving of about $600,000,000 over that period; in other words, had the bill we propose here

today been in effect we would have realized a net saving in the cost of administration of approximately $65,222,000 per year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement, as it bears me out in my efforts in February 1942 to do this very thing. In other words, had the Congress at that time accepted my bill, H. R. 6512, which appears in the RECORD of June 8, 1942, on page 5029, and which was introduced in February of that year, instead of ruling it arbitrarily out of order when it was offered as an amendment to another bill on that day, the taxpayers of this Nation would have been ahead an additional $600,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The administrative problems connected with national service life insurance were so complicated and so heavy during the years we have mentioned that last year the Assistant Administrator for Insurance of the Veterans' Administration declared before the Porter-Hardy subcommittee that it was doubtful whether the system could go through another national emergency and could provide itself with the trained manpower that would be needed to operate the system. Of course, in peacetime, the manpower problem would not be difficult to solve, in itself, if no consideration is given to the cost factors involved. It is in time of national emergencies, in time of world wars that we are faced with the urgent necessity of conserving manpower, man-days and even man-hours.

Since the Assistant Administrator for Insurance made his statement, as we know, an emergency has developed and it now behooves us, as I see it, to try to work out some system which will be practical and will avoid the extreme costs of the present system, costs both in terms of manpower and in terms of dollars.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Was any effort made by your subcommittee to find out whether private insurance companies could take over the contracts which the Veterans' Administration now has with the veterans to provide them that insurance? In other words, I am reluctant to see the Federal Government engaging in insurance business or any other business unless it is absolutely necessary. And I am wondering if your subcommittee went into that field to see if the private companies would not take those contracts without having these costs to the veterans as the situation now is.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman a representative of the commercial companies advised privately that the large insurance companies have considered such a proposal and found it not to be feasible. I am inclined to think that with the shifting situation which exists in connection with the national service life insurance it would be impossible or practically impossible for present contracts to be taken over. I think if we are to improve the system, the improvements will have to be made from here on out, rather than to improve anything that has occurred in the past. Of course we all realize that nothing can be done, and I think there is no desire on the part of anyone, and certainly not on my part to do anything which would in anywise impair any contract of national service life insurance which is outstanding at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, that the insurance companies said they would not and could not take up the existing policies.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Should this bill become law, does it mean that the Government eventually will get out of the life insurance business?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; the Government will largely get out of the life insurance business, but will not get out of that phase which is provided for in this bill where in the event a veteran is unable to procure life insurance, within 90 days after he has finished his service, at standard rates from commercial companies, then he is entitled to continue his insurance under the terms and provisions of this bill under what is commonly known as H insurance or health insurance under the National Service Life Insurance System.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it to be assumed the veteran who cannot buy standard life insurance 90 days after his discharge from the service was not disabled while in the service?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Any veteran who dies within 90 days after discharge is covered by this bill no matter what the cause of his death. After that, at any time a veteran develops a service-connected disability and is uninsurable by commercial standards he may get insurance.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is there any provision providing for the reinstatement of a policy which might have lapsed? I am thinking of the veteran who may let his insurance lapse. Could he be reinstated in any way under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is nothing in this bill which would impair the present right of reinstatement that goes along with every contract of insurance issued under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. It is the same right as exists today for reinstatement or conversion.

Mr. GOLDEN. How long would that exist? How much time is given for him to reinstate his insurance?

Mr. ELLIOTT. As the law now stands he could reinstate it or convert a permanent policy at any time, under certain conditions, as long as he lives. In the case of term insurance the reinstatement must be made before the term expires—that is the law today in which we are making no change. The Congress must continue to extend the 5-year level term premium plan under which these policies are presently being operated for this to be true.

Mr. GOLDEN. Does that only apply to the 5-year term insurance policies in force, or does it extend to those veterans who have let their policies lapse, who have a certain period of time in which they could reinstate them?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They could reinstate them in accordance with the provisions of the contract which lapsed, regardless of the type of national service life insurance contract which lapsed.

Mr. GOLDEN. There is no provision in this act which violates any of the rights of a veteran under the contracts they may have, is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is exactly right, and to be absolutely sure about that, we wrote in section 11, from which I quote:

> Nothing contained in part I or part II of this act shall be construed to cancel or restrict any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of its enactment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In answer to the inquiry by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you said that if a veteran could not get private insurance coverage within 90 days at standard rates, that was an inference that he had a service-connected or non-service-connected military disability. Does the gentleman from Alabama mean to infer that that turn-down would be prima facie evidence which could be used in the veterans' application for a disability pension? I do not think you intended to go quite that far.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I did not. And in clarification of the gentleman's question, I want to read from section 620 of the act:

> SEC. 620. Any person who is released from active service under other than dishonorable conditions on or after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, and is found by the Administrator to be suffering from a disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree which renders such person uninsurable at standard rates for ordinary life insurance, according to recognized underwriting requirements of nongovernmental insurers, shall, upon application in writing and payment of premiums as provided in this act, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force.

Mr. FORD. In other words, if he qualifies in that respect, then he is eligible for this insurance, for those who cannot get coverage under commercial policies?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true the veteran must have a service-connected disability before he is eligible to extend his insurance?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right, although that service-connected disability need not necessarily be 10 percent in degree, that it need not be sufficient in degree to entitle him to compensation benefits under the compensation laws.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Is the 90-day period ample for veterans to apply for this kind of insurance if they cannot get commercial policies?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am inclined to think that 90 days might be sufficient.

However, under the bill as reported by the committee, the veteran may obtain insurance at any time he can show he has a service-connected disability which makes him uninsurable at standard rates by commercial companies.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Did I understand you to say that the veteran has a right to reinstate his present policy or former policy? In other words, I want to know what would happen to a veteran who had a policy and whose policy lapsed and then H. R. 1 becomes law. Would he have a right then to reinstate his former policy?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He certainly would, in complete accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract between him and the national service life-insurance system under the policy which he allowed to lapse or dropped.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. As I understand the gentleman, nothing in this act affects the World War I policy that is now in effect and has been paid up.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BONNER. All of the benefits that are guaranteed under that contract continue?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BONNER. And adjudication of the policy will be carried out by the Veterans' Administration, and no other agency?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct. Likewise, the same is true with respect to policies of national service life insurance issued to veterans of World War II. There is nothing in this act whatsoever that impairs any right which any policyholder now has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman should point out that while there is nothing in this legislation which would impair the right of contract with veterans of World War I and World War II, if part II of the bill is adopted there will be no further issuance of national service life insurance to future veterans.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Except those who are disabled, in accordance with the provision that I have mentioned.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama if any thought was given in the preparation of this legislation to the terms of the new selective or universal military training bill that is now up for consideration by the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Senate? In other words, the thought I am trying to get across is that after their term of 21 months' or 27 months' training they can still be held in the Reserves for another 7 years, making the man available for approximately 10 years. Is there anything in this legislation that when a man comes out of his 27 months' or 21 months' training and his policy is automatically canceled, to continue it while he was in the Reserves?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He would be automatically covered on return to active military service.

Mr. BAILEY. I think we ought to take that into consideration in drafting this legislation. We ought to know what we are running into in this new selective-service requirement.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It seems to me that we solve this problem when we provide coverage for everybody in the armed services.

Mr. BAILEY. I am talking about the Reserves.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia that there was not any contemplated plan for taking care of the Reserves or the National Guard unless the Reserves or the National Guard were called into active service. It does not make any difference how long they are in active service, whether it be a day or a year they are covered while they are on active duty even after they serve their 27 months or whatever length of time it is.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Would they at the expiration of their 27 months of service, or 21 months, as the case may be, cancel that policy and then when he was called from the Reserves back into active duty write a new policy for him?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would not be necessary to write a policy at all. When the soldier left the service his coverage would expire in 90 days. If he were recalled his $10,000 coverage would be automatically reinstated.

Mr. BAILEY. Here is another thing to consider: A man goes into active service at the age of 21 and serves his 21 or 27 months and he serves so long in the Reserves, 6, 8, or 10 years. He is that much older than he was when he entered the service, and the rate of commercial insurance on him would have doubled what it was at age 21. That is another thing that ought to be considered.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is my understanding the person while on active duty is automatically covered under the provisions of this bill. Is that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When he is released to inactive duty the policy terminates, but if he is called back to active duty the policy is revived.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that this bill represents a fundamental change in the matter of the type of insurance provided? You are going to give all indemnity against the hazards of being in the armed services, not as a perquisite such as we gave them in World War II but on a very much different basis.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. While I am not saying we do not have the right to change the policy, yet I say that if we do change it we ought to be clear so that there can be no question left that this is a fundamental change of policy; this is no longer a perquisite that is given to the men for serving in the Armed Forces.

Mr. RANKIN. The coverage is very much broadened and includes the ones who could not take out insurance, men who never had been insured before.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not arguing on the merits of the legislation; I am only pointing out that this does represent a fundamental change in policy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. Under the policy in effect in World War II we never were able to get universal coverage of all the people brought into the Armed Forces. As a matter of fact, after spending years trying to sell insurance to the members of the Armed Forces—and every single unit in the military forces, so far as I know, had at least one officer who was designated as insurance officer as an additional duty, we never did achieve universal coverage. Try hard as we did, we were unable to get more than 95 percent coverage; and that came only in December of 1945.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The gentleman said that if a man were recalled to active duty he would be covered by this insurance.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right; if he is a National Guard man and is recalled for a period of 14 days or longer or a member of the Organized Reserves and is recalled for a period of 30 days or longer, he is covered; and, in addition, he is covered on any military flights in Government planes.

Mr. CLEMENTE. If the reserve converted his insurance to what extent are they covered during the period of suspension, during inactive service? If he converted his insurance to endowment

payments or annuity payments and came back to service would he still be covered?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not sure I understand the gentleman's question but I want to make this statement as a matter of clarification. Any person on and after June 27, 1950, who enters the armed services is covered by this automatic $10,000 indemnity. If he has national service life insurance on the 5-year level term premium plan, he can lapse that and take advantage of the indemnity provided by this act. When his service is over he may renew his national service life insurance coverage. The same thing is true with people who have converted their policies. In addition, it permits a conversion principle which I will try to find here and read to the gentleman right now.

Section 5 provides:

The automatic indemnity coverage authorized by section 2 shall apply to any person in the active service of the named Armed Forces who, upon death in such active service, or within 90 days after separation or release from such active service as prescribed in section 2, is insured against such death under a contract of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance.

Any person in active service, who is insured under a permanent plan of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, may elect to surrender such contract for its cash value. In any such case the person, upon application in writing made within 90 days after separation from active service, may be granted, without medical examination, permanent plan insurance on the same plan not in excess of the amount surrendered for cash, or may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month.

Mr. CLEMENTE. When he is recalled to active duty and has a converted insurance plan, can he continue his insurance?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Absolutely.

Mr. CLEMENTE. And not take this insurance policy at all?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He may completely ignore the plan set forth in H. R. 1 if he deems that to be to his best interest.

Mr. CLEMENTE. A young boy 21 years of age is in the service and is covered by this insurance. His civilian rate at that time would be five-dollars-and-something a month. Suppose he decided he did not want your insurance and wanted to buy it himself so that when he completed his service he would be able to convert his insurance. Could he do that under this bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; this bill does not provide for those people coming into the Armed Forces since June 27, 1950, any insurance after the expiration of 90 days after discharge from the service, except for those so disabled by their service that they cannot obtain commercial insurance at standard rates.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The point is whether he could buy his own insurance now as he enters the service.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman mean from commercial companies?

Mr. CLEMENTE. No; from the VA under the National Service Life Insurance Company.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No, he cannot.

Mr. CLEMENTE. In other words, we are cutting off this right; this bill cuts off that right?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill gives him automatic insurance to the amount of $10,000, which is the limit under any consideration.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. This bill, of course, gives absolutely free to every person who enters the armed services $10,000 of coverage. It gives it to him free rather than charge him $6 or $7 per month as is true under the present system. In addition to that, it has the effect of saving thousands of employees in the Veterans' Administration, and it saves probably fifty to sixty million dollars per year in administrative cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Let us consider the case of a former serviceman who holds, we will say, insurance from World War I and he is called back to active duty for the present emergency. He elects to retain his present World War I insurance. Who will pay the premiums?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He will pay the premiums.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. He will pay the premiums?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If he pays the premiums on his World War I insurance, will he still be covered by the $10,000 gratuitous insurance policy for the present emergency?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He will not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. He cannot have both?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. What about the case of the presently existing term insurance held by veterans of the last war?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They can continue that insurance if they desire to do so, or they can drop it and be covered by the automatic coverage provided by this act; then reinstate 90 days after their discharge from the service.

Mr. ALBERT. I know, but those that do not go back into the service, does this affect their term insurance?

Mr. ELLIOTT. This does not affect them in any manner or means whatsoever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in a position to advise the Members of the House as to the comparative premium rates on policies under this act as compared to the policies under the Veterans' Administration as they are administering it at the present time. What is the premium rate? The statement was made by the chairman of the committee that had it been in operation since 1940 it would have saved $587,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is the testimony of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BAILEY. That leads me to the assumption that the rates under this bill are going to be considerably lower than the rates that the veteran would have to pay now; $5, $6, or $7 a month.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There are no rates.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, there must be. Somebody is paying the insurance.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Well, Uncle Sam is paying out of the Treasury just as he paid for 89 percent of the deaths that grew out of World War II.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand the gratuitous feature of it, but what about the man after he gets his honorable discharge? Can he buy national life insurance from the Government?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He cannot, unless he has a service-connected disability that would prevent him from obtaining commercial insurance at standard rates.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under this bill he cannot?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He cannot.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is no way for him to buy?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Unless he is a veteran of World War I or World War II and has some reinstatement rights under United States Government life insurance or national life insurance.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But a young man going into the service under selective service or who volunteers, would have gratuitous insurance in the armed services, but he cannot buy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Unless he has an injury that will prohibit him from obtaining ordinary life insurance.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. My understanding is that if a veteran of World War II has a policy which has expired or lapsed, he has a right to reinstate or purchase a policy. If this bill passes, would he still have that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He certainly will. He will have the same rights he has now.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama to clarify this thought having been expressed here. This amount is in a total of $10,000. In other words, if a reservist is called back into the service carrying, we will say, $5,000 of national service life insurance, this amount of $10,000 would not be cut in half so that he would be able to carry the $5,000 national service life. He would have to either drop that or he would have to drop it in order to qualify, or his beneficiaries, for the $10,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. If I understand what the gentleman is asking, if he came into the service with $5,000 of national service life insurance, and if he kept that $5,000, then he would have in addition to that $5,000 of the indemnity provided by this act so as to make a total of $10,000, but no more than that total.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, the beneficiaries could not claim any more than the total.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They could not claim any more than $10,000. But, I endeavored to point out to the gentleman that this bill provides that the fruits of this insurance can only be paid to the beneficiary in amounts of $92.90 per month over a period of 120 months, or 10 years, and $92.90 times 120 figures out more than $11,000 that this policy would bring to the beneficiary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is if a reservist is called in for active duty and he is killed on the day he is called in, then his family would receive $10,000 insurance?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right, and that is one provision of this act that is more liberal than the National Service Life Insurance Act. It provides that any person who under orders is called into the service for a period of 30 days or more is covered from the time he becomes in travel status from his home to the station where he reports, whether he be a Reserve or a National Guardman or a selectee under the Selective Service System Act of 1948. He would still be covered in the event of duty. This would cover those who were killed in the Pennsylvania train wreck and those members of the Tennessee Air Guard killed at Myrtle Beach, S. C.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And this will go on all through the years, not just at this time?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, last December 18, only about a month ago, this House passed without a dissenting vote H. R. 9911, which provided a gratuitous indemnity of $10,000 for all members of the Armed Forces. Unfortunately, the Senate took no action upon the measure, and it died with the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress.

The bill we are considering today, H. R. 1, is similar in most of its details to the former measure. A few changes have been made, but the only alterations are of a perfecting nature.

For the benefit of those Members of Congress who were not here when the measure was under consideration in December, I will review the provisions of the bill. It provides that on and after June 27, 1950, each and every person in the Armed Forces is insured against death in the amount of $10,000 without cost to the person. This, naturally, would cover all of those who have been killed in the Korean conflict, as well as those National Guard men who died in the tragic train wreck, and those who died later in the airplane disaster.

Protection covers the period from order for induction into active service and for 90 days after separation from service.

If a person is disabled in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable at standard commercial rates, he may obtain national service life insurance after his separation from service, and if his disability is permanent and total, waiver of premiums may be granted.

After enactment of this measure, entrance into United States Government life insurance and the national service life insurance program is barred. However, any person in the active service having one of these policies may continue it in force or if he has surrendered a permanent-plan policy for cash, he may reinstate it or be granted a new policy on the same plan and in the same amount without a showing of good health.

Beneficiaries are limited to the surviving spouse, child, or children—including a stepchild, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured—parent—including a stepparent, parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured—brother, or sister of the insured.

Maximum indemnity of $10,000 with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum is payable in 120 monthly installments. This makes the monthly installment $92.90. The total payable under this plan amounts to $11,148 over the 10-year period.

This indemnity is exempt from the claims of creditors and from taxation.

This proposal for gratuitous indemnity stems from a resolution passed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs last May. At that time a subcommittee had completed rather extensive hearings on amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act and it resolved that the staff of the committee should conduct an investigation during the recess of Congress of the possibilities of a new insurance law to take the place of the present National Service Life Insurance Act, but not to alter contracts that are presently in existence.

Pursuant to this resolution, the staff conducted a number of meetings with representatives of the four veterans' organizations chartered by act of Congress, the Veterans' Administration, Department of Defense, General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget.

As a result of these meetings, several bills were prepared for consideration by a special subcommittee on insurance, which conducted extensive open hearings, beginning November 23, 1950. All proposals were given minute consideration and finally the bill we have before us today was reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs without a dissenting vote.

That there is a great need for gratuitous indemnity is obvious, but I would like to present to my colleagues one or two salient facts concerning insurance during World War II. With the enactment of the measure under consideration we hope to eliminate such discrepancies.

As many of you know, who were in the Armed Forces during World War II, a great drive was made in every echelon of our services to bring service men and women under the protection of our Government insurance laws. Especial emphasis was made to insure those who were serving in combat areas. However, despite the careful screening and broad propaganda measures used to sell Government insurance to all who were in danger, Army casualty reports as of November 27, 1942, show that 6 percent of the officers and 25 percent of the enlisted men killed in action were without insurance coverage. In another casualty report, dated January 20, 1943, it was found that 12.79 percent of the officers and 20.05 percent of the enlisted men were without insurance. Two other reports, both dated April 5, 1943, from different theaters of war, established that all of the officers had insurance coverage, but 27 percent of the enlisted men were without insurance from one theater and those with insurance coverage had policies averaging only $5,833. In another theater, 22 percent of the enlisted men had no coverage and those with coverage had policies averaging $7,000. Or, to put it another way, one out of nine combat casualties had no life insurance whatsoever and for those covered, the average face value of policies issued from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day was slightly over $7,000.

The bill we have before us today covers every man who enters the Armed Forces and it covers him or her equally. All of us have had distressing experiences with those cases where men were killed without insurance or with too little insurance. That would not happen under this measure.

The fact that everyone would be covered equally is, to my mind, the primary reason for the enactment of this legislation. There are other compelling reasons for the passage of the bill. Testimony during our hearings, and during hearings on a similar subject before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, developed that had this legislation been in effect during the period 1940–49, the cost to the Government would have been reduced by approximately $587,000,000. Aside from the tremendous saving in money, the great reduction in the number of personnel necessary to carry out the program is important. Undoubtedly, if the conflict in Korea continues at its present pace or if it develops into a world war III, every saving in manpower we can make must be made.

As I stated when we passed the bill last December, it is not a perfect bill, and I doubt that we can ever enact a measure that would be perfect, but it is, in my opinion, the proper approach to a problem that we must solve. I have long favored gratuitous indemnity for our fighting men and everyone will agree with me that there is an imperative need at this time for the enactment of this legislation.

In talking with my colleagues about the proposal, several of them expressed the hope that the bill could be amended so that the dependents of a deceased

serviceman could obtain a small lump-sum payment immediately after death. The committee had such a proposal under consideration, but decided eventually that such a clause was unnecessary, in view of the 6-month gratuity paid to the dependents of each deceased person in the Armed Forces. Under the existing pay tables, the amount of this gratuity runs from more than $500 for a private to more than $6,000 for high-ranking officers. In the enlisted branch, payments run from $576 to $1,429, according to rank. This immediate payment was deemed sufficient to take care of any emergency need caused by the death of the serviceman.

Testimony before the committee developed that all of the services have a standard casualty form which is in every man's jacket, and every man throughout the service has a standard pay card, and either one of those could be adapted so that there would be no need for the Veterans' Administration to keep any file on who was going to get the insurance until such time as a man died.

Administrative procedures would be simplified materially. Instead of having a file of 26,000,000 insurance cases, as happened in World War II, the Veterans' Administration would not make up a file until such time as it was notified that the man had died. Then its function would be to pay the 120 installments to the dependents who had been certified by the Department of Defense.

I hope that the House will pass this bill today. The need for it is great. Our casualties in Korea are appalling and we have a moral duty to care for the dependents of these men who were told to fight for the United Nations.

Our committee has labored long and well upon the technicalities of the subject. It is not easy to enact legislation that will please all, but I believe this bill is the proper approach to the existing problem, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring out again one point that I think has not ben brought too clearly: that the maximum indemnity of $10,000, with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum, is payable in 120 monthly installments. This makes the monthly installment $92.90. The total payment under this plan is $11,148 over the 10-year period, so it gives the recipients an additional $1,000 or more, which is very helpful.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, as has already been stated, the bill H. R. 1 provides a gratuitous indemnity in the sum of $10,000 to the survivors of all members of the Armed Forces killed while on active duty on and after June 27, 1950, without any cost to the servicemen.

Before going into the provisions of this bill, let me say to my colleagues that I have always favored this type of insurance for the men and women in the armed services. I only wish this sort of legislation had been on the statute books during World War I and World War II. We have been advised that if this type of legislation had been on the statute books, particularly as reported in a bill sponsored by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], we would have saved the taxpayers of the country somewhere between $585,000,000 and $1,000,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, that would have been the saving in World War II. If this law had been in effect from the beginning of World War I down to the present time the Government probably would have saved billions of dollars in administration costs.

Mr. KEARNEY. I thank the gentleman.

The bill comes to the House as a result of a rule granted by the Rules Committee after a hearing held last Friday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is practically the same as passed the House on December 18, 1950, then known as H. R. 9911.

Weeks of intensive hearings were conducted by a subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans and the AMVETS have all heartily endorsed the bill and have asked for its speedy enactment into law. I cannot let this occasion go by without complimenting the members of the subcommittee for a job well done.

In addition to providing a gratuitous indemnity in the sum of $10,000 to the survivors of those killed on and after June 27, 1950, it provides protection for the individual for a period of 90 days after his release from active duty in order to permit a readjustment to civilian life and determine the sort of commercial insurance he wishes to obtain.

To go on with the provisions of the bill, the beneficiaries are limited to the immediate family of the serviceman and the indemnity is paid over a 10-year period in monthly installments of $92.90, with interest at 2¼ percent.

Veterans of World War I or World War II may maintain their insurance if they are recalled to active duty, or they may avail themselves of the gratuitous insurance. Those who have the permanent insurance may surrender the policies for cash and reinstate them at a future date with a saving to the individual. This applies to reinstatement of term insurance also.

The provisions of this bill do bar the individual from taking out national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, but anyone having either of these policies may reinstate them, if lapsed, in the manner now followed where the policy has lapsed.

The provisions of this bill cover such tragedies as the railroad wreck on September 11, 1950, when National Guard men of the Pennsylvania National Guard were bound for Camp Atterbury, Ind. These lads had just gone into the Federal service and had no opportunity to file any application before they were processed into the Federal service. These men gave their lives for their country, were on active duty, and were killed as though they were in Korea. It is just that the families of these men should be protected.

Mr. Chairman, some members have asked if this is, in effect, a substitute for the national service life insurance program we had during World War II. My answer is that it is. It is a step toward taking the Government out of permanent life insurance business and, while protecting members of the armed services while on active duty, will save millions of dollars to the Government. The Bureau of the Budget has indicated its approval of the legislation under discussion. I want it understood that by the provisions of this bill, any individual so disabled as not to be able to obtain insurance from commercial life insurance companies can, if he had national service life insurance in the past, reinstate it, or if he did not, he will be permitted to take out Government insurance. If in addition he is totally disabled as a result of service he may obtain this insurance and the premium will be waived.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also covers National Guard men while on 2 weeks' active service during the summer months of field training—aviation pilots flying a few hours a week or a month—aviation cadets on active duty.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I will say to the House that this bill was reported from committee by a unanimous vote and I believe it to be a constructive piece of legislation and should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the information I am about to give to the House will be interesting if not revealing. During World War I, when the members of the Armed Forces totaled 4,500,000, the number of war-risk insurance policies, at its peak, was only 660,000. In World War II there were approximately 16,000,000 national service life insurance policies in effect, and from 1945 to 1946 over 9,000,000 of those policies were dropped by the individual. Today there are approximately 5,500,000 policies in effect. These figures are somewhat startling; are they not? The beneficiaries are limited to the immediate family of the serviceman, and the indemnity is paid over a 10-year period, as has already been explained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is one thing that troubles me, and that is whether the subcommittee looked into the question of whether a man who is brought into the Armed Forces is thereby deprived of the opportunity at that point of getting standard insurance from a civilian company, and whether or not, therefore, he should be protected for the difference between the premium rate at the age when he was called into the service, and the premium rate at the age when he was discharged from the service.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was not on the subcommittee, I will say to the gentleman from New York. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] if he has any knowledge of that.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may repeat the question, then. Assuming that a man was called into the service and cannot

at that point get commercial insurance or regular civilian insurance. Was there any thought given to protecting him as to the premium rate which would be effective as of his age when he was called into the service and higher premium rate effective at his age when he is discharged? In other words, he would have to seek insurance when he was discharged. Was any thought or any consideration given to that problem?

Mr. KEARNEY. No consideration was given to that.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Under the present program of the national insurance, is it not true that after his 5 years is up, then he goes in at his present age? When he renews his policy he has to renew it at his present age? Am I right in that assumption?

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean if you are carrying the 5-year term?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes; that is so.

Mr. POTTER. So, so far as the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is concerned, it would have no effect, as far as term insurance is concerned?

Mr. KEARNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Was any consideration given to the question of giving the man an opportunity to pay for his own insurance so that he could use it when he came out?

Mr. KEARNEY. Not under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I, too, as a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill, urge the Members of the House to support this legislation.

It should be made clear here, and there is seemingly some question about it, that this is a new approach. It substitutes the principle of indemnity for the system of premium-paying insurance. I think every member of the subcommittee, every member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, was completely aware of that change of approach. We realized exactly what we were doing in bringing this measure to the floor.

There are several advantages to that new approach, to the new system of indemnity coverage that would be granted to every serviceman when he went on active duty. Three major advantages can be summarized as follows:

First. It gives more adequate coverage to the man in the service.

Second. It will result in the elimination of a tremendous administrative overhead.

Third. The net cost to the taxpayers of this country will be less.

Taking those three things into consideration, any drawbacks that might be mentioned—and there have been a number of good questions asked about it—certainly fade into insignificance in view of the advantages that will be obtained under this program.

Briefly, I think we might go into those three advantages, as I see them, for just a minute.

First, more adequate coverage: I do not think there is a Member on this floor today who has not been bothered—perhaps that is not quite the correct word—but who has not had a number of veterans in his district who have had their insuranee papers fouled up. The beneficiaries of other people have had to wait for months in an attempt to get some of these things untangled. This bill does away with all of that. It simply says to a man, "We are not going to try to write out anything and give you a policy. You are automatically covered. These are the people who are the beneficiaries of that kind of indemnity that you get." There is not any heavy overhead. We simply certify that this man has lost his life while in the service and the beneficiaries are entitled automatically to get that money.

Not only a great number of bookkeeping transactions that we now have, and the fact that those records have been inadequately kept, but often have been lost—that in itself is a substantial advantage of this new kind of program.

That hints at the second advantage; that is, the elimination of the tremendous amount of administrative overhead. During World War II the Veterans' Administration had some 26,000,000 files on various men who had been in the service at one time or another. If this legislation had been in effect there would have been about 400,000—less than a half million. In other words, about one-fiftieth the number of files would have been required if we had had this legislation in effect.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. It also protects the individual, does it not, who, under some circumstances, might not even take out any insurance while in the service? So automatically he is protected or his beneficiaries are, or his heirs, up to $10,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is an important point. It should be brought out that the Government is stepping in here to protect the beneficiaries, the dear ones, of a man who has shown himself so irresponsible as to not want to take out the kind of insurance that he could under the present program.

This cutting down of bookkeeping work will make possible a substantial reduction in existing personnel besides forestalling the great number of additional personnel that would have to be hired if the present program were to be used with the great number of additional servicemen who are now being called to the colors. We already have in excess of 2,000,000 civilian employees in the Government, and I think that anything that can reduce it substantially ought to appeal to everyone in this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And is it not true that a good many of the veterans have lost their insurance because they let it lapse? Under this bill they will, of course, be covered.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That did happen in many cases. In a period of all-out mobilization, or even in the present emergency that we now have there always exists a shortage of qualified manpower. Here we have another example where we simply would not be able to do the job in an efficient manner if the present program were to be continued. This bill permits the doing of a better job for the serviceman with a whole lot less personnel. For instance, during 1944 and 1945, the two big years of the war effort in World War II, the Army and the Air Force alone found it necessary to allocate 7,000 man-years during 1944, and over 8,000 man-years during 1945 simply to do the paper work in connection with the national service life-insurance program. That is over and above the thousands of man-years that were necessary in the Veterans' Administration to continue that program. This in spite of the diversion of this manpower from the necessary war effort.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that, according to the Comptroller General, had this law been in effect during the recent war we would have saved $587,000,000 in administrative expenses. That would have been enough to pay $10,000 apiece to 58,700 men, or more men than we have lost, both killed and wounded, in this Asiatic conflict.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As I understood it, Mr. Chairman, it was not only the saving of that amount of administrative expense; it was a net saving to the taxpayers of this country on payments made during that period.

Mr. RANKIN. A net saving of that amount, enough to have taken care of all the men who have been killed, wounded, or injured in this Korean "police action."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think it is any wonder that Mr. Harold Breining, the Assistant Administrator for Veterans' Insurance, when he testified before the Hardy subcommittee, stated that it would be an almost impossible task to try to administer a national service life insurance program if we had another period of complete mobilization. In the testimony the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] asked him this question:

> In the event we have another war, would we not be able to use the present national service insurance legislation?

Mr. Breining's answer was: "I think from a manpower standpoint it would be unsatisfactory."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand this legislation, if it is enacted into law the benefits will begin on June 25, 1950?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. June 27, 1950.

Mr. STEFAN. It will expire after the man's service, plus 90 days.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is when his indemnity coverage expires; that is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. If this legislation is enacted into law when will we stop writing national service life insurance policies?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We will stop writing any new national service policies as of the day this law becomes effective. There will, of course, continue to be men who now have national service life insurance policies or who are entitled to reinstatement of such policies who would continue to have their national service life insurance just as they have it today.

Mr. STEFAN. Those who want to convert——

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Or those who have converted.

Mr. STEFAN. Or those who cannot secure commercial life insurance policies, will they be able to receive a national life insurance policy?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They would have what is known as H insurance, those men whose insurability has been reduced, but they would also have, if I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska, the right of present term policyholders to reinstate that policy. That is the right they had when they took out the original contract.

Mr. STEFAN. But new national life insurance will not be written after the enactment of this law?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes, that is right.

Mr. STEFAN. What will happen to the 9,000,000 policies that were dropped in 1945 or 1946 as explained by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] a little while ago, some dropped because they could not pay; could they reinstate under this legislation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes, they have a contractual right to do that. We are not affecting their present national life insurance policy at all.

Mr. STEFAN. They could reinstate?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They could reinstate.

Mr. STEFAN. When it is stated that this takes the place of a national life insurance policy, it only takes place in those cases where new policies are required?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let us say where a new policy would otherwise be written, because there is not any policy under this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. There would be some additional national life insurance policies written where they are converting or where they have made a conversion, where they have shown they cannot get regular commercial life insurance policies?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice in the bill that we have taken all kinds of services, including the Coast Guard and Public Health officers and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which automatically goes into the Navy when there is a crisis or war. Reference is made to the commissioned officers. What happens to the men?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They will be covered under this.

Mr. STEFAN. It does not say so. It only says "commissioned officers of the Public Health Service while entitled to full military benefits as provided in section 212 (a) of the act of July 1, 1944; and commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey while assigned to duty during a period of war or an emergency." It says nothing about the men who man the ships.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I did not quite get all of the gentleman's question but if I understood correctly what I did hear, there are no noncommissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and there are no privates. They are all officers.

Mr. STEFAN. There are commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but they have large crews. What happens to the men who man the ships?

Mr. KEARNEY. We were definitely advised there are no noncommissioned officers, no warrant officers, or no privates in that organization.

Mr. STEFAN. Who mans the ships? There is a crew, is there not?

Mr. KEARNEY. For instance, the merchant marine does not come under this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. The Coast and Geodetic Survey does. I am just looking for information.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. It is my understanding those ships are manned in time of war by the Coast Guard personnel and that officers are the only employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey at sea. The Navy and Coast Guard furnish the personnel.

Mr. STEFAN. I see.

Mr. KEARNEY. They would come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. The merchant marine is not covered?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No.

The third advantage of this proposal is the one which has been mentioned here several times and which I want to reiterate. That is, the cost would be less, and I refer to the total over-all cost. I think it should be made clear here, in order to understand, that if a man under the present program is killed while on military duty, the money to pay his beneficiary does not come out of the national life insurance fund. There has been considerable misunderstanding about that. That money today comes out of the general fund of the Treasury, and it would under the program which we are recommending here today. So that perhaps explains to many Members who would question the fact that the cost would be less. Actually a great deal of that money is being paid for by the taxpayers now. This gets rid of a lot of administrative costs, and adds a few more, not a great many more, whose beneficiaries would be paid out of the general fund. I think we can appreciate the administrative cost of the present program when we realize that the administrative cost for other than the armed services, which would be the Veterans' Administration, the Treasury, and so forth, ran in the neighborhood of $600,000,000 during World War II, and that the armed services spent over $100,000,000; that there was $31,000,000 paid in premiums for the aviation cadets.

Now, there has been some objection raised to this bill by those who object because it does not permit all persons who now start to serve in the Armed Forces to continue some form of Government insurance after discharge. Well, this bill has so many advantages that that one objection, if it be an objection, certainly ought not to carry any weight here. For my part I cannot see any more reason for a subsidized insurance program for an able-bodied veteran than I can see for the Government to sell him his groceries and his clothing or any other commodity that he may need under a method which compels the Government to pay the administrative cost thereof.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Under section 620 of the bill, if anyone is injured in the armed services and therefore is not insurable on regular rates, he may still have Government insurance; is that not right?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. HAND. Would that be under the National Insurance Corporation now set up?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes; that will be handled as it is at the present time. It is not interfered with at all.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman, this bill would provide indemnity coverage for the men who wear the uniform of our country. It would get the Government out of the insurance business in times of peace; it would get rid of a great deal of administrative overhead that is not necessary and, thirdly, it would save the taxpayers of this country some money. I think there are overwhelming reasons why this House should pass this bill unanimously today, just as it did in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the subcommittee upon their very remarkable work in bringing this bill to the main committee and the chairman of the committee and members of the committee for reporting it. I do not think any committee ever worked

any harder over a bill than the subcommittee, with the staff of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the veterans' organizations, too. They have done a remarkable piece of work.

There is one thing I would like to bring out that I think some of the Members perhaps have forgotten, and that is that a man, a soldier, upon being separated from the service, receives a gratuity in the form of 6 months' pay. The amount of this gratuity runs from $500 for a private to more than $6,000 for the high ranking officers. In the enlisted branch it will run from $576 to $1,429, according to rank. This immediate payment, while not sufficient to take care of any emergency that was caused by the death of a serviceman, will be a great help. Some of the Members wish that a lump-sum payment of $1,000 or $2,000 could be given to the widow or the child of a beneficiary and I agree with those Members, but the committee decided that this amount would suffice.

If a lump-sum payment should be given, I think the other body will take care of it. Also I am under the impression that perhaps the other body will take care of allowing the man to take out Government life insurance after 90 days and I hope it will. I do not believe the bill could be amended on the floor without great confusion, even if the Members should want to amend it and at the moment the primary consideration is to pass the gratuitous insurance provision.

Mr. KEARNEY. If the gentlewoman will yield, in addition to what has already been spoken of here by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the widow, for instance, of the soldier, sailor, or marine, is also entitled to a widow's pension.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; that is absolutely true. Of course, that pension does not start immediately, and the widow or the orphans would need that money at once.

Mr. Chairman I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, in any debate upon such a bill as this, which provides for a gratuitous indemnity for all members of the Armed Forces, I think it is most important to get to the salient features of the bill. As has been said, I think there are possibly two important ones. The one with reference to the gratuitous indemnity has already been discussed at quite some length. The second feature of this bill, and it seems to me certainly one that is just as important as the first one, is that after the veteran is separated from service the Government is out of the life-insurance business.

I know there are many here who have served in the Armed Forces, as I have, who may be asking why we should take the United States Government out of the insurance business for veterans. Much has been said here about the fact that there could have been saved over a half billion dollars if this bill had been in effect during the past 10 years. I should like to give a couple of examples which I think are pertinent to show the extreme administrative costs that have been incurred in the past 30 years.

I made a survey on my own and found that to service a definite number of policies in one standard life insurance company, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., it would take, according to their figures, 343 people; but I found that in the Veterans' Administration to service the same number of policies it took 1,560 people. This alone, I think, gives you some idea of the inefficiency when Government takes over a business in which it is not an expert in that particular field.

I wanted to find out what it would cost to service a policy upon myself, having been a veteran beginning 8 years ago.

I find that a man of my age who went into the service at 32 paid $7.80 a month. I am still paying the same figure. If I included the refunds which I have received from the Veterans' Administration since 1942, I have paid approximately $5.50 per month. Gentlemen, that same term life insurance policy in an old-line company today costs approximately $13 per thousand at my age. I think you can see that the Government is operating at a dead loss of approximately 58 percent for national life insurance policies issued to men at my age, which is 41 years.

Let me give you just one more example of what inefficiency in this kind of a program can amount to. At one time in the thirties the Pension Bureau of the Veterans' Administration was paying out approximately $4,000,000 a year. The cost to the Bureau to administer that program was approximately $3,000,000. This is, indeed, to me, a new Member, a sad picture of what the cost of administering this type of thing was before World War II.

To me this bill accomplishes two purposes. First, it will indemnify dependent survivors of every veteran killed from June 27, 1950. Second, it will take the United States Government out of the life-insurance business for veterans after they are separated from the service. At that period the obligation of the United States Government is definitely ended insofar as insurance is concerned.

I do not believe the Members of this body want a program which could extend, like the veterans' pension program of the Mexican War of 1848, for another 100 years.

It is my understanding this bill has the endorsement of three of the four major veterans' organizations. It has the endorsement of the National Association of Life Insurance Underwriters, and although there were commercial insurance representatives present, they did not commit themselves upon the program. However, I think it is safe to say that a large segment of this business favors the gratuitous approach and believe it would be advantageous to the servicemen and to the country.

Last, as a new member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I was most impressed by the thoroughness with which this whole bill was studied. I believe that the committee has done about the best job that could have been done in reporting this bill to the House. I believe it is fair to the members of the Armed Forces. As one who spent 41 months in the service, I think I got the approach of the enlisted man and the officer to this particular problem. I believe, from experience over a long period of years, you will find in your own district that this will be well received. It is an adaptable program, which is workable, and it is the most economical plan that could be provided for the servicemen.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering here today is substantially the same measure as was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress and passed by unanimous consent on the floor of the House at that time. It has been again favorably reported as was well pointed out. I think in view of the Korean situation it is very important that this constitute a part of the initial legislation of this new Congress. I have supported this measure both in committee and on the floor of the House. It has already been pointed out as to what the bill provides. It provides $10,000 indemnity coverage for all men called into the service. The bill is made retroactive to June 27, 1950, and covers the National Guard men who were killed in the train crash in Ohio last summer, and also the Tennessee guardsmen who were killed in an airplane crash while returning from maneuvers in South Carolina. There are other excellent features of the bill, including the monthly installment payment of $92.90 per month over a period of 10 years. The bill also restricts payments to members of the serviceman's family. The measure exempts the indemnity from claims of creditors and from taxation. All of these features of the bill are meritorious and beneficial and commend it for passage.

However, as has been pointed out, a new policy is injected into the bill with respect to part II of the bill. The position of the American Legion has not been made known heretofore with respect to this legislation. It has been said several times that two or three of the major veterans' organizations favor it, but we have here the testimony of representatives of the American Legion with respect to the measure. In brief, I might quote them as follows.

In testimony before the committee on this bill, T. O. Krable, chairman of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion said:

> We cannot be a party to any abridgment of the benefits and provisions that have been made by the Government to both veterans of World War I and World War II. The American Legion strongly urges that provision be made that veterans be permitted to continue their national service life insurance after separation.

Certainly the right of the veteran to obtain national service life insurance should be preserved and the right to existing benefits continued, all considerations of service being taken into account. The American Legion adopted a resolu-

tion at Indianapolis on November 19, last, reading, in part, as follows:

The American Legion reaffirms its stand that national service life insurance and United States Government insurance contracts and trust funds established heretofore should be preserved, and that an opportunity to obtain national service life insurance should be continued for members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk which would permit a man, after being discharged, to apply for national service life insurance if he cares to do so. The argument has been made that such a provision would continue the Government in the insurance business. Let me say that the Government is going to continue in the insurance business for a long time to come, regardless of the action we take here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. May I just finish this statement first, and then I will be glad to yield.

The information I have been able to obtain is that only one out of seven ex-servicemen have continued their national service life insurance after discharge. That is, as of now, only 10 percent of the veterans of World War I have continued their national service life insurance, and only 25 percent of the veterans of World War II have continued their insurance. So the number is not great, but those who wish to contract for Government life insurance should be permitted to do so after discharge. My amendment would permit this.

Here are some of the reasons why it should be done: Because it is a right that was given to veterans of World War I and extended to veterans of World War II. But to veterans of the Korean War we would deny them the right to have national service life insurance. Those men who are fighting today will probably be 2, 5, or 10 years older after the war, by which time the commercial insurance rates for them will have been enhanced. We do not know how long the emergency will continue. Commercial rates to some of our veterans might have become prohibitive by the end of the emergency and during the time they are in service. Disabilities might have been incurred which, although not recognized by the Veterans' Administration, might be recognized by commercial insurance companies, and a veteran thereby might be denied the right to take out insurance after discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. EVINS. I am wholeheartedly and strongly in favor of the automatic coverage feature of this bill and am, of course, supporting the legislation, but I feel my amendment would improve and perfect the legislation by permitting the continuance of national service life insurance after discharge. Let us not say in effect to our future veteran that "After you are released from the service we will forget all about your service;" but rather let us say that a grateful Nation appreciates the service and sacrifice of our men of arms. Let us say that America will not forget. Let us perfect this legislation and let us pass it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has mentioned certain coverage. Would it cover a case of this kind? A plane from the Philippines to Okinawa went into the mountains on December 19. The plane went down and some army personnel were killed. Would this bill cover a case of that kind?

Mr. EVINS. If the accident occurred after June 27, 1950, and if it were incident to call or maneuvers it would cover such an accident.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentlewoman. I hope that the amendment which will be offered later may have the favorable consideration of the House.

The argument was made, as was pointed out, that this bill will take the Veterans' Administration out of the insurance business. May I say that it is going to be necessary for the Government to continue in the insurance business for the next 50 years because of existing contracts.

It has been further insisted that the bill will effect a savings in manpower. To the extent that the measure does so, I applaud the action taken. However, the manpower requirements of the bill will take effect largely after the war is over and history and experience of veterans' insurance show that only about one out of seven ex-servicemen continue their insurance and the manpower argument is not persuasive. As I say, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. If it is not adopted here, I feel sure I can predict that it will be adopted in the other body.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. In World Wars I and II men had no coverage unless they paid for it. Is not that correct?

Mr. EVINS. That is quite true.

Mr. MORTON. So the enlisted man gets the benefit of this indemnity even though he is not permitted under the terms of the bill before us to get in on the national service life insurance program.

Mr. EVINS. Not on the national life insurance program for that is, in effect, discontinued, but he is given war service insurance coverage. After serving a period of four, five, or more years, and after discharge the veteran may find the commercial insurance rates so high as to be prohibitive.

Mr. MORTON. We can deal with that when that question comes up.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has pointed to the crux of this bill, the question of insurance coverage after a man has been honorably discharged and released from the service. Our future veterans should be entitled to apply for national service life insurance on the same basis as veterans of World Wars I and II.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee whether he has submitted this amendment to the committee and whether it was considered there? And, if so, what was the result?

Mr. EVINS. This amendment was not considered by the committee. The bill was reported out the first day that the committee met when the committee was organized, and the amendment was not considered. But I will say to the gentleman that it has had very careful consideration in its draftsmanship.

Mr. RANKIN. Why does not the gentleman from Tennessee tell the House that he did not bring this amendment before the committee, and that he seconded the motion to report the bill out as it is?

Mr. EVINS. I not only seconded the motion to report the bill but I have consistently supported this measure. I think the bill is a good bill but that we could improve upon it by adoption of the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. RANKIN. Another point I would like to make for the benefit of the Members is that in previous wars the serviceman did not have the benefit of this automatic insurance.

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman that representatives of the American Legion not only made Legion position clear in testimony before the subcommittee but also sent to me a statement of its position on this issue and this statement was passed around by me to members of the committee but was not acted upon.

What action we take here today may well determine the economic security of untold thousands of families of veterans in the future. Under unanimous consent I ask that letters and telegrams in relation to this matter be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1951.

Re H. R. 1.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: It is my understanding the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will meet Tuesday morning, January 16, to consider what action shall be taken on H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment of a gratuitous indemnity in the amount of $10,000 to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, retroactive to June 27, 1950.

As legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States I am pleased to advise that our organization is in full accord with this bill and we strongly urge early and favorable action by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in reporting the bill to the House.

Representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have followed closely the lengthy hearings on all phases of insurance coverage for service personnel, first, in the subcommittee of the House Committee on Executive Expenditures and,

secondly, in the study and hearings by the staff and subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is our considered judgment that the gratuitous indemnity approach is the sound and reasonable method to protect the survivors of active service personnel who are killed or may die in the service.

In view of the lengthy hearings which were held on the insurance question during the Eighty-first Congress and the fact that H. R. 1 is almost identical with H. R. 9911 which was reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee and approved by the House of Representatives in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress, may I respectfully suggest that H. R. 1 be reported without the necessity of lengthy and formal hearings. It is quite likely that hearings will be held on the Senate side and I can see no valid reason for the House to duplicate the lengthy and voluminous work which was done in the Eighty-first Congress.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1951.*

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives:

Disabled American Veterans endorses H. R. 1 and would appreciate your support of measure. Extensive hearings were held in Eighty-first Congress on similar proposal and these printed hearings available Veterans' Affairs Committee room. Anything you may do toward obtaining favorable report of H. R. 1 will be appreciated by DAV.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1951.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: In keeping with your telephone conversations this morning with Mr. T. C. Kraabel and myself relative to H. R. 1, I enclose several copies of a brief analysis showing our position in connection with this bill.

We are sending the extra copies to you so that you may have them available in the event you wish to distribute them to the other members of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

Thanking you for your courtesy in the matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

COMMENTS ON H. R. 1, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1951.

We respectfully submit the following views of the American Legion as to this legislation:

1. We agree that there should be an automatic-insurance protection for the members of the Armed Forces in active service from June 27, 1950.

2. We believe the extension of this protection can best be accomplished under the formula already established by Congress in its amendment to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by the act of December 20, 1941. If this were done there would be protection from the beginning of hostilities, viz, June 27, 1950, up to 120 days after the enactment of an amendment to that effect.

3. We agree this automatic protection should be in the amount of $10,000 and that no dependency of the parent should be required. As to definitions of persons entitled, we believe that the rules established under existing law should govern.

4. Our principal objection to H. R. 1 is the revolutionary change that is proposed in that the right of servicemen and veterans of the present hostilities to contract for insurance in service and after separation would be taken away from them. True, the bill provides for those suffering from disablements incurred in service to take out insurance, but we submit that such an arrangement is fraught with unknown expense and difficulties in that service connection for disabilities is not established in thousands of cases until years after separation from service. If the committee is intent upon adoption of the life indemnity provisions of the bill, then the American Legion strongly urges that provision be made for veterans to obtain contract national service life insurance after separation, whether or not disabled.

5. The American Legion must vigorously object to any benefit being withdrawn from veterans which they now have. The right of persons to obtain new United States Government life insurance or new national service life insurance should not be impaired, providing they had the requisite service, either in World War I or World War II.

T. O. KRAABEL,
Director.

CHARLES W. STEVENS,
Assistant Director.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is to be commended for this very constructive piece of legislation.

Most of us, I think, when we reach our first reaction on this legislation find it difficult to realize that we can provide a gratuitous indemnity at less cost to the Government than was the case when a premium was charged for insurance policies; nevertheless, that is the fact. There seems to be some question as to the amount of savings that will be effected; the estimates run all the way from $450,000,000 over a 10-year period to over a billion. I am inclined to go along with the estimate of the General Accounting Office of $587,000,000. I think that is conservative and that perhaps the savings may actually be somewhat more than that, while at the same time there is general coverage for all of the men in the services rather than purely for those who elect to pay premiums.

I want to talk about another phase of this matter this afternoon. I was in a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services considering a revision of the selective service law under which we are proposing to induct men below the age of 19. We are forced to that position because of the critical manpower shortage. A great deal has been said about the administrative cost to the Veterans' Administration, but I have not heard much said about what it costs the armed services for their participation in the national service life insurance program. I have not heard a great deal said about the military personnel whose time is consumed in explaining national service life insurance to the personnel of the services. I call attention of the Committee to the fact that in 1945 in the Army and Air Force alone more than 8,000 man-years of military personnel were employed in connection with national service life insurance.

As our Military Establishment increases in size—I do not know what is being required at the present time—the demand and the requirements upon the military to detail men for the handling of national service life insurance will increase and if it has not already reached the point it reached in 1945 it will very soon. It is inconceivable to me that we should take more than 8,000 men who otherwise would be serving in a military capacity and assign them to purely administrative work in connection with the sale of national service life insurance to the men. That is a gross waste of manpower in my judgment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The statement which the gentleman has just made would not apply, however, after the war is over.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, the gentleman is correct. But when do we need this military personnel? We need them while the war is going on, we need them now, and if the situation becomes worse we are going to need them more than we do today.

Mr. EVINS. There is nothing in the bill which would divert the manpower under this automatic coverage.

Mr. HARDY. Under the automatic coverage these people would not be required for national service life insurance purposes. They could be used for much more useful purposes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that I did quote to the House the figures which he just mentioned regarding the 8,000 man-years for 1945. I got those figures from a very good report which the subcommittee, headed by the gentleman now addressing the Committee, made in connection with a study on this subject. I want him to know also that our subcommittee leaned very heavily upon the information which his subcommittee uncovered in that respect as well as in many other respects in formulating this legislation.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman. I do recall the observation concerning the statement which Mr. Breining made in connection with the situation which would arise in the event we had an emergency. Mr. Breining made a flat, unequivocal statement before our committee that in another national emergency the manpower would not be available to the Veterans' Administration if we should continue the national service life insurance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the 8,000 people the gentleman from Tennessee is talking about be carried on the roll under the pretense they are needed?

Mr. HARDY. The 8,000 people I have reference to are members of the Armed Forces and that covers only the Army and Air Force. It does not include the Navy personnel. If those people were released from their duties in connection with the handling of national service life insurance, and they would be, they could devote their time and attention to much more essential activities.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it not true that in the gentleman's subcommittee you were unable to get any breakdown from the Veterans' Administration as to how many thousand man-years it is now taking them to administer this law?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct. I was interested in listening to some comparisons made by one of the gentlemen on this side a while ago as between the personnel required by commercial insurance companies and the Government insurance agency. I do not know where he got his figures because we were not able to secure them. Certain functions in connection with life insurance are carried on by other divisions than the insurance division in the Veterans' Administration and as a consequence there is no breakdown and you cannot get the figures.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more point I want to call attention to. The Veterans' Administration right now maintains approximately 23,000,000 individual active and semiactive insurance files. If H. R. 1 had been in effect in 1940 the Veterans' Administration would have less than 500,000 insurance files, a reduction in administrative paper work of more than 95 percent.

If there is one thing we can do without in Uncle Sam's Government today, it is some of the unnecessary paper work that goes on. There are a great many factors that enter into the cost of national service life insurance to the Government. I am pretty sure they have been discussed, perhaps, in some of the debate that I have not heard. But the main thing to me that this legislation means to the servicemen and to the families of the servicemen is that, regardless of whether the individual has sufficient foresight to take out insurance, his dependents are protected and covered. We had relatively a small percentage of the total people in the service during the last war who had the foresight to protect their families in that manner. Under this legislation, every man will be treated equally. I think it was a travesty on justice where we had, we will say, three people that might have been killed at the same time. One of them had $5,000 insurance under national service life. His beneficiary under that policy received the $5,000 paid for out of the Federal Treasury. He was killed in combat. The second man had a $10,000 policy, and Uncle Sam out of the Federal Treasury paid his beneficiary $10,000. The third man had not seen fit to pay the premium to cover him for insurance, so consequently Uncle Sam paid nothing to his beneficiary. Now, it seems to me that the life of one man means just as much to the Nation as the life of another, and each of them should have had equal treatment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the last 4 years. I consider this one of the most important bills that we have ever considered. It has been my privilege to vote for it twice before the committee and once before the House, and I look toward voting for it today. There are a great many GI's who are not able to take out the insurance. I know of a number of them who are not able to take out the insurance and did not take it out and do not have it now. This gives it to them, I think, at a minimum cost, and I think it is a splendid bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of the most important bills of its kind coming before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs since I have been a member of the committee. The question of insurance has been an enigma before the committee for some time. We have all been impressed with the fact that the program for insurance of GI's has been costing more than it should without recurring benefit to the veterans or the Government. Furthermore, we have been impressed with the fact that many GI's have not been protected by death insurance. Some because of carelessness, but most of them because of the cost of insurance added to many other expenses made it financially impossible for them to carry it.

It has been estimated by the Comptroller General that had this program been in effect during 1940 through 1949, the cost to the Government would have been reduced by approximately $587,000,000. This bill is a practical, efficient one and should be passed by the Congress as it sets up a protection in case of death for every GI without any cost to him and at the same time saves the Government the enormous expense over a period of years of collecting and receipting premiums paid and naturally reduces the cost of the insurance program in case of death by substantial figures as above stated. And, last but not least, it gives a protection of $10,000 in case of death to every GI in the service of his country, which continues through the period of induction into the service and 90 days after separation from same.

I am very strongly in favor of the bill, and wish I could discuss it more fully.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in these trying times as we occupy ourselves so extensively with the problems overseas we are apt to overlook the problems that are at our very side and seem to forget the tremendous and terrifying national debt that is following in our wake. If we do not take affirmative action in this area shortly, we will not have to concern ourselves with communism overseas, because it will already have made a salient attack in our back door.

The basic question before us today is whether you believe in bureaucracy, whether or not you want the United States Government to be in a business, in which I personally do not believe it should be. That is the basic decision we have to face, and that will be the issue on which we will vote when the amendment is presented to this bill.

I believe this legislation faces up to our responsibility. It was recommended by the Hook Commission. It contains that very unusual combination of giving free and wider benefits to servicemen and their dependents, and at less cost to the taxpayer.

The basic features of the bill are outlined in detail in the report and have also been outlined by previous speakers. It is not my intention to reiterate them at this time. However, down through the years it has been evident that the national life insurance system has not been satisfactory. Intermittent legislation has been necessary to placate the symptoms of inadequacy that are in the system. This is the first time we have made a real attempt to get at the causes of the trouble.

Among the faults of the National Life Insurance Act was that it did not, in fact, give uniform benefits to all members of the service. That was because, unfortunately, many members in the lower-paid brackets did not have the financial ability nor the interest to select this particular program.

There is a serious question in my mind, too, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we should call national life insurance real insurance, because the fact of the matter is, that at the present time between 80 percent and 89 percent of the payments are paid, not out of the fund, but by direct appropriations of the Federal Government. The present system is complex, and it is expensive. It costs $80,000,000 a year and requires 25,000 people to operate it.

I call the attention of the committee to the report of the Veterans' Administration Insurance Administrator, appearing on page 3 of the committee report, in which he said in part:

> In time of emergency I think the manpower to operate an insurance system, projecting in the future, would probably not be available.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman does not contend that if my amendment would prevail to permit the life insurance after discharge and after the war is over, the manpower problem would be persuasive?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I quite agree with the gentleman that his amendment would have no effect whatsoever upon the present situation.

It will, however, have a very serious effect upon the financial stability of this Government at the end of the war when we will have to certainly face most desperate financial problems.

In addition to these facts, Mr. Chairman, only one-sixth of the veterans today have continued their national life insurance. In other words, the program is being supported by the taxpayers and by five-sixths of the veterans who did not choose to continue the program. There have been many ridiculous situations arising during these last few years. The aviation cadets who did not even pay the premiums on their insurance, were paid dividends by the Federal Government even though their insurance policy did not cost them one cent.

Mr. Chairman, almost every witness who appeared before our committee was strongly in favor of this bill. This is a chance to save money and it is an opportunity to extend benefits to the servicemen and their dependents. I believe the bill should receive the unanimous vote of this body.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to this bill, but that was prior to realizing that it had been discussed fully in the subcommittee. The amendment I had proposed to offer was not one of changing the amount of money which we are proposing to pay the beneficiary of a serviceman, but it is putting it on a level where we would be taking a little human interest in the people who are going to be receiving the money.

During the war I had occasion to call on a number of people who were the beneficiaries of servicemen who had been killed in action. I can assure you there is no time in a mother's life or in a widow's life when she is more disturbed than when she receives the wire saying that her son or husband has been killed in action. By the same token there is no time in her life when she needs a morale builder more and the insurance helps her to know that she is not going to be left destitute. I have felt from a human point of view that the $10,000 should be paid in a lump sum of $2,000 on the death of the soldier, and the $8,000 spread in monthly payments over a period of 10 years. I feel we would be doing the widow or mother a big favor by assuring her that she at least has a little financial backing to readjust herself—it is at that time when she needs this assistance. It has been mentioned she is going to receive 6 months' pay. Having been in the Army myself, and having been drafted when I had three children, if I had remained in the Army much longer I would not even have had a roof over my head.

On the other hand, if we can give them a little cash to readjust themselves, and give them the assurance that the whole world is not against them because most of these people think that the whole world is against them, and sometimes they are a little doubtful as to whether they can readjust themselves; as I say, if we can give them a little cash at that time, it would be encouraging to them. However, in view of the fact I am in agreement with the bill and know that it should be passed, and if this amendment is necessary in the opinion of the people of America, and in the opinion of the House of Representatives, it can be referred to the other body when it comes before them. I shall work in that direction.

I think the subcommittee has done a good job. I believe the chairman of the committee is right when he asks for the passage of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman's amendment has a great deal of merit. I am very sure the gentleman will get every assistance and perhaps the amendment can be introduced in the bill there.

Mr. AYRES. If it is found that the amendment is necessary, I hope that that may be done. I trust the Members will be willing to express their views when this bill is referred to the other body.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to help if the gentleman would like to have me do so.

Mr. AYRES. I repeat that the bill should be passed. Speaking from a small-business man's point of view, I am for any bill that will get us less government and better government, and get the Government out of business. This bill is a step in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the members of the subcommittee for the splendid work they have done on this bill. I think it is one of the best pieces of work that has come out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee since I have been a member of it. The members of that subcommittee were the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Noland, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. Those Members present have spoken today and have given their reasons for the passage of the bill.

I believe that the bill H. R. 1 carries an appropriate number, because I think it ought to be No. 1 on the House Calendar to see that we take care of this obligation.

While I went back home last week end, I talked to several people, who raised some objections to the bill, simply because they did not understand it. Several people, knowing that I was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, made objection to the bill saying that it would raise their taxes. After explaining to them that it would not raise their taxes a bit, that alleviated the situation somewhat. Others raised the question that we were raising the pay of the boys in the service. That is not true. Only the dependents of those boys who are killed or lose their lives might receive additional benefits. But that is not the question. It costs the Government less. We have an obligation to these boys. As we all know, all through history our soldiers have been taken from their families. And they have nothing to say about it. We have an obligation to those dependent families, and this is one way to pay it, because if they lose their lives this will hold out some help in the support of those dependents.

This covers everyone. It does not cover just those who can afford to pay for it or those who have enough foresight to take out insurance, or those who think enough of their dependents to take out insurance. There are a great many of our veterans who go into the service who do not care about the people back home at all. Normally, those are the ones who need this protection. It does cover them, as well as those in the higher brackets, who can afford to pay for it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to ask the gentleman, or the chairman of the committee, this question. On the first page of the bill there is included Reserve components, including the National Guard, and so forth. Under certain conditions, certain reserves have protection of a sort under the Employees' Compensation Act. I presume it is not the purpose of the committee to provide duplicate coverage for identical hazards. I just wanted to be certain that my understanding is correct, and that people who are determined to be eligible to receive benefits under the Employees' Compensation Act will not also receive benefits under this act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Virginia is entirely correct.

Mr. HARDY. In other words, if an individual receives benefits under this act he would not be eligible for benefits under the Employees' Compensation Act?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is correct. We do not give anybody double insurance.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] for his observation, because I believe it is proper that we should not duplicate in any way.

Now, the bill costs less, as it has been shown to you, and it gets the Government out of the insurance business, which it ought to do. I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] in regard to the cost of private insurance and the cost of Government insurance. For an equal number of men it required over 300 men to administer the commercial insurance, but for the Government it took over 1,500 men to administer the same insurance. Also I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia as to the matter of man-years needed to take care of our national service life insurance program. I am in favor of the bill 100 percent as it is. I hope it will be voted up.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, nearly 9 years ago, by the introduction of H. R. 6512, in February 1942, I first requested of the Congress that automatic insurance be given all men and women the instant they were sworn into the armed services of our Nation. I said on that day, quoting from the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, the United States will probably call up for service 10,000,000 or more of the best men of our country. These men are willing to give their lives that our Nation might live. To me it seems that our great country can at the very least give, free of charge, to each and every one of these men, a $5,000 life-insurance policy to afford protection to their dear ones back home in case the ultimate sacrifice is exacted. I am today [February 2, 1942] introducing a bill to take care of this obligation to our servicemen and sincerely hope that this automatic insurance will soon become the law of our land.

Mr. Chairman, on February 5, March 2, May 26, and June 8, 1942, I spoke to the House, asking and pleading for consideration of my proposal. On June 8, I offered my bill, H. R. 6512, as an amendment to H. R. 7119, which provided family allowances for the families of enlisted men in the armed services. In the debate on the rule, I read from the RECORD of June 8, 1942, page 5013:

Last November I suggested to General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, in committee, that it was fundamentally sound and just that any man or woman entering any branch of our armed services should be automatically covered on entrance into the service by insurance. * * * In line with that study and contention, and after consultation with the Veterans' Administration as to the wording of the bill, I introduced on February 2, 1942, H. R. 6512. Hearings on this was requested of the Ways and Means Committee without success.

Mr. Chairman, that refusal of the Ways and Means Committee to consider the principle of automatic insurance as contained in my bill, H. R. 6512, the genesis of the bill before us today, cost the taxpayers of America $587,000,000. Comptroller General Warren has estimated that amount would have been saved had my proposal as to automatic insurance been in effect during the World War II period—see the report, page 2.

On June 8, 1942, when pleading with the House to accept H. R. 6512 as an additional title to H. R. 7119, I said, among other things, page 5030:

Why in the name of common sense should we provide 2,000 stenographers to sit up here in some Government building, to write out these eight or ten million policies, all of which would be unnecessary under this amendment? Bookkeeping starts—

Referring to H. R. 6512—

when the War and Navy Departments certifies to the national service life insurance that a certain man has been killed or totally disabled. That is where bookkeeping starts, rather than having no one knows how many women writing out policies, checking monthly collections from every unit in the services, and filling out forms without number. If you want to cut red tape, this will do it. Let us give to the servicemen's children this money instead of to unnecessary office workers.

That was my statement of 9 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, now we are finally cutting this red tape, but only after a loss to America of over one-half billion dollars and no one knows how many heartaches of servicemen's dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely compliment the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for bringing out this very worthwhile legislation, even though we should have had it long ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In just a minute I will yield.

On February 14, 1942, I had received a letter from the Legion post in Starbuck, Minn., advising me as follows:

We have buried two draftees. The last one, of a destitute family, was buried by the county, a $60 burial. He had an honorable discharge, got an infection while he was in service, spent 5 weeks at Walter Reed Hospital, had his leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration in Minneapolis. They said there was no provision for giving to that family any relief in that particular case.

W. W. LARSON,
Service Officer.

That letter, Mr. Chairman, is really the heart, so to speak, of my interest in this sort of legislation. Every service man and woman must be covered by insurance in fairness to themselves and their families.

It has been brought out here several times today that we cannot leave it to each and every individual member of the Armed Forces to decide whether or not he should take out insurance. It is for his best interest that we cover them all under a compulsory blanketing program of insurance. I feel positive that the committee has in this bill protected fully all of the rights which the veterans and service men and women are entitled to under present-day legislation. There should never again be any question of a situation happening as referred to in the letter I have just read from the American Legion post of Starbuck, Minn. We simply must not permit the possibility of such again happening.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. In the case the gentleman referred to, was the man killed in service or was he a veteran after discharge?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This has been nearly 9 years ago and I do not recall the exact circumstances. I am reading from the RECORD of June 8, 1942.

Mr. EVINS. If he was a discharged veteran there would still be no protection under this law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If he should die within 3 months after his discharge he would be covered by this bill even though he might have received his injury after he came home.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As one gentleman brought out on the floor of the House today, unless we watch out for the financial stability of this Government we are apt to get into very serious difficulties. From that particular side of the question alone, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is entitled to the thanks of the people of the Nation for bringing in this very worth-while legislation. Think what we could have done with this $600,000,000 wasted unnecessarily in the last 10 years. Think of what good we could have done with it in helping the widows and children of the men who were killed during World War II. I was amazed to hear that 8,000 Army officers and men were required to take care of all of the work in the armed services in connection with national service life during World War II. Surely that many men and that effort should have been put to far better use and today we profit from the lesson which cost us so dearly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman refers to the $600,000,000 that would have been saved. How about the millions of dollars that would have been saved to World War I and World War II veterans who had to pay monthly premiums?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The committee will pardon me for making this talk. Sometimes it may be considered in poor taste to get up here and say, "I told you so," but I am not trying to do anything of that kind. To me this is the correction of a costly blunder made 9 years ago and we can all profit from our experiences of the past. The service men and women will be well protected by the bill before us and I am much pleased that we have today practically a complete agreement upon this very worth-while measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for bringing this important legislation, H. R. 1, so necessary to the welfare of our servicemen and their families before the House at this early date. It means much to our servicemen and their families. It is a worth-while and constructive approach in the important matter of providing insurance benefits in case of death resulting from service.

The bill provides:

First. On and after June 27, 1950, each person in the Armed Forces is insured against death in the amount of $10,000 without cost to the person.

Second. Protection covers period of active service and periods following call or order to active service or final induction and, in most cases, 90 days after separation from service.

Third. If person is disabled in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable at standard commercial rates, he may obtain nonparticipating national service life insurance after separation from service, and where the disability is total, waiver of premiums may be granted.

Fourth. Bars generally future entrants to United States Government life insurance and the national service life insurance programs, after enactment of this act. But any person in the active service having one of these policies may continue it in force or if he has surrendered a permanent plan policy for cash, he may reinstate it or be granted a new policy on the same plan and in the same amount without a showing of good health.

Fifth. Beneficiaries limited to members of immediate family.

Sixth. Maximum indemnity paid in monthly installments of $92.90 each over 10-year period.

Seventh Indemnity is exempt from the claims of creditors and from taxation.

Enactment of this uniform indemnity coverage bill will remove what has been considered a basic inequity and inadequacy in the Government insurance program. Take, for example, the case of three individuals. They were all in combat service. Each was married and had children. For reasons best known to themselves one had no national service life insurance coverage; another one of them had taken out a $5,000 term policy of insurance; the remaining one had taken out a $10,000 policy. They were all in the same outfit and subject to the same hazards. All three were killed. The family of the one who held a $5,000 policy received $5,000 from the Government, the family of the one who held a $10,000 policy received $10,000. But the family of the one who had not taken out any insurance received nothing. This unfortunate result was due to the failure by neglect, or lack of interest, upon the part of the last-named serviceman, for the welfare of his family. The family suffers as a result. This bill seeks to correct such a possibility by providing a straight $10,000 indemnity policy to all servicemen, payable in the event of death as a result of service.

Thus, this bill provides uniform coverage for all men in the service, which is quite different from the situation presently prevailing under national service life insurance. This bill protects the interests of all dependents of all men in the service to a uniform degree, which the present and existing program does not do. It is my opinion that uniform benefits to all servicemen are highly desirable. The present emergency makes prompt action imperative.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I do not believe there will be a vote against this bill. I have long favored veterans' insurance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, among some very limited objections to this bill was the statement that the young soldier after he gets out of the service will not be able to buy from the commercial companies a policy as inexpensively as he could from the NSLI. I believed that statement until I checked into the figures.

For the information of the committee the tabluation which I shall include shows that a man coming out of the service at age 20, 25, or 30, can buy his insurance from commercial companies for less money than it would cost him from the Government. To substantiate that I include the following statistical information:

Annual premiums per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
National service life insurance	$7.70	$7.93	$8.41	$9.00
Lowest	$5.54	$6.09	$6.40	$7.26
Number of companies lower than NSLI	49	42	39	32
Percent of total	65	54	50	41
Number of companies higher than NSLI	26	36	39	46
Percent of total	35	46	50	59
Total companies	75	78	78	78
Percent	100	100	100	100

[Page references, Flitcraft compendium for 1950]

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
National service life insurance	$7.70	$7.93	$8.41	$9.00
Aetna Life (Hartford, Conn.) (see p. 11)	6.11	6.33	6.74	7.69
	.33	.40	.50	.67
	6.44	6.73	7.24	8.36
American General (Houston, Tex.) (see p. 16)	5.85	5.90	6.44	7.45
	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
American Mutual (Des Moines, Iowa) (see p. 17)	7.10	7.71	8.63	10.05
	.67	.85	1.08	1.42
	7.77	8.56	9.71	11.47
American National (Galveston, Tex.) (see p. 19)	6.04	6.29	6.73	7.68
	.60	.60	.60	.60
	6.64	6.89	7.33	8.28
Amicable (Waco, Tex.) (see p. 26)	5.36	5.71	6.36	7.46
	.44	.57	.75	1.01
	5.80	6.28	7.11	8.47
Atlantic (Richmond, Va.) (see p. 28)	6.17	6.42	6.72	7.52
	.43	.50	.60	.77
	6.60	6.92	7.32	8.29
Bankers National (Montclair, N. J.) (see p. 43)	7.96	8.31	8.51	9.23
	.52	.67	.87	1.17
	8.48	8.98	9.38	10.40
Beneficial (Salt Lake City, Utah) (see p. 45)	7.14	7.72	8.60	9.98
	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Berkshire (Pittsfield, Mass.) (see p. 49)	7.92	8.55	9.50	10.96
	(?)	.47	(?)	.79
	(?)	9.02	(?)	11.75
Bankers Life (Des Moines, Iowa) (see p. 34)	7.51	8.07	8.99	10.46
	.70	.85	(?)	1.37
	8.21	8.92	(?)	11.83
Capitol Life (Denver, Colo.) (see p. 64)	6.19	6.32	6.74	7.64
	.33	.40	.50	.67
	6.52	6.72	7.24	8.31

Annual premiums per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit—Continued

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
Columbus Mutual (Columbus, Ohio) (see p. 74)	$8.86	$9.46	$10.39	$11.80
	.52	.63	.81	1.19
	9.38	10.09	11.20	12.99
Commonwealth (Louisville, Ky.) (see p. 73)	6.21	6.47	7.00	7.89
	.57	.73	.89	1.13
	6.78	7.20	7.89	9.02
Connecticut General (Hartford, Conn.) (see p. 83)	6.20	6.41	6.74	7.52
	1.35	1.42	1.52	1.69
	6.55	6.86	7.26	8.21
Connecticut Mutual (Hartford, Conn.) (see p. 98)	7.54	8.16	9.11	10.55
	.64	.83	(?)	1.46
	8.18	8.99	(?)	12.01
Equitable Ass'n Society (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 128)	9.07	9.45	10.15	11.36
	(?)	.54	(?)	.93
	(?)	9.99	(?)	12.29
Equitable (Washington, D. C.) (see p. 134)	8.19	8.49	8.74	9.38
	.34	.41	.49	.65
	8.53	8.90	9.23	10.03
Equitable (Des Moines Iowa) (see p. 136)	6.26	6.43	6.66	7.51
	.57	.70	.89	1.16
	6.83	7.13	7.55	8.67
Federal (Chicago, Ill.) (see p. 148)	6.11	6.30	6.82	8.09
	.62	.76	.95	1.24
	6.73	7.06	7.77	9.33
Fidelity Mutual (Philadelphia, Pa.) (see p. 152)	8.16	8.80	9.79	11.29
	.72	.82	(?)	1.12
	8.88	9.62	?	12.41
Franklin (Springfield, Ill.) (see p. 157)	6.07	6.32	6.62	7.49
	.14	.15	.15	.16
	6.21	6.47	6.77	7.65
General American (St. Louis, Mo.) (see p. 163)	8.16	8.60	9.38	10.65
	.35	.44	(?)	.72
	8.51	9.04	?	11.37
Great Southern (Houston, Tex.) (see p. 167)	5.80	6.02	6.55	7.78
	.36	.47	.61	.81
	6.16	6.49	7.16	8.59
Guarantee Mutual (Omaha, Nebr.) (see p. 177)	7.16	7.53	8.21	9.41
	.20	.22	.22	.23
	7.36	7.75	8.43	9.64
Guardian (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 180)	7.41	8.05	9.00	10.43
	.86	1.09	1.41	1.89
	8.27	9.14	10.41	12.32
Gulf (Jacksonville, Fla.) (see p. 186)	7.94	8.29	8.38	8.95
	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
Home (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 191)	7.15	7.78	8.75	10.23
	(?)	.57	(?)	.90
	(?)	8.35	(?)	11.13
Home (Philadelphia, Pa.) (see p. 194)	(?)	8.28	9.08	10.21
	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)

[1] Approximate.

Annual premiums per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit—Continued

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
Illinois Bankers (Monmouth, Ill.) (see p. 195)	$6.30	$6.58	$6.94	$7.88
	.65	.78	.96	1.23
	6.95	7.36	7.90	9.11
Indianapolis Life (Indianapolis, Ind.) (see p. 199)	7.16	7.80	8.79	10.29
	.72	.88	1.09	1.41
	7.88	8.68	9.88	11.70
Jefferson Standard (Greensboro, N. C.) (see p. 204)	6.01	6.28	6.66	7.65
	.56	.69	.87	1.15
	6.57	6.97	7.53	8.80
John Hancock (Boston, Mass.) (see p. 216)	7.08	7.72	8.68	10.16
	.76	.91	1.12	1.43
	7.84	8.63	9.80	11.59
Kansas City (Kansas City, Mo.) (see p. 223)	6.25	6.50	6.80	7.45
	.58	.70	.86	1.10
	6.83	7.20	7.66	8.55
Liberty (Greenville, S. C.) (see p. 227)	5.98	6.19	6.46	7.37
	.57	.71	.88	1.16
	6.55	6.90	7.34	8.53
Liberty National (Birmingham, Ala.) (see p. 228)	6.72	7.01	7.39	8.27
	.63	.75	.98	1.19
	7.35	7.76	8.32	9.46
Life Insurance Co. of Georgia (Atlanta, Ga.) (see p. 232)	5.10	5.67	6.56	7.90
	.44	.56	.73	.99
	5.54	6.23	7.29	8.89
Lincoln National (Fort Wayne, Ind.) (see pp. 238–240)	5.98	6.26	6.64	7.52
	.35	.43	.56	.73
	6.33	6.69	7.20	8.25
Manhattan (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 252)	8.38	8.99	9.90	11.31
	0	0	0	0
	8.38	8.99	9.90	11.31
Massachusetts Mutual (Springfield, Mass.) (see p. 268)	7.16	7.87	8.91	10.46
	(?)	.46	(?)	.77
	(?)	8.33	(?)	11.23
Metropolitan (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 281)	6.91	7.58	8.61	10.20
	0	0	0	0
	6.91	7.58	8.61	10.20
Minnesota Mutual (St. Paul, Minn.) (see p. 296)	7.44	8.15	9.25	10.92
	.71	.87	1.10	1.42
	8.15	9.02	10.35	12.34
Mutual Benefit (Newark, N. J.) (see p. 307)	6.64	7.29	8.29	9.82
	.52	.61	.73	.92
	7.16	7.90	9.02	10.74
Mutual (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 327)	7.21	7.86	8.86	10.39
	(?)	.53	(?)	.87
	(?)	8.39	(?)	11.26
National Life (Montpelier, Vt.) (see p. 344)	7.25	7.90	8.91	10.46
	.71	.87	1.09	1.41
	7.96	8.77	10.00	11.87

Annual premium per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit—Continued

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
New England Mutual (Boston, Mass.) (see p. 356)	$7.10	$7.83	$8.87	$10.37
	(?)	.78	(?)	1.32
	(?)	8.61	(?)	11.69
New World (Seattle, Wash.) (see p. 361)	6.12	6.30	6.70	7.73
	.53	.66	.84	1.11
	6.65	6.96	7.54	8.84
New York (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 368)	7.02	7.90	9.19	11.01
	(?)	.93	(?)	1.48
	(?)	8.83	(?)	12.49
Northwestern Mutual (Milwaukee, Wis.) (see p. 386)	7.17	8.00	9.23	11.06
	.25	.32	.43	.62
	7.42	8.32	9.66	11.68
Northwestern National (Minneapolis, Minn.) (see p. 396)	5.84	6.09	6.40	7.26
	0	0	0	0
	5.84	6.09	6.40	7.26
Occidental (Los Angeles, Calif.) (see p. 404)	6.60	6.71	6.88	7.68
	.53	.54	.58	.74
	7.13	7.25	7.46	8.42
Old Line (Milwaukee, Wis.) (see p. 415)	5.63	5.96	6.58	7.70
	.54	.65	.81	1.05
	6.17	6.61	7.39	8.75
Pacific Mutual (Los Angeles, Calif.) (see p. 417)	6.79	7.04	7.34	8.13
	.27	.33	.42	.57
	7.06	7.37	7.76	8.70
Penn Mutual (Philadelphia, Pa.) (see p. 433)	8.04	8.66	9.61	11.05
	.54	.67	(?)	1.08
	8.58	9.33	(?)	12.15
Peoples (Frankfort, Ind.) (see p. 440)	6.80	7.05	7.35	8.20
	.53	.64	.89	1.05
	7.33	7.69	8.15	9.25
Philadelphia (Philadelphia, Pa.): (see p. 441)	6.16	6.40	6.73	7.52
	.49	.60	.75	.97
	6.65	7.00	7.48	8.49
Protective (Birmingham, Ala.) (see p. 453)	6.11	6.33	6.74	7.69
	.48	.59	.76	1.00
	6.59	6.92	7.50	8.69
Provident Life & Accident (Chattanooga, Tenn.) (see p. 455)	5.90	6.23	6.64	7.47
	.49	.59	.73	.95
	6.39	6.82	7.37	8.42
Provident (Bismarck, N. Dak.) (see p. 456)	6.27	6.41	6.82	7.68
	.54	.66	.83	1.08
	6.81	7.07	7.65	8.76
Provident Mutual (Philadelphia, Pa.) (see p. 462)	7.44	8.08	9.06	10.55
	(?)	.78	(?)	1.25
	(?)	8.86	(?)	11.80
Prudential (Newark, N. J.) (see p. 473)	7.60	8.18	8.61	9.62
	0	0	0	0
	7.60	8.18	8.61	9.62

Annual premiums per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit—Continued

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
Republic National (Dallas, Tex.) (see p. 488)	$5.82	$6.13	$6.61	$7.35
	.47	.59	.76	1.02
	6.29	6.72	7.37	8.37
Security Life & Trust (Winston-Salem, N. C.) (See p. 491)	6.01	6.28	6.66	7.65
	.61	.74	.92	1.18
	6.62	7.02	7.58	8.83
Security Mutual (Binghamton, N. Y.) (See p. 493)	7.12	7.74	8.71	10.18
	.73	.89	1.11	1.43
	7.85	8.63	9.82	11.61
Standard (Portland, Oreg.) (see p. 501)	8.82	9.40	9.54	10.16
	.40	.49	.61	.80
	9.22	9.89	10.15	10.96
State (Indianapolis, Ind.) (see p. 507)	6.86	7.15	7.64	8.52
	.36	.45	.57	.75
	7.22	7.60	8.21	9.27
State Mutual (Worcester, Mass.) (see p. 511)	7.23	7.91	8.92	10.43
	.52	.82	.73	.93
	7.75	8.53	9.65	11.36
Sun (Baltimore, Md.) (see p. 528)	6.83	7.19	7.70	8.75
	0	0	0	0
	6.83	7.19	7.70	8.75
Travelers (Hartford, Conn.) (see p. 532)	6.49	6.55	6.71	7.49
	.49	.59	.73	.95
	6.98	7.14	7.44	8.44
Union Central (Cincinnati, Ohio) (see p. 542)	8.01	8.70	9.72	11.24
	(?)	.87	(?)	1.39
	(?)	9.57	(?)	12.63
Union Mutual (Portland, Maine) (see p. 546)	8.29	8.96	9.98	11.54
	.65	.83	1.06	1.40
	8.94	9.79	11.04	12.94
Union National (Lincoln, Nebr.) (see p. 549)	6.75	7.32	8.17	8.83
	.70	.83	1.03	1.32
	7.45	8.15	9.20	10.15
United Benefit (Omaha, Nebr.) (see p. 551)	6.76	6.91	7.26	8.22
	.44	.55	.71	.94
	7.20	7.46	7.97	9.16
United Life & Accident (Concord, N. H.) (see p. 554)	6.09	6.34	6.68	7.49
	.58	.70	.88	1.14
	6.67	7.04	7.56	8.63
United States (New York, N. Y.) (see p. 560)	6.10	6.30	6.65	7.45
	.34	.41	.49	.65
	6.44	6.71	7.14	8.10
Volunteer State (Chattanoogn, Tenn.) (see p. 562)	6.23	6.49	6.75	7.59
	.45	.55	.67	.84
	6.68	7.04	7.42	8.43
Washington National (Chicago, Ill.) (see p. 564)	6.23	6.44	6.81	7.77
	.48	.60	.76	1.00
	6.71	7.04	7.57	8.77

Annual premiums per $1,000 insurance 5-year-term policies, including disability waiver of premium benefit—Continued

	Age at issue			
	20	25	30	35
Western & Southern (Cincinnati, Ohio) (see p. 569)	$7.71 0	$8.38 0	$9.39 0	$10.89 0
	7.71	8.38	9.39	10.89
Western (Helena, Mont.) (see p. 571)	6.75 .60	7.31 .74	8.17 .94	9.47 1.24
	7.35	8.05	9.11	10.71

Source: Fliteraft Compendium for 1950, published by Fliteraft, Inc., 75 Fulton St., New York 7, N. Y.

NOTE.—The 78 companies (all companies showing figures for 5-year term in Fliteraft Compendium for 1950) are spread all over the country in 33 different States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], that I am carrying my straight-life insurance under the Veterans' Administration and I am paying $38.20 a month for life for a coverage of $10,000. I could probably have got the same insurance from a private company without paying any more.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. I have had considerable experience with life-insurance companies, and I never heard that statement made before. I think the gentleman is incorrect. I think the rates of private companies are higher than national servicemen's rates. That is my opinion.

Mr. RANKIN. I was giving the gentleman the figures, and he can check up on them any time he desires to do so. In my opinion, if I had taken out this insurance in a private company, I would not have been paying as much as $38.20 a month for $10,000 life insurance.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the enactment of H. R. 1 which is designed to give gratuitous insurance to our boys on active duty in our military and naval forces. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee during the last Congress, it was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee studying this insurance program, during the closing days of that Congress. This committee worked diligently for many days trying to find the solution to the many inequities that existed in the national service life insurance program. With Mr. Noland ably serving as its chairman the committee brought forth the solution to our problems. I feel that our former colleague should be commended for his outstanding work as chairman of this subcommittee which drafted the original gratuitous insurance bill. He has not only rendered a great service to the men in our military forces but to the taxpayers of our country as well.

It has been estimated that over $500,000,000 could have been saved if this bill had been enacted prior to World War II. This bill eliminates the necessity of keeping files on the individuals in the military service in the insurance department of the Veterans' Administration and the administrative expense of making the deductions for the insurance premiums. It eliminates the mortality and annuity table calculations and the necessity of having insurance salesmen in our military forces. In my opinion this gratuitous insurance program is the only sound solution to the insurance program and it is urgently needed at this very time as many new men are being called into the services.

During the last two wars many of our men served and were killed without having the protection for their beneficiaries as provided in this bill because they failed to make application for Government insurance. Many others felt that they could not afford the premiums for $10,000 and therefore settled for lesser amounts. In many cases the men with little or no insurance were from families that needed this assistance the most. I am not of the opinion that the families of these men should be penalized because of the lack of foresight of these veterans who failed to apply for national service life insurance.

Under this bill universal coverage would be provided and the beneficiaries of every man and woman in our military services would be protected in the event of his death. In view of the fact that this bill would effect substantial savings for our taxpayers and at the same time provide additional benefits for our servicemen, I believe that it merits the support of every Member of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

PART I—SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY

SECTION 1. This part may be cited as the "Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. Except as hereinafter provided, on and after June 27, 1950, any person in the active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including the National Guard, when called or ordered to active duty or active training duty for 14 days or more; cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies; commissioned officers of the Public Health Service while entitled to full military benefits as provided in section 212 (a) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 689), as amended (42 U. S. C. 213); and commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey while assigned to duty during a period of war or an emergency as proclaimed by the President or the Congress on projects for the Army, Navy, or Air Force in areas outside the continental United States or in Alaska or in coastal areas of the United States determined by the Department of Defense to be of immediate military hazard, shall be automatically insured by the United States, without cost to such person, against death in such service in the principal amount of $10,000: *Provided*, That any person called to extended active service for a period exceeding 30 days shall continue to be so protected for a period of 90 days after separation or release from such active service: *Provided further*, That persons in the Reserve components, including the National Guard, while engaged in aerial flights in Government owned or leased aircraft for any period, with or without pay, as an incident to their military or naval training, shall be deemed to be in the active service for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. Upon certification by the Secretary of the service department concerned of the death of any person deemed to have been automatically insured under this part, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause the indemnity to be paid as provided in section 4 only to the surviving spouse child or children (including a stepchild, adopted child, or an illegitimate child if the latter was designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including a stepparent, parent by adoption, or person who stood in loco parentis to the insured), brother, or sister of the insured. The insured shall have the right to designate the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the indemnity within the classes herein provided; to designate the proportion of the principal amount to be paid to each; and to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent thereof but only within the classes herein provided. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the Administrator shall make payment of the indemnity to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person.

Any installments not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime shall be paid to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority.

SEC. 4. The indemnity shall be payable in equal monthly installments of 120 in number with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum.

SEC. 5. The automatic indemnity coverage authorized by section 2 shall apply to any person in the active service of the named Armed Forces who, upon death in such active service, or within 90 days after separation or release from such active service as prescribed in section 2, is insured against such death under a contract of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, but only with respect to a principal amount of indemnity equal to the difference between the amount of insurance in force at the time of death and $10,000. Any person in active service, who is insured under a permanent plan of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance, may elect to surrender such contract for its cash value. In any such case the person, upon application in writing made within 90 days after separation from active service, may be granted, without medical examination, permanent plan insurance on the same plan not in excess of the amount surrendered for cash, or may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month. Waiver of premiums under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be denied in any case in which it is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator that total disability of the applicant commenced prior to the date of his application.

SEC. 6. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this part, as are necessary or appropriate to carry out its purposes.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, to be known as the servicemen's indemnity appropriation, for the payment of liabilities under this part.

SEC. 8. Any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections refuses to perform

services in the land or naval forces of the United States or refuses to wear the uniform of such force, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under this act: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person who is thereafter restored to active duty. No indemnity shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or for military or naval offense, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States.

SEC. 9. The provisions of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), and titles II and III of Public Law No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2031), insofar as they are applicable, shall apply to the provisions of this part: *Provided*, That assignments of all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be made by a beneficiary to a widow, widower, child, father, mother, brother, or sister of the insured, when all other persons within the permitted classes join in the assignment.

PART II—RESTRICTIONS ON ISSUANCE OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE AND NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

SEC. 10. The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new sections:

"SEC. 619. On and after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, except as otherwise provided in section 11 thereof, and section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 and section 620 hereof, no national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance shall be granted to any person under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, or the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, nor shall any Government life insurance or national service life insurance, on which the United States is authorized by law to pay the premium, be issued or granted to any person under any provision of law: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not be construed to prohibit the granting or issuing of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance in cases in which acceptable applications accompanied by proper and valid remittances or authorizations for the payment of premiums have, prior to the date of approval of the Insurance Act of 1951, been received by the Veterans' Administration, or which have, prior to said date, been placed in the mails properly directly to the Veterans' Administration, or been delivered to an authorized representative of any of the uniformed services.

"SEC. 620. Any person who is released from active service under other than dishonorable conditions on or after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, and is found by the Administrator to be suffering from a disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree which renders such person uninsurable at standard rates for ordinary life insurance, according to recognized underwriting requirements of nongovernmental insurers, shall, upon application in writing made within 1 year from the date of release from active service and payment of premiums as provided in this act, be granted insurance by the United States against the death of such person occurring while such insurance is in force. Insurance granted under the provisions of this section shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor and premiums and other collections hereafter received on nonparticipating insurance issued under other provisions of this act, as amended, shall be credited directly to a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States, and any payments on such insurance shall be made directly from such fund. Appropriations to such fund are hereby authorized. Except as herein provided, the other provisions of this act shall be for application to such insurance: *Provided*, That waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) shall not be denied under this subsection on the ground that total service-connected disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance."

SEC. 11. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of this enactment.

SEC. 12. This part may be cited as the Insurance Act of 1951."

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed at this point, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Guard", strike out the comma.

Page 2, line 25, after the colon, insert "*And provided further*, That for the purposes of this part, any person, who, on or after June 27, 1950, was or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance or for entry upon active duty in the military or naval service and who died or shall die as the result of disability incurred while en route to such place, or any registrant under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, who on or after June 27, 1950, in response to an order to report for induction into the Armed Forces and who, after reporting to a local draft board, died or dies as the result of disability incurred while en route from such draft board to a designated induction station shall be deemed to have died in active service."

Page 4, line 9, after "installments", insert "of an indemnity."

Page 5, after line 11, insert "Any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level-premium-term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of this enactment, shall, upon application made within 90 days after separation from service, payment of premiums and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level-premium-term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age."

Page 5, line 23, after "case", insert "of issue or reinstatement of insurance on a permanent plan under this section."

Page 6, line 25, after "607),", insert "as amended."

Page 7, line 2, after "2031),", insert "as amended."

Page 8, line 9, strike out "directly" and insert "directed."

Page 8, line 21, strike out "made within 1 year from the date of release from active service."

Page 9, line 15, after the word "in", insert "part I or part II."

Page 9, line 16, strike out "affect" and insert "cancel or restrict."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS: Strike out all of part II and substitute the following:

"PART II—ISSUANCE OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

"SEC. 10. Section 602 (c) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Any person who has had active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to the termination of the present emergency, as proclaimed by the President, shall be granted national service life insurance upon application therefor in writing after discharge or release from such active service and upon payment of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing such person to be in good health at the time of such application: *Provided*, That in any case in which such application is made within 5 years after discharge or release from active service the Administrator shall not deny for the purposes of this paragraph that the applicant is in good health because of any disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, and waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) shall not be denied in any case under this paragraph on the ground that total service-connected disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance: *And provided further*, That in any case in which insurance is granted by reason of the preceding proviso the premium paid on such insurance shall be credited directly to the national service life insurance appropriation, and any payments of benefits on such insurance shall be made directly from such appropriations.'

"SEC. 11. This part may be cited as the 'Insurance Act of 1951.'"

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. May I say that I have had the assistance of the Legislative Drafting Service, of the general counsel's office of the Veterans' Administration, and of the officials of the various veterans' organizations with respect to the language in this amendment. So it has been carefully prepared. It provides simply in substance that an honorably discharged veteran after the present hostilities may make application for and where qualified and on the same basis be granted national service life insurance as veterans of World War I and World War II. All this amendment does is give to future veterans the opportunity to acquire national service life insurance. We know that there will not be the great administrative cost of the insurance program during any future war under terms of this bill. The amendment which I propose would permit those who desire to contract for Government insurance after discharge the right to do so. We have already pointed out that the percentage of veterans who acquired insurance after discharge has, in the past, been limited in number, but those veterans who do desire to obtain veterans' insurance should be permitted to do so. My amendment provides for equity among veterans. It is a continuation of benefits that have already been provided. It is not a retraction, it is not a retrenchment and cutting back. My amendment would preserve benefits for future veterans which are presently existing in law.

I hope the amendment may be favorably considered by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment would merely kill the bill.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. It was not offered in the committee, although the gentleman from Tennessee is on the committee and

seconded the motion to report the bill out.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. As I understand the amendment I have just heard read, it was not offered before the subcommittee or the committee. The committee has had no opportunity to study it. In addition, it has what seems to me the fatal defect that it strikes out section 11, which preserves the integrity of the policies that were issued in World War I and World War II. I think the amendment is ill-considered and I regret that the gentleman from Tennessee has seen fit to offer it before first having it considered by the committee. The adoption of the amendment, would, in my judgment, greatly weaken this bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is adopted, the whole purpose of this bill will be defeated.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the veteran of World War I or the veteran of World War II who enjoys the privilege of reinstating his insurance paid premiums monthly while he was in the service?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir; they did not get the benefit of this automatic insurance.

Here are some letters I have received from veterans' organizations approving this bill.

The first is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It reads as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Re H. R. 1.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: I want to express the appreciation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the splendid work of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in connection with H. R. 1, which would provide a new approach to insurance coverage on the lives of all persons on active duty in the Armed Forces. I hope the House of Representatives will concur in the work of the Commitee and approve H. R. 1 as reported, without amendments.

I understand there is some sentiment in the Congress toward an amendment which would grant a period of 2 years after release from active duty in which ex-servicemen, not previously policyholders under NSLI, would be privileged to subscribe to national service life insurance. On the surface this would appear to be a reasonable proposition but experience in the past clearly indicates that at the end of the 2-year period there will be a demand for another period, etc. If it should be the intention of Congress to perpetuate national service life insurance for all persons who enter the Armed Forces there would be no purpose in adopting the gratuitous indemnity form of coverage. To those who sincerely believe that veterans should not be denied the right to subscribe to low-cost, subsidized Government insurance after leaving the service it should be pointed out that of some 20,000,000 policies issued during World War II, over 15,000,000 of said policies have been dropped.

It is the considered judgment of this office and the special insurance committee of our National Rehabilitation Service that the gratuitous indemnity coverage for all service personnel will provide equitable protection to all service personnel with a minimum of administrative red tape and far less cost to the Government than the current national service life insurance program.

Respectfully yours,
Omar B. Ketchum,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

The next one is from the Disabled American Veterans. It reads as follows:

The Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to be congratulated upon favorably reporting the bill, H. R. 1, to authorize the payment of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. We of the DAV are hopeful the measure will be accepted by the House as reported because of its many desirable features; also because of the resultant vast savings in money and manpower to the Federal Government.

The Comptroller General has estimated that had a gratuitous indemnity program been in effect during the period 1940–49, the saving to the Government would have been approximately $587,000,000. Regarding necessary insurance personnel, the testimony in 1950 of the Veterans' Administration Insurance Administrator was that in time of emergency he thought "the manpower to operate an insurance system, projecting in the future, would probably not be available." He was then speaking about national service life insurance.

It might be pertinent to point out that since October 8, 1940, more than 22,500,000 NSLI policies have been issued. Three out of four of all former NSLI policyholders have permitted their policies to lapse. About 25.9 percent of NSLI policies now in force are carried by persons serving in the Armed Forces. Only 78 percent of those currently in the Armed Forces have taken out insurance. One out of every nine combat casualties of World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

For the foregoing reasons, we of the DAV hope the House will pass H. R. 1 as reported by your committee, thus providing a complete insurance system to the members of our armed services at less cost to the Federal Government.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Then here is one from the AMVETS:

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: AMVETS note with gratification that H. R. 1 is coming up for a vote in the House of Representatives on this date. Needless to say we are very happy that the Congress is seeing fit to consider this meritorious legislation. Many men in Korea today are without insurance protection due to the technical aspects of contractual relationships mandated by the Government insurance program. It is the sincere hope of our organization that Congress will pass H. R. 1 immediately.

AMVETS has for a considerable length of time favorably endorsed the theories set forth in H. R. 1. We believe that the bill carries out this Nation's obligations to its servicemen and to its veterans. In addition it will save this Government a considerable amount of money, and it will eliminate much of the red tape now existent in the Veterans' Administration.

The Assistant Administrator for insurance at the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Harold W. Breining, has testified that in the case of a national emergency it would be almost impossible to administer the present national service life insurance program. This, to us, seems to be enough evidence to warrant changing the system at once. However, change for the sake of change itself would not be in keeping with the expressed desires of the membership of this organization. We think that there are many other good reasons why H. R. 1 is good legislation:

1. It provides a universal coverage for all servicemen.

2. It is infinitely more simple to administer than the present unwieldy Government insurance programs.

3. The present program, if continued, could not be successfully administered in time of national emergency.

4. The present program is a costly item that is being tacked on to the cost of veterans' benefits, and we believe that if allowed to continue it will eventually affect the pension and compensation program as laid down by the Congress.

5. This new approach does not affect present policies issued under United States Government life insurance, nor under national service life insurance contracts.

6. All men disabled by reason of service to their country would be able to go into the national service life insurance program in the event that they were unable to obtain commercial coverage at normal premium-paying rates.

7. All men are protected for a reansonable time after the expiration of their service.

As you are aware, this matter has been studied extensively by the Hook Commission, by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. All of these agencies have recommended a proposal similar to H. R. 1. We believe therefore that it is self-evident that H. R. 1 should and must be passed.

We urge that you do everything possible to get the House of Representatives to act favorably on H. R. 1. It is our feeling that the bill should be passed as written without any amendments unless those amendments are necessary for clarification purposes.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD RUSSELL,
National Commander.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very greatly surprised at the turn that this matter has taken. I am not a member, of course, of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but having served in the House for six terms I have viewed with amazement the fact that every year we pass legislation which treats the veterans of different wars in a different way. Every veteran here of the First World War, and I am one of them, knows that the Government has servicemen's life insurance, and that we have the right to keep that insurance up after we were discharged from the Army. I continued my Government insurance and it is now paid up. Everybody here knows as a practical matter that the Veterans' Administration has an office which looks

after that insurance. We all know that the veterans of the Second World War were allowed to have servicemen's insurance. While it is true that this bill gives free insurance to these Korean veterans who do not have the right to take insurance, yet I see no reason in the world why we should not let those men take out servicemen's insurance on their release from duty if they want to do so and pay the premiums on it. If they are not allowed that right, then they will be getting different treatment from the veterans of the other two wars. As to the question of the excessive cost of administration I cannot understand that because the Government already has to keep an office to take care of the veterans who are carrying the insurance of the past two wars. We should not deny this right to these boys. It is said here that the private insurance companies will write the insurance for them cheaper than the Government. Everybody who has a policy with the Government knows that his insurance comes to him cheaper than it would if he had taken it out with one of the old-line life-insurance companies. We all know that. There is no argument about that.

So far as this amendment destroying the effect of this bill, I cannot understand that argument. This amendment makes it a better bill. I hope we will adopt this amendment and give these boys the right to take out the insurance.

Here is another reason why they should have it. The life-insurance companies give their policies on the basis of a strict medical examination. Many of these boys will not be able to get insurance in the old-line companies when they return. Many of them cannot get that insurance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the provisions of the bill under which the soldiers will be able to take out national service life insurance.

Mr. CAMP. I think the provision of your bill is that if he has a disability which would grant him a pension, then he can take out the insurance. Does not your bill say that he must be 10 percent disabled?

Mr. RANKIN. No; it does not.

Mr. CAMP. All right. Then the bill only gives the right to take out the insurance to those who are disabled, is that right? Suppose a man comes out of the service and he is not disabled. Then you are treating him differently from the way the veterans of the other two wars are being treated. I think he should have the right to take out the insurance if he pays the premium for it. The premium charged for it is more than the cost of it. To illustrate that, the Government recently paid back huge dividends out of the profit they made on the servicemen's insurance. This thing would not cost the Government anything. Bear that in mind. These veterans have paid premiums for the insurance, and they should have that right.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. With reference to the gentleman's statement that the premiums are more than the cost of the insurance, I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that the premiums do not pay any of the administrative costs and that is entirely paid by the Government.

Mr. CAMP. That is exactly the point I am making. I sat here and listened to your argument as well as the arguments of the other gentlemen. The Government will have to have an office and will have to have these men taking care of the insurance already taken out by the veterans of the other two wars and it will not take any additional cost. That argument, I think, is specious. I hope the House will give these boys the right to take out a policy when they come out of the service, just like the other boys have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment amounts to is that those who want to give them this national service life insurance right are willing to take all the benefits that would come to them under this bill, but they are also willing to cut any benefits to the American taxpayer that would come from this bill. "Take all that we can get and give us something else in addition to it. Do not worry about anybody else."

The basic benefit to be derived from this bill is to cut out the myriads of red tape, the unnecessary personnel that goes with the continuance, year after year, of the national service life insurance. When a man comes out of the service without any service-connected disability, he comes out as an able-bodied man. What more reason is there for furnishing that man with subsidized insurance for which he pays no part of the administration cost than there would be for setting up a commissary and furnishing him with his clothing and his food, or anything else that he might want, and have the Government pay for the administrative cost? If insurance is necessary to that man, so are his food and his clothing. The same argument that applies to giving him subsidized insurance would apply to any other necessity or convenience in his life.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Is it not true that our first obligation to the man who is fighting in Korea, and who we hope will come back here able-bodied, is to give him a country with a fiscal policy sound enough to preserve those things for which he is now fighting, and not yield to the pressure of the moment to some group that might favor some additional benefit?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That I would say, plus freedom from the myriads of miles of red tape which would hamstring his Government so that Government could not continue to function.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman spoke of additional benefits. All we are going to do is to preserve and save the present benefits; not to cut back.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let me answer that by saying this: That when we give increased and improved benefits to veterans of each succeeding war of this country, does the gentleman feel that there is an obligation, in addition to those improved benefits, to add thereto any benefits that any veteran has ever had in the history of the United States? I think that is about what the position of the gentleman amounts to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In addition to giving complete coverage to every man in the service, the second basic reason for this bill was to eventually, someday, get the Government out of the insurance business.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. And if we do not make a start here, we are just going to continue in the insurance business as much as ever.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. This bill protects every existing right that the veteran has.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. There is no abridgment of any rights to any existing policy holder by the passage of this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. So that any holder of life insurance is completely protected?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. He loses no benefits.

Mr. HARDY. He has every right that he now has?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. But he does not have the right to have servicemen's life insurance which the veteran of World War I and the veteran of World War II has, if the veteran wants to pay the premium?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct, but you completely ignore the fact that during the time he was in the service he pays nothing for the insurance. Those men who carried it during wartime had to pay substantial premiums on that policy during the time that they were in the service of our country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I was just going to suggest to the gentleman that members of the service in World War I and World War II did not have free insurance, either.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They certainly did not.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down, because I consider that it would be losing a major portion of the benefit of this legislation were the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to be adopted.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the indemnity provisions of H. R. 1 are certainly sound and desirable, but there should be added to this bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, which amendment would give to the veterans now in service the same opportunities to acquire national service life insurance that were given to those of us who served in World War II. Certainly we should make every effort to curtail unnecessary expenses, but this could be better done by eliminating farm subsidies and other currently unnecessary expenses instead of denying insurance benefits to the men and women in Korea who are unable to be here to speak for themselves, and who are not even allowed the option of deciding which they would prefer, indemnity or insurance.

The savings made by denying national service life insurance to those now serving in the Armed Forces will be negligible compared with what we could save the taxpayers by effective price control and elimination of some politically popular subsidies.

Some of the gentlemen opposed to the national service life insurance for present service men and women have pointed to the inefficiency of the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration. This inefficiency should be eliminated, even if we find it necessary to have the work done by contract with a private company. As a matter of fact, if private companies are willing, as some have said, to issue policies comparable with national service life insurance policies at the same premiums, it seems to me the gentlemen who wish to get the Government out of the insurance business by abolishing national service life insurance might very well consider asking private carriers to arrange to take over the risks and premiums of the existing insurance, instead of denying service men and women any opportunity at all to obtain national service life insurance in the future.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has predicted the adoption in the Senate of an amendment similar to the one proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee, but we cannot be certain that the Senate will adopt such an amendment, and therefore we should do so here and now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EVINS) there were—ayes 14, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 83, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—390

Aandahl	Buffett	Fallon
Abbitt	Burdick	Feighan
Abernethy	Burleson	Fellows
Adair	Burnside	Fenton
Addonizio	Burton	Fernandez
Albert	Busbey	Fine
Allen, Calif.	Bush	Flood
Allen, Ill.	Butler	Fogarty
Allen, La.	Byrne, N. Y.	Forand
Andersen, H. Carl	Byrnes, Wis.	Ford
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Forrester
Andresen, August H.	Cannon	Frazier
Andrews	Carlyle	Fugate
Arends	Carnahan	Fulton
Armstrong	Chatham	Furcolo
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Gamble
Auchincloss	Chiperfield	Garmatz
Ayres	Chudoff	Gary
Bailey	Church	Gathings
Baker	Clemente	Gavin
Barden	Clevenger	George
Baring	Cole, Kans.	Golden
Barrett	Cooley	Goodwin
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Gordon
Bates, Mass.	Corbett	Gore
Battle	Cotton	Gossett
Beall	Cox	Graham
Beamer	Crawford	Granahan
Beckworth	Crosser	Granger
Belcher	Crumpacker	Grant
Bender	Cunningham	Green
Bennett, Fla.	Curtis, Mo.	Greenwood
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Nebr.	Gregory
Bentsen	Dague	Gross
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Gwinn
Betts	Davis, Tenn.	Hagen
Bishop	Davis, Wis.	Hale
Blackney	Dawson	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Blatnik	Deane	Hall, Leonard W.
Boggs, Del.	Delaney	Halleck
Boggs, La.	Dempsey	Hand
Bolling	Denny	Harden
Bolton	Denton	Hardy
Bonner	Devereux	Harris
Bosone	D'Ewart	Harrison, Va.
Bow	Dollinger	Harrison, Wyo.
Boykin	Dolliver	Hart
Bramblett	Dondero	Harvey
Bray	Donohue	Havenner
Brehm	Donovan	Hays, Ark.
Brown, Ga.	Dorn	Hays, Ohio
Brown, Ohio	Doughton	Hedrick
Brownson	Doyle	Heffernan
Bryson	Eaton	Heller
Buchanan	Elliott	Herlong
Buckley	Elston	Heselton
Burke	Engle	Hess
Burleson	Evins	Hill
Burnside	Fallon	Hillings
Burton	Feighan	Hinshaw
Busbey	Fellows	Hoeven
Bush	Fenton	Hoffman, Mich.
Butler	Fernandez	Holifield
Byrne, N. Y.	Fine	Holmes
Byrnes, Wis.	Flood	Hope
Camp	Fogarty	Horan
Cannon	Forand	Howell
Carlyle	Forrester	Hull
Carnahan	Frazier	Hunter
Chatham	Fugate	Irving
Chenoweth	Fulton	Jackson, Calif.
Chiperfield	Furcolo	James
Chudoff	Gamble	Jarman
Church	Garmatz	Javits
Clemente	Gary	Jenison
Clevenger	Gathings	Jenkins
Cole, Kans.	Gavin	Jensen
Cooley	George	Johnson
Cooper	Golden	Jonas
Corbett	Goodwin	Jones, Ala.
Cotton	Gordon	Jones, Mo.
Cox	Gore	Jones, Hamilton C.
Crawford	Gossett	Jones, Woodrow W.
Crosser	Graham	Judd
Crumpacker	Granahan	Karsten, Mo.
Cunningham	Granger	Kean
Curtis, Mo.	Grant	Kearney
Curtis, Nebr.	Green	Kearns
Dague	Greenwood	Keating
Davis, Ga.	Gregory	Kelley, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Gross	Kelly, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	Gwinn	Keogh
Dawson	Hagen	Kerr
Deane	Hale	Kersten, Wis.
Delaney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Kilburn
Dempsey	Hall, Leonard W.	Kilday
Denny	Halleck	Kirwan
Denton	Hand	Klein
Devereux	Harden	Kluczynski
D'Ewart	Hardy	Lane
Dollinger	Harris	Lanham
Dolliver	Harrison, Va.	Lantaff
Dondero	Harrison, Wyo.	Larcade
Donohue	Hart	Latham
Donovan	Harvey	LeCompte
Dorn	Havenner	Lesinski
Doughton	Hays, Ark.	Lind
Doyle	Hays, Ohio	Lovre
Eaton	Hedrick	Lucas
Elliott	Heffernan	Lyle
Elston	Heller	McCarthy
Engle	Herlong	McConnell
Evins	Heselton	McCormack
Fallon	Hess	McCulloch
Feighan	Hill	McDonough
Fellows	Hillings	McGrath
Fenton	Hinshaw	McGregor
Fernandez	Hoeven	McGuire
Fine	Hoffman, Mich.	McKinnon
Flood	Holifield	McMillan
Fogarty	Holmes	McMullen
Forand	Hope	McVey
Ford	Horan	Machrowicz
Forrester	Howell	Mack, Ill.
Frazier	Hull	Mack, Wash.
Fugate	Hunter	Madden
Fulton	Irving	Magee
Furcolo	Jackson, Calif.	Mansfield
Gamble	James	Marshall
Garmatz	Jarman	Martin, Iowa
Gary	Javits	Martin, Mass.
Gathings	Jenison	Mason
Gavin	Jenkins	Meader
George	Jensen	Merrow
Golden	Johnson	Miller, Md.
Goodwin	Jonas	Miller, Nebr.
Gordon	Jones, Ala.	Miller, N. Y.
Gore	Jones, Mo.	Mills
Gossett	Jones, Hamilton C.	Mitchell
Graham	Jones, Woodrow W.	Morano
Granahan	Judd	Morgan
Granger	Karsten, Mo.	Morris
Grant	Kean	Morton
Green	Kearney	Multer
Greenwood	Kearns	Mumma
Gregory	Keating	Murdock
Gross	Kelley, Pa.	Murphy
Gwinn	Kelly, N. Y.	Murray, Tenn.
Hagen	Keogh	Murray, Wis.
Hale	Kerr	Nelson
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Kersten, Wis.	Nicholson
Hall, Leonard W.	Kilburn	Norblad
Halleck	Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.
Hand	Kirwan	O'Brien, Mich.
Harden	Klein	O'Hara
Hardy	Kluczynski	O'Neill
Harris	Lane	Ostertag
Harrison, Va.	Lanham	Passman
Harrison, Wyo.	Lantaff	Patman
Hart	Larcade	Patten
Harvey	Latham	Patterson
Havenner	LeCompte	Perkins
Hays, Ark.	Lesinski	Philbin
Hays, Ohio	Lind	Phillips
Hedrick	Lovre	Pickett
Heffernan	Lucas	Poage
Heller	Lyle	Polk
Herlong	McCarthy	Potter
Heselton	McConnell	Poulson
Hess	McCormack	Powell
Hill	McCulloch	Preston
Hillings	McDonough	Price
Hinshaw	McGrath	Priest
Hoeven	McGregor	Prouty
Hoffman, Mich.	McGuire	Quinn
Holifield	McKinnon	Radwan
Holmes	McMillan	Rains
Hope	McMullen	Ramsay
Horan	McVey	Rankin
Howell	Machrowicz	Reams
Hull	Mack, Ill.	Redden
Hunter	Mack, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Irving	Madden	Reed, Ill.
Jackson, Calif.	Magee	Reed, N. Y.
James	Mansfield	Rees, Kans.
Jarman	Marshall	Regan
Javits	Martin, Iowa	Rhodes
Jenison	Martin, Mass.	Ribicoff
Jenkins	Mason	Richards
Jensen	Meader	Riehlman
Johnson	Merrow	Riley
Jonas	Miller, Md.	Rivers
Jones, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Roberts
Jones, Mo.	Miller, N. Y.	Robeson
Jones, Hamilton C.	Mills	Rodino
Jones, Woodrow W.	Mitchell	Rogers, Colo.
Judd	Morano	Rogers, Fla.
Karsten, Mo.	Morgan	Rogers, Mass.
Kean	Morris	Rogers, Tex.
Kearney	Morton	Roosevelt
Kearns	Multer	Sabath
Keating	Mumma	Sadlak
Kelley, Pa.	Murdock	St George
Kelly, N. Y.	Murphy	Sasscer
Keogh	Murray, Tenn.	Saylor
Kerr	Murray, Wis.	Schwabe
Kersten, Wis.	Nelson	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Kilburn	Nicholson	Scudder
Kilday	Norblad	Secrest
Kirwan	O'Brien, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Klein	O'Brien, Mich.	Shafer
Kluczynski	O'Hara	Sheehan
Lane	O'Neill	Shelley
Lanham	Ostertag	Sheppard
Lantaff	Passman	Sieminski
Larcade	Patman	Sikes
Latham	Patten	Simpson, Ill.
LeCompte	Patterson	Simpson, Pa.
Lesinski	Perkins	Sittler
Lind	Philbin	Smith, Kans.
Lovre	Phillips	Smith, Miss.
Lucas	Pickett	Smith, Va.
Lyle	Poage	Smith, Wis.
McCarthy	Polk	Spence
McConnell	Potter	Springer
McCormack	Poulson	Staggers
McCulloch	Powell	Stanley
McDonough	Preston	Steed
McGrath	Price	Stefan
McGregor	Priest	Stigler
McGuire	Prouty	Stockman
McKinnon	Quinn	Sullivan
McMillan	Radwan	Sutton
McMullen	Rains	Tackett
McVey	Ramsay	Talle
Machrowicz	Rankin	Taylor
Mack, Ill.	Reams	Teague
Mack, Wash.	Redden	Thomas
Madden	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, Mich.
Magee	Reed, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Mansfield	Reed, N. Y.	Thornberry
Marshall	Rees, Kans.	Tollefson
Martin, Iowa	Regan	Towe
Martin, Mass.	Rhodes	Trimble
Mason	Ribicoff	Underwood
Meader	Richards	Vail
Merrow	Riehlman	Van Zandt
Miller, Md.	Riley	Vaughn
Miller, Nebr.	Rivers	Vinson
Miller, N. Y.	Roberts	Vorys
Mills	Robeson	Vursell
Mitchell	Rodino	Walter
Morano	Rogers, Colo.	Weichel
Morgan	Rogers, Fla.	Welch
Morris	Rogers, Mass.	Werdel
Morton	Rogers, Tex.	Wharton
Multer	Roosevelt	Wheeler
Mumma	Sabath	Whitaker
Murdock	Sadlak	Whitten
Murphy	St George	Wickersham
Murray, Tenn.	Sasscer	Widnall
Murray, Wis.	Saylor	Wier
Nelson	Schwabe	Williams, Miss.
Nicholson	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.	Williams, N. Y.
Norblad	Scudder	Willis
O'Brien, Ill.	Secrest	Wilson, Ind.
O'Brien, Mich.	Seely-Brown	Winstead
O'Hara	Shafer	Withrow
O'Neill	Sheehan	Wolcott
Ostertag	Shelley	Wolverton
Passman	Sheppard	Wood, Ga.
Patman	Sieminski	Wood, Idaho
Patten	Sikes	Woodruff
Patterson	Simpson, Ill.	Yates
Perkins	Simpson, Pa.	Yorty
Philbin	Sittler	Zablocki
Phillips	Smith, Kans.	
Pickett	Smith, Miss.	
Poage	Smith, Va.	
Polk	Smith, Wis.	
Potter	Spence	
Poulson	Springer	
Powell	Staggers	
Preston	Stanley	
Price	Steed	
Priest	Stefan	
Prouty	Stigler	
Quinn	Stockman	
Radwan	Sullivan	
Rains	Sutton	
Ramsay	Tackett	
Rankin	Talle	
Reams	Taylor	
Redden	Teague	
Reece, Tenn.	Thomas	
Reed, Ill.	Thompson, Mich.	
Reed, N. Y.	Thompson, Tex.	
Rees, Kans.	Thornberry	
Regan	Tollefson	
Rhodes	Towe	
Ribicoff	Trimble	
Richards	Underwood	
Riehlman	Vail	
Riley	Van Zandt	
Rivers	Vaughn	
Roberts	Vinson	
Robeson	Vorys	
Rodino	Vursell	
Rogers, Colo.	Walter	
Rogers, Fla.	Weichel	
Rogers, Mass.	Welch	
Rogers, Tex.	Werdel	
Roosevelt	Wharton	
Sabath	Wheeler	
Sadlak	Whitaker	
St George	Whitten	
Sasscer	Wickersham	
Saylor	Widnall	
Schwabe	Wier	
Scott, Hugh D. Jr.	Williams, Miss.	
Scudder	Williams, N. Y.	
Secrest	Willis	
Seely-Brown	Wilson, Ind.	
Shafer	Winstead	
Sheehan	Withrow	
Shelley	Wolcott	
Sheppard	Wolverton	
Sieminski	Wood, Ga.	
Sikes	Wood, Idaho	
Simpson, Ill.	Woodruff	
Simpson, Pa.	Yates	
Sittler	Yorty	
Smith, Kans.	Zablocki	
Smith, Miss.		
Smith, Va.		
Smith, Wis.		
Spence		
Springer		
Staggers		
Stanley		
Steed		
Stefan		
Stigler		
Stockman		
Sullivan		
Sutton		
Tackett		
Talle		
Taylor		
Teague		
Thomas		
Thompson, Mich.		
Thompson, Tex.		
Thornberry		
Tollefson		
Towe		
Trimble		
Underwood		
Vail		
Van Zandt		
Vaughn		
Vinson		
Vorys		
Vursell		
Walter		
Weichel		
Welch		
Werdel		
Wharton		
Wheeler		
Whitaker		
Whitten		
Wickersham		
Widnall		
Wier		
Williams, Miss.		
Williams, N. Y.		
Willis		
Wilson, Ind.		
Winstead		
Withrow		
Wolcott		
Wolverton		
Wood, Ga.		
Wood, Idaho		
Woodruff		
Yates		
Yorty		
Zablocki		

NOT VOTING—44

Anfuso	Durham	Moulder
Angell	Eberharter	Norrell
Breen	Ellsworth	O'Konski
Brooks	Fisher	O'Toole
Budge	Gillette	Rabaut
Canfield	Hébert	Rooney
Case	Herter	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Chelf	Jackson, Wash.	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Taber
Colmer	Kennedy	Van Pelt
Combs	King	Velde
Coudert	Mahon	Wigglesworth
DeGraffenried	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Dingell	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Durham with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Wilson of Texas with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Short.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. King with Mr. Case.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Scrivner.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZATION OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1726, with Mr. BATTLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the title of this bill pretty thoroughly expresses the purpose of the bill, which is to provide for organization of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes. This is a counterpart of the bill which we had here in the last Congress for the statutory organization of the Army.

First, let me point out some things that this bill does not do: It does not in any way increase or diminish the personnel strength of the Air Force, either the officer personnel or the enlisted personnel. I make this point because I found before the Rules Committee that I did not make that strong enough and some were of the opinion that it increased the number of higher-ranking officers of the Air Force; it does not do so.

The Air Force, of course, is a new organization, having been separated from the Army by the so-called Unification Act, the National Security Act of 1947.

The Army has been in existence for many, many years. Over a period of 150 years through historical organization, through tradition, and through legislation it had acquired a very rigid statutory organization. The organization existing for the Army on a permanent basis was the organization provided in the National Defense Act of 1916 as amended in 1921.

The organizational set-up by statute, as I said, was very rigid, separating the Army into branches, services, departments, and corps. The Air Force became a separate organization; it became so under the National Security Act which was reported to the House by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and not by either of the committees which for a long period of time had handled legislation affecting the armed services. Thus, other than those provisions for organization which the Air Force took with them from the Army, practically the only permanent law with reference to Air Force organization is that there shall be an Air Force, a Secretary of the Air Force, and a Chief of Staff who shall command the same.

In this bill we do not intend to impose the rigid type of organization upon the Air Force which the Army has had in the past; thus the approach, in considering the Air Force bill and the Army bill—they were considered by the same subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services—was completely opposite. The purpose in the Army organization bill was to relieve the Army from many of the rigid controls as to organization and administration which had previously affected it. The approach to this, inasmuch as the Air Force has very few laws controlling it, was to exercise the constitutional obligation and duty of the Congress to provide legislative authority and a legislative policy as to the organization of the Air Force.

It sets out in brief a codification of the system under which the Air Force is presently operated, making very few changes, the principal one I propose to mention specifically as we consider the bill. It follows pretty generally the definitions such as we have affecting the Army. It provides, of course, for a Secretary, an Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, and it provides for the first time an Air Staff.

The General Staff system of the Army was set up in 1903 by law. There is no such law as to the Air Force, although the Air Force has had from time to time, separated from the Army, an Air Staff as distinguished from the Army General Staff. It is called the Air Staff. For the first time by law we authorize the Air Staff.

We also provide for a Chief of Staff, a Vice Chief of Staff, not to exceed five Deputy Chiefs of Staff, and such other members of the Air Force and such civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force as may be assigned or detailed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The important place where we have changed the statutory organization of the Air Force is as to the command of the Air Force by the Chief of Staff.

The National Security Act of 1947 provides that the Chief of Staff shall command the Air Force. The Chief of Staff of the Army does not and has never had command of the Army. He has had supervision of the Army. In the Navy the Chief of Naval Operations does not command the Navy. The Chief of Naval Operations commands the operating forces of the Navy. This is of very considerable importance, although first it may seem to be a play on words. Our bill provides for supervision and not command. The Army Chief of Staff has supervision, not command.

In other words, in conformity with our system of government as provided in the Constitution, it is the view of our committee that no individual, no professional military individual, should be permitted to command the entire military force, whether it be the Army, Navy, or Air Force. The command of the Armed Forces of the United States is by the Constitution vested in the President of the United States. He is the Commander in Chief. So that no individual should be permitted to command the entire Army, the entire Navy, or the entire Air Force. There is no objection to a military man commanding any given segment of any one of the three services, but in the over-all command of all it should be the President as provided in the Constitution. This bill, throughout, preserves civilian control of the Air Force; so does the bill organizing the Army and organizing the Navy. The President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the particular service are in general supervision of the Military Establishment, and they always come ahead of the military. That preserves the type of government that we have organized in the United States from the beginning.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would kindly explain to the Committee the provision on page 5, paragraph (c). Some of the Members are in doubt as to exactly what that means, and I am sure the gentleman can explain it so that it has no hidden meaning or derogatory effect if the bill is passed.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman means if he is acting as Secretary of the Air Force, "section 1222, Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 576) shall not apply to him by reason of his temporary performing such duties"?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. It is the same provision as has been in effect with reference to the Army; in other words, if a catastrophe happens and the Secretaries are all killed, then the President could temporarily appoint the Chief of Staff as the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. KILDAY. The purpose of the exception to the Revised Statutes is to protect the Chief of Staff's appointment as Chief of Staff. Otherwise, upon assuming the office temporarily he would be affected by the section of the Revised Statutes which prohibits an officer from holding a civil office while on the active list. I understand some have raised the question of having the Chief of Staff appear in line of succession with the civilian Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries. That is nothing new in our military system. As a matter of fact, it seldom happens, but it has occasionally happened that the Chief of Staff of the Army has functioned as Acting Secretary of War. I do not believe it has happened since we have had the Secretary of the Army. General Craig, perhaps General Marshall—but I am sure General Craig served as Acting Secretary of War. In that one place we have a slight deviation from the civilian

control, of which I was speaking. It is one place that seems to be lax, but it is in accordance with traditions and history. It has presented no difficulty in the past, but on the contrary, on occasion, has been found to be helpful and convenient.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that all this law does is to codify the practices that the Air Force has been administering for the last 20 years; ever since they were established?

Mr. KILDAY. I want to emphasize that it is a codification of the system already existing in the Air Force. For 20 years? I cannot say that, because we did not have a complete separation until the National Security Act of 1947. In that respect there is this distinction—the bill does not create any separate corps in the Air Force. The Army has many corps, departments, and branches that have been set up, and they have come down through the years. The Air Force has never been organized that way. It has had a more elastic organization from the time it was separated from the Army, and we preserve that situation here. There is no separate corps. Of course, it was suggested that there should be. Testimony was given and witnesses appeared suggesting that a separate Judge Advocate General Corps be provided for the Air Force. That is not done by this bill. In one respect, however, it departs from the general formula of the bill. It provides that the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force shall be a permanent major general. I said we did not create any new general grades. Well, we did not. The Judge Advocate General now is a major general, but he is not a permanent major general. He has a spot promotion as major general while acting as Judge Advocate General. It is the view of the committee that it would probably be better to make him a permanent major general to lessen any suspicion of control over him by the commanding officers of the Air Force in discharging his function in connection with the administration of military justice. It provides that he be a permanent major general, so he is not going to be looking to promotion or fear any reduction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In the bill as it is now written it does not provide that the Judge Advocate General be a lawyer. However, it is my understanding that another act does make that provision; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Of course, he has to be a lawyer.

The other provisions with respect to the Judge Advocate General are to integrate the Air Force into the uniform code of military justice which was adopted in the last Congress and which becomes effective on the 31st day of May this year. It is to make sure that those things to be done by the Judge Advocate General under that code come within the jurisdiction of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force.

The other principal provision is that we create by statute three commands that we specify as major commands. They are the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command, and the Tactical Air Command. These are all combat forces. The three major commands created by the statute are all combat forces.

There is another provision that authorizes such other commands, organizations, and forces as may from time to time be established by the Secretary of the Air Force. Of course, now you have the training command, the matériel command, and others. Thus there may be other commands, but they are not specified as major commands. The major commands are the three combat commands.

We thought it was very important that we stress these three commands; one of the greatest reasons being that we wanted Congress to emphasize that we wanted these strategic and tactical forces built up and maintained, the emphasis being on the tactical command as well as the strategic command, and then the air-defense command, which is, of course, for the defense of our own country; so we have the three major fighting commands.

Then the bill provides that the country can be divided into various areas, for the purpose of command.

It may be that as time goes on we are going to find it necessary to impose a more rigid organization upon the Air Force. We feel that at this time, while it is in its formative period, it should not be too rigidly controlled, that experience should be permitted to develop, so we will know just where additional organization is necessary. That controlled us a great deal in providing only the three major commands by statute, and then setting up other or less important commands by administrative procedure in the department.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman be kind enough to place in the RECORD, unless he happens to know exactly what it is now, the provisions of section 203? We want to have in the RECORD how many lieutenant generals will be permitted in this new Air Force.

Mr. KILDAY. The Air Force is authorized 13 permanent lieutenant generals and 4 permanent four-star generals.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill is adequate for the purposes, and, under existing circumstances, as far as we should go in discharging our obligation to formulate the military policy and the legislative policy for the armed services. We should take this step at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for the full and comprehensive report on the bill presently before us. There seems to be no opposition. There was no opposition in the Committee on Armed Services in reporting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of the time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this minute in order to make an announcement as requested by the majority leader. The majority leader has instructed me to say for the information of the Members of the House that after the conclusion of this bill, there is no further legislative program for this week. The House, of course, will meet tomorrow, when it is hoped that we may be able to adjourn over until Monday. There is no legislative program for tomorrow.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for this opportunity of rising and explaining my position. During the 6 years that I have been in the House I have always offered an antisegregation amendment to every bill that has come before us pertaining to the Armed Forces. I rise today to state that I will not do this during the period now—the period when we are at war. The thing that is important to us now is victory, victory at all costs, except the cost of losing our civil liberties.

During the 6 years that I have fought for the abolition of segregation in the Armed Forces, step by step we have seen great improvement; and I am happy to state today that men of my racial group are serving with great distinction and courage in the Korean conflict. Before the Korean conflict Paul Robeson said that Negro people would not take up arms against Soviet Russia. The very next morning I stood in the well of this House and said that Paul Robeson was not stating the truth concerning the peoples of my group, that when the call to arms came, we would answer the same as anyone else, as they always have done. Time has proven that I was correct. Already the Congressman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has told this House of the courage of the Twenty-fourth Infantry, and the heroic stand that they took, which helped to give us our first victory in the Korean conflict.

I have before me an article concerning Lieutenant Wynn, of North Carolina. The article is as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier]

NEGRO OFFICER'S ACTION UNEQUALED IN MILITARY HISTORY

(By Alex M. Rivera, Jr.)

DURHAM, N. C.—Will Lt. Ellison Wynn of the baker company of the second division receive the Nation's highest decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor?

Twice wounded in the Korean fighting zone, Lieutenant Wynn, of Durham, N. C., is now recovering at an Army hospital in Osaka, Japan, for action which an authoritative Army historian has described as "perhaps unequaled in American military history."

A baker in a Durham hospital before he volunteered for Korean combat duty, Lieutenant Wynn, who is married and the father of two small daughters, distinguished himself as leader of an integrated unit of white and Negro fighting men.

Col. L. S. A. Marshall, the Army's roving efficiency expert on Infantry operations in Korea, picked Wynn's unit "as possibly the bravest in the action."

Wynn's wife, Mrs. Meneva Wynn, of 1205 Fifth Avenue, Durham, told this reporter who was one of Wynn's high school classmates, that her husband "has been badly hit by mortar fire." It has been learned that the right side of Wynn's face was virtually blown away. Plastic surgery is being considered for him.

WYNN AND THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL

Colonel Marshall has said of the action of the mixed white and Negro unit under Wynn's command: "That company's stand was perhaps unequaled in American military history. It entered action with 125 men and withdrew only on regimental orders with its tail fighting like hell 24 hours later with only 34 men not wounded."

The company commander, Capt. William C. Wallace, Petersburg, Va., was wounded in the first hour of battle and his executive officer, Lieutenant Wynn, led the company for the next 24 hours.

"Get the picture," Marshall said. "The commanding officer from Virginia, a Negro second in command and two noncoms, Cpl. Donald Crawford (South Boston, Va.) and Sgt. Laurence C. Smith, Jr. (Sandstone, Va.) distinguished themselves along with Wynn."

Marshall said that the fighting at close quarters was so savage that there were reported instances of fist fighting between Americans and Chinese. He added that neither in the Pacific nor European campaigns of World War II did "I find a division that fought with more gallantry than the Second."

Marshall compiled the detailed histories of 16 companies of the Ninth, Twenty-third and Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiments during their furious week-long battle and withdrawal from Kujangdong south to Suchon last month.

Marshall is chief editorial writer of the Detroit News and a former Army historian of World War II.

May I further quote from this newspaper concerning Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of the Bronx:

SAVED BEACHHEAD—LIEUTENANT, HIS PLATOON HUNGNAM HEROES

HUNGNAM, KOREA.—Leonidas, the intrepid Spartan at Thermopylae, found his twentieth century counterpart on the ever-tightening UN beachhead here at this beleaguered port early on the morning of December 18. He was First Lt. Harry E. Sutton of the Bronx, N. Y., who, with his platoon, stood off frenzied Chinese attacks and saved every UN soldier on this beachhead.

Only Lieutenant Sutton and his little platoon of heroic Negro doughboys stood between the Reds and the Sea of Japan, into which the Reds are trying to drive the UN forces. If Lieutenant Sutton's platoon had yielded the end would have been written then and there to the saga of the allied evacuation from North Korea. He did not yield.

ATTACKED BEFORE DAWN

Starting before dawn on that subzero Monday morning in banzai yells of charging Chinese, the sound of their blowing bugles and their fanatic battering away at the position held by Lieutenant Sutton, were the signals for the beginning of one more epic stand in the annals of military history.

From early dawn Monday until Tuesday afternoon, Lieutenant Sutton led his men to attack and counterattack, and the blood of Chinese soldiers reddened the white snow atop the triple ridges over which Sutton had strung out his weary, grimy, half-frozen men. Before the day was ended, allied officers had added a new name to the long list made famous by gallant stands: Sutton's Ridge, they called the triple hills.

INCESSANT WAVES

Repeatedly the Chinese threw themselves in incessant waves against the valiant band of Negro soldiers who calmly loaded and reloaded their M1 rifles and Browning automatic rifles and fired again and again into the oncoming human waves. They wrote a brilliant story of heroism here on Hungnam's beachhead which will live forever in the minds of the thousands of UN troops who are living today because these Negro soldiers said: "They shall not pass." For the Chinese did not pass.

Lieutenant Sutton's platoon was assigned to hold a long three-humped ridge as part of the port defenses of the United States Third Infantry Division, on the eastern flank of the beachhead. The Reds—Chinese and North Koreans—were on the next ridge line over the Negro GI's. At 7:45 Monday morning they struck. They hit Sutton's position with everything they had.

OLD-FASHIONED FIGHTING

Moving back and forth in World War I trench fashion, Sutton and his men picked the Reds off as they came with a cross-fire. "But they just kept coming," Lieutenant Sutton said later, "All day they kept hitting us in small groups. We would wipe out one bunch, and before we knew it another bunch was coming in."

The Reds tried to pin down Sutton and his men with heavy fire, so they could rush the entrenchments. Sutton's men brought all their firepower into play in return. The Reds were using captured American rifles and machine guns in this attack.

Brilliant individual examples of heroism stood out. Facing the Reds head-on, Master Sgt. Tyler Collins, of Malone, Fla., stood upright and picked off seven Reds, one by one, as they rushed in, cooly disregarding their frantic fire. One bazooka man in the platoon fired one burst at the Reds and his single shot killed ten of them. Around 7 o'clock Monday evening, the Reds eased their attack.

Two hours later they broke loose again and Lieutenant Sutton and his men went back into action facing a new type of attack from the Reds. They had altered their tactics and were using sniper style attacks. These kept up all through the long, cold night.

NEW ATTACKS

At 6 a. m Tuesday, the Reds threw a wall of fire at the center of Sutton's ridge, as the spot was now known. A suicide attack was thrown at Lieutenant Sutton's left flank. But the intrepid platoon then got some help—for the first time in the fray. It came from the massed fire of United States artillery to the rear on the shrinking beachhead. Sutton's men fought from trench to foxholes as the Reds attacked again and again. But the Reds couldn't break through.

Had they broken through, they would have gone straight through to the sea of Japan. Some Reds managed to get into Sutton's lines, but he and his men killed them off as fast as they got in. After-battle examination showed that some of the Reds had morphine on their persons, indicating that they might have come into the battle doped. One Negro GI was found dead beneath the bodies of two Reds; he had killed them both.

KNOCKED OUT MG

Pfc. Elijah Whitley, of Toledo, Ark., used his BAR to put a Red machine gun out of action just as the Reds had gotten it into place along the ridge line. When all was over, Reds were strewn over the snowclad hillsides in all kinds of crazy positions. They had failed to take the position held by Lieutenant Sutton and his men.

Lieutenant Sutton, a veteran of the Pacific in World War II, and with some 10 years of Army experience behind him, said he had never seen anything like it before. "I'm proud of my men," he said. "We're proud of the lieutenant," said the men; "he was great."

And then came the most startling revelation of all: When the Reds finally gave up their attack, every man in his platoon was down to his very last clip of .30 caliber ammunition for their M1 rifles.

The New York Times of Friday, December 22, 1950, further supports the Pittsburgh Courier article on Lieutenant Sutton, with a press release from the Associated Press:

NEGRO UNIT HAILED ON HUNGNAM STAND—PLATOON LED BY BRONX OFFICER STAVED OFF MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO BEACHHEAD

WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, December 20.—A gallant Negro infantry platoon fought off the most threatening approach yet to a Communist break-through into the Hungnam beachhead.

The United States unit was led by Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of 1100 Franklin Avenue, the Bronx, N. Y., when the North Koreans made their wild charge.

The Red assault disintegrated when each United States soldier was down to his last ammunition clip of eight bullets. That's how close the Communists came to penetrating at least the outer United Nations defense ring.

The savage battle of "Sutton's Ridge" began before dawn Monday. The United States counter-attack ended Tuesday noon.

Since then the United States troops have shifted positions. The story now can be told without endangering security.

A famous Third Division regiment was holding part of the hilly eastern flank of the beachhead. Lieutenant Sutton's platoon was assigned to a long, three-humped ridge.

Lieutenant Sutton has been a soldier a long time and an infantry lieutenant 5 years. He spotted his men in strong points on the three ridge nipples and along the World War I type trenches that civilian workers had gouged in the frozen earth.

He was worried. Fresh North Korean soldiers—reorganized, reequipped, and fanatic—were on the next ridge line over. On his right flank they had strongpointed a hill that surrounding crags masked from United States artillery.

At 7:45 a. m., Monday, the Communists struck. Crawling up the bare windswept ridge came 3 groups of 20 men—1 group on each flank, 1 dead center. Just a small attack, but made by ferocious men who would not stop even when wounded.

The United States soldiers moved back and forth in their old-fashioned trench, picking off the Reds.

"But they kept coming and coming, Lieutenant Sutton said. "All day small groups of them kept coming. We would wipe out this bunch, and before we knew it the Reds were back again."

The Communists from the ridge line opposite tried to pin down Lieutenant Sutton's men with fire so the assault groups could reach the trench line. The Reds were firing captured United States Browning automatic rifles, machine guns, and Garand rifles.

Master Sgt. Tyler Collins, of Malone, Fla., stood bolt upright and picked off seven Communists. A bazooka man killed 10 with a single shell. But the Reds kept coming for more than 11 hours. Finally at 7 p. m. there was a break.

"We have licked them," the GI's told each other jubilantly.

But 2 hours later the snarl of small arms began again from the opposite ridge. There was no assault this time, just the continual bark of snipers' rifles through the long, frigid night.

REDS ATTACK ANEW AFTER HALT

At 6 a. m. Tuesday the Reds assaulted "Sutton Ridge." From the ridge opposite the center of the line came a fierce wall of fire.

A suicide enemy force struck up the slope against the left flank.

Lieutenant Sutton was not too worried about these two fronts—the massed firepower of United States artillery could hit there.

But from the hill on the right—masked from the guns by the other hills—the main force of the enemy was assaulting in the darkness. The Reds were coming down a precipitous slope, tying short fiber ropes on scrub pines and lowering themselves.

With flashing bayonets they burst into the strong point on the last of the three nipples on Lieutenant Sutton's ridge. The GI's there fought desperately. Later, in one fox hole, Lieutenant Sutton found two dead North Koreans and the body of the United States soldier who had killed them before he died.

Once inside the trenches the Reds turned the United States soldiers' own machine gun down the ridge line.

Pfc Elijah Whitley, of Toledo, Ark., replied with his Browning automatic rifle, silencing the machine gun. Along the ridge line Lieutenant Sutton and his men rolled hand grenades down the slope. In the breaking dawn they could see the Communists crumple and tumble down the slope and then see new men replace them. Bodies were strewn crazily on the slopes.

May I also call the attention of the House to the article in Collier's magazine, January 13, 1951, on Sgt. Arthur Dudley, of Florida:

FOURTH SQUAD, THIRD PLATOON

(By Bill Stapleton)

(Officers watching him in action called Sgt. Arthur C. Dudley "the best damn squad leader in Korea." And his men, American and Korean, had one thing in common; respect for their Negro sarge.)

KOREA.—Coming down from the Nineteenth Infantry Regiment's front-line positions on the bleak hill that rose behind the battalion command post, Sgt. (1c) Arthur Charles Dudley led the seven men into the farmyard. They had been visible for about 10 minutes. All walked with the tired step of the veteran infantryman. All were hunched against the bitter, stinging cold of the North Korea winter.

Sergeant Dudley was apologetic about the absence of Guido. He explained to the battalion commander: "We were diggin' in on the hill last night when the han' grenade that Guido had in his pocket went off. Guess it hit his shovel or something. Anyway, we got him evacuated and I think he's gonna be O. K. It didn't kill him. It jest tore up his leg some."

The other members of the squad watched Dudley intently as he talked. Obviously, the sergeant had won high respect and admiration from men who admire top leadership in a very tough profession.

Guido. Corp. Guido Schoentrup, aged 25, assistant squad leader, home town, Indianapolis, had been Sergeant Dudley's strong right arm. They all missed him.

A GARAND WITH MANY NOTCHES

Guido had been there when the legends began to grow about the now famous international squad, led by the deadliest of rifle marksmen—a Negro sergeant who could count at least 53 enemy dead on the butt of his Garand, and whom I heard referred to respectfully by war-weary senior officers as "the best damn squad leader in Korea."

Word of Sergeant Dudley and his international squad had first reached me at the Chongchon River front, where I was photographing combat operations for Collier's. The stories of the unit's achievements in action impressed me, of course. But there was more to it than that. It seemed to me their importance was inescapable: The squad was a heart-warming and dramatic symbol of cooperation and mutual respect among freemen fighting for a common cause. I felt I had to find them; know them. That's how I came to be waiting at the command post.

Sergeant Dudley saluted his battalion officer, turned to his squad, and said in a soft southern voice that could also crackle with military authority when necessary, "Let it rest, children." He motioned them to a bonfire in the corner of the farmyard.

The squad—Jennings, Smith, Jesse, Sparks, Jones, Chief, and Miller—rested.

For the record, the full names: Corp. Elmer D. Jennings, 18, of Hillsville, Va.; Corp. Clifford H. Smith, 20, of Detroit, Mich.; Pvt. Kim Sung (Jesse) Duk, 19, of Haman, Korea; Pfc Carlton F. Sparks, 18, of Marion, N. C.; Pvt. Un Kae (Jones) Pyong, 22, of Taegu, Korea; Pvt. Im Chong (Chief) Myung, 28, of Taegu, Korea, and Pfc James H. Miller, 19, of Iron City, Ga.

Heavy artillery—big stuff, outgoing—crumped into the nearby enemy country, but the front was quiet. A pig in the farmyard rooted noisily and one of the squad threw a rock at him.

Sergeant Dudley thumbed through a short personal record of his little outfit, the smallest unit of command in the Army.

His record of the lives of his men was written neatly enough on a page in the center fold of a parachutist's logbook. The book, picked up off the ground at Fort Benning, Ga., last year, was small enough to fit in the corner of Dudley's wallet.

Some of the names were misspelled.

A name, Pfc Frank Brandt, carried the notation—with ROK's. A name, Pfc Herschel Wallingham—gone to platoon. A name, Pvt. Tony Ramirez—bad feet, transferred.

The squad, in such quiet moments, didn't talk about the war, the United Nations or the big picture. They didn't care.

They remembered, instead, that Sergeant Dudley owed the squad a Coke a day for every day that the war lasted beyond September 19. Dudley had predicted the war would be over by then and they'd all go back to Japan. The Coke bet was important. They needled him about it, in wry humor.

As they spoke of getting back to Japan, as some might speak of getting back to the United States, these cold, weary men pointed up their occasional terrible homesickness for security and peace. Japan was closer.

Dudley invited everyone to Florida after the war to bask in the warm sunshine near his home at Warrington, near Pensacola. Even the Korean boys understood what this talk meant and they smiled in appreciation.

Twenty-eight-year-old Arthur C. Dudley entered service at Camp Blanding, Florida, October 7, 1942. He was a draftee, leaving a job in a paper pulp mill at Marianna, Fla. He was assigned to Camp Hood, Texas, for training with the armored forces and sailed for Europe with the Eight Hundred and Twenty-seventh Tank Destroyer Battalion. He served in France, Germany, and Austria. After three re-enlistments, he was a career soldier, intending to become an ordnance expert.

But in Korea, shivering in the bone-chilling winds that whistled out of Manchuria 60 miles away, he thought a lot of home, his wife, Hattie, and their two daughters, Yvonne and Sheila, aged 4 and 5 years.

Private First Class Miller, youngest of the squad and assistant BAR gunner, was very apparently proud of his leader.

"Tell 'em how you picked off that gook at that long range, Sergeant Dudley." He turned to the rest of the squad. Chief grinned in appreciation.

DUDLEY'S VERSION OF THE SHOOTING

The squad leader shifted his seat around the fire to include all of the group:

"Like I've told you people before, know your rifle. It wasn't too much. It was pretty long range. I fired once, noticed where the dust kicked up near this guy, then I raised my sights a hair and got him. I don't know where it hit him, but it killed him."

They measured it later. The range was 1,300 yards. (According to the Army, the rifle is accurate up to 1,200 yards.) Maybe it was easy for a sharpshooting hunter who used to strike matches with a .22 when he was 11 years old.

Corporal Jennings, the bazookaman, chimed in, saying, "The sergeant doesn't ever say much."

The rest of the men nodded slowly, their heads bobbing under steel helmets blackened by use in heating water and cooking.

"That's the truth," said Corporal Smith. "He never does say much."

The Department of the Army said it for Sergeant Dudley in General Orders, No. 110, dated October 11, 1950. They awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism.

Headquarters Eighth Army gave him the medal, the Nation's second highest military award, in recognition of his services during the action at Ch'ang-nyong. The action took place over a 5-day period, August 2–7. Dudley, a new replacement for Baker Company, first joined the unit on the 3d of August, reporting in during the heat of the battle.

During fighting at the Naktong River, Sergeant Dudley personally eliminated 50 enemy riflemen, after first exposing himself, to draw fire.

The Army, in military language, says, "Men were exhausted and were subject to harassing fire, particularly from enemy snipers and automatic weapons. The company was at half strength, having taken severe casualties over a period of weeks."

Dudley was also commended for his action on August 7 when he unjammed a machine gun for a worried gunner, again under heavy enemy fire. Later the same day, he was wounded and evacuated, under protests from Dudley that he be allowed to stay with his squad.

THE SERGEANT IS WOUNDED

Sergeant Dudley was hit—mortar fragments in the right leg and arm—and was hospitalized for 12 days, after which he immediately rejoined his unit.

That was where most of the squad caught it. They all spoke of the battle positions there as "the Notch."

Smith got knocked flat and was later hospitalized for concussion from another mortar shell.

Miller watched in some amazement as the bipod legs of his automatic rifle were shot away during one frenzied charge by the enemy.

A boy by the name of Oldamaker or Oldemeyer from Indiana got knocked out by blast concussion and didn't rejoin the squad. No one remembered his first name.

And, the squad remembered, a Spanish kid from Texas got killed outright from a sniper's bullet.

"Hand grenades flew like baseballs," Jennings recalled.

Just then a jeep courier whizzed into the command post and two bundled-up riders hurried into the thatched farmhouse. A field telephone nearby rang and the soldier who answered it said "Doughboy Red."

We couldn't hear the conversation.

Sergeant Dudley picked up again. "I came out here originally as a replacement soldier for the Twenty-fifth Division, but we got kinda mixed up and the Twenty-fourth needed the replacements quicker, I guess. So we came here."

The sergeant paused to listen to Jennings and Sparks argue over where they had been.

Miller said, "We could tell you better if we could remember some of these little old towns, but most of 'em end in Yong or Dong,

and how can you remember anything from that?"

He stopped talking to accept a roasted corncob from Jesse, the Korean ammunition carrier, and began to munch it.

The South Koreans assigned to the squad never spoke of one another by their right, or native names. Instead, they used the nicknames given them by the Americans, even when talking among themselves.

The conversation on the field telephone was terminated by the soldier, who said, "Okay, I'll tell him."

Sergeant Dudley said, "You know this figure of 53 dead gooks? Well, I have a quota of 75. Me and a boy named Gant in Charlie Company got a bet on. I'm way ahead of him now, but maybe I'll fill my quota before this war's over.

"These Chinese boys we're running up against are pretty good fighters. You can't see them. They take advantage of all the cover and they fight like real trained soldiers, not like the North Koreans."

Chief spat into the fire.

Jennings spoke up: "We've got a pretty wonderful squad here and we couldn't have a much better leader than what we have. He always tells the new guys that we're like a chain and that we aren't any better than our weakest link. We always dig our fox holes that way. Like a chain, in a way."

Sparks said it should be put in the story that Sergeant Dudley didn't go to sleep some nights until he was sure the squad was O. K.

The interview time was going fast.

THEY TALK MOSTLY OF THEIR FAMILIES

Sergeant Dudley stood up and so did his squad. "We ain't got much more to say. Usually we jest sit around and talk about our families. We don't know a lot about this war."

He picked up his rifle and walked out on the pathway to the hills. Pfc. Carlton Sparks, of Marion, N. C., helped Pvt. Un Kae Pyong, of Taegu, Korea, put on his pack. The rest of the squad quietly, almost automatically, fell into a line.

Sparks said, "We don't worry about talking to the Korean guys. Chief has a list of words we use most and he's studying on it."

Everyone looked at Sergeant Dudley. "Let's move out," he said softly and they swung down the path, away from the farmyard and toward the frowning hill. The artillery started up again.

Away from the command post, to the left, was a battered cornfield and the line stopped there to wave back. You could see Sergeant Dudley plainly, even though he was at the head of the small column. He was standing on something and his face was outlined against the whitening cornstalks. He stood out clearly.

Now, I not only want to call attention to the bravery of these men and their troops and others unknown, but I want to say that I believe effective action should be taken to see that a Congressional Medal of Honor is issued to either one or all three of these highly praised heroes.

I further want to point out that Lieutenant Wynn, of North Carolina, and Sergeant Dudley, of Florida, were the officers in charge of mixed groups of Negro and white troops. Segregation is vanishing in the Armed Forces.

Before June 25, the Korean conflict, my aim was the abolition of segregation in the Armed Forces, and my record for 6 years substantiates that, but now we are at war and we must win. We must not give aid and comfort to our enemies, and on the other hand we must not lose any vestige of democracy that we have already won. In fact, we must go forward.

Personally, during this session of Congress, I intend to press for all civil-rights bills and intend to fight, by the way of amendments, for increased democracy on the home front. I intend to support during this war every single piece of legislation aimed at victory for our way of life. For the duration only, I will not offer any antisegregation bills as amendments to bills pertaining to the Military Establishment as long as progress continues and there are no violations of the order abolishing segregation.

I leave all this now in the hands of the Commander in Chief, our President, Mr. Truman. He can by Executive order abolish any form of segregation that may still be left or any that does creep out. However, if there are any flagrant abuses, if there are any cases where segregation and discrimination do come to the forefront, then I will fight the slightest injustice and if this injustice continues as a pattern, then I will be forced to come back to this floor and again raise the issue. I wish to serve notice, however, that I will in every way fight a universal military training bill because I am against it for many reasons, not only from the standpoint of establishing a permanent pattern of segregation, but from other standpoints as well.

I want to finally conclude with a letter which came to me from Mr. James Evans, the civilian assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and I think that this will help shape up our entire problem.

(The letter is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1951.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. POWELL: We are furnishing herewith an account of the heroic service of Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of the Bronx, and his platoon on the Hungnam beachhead.

We are also enclosing press releases of current Medal of Honor awards with the thought that these may assist with the representations which you propose to make in asking that the Medal of Honor be bestowed upon Lieutenant Sutton.

I am advised by some of our high-ranking officers, who are thoroughly familiar with the matter under consideration, that nothing in these commendations surpasses the achievements of Lieutenant Sutton. It is to be noted that he is alive where many others have lost their lives in undertaking similar heroic actions.

We greatly need an outstanding, live, active Negro hero to symbolize the heroic sacrifices and accomplishments of all our men in the Far East. Lieutenant Sutton and his outfit are outstanding in this regard. Permit us to commend for your attention also the achievements of Sgt. (1c) Arthur Charles Dudley as set forth in the January 13, 1951, issue of Collier's magazine, pages 9–11.

Permit me to treat further the seriousness of our need in this connection. I am enclosing copies of an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eighty-first Congress which pertains to a statement by Congressman LANE, of Massachusetts, on some of the exploits of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment. Following this account, the Twenty-fourth achieved further distinction in spearheading a successful movement to the east and west and north. At the same time, there were splendid accounts of outstanding achievement on the part of our officers and men who were functioning in integrated units and otherwise performing their military duties without regard to race.

* * * * *

On the alert as you always are, you can greatly serve our men in the service by taking up where others left off months ago and restore Lieutenant Sutton and all who he typifies to their rightful place before those who so greatly need bases for encouragement and inspiration.

I would assume that you will receive additional specific aid in this matter through the Chief of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Army, but I hope that you will call upon us for such further details as you may consider essential.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. EVANS,
Civilian Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman cite that instance where the Negro flier was shot down, and was seen in the plane by a white man who saved him?

Mr. POWELL. I do not think I have that item, but I would be happy to include that with my remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That shows there is not anywhere near as much discrimination when the chips are down as some folks seem to think.

Mr. POWELL. That is what I am pointing out in my speech. The War Department records show that Negro and white troops are fighting side by side in Korea, some commanded by Negroes and some by whites in every phase of our Armed Forces.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This act may be cited as the "Air Force Organization Act of 1951."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title of act.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Title I. Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force.
Title II. Chief of Staff and the Air Staff.
Title III. Composition and organization of the Air Force.
Title IV. Repeals, amendments, and saving provisions.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The terms "United States Air Force" and "Air Force" are synonymous and mean the United States Air Force established by the National Security Act of 1947, and said terms include the components and persons prescribed in section 301 of this act.

(b) The term "members of the Air Force" means all persons appointed, enlisted, or inducted in, or transferred to, any of the components of the Air Force; all persons appointed, enlisted, or inducted in, or transferred to the Air Force without specification of component; and all persons serving as members of the Air Force under call or conscription under any provision of law. The term "officers of the Air Force" means all members of the Air Force appointed to and

holding a commissioned or warrant officer grade. The term "airmen" is synonymous with "enlisted members" and means all members of the Air Force in any enlisted grade.

(c) The term "Air Force Establishment" means all commands, organizations, forces, agencies, installations, and activities, including the Department of the Air Force, all members of the Air Force, all property of every kind and character—real, personal, and mixed—and all civilian personnel, under the control or supervision of the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) The term "Department of the Air Force" means the executive part of the Air Force Establishment at the seat of government.

TITLE I—SECRETARY, UNDER SECRETARY, AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force shall be responsible for and shall have the authority necessary to conduct all affairs of the Air Force Establishment, including, but not limited to, those necessary or appropriate for the training, operations, administration, logistical support and maintenance, welfare, preparedness, and effectiveness of the Air Force, including research and development, and such other activities as may be prescribed by the President or the Secretary of Defense as authorized by law. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to conduct the affairs of the Air Force Establishment.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force may assign to the Under Secretary of the Air Force and to the Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force such of his functions, powers, and duties as he may consider proper. Officers of the Air Force shall report regarding any matters to the Secretary, Under Secretary, or either Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

(c) The Secretary of the Air Force or, as he may prescribe, the Under Secretary of the Air Force or either Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, shall, in addition to other duties, be charged with supervision of the procurement activities of the Air Force Establishment, of plans for the mobilization of materials and industrial organizations essential to wartime needs of the Air Force, and of other business pertaining thereto.

(d) The Secretary of the Air Force may make such assignments and details of members of the Air Force and civilian personnel as he thinks proper, and may prescribe the duties of the members and civilian personnel so assigned; and such members and civilian personnel shall be responsible for, and shall have the authority necessary to perform, such duties as may be so prescribed for them.

(e) The Secretary of the Air Force may cause to be manufactured or produced at Government arsenals, depots, or Government-owned factories of the United States all those supplies needed by the Air Force which can be manufactured or produced upon an economical basis at such arsenals, depots, or factories.

SEC. 102. (a) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the compensation prescribed by law.

(b) In case of the death, resignation, removal from office, absence, or disability of the Secretary of the Air Force, the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not absent, or disabled, shall, until the President directs some other person to perform such duties in accordance with section 179, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 6), perform his duties until a successor is appointed, or until such absence or disability shall cease—

(1) the Under Secretary of the Air Force;

(2) the Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force in the order fixed by their length of service as such; and

(3) the Chief of Staff.

(c) If the Chief of Staff by reason of succession assumes, or if he or any other officer of the Air Force is designated in accordance with section 179, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 6), to perform the duties of the Secretary of the Air Force, section 1222, Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 576), shall not apply to him by reason of his temporarily performing such duties.

TITLE II—CHIEF OF STAFF AND THE AIR STAFF

SEC. 201. (a) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force a staff, which shall be known as the Air Staff, and which shall consist of—

(1) the Chief of Staff;

(2) a Vice Chief of Staff;

(3) not to exceed five Deputy Chiefs of Staff; and

(4) such other members of the Air Force and such civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force as may be assigned or detailed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(b) The Air Staff shall be organized in such manner and its members shall perform such duties and bear such titles, as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

(c) Except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, not more than 2,800 officers of the Air Force shall be detailed or assigned to permanent duty in the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the numerical limit prescribed in this subsection shall not apply upon a finding by the President that an increase in the number of officers in the Department of the Air Force is in the national interest: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall report quarterly to the Congress the number of officers in the Department of the Air Force and the justification therefor.

(d) A commissioned officer of the Air Force now or hereafter detailed or assigned to duty in the Department of the Air Force shall serve for a tour of duty not to exceed 4 years, except that such tour of duty may be extended beyond 4 years upon a special finding by the Secretary of the Air Force that the extension is necessary in the public interest. Upon relief from such duty no such officer shall again be detailed or assigned within 2 years to duty in the Department of the Air Force except upon a like finding by the Secretary of the Air Force. This subsection shall not take effect until 1 year after the enactment of this act, and shall be inapplicable in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

SEC. 202. The Chief of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the general officers of the Air Force, to serve during the pleasure of the President, but no persons shall serve as Chief of Staff for a term of more than 4 years unless reappointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chief of Staff, while holding office as such, shall have the grade of general, without vacation of his permanent grade in the Air Force, and shall take rank as prescribed by law. He shall receive the compensation prescribed by law and shall be counted as one of the officers authorized to be serving in grade above lieutenant general under the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 886), as amended.

SEC. 203. (a) The Vice Chief of Staff and the Deputy Chiefs of Staff shall be general officers of the Air Force detailed to those positions. In case of a vacancy in the office or the absence or disability of the Chief of Staff, the Vice Chief of Staff or the senior Deputy Chief of Staff, who is not absent or disabled, shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, perform the duties of Chief of Staff until his successor is appointed or such absence or disability shall cease.

(b) In case of a vacancy in the position, or the absence or disability, of the Vice Chief of Staff, the senior Deputy Chief of Staff who is not absent or disabled shall, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, perform the duties of the Vice Chief of Staff until his successor is designated or such absence or disability shall cease.

SEC. 204. (a) The Chief of Staff shall have supervision of all members and organizations of the Air Force, shall perform the duties prescribed for him by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and by other laws, and shall perform such other military duties not otherwise assigned by law as may be assigned to him by the President.

(b) The Chief of Staff shall preside over the Air Staff. Subject to the provisions of section 101 of this act, and of subsection (c) of this section, he shall be directly responsible to the Secretary of the Air Force for the efficiency of the Air Force, its state of preparation for military operations, and plans therefor. He shall transmit to the Secretary of the Air Force the plans and recommendations of the Air Staff, shall advise him in regard thereto, and, upon the approval of such plans or recommendations by the Secretary of the Air Force, he shall act as the agent of the Secretary of the Air Force in carrying the same into effect.

(c) Except as otherwise prescribed by law, the Chief of Staff shall perform his duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force.

SEC. 205. (a) The Air Staff shall render professional aid and assistance to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Under Secretary of the Air Force, the Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, and the Chief of Staff.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Air Staff—

(1) to prepare such plans for the national security, and the use of the Air Force for that purpose, both separately and in conjunction with land and naval forces, and for recruiting, organizing, supplying, equipping, training, serving, mobilizing, and demobilizing the Air Force, as will assist the execution of any power vested in, duty imposed upon, or function assigned to the Secretary of the Air Force or the Chief of Staff;

(2) to investigate and report upon all questions affecting the efficiency of the Air Force and its state of preparation for military operations;

(3) to prepare detailed instructions for the execution of approved plans and to supervise the execution of such plans and instructions;

(4) to act as the agents of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff in coordinating the action of all organizations of the Air Force Establishment; and

(5) to perform such other duties not otherwise assigned by law as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

TITLE III—COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. The United States Air Force shall consist of the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard while in the service of the United States; and shall include persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed without specification of component in the Air Force, and all persons serving in the Air Force under call or conscription under any provision of law, includ-

ing members of the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia when in the service of the United States pursuant to call as provided by law.

SEC. 302. (a) The Regular Air Force is that component of the Air Force which consists of persons whose continuous service on active duty in both peace and war is contemplated by law, and of persons who are retired members of the Regular Air Force.

(b) The Regular Air Force shall include the commissioned officers, warrant officers, and airmen holding appointments or enlisted in the Regular Air Force as now or hereafter provided by law, the retired commissioned officers, warrant officers, and airmen of the Regular Air Force, and such other persons as are now or may hereafter be specified by law. No person who is now a member of the Regular Air Force, active or retired, shall, by reason of the enactment of this act, be deprived of his membership in the Regular Air Force.

SEC. 303. The Air Force Reserve referred to in the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949 shall be a Reserve component of the Air Force to provide a reserve for military service, and shall consist of all persons appointed or enlisted therein, or transferred therein, as now or hereafter provided by law.

SEC. 304. The Air National Guard of the United States referred to in the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949 shall be a Reserve component of the Air Force to provide a reserve for military service, and shall consist of all federally recognized units and organizations of the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia, and of all personnel of the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia who shall have been appointed or enlisted in the Air National Guard of the United States, or who shall have been temporarily extended Federal recognition by the Secretary of the Air Force pursuant to section 530 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802).

SEC. 305. The Air National Guard referred to in the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949, which consists of those units, organizations, and personnel of the National Guard (as that term is defined in section 71 of the National Defense Act, as amended) for which Federal responsibility has been vested in the Secretary of the Air Force or the Department of the Air Force pursuant to law, shall be, while in the service of the United States, a component of the Air Force.

SEC. 306. All persons inducted in or holding appointments or enlistments in the Air Force or transferred therein pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, on the effective date of this act, shall be deemed, without further action, to hold their military status in the corresponding components set forth in section 301 of this act or in the Air Force without specification of component and without specification of any arm, branch, service, or corps.

SEC. 307. (a) Qualified members of the Air Force shall be designated to perform medical, dental, medical service, veterinary, nursing, women's medical specialist, judge advocate, chaplain, or other duties requiring special training or experience, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. Qualifications for designations under this subsection shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force in conformity with qualifications specified in any of the following statutory provisions for the respective types of duties: *Provided*, That there shall be no separately constituted or administered arms, branches, services, or corps in the Air Force or any component thereof:

(1) Act of August 5, 1947 (ch. 494, title II, sec. 201; 61 Stat. 777 (10 U. S. C. 91 a, 121 a)).

(2) Act of April 23, 1907 (ch. 150, sec. 4, 35 Stat. 67 (10 U. S. C. 93)).

(3) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 101 (c); 61 Stat. 41, 10 U. S. C. 166 (c)).

(4) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 102 (c); 61 Stat. 42, 10 U. S. C. 166a (c)).

(5) Act of March 2, 1899 (ch. 352, sec. 7, 30 Stat. 979; 10 U. S. C. 232).

(6) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 116; 61 Stat. 46, 10 U. S. C. 376).

(7) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 506; 61 Stat. 890, 10 U. S. C. 506c).

(8) Act of May 16, 1950 (ch. 186, sec. 1; 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166b–1, 2).

(b) Original appointments made with a view to designation for the performance of duties under subsection (a) of this section shall be in the grades prescribed in any of the following statutory provisions for the respective types of duties:

(1) Act of August 5, 1947 (ch. 494, title II, sec. 201; 61 Stat. 777, 10 U. S. C. 91a, 121a).

(2) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 101 (c); 61 Stat. 41, 10 U. S. C. 166 (c)).

(3) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 102 (c); 61 Stat. 42, 10 U. S. C. 166a (c)).

(4) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 104; 61 Stat. 43, as amended May 16, 1950; ch. 186, sec. 3 (b); 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166c).

(5) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 105; 61 Stat. 43, 10 U. S. C. 166d).

(6) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 116; 61 Stat. 46, 10 U. S. C. 376).

(7) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 506; 61 Stat. 890, 10 U. S. C. 506c).

(8) Act of May 16, 1950 (ch. 186, secs. 1, 2; 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166b–1, 2, d–1).

(c) Members of the Air Force designated to perform duties under subsection (a) of this section shall, while performing such duties, have the benefits and be subject to the conditions provided by the following statutory provisions, insofar as the same are presently in effect, relating to their respective types of duties and components:

(1) Act of August 5, 1947 (ch. 494, title II, sec. 201; 61 Stat. 777, 10 U. S. C. 91a, 121a).

(2) Act of April 23, 1908 (ch. 150, sec. 5; 35 Stat. 67, 10 U. S. C. 101, 102).

(3) Act of March 3, 1909 (ch. 252, 35 Stat. 737, 10 U. S. C. 103).

(4) Act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, sec. 24c, as added June 4, 1920; ch. 227, sec. 24; 41 Stat. 774, and amended August 7, 1947; ch. 512, title V, sec. 507 (d) (1); 61 Stat. 894, 10 U. S. C. 125, 143a).

(5) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 105; 61 Stat. 43, as amended May 16, 1950; ch. 186, secs. 1, 2, 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166d).

(6) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 106; 61 Stat. 44, 10 U. S. C. 166e).

(7) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 107; 61 Stat. 44, as amended May 16, 1950; ch. 186, sec. 3 (c), 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166f).

(8) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 108 (a); 61 Stat. 44, as amended May 16, 1950; ch. 186, sec. 3 (d); 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166g (a)).

(9) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 109; 61 Stat. 45, 10 U. S. C. 166h).

(10) Act of April 16, 1947 (ch. 38, title I, sec. 110; 61 Stat. 46, as amended May 16, 1950; ch. 186, sec. 3 (f); 64 Stat. 160, 10 U. S. C. 166i).

(11) Revised Statutes, section 1122 (10 U. S. C. 235).

(12) Act of June 24, 1948 (ch. 632, sec. 1; 62 Stat. 650, 10 U. S. C. 291c–1).

(13) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 506 (c); 61 Stat. 890, 10 U. S. C. 506c (c)).

(14) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 505; 61 Stat. 888, 10 U. S. C. 559).

(15) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 517; 61 Stat. 909, 10 U. S. C. 559h).

(16) Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, title V, sec. 514 (d); 61 Stat. 902, 10 U. S. C. 941a (d)).

(17) Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 902, 45 Stat. 996, as amended January 29, 1938; ch. 12, sec. 2; 52 Stat. 8, 10 U. S. C. 953a).

(18) Act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 708, title II, sec. 203 (d); 62 Stat. 1085, 10 U. S. C. 1063).

(19) Act of October 12, 1949 (ch. 681, title II, sec. 203; 63 Stat. 809, 37 U. S. C. 234).

(d) Separate promotion lists are authorized, within the discretion of the Secretary, for each of the categories of duties to which members of the Air Force are designated under section 307 (a) of this act. Seniority and numbers in the several grades on the promotion lists so established under this section shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force in accordance with the provisions of sections 505 (b) and 505 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 883; 10 U. S. C. 559 (b), 559 (d)): *Provided*, That such provisions of said section 505 (b) as relate to medical, dental, and chaplain officers shall, for the purposes of this section, also be applicable to officers designated to perform judge advocate duties in the Air Force.

SEC. 308. (a) There shall be within the Air Force—

(1) the following major air commands:

(i) an air defense command;

(ii) a strategic air command; and

(iii) a tactical air command;

(2) such other commands, forces, and organizations as may from time to time be established by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(b) For the duration of any war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, the Secretary of the Air Force may establish new major commands in lieu of, or discontinue or consolidate the major commands enumerated in, subsection (a) (1) of this section.

SEC. 309. For Air Force purposes, the United States of America, its Territories and possessions, and other territory in which elements of the Air Force may be stationed or operate, may be divided into such areas as directed by the Secretary of the Air Force; and officers of the Air Force may be assigned to command of the Air Force activities, installations, and personnel in such areas. In the discharge of the Air Force's functions or such other functions as may be authorized by other provisions of law, officers of the Air Force so assigned shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

SEC. 310. (a) There shall be in the Air Force a Judge Advocate General who shall be appointed, subject to the provisions of the act of May 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 147; 50 U. S. C. 741), by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years, which term may be extended by the President at his discretion. Any such appointment may be terminated at any time by the President at his discretion. An officer heretofore or hereafter appointed as Judge Advocate General of the Air Force shall not be a chief of a branch, arm, or service within the meaning of section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 901; 10 U. S. C. 559g) but he shall nevertheless, if he does not already hold a permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of major general, be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as a permanent major general in the Regular Air Force. The officer serving as Judge Advocate General on the effective date of this act shall, subject to the provisions of this section, continue to hold his appointment as Judge Advocate General and no reappointment of such officer as Judge Advocate General shall be required after the enactment of this act.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, and officers heretofore or hereafter designated as judge advocates shall be vested with

and shall exercise the same powers and duties with respect to the administration of military justice within the Air Force as are vested in the Secretary of the Army, the Judge Advocate General of the Army and judge advocates of the Army, respectively, with respect to the administration of military justice within the Army. The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force shall perform such other legal duties as may be directed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

TITLE IV—REPEALS, AMENDMENTS, AND SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) The proviso of section 401 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and all laws and parts of laws set forth in said section to the extent applicable to the Department of the Air Force or the Air Force Establishment and not heretofore repealed;

(2) Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1014; 5 U. S. C. 627j–1): *Provided*, That such repeal shall not affect the existing applicability of the Articles of War to the Air Force and actions under such articles shall be enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

(b) Sections 246, 247, 248, and 249 of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 643; 10 U. S. C. 61, 65, 62a, 61a), shall not be construed to be applicable to the Air Force.

(c) All other laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 402. The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the word "command" in section 208 (b) thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the word "supervision."

SEC. 403. All laws and parts of laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act applicable to the Air Force Establishment, or to organizations, components or personnel thereof, whether so applicable by their terms or by operation of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall continue in effect and shall be construed to apply to the Air Force Establishment and to the corresponding successive organizations, components, and personnel as set forth in this act.

SEC. 404. (a) Nothing in this act shall require the reappointment or redesignation of any person in the Air Force Establishment occupying a position or performing a duty as now prescribed by law.

(b) Except as otherwise expressly provided in this act, every power vested in and every duty imposed upon any office or officer, civilian or military, of the Air Force Establishment by any law, regulation, or order in force immediately prior to the effective date of this act, shall continue to be applicable to such office and exercised and performed by such officer until the Secretary of the Air Force shall otherwise direct in accordance with the authority conferred upon him by this act.

SEC. 405. Except as provided in section 305, nothing contained in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal the provisions of law pertaining to the National Guard, the Air National Guard or the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

SEC. 406. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, officers of the Air Force accountable for public moneys may intrust moneys to other officers of the Air Force for the purpose of having them make disbursements as their agents, and the officer to whom the moneys are intrusted, as well as the officer who intrusts the moneys to him, shall be held pecuniarily responsible therefor to the United States.

SEC. 407. Except as provided in section 402 of this act, nothing in this act shall be construed as amending, repealing, limiting, enlarging, or in any way modifying any provision of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

SEC. 408. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and be subject to amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. There is one committee amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 7, line 19, strike out the word "persons" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "person."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BATTLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 88, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. TABER, and Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. CANNON), for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. BUDGE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for January 24, 1951, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made under the 5-minute rule in Committee of the Whole, and to include letters from various veterans' organizations.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 1, and to include letters and other documents.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 1 by including a table and certain figures on life-insurance premiums.

Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 1, and to include three clippings from periodicals.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. James A. Farley.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter from a disabled American veterans' organization regarding the bill H. R. 1.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include an article.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 25, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

114. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of leases as of December 1, 1950, pursuant to Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

115. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Waclaw Zaremba, file No. A–6018653 CR 28661, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and

returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

116. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting certain reports for the calendar year 1950, for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government, pursuant to section 12 of an act approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

117. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Nantasket Beach, Mass.; this investigation was made under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Public Works.

118. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, harbor facilities in Horseshoe Lake near Granite City, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

119. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on New London Harbor, Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

120. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Maunabo River and Quebrada arena and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

121. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Opookta Creek, Attala County, Miss., for flood control and drainage, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1980. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1981. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr BENTSEN:

H. R. 1982. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 1983. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require Federal grand and petit jurors to take an oath of allegiance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1984. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 101); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 1985. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of June 23, 1938, by providing for compensation for death by wrongful act in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1986. A bill to amend the Sherman and Clayton Acts to provide a uniform period of limitations within which treble-damage actions may be instituted under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 1987. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 1332, to classify foreign corporations as citizens of States where they are doing business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1988. A bill to limit the removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1989. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946, to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1990. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the period of presumption of service connection in the case of pulmonary tuberculosis from 3 to 7 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1991. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control and hydroelectric dams on the Red Lake River, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1992. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1993. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of worsted fabric in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the worsted-fabric industry, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1994. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 1995. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1996. A bill to provide relief for certain officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1997. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules and regulations in connection therewith to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 2000. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to eliminate the right of certain citizens of foreign countries residing in the United States to be relieved from liability for training and service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2001. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2002. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2003. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2004. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 2005. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2006. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2007. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2008. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2009. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2010. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 2011. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2012. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOVAN:
H. R. 2013. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS:
H. R. 2014. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:
H. R. 2015. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FUGATE:
H. R. 2016. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE:
H. R. 2017. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GORDON:
H. R. 2018. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAHAM:
H. R. 2019. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:
H. R. 2020. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HESS:
H. R. 2021. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILLINGS:
H. R. 2022. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:
H. R. 2023. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H. R. 2024. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:
H. R. 2025. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:
H. R. 2026. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES:
H. R. 2027. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 2028. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNEY:
H. R. 2029. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:
H. R. 2030. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIND:
H. R. 2031. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H. R. 2032. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McKINNON:
H. R. 2033. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H. R. 2034. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:
H. R. 2035. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 2036. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:
H. R. 2037. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORGAN:
H. R. 2038. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORBLAD:
H. R. 2039. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:
H. R. 2040. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 2041. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 2042. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:
H. R. 2043. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRESTON:
H. R. 2044. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS:
H. R. 2045. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:
H. R. 2046. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. R. 2047. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H. R. 2048. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:
H. R. 2049. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FURCOLO:
H. R. 2050. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that retired medical and dental officers recalled to active duty after September 1, 1947, shall be entitled to receive the special pay provided by such act for other medical and dental officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SABATH:
H. R. 2051. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2052. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of poisonous weeds, especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2053. A bill to waive the charge for migratory-bird hunting stamps sold to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to require that at least one member of each local board and each appeal board shall be a veteran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2055. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 2056. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2057. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2058. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2059. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 2060. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2061. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2062. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 2063. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for a revision of the regulations relating to the deferment from service in the Armed Forces of persons employed in agriculture, so as to assure essential production of food; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1951, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution relating to peanut acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Police Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to favor a Pacific Pact and United States participation therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 94. Resolution authorizing printing of the History of the Committee on the Judiciary as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 95. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 96. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 97. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules); to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to the central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Vesther W. Ash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of Sook Kat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Daisuke Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Thomas Clayton Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Maj. Thomas H. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Sister Concezione-Eleanora Sudano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Mr. Carlo Bardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Basile Carras and Calliope Carras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2078. A bill to provide for the sale of certain land in Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Kupiszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

22. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of seven members of the Union Presbyterian Church, of Cannelton, Pa., urging that the serving and selling of alcoholic liquors and alcoholic beverages to service men and women be discontinued; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. Also, petition of 13 members of the Mount Pleasant Presbyterian Church, of Darlington, Pa., urging that the serving and selling of alcoholic liquors and alcoholic beverages to service men and women be discontinued; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. Florence Shutter and others, of Burtrum and Swanville, Minn., protesting universal military training or lowering age of induction if alcoholic beverages are sold on or near military posts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Isaac Steenson, minister, Clarendon Presbyterian Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Grant, O God, that those who are to bear the burden of high responsibility in this place this day may draw strength from these moments of prayer. Thou art reaching out to help them; may they reach out to Thee to be helped.

May Thy servants here never allow themselves to become common when they are called upon to deal with common things, but may there be about them a quiet dignity and sincerity that shall command respect everywhere, and that shall be more persuasive than a multitude of words.

May the voice that speaks from this place convey the accents of a higher voice than ours, that the other peoples of the world may see that our upreach is as much a part of our lives as our outreach. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 23, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1726. An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] be permitted to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week in order that he may represent this Nation in connection with the inauguration of the President of Brazil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during next week on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon for hearings on veterans' bills.

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER TO THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will address an informal meeting of the two branches of Congress in the Congressional Library next Thursday at the hour of 10:30 a. m. The meeting will be held in the Coolidge Auditorium. No tickets will be issued to Members of either House. Members will be admitted upon recognition.

We have been informed that because of the limited seating capacity Members will not be permitted to bring guests. There are about 500 seats in the auditorium. I know that every Member of the Senate is anxious to obtain the benefit of General Eisenhower's views upon the situation which he found during his recent trip to Europe. It is for that reason that I am making this announcement at this time.

It is the general's desire to meet in executive session on Thursday with members of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. I make that announcement so that committee members may know of it, and so that the chairmen of the two committees may make arrangements for the meeting.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Malone
Bennett	Hayden	Martin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Chapman	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ecton	Long	Tobey
Ellender	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarthy	Welker
Flanders	McClellan	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Young
Gillette	Magnuson	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CALLING THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that it is our intention to call the calendar from time to time, as often as possible, in order to keep it clear. While there is not much on the calendar at present, we expect to have a call of the calendar on Monday next.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will there be an adjournment, and a call of the calendar under rule VIII?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no objection to that being done.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator does not intend to ask unanimous consent for the call of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: In further answer to the question of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, following the transaction of routine business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected-to bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be allowed to submit reports from committees, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and make insertions in the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SURVEY OF MINERAL AND NATIONAL MONUMENT VALUES, JOSHUA TREE NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the area within the revised boundaries of the Joshua Tree National Monument with a view to determining to what extent the said area is more valuable for minerals than for the national monument purposes for which it was created (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LEASES OF PROPERTY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on

leases of real or personal property by the Department of the Army, as of December 1, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the name of Waclaw Zaremba from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, granting the applications for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in each case and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each case, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Archivist of the United States on the disposal of certain records for the calendar year 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the first two sentences of section 9 (a) of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a Department of Natural Resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Colorado

"Whereas the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has recommended the reorganization of the Department of the Interior and the incorporation of its functions and related functions concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources into a new Department of Natural Resources; and

"Whereas it would be highly desirable that regional offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies be established in order to bring the Federal Government and its activities closer to the people; and

"Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of a United States Military Academy of the Air: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the thirty-eighth general assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for—

"(1) The creation of a new Department of Natural Resources;

"(2) The location of a regional office of that Department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Colorado; and

"(3) The location of the United States Military Academy of the Air likewise in Colorado; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the senate,
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the senate,
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the house of representatives.
"VINCENT CRAWSHAW,
"Chief Clerk of the house of representatives."

A joint resolution of the senate of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to the central Arizona project

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill which would authorize construction of the central Arizona reclamation project; and

"Whereas no provision is made for payment by the project of any part of the interest on the national debt, which would be incurred to construct the project; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has reported that he estimates the cost of the project at $708,000,000 and the time for the recovery of the principal at 75 years, and, therefore, that the project would cost the taxpayers of the United States for interest alone, at 2½ percent per annum, in excess of $2,000,000,000; and

"Whereas the taxpayers of California would be required to pay in excess of $172,000,000 of such interest; and

"Whereas the central Arizona project is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost to grow common field crops, with the result that additional taxes would be required to pay Government subsidies on such crops and such project would not, therefore, enhance the national welfare; and

"Whereas the central Arizona project would require the use of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually (the equivalent to the use of 2,500,000 barrels of fuel oil) to pump irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet, and such use would be an economic waste of an urgently needed public resource; and

"Whereas the construction cost of the irrigation features of the project alone would be many times the value of the land, when irrigated and the irrigators would not repay any part of such construction cost; and

"Whereas such central Arizona project is, therefore, economically unsound; and

"Whereas sufficient water for such central Arizona project could be secured only by diverting to that project water now needed to serve authorized and existing projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the diversion of water from such existing projects would jeopardize the water supply of over 4,000,000 residents of California, who, in reliance on their contracts for water executed by the United States Government, have invested more than $500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of water and power from the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the rights of California to the use of Colorado River water have been established by prior appropriations and by contracts with the Secretary of the Interior under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Secretary of the Interior has declared that 'If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse passage of any bill authorizing the central Arizona project as proposed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation consenting to the joinder of the United States in an interstate suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the water rights of the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Colorado River Board of California and all other agencies and officers of the State of California are directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A paper in the nature of a memorial from the board of directors of the Lions Club, San Juan, Tex., relating to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to give title to the Federal Government of the tidelands off the shore of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEFEND AMERICA AT HOME — DON'T WASTE AMERICAN LIVES ON FOREIGN SOIL—PETITION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by about 3,000 citizens of the State of Iowa, entitled "Defend America at Home—Don't Waste American Lives on Foreign Soil."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Iowa will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SCHICK HOSPITAL AT CLINTON, IOWA—RESOLUTION OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a certified copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, requesting Congress to take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the former Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, now being used exclusively for domiciliary purposes by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the said veterans' domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, is now being operated at less than one-fourth the capacity of the institution, resulting in inefficient, costly, and wasteful administration; and

Whereas thousands of veterans in the central United States are now urgently in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas many more thousands of disabled and sick veterans will soon be added, as a result of the fighting in Korea; and

Whereas the Schick Hospital should be opened to full capacity to provide care for the many thousand veterans and veterans-to-be, who are now in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas the Iowa Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly by Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, passed a resolution of February 3, 1947, requesting the Veterans' Administration to utilize Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; and

Whereas in the interests of economy and in the interest of the veterans of the central United States, we deem it advisable and necessary that the veterans' domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, be used to full capacity; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea of veterans that the Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, be opened to full bed capacity, thereby utilizing present existing facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, from the present limited 500 domiciliary beds to also include an additional minimum of 1,000 beds for hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and Gen. Carl R. Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

O. H. HENNINGSEN.

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 658. A bill to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 44).

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of sundry resolutions ordered reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. First, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably Senate Resolution No. 40 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 40), as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 30,000 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government," such additional copies to be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question as to the resolutions. How many has the Senator to report?

Mr. HAYDEN. About eight of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many of them would create new subcommittees?

Mr. HAYDEN. One.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator kindly tell us what that is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution would not create a new subcommittee. The subcommittee was created only about a month ago. The purpose is to increase the limit of expenses under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to investigation of internal security of the United States by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who will appoint the subcommittee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money is requested by the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The request was for $150,000 for a 2-year term of the committee. Half of that is requested until next January.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the appropriation which is sought is to be cut in half?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposed appropriation is to be for 1 year, instead of allowing $150,000 for 1 year?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the request was for $150,000 for 2 years. We limited the time to January 31 on all these resolutions, because they will come back to the committee, and the Senate can consider them again next January.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do the resolutions give authority to the committee to select experts and a clerical force in addition to the experts and clerical forces now authorized by the Reorganization Act?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right further to object, I am in hopes the matter will be delayed for a week or 10 days. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the legislative branch, I asked Mr. Oco Thompson, the Financial Clerk of the Senate, to prepare for me some data showing the extent to which the Senate has been spending money for special investigations. The work has not yet been completed, but I have today a partial report and offer it to the Senate for its perusal. The summary was made by Mr. Thompson, as I have just indicated, for the 10-year period from the year 1940 to the year 1950, with an estimate for 1951.

There is a great hue and cry about cutting expenses here and cutting expenses there in an effort to try to reduce Government spending. I think we in the Senate should set the example.

For the fiscal year 1940 the total amount of money spent by the Senate from the contingent fund for special investigations amounted to $170,268.04. For 1941 it was approximately the same amount. For 1942 it was $210,000 plus. For 1943 it was $381,000 plus. For 1944 it was $385,000 plus. For 1945 it was $427,000 plus. For 1946 it was $588,000 plus. For 1947 it was $692,000 plus. For 1948 it was $1,269,603. For 1949 it was $1,068,461. For last year, 1950, it was $1,277,000 plus. The estimate for 1951 is $1,732,000.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, as I tried to point out a moment ago, these sums are in addition to the amount which is now being spent by all the regular committees of this body. These sums do not include the tremendous cost of printing the many reports made by these special committees. As all Senators know, under the Reorganization Act each committee is empowered to employ a force of six on its clerical staff, and a force of four experts. I would urge no objection to the creation of necessary special committees created by the standing committees of the Senate provided that the expert and clerical assistance used would be that provided for under the Reorganization Act. I realize that in some cases it may be necessary to provide additional help, and if a good case can be made, then the Senate should act accordingly.

A certain practice has arisen here. I do not want to accuse any Senator. But we have in the Capitol quite a few experts who seem to be very good at selling themselves to Senate groups, organizing special committees to investigate all sorts of problems, and they succeed in spending quite a bit of money in so doing.

I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona to postpone consideration of the resolutions for 10 days so that we can look further into the matter and allow me to bring before the Senate the whole picture, including in detail the amount of money we are now spending for such purposes, and the possibilities of having all investigations made within the committees themselves with the force that each committee is empowered to employ to conduct its business. I believe that I can present what I consider as astounding figures, the excessive printing bills incident to this special work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration adopted the practice that no resolution providing for an investigation shall extend it any further than January 31 of this year. All the committees that were created in the last Congress were to expire on the 31st of January. So it would seem proper——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I suggest, if the Senator insists on action being taken now, that we extend the life of the existing subcommittees to June 30, the end of the present fiscal year? That would include existing subcommittees that have been heretofore at work and not those that have not been organized and without clerical and expert assistance. That will give us a chance to look into the matter. It will give Congress a better opportunity of taking up the question during this year when we provide for funds to operate the legislative branch of our Government for the next fiscal year. If the Senator will consent to follow my suggestion I shall not object. I should like opportunity further to study this matter with a view of trying to save a few dollars, if I can. It strikes me that if we are to save money for the taxpayers during this emergency we in the Senate should set the example, as I indicated a while ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been greatly delighted to hear what the Senator from Louisiana has said. I think the Senate ought to take the lead in cutting down expenditures, and in many cases cutting out expenditures. I hope the Senator will not ask that the subcommittee be empowered to continue until next June. I believe, if the Senator will examine the situation, he will find that the money can be cut out at the present time, that it will not be necessary to provide money to carry on the work until June. When matters of this kind are postponed from time to time, as the Senator knows, it is very difficult to prevent adoption of resolutions relating to them when a Senator asks for their adoption. I hope the Senator will act at once. The Senator is a very able member of the Appropriations Committee and has done wonderful work on that committee, and I hope he will undertake to have action taken to end the work now.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator from Tennessee. In the first place the fiscal year has nothing to do with the session of Congress. The fiscal year operates with respect to the executive branch of the Government. Congress meets in January and adjourns some time in the summer when it gets around to it. So the appropriations have to start in January. The 30th of June is a date of no significance so far as Congress is concerned.

Second, let me point out——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that once special committees are established, it is rather hard to root them out. From time to time they seem to be able to obtain funds with which to continue and with which to build up large clerical and expert forces.

This is my fifteenth year of service as a Member of the Senate, and from session to session I have seen here a good many of the same persons, who work from one special subcommittee to another. They seem to have a knack at being able to "sell a bill of goods" to some of my distinguished colleagues. A special subcommittee employing a large staff is created, and it goes on from year to year.

I do not think I am being unreasonable about this matter and I again renew my suggestion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator should be fair about it. There are men who are expert investigators.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say that my comments may not be applicable to all such subcommittees, but I know of quite a number which I would brand in that way.

Mr. HAYDEN. If such persons are efficient and if they do the work required to be done, why not employ them?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just pointed out to the distinguished Senator, in the past 10 years the amounts spent for these purposes have increased enormously. Today we are spending 10 times more for these purposes than we spent 10 years ago. It strikes me that we should draw the line somewhere. All I am requesting is a little more time to study the resolution. The distinguished Senator has reported these resolutions to the Senate today, and I should like to have a little time in which to consider them.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, dealing with legislative expenditures, I am responsible to some extent for recommending appropriations of these funds, and I should like to have an opportunity to look into the matter, with a view to ascertaining how much more money it will cost.

The Senator from Arizona has eight more resolutions ready. I do not know what the total amount will be; but I have before me a brief statement, prepared by Mr. Oco Thompson, financial clerk of the Senate, which indicates that for the last 5 months of 1950 special committees have spent $866,029.19. That is five times more than was spent in the entire fiscal year of 1940.

I believe that we should draw the line somewhere and should show an inclination to economize in our own operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD, following my remarks, the figures to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures paid by the Senate during the fiscal years shown for investigations by the standing committees (including subcommittees), special committees, and joint committees

Fiscal year:	
1940	$170,268.04
1941	170,619.16
1942	210,574.02
1943	381,381.89
1944	335,983.52
1945	427,574.15
1946	588,507.15
1947	692,603.65
1948	1,269,603.02
1949	1,277,094.39
1950	1,732,000.00
1951 (estimated)	1,068,461.45

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE LAST 6 MONTHS OF 1950, SHOWING AMOUNTS SPENT, UNEXPENDED BALANCES, AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Biographical Congressional Directory: No limitation. Unexpended balance, December 1, 1950, $2,726.79; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, $160,135; number of employees, November 1950, 18.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, $125,585; number of employees, November 1951, 14.

Joint Committee on Federal Expenditures: No limitation. Appropriation (September 6, 1950), $20,000; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Joint Committee on Printing: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, $28,180; number of employees, November 1950, 3.

Senate policy committees: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, majority, $45,715; minority, $45,715; total, $91,430; number of employees, November 1950, majority, 10; minority, 6.

Senate conference committees: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Appropriation, majority, $30,280; minority, $30,280; total, $60,560; number of employees, November 1950, majority, 10; minority, 7.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee investigating ways and means of stimulating the exports of surplus agricultural commodities), under authority of Senate Resolution 173, agreed to October 13, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, $25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $8,859.06; balance December 1, 1950, $16,140.94; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee making a study and investigation of current infestations by the European corn borer), under authority of Senate Resolution 158, agreed to October 13, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, $10,000; no expenditures.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee making a study of the foot and mouth disease), under authority of Senate Resolution 223, agreed to June 12, 1948, and Senate Resolution 72, agreed to February 25, 1949: Limitation, Eightieth Congress (S. Res. 223): Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 72): Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 223, $6,000; by Senate Resolution 72, $2,000; total, $8,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $2,332.72; balance December 1, 1950, $5,667.28; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (subcommittee investigating the production of all types of agricultural crops), under authority of Senate Resolution 36, agreed to April 11, 1949 and Senate Resolution 198, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 36, $12,000; by Senate Resolution 198, $38,000; total $50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $26,805.76; balance December 1, 1950, $23,194.24; number of employees, November 1950, 4.

Committee on Appropriations (Foreign Economic Cooperation Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and the General Appropriations Act for 1951: Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Amount appropriated, $50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $21,338.73; balance December 1, 1950, $28,661.27; number of employees, November 1950, 11.

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 129, agreed to June 26, 1947: No limitation. Amount authorized, $50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $25,848.51; balance December 1, 1950, $24,151.49; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Armed Services (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 93, agreed to

June 22, 1949: Limitation, December 31, 1950. Amount authorized, $25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $12,880.98; balance December 1, 1950, $12,119.02; number of employees, November 1950, 8.

Committee on Banking and Currency (Subcommittee on Banking and Credit Legislation), under authority of Senate Resolution 101, agreed to May 6, 1949, and Senate Resolution 218, agreed to February 9, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1950 (S. Res. 101), February 15, 1951 (S. Res. 218). Amount authorized, $60,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $52,081.81; balance, December 1, 1950, $7,918.19; number of employees, November 1950, 5.

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee studying the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation), under authority of Senate Resolution 219, agreed to February 8, 1950; Senate Resolution 279, agreed to May 19, 1950; and Senate Resolution 307, agreed to July 13, 1950: Limitation, June 1, 1950 (S. Res. 219), July 15, 1950 (S. Res. 279), January 31, 1951 (S. Res. 307). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 219, $50,000; by Senate Resolution 307, $35,000; total, $85,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $62,830.69; balance, December 1, 1950, $22,169.31; number of employees, November 1950, 6.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations With States and Municipalities), under authority of Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1951. Amount authorized, $15,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $10,725.60; balance, December 1, 1950, $4,274.40; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (subcommittee studying relations with international organizations), under authority of Senate Resolution 205, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, February 15, 1951. Amount authorized, $18,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $10,626.88; balance, December 1, 1950, $7,373.12; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 206, agreed to February 1, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Balance from prior authority (S. Res. 52, agreed to February 9, 1949), $6,641.27; amount authorized by Senate Resolution 206, $100,000; total authorization, $106,641.27; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $68,643.64; balance, December 1, 1950, $37,997.63; number of employees, November 1950, 12.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 280, agreed to June 7, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, $10,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $6,875.86; balance December 1, 1950, $3,124.14; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Finance (Subcommittee on Social Security Programs), under authority of Senate Resolution 300, agreed to June 20, 1950; Limitation, none. Amount authorized, $25,000; no expenditures.

Committee on Foreign Relations (Subcommittee on Disloyalty of State Department Employees), under authority of Senate Resolution 231, agreed to February 22, 1950; Senate Resolution 237, agreed to March 15, 1950; and Senate Resolution 303, agreed to June 29, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 237, $25,000, by Senate Resolution 303, $10,000; total, $35,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $27,407.11; balance December 1, 1950, $7,592.89; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Subcommittee on the Fuel Reserves of the United States), under authority of Senate Resolution 239, agreed to August 15, 1950: Limitation, January 3, 1951. Amount authorized, $20,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $327.80; balance December 1, 1950, $19,672.20; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Subcommittee Investigating Any Matter Referred to the Committee), under authority of Senate Resolution 32, agreed to March 18, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, $25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $3,355.14; balance December 1, 1950, $21,644.86; number of employees, November 1950, none.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee on relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes), under authority of Senate Resolution 292, agreed to July 13, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, $25,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $1,829.45; balance December 1, 1950, $23,170.55; number of employees, November 1950, 2.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (subcommittee investigating the airline industry, merchant marine, transportations, communications, etc.), under authority of Senate Resolution 50, agreed to April 11, 1949, and Senate Resolution 308, agreed to July 27, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 50), February 28, 1951 (S. Res. 308). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 50, $165,000; by Senate Resolution 308, $69,000; total, $234,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $180,192.72; balance, December 1, 1950, $53,807.28; number of employees, November 1950, 11.

Committee on the Judiciary (immigration subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 228, agreed to February 27, 1950: Limitation, January 31, 1951. Amount authorized, $80,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $63,840.88; balance December 1, 1950, $16,159.12; number of employees, November 1950, 16.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (subcommittee on health), under authority of Senate Resolution 273, agreed to May 26, 1950: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, $37,800; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $15,680.36; balance December 1, 1950, $22,119.64; number of employees, November 1950, 7.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations), under authority of Senate Resolution 140, agreed to August 15, 1949, and Senate Resolution 217, agreed to February 1, 1950; Limitation, December 31, 1950. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 140, $25,000; by Senate Resolution 217, $108,000; total, $133,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $109,886.34; balance, December 1, 1950, $23,113.66; number of employees, November 1950, 17.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 78, agreed to April 11, 1949; Senate Resolution 179, agreed to October 13, 1949; and Senate Resolution 275, agreed to May 24, 1950: Limitation, December 31, 1949 (S. Res. 78), Eighty-first Congress (S. Res. 179). Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 78, $5,000; by Senate Resolution 179, $3,000; by Senate Resolution 275, $3,000; total, $11,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $9,554.07; balance, December 1, 1950, $1,445.93; number of employees, November 1950, 1.

Committee on Public Works (Investigations Subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 123, agreed to August 11, 1949: Limitation, Eighty-first Congress. Amount authorized, $50,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $7,719.33; balance, December 1, 1950, $42,280.67; no employees during November 1950.

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 250, agreed to April 13, 1950, and Senate Resolution 311, agreed to July 27, 1950: No limitation. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 250, $50,000; by Senate Resolution 311, $25,000; total, $75,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $23,535.21; balance, December 1, 1950, $51,464.79; number of employees, November 1950, 9.

Joint Committee on Defense Production, under authority of Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950 (Defense Production Act of 1950): Limitation, fiscal year 1951. Amount authorized (from September 8, 1950, to June 30, 1951), $40,694.43; to be disbursed by the House of Representatives.

Select Committee on Small Business (subcommittee investigating the fuel supplies in New England), under authority of Senate Resolution 344, agreed to September 15, 1950, and Senate Resolution 354, agreed to September 19, 1950: Limitation, December 15, 1950 (S. Res. 344). Amount authorized (S. Res. 354), $5,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $3,784.58; balance December 1, 1950, $1,215.42; Number of employees, November 1950, 10.

Special Committee Investigating Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, under authority of Senate Resolution 202, agreed to May 3, 1950 and Senate Resolution 334, agreed to August 30, 1950: Limitation, March 31, 1950. Amount authorized by Senate Resolution 202, $150,000; by Senate Resolution 334, $50,000; total, $200,000; expenditures to November 30, 1950, $95,271.84; balance December 1, 1950, $104,728.16; number of employees, November 1950, 30.

Total number of employees listed above, 229.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana object to the present consideration of these resolutions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Unless I can get time to look into them further, I do.

As I said, I would not object to the immediate consideration of resolutions that would expire on June 30, 1951, in all cases where the special committees have been created and actually at work.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can report them and have them placed on the calendar, and then the Senator can take his own time, if he so desires.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have some additional time. At this time, Mr. President, I object to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the resolutions will be received and placed on the calendar, for consideration later.

The resolutions reported by Mr. HAYDEN from the Committee on Rules and Administration were ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

S. Res. 40. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling To Your Government"; without amendment (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 19. Resolution authorizing the temporary employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 33. Resolution extending the authority for the investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy for the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 37);

S. Res. 32. Resolution extending the authority for an investigation of the relationship of the United States with the Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 51. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive

Departments to employ temporary additional personnel and increasing the limit of expenditures; with an amendment (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 18. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services; with aditional amendments (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 17. Resolution continuing the authority for a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries; with an amendment (Rept. No. 41);

S. Res. 6. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from February 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, and increasing the limit of expenditures; without amendment (Rept. No. 42); and

S. Res. 7. Resolution to increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; with additional amendments (Rept. No. 43).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 659. A bill for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LODGE also introduced Senate bill 660, to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES introduced Senate bill 661, to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES also introduced Senate bill 662, to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. IVES also introduced Senate bill 663, to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 664. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 665. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 666. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas; and

S. 667. A bill for the relief of Pieter Mathias Pennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Louis Bernard Lapides; and

S. 670. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Gieusepps Gallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 671. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 672. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; and

S. 673. A bill to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Arthur Koestler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 675. A bill for the relief of Bedrich Donath, Vera Donath, and Brigitta Graetzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 676. A bill to provide for research in child life; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. NIXON, Mr. THYE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MAGNUSON) also introduced Senate bill 677, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. DOUGLAS also introduced Senate bill 678, to prevent undue increases in the number of permanent personnel, and to facilitate the transfer of employees from nondefense to defense agencies, in the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of John Quincy Adams, formerly a captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy; and

S. 680. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide leave credit for National Guard personnel undergoing training under provisions 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 681. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of wages which disabled annuitants and survivors of insured employees may earn without impairing the benefits accorded to them under such act; and

S. 682. A bill to exempt the appointed members of the national advisory councils for the National Institutes of Health from certain provisions of the criminal laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 683 (by request). A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 684. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 685. A bill to subordinate claims of the United States to certain wage claims; and

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Valeria Kempinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Bellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 689. A bill to authorize the sale of land allotted to Annie Shot To Pieces;

S. 690. A bill to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S. 691. A bill to authorize the sale of land allotted to William Burning Breast on the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak.;

S. 692. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Len Bliss a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 693. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 694. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Sisseton Indian Agency, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of William Greville Birkett; and

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 698. A bill for the relief of William E. Koerting; and

S. 699. A bill for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GRANTING OF CITIZENSHIP TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that alien mothers and fathers whose sons lost their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war may be granted United States citizenship notwithstanding their inability to speak, read, or write the English language or to sign their names. This proposed legislation is suggested to me by the action of State Senator Michael LoPresti, of Boston, who has just introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature a resolution memorializing Congress in favor of such legislation. I understand that the parents of children who have died in the service of their country must still register as aliens because of their inability to read and write English. These men and women have given their flesh and blood to the country of their

choice. No citizen can do more. They richly deserve citizenship, and have unquestionably proven their right to have it.

The bill (S. 660) to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF MALE NURSES IN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 661) to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

This bill would provide for equal status for male nurses in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps. In World War II, and in the years ensuing, men, performing the same duties as women nurses, received no officer status and were subordinate to women officers. I raise no objection to the fact that women served in superior command posts, but I strongly feel that men should be given an opportunity to have equal rank for equal duties.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill in collaboration with Congresswoman BOLTON in the House. In the past objection to this proposal has been raised by the Department of Defense on the grounds that such a realinement would necessitate great administrative and legislative difficulty within the Department. I do not feel this to be an adequate ground for rejection of the proposal, inasmuch as male officers in the Nurse Corps could be housed with Regular officers—or in the same quarters as male doctors who also have officer status. I can see no administrative difficulty that would be serious enough to deprive qualified men from attaining appropriate rank as members of the Nurse Corps.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 406 OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, explaining the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 662) to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The Nationality Act of 1940 provides that a naturalized citizen of the United States is subject to loss of citizenship should he reside outside the United States for five continuous years after having been naturalized. The act also exempts veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I from this provision of the law. I believe that veterans of World War II should be given the same privilege as is afforded to the previous veterans.

Great injustices are being wrought because the act has not been thus amended. Men who have served their adopted country with valor and heroism are being denied the same opportunities enjoyed by their counterparts of our previous wars. This to me is unjust and therefore I am introducing this amendment with the hope that the veterans of World War II will be treated with the deference they deserve as far as the Nationality Act is concerned.

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF ADDITIONAL ITALIAN ALIENS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 663) to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

This bill would provide for the issuance of a number of visas to Italian immigrants equal to the unused number forfeited during the last period of hostilities. During that time, 1939–46, travel between Italy and the United States was at a standstill; consequently many persons who would have had the opportunity to come to the United States were unable to do so.

In the spirit of humanity and fairness, I urge that this bill be given full consideration, for if it is enacted, we shall know that we have thus afforded to the Italian people an opportunity they deserve and we shall have corrected an inequity which exists in our present immigration procedure.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF MARINE CORPS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps at four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and other organic units, and to fix the personnel strength of the Marine Corps at not less than 400,000, and, in addition, to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that mean that it is to be the permanent establishment, or is it merely to apply in time of war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is to be a permanent establishment.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is to be a permanent establishment of 400,000 men. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the present strength?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is approximately 160,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill would more than double the present number, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would.

Mr. President, I should like to add that identical bills have been introduced in the House by 60 Members, and there will probably be introduced today at least from 5 to 10 more identical bills.

The bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—REPEAL OF A PORTION OF THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal that portion of the so-called Whitten amendment, dealing with the transfer of Government employees, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and a statement which I have prepared in support of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 678) to prevent undue increases in the number of permanent personnel, and to facilitate the transfer of employees from nondefense to defense agencies, in the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after September 1, 1950, and until the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) In making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel and no employee in the Federal civil service promoted or appointed to a position of higher grade shall be eligible, in the event of separation from the service through reduction in force, to reinstatement at a grade above the grade held by such employee on September 1, 1950; and all reinstatements or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary and for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to the individual reinstated, transferred or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to postaudit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission;

(b) The names of all persons to be terminated under reductions in force in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be certified as eligible for appointment to positions in agency programs determined by the President to be related directly to national defense, if qualified, at not to exceed the grade and salary last held in the terminating agency or department; and

(c) The Department of Defense is authorized to call on other departments or agencies for such additional personnel as it may require within the limits of its funds.

SEC. 2. Section 1302 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong.), is hereby repealed.

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

A serious problem has developed under the so-called Whitten amendment (sec. 1302 of Public Law 843, 81st Cong.—Supplemental Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1951). Its present operation prevents an orderly flow of Federal personnel from nondefense to defense agencies. At a time when we must severely curtail the expense of the nondefense agencies, we should facilitate the movement of personnel away from them.

This would serve the dual purpose of reducing nondefense expenditures and at the same time, make fuller use of experienced personnel where they are needed.

The Whitten amendment provides that in making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel. But it also provides that all transfers to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary.

The provision instructing the Civil Service Commission to make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments is reasonable and just. It prevents loading down the Federal Government with a tremendous number of permanent employees many of whom might be retained long after the need for them had passed. It also simplifies the problems connected with the return of veterans to their old jobs and with the employment of future veterans.

The provision that all transfers to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary, however, is open to serious question. Federal employees with permanent status in an old-line agency are hesitating to transfer to a defense agency where their status would be only temporary. In some cases, not even the lure of promotions is sufficient to overcome the lack of security which is the result of the provisions of the Whitten amendment.

As a matter of fact, the Whitten amendment fails to accomplish its stated purposes for the returning veteran. Take the employee who, for patriotic reasons, transfers to a defense job, thereby assuming an indefinite status: Such employee—if later drafted or if he volunteers for military service—would lose all rights to restoration either to his old or new job.

All possible steps should be taken to facilitate the flow of present Federal employees to the new emergency agencies and units which are of necessity being established. In most instances, I believe, the old agencies will find that they can continue to operate without replacing the transferred employee. The total number of Federal employees would thus be held to a considerably lower level than would be the case if all emergency agency employees had to be recruited from the outside. Also many present employees possess certain skills or forms of expertness not elsewhere available, and are familiar with the proceses commonly used in the Government, thus requiring less training.

For these reasons that portion of the Whitten amendment which operates to prevent the flow of Federal employees from the nondefense to the defense agencies should be repealed, and the bill I am now introducing would do this by repealing the Whitten amendment references to transfers. As it now operates, the Whitten amendment is hampering rather than helping our defense effort. We must take all possible steps to facilitate the prompt and efficient staffing of the defense agencies and cut down on the number of employees in the nondefense agencies.

I believe my bill will accomplish the desirable objective of the Whitten amendment, yet provide protection to the employee so that transfers from nondefense to defense agencies will be facilitated, not hampered.

In my judgment, the whole problem of personnel during a period of defense mobilization should be thoroughly studied and appropriate legislation introduced. My bill will accomplish one of the desirable ends, but it is my hope that when this bill is referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee they will take up the broad problem as well. I understand that the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. JOHNSTON, has indicated that his committee will make such a study. I want to congratulate Senator JOHNSTON for making this move, which indicates his acute awareness of our personnel needs.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LODGE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the second paragraph of subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to cloture) is amended by striking out "by two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the vote of a majority of the authorized membership of the Senate."

ALASKA STATEHOOD—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1726. An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, reappointment;

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, reappointment;

Leroy D. Stinebower, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years;

Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Director for International Security Affairs;

John D. Erwin, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras;

Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Israel;

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain;

Horatio Mooers, of Maine, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America;

William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America;

Charles H. Whitaker, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America;

Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey, and several other Foreign Service staff officers, to be consuls of the United States; and

Jack C. McDermott, of Texas, and several other Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States.

A FOREIGN POLICY: WHAT'S THE ANSWER?—RADIO DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR DOUGLAS AND SENATOR DIRKSEN

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of the debate between Senator DOUGLAS and Senator DIRKSEN on the question "A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?" broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on January 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WOLF CREEK PROJECT OF THE CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN—ADDRESS BY COL. HENRY WALSH

[Mr. CHAPMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Wolf Creek project of the Cumberland River Basin, delivered by Col. Henry Walsh, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of Nashville, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR KEM FILLS A NECESSARY ROLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWS-LEADER OF SPRINGFIELD, MO.

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator KEM Fills a Necessary Role," published in the News-Leader, of Springfield, Mo., January 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO MILLARD F. CALDWELL, JR., BY CROSBY S. NOYES

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., written by Crosby S. Noyes, and published in the Washington Evening Star, January 23, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENSIONS FOR THE ELDERLY—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. McMASTERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding pensions for the elderly, written by William H. McMasters, and published in the National Welfare Advocate, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAXATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES—ARTICLE FROM THE NORTH DAKOTA UNION FARMER.

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mutual Insurance Companies Angered by NTEA Attack," published in the North Dakota Union Farmer January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES—EDITORIAL BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facts on Food Prices," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer on January 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

OWEN LATTIMORE—LETTER FROM EUGENE LYONS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Eugene Lyons, regarding the attitude of the Soviet press toward Owen Lattimore, published in the New Leader, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DR. L. R. SANTE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address on the subject The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice During the Last Half Century, delivered by Dr. L. R. Sante, at the one hundred and sixteenth annual meeting of the St. Louis Medical Society, on January 3, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE OF THE NEW DAY—SERMON BY DR. EARLE B. JEWELL

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered on January 14, 1951, by Dr. Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrew Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo., which appears in the Appendix.]

NEWSPAPER POLL ON KOREAN AND RUSSIAN QUESTIONS—ARTICLE BY EDWARD W. SOWERS

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding a poll by the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News regarding foreign and domestic policies, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR'S APPROACH TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. HARRISON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Labor's Approach to the National Emergency, delivered by George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, before the Economic Club of New York on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION AND THE NATIONAL SURVIVAL—ADDRESS BY HARRY A. BULLIS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Inflation and the National Survival, delivered by Harry A. Bullis, chairman, General Mills, Inc., before the Economic Club of New York on January 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY NOT TALK PEACE FOR A CHANGE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD COURANT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?" published in the Hartford Courant of January 24, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER—LETTER FROM REV. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president of Notre Dame University, regarding a declaration on manpower adopted at a meeting of the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City, N. J., on January 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY POLICY IN KOREA AND EUROPE—ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rolla, Mo., Says Quit Korea, but Stay in Europe," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL FROM KOREA—ARTICLE FROM THE EVANSVILLE COURIER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henderson Plans 'Evacuate Korea' Meeting Tonight," published in the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., on January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMISSION ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press release from the White House and the Executive order establishing the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

The President is to be congratulated upon the selection of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz as Chairman of this new Commission. I am sure he will function in his usual excellent manner.

There being no objection, the release and order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, JANUARY 23, 1951

I have today established a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights. The Commission will be composed of nine members. Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz will serve as Chairman.

The Commission will consider in all its aspects the question of how this Nation can best deal with the problem of protecting its internal security and at the same time maintaining the freedoms of its citizens. It will consider the harm that comes from the wrong kind of action as well as the good that comes from the right kind of action.

The Commission will make a thorough examination of the laws, practices, and procedures concerning the protection of our Nation against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities, and of the operation of and any need for changes in such laws, practices, and procedures. The Commission will also consider the methods used by public or private groups for the purpose of protecting us against such activities. It will consider these matters from the standpoint of protecting both the internal security of our country and the rights of individuals, and will seek the wisest balance that can be struck between security and freedom. The Commission will report its conclusions and recommendations for legislative, administrative, or other action it deems appropriate.

I consider the task of this Commission to be of extraordinary importance. The world is in the midst of a struggle between freedom and tyranny. The United States is one of the leaders of the free world—not just because we are powerful in material things, but because we have preserved and expanded the freedom of our people. We have built our society in the faith and in the practice of freedom—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of association and political belief.

We in this country have always been ready to protect our freedom—to protect it against external or internal enemies and to protect it against unwarranted restrictions by Government. From time to time in our history we have faced the need to protect our freedom from these different kinds of encroachment. Each of these occasions has presented our Nation with new and often conflicting considerations. To reconcile these consid-

erations, and to find the proper national policy is always difficult, and is especially so at times like the present, when our freedom is severely threatened abroad and at home.

Today we are particularly concerned by the threat to our Government and our national life arising from the activities of the forces of Communist imperialism. In addition to the vigorous action we are taking abroad to meet this threat, we must be sure that our laws and procedures at home are adequate to protect our system of government against unconstitutional attacks and to preserve our national security against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive acts designed to weaken or overthrow our Government. At the same time, we are concerned lest the measures taken to protect us from these dangers infringe the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and stifle the atmosphere of freedom in which we have so long expressed our thoughts and carried on our daily affairs.

These are problems of momentous importance for our country and its future, and for the future of our leadership in the world. They should be approached in a serious and fair-minded way by all our citizens. We must not let our differences about how to solve these problems degenerate into partisan controversies. We must continue to protect our security within the framework of our historic liberties, without thought of partisan advantage or political gain.

To keep these great problems from falling into the arena of partisanship, I am appointing this Commission of distinguished citizens on a nonpartisan basis. I believe the people of this country will receive from them an authoritative judgment on these problems, based on the facts and formulated in the national interest, with no question of political advantage.

The Commission will undoubtedly wish to focus its primary attention on Federal laws and procedures. But I do not believe the Commission should limit itself to reviewing Government actions. Instead, I hope it will consider afresh, in all its present-day ramifications, the recurrent question of how a free people protect their society from subversive attack without at the same time destroying their own liberties.

This question is, of course, far broader than the activities of the Federal Government. It concerns State and local governments as well, private groups of all kinds, and citizens in their daily work and in their homes. I hope that the report of this Commission will provide guidelines of sufficiently wide application to be helpful in protecting both internal security and individual rights in every part of our national life.

The field of study for this Commission is very complex and far reaching. Much study will be necessary before a report can be drafted. I am giving instructions that the Commission shall have complete freedom to conduct its study as it sees fit. I am asking the Commission to make such interim reports as it may deem desirable, and I hope the Commission will find it possible to complete its work in a year.

One of the important matters for the Commission to consider is the operation of the Government employee loyalty and security programs. I wish to make it clear, however, that this Commission is not being established as an appeals tribunal for individual cases. The Commission will be expected to report on the effectiveness and fairness of the Government's loyalty and security programs. In doing this, the Commision may wish to inspect individual case files—and it will be authorized to do so to whatever extent it may determine to be necessary.

In connection with loyalty and security procedures, and also in considering the operation of such statutes as the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Commission will necessarily be reviewing information of very high security classifications. I am directing the Commission therefore, to take appropriate measures to safeguard the security of any classified or confidential information it may wish to examine.

I intend to do everything I can to enable this Commission to make a thorough and careful study.

We, in the United States have a special responsibility for leadership in these critical times, when free men the world over are strongly resisting the challenge of the Communist drive for world domination. We must guard our freedom well—guard it from armed assault, guard it from subversive infiltration, guard it from internal suppression and the deadly imposition of conformity. For the kind of freedom we have enjoyed in this country has been the shining goal for millions in other lands—and the results of freedom in this country have been the shattering reply to the false claims of Communist imperialism.

If we are to continue growing in strength here at home—if we are to continue leading the world toward peace with freedom and justice—we must both protect the security of our Nation and safeguard the freedom of our people.

I know the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights will undertake its work in full recognition of the immense importance and world-wide significance of its task.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

1. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a commission to be known as the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, which shall be composed of a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and seven other members, all of whom shall be designated by the President.

2. (a) The Commission shall make a thorough study of the problem of providing for the internal security of the United States and at the same time protecting the rights and freedoms of individuals. The Commission shall consider how this problem should be met by Government action and by private action. Among other things, the Commission shall examine the laws, practices, and procedures concerning protection against treason, sabotage, espionage, and other matters affecting the internal security of the Nation; and the Commission shall consider the operation of and any need for changes in such laws, practices, and procedures. The subjects considered by the Commission shall include the Government employee loyalty program and the Government employee security program. The Commission shall also consider the need for protecting individuals from unwarranted attacks and from unwarranted infringement of their rights and liberties in the name of security.

(b) The Commission shall make a report to the President of its findings and conclusions (to be preceded by such interim reports as it may find desirable), and shall make such recommendations for legislative, administrative, or other action as it deems appropriate.

3. In carrying out its functions under this order, the Commission shall prescribe its own rules of procedure. The Commission may hold such public hearings and hear such witnesses as it may determine, and it may, in connection with matters relating to Federal employees, examine any and all records and files relating to individual cases in possession of any executive department or agency. All executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission such information and assistance, not inconsistent with law, as it may require in the performance of its functions. The Commission shall take appropriate measures to protect the security or confidential character of any security-classified information or information of a confidential nature submitted to it or examined by it.

4. The expenditures of the Commission shall be paid out of an allotment made by the President from the appropriation "Executive Office of the President—Emergencies (National Defense)". Such payments shall be made without regard to the provisions of (a) section 3681 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U. S. C. 672), (b) section 9 of the act of March 4, 1909, 35 Stat. 1027 (31 U. S. C. 673), and (c) such other laws as the President may hereafter specify.

5. Thirty days after the presentation of its final report to the President, the Commission shall cease to exist unless the President shall otherwise direct.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS WEEKS—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a proclamation by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, designating the weeks of January 15–31 as Infantile Paralysis Weeks in New York State, as part of the Nation-wide March of Dimes drive to raise funds for the continuance of the battle against this dread disease.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

The most dreaded of diseases are those which attack their victims without warning and without apparent cause. Such an affliction is poliomyelitis, which comes, as it were, like a thief in the night to attack those who are apparently full of health and vigor. The fear of this disease lurks in every American home. The worst of it is that most of its victims are young boys and girls. During the last 3 years it has laid low more than 100,000 people in our country. During the year 1950 alone more than 4,200 residents of New York were polio patients.

In coping with the local and national case load the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has exhausted its funds available for the care of patients. This indispensable institution is now trying to replenish its treasury through the 1951 March of Dimes, in order that its great work may continue. Despite the gravity of the world situation we cannot neglect the health and welfare of our boys and girls.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the weeks of January 15–31 as Infantile Paralysis Weeks in New York State, and I urge the people of the State to recognize the gravity of this cause and cooperate to the limit of their ability.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 11th day of January in the year of our Lord 1951.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

EGG PRICES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a brief letter which I hold in my hand:

BUTTE, N. DAK., *January 3, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: About 2 or 3 weeks ago my wife took a case of eggs—that is 12 dozen—at 40 cents per dozen and she got $4.80.

Yesterday we took another 12 dozen of eggs, and we got $3.12—it is only 26 cents a dozen. What is going on now? Whatever we buy in the store it is a terrible price for anything we buy. I feed oats to my chickens, and they eat 10 bushels of oats, and the price of oats is 75 cents per bushel. Is there anything that you can do about that?

Your friend,

PAUL NOVAK.

Mr. President, that letter bears out what I said on Monday about the price of eggs: That it is ridiculous to have the farmers receive 21 or 22 cents a dozen for eggs, whereas the consumer is obliged to pay anywhere from 70 cents to $1 for a dozen.

I may say that I sent a copy of Mr. Novak's letter to Mr. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, on the 9th day of January. However, up to the present time I have not received a reply.

SPEECH BY GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE ON THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a speech on the present international crisis, recently delivered by Gen. Charles de Gaulle, at Nimes, France. I regard General de Gaulle as one of the great figures of contemporary history. Whatever may be said of General de Gaulle, no one has ever doubted his courage and flaming patriotism. I do not agree with every line of his speech, but in its entirety it reflects a refreshing and inspiring will to resist communism.

General de Gaulle is a political figure today, but he is also a realist. This is demonstrated by his insistence that Germany be permitted to rearm and that Spain be brought into any plan for the defense of Western Europe. He also insists very vigorously that all the Atlantic Pact Nations, including his own beloved France, make a much greater contribution to the cause of resistence to Communist aggression than is contemplated under present plans.

I believe that his address is a notable contribution to the cause of human freedom, and casts a great deal of light upon the issues which are pending in the Senate at the present time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE AT NIMES, JANUARY 7, 1951

The battle raging in Korea and Tonkin has finally awakened the world. Rubbing their eyes, the free peoples perceive that the curtain has risen on the harsh light of danger.

Everywhere, in Washington and in Paris, in Rome and in London, in Bonn and in Madrid, the people are forced to give up this sleep on the edge of the abyss, this deliberate illusion, this artificial indifference in which they have been plunged for so long because they were afraid to look the facts in the face.

In the full light of events the joyless games of political partisans seem lugubrious and ridiculous. The concessions made to those whose threats were feared, in the hope of appeasing them by granting them favors—these concessions, too, can be clearly seen for what they are, that is, absurd and ruinous. It is now clear that our only hope lies in strength and firmness.

We in France are also emerging from our torpor. We are beginning to move, despite the pressures to which we have been subjected, despite the drugs with which the present political regime has wished to put us to sleep. The instinct of life, the desire to act which have been stirring in the depths of the nation, are coming to the surface, as unmistakable signs show. Here is one such sign. Look around you today. Look at this immense gathering of French people here at Nimes.

In truth, it is high time that on this side of the Atlantic, as on the other, we cease to dance a hesitation waltz. After so many councils, conferences, committees, plans, studies, and communiqués, it is high time that common action, without which everything might collapse, should really be prepared and organized. But within the whole everyone has his own special duty to perform.

Within the camp of freedom, there are different responsibilities on which the whole future depends and which the nation and the world must clearly understand. At this grave hour, surrounded by this anxious mass of Frenchmen called together at the appeal of the war veterans, I intend to say what these responsibilities are and how they are divided between the United States of America, Europe, and France.

As for our various responsibilities, it is on your shoulders, Americans, that the chief responsibilities rest. As a nation you are intact. As a power, no other possesses the means you possess. As a state, you stand upright, because up till now the circumstances have sheltered you from those misfortunes which destroy institutions.

On the great tablets of history on which the merits and mistakes of the nations are inscribed your name is now inscribed in first place. This is a privilege heavy to bear. We Frenchmen know this, for France was for a long time the chief champion of human freedom. Due to her trials, she can no longer suffice for this task. It is your turn. On the attitude you are now going to take in the drama in which we are all engaged will depend your fate—and to a large extent the fate of the rest of the world.

I appeal to you Americans to defend Europe. Europe needs you. You need Europe.

You no doubt say that Europe is troubled, bitter, divided. That is so. You no doubt say that none of the free nations of the old Continent have yet recovered their equilibrium. I agree. You no doubt say that despite the threat menacing all the European nations, one has to move mountains in order to get them to unite. That is true.

And yet, in spite of what you find uncertain and disconcerting in the old Continent, Europe is there; she exists, full of men and means, linked to your America by a thousand vital links, profoundly involved with Asia and Africa, conscious of her value to the point that today, in the midst of her anguish, she is sure that, in the ultimate outcome, the road the world will follow will be the road that she will have taken. Believe me, Europe being what she is, her salvation is the condition of your own salvation.

For despite its ruins, the old Continent contains immense resources.

In that part of Europe which remains free there are more men, women, and children, more iron, coal, copper, aluminum, wheat, meat, and sugar than in Soviet Russia or in the United States of America. The capacities for work, for production, and for invention of our peoples have been absorbed in the work of reconstruction, but they do not remain any the less enormous for that.

Although their material losses, their moral depression, and their political confusion have so far prevented the rebirth of their armies, they possess a very vast war potential.

Let all that be used and the west will dictate the peace.

To allow the Soviet system to swamp the French, Germanic, Latin, and Scandinavian territories, even after having scorched them, would be to hand over to the Soviet system an incalculable additional source of strength.

And what a jumping-off ground it would be for the Soviet system for more distant conquests. I know full well that some who live on the periphery of the Western World apply the scale of the past to anticipations of the future, and reassure themselves by measuring the width of the Channel, the height of the Pyrenees, the distance to Morocco, and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. But if death and destruction cannot cross these geographical obstacles on foot, in automobiles, or in ships, they can cross them with flying missiles and on wings.

Above all, who can measure the shattering effect on the whole world which would result from the totalitarians becoming masters of Paris, Rome, Vienna, Berlin, and Istanbul? After this forward leap of the conquerors, what currents would carry away the masses in Asia? How, in their resulting confusion, would the Africans react?

In such an eventuality, the men and women of the New World would see the lights going out one after the other in all the windows of the earth while, among general maledictions, the Parthenon, the Coliseum, Notre Dame de Paris would crumble with the rest under their own bombs. Who knows whether in its isolation the New World would not itself be crushed by the terrible burden of war.

No. The camp of freedom must in no event and at no price lose what it still has of Europe. The priority is over here. This implies, evidently, that the Armed Forces of America must be built up with a view to flowing massively and without delay, if the need arises, to this side of the seas. It means that the eventual battle must be prepared on the most forward possible line and that powerful units must be put in place there right away.

What the masters of the Kremlin want to achieve by fixing the largest possible western forces in Asia and by demanding with loud shouts what they call the demilitarization of Germany, is to get America to leave our Continent. If their plan succeeded we should see their policy playing alternatively on the illusions and the fears of the European states abandoned to their fate. We should see them maneuvering from within these states and using the activities and the votes of the Separatists (Communists), the camouflage of the fellow travelers, the opportunism of the politicians, so that they would perhaps conquer the peoples of Europe through the disintegration of their political regimes. The first signs of this attempt are already visible in Paris.

But, on the other hand, what an electrifying effect rapid and powerful aid from across the Atlantic would have on the old Continent. For the whole world knows the courage of your American soldiers and the value of your American chiefs and you are proving it every day.

Then you would see the old values, which, armed with weapons, give nations good armies, flourish again on the ancient territory. Then you would see that sacred solidarity establish itself among the peoples of

the Continent which is today being suffocated by doubt.

But if American support must come to the aid of the Europeans, this aid does not have the function of relieving the Europeans of their own responsibilities, any more than it would be intended to infringe on their independence. It is above all up to the Europeans themselves to defend their Continent and one day to make the whole of it free again.

There is a great deal of talk of common defense, but nothing is being done, finally, to assure it. If common defense is to be anything more than an alibi for cabinet ministers, a puzzle for experts, a poster for the Council of Strasbourg, numerous grievances and mental reservations must be forgotten. To make common defense effective all the nations must participate in the effort, whatever the condition in which they find themselves and the internal conflicts which divide them.

At the stage we have reached any excommunications are ridiculous. Today free Europe risks being submerged from one day to the next, and this is really not the moment to prevent it from rallying all its forces. Whatever may be a man's opinions, for example, on the regime governing Spain, this proud and valiant people, whose territory is one of the essential dykes of the west, must be incorporated without delay in the western entity.

Whatever may have been from century to century on both sides of the Rhine the pain and the anger, it is a fact that Germany lies at the heart of Europe and that military cover on the Elbe demands the collaboration of the Germans. As for the Germans themselves, let them take their place without insisting too much on their alarms or their demands. Let them seize the opportunity which history has suddenly offered them. Let them restore to the old occident the chance the Emperor Charlemagne carried to the tomb with him.

To organize Europe we must take Europe as it is, that is to say, as a collection of peoples very distinct from each other, each having its own body, soul, and genius. Each must therefore have its own armed forces. Let us leave to the geometricians the strange plans which claim to mix contingents from different countries in the same military units in order to fabricate a nonnational army. From where would the soldiers of this military Babel draw their virtues? A coalition must of course have a single system on the higher levels of command, but the principle dominating everything is that an army fights for its country under the authority of its government and under the orders of its own chiefs. None of the armies, and I repeat none, which Europe must supply could possibly be created or used on any other terms.

As soon as a solid and resolute system is born on the Continent, the tendency toward insularity, which is sometimes imputed to Great Britain, can and should disappear. Thus it was, for the glory of Britain, when from 1914 to 1919, her armies fought without reserve and to the full alongside our own, or when in the recent war, they participated on a large scale in the Allied enterprise.

On the other hand, Dunkerque was the bitter fruit of a badly coordinated and last-minute strategy. Tomorrow, neither the safety offered by the English Channel nor any illusory African profits to be reaped in the catastrophe would prevent the British Isles from being involved in the disaster of our own collapse. As much as ever, Europe counts firmly on England.

But it is our own Nation which above all must give the example in order to bring about the revival of the Old Continent. There lies the responsibility of France. I know that too many people among us compare our relative former power with that which the vicissitudes of history have left us, and take refuge in passivity and in saying "What is the good?" Those who do and say that understand nothing of their own country nor of the period in which we live. Worse still, they make worse the position which appalls and desolates them by preventing France from playing her role and by delivering her to the influence of others.

Once before we have witnessed a similar state of mind and we have measured its cost to us. At that time the regime had not just been built following a terrible disaster. Today the demons of abandonment are at work at a time when our Nation is being offered the opportunity to influence the course of events decisively.

Surely we can stand up. We can create an army able to strike effectively which would be the essential part of the continental forces, with its 20 permanent divisions, plus 20 reserve divisions, its 5,000 planes, its 350,000 tons of modern warships, its young men of quality, its ardent and able chiefs. We can reestablish national unity by carrying out, through association of labor and capital, the great social and economic reform of the century. We can go ahead toward a direct understanding between the French and the Germans, from which will emerge the unity of Europe. We can make the part which belongs to us a matter of life and death. In our country, which works, produces and trades widely and which is not deprived of outside aid if it justifies it, we can solve without too many shocks the problems of the division of costs, credit, labor power, raw material, and food supplies, which our rearmament will constantly make heavier.

We can reestablish the credit of the state, this essential and traditional source for financing the cost of national defense, once it is established that an extraordinary and temporary effort is needed. Above all, we can regain our soul, that is to say, our faith and our hope.

Yes, we can do that. But on condition that a regenerated government at last leads the nation. The regime, constructed 4 years ago amid boundless confusion by the political parties working for themselves, is condemned by events. As events get worse, the confusion and the impotence of the system gets worse too. Its principle is to form the government by the juxtaposition of political cliques and rivalries. Its type of action is to oppose groups of electors to each other, and that very fact prevents it from ever identifying itself with the French community. All this, and the fact that the regime feels it has been disavowed by the nation renders it incapable of facing the terrible problems which press on us from all sides.

In all fields, the regime drags itself from one compromise to another, offering its weakness to the temptation of the totalitarians, puzzling its allies with its enigmas, and alarming the country, which is less worried about being in danger than about being leaderless.

What a pity it is, in these times, to see many a man of value getting engulfed in these quicksands. If, even within this regime, their conscience and their reason succeeded in overcoming the sectarianism of the cliques, the republic would quickly be restored to its real function which is to be the state for the sole benefit of the nation, and to its proper purpose which is that of the public welfare. A government based on the unity of the French people, above parties, which would call on the people to rally around France and would obtain by democratic elections the ardent approval of the country, would be able to carry out the needed reforms of our existing institutions, to put the country on its feet and lead it towards its destiny.

I have already said this is the north, and I repeat it here in the south. For my part, I am ready, fully ready. Failing this, the consultation of the nation, which must take place this year, unless there is an act of usurpation, will decide the question, despite all trickery, by calling to account those who hang on to this system of sterility and who have thrown away for nothing some of the nation's trump cards.

The hour of responsibility has struck. In the battle now engaged between light and darkness, and which can bring war and catastrophe to the weak or assure life and peace to the strong, may America, may Europe, may France, together do their duty. Long live France.

THE FEDERAL OLEOMARGARINE LAW—REPORT OF SURVEY BY DAIRY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a release which I have prepared giving my views on the subject of America's dairy industry in relation to the oleomargarine threat. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my release be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, to be followed thereafter by the text of a special report of a survey by three great dairy organizations, pointing out violations under the new oleo law.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the survey referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin, made on behalf of the American Butter Institute, the National Creameries Association, and the National Milk Producers Federation. It had been my purpose to ask that it be printed in the RECORD, but since the Senator from Wisconsin has made such a request I do not, of course, desire to have a duplication in the RECORD.

I may say, however, that the survey made on behalf of the three leading butter and dairy institutes of America in relation to prevalent restaurant practices in the sale of spreads for bread discloses the startling circumstance that the overwhelming majority of the restaurants visited by the investigators served oleomargarine in violation of the law without notice or advice to the purchasing public.

The survey also discloses, I am proud to say, that there were no violations observed in the State of New York, where production of oleomargarine in imitation of butter is prohibited.

Of course, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the release by Mr. WILEY and the report of the survey were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES THREE ACTIONS TO PROTECT UNITED STATES DAIRYING—SAYS PREDICTIONS OF HARM TO BUTTER INDUSTRY FROM NEW OLEO LAW ARE STARTING TO BE BORNE OUT

"American dairying must be aided by three specific Federal and State actions," Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, stated today, "if the Oleo Trust is to be prevented from causing lasting damage."

The Wisconsin legislator contended that "the artificial supply and demand for food products during the present defense effort may have blinded some folks to the real facts. Thus, the new oleo law has already severely harmed dairying although that fact is not generally understood. Just look at farm papers and see the auction sales being conducted on dairy farms."

The Wisconsin legislator had led the fight for the butter amendment to the oleo bill—a battle which ended in January 1950 with the temporary defeat of the dairy forces.

SENATE SHOULD STUDY OLEO MONOPOLY

WILEY accordingly urged new action which he reported could "only partly help the present situation," as follows:

1. He recommended that the Senate take action on a bill which will shortly be reintroduced by Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, with cosponsorship by Senators from Wisconsin and other dairy States. Purpose of the resolution is to secure an investigation by the Senate and the Federal Trade Commission of the monopolistic character of the oleomargarine industry. "The FTC," said WILEY, "should also investigate unfair trade practices by that industry.

"In addition, it should review the loopholes in the oleo law which Congress passed last year. Under that law, oleo manufacturers were supposed to have been prevented from giving readers of newspaper ads or leaflets the impression that they were selling a natural dairy-type product when actually an artificial product was being sold. That restriction against such improper advertising has, however, been shown to be shot through with wide loopholes."

WILEY URGES STATES TO PROTECT BUTTER

2. Senator WILEY also issued an appeal to 14 State legislatures "to beat down the oleo trust's latest legislative efforts, to destroy butter." "These are the last 14 commonwealths which prohibit the sale of yellow-colored oleo. A determined effort is being made this year to repeal these 14 State statutes. If oleo is allowed to masquerade as butter in those States, then the dairy industry will have been that much further severely harmed.

"Some pro-oleo bills that are being or have been introduced would authorize so-called identification of oleo in restaurants as well as authorizing other half-baked, impractical measures. Yet, we have seen that these so-called restaurant safeguards against false identification are a farce."

PRO-OLEO FEDERAL LAW SHOULD NOT BE USED AS MODEL

"In many State legislatures the cry for repeal of the present butter statute is being made on this basis: 'Let us pattern a new State statute along the lines of the new Federal pro-oleo law.' I trust, however, that the State legislatures will not listen to that dangerous appeal. Why? Because the Federal law instead of being something that should serve as a model, is actually unfair, impractical and practically unenforceable. The oleo lobby even succeeded in knocking out the few minimum safeguards which we had proposed in it such as triangular identification of all retail oleo."

ENFORCEMENT FUNDS NECESSARY

3. WILEY stated that he will insist that Congress increase appropriations to the Pure Food and Drug Administration to try to tighten enforcement of the mislabeling law. He pointed out that some $6,000,000 was originally requested for enforcement of the law, only $200,000 of which was actually ultimately granted by the Congress. "Such a pitiful sum," he said, "constitutes no enforcement whatsoever. It is ridiculous to place a law on the statute books and to fail to provide appropriations necessary to enforce it."

DAIRY PREDICTIONS HAVE BEEN BORNE OUT

WILEY stated that experience under the oleomargarine law confirmed predictions which he and other dairy spokesmen had made during the battle on the floor of the Senate.

"1. As predicted, the sale of white oleomargarine has practically disappeared. Thus, in 1948, only 10 percent of the oleo which was sold was yellow. In 1949, that percentage had increased to 30 percent, and last year the percentage increased to around 70 percent. We all know that the oleo industry shed crocodile tears in its alleged love of folks in the low-income brackets. Now, however, do we find that the oleo industry is concentrating on the sale of the inexpensive white product? On the contrary, it is concentrating on selling the yellow product which sells for more and gives it more profit. This proves the falsity of the oleo industry's claims.

"2. As predicted, the price of oleo has tremendously increased. It is a fact, of course, that there has been a general price rise throughout our entire economy and that the prices of the component oils in oleo have also increased. Nevertheless, the monopolistic character of the oleo industry makes its product particularly susceptible to price manipulation by the few manufacturers who control it.

"DAIRYMEN ARE SWITCHING TO OTHER FARMING

"3. As predicted, there is more and more of a tendency for dairy farmers to sell their herds in order to turn to more types of farming with greater financial appeal. While income to dairymen has increased, it has not increased as fast as have the costs of farm machinery, farm labor, etc. Moreover, if the dairyman's income does not increase as fast or faster than income received by other segments of American agriculture, there will be a greatly speeded tendency to turn from dairying to other types of farming. It must never be forgotten that there is no single type of farming which is more beneficial to the health of the Nation's population and the health of the Nation's soil than is dairying."

In making these comments, Senator WILEY emphasized, "I am not speaking merely as the senior Senator from America's Dairyland, Wisconsin, but rather I am speaking for the welfare of the present and future generations of Americans whose health depends upon a healthy dairy industry."

SURVEY BY DAIRY ORGANIZATIONS UNCOVERS FLAGRANT VIOLATION OF NEW FEDERAL OLEO LAW

The new Federal oleomargarine law is being "flagrantly violated on a scale not equaled since the days of Federal prohibition of alcohol," three national dairy organizations charged here today.

Speaking for the three organizations, the American Butter Institute, National Creameries Association, and National Milk Producers Federation, Charles W. Holman, federation secretary, declared that:

"Patrons of public eating places who order and pay for bread and butter in three States where yellow oleomargarine is legal, checked by researchers of an independent survey agency, are being illegally and fraudulently served the cheaper substitute without the notice specifically required by the Federal statute. The investigators sampled eating places in Atlanta, Macon, Savannah, Augusta, and La Grange, Ga.; Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Stillwater, and Ponca City in Oklahoma; Wichita, Topeka, and Manhattan in Kansas. They reported that 69 out of 109 eating places in those cities were serving a substitute spread when patrons ordered butter. Only 3 of the 69 complied with the Federal law requiring notice when the substitute is served.

"The investigators also checked the service of 'buttered' toast, and encountered an even more outrageous degree of fraud and violation of the law. Thirty-one out of 37 samples of 'buttered' toast picked up for laboratory analysis were found to be spread with a substitute."

At the same time, the three organizations reported that spot checks in two States (New York and Illinois) where the sale of yellow oleomargarine is banned showed satisfactory compliance with the Federal law in such States.

Holman emphasized that dairy farmers were not critical of efforts of the Federal Food and Drug Administration to enforce "an impossible law." He recalled that the Food and Drug Administration estimated at least $6,000,000 should be provided by Congress to enforce the statute, but that actually only $200,000 has been made available to the Federal agency.

Commenting on the findings, Holman said, "the contrasting results of the surveys in the two groups of States prove beyond doubt the wisdom of retaining statutory prohibition of the sale and serving of colored oleomargarine now in force in 14 States. Such State laws should be backed by a ban on the shipment of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce to simplify the task of the Food and Drug Administration.

"In Albany and New York City, N. Y., and in Chicago and Springfield, Ill., States which prohibit yellow oleomargarine, our investigators collected 40 samples of bread and butter and discovered no violations of the Federal law. On the other hand, in the three States which have lifted the bars on yellow oleomargarine, the public is being gypped on a wholesale basis as is indicated by the finding that 66 of 109 eating places sampled were violating the Federal law.

"The findings justify the contention that dairy farmers have been advancing to Congress and the State legislatures. Farmers have never objected to the sale of a product which is sold on its own merits. They rightfully can protest allowing a product to steal the table spread market by deception, fraud, and through open violation of the Federal law."

(There follows a summary of the methods and findings of the surveys:)

BACKGROUND OF THE SURVEYS

The three organizations authorized the surveys to ascertain whether the Federal law, which went into effect July 1, 1950, repealing the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine, was actually being observed throughout the country. The investigator's method of procedure was to enter a restaurant that had no sign or notice concerning the service of oleomargarine and order bread and butter. The spread served was then placed into a refrigerated container and subsequently mailed to the laboratory for analysis. In approximately one-half of the cities, investigators ordered buttered toast and submitted the buttered toast samples for analysis. Affidavits testifying to their findings and reports of the laboratory tests are filed by the agency (Fact Finders Associates, Inc.).

The Federal law requires two types of identification or notice to consumers if an eating place served oleomargarine instead of butter. The eating place must either post a sign or notice on its walls or counters or publish this information on their menus. In addition, the eating places are required to serve the oleomargarine in a triangular pat or place a notice on the plate or tray from which the consumer is served the spread.

In the case of the 69 eating places serving oleomargarine without publishing a wall or counter notice, three did state on their menus that oleomargarine was used. Thus, 66 out of the 109 eating places flagrantly violated the Federal statute. With regard to the requirements for notice with individual servings, the investigators reported a somewhat better degree of compliance. Thirty-two of the 69 eating places serving oleomargarine in place of butter furnished the spread in triangular pats.

FINDINGS IN THE CITIES

The following were the results city by city:

	Number of places sampled	Violations of Federal law
Kansas:		
Wichita	5	2
Topeka	17	5
Manhattan	7	4
Oklahoma:		
Oklahoma City	9	1[1]
Tulsa	10	5
Stillwater	8	1[1]
Ponca City	8	7
Georgia:		
Atlanta	10	4
Savannah	10	5
La Grange	8	6
Augusta	11	8
Macon	6	4
New York:		
New York City [2]	15	0
Albany	5	0
Illinois:		
Chicago [2]	15	0
Springfield	5	0

[1] 100 percent violation.
[2] 2 restaurants in New York City and 2 in Chicago were found to be serving a substitute spread on "buttered toast."

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] I report from the Senate Committee on Armed Services numerous routine nominations and promotions. It would eliminate a considerable printing bill if the Senate could now, as in executive session, confirm the appointments, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not quite catch the Senator's statement regarding the nominations.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are various routine nominations and promotions in the regular military establishment. The purpose of asking that they be considered now, without going to the Executive Calendar, is that we may save a printing bill of approximately $200. I can assure the Senator from North Dakota that this is in accordance with the custom which has been followed lately. The list does not show the home States from which the nominees come, but they are all nominations in the armed services, and, being familiar with the contribution of North Dakota to the defense of the country, I doubt not that some of the higher promotions affect citizens of North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire whether the vote of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. The nominations were ordered reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the armed services are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND TROOPS FOR SERVICE IN EUROPE

I. SENATE RESOLUTION 8

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the provisions of Senate Resolution 8, which has been referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, have been clarified to a great extent by the press and by certain periodicals throughout the country. The over-all issue which is to be determined by the Congress is this: That no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area until such a policy is approved by the Congress. Shall the President make commitments to send our American boys to become a part of an integrated international army, without the approval of Congress?

Members of the Senate, that issue will be determined upon the floor of the Senate when the Joint Committees of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations report back for consideration their recommendations on the subject matter of Senate Resolution 8.

II. THE RESOLUTION MAY BE AMENDED

While it is true that the joint committee may report Senate Resolution 8 favorably, or unfavorably, or with amendments, or may report a resolution of their own, the subject matter of the provisions of Senate Resolution 8 will, in the final analysis, be determined by the Members of the Senate. It is my position that the subject matter cannot be avoided.

As I said on Tuesday, January 16, when I presented the resolution and explained it, I had no pride of authorship. It was perfectly agreeable to me for anyone to amend the resolution insofar as the phraseology was concerned; but the subject matter, which involves the great overriding issue, as to whether the President can commit the Congress, and thereby, the United States, without congressional approval, must be included for a vote of the Senate.

While the resolution may be stripped of some of its words or of its sponsor's name, and regardless of whether a new resolution is brought to the Senate by the joint committee—and certainly it makes no difference how many more resolutions are submitted, or how many amendments are made—the issue here is embodied within the provisions of Senate Resolution 8. The issue is that Congress must make the determination whether Congress will permit the President to commit the people of the United States to an integrated army in Europe without the approval of Congress, and also that Congress should assert its right to put limitations on the sending of United States ground forces to the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The whole issue boils down to the question of whether the Congress shall be a full-fledged partner with the President in this new and very high policy, by officially considering his recommendations, whatever they may happen to be.

So, plainly, the resolution is just as much alive today as it was when it was offered, and as it will be when the subject matter of its provisions is debated and discussed on the floor of the Senate in the near future.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is reported to have said that the Wherry resolution was "ridiculous," that it would be consigned to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that it would be sidetracked.

He was further reported to have said that he would bring out an affirmative resolution from the committee, broadly declaring that the Senate favors sending ground forces to Europe for an international army, but not stating there must be no commitment of foot soldiers until the Congress declares a policy on the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use that language. I did say that the committee would bring out a substitute; but so far as the word "sidetracked" is concerned, I made no such statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I am giving the report as it came over the radio, and I am sure that when we get the transcript it will be found that the Senator used those words. But I am glad to hear that he will not sidetrack the resolution. I think that shows fine statesmanship on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sure the matter will be given every consideration.

The Senator from Texas was reported further to have said that he would bring out an affirmative resolution.

A story in the New York Times of Thursday, January 25, from a Times correspondent in Washington says:

> After a long meeting of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee, which forms the party's leadership, its chairman, Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, of Arizona, announced that foreign policy has been discussed "in every aspect."
>
> He made it clear that the President's Senate supporters expected the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, which will meet shortly to prepare a proposed Senate declaration on the troop issue, to bring out nothing but an affirmative statement in no way restricting the President.

That is the issue. Do we want to restrict the President, or do we not?

Yesterday, however, the distinguished majority leader made a statement after the Democratic policy meeting, which lasted for several hours, on the subject of foreign policy.

The United Press ticker in the Senate cloak room carried the following report of that meeting:

> Senate Democratic leaders discussed foreign policy issues today but agreed that congressional decision must await the forthcoming report of General Eisenhower. After a meeting of the Senate Democratic policy committee, Democratic Leader MCFARLAND told reporters that the group discussed foreign policy but reached no conclusion. He said, "General Eisenhower will address House and Senate Members February 1 and appear in a closed session before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that afternoon." MCFARLAND believes Eisenhower will appear before the corresponding House committees the next day.

"We are hopeful that the committees will bring in an affirmative resolution," MCFARLAND said.

Asked if he meant a resolution to approve the assignment of troops, he replied that he could not say what it should be.

No doubt the reason why the distinguished majority leader made the observation that he would have to wait and see, is because of the great issue involved.

I think the Senator made an intelligent statement. He, himself, of course, is, I think, taking the position that we must wait and see whether the President, without congressional approval can make a commitment and determine the policy; that we should wait and see if the Democratic conference wants to bring out a resolution that Congress must approve what the President recommends before any troop commitment is made. I want to compliment the Senator on his statement.

Is it enough to report a resolution simply saying the Senate favors sending ground forces to Europe?

The question is, Who is to decide the number and set the pattern? Is it to be the President or Congress, or both the President and Congress?

Shall the President make such commitments or shall the Congress of the United States determine that policy?

That is exactly what is embodied in Senate Resolution 8. It provides that no commitment of ground troops shall be made until the Congress adopts a policy respecting the matter. That requires the legislative process.

That is the issue before the country. So, whether or not the Wherry resolution, word by word, or phrase by phrase, comes back to the Senate, the underlying issue which inevitably must be determined is whether or not the President shall commit the Nation to such a course without the approval of the Congress, or whether the Congress shall insist that the Executive must submit for its approval commitments he intends to make, to provide an integrated international army in Western Europe.

As I understand, the Senator from Texas wants the Congress to permit the President alone to determine the policy of how many foot soldiers, their location, and everything that goes into this program, including barracks, transports, and servicing of the troops should be committed.

The Senator from Texas wants it all left to the determination of the President. In taking that position now he would scrap the procedures prescribed in the North Atlantic Treaty and the assurances given to the Senate when that treaty was ratified.

The senior Senator from Texas would let the President alone determine our whole national defense policy, since the whole policy revolves around the matter of sending ground troops to Western Europe.

However, there are other Senators who have expressed themselves that while they would agree to send a limited number of ground troops to Europe, they feel the Congress should determine the limitations, as provided in the so-called Wherry resolution. Many Senators have expressed that thought to me.

So, once again I want to suggest to the Members of the Senate that this subject matter is included in the provisions of Senate Resolution 8, which specifically provides that no commitments shall be made until the Congress determines the policy.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, as the author and sponsor of Senate Resolution 8, is moved to make these observations in the interest of clarifying further the issue as he sees it.

Undoubtedly the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, which are now jointly considering Senate Resolution 8, will look into all the ramifications of this great issue. The junior Senator from Nebraska has confidence in the wisdom of the members of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services committees. Twenty-six Senators will be called upon to hold hearings and to investigate the situation in reference to this basic issue.

In conclusion, I want to suggest that the question confronting the Senate is divided into two parts: First, it must be determined whether Congress is to have jurisdiction over the question of whether there shall be commitment of American boys to the peacetime international army in Western Europe; second, after it is decided that Congress does have the right to fix the policy, as contemplated in the North Atlantic Treaty, the merits of whether ground troops shall be sent then should be gone into exhaustively.

Obviously, all our debate on the subject will be pointless if the President alone is to do all the deciding, and the Congress becomes merely a rubber stamp to appropriate whatever sums of money he may deem to be necessary to finance the defense policy that he alone determines.

There should be thorough hearings, with all competent witnesses being called to testify. This is a tremendous question. It vitally affects every man, woman, and child in the land. Upon the determination of this issue rests our entire national defense efforts, taxes, controls, prices, and many other features.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the Senator's speech, especially the last part of it, he states that there are two questions before the joint committee. The first question is whether or not article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty shall be redefined to include troops, as well as equipment. At the present time, according to the testimony of Secretary of State Acheson, article 3 is confined to equipment. The issue which the Senator from Nebraska brings before us is whether or not, as a question of policy to be determined by Congress, article 3 shall be defined to include troops as well as equipment. If that question is answered in the negative by the joint committee, and the Senate supports the stand of the committee, article 3 would be left to mean equipment only. On the other hand, if the committee and the Senate should decide, as a matter of policy, that troops may be sent, as well as equipment, the subject will then have been decided as a matter of policy. That is the first question I am asking of the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the first question. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that that is the question which is involved. The question is, Are we to supply ground troops before an attack is made? That question comes under article 3. According to the report which was brought to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Iowa asked the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, the specific question as to what was meant by arms. He asked the Secretary of State whether it included manpower. I do not have the testimony before me, but, as I recall, the Secretary of State answered unequivocally that it did not mean manpower. All I am saying is that there are two steps. In other words, if such aid is to be given prior to an attack, and it includes ground forces, I think the Senate of the United States should be so advised and the Senate should make such a determination. The inclusion of ground forces would expand the provisions of article 3. Such an expanded program of aid would go beyond the provisions of article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, if it is determined to send troops, and article 3 is to be interpreted to include them, the determination should be made by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the question is, How many men shall be sent?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the second question. I think that policy should be determined by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator mean Congress or the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Congress. I think the policy should be determined by Congress, because my feeling is that the question of limitation goes to the root of the subject, just as the question of sending any Armed Forces goes to the root of the subject. Whether or not we should send any men should be determined by Congress. If the number is to be limited, I think Congress should decide what the limitation should be. That question should not be left to the determination by the President of the United States. He can suggest the policy; can submit his proposals and recommendations; it is his function to do so; but after he has made his proposals and recommendations, it is the prerogative of Congress either to approve or disapprove any limitations which he may suggest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the first question is determined in the affirmative, namely, that troops should be sent, do I understand that the Senator believes it would be the function of the joint committee to determine the second question, even though it would involve extensive hearings by the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am not telling the committee what to do.

I did not suggest such a thing. All I am saying is that two steps are involved. Of course, the committee will do as it chooses. I have absolute confidence in the committee. However, I would answer the question of the Senator in the affirmative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In listening to the Senator's remarks, I wonder whether he would clarify one or two points for us. As I understand, the Senator is now speaking about the so-called peacetime forces which would be sent to Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator raises no question, in the event of aggression by the Soviet Union against the North Atlantic Pact signatories, on the general theory that an attack upon one is an attack upon all?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the event of aggression, the President, acting under the obligations of the North Atlantic Pact, could send troops?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly feel that in such event the President should invoke the provisions of article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which specifically sets forth his duties in such circumstances. Article 5 deals with an entirely different situation. The resolution does not go to article 5. In the event of an attack on any signatory to the pact we are committed to come to its aid.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important to make that point clear, so that members of the North Atlantic Pact will not get the impression that there is any attempt on our part to renege on the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator from California has brought out that point. It is not the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska to suggest that we should welsh in any way on the policy of Congress. We ratified the treaty. Under the treaty, if a country is attacked we are absolutely obligated to come to its defense. Such procedure is provided under article 5. Article 3, on the other hand, speaks of the aid which is to be given prior to an attack. The whole question of aid is dealt with in article 9, which sets up an advisory board, consisting of the North Atlantic Pact countries, and under article 11 it is to be carried out in accordance with constitutional processes.

Senate Resolution 8 brings the whole subject matter under discussion. The issue is, Shall the President extend the provisions of article 3 by sending men? If he believes he has the right to do so, the next question is, How many men should be sent? My contention is that instead of letting the President determine the policy, and thus extending the provisions of article 3, he should submit his proposals to Congress through legislative committees. The Senate should then decide whether there is to be an extension of article 3. If men are to be sent, the next question is, What limitation shall be placed on the number of men to be sent?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In addition to our obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified by an overwhelming number of the members of this body, we also are in the position of an occupying power in Germany, the state of war not having been ended. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree that in carrying out our duties as an occupying power the President has the right to send troops to Germany, either to replace troops, or, in the event the security of the American forces is involved, to reenforce them to such an extent as military necessity may require?

Mr. WHERRY. I am in total agreement with the President as to his right and power in that respect. I think it is an entirely different subject. It is up to the President to decide whether more or fewer troops are required for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator would agree, would he not, that unless there is some kind of wide flanking movement of Russian aggression in Europe, the only way the Russians could get to France, Belgium, or the Netherlands would be by going through the American occupying forces in Germany, and in such event we would be immediately precipitated into hostilities with the Soviet Union, even without the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. There can be no doubt about that. It would be a matter of how to meet the invasion, or to protect our interests in Germany. We would be on an entirely different footing in such event than we are now faced with under the proposal to extend article 3. I thank the Senator from California for asking his questions. They are pertinent and will help to clarify the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make one comment. I think the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting as chairman of the joint committee, was quite correct in feeling that action should not be taken on another resolution until General Eisenhower had an opportunity to report because what we need more than anything else at the present time are facts upon which to base sound judgments.

There is some difference of opinion, which has been raised, as to the constitutional power of the Executive to send troops in peacetime which are not intended for the specific purpose of protecting American lives, as has been done on numerous occasions in the past. There is some question as to the authority of the Commander in Chief to send a peacetime army whose operations might extend over a long period of years. Some think he has the power and some question whether he has such power. But does the Senator from Nebraska feel that, regardless of whether that power exists under the broad terms of the Constitution, with the difference of opinion in the country and in the Congress, the President would be well advised to consult with the Congress in the matter of the permanent establishment of an occupying force in Europe under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly would answer "yes" to that question. I feel that the same position should be taken here as was taken on the question of the submission of the implementation of the United Nations Charter relative to the forces to be furnished in the event a mandate were issued by the Security Council. The whole question was discussed as to whether the United Nations could use our forces without referring the matter back to the Congress to obtain its approval. I think the Senator remembers the debate. I am sure that the Senator will remember that in the course of the debate a message came from President Truman, who was then attending a conference at Potsdam, to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The President stated in his message that it might be announced by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in effect—I do not remember the exact words—that the President would seek the approval of Congress, regardless of his constitutional power. In the report of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if I correctly recall, the statement was made by the distinguished chairman in the very last paragraph that, regarding the question of whether the President has the right or does not have the right, it should be settled once and for all that the proposed action will be submitted for the approval of Congress.

While the present situation is not exactly the same, yet so far as concerns the policy relating to the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty under section 3, before an attack, whether the President of the United States has the authority or does not have the authority, for the good of the united foreign policy I believe it would be acceptable to the Congress if the President would submit his recommendations, whether or not he feels that he has certain constitutional authority, and have the Congress go along as a full-fledged partner.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. I felt that it was necessary to clarify the situation to some extent, because there has been great misunderstanding in some quarters in Europe, both among our friends and among potential aggressors. There has been the feeling that perhaps there was some major movement to renege on the provisions of the North Atlantic Charter.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator very ably brought out that that was not in his mind, and that we are prepared to assume our full obligations under the treaty. We have given our word.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is also important for potential aggressors to recognize the fact that, while in the Senate we may disagree from time to time, and we may disagree across the aisle, when, as my old New England grandmother used to say, our righteous indignation is aroused, the Congress of the United States can solidify very

quickly, as can the American people. I think that was demonstrated in the vote of the Senate the other day, of 91 to 0, when we had finally been pushed to the point where the moral sensibilities of the American people were shocked by what had taken place. Without a dissenting vote, either Democratic or Republican, the United States Senate was a unit. I think if there is aggression in Europe, that same solidification, both in Congress and among the American people, will take place. I hope the Soviet Union recognizes that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

ACCESS BY DREW PEARSON TO CERTAIN SECRET DOCUMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be permitted to yield to me to read into the RECORD three letters, and that the Senator from South Carolina not lose the floor because of so yielding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to read into the RECORD three letters which I think should be of considerable interest to the Senate and to the Department of Justice.

The first letter is dated January 13, 1951, and reads as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1951.

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: This letter is unofficial and confidential. I trust you will treat it as such. However, it contains information which I think should be fully explored.

I am an officer working in the intelligence section of the far eastern command. There has been forwarded to us copies of articles by Drew Pearson in which he quotes from secret documents prepared in this intelligence section. One of the documents which concerned us greatly was contained in Mr. Pearson's column of December 30 in which he quotes from, and identifies by date, document 3019, dated December 6, 1950. The quotes are accurate, and the date given by Mr. Pearson was accurate. It proves beyond a doubt that someone has been handing secert documents to Mr. Pearson. Whoever did this knew that he was violating our espionage laws because I have since checked and find that the document from which Mr. Pearson quoted, had stamped upon it in large red letters the warning that if made public, it would be of benefit to the enemy, and that transmitting or revealing this information to any unauthorized person would be a violation of the Espionage Act.

This article properly identified the Chinese Communists units which were arrayed against us. It is of course of tremendous value for the Communists to know just how much information we have about them. Such information is of great value to their counter-intelligence units. For example, if someone would publish for our benefit just exactly what Chinese intelligence knew about our units, it would save the lives of many of our men. Those of us like myself who have relatively safe jobs in intelligence work, as well as our people who are risking their lives daily behind the enemy lines, feel that Mr. Pearson and whoever stole these secrets for him are guilty of high treason.

We cannot understand the inactivity of the Congress, the Justice Department and the Army in not starting criminal action against this man. While we are concerned with the publication of this one document, we are a thousand times more concerned with the fact that this means that Mr. Pearson has unlimited access to military secrets. It means also that there is a spy handling our military secrets, secrets obtained at great hazard and in many cases the expenditure of lives.

Incidentally, we noted that while Mr. Pearson correctly quoted the dispatch listing the six Chinese armies, he then proceeded to do a job of addition and multiplication which should embarass a child in kindergarten. In order to make the Chinese Communists look braver and better fighters than our men, he stated that the six armies contained only 96,000 Communist soldiers.

I may say at that point that any private who has been in the Army 2 or 3 days, knows that one army contains more than 96,000 soldiers, let alone six armies.

Hope this information may be of some value to you.

Very sincerely.

In view of the fact that this intelligence officer had stated that this letter was confidential and could not be used, I wrote to him on January 16, 1951, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1951.

DEAR ———: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of January 6. I shall, of course, keep this information in strictest confidence if you so desire. However, it would be of considerable value if I could read your letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it could be brought to the attention of the other Senators. This could be done omitting your name.

I would very much appreciate receiving your permission to do this by wire collect.

As stated above, if you desire this to remain confidential, I shall certainly respect your wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

On the 22d of January 1951, Mr. President, I received the following letter from the same officer:

JANUARY 22, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 16th finally caught up with me. I would have replied, as you requested, by telegram but I am not certain of the integrity of such a communication.

Steps should, and must, be taken to stop such leaks of secret information. It is obvious, to me at least, there is a clique who desire to undermine the prestige and power of General MacArthur. To the troops in the field I know this campaign has had a shattering morale effect. When I see our fighting men being betrayed it sickens me.

You may use my letter in the RECORD if you will do the following things for me: (1) guarantee my name will never be revealed; (2) return to me by registered mail the original copy of my letter with this letter.

Good luck in your efforts to stop this "leak."

Sincerely.

FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has been 7 months since the Communists marched into Korea. This afternoon I desire to review what has happened to employment in our Federal Government in that short period, to look ahead and forecast what is in prospect, and to make a recommendation on the manpower problem in Government that will be of interest to all our people.

At the end of June 1950, when the Reds invaded Korea, the records of the Civil Service Commission showed that we had 1,967,111 Federal workers in the executive branch of the Government. Of that number, 753,149 were in the Defense Department—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The latest report made by Civil Service, for the month of November, shows the total number in the executive branch to have risen to 2,159,997, of whom 966,886 are in the Defense Department. That is a total increase of 192,886. The over-all increase in the Defense Department, however, is 213,737.

Reductions which offset some of the increase in the Defense Department were made in the Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture Departments. But these reductions were in seasonal and temporary personnel—reductions that would have been made in any event. For example, the Department of Commerce has reduced its staff which is working on returns from its seventeenth decenniel census. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior reductions were in their seasonal staffs—people who work during the summer months in the forests and on the public lands. These people will again be put back to work this coming summer.

My point is that there has been no actual decrease whatsoever, none that was not already planned, in employment in the nondefense agencies.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a breakdown by departments showing the increases in Federal jobs proposed by the President's Budget for 1952. It also shows reductions which are proposed to be made under the President's 1952 Budget. I ask that the breakdown may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

These are among the increases in Federal jobs proposed in the President's 1952 budget (all are approximate figures):

	Jobs
Post Office	20,000
Internal Revenue	2,500
Customs	300
State Department (about)	3,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service	600
Geological Survey (Interior)	500
Civil Aeronautics Administration	500
Commodity Credit Corporation	900
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance	1,000
Civil Service Commission	900
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1,800

These few reductions are to be made under the President's proposed 1952 budget:

	Jobs
Reclamation Bureau	2,600
Maritime	800
Soil Conservation Service	600
General Accounting Office	900
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	600

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since the last Civil Service report, for the month of November, I am reliably informed that the total Fed-

eral employment has increased about 55,000, which would make the over-all increase in Federal employment, since Korea, about 250,000 in seven short months.

In addition, we have reliable estimates that Federal employment will increase by perhaps another half million workers by June 30, 1952, 17 months from now. If that happens, the total increase in Federal employment since Korea would reach 750,000.

I believe we all realize that some increase in Federal employment, particularly in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, is and will be necessary to support our troops in Korea and elsewhere overseas. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have hired many thousands of civilian workers to manufacture munitions, to build and repair naval vessels, to store and load supplies, to man airfields, and so forth.

But I believe, too, that most of us here and the people in general are disappointed by the failure of the President to cut nondefense expenditures to the bone, by the failure of the Civil Service Commission to adopt a realistic and hard-boiled manpower policy for the Government, and by the failure of Federal agencies to transfer more of their experienced employees to the defense agencies where they are urgently needed at this particular time.

These are some of the problems I propose to discuss with the Senate this afternoon.

Senators will recall that in his state of the Union message the President called on Congress to cut nondefense expenditures, and we applauded him for his statement. He said the Government would have to forego some of the things which some of the agencies believed were necessary.

But the President failed to follow up his statements when he submitted his proposed budget for the 1952 fiscal year. I have examined that budget in detail. In only isolated instances did he propose fewer employees for the nondefense agencies. By and large, he submitted estimates to Congress which proposed either that these agencies retain their present staffs or that they be given increases in personnel. In other words, he has challenged Congress to carry out his expressed desire to cut nondefense spending. I believe we should accept that challenge.

A week ago the President made public his national manpower mobilization policy. I wish to quote two provisions contained in it. They are:

First. Each individual will be expected to serve in the capacity in which he can contribute most to the total mobilization program; and

Second. That the Government should assist workers to arrange for their transfer to essential jobs.

The central manpower agency for our Government is the Civil Service Commission. I am frank but sorry to say that it has done very little in developing plans to meet this situation. I often wonder if the Commission and its officials realize the gravity of the situation at this time.

As far back as last September the Congress itself, in an indirect manner, expressed its resentment at the do-nothing and feet-dragging attitude of the Civil Service Commission in regard to the acute manpower problem brought about by the Korean War.

At that time the Congress voted approval of a rider, written by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi, to a supplemental appropriation bill. The Whitten rider now requires the Government to place on a temporary basis most of its personnel actions, such as appointments, grade promotions, interagency transfers, and the like. It also sought to have nondefense agencies transfer some of their employees to the defense agencies.

If the Civil Service Commission had been aware of its responsibilities and had acted to meet the emergency situation in Government after the Korean invasion by the Communists, there would not be a Whitten rider. There would have been no necessity for it.

Mr. President, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has honored me with its chairmanship, has a definite and clear-cut responsibility to see that the Civil Service Commission is prepared to meet this problem and is prepared to assume its responsibility in directing the manpower policy of this vast Government. We believe that the Senate committee must assist in working out a realistic policy. We must see to it that every person in the Government's employ is in a job which contributes most to the defenses of our Nation, that no agency has more employees than it needs, that red tape and regulations that make it difficult for experienced employees to transfer to the defense agencies are abolished.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, to appoint a special subcommittee, to be composed of seven members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—four Democrats and three Republicans, to make a detailed inquiry into civil-service policies, to examine the manpower needs of Federal agencies, and to hammer out a manpower policy for the Government for the duration of the emergency.

These are some of the problems into which I believe the special subcommittee should inquire:

Whether the personnel of nondefense agencies should be frozen at their present levels in order to give defense agencies their choice of the available workers.

To require old-line agencies which either have or will be given defense duties—such as Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Interstate Commerce, Labor, and others—to handle their new duties by transferring employees from less essential work to them.

To give you an example of what I have in mind, Mr. President, let me say that we are now told that the Office of Economic Stabilization is hiring a large new staff to enforce a forthcoming order to freeze prices and wages. May I be permitted to make this suggestion: That the Office of Economic Stabilization be permitted to make use of the inspection staff of the Wage and Hour Division, as well as the inspection staffs of other Federal agencies, to help enforce its orders. I am certain it could be done and would be both more economical and more efficient.

To draft a transfer policy, free of red tape and restrictions, that would encourage employees in the nondefense agencies to transfer to defense jobs.

To determine whether the time-consuming civil-service competitive tests are necessary during the emergency.

To examine promotion and appointment policies, to make certain they are streamlined to meet emergency conditions.

To spotlight Government programs and activities that can be set aside for the duration, in order to free employees in nondefense work for pressing defense needs.

To examine the possibility and cost of longer hours for more Government people, in order to save manpower, the costs of materials, and the office space which additional employees will require.

To go into the question of annual leave, to determine whether the rider adopted by the Eighty-first Congress to require employees to take by next June 30 leave earned during the 1950 calendar year, or else lose it, is now feasible. Also, adjustments in the leave system may also be considered.

To study the policies relating to the use of civilian and military personnel.

Why is it necessary to assign military persons to civilian positions to get the job done?

The concept of the military and civilian roles in waging a war underwent radical changes during World War II. Technological war, as contrasted to hand-to-hand fighting, resulted in only one in seven, or even fewer, of the military personnel getting into combat areas. The trend which started in World War II requires a new concept of the definition as to which are civilian and which are military positions.

There are fundamental advantages, in terms of cost, efficiency, stability, and disruption of lives, in having in civilian positions the greatest possible number of those who are engaged in the defense effort. If all positions which did not involve actual combat or combat planning and training for combat were filled with civilians, the result would be large-scale economies in both money and manpower.

There are many persons who are able to hold desk jobs, even though they cannot pass the physical examination required in order to qualify for service in the field with the military forces.

Conservatively, at least half of the positions in the National Military Establishment now filled by military personnel are in reality civilian positions. The average Government civilian costs approximately $3,400 a year. The direct and indirect cost of a soldier in uniform is estimated to be at least $5,000 a year, and some estimates place the cost as high as $9,000 a year, when veteran and other indirect costs are included. Even if one-half the military positions were changed to civilian positions, there would be an annual saving of over one and one-half billion dollars, on a conservative estimate, and probably the savings would be several times this amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's speech brings very clearly to our attention a problem now confronting the Nation. Is it not true that the men taken into the armed services are taken for the purpose of being able to fight for the United States, which is the purpose for which the Armed Forces are recruited. Therefore we give pensions and GI rights and similar benefits to those who are taken into the armed services, in which service they may be required to sacrifice their lives for their country. However, when military personnel fill civilian positions, they no more warrant such special treatment than do any of the civilians who hold jobs in Washington. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly do; the Senator is entirely correct. Furthermore, let me point out that the dependents of persons in the military service—whether in the Army, Navy, or the Air Corps—will ask the Government for assistance, although their loved ones served in civilian positions, while actually in the military service.

Mr. FERGUSON. In fact, many military persons while holding such civilian positions wear civilian clothing, rather than military uniforms. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina very much for the constructive suggestions he is making. I think they will result in very large savings to the Government and to the people of the United States.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in time of national emergency, the annual savings would be many, many times the $1,500,000,000 I have mentioned. Since civilians form a more stable working force, such a change would result in widespread improvement in efficiency. Added savings would be made as a result of reductions in the number of positions required. Savings of other types would result from this work because of increased efficiency as a result of the use of such information in connection with the recruiting, pay, training, organizational planning, and other management processes.

The proposed special committee should also undertake to look into the policy of drafting Federal employees for active military service. I am told there is, after all this time, still no over-all Government policy in this regard.

To insist that Government supervisors and officials emphasize efficiency and economy in the administration of their offices; encourage and give their employees the incentive to do better work; save manpower; and cut operating expenses.

To determine whether the Federal Government has adequate machinery to bring into the Government people with the necessary know-how to do an effective mobilization job.

We have all been told many times how Government supervisors build up their staffs in order to justify larger salaries for themselves. Our committee considered this problem some months ago. At that time, our able colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] proposed that employees and supervisors alike be rewarded in cash for economies initiated by them in their operations. The Long plan was incorporated in the bill which revised the Classification Act. That was 16 months ago. I was shocked recently to read an account of an address delivered by the Senator from Louisiana in which he pointed out that only a single award had been made under that provision. He asked whether those few employees were the only ones in the Government who were interested in economy. The Senator brought out that 40 percent of all Federal agencies have shown no interest whatsoever in his economy plan.

This situation brings to mind another major function and responsibility which will be placed on this subcommittee, that of keeping a careful watch on the agencies to see that they carry out the intentions of any congressional action taken. Some people have chosen to call this a "watchdog committee." I like that name. It has been very apparent that some agency officials have upon their staffs people whose sole function it is to find ways to circumvent the actions and intent of Congress.

These are only a few of the problems which come to mind for the special subcommittee to study. There will be others. Our Government is the Nation's largest employer. It must take the lead in forging a manpower policy which will get the most out of every employee in these perilous times when the future of our great Nation is at stake.

In the years I have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have had frequent, almost daily, contact with Federal employees and their representatives. I am thoroughly convinced that the Government people themselves will unite in throwing their full support behind a program to place them in jobs where they will contribute more to the defense program and to their Nation. They are merely waiting to be led, to be told what to do, and how. Many of them, engaged in nondefense work, are impatient and are anxious to be of greater service to the country in her fight for our way of life.

From the detailed study I have been able to make of this problem, I am confident that at the end of 1952 we shall be able to show the Eighty-second Congress and the people of this Nation that we were able to pave the way for conservation of manpower, and to save the taxpayers many million dollars by getting the job done more efficiently, without the necessity of hiring hundreds of thousands of additional workers. To this end we dedicate our best efforts, and with the unqualified cooperation of the Congress, I am confident we shall, in the future, be able to show results.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to provide funds for the necessary staffing and other expenses to assist this proposed subcommittee in carrying out this investigation.

There being no objection the resolution (S. Res. 53) was received and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government, with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel by such departments and agencies during the period of the national emergency. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IMPENDING RUSSIAN VICTORY—RECOGNITION OF CHINESE RED PUPPET

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have a statement to make regarding a grave situation. In a measure, it is a warning, because there is one possible alternative open to the American people.

Our enemy is about to be victorious, not in Korea, but on a global basis, not in 3 years or 1 year, but in the next few weeks, possibly days.

THE GOAL—30 YEARS' CONTINUOUS EFFORT

While we talk here of future preparation for war or defense, of spending all our substance, past, present, and future, on a big war machine, of putting the entire Nation on a war basis, our potential enemy goes easily along making daily progress toward his goal.

What is the enemy's goal?

Moscow's recent conquests in China are the culmination of 30 years of continuous, persistent, and far-ranging efforts. With continental China enslaved, it now has the immediate prospect of overrunning great additional areas in southern Asia with overwhelming force.

CHINA COULD MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

The thing that stands in her way now in her conquest of all Asia is the withholding of official world-wide recognition of her puppet regime of Chinese Communists.

The Senate has taken its stand—in the resolution passed Tuesday—against United Nations admission of the Chinese Communist regime. But, does anyone here think for a moment that the Senate resolution will change the minds and hearts of those—here and abroad—who have been working and conniving with the Reds?

For us in the present struggle, China free or China under the Soviets could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

What good the billions of dollars of appropriations, what good the sacrifices, what good the taking of our 18-year-old boys, what good the girding for world war III, if Russia can gain her goal through our diplomatic weakness?

DEFEATED BY OUR DIPLOMATS

What followed the world's worst war is the world's most dismal inability to achieve any kind of peace. We are being defeated by our so-called diplomats, and it looks as if they are going to sell us out long before we are prepared to wage war.

In my December 14 speech on the Senate floor, I listed 10 suggestions for our survival. I have discussed the first two. The third is the subject of my remarks today. On later dates I shall discuss the remaining suggestions in the list.

THE PROPOSED ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE UN

Suggestion No. 3 was:

Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

It is this vitally urgent matter to which I wish to address myself today.

THE PATTERN OF THE PLOT

The junior Senator from Nevada will hold up for all to see the pattern of the plot, of which we are the victim. This examination will show, step by step, how we got into this mess, and will suggest a course of action by which we may be saved from the great and permanent defeat.

There are current rumors of a compromise settlement of the China and Korea questions before the UN which would involve seating the Communist delegates, and presumably letting the Chinese Republic's formal charges of aggression against the Soviet Union go by default.

There are so-called Americans in our Government service working for the admission of Red China to the UN and perhaps even diplomatic recognition by this country at the very time Chinese Reds are slaughtering American boys in Korea.

The disaster that has overtaken us—and a third world war, no matter what its outcmoe, is little short of a disaster—is due to the propaganda of socialistic, communistic, and internationalist elements in the United States.

Behind the insults the American people take almost daily in the United Nations the insidious propaganda for admission of Chinese Reds continues.

ENGLAND'S REAL POSITION DISCLOSED

When Prime Minister Attlee made his recent trip to Washington, the Senator now speaking said publicly that Attlee's chief interest was in the protection of British trade and that Attlee was, therefore, on the side of the United Nations' admission of the Chinese Reds. Following my remarks, Mr. Attlee issued a statement denying the charges, saying there could be "no thought of appeasement or of rewarding aggression."

The incongruity of that is apparent when one observes that England had officially recognized Communist China and had not withdrawn that recognition. I stated at the time that the truth would eventually be revealed. Now, it has been, through the statement which British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin submitted to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Bevin listed six points regarding the far-eastern situation, the first of which was for recognition and admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

In the fall of 1949, when the Senate was discussing the conferences then being held on the subject of storing atomic bombs in England, this Senator warned that England, whom we had been keeping, would soon affront us by extending official recognition to the Chinese Communists.

England denied she would recognize the Chinese Communists; soon thereafter England did officially recognize them.

COMMUNIST WORLD PLANS

With the exception of small fellow-traveller minorities and their sympathizers, almost everyone agrees that Soviet communism has been planning world conquest systematically for decades.

The current behind-the-scenes actions of American Government officials in the interest of recognition of the Chinese Communists are part of a far-reaching plan, the pattern of which is clearly discernible to anyone who will only examine it.

The intellectual climate in the administration in the early days of the New Deal was a depressing compound of profound ignorance, wishful thinking, and impractical dreaming, all of which played into the hands of the group of individuals who consciously placed loyalty to the Kremlin above all other considerations.

Some of these succeded in getting into key positions in our Government agencies. They were able to operate freely and were able to influence liberals of the world-saver and one-economic-world complex. One of Roosevelt's Vice Presidents, Henry Wallace, is an example of the latter class.

Pro-Sovietism was the party line of the administration. Under these circumstances, infiltration of strategic Government agencies by fanatical Soviet sympathizers encountered no difficulty. We were, and still are, plagued with the working of policies which were in the interest of foreign powers.

FESTERING SORES DO NOT HEAL IF COVERED UP

Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe we should keep quiet about past mistakes. They are festering sores which will not heal by being ignored. We are not going to build a strong structure on a rotten foundation. We are not going to straighten out a deplorable situation by trying to act as though it were not there. It is our duty to call the attention of the public to what is wrong in our Government. It is vital that we examine what has been done, because the men responsible are still in control.

THE COMMUNIST PATTERN—IN GOVERNMENT

World War II agencies were a haven for those whose first loyalty was to the Kremlin.

The OWI, Office of War Information, under Elmer Davis was ridden with fellow-travellers. Many of those selected for good positions in the OWI were persons of foreign birth with political pasts suggestive of Communist sympathies. Some of our own Government offices thus conducted what could only be termed pro-Soviet propaganda.

After the war at least three employees of OWI, a Mr. Herz, a Mr. Arsky, and a Miss Balinska, appeared in the service of the Communist regime in Poland. They should have been on the payroll of Stalin instead of our payroll. Another person in the Office of War Information, a Miss Annabelle Bucar, went to Moscow after the war and renounced her American citizenship.

Articles by former employees of OWI critical of American and favorable to Soviet policy have appeared in various magazines.

Other Government agencies have had their quota of bad security risks, as has been brought out in various investigations.

Alger Hiss is not the only high official who has been exposed as pro-Communist. Julian Henry Wadleigh, another former State Department official, confessed his guilt as a Soviet spy.

Harry Dexter White, a high Treasury official and principal author of the Morgenthau plan, mentioned by many as being pro-Soviet, committed suicide while under investigation. Carl Aldo Marzani was another Communist who found a high niche in the State Department. Marzani was indicted in 1947 for perjury in saying that he was not a member of the Communist Party. He was found guilty on all counts in the indictment. Emanuel S. Larsen, another State Department official, paid a fine of $500 in the infamous Amerasia case, which had to do with the stealing of secret Government documents and turning them over to the Soviets. Judith Coplon, another in our Government service, was found to be spying for Russia. In her trials in both Washington and New York, she was found guilty. Noel Field, another Government official, disappeared behind the iron curtain while under investigation.

Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, still another United States Government official, refused to answer the question as to whether he was a Communist, "for fear of self-incrimination."

In 1942 the Civil Service Commission reported:

There is considerable testimony in the file indicating that, about 1920, Mr. Silvermaster was an underground agent of the Communist Party. From that time until the present * * * he has been everything from a fellow-traveller to an agent of the OGPU (Soviet Political Police).

Yet Silvermaster, protected in some high quarters, went from one confidential Government appointment to another.

Henry Wallace, Vice President of the United States, was prevented by Gen. Leslie Groves, then director of the atomic-bomb project, from seeing secret data about the bomb. When pressed for his reason for not showing Mr. Wallace the secret information, General Groves answered:

We took a number of deliberate risks on security matters in an effort to bring the war

to a quicker end, but we took no unnecessary, recognizable risks.

That is a very significant statement, Mr. President, in connection with withholding information from the Vice President of the United States.

Someone in our Government was responsible for giving access to atomic bomb secrets to Dr. Klaus Fuchs, who passed them on to Soviet espionage agents through Dr. Harry Gold, of Philadelphia, who has since confessed.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN FAR EAST POLICY

Without question, there were strong pro-Communist influences at work in shaping American policy in the Far East. As has been well established, this policy came from the so-called Institute of Pacific Relations, and from their publications Pacific Affairs and Far Eastern Survey. A study of the editorial policy of these publications will clearly reveal a pro-Soviet, pro-Chinese Communist bias.

Mr. President, as further evidence of the power of the pro-Communist group in our Government, the famous Amerasia case was suddenly and mysteriously dropped, even after the FBI, which is seldom wrong, had discovered large numbers of confidential documents from the State, War, and Navy Departments and from other Government agencies in the office of Amerasia. One of those arrested by the FBI in the Amerasia case was John S. Service, the same John S. Service who was sent back to America from China by Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, because, in the opinion of General Hurley, Service was working in the interests of the Soviet Union rather than in the interests of the United States. I understand Service is still in the State Department, and, I am informed, has been promoted.

Much of this has been exposed, but I want to show the pattern. We cannot save ourselves unless we face the truth.

At this critical time, when the pressure is upon us to decide our course to save our sons from untimely death in war, when we are faced starkly with Russian victory over all Asia, we must have the whole truth, whatever it may be.

The pro-Russian clique took over the State Department in 1944. Under oath, before the Un-American Activities Committee on August 30, 1948, Mr. Adolf Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State, testified:

> In the fall of 1944 there was a difference of opinion in the State Department. * * * I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut showdown (with the Russians) then (at a time) when our position was strongest. The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal assistant. * * * I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil and that ended my diplomatic career.

Later in his testimony, he referred to the Acheson group as the pro-Russian clique.

PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Still further evidence of the pro-Soviet influence in the administration may be found in the shocking, secret directive issued December 30, 1944, to let down the bars in the United States Army so that Communists could be commissioned as Army officers. The administration tried to keep this a secret, and even refused to answer congressional inquiries about it until it leaked out.

This order followed one, issued May 7, 1944, to destroy the subversive records within the War Department. In testimony before a congressional committee, the Deputy Chief of Staff said that the directive had been issued without the knowledge of either Secretary of War Stimson or Chief of Staff Marshall, intimating that it had come from someone in the White House.

PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE REACHED INTO THE NAVY

Two admirals in our Navy were forced to retire because they tried to get rid of Communist radio operators in United States naval vessels. They were Rear Adm. S. C. Hooper and Rear Adm. Adolphus Staton. Three leaders of the American Communications Association, communistic labor union, 7 of whose 10 national officers were known Communist Party members, called on these admirals and demanded the reinstatement of the suspected subversives whom the admirals had discharged, and the 3 Communist labor leaders quite boldly threatened that unless they were reinstated there would be two admirals out of a job.

The admirals did not give in. There was a conference at the White House, with Secretary Knox and Federal Communications Commissioner Fly present. The admirals were shortly out of a job. Admiral Hooper was given the relatively minor post of inspector in a factory, replacing a $4,000-a-year civilian. Admiral Staton was retired.

A thorough account of all of this may be found in the New York World Telegram of January 12, 1944, and in the record of hearings before Select Committee, House of Representatives, to Investigate the FCC, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, volumes I and II, particularly pages 1 to 20, page 69 of volume I, and pages 2303 to end of volume II.

ADMINISTRATION PROTECTED PRO-COMMUNISTS

Further evidence of the pro-Communist influence within the administration is shown by what happened in regard to the Soviet spy ring which was discovered in Canada. Prime Minister Mackenzie King flew to Washington and presented the President a report on the spy ring. The report contained a list of spies or suspected spies in the United States. So far as is known, not one of that list has been arrested.

Here is another indication of pro-Soviet influence in the administration: Invariably the administration has rushed to the defense of anyone accused of pro-Soviet activities, has refused access to files, and has had a hand in trying to clear the accused pro-Communist, and smear the accuser. Exposés, backed by sworn confessions and a great volume of corroborative evidence, have been called "red herrings," and high Government officials have disgraced themselves by testifying to the good character of the accused.

Beginning in 1944, when Alger Hiss was put in charge of United States activities in the UN, there has continuously been a strange assortment of persons soft to communism acting as representatives of the United States and as staff members. Small wonder that the UN, created ostensibly to enforce the peace, has been helpless in eastern Europe and in China, and could act in Korea only because of the then temporary absence of Russia and our willingness to carry the burden.

This is not a witch-hunt. It is a review of accepted facts to show, to those who are not afraid to face facts, that there is a pattern suggesting a gigantic conspiracy on behalf of Soviet Russia.

Some so-called American in official position turned over to Russia the hundreds of Danube barges we held, just before the Danubian Conference met. This was our only trading point in that conference. Without it, at the conference, we were treated contemptuously, as could be expected. Was it not one of the pro-Soviets in a Government department who was responsible for our turning these barges over to Russia?

THE BERLIN AIRLIFT—STATE DEPARTMENT CRIME

State Department pro-Sovietism caused the Berlin airlift. At Potsdam, in July 1945, it was agreed that our forces in Berlin would have a ground and air corridor from West Germany to Berlin. The State Department opposed getting this in writing from the Russians. The Air Force insisted and got the air corridor written in the agreement. The State Department, somehow or other, is always found to be the Soviet's advocate.

Late in 1948 the UN met in Paris to attempt to settle the Berlin airlift and blockade. It is reported that Ambassador Jessup asked the Chinese delegation, which had intended to vote with the United States, not to do so. This top mystery leaves unanswered the question of whom Ambassador Jessup really represented. Again in Paris, in 1949, at the meeting arranged by Jessup and Malik, which finally ended the airlift, Jessup fought for acceptance of the Russian terms. General Clay had to fight to stop it.

ACHESON'S $90,000,000 LOAN TO POLISH COMMUNISTS

After the Polish Communist Government had scornfully rejected America's request for free elections, as pledged at Yalta, and refused our ambassador permission to visit Americans in jail there, Secretary Acheson approved a $90,000,000 loan to Poland. Incidentally, Mr. Acheson's law firm acted as the agent of the Polish Communist Government.

NATIONALIST CHINA AND GERMAN ARMS

After VE-day, the Chinese applied for surrendered German arms and ammunition. The Joint Chiefs of staff approved, sent orders to General Eisenhower, and 20,000 rifles actually left a German port for China, by way of India. The order was then countermanded by Presidential order signed by Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant, since

named by Whitaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley as a pro-Communist. The vast stores of German armament were then destroyed.

THE DOUBLE-CROSS IN GERMANY

In discussing pro-Soviet influence we cannot overlook the halt of the American Army's march on Berlin. Who stopped the American Army's march on Berlin? At that time our Ninth Army was not more than 30 miles away. Resistance had practically ceased. They could have been in Berlin the next day. Goebbel's sound trucks were notifying the Berliners to surrender to the Americans.

Who ordered our forces to retreat to the Elbe and leave Berlin for the Russians—a decision that has cost us so dearly since?

Who was responsible for stopping General Patton 30 miles from Prague? In the Saturday Evening Post of April 17, 1948, Demaree Bess reported that Gen. George Patton was ordered to halt his conquest of Czechoslovakia and to refuse the German surrender which had already been made by the German general to one of Patton's colonels. The fate of Czechoslovakia was sealed.

Who ordered General Eisenhower, after the German surrender, to withdraw from already occupied western Saxony and Thuringia and turn them, with their uranium deposits, over to the Russians?

The actions of our Government since 1945 have tended to make more sure that the United States would lose everything she won by the war, and that Soviet Russia would receive all possible benefits.

PREMATURE DISBANDING OF AMERICAN ARMY

The United States let Soviet Russia seize just about all the parts of Germany she wanted. The United States proceeded at breakneck speed to disband the American Army and Air Force and to put our fleet in mothballs. The United States proceeded to destroy, in the face of determined opposition of scattered individuals who knew the significance of the move, huge quantities of war material. Bombers that would have been of incalculable value today were ruthlessly destroyed. Even the tools, jigs, and dies for making them were likewise sacrificed. Precision instruments, including watches, were put under trip hammers and destroyed.

Were these steps part of a definite plan of the internationalists—those American citizens who have forgotten, if they ever knew, about the significance of the American Republic, its great history, and its great place in the evolution of human freedom?

AID TO RUSSIA

The Communists are now almost certainly using against us in Korea part of the enormous stock of aviation gasoline which we made available to Russia after the World War II crisis had passed.

Back of this situation is the fantastic story of how America helped Stalin in an orgy of stockpiling in the postwar period.

Evidence of traitorous intent and purpose on the part of the pro-Communist group here may be observed in the fact that when it was exposed that Britain and other Marshall plan countries were sending Russia war-making materials, not one of this influential clique lifted a finger to stop our money and materials from flowing to those countries; in fact, they actually opposed the measure introduced here, which would have stopped our indirect arming of Russia. War-making materials were still being sent to Russia a few weeks ago.

ACHESON-LILIENTHAL—BOMB SECRETS TO RUSSIA

Late in 1949, the President proposed to share the atomic bomb with Russia. When the voice of the people against this was heard, then others in the Government service saw to it that the Russians received the atomic bomb secrets anyhow. Without question, the pro-Communists in Government positions were responsible for this traitorous sellout.

Going back to the origin of the suggestion of giving the atomic bomb secret to Russia, there was the Acheson-Lilienthal report in 1946. It proposed the step-by-step release of all atomic data on the basis of an international agreement. At that time Russia had a 100 percent record of broken promises to us and to all the world.

YALTA AND POTSDAM—PRO-COMMUNIST GROUP

It was the pro-Communist group in the Government which formulated the Yalta agreement and the Morgenthau plan and the Potsdam agreement, all of which were not only complete repudiations of the Atlantic Charter, but against all humanitarian principles.

Are there not still further signs of Soviet conspiracy in this country?

The conference at Yalta in February 1945 reported the high point of Soviet diplomatic success and, correspondingly, the low point of American appeasement.

At the price of a few worthless promises Stalin got what he wanted in Poland. We gave the go ahead signal to the Red army to loot East Germany. The Red army proceeded to remove, physically, Germany's industries. Germany was stripped of assets worth many billions of dollars.

In the pro-Soviet climate at Yalta, China was offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of appeasement. The concessions made concerning Manchuria were of fateful importance for China's independence and territorial integrity. To give a strong foreign power like Russia control of Manchurian railways, a predominant interest in its chief port, Darien, and a naval base at Port Arthur was to sell away China's sovereignty in Manchuria.

In addition to turning over Manchurian railways and its chief port and naval base to the Soviet Union, we also handed her the Kurile Islands. We also told Russia that she could keep Outer Mongolia, which she had stolen.

As is well known, the concession of Manchuria was the important link in the Communist advance into China. Not only did Manchuria have a wealth of coal, iron, soy beans, and other resources, but it was where large investments of Japanese capital and skill had made it the most industrially developed part of China. Manchuria became the base from which the Chinese Communists could launch the campaign which led them to overrunning almost all of China.

There was not one positive, worthwhile contribution to European or Asiatic stability in the sordid deals at Yalta.

There was no military necessity for the Yalta concessions. America was at that time close to the peak of its military power. We possessed the most powerful navy in the world, the greatest aircraft production in quality and quantity, and an army which had swept the Germans from north Africa, France, Belgium, and much of Italy. Two days before the President left Washington for Yalta he received an official report outlining five Japanese peace overtures which amounted to unconditional surrender. There was no reason to give in to Stalin's far eastern demands. Apparently the President was the victim of the pro-Soviet influence of his American advisors, one of which was the notorious Alger Hiss.

GENERAL MARSHALL AND HIS CHINESE AGRARIAN REFORMERS

Was it not pro-Soviet influence in the administration which caused General Marshall to go to China in December 1945 to force the Chinese to accept the Communists in a coalition government? The Communists felt then that they needed this help from a high level official in our Government. At that time the Chinese Republic was at the height of its power. Its Nationalist troops had surrounded 100,000 Communists near Canton and 70,000 near Hankow and had blocked off the rest from Manchuria.

Into this picture, direct from the pro-Communist atmosphere of the American State Department, stepped Gen. George Marshall. General Marshall pressured the Nationalists to withdraw their forces, which permitted the Communists to go into Manchuria, where they obtained the 5-year stock of Japanese arms and ammunition. The Nationalists even agreed to admit 13 Communists into a national council of 40 but the Communists demanded 14 which would have given them veto power since a two-thirds vote was required for changes of policy. To force acceptance of this outrageous demand, General Marshall placed a 10-month embargo against all shipments of arms and ammunition to the Nationalists.

After Congress appropriated $125,000,000 for military equipment for the Republic of China in April 1948, the administration placed China on so low a priority that no shipments moved until October and then at prices approximately double their cost and fifteen or more times the prices charged Greece and Turkey.

PRO-COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Here is further evidence of pro-Soviet influence in the administration:

We had the case of a man who called himself Michael Lee. He was a Russian, born in China, and his real name was Ephraim Zinovi Liberman. He had been refused American citizenship on the grounds that he was not in sympathy with the principles of the American Government, and for the further reason that

he was not of good character. Later, however, after changing his name, he succeeded in getting his citizenship papers. And a few weeks later we find him in Washington, D. C., head of a United States Government office having to do with shipments to Asia. Officials of the Republic of China blame him to a great extent for the success of the Reds in China, because he held up shipments of much needed gasoline at a time when the Nationalist Army of China needed it the most.

After persistent effort on the part of the junior Senator from Nevada, we finally got Liberman out of that key position, but not without argument from his superiors in the Department of Commerce.

The postscript to this is almost unbelievable, Mr. President. The Secretary of Commerce, before dismissing Liberman, reversed the loyalty board and cleared Liberman, which action in itself would permit Liberman (or Michael Lee) to get another important Government post in some other United States Government department or agency.

The one who has fought communism in the Far East is Chiang Kai-shek, with his aides and generals. It is interesting in this connection to observe that Chiang Kai-shek is not liked by any pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, or "pink" in Washington, D. C. Chiang Kai-shek represents the free government of China, recognized by America.

If we now betray Chiang into the hands of the Communists, as all the pro-Communists want, free people everywhere will be asking themselves: "Who among us are next to be betrayed by the appeasers in Washington under the cloak of the United Nations?"

It is almost impossible to explain why we do not take advantage of Chiang Kai-shek's offer of troops as foot soldiers in Korea. The present policy makes no sense.

The State Department "generals" continue to reject Chiang's services, although his participation would force Soviet China to withdraw troops from Korea.

There is further evidence, if any should be needed, that communism has friends in our Government in the fact that Chinese Communists were represented to us by State Department white papers as simple agrarian reformers, innocent peasants. Mr. Acheson and his coterie of "pink" intellectuals spent years in building State Department policy and American public opinion to support the theory that these Chinese Communists were the leaders of China whom we should support.

THE KOREAN WAR

It was this same State Department group that insisted that the United Nations forces be held up at the thirty-eighth parallel for more than a week, until the United Nations could at its leisure grant them official authority to go beyond that point, a fact that gave the North Koreans an opportunity to regroup their forces and provide costly resistance.

And it is this group who dictate, at this minute, that the American forces must not fight the war as it should be fought, with the bombing of strategic targets behind the enemy lines, to paralyze their supplies and their reserves.

The American army was turned over to the United Nations by the Administration after they were sent into Korea. The UN immediately placed them under a committee some of whose members represent countries which have recognized Communist China. Thus we have the spectacle of a United States Army fighting Communist China while being under the control of those who are friendly to and have recognized Communist China.

THE UNITED NATIONS—COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

Incidentally, if the United Nations is ever to be useful to the human race, it must free itself of Communist domination.

Who may I ask, is responsible for our begging the Chinese Communists through the United Nations to let up on their war against us, while at the same time virtually telling them that we will not let our military men bomb their sources of supply?

THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND MILITARY DECISIONS

We have heard here on the Senate floor insistence from certain quarters that Members of this body should not try to decide military maneuvers. I certainly agree with this. There is, however, sometimes a thin line between the realm of military decision and the realm of foreign policy. It is not only the right but the duty of this body to examine matters pertaining to the foreign policy of the United States.

Incidentally, I have no doubt but that some of these same people who do not want us to discuss military policies here would justify the actions of other nonmilitary men in making military decisions.

Did the unconditional surrender demand in World War II come from military men? Was it our military men who decided to withdraw from Saxony and Thuringia and turn them over to the Russians? Was it our military men who decided to let the Russians enter Berlin first?

Was it our military men who recommended that we share our atomic bomb secrets with Russia?

Was it our military men who held General MacArthur at the thirty-eighth parallel while the Chinese Communists were completing their preparations to enter the fight?

Are the military decisions being made by the United Nations "generals" quite satisfactory with those here who ask us to be quiet about such matters?

Do we leave military decisions to military men only when the military men agree wholeheartedly with the State Department "generals"?

THE PRESIDENT AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The President said, in his budget message: "When the American people resolved to undertake the defense program now under way, they accepted also the necessity for the increases in their taxes that the level of expenditures requires."

When, I ask, Mr. President, did the American people resolve to undertake the defense program now under way? How did they make their resolution known? When did they resolve to accept the incident tax burdens?

If the administration thinks it is reflecting the wishes of the American people, I challenge the administration to submit the matter to a popular vote of all the people.

WHAT HAPPENED TO $50,000,000,000?

Since the close of World War II, Congress has appropriated more than fifty thousand million dollars for defense. Where is this equipment and preparation which we have paid for? Is there any reason to believe that more billions would not be wasted in the same way?

The President reaches for more power and more billions with hands too weak to use it effectively.

When Mr. Truman became President, he became Commander in Chief of the greatest Air Force, the greatest Navy, and the most powerful Army in the history of the world. According to the Hoover Commission report, we had equipment for 89 divisions at the end of the war.

When Mr. Truman became President, those of our allies who ruled by consent of their people numbered their population at 1,700,000,000. Furthermore, since Mr. Truman became President, Congress has given him the defense appropriations for which he has asked. What can he show us today? An Army which he has allowed to disintegrate, which can now be pushed around by a fifth-rate power; a Navy, much of which has been scuttled; an Air Force which is mostly on paper. And today, 830,000,00 people are ruled from the Kremlin; while our allies, if any, are on unknown quantity.

WORLD CONTRIBUTIONS—FRIENDSHIP PURCHASE

For nearly 5½ years the United States has poured into foreign countries $36,500,000,000 plus $6,052,000,000 in military aid. It was to buy for us and the world, peace, and for us friendship, the kind of friends who will take off their coats when we get into a fight.

The peace is fictional, as Korea has shown. As to the friendship these billions are supposed to have bought, that too, is proving illusory. After 5 years of vast tribute to ally and defeated enemy alike, we find ourselves fighting virtually alone.

But regardless of all things, with the President and his coterie of advisers, unfortunately, the policy seems to be spend as usual, give away as usual, bureaucracy as usual.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Pursuing a bit further the subject of official recognition of the Chinese Reds, which is the great goal of the Soviets, here and abroad:

There are evidences that State Department officials have been advancing this cause of the Communists on a global scale. The Italian Foreign Minister, Count Carlo Sforza, told the Chamber of Deputies that the Italian Government

had been considering recognition of the Communist regime in China, and he indicated that the Italian attitude on that question had been influenced strongly by some alluring suggestions which he said had been made to him by persons in "very responsible quarters" during his trip to the United States last September.

These suggestions, he said, were that the Soviet Union would not veto Italy's admission to the United Nations if the United States and other member states would not veto the admission of Communist China.

The United States is playing diametrically opposing roles, Mr. President.

In the one case, we are resisting Moscow's aggression with arms. In the other case, we, first, compel China to go into an alliance with the Soviet Union; second, we attempt to force upon the Chinese Government a peaceful submission to Moscow's control, through a coalition with the Soviet puppets, the Chinese Communists; and, finally, we covertly seek the recognition of the Kremlin's conquest by announcing long in advance our intended refusal to defend the Chinese Republic by use of a United States veto in its behalf. It will be remembered that last year, when Mr. Acheson returned from Europe, after a conference he announced to Members of both Houses of Congress at a meeting that the United States would not use the veto in the United Nations to prevent the admission of Communist China.

Such a conclusion is inescapable when observing the course of the State Department's dealings since 1944.

Current belief anticipates the final consummation of this sell-out of the Nationalist Government within a few weeks. We are not talking about years, Mr. President; it will come within a few weeks.

ENGLAND AND COMMUNIST CHINA

While Mr. Truman was mouthing his no-appeasement pledge to Congress, Attlee and the other prime ministers of the British Commonwealth were deciding in London that the Communist regime in China should receive sympathetic consideration; that it should not only be seated in the United Nations but that it should be handed Formosa; and that it should have an equal voice with the United States in any peace treaty dictated to Japan, which we defeated singlehandedly.

It was against this background that the British bloc in UN, supported by countries of Asia and the Middle East, worked out the UN terms for a far eastern Munich, granting the Chinese Communists everything it ever asked as the price for ending the Korean war.

THE UNITED NATIONS SELL-OUT

Further evidence of what the UN proposed to do about admission of the Communist regime in China may be found in the report of the so-called cease-fire committee of the UN. It specified that England, the United States, Soviet Russia, and the Chinese Communist regime should participate in a conference to decide the question of Formosa and the question of China's representation in the UN. The suggested conference would not include representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, but would include representatives of the Communist regime in China, who would sit down with the representatives of the United Nations to decide the fate of China. Is not this exclusion in itself a judgment and a decision?

With such a conference, there would be only two questions to resolve:

First. How would the Communist Reds like Formosa—rare, medium, or well done?

Second. How soon could the Chinese Reds send delegates to unseat the regular delegates of the Republic of China?

If the shabby deal, to which our representatives agreed, had gone through, these would have been the results—as quoted from the January 13 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

1. The aggressor would be richly rewarded, in contradiction of the cries of "no appeasement."

2. The United States would have fought a costly and useless war at Truman's instigation in Korea and had its ears beaten off for the privilege of giving to the Chinese Communists not only Korea but Formosa and other advantages not remotely at issue in Korea.

3. The very willingness of the State Department to entertain such a deal shows that Korea itself was never worth a fight, but that more than 6,200 Americans have been slaughtered in Korea in order to gratify Communist China's demand for Formosa, a base from which the whole American position in the Pacific can be threatened.

Mr. President, we should add the total of approximately 46,000 American boys who are wounded, missing, or killed.

I quote further from the article appearing in the Chicago Tribune:

4. The British have succeeded in putting across the great appeasement gift package in order to curry favor with Communist China so that they may hope to retain Hong Kong. Nobody is suggesting the surrender of Hong Kong in place of Formosa.

5. Chiang Kai-shek's large Nationalist Army on Formosa will be sacrificed to the Communists, ending all opposition to the Peiping regime of Mao; and Chiang will, in all likelihood, go the way of General Mihailovitch and other sacrifices to the Communist executioner.

6. America will be left without a friend in Asia or the Pacific. Anti-Communists not yet sacrificed will hasten to come to terms with the triumphant Communist tide.

7. Secretary of State Acheson will achieve his most faithful service to his British masters, together with his greatest contribution to Communist success.

Mr. President, parents whose captured sons had their hands tied and were shot in the face, want no such appeasement of Communists anywhere.

What can we do?

REMEMBER WASHINGTON'S ORDER

No civilization is destroyed from the outside unless it has already decayed from within. A wise philosopher once said: "No empire is conquered from abroad unless it has first destroyed itself."

Few fields need more to be reexamined than the presence and practices in high or strategic places of alien minds who have helped formulate American policy. Some have been smoked out.

But we should remember George Washington's order at a critical point in the American Revolution, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight!"

PUT AMERICANS ON GUARD

No person against whom there are citations for communistic association, by either the Attorney General's office or the House Committee on Un-American Activities, should be even considered for any office. Mr. President, we have reached a deplorable state of affairs when we find that it is necessary to appoint to high positions in the United States Government persons who have been on trial for treason against this country.

At the height of this folly, it virtually became necessary, as a condition of being considered for a high appointive office in the Government, for the applicant to have been investigated for traitorous conduct.

Many American people are now awake and alert to the danger. Still there is reason to fear that if the same men are continued in power, whether in public office or even in an advisory capacity behind the administration, the United States will continue to decline and Soviet Russia will triumph.

THIS INCREDIBLE TREND

To those who have given no careful thought to what we are up against, all this will seem incredible. Yet unless we realize that it can happen and do the necessary things to prevent it, there is great danger that it will happen.

The most important step toward preventing world war III is to destroy the Soviet fifth column in the United States. This is not going to be done by ignoring it.

There must be a complete clean-up. These men who still sit in control and push the buttons are responsible for the tragedy of Korea. Any statement by a defender of this group or its head does not change that fact. What is going on did not just happen. It was brought on by persons who did wrong things and followed the wrong policies.

No individual or bloc should be permitted at this time to deteriorate America's capacity to survive.

Let us clean house. Let us have only Americans on guard.

HOW LONG?

How long is the public going to submit to the foibles of those in the Administration who have followed the party line of the Kremlin, who have been loyal to our enemy at the expense of our own country?

Unfortunately, public opinion in the past placed no effective brake on the mistaken Administration policies in which Soviet agents and propagandists, native and foreign, found it easy to operate. Now, however, the American public is making itself heard and through this it may be possible to head off this sell-out to the Communists.

COMMUNIST CHINA MUST NOT BE RECOGNIZED

Our one salvation may be found in the voice of the people, sounding forth in

wires and letters to the President, to Senators and Congressmen, and to editors and columnists and commentators.

Every loyal American should make his voice heard against admission to the UN and recognition by the United States of the Chinese Communists. Every loyal American should demand that every possible means, including our veto power in the United Nations, be used to defeat this long-range goal of the Soviets.

ACHESON AND THE VETO POWER

Dean Acheson said that we would not use the veto in the United Nations to prevent that admission, but the voice of the American people is more powerful than that of Mr. Acheson. If the people of America do not want this deplorable sell-out to Russia, which will affect seriously the future of the world, let them now speak in clear and unmistakable terms. And let this body always represent the will of the people.

THERE IS YET TIME—THE CONSTITUTION

There is yet time, God willing, for the American people to regain the control over their own destinies, so wisely guaranteed by the Constitution. There is yet time to snatch from usurpation by ignorant little men and their traitorous advisers the basic powers categorically affirmed by the Constitution of the United States.

It is only the Constitution, and the people's stringent demand that it be observed, that will preserve government "of" and "by" the people and deliver us from the consequences of the folly that has long guided our affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the 10 recommendations made by the junior Senator from Nevada in his December 14 address.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN SUGGESTIONS IN PRESENT EMERGENCY

1. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for World War III.

2. Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

3. Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

4. Three suggested approaches to the war in Korea and Asia:

A. We could do the obvious thing—arm Chiang Kai-shek's nationals and guerrillas to furnish the foot soldiers for the job, then under General MacArthur make the most efficient use of our air power, our Navy, including submarines, to destroy the war-making power of Communist Korea and the aggressor Communist China troops.

B. We could withdraw from Korea, arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops, and let him do the job. It would require a longer time, but he would engage the Communist forces to the extent that it would be doubtful if they could harass us for a considerable time.

C. We could completely abandon Korea and China with all of its possible consequences and repercussions.

D. We can then establish our first line of defense through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia.

E. If all of these suggestions are discarded, then we can come home and defend the Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to defend this continent in any case. The one thing that we cannot do is to continue the present course of indecision and nervous jittery attitude.

5. Inform the governments of Europe which still maintain political and economic agreements with the Soviet Union that these should be terminated at the earliest possible date, as a prerequisite to the continued friendship and assistance of Europe in the United States.

6. Give no more money as loans or gifts to any government, but if necessary loan such funds to private business in strategic areas without weakening our own economy, in the same manner that the RFC loans such funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

7. Build as rapidly as possible a military force, spearheaded by an adequate submarine fleet and an air corps of whatever number of groups may be called for, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere.

8. If the European people will enlist in their own armies and furnish the ground troops, then serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with an aggressive aerial attack on their means of making war, using every means at our command to defeat their purpose of controlling Europe.

9. In every possible way, protect and strengthen our national economy; while making all possible speed toward proper preparedness, guard well our national economy; stop wasting the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers through Marshall plan and other give-away schemes; inaugurate a businesslike fiscal policy.

10. Clean up our own government, throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness and other dangerous security risks. The Armed Services Committees of the Congress should immediately institute a thorough investigation to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, our Nation is girding for a desperate struggle with Communist aggression. The nature of that struggle may be measured by our preparations, which are going so far as to completely disrupt and recast our economy. In a short time we shall experience economic regimentation such as we have known previously only during all-out war. We are going to be asked for new taxes, which will have the effect of diverting to the Federal Government 26 cents out of every dollar that is earned in this country, reducing our standard of living in just that proportion. We also have in prospect a military force of approximately 3,500,000 men and women, which may involve the drafting of 18-year-olds. That, or universal military training, which is another prospect would have a further profound effect on our social structure.

What is it we are preparing for? What are we preparing against?

The world now knows that communism operates on three fronts in its program of aggression for world dominion.

It operates, first, within its target countries, by penetration and infiltration. It does so by novel and consequently most dangerous means. It operates through native tongues and native minds. All those who do the bidding of the Kremlin do not carry the cards of the Communist Party, which they actually serve. The test is not so much whether they actually carry cards in the Communist Party and thereby aid the Communist movement, but the test is, Do their deeds serve communism and communistic aggression?

Second, it operates through its satellites or puppets, employing their armed forces for purposes of aggression. This is the story of the North Koreans and the Chinese Reds. No one knows this better than the American boys now serving in Korea against these evil forces. Only 2 days ago, the Senate adopted a resolution asserting it to be the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China to be an aggressor in Korea. Everyone who had ears and who wanted to hear knew that Communist China was an aggressor. Certainly the boys at the front did not require a statement by the Senate of the United States to know that Communist and Socialist and Red China was an aggressor. This is imperialist Communist aggression, even though no Russian soldier may be engaged in the conflict. The movement emanates from Russia as the second front of its imperialist designs.

Third. Communism stands ready with the tremendous Russian military machine to enforce its objectives where either of its other two tactics fail or are insufficient.

We are now preparing to defend against the naked aggression of the second and third tactics. We are planning to spend something like $70,000,000,000 a year to build up a resistance force against the armed aggression of Russia and its satellites.

But what of the first front—internal penetration?

This is the front on which the ultimate battles will be fought and where ultimate solutions lie.

Mr. President, even though a nation be defeated by the military might of communism, it will finally end up by facing internal penetration and the destruction of the rights and the liberties of its citizens. As such it can have no less than equal importance with the military front, for it can sabotage the military effort.

This is the front upon which Russia, since 1945, has increased its dominion from 15 percent of the world's land area to 30 percent, and from less than 10 percent of the world's population to approximately 33 percent. This was the method used in taking over China, with the exception of those persons who are now acting as guerrillas in China, and those who are on Formosa. It did not take a Russian gun to make China a puppet of the Communist world.

I scarcely need to recall the tortuous struggle which has gone on within this country to establish protections against this device of internal penetration by communism. Members of Congress all recall the rocky road of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I recall vividly the attempts of an investigating subcommittee of which I was chairman in 1948 to pierce the iron curtain at home and inquire into the operations of the Government's loyalty program. We ran head on, as have so many other committees of Congress, into a

refusal by the executive departments to open their doors for inspection.

Essentially, the struggle to protect against the internal penetration of communism in this country has revolved about a contest between the executive branch and the Congress. For many years strong sentiment in Congress has sought to erect barriers to the penetration of Communist influences in America by their exposure and by efforts at corrective legislation.

Equally strong sentiment in the executive branch has sought to minimize the threat by dismissing it as nonexistent and by defying congressional efforts to prevent it. The executive branch has taken the position that any problem which exists in this field can be solved by executive decree. Hence the listing of subversive organizations by the Attorney General. Hence the Government loyalty boards, which are responsible only to the Executive and which in fact are limited so that they may not pass upon the fundamental question of security, as against the abstruse question of loyalty.

Mr. President, under Executive order today, if a person who had been a Communist in the 1940's or the 1930's and carried a Communist card at that time comes before a loyalty board and denies that he was such a Communist, thereby committing perjury, he cannot be taken from the public payroll unless perchance the perjury can be proved on the spot. Knowing how difficult it is to prove perjury, this is a strange standard. As I have previously stated, it is not a question of whether or not he carries a Communist card. The question is whether he is serving communism. Is he serving communism rather than the fundamental principles of the Republic for which he is now working? That is a test of security and the meaning of loyalty.

From this independent attitude of the executive branch which I have described comes also the untiring defiance of Congress by the President, when the Congress has sought information on possible subversion from executive files.

But this problem of internal defense cannot be solved unilaterally, by the President or by mere decrees.

We are a nation owing allegiance to laws, and not to men. This is a problem which must be solved by laws. Laws are the function of Congress. But to have proper and effective laws with which to protect our liberties and our freedoms we must have the facts. They must be facts developed by the Congress to its own satisfaction, in order to discharge its functions and responsibilities.

The President has consistently opposed that point of view by a determination to substitute his facts and his decrees.

There now comes a new and highly significant development in the struggle to protect this Nation on the first front of Communist aggression which is through internal penetration.

The President has just appointed another commission to deal with problems of loyalty and internal security.

This latest move is extremely unfortunate because it plainly appears to be another maneuver by the President which is bound to create strained relations between the Executive and Congress. The whole history of loyalty and security in Government service has been one long series of attempts by the President to thwart the Congress in its attempt to protect the country from subversive influences.

There is at this moment pending in Congress Senate Resolution 27, Eighty-second Congress, introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to set up a Senate bipartisan commission to investigate loyalty and security cases. There has also been set up in the Judiciary Committee a bipartisan investigating subcommittee to deal with the subject through Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress. These actions in Congress have come about after several years of deplorable conditions in the executive branch in the matter of loyalty and security cases.

At this moment the President has still another board, provided for under Public Law 831 of the Eighty-first Congress, the Internal Security Act. That Board is presently compromised in its functioning because the President has not submitted the names of his appointees to the Senate. Can it be that by appointing his own new board, the President intends to ignore the laws and procedures provided by Congress?

When the President, by Executive order, creates a new commission on the same subject, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that once again the President seeks to foreclose congressional action on these vital matters. It is difficult to escape the feeling that the President once again has been persuaded by his advisers to cloak the subject with confusion in the hope that nothing effective will be done about security risks in Government service.

These advisers—whoever they are—have reason to fear Congress. It has only been through the insistent pressure of Congress that people like Marzani, Hiss, Wadleigh, Remington, and others have been brought to light. It will be only through Congress that the State Department and other agencies of Government will be cleared of security risks. People of questionable standing in the executive departments know that, and hence they are determined to keep all loyalty and security investigations in hands they can control.

There are many aspects about the President's latest move that should give Congress occasion for sober thought.

The President's Executive order amounts to the setting up of a commission which to all intents and purposes is above the status of duly constituted committees of Congress.

The President's commission, which is appointed by him, is responsible only to him. It should be made clear that it is not a commission which is elected by the people, or is responsible to the people, as Members of Congress are responsible. If the people of the United States understood that the only purpose of the commission was to advise the President of the United States, it would be one thing. I fear that the commission will be accepted as something much more than it is, as a substitute for the fact-finding and policy-making functions of Congress. I fear that is intentionally its design.

The President's commission is given powers which the President has denied to Congress.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the able Senator from Michigan whether the Constitution contains any authority for such an appointment by the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of no such authority in the Constitution, for an executive commission to displace the functions of Congress. However, if the President merely wants personal advice on the subject, I believe the Constitution would allow him to seek such personal advice from a commission which he could name, or from people whose advise he sought.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Executive order in the present case contemplate that certain power or authority shall be vested in the commission? In other words, is the commission purely advisory?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the announcement of the appointment of the commission suggests an attempt to go much further than merely seeking advice from it.

Mr. KEM. Under the Constitution, is it not the duty and responsibility of the legislative branch of the Government to set up such a body?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts has introduced a bill under which such a commission would be created for the purpose of doing the job on behalf of the people.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether or not the proposed commission represents another instance of the apparent desire on the part of the President to build up the power and authority of the executive branch of the Government at the expense of the legislative branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. It is sad to contemplate that we should be faced continuously with such action on the part of the President. The same question presented itself very forcibly when the President said, in effect, that the Army belonged to the President, and that he could send it wherever he wanted to send it and use it in any way he wanted to use it. Of course, since then he has shown some realization that such a position on his part will not satisfy the people of America.

Mr. KEM. Has not the President done more than merely claim such authority? Has he not actually exercised such authority in issuing the order under which the Armed Forces of the United States went into battle in Korea?

Mr. FERGUSON. The President claimed that he was acting under a statute which authorized him to send troops to Korea in order to carry out orders or executive decrees of the United Nations.

Mr. KEM. Was that subject referred to in the original press release which was read to the Senate by the majority

leader? My recollection is that it was not referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not recall that it was referred to in the original press release.

Mr. KEM. Was that not the first time the Senate knew of the action which the President of the United States had taken?

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the first time that the Senator from Michigan knew about it, and I am sure the Senate had not previously known about it. I know of no conferences that were held with Representatives of Congress and I know of no word that had come to the Senate prior to that time.

Mr. KEM. I shall not tax the Senator much further. I should like to ask him whether he does not regard it as one of the most pressing and important problems, not only before the Congress, but before the American people as well, who love the Constitution, to see that the elected Representatives of the people resume their constitutional functions, as intended by the founding fathers?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Missouri has stated the problem very clearly. The issue is drawn when we look at the Constitution, which separates the powers of the Federal Government among three coordinate branches. That separation of powers was a device to protect a basic conception of the inalienable rights of the people, of rights which may not be taken from them except by their consent and as a gift from them. Under the Constitution we have a government of limited jurisdictions, because sovereignty is in the people. The people reserve to themselves certain inalienable rights. The Constitution and its concept of inalienable rights of the people stands. But somehow or other we are losing the philosophy, the mores which holds that government is the servant of the people. When such powers are taken from the jurisdiction of the legislative branch of the Government, whose representatives in the House are elected from districts, and in the Senate from States as a whole, it is in effect taking rights away from the people of the United States. When that is done we no longer have the Republic as it was conceived and created by the founding fathers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator several questions having to do with his very able address and presentation of this important subject. I came to the Chamber only a few minutes ago. I assume the Senator is speaking of the new loyalty commission, which is to be headed by Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, I should like to say that my attitude with respect to the commission was inadvertently misrepresented in the public press the other day, when at least one article stated that I had praised the appointment. I did not mean to indicate that I approved or praised the creation of the new loyalty commission. I praised Admiral Nimitz as a highly patriotic American citizen, for whom I have great personal admiration.

Mr. FERGUSON. I join the Senator in that statement. I trust my remarks regarding the commission will not be misunderstood as reflecting upon the character or qualifications of Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not express approval of the appointment of the commission. I fear it will be compounding evils already in existence. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels any commission of this kind, arbitrarily set up under the complete and sole control—and secret control—of the President, can possibly operate to clear out the known subversives and fellow travelers in Government so long as the Executive order under which it operates requires the commission to find that an individual is at the moment of hearing a member of the Communist Party, and limits it to that particular finding before the commission can act?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it is absolutely impossible. It is merely an attempt to lull the people into a sense of security which does not actually exist. The test is not, as I have already said, whether an individual carries a membership card in the Communist Party on the day of the order or the date of the hearing. The test is, Does he owe allegiance to the Communist movement of the world, and is he carrying out such allegiance, instead of being loyal to the Republic of the United States of America?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like more specifically to bring a case to the attention of the Senator and see if his understanding of the general principles involved is virtually the same as mine.

Let us take the Remington case, which is now pending in the courts. It is my understanding that the so-called Loyalty Board which, as a Government agency, cleared Mr. Remington some time ago, cleared him, among other things, on the basis that, while they admitted there was reasonable ground to believe that he had been a Communist at some time in the past, yet his denial that he was now a Communist was an obstacle over which they could not jump, in the light of the President's restrictive order that they must find him to be now a Communist or he could not be discharged from public office. Does the Senator understand that there is a great element of that particular factor in these investigations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I do. I understand that that is the claim of the Loyalty Board.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is my understanding, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has written a column upon the subject, clearly pointing that out to be the position of the Loyalty Board. Until recently the Senator from Michigan could not fathom how the Loyalty Board was able to clear Mr. Remington. The Senator from Michigan does not fully understand as yet, unless the answer is as given by the Senator from Iowa and Mr. Krock, how it was possible to clear him, when the Board's own files showed evidence that there was reason to believe that he had been a Communist, or owed allegiance to communism. As I have previously indicated I do not draw a distinction between membership and allegiance when it is a question of loyalty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Leaving the Remington case, as a particular case, out of consideration, and taking a hypothetical case, I believe that the facts which I state are true, and that what I have described as to procedure is true. Therefore, under the President's recent order, which so restricts the Loyalty Board, if it follows his order it can scarcely operate. This is the illustration:

Assume that an individual was proved beyond all doubt, by his own admission, to have been a Communist for the past 7 or 8 years, up until 6 months ago, we will say. He states, at the time of the loyalty examination, "It is true that I had been a Communist for a long period of time, but for the past several months or a year I have not been a member of the Communist Party." The Loyalty Board is unable to produce proof that he is at this moment a member of the Communist Party, although it may have strong reason to believe that he may secretly be a member. Under the President's order, if it were followed strictly, the Board would be required to clear that man, because the Board could not produce positive proof that he was at that particular moment a member of the Communist Party.

I believe that the order has been interpreted as going that far, and that it virtually ties the hands of any loyalty board. The President has established one board on top of another, which compounds confusion in the matter. Any loyalty board established under his recent order could not function unless it could produce proof positive that at the present moment—not yesterday, last week, or last month, but at this moment—the man is an active, operating Communist. The Communists have ordered their members to go underground, to deny their membership, and conceal every activity they can. That makes the order practically unworkable. I wonder if the Senator agrees.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that is what the Board interprets the order to mean. It is now coming to light for the first time that for all these years the Board has been functioning under an order which it believes should be so interpreted as to require proof of disloyalty, as of the time of the hearings.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I invite the Senator's attention to a report filed by one of the departments. I have not seen it for some months. I will not name the

department. I am sure that the Senator must be familiar with the report.

The examining board went through the department and found and reported, for example, 28 or 30 individuals whom it found to be actually disloyal. The board restored to their former status and pay and returned to work 40 or 50 other individuals whom the board itself stated it strongly suspected. The board strongly doubted their loyalty to the United States, but it was unable to prove an overt act in the past few months. Therefore those employees were restored to their jobs, even though the board strongly suspected them, and was of the opinion, without proof of an overt act, that they were disloyal. Is the Senator familiar with that report?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not familiar with the particular report, but I am familiar with the fact that there has been that interpretation of the board's function. I am also familiar with the fact that on as many as three occasions when the Loyalty Board itself had every reason to believe that there was evidence of disloyalty, an individual's case was directed to be reviewed by the loyalty board of the particular department, but each time the case was sent back to the over-all Board. There was so much question about the person's loyalty that the case was sent back three times; yet, all that time the person was on the payroll of the Government.

I know it to be a fact that on occasion there would be an order in the personnel file of an individual to the effect that because of the strong suspicion and evidence of disloyalty, the particular employee was not to see any confidential papers. While that person was working for the Government, and while the order was in the file, the man for whom the person was working as secretary did not even know that such an order was in the file, and was allowing the secretary to see all the documents which came across his desk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall not trespass further on the Senator's time.

Does the Senator believe that we will ever get a vigorous job done in cleaning subversives out of the American Government, in the interest of the American public, until the Executive and the department heads of the Government are themselves determined to do an honest and sincere job of cleaning them out?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. Until those who have had working for them persons who have been disloyal, or with respect to whom there is evidence of disloyalty, come to the conclusion that they are willing to confess error, subversives are not going to be cleaned out.

What we need is men occupying these positions who will do what General Lee did. When Pickett made his famous charge at Gettysburg and lost practically his entire army, and came in tears and blood to where General Lee sat upon his horse watching the charge, General Lee said even before Pickett could speak, "It was my mistake." Such honesty, and a capacity for self-criticism, is what we need in Government. Not maintenance of vested interest in error, but confession of error is what we need.

I welcome the colloquy with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Iowa. Before departing from my prepared remarks I had observed that the President gives to the new Commission powers which he has denied to Congress. The President has directed all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate with the Commission. When Congress, in the past, sought to get such cooperation, the President either denied it outright or so limited the cooperation that Congress' hands were tied.

Mr. President, an admiral in the United States Navy appeared before a Senate committee on which I was serving, and told the committee that by direct orders of the President he could not testify. It happens we were seeking certain loyalty data which he alone was in a position to provide. How can the Congress solve its problems when its hands are tied in that way?

The President's Commission now being appointed is to have, it is said, access to all classified information and even individual files which the President has denied to Members of Congress.

I should like someone to explain on the Senate floor, in behalf of the President of the United States, how it can be possible that he should refuse that kind of data to a committee of the United States Senate, whose Members are elected by the people of their respective States, while he now says he is willing to give it to nine members of a commission to be appointed by himself, individuals who have not been elected by the people of the United States and therefore hold no direct responsibility to them. How can he now say that he will not only give such data to the Commission, but that he will give it also to their hundreds of employees, whereas he denies to give, even in executive session, that kind of evidence to the Congress of the United States and its duly selected congressional committees, composed of persons who have been elected by and are directly responsible to the people. I should like to have that explained upon the Senate floor. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to such an explanation.

The Commission is to be vested with power to make recommendations for legislation. Does that not suggest an infringement of the powers of congressional committees? It is the basic duty of the committees of the Congress to look into the question of what legislation may be needed and enacted.

In fact, the Commission will have all the powers normally possessed by standing committees of Congress, and in addition it will have powers which the President denies to Congress.

Congress will do well to ponder the significance of this condition. Already the executive department has encroached heavily on the functions and powers of the legislative department. And now we have the President setting up a committee which is superior to a congressional committee in a field squarely within the province of Congress.

This Commission is directed to do what Congress must do itself. Congress has been trying for 4 years to develop the true facts on which legislation must be based. The President has thus far not only failed to cooperate with Congress, but has affirmatively denied Congress the facts it must have. Congress cannot take the recommendations of this Commission as the facts. It must have and develop the facts for itself.

In his statement the President declares he wants to keep security problems from falling into the arena of "partisanship." But his own action in seeking to foreclose Congress by the appointment of an independent commission is itself a partisan action. The President alone is to designate the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and all other members of his Commission. His appointments will not be subject to the advice or consent of the Senate. That in itself is a partisan action because we know how such commissions have been selected in the past. From past history we know they will assert their independence of Congress. We know they will refuse to cooperate with Congress. We know they will withhold information from Congress. What is this, then, but a partisan device?

What the President did as a unilateral action should have been done in cooperation with Congress. The President's statement on the appointment of this new Commission should have been addressed to Congress, asking for cooperation. Congress is a bipartisan body—the legislature of all the people. Its Members are the representatives of the people—elected by the people and responsible to the people. Loyalty and security is the people's business. The President almost intimates that he does not trust the Congress.

Some uncomfortable conclusions stem from the President's latest act:

First. The creation of yet another commission looks like an attempt to foreclose congressional action on the public business.

Second. The creation of such a commission looks like a further encroachment of the executive on the legislative body because the President's commission parallels congressional committees and is vested with powers superior to congressional committees.

Third. The President's action looks like an attempt at further confusion of loyalty and security matters which are now confusion worse confounded.

Fourth. The President's action comes close to an open disregard for Public Law 831, passed by the Eighty-first Congress expressly to deal with internal security and subversive matters. O, the Senate well knows what the President thinks of that law, for he vetoed it, but notwithstanding his veto it was passed.

Fifth. Even though the President speaks of nonpartisan treatment of loyalty and security matters—and, Mr. President, I say in utmost sincerity that nothing should be further from politics

than the matter of loyalty and security in the United States—his act in setting up this Commission by his sole appointment of its members and by vesting the Commission with powers denied to standing congressional committees, is itself a partisan action.

I fear the only result to come from this is further confusion, further strained relations between the President and Congress, and continuing danger to the country from subversion, disloyalty, and security risks in an hour of great peril for America.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if a commission set up by Executive order has the power to compel attendance of witnesses and require their testimony?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot positively answer the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator as a lawyer venture the opinion that is something which is very doubtful?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would consider it very doubtful. The Senator's question is most pertinent. If the Commission is to function at all effectively, even no more than to advise the President, it would have to be in the position of subpenaing witnesses, and taking their testimony under oath, upon which a charge of perjury might be based. Those powers are clearly possessed by committees of Congress, of course, and that is one reason the committees are very effective.

Mr. KEM. Such an order runs in the name of the United States of America, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, it would have to.

Mr. KEM. Could it be issued otherwise than by means of the authority of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that it would have to come under some law enacted by the Congress.

Mr. KEM. The Senator does not know of any law by which the Congress has authorized the issuance of such subpenas, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. By the new Commission? No, I know of none. That is why I doubt that such subpena authority exists. On the other hand, I do not see how such an agency can function effectively without that authority.

Mr. President, in the course of my colloquy with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] I cited an article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times for January 23, and quoted indirectly from it. I now ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC PROBLEM OF LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The members of the new and statutory Subversive Activities Control Board, headed by Seth W. Richardson, still await confirmation by the Senate as they proceed with the early stages of their onerous task. The members of the President's Loyalty Review Board, which is not statutory and therefore is not subject to confirmation, are working under a different kind of handicap. But one difficulty which confronts both groups has its origin in Executive Order No. 9835.

Though Mr. Richardson is a North Dakota Republican of undeviating party record, Republican Senators whose domestic and foreign policies are much like his own are obstructing and opposing his confirmation on the ground that the Loyalty Review Board, when he was its chairman, cleared of disloyalty charges William W. Remington, then an official of the Department of Commerce, now on trial for perjury growing out of charges that he denied to a grand jury former association with the Communist Party. But the terms of Executive Order No. 9835 virtually dictated that clearance.

EFFECT OF THE EXECUTIVE ORDER

Former Senator Hiram Bingham, also a Republican, who succeeded Mr. Richardson as Chairman of the LRB, is about to wrestle with the same obstacle in trying to eliminate and bar disloyal persons from the public service. If the Board's terms of reference remain as they are Mr. Bingham may find himself under the same attack as Mr. Richardson.

The sources of the trouble, past and current, are to be found in the circumstances that Executive Order No. 9835 directs the LRB (1) to confine its judgment to whether or not a Government employee is loyal, and (2) bars an adverse judgment on the basis of reasonable doubt of that loyalty or on remote evidence or implication of past disloyalty. Thus, while the LRB members might feel reasonable doubt of an employee's loyalty, or regard a loyal employee as a security risk just the same, or find in the remote evidence grounds for belief that disloyalty still exists, they are under Presidential direction to clear that employee when his case comes before them for review.

Under this directive the Board tried and cleared Remington when Mr. Richardson was Chairman. But, regardless of whether this clearance is supported by the New York City jury, Mr. Bingham also will be similarly limited in other trials, and probably he also will be attacked by fellow Republicans.

BROADER STANDARDS OF 1942

The ban on "reasonable doubt" of loyalty as an adverse finding was not included in the civil-service regulations of 1942, which grew out of President Roosevelt's Executive Orders Nos. 9063 and 9243. This made it possible to bar or dismiss Federal employees on such grounds, which also permitted consideration of the risk element of security as well as loyalty. The LRB under both Messrs. Richardson and Bingham has no such latitude because its standards of judgment were promulgated in 1947 when the threat of world communism to American security was not recognized by the Executive to the degree it is today. If these standards are not changed from the 1947 to the 1942 type, the Bingham board will have the same experiences it had under Mr. Richardson.

The order of 1947 applies only to executive employees. It can be applied and enforced only if, "on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States" now, and the fact that the Board may consider him loyal but a security risk does not give it basis for an adverse finding. Obedient to this order, the LRB has consistently found that youthful, including student, activities and associations were insufficient grounds for a judgment of disloyalty if there was nothing in the employee's record of later years to indicate a continuation of such earlier beliefs and activities.

APPROVED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Executive order of 1947 uses the words "loyalty" and "disloyalty" in all sections, even to the authority given the LRB to make rules and regulations relating to "employee loyalty." Hence, it being plain that the Board is given no other test for investigation and adjudication, the LRB at no time has sought to deal with the question of security. Its members concluded that, while an employee's morals or habits or lack of discretion or personal associations might readily raise the issue of security risk, these could not be used to determine the issue of loyalty with which alone it was empowered to deal.

But Mr. Richardson asked the Attorney General if this interpretation by the Board of Executive Order No. 9835 was correct, just to be certain it wasn't too literal and legalistic. The Attorney General specifically affirmed the interpretation. That was the standard by which it judged the cases of Remington and others, and that is the standard by which Mr. Bingham will have to abide if the order is not expanded and he decides to try to work within the close limitation of its terms.

If and when the Republican Senators who, with some Democrats, are holding up confirmation of Mr. Richardson and his fellow appointees begin their hearings on the subject, prior to advising the Senate whether to approve or disapprove all or some members of the Subversive Activities Control Board, these pertinent facts will enter the official record.

A TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, AND AN ESTIMATE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ACTION IN KOREA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words to mark an important occasion which will occur tomorrow. I understand that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, so I speak on this matter today.

On Friday, January 26, America will celebrate the seventy-first birthday of one of her greatest sons, a man in whom we in Wisconsin take particular pride because of his deep roots in our State. I refer, of course, to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, supreme commander of the United Nations forces in Korea, chief of America's military occupation of Japan, hero of Bataan.

Because of the million of words which have been written about this distinguished soldier and administrator, there is very little one can add at this point. It is enough to say, however, that history undoubtedly will honor him not only as one of the great men of our times, but as one of the greatest Americans in our entire history.

Most Americans believed that General MacArthur's exploits in World War II probably would represent the climax in his career: his amazing return from Australia, up the chain of Pacific islands; his brilliant strategy in the Pacific campaign, which—with a minimum of casualties—ended with the signing of the Japanese surrender aboard the battleship *Missouri*. Those achievements seemed to be the greatest of his career. But still greater triumphs were in the making. General MacArthur's accomplishments in Japan are the work of an administrative genius. When we compare those accomplishments with what our administrators have been doing in

Europe, we reach that definite conclusion. At noon today I had lunch with three of Japan's great leaders, one of whom was governor of the Bank of Japan. In speaking about MacArthur, he said, "MacArthur we respect, we honor; we have an affectionate regard for him. We almost love him."

LET US NOT BE TOO QUICK IN RENDERING JUDGMENT

What about Korea, Mr. President? This gives me an opportunity to say something about judgment. Let us not be too quick in rendering judgment in regard to the Korean situation. It has been fashionable for certain swivel-chair generals—and I refer in particular to civilians who pretend to be all-wise in military affairs—to assume that Korea is an entire fiasco, a closed book, with absolutely no redeeming points at all. I believe that Korea was a trap for us, of course; and I believe that we fell into it. I believe that the Russians purposely had their representatives keep away from the United Nations. However, those things do not prove that the action in Korea has been a fiasco. We should realize that the final chapter in the Korean story has not as yet been written. Let us not forget that, although at first there was practically universal criticism of our military policy, at the time when American forces fell back under the North Korean attack in the first few days of the war, yet at long last the United States mounted its counteroffensive, and we saw in the brilliant landing at Inchon the finest type of military master stroke. Let us not be so quick, therefore, in attempting to render final judgment.

THERE ARE SOME ASSETS IN THE KOREAN VENTURE

Yes, Mr. President, although the news from Korea has been grim, and is today, let us not forget that for all of its liabilities—and they are many and grave—there have been some notable successes in the Korean venture thus far.

I personally, of course, have pointed out that unfortunately our Korean adventure seems to have been playing into Russia's hands.

What is Russia's technique? It is, first, penetration by every known means, including propaganda, fear, hatred, division. By those means Russia took over 150,000,000 people in Europe. That is the first prong of the Russian technique. By means of the same prong she tried to penetrate Southern Korea, where the United Nations had been building up the country and had succeeded to such an extent that the Southern Koreans declined, despite the Russian propaganda penetration, to choose the Communist philosophy or way.

Then Russia used the second prong of her technique. She sent into action one of her stooges, the North Koreans, whom she had armed and equipped. After we defeated the North Koreans, Russia called on another of her stooges, the Chinese Communists. Russia has stooges all over the world.

Russia has not yet used the third prong of her technique, and probably she will not use it until she has exhausted her stooges.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the fact that there are some assets in the case of the Korean adventure, and I shall enumerate them. At this point I must say that all of us have followed with sorrow the casualty lists, as the cost in human lives has mounted higher and higher. Yet, as I have said, there is an assets side of the Korean ledger. What are the assets?

KOREA HAS PROVED RED CONSPIRACY

First. For one thing, the invasion by North Korea and then by Red China has shown the American people, if any further proof was necessary, the true nature of the Communist conspiracy to control the world.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, that caused a tremendous explosion in the minds of the people of the United States and in the minds of the people of the world.

Second. It has alerted America, so that now we are embarked on a gigantic preparedness program, a program by which we will make sure, we trust, that never again will our country be caught in a Pearl Harbor-like surprise attack, helpless and defenseless, either within or without. We might not have embarked on that preparedness program, had it not been for the developments in Korea.

Third. Equally important, the Korean invasion has shown all the free peoples of the world how Russia intends to use her stooges for the second stage of her assault on the West or in Iran or Turkey or Greece.

Korea has brought about a reawakening of the Western Allies, as I pointed out in an address delivered in New York last Wednesday night. France, England, and other countries have stepped up their plans for an increased number of infantry divisions, and have increased their appropriations for defense purposes. Turkey has proved her proud mettle in combat.

KOREA HAS PROVED MILITARY MIGHT IS CRUCIAL

Fourth. Korea has shown that military strength in our allies must be of major concern to us. Korea has shown how imperatively necessary it is for us therefore to mobilize Japan, Germany, Spain, and other countries which we have not adequately utilized to date, so that they can become bastions of defense—military assets, rather than liabilities.

Mr. President, if we consider the situation which existed a few months ago, we remember that at that time we were complacent and unalert, just as we were at the time of Pearl Harbor. Think of the change which has occurred as of today. No one questions the need; no one is doubtful as to the seriousness of the situation; today no one doubts why Russia has built snorkel submarines and is building bombs. No, Mr. President; today we are alert, we are going to work; we are embarking upon a broad production program; we are going to be ready for whatever may happen.

UNITED NATIONS MAY YET BE VINDICATED

Fifth. The North Korean invasion galvanized the United Nations into action. While, more recently, when we have suffered reverses, the UN has shown itself to be dragging its feet in labeling Red China as an aggressor, it is our prayer that the United Nations will yet vindicate itself. It is our prayer that it will find within itself the capacity to be adequate to the present situation.

It is the hope of the world that in this challenging period the United Nations will not fail us. This is no time for us to abandon the United Nations. It is the great beacon of hope for mankind. Through the ages, hungering humanity has sought peace. Is the United Nations to be but another wreck on the shore of time? I say, Mr. President, let not America wreck it. Let us give hope. Let us also appreciate that the nations which are members of the United Nations are seeking help, and are fearful. They need our strength. They need our guidance. Yes, it is easy enough for us, with two oceans between us and the Russian bear, to be supremely confident at times perhaps; but we should be considerate of those who are next door, only a matter of minutes from the Russian airplanes. Let us be thoughtful of them, and helpful. But let us build toward security and adequacy.

KOREA HAS SHOWN UNITED STATES STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Sixth. The Korean adventure has shown us both the strengths and weaknesses of our fighting forces. It has proved that the American soldier, given the right equipment, is the greatest fighting man in the world. It has proved how our Army, Navy, and Air Forces can cooperate brilliantly, such as in the masterful evacuation of Hungnam. It has shown that American jet planes are the superiors of at least those Russian-made jets which have been brought into action. We do not know whether they are her best planes or not.

At the same time, Korea has proved that much of our military thinking, at least in situations involving that type of terrain, was inadequate, that our weapons could be considerably improved, and that strategies of land warfare should be revised accordingly.

Someone has said that Korea is the Spain of a third world war. I trust that will not prove to be true. I am hoping that what has happened in Korea will teach the Russians that, with the revitalized spirit of the free people of earth, this is no time for her to start a third world war.

KOREA HAS WRECKED RED CHINESE TIMETABLE

Seventh. By our action in Korea we have already destroyed much of the flower of at least one corps of the Chinese Red army. We have pinned down a tremendous number of Chinese Red troops which might otherwise be prepared for action against Formosa, southeast Asia, and so forth.

These are some of the assets amid the liabilities, if we may call them that, of the Korean venture on the world chessboard. Who knows what the imponderable events of tomorrow may prove about Korea?

So I contend, Mr. President, that all these various factors must be weighed in the balance against the admitted liabilities of the Korean chapter.

At this time, because we recognize that all the world is a chessboard, a play here has certain repercussions on another

play yonder. Certainly by our own invention the world has been contracted, so to speak. With our planes, which attain speeds of from 900 to 1,000 miles an hour, and with our weapons, the world is now a small place. We must realize that things have changed even since 1939.

At this time we can recall the philosophy of early American patriots, who warned us that those who expected to enjoy the blessings of freedom would also have to expect to make sacrifices to maintain freedom. "Tyranny," said Tom Paine, "like hell, is not easily conquered."

LET NOT DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR BE BELITTLED

Let not the armchair generals belittle, ridicule, and defame one of our greatest sons, Douglas MacArthur, a man who has hardly had the freedom of action worthy of his role. Actually, he needs no defense on my part or on the part of any other American. Why? Because his thundering actions and his epic successes speak louder than all the words which we could possibly utter in his behalf.

The American people have not lost and will not lose their faith in this great American. He stands as a great pillar of strength. His patriotism is unquestioned; his vigor, his alertness, his enterprise, in spite of advanced years, are respected by every American. His years are not really advanced. I saw a man yesterday, who is, I believe, 9 years older than General MacArthur—Mr. Cordell Hull, and his mind is as keen as a razor's edge. So is Gen. Douglas MacArthur's. He is respected by every American.

As one Wisconsonite to another, I salute General MacArthur. I pray that the day may not be far distant when in a more peaceful and more secure time, his mission completed, he may return to these shores. Then may he receive the honors at first hand which are so deservedly his, after his long years of absence from his native land.

EUROPEAN PREPARATION AND WILL TO RESIST RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, last December I sent a letter to the President of the United States requesting that he provide Congress with the facts regarding the condition of Europe's preparedness and its will to resist Russian aggression. At that time I was confronted on the one hand by reports that the people of Western Europe were demoralized and sick of war, and that they lacked the will to stand up to Soviet aggression. On the other hand, there were reports, largely advanced by the administration, that the people of Europe had the will to resist Communist aggression, that their courage and determination were vibrant and alive, and that all that was needed was an assurance of American backing.

When I dispatched my letter to the President it was my hope that he would promptly provide the information at the disposal of the executive department regarding the preparedness of the European Nations to defend themselves from a military point of view, and also whether or not they were able to unite as one economic unit so that their resources would be integrated for defense purposes.

It seemed to me then, as it does now, that with the sharp conflict between the views of former President Hoover and those of the administration with respect to the will of Europe to defend itself and its state of preparedness, a statement of facts by the administration on which its conclusions that our western allies meant business was founded, was needed, if we were to act intelligently.

It should be apparent that if Europe does not have the will to defend itself, that if its morale is so low that it will not fight, and that if it has done practically nothing to prepare itself against an attack, then the United States would be justified in pursuing the course proposed by Mr. Hoover.

On the other hand, if our European allies are firm in their will to fight, and are preparing their defenses with all the resources at their command, we should then be bound by the terms of the Atlantic Pact to support them with such efforts in both an economic and military way as we should deem necessary under the circumstances. In other words, our future course of conduct in Western Europe, and in fact as a part of the defense of the free world against aggression, would largely be determined by what the true situation is in Europe with regard to the questions which have been raised.

Under date of January 23, 1951, the President replied to my letter of last December. He informed me that he had been undertaking the preparation of a reply containing information of the type I had requested, but that events have been moving so rapidly he had now come to the conclusion that the purpose of my letter could best be served by waiting a short time until General Eisenhower returns from Europe.

The President went on to say that General Eisenhower no doubt will have a large amount of new information which he will give to Congress soon after he reaches Washington and that that information will do a great deal to help clarify the questions which I raised in my letter.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a letter which I addressed to the President, and his reply thereto, to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the President of the United States for his letter. It is good to know that it is the President's intention to have General Eisenhower report to the Congress as well as to the executive branch. The whole Nation wants the facts first-hand. It is my hope that General Eisenhower, on his short and hurried trip to Europe, will be able to get first-hand information on the vital questions raised.

Mr. President, the condition of our relationships with the world's non-Communist nations should give us cause for alarm. There are indications that some of the nations we thought were standing by us in courage and determination are faltering as the time for decision approaches.

Great Britain, our great wartime friend and ally, is divided between its hesitancy at offending the United States and its fear of Red China and her Russian ally. Present reports indicate that it is doubtful the British Government will support United Nations condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor. The British Government hesitates even while her troops are fighting and dying in the battle against armed Communist aggression in Korea.

At the very moment that India seeks 2,000,000 tons of American wheat, her Prime Minister has rebuked the United States for its sponsorship of a United Nations resolution to brand Red China an aggressor in Korea. The Government of India is in the forefront of the drive to admit Red China to the United Nations, even while Red China is conducting a war of aggression against the United Nations in Korea.

The Arab states, who are closely tied to Great Britain by bonds of friendship and trade, are joined with Great Britain and India in the desire to avoid indicting Red China as an aggressor in Korea.

Some of our friends and allies have extended diplomatic recognition to the government of Red China. There are repeated reports that Great Britain and some of our other friends are engaged in brisk and profitable trade with Red China.

Some of the items being sent to Communist China are suitable for military use and will therefore aid the Communist Chinese armed forces in their aggression in Korea and planned aggression elsewhere in Asia.

Under the North Atlantic Pact the United States joined with the nations of Western Europe in a defensive alliance in which it was agreed that an attack on one of the member nations is in effect an attack on all, and that all will promptly come to the assistance of any member which has been subjected to an armed attack. In that respect, let me quote paragraph 1 of article 5 of the treaty. That paragraph is the pledge of mutual assistance which all nations have taken who are members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization:

> The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in the exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

The North Atlantic Pact recognizes the right of self-defense as a sovereign right of all nations. It in no way impairs any signatory nation's right to defend itself from an armed attack by the use of armed force.

The North Atlantic Pact is a pledge of mutual assistance in the event of an attack. It imposes an obligation on each of the signatory powers to come to the assistance of any one or more of the pact members who have been attacked. There is no such obligation, however, if the attack is not made in the general area of the North Atlantic and North America.

In respect to the geographical area of the world covered by the North Atlantic Pact and in which an attack must occur before the obligation of mutual assistance comes into play, let me quote article 6 of the treaty:

For the purpose of article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer, or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

The North Atlantic Pact is not a pledge by the United States that the United States by itself will take on the burden of defending Western Europe. It is a pledge of cooperative effort in mutual self-defense, carrying obligations which all must meet.

The ties of friendship and mutual assistance in the North Atlantic Pact can be no stronger than the will of the individual nations who joined together to bring the pact into being. The pact can be no stronger than its weakest link. When one or more of its members falters in its dealings with a common enemy and accepts the doctrine of appeasement, it strikes at the strength of the pact itself.

In the past few days the British-Asian-Arab bloc of nations seems to have deserted us in the fight against Communist aggression. Behind the leadership of the Labor-Socialist Government of Great Britain, these nations have joined together and helped bring about the tabling of a resolution to brand Communist China an aggressor in Korea. Thus some of the very nations who are joined with us for mutual assistance in defense against Communist aggression in the North Atlantic area have served notice that they are unwilling to stand with us against Communist aggression in Asia. Thus the nations which have accepted our economic bounty and military assistance, and who still stand with hands outstretched, seem determined to let us stand alone in this hour of peril in Asia.

The lesson of recent events is clear. The people of the United States realize that if their Nation is to survive, it must make itself strong quickly. As its first objective, the United States must build up its own strength within its own borders and must raise a wall of ships and planes which no aggressor can pierce. That must be done quickly and at all costs; that must be our first objective.

In addition to the building up of America as a great inner fortress of freedom, the United States must have defense bases beyond its territorial limits and must join with allies abroad. These allies must be friends whose objectives are the same as ours. They must be endowed with courage and determination and the will to fight, if necessary, to maintain their freedom. Once having found such allies, we must do all we can to help them to effective defense without sacrificing our own defenses.

The very survival of our Nation may well be in the balance. The decisions which are to be made should be made not by the executive branch alone, not by the Senate alone, but by the people of the United States and their Government in all its branches, acting together in unity, determination, and common purpose.

EXHIBIT 1

DECEMBER 29, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Public debate over our foreign policy, and particularly our relationship to the Atlantic Pact Nations, points up conflicting statements of facts as they pertain to Europe's desire and efforts to resist the rising tide of communism.

Mr. Hoover says in effect that Continental Europe has not in 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose and that willpower necessary for its own defense; that the minds of Western Europeans are confused with fears and disunity and that, notwithstanding our generous help to this date, they have failed to develop a unity of purpose or organization. They vacillate, Mr. Hoover says, in the belief that they are in little danger and hope to avoid being a theater of war, and because of this state of mind they have done practically nothing to prepare their defense.

Many able newspaper correspondents support Mr. Hoover's conclusions on the European state of mind as well as his conclusions on their preparedness or lack of preparedness.

If the press quoted you correctly, Mr. President, you sharply contradicted Mr. Hoover's statements. Thus, an issue over facts is raised which serves only to greatly confuse the Members of Congress and the American public. Surely it would be helpful if we could agree on what the true situation is. The American people are justified in asking for the facts and not conclusions based on alleged facts. If they know the truth, I am certain they can be relied upon to exercise proper judgment.

To get the actual situation, Mr. President, the American people should be fully informed by you and your Secretary of State, through answers to the following questions:

What progress, if any, has been made by our European Allies in preparing themselves to meet a Communist attack since the ratification of the Atlantic Pact some 16 months ago?

I hope this question, as far as security will permit, will be answered not only with respect to paper plans, but to actual increases of armament as well as the mobilization of fighting divisions.

Is there a public sentiment of major proportions in Western European countries in favor of a neutral position in any war in which the United States and Russia and her satellites would be involved?

To illustrate, is there a growing anti-American feeling in England which expresses itself in the statement, "Let America fight her own wars"?

Ludwell Denny, foreign news correspondent reports that there is such a sentiment in England. Is he right?

And only today, Mr. Denny reports from London on European sentiment:

"The public in almost all countries—Norway is an exception—is either lukewarm to rearmament or openly hostile." Can this possibly be true?

Only a few days ago you were reported as declaring, "Our allies mean business." Is that based on mere promises for future action, or have they put into effect measures which will establish such a claim?

What, if anything, have our European allies done to bring about an economic union as contemplated by the ECA program?

What concessions, if any, has this administration made to our Western European allies in the Far East?

What arrangements have been made with our allies concerning the division and allocation for civilian and military use of strategic materials?

What concessions, if any, has this administration made concerning the financing of the rearmament of Western Europe in proportion to the contributions of our allies? There seems to be no point in shuffling hand-out programs by announcing the termination of ECA on one hand and the gift of $12,000,000,000 in armaments on the other. We desperately need to know what the European nations are determined to do for themselves.

What is the maximum manpower potential of the Western European nations themselves which is available for the defense of Europe, and what proportion of that available manpower are they willing to enlist in the program?

What is the basic military defense strategy underlying the North Atlantic Pact? Does it call for the defense of anti-Soviet Europe or just for part of Western Europe?

There are other questions, Mr. President, which might bring out more of the facts with respect to our foreign policy, but those I have submitted, I believe will cover the main points now in controversy. In presenting these questions to you, I have a feeling that no revelation of defense secrets need be involved in giving the American people much needed information. You, of course, will have to be the judge as to what may properly be said.

May I submit that if anything has been done to build up European defenses, that fact should be revealed to offset the damaging statements that have been made repeatedly not only by the press, but semi-officially, that little, if anything, has been done to this date. Giving the American people the facts that substantial progress has been made, if such is the case—not theories or promises—will do more to restore the confidence of the people in our present policies with respect to our defense preparations in the Atlantic area than all the glittering promises our diplomats can make for future action.

In Scriptural language, we may say that our European allies should prove their faith by their works.

When we adopted the Atlantic Pact, it became the law and, as a loyal American, I have supported that pact as the law of my country. Even though I voted against it because reservations protecting the constitutional right of Congress to declare war were not adopted, yet it became our plan of defense and should be given every opportunity to succeed. But, with many other Americans, I have heard and read with grave misgivings reports which indicated that our Allies were actually becoming isolationists and were not making progress toward building their defenses, but were yielding to heavy public pressure that they stay out of any controversy or war which might eventually arise between us and Russia and her satellites.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I sincerely believe that with the facts in your possession which are not available to the rest of us, you may be able to clear up much of the misunderstanding which now exists. If the situation is actually better than it has been pictured, then the people ought to know it. On the other hand, if the state of affairs in Europe is as dangerous as Mr. Hoover believes it to be, the fact ought to be known and considered in our final determination of what our foreign policy should be.

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of a speech which I delivered in the Senate on December 22. It contains a more complete statement of the matters discussed in this letter.

Yours very respectfully,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 23, 1951.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Since receiving your letter of December 29, I have been undertaking the preparation of a reply containing information of the type you requested.

Events have been moving so rapidly, however, that I have come to the conclusion that the purpose of your letter will be best served by waiting a short time until General Eisenhower returns. He will have a large amount of new information which he will give the Congress soon after he reaches Washington. I think this information will do a great deal to help clarify the questions you raised.

I hope this will be agreeable to you. If you desire to discuss this matter with me, I will be glad to see you.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

TO BE ENSIGNS

Barbour C. Stokes, Jr., effective January 18, 1950.

Robert E. Williams, effective March 7, 1951.

Michael C. Fox, effective March 18, 1951.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 25 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 38 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. Harry Lynn Bolen, O185986, to date from October 26, 1950.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, O113537, to date from October 26, 1950.

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. James William Cook, O298148, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Vincent Paul Coyne, O236410, to date from August 28, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Roy Albert Green, O226513, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Naylor, O265997, to date from August 28, 1950.

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. James Aloysius Murphy, O143370, to date from June 1, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Julian Olson, O232882, to date from October 26, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Fred Calvin Tandy, O206131, to date from October 26, 1950.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADES AND CORPS SPECIFIED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.), AND PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 514, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be major

Raymond Maret, MC, O329011.

To be captains

Blanche C. Albright, ANC, N728932.
Edythe Alt, ANC, N742202.
Ida B. Ayer, ANC, N768699.
Dorothy J. Barber, ANC, N735521.
Jane T. Becker, ANC, N728047.
Grace D. Boisvert, ANC, N730776.
Dorothea V. Bowers, ANC, N721221.
Margarita E. Breton, ANC, N783005.
Mary C. Bryan, ANC, N726867.
Doyle E. Burns, DC, O1775377.
Frances E. Cale, ANC, N763747.
James D. Caskie, MC, O1705710.
Elizabeth S. Chamberlin, ANC, N757040.
Dorothy M. Chartrau, ANC, N733447.
Gertrude M. Classen, ANC, N775131.
Ethel W. Coeling, WMSC, M516.
Edward F. Counts, Jr., MC, O935617.
Gladys M. Crosno, ANC, N736195.
Myrtle A. Croswell, ANC, N771131.
Elizabeth J. Davies, WMSC, M2491.
June M. Dickie, ANC, N751533.
Mary L. Dombrosky, ANC, N723550.
Helen I. Dunne, ANC, N726819.
Ruth Edenfield, ANC, N767392.
Margaret M. Egan, ANC, N722650.
Vera A. Enquist, ANC, N736267.
Gladys M. Eppright, ANC, N779972.
Adeline C. Evans, ANC, N767057.
Mercedes M. Fischer, ANC, N732315.
Georgia I. Fleet, ANC, N723382.
Janet M. Fleming, ANC, N741892.
Lillian Fore, ANC, N779252.
Gladys O. Fowlie, ANC, N727976.
Sybil C. Freiman, ANC, N726035.
Edith F. Frew, ANC, N742165.
Mary H. Gayle, ANC, N736305.
Rita M. Geis, ANC, N732135.
Beatrice Goldberger, WMSC, R1331.
Mary M. Grant, ANC, N745086.
Mabel Hammarlund, ANC, N733333.
Elizabeth T. Hanna, ANC, N727354.
Ebba V. Hanson, ANC, N787479.
Levenia E. Hill, ANC, N764708.
Alice E. Holland, ANC, N723789.
Edith E. Hopkins, WMSC, R2222.
George W. Houck, MC, O1725757.
M. Marguerite Huff, ANC, N724643.
Helen F. Kay, ANC, N743771.
Marie Kimmet, ANC, N736074.
Nancy B. Kinsey, ANC, N724922.
Mary S. Kollner, ANC, N744834.
Olga R. Kugler, ANC, N756911.
Janie L. Lassiter, ANC, N763875.
Marguerite M. Lavin, ANC, N759550.
Mary S. Lawrence, WMSC, M601.
Margaret L. Loucks, ANC, N723105.
Martha C. McLaughlin, ANC, N743335.
Florence C. Malone, ANC, N720370.
Maria L. Marshall, ANC, N728687.
Dorothy C. Martone, ANC, N759391.
Beulah L. Marwine, ANC, N745567.
Margaret E. Megill, ANC, N724008.
Hubert W. Merchant, DC, O487380.
Mary C. Morris, ANC, N744161.
Clara R. Oberg, ANC, N730086.
Marie A. Oswald, ANC, N779052.
Floyce Parham, ANC, N775813.
Sylvia R. Pavlovich, ANC, N741620.
Loucelle E. Peck, ANC, N758550.
Alice E. Pettengill, ANC, N721998.
Ollie W. Plunkett, ANC, N745327.
Mary M. Preston, ANC, N763725.
Eleanor R. Reimers, WMSC, R1087.
Mary E. Riley, ANC, N772827.
Sophia D. Sedor, ANC, N761695.
Geraldine S. Smith, ANC, N724120.
Thelma I. Sooman, ANC, N783778.
Barbara C. Sox, ANC, N727839.
Ruth M. Steenburgh, ANC, N756235.
Alice E. Still, ANC, N742943.
Ida R. Strickland, WMSC, R408.
Ruth M. Stroemer, ANC, N772941.
Mary A. Taney, ANC, N755309.
Elizabeth P. Taylor, ANC, N728297.
Gladys A. Theiss, ANC, N736098.
Jeanne M. Treacy, ANC, N724830.
Celestia H. Uftring, ANC, N767068.
Fanny Urette, ANC, N730574.
Eileen M. Waite, ANC, N737274.
Nellie E. Walls, ANC, N759333.
Gladys M. Welch, ANC, N731925.
Margaret H. Wheeler, ANC, N774699.
Mary E. White, ANC, N752315.
Althea E. Williams, ANC, N733494.
Miriam E. Young, ANC, N733473.

To be first lieutenants

Mayna R. Allen, ANC, N776564.
Eugene J. Bell, Jr., JAGC, O989155.
Angela R. Benda, ANC, N784722.
Eugene F. Chandler, MC, O976732.
Betty P. Chellman, WMSC, R2293.
Edwin T. Cooke, MC, O984778.
Alyce-Marie C. Cushnie, ANC, N793733.
Virginia L. Jones, WMSC, R1394.
Robert L. Massonneau, MC, O975718.
Dorothy J. Matheson, ANC, N785581.
Patricia T. Murphy, ANC, N752652.
Marjorie K. Neuman, ANC, N797941.
Joseph P. O'Leary, DC, O980923.
Edwin M. Schmidt, JAGC, O989985.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS), SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

Marion C. Allbright, O1179758.
Raymond H. Beaty, O2021091.
Ian K. Burgess, O2203170.
Edwin D. Chavous, O2205567.
Jack R. Clawson, O978547.
Harry H. Collier, O2203917.
Carroll C. Davis, O2202355.
Eley P. Denson, Jr., O2211054.
Thomas J. Dilbeck, O967483.
Earl D. Downing, O2207320.
Robert C. Ebersberger, O966933.
Robert C. Effinger, Jr., O2204907.
Elmer D. Gates, O2201156.
Angelo Giambusso, AO12799.
James C. Griffith, A2207065.
Robert L. Harper, O2704789.
Gerald G. Hennis, O2202952.
William J. Hoar, O2200449.
Ernest P. Hoff, Jr., O971161.
Edward B. Kenney, O2205222.
Richard D. Kolter, O973381.
Keith E. Larsen, O2210833.
John F. Prendiville, Jr.
Albert E. Riley.
Hansel Y. Smith, Jr., O2209902.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Peggy Sappington, N805037.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All medical officers nominated for promotion have been found professionally qualified for promotion as required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Ellenbogen, Edward, 18771A.
Rogers, Vernon Otto, 18770A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Anderson, Robert Seymour, 15199A.
Andrews, George Allen, 15103A.
Antosz, Leo Joseph, 15197A.
Bales, Glenn Edward, 15055A.
Bartek, Joe John, 15211A.
Barth, John Craig, 15152A.
Bathurst, John Forrest, 15144A.
Blunk, John Robert, 15066A.
Borbe, Alfred Thomas, 15050A.
Brazelton, Leslie Felix, 15214A.
Brock, Arthur Wellington, 15173A.
Brown, Bernard Leon, 15081A.
Brown, Henry William, 15225A.
Bryan, Warren Leroy, 15109A.
Burke, John Thomas, 15181A.
Butler, Ralph Joseph, 15142A.
Campbell, Glenn Vincent, 15070A.
Carlstrom, Robert Donald, 15098A.
Cavanaugh, Charles Elmer, Jr., 15200A.
×Chafin, James Troy, Jr., 15113A.
Chauret, Colin Joseph Nicholas, 15218A.
Chmura, Edward, 15077A.
×Cismowski, Aloysius Michael, 15106A.
Clark, Frederick A., 15189A.
Coleman, Fred, 15119A.
Conway, Jack Melvin, 15124A.
Corbin, Zane Edwin, 15082A.
Cox, Harold Donavon, 15068A.
Daffern, Troey, 15048A.
Dankof, Karl Elson, 15171A.
Deschamps, Elzeard John, 15216A.
×Di Labbio, Paul, 15047A.
Dix, Roy Arthur, 15111A.
Doering, Edward Wayne, 15118A.
Douglas, Logan Albert, 15227A.
Downey, Richard Forrest, 15190A.
Drake, William Henry, 15219A.
Edens, Billy Gene, 15209A.
Eggleston, John Waller, 15169A.
Elrod, John Hale, 15187A.
England, John Brooke, 15188A.
Englebretson, Robert Edward, 15088A.
Erickson, Arnold Theadore, 15215A.
Fairbank, Charles Edward, 15059A.
Falkenberg, Harold Stanton, 15083A.
Fisher, Harrison Lee, 15148A.
Fisher, Robert Jeremy, 15166A.
Fox, Bob Duane, 15058A.
French, George Holmes, 15201A.
×Frost, Douglas Hugh, 15194A.
Frost, Jack Junior, 15150A.
Garrison, Keith M., 15180A.
Gibson, John Raymond, 15122A.
Glasgow, Thurman Arnold, 15080A.
×Goldblum, Theodore, 15174A.
Graham, Harold Bruce, 15183A
Graham, Neil James, 15052A.
Hall, Marvin Russell, 15163A.
Hanlen, John Wayne, 15195A.
Hardy, Nathan Chester, 15069A.
Hargis, Horrace Peyton, 15139A.
×Hartman, Richard John, 15056A.
Harvey, Theodore Richard, 15204A.
Hasselbaum, Roth Oscar, 15196A.
Heller, Richard Frederick, Jr., 15089A.
Higgins, Richard William, 15153A.
×Hilburn, John E., 15213A.
×Hinkle, Arthur Lee, 15061A.
Hobbs, Robert Alan, 15206A.
Hoyl, Basil Landon, 15154A.
Hunt, Hollis Hubert, 15133A.
×Hunt, Raymond Dale, 15051A.
Hurley, Raymond Leo, 15054A.
×Hurrle, Robert Paige, 15138A.
Hurst, Eugene Edward, 15170A.
Iannacito, George James, 15101A.
Jensen, Loyd Eugene, 15074A.
×Johnson, Haddon, Jr., 15100A.
×Jones, Paul Daniel, 15146A.
×Keppler, Elmer Charles, 15158A.
Kerr, Teddy Junior, 15179A.
Lane, Harry Wesley, 15096A.
Laster, Tom Garrison, 15110A.
Leone, Joseph Michele, 15102A.
Lindsey, Wilbur Ross, Jr., 15071A.
Lozito, Francis Carmel, 15065A.
Mabrey, Thomas Franklin, 15063A.
Madara, George Leonard, Jr., 15202A.
Madsen, Lawrence Edwards, 15092A.
Maloney, Robert Alphonse, 15078A.
Martin, Walter Don, 15108A.
Martin, Warren Harry, 15210A.
Matthews, Albert McKay, 15131A.
Mattick, Stephen, 15049A.
McCulloch, Donald Edward, 15151A.
McDaniel, Henry Bailey, Jr., 15105A.
McGill, Allen Keith, 15175A.
McKee, Donald Eugene, 15149A.
McKee, William Vincent, 15172A.
Meintsma, Seward Mortimer, 15127A.
Melton, Ramon Reeves, 15086A.
Miller, Francis Leo, 15128A.
Mitchell, Frank Grover, Jr., 15177A.
Moore, Robert Edward, 15126A.
Morrow, Craig Godfrey, 15094A.
Morrow, Russell Ellis, 15168A.
Moser, Fred A., Jr., 15141A.
Mullins, George Herbert, 15067A.
Myers, Thomas Ellis, 15136A.
Neuharth, Richard Emanuel, 15182A.
Nevill, Rex Ferrall, 15162A.
×Noll, John Roger, 15134A.
Nourie, Robert Baron, 15114A.
Ochs, Robert Glen, 15229A.
O'Grady, Joe Milton, 15164A.
Parks, Joseph Wayne, Jr., 15212A.
Pensinger, Wilbur Carl, 15167A.
Peters, Marvin Leroy Wells, 15057A.
Plummer, John Augustine, 15087A.
Poindexter, Walter Edwin, 15205A.
Popham, Jack Edward, 15097A.
Preston, William Nathanial, 15076A.
Rattie, Joseph Jackson, 15090A.
×Rayner, Clyde Frederick, 15159A.
Regis, Edward Robert, 15223A.
Robinson, Lester William, 15075A.
Rodriguez, Miguel Ramon, Jr., 15120A.
Rohr, Charles Edmond, 15117A.
Rose, Eugene Simon, Jr., 15060A.
Rose, Franklin, Jr., 15224A.
Savage, Thomas Potter, 15208A.
Scheider, Rube Frank, Jr., 15185A.
Sewell, Jack Kennard, 15130A.
Sharp, William Carmen, 15160A.
Sittler, Lloyd Wayne, 15178A.
Smith, Bernard Cyril, 15112A.
Smith, Douglas Ray, 15186A.
Smith, Robert Ritchie, 15191A.
Sorensen, Glenn Kenneth, 15132A.
Sparkman, Donald Herrick, 15165A.
Stewart, William Henry, 15123A.
Stout, Carl Edward, 15221A.
Stringer, Thomas Henry, 15135A.
Stuempfle, Robert Alan, 15125A.
Svimonoff, Constantine, 15072A.
Swaim, Thomas Stephen, 15203A.
Swigler, Adam William, Jr., 15099A.
×Taylor, Robert Guilford, 15116A.
Tench, William Cabell, 15115A.
Thomas, Lyle Scott, 15121A.
Thomas, Richard Jay, 15147A.
Thompson, Lyle William, 15228A.
Thorne, Richard Eugene, 15079A.
Torgesen, Elmer, 15107A.
Upton, Julian Bernard, 15064A.
Upton, Thomas Jefferson, 15053A.
Van Camp, Lawrence Fisher, 15155A.
Vickery, William Wilson, 15073A.
Voss, Robert Henry, 15129A.
Walker, George Thomas, 15161A.
Wallace, Jamie Walker, Jr., 15207A.
Warmack, Charles William, 15140A.
Waterhouse, William Carson, 15104A.
White, Alan Ralph, 15085A.
Wienberg, Harold Frank, 15220A.
Wilhelmi, William Henry, 15095A.
Willoughby, Albert Milton, Jr., 15156A.
Wilson, Edward Spaulding, 15217A.
Wilson, Thomas Lee, 15143A.
Winn, Earl Hardy, 15157A.
Wise, Henry Grady, Jr., 15084A.
Wright, Tandy Allison, 15222A.
Young, Herbert Lee, 15137A.

MEDICAL

Foley, Francis Edward, 19543A.
Hamilton, Charles Irving, Jr., 19558A.
Leavel, Boude Bowman, 19542A.
Payne, John William, 19544A.
Thornton, Nathaniel Albert, 19583A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Goings, Charles Edward, Jr., 19522A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Adams, Gordon Sackett, 18186A.
Adcock, James Kenneth, 20589A.
Ahrens, George Leo, 17732A.
Alexander, Ernest Lee, 18143A.
Allison, Thomas I., 17713A.
Anderson, Charles Keller, 20616A.
Anderson, George Olaf, 18184A.
Anderson, Hunter Wilson, 17737A.
Anderson, Jack Garner, 18188A.
Avise, Herbert Jack, 18114A.
Aust, Abner Maurice, Jr., 20631A.
Ayres, Frank Lawrence, 18173A.
Baker, Marshall Erbie, 20675A.
Baker, Wilson Kirby, Jr., 17740A.
Baldwin, Richard Allen, 18262A.
Barns, William Frederick, 20630A.
Barry, Russell John, 20656A.
Barter, John Wallace, 18208A.
Bass, Robert Albert, 20632A.
Baumann, Robert Price, Jr., 18203A.
Becker, Bertram David, 17971A.
Beisner, Gerald Jean, 18251A.
Bell, Robert Malcolm, 18145A.
Bennett, George Alfred, 18154A.
Beno, William George, 18205A.
Bieber, Robert Warren, 17739A.
Blanton, Franklin Dickinson, 21458A.
Blodgett, Henry Parson, Jr., 18214A.
Blount, Buford Charles, 17699A.
Bobbitt, Aubrey Malcolm, 20644A.
Bohannon, James Raymond, Jr., 18146A.
Boone, Warren Wallace, 17708A.
Borders, Charles Wesley, 18149A.
Bostick, Arthur Worth, 18239A.
Boswell, Marion Lillard, 17719A.
Bowman, Ralph Irving, Jr., 18209A.
Boyle, William Fredrick, 17729A.
Bray, Leslie William, Jr., 18136A.
Brennan, Joseph Xavier, 17728A.
Brinson, William Leslie, 18117A.
Brisley, Bernard Anthony, 18265A.
Brown, Jack Riley, 20599A.
Brownfield, Paul Wehrle, 20597A.
Brumm, Robert Ellsworth, 17717A.
Burkhart, James Murrell, 18230A.
Burnett, Elvin Earl, 20601A.
Burns, Robert Bernard, 17727A.
Bush, Frederick Eugene, 20643A.
Busha, George Francis, 20628A.
Byrn, John Stanford, 18196A.
Canning, Douglas Strickland, 20577A.
Chapman, John Monroe, Jr., 17700A.
Clark, Earl Otis, Jr., 20682A.
Clements, Ben Hill, Jr., 17733A.
Clifton, Leecroy, 20650A.
Collington, Frederick, 20663A.
Collings, Perry Velmont, 18156A.
Cook, William, Jr., 18257A.

Cooney, Jack Bernard, 20657A.
Cooper, Dewey Glenn, 18260A.
Craig, Robert Peter, 20649A.
Crosby, Samuel Eugene, Jr., 20612A.
Crowley, John McBride, 18217A.
Crowther, Frederick Earl, 18221A.
Cude, Willis Augustus, Jr., 21463A.
Cummins, James Dirickson, Jr., 20618A.
Curry, Ralph Jack, 18245A.
Davis, Bruce, 18120A.
De Gennaro, Carlo Nicola, 20570A.
Doe, Irving Chester, 18155A.
Doiron, Claude Joseph, Jr., 20596A.
Donegan, Charles Edward, 18283A.
Doran, Patrick Leo, 18207A.
Dotson, Herbert Forrest, Jr., 20587A.
DuFault, William Francis, 20680A.
DuMontier, Louis Devine, 18171A.
Eagle, Comly Joel, 18115A.
Eberhardt, Donald Elwin, 18182A.
Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.
Eckmann, Frederick Charles, 17718A.
Elliott, Donald Ancil, 20636A.
Elizey, J. Murray, 18204A.
Ernst, William Joseph, 20609A.
Escue, Walter Harbin, 17702A.
Eubank, Graydon Knox, 18132A.
Fahrney, Richard Lee, 18191A.
Farnsworth, Al W., 18229A.
Farr, John Wesley, 20660A.
Foote, Richard Harold, 18219A.
Fowler, Oscar Frank, 20583A.
Fraser, Paul Victor, 20654A.
Frazier, Max Eugene, 21456A.
Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.
Gallagher, Rial Frederick, 20621A.
Geary, James Eugene, 17701A.
Gentzler, Robert Francis, 20678A.
Gilpin, Harry Duncan, 18124A.
Gleaves, Donald Heavner, 18282A.
Glines, Carroll Vane, Jr., 20579A.
Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
Goppert, Jean Glen, 18167A.
Gourley, Edwin Parker, 18181A.
Gray, Donald Underwood, Jr., 18223A.
Green, Norman Morgan, 18237A.
Greene, Sidney, 20658A.
Greenamyre, Vernie Baird, 18140A.
Gregory, Willie Preston, 18236A.
Griffard, Robert Marcel, 18264A.
Gruber, Kenneth Willis, 20623A.
Haggard, Richard Lowell, 17725A.
Hall, Benny Bob, 18272A.
Hall, Harvey Preston, 20674A.
Hamilton, Calvin Lee, 18139A.
Hanigan, Edward James, Jr., 18222A.
Hansen, Robert Paul, 18159A.
Hanton, John Thomas, 18138A.
Hawes, Warren Harding, 18160A.
Haynes, Clarence Gilbert, 20653A.
Henry, David Watters, Jr., 20590A.
Henry, Mervin Lester, 20604A.
Herrera, Alfred Charles, 20608A.
Hicks, Malcolm Glenn, 18185A.
Hill, Marcus Lee, Jr., 20622A.
Hinerman, Maurice Elwyn, 18218A.
Hink, Harry Devere, 17710A.
Hochstetler, George Edward, 18216A.
Hoffman, Charles Addison, Jr., 18244A.
Holt, Garland Edward, 20607A.
Horn, Robert Paul, 17743A.
Houghtby, James Kenneth, 18240A.
Howes, Lewis Langdon, Jr., 18220A.
Humphries, Buford Milton, 18175A.
Hurlburt, Dana Follett, 18119A.
Hurst, Guy, Jr., 18243A.
Hutchinson, Paul Eugene, 18158A.
Jensen, Lloyd Kenneth, 20624A.
Jensen, Sigurd Lars, Jr., 20651A.
Jewell, Malcolm Eugene, 20588A.
Johanson, Alvin Lars Anton, 18248A.
Johnson, Clarence LaVerne, 18213A.
Johnson, George Alvin, 20672A.
Jones, David Boone, 18183A.
Jones, Donald Alfred, 18157A.
Jones, Richard Ernest, 18170A.
Jones, William Monroe, 20641A.
Kane, Richard Weidner, 17711A.
Kar, Edward George, 18252A.
Kelly, James Wyatt, 21462A.
Kemerling, William Earl, 21460A.
Kennedy, Dean Lewis, 18235A.
Kent, Joseph Francis, Jr., 17724A.
Kenyon, Benjamin Clarence, Jr., 18215A.
Kenyon, Donald Edward, 18268A.
Kester, Clifford Daniel, 18163A.
King, Edwin Vernon, 20585A.
Kirschman, Iran Paul, 18258A.
Kohrman, Elwood Netherton, 20602A.
Latta, Arthur W., 18273A.
Lauterbach, Harris Young, 18256A.
Lawson, Francis Robert, 20606A.
Lewis, Oliver Wendell, 18227A.
Light, Herbert Myron, 18128A.
Lineham, Thomas Uriah, Jr., 18112A.
Little, David Lee, 18253A.
Littlewood, Theodore Peterson, 20642A.
Lloyd, Glenn Howard, 18226A.
Lockhart, George Andrew, Jr., 20594A.
Locklear, James Quinton, 18133A.
Loman, William Thomas, Jr., 20669A.
Long, Paul Henry, 20635A.
Long, Robert Francis, 18142A.
Lopez, Donald Sewell, 18164A.
Luber, Vernon Norton, 18127A.
Lunos, Austin Edward, 20645A.
Magill, Francis William, 20652A.
Maher, Thomas Joseph, 20655A.
Malloy, William James, 18197A.
Mandina, Sidney Reginald I., 18125A.
Marshall, Sidney Currier, 18206A.
Martin, Eugene, Jr., 18233A.
McAnally, Paul Edward, 20581A.
McBride, Hugh Walker, 17736A.
McCleary, George Carlton, 17735A.
McCully, Robert Humes, 18274A.
McGaughey, Donald Keith, 20662A.
McGowan, Samuel Benjamin, 20572A.
McKay, Allen Fraser, 20613A.
McMinis, Jonathan Burns, 18249A.
McNeil, Edwin Evan, 18192A.
Melton, Carl Mudgett, 18190A.
Melucas, Paul Joseph, 20640A.
Melvin, Robert Elwood, 18193A.
Meredith, Jim Tom, 17706A.
Merino, Robert Francis, 18224A.
Mertely, Frank, 18201A.
Miller, Edgar Cornelius, 20614A.
Miller, John William, 18198A.
Miller, Sidney Harry, 21459A.
Mills, Arthur Julius, 18180A.
Mills, James Edward, Jr., 18281A.
Moehle, Charles Fred, 18131A.
Moir, James Ferriss, 17712A.
Monaco, Anthony William, Jr., 20605A.
Montgomery, Bill Alexander, 17705A.
Montgomery, Joe Sheldon, 20633A.
Moore, Jack Kenneth, 18135A.
Moore, James Conway, Jr., 20664A.
Moore, Richard Raymond, 19795A.
Moore, Winston Eugene, 17722A.
Morton, Walter Pickney, Jr., 18129A.
Mullan, Alfred William, Jr., 17709A.
Munns, Orlin Charles, 18199A.
Myers, Andrew Jackson, Jr., 20769A.
Nanney, James Thomas, 18177A.
Neville, Harry Walter, 17704A.
Newgarden, George Joseph, 3d, 20591A.
Newton, Frederick Carter, 18228A.
Niemczyk, Julian Martin, 20671A.
Nole, Jack Dean, 20598A.
O'Donnell, William Joseph, 20574A.
O'Halloran, Christopher John, 18259A.
Olivera-Barroso, Manuel, 17744A.
Orillion, Arthur Joseph, Jr., 20593A.
Paige, Carl Addison, 18241A.
Payant, Peter, 18232A.
Pedersen, Stanley Cartwright, 20617A.
Pendergraft, Wesley Lael, 18242A.
Penick, Everett Smith, Jr., 18234A.
Perry, James Wallace, 20673A.
Perry, Roland Archibald, 18231A.
Peters, Francis David, Jr., 18137A.
Peters, Warren Edmund, 18276A.
Peterson, Harry William, 18275A.
Pettitt, Bert Edward, Jr., 17698A.
Phillips, Thomas Roland, Jr., 18266A.
Phillips, Lowell Gene, 18050A.
Pierce, Russell Kurtz, Jr., 18118A.
Potter, Edward Mac, Jr., 17716A.
Prager, Arthur, 20681A.
Prager, John William, 20586A.
Preller, Gordon Charles, 18144A.
Price, Robert Harold, 20571A.
Purcell, Richard McKnight, 18267A.
Radcliffe, John Bilton, Jr., 20667A.
Raley, Theodore, Maxwell, 18200A.
Randall, Richard Clary, 18212A.
Raphun, Leland Richards, 18130A.
Rath, Leland John, 20620A.
Rea, Thomas Samuel, 17707A.
Reeder, William Dean, 18161A.
Reid, Milton Morgan, 20647A.
Reisner, Horace Jackson, 18271A.
Rementer, William John, Jr., 18250A.
Reuteler, Bruce Ervin, 18168A.
Riley, Eldon Stanley, 17703A.
Ristau, Siegfried Edward, 18169A.
Roderick, Jack Victor, 18122A.
Rogers, Dan Terrance, 20665A.
Rosenberg, Leslie Benjamin, 18210A.
Rotstan, Robert, 17723A.
Rutherford, Richard Thomas, 18134A.
Salyards, John Albert, Jr., 18279A.
Sandvig, Kenneth Leslie, 20595A.
Sanna, Francis Patsy, 18148A.
Saylor, Warren Daniel, 20637A.
Scarpero, William John, 20677A.
Schmidt, George Robert, 18202A.
Schmidt, Howard Richard, 18123A.
Schoeffler, Clifford, 18179A.
Schuering, Alvin George, 18166A.
Scroggin, Orville Oliver, 3d, 17738A.
Schwaller, Charles Dale, 17731A.
Schwaner, Charles Fred, 17714A.
Selbie, Frederick Donald, Jr., 18225A.
Sever, James Edward, 20592A.
Sharp, Stuart Mayer, 20629A.
Shawhan, Zac George, 20576A.
Sheperd, Olen Dean, 20619A.
Shewan, Clifford Wayne, 18150A.
Shusta, Chester Joseph, 21461A.
Simpson, Russell Reavely, 19565A.
Singer, Solomon Elias, 20666A.
Sinnett, Jefferson David, 18269A.
Slade, William Arthur, 20573A.
Smith, Bennie Cozzens, 18141A.
Smith, Clark Bridgland, 17730A.
Smith, J. B., 20638A.
Smith, Mart Gary, Jr., 17976A.
Smith, Maurice Hunter, 18172A.
Snyder, George Francis, 18153A.
Son, Herman Franklin, 17734A.
Spencer, Jack, 20661A.
Spencer, Loren James, 18255A.
Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.
Springer, Paul Richard, 17715A.
Staples, Johnston Raleigh, 20578A.
Stephenson, Wayne Louis, 18238A.
Stevens, Jack Duane, 20679A.
Stevens, Wendelle Castyle, 18195A.
Stewart, Walter Claiborne, Jr., 20639A.
Stone, James Samuel, 18247A.
Stroff, Michael John, Jr., 20648A.
Sturm, Wilmer Ross, 20676A.
Suttie, James, 20646A.
Talbot, George Edward, 18126A.
Taylor, Charles Kersey, Jr., 18113A.
Taylor, Jay Johnson, 20580A.
Taylor, Joseph Thomas, 20611A.
Theus, Lucius, 18270A.
Thomas, Alan Brainerd, 17721A.
Thompson, George Willard, 17726A.
Titus, Frank Alvin, 17741A.
Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.
Trammell, Andrew Jack, 17720A.
Traylor, Horace Cleveland, Jr., 18165A.
Urquhart, Charles Thomas, Jr., 20584A.
Urquhart, Roland Leslie, Jr., 18162A.
Van Bloom, Jay Clark, 18147A.
Vega, John William, 18280A.
Vincent, Robert Wilson, 20575A.
Vogler, Alfred Fritz, 20670A.
Volet, Leonard, 18174A.
Voris, George Arthur, 17968A.
Warner, Walter Eugene, 20610A.
Watkins, Marvin Maurice, 17742A.
Weeks, Roy Franklyn, Jr., 18189A.
Welsh, Stephen Jackson, 20634A.
Wendt, Willard Arthur, 20625A.
Werber, William Alexander, 18178A.
White, Boyd Barnard, 20626A.
Wilborn, William Thomas, 18194A.
Williams, James Coleman, 18261A.
Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.
Williams, Wilson Byron, 20668A.

Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.
Wilson, Richard Stanley, 18121A.
Winfree, Douglas Woodson, Jr., 18278A.
Winner, Donald Carlton, 17973A.
Wolfe, Charles Spurgeon, 18176A.
Woolf, Simpson Molen, 20569A.
Yeager, Paul Meryald, 18116A.
Yusievicz, John Joseph, 20582A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Allinson, John Nils, 21626A.
Beck, William Stanislaus, 21612A.
Cook, Raymond John, 21610A.
Garner, Walter Frank, 21609A.
Herrin, Daniel Monroe, Jr., 21620A.
Holihan, Francis Leonard, 21607A.
Johnson, John Alfred, 21611A.
Little, Herman Ivy, 21616A.
Marolf, Kenneth Loyd, 21613A.
Nicely, Harry Benson, Jr., 21622A.
Roftis, Robert Jesse, 21623A.
Ruffing, Donald Joseph, 21621A.
Schult, Harold George, 21617A.
Smyth, Kenneth E., 21619A.
Weller, William Edger, 21618A.
Whitt, Orbin Russell, 21625A.
Winkelbiech, Donald Ray, 21624A.
Woolf, Henry McCune, 21615A.
Zellers, Billy Bob, 21614A.

The following-named officer for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. This officer is subject to physical examination required by law.

×Hetland, Mona Oline, AN1737.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of January 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Geigel, Francis Gerald, 18772A.
Montcalm, Rosario Louis Ulric, 18773A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Abbott, Charles Whitney, 15243A.
Alexander, James Constantine, 15372A.
×Amundson, Ray Kenneth, 15367A.
Angelakis, Charles, 15362A.
Atkinson, Berkeley, 15329A.
Baker, William Harding, 15261A.
Bartheimess, Robert Platt, 15309A.
Baxter, James Marvin, 15301A.
Beasley, Roland Clark, 15293A.
Benham, Harold Nolan, 15249A.
Bennett, Robert Alexander, 15312A.
×Beveridge, Richard Franklin, 15352A.
Bird, Raymond Casimer, 15256A.
Blake, Earl Gifford, 15303A.
Blizzard, Alpheus Wesley, Jr., 15290A.
Bosworth, Richard Arnold, 15330A.
×Boyd, Raymond Andrew, 15295A.
Brady, James William, 15285A.
Brown, Albert James, 15246A.
Butler, John Bryon, 15308A.
Butt, Oscar Adolph, 15346A.
Cahill, Robert Joseph, 15334A.
×Caples, James Edward, 15315A.
Cardin, Philip George, 15257A.
Carlisle, Paul Leroy, 15306A.
Carter, Richard Bruce, 15363A.
Chance, James Harvey, 15355A.
Collins, Fred Alvin, Jr., 15374A.
Collins, Richard Vincent, 15380A.
Cook, Harvey Andrew, Jr., 15382A.
Croyts, Harold Simon, 15277A.
Cundiff, Jack Baker, 15269A.
Dacus, Rector Claiborne, 15258A.
Dallman, Howard Marvin, 15281A.
Danielson, James Elmer, 15323A.
Dewberry, Raymond Kenneth, 15344A.
Dingivan, Edward Arthur, 15262A.
Donohue, William Roberts, 15239A.
×Driskell, Claude Thomas, 15381A.
Duckett, Wayne George, 15265A.
Dunlap, Carl K., 15364A.
Evans, George Ollie, 15337A.
Evans, Ivor Parry, 15353A.
Farrar, George Balch, 15354A.
Fernbaugh, Richard Mathew, 15370A.
Galligar, Newton Ray, 15379A.
Gammons, David Bradley, 15297A.
George, Harry Hendrick, 15271A.
George, Rex Hall, 15242A.
Goetz, Paul Arthur, 15376A.
Goodson, John Schley, Jr., 15339A.
Grobe, Joe Bailey, 15328A.
Harris, Paul Edgar, 15278A.
Hart, Frederick Francis, 15351A.
Hartzell, James Harris, 15263A.
Hayes, Robert Ralph, 15255A.
Hearne, Alfred Carroll, 15321A.
Hesse, George Albert, Jr., 15311A.
Hight, James Russell, 15325A.
Holman, Albert Hugh, 15319A.
Howze, Stuart Alston, Jr., 15345A.
Hoza, Paul Peter, 15268A.
Hughes, Lloyd Chalmers, 15267A.
Hunt, Robert Louis, 15234A.
Hybki, Casimir Francis, Jr., 15273A.
Johnson, Milo Claude, 15241A.
Jones, John Preston, 15360A.
Joseph, Edward Bell, 15366A.
Keegan, George Joseph, Jr., 15333A.
Kielgass, Earl Lehman, 15292A.
Kinder, Richard Oscar, 15245A.
Kinkade, Otis Mansel, 15266A.
Kirschbaum, Everett Julius, 15317A.
Klibbe, Frank William, 15342A.
Knight, Lyle Franklin, 15316A.
Kocher, John Wayland, 15254A.
Kopit, Alfred Leo, 15327A.
Kunkel, William Roy, 15231A.
Lathrop, Robert Young, 15250A.
Latimore, Henry James, Jr., 15368A.
Lawrence, Willard James, 15369A.
Leonard, William Charles, Jr., 15279A.
Lester, Clarence Dewey, 15338A.
×Lollis, Clyde Washington, Jr., 15314A.
Macken, Gerald Bernard, 15291A.
×McCarthy, Peter James, Jr., 15244A.
McDonald, Bill, 15358A.
McDonald, William Allan, 15350A.
McKnight, Douglas Knox, 15365A.
Mikell, Emory Allen, 15232A.
Miller, Homer Britt, 15322A.
Mims, Hayden Pegram, 15375A.
×Montone, Neil Anthony, 15248A.
Myers, George Harvey, 15324A.
Newmeyer, Howard Walter, 15300A.
Neill, John Cleo, 15286A.
Oberg, John Joseph William, 15348A.
Ostrye, Norbert Benedict, 15299A.
Parnell, Roland Cleveland, 15313A.
Pazin, Peter, 15239A.
×Peterson, John Francis, 15356A.
Pollyea, Albert, 15275A.
Prichard, Artist Hudson, Jr., 15326A.
Provancha, Earl Deloss, 15383A.
Queen, Thomas Walter, Jr., 15335A.
Raymer, John Cecil, Jr., 15310A.
Reinert, Robert Amandus, 15270A.
Rieker, Thomas Henry, 15251A.
Rhodehamel, Wesley Richard, 15347A.
Roberts, John Wendell, 15280A.
Rodgers, John Robert, 15341A.
Roe, David Allen, 15282A.
Ruehle, John Richard, 15276A.
Sales, Robert Newton, 15294A.
Sanders, James Burton, 15235A.
Sanderson, Edward Jennings, 15274A.
Sawyer, Clyde Lenox, Jr., 15238A.
Sawyer, Russell, 15272A.
Scheller, Donald Richard, 15318A.
Schroeder, Norman Clark, 15359A.
Scott, Samuel Woodward, 15264A.
Shafer, Jonathan Karl, 15298A.
Shelton, William Edgar, 15247A.
Simeone, Harold Martin, 15373A.
Smith, Chester Allen Arthur, 15230A.
Snoden, Charles Arthur, 15361A.
Spurrier, Paul McLellan, 15305A.
Stamm, Eugene Clarence, Jr., 15302A.
Stearns, Richard Charles, 15283A.
Steere, Lowell Beall, 15340A.
Stratton, Edward Earl, 15289A.
Stormo, Virgil MacArthur, 15287A.
Swindell, Charles William, 15240A.
×Taylor, Frank Raymond, 15377A.
Terry, Charles Millard, 15378A.
Thome, Joseph Eduard, 15371A.
Tipton, Jack Ray, 15336A.
Tomlinson, William Warren, 15236A.
Townsend, James Gordon, 15260A.
Vincenzi, August, 15252A.
Ward, Walter Earl, 15259A.
Webber, John Wallace, 15331A.
Wengel, Emil Joe, 15296A.
Wheless, Ellis Joe, 15[illegible]2A.
White, Herbert Richard, 15343A.
Willets, Ray Joseph, 15349A.
Wilson, Joseph Griswold, 15284A.
Workman, John Richard, 15253A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Buchanan, Robert Sylvester, 18292A.
Gross, Kenneth Eugene, 18289A.
Jackson, Charles Wilbur, 18284A.
League, Miles Richard, 18286A.
Matte, Joseph Zannet, 20615A.
Pulley, John Hubert, Jr., 18288A.
Rigsby, Cecil Harding, 18285A.
Tanner, Theodore John, 18287A.
Terrell, Harry Evans, Jr., 18291A.
Werbeck, Donald Louis, 18290A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

AIR FORCE NURSES

Casey, Corinne, 21152W.
×Cigagna, Valarie Prima, 21083W.
Schadt, Sophia Marie, 21130W.
Visnovsky, Helen M., 21043W.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of February 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

To be rear admirals

The following-named line officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence L. C. Atkeson, Jr.	William K. Mendenhall, Jr.
John B. Pearson, Jr.	Harry D. Felt
Harry Sanders	John M. Will
William B. Ammon	Francis M. Hughes
Roland N. Smoot	Murr E. Arnold
James H. Thach, Jr.	John B. Moss
Frederick M. Trapnell	

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Batchelder
Charles H. Gillilan

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Peter J. Rahill, of Catholic University, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we thank Thee that among Thy whole earthly creation, to man alone Thou hast given an eternal soul, endowed with the wondrous faculties of intellect and will. For all mankind so blessed Thy loving mercy is entreated. Especially for our President and for the Members of this Congress do we today implore two heavenly graces. First, dear God, graciously grant to them clear understanding of the problems confronting our Nation. Then do Thou guide these men and women, our country's leaders, to choose the solutions most pleasing to Thy holy will. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 98) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives: HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota, and JAMES T. PATTERSON, Connecticut.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next and also on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader what the legislative program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no definite program for next week. As heretofore announced, on Thursday next at 10:30 a. m. there will be a meeting in the auditorium of the Library of Congress. This is not a part of the legislative program of the House but I repeat that announcement at this time for the information of the Members.

There is nothing for Monday or Tuesday. I can definitely say there will be no legislation considered on Monday.

One bill has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce relating to the monitoring of the radio, H. R. 1730, but whether or not that committee will seek and get a rule I am unable to state at this time.

So far as I know at this time, no bills will come up for consideration next week. If there are any, I will announce to the House just as soon as I possibly can. At the present time there is no definite program for next week. When extension of reciprocal trade is reported out of committee, it will be brought up as soon as possible; I hope, next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that in accordance with past custom the Republicans would like to attend some Lincoln Day dinners in the early part of February, so that I hope the gentleman will adjust his legislative program with that thought in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is the anniversary of the birthday of the late President McKinley and, of course, there are appropriate speeches made on that occasion each year. Tuesday is the anniversary of the birthday of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and speeches will be made on that day. But that is not a part of the legislative program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will arrange his program with the thought in mind that for several days before the birthday and for a few days afterward a good many Members of the House will be speaking at various Lincoln Day celebrations. The gentleman has always been very helpful in the past.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that any program of the House around that time will be consistent with circumstances confronting the Republican Members in the making of speeches. When the party represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was in control, the same consideration was given to us on Jackson Day and Jefferson Day. I will get together with the gentleman from Massachusetts and we will arrange a program that is satisfactory. Whatever program he wants we will make.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No one could ask for more.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PEOPLE—YES AND NO

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the minority and majority leaders did not ask me anything about the program for next week, but I am always willing to be helpful. I will volunteer the statement that it is possible the majority cannot give us any idea about the program for next week because they have not heard from the United Nations yet and they do not know just what to do while waiting for a canned report from General Eisenhower. That is one thing that is causing trouble with the legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good speech I am about to make. I did not write it. I am just making it.

I notice the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is present. He has not been making as many speeches in the well of the House about the situation in the Far East as he formerly did. I think he knows as much about that situation as any other Member of the House, and many have been hoping he would give us the benefit of his views.

This is the speech. Listen, please.

Today one question haunts the sleep of most of the people of the United States. It concerns our foreign policy.

Past, present, and future foreign policy has been debated on the radio and by the press. It has been the subject of addresses by such men as Dewey, Hoover, Dulles, Taft, and Stassen. Foreign policy and its effect on our way of life is the current topic of conversation in country stores, barrooms, barber shops, pool halls, homes, churches, and every place where men and women gather. Most every housewife, taxi driver, school teacher, and professional man has an opinion and does not hesitate to express it. At a school meeting we should get out of Korea, in the barber shop we should build a huge Navy, at the Elks, we should arm the Chinese Nationalists and hang onto Formosa, at the bridge table we should bomb the Manchurian industrial cities, at the courthouse we should withdraw from Europe. So it goes—different opinions from different people.

From these discussions, however, we get the impression that the people are more afraid of the mistakes that Truman and Acheson may make than they are of Communist aggression. A majority of the people are not stubborn, they realize that they are not in a position to make decisions and are willing to abide by the decisions of responsible, sincere, loyal, and intelligent men. In their present temper, however, they will not unite behind a foolish man stubbornly following a foolish policy. Universally, the people do not care where they have to fight, but they do not desire to fight needlessly or foolishly. The people are willing to make total sacrifice if necessary to preserve this country, but they have no desire to waste their lives and property in a vain attempt to create or preserve freedom for others who have not the inclination to do so.

The people also have no desire to make sacrifices to preserve the United Nations. They are opposed to the idea that our men must serve as United Nations policemen. The citizens of this Nation are not in the mood to be committed to a continuation of a foolish policy to save a political face or to satisfy a stubborn character.

The people recognize the Communist threat, they are mentally and morally prepared to meet this threat upon any battleground selected by a responsible, sincere, intelligent leader, devoted to his country.

The people are prepared to pay huge taxes to support an adequate military force. They are unwilling to pay huge taxes to promote socialism in this country.

Mr. Truman, as evidenced by his refusal to remove Mr. Acheson, by his re-

fusal to give authority to General MacArthur necessary to protect our Army in Korea, by his persistence in wasting billions of the taxpayers' money upon social schemes now termed defense measures, by his determination to sacrifice men in Europe regardless of Europe's determination to save itself, by his continued acceptance of UN policy to appease Red China, evidently has lost contact with the people.

The Presidential ear is not bent to the ground. The Presidential head is soaring in the clouds, while the Presidential mind is dreaming of the presidency of a united world.

It would be good for the country and for Mr. Truman, if he took a taxi, to the barber shop, stopped at the local Elks club for a drink, went to church, played a game of bridge and listened to what the people had to say.

If he did, he would return to his office a deflated but wiser man.

That is the end of what I say is a good speech. That speech was written by a young man way out in Michigan. I will say to my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], that we have some good men in Michigan who want none of UN, who are weary of fighting other nations' wars, just as he has down in Mississippi, and they think as seriously about these matters as does he or his people. This young man who wrote this speech which I just made, served 2 years and 8 months in the armed services in the Second World War. When he enlisted, he had two boys, a wife, and a business. He enlisted. He was not subject to draft. When I asked him, "What are you enlisting for?" he said, "I do not want my boys to fight the Japs some day in the future; I want to keep them out of war." Now, what he is worrying about is that notwithstanding his service, and he was lucky, those boys are almost certain to go. He just realizes, as do a few million others, that all of his service and that all those who served to a much greater extent did not do anyone any lasting good. That neither World War I nor World War II ended war or gave freedom to all.

Most seriously, my colleagues, is it not about time that somebody here in the House who is competent, who knows about war like my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH], who served in the other war and who had command of a part of an army, who knows Germany like most of us know our own back yards—and we have another gentleman, an officer, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], who served with the Marines—is it not about time that they—and I am told there are some 225 or 250 veterans in this House who have some first-hand information who know more about the actual fighting than the rest of us, should tell us and tell the country how to get us out of this war before a million of our men are killed. This war will wreck us, there is no question about that. You all know that as well or far better than I do. It is one thing to fight for your country—it is something else to be used as a cat's paw by another nation to fall sucker into Stalin's trap.

Oh, yes, I almost forgot that speech was just an editorial written by Leo W. Hoffman, printed in the Allegan Gazette, my home-town paper.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SOURCE FROM WHICH FUNDS CAN BE OBTAINED TO BALANCE THE BUDGET—GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the subject I am going to discuss is how we can meet the budget which the President of the United States submitted to the Congress only a few days ago. I am going to deal with the question of average wage levels, average price levels, national income, and credit extension, as they relate to this subject. You may be able to get a few drops of comfort out of what I have to say, because I am not selling the United States short yet.

I shall give credit to Mr. Carl Wilken, who has spent many years here on the Hill analyzing economic conditions and forces and consequences, who has collaborated with me in this statement, and I have worked with him.

I have also a brief statistical summary presented by Paul Peters, who has also been here on the Hill for a number of years.

The basis of all the remarks I am going to make is found in the economic report recently submitted by the President of the United States through the Advisory Council headed by Mr. Keyserling.

In the field of production of goods, whether primary, basic raw materials or manufactured materials, we have such a thing as wage levels. As hourly wages advance, cost goes up, as a general rule.

Only a few years ago in 1929 the hourly wage was 56.6 cents per hour. In December, in the last quarter of 1950, it was $1.51 per hour, or an increase of approximately 167 or 168 percent in the hourly wage between 1929 and 1950.

That means the selling price had to increase if you were to stay on a profitable basis so that the articles could be produced and the income be taxed and the tax money put into the tax box. In 1929 with the average wage figure which I gave and with that big increase, we have reason to assume that these costs are higher now and that the higher prices are justified. In 1929 the prices of all commodities, the BLS wholesale index, was 95.3 as related to 100 for 1926. In December 1950 the wholesale price index was 174.5, or an increase of approximately 100 percent. The comparison of the hourly wage as to the price level in 1929 and December 1950 shows an increase of 33½ percent of buying power of an hour of work and that is really what counts—what can you buy with the work that you perform?

Thus the increase in our standard of living includes the increase in the per hour production.

Let us take our national income for a moment. In 1939 the national income was $72,500,000,000. In 1948 it had jumped to $223,500,000,000. In the last quarter of 1950 it was knocking along at the rate of $254,000,000,000 per annum. I am talking about the national income in those periods.

As to the price level in 1939, it was 77 percent of what it was in 1926; in 1948 it was 165 percent of what it was in 1926, and in the last quarter of 1950 it was 174 percent of what it was in 1926.

What was your labor income? In 1939 it was $45,700,000,000. In 1948 it was $134,000,000,000, and in the last quarter of 1950 it was knocking along at $155,900,000,000 for wages for people who were on the payrolls.

If you want to break this thing down over the period of years you will find that total wage income runs about 62 percent of the national income. There is a constant there that you can depend on and that is 62 percent of the national income.

How many workers do we have today? Well, we are talking about having 65,000,000 people on the payroll within a few months. If this war situation develops as we are now planning in every way that I know of that we can plan, we should have around 67,000,000 payrollees. If we keep the price level the way it is at the present time those 65 to 67 million payrollees, if they will work, with our present productive facilities, should turn out a volume of goods, which multiplied by this present price level will give us a national income of not less than $360,000,000,000 a year—let us say in 1952.

Take 60 percent of that and see what your wage income is—your spendable income of the workers. That gets into big money in any man's language. Take 16 percent of that $360,000,000,000 for Federal taxes and see how many dollars you put into the tax box as compared with 17 percent at the rate you paid last year, and figure out if you can how much the additional contribution to the tax box is hurting you, if it is hurting you at all.

In other words, if you want to buy an automobile or a washing machine or a sewing machine and do not have the money to pay for it, and you do not want to go in debt, then get out somewhere and go to work and earn the money to buy a washing machine or automobile or sewing machine. If you want a $72,000,000,000 budget in peacetime, and you do not have the money to pay for it, get out and go to work and make the money, by producing the goods and selling those goods, and putting the money in the tax box that you need to cover the budget. That is the sound way to do it. Do not sit around on your soft seats and pray to God to pay the bills for you.

So my flat, cold-blooded proposition is, that if we want to, we can meet the $72,000,000,000 budget which has been submitted to us and cover every dollar of it into the tax box from the production that we can produce with our present employees and our present productive facilities if we will get on the job and produce the goods.

Do not understand me at all to be advocating a $72,000,000,000 budget, if that $72,000,000,000 budget is even $100,000 more than it should be. I do not have any patience or any respect for anyone who wastes things economically. I do not care who he is or who she is, especially in a crisis such as we now face.

I am going back to some more figures. Of the 60,000,000 civilian employees which we have had in recent months there are about 10,000,000 engaged in business operations. About 50,000,000 of them receive their income in the form of pay checks. Those pay checks in turn represent their share of the income generated by the economic cycle of production, processing, and distribution in the United States. In 1939 you had a national income of $72,500,000,000. The last quarter of 1950 was on the basis of 254 billion, as I previously pointed out, which was an increase of 251 percent. The increase in the wage income was 241 percent in 1950 as compared with 1939. The increase in retail sales volume was 212 percent. National income, wage income, and retail sales—you cannot separate them. They go together, because if people earn money they are going to spend it. You have certain constants all the way through this picture, which tell you whether or not your economy is balanced over a period of 50 or 75 or 100 years in the United States.

The people who constantly yell about prices being too high are not considering and weighing all those things which are related to prices. If you are going to pay a man $15 an hour wages, you can bet your life that whatever he produces is going to cost a lot of money. If you do not want high costs and a high selling price, then cut wages down to 50 cents an hour and you can have your low price—if low price is all you want. But I am not advocating you do this.

The increase in total wage as compared to the increase in total sales volume indicates clearly that the worker was in a better ratio to price levels in 1950 than he was in 1929.

The total payroll brought approximately 13 percent more goods for him to consume, and he is crying his eyes out about prices being so high, but he does not say anything in the world about the fact that his wages are much higher and his standard of living up considerably.

Last fall I think every Member of this House heard a great deal said about restricting credit—taking the credit privilege away from the people. Well, whose idea was that? Some fellow promoted the idea that if you wanted to prevent inflation you should cut down credit extension. So the order was issued to cut out credit. Let us see what that did.

In 1929 you had a certain ratio of credit to the total volume of retail sales. You had a certain ratio of credit to total wage income. You had a certain ratio of credit to total national income. Take 1919, take 1928, take 1939, and check those figures closely. You will find that the $20,000,000,000 of consumer credit in the last quarter of 1950 was not excessive as compared with previous years' operations. Yet many people contended, and millions believed, that if they would restrict credit, price inflation would be prevented.

Here are some details:

In 1939 all consumer credit totaled $7,000,000,000 as compared to $20,000,000,000 in December 1950. This is an increase of 185 percent. Credit extension in 1939 when compared to total retail sales of $42,000,000,000 in 1939 was $1 of credit for $6 of sales. In 1948 total retail sales were $123,800,000,000 with a credit extension of $14,300,000,000 or $1 of credit extension for each $8.40 of retail sales. In fourth quarter 1950 total retail sales were running at a level of $136,000,000,000 and consumer credit extension averaged $19,600,000,000 or $1 of credit for each $7 of sales.

In other words credit extension in 1948 and 1949 and 1950 was less in ratio to sales than in 1939 when we had a depression. This is a natural corollary as a state of prosperity or full employment finds individuals better able to pay cash for many items.

Stated in another way credit extension has not been excessive and was not the cause for rising prices. The real facts are that the increase in hourly wages, commodity prices, and so forth, increased the use of credit in ratio to dollar volume of sales.

The same illustration can be applied to inventories and bank deposits and currency.

In 1939, total deposits and currency totaled $68,300,000,000 as compared to $183,500,000,000 in 1950 (December). This is an increase of approximately 170 percent as compared to an increase of 223 percent in retail sales volume. The money supply in 1939 ratioed lower to total volume of business than in 1939.

In the case of inventories, total inventories in 1939 were $20,100,000,000 as compared to $59,700,000,000 in November 1950. This increase of 197 percent in inventories can be compared to the increase in retail sales amounting to 223 percent.

Summed up, our business units were doing a larger volume of sales in 1950 on a lower extension of credit and with a comparatively smaller inventory than in 1939. Credit was restricted, drastically restricted, since last summer; and every day since that restriction took place your prices have gone up, up, up; and wage increases have occurred; wages have gone up, national income has gone up, volume of retail sales has gone up; and the restriction of credit did not amount to anything so far as keeping prices down. During the campaign the story was, "We are going to restrict credit and thereby prevent inflation." You who so advocated sold a bill of goods to the people of this country. The national income increased from $214,000,000,000 in the last quarter of 1949 to $254,000,000,000 in the last quarter of 1950. Here you see an increase in the national income of $40,000,000,000 in 12 months.

The factors that result in an increase in income operate to affect an increase in the cost of unit production, in the unit sales price. With an economy that moves up and down as swiftly as ours any appropriations made by Congress are merely wild guesses, just as I stated on the floor a few days ago when we had under consideration the big air carrier bill; the question arose about whether or not the program could be built for $2,000,000,000. I said at that time that you could not tell but what it might take $20,000,000,000 to build it within 3½ years because we could not tell what the price level would be or what the wage level would be. So I said we were just making guesses on it and advocated renegotiated contracts. I am not complaining about the fact that we make guesses; I am simply pointing out the fact that we do make guesses; these appropriations are merely guesses. We come in later and ask for other appropriations to complete the projects, but the subsequent appropriations can be nothing but guesses either. Unless prices are stabilized appropriations may effectuate only 70, 50, or 40 percent of what we thought they would at the time the appropriation was made.

In like manner, any taxes which may be assessed, that is, through the provisions of a tax bill here, is simply a guess. For example, corporate taxes in 1949 were $10,600,000,000; in 1950 they were $18,300,000,000. This increase of $7,700,000,000 in Federal revenue was not expected when the 1950 and 1951 budget was prepared. Because of this increase in current tax income we just about balanced the cash outgo through the budget operations.

Unless certain steps are taken to stabilize prices—here is where we get into it—to stabilize prices our whole financial structure will continue to be one of confusion because of this instability. Congress, on the other hand, will be completely at sea as to what would constitute a proper tax approach or a proper appropriations approach. It might be well to give a brief analysis of the dynamic economy we have simply to illustrate just what we have. First, let us consider our efficiency ratio. I had three letters on this subject this morning in my mail from very, very prominent people in my district; one is a very prominent young lawyer. Our fiscal ratio is such that each $1 of gross farm income turns over about seven times, supporting $7 of our national income. But this ratio can be altered by a downward swing in national income such as in 1929 to 1932, and from 1948 to 1949, and the upward swing of the transition from 1949 to 1950. In 1932 there was the same farm production as you had in 1929, but it produced $7,000,000,000 less of gross farm income. The result in national income was a drop of, roughly, $45,000,000,000 in 1933. The low point in our national income usually comes about 6 months after the low in gross farm income. One of my writers this morning asks: "When are you fellows in Congress going to cut out these supports and subsidies for the farmer?" I write back and tell them: "If you will eliminate collective bargaining, the

Wagner Act and all that came out of that act, and the Taft-Hartley Act and all that came out of it, put labor back on the open-market basis where there is no collective bargaining whatsoever, no support by the Congress, no support by the machinery of the Federal Government, turn it loose, let it work its own way, the farmer can go along just as well as labor." But if you are going to do all of these things that the organized labor laws give to those who work in industry, and provided you want to sell those goods from the factories, the transportation lines of all kinds, and other activities, if you want to sell those things you can bet your bottom dollar the farmer has got to have his piece of cake in the form of a fair wage so as to have enough income to buy that which is produced in the factories under collective bargaining. You cannot get around that—if you think you can, go ahead and cut the farm income back to $20,000,000,000 instead of $35,000,000,000. Go ahead and try that just once. If you do, you will be the sickest group of economic planners that you ever saw.

On the other hand, if you want a high, strong national income, full employment, full payrolls, pay the primary producer a comparable wage for his production so that he can buy the goods of industry. Pay him parity. That is all that is necessary. That is the only answer I have. If you have a better one I wish you would submit it here some time. I would like to have it, and the country needs the truth.

Now, farm prices dropped, and let us consider recent years; in 1948 farm prices dropped. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] knows they dropped approximately $3,000,000,000 in gross farm income, which results in a loss of about $20,000,000,000 of national income. If you have a drop in national income what happens to the wage income? It is going to drop also. What is going to happen to retail sales volume? It is going to drop. What is going to happen to the tax dollar stream to the Federal Treasury? It is going to drop because taxable income drops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's comment on farm income. A few weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the farm income for 1951 would be increased by 10 percent, but he failed to say that the things that the farmer had to buy increased over 20 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the farmer is worse off by a 10-percent increase than he was before they started in with this new scheme.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to the turn-over as a result of agricultural production as being 7 to 1. It is quite apparent that the administration is going to put on price control, particularly on meat and other commodities. The gentleman knows this will retard production, that a great deal of these scarce commodities, not only in food but in other lines, will pass into the black market; and the money received in the black market will be hidden and not really pass through normal channels of trade. What does the gentleman think of that kind of an economy?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is about as destructive to the so-called poor man as anything could be. I have written to people in my district in the last 2 or 3 days to the effect that within 60 to 90 days after controls are put on meat and meat products the products will begin to move into the black markets, meat will become much scarcer and the price at the retail butcher's counter will be higher than at the present time because these products will be moving out through black-market channels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And eventually, I may say, meat will pass into the black market so that the people who want to abide by the laws and the regulations will not be able to get it through normal channels of trade.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is what is going to happen.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are we admitting here that we have not the courage to deal with the black-market situation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not say that. I simply say that what the Congress did a few months ago, back last summer, was to put into operation a program which when it is effectuated will promote the black market. So whether we have courage or not, we took that action.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows, and I know, from experience that we have, particularly in meat, a Nation-wide black-market ring ready to take over the merchandising of meat through black-market channels; in fact, the black marketeers are among those people who are urging this price control, the control system, over meat and other products.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. Here is a check that was given to me this morning by a farmer who lives within about 30 minutes drive of this building. That check is for $325. What do you suppose it paid for? It paid for a little steer I sold to him this morning. I helped him load it on the truck before I came to the office—$325 for one little critter in the form of a beef animal. I sold him some more of these steers at the same price previous to this. This was his third order. When you sell a piece of meat on the hoof at a price like that—and I did not send for this man to come and buy this steer; he made repeated trips there to buy them—that steer will be worth more money next week than it was today, and this $325 will buy less in the market next week than it does today. So, why would I want the check? Why does he want the steer? If you are going to pay that kind of a price for meat on the hoof you are going to pay a dollar a pound for beefsteak at the retail store; make no mistake about that. But this comes out of the high wages, the high income, the high retail sales value, and the high prices, and so on, down the line. There is nothing unnatural. This will pay the farmer who raised it about 35 cents an hour wage. The man who eats the beefsteak gets $1.56 an hour average wage. Is there anything wrong with that? Figure it out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Contributing to that, such things as they have done recently, increasing the price per quart of milk, there was nothing back of that at all. By their own admission, there is nothing back of that at all; no wage increase, no added service performed by the milk distributors in the Washington milkshed. Yet, they increased the price.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is administered prices.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. I wanted to be perfectly sure. I was a bit surprised a while ago when the gentleman referred to the price going up unless, as I understood him originally, price control, or management of prices was put into effect. Does the gentleman favor such a program?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me make that clear. I said you have to stabilize these prices. Who is going to stabilize the wage? If every few days organized labor is going to come in and demand and receive, with the full approval of the Government of the United States, another 5, 10, 15 or 20 cents an hour wage increase, is there any stability in that? Suppose wages do not go up any more, would there be any reason to increase prices? Of course not. Suppose we put wages to $25 an hour all the way across the board, where do you think prices are going to go? Now, as long as you keep raising these wages you are going to keep increasing your costs and the prices are going to continue upward. Who handles the wage increases? Who can stop wage increases? That is No. 1. But listen to your radio reports this morning. Is your wage control to come out first? No; that will be the last thing. You see what I mean? So I voted against the price-control bill. I have never supported price control, but I am discussing now the question of price levels, the question of having a gross national income, a wage income, which can be taxed in such a manner so as to pay the legitimate expenditures of this Government, trying to show where we can get this money to meet this budget.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the gentleman knows, will he advise the House what the weight of that steer was that he sold this morning for $325?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It weighed, I would guess, about between 1,000 and 1,100 pounds. I never weigh them. I say, "I want so much for this steer. If you want to buy it, all right."

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the price per pound?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us say around 32 or 33 cents a pound.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not intend to inject myself into the gentleman's speech, but I am wondering if the gentleman will reconcile that $325 check he received this morning with the fact that there is no control and his statement that he is against control. I am just trying to reconcile the two statements of my friend.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The steer brings $325, or let us say 32.5 cents a pound, because of the costs involved in the feeding, the machinery that is used on the farm to produce the feed, farm labor, and so forth. If those costs advance, the price of that steer is going to advance. If the wages for making these cattle advance, the price of steers is going to advance in another year or two. If the beef population drops, the price of beef will advance even without an advance in the price of these other products. We have had the idea that we could push this so-called spendable proposition to the top of the mountain. As long as we are doing that, we are going to keep pushing these prices up.

There is no big income in the sale of the steer, because if there was there would be a lot more steers grown. The farmers in my district, and there are letters which came in my mail this morning which I can show to the gentleman from Massachusetts that show this, are switching away from the beef animal. We are going into hogs. Why are we doing that? We cannot grow the beef animals so quickly, there is a bigger risk in the market, a lot more labor is involved, and we can take 12 bushels of corn and grow so many pounds of meat in the form of a pig which would sell at such and such a price and which would be a better price than the $325 steer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can understand those factors entering into it, but the gentleman was apparently saying that he should never have got this $325 price for the steer he sold.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Those factors exist. How are you going to stop this from going on unless you have some kind of controls?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We either stop it voluntarily——

Mr. McCORMACK. Which the gentleman knows cannot be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not admit that at all. We either stop it voluntarily or we subject ourselves to a controlled-black-market, decrease-production economy; and I prefer the first.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just trying to form in my own mind how the gentleman reconciles the basic position he takes in his speech, that he is against controls, with his further statement that he should never have received $325 for the steer he sold this morning. We know the factors that enter into that, wages, cost of feed, and other things; true. As they increase, naturally the prices are going to increase. The gentleman complains against receiving $325 for that steer. He would object to receiving $400 a month later or 2 months later, or any higher amount. How does the gentleman reconcile his statements, that is what I should like to know. What can we do? Please understand, I am seeking information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This Nation has existed for 175 years. Roughly, most of the time we operated this country on an open-market basis, where the law of supply and demand governed, where you would go into the market and pay what you thought you ought to pay, and if the other fellow did not want to sell he did not have to sell. We got along pretty well that way. Now we have jimmied our whole economy up to where we think we can just walk out and, any time we please, say "If you don't give me 20 cents an hour increase in wages I am going to strike and stop production."

We have followed that course for several years here, and we have come around to the present moment. I think that course is very false. I do not think we should follow it. I do not think beef should sell at a dollar and a quarter a pound at the retail store and I do not think the steer should sell for $325, but it does, by reason of what went before. It is a consequence of the cause.

I am just against that kind of thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would the gentleman do?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would stop increasing these costs.

Mr. McCORMACK. How would the gentleman do it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. By stopping the increasing of the wage structures.

Mr. McCORMACK. How would the gentleman do that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, when the people have no leadership they perish. That applies to payrollees as well as other people.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is no answer to the problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, if there is a man down the street murdering another man, do you say, "What would you suggest as a substitute?" I am suggesting to stop the murder.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman's answer to my question is to grind down the worker.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No. Now, I said no such thing, and you are not going to put words in my mouth. I said no such thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course it is true that the gentleman did not use that exact language.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I was afraid that you would get off on that kind of track. I tried to teach you in the first place that if you increase the cost, the prices are going to go up. If you stop increasing the cost it would stabilize the price level. The administration ought to know that controls do not work. They have found that out. When they tell the people to sell goods cheaper and then raise the wages, that is all poppycock and phony and fallacious economic doctrine and it is no good at all.

I want to make this additional point before my time expires. On the basis of full employment on a 40-hour week we can in 1952, if we want to do so, produce $360,000,000,000 of national income here in the United States on today's price level. Do we want to do it? My guess is no, because they do not want to work 40 hours a week full time.

They do not want to work 48 hours a week. But with $375,000,000,000, and on the basis of today's price level, with that national income you can raise your $72,000,000,000 and balance this budget and hurt nobody any more than they were hurt last year in paying their taxes. That is the point I want to make. So I repeat what I said on the floor the other day. I am in favor of expanding the work week to 48 hours, with no further wage increases, with time and a half not paid for the extra 8 hours over the 40 hours. Do I make my position clear on that? That would give you more goods for the people. It will effectuate a lower cost price so that your selling price can come down in proportion and it will take care of the total gross income of the Nation, the total spendable income to the payrollees, and give you a sound economy and a balanced budget for the first time, of any consequence, in 20 years. I think it is about time we got down to brass tacks and looked the mule right straight in the face, and admit that we are willing to pay this party we are trying to put on. If you do not want to do that, then go ahead and take the economic consequences. Try to go ahead with deficit financing again. Try to push your debt from $260,000,000,000 to $360,000,000,000. Suffer from inflation. Put on new price controls. Surrender your economic life in this country to some dictator sitting here in a central office. Establish a local commissar. Extend your one-party system. Kiss your good old Government of the United States good-by. So far as I am concerned, I am against any such proposal.

PRICE CEILINGS

The record and common sense should dictate the price policy. We know that we have a lot of submarginal production at all times because of unequal production from our natural resources. We have good farm land and poor farm land. We have rich ore bodies and other ore bodies of lower grade. Care, therefore, should be taken in any program of price ceilings to avoid too great a rigidity of prices.

A careful study of our American system would indicate that a price floor 90 percent of parity as assurance to the producer of basic commodities and a ceiling of 110 percent as a protection for the consumer would bring about a price structure averaging about 100 percent of parity while at the same time permitting

the flexibility of price to make adjustments in both production and consumption of goods in surplus and scare supply.

Wages should be stabilized in ratio to the commodity price level and in ratio to per man production. Finally the business operations should be permitted an operating margin comparable to normal margins existing when our economy was operating on a full production basis.

Under a system of tariffs we have always had a support price in proportion to the amount of the tariff and in turn the tariff has acted as a ceiling, permitting competitive imports in case of shortages.

If we are to have collective bargaining for industry and with a program of price stabilization the Nation should not have any serious inflation or depressions.

On a basis of full employment and a 40-hour week our economy could generate $360,000,000,000 of national income at price levels which now prevail. Any further increase which might be gained through a longer work week would add national income in proportion. With a system of taxes in ratio to Federal expenditures we could operate on a pay-as-you-go basis.

For example, during World War II the American public after their expenditures for goods and services in the 3-year period 1943–45, had $200,000,000,000 left over. After paying $55,000,000,000 of personal income taxes they still had remaining $144,000,000,000. Failure to tax this income added to the inflationary pressure in the amount of the increase in our national debt. In peacetime consumers tax their income for the purchase of a car or other form of durable goods. If the same tax was levied against our personal income to pay for such goods diverted for war purposes, we could pay as we go. Fundamentally goods produced for peace or war at a proper price level will generate the national income to consume them.

I have pointed out that the national income is the buying power in whatever amount created from production times the prevailing price level. Below are the comparisons of the principal factors in national income for 1939, 1942, and 1950. The year 1942 has been used, as 1939 is not a fair comparison because of the fact that we had 9,000,000 workers unemployed and our economy was not operating efficiently, or with a volume to warrant proper comparisons of profit for business units.

National income

Year	National income	Percentage increase to 1950
	Billions	
1939	$72.5	225.7
1942	137.1	72.2
1950	236.2	----------

Hourly wages, all industry

Year	Wages, per hour	Increase
1939	63.3 cents	From 1939 to 1950, 130.6 percent.
1942	85.3 cents	From 1942 to 1950, 71.4 percent.
1950	$1.46	

NOTE.—Similarity of percentage of increase of hourly wages and national income increase from 1942 to 1950.

Total wage income, less social-security payments

Year	Income	Percent increase to 1950	Percent of national income
	Billions		
1939	$45.7	217.7	63.0
1942	81.4	66.0	59.3
1950	145.2	----------	61.5

Retail sales

Year	Retail sales (billions)	Percent of 1950	Percent of national income
1939	$42.0	212.3	58.0
1942	60.0	118.6	43.8
1950	131.2	----------	55.5

NOTE.—Low percentage of retail sales to national income in 1942 shows the lag between rising prices for raw materials and wages and their transition into higher prices at retail.

Wholesale commodity price level

[BLS, 1926=100]

Year	Price level	Percent increase to 1950
1939	77.1	109.3
1942	98.8	63.3
1950	161.4	----------

Consumer credit

Year	Billions	Percent of national income
1939	$7.0	9.66
1942	5.7	4.15
1950	20.0	8.46

Bank deposits and currency

Year	Billions	Percent of national income
1939	$68.3	94.2
1950	183.5	77.6

STOP FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have consistently supported various programs for economic and military aid to friendly nations, some of their actions and attitudes come as a considerable shock.

With some justification our colleagues who have opposed these programs say to us, "You see, these nations which we have helped to get on their feet cannot be relied on to stand with us in a struggle to maintain ideals, if their own economic or political interests are in any way adversely affected."

The time has come, if it has not passed, for our Government to serve notice on those who seek our financial assistance that we have reached the stop sign at the end of the one-way street. The determination of our future course is now largely in their hands. It is they who must remove the stop sign and open the street up to traffic flowing in both directions. We have invited them, we have urged them to meet us part way and to travel together toward our goal to repel and discourage naked aggression and to achieve a solid and just foundation for a peaceful world. If they prefer to give priority to the advancement of their own nationalistic or economic aims and shut the door in our faces, regrettable as that may be from every point of view, let them not complain if we match this attitude of ultraisolationism on their part with a hard-boiled realization that, when the chips are down, we must depend primarily upon United States industrial might, the courage and resourcefulness of United States fighting men, and the determination of United States citizenry to remain free. Let us hope and pray that a prompt and basic change in the policy of our sister nations may take place. The outlook at the moment is bleak.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem on the American flag.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a letter and an article from the Reader's Digest and in the other the opinions of the National Opinion Research Center.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter he wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. POULSON and Mr. JAVITS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two newspaper editorials.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

122. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain surveys and a part of a report, pursuant to section 4 of the act of September 25, 1950 (Public Law 837, 81st Cong.), pertaining to the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and the National Park Service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1730. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2081. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2082. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2083. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2084. A bill relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2085. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2086. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2087. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2088. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barbourville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2089. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2090. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2091. A bill to guarantee all existing industrial centers in the United States a fair share of defense industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2092. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2093. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2094. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 2095. A bill granting to persons who serve in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities, and to their dependents, all the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of World War II and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2096. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2097. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), relating to the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2099. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 2100. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2101. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2103. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 2104. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 2105. A bill to include the fees for issuing money orders as a part of the gross postal receipts of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution inviting the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a federal convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 99. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make studies and investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 100. Resolution to amend certain clauses of rules X, XI, and XII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2106. A bill for the relief of Marianne Ese Banck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co., of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 2108. A bill for the relief of Constantin Michel Zampikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2109. A bill for the relief of Arthur Cleveland Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2110. A bill for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2112. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 2,038,584, issued April 28, 1936, relating to food containers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 2113. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2115. A bill for the relief of Elmer E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Cecil D. Rose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 1, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney (P)	$5,422.98
John Heimburger	Research specialist (P).	5,422.98
Altavene Clark	Executive officer (P)	3,615.32
Mabel Downey	Clerk (C)	5,422.98
Alice Baker	Staff assistant (C)	2,627.52
Lydia Vacin	do	2,627.52
Lorraine Adamson	do	2,207.52
Betty Prezioso	do	2,015.58
Leo R. Mozingo (July)	Messenger	191.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,607.31
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	4,646.69
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1950	20,254.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	29,746.00

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$5,422.98
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,422.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	5,242.50
Corbal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,242.50
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,242.50
Arthur Orr	do	4,896.90
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,896.90
Ross P. Pope	do	4,758.60
Robert P. Williams	do	4,689.48
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	4,436.04
Jay B. Howe	do	4,436.04
Frank Sanders	do	3,859.98
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk	2,786.88
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,521.34
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,448.92
Melvin E. Lefever	Clerk-stenographer	1,990.26
Robert W. Thompson	do	1,990.26
James A. Eastop	do	718.70
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,686.12
Frank B. Avery, Jr.	Page	1,555.74
John Pugh	Consultant	612.88
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the majority.	4,205.64
Robert E. Lee	Clerk to the minority.	5,422.98
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,990.26
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	1,990.26
Vivian V. Martin	do	1,990.26
Eula D. Rigsby	do	1,990.26
Marion B. Lacey	do	1,990.26
Josephine E. Frick	do	995.13
Alice C. Keeffe	do	1,990.26
William J. Neary	do	1,990.26
N. C. Barrett	do	1,658.55
Michael J. McGrath	do	1,990.26
Geneva Nichols	do	995.13
Norajean Ray	do	331.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$232,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	104,389.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	127,610.28

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. Maloney	Chief investigator	$4,274.76
Frederic D. Vechery	Investigator	4,179.08
Hazel N. Ward	Clerk-stenographer	1,809.24
Anna R. Murabito	do	1,686.12
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Albert P. Pollman	Investigator	2,725.80
Ned Williams	do	2,250.00
Civil Service Commission:		
John E. Moore	do	3,786.15
George R. Boss	do	2,798.49
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
James E. Nugent	do	3,996.64
Robert E. Rightmyer	do	3,496.66
Paul G. Travers	do	2,238.47
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky	do	1,496.14
Federal Power Commission:		
Oscar A. Arnold	do	3,492.30
Arne H. Ronka	do	3,461.50
Federal Security Agency:		
Charles M. Erisman	do	2,100.00
C. Erwin Rice	do	3,702.11
Department of Labor: Charles E. Hutsler	do	1,349.99
Department of the Navy:		
Donald M. Patterson	do	3,465.28
Paul G. Ross	do	3,088.96
Securities and Exchange Commission:		
Michael J. LaPadula	do	1,847.32
Joseph Bernstein	do	1,829.21
The Panama Canal:		
Edwin M. McGinnis	do	3,118.20
Augustus C. Medinger	do	3,461.55
Nelson E. Wise	do	2,561.20
Veterans' Administration:		
Stephen J. Grillo	do	2,784.00
Joe M. Hansman	do	2,855.38
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Maurice A. Hickey	Temporary clerical assistant.	187.99
Frederick C. Fehl	do	490.79
Federal Security Agency: Irene Bialek	do	97.24
Treasury Department:		
Frances E. Donovan	do	141.12
Anna Mae Fleishell	do	125.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	96,083.15
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	53,916.85
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period	3,148.77

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief clerk	$5,422.98
William Wingate	Assistant clerk	2,142.36
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member.	5,422.98
Charles F. Ducander	do	5,422.98
Bryce N. Harlow	do	5,422.98
Robert W. Smart	do	5,422.98
Agnes H. Johnston	Stenographer	2,685.48
Rosemary Curry	do	2,482.74
Gladys Flanagan	do	2,482.74
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,482.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,321.92
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,499.70
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	17,821.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	17,178.38

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff	$4,758.60
John E. Barriere	do	4,027.59
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,422.98
Elsie L. Gould	Assistant clerk	3,721.74
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,511.69
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	2,406.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,710.14
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	480.87
Total amount expended from Oct. 19, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	12,191.01
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 1950	12,808.99

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 11, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,422.26
Mabel Haller	Professional staff	4,551.31
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	2,424.84
Witmer H. Kelley	Investigator (through Aug. 31, 1950).	1,186.66
Charles D. Farmer	Minority clerk (through Nov. 30, 1950).	3,216.05
Jeanne Richards	Minority clerk (appointed Dec. 1, 1950).	643.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,666.95
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	45.99
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	45.99
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	287.06

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 11, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hyman L. Fischback	Professional services as counsel (vouchers submitted for services from Mar. 1 to Sept. 18, 1950.	$5,000.00
John F. Woog	Investigator (salary) Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950.	4,723.47
P. Gabrielle Tarter	Secretary (salary) July 1 to Sept. 30, 1950.	1,114.62
Helen Horton	Secretary (salary) Nov. 1 to Nov. 30, 1950, expenses.	313.54
Sandy L. Smith	Witness fee	6.00
Noble D. Butler	do	6.00
Ben Hillman	do	6.00
William D. Marrow	do	6.00
Winston Sims	do	6.00
Robert L. Thompson	do	6.00
Samuel Green	do	6.00
Elsie G. Menefee		36.00
House stationery room		24.30
Hyman L. Fischback		587.69
P. Gabrielle Tarter		13.88
Olin E. Teague		35.26
J. Harry Welch		33.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,997.66
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	12,237.58
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	12,237.58
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	7,759.76

JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 12, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk (July 17 to Dec. 31).	$4,940.93
John S. Forsythe	General counsel	5,422.98
Frank E. Boyer	Investigator	5,422.98
John O. Graham	Minority clerk	5,422.98
Charles A. Quattlebaum.	Research specialist (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31).	636.42
Levi K. Alderman	Research analyst (July 1 to Sept. 6).	1,064.59
Joseph Koski	Chief clerk and executive assistant (July 1 to July 16).	482.03
Mary Pauline Smith	Assistant clerk	2,728.92
Mary E. Gilbert Sanders.	do	2,728.92
Barbara A. White	do	2,728.92
Myrtle S. Locher	do	2,728.92
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk (Dec. 15 to Dec. 31).	242.56
Frances Los	Assistant clerk (July 1 to July 25).	365.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	22,353.64
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	5,277.82
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	27,631.46
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	2,368.54

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William A. Young	Staff director	$5,422.98
Thomas A. Kennedy	General counsel	5,422.98
Christine Ray Davis	Chief clerk	5,422.98
Martha C. Roland	Assistant chief clerk	4,839.29
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	3,859.98
Carl E. Hoffman	Minority counsel, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950.	1,517.08
Annabell Zue	Minority clerk	3,859.98
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	3,112.77
Olive Willeroy	do	3,112.77
Teresa Barrett	Clerk-typist	1,900.26

Full committee	$2,133.74
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman	3,981.08
Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK KARSTEN, chairman	4,410.01
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman	5,256.40
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	13,034.10
Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	13,306.58
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman	31,770.53
Total spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	73,892.44
Balance unexpended July 1, 1950	141,862.98
Amount spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	73,892.44
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1951	67,970.54

Expenses of full committee:

Stationery supplies	242.19
Telephone	165.35
Plane transportation	292.89
Reporting—away from Washington, D. C.	575.85
Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, reimbursement for expenses	451.00
Annabell Zue, reimbursement for expenses	301.05
Helen M. Boyer, reimbursement for expenses	91.55
Miscellaneous expenses	13.86
Total	2,133.74

Subcommittee Making Inquiry into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:

Lyman I. Fischback, special counsel	10,000.00
Railroad transportation	276.64
Plane transportation	917.58
Reporting—away from Washington, D. C.	392.95
Expenses of members of staff	1,101.12
Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, reimbursement for expenses	118.92
Witness expenses	480.69
Miscellaneous expense	18.68
Total	13,306.58

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman:

Lindsay C. Warren, Jr., clerk, July 1 to Sept. 20, 1950	1,142.05
Hilary E. Price, clerk, July 1 to Oct. 31, 1950	1,616.52
John H. Small, clerk, Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,001.38
Delphine Churko, stenographer, Sept. 7-21, 1950	167.96
James A. Chaney, reimbursement for expenses	53.17
Total	3,981.08

Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK KARSTEN, chairman:

Harry E. Harper, staff director, July 1 to Nov. 29, 1950	3,360.65
Ellis Bernard, clerk-stenographer, July 1 to Oct. 31, 1950	1,037.16
Stationery supplies	4.35
Telephone	7.85
Total	4,410.01

Federal Relations with International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:

Franklin D. Rogers, clerk	3,100.70
Maisie O. Hudnall, assistant clerk	2,062.68
Stationery supplies	37.16
Travel expense	55.86
Total	5,256.40

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:

W. Brooke Graves, staff director, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950	$1,607.66
Julian Fahy, staff member	4,551.24
Herbert Roback, staff member	4,532.23
Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk	2,931.72
Stationery supplies	11.25
Total	13,034.10

Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman:	
Carl H. Monsees, operations analyst	4,942.96
Stephen D. Carnes, administrative analyst, July 1 to Sept. 15, 1950	1,312.07
John C. Vick, administrative analyst	2,015.58
Hester H. Harper, administrative analyst, July 1 to Aug. 31, 1950	922.92
Ann F. Cavanagh, administrative analyst	1,954.48
Herbert E. Wickenheiser, administrative analyst, July 1 to Aug. 15, 1950	606.18
George H. Bowers, Jr., legal analyst, July 1 to Nov. 19, 1950	1,839.60
George Miller Rose, administrative analyst, July 1 to Sept. 30, 1950	1,716.96
Frances Hardy, research, Sept. 15 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,513.2
Herbert H. Trotman, investigator, Oct. 13 to Dec. 31, 1950	1,612.75
Mildred H. Lang, stenographer	2,015.58
Carlotta Dondero, stenographer	1,845.42
Lucille Brooks, stenographer	746.36
John H. Dorsey, legal services as special counsel, July 1 to Sept. 7, 1950	1,386.00
Gordon Pickett Peyton, legal services as special counsel	1,710.97
Stephen D. Carnes, special Adviser, Dec. 1-20, 1950	405.28
U. S. General Accounting Office:	
Reimbursement for services of Ralph E. Casey, Sept. 27 to Dec. 31, 1950	2,811.64
Reimbursement for services of Robert F. Keller, Sept. 27 to Nov. 15, 1950	1,384.74
Stationery supplies	109.55
Plane transportation	141.62
Railroad transportation	342.02
Reimbursement for expenses of members of the subcommittee and members of the staff for July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	391.58
Telephone expense	43.05
Total	31,770.53

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$5,423.00
Ira E. Bennett	Staff consultant	5,423.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	do	5,423.00
George Lee Millikan	do	5,423.00
June Nigh	Staff assistant	2,859.31
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,076.57
Doris Leone	do	2,859.31
Mabel Wofford	do	2,750.67
Mary G. Chace	do	3,583.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	14,931.81
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	8,238.25
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1950	23,170.06
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	26,829.94

JOHN KEE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 2, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeanne McDonagh	Clerk Committee on House Administration.	$3,034.16
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	4,413.00
Jack Watson	do	4,274.76
Lura Cannon	do	3,004.14
Maureen B. Sandiford	do	3,004.14
Merle Harris	do	3,004.14

MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 11, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,422.98
Glenn R. Ward	Assistant clerk	3,004.14
Royice Reno	do	2,569.62
Georgia G. Glasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,294.40
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,207.52
Frances W. Galvin	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 157).	2,106.12
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	1,017.84
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,422.98
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,422.98
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	5,422.98
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	4,551.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 157)	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	17,289.40
Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1950	4,333.33
Total amount expended from January 1, 1949, to December 31, 1950	21,622.73
Balance unexpended as of December 31, 1950	38,377.27

ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dick, Bess Effrat	Chief clerk	$5,422.98
Bernhardt, C. Murray	Committee counsel	5,422.98
Besterman, Walter M.	Legislative assistant	5,422.98
Foley, William R.	Committee counsel	5,422.98
Lee, Walter R.	Legislative assistant	5,422.98
Smedley, Velma	Assistant chief clerk	5,422.98
Benn, Violet T. (pursuant to H. Res. 464).	Clerical assistant	3,148.98
Baker, Mabel C.	Clerk-stenographer	2,279.94
Berger, Anne J.	do	2,678.22
Christy, Frances	do	2,497.20
Hahn, Jane (pursuant to H. Res. 464).	do	2,497.20
Kaslow, Berta	do	3,859.98
Lamon, Lucile P.	do	2,279.94

1. Funds for preparation of U. S. Code and Revision of the Laws:	
A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1950	$152,471.91
Expended	7,714.44
Balance Dec. 31, 1950	144,757.47
B. Revision of the Laws, 1951:	
Authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1951	12,600.00
Expended	5,422.98
Balance December 1950	7,177.02
C. Revision of the Laws, 1950:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1950	121.86
Expended	54.99
Balance Dec. 31, 1950 (to be returned to Treasury)	66.87
D. Preparation of new edition District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Authorized by deficiency appropriation	30,000.00
Expended	0.00
Balance	30,000.00
2. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 156, H. Res. 415, and H. Res. 637 (pursuant to H. Res. 137)	85,000.00
Amount expended	59,909.33
Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1950	25,090.67
3. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 246 (pursuant to H. Res. 238)	45,000.00
Amount expended	25,320.39
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	19,679.61

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	General counsel	$5,422.98
Lynn E. Mote	Assistant counsel	3,772.70
Reginald S. Losee	Chief investigator	4,482.12
Gus S. Caras	Investigator to minority.	4,482.12
Frances Still	Chief clerk	3,859.98
Marie Wilson	Secretary	3,148.98
Madonna Haworth	Assistant clerk	3,003.60
Leonard P. Pliska	do	3,003.60
Total		31,176.08

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

(Pursuant to H. Res. 44, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

No additional expenditures have been made since the last report was filed for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$15,000.00
Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	8,061.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	6,938.49

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Pursuant to H. Res. 215, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles A. Miller	Investigator	$4,205.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	22,151.33
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1950	4,261.99
Total amount expended from June 30, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	26,413.37
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	23,586.63

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EXPLOSION AT SOUTH AMBOY, N. J., OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Pursuant to H. Res. 643, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

JANUARY 10, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Rafferty	Counsel	$3,172.40
Bernard J. Zincke	Investigator	2,988.08
Total		6,160.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$15,000.00
Amount expended from July 19 to Dec. 31 (July 19, 1950, was the date funds were authorized)	8,671.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	6,328.46

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$5,422.98
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	5,422.98
John B. Price	Staff assistant	3,028.28
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,883.44
Elayne M. Hoffman	Secretary	2,521.34
Lillian Hopkins	do	2,521.34
Ann Hayden	Stenographer	2,376.50
Pursuant to H. Res. 114, 115, and 472:		
Russell A. Hoddleston	Staff director	4,000.00
Reginald I. Heath	Investigator	3,684.25
Henry C. Cassel	do	3,684.25
Jean H. O'Brien	Stenographer	1,730.97
	Telephone, telegraph, and office supplies.	233.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,514.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	13,933.07
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	22,447.62
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	27,552.38

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JANUARY 2, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
George H. Soule	Technical consultant.	$5,422.98
Preston E. Peden	Counsel	4,519.15
CLERICAL STAFF		
Claude E. Ragan	Clerk	5,422.98
Nancy Arnold	do	3,721.74
Virginia McMichael	do	3,004.14
Geraldine Baker	do	2,424.78
Betty Lee Angus	do	2,153.22
Arthur James Brookshire.	Investigation clerk to committee and chargeable to special fund.	1,347.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	13,852.86
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	5,147.09
Total amount expended from Apr. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	18,999.95
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	11,000.05

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 3, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Clerk	$4,343.88
Thomas E. Massie	Counsel	4,343.88
Robert F. McConnell	Assistant clerk	3,293.82
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	do	2,786.88
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter.	Clerk-stenographer	2,786.88
Miss Mary Elizabeth McBee.	do	2,786.88
Mrs. Helen Dooley	do	2,786.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$15,000
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1951	15,000

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

DECEMBER 20, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive,

together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey S. Shaw	Chief Clerk	$5,380.74
Merritt R. Kotin	Assistant clerk	4,551.24
T. Howard Doian	Assistant to the clerk.	3,018.63
Elliodor M. Libonati	Clerk	3,018.60
Jane W. Snader	Minority clerk	3,018.60

ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to January 1, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Employees paid by voucher:		
William A. Wheeler.	Investigator	$4,620.36
Courtney E. Owens.	do	4,343.48
Charles E. McKillips.	do	3,998.22
James A. Andrews.	do	3,101.45
William J. Jones.	do	4,136.46
Alvin Stokes	do	4,067.28
Lillian Howard	Research clerk	2,786.88
Helen Mattson	do	2,931.18
Mary Ann Moffett.	do	2,424.78
Asselia Poore	do	3,005.76
Blanche McCall	do	2,279.94
Pearle Gay	Clerk-stenographer	2,424.78
Sidney Phillips	do	861.26
Jane Gordon	do	2,279.94
Helen McCarthy	do	2,424.78
Lorraine Nichols	do	2,424.78
Rose Sanko	do	2,424.78
Ruth Tansill	do	2,424.78
Virginia McCraw	Clerk-typist	2,135.16
Alyce Cartrell	do	2,424.78
Lucille Fitzgerald	do	2,424.78
Catherine Crews	do	2,424.78
Jo B. Kennedy	do	2,424.78
Eileen Sonnett	do	2,279.94
Alice Walker	do	2,424.78
Gladys Slack	do	2,279.94
Employees carried on permanent payroll:		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Committee counsel	5,423.04
Louis J. Russell	Senior investigator	5,423.04
John W. Carrington.	Clerk of committee	5,242.56
Benjamin Mandel.	Director of research	5,045.04
Donald T. Appell.	Investigator	5,081.22
Ann D. Turner	File chief	4,067.34
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant file chief	2,907.62
Rosella A. Purdy.	Secretary to committee counsel.	3,438.66
Juliette Joray	Secretary to clerk	2,714.46
Thelma Scearce	Secretary to senior investigator.	3,148.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$350,000.00
Feb. 9, 1949	200,000.00
Mar. 23, 1950	150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported Jan. 1, 1949, to July 1, 1950	235,881.62
Amount expended from July 1, 1950, to Jan. 1, 1951	$89,040.34
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1949, to Jan. 1, 1951	324,921.96
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1951	25,078.04

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan	Chief clerk	$5,422.98
Edwin B. Patterson	Professional aide	5,422.98
Casey M. Jones	do	5,422.98
Karl Standish	do	5,422.98
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,551.24
Frances Montanye	Clerk-stenographer	2,569.62
Mary Schmidt Ponow	do	404.13
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	2,497.20
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	2,141.35
Noah S. Sweat, Jr.	Assistant clerk	3,148.98

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 13, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis	Clerk (C)	$5,422.98
Leo H. Irwin	Professional assistant (P).	3,929.10
Stella O. Miller [1]	Assistant clerk (C)	1,025.52
Harriet B. Lamb	Staff assistant (C)	2,207.52
Doris C. Mickelson	do	2,159.24
Johnnie Koontz [2]	do	343.78
Jeannine S. Coble [3]	do	1,426.35
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Minority adviser (P)	5,242.50
Susan Alice Taylor	Minority stenographer (C).	2,377.68
Harry Parker	Messenger	1,381.92
Sam Hardy [4]	do	446.60
Esmer Durham [5]	do	237.57
Rudolph P. Crouch [6]	do	945.29

[1] From July 1 to Sept. 1, 1950.
[2] From July 1 to Aug. 1, 1950.
[3] From Aug. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950.
[4] From July 1 to Sept. 1, 1950.
[5] From July 1 to Aug. 1, 1950.
[6] From Aug. 24 to Dec. 31, 1950.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,074.32
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	635.59
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	17,290.09

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter Adams	Economic consultant (July 1 to Nov. 25, various dates).	$1,900.00
Jean C. Curtis	Research and editorial assistant (Aug. 21 to Dec. 21).	1,417.17
Victor P. Dalmas	Executive director	5,422.98
Mildred Deen	Stenographer	1,979.40
Otis H. Ellis	Special counsel for petroleum (July 1 to 15).	226.20
Richard R. Haas	Research assistant	1,830.96
Edward Hart	Research consultant (Oct. 1 to 15).	399.43
Joseph W. Kaufman	Chief counsel (July 1 to Oct. 31).	3,615.32
Arthur F. Lucas	Economic consultant (July 1 to Dec. 29, various dates).	2,814.00
Bernard Marcus	Investigator (July 28 to Nov. 15).	1,441.83
Vernon A. Mund	Economic consultant (July 1 to Sept. 18, various dates).	1,675.00
Laverne Maynard	Stenographer	2,250.96
Bertha A. Padgett	Secretary-clerk	2,587.71
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk (July 1 to Oct. 31).	1,737.20
Mary Nell Snow	Typist	1,392.48
M. Elizabeth Soper	Stenographer (Aug. 14 to Dec. 31).	1,437.63
Ernest L. Stockton	Research Analyst (Aug. 28 to Dec. 31).	3,110.01
Emma Trenchi	Stenographer (Oct. 16 to 20).	47.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	90,382.79
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	37,202.27
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	127,585.06
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	22,414.94

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAM UNDER THE GI BILL

JANUARY 8, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from September 22, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	General counsel	$572.35
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk	1,878.15
James E. Flannery	Research analyst	1,393.44
Josephine E. Frick	Stenographer	1,248.60
Harry Hageney	Investigator	1,586.00
Arthur Pearlman	do	1,419.04
George M. Rose	Staff member	1,755.54
Irene Wade	Stenographer	1,377.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount expended from Sept. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950	14,360.48
Total amount expended from Sept. 22 to Dec. 31, 1950	14,360.48
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	15,639.52

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 21, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vincent A. Kleinfeld	Chief counsel (Reimburse U. S. Treasury, Department of Justice)	$2,836.34
Frances K. Topping	Staff director	2,787.75
Dolores Cook	Secretary	1,541.19
Franklin C. Bing	Consultant WAE	723.01
Frank Laspia	Clerk	53.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount expended from Aug. 21 to Dec. 31, 1950	15,947.44
Total amount expended from Aug. 21 to Dec. 31, 1950	15,947.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950	19,052.56

JAMES J. DELANEY,
Chairman.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1951

Rev. Nathaniel C. Acton, rector, St. Andrew's Church, College Park, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to look with favor upon our land and people. All undeserving, Thou hast made us great among the nations of the earth. Let us not forget that this place and this power have come of Thee, and that we have them as a trust to use in Thy service. Save us from pride and arrogance; make us quick to see the needs of those less fortunate than ourselves, and to be resolute in purpose to promote good will and fellowship among all men. Guide, we pray Thee, our President and all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation, and grant to them special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength; that upholding what is right, and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine purpose; for Thine, O God, is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week, on official business.

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ELLENDER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week, on official business to attend conferences between the United States and Mexico regarding agricultural labor contracts, as an observer from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Wednesday.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Martin
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Benton	Hennings	Murray
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kerr	Stennis
Cordon	Kilgore	Taft
Dirksen	Langer	Thye
Douglas	Lehman	Tobey
Duff	Lodge	Watkins
Dworshak	McCarran	Welker
Ecton	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McFarland	Wiley
Frear	McKellar	Williams
Fulbright	McMahon	Young
George	Magnuson	
Gillette	Malone	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as an observer from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, attending conferences between the Governments of the United States and Mexico regarding agricultural labor contracts.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO 13)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1951.*

(NOTE.—Report accompanied a similar message to House of Representatives.)

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that under the rule creating the Committee on Small Business the committee must be appointed at the beginning of each session of each Congress. At the time the committee was created and the Chair made the original appointments, he felt that he had appointed a good committee. He still thinks so, and he reappoints the same members of the committee, and asks the clerk to read the names of the members.

The legislative clerk read the names of Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it in order to make an observation at this time relative to the appointments? I know that we are in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I rise to make only one observation, and that is that the number on the Small Business Committee is 13. I presume that the appointments in the former Congress were based upon the percentage which then prevailed. At that time the ratio was either eight to five or seven to six, to which I did not object at the time, inasmuch as it was a special committee.

In former years the membership of the committee was divided on the basis of an equal number of Members from each

party. I have forgotten how we got away from that practice. However, as I recall, until the last Congress there was no division which represented such a large proportion in favor of one party.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to observe that he thinks there is something in the point raised by the Senator from Nebraska. Inasmuch as the proportion has been changed on the standing committees, the Chair had thought that perhaps it should be changed on this committee. However, the question arose as to whether the Chair should leave off some Member who is now on the committee, in order to appoint some other Senator. The Chair felt that that question outweighed the other consideration. However, the Chair will give very careful consideration to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska; and if the Chair concludes, as well he might, that there ought to be a difference in the proportion, the Chair will adjust it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the assurance from the distinguished Vice President that he will give the matter further consideration.

If the Chair will permit, I should like to make one further observation. We have suggested for membership on the committee the names of certain Senators who have just been reelected, and who do not have a heavy workload in the committee assignments they now have to legislative committees. I know that they would have ample time to serve on the Small Business Committee. It was with that idea in mind that I felt that if the number of members on the committee could be increased there would be no objection from our side to making the number 16, with a division of 8 on a side, so that no member would be dropped from the committee.

I am suggesting to the Vice President that the number be increased so that the workload of the Small Business Committee may be properly distributed. Some Senators are not overburdened with work on the legislative committees, and they could be very helpful in distributing the workload we have been talking about, and will continue to talk about until it is more equitably distributed.

I appeal to the distinguished Vice President to give consideration to the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be glad to consider it. However, the Chair does not believe that he has authority to increase the total number of the membership. The original resolution provided for a membership of 13. The Chair cannot change that. If the Chair decides that he may change the proportion, that will take care of at least one additional member of the minority.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the distinguished Vice President a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it necessary to enter any motion, such as a motion to reconsider, or may I have the assurance of the distinguished Vice President that at some time in the near future the question will be brought up when the time for the announcement arrives, and that any rights we may have will be preserved at that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will announce his decision either today or not later than tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: With respect to the membership of the Select Committee on Small Business, concerning which some discussion was had earlier in the day, the Chair has been informed that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] does not desire to continue longer as a member of the committee. Therefore, in order to give to the minority the same representation on this committee that obtains with respect to the several standing committees, the Chair appoints the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] as a minority member of the committee.

PROPER DISPLAY OF AMERICAN FLAG—RESOLUTION OF SWEETWATER DISTRICT (TENN.) JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the United Order of Mechanics of Sweetwater, Tenn., concerning the use of the American flag. They protest against any flag being considered in preference to the American flag, and I join them in that protest as strongly as I know how.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since it is our belief that America is the best Nation there is, and since it is our belief that the American flag embodies the ideals and flies as a token of that Nation;

And since we feel that the American flag has always flown upperm .t in times of victory or distress;

And since it is the law of the land that no flag shall fly above or to the right of the American banner;

And since we have information that the present time in some instances that the flag of the United Nations has been carried higher than the American flag where American men are involved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Sweetwater District of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, a patriotic fraternity do hereby deplore such a situation; and be it further

Resolved, That we think it is an injustice to the men and women who have given their lives for this same flag and are so doing now and for the millions who have, who are now, and who will in the future support this emblem to the best of their ability in many fields of endeavor; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby petition our fellow members to speak against any action that lets any banner in any way supplant the Stars and Stripes, and be it further resolved that we hereby ask our Representatives in legislative halls of the Government to lend their supports to stopping any practice that allows the American flag to be second to any banner in the world; furthermore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our State and national officials of this fraternity and to the Members of Congress from our district and to our United States Senators, as well as a copy of the same be spread in the local press.

Respectfuly submitted.

J. NEAL ENSMINGER,
CHARLIE BARNETT,
HURL W. RAY,
Resolution Committee, Sweetwater District, Junior Order United American Mechanics.

Attested this the 4th day of January 1951.

[SEAL] W. J. BRYANT,
District Secretary.

INCREASED PAY FOR CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES AT NASHVILLE, TENN.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from William R. Douglas, president of Local No. 936, National Federation of Federal Employees, of Nashville, Tenn., enclosing a resolution adopted by the executive committee of that local, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the basic salary of the employees of the Veterans' Administration regional office and veterans' hospital at Nashville, Tenn., and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL NO. 936
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Nashville, Tenn., January 25, 1951.

Hon. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The attached resolution has been adopted by the executive committee of Local 936, National Federation of Federal Employees, Nashville, Tenn.

Your consideration of this resolution and efforts toward the passage of an increase in pay for Federal employees will be greatly appreciated.

It is requested that the president of Local 936 be furnished an expression of your attitude toward an increase in salary for Federal employees.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM R. DOUGLAS,
President.

Whereas employees of the Federal Government, in cooperation with all other citizens, are anxious and willing to fully participate in any and all sacrifices that our preparedness program may require, to serve where and when most needed for the overall common good of our country, and make all possible personal adjustments to fit the general circumstances of these unusual times; and

Whereas said Federal employees, like other good citizens, have the sacred obligation to support their dependents as to the necessities of life, and to earn a fair living wage; and

Whereas it is a known fact that the cost of living has advanced materially and that the cost of commodities has reduced the take-home pay; and

Whereas employees of the Federal Government have had no increase in their salary range since October 1949 and are unable to get such increase except through an act of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of Local 936, NFFE, representing employees of the Veterans' Administration regional office and veterans' hospital, Nashville, Tenn.,

urge our Representatives in the National Congress to support pending legislation for a substantial increase in their basic salary, and that expedited action be taken by them for this action; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Tennessee Representative with a request that they furnish the President of our local an expression of their attitude toward our request for this needed relief to loyal Federal employees.

DANGERS OF INFLATION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Vermont Legislature, and approved by the Governor on January 26, 1951, relating to dangers of inflation and providing ways and means to prevent same.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint Resolution 13

Whereas the threat of inflation is one of imminent danger; and

Whereas inflation reduces the value of savings, places a heavy penalty upon all those with fixed incomes, discourages thrift and good management, and places a premium upon speculation; and

Whereas, the adoption of price and wage controls alone is merely a stop-gap measure: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of Representatives, That the impending inflation be curtailed and eventually stopped by taking the following measures:

I. Increased production of needed goods through commonly accepted measures, including extension of the workweek;

II. A program of "pay as we go" taxes;

III. Elimination of all nonessential Government expenses, including a reduction in the number of persons on the Government payroll;

IV. Proper exercise of controls and functions in the field of monetary, credit and fiscal policy in order to reduce the supply of purchasing power.

That the secretary of state forward a certified copy of these resolutions to President Harry S. Truman, Senators George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Ralph Flanders, of Vermont; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona; Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; and Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; Representatives Winston Prouty, of Vermont; Sam Rayburn, of Texas; John W. McCormack, and Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Eric Johnston, economic stabilization administrator; and Michael DiSalle, price director of the Economic Stabilization Administration—all in Washington, D. C.

WALLACE M. FAY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 26, 1951.

LEE E. EMERSON.

ADEQUATE BOXCARS FOR SHIPMENT OF DURUM GRAIN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and printing in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Dakota, relating to the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of durum grain.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution F

Concurrent resolution requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to take such action as may be necessary to insure the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of durum grain

Whereas the State of North Dakota produces 85 percent of the durum raised in the United States and the bulk of such production is in the northerly portion of the State; and

Whereas late summer rains and early snow came before a large portion of such durum could be threshed, with the result that much of such durum contains more than 15-percent moisture; and

Whereas such grain cannot be safely stored on the farm nor in the grain elevators because of the danger of heating and it is necessary that such grain be sent to terminal markets where it can be properly dried and stored; and

Whereas the marketing and shipping of such grain is being prevented by a shortage of boxcars and if such grain cannot be shipped before warm weather starts a great deal of such grain will spoil, with great financial loss to the farmers and great loss of human foods; and

Whereas by reason of the aforesaid facts an emergency exists: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to take such action as may be necessary to insure the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of such grain: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the North Dakota Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

MILTON RUE,
President pro Tempore.
W. J. TOAUT,
Secretary of the Senate.
LEO STUKA,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

COMMUNIST CHINA AGGRESSION IN KOREA—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington favoring the resolution submitted in the United Nations to brand Communist China as an aggressor in Korea.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rules, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the United Nations did create the Republic of Korea; and

"Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are now engaged in armed combat in Korea, all as a representative of the United Nations; and

"Whereas Communist China has either directly or indirectly sent armies and/or soldiers into Korea and is now openly fighting the United Nations forces in Korea; and

"Whereas the United States has submitted or is about to submit to the United Nations a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in Korea: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do support the principles involved in such resolution now submitted, or about to be submitted to the United Nations and do respectfully request Your Excellency to take every appropriate step in support of such resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in Korea; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on January 23, 1951.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

AID TO VETERANS' DEPENDENTS—RESOLUTION OF BAY VIEW (WIS.) POST, NO. 180, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from an American Legion post in Milwaukee, Wis., Bay View Post, No. 180, a resolution urging the remedying of the deplorable delays in sending out allotment checks to families and dependents of our veterans. Many instances have come to my attention from my State in which there has been genuine hardship caused to parents, wives, and so forth, because servicemen's allowances were not received rapidly.

As an indication, therefore, of the deep sentiment of veterans' organizations on this issue, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, as forwarded to me by Commander Emmett J. Heup, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas information has come to the officers of Bay View Post, No. 180, the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, that dependents of veterans in the armed services of the United States are facing delay in the receipt of their allotment checks and thereby being caused unnecessary inconvenience, and in many instances, suffering; and

Whereas information has come to the officers of Bay View Post, No. 180, the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, that pay to veterans who have been called back into service is delayed in reaching those veterans, in some instances extending over a period of time of several months, and by reason of this the veterans are caused unnecessary inconvenience, and in some instances, suffering: Therefore be it

Resolved by Bay View Post, No. 180, the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, in regular meeting assembled, That immediate action be requested by the proper officers of the various branches of the armed services of the United States to remedy the above conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY and Hon. JOSEPH MCCARTHY, United States Senators for the State of Wisconsin, and Hon. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and Hon. CHARLES KERSTEN, Congressmen from the Fourth and Fifth Districts of Milwaukee County respectfully, requesting their immediate attention looking to the remedying of these conditions.

DATE FOR HEARING IN NATURAL GAS CASE—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Stanley Witkowski, city clerk of Milwaukee, Wis., a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee urging the setting of a day certain by the Federal Power Commission to consider the petition filed by the State of Wisconsin in the Phillips Petroleum Natural Gas Rate case.

I absolutely endorse the sentiments expressed in this resolution. I feel that the State of Wisconsin is eminently fair and just in making this request. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Attorney General Vernon Thompson and William E. Torkelson, chief counsel of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, have petitioned the Federal Power Commission for a definite hearing date relative to natural-gas rates by the Phillips Petroleum Co., exclusive supplier of natural gas to the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., the only wholesale supplier of natural gas to Wisconsin distributing companies, including the Milwaukee Gas Light Co.; and

Whereas the wholesale rates charged by the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. are regulated by said Federal Power Commission but there is no regulation of rates charged by said Phillips Petroleum Co. at the well head; and

Whereas the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin contends that unless the cost of natural gas is regulated all the way, any regulation is an empty and meaningless formality; and

Whereas on October 1948 the Federal Power Commission ordered an investigation to determine whether the Natural Gas Act gave the Federal Power Commission power to regulate a natural-gas company and the first hearing was not scheduled until March 20, 1950, and since then there have been seven postponements; and

Whereas on December 19, 1950, said Federal Power Commission, at the request of the said Phillips Petroleum Co., ordered indefinite postponement of the hearings; and

Whereas proponents of lower natural-gas rates contend that the cost of natural gas charged by the Phillips Petroleum Co. and the pipe line company is approximately $5,000,000 per year greater than the amount which would have been permitted under the original contract; and

Whereas the aforesaid petition by Messrs. Thompson and Torkelson suggests a procedure under which the public interest can be fully served and the companies participation in the national mobilization effort can be fully protected: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it urges the Federal Power Commission to immediately consider the petition filed by officials of the State of Wisconsin relative to the aforesaid matter; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and to Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 101. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, with an amendment (Rept. No. 45); and

S. 379. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 46).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy (Rept. No. 47);

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria (Rept. No. 48);

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Dewey Pickett (Rept. No. 49);

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolau and his wife, Emilia (Rept. No. 50);

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong (Rept. No. 51);

S. 427. A bill for the relief of Nene Baalstad (Rept. No. 52);

S. 448. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans. (Rept. No. 53);

S. 451. A bill for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic (Rept. No. 54);

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious (Rept. No. 55);

S. 552. A bill to amend Public Law 717 of the Eighty-first Congress to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces (Rept. No. 56);

S. 568. A bill for the relief of George W. Purdy (Rept. No. 57); and

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs (Rept. No. 58);

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 28. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 59);

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury (Rept. No. 60);

S. 119. A bill for the relief of Joseph Girardi (Rept. No. 61);

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen (Rept. No. 62);

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen (Rept. No. 63);

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Zdenek Marek (Rept. No. 64);

S. 210. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal (Rept. No. 65);

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Azy Ajderian (Rept. No. 66);

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe (Rept. No. 67); and

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek (Rept. No. 68).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 516. A bill to amend the act incorporating The American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name The American Legion and American Legion; without amendment (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers, authorized certifying officer, Federal Works Agency; with an amendment (Rept. No. 72).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to employ temporary personnel during the Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 73); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 69) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-3490319, Abe Shizu.

A-2663540, Albramo, Filippo.

A-3002010, Ahmed, Ismail.

A-3161900, Ahmed, Yusef or Yousef Ahmed and Kasim Said.

A-6961793, Aitken, Marcella Vitalini.

A-9777218, Albanese, Frank.

A-3262789, Albert, Mary (nee Teuber).

A-2541785, Albert, Anton.

A-1369863, Albu, George Vasile or Josif Toth.

A-3528892, Alfonso, Joaquina Maria Mrs. or Joaquina Maria Alfonso, formerly Fidalgo (nee Pinto); J. Maria Alfonso; Joaquina Goncalves Barroso; Joaquina Maria Pinto; Joaquinnia Alfonza; Maria Joaquina Pinto; Joaquina Maria Pinto Barraso dias Fidago; Mary Alfonso; Maria Alfonso.

A-4513584, Allie, Ahmed Ben (alias Ahmed Allie alias Samuel Ben Allie).

A-5537150, Alt, Fred Willy.

A-5673027, Andrew, Peter James or Pete James Andrew or Panagiotis Demetriou Andritsakos.

A-3209155, Andriolas, Leonidas Nick or Leonidas Andreolas.

A-6357998, Anestakis, Paraskevi or Paraskevi Kornelios Anestakis or Paraskeri Anestaki.

A-1190242, Antonelos, Alexandros Demetriou or Anthony Antonelos.

A-6397402, Antypas, William George.

A-2900070, Apergis, Konstantinos Nicolaou or Gus Pappas.

A-4874680, Arsenis, Peter Gabriel.

A-1161603, Atkinson, George.

A-4440886, Baddo, Benedicto Balais or Victor Baddu.

A-6737690, Baldini, Malania Ada (nee Tozzi).

A-5391338, Babaris, Pavlos or Paul Felix.

A-3832721, Barberis, Vasilios or Bill Barbaris or Varvaris.

A-1771910, Bargellini, Louis.

A-3901595, Bauco, Basilio.

A-5778253, Baxter, Bessie Margaret Rosalind or Bessie Rosalind Margaret Baxter or Bessie Margaret Rosalind Durn (nee Dow).

A-6317580, Belazis, Niki Thomas or Mrs. Niki Angelopoulos Belzais (nee Niki Polyrios Angelopoulou) or Niki Belazis.

A-3760573, Benedix, Ernst Gustav.

A-6798708, Benton, Madeleine Patricia formerly Parker (nee Quick).

A-6709270, Berck, Lionel Neil.

A-4483707, Bertuccelli, Amleto.

A-1662385, Biale, Giovanni Battista or John Battista Biale or Gio Batta Biale.

A-5886141, Blanco, Mary Florence Byrne alias Mabel Blanco.

A-9795302, Bluet, Roger Gabriel Marie Maurice or Roger Gabriel Bluet.
A-4164153, Bolnavita, Zaharia.
A-4069160, Bonechi, Dante.
A-6457503, Bonime, Selma or Selma Plaschges (nee Selma Fehl).
A-6958173, Bonner, John Herbert.
A-4941272, Bosetti, Enrico Ambrogio.
A-3498346, Bostos, Demetrios Nicholas or James Nicholas Bastos or Demetrios Nicholas.
A-6390971, Braun, Elly (nee Schlesinger).
A-4474635, Buono, Domenico Lo or Joe Costa.
A-1800618, Bursich, Louis.
A-6576275, Butkus, Antanos.
A-5040766, Caetano, Joao, Jr.
A-2691402, Campbell, Anna Mary or Anastasia Carey.
A-9559042, Carbajo, Salvador Pena.
A-6160261, Carfagna, Frank Joseph.
A-6910279, Carney, Valerie Boyle (nee Boyle).
A-4395390, Carpino, Agostino Eugenio Angelo or Carmelo Angelo Carpino or Angelo Carpino.
A-7083796, Caruso, Michael Vittorio.
A-5257495, Chamberlain, Mary Elizabeth.
A-7575864, Chan, Woon Lum or William Chan.
A-7575866, Chan, Kwan Ying Taam or Mrs. William Chan.
A-7575865, Chan, Shirley Shui-Ling.
A-6855472, Chang, Meng Ling.
A-7081472, Chang Shurman You Hsi or You-Hsi Chang.
A-7580983 Chang, Shurman Shao Mei.
A-4279952, Chao, Fang Yu or David Chao.
A-4518181, Chao, Manuel Perez.
A-7092967, Chayes, Chainine or Norman Chayes.
A-6760582, Chejfec, Yevel or Joel Chafetz.
A-5873433, Chen, Julia I. H. (Chinese name—I-Hsuan) or Julia H. Chen.
A-5726674, Chi, En Tao or Andrew Robert Chi.
A-7050354, Chin, Quong Lun.
A-5151324, Chira, Betty (nee Dweck).
A-7268982, Chounard, Janice Veronica or Janice Veronica Dunn.
A-4965336, Christensen, Charles William.
A5833884, Christiades, Athanasios Georgiou.
A-1007342, Cintala, Andrej or Andy Cintala.
A-4356595, Coelho, Joaquim.
A-5560179, Coggins, John William.
A-6146599, Coleman, Garland Michael.
A-3891055, Conlon, Matthew.
A-7049117, Contogiannis, Constantinos Demetrios.
A-3675543, Cornelius, Margaret (nee Nicholson), formerly Steacy.
A-4504050, Dan, Eng Suey or Suey Eng or Edward Eng.
A-4105803, Dantas, Alberto.
A-7203444, De Lisa, Velia.
A-5406233, Demouchikos, John Nicholas or John Nick Dimos or Ioannia Demouchikos or John Nick Demouchikos or Ioannia Nicolaos Demouchikos.
A-3251192, De Barros, Antonio Rodrigues or Antonio Rodrigues.
A-6153523, De Mandelbaum, Carmen Rickards or Carmen R. Mandelbaum; Carmen Rickards Mandelbaum.
A-6813667, De Martini, Rosa Victoria.
A-3046685, De Martino, Pasquale.
A-3126180, De Mergel, Maria Lunar (nee Lunar).
A-7050741, De Olmedo, Guadelupe Sevilla or Inez Garcia.
A-3662123, De Pirro, Filippo or Lilippo De Pisso.
A-5959320, De Winne, Vitale or Vital De Winne also known as August De Winne.
A-4502595, Diamantakis, Maria (nee Maria Papageorgiu).
A-1364906, Di Costanzo, Lucy (nee Trani) or Lucy Trany.
A-3852007, Dock, Lee or Dock Lee.
A-5529780, Donohue, Alexandra (nee Trzetrzewinski) or Alexandria Trzet.
A-6741596, Dorenfeld, Lola (nee Lola Elainbaum).
A-4417414, Dos Santos, Agostinho Goncalves or Augustino Santos.
A-6676366, Dracius, Raphael Anatole.
A-7599638, Durantini, Caterina Alice.
A-4947782, Economou, Vasilios Alexandrou or Basil Alexander Economou.
A-7203604, Edquid, Uldarico M. or Uldarico Maatubang Edquid.
A-7203603, Edquid, Ludivino M. or Ludivino Maatubang Edquid.
A-7203601, Edqu . Ida Ruth M. or Ida Ruth Maatubang Edquid.
A-7188365, Eide, Inger Else.
A-6246412, Eleffher, Sofia.
A-3403559, Eng, Bee.
A-6261634, Etimos, Martha (nee Koudjari or Kotzaria).
A-6840137, Etimos, Mary.
A-3493248, Evenson, Olav Arthur or Arthur Boyd.
A-3370301, Fabio, Carmelo or Charles or Charlie Fabio.
A-6738370, Fabrizio, Anna Maria (nee Cappelletta).
A-6651932, Fait, Josef Ferdinand or Josef F. Fait or Josef Fait.
A-6821621, Fait, Eliska or Eliska Freiberg.
A-7079681, Farhat, Mansour.
A-5142947, Fatovic, Ante.
A-5124482, Fernandez, John or John Fernandez Marino.
A-4931665, Ferenz, John.
A-4185448, Fernandez, Pilar (nee Rodriguez).
A-5204552, Ferri, Domingo Pinar.
A-5683153, Fikaris, Constantinos or Costas or Gust Fikaris.
A-6486998, Filipovic, Frank or Franjo.
A-5244846, Finando, Yetta (nee Feiga Yenta Kalich) or Feiga Yetta Tuch.
A-1179300, Fischl, Anna (nee Weissberger).
A-4920771, Fong, Woo Lan or Woo Lang Fong (Shee).
A-5107266, Fontana, Adelino or Leo Fontana.
A-3694110, Fook, Wong or Fook Wong.
A-4919356, Fragakis, Gerasimos George or Jerry Fragakis.
A-2326918, Fragkias, Jerry or Gerassimos Gragkias.
A-6505233, Franczoz, Emery or Emeric or Imre Franczos or Moishe or Mirko or Imre Franczoz.
A-6505227, Franczoz, Ireni (nee Menczer) or Irene Franczoz or Franczos.
A-6828809, Fuller, Stanley William.
A-6163652, Funk, Clementina Fidela (nee Clementina Fidela Cuyugan).
A-5243083, Galatolo, Armando.
A-6044645, Galos, William Ernest or Emanuel Galos or William Emanuel Galos or William Ernest Mastrosoff or Kobeliachenko.
A-4532091, Geller, Louis or Liepe Celler.
A-7083777, German, Philip Zaker.
A-6495830, Gevorkian, Vazgen or Gevorgian (alias Vazgen Nazar-Begian).
A-3886024, Glinos, John.
A-1245466, Goldstein, Fred or Fritz Goldstein or Fritz Goldstone.
A-3610193, Gomes, Anthony Lopes or Anthony Santos Gomes or Antonio Gomes or Anthony Santos and Antonio Santos.
A-3792106, Goo, Oy Lin Lam or Lam Oy Lin or Oy Ling Lum.
A-6799266, Grabner, Katherine Siha or Katherine Siha.
A-6690075, Graiman, Helen or Helene Slobotzki.
A-5954836, Gralak, Ludwig or Ludwik Gralak.
A-3054760, Gray, John William.
A-3237203, Greer, Thomas Anthony.
A-7222258, Grimes, Francis or Francois Scherer.
A-5280985, Grivich, Ivan or John Grivich.
A5049393, Grunberg, Romuald Peter or Roman Peter Eilers.
A-4792060, Hafenbraedl, Otto or Charles Hafenbraedl.
A-6502870, Halberstam, Janka (nee Janka Ungar).
A-9144350, Hamiga, Franciszek.
A-6042315, Hanacik, Anna (nee Barvir).
A-7601609, Harlow, Contantine or Constantin Harlow.
A-3398080, Hart, Ida Miriam (nee Schwartz).
A-7741274, Haynie, Ann Feng or Anna Budich.
A-6989369, Heathorn, George Alfred or George Alfred Heath.
A-7525841, Helm, Betty Stucken.
A-6261619, Heropoulos, Galliope (nee Mavromatis).
A-5016580, Hewitt, Barbara.
A-7251784, Hill, Aarne Allan or Aarne Allan Jaakkola.
A-3019321, Hiltunen, Anna.
A-4223203, Hing, Leung, Wai or Leung Shee.
A-3843187, Chow, Chan Fung or F. C. Chan or Chan Chow Ming.
A-3421389, Holmsten, Sylvia Suleima (nee Harma).
A-9574471, Holst, Prehen Wilhelm.
A-6920809, Hondas, John.
A-3066243, Hong, Sheng Hwa or Hung or Wesley Sheng.
A-5740977, Hong, Florence Fung Yee Wong (nee Fung Yee Wong).
A-5371149, Horngacher, Hedwig Magdalena or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacher.
A-4948589, Howlett, John Joseph.
A-4949207, Huff, Bertha Isabella or Bertha Isabella Hanna.
A-4829032, Huneke, Nikolaus.
A-1145007, Hurtl, Frank Anthony or Franz Anton Hurtl, Frank Anton Hurtl or Frank Anthony Xavier Hurtl, Frank Hurtdle.
A-1187113, Hyuck, Choy Lung or Choy Long Hyuck or Hugh L. Choy.
A-3237648, Iwanaga, Toshio.
A-6652953, Jakobowicz, Rosalia or Rozalia Jakobowitz or Rosalia Buxbaum or Rosalia Menczer.
A-7081613, Janner, Maria Hubertina.
A-4068105, Janssens, Michael.
A-7127705, Jelsovsky, Karl or Carl Heinz or Carl Heinz Jelsovsky or Heinz Henninger or Karl Heinz Henninger.
A-6862515, Jepeway, Marie or Marie Salim De Miguel.
A-1441431, Jianakas, Epaminonoas Zenophone or Peter Jianakas.
A-4349998, Johannsen, Emil Peter.
A-4949774, Johnson, Lempi Alexandra Koskinen.
A-4751308, Johnson, Martha Irene or Martha Irene Miskala.
A-5399796, Junus, Jeff.
A-6258288, Juul, Poul Tage.
A-9799503, Kadlec, Edward Laurence.
A-3511268, Kaliszczuk, Onofry or Fred Kallin or Otto Fred Kallin.
A-7188278, Kamp, Gisela Mertins or Gisela Kamp Mertins.
A-1984087, Kane, Sara or Sale Kane.
A-3282333, Kaps, Frank alias Frank Capps (alias Kapsch alias Capsch).
A-7130272, Kaptzan, Ariadna.
A-5065624, Karas, Dora or Dnora Karasik.
A-3321122, Karavolos, Stavros Nicolau (alias Steve Nicolau Karavolos).
A-5916574, Karlsen, Karl Bjorn.
A-9663171, Karnavouras, Michael.
A-4284828, Karnuts, John.
A-8876266, Karnuts, Elizabeth (nee Kiss).
A-1895336, Katikas, Christos Nicolau.
A-5038520, Katona, Laszlo (or Louis).
A-5633270, Katsimpiris, Nickolaos Michael or Nick Fadis.
A-1393507, Katz, Dorothy or Dwojra Katz or Kora Katz (nee Dorothy Mandelbaum).
A-6347259, Katzias, Concepcion (nee Linares).
A-7140301, Kee, Yip Hon or Hon Yip or Hon Kee Yip.
A-5335599, Kegyes, John or Janos Kegyes.
A-6716722, Kekenak, Steve.

A-6009275, Khodabandeh, Mostafa.
A-3284953, Kim, Lucia or Ryang Kim.
A-6145917, King, Patricia Biel (nee Patricia Biel).
A-7736558, Kircan, Rasit.
A-5359485, Klimm, Basilius.
A-3558777, Koltz, Harry.
A-5157018, Komar, Julianna.
A-5130827, Koplowitz, Bertha formerly Miller formerly Wachman (nee Grabovsky).
A-9545100, Kopasakis, Emmanuel Xenophon or Emmanuel Xenophon Copossakis or Kopasais, or Kopasakis.
A-1122763, Koprowski, Bolesiaw Karol or Bolesiaw Koprowski.
A-4345827, Korman, John.
A-5137819, Kornis, Louis or Louis E. Kornis.
A-7222416, Koulianos, Theofilos or Theofilos Coulianos or Teddy Koulos.
A-3684843, Kozas, Semon or James Alexander Cozano.
A-2880774, Kremke, Harry Herman.
A-5505097, Kremmydas, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Krommydas or Panagiotis Grommydas or Panagiote Crommidas or Peter Dallas or Pete Dallas.
A-3025719, Kuchta, John.
A-5234321, Kuhle, Arnold John or John J. Purvishk.
A-5589962, Krause, Elizabeth Pauline or Elizabeth Pauline Kuhle or Elizabeth Paula Purvishk.
A-4528748, Kukkanen, Lydia.
A-5275512, Kushigemachi, Suyekichi.
A-6763383, Kuypers, Corstinus.
A-2449614, Kuypers, Jannetje Maria (nee De Groot).
A-4349542, Kwan, Hai Lu or Harry Lu Kwan.
A-5028506, Kwan, Siu Ying Hou or Susan Kwan or Susan Y. Kwan.
A-1289859, Kyriakides, Costas or Costas Papazogiou or Gus Pappras.
A-4508155, Labaro, Raffaele.
A-3707772, Labos, De Devenyi Rajmond or Raymond Labos or Raymond Von Labos.
A-2194854, Labrinidis, Ioannis Michael or John Lambros or John Michael Lambros or Michael Lambros or Ioannis Michael Lamprinidis or Ioannis Lamprinidis.
A-4144162, Lacono, Federico.
A-1417553, Lanahas, Nickalos.
A-6676346, Lande, Sevine (nee Serine Skeie).
A-7084939, Lang, Gudrun Margarete.
A-5191791, Langa, Michel or Michel Langas or Mike Langa.
A-1121428, Langemyr, Knut or Knute Langmuir.
A-4269828, Lannou, Jean Herve Marie or John Lannou.
A-5441581, Lauridsen, Halver Norup.
A-4414522, Laux, Rosine Katherina (nee Seitz).
A-9799330, Laynas, John George.
A-5253289, Lee, Bessie Pi-Yun or Bessie Pi Yun Wang (maiden name).
A-9765299, Lee, Bor or Lee Bor Cheung.
A-3336117, Leon, Emanuel Constantin or Emanuel Constantinou Leontopoulos.
A-2150253, Lewinski, John Stanislaw.
A-7068990, Lewis, Guilhermina Mendonca Toledo.
A-4892573, Lione, Edward John or Edoardo Giovanni Lione.
A-5267443, Liptak, Andrew.
A-3935383, Lo, Shih Ting or Steven Lo.
A-6867963, Loftus, Larry Arthur.
A-7092277, Long, Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd Vaubell.
A-4883409, Longolius, Conrad Rudolf.
A-6921120, Lordt, Antoine Leon.
A-3836653, Losada, Manuel Fraga.
A-5196440, Lourbacos, Petros or Pete or Peter Lourbacos.
A-3428707, Lourenco, Jose Maria.
A-5916063, Malliaroudakis, Constantinos Pericles or Kostas Pericles Malliaroudakis or Gust Malliaroudakis.
A-3349959, Mallon, Sarah Jane (nee Devlin).
A-2645007, Manalis, Constantinos or Gus Manalis.
A-4706257, Maniatis, Constantinos or Gus Manos.
A-7083491, Mantzaris, George or Georgios Mantzaris.
A-4027807, Manzino, Torino Hugo.
A-4845930, Mariotti, Anelio.
A-4516836, Mark, August George or August Mark.
A-3436330, Markarian, Markar.
A-3500860, Martin, Andrew or Andras Marton.
A-4025266, Martinez, Antonio Gonzalez.
A-6661338, Marttinen, Lea Mirjam.
A-6661330, Marttinen, Risto Kullervo.
A-6661337, Marttinen Hannu Matti.
A-6661336, Marttinen, Pekke.
A-7203781, Mascarinas, Arturo or Arturo Ando.
A-7203782, Mascarinas, Antonio or Antonio Ando.
A-3803609, Matsuba, Shige.
A-3413681, Mattera, John or Giovanni Mattera.
A-3360760, Matura, Marijan.
A-7145885, Mazzone, Giuseppina Pala.
A-7049500, Mekjian, Dikranoi or Dikranoi Semizoglu.
A-2362402, Metaxas, Gerasimos Agourias or Jerry Mataxes.
A-4724981, Micko, Stefan.
A-5009846, Milcetich, Peter or Peter or Pete Miller.
A-3036784, Milisis, John.
A-3493407, Miller, Aino Johanna or Aino Johanna Matsel (nee Kolemainen).
A-6415774, Miller, Eugenie Gabrielle Fuynel (nee Eugenie Gabrielle Guynel).
A-6415773, Miller, Charlotte Jennifer.
A-6742024, Milrod, Izrael.
A-7092040, Milrod, Lydia Ruth.
A-2571918, Moi, Jung Yin or Teddy Moi.
A-2982568, Moi, Goon Shee or Wai Ying.
A-6010467, Monzo, Jessie Leaetta (nee Alexandra or De Alexandra).
A-4040538, Morales, Matilde or Matilde Torre.
A-7203774, Morrow, Maria or Maria Morariu.
A-7203794, Moschos, Nick John or Nicolaos John Moschos.
A-2398946, Moy, Shee Tong.
A-5946330, Muller, Eugenia.
A-3837423, Musial, Hans Erich Kurt or Hans Peschkow or Erick Musial.
A-5317545, Musiu, Mihail Johan or Mike Johns or John Michael or Mihali Joan Musi.
A-6923076, McCutcheon, Grace (nee Grace Steinmetz).
A-4635079, Napoleoni, Maria Palma.
A-4032775, Neider, Edward Julius or Edort Julius Neider.
A-3621598, Nicolescu, Traian or Dan or Daniel Nicholas or Dan Nicolescu or Floria Bergian.
A-1126088, Nicosia, Gaetano or David C. Marsano.
A-7527958, Noxon, Anne Wookdridge.
A-4726441, Nunes, Serafino Da Rocha.
A-6925755, Oaks, Eugene Vernon.
A-6316253, O'Connor, Earle Robin.
A-7178580, Odenbach, Rolf Dieter.
A-7200144, Olmer, Joseph or Joseph Morris Olmer.
A-2521766, On, Haw (How) Duck or Wilbur Hall.
A-2279204, Haw (How), So Woon Ying or Susie Hall (nee So Woon Ying).
A-3563377, Ortoljo, Math or Matthew or Matthew John Ortoljo.
A-4056904, Orzea, Candit or Orzia or John Orzea.
A-7115536, Oseguera, Karl or Karl Vizvari.
A-5602910, Otamendi, Maria or Sister Marta.
A-2934218, Ozaki, Yoshio (nee Toshiyo Miyano).
A-7767272, Ozdizdar, Hamdi Hasan.
A-5524682, Paasuke, August Richard.
A-4125236, Pagano, Aniello.
A-2457076, Page, Albert Joseph.
A-3871266, Pagoulatos, Jerasimos or Jerry Pagoulatos.
A-7222516, Panagakos, Dimitra or Dimitra Nicholas Selimou (maiden name).
A-6422587, Panagopoulos, Eugene.
A-4052705, Pangos Eugenio.
A-3085849, Pantazis, John Nicholas or John Pantazis.
A-9777311, Papadakis, Nicolaos.
A-7117540, Papademas, Charalambos (alias Bob).
A-9505138, Papadopoulos, Stefanos.
A-3544491, Papoutsis, George.
A-5734016, Paris, May Estelle.
A-4363160, Pastor, Charles Emil (alias Karaly Emeil Pastor).
A-4501417, Patterson, John.
A-4129552, Pejko, Joseph or Jozef or Joe Baker.
A-4212645, Pelechata, Anna.
A-6839278, Perdew, Blanche Sophie Ghlisiane or Blanche Sophie Ghlisiane De Vriendt.
A-9561382, Perez, Andres or Andrew Perez.
A-1565944, Pessl, Eric.
A-3817284, Peters, Benjamin or Peter Benjamin and Samuel Anderson.
A-3451259, Petrator, Peter or Petros Petratos.
A-2556975, Petratos, Peter Panagiotis.
A-5598847, Petrowsky, Emil Edouard Bernhard or Emil Werner.
A-1125876, Phasoulakes, Eustratios Michel or George Fasalakis or Fassalakis or George Michael Fasalakis or Fassalakis.
A-6569456, Pihala, Kalho Marjatta (nee Valo).
A-6569457, Pihala, Kauko Einar or Kauko Einar Riuttanen.
A-2073410, Ping, Poon Shut (Mrs. George Pung).
A-4706265, Plagmann, Max or Michael or Michale Lewis.
A-4388693, Pochert, Emil Herman.
A-7083110, Polselli, Federico or Frederick Polselli.
A-6771537, Posantzis, Vasilios Homer.
A-6924081, Poulios, Theodore.
A-6217721, Prester, Julio.
A-3543489, Prochaska, Nora Zweybruck or Nora Editha Ernestine Prochaska.
A-7203353, Quinagon, Fely or Fely Guzman Quinagon formerly Felipa Reyes.
A-7203352, Quinagon, Maurice or Maurice Guzman Quinagon formerly Mauricio Guzman Reyes or Mauricio Amador Reyes.
A-3632442, Quinn, James Hannick.
A-5188632, Racenstein, Harry or Harry Ratzenstein.
A-1275470, Raftopoulos, Deoneseos Socrates or Dennis Raftis.
A-5110083, Ramiene, Chana (nee Epstein) or Chana Ramm.
A-4366566, Ramos, Carlos Gumsindo.
A-9580343, Rasmussen, Erik Aage.
A-6970209, Rasofsky, Ladislav or Larry Rush.
A-5314172, Raypert, Stanislawa (nee Kowalski).
A-1247190, Reeves, Clara Brandon (nee Morrison) or Clara Lewis Brandon Reeves.
A-6887362, Reid, Irma Maria or Serena Irma Maria Reid.
A-4082754, Reitz, Margaret Kunst or Margaret Schmidt.
A-6921469, Rekow, Christine Kay.
A-5803209, Riley, Harry Edward (alias Harry Edward Bull).
A-4817858, Rinaldi, Antonio.
A-7070752, Rivera-Medrano, Augusto.
A-4307763, Robles, Gregorio Laciste.
A-5890431, Roig, Juan Jose Balta Seller.
A-5154920, Rose, Ramiro.
A-4829114, Rosovich, Emil Zebo or Eusebio Rosovich.
A-7140438, Rossbacher, Ingeborg Gerda.
A-3866831, Roussos, John.
A-2199705, Ruckdeschel, August Franz.
A-7264094, Ruppert, Peter Karl or Peter Karl Ruppert Jones.
A-7261095, Ruppert, Kurt or Kurt Ruppert Jones.

A-1819037, Russo, Francesco or Frank Russo.
A-3971558, Rytkonen, Waino Heikki.
A-3639497, Sabaija, Joseph or Josip.
A-7085229, Sagner, Karin Monica Eliese.
A-5720260, Sakaguchi, Namie or Namie Saruwatari.
A-4525969, Sakamoto, Shonosuke or Frank Sakamoto.
A-4855886, Sakamoto, Koito.
A-5749141, Sandberg, Gustaf Adolf.
A-9702346, Sandnes, Rolf George.
A-5885559, Sang, Ho or San Ho or Ho Tin Sik.
A-2890222, Sanics, Ricardo Santos or Diamontino, Almeira Campos.
A-6711698, Santini, Enrico Enio.
A-320614, Sardis, Eleftherios Nicholas.
A-5111935, Schaefer, Reinhardt.
A-5386287, Schaefer, Willi m Erich or Willi Erich Schaefer or Willie E. Schaefer or Erich Max Willy Schaefer.
A-4381292, Schonfeld, Isidor.
A-5985477, Schultz, Helena (nee Pawlak).
A-4553340, Schwalie, Barbara.
A-3405484, Schwulera Ida (nee Kommorowski).
A-1978517, Scibetta, Josephine or Giuseppa or Giuseppina Scibetta or Schibetta (nee Perrone or Perrune or Hrrone).
A-5329509, Seemann, Rudolf.
A-5475209, Seitzer, Catherine (nee Appinel) formerly Brett.
A-1966918, Shadrina, Agreppina Terentievna.
A-6216427, Shee, Der Lee.
A-5120812, Sheung, Chan Lai or Evelyn Jiu.
A-5870139, Silinonte, Giuseppe or Joseph or Giuseppe or Joseph Silinunte or Silinunte or Silimonte or Selinonte or Selimunte or Selimonte or Selinunte or De Giriolomo or Muffolette or Muoletta or Muolietta or Nuffolette or Monte.
A-6032827, Simhon, Enrique or Entique Simhon Cohen.
A-7719736, Skellas, Stefanos.
A-1459289, Sklavounos, Aggelos or Angelo Sklavos.
A-2561863, Smith, Stephen Klar.
A-6187108, Souza, Mary Alice Kim or Mary Alice Souza Kim or Mary Alice Kim.
A-3555511, Spathari, Antonio.
A-5571492, Nitas, Antonios Speridon or Evangelos Stelatos.
A-4411288, Spicjarich, John.
A-4054497, Spithogaiannis, Lambros Konstantine or Louis Spittas.
A-6623448, Steinfeld, Paul.
A-6623449, Steinfeld, Ruzena (nee Herzog), alias Rose or Rosalie Herzog.
A-7247857, Stephan, Irene Jerome or Irene Nicolaou Stefanitsis (maiden name).
A-3372820, Stenger, Michael.
A-3269664, Stulman, Max, or Norbert Max Stulmann.
A-9522398, Sundstrum, Karl Hjalmar.
A-5359125, Svevar, Axel Lennart Waldemar or Axel Svevar.
A-7197893, Switzeny, Peter Klaus.
A-7197894, Switzeny, Leonora.
A-2442047, Syvertsen, Bernt Johan or Bert Johan Syvertsen.
A-9777416, Szczepski, Walenty or Valentine Szczepski.
A-5628354, Sze, Manuel, or Sze Chiu Wah or Sze Chiu Hua.
A-4261394, Takahashi, Iku.
A-2891028, Tang, Kwok Cho or Danny Tang.
A-7604862, Tang, Marguerite Zing-Tsung or Mrs. Zubin Percy Tang.
A-7604864, Tang, Zubin Percy.
A-7604861, Tang, Mina.
A-1370061, Tanikawa, Masashi or Tadashi Tanikawa.
A-4909619, Teachman, Brame Jay or Teackman or Ben Teachman.
A-3300712, Terecido, Ramon Deus or Ramon Deus.
A-4301512, Terpich, Romano Dominic or Romano Terpich.
A-9559475, Throbjornsen, Arne Thorlef.
A-5905102, Toralballa, Leopoldo Vasquez.
A-5379958, Toralballa, Gloria (nee Cortes).
A-4652874, Torcello, Rodulfo.
A-5972551, Traqueia, Cipriano Marques.
A-6145977, Treash, Purificacion Nabong.
A-4032321, Tsang, Betty Ling or Shu Hsieng Tsang (nee Ling) or Elixabeth Simpson Ling.
A-1056611, Tsang, Sien Moo or Seymour.
A-5873471, Tsien, Virginia or Cho Ing or Virginia C. Tsien.
A-3416836, Tsikouris, Helen or Helen Gatis Tsikouris or Helen Kouskoutis.
A-4495399, Tsikouris, Ioannis or John Tsikouris or Giovannis Kachias or John Nicolaou Kakias or John Chekouris.
A-5248482, Tyler, Bertha Drewett or Bertha Tyler.
A-6346545, Vaccaro, Alida Margaretha (nee Martens) formerly Gravesteyn.
A-6970152, Vago, Isabella Natalina.
A-4120108, Valentis, Jacovoa or Jacobos Valentis or Jacovos J. Valentis.
A-9738379, Vanenburg, Jules Armand.
A-6094783, Varian, Maria Franco.
A-6094785, Varian, Morris Franco.
A-6094786, Varian, Terestia Franco.
A-6094787, Varian, Helen Franco.
A-6806886, Vecere, Maria Maddalena or Placentra or Peluso (nee Sevilla).
A-6173909, Ver, Paz Silva.
A-4095062, Veta, Benedetto.
A-9825152, Vigorita, Gaetano or Thomas Vigorita.
A-4319801, Visnjak, George Philip or George Visnjak.
A-6701189, Wagner, Gisele Marie Therese or Gisela Wagner.
A-4532548, Warnack, Fritz Johann.
A-5026668, Wegelius, Lennart.
A-6923530, Weintraub, Stanislaus.
A-5225571, Weiss, John or John or Janos Weiss.
A-5294022, Weller, John.
A-7197925, Wellner, Christine Doris.
A-3099269, Weskis, Johannes.
A-6920066, Wiest, Harold Henri.
A-2088278, Wilkinson, Maurice Finbar.
A-6723783, Williamson, James Oliver or John James Peters.
A-2599271, Wincup, Charles Christopher.
A-4800918, Wing, Ching or Hing Ching or Jimmie Hing.
A-7145748, Woods, Synnove or Synnove Pedersen or Synnove Pedersen Woods.
A-3588100, Wujcik, Paul or Wujick.
A-3588105, Wujcik, Frances or Wujick (nee Slawak).
A-4322153, Yaco (Jaco) Ymrich or Emrich or Imrich or Yatsko, Emrich.
A-2411482, Yamicic, Josef or Joseph Yamich.
A-3726892, Yau, Lam Chai or Walter Lum or Lum Chai You (alias Walter Lam or Lam San Ping).
A-5366278, Yokoya, Yoshi or Sei Cho or Shiqu Ono or Yoshi Mori or Toshi Toyoshima.
A-720890, Young, Choy Shie or Choy Sie Young or Choy Yong.
A-9687179, Yuen, Wong or Wong Yun.
A-1344004, Yunger, Anna Steibel or Anna Kirch (maiden name).
A-2383005, Zainudin, Yousuf or Esouf Jainodin or Eusoof Jainoo.
A-5819992, Zamparo, Frank or Francesco Zamparo.
A-5292396, Zanicos, Kyriakos.
A-2795128, Zolas, Astghik formerly Boyadjian (nee Hatabian).
A-7011519, Zolas, Edward.
A-7011518, Zolas, Astghik Fimi.
A-4043587, Zorrilla, Jesus Aparicio or Jesus Zorilla or Zorrilla.
A-7598245, Mora y Gonzales, Isidore Felipe de.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, also from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 70) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-2045097, Abalo, Celestino or George Abalo or Celestine Aballe.
A-5706398, Ackerman, Zelda (nee Schneider).
A-4158873, Agaccio, Edmondo Giuseppe or Edmondo Joseph Agaccio or Joe Agaccio or Edmondo Ogaccio
A-5310181, Akiyama, Sumiyuki or Stanley Akiyama.
A-7112346, Allen, Arthur Albert (alias Albert Allen).
A-6719955, Almaz, Paul Salin.
A-3311107, Alves, Jose Lino.
A-4736061, Anagnostidis, Constantin Emanuel or Gustav or Constantin Emannel or Constantin Emanuel Efstratiadis or Lorenz Melerand or Milerand.
A-744135, Angelaras, Dimetrios.
A-5373734, Angeles, Lopez, Augustine George (Jorge) or Agustine Angeles Comacho or Augustine George Angeles.
A-7081526, Angelopoulous, John or John Angel.
A-5183849, Arakaki, Taro or Isamu Okamura.
A-9777123, Bachas, Loukas or Lucas Bachas.
A-5147731, Backhaus, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Hartman or Elizabeth Vogel or Elizabeth Klein.
A-4548118, Backhaus, Joseph or Joseph Klein.
A-5666084, Badamo, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-6315183, Ballis, Constantin Stavros.
A-4443905, Ballis, Helen Constantine (nee Andrews or Andriou).
A-5952407, Ballis, Kimon or Cimon Constantin.
A-5867159, Barbieri, Giorgio Angelo.
A-6732354, Barbosa-Ramos, Rosendo (alias Roberto Rodriguez).
A-7083924, Barone, Antonio or Tony Barone.
A-7796121, Bascome, Altamont Stanley.
A-7776922, Nathalie, Velma or Bascome (nee Joell).
A-6984660, Bastoni, Albertina Fosca (nee Mariotti).
A-6322088, Beck, Redvers Howard or Redvers Howard Simpson.
A-6322087, Beck, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Gazzard), formerly Simpson.
A-3923866, Bekrakis, John.
A-6911160, Belvedere, Vittorio.
A-5261578, Berry, Robert Duncan.
A-2818969, Bertoglio, Giacomo (alias Pete Bertoglio).
A-7197804, Bestani, Mohamed Adib Amine.
A-4723723, Bladt, Michael or Mikal Bledt.
A-4083831, Blais, Marie Madelaine (nee Gagne).
A-6706400, Bodfish, George aka Juergen Kantor.
A-6887476, Bonati, Richard Joseph.
A-9777127, Bonello, Anthony.

A-9533410, Boot, Anton.
A-3883467, Bottino, Mariano.
A-7070348, Boules, Antonios Michael.
A-6438769, Bove, Fulvia Teresa (or Theresa) (nee Capuana) or Sylvia Capuiano.
A-3790584, Bravo, Thomas Amorin.
A-3469669, Bregant, Francis Charles or Franz or Frank Bregant.
A-4015777, Brown, Jack.
A-7140108, Brussee, Wietske Van Der Goot.
A-7240575, Buchinnick, Harri or Harry Kitz.
A-7178460, Buono, Giuseppe or Joseph Buono or Jose Buono.
A-7278601, Butterfield, Jean Donald.
A-2072584, Cacerez, Saturnino Rodriguez.
A-4394545, Calcanides, Sofia (nee Christoforides).
A-7029003, Calcanides, Despina.
A-1078605, Carekias, Orestes George or Oreste Carecias.
A-5310708, Carinos, Emanuel or Emmanuel or Emanuel Karinos.
A-6971651, Caropreso, Virginio or Virginio Rocco Antonio Caropreso.
A-5293002, Carrieri, Raffaele (alias Ralph Carrieri).
A-3505946, Caruana, Carlo.
A-3347257, Castagna, Pietro.
A-2668695, Cavallaro, Ilario.
A-7618927, Chang, Cheng Shu Wang.
A-1459989, Charbides, Evdochia (nee Mimopoulos).
A-1775243, Charron, William Joseph.
A-4459707, Chen, Man Chu.
A-5229612, Chen, Shou Heng Chue.
A-7030751, Chen, Fung-Cheung or Francis Feng-Hsiang Chen.
A-7030752, Chen, Raymond Fung-Chu or Fung Chu-Chen.
A-1015190, Chengges, Louis or Elias Dimitrius Chenggis or Cheggis or Tsengges.
A-3574562, Chengges, Christina or Christina Louis Chegges or Cheggis or Tsengges.
A-6028159, Chiang, Hsui-Chang.
A-6028156, Chiang, Zoh-Ing (nee Shen).
A-7171734, Chin, James Chee or Wing Chin (Chan).
A-4210249, Chinchefas, Michael Constantino.
A-6355300, Chryssikos, Paul Nicholas or Paul Nicolas Chryssicos.
A-7606579, Chuan, Raymond Lu-Po.
A-3566305, Clarizio, Saverio or Sam.
A-4454594, Clasoff, Elia Dimitroff or Ilija Dimeff Klasoff or Dimovich or Lewie Dimitroff.
A-4577197, Cohen, Frances (alias Frances Kneeter).
A-4422386, Colombos, John or Ioannis Colombos.
A-6699637, Constantinides, Eugenia Savvas or Eugenia Savva (nee Eugenia Evangelou Pagonis).
A-6998281, Costas, Elpiniki or Elpiniki Petros Giannopoulou.
A-6694937, Crowder, Gertrude Agnes or Jerabek.
A-2119529, Czerniawska, Anna.
A-6899247, Daniel, Suzanne Olga or Suzanne Olga Mornaghini.
A-2918394, Daras, Gerasimos Anastassias or Gerasimos Daras or Jerry or Geris or Gerry Daras or Darros.
A-5557874, Darinskas, Bernardas or Ben Darin.
A-3465828, D'Arpino, Arcangelo.
A-5362108, Da Silva, Agostinho Ferreira or Manuel Maria.
A-1563596, Da Silva, Alfred Alves.
A-6159617, Daughenbaugh, Edith Cecelia Lopez or Eddit Lopez.
A-6718188, Davis, Aglaia Constintin Stafilas or Aglaia Constantin Stafilas.
A-4168731, Dawson, William Rudeman or William Rudman Dawson.
A-5470962, Dawson, Constance Beatrice.
A-6290600, Debney, Audrey Rennie.
A-6839756, De Carvalho, Manuel Cordeiro.
A-5215233, De Covello, V'ncent Scotto or Scotto, Vincent.
A-3869583, Defterecos, Nicholas John or Nicholas J. Defterecos or Nicholaos Defterecos or Nicholas Thefteros or Nick Defterios or Nick Defterion.
A-3504330, Del Greco, Dino or Danny.
A-1415099, Dell'Aquila, Pasquale.
A-5410408, De Mammos, Maria, formerly Maria Eichvald (nee Maria Amers).
A-5981624, De Seaton, Celia Torres or Celia Torres Villanueva or Celia Villanueva de Seaton or Celia Villanueva de Espinoza.
A-6535879, De Wit, Louis Charles.
A-9749370, Diamandopoulos, Eustache.
A-5417653, Di Carlo, Francesco or Frank Di Carlo.
A-4083381, Di Filippi, Antonino.
A-7049191, Di Meo, Gennaro.
A-5096248, Dimoff, Pete or Pando Eftimovich.
A-2174286, Dittiger, John Caspar or John Dittiger.
A-4360055, Dobrocky, Michael.
A-3896350, D'Oliveira, Manuel.
A-6839754, Dorizas Katina Michalopoulos (nee Katina Michalopoulos).
A-6261646, Doukis, Ourania S. (nee Ouranis Sahinis or Ourania Doukis or Aurania Doukis).
A-5353927, Drivas, George J. or Georgios Drivas or George John Drivas.
A-2212407, Du, Theodora Sumner Hsu.
A-3269969, Dugdale, Ernest or Thomas Dugdale.
A-2185752, Dunat, Kuzman or Cosman Dunat.
A-6999680, Duvekot, Taetske (nee Van Der Heide aka Thea Duvekot).
A-9799328, Edwards, Alfred James.
A-7145332, Elfant, Zelman.
A-2531836, Esposito, Crescenzo or Christie or Frank.
A-7284898, Ewing, Ernest Aleck or Ernest Aleck Kleeman.
A-7284899, Ewing, Monika Margot or Monika Margot Kleeman.
A-7188325, Fafalios, Spiros or Spiros Leonida Fafalios.
A-6971390, Farga, Soledad Maria Comparro formerly known as Soledad Maria Camporro or Soledad Camporro Alonso.
A-9652011, Fernandez, Manuel Ben or Manuel Ben.
A-7049254, Ferell, Alvan Sigfrid or Alvar Sigfrid Carlson.
A-1437306, Ferrugia, Charles.
A-6526172, Finkelstein, Benjamin or Benjamin Finkelsztejn.
A-6596017, Fisch, Esther or Esther Persiner.
A-7197054, Follet, Claude Jean Rene.
A-7197055, Follet, Guy.
A-5307372, Frank, Ernest or Ernst Stopsack.
A-7089739, Fricioni, Giuseppina (nee Balerini).
A-5966205, Frost, Joseph or "Joe" Frost or Meroski or Marawske or Muryczka.
A-4916360, Fucco, Pasquale.
A-6389940, Fuchs, Alexander.
A-6389941, Fuchs, Serena (nee Serena Zoldan).
A-7081487, Fut, Lim Yun.
A-4506474, Garcia, Geronimo or Geronimo Garcia Nieves.
A-6972499, Garcia, Jesus Dopazo or Jesus Dopazo or De Paso.
A-9782964, Garcia, Jose Lago or Jose Garcia Lago or Lago Jose Garcia.
A-6879782, Gatsios, Panagiotis.
A-6879783, Gatsios, Olga.
A-7209333, Gavitt, Ethel May (nee Leane).
A-2405954, Georgopoulos, Konstantin Gerasimos or Jerry Gregory.
A-5556841, Giancarli, Sarah E. or Serafina Emilia Giancarli (nee Mattioli).
A-4495632, Giardina, Serafina Cascio.
A-4185674, Ginters, Emma Emilia (nee Stulpe).
A-9777433, Gioulis, Constantinos Michael.
A-5112884, Glass, Rachel Anna nee Neumark or Rae Glass.
A-5504869, Glenos, Athanasios Demetrios or Tom Glenos.
A-6800343, Goldberg, Sophie or Sophie Goldenberg.
A-6092467, Gonzalez-Garcia, Demetrio.
A-2319833, Gorlero, Gilbert or Gilberto Corlero or Gilbert Golero.
A-7083775, Goudas, Spiros Charilaos.
A-7180856, Gray, James McEwan.
A-1423786, Gray, Wesley.
A-6323335, Grayson, Yvonne Carole.
A-4958502, Green, Eva.
A-4178981, Grenedier, Masha (nee Golad alias Molly Grand).
A-3324111, Grenedier, Solomon or Solomon Grand or Sol Grand.
A-5647127, Grigoriou, Vasilios or Bill Grigouriu or Vasilios Grigauriu.
A-9634633, Grimley, George.
A-4545619, Grubelich, Jacob.
A-2761190, Guariglia, Nicola.
A-3513690, Gunther, Carl Heinrich or Carl Heinrich Guenther or Carl Henry Guenther.
A-6953520, Hannah, Cornelia Sophie or Cornelia Sophie Van Dillen or Cornelia Sophie Tierie.
A-4471429, Hansen, Johannes Vikkelso or John Vi.
A-1345163, Hanuszek, Rosa Lina (nee Heymann).
A-7130823, Haripar, Kurt Claus formerly Bahner.
A-4421499, Havlik, Edward.
A-7125433, Heckert, France Aimee, maiden name Meister.
A-5968471, Hee, Mrs. Wong Wah or Ng Yee or Ng Woon Tai or Suey Yee Wong or Woon Tai Ng or Suey Yee or Woon Tai.
A-5278938, Hellevik, Konstanse Petrine or Konstance or Constance Petrine Hellevik.
A-6780479, Hendry, Violet Maryon Oma.
A-5877733, Hignett, Thomas Henry.
A-6904693, Him, Quon Ming or Quon Seetoo.
A-7174613, Hing, Lee Wai or Harry Lee.
A-4080327, Ho, Guy Chang-Ching.
A-7083611, Ho, Wan or Ho Wan.
A-3624950, Hoi, Lo or Hoi Lo or Lo Park Chen.
A-3067209, Hummel, Wenzel.
A-7247151, Hutt, Florence.
A-5148709, Hyla, Wladyslaw or William Hyla.
A-1479112, Iengo, Antonio.
A-6661800, Imre, Strasser or Imre Strasser.
A-6656455, Strasser, Irene (nee Menczer).
A-4832360, Ing, Dick or Charlie Woo.
A-69211380, Inkster, Norah (nee Park).
A-5264598, Inouye, Shokichi or Henry Inouyn.
A-2659814, Ioannou, Petros or Peter Joanou.
A-1188545, Ishakawa, Kichihei or Ishikawa Kichihei or Junjiro Koshimizu.
A-6921066, Isnard, Marcel Eugene Theodore.
A-9529101, Iversen, Jhalmar Lindberg.
A-7083001, Jeffrey, Moses or Mohamed Jaferji.
A-6026320, Jensen, Ole.
A-5675472, Johansen, Halfdan Jarl or Halfdan Karl Johansen.
A-5070273, Johansson, Werner Leopold.
A-9503537, Johnsen, Kristian Henry Vincents.
A-5162750, Jongejans, Gerrit, Jr. (alias George Johnson).
A-4342693, Junke, Gerhard Kurt Hugo or Gerhardt Juemke.
A-4539486, Kainz, Karl Joseph.
A-3411826, Kainz, Helen Marie.
A-4583192, Kajiwara, Kaori.
A-7130627, Kapor, Vincent Dominick or Vincent Kapor.
A-6503759, Karan, Nikola P. or Nicolas Peter Karan formerly Nikola P. Karanikitch.
A-7274254, Karavitis, Nicholas George.

A-6491559, Karibon, Lilly (nee Schott).
A-5137432, Karpenkiel, Theodore Karl or Theodore Karpenkiel.
A-3471303, Karpenkiel, Gertrude (nee Labahn).
A-1380225, Kastrissios, Emmanouel D. or Emmanouel Demetrios Kastrissios.
A-5979400, Kataoka, Yoshizo.
A-3209626, Katomeritis, Nicholas Stephanis.
A-6708259, Kavooras, Eleanora (nee Skouras).
A-6710199, Kawczynski, Antoni or Anthony Kawczynski.
A-6942762, Kechriotis, Stamatios.
A-4659836, Keller, Nicolai or Nicolae Keller.
A-4336532, Keller, Maria.
A-6920532, Kennedy, Noel Percy.
A-4588694, Keong, Louie Wah or Lay Hua Chiang or Willis Louie.
A-3207099, Khan, Peer.
A-2928807, Kimm, Richard Chi Yon or Chi Yon Kimm or Richard Chiyon Kimm.
A-3255913, Kiparisus, Evangelos Georgos or Angelo George Kipper.
A-2686954, Klausen, Karl Johan or Carl Johan Clausen.
A-9676432, Kleppe, Lars Johnson.
A-5609936, Klinger, Magdalina (nee Ganz).
A-7117817, Kloucek, Henrik Peter.
A-7273957, Knotick, Annie or Annie Lillian Fusier.
A-4854994, Kobylinski, Aleksander (alias Arthur Collier).
A-5428796, Kosparek, Mary Frances (nee Chmelar) or Mary Frances Harrison.
A-5633426, Kostandinos, Risto or Hristo Vasil Naumovich Sandros (alias Thomas Christ Stoikoff).
A-2645008, Kousoulinos, Timoleo Panteli (alias Timoleon Koussoulinos alias Tom Konsolas).
A-1218279, Krazik, Alexander Ignatz or Alex Krazik or Ignatz Krazik.
A-4876514, Kremedas, Ioannis Mihail or Johm Michael Medas or John Mitchell Medas.
A-4022622, Kylitis, Antonios or Anton Kylitis.
A-9836824, Lahti, Eino Esajas or Eino Lahti.
A-2578292, Lambrinides, Pholikroni or Paul Lambros.
A-4660341, Lanzoni, Rino Custone.
A-5986180, Lardas, Kyriakos Nick or Antonios Patrinos.
A-7099692, Larson, Gudbjorg (nee Gudbjorg Stefansdottir).
A-5627286, Laughton, Walter or Walter Lauktien.
A-6142233, Leng, Hsi-Hung.
A-7174620, Leong, Yot Chung or George Leong or Loeng Ling or Leong Ling or Mon Tong.
A-2862498, Leto, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-6505212, Leung, Alicia (nee Alicia Sevilla).
A-4650870, Levedas, George Leonidas.
A-6989241, Levi, Pamela Shirley Louise or Pam Levi.
A-5498166, Lezis, Apostolos or Paul Lazos or Jim Raftopules.
A-6570820, Liblich, Zofia (nee Laurowicz).
A-6742221, Lie, Leif.
A-7112359, Lier, Martinus Van.
A-4862099, Ling, Young or Alvin Young Ling.
A-3377965, Liu, Yoh-Han or Yok John Liu or Y John Liu.
A-7267749, Lokker, Aaltje Wilhelmina or Aaltje Wilhelmina Noback.
A-6205098, Lopez, Alejandrina or Alejandrina Mendez y Perez.
A-6205070, Lopez, Manuel or Mannel Lopez y Barredo.
A-6289676, Louda, Svatava or Svatava Louda (nee Kysela).
A-6289674, Louda, Frantisek or Frank Louda.
A-2953851, Lucza, Emery Khiss or Emreic Lucza or Khiss or Emery Lucza.
A-5180161, Macaleese, Angele Marie Aimee or Angele Marie Aimee Bertrand (maiden name) or Angele Marie Aimee Defosse (first marriage).
A-4790455, MacGillicuddy, Joan Marie Therese or Joan Maggill or Joan Winfield.
A-5710585, MacGillicuddy, Mellie Veronica (nee O'Connor).
A-4405262, Macia, Rodasindo Beloso.
A-6858764, Macone, Pasquale.
A-5423568, Maggiore, Vincienzo or Vincent Maggiore.
A-6840814, Makris, Evangelia or (nee Christopoulou).
A-7145609, Mamais, Anthony or Antonios Nicolaou Mamais.
A-3386218, Manis, George C. or George Constantinos Zagrimanis.
A-9771356, Martinez, Francisco Gonzalez.
A-2647320, Martinovich, Joseph or Joso Sime Martinovic.
A-4030040, Martinsons, Anna or Stankious (nee Beckman).
A-3595092, Massimino, Mario.
A-5342620, Mastrogeorgakes, Demetrios or James Mastrogeorge.
A-2185685, Mastrojohn, John or Ioannis Mastrogianis.
A-2733208, Matsui, Yoshiaki.
A-2936516, Matsui, Matsuko.
A-5002506, Maynard, Irene Agatha (nee Ward).
A-4636736, McDowell, Thomas.
A-4961435, Mecker, Bernhard Frederich Wilhelm.
A-6965139, Mestousis, Demetrios Nick or James Nick Metousis.
A-3945643, Meteliz, Trudy Louise or Liza Meteliza or Elka Samseber.
A-2487212, Miah, Chang or Abdul Miah or Suna Miah.
A-7083159, Michalek, Peter Michael.
A-6743477, Milicia, Pietro.
A-6838533, Millas, Themis Demetrios or Themistogles Demetrios Millas.
A-5712651, Moe, Ho Fuh or Moe Ho Fuh.
A-2535148, Momjian, Harry or Haroutine Setrag Momjian.
A-6521626, Montella, Giuseppe or Joseph Montella or Giuseppe Montella or Montello.
A-5676542, Morgan, Ernest George.
A-6899744, Moschouris, Loukas.
A-4727178, Mouldevanou, Konstantina I.
A-4041219, Moy, Ou.
A-2644084, Mulholland, Patrick Joseph.
A-7050104, Najera, Manuel or Manuel Najera Cano.
A-6874299, Naccache, Elias Gabriel.
A-6799271, Nannetti, Roberto or Robert Nannetti.
A-4100489, Nicolau, Stilian Iovanis or Steve John.
A-4660725, Nordbeck, Ture Einar or John Einar Nordbeck.
A-9606943, Norman, Horatio Macfadyen.
A-0776639, Ntuli, Isaac William.
A-5060085, Nunes, Xavier.
A-7122408, Nymann, Elsa Irene Catharina Wang (nee Elsa Irene Catharina Wang).
A-7122409, Nymann, Rolf.
A-7122410, Nymann, Bjorn.
A-4854505, Okubo, Sugao or Kudao Okubo (alias Sam Saiki).
A-6551018, Oling, Emil Isak.
A-5869211, Olsen, Agnes Ovida (nee Agnes Ovida Abrahamsen).
A-7083511, Orenbain, Saul or Salo Morit Orenbain.
A-4300708, Otero-Ventin, Jose or Jose Caruso.
A-6179490, Ozata, Mehmet Selim.
A-6965411, Pacheco, Arnaldo or Chico Pacheco.
A-3171244, Pagliara, Gennaro or Jerry Pagliara.
A-7203823, Pahy, Lota or Lotta Pary.
A-7083111, Palan, Vlasta.
A-7117695, Paloheimo, Riitta Marjatta (Liikola).
A-7117696, Paloheimo, Eric Scott.
A-2150595, Papadopoulos, Kostas.
A-3327341, Papalazaros, Lazaros Demetrios or Lazaros Demetrios Papalazarou.
A-5630940, Pasquale, Aiano, De.
A-6925922, Patterson, Richard.
A-6072074, Patterson, Theodora Aguilion.
A-6928373, Patterson, Sylvia.
A-4663417, Paupin, Lisa (nee Lisa Kiec or Lisa Kundsin).
A-4761664, Pelizon, Celestine Kowalska or Celestine Genovefe Klein or Ciestine Kowalska.
A-9537792, Pereira, Eduardo Vicente.
A-1135764, Peros, Frane Mile.
A-6899277, Pesic, Paolo Svetislav or Paul Pesic.
A-6899278, Pesic, Milena Bojovic de (nee Milena Bojovic or Boyovic).
A-2907484, Petekas, Peter or Panagiotis Petekas.
A-4385958, Petrides, Stephan or Stephan Peters.
A-9661984, Pettersen, George.
A-5866634, Philipides, Novolaos Theodoros.
A-6965413, Phillis, Antigone or Antigone Karavia.
A-3556000, Piao, Liou King or King Piao Liou.
A-1870026, Piarulli, Constantino alias Vincenzo Piccolomo now known as Frank Spano.
A-1120486, Piccininno, Vito Antonio.
A-6844816, Pizzo, Concetta formerly Esposito (nee Borrelli).
A-9799905, Piscopos, Peter or Panagiotis Piscopos.
A-7267691, Plaxton, William Michael.
A-1352403, Podimatos, Dionissios or Denny Pappas.
A-6168542, Ponevejsky, Gita Samuilovena or Ponve.
A-6145898, Ponevejsky, Irene Anatolievna.
A-6145899, Ponevejsky, Tamara Anatolievna.
A-3308927, Poon, Sew Kai or Poon Sew Kai.
A-4364657, Portcheller, Max.
A-4382348, Portcheller, Eva (nee Trendler).
A-7032884, Portcheller, Eva.
A-4304489, Portos, Peter or Panagiotis Antonios Portocalides.
A-3492516, Pozner, Goldie or Goldie Himel.
A-6621663, Pulido, Susana Peralta Sumalbag or Susan Peralta Sumalbag.
A-3145731, Quintas, Trinidad (nee Trinidad Sosin Rey).
A-6965844, Quistgaard, Helma Kirsten Dolores or (nee Muerlin).
A-2030155, Rados, Demetrios George or James Rados.
A-2522222, Ramirez, Ramon or Ramon Ramirez Tello or Primo Reymond Raniero.
A-5085655, Rando, Giuseppe or Joseph Rando.
A-5913951, Rasmussen, Victor Emanuel.
A-4496894, Ratoliska, Dalibor Vaclav or Dalibor Ratioliska.
A-7178653, Reppas, Spiros.
A-4138551, Ricchetti, Giacomo Mario or Giacomo Carlo Domenico Ricchetti.
A-5536030, Richmond, Stanislawa Stompka Jackowski.
A-3966304, Rissone, Adelina or Adelina Kissone or Rissone or Adelina Gibellino or Adele Rissone.
A-5257814, Rodrigues, Joao or Rodriguez or John Rodrigues.
A-7092903, Rodriguez, Fredesbinda Altagracia Russo or Altagracia Russo.
A-2117428, Rodriguez, Isidro or Isidro Rodriguez y Lopez.
A-2044261, Rodriguez, Edita (nee Edita Dominguez-Fernandez).
A-3400771, Rogale, Josef (Joseph).
A-6953512, Rondon, Sidney.
A-1951935, Roumeliotis, Peter John or Panagiotis Roumeliotis.
A-3726265, Roussos, George or George M. Roussos.
A-3245886, Rudani, Enrico or Henry Rudan.
A-6828827, Ruona, Maire Maria.

A-2683038, Salutsky, Arvum or Mordche Semigielski or Max Semigielski or Abraham Salutsky.
A-2819451, Samonas, Nicolaos or Nicholas Semonies.
A-7140311, Sander, Bernat.
A-3629562, Sankilampi, Johan Jhalmar or John Lampi.
A-4813509, Santamaria, Ventura.
A-6711295, Sauro, Gregorina (nee Procopio).
A-5034667, Scheuer, Berish or Benjamin or Ben Scheuer.
A-4819277, Schmidt, Helene (nee Pollack).
A-5118237, Schneider, Michael or Michel Schneider.
A-5027863, Scognamillo, Giovanni or John Scognamillo.
A-1263790, Scuderi, Giuseppe or Joseph Scuderi.
A-6885543, Shalhoub, Violette Youssef (nee Fallaha).
A-6475537, Sharman, Edna Gladys May or Edna Gladys May Lane or Edna Gladys May Watton.
A-2688594, Shee, Ho or Law Ho Shee.
A-7586570, Shee, Lum Woo (maiden name); Woo Hing Sheong.
A-3811823, Shuitkas, Spiros Georgiou or Steve Adams or Styros Shuthas.
A-4466882, Siira, Sulo Onni.
A-9541852, Silinsky, Alexander Basil.
A-1221603, Siva, Ralph or Rafael (alias Arturo Sanchez).
A-2801424, Siva, Diamante or Diamante Nassy y Alterez alias Mercedes Morina Hernandez.
A-9798309, Sjolin, Erik Gunnar.
A-6062329, Smilovici, Otto-Michel or Michael Smiley.
A-5496431, Smith, Arnold Wilhelm Robert or Arnold Wilhelm Robert Ligmann.
A-5083163, Smith, Hannah (nee Callaghan).
A-6921126, Soderquist, Elof Rolf Aka.
A-4374035, Sokolowski, William Dominick or William Falconer.
A-6948925, Spacek, James Vaclav.
A-3811656, Spathis, Penogiotes or Panagiotes Spathis or Pete Panagiotis.
A-5601609, Spiegel, Sidonia (nee Hirsch).
A-6769419, Spilipoulos, Evangelos.
A-5958229, Stalder, Herman Peter.
A-6678105, Stamatiou, Lesvia Jean or Lesvia Jean Simanderis.
A-2110632, Stanton, Charles or Constantine Studitis or Constantin Studiti.
A-6177929, Stave, Mary Kristiane.
A-6177930, Stave, Tonnes.
A-2091703, Stevens, Ross William or Ross William Langford or Ross Boyd.
A-5937342, Stolica, Isidoro or Isidoro Stoleca or Isidore Stolesia.
A-6816106, Syropoulos, Maria Athanasiou.
A-9765367, Tai, Lee Kin or Charlie Lee.
A-2308840, Takeuchi, Yuwako, or Yuwako Yukawa.
A-6582713, Tamzarian, Kegham or Kay Tamzatian.
A-1066805, Tarcson, Maria or Mary or Maria or Mary Nyakas.
A-5407239, Tasso, Giuseppe Felice or Joseph Tasso.
A-6989473, Tessman, Manuel or Manuel Quijada.
A-7240112, Teus, Dolores Deanna or Dolores Deana Teus.
A-9733225, Thorsen, Reidar Geyer.
A-5269602, Tomaszewski, Frank.
A-3777795, Tripodi, James Vincenzo or Vincenzo Tripodi.
A-4764125, Tsemperis, Michael Nick or Michael Tsemperis or Michael N. Tsemperis or Mike N. Tsemperis.
A-5369830, Udris, John Arcid or Harry Uders.
A-5659165, Udris, Emily or Emily Auder.
A-4773369, Urrutia, David Victorio Gastelu or David Gastelu.
A-6697569, Uy, Julita Habaluyas (nee Julita De Guzman Habaluyas).
A-6407207, Uy, Yu Sin or Florencio Chuytie Uy.
A-3078317, Uzzell, Henry.
A-5906316, Valente, Raul.
A-9682129, Van Bokhoven, Alexander Johannes Andrianus Marinus or Alexander J. Van Bokhoven.
A-6195016, Vasiliou, Anna nee Vrostou or Anna Vassili.
A-4634924, Vasiloff, Bozin (alias Christ Vasilia Gerogopoulos).
A-6729843, Vassiliou, Theocharis Constantin.
A-5880791, Venzen, Lily Vitalia.
A-6357989, Vergou, Aikaterini or Katherine Vergou.
A-6346409, Vergou, Demetrios or James Vergou.
A-5335917, Vineberg, Benjamin or Benjamin Wajnbergier.
A-2790561, Vocos, James Dimitrios or James Vocos or James John Vocos.
A-7073617, Vonakis, Julia (nee Julia Charalambos Hatziharalambos).
A 6550668, Wajsman, Perla or Waisman or Perla Windman or Perla Winderman.
A-5055223, Weissman, Osias Noe or Jean Blank.
A-4332654, Wilson, Alice Ann.
A-3032503, Wolther, Irving or Isaak Wolski.
A-3501199, Wong, Tom or Wong Chou.
A-3352994, Worobetz, Dmytro or Dmytro Worubec.
A-7730396, Yamanaka, Satiko.
A-5551057, Yang, Ling Fu or Yang Ling Fu.
A-6083732, Yang, Shiang Ping.
A-6847844, Yang, Anna Hsiao or Anna Hsiao.
A-9652853, Yanushkevich, Gregorio or Gricori.
A-5099933, Yensen, Lauritz Johannes or Lauritz Johannes Jensen or Fritz L. Yensen.
A-4490275, Young, Anthony Michael Gascoyne.
A-6848712, Yu, Horace I-Sen.
A-6923858, Yu, Lota Lois.
A-5654491, Yuki, Anthony Toschimichi.
A-6992360, Zeffer, Astrid Sigrid.
A-5426265, Kulukundis, Manuel Elias also known as Manuel Kulukundis.
A-5601575, Kulukundis, Calliope aka Calliope Manuel Kulukundis (nee Calliope Elias Hadjilias).
A-7029226, Kulukundis, George Elias.
A-7029225, Kulukundis, Manuel Michael.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending on February 1, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $19,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

INVESTIGATION OF EXPORT POLICIES BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 365, Eighty-first Congress (providing for a study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement by Government departments and agencies of the export policies and control regulations of the United States), agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before ————.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tit Wong; and

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 703. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 704. A bill for the relief of Hermann Suess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 705. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Frank David Blackhoop and Thomas Blackhoop; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 706. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of furs from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 707. A bill directing the conveyance of certain property to the city of Rupert, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen Yen Tchou;

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Spilios;

S. 710. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; and

S. 711. A bill for the relief of Olga Koscinkiewicz Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MARTIN introduced Senate bill 712, to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MARTIN also introduced Senate bill 713, to provide allowance of death pension

when death in service is denied service connection, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MARTIN also introduced Senate bill 714, to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces on active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 716, to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 717. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on inland water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 718. A bill to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. McCARRAN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 719, to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 720. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 68 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 721. A bill to prohibit the sale of basic agricultural commodities at prices below ceiling prices determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 722. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, with respect to distribution of proceeds of mineral leases on unsurveyed public lands; and

S. 723. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Virgin River subbasin reclamation project in Arizona, Nevada, and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 724. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aristides E. Bolotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 725. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to permit voluntary retirement thereunder at age 60 and to require compulsory retirement at age 70 by individuals who have completed 30 years' service; and

S. 726. A bill to amend the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, so as to provide increased benefits for Federal employees suffering from occupational disease or infection; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 727. A bill to establish parity in the rates of disability and death compensation payable for disability or death resulting from service-connected disability; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 728. A bill to amend section 174.1, chapter I, title 8, of the Code of Federal Regulations, relating to control pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 of persons entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIBERALIZATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 712) to liberalize the basis for estabishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MARTIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

Under existing law (Veterans Regulation No. 1a, part I, par. I (c)), a presumption is established, with certain limitations, that a chronic disease which becomes manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year after separation from active service shall be considered to be service incurred or aggravated. The term "chronic disease" is defined and includes "tuberculosis, active (other than pulmonary)" and such other chronic diseases as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may add. Under this same law, pulmonary tuberculosis is given preferential treatment to the extent that a 3-year period after separation from the service is permitted within which the presumption of service connection will be indulged.

The effect of the attached bill would be to treat all types of tuberculosis alike and to accord to this disease the preferential 3-year period described above. The bill would further give this preferential treatment to the psychoses, which at present are among the diseases to which the 1-year service-connection presumption is applicable.

ALLOWANCE OF DEATH PENSION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service-connection and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 713) to provide allowance of death pension when death in service is denied service-connection, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MARTIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

Under existing law (Veterans Regulation No. 1a, pts. I and II), pensions are provided for the dependents of deceased servicemen who died, or die, as a result of personal injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. Lower rates of compensation are provided when the death occurs during peacetime service. Veterans Regulation No. 10, part VIII, provides that an injury or disease incurred during military or naval service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty unless such injury or disease was the result of the serviceman's own willful misconduct.

The effect of the attached bill would be to eliminate for those persons covered by the bill the present prerequisite to the granting of pensions that death must not be the result of the deceased's own willful misconduct and to substitute therefor the restrictions contained in the proviso to the bill.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces on active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II and I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 714) to extend to personnel of the Armed Forces on active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, certain benefits provided by law for veterans of World War II, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The bill would extend to members of the Armed Forces on active service on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits, described below, now provided by law for veterans of World War II.

1. The basis for computing compensation for service-connected disability or death would be the wartime basis rather than the peacetime basis. As you know, compensation payable for disability or death of a member of the armed services incurred during time of war is considerably higher than similar compensation paid for disability or death incurred in active service in time of peace. This proposed change is effected by amending paragraph I (a), part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

2. The bill would amend the definition of "veteran of any war" contained in paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10 so as to include thereunder a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be specified later, either by proclamation of the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. The effect of this change would be to entitle such a veteran to the benefits of those laws whose application is dependent upon the definition contained in paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10.

3. The bill would extend to veterans described in the paragraph above the benefits of titles II, III, and V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Title II of such act is the title which provides educational benefits for veterans of World War II. Title III of such act is the title which provides for the guaranty of loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business

property for veterans of World War II. Title V of such act provided readjustment allowances (during periods of unemployment) for veterans of World War II. The benefits described would be extended subject to the provisions, conditions, and limitations contained in the enumerated titles of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, with two exceptions:

1. With respect to the benefits of title V (readjustment allowances during periods of unemployment), a person who received benefits under such title on account of World War II service may receive additional benefits on account of service on and after June 27, 1950, without having charged against him the benefits which he received on account of his World War II service. If such a veteran has remaining available to him any benefits on account of his World War II service, he may add such remaining benefits to the benefits to which he becomes entitled on account of his service on or after June 27, 1950, but in such case the total benefits to which he may become entitled may not exceed the maximum permitted under title V (52 weeks of unemployment readjustment allowances). It should perhaps be noted that, because of the termination dates specified in title V, relatively few veterans have any benefits under such title remaining available to them.

2. A person who becomes eligible for the benefits of titles II, III, and V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act on account of service on or after June 27, 1950, and who at the time of such service was not a citizen of the United States, will be entitled to such benefits only while he is a resident of a State, Territory, or possession of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

In connection with the proposed bill, your attention is called to section 3 of S. 284, Eighty-second Congress, which, on a more limited scale, is intended to grant benefits similar to those granted by section 3 of the proposed bill.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

The bill (S. 716) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the Eighty-first Congress, on April 20, 1950, I introduced in the Senate S. 3455, which is an omnibus bill to revise the immigration and naturalization laws. As I explained to the Senate at that time, the omnibus bill was the result of an investigation and study of our entire immigration and naturalization system, which was made over the course of 2½ years by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

After the introduction of S. 3455, copies of the bill were circulated to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies for study and comment. Since that time, committee staff members and experts from appropriate Government agencies have been checking and rechecking the thousands of provisions of the bill which revises hundreds of prior immigration or naturalization laws.

The bill which I am today introducing constitutes a refinement of the omnibus bill, S. 3455, which I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress.

It is my understanding that Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, who is chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, will introduce a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

Joint hearings on the Senate bill and on the companion House bill will begin in the course of the next few weeks.

I, therefore, announce that all persons who desire to testify should promptly communicate with Richard Arens, room 449, Senate Office Building, who is the staff member who will set up the schedule for the hearings.

WAIVER OF NATURALIZATION LAWS IN CERTAIN CASES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 660) to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by me on January 25, 1951, and that the bill be reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INDUSTRIAL NEEDS IN MANUFACTURE OF MACHINERY FOR PRODUCING AND PROCESSING FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the Defense Production Act of 1950 authorizes the President to assign priorities and to allocate materials and facilities; and

Whereas such Defense Production Act of 1950 established a Joint Committee on Defense Production, composed of members of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to make a continuous study of programs authorized by such act; and

Whereas the industries producing machinery for the production and processing of farm products have special problems under the Defense Production Act in that—

(1) The food and fiber goals during 1951 and during the emergency will exceed the actual production of 1950; and farmers must be provided with as much farm machinery, equipment, and repair parts as they obtained in 1950, and, likewise, processors must be provided with as much machinery, equipment, and repair parts as they obtained in 1950;

(2) The needs of the farmers and the processing industry for machinery and equipment will continue to rise as labor-saving machinery is required to replace workers who will leave farms and processing plants for industrial centers and for military service;

(3) The number of work animals on farms has declined from 26,000,000 in 1920 to 8,000,000 in 1949, and is continuing to decline;

(4) On hundreds of types of machines there are no mortality tables to indicate the replacement, wear-out, and repair rates—but they must be replaced and repaired;

(5) The latest and best estimates of carry-over for the corn crop, one of the most important of all feed crops, is reported to be 100,000,000 bushels below the carry-over needed to obtain adequate livestock production, poultry output, and milk production;

(6) In addition to the necessity for greater corn and other key crops, such as rice, wheat, cotton, and soy beans, essential to fill domestic requirements, there is the necessity of being prepared to meet urgent food needs abroad under our commitments;

(7) To produce as much farm machinery, equipment, and repair parts in 1951 as in 1950 will require at least 2,760,000 tons of steel annually, including the tonnage required for parts and assemblies furnished by outside suppliers;

(8) Equipment for the processing industry will require many thousands of tons of steel, many other materials and components;

(9) Approximately 1,600 factories or manufacturers are engaged in the production of farm machinery and equipment in this country, with a value which is undetermined, but which is increasing greatly during the emergency;

(10) The processing industry likewise has many factories processing the valuable farm products;

(11) The farm machinery and equipment industry produces more than 2,000 varieties of equipment, ranging from the ordinary spiked-tooth harrow to electronically controlled incubators, hygienic milking machines, automatic hay balers, high-precision corn and cotton planters, combines, cotton pickers, and a wide variety of gasoline and Diesel tractors, and power units; and many other items, such as plows, listers, harrows, rollers, pulverizers, stalk cutters, planting, seeding, and fertilizing machinery, cultivators and weeders; sprayers and dusters; harvesting machinery, haying machinery, machines for preparing crops for market or for use, farm elevators and blowers, farm wagons, trucks, and other farm transportation equipment, farm dairy machines and equipment; barn and barnyard equipment, farm poultry equipment, tractors for farm use, farm pumps, windmills and domestic water systems, metal for erection of barns, bins, and repairs, and supplies and equipment for gins, oil mills, and so forth;

(12) Farm machines and equipment are ordinarily distributed through wholesalers, distributors, or manufacturers' branch houses to some 30,000 retailers, and these retailers, in turn, distribute and service the equipment in all 3,000 counties with their 5,800,000 farms and 27,500,000 farm population;

(13) During recent years the manufacturers of farm machinery and equipment have made strenuous efforts in the procurement of materials to keep their factories running and to provide necessary tools to their farmer customers;

(14) It is becoming apparent that in the coming year farm-equipment manufacturers will be increasingly handicapped in obtaining necessary materials for farm-equipment production, if the Government designates more and more producers of other civilian goods to receive preferential treatment from suppliers;

(15) Allocations are either in effect or are being considered for freight cars, lake carriers, fast ocean transports, petroleum pipelines, and the steel warehouse industry; and several of these programs cut straight across the flow of material into farm machinery

and equipment plants, as well as processing plants, with the result that one production line after another could be stopped for lack of material in the weeks and months ahead;

(16) Many farmers have taxed their equipment very heavily due to excessive use due to greenbugs, bollworms, bollweevils, excessive rains, hail, and drought;

(17) Many farmers have been unable to replace their machinery because of crop failure or low production in many instances; and

Whereas the industry making farm equipment and machinery requires only 3.8 percent of the finished steel output of the country and employs less than four-tenths of 1 percent of the Nation's gainfully employed; and since the plants processing farm food and fiber likewise require only a small percent of the total supply of critical materials and labor; and since so much in the way of farm production and processing depends on so little in the way of material and manpower that it would be wise to plan for a safe agricultural program and for an adequate equipment program with which to produce and process it; and

Whereas the farm-equipment industry and the farm-product-processing industry will in the future as in the past wholeheartedly support and fully participate in any direct military program necessary to the national defense and will endeavor in every way possible to fit its needs for materials to the military requirements; and

Whereas, in the event military requirements increase to a point where they seriously affect the civilian economy and adequate production of essential nonmilitary items is thereby jeopardized, the farm machinery and equipment industry should then be assured, by all means possible, that the materials it must have to produce sufficient farm equipment and to process such food and fiber farm commodities will be made available; and

Whereas the emergency, and world war III if it comes, in spite of everything that can be done to avoid it, will impose heavy demands upon a food-producing country such as ours; and

Whereas the Armed Forces must be kept in fighting form, and granary reserves must be developed against possible crop failures, shipping losses, and unforeseen military requirements; and

Whereas the health of the civilian population must be preserved for employment at more strenuous work for longer hours; and

Whereas friendly nations, if unable to produce the food they require, as a result of their lands being used as a battleground, must be helped: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the needs of industries of the United States producing machinery and equipment for the production and processing of farm products for the purpose of determining: (1) The requirements of such industries for critical materials essential to the production of so much of such machinery and equipment as the committee may have determined in the course of its investigation to be sufficient to assure the successful prosecution of the Nation's food, feed, and fiber program; (2) the necessity for securing from the appropriate administrative authority preference for such industries in the allocation of such materials; and (3) those products (other than such machinery and equipment) essential to the national defense, which might be manufactured by such industries during the present emergency.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall advise the Joint Committee on Defense Production of its findings from time to time and otherwise cooperate with such Joint Committee on Defense Production and shall report to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, hereby is extended to June 30, 1951.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 202, agreed to May 3, 1950 (establishing a special committee to investigate organized crime), is hereby increased by $50,000.

SUBMISSION OF REPORTS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That section 6 of Senate Resolution 202, agreed to May 3, 1950, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Committee shall make an interim report to the Senate on or before February 28, 1951, and a final report to the Senate on or before March 31, 1951, with respect to the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Morris Fay, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia;

Dalton T. Pierson, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana, vice John B. Tansil, deceased;

Arthur A. Maguire, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania; and

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT BEFORE EXECUTIVES CLUB OF CHICAGO

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the Executives Club of Chicago, in Chicago, Ill., January 26, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD MacLEISH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Archibald MacLeish at the Roosevelt Day dinner held under the auspices of Americans for Democratic Action in Washington, D. C., on January 26, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RELIGION OF ROBERT E. LEE—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANCIS P. GAINES

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Religion of Robert E. Lee," delivered by Dr. Francis P. Gaines on January 14, 1951, at the Washington Cathedral, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC PLANNING—STATEMENT BY J. K. VARDAMAN

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding economic planning, made by Hon. James K. Vardaman, Jr., member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY H. H. FISHER

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding conditions in Europe, delivered by H. H. Fisher, of Salt Lake City, before the Salt Lake Rotary Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLOCATION AND PRICES OF MEAT PRODUCTS AND OTHER RELATED SUBJECTS—REPORT BY CARL H. WILKEN

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report entitled, "Allocation and Prices of Meat Products and Other Related Subjects," prepared for the National Independent Meat Packers Association by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

GIFTS OF BUTTER BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. BALL

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Since Korean War Began More Than 75,000,000 Pounds of Butter Given Away by United States," written by John W. Ball, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 28, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS OF REVENUES IN CANADA—ARTICLE FROM THE MONTREAL GAZETTE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ottawa Shows Heavy Surplus," published in the Montreal (Canada) Gazette of January 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST—ANNUAL REPORT BY L. M. GIANNINI

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the portion of the annual report by L. M. Giannini, president of the Bank of America, entitled "Our National Interest," which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW TO COOK A WILD DUCK—ARTICLE IN THE LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 9, 1951, regarding a challenge as to the proper way to cook a wild duck, and comments by him, which appear in the Appendix.]

DR. GORDON SEAGRAVE—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Another Paradox," regarding the Dr. Gordon Seagrave case, published in the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONALISM IN ACTION: 1940–50—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS EVENING DISPATCH

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Internationalism in Action: 1940–50," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of Monday, January 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARINES' ESPRIT DE CORPS—ARTICLE BY JIM G. LUCAS

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "They're Just Tougher," written by Jim G Lucas and published in the Washington Daily News on Friday, January 26, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FIGHTING RESOURCEFULNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOZEMAN DAILY CHRONICLE

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Betting on Americans," published in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of January 18, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we are off to a bad start. Here is the pattern, as summarized in four words in an article in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 27, 1951, ESA for Democrats Only.

This was the conclusion of the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard newspapers after the hectic activities in the Nation's Capital last week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column to which I refer be reprinted at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY

Economic Stabilization Agency (ESA) is being built into Nation-wide Democratic machine.

Democratic National Committee is in charge; is passing on candidates for every job paying $4,000 and up.

Committee asks Democratic governors, Senators, State chairmen, national committeemen, for names, sends them on to Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle.

Party loyalty is a test. No Dixiecrats accepted and no one who opposed President Truman's renomination or otherwise offended top Democrats. Backing from potent party figures is required. Some appointees have price-control experience; most have not. Lists submitted by Republican officials aren't considered.

It's a contrast to procedure in OPA 10 years ago. Politicians weren't consulted, party labels weren't checked. One result: Constant attacks on OPA from Capitol Hill, constant threats to withhold appropriations.

A few Democrats in Congress worry about staffing ESA with party men from top to bottom because it pins responsibility for success or failure of new price-control agency directly on party. They're afraid it may be unpopular by next election. Same men refuse to sponsor candidates for district office, for same reason. But they're the exception.

Pay of new officials isn't fixed. They'll get $50 a day until Congress acts.

Here's sample of how the picking's done.

Regional administrator for Rocky Mountain States will be George Rock, president of Truman-Barkley Club in 1948. Before Alan Valentine was fired, a five-man panel he had named picked another man.

New outfit's a haven for "lame ducks." Already slated for jobs: Vernon Dwyer, Indiana State director, defeated Democratic candidate for Congress; Doc O. A. Noland, consultant to DiSalle, and father of a defeated Indiana Congressman; Herbert Meighan, defeated for reelection as mayor of Gadsen, Ala.; James G. Lyons, New York regional office, defeated for reelection to State legislature; Michael Howlett, Jr., Illinois temporary consultant, defeated for State treasurer.

Washington's full of party officials elbowing each other in rush to pie counter.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement previously entered into, the Senate will proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. The Secretary will state the first order of business on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1951, pp. 352–353) was considered and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1951, pp. 353–356) was considered and agreed to.

SOLICITATION OR ACCEPTANCE OF FEES IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS

The bill (S. 15) to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"Whoever solicits or receives any money or thing of value in consideration of aiding any person to obtain any appointive office or place under the United States either by referring his name to any executive department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States for consideration, or otherwise, or by requiring the payment of a fee from any person because such person has secured any appointive office or place under the United States shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

MAILING OBSCENE MATTER—AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (S. 34) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance; and * * *."

SEC. 2. The fifth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18, United States Code, reading "Every letter, packet, or package, or other mail matter containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing, device, or substance; and" is hereby repealed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I notice that the bill deals with provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations. I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary about the bill, and we are considering sending it to the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office for further consideration. Therefore, I ask that the bill be passed over at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is Calendar No. 6, Senate bill 35.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the request of the Senator? Does he ask that the bill be passed over?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN E. TURRI AND EDWARD H. TURRI

The bill (S. 44) for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) and (c) of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940, John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri, honorably discharged United States citizen veterans of World War II, shall be held and considered to have retained their United States citizenship regardless of any period of residence outside of the United States: *Provided*, That the said John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri return to the United States for permanent residence within 1 year following the effective date of this act.

RUTH OBRE DUBONNET

The bill (S. 46) for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Ruth Obre Dubonnet, a native-born former citizen of the United States, born in New York City on January 28, 1900, who lost citizenship of the United States on May 18, 1943, under section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 801), may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Ruth Obre Dubonnet shall have the same citizenship status which she had immediately prior to its loss.

MR. AND MRS. LUCILLO GRASSI

The bill (S. 48) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 401 and section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (relating to loss of nationality) Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi shall not be considered to have lost their United States citizenship because of voting in a foreign election or because of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the enactment of this act.

ARTHUR HENRIK SORENSEN ET AL.

The bill (S. 51) for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DELFO GIORGI

The bill (S. 52) for the relief of Delfo Giorgi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Delfo Giorgi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

VITTORIO QUILICI

The bill (S. 53) for the relief of Vittorio Quilici was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vittorio Quilici shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

STELLA JEAN STATHOPOULOU

The bill (S. 54) for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I am not going to object to the bill; but, as I recall, objection was made to consideration of a similar bill during the last call of the calendar at the last session. I wish to inquire whether there is objection to the bill at the present time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a case of a United States citizen——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; but I should like to ask whether there is any difference between this bill and a similar bill which was on the calendar at the last session.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill was not objected to at that time.

Mr. WHERRY. It was not objected to?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not so far as I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 54) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stella Jean Stathopoulou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ERTOGROUL OSMAN AND MEHMED FAHREDDIN

The bill (S. 57) for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

EDULJI DINSHAW AND HIS SISTER, MRS. BACHOO DINSHA WORONZOW

The bill (S. 58) for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

VERNON CRUDGE

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Vernon Crudge was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vernon Crudge, who was born in China of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

STEFANOS STEFANOU

The bill (S. 62) for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Stefanos Stefanou as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year the said quota is available.

MARIE LOUISE ARDANS

The bill (S. 63) for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the bill, if I may. If, in order to ask a question, I have to temporarily reserve the right to object to the present consideration of the bill, I shall do so. However, I simply wish to ask a question: Is it not a fact that the report shows that administrative relief is available and might be given to this person?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think so. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the bill, and probably I shall answer the Senator's question in the course of the statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to raise a question as to whether it is good policy for the Congress to provide legislative relief before all possible administrative relief has been taken advantage of.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that that is one matter which the committee constantly has in mind, namely, that when administrative relief is available we try to avoid the provision of legislative relief.

Mr. President, this is the case of a woman who is a native and a citizen of France. She is presently being supported by her two brothers, both of whom are engaged in the ranching business in the United States. One of them is in Buffalo, Wyo., and the other is in Reno, Nev. She no longer has any relatives in France and has no income of her own. Her brothers are quite able and willing to take care of her.

The purpose of the bill is to let this woman remain in the United States. Immigration visas under the French quota are not presently available to aliens temporarily residing in the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If such persons leave the United States, cannot they apply for admission and be allowed to return within 2 or 3 months? That is my point.

Mr. McCARRAN. The French quota is presently heavily oversubscribed; in fact, the quota for every nation is now heavily oversubscribed.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been unofficially advised that as of Friday, January 19, the French quota was not in that condition; or if the handling of the applications of persons seeking admission under French quotas was not current, it was nearly so, and that persons awaiting admission to the United States under that quota probably would not have to wait for more than 2 months, or not more than 3 months at the most.

I am not objecting to this bill, because I know the Senator from Nevada is attempting to iron out all these problems, and I also know that he is short of staff members for his committee and needs additional staff members in order to be able to make sure that all available administrative relief is taken advantage of, before attempts are made to provide legislative relief.

However, I wish to point out that, if I am not mistaken, the person referred to in this bill would be inconvenienced only to the extent of having to wait outside the United States for 2 or 3 months, after which time she would be able to enter the United States under the French quota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if what the Senator from Nebraska says were factual, it would have previously been called to the attention of the staff of the committee, I am sure. However, I believe the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not insisting on it; I merely point out that if administrative relief is available we should proceed on that basis, rather than on the basis of the provision of legislative relief.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska does not have to raise that point with me; in the committee we are constantly on the alert in regard to that situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 63) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marie Louise Ardans, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTER PROHIBITED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 27) to prohibit the transportation of obscene matter in interstate or foreign commerce, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 15, after the word "shall", to strike out "be presumptive evidence" and insert "create a presumption", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 1464, as contained in such analysis, the following new item:

"1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution."

SEC. 2. Chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately following section 1464 of such chapter, a new section, to be designated as section 1465, and to read as follows:

"§ 1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution.

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution, any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"The transportation as aforesaid of two or more copies of any publication or two or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of five such publications and articles, shall create a presumption that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this act, the court in its judgment of conviction may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the confiscation and disposal of such items described herein which were found in the possession or under the immediate control of such person at the time of his arrest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

ALFRED F. BOSCHE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 45) for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "States," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the said Alfred F. Bosche returns to the United States to reside permanently within 2 years following the effective date of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 404, of the Nationality Act of 1940, Alfred F. Bosche, an honorably discharged veteran of the United States Armed Forces, shall be held and considered to have retained his United States citizenship regardless of any period of residence outside the United States: *Provided*, That the said Alfred F. Basche returns to the United States to reside permanently within 2 years following the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS KUEEN SAN THU ET AL.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for

in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "SELLING TO YOUR GOVERNMENT"

The resolution (S. Res. 40) providing for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government" was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] whether the resolution makes provision for something new in the way of appropriations. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is unavoidably absent, has taken up this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. This resolution provides for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government." The total cost of printing 30,000 copies would be $589.55. The committee was advised by the Small Business Committee that it has received letters from all over the United States requesting copies of this pamphlet.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under those circumstances there will be no objection to this particular item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 40), submitted by Mr. SPARKMAN on January 17, 1951, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 30,000 additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Selling to Your Government", such additional copies to be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The resolution (S. Res. 19) authorizing the temporary employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona the facts in regard to the resolution. It is another resolution to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected. So I should like to have the resolution passed over at this call of the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think there will be no objection to the resolution; but if there is objection, the Senator from South Carolina can explain the resolution better than I can, I am sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] told the Senator from South Carolina that he wished to have the resolution go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have not talked to the Senator from Louisiana concerning the resolution. However, the resolution, if adopted, would allow an additional expense of $3,000 for this purpose; and if the authority requested in this connection is provided, we shall avoid the expenditure of almost $11,000 annually, instead. In other words, at the present time, without additional authority, the committee can employ an additional administrative assistant or expert at a salary of $10,800. However, I do not wish to do that.

So I hope we can obtain authority for the employment of an additional member of the staff at a salary of $3,000, thus avoiding the expenditure of a considerably greater amount. It is a matter of saving some money. I am on the committee. We need another stenographer, but we do not need two experts at this time. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Committee on Rules and Administration was satisfied there would be a saving, and therefore favorably reported the resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would not object, under the circumstances, and I do not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 19) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-second Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $3,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF FUEL RESERVES

The resolution (S. Res. 33) extending the authority for the investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy for the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. This resolution comes within the objections made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I therefore object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I consulted the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] last Thursday, after the objection had been made. I find that this resolution and the next one, Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 32, do not fall within the objections raised by the Senator from Louisiana. He gave me his assurance that he would have no objection to their adoption. I may say that in each instance the resolution, and the authority granted thereunder, terminate on the 20th of June. On page 659 of the RECORD for January 25, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said:

May I suggest, if the Senator insists on action being taken now, that we extend the life of the existing subcommittees to June 30, the end of the present fiscal year?

His objection was directed toward the extension of authority beyond the fiscal year. Neither of these resolutions conflicts with the policy which he laid down, because the authority expires as of the 30th of June. I am very glad to be able to advise the Senator from Tennessee that the Senator from Louisiana assured me he would have no objection to these two resolutions in this respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator give me the further assurance that an extension will not be requested on and after July 1? If so, I shall withdraw the objection; if not, I shall feel obliged to insist upon it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that it is my purpose, and I know it is the purpose of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to complete both of these studies before the 30th of June. I have no reason to believe that I shall come back to the Senate, or that the committee will come back, asking for any more money.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will give me the same sort of assurance that he gave the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I shall withdraw the objection; otherwise, I shall have to make the objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have done my best to give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. First, I want the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to know that I am in favor of extending the resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I say that because, if the study is cut off now and a report is not made, what has been spent will have been lost to a large extent. But I do not quite understand the statement by the Senator of the reasons for taking these two out of the category of the other investigations. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected to the expenditures, and while it is true, as I understand, that no money will be requested in addition to the amounts called for by these resolutions, it is further the fact that any of the appropriations unexpended would be returned in the event of the investigations being cut off.

The point I am trying to make is that I am for each of these resolutions. I think the cost will be considerable. I think the Senator from Louisiana stated it will cost 10 times more to conduct investigations during the present year than it cost 10 years ago. That is probably true. But I favor these resolutions, because all that has been done heretofore will have been lost if these committees are not continued. They are supposed to complete their work by the end of June. If the distinguished Senator from Wyoming could give me

assurance, and could assure the Senator from Tennessee, that the studies would actually terminate on that date, then I can see why the resolutions should be regarded as being in categories different from the others. But if such assurance is not forthcoming, it seems to me it is a question of expense, and, if these resolutions were to be adopted, I should like to see the others agreed to also; for example, Senate Resolution 17, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, regarding the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is also on the calendar, and is Calendar No. 39. We shall lose the benefit of all the work heretofore done unless the resolution can be adopted enabling the committee to bring its work up to date before it goes out of existence. I merely desired to make that point clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct. If the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Wyoming will give us that assurance, I shall have no objection to the work being continued to July 1, but not beyond that. The Senator from Wyoming has given us that assurance. He has construed his words, and I have accepted them. I think the Senator from Arkansas will do likewise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We only ask for an extension to April 30. I can absolutely assure the Senator that I shall not ask either for an extension or for more money beyond that date; much less, following June 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with that assurance, I withdraw the objection made on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana and myself.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I feel that an amendment should be offered to fix the termination date of both resolutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The date is in the pending resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. But there is also a resolution regarding RFC.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is a date in each resolution submitted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the same amendment be adopted now, if the Senator will offer an amendment fixing the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is already included.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The date in my resolution is April 30, which is even before June 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. We shall leave it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 33) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 239, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 374, agreed to December 21, 1950 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued through June 30, 1951.

XCVII—46

RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS—EXTENSION OF INVESTIGATION

The resolution (S. Res. 32) extending the authority for an investigation of the relationship of the United States with the Indians was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to reserve the right to object, but there is no doubt from what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that this is the resolution on which the assurance was given by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I gave assurance with respect to two resolutions, Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 33, and Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 32) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 292, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 13, 1950 (to investigate the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes), is hereby continued through June 30, 1951.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 51) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to employ temporary additional personnel and increasing the limit of expenditures was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under instructions of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] I am obliged to object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I withhold it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] had no objection to this particular resolution. I feel that it is imperative that it be acted upon. If it is not considered now, I must give notice to the Senate that I shall later move that the resolution be considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is within the province of the majority leader to move to consider it at any time he wishes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether it is not a fact that the legislative subcommittee will terminate as of February 1.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is not a resolution regarding a legislative subcommittee, but a standing subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. WHERRY. What I mean is that the funds will be exhausted as of February 1, will they not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a legislative committee, is it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is a standing subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, if the funds are not available after February 1, the committee will be without funds and, in reality, will be out of business. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought we were discussing Calendar No. 38.

Mr. WHERRY. We were discussing Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 32.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I find we were discussing Calendar 36, Senate Resolution 32.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the resolution, if I may have the floor for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, regarding Senate Resolution 51, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is undertaking to make a study of the Reorganization Act of 1946, with a view of determining what amendments should be made to that act. We have secured temporarily the services of Dr. Galloway, who is with the Library of Congress, and who was on the staff of former Senator La Follette and the other members of the committee which originally, after long hearings, drafted the act. We have simply borrowed the doctor from his present position. Of course, the committee wants to pay him. The purpose of the resolution is to have his counsel and his assistance during the period of study of the Reorganization Act. I hope the Senate will act on the resolution before February 1. It is not all-important that it act today.

May I inquire of the able Senator from Tennessee if he knows when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] expects to return to the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand he will be back tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Frankly, I seriously doubt that the Senator had in mind this resolution at the time he was speaking of funds for special investigating committees.

Mr. McKELLAR. He stated that he had reference to appropriations for subcommittees and special committees. I told him I would make the objection in his name.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This does not have to do with the work of an investigating subcommittee of the Senate. It has to do with work of the full committee, not of a subcommittee or a special committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me suggest that the resolution go over, and we will take it up later.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The resolution will be passed over.

EXPRESSION OF AMERICA'S FRIENDSHIP FOR THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I desire to take a moment to say that the suggestion which I made a week ago——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is impossible to hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if we had used good judgment and had placed loud speakers in the Senate 2 years ago, we would not have difficulty in hearing Senators. We became sufficiently modern to remodel the Senate Chamber, but we have not taken advantage of the amplification facilities which I see have been halfway arranged for on the floor of the Chamber. I hope that in the near future we will go the rest of the way. It would be much easier for me.

Mr. President, the suggestion I made a week ago that the Senate go on record as expressing its friendship to the Russian people as distinguished from the gentlemen in the Kremlin has had a splendid reception in the press of the Nation. I rose to state that although the resolution has not yet been presented, it is in process of preparation, and I do not want the Members of the Senate or of the press to think that simply because the resolution has not been presented during the past week the idea which I expressed is going to be abandoned. It will be pressed with a great deal of vigor. I personally believe that it is the wise thing to do, and Members of the Senate will, I am sure, have an opportunity to vote on the resolution before a long period of time has elapsed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next measure on the calendar.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) to increase the limit of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments, as follows:

From the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, in line 10, after the word "resolution", to strike out ", which shall", in the same line, after the word "not", to insert "to"; and in the same line, after the figures "$115,000", to strike out the comma and insert "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951,".

From the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments, as follows: In line 6, after the word "ending", to strike out "December" and insert "January"; and in line 10, after the word "resolution", to strike out the comma and "which shall not exceed $115,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951," as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Armed Services, and insert "shall not exceed $190,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1951, through January 31, 1952, and", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $190,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1951, through January 31, 1952, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that means that the resolution will continue through January 31, 1952.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. If I recall correctly, he suggested the amendment in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 17) continuing the authority for a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 9, after the word "continued" to strike out "until May 1," and insert "through April 30,", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on February 8, 1950 (providing for a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries), as continued by Senate Resolution 279, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on May 19, 1950, and Senate Resolution 307, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to on July 13, 1950, is hereby continued through April 30, 1951, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 6) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from February 1, 1951, to January 31, 1952, and increasing the limit of expenditures, which had been reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and reported from that committee by Mr. HAYDEN on January 8, 1951, without amendment was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada to explain the resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is to provide an appropriation to enable the Judiciary Committee to carry on its work in connection with immigration and naturalization matters which have been assigned to it by law.

Mr. McKELLAR. How did it happen that it was not provided for in the deficiency bill or in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Because it is different work from the regular work of the committee, in that it has to be conducted by a special staff. We received last year for consideration a total of approximately 4,000 general immigration cases and approximately 1,400 private immigration cases. All those cases have to be screened, dealt with, and reported to the Senate. This resolution makes provision for an additional sum of money to give the committee the needed facilities with which to work.

Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that if objection is made to the consideration of the resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary will be found with a staff but with no money to pay the staff on and after the first day of February. In other words, we have money to operate only until February, and then the staff will be through. The work continues just the same, but no result can be accomplished without the staff. This is not a case of a special committee; this is the Committee on the Judiciary which is doing the work which the law assigns to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I see there is one other measure on the calendar to be considered, and in view of the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I suggest that the resolution go to the foot of the calendar, and then it can be taken up by motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is my intention, if the Senator objects, to endeavor to have the resolution considered on motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I usually find myself in complete agreement with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, but many of the bills on the calendar prior to the point where this resolution was reached involve questions of immigration requiring research and investigation of persons who seek to remain in the United States. If this were a special committee, the life of which is supposed to terminate at a specific date, there might be some justification for the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] offering a blanket objection to the consideration of these resolutions. But that is not the case.

I know the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee does not want to hurt the work of a legislative committee. I hope that point may be made clear. I do not know that it has yet been made clear. The Senator from Nevada did not press it.

It seems to me this is one legislative committee which stands between the United States of America and persons who are involved in deportation proceedings. The Judiciary Committee is the only committee which does that work. As the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows, it is

very difficult to staff a committee when it is not known, except from month to month or from day to day, whether such staff will be employed.

Let me remind the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I served on the Judiciary Committee for many years. I know that under the Reorganization Act the additional work devolved on that committee amounts to between 40 and 50 percent of all the resolutions and reports that come before the Senate. That shows that the Committee on the Judiciary must have the necessary staff if they are properly to protect the interests of our citizens.

I shall not make an extended plea. I know what the Senator from Tennessee wishes to do. He wishes to carry out the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the effect that no unnecessary money be appropriated for special committees, and so forth. I commend the Senator. However, we are dealing with a legislative committee. To deprive the committee of the necessary funds is to jeopardize and penalize a legislative committee of the Senate, which was set up under the Reorganization Act. Unless the resolution is agreed to the staff of the committee will terminate its work on February 1. If the Senator from Louisiana does not return to the Senate by the 1st of February, the committee will have lost its staff.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in support of the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, I wish to say that today there are pending before the Committee on the Judiciary several cases—and there are innumerable other instances of the same kind—involving persons of supposed subversive tendencies who are in the country. Those persons are being screened by the Committee on the Judiciary. Unless a continuing investigation is made by the committee serious consequences may result. It is only through the work of the committee that such persons may be detected and investigated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I have additional time, I should like to make one further observation. Of course, if the Senate had seen fit to adopt the proposed change in the rule which was submitted by me at the beginning of the session, under which more Senators could have been assigned to do the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, and thus provide a more equitable distribution of the workload, it might have been possible to get along without some of the important staff members. However, in view of the workload which is imposed on the committee, and in the light of our failure to increase the membership of the committee from 13 to 17 members, so that Senators could do some of the additional work of the committee, the only thing to do, it seems to me, is to have an adequate staff to handle the cases which come before the committee.

In conclusion, I should like to say once again that I know what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for whom I have the profoundest respect, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are attempting to do. I commend them for it. However, I appeal to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations not to object to the resolution, particularly because it relates to a legislative committee which is trying to perform its functions. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I know that the requested appropriations are justified.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No matter before the Congress of the United States is of greater importance at the present time than that of having our immigration affairs looked into. I want to say that no one in the Senate has done a better job than has the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] in dealing with the question of immigration since it has been placed under his jurisdiction. He and his committee have done a grand work. I think it ought to be continued. Inasmuch as the committee is functioning under a specific statutory provision, and because we are at this particular time in a turmoil on the whole question of communism and other isms infiltrating into this country from abroad, I shall take the liberty of differing on this question with my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Therefore I shall not object to the resolution. I believe the internal interests of the people of the country ought to be safeguarded. Such matters as those referred to should be scrutinized. Therefore, instead of refusing an appropriation for this purpose to the committee of my distinguished friend from Nevada, money should be provided for his committee, and should be given at this time.

I withdraw my objection and take the chance that the Senator from Louisiana will adopt the view I am taking. I think the resolution ought to be agreed to in the interest of the Government. I am very much more afraid of communism in this country than I am of communism in other countries of the world. Communism in other countries does not concern me very much; but we should combat communism in this country. I know there is not in the Senate a better man to look after matters of immigration than the Senator from Nevada. I withdraw all objections on my part and on the part of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his timely observations. I am satisfied that the adoption of the resolution will result satisfactorily to everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 366, RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 7) to increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, which had been reported by Mr. MCCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the word "by", to insert "$150,000", and referred to Committee on Rules and Administration, and subsequently reported by Mr. HAYDEN from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments, as follows:

In line 4, to strike out "$150,000", as proposed to be amended, and insert "$75,000"; and in line 10, to strike out "December" and insert "January", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $75,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution on or before January 31, 1952.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

WORK OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it proper that I should say a word at this point with respect to the magnanimous and rightful attitude taken by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. We hope that we may live up to his kind words. I believe the Senate should know what the Committee on the Judiciary does.

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, consisted of 40.9 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 52.7 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 44.1 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 2,701 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,417, which represents 52.4 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 4,716 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation. Each immigration case is equivalent to a bill.

During both sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, the Judiciary Committee has received 2,039 Senate bills and resolutions and 959 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,998 bills and resolutions.

As of the close of the Eighty-first Congress, the committee had disposed of 1,659 Senate bills and resolutions and 917 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 2,576 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of, 276 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 938 were private relief bills,

1,274 were private immigration bills, 31 were general claims bills, and 57 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 647 Senate bills and resolutions and 783 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,430 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 13 of the 1,430 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably, 149 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 574 were private relief bills, 674 were private immigration bills, 20 were general claims bills, and 13 were general immigration bills.

Bills indefinitely postponed by the committee included 1,012 Senate bills and resolutions, 134 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,146 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably, 127 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 364 were private relief bills, 600 were private immigration bills, 44 were general immigration bills, and 11 were general claims bills.

Measures pending before the committee at the close of the Eighty-first Congress included 380 Senate bills and resolutions and 42 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 422 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills, 102 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 96 are private relief bills, 209 are private immigration bills, 7 are general claims bills, and 8 are general immigration bills.

Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. When the Eighty-first Congress adjourned sine die, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports had been requested, but not received, was 225, of which 29 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 36 were private relief bills, and 160 were private immigration bills.

Thus it will be seen that out of the 2,998 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary totaled only 197, of which 73 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 60 were private relief bills, 49 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 8 were general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee disposed of 917 House bills and resolutions out of 959 such measures referred to it, leaving only 42 House bills and resolutions pending. This means the committee took action on 95.6 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 2,039 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 1,659, leaving 380 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to start from scratch in all such cases, action was taken on 81.3 percent of all Senate measures received.

In this connection it should be noted the committee received 58 Senate bills and 5 House bills subsequent to the reconvening of the Congress on November 27, 1950.

Suspension of deportation by the Attorney General, under authority delegated by the Congress, are reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, there were pending in the committee 1,501 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 6,037 additional cases submitted during the Eighty-first Congress making a total of 7,538 cases, of which 4,716 were approved, 59 were rejected, and 10 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; leaving 2,753 cases in process.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the committee received 264 Executive nominations, of which 117 were Federal judges, 61 were United States district attorneys, 60 were United States marshals, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 1 was Assistant Solicitor General, 5 were assistant attorneys general, 1 was Commissioner of Patents, 4 were members of the Displaced Persons Commission, 4 were members of the War Claims Commission, and 5 were members of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, and 5 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Nominations not acted upon totaled only 11, all of which were received in committee between November 27 and December 21, 1950.

During the Eighty-first Congress the committee and its subcommittees conducted 190 hearings which involved 330 separate hearing sessions. The records of these hearings total 36,991 folios.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I ask that the bill go over for 1 week.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the request by the Senator from North Dakota. This is certainly a very far-reaching bill. It has heretofore passed the Senate. It makes a complete modification of the Federal Communications Act, authorizing the granting of emergency authority and providing for more complete compliance with certain treaties.

As I understand, the North American Broadcasting Agreement will shortly come before the Senate for consideration. In view of that fact, it seems to me that those of us who are not familiar with the contents of this bill should have a little opportunity to study it. Therefore, I very much appreciate the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course I could have no objection to any Senator having an opportunity to study the bill. However, it is most important that the bill be acted upon at an early date if it cannot be passed on the call of the calendar. Previously it has been passed twice by the Senate on the call of the calendar.

The bill has almost the unanimous approval of the industry. There has been a great deal of criticism of the procedure of the Federal Communications Commission. The bill is as nearly noncontroversial as any bill on the subject that could be written. It is the result of long study by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both Houses, and consideration of the reports of the House committee. I am hopeful that the bill may be passed at an early date. The House has not yet seen fit to act upon it.

The bill contains certain provisions in regard to the monitoring features. The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission is very anxious that the bill be passed at an early date. If there are any differences, I think they can be ironed out in conference. I want every Senator to have an opportunity to study the bill, but I feel that we should pass it at a very early date, so that the House may have an opportunity to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TEMPORARY INCREASE OF PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, has the call of the calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to return to Senate Resolution 51, Calendar No. 37. I came into the Chamber a few moments ago, after having been summoned to the reception room, and this resolution was called up. At that time I was a bit confused. From the way the calendar was called, I thought another resolution had been called, one which involved the matter which I discussed at that time. I find I was mistaken as to the nature of the resolution.

The purpose of Senate Resolution 51 is to authorize funds for the regular standing Subcommittee on Senate Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The funds for that subcommittee will expire February 1. As everyone knows, this is the over-all committee which is charged with the duty of conducting investigations into all departments and activities of Government. The subcommittee in question was set up as a regular standing subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress, immediately after the enactment of the Reorganization Act. It is under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who now occupies the chair.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I heard the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on Thursday last, when he made objection to the various resolutions reported at that time and asked that they be passed over, by reason of the increases in expenditures of this character proposed to be made under the resolutions. I may say to the able Pre-

siding Officer and to my colleagues that this year we are asking for less money than was expended last year, notwithstanding that we anticipate the work will be heavier this year. The $100,000 we are requesting in Senate Resolution 51 includes the unexpended balance of $16,000 from last year's funds. So we are actually asking for only about $84,000 in addition to the carry-over funds.

I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will return tomorrow at some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say I was mistaken when I said the Senator from Louisiana will return tomorrow. He will return, I believe, Tuesday of next week. At least it will be a week before he returns.

I ask the Senator from Arkansas, has the committee in question made a report of any kind this year?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; it has made a comprehensive report on all the work of the committee and its activities, and particularly with reference to the general investigations it has conducted. I am speaking now of the Subcommittee on Senate Investigations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it proposed that the appropriation shall extend beyond the 1st of July? That is, will the appropriation extend the activities of the committee beyond the 1st of July?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it will extend the activities of the committee until the next year.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the whole year?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arkansas, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, knows it is a very bad practice to authorize a committee to receive its appropriations at a different time than the general run of committees receive their appropriations. If the Senator from Arkansas will amend the resolution so as to provide that money be provided until the first of July of this year, I shall have no objection to it. Then when the appropriation bill comes up in the regular way we can determine what shall be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that the money for the subcommittee comes out of the contingent fund which is appropriated to the Senate, and not out of direct appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the money comes out of appropriations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is money which comes from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. A great many appropriations are continued in just that way. If the Senator would amend his resolution so as to provide for money until the first of July I shall have no objection. Then when it comes up we can consider the matter on its merits. It is very difficult to consider such a matter when it comes up as it does now, and not in the regular way. I hope the Senator will agree to amend his resolution accordingly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection if that is going to be the policy applied to all committees. But I ask the Senator to remember that we are not dealing now with a special committee. We are dealing with a regular standing committee of the United States Senate charged with a specific duty.

Mr. McKELLAR. We ought to deal with it as with other regular standing committees, and, so far as I am concerned, I wish to say to the Senator that is what I expect shall be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If what the Senator has suggested is going to be established as a precedent I am willing that my committee follow it. But if our committee is to be singled out and dealt with in a different manner than others, I shall object.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know the Senator does not mean to do any such thing. All the funds granted to the committees for their purposes are granted from the first of February through the first of February of the next year. That is the practice of the Senate. That is its policy. We do not operate on a fiscal year basis, but rather on a calendar year basis. I can hardly see the justification for making an exception and applying a different rule and procedure to this committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have objected in the name of myself and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to measures making appropriations in this way. The only exception to the rule was the case of the Senator's colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who said that his committee would go out of existence on the 30th of April.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That committee was charged with one specific task.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whereas the one I am speaking of is charged with a continuing duty and responsibility.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, and continuing appropriations will be made for it. When the Senator asks for special appropriation for the committee, to extend its activities for a year, that would take it out of the regular appropriation bill. I hope the Senator will agree to have it done in the manner I have suggested. That is the way such matters should be handled. I say to the Senator there will be no exception in his case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no rule to that effect, Mr. President. That has not been the practice in the past. If it is desired to proceed in the way the Senator has suggested, I certainly shall feel that we are changing precedent here now, we are establishing a new precedent with reference to standing committees. I feel that the same rule should apply to all committees with respect to allowance of funds to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. In his effort to have the rule apply to all committees in exactly the same way the Senator will have my support.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I regret I was not able to be present at the time the calendar was called, so I am not familiar with the whole background of the debate proceeding at this time, but I believe I have a correct picture of it. I wish to say that the Subcommittee on Senate Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has done a magnificent job. I think it would be a tragic error if provision were not made for continuance of the work of that committee. I hope that at the next session of the Senate, or at a very early date, the matter may be taken up in the regular manner and that provisions for the funds will be made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The authorization will soon expire and we will have no funds with which to pay the staff of the Subcommittee on Senate Investigations. In order to secure the necessary funds I shall yield to the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to say, however, that it will simply mean that we will review such matters twice each year, if that is the program to be followed, instead of once each year. We make all appropriations for committees on an annual basis, and make the general appropriations for a fiscal year. With respect to the permanent standing committees of the Senate, it seems to me we are simply burdening ourselves by having to consider the matter twice each year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall agree to the resolution if the Senator will agree to amend it to provide that the funds shall extend only to the first of July.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do so reluctantly, but I do so because of the situation which exists. If we are going to handle the committee's work in the manner proposed, we had better give some serious thought to the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate the Senator's position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that a number of other resolutions similar to this one have already been agreed to; they were not objected to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; all of them were objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the call of the calendar two resolutions were agreed to, without objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They call for a continuation for 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both of the resolutions which have been agreed to call for a continuation for 1 year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I should like to have the Senate return to the ones which provide for continuing the authority beyond the first of July.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to object. Most of the Members on my side of the aisle have left the Chamber; and this resolution was originally reached during the call of the calendar, when a large number of Senators were present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to introduce a bill and make a short statement explanatory thereof. Will it interfere with

the Senator's plans if I do so at this time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before we go to another matter, I simply wish to say in regard to the resolution we have been discussing that in all probability all the other resolutions will be handled in the usual way, the way in which they have always been handled, so far as I know. However, if the change now proposed is made, it will simply mean that in 6 months' time we shall have to ask for additional authority and additional funds for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas modify his resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I modify it simply by striking out "January 31, 1952," in line 8, on page 1, and inserting "July 1, 1951."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very reluctantly and regretfully, I have to object, because hardly any of the Members on my side of the aisle are now present. They relied on the action previously taken in regard to this resolution when it was reached during the call of the calendar. Therefore, I am obliged to object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it was the minority leader who called my attention to my error in regard to which resolution was referred to.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my friend that if there is no objection to doing so, I should like to have a quorum call, and then we can take up the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection to having a quorum call.

Mr. LANGER. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Ives	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Carlson	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Green	McCarran	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Young
Hoey	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KERR, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. NIXON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until next Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withhold the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion to adjourn to a day certain is not in order. When there is no quorum present, a motion can be made to adjourn only to the following day.

Mr. McCARRAN. The majority leader is now present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nevada will not press his motion to adjourn.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is nothing else to do.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion has been made.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HUNT, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. FREAR entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WILEY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 51, Calendar No. 37.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 51) reported by Mr. McCLELLAN from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on January 23, 1951, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the figures "$100,000", to strike out "in addition to" and insert "including", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1951, and ending on January 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, including any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 206, Eighty-first Congress, second session, agreed to February 1, 1950, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the time I yielded for the purpose of the quorum call the Senate was considering Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 51, which, at the request of the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] I had agreed to modify by changing the date on line 8, from January 31, 1952, to July 1, 1951. I do not see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Tennessee who suggested the modification. He had indicated that he would object if the resolution were presented in its original form.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am reluctantly agreeing to modify the resolution. I want to say to the Senate, however, that in doing so, if my action should set a precedent, it should apply to every special committee and every regular subcommittee which seeks special funds to cover its expenses for the purpose of carrying on its work. I believe that the proposed action will result in an exception being made with reference to this committee, and that upon full consideration the Senate will agree that it is not sound policy to do so. I believe the Senate will agree that it is neither a wise policy nor a necessary procedure. I dare say that the Senate will not further apply the precedent, because we appropriate funds on an annual basis for all committees, except in the case of a special committee which is created to do a special job and when it is anticipated that the job will be completed within a limited time. This subcommittee is not of that order. We are dealing with a regular subcommittee of a standing committee, which is charged under the law and under the rules of the Senate with performing a continuous service, not a limited service within a limited time. I do not see any justification for the action proposed in regard to this resolution when two other committees have today received funds for their subcommittees. One of them is a new subcommittee, which is to conduct a year's service for the full committee.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is operating economically, as is shown by the report. We are asking for less money than we received last year. By limiting the time to 6 months, it will mean that we shall have to come back to the Senate and make further request in another 6 months. I think it is entirely uncalled for.

I see that the able Senator from Tennessee is not on the floor. He indicated he would object if the proposed modification is not made. Therefore, I shall modify the resolution, but I point out now, and I shall continue to point out when other similar resolutions come before the Senate, the course of action taken on the pending resolution. I shall not insist that other resolutions be treated in the same way. I do not think

they should be. However, I want to point out that it will result in an exception being made with respect to this one committee, without rhyme or reason, and without justification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the approval of the Senator from Arkansas, the date will be changed as indicated, because of the fiscal-year situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I modify the resolution in line 8 by striking out January 31, 1952," and inserting in lieu thereof June 30, 1951."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified and amended.

The resolution, as modified and amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1951, and ending on June 30, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, including any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 206, Eighty-first Congress, second session, agreed to February 1, 1950, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

GOOD FAITH PRICE DIFFERENTIAL AS DEFENSE TO CHARGE OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may introduce a bill and make a short statement in connection with it?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Nevada for that purpose without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, and I desire to say just a few words regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. The purpose of this bill is, as its title states, "to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor."

Enactment of this bill will end the so-called "basing-point" controversy.

Senators will remember that I recently discussed the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil case. The bill which I have just introduced would reaffirm the doctrine of that decision, and write it into permanent law.

This bill, Mr. President, borrows from the language of the Court itself, in the Standard Oil case. It does not change the doctrine laid down in that case. It does not extend it, or contract it. It merely asserts, in statutory form, what the Court, in the Standard Oil case, declared the law to be.

I believe, Mr. President, that this bill can be speedily enacted. I do not anticipate that it will be the subject of any substantial controversy.

Speaking very frankly, Mr. President, the reason I do not anticipate much controversy over this bill is that those of us who sought enactment of S. 1008, which the President vetoed after it had passed both Houses of the Congress, can say, with accuracy, that the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case, and this bill, which writes that decision into permanent law, are exactly in accord with what we said the law was at the time we were pushing for enactment of S. 1008.

On the other hand, those who opposed the enactment of S. 1008 can say that they held the fort and prevented the enactment of legislation until the Supreme Court had spoken on the question, and they can go along with this bill because it is in complete accord with the Supreme Court's decision.

Language which was contained in the various versions of S. 1008, and which was the subject of violent controversy, has been eliminated. This bill uses the language of the Court, almost verbatim, and yet there is nothing in the bill that a nonlawyer will have any difficulty in understanding.

The bill is very short and I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill, as I have introduced it, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 719) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of section 2 thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In any proceeding involving an alleged violation of this section, it shall be a complete defense to a charge of discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished for the seller to show that his differential in price, or his furnishing of greater services or facilities, was made in good faith to meet the equally low price of, or the equally extensive services or facilities furnished by, a competitor: *Provided,* That a seller shall not be deemed to have acted in good faith if he knew or should have known that the lower price or more extensive services or facilities which he met were in fact unlawful."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am a cosponsor, with the Senator from Nevada, in introducing this bill. I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with the bill, to go into the RECORD following the printing of the bill itself.

Mr. President, last December the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee completed a lengthy study of what the Federal Trade Commission was doing to eliminate confusion as to the legality of freight absorption and other competitive pricing practices. Our report (S. Rept. 2627) concluded that the Federal Trade Commission had not, and could not, eliminate this confusion. We recommended that the Congress enact legislation and directed our staff to prepare a bill.

Since that time the cause of businessmen who really want to compete has been advanced by a marvelous decision of the Supreme Court. I refer to the decision in Standard Oil Company against Federal Trade Commission on January 8, 1951. On January 17, 1951 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. MCCARRAN] made one of his customary fine analyses to the Senate in which he discussed this case. I shall not attempt to expand upon his excellent discussion of that case, except to make one point. I want to call to the attention of the Senate that both the majority and the minority of the Supreme Court agreed that the position of the Federal Trade Commission in this matter weakened competition. I have consistently opposed that position as I oppose everything that weakens competition.

In finding that the present law is exactly what the supporters of S. 1008 in the last Congress advocated, the majority of the Court said:

> The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition.

The Supreme Court minority—who sustained the Commission's view—admitted that—

> Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer.

The Court minority did not say that that was a good thing, they merely argued that weakening competition in this

manner was the intention of the Congress.

I am indeed pleased, however, that the majority of the Court did not attribute to Congress a policy which would be so destructive to the interests of the consumers. On the contrary, the majority of the Court held that—

> It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor.

The Supreme Court certainly expressed the view of the senior Senator from Colorado when it said:

> Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent.

I know that when the Court said this, it also expressed the views of the overwhelming majority of the Congress. To accomplish the purposes sought by our committee, as well as those referred to on January 17 by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we have collaborated to draft suitable legislation.

I am glad to join with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and others who have worked diligently on this matter in the introduction of a bill to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act.

This bill will not change the law from what a majority of the Supreme Court say is now the law. However, for the reasons given on this floor last week by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it is vital that we end the existing confusion by clarifying the statute to conform to the interpretation given to it by the majority of the Supreme Court.

The enactment of this bill will also eliminate any basis for the surprising view expressed by the minority of the Court that the Congress intended to "weaken competition."

My concern in this matter relates primarily to freight absorption. This bill applies to a seller lowering his price in good faith to meet a competitor's lower price. This is a complete solution to the freight absorption problem, as far as the Clayton Act is concerned, for freight absorption is merely one means by which a seller reduces his price to meet the lower price of a competitor. Whenever a seller absorbs freight to meet the lower price of a competitor who is located nearer to the buyer he is not doing anything other than to reduce his price to meet the equally low price of a competitor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill just introduced, but my opinion is that it is an effort to overturn the decision of the Supreme Court, which has been in favor of the common people of the country for a long time. If we are to permit a measure like this to become law, we might just as well repeal the antitrust acts entirely.

The bill is not now before the Senate, but I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield? I shall not take much time.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope that my good friends the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] will not take violent exception if I make the observation that when the Supreme Court hands down decisions against business practices existing in the major industries of the country, such as the basing point pricing practices, and so forth, legislation is then introduced in Congress to reverse the decisions of the Supreme Court and to uphold business practices, whether or not they are in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Then when the Supreme Court hands down a decision upholding business practices, we have legislation introduced to fasten the Supreme Court decisions into the statute laws of the country.

I hope that my good friends from Nevada and Colorado will pardon me if I say that it looks like "Heads the public loses; tails the monopolists win."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in accordance with Senate Resolution 140 of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare created the Special Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, of which I am chairman. This subcommittee has made exhaustive investigations and held extensive hearings on which formal reports must be made. The latest hearing was held on December 7, 1950, and this hearing, like the others, has required careful analysis, the digesting of voluminous testimony and exhibits, and the preparation of a report. Tentative drafts of all reports have now been submitted to the subcommittee. Some have been approved; others are under consideration, either by the subcommittee or the standing committee. In some cases there will be minority reports, and because of the lateness of the hearings that were held and the volume of the work it has been impossible to prepare drafts. Under our present authority all reports must be filed on or before January 31, 1951.

Consequently, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I have agreed that the time for filing reports and minority views should be extended. There is no objection to such an extension on the part of any member of the subcommittee, and the standing committee unanimously approved and instructed me to make this request. The budget of the subcommittee is exhausted, and the proposed extension will not involve either additional appropriation or the expenditure of any funds.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time within which the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations may file reports, or minority or separate views, be extended through February 28, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time within which the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations may file reports will be extended through February 28, 1951.

THE FOOD-PRICE SITUATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, like all Members of Congress representing agricultural States, I am greatly concerned about the adverse publicity on the food-price situation which is appearing in many newspapers and magazines. Often these stories are very inaccurate and do not tell the true story.

For example, most farm-commodity prices now are far below what they were in 1947 and 1948. Wheat is a good example. The price of wheat is far below what it was in 1947 and 1948, yet bread is selling for 2 or 3 cents a loaf higher. A similar situation exists with respect to most farm commodities.

During that same period the price of everything the farmer has had to buy has risen. I wish to go into that subject in greater detail later during my remarks. First, I wish to read a portion of an article from Sunday morning's Washington Post, dated January 28, 1951, on the farm-price-support situation:

> The Government's price-support program has cost more than $100,000,000 already this year, according to President Truman's budget message. It probably will reach double that figure by the year's end, June 30. It cost $1,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1949.

I called the Commodity Credit Corporation this morning to get some accurate figures on the situation, if I could. I have received a letter from Mr. Frank Wooley, Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The letter is dated January 29, 1951. In part, he has this to say:

> From 1933 through November 30, 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sustained a net realized loss of $736,300,000 on all of its price-support operations, or approximately 5 cents per dollar invested in loans and purchases of commodities.

It seems to me that the little more than $700,000,000 used to stabilize the great agricultural economy of the Nation over a 17-year period is a very small price to pay. That is in considerable contrast with the $20,000,000,000 or more which we have spent in Europe since the war, often on purely boondoggling projects.

Mr. President, I should like to read another very interesting paragraph from this letter. This is in answer to Mr. Ball's statement in the Washington Post that the price-support program for 1949 cost $1,600,000,000. Mr. Wooley has this to say:

> The figure of $1,600,000,000 which has been used in newspapers as the figure representing the cost of CCC price-support programs actually represents the net withdrawals of funds from the United States Treasury during the fiscal year 1950 (about the same in 1949) for investment in loans or inventories by the Corporation.

That is quite a different story. It would be just as fair to take the total loans of, say, the RFC and assert that that figure represented the total operational loss under that program.

Many of these loans programs result in a profit, and certainly at the present time our Government stockpiles of food

are a great asset to this country. I believe the fact that we have a large supply of wheat on hand is a great asset. We ought to have had more cotton on hand, more wool on hand, and we probably would had it not been for the severe critics of this worth-while program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the letter from Frank Woolley, Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1951.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This refers to our telephone conversation of this morning.

The Commodity Credit Corporation showed a net realized loss on its price-support operations in the fiscal year 1949 amounting to $254,761,993. Of this loss, $28,507,649 represented the realized loss on basic commodities.

From 1933 through November 30, 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sustained a net realized loss of $736,300,000 on all of its price-support operations, or approximately 5 cents per dollar invested in loans and purchases of commodities. During the same period, the Corporation has realized a gain of approximately $49,000,000 on the basic commodities, this amount representing a gain of about one-half cent per dollar invested in loans on and purchases of such commodities.

Our current budget estimates anticipate a net realized loss of approximately $374,000,000 during the fiscal year 1951 on all price support commodities. On the basic commodities, it is estimated that a net loss of approximately $45,000,000 will be realized in the fiscal year 1951.

The figure of $1,600,000,000 which has been used in newspapers as the figure representing the cost of CCC price-support programs actually represents the net withdrawals of funds from the United States Treasury during the fiscal year 1950 (about the same in 1949) for investment in loans or inventories by the Corporation. It in no sense represents the net cost of the price-support program since, as you know, a large portion of the investment in both loans and inventories is recovered by the Corporation when commodities are sold.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Vice President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, since the outbreak of the Korean War, many metropolitan newspapers, nationally circulated magazines, and radio commentators have undertaken what amounts to a smear campaign against the American farmer. They have played up stories of rising living costs, with special emphasis upon food prices. The farmer is invariably represented as a villain whose political influence is so great that Congress dares not impose effective controls on agricultural prices.

A typical example of this may be found on page 1 of the pro-Democrat Washington Post of Sunday, January 21, 1951. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it is captioned "Farmer gets most of hike in food cost—more than 75 percent of recent increase in edibles found going to producer." The story carries the byline of Mr. John W. Ball, the Post's agricultural expert. The gist of the story, which is based upon a report by some unnamed governmental agency, is that the farmer has received more than three-fourths of the increased prices paid by consumers for foods since last June 25.

Mr. Ball asserts that the study makes it plain why consumers are shouting for price controls while farmers are opposing them.

The story goes on to quote from a report by the Commodity Exchange Authority which shows that futures prices of a number of agricultural commodities have risen sharply in recent months.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that a report appeared very recently to the effect that the producer was receiving only 51 percent of the consumer's dollar expended for food; that 51 percent of the consumer's dollar expended for food was the amount the producer actually received?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And that included green vegetables, such as out-of-season vegetables, which were shipped into the United States and even Spanish watermelons and cantaloupes which were shipped in. All of that was figured into the actual market-basket food dollar; and the producer received only 51 percent of that dollar.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have that observation made by my friend from Minnesota. Of course, Mr. Ball used future price quotations, and future price quotations oftentimes have little relationship to cash market prices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows, of course, that those prices purporting to be farm prices were completely erroneous. In fact as I understand they are not in the Commodity Exchange Authority report. Where they came from seems to be a mystery. But evidently they were compiled by taking farm prices, then adding to the farm prices such costs as transportation, packing, storage, warehouse charges, transfer charges, commission charges, and others, and calling them all farm prices. They were erroneous. I do not know whether the Senator intends to put in the RECORD the farm prices which appeared in the Washington Post the next day or not, but if he does he knows, of course, that when the purpose was to prove something else the next day a completely different list of farm prices was used, with the price of wheat varying 40 cents a bushel between Sunday and Monday, although both were given as authoritative figures out of the Department of Agriculture. I would assume that the Commodity Exchange Authority is not happy over the liberties that were taken with its report.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have that statement coming from the Senator from Vermont, who follows the agricultural situation very closely, and who, I believe, has always been very fair to the consumer and labor as well—also the farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the mystery is why a responsible paper like the Washington Post will lend its columns to such erroneous and mischievous propaganda.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the average person reading some of the metropolitan newspapers conducting what my colleague has said is a smear campaign, would figure that the farmer, for example, is receiving a dollar a dozen for eggs. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the farmer in the West today is receiving from 21 cents to not more than 30 cents a dozen for his eggs on the farm. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. I have received many letters from farmers complaining about the price of eggs being only 21 cents a dozen.

Mr. LANGER. And the farmer must feed his chickens oats valued at about 70 to 75 cents a bushel as a part of the feed for his chickens. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG. It certainly is.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to say further that all over the Northwest there is an intense feeling of resentment over the fact that the surplus of dried eggs was not sold to the Army. The Army said that these millions and millions of pounds of dried eggs could not be used. Is that not true?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, after the Army had spent thousands and thousands of dollars, even millions of dollars, for dried eggs, it developed that the dried eggs in the possession of the Department of Agriculture were in perfect condition and could be used by the Army.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have that observation.

A second villain now appears on the stage: the speculator.

The reader is left with the impression that between the farmer and the speculator, the poor consumer just does not have a chance.

Mr. Ball winds up his piece by asserting that these figures are direct answers to President Truman and the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee [Mr. ELLENDER], both of whom have charged that food-price increases are attributable to gouging by middlemen and processors and that farmers are not profiting.

It should be fairly obvious that if farmers have been profiteering, that fact would be reflected in their incomes for 1950. A quick check with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics would have provided Mr. Ball with an interesting footnote to his story. It would have revealed that while gross farm income in 1949 was $28,100,000,000, the 1950 figure to be released this week will show a total below $28,000,000,000. The Department of Commerce could have told the Washington Post that net farm income in 1950 was only $13,000,000,000, as against $13,400,000,000 in 1949.

Meanwhile, let us see how the rest of the population has been faring. Our national income for 1950 is estimated at $236,200,000,000 against $216,800,000,000 in 1949. In other words, while the income of the Nation's farmers was declining some $400,000,000 below the 1949 level, the income of the rest of our citizens was increasing by approximately $20,000,000,000 during 1950.

Department of Agriculture figures also reveal that farm production expenses for 1950 were at a record high, and that during 1951 they are expected to advance an additional 5 to 10 percent. As an example of this, a tractor which cost the farmer $1,270 during the 1935–39 period had advanced in price to $2,420 by September of last year. The wholesale price of such a tractor jumped from $1,595.67 in June of last year to $1,743.27 in November.

Could it be just barely possible that the farmer must receive higher prices for his products if he is to meet the mounting costs of his operations?

If farming is as profitable as some of the farmers' critics would like to make the public believe it is, then it is difficult to understand why for several decades the population trend in America has been from the farms to the cities. Perhaps at least a part of the explanation is to be found in the studies of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which reveal that in 1948 the average per capita income for farm people was $892, as compared with $1,551 for nonfarm residents. In 1949, the figures were $765 and $1,520.

When 1950 statistics are available, they will show an even wider discrepancy. It should be remembered that these farm-income figures include the value of food produced by farmers for their own consumption, as well as wages received in outside employment.

Generally speaking, the American farmer not only earns far less than his city cousin, but he also works longer hours. Mr. President, I often wonder what would happen to the Nation if the farmer only worked 40 hours a week. There is only one answer to that: The result would be a terrible shortage of food, and prices two or three times what they are at the present time.

Mr. President, the farmer's children attend poorer schools. The farmer is likely to have inadequate medical service for himself and his family. His opportunities for recreation and entertainment are limited. He enjoys far fewer modern conveniences than do city folks. Finally, when he is depicted by city newspapermen as a profiteer, about all the farmer can do by way of retaliation is kick the side of the barn.

The following tabulation, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, is compiled from official Department of Agriculture figures, and reveals unmistakably that prices of the agricultural commodities cited by Mr. Ball have not skyrocketed since the outbreak of the Korean War—and that, in fact, most of them are still well below parity. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity	Average price received by farmers			6-month increase or decrease	Effective parity price	
	Dec. 15, 1947	June 15, 1950	Dec. 15, 1950		Dec. 15, 1950	Percent of parity
Wheat (bushel)	$2.79	$1.93	$2.03	.10	$2.31	88
Corn (bushel)	2.37	1.36	1.45	.09	1.68	86
Oats (bushel)	1.18	.804	.849	.045	.988	86
Rye (bushel)	2.45	1.21	1.37	.16	1.79	77
Flax (bushel)	6.66	3.68	3.59	−.09	4.53	----------
Soybeans (bushel)	3.69	2.80	2.70	−.10	2.65	102
Rice (hundredweight)	6.42	4.18	5.32	1.14	5.25	101
Cotton (pound)	.345	.2991	.4036	.1045	.3236	125
Wool (pound)	.416	.562	.798	.236	.533	150
Butterfat (pound)	.877	.662	.592	−.06	.734	[1] 81
Eggs (dozen)	.587	.338	.506	.168	.533	[1] 96

[1] Indicates percentage of seasonally adjusted prices to parity prices.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, comparing the figures cited above with those which Mr. Ball attributes to the Commodity Exchange Authority, it will be seen that the price farmers actually received for wheat did not increase 27⅜ cents a bushel in the 6-month period. The rise was an even 10 cents a bushel, as against the 27⅜ cents a bushel which Mr. Ball said the increase was. It happens that the parity price for wheat increased by about the same amount during the period. Putting it another way, the $1.93 which the farmer received for a bushel of wheat on June 15, 1950, gave him as much purchasing power as did the $2.03 which he received for a bushel of wheat 6 months later.

Whereas the Post story says that the price of flaxseed increased by 94 cents during a 6-month interval, official Department of Agriculture figures show that farmers were actually receiving less for flax on December 15, 1950, than they were on June 15, 1950. The decline was from $3.68 a bushel to $3.59.

The CEA figures cited by Mr. Ball show an increase of 26¾ cents a bushel in the price of corn between the pre-Korean War 30-day period and December 1950. The Agricultural Prices bulletin published by the Department of Agriculture shows that the average price to farmers increased from $1.36 to $1.45, an increase of 9 cents. So it goes for various other commodities. As the foregoing tabulation will show, the prices of most major farm commodities are still well below parity—the level which Congress has said would give the farmer a fair exchange price for his commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there is another reason for the erroneous impression as to the prices received by the farmers, namely, the farmer markets certain of his commodities seasonally. For instance, soybeans are sold when they are harvested, as a rule. If the Senator has observed the trend in the prices of soybeans in recent years, he has noticed that after they have left the farmers' hands, the price increases rapidly.

Let us consider wool, which is sheared from late March until the middle of June. It is usually out of the farmers' hands by midsummer. Since midsummer the price of wool has approximately doubled, or at least that was the case as of December when the figures which are so popular with the press today were compiled. That increase in the price of wool took place after the wool left the farmers' hands, but it is still figured into the prices received by the farmers, and it is responsible for a considerable part of the over-all paper increase in farm commodity prices, although not all of that increase has been received by the farmers themselves.

We know that when the price of wool doubles by mid-December, that doubled price is listed as the price received by the farmers. Of course it is true that if the farmer had kept back his wool until December, he probably could have received that price or somewhere near it. However, he does not have any wool by that time. The same situation exists in the case of other commodities.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the price of wool is not established in the United States, but is a world price. We are importing two-thirds of all the wool we use.

The price increases of other commodities which have risen so much in price—commodities such as coffee and cocoa—should also be considered in connection with an understanding of the origin of the crops. Coffee and cocoa are not produced at all in the United States; yet the prices of those commodities enter into the cost-of-living index, which I believe has recently been changed in name to consumer-price index. Yet the prices of those commodities are figured into the consumer-price index, in an effort to put on the farmers of the United States the blame for the increase in the cost of living. The farmer is getting about 50 percent of the consumer's food dollar, which is a smaller percentage than he was getting several years ago.

Mr. President, let me point out that today the method of living contributes

especially to the high cost of living. I know of persons who go to a grocery store and buy canned potatoes, and pay as much for four cans of potatoes as they would pay for a bushel of uncanned potatoes, if they wished to buy potatoes in the way they used to buy them, and then prepare them at home.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has given us some very important information. It leads me to observe that any increase in the price of any canned vegetable, for example, is an increase in which the producer has no part whatever. The farmer was paid for his vegetables last summer or last fall at canning time; and all the increase in the price of the canned goods goes to people other than the producer.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I did not hear the first part of the Senator's statement, but I presume that either he did or he will touch on the fact that the storage of crops in the raw stage is now almost exclusively in the hands of one agency, and that is a Government agency. I wonder whether that fact may in any way tend to bring to the producer a larger share of the price paid by the consumers—the larger share which he should receive, as the Senator from Vermont was just indicating.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it will—that is, if the farmer holds the crop under loan. If he holds on to the crop, and if the price goes above the loan price, the farmer will receive the benefit of the increase.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Of course it is also necessary to consider another cost, namely, that involved in the processing and distribution of the commodity. Of course, that cost is incurred at a time when the commodity has left the hands of the producer. It appears that it is at that stage that most of the addition occurs to what we call the cost of food. The increase occurs, not in the cost of the raw food, but in the cost of the processed food.

That leads me to ask this question: Under the price-control orders which recently were issued—and which I suppose as yet none of us really understand—it was very definitely stated that they do not apply to the raw crops produced by the farmers. However, they do apply to the processed crops. I wonder whether it is a foregone conclusion that fixing the price of the processed commodities—for instance, the price of meat—automatically will fix the price of the livestock on the hoof.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it does in a large measure.

Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he intends to insert or whether he has inserted in the RECORD some of the most recent parity prices—for instance, the parity prices for wheat, corn, and other commodities—as of the last announced figures given out in December 1950.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; they are included in the table I have had inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. The RECORD will have the table of parity figures in the case of wheat, corn, dairy products, poultry, and so forth.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; some of those figures will appear in the RECORD. It might be well to insert the table following my remarks, also, because probably it will cover some figures which I shall not include in my own statement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. THYE. It has been very interesting to note the remarks of the very able and distinguished Senator on the question of what the producer receives and what the consumer actually has to pay. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] gave a very clear and understandable description of how the consumer is purchasing in the wrong manner, in the case of canned potatoes. Certainly the consumers who buy canned potatoes have to pay for the cost of canning the potatoes and also for the cost of the tin cans which are used in the canning process.

But going back to the simple purchasing habits of the consumer, one reason why beef prices are high is that there is not enough beef to supply the demands of the purchasers; but, if the purchasers had purchased poultry last fall, when there was a tremendous supply, beef prices would then have leveled off. Last fall I noticed that many produce dealers in the Middle West actually paid 13 cents a pound for chickens averaging less than 5 pounds. A 4- or 4½-pound chicken, or a year-old hen makes splendid eating, and they were being marketed by the producer at about 13 cents a pound. Thirteen cents a pound is not an unreasonable price to pay for a 4-pound chicken, and it would certainly be large enough for a good-sized family. If a hen weighed 5 pounds or more, it brought 15 cents a pound, live weight. Fifteen cents a pound to a producer for such a hen was certainly one of the lowest levels reached in many a year; yet if one went to a produce market and attempted to buy a dressed chicken, he found it necessary to pay a very high price.

I recall that when we returned to Washington in December, eggs in the Middle West had been selling for an average of about 48 cents a dozen. Some of the No. 1 grades probably brought 52 or 53 cents a dozen; yet they were quoted on the markets in the District of Columbia at $1, $1.04, and $1.05.

On one occasion when I was shopping for a few groceries, I said to the grocer, "Prices are very high." He promptly replied, "Oh, it is the farm-support program. It is just terrible." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "It is the farm-support program. That is what is raising the prices of food to the consumers, and to us, who are retailing food." I asked him certain other questions regarding the farm program. He stated that, in his opinion, it was influencing the rising cost of bread and of certain other foods, such as Crisco, vegetable oils, eggs, and so forth.

I am indeed happy that the Senator from North Dakota is going into this matter in detail this afternoon. The housewife is entitled to know the exact figures, insofar as they concern the prices paid the farmers. Last fall, soybeans selling from the field were bringing around $2, or a little over $2 per bushel. Look at the soybean market today. That is an example.

I repeat, I appreciate the fact that the able Senator from North Dakota is delving into this subject and getting some of the facts into the RECORD, in order that we may to some extent determine who is at fault. It certainly is not the producer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Adding to the example given by the Senator from Minnesota, in connection with chickens, I may say that I do not know what the farm price of turkeys is at the present time. It is probably from 40 to 50 cents a pound. I think it would not be more than that.

Mr. THYE. I withhold my comment on that, because I have not checked it.

Mr. AIKEN. In a Washington store recently I saw customers buying cooked turkey at $4 a pound. I am glad they are able to do it. I realize that if we were to return to our old habits of cooking and eating in the home, many people would be thrown out of employment. The housewife would not be thrown out of employment; she would have more to do than ever. I am glad she is freed of her drudgery over the kitchen stove. But I hope that when Washington customers pay $4 a pound for cooked turkey they will not think the farmer is getting three-fourths of it, or even 51 percent of it, because he is getting about 10 percent of it only.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment?

Mr. YOUNG. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THYE. In the month of December the producer of milk selling on the Twin City market—that is, the fluid-milk markets of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul—received for grade A milk, which is the same quality and type of milk that is demanded on the Washington market, $3.67 per 100 pounds. That was for grade A, 3½ percent butterfat milk. Milk not qualifying as grade A sold for 61 cents per hundred pounds less. That represents the price of the raw product.

An analysis of the figures, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said as he went out of the door just now, would show a payment of possibly 7 cents a quart. If the producer receives 7 cents, consider his investment for real estate, personal property, equipment to maintain, care, and house and produce the feed for his herd of dairy cattle, as well as for manpower to care for the herd, and to deliver the milk to a central point, where it is bottled for distribution. The farmer receives from 5 to 7 cents a quart,

in return for all that manual labor and expense. If he receives 7 cents, who then gets the difference between the 7 cents and the price to the consumer? There is the answer to some of the questions regarding food costs.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator has raised a very important point. What we ought to be doing is to investigate the spread between what the consumer is required to pay and what the producer receives. I think oftentimes it would be found that there are unwarranted price rises. Of course, higher labor costs and higher taxes naturally increase the spread. I think we ought to be fair about the whole thing.

From a reading of magazine and newspaper stories one would get the impression that farmers were receiving an all-time-high price for farm commodities. That is far from the truth. I should like to quote a few figures which I obtained from the Department of Agriculture only last week. These figures will doubtlessly amaze some people. The average price received by the farmer for wheat on December 15, 1947, was $2.79 a bushel. The average price he received on December 15, 1950, was $2.03 a bushel. In other words, the farmer was actually receiving 76 cents a bushel less for his wheat in December 1950 than in December 1947; yet, during that identical period, there was a rise in the price of bread of from 2 to 3 cents a loaf.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that the cost of living was never higher than it is today, and that, as a matter of fact, wheat is 15 percent below parity.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. It is about that. I think most people believe that corn is perhaps selling at an all-time high. It is not. During most of 1947 and 1948, it was selling at much higher prices. For example, the average price which a farmer received for corn, on December 15, 1947, was $2.37 a bushel; whereas, as of December 15, 1950, he was receiving $1.45 a bushel, or nearly a dollar a bushel less.

In December 1947 the price of oats was $1.18 a bushel. It is now 84.9 cents a bushel.

The average price the farmer received for rye on December 15, 1947, was $2.45. His average price at this time is $1.37.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that since the big slump has come in farm prices, transportation costs have gone the other way and have increased tremendously, that wage rates, on the whole, have also increased, and the prices of everything the farmer buys have increased? Consequently, when a little betterment in farm prices is shown it is from a very low level, whereas any increase in transportation costs, labor costs, and machinery costs is already at a high level, and, therefore, does not rise as much as do farm prices, which start from away down in the valley of the low-price area.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Vermont would be interested in these figures on butterfat:

Butterfat, on December 15, 1947, average price received by farmers was 87.7 cents; on December 15, 1950, the average price was 59.2 cents.

Butterfat was selling at approximately 28 cents a pound less on December 15, 1950, than it was in December 1947. Since December 15 I think the price of butter has risen a little, but not very much.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from North Dakota acquainted with the claim that is being made currently that there is very little labor or wage costs involved in the price of food? That claim was made before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Mr. Ching, when he was asked with reference to the cost of labor in connection with the cost of manufactured articles. We put food into a special class. Is the Senator acquainted with that matter?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say that increased labor costs, transportation, and taxes have all had a major part in the spread between what the producer receives and the consumer has to pay.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator agree with the claim that wages and labor are not involved to any great extent in the production of food?

Mr. YOUNG. No; I think that is incorrect. They play a very major part in the cost of food.

Mr. WATKINS. I may observe that I pointed out to Mr. Ching that the matter of labor was entirely misunderstood by the average American housewife and by most of the people in the cities, who think that all a farmer has to do is to plant a crop, wait a certain number of months, and then harvest the crop. We used a loaf of bread as an example. I think the Senator has already called attention to that. The actual value of the wheat involved in producing a loaf of bread would not exceed 3 cents, and is probably 2 cents, whereas the rest of the cost is in railroad labor, transportation of various kinds, manufacturing, packaging, and the final distribution from the bakery to the grocer who disposes of the product. The same would be true of nearly all other foods. The view to which I have referred is largely held by a great many persons who think there is little cost of labor involved in the production of food.

Mr. YOUNG. In most of the cities in the United States it costs from 12 to 13 cents to deliver an empty milk bottle on the doorstep of the consumer. It costs more to deliver the empty milk bottle than the producer gets for his milk. The producer for all of his work and investment gets on the average not more than 10 cents a bottle.

What part speculation has played in the rise of commodity prices, I am unable to say. It is strange, however, that the only time we hear any outcry against speculators is when prices are rising. When farm prices are falling—and over a period of years they go down about as much as they go up—no one seems to be concerned about the possible effects of speculation on our farm economy.

I do know, however, that prices of most farm commodities today are not as high as they were 3 years ago, although wool and cotton are exceptions to this. At the same time prices paid by farmers for goods and services today are the highest on record.

The average working man in America is eating better now than at any time in our history and he is spending a smaller percentage of his disposable income for food than he did in pre-World War II days.

In 1929, for example, the average retail price in 51 large cities for one pound of round steak was 46 cents. At that time the average hourly wage in all industries was 56.6 cents. This meant that a man could buy 1.22 pounds of meat with one hour's pay. By 1949, the average price of round steak had gone up to 85.3 cents but average hourly wages had gone up to $1.40. The pay for one hour of labor would buy 1.64 pounds of round steak. By June 1950, the average price of round steak was 89 cents and average hourly wages were $1.454. This meant 1.63 pounds of meat for one hour of work.

Everything considered, American farmers are doing a remarkable job in the face of grave handicaps. It seems to me that we should be more concerned with expanding our agricultural production—which, after all, is the only solution to the twin problems of shortages and high prices—than in attempting to make the farmer the goat in the present price controversy. Certainly there should be no change in the Defense Production Act of 1950 to reduce the permissible minimum ceiling prices on farm commodities as has been proposed by some.

Given the necessary labor, farm machinery and normal weather conditions, the American farmer will do a production job at least equal to that of any other segment of our population.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post of January 21, 1951]

FARMER GETS MOST OF HIKE IN FOOD COST—MORE THAN 75 PERCENT OF RECENT INCREASE IN EDIBLES FOUND GOING TO PRODUCER

(By John W. Ball)

A Government study of food prices reveals that almost 80 percent of the huge increases since the Korean fighting started last June 25 has gone to the Nation's farmers.

(President Truman declared at his news conference 10 days ago that the farmer had not profited from food price increases since the Korean War began.)

This study, by one of Government's top economics bureaus, was worked out for the men who are entrusted with the job of stabilizing prices in the present emergency.

Almost an exact half of the increases in food costs since June came between November 15 and December 15, the study discloses. In that month the average annual cost of an average consumer's food went up from $219 to $227 or about $8. Between June and November it had gone up from $211 to $219.

Of this $16 jump since last June the farmer got a little more than $12. The remaining $4 went to transportation, wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers.

The study makes plain why consumers are shouting for price controls, while the farmers are opposing them. A comparison

of food prices in June 1946—the last month of OPA ceilings—and those in last November, shows why the public is clamoring for action.

In June 1946 the food cost for an average consumer for a year was estimated at about $160. The same amount of food last month would cost $227. In 1946 the farmer got $87 as his share and last month was getting about $113.

Bearing out these figures as to the sharp increase at the farm level for food and fiber are figures released this week by the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture. According to these figures, all farm commodities dealt in on the Nation's principal markets, except potatoes, have gone up since the period May 24–June 24—the month before Korean fighting. Here are the CEA figures:

	May 24–June 24	December 1950	Gain
Wheat	$2.18¾	$2.45¾	$0.27¾
Corn	1.46¼	1.73	.26¾
Oats	.82	.97	.15
Rye	1.36	1.72½	.36½
Flaxseed	3.26	4.20	.94
Soybeans	3.09½	3.13⅝	.03⅝
Rice, hundredweight	9.33	10.10	.77
Cotton, hundredweight	33.47	43.05	9.58
Wool tops, pound [1]	1.99⅘	5.60	1.60⅘
Butter	$0.56½	$0.70¼	$0.13¾
Eggs, dozen	.37¾	.39¼	.01½
Cottonseed oil, per hundredweight	16.50	24.03	7.53
Soybean oil, hundredweight	13.19	19.45	6.26
Lard, hundredweight	11.97	18.00	6.03

[1] The price for wool tops reached $4.00½ last Thursday—the highest price since records were started by CEA in 1931. The previous high was $2.01 in 1931. This reflects the state of the Nation's sheep herds—the lowest in number since records were started at the close of the Civil War.

In a statement accompanying the report, Joseph M. Mehl, CEA Administrator, pointed out that:

1. An influx of speculators into the commodity markets last June, following the Korean outbreak, was largely responsible for the sharp increase in prices. In less than 1 month soybeans went up 25 percent, cottonseed oil 31 percent, and lard 41 percent.

2. The dollar value of tradings on the 18 commodity exchanges was almost twice that of all trading in stocks and bonds on the Nation's 16 registered securities exchanges, or $32,400,000,000 compared with $17,300,000,000.

3. Trading in soybeans, for instance, was more than 15 times the size of the crop.

4. Low margin rates have attracted speculators into commodity markets from securities exchanges. Commodity margins range from 6 to 13 percent; those for securities are now 75 percent.

The Government study of food prices and the CEA report are direct answers to President Truman and Chairman ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana, of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Both have charged that recent jumps in food prices were due to gouging by middlemen and retailers, and that the farmer was not profiting.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from North Dakota, and I am sorry I cannot wait to hear his address so that I might follow him instead of preceding him.

Mr. LANGER. It is too bad, because I intend to talk about the Democratic Party, and I cannot imagine having listen to me any Senator more appreciative than is the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to speak about two most eminent members of the Republican Party. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will enjoy my words, perhaps more than I might be privileged to enjoy his about the Democrats were I able to remain to hear his address.

I was not on the floor last week, Mr. President, when the nomination of Mr. Eric Johnston was confirmed as Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency. The appointment was an urgent one, and the nomination was acted on quickly. If I had been present, I would have tried to pay Mr. Johnston the tribute which I think is due him for taking this hazardous and very onerous job.

When he appeared last week as a witness before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which I am a member, I asked him whether he thought he would come through his new position with his reputation unsullied. I reminded him of a story told me by Mr. Leon Henderson. Mr. Henderson says that at the peak of his OPA activities there were certain persons placed in asylums and institutions throughout the country who still today go to bed at night muttering imprecations against Mr. Henderson.

I have just gone through a political campaign with one of Mr. Johnston's predecessors, Mr. Chester Bowles. His reputation with a certain segment of the business community suffered as a result of the great job he did during the war in his successful effort to maintain prices over a two-year period.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that if Mr. Johnston has not taken the toughest job in town, at least, he has taken the most thankless job. When the "dead cats" start flying around his ears, I hope we shall remember the fine things now being said about him on the radio and in the press in tribute to his patriotic response to what I regard as a high and imperative call to duty.

I first met Mr. Eric Johnston in the spring of 1942, when he came from the West as a young and enterprising independent businessman to succeed to the presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

It was in the spring of 1942 that Mr. Jesse Jones, then Secretary of Commerce, appointed Mr. Johnston to the first Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development, of which I was Vice Chairman. I worked on the Board with Mr. Johnston, as I did on the Research Committee of the CED, under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. We all learned to admire Mr. Johnston for his open mind, his liberal views, his high intelligence, and his integrity. Indeed, it was during the war years that Mr. Paul Hoffman, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development, said—and I agree with Mr. Hoffman's appraisal—that no one in the business community was doing a finer job on behalf of the business community as a whole, and thus on behalf of the American people as a whole, than was Mr. Johnston.

Mr. President, I remembered that statement of Mr. Hoffman's when I saw an editorial this morning in the Spartanburg, S. C., Herald-Journal. It states that Mr. Johnston first came into prominence as President of the United States Chamber of Commerce some years ago, "when he came in with more aggressive and more liberal views than that organization was ready to accept with happiness." I am glad to report that the editorial, according to my observations at that time, is exaggerated, although it is true that there was a certain small segment of the Chamber of Commerce constituency which found Mr. Johnston's views more liberal than it liked. This very fact in part explains why he was so much needed.

I became intimately and personally acquainted with Mr. Johnston in 1943, when I accompanied him to England. It was at the peak of the war. He and I had been invited to go to England as representatives of the American business community to talk to British business leaders about postwar economic problems which would be anticipated between the two countries. Mr. President, for thirty-three days I was constantly with Mr. Johnston. I grew to admire his courage and high sense of duty, as well as his eloquence, for which he is famous and for which he was applauded by British business groups.

Mr. President, if my remarks begin to sound like a eulogy, I admit that that is what they are supposed to sound like, and I am very glad to appropriate that word for my comments. You will see that I think President Truman is to be congratulated on his appointment of Mr. Johnston. Mr. Charles Wilson is also to be congratulated. In passing I should like to say that I have had mail from all over the United States, from leading businessmen, congratulating the people of the United States on the appointment of Mr. Charles Wilson. I have had countless expressions to the effect that his is the finest appointment the President could have made to fill the most difficult role he is assuming. He and Mr. Johnston bring great special values to those two difficult jobs——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that both gentlemen are Republicans?

Mr. BENTON. Both gentlemen are Republicans. That is one reason why I was glad to assure the Senator from North Dakota that he would at least find something he liked in my comments. Does he not agree, however, that it is a great tribute to the open-mindedness of our President that he should appoint these two eminent Republicans from the business community?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe the newspapers stated that President Truman had offered the job to twenty-five other men and that none of them would take the job. I presume that there were

twenty-five Democrats who were not smart enough to handle the job, and that therefore the President finally had to find a Republican who would take the job.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I did not see the newspaper report to which the Senator from North Dakota referred, and I cannot speak as to the accuracy of it. Twenty-five Democrats could have been well advised in thinking that they were not smart enough to handle the job. I know of no job which is more difficult to handle. However, if there is one man in the country who is capable of handling the job I submitted it is No. twenty-six, if there were twenty-five predecessors, which I seriously doubt.

One of the great values which Mr. Johnston and Mr. Wilson bring to their jobs is the willingness of the best men in the country to associate themselves with them. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston will not have to go through a list of five, ten, fifteen, or twenty men to find the men they want. I believe they will be able to call on the top men in the business community and the top civic leaders, who will be proud to come in and accept difficult jobs under such leadership and sponsorship.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, another Republican who was appointed by President Truman, in the President's effort to get the best qualified man whom he could find for a difficult role, brought the same kind of capacity to the development of the ECA. He brought into the ECA leading men from all over the United States. One day I was congratulating him on that fact, and I said to him, "Don't you think that your greatest asset was your ability to staff the ECA out of your intimate knowledge of who the key men are throughout the country? Don't you think that you brought to your assignment as head of the ECA a better knowledge of the American business community than other men who have come to Washington in these tough roles?"

Mr. Hoffman looked at me and shook his head and said, "Don't forget Jesse Jones. It was Mr. Jesse Jones who brought me into Washington in the CED. It was Mr. Jones, with his phenomenal knowledge of the business community, who assembled so many leaders from it, many of whom are now playing an active role in public life."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I stated several times that I thought it was of great credit to the Administration that Mr. Charles Wilson, the able business executive and leader, was willing to accept the call of the President and take on a very difficult and what will become an unappreciated assignment. I think it was a grand thing for this Nation that Eric Johnston consented to come into Government. Mr. President, if the administration will only permit Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston to make their selections and to staff their organizations with their own recommendations, rather than with the political recommendations which I have seen coming in during the last week, we will be able to go forward with some assurance that the Price Administrator's office will render a great service to our Nation. However, if we are to see every disappointed politician and every individual who is seeking some job security for himself given a place on the staff of the Price Administrator's Office, we shall make a very poor start indeed. That is the danger that I see and wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. The danger is that we may see such politicians getting into leading roles, instead of having the able brains of Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston making executive rulings.

Mr. BENTON. I agree wholly, from my knowledge of the problems which confronted former Governor Bowles when he was head of OPA, that there is no other area in our economy in which more effort should be made to eliminate political considerations, and I do not think the President would have appointed either Mr. Johnston or Mr. Wilson without expecting them to take responsibility for staffing their agencies.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will further yield, we have had a little experience in the past week which does not promise that we are to operate strictly on the basis of the ability of a man to administer a particular job. I think the experience of the past week has shown us that there is more politics in these particular appointments than most of us would like to see. I want the Administration to be successful in this Price Administrator activity, but it cannot be successful if the experience of the past week is to continue. I could relate quite a bit of information about that experience, but I shall not impose upon the distinguished Senator from Connecticut or take his time to relate it.

Mr. BENTON. I do not know the particular experiences to which the Senator from Minnesota refers; but I do not feel that appointments must be Republican in order to be nonpolitical. Cannot we come to an agreement that we do not have to continue to demonstrate, as the President has already demonstrated with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston, that appointments are nonpolitical by appointing only Republicans?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will further yield, I will say to the very able Senator that I do not believe any one of us is exactly thinking in terms of whether the appointees are Democrats or Republicans. We were all exceedingly happy that a man like Eric Johnston accepted the assignment. We entertain like feelings with respect to Mr. Charles Wilson.

The administration would possibly be more successful and have a greater public acceptance if the so-called political organizations through the States were not moving in to make all the recommendations. Those political organizations happen to be of the same political party that is now in power within the National Government. I have witnessed that situation over much of the Nation. Political committees are proceeding to make recommendations. I do not need to remind the Senator as to what has appeared in the press.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I should be very happy to yield, but I have not the floor.

Mr. BENTON. I think the Senator from Minnesota and I can agree that it is a question of the ability of the man rather than his political affiliations. The President certainly demonstrated his attitude on that subject with the two major appointments about which I have been speaking. Apparently the Senator from Minnesota has been receiving, as I have been receiving, favorable reports with respect to these two appointments. I have received such reports from all over the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. All the communications which I have received relative to Charles Wilson and Eric Johnston have been most favorable. I do not believe anyone could criticize the ability of either man, or his past conduct in discharging any public trust.

Mr. BENTON. I am sure that they will assume full responsibility for the development of their organizations. Indeed, that is one of their most important duties, because if they do not get able men in the regional and State offices, there will be a violent public reaction, and the opportunity of the top men for rendering public service will be destroyed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in connection with this subject I wonder if the Senator will permit me to make an observation and to make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. BENTON. I yield for that purpose. I shall be through in about 2 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. The observation has to do with this particular subject.

Mr. BENTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Reference was made to statements in the press about politics being manifest in the Economic Stabilization Administration, in the matter of appointments. In that connection I invite attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 27, 1951; also an article in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 28, 1951, the article being entitled "Admiral Hoover Hits 'Politics' as He Quits ESA Post."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, may the articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota. Indeed, it was he who yielded a few minutes to me. I am sorry that this is taking longer than I anticipated.

Mr. LANGER. Twice the distinguished and able Senator has said that

Mr. Johnston and Mr. Wilson have done the country a great favor by accepting these jobs. Does not the Senator believe that the President of the United States ought to have the right to call on any man in the country, regardless of what his salary is, for public service? We draft soldiers. We take men from their jobs and induct them into the Army. What is there so sacred about drafting a man who happens to be at the head of a large industry and taking a little of his time to work for the Government at $17,500 or up to $22,000 a year? I think it is his patriotic duty to serve. I believe that such men ought to be glad to have the opportunity to serve their country. Therefore, I cannot quite comprehend just why the distinguished Senator says that we ought to be so grateful because these men have accepted the appointments.

Mr. BENTON. Only a moment ago I heard the distinguished Senator from North Dakota speak of the fact that he had heard that Eric Johnston was the twenty-sixth man who had been asked by the President to take the position.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BENTON. He therefore should be commended for responding as he did in this patriotic way to the call to duty. That is why I have been congratulating him for so responding.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask my distinguished friend another question. Does not the Senator believe that if the President selected twenty-five other men first, he must have felt——

Mr. BENTON. I do not believe that he asked twenty-five others.

Mr. LANGER. The statement was published in the press. Does not the Senator believe that every one of those men, when asked by the President to serve his country, was under obligation to accept? Does not the Senator believe that the President ought to have the power to say to any man in the country, just as he says to the humblest and poorest soldier, "Come and serve your Government"?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in answer to that question, let me say that I think there are certain jobs which men could not fill effectively if they went into them reluctantly and by draft. It may be that in time of war—indeed, it has been proved to be so—that men may become brave and effective soldiers, even though they were drafted. I seriously doubt however, whether any of our civic or business leaders, if he were drafted, and accepted against his will, and reluctantly, could possibly be effective in one of these difficult top jobs here in Washington. Under the circumstances, I think the President has no choice but to continue to seek men who will respond patriotically as demanded by the Senator from North Dakota, and respond in the spirit which he has advocated for all Americans.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was very much interested in hearing the Senator from North Dakota say that he thought that any man or women should respond to a Presidential call for national service. I agree with the spirit of that statement. I wish it could be so. We know that it is not.

I believe that one of the reasons why at least some men and women do not respond to the call to accept public service is the terrific and inexcusable vilification to which men in the public service are frequently subjected. On the floor of the Senate I have heard great Americans, patriotic and loyal men, crucified and called traitors, and disloyal to their country. I have sat through a tirade by a Member of the Senate against that magnificent public servant, General George Marshall.

I have read in the press and have heard over the radio attacks on various persons for political purposes. I have heard them called upon to resign after they had rendered devoted and unselfish service. In my opinion, such demands were based exclusively on political grounds.

I wish to tell the Senator from North Dakota—and I know it from experience, because I have held public office and have had to suffer unjust attacks—that the lack of appreciation, the playing of politics, and the blackening of the reputations of loyal and patriotic American citizens are, and will continue to be, great deterrents to the acceptance of positions of high responsibility by many men and women in this country. I need only cite, in addition to the cases of General Marshall and Secretary Acheson, the names of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Mr. David Lilienthal, Dr. Edward Condon, Ambassador Philip Jessup, and most recently, even Admiral Chester Nimitz. There were many others, too.

I wish we could do something to correct that evil situation.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before the vilification starts on Eric Johnston—and I share wholly the views just expressed by the distinguished Senator from New York—may I read into the RECORD half a dozen sentences, and ask that the editorials from which the sentences are quoted may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, because I hope we can remember these sentences and these editorials when Mr. Johnston becomes subject, as he surely will, to the kind of attacks which the Senator from New York has described?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Here is one:

He is an executive of tested ability.

Here is another:

He is energetic, resourceful, and quick on his feet.

Here is another:

The country can anticipate fast action by Mr. Johnston.

Here is another:

He is a man who gets things done.

Here is one from the New York Mirror with the headline:

Stabilization job goes to good man. * * * With Johnston in office, we've got an able man in charge.

The Times-Picayune speaks of Eric Johnston's "reputation for forthright action which has long been firmly established."

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for having yielded to me.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of January 20, 1951]

ERIC JOHNSTON HAS CLEAR TRACK ON JOB WHICH WAS MADE IMPOSSIBLE FOR VALENTINE

Things move rapidly in Washington, once the pressure is on. On Thursday of this week the President, in his press conference, said that he had not discussed with Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson a reported proposal to bring Eric Johnston into the Office of Defense Mobilization as chief economic advisor. If Wilson had any such proposal in mind, he added, he was sure he would discuss it with the President.

A few hours later, on Friday, such a discussion had been held. Alan Valentine had resigned as Economic Stabilization Director, and Eric Johnston had been appointed to succeed him.

The Valentine letter of resignation is frank in its disclosures of differences of opinion and may throw light why action on controls and stabilization has long been held up. As late as Thursday Valentine presented a detailed report which was not acceptable to Mr. Wilson and the resignation followed, "in response to what I understand to be your (the President's) wish."

Mr. Valentine's 3 months in the office have been troubled ones and would have been no easier for any man who happened to fill the post. He was consistently pressured by both sides of the question of price and wage controls and regularly saw one day's high-level memorandum contradict one issued the day before. He did not get along with Michael V. DiSalle, Federal Price Stabilizer, and there were arguments over voluntary versus involuntary controls; selective versus over-all ones. The job became impossible.

Eric Johnston can take over with a slate free of controversy and of "trial balloon" opinions such as were forced from Mr. Valentine. He is an executive of tested ability, as is Mr. Wilson. A program which is at last said to be ready for operation should get under way smoothly.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of January 20, 1951]

VALENTINE: VICTIM

Alan Valentine has resigned and President Truman has named Eric Johnston to succeed him as Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency.

When Mr. Valentine took the job last October 6, the President said his duty would be—

To plan and develop both short- and long-range price and wage stabilization policies and measures and create the necessary organization for their administration.

Mr. Valentine says the President wished him to resign because of honest differences of opinion as to how and when over-all price and wage controls should be put into effect. The President, Mr. Valentine says, now wants immediate drastic action, which Mr. Valentine has felt would be premature. Despite that feeling, he prepared a plan to start over-all controls on February 1, but it was found unacceptable.

Two things are clear:

1. No well-considered policies and measures for over-all control of prices and wages are ready.

2. No adequate organization has been created to enforce them.

This newspaper is not inclined to criticize Mr. Valentine harshly. He is a victim of the indecision, confusion, delays, errors of judgment, and economic blunders which have

characterized the Truman administration's whole attitude toward the menace of inflation for the last 6 months.

If Mr. Valentine was still on a cautious zig course when Mr. Truman suddenly decided the time had come to zag—well, he's not the first man to be caught in such a switch. Nor is he likely to be the last.

But Eric Johnston, who inherits the mess, has a better understanding of how things operate, or don't operate, in Washington. He's spent a big part of his time here, for a good many years, as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and, more recently, of the Motion Picture Association. He is energetic, resourceful, and quick on his feet.

Here's hoping he will get done fast the job that Mr. Valentine didn't, and under the circumstances probably couldn't, do. He, or somebody, will have to if this runaway price-wage race is to be stopped short of inflationary disaster.

[From the Springfield (Ohio) News-Sun of January 21, 1951]

THE COMING ERIC JOHNSTON

President Lincoln experimented with inadequate generals for 3 years before he finally found the man fitted to command the Army of the Potomac, U. S. Grant.

It is not surprising that President Truman has had to fish around for a while before finding the right leaders for the economic mobilization that lies ahead. Now, for one phase of that activity, the directorship of the Office of Economic Stabilization, he apparently has settled on a splendid man. Eric Johnston, a man of business experience and rather extraordinary diplomatic talents—and a tough guy when he has to be—takes the place of Dr. Alan Valentine.

Before things in Asia really got tough, the President was having a terrible time convincing men of first class ability and reputation to come to Washington. The financial sacrifice in taking such posts, plus the hazards to peace of mind and reputation caused by mushrooming of the smear brigade, frightened off the men most eagerly sought.

When the country really got into a jam, with the invasion of Korea by the Chinese Communists, the call of national duty became the overriding call in most minds. Hence the coming of men like Charles E. Wilson to top jobs in Washington—and now Eric Johnston.

In a job of frightening complexity, Dr. Valentine, a former president of a small university, did the best with what he had. It was not good enough. The effort to stabilize the economy was simply not getting under way fast enough. The penalty of delay loomed so large that a change had to be made. The country can anticipate fast and effective action by Mr. Johnston.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News of January 22, 1951]

FIRMER DIRECTION

The appointment of Eric Johnston to replace Alan Valentine as Director of Economic Stabilization should help to step up the pace of measures designed to check and control inflation. Dr. Valentine who stepped into a thankless job before the real framework for mobilization had been established still was inclined toward the "wait awhile" attitude of those earlier days—an attitude that conflicted with Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson's belief that too much ground already has been lost and that the time has come for prompt and positive action.

The change should bring more harmony into the organization of the economic mobilization agencies, and it demonstrates that Mr. Wilson does indeed have full administrative power and intends to use it. The new Stabilization Director, Mr. Johnston, is a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and certainly cannot be regarded as an advocate of "controls-for-controls sake." Like Mr. Wilson, however, he is conscious of the hard necessities of the present situation and he is a man who gets things done.

Both qualities are needed in Washington.

[From the New York Mirror of January 20, 1951]

STABILIZATION JOB GOES TO GOOD MAN

Crisis is separating the men from the boys in Washington. As things get tougher, they're finally bringing in capable men.

Eric Johnston's appointment as United States price-wage boss will make the Nation heave with relief. It's the first sane move so far to cope with economic stabilization.

Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and now president of the Motion Picture Association, is an executive of international repute. On merit, he enjoys the respect of business and labor.

Johnston is getting no bargain. His new job is one of the toughest in the defense setup. He inherits little but a mess of confusion compounded by previous indecision and ineptitude.

Outside of some tall talk, most of it conflicting, and the naming of nonentities who have shown conspicuous inability to cope with a gigantic chore, the Truman administration had done nothing to stabilize our crisis economy before Johnston was named to office.

Food prices this week topped all previous records. This hits the average family hard, as food costs take a larger slice of the total budget in lower and middle income brackets.

Failure to impose proper economic controls months ago has cost us billions. Tax dollars won't buy as many airplanes and tanks and other tools of defense now, because arms costs have skyrocketed along with everything else.

Contradictory statements about stabilization plans have prompted scare buying, driving prices higher in the consumer goods field.

Bernard Baruch urged imposition of real controls 6 months ago, but his advice was disregarded. (Baruch was in the political dog house, because he refused to shake down his friends for the 1948 political campaign. Apparently the Missouri waltzers around Mr. Truman felt it was better to let the economy go to pot than follow Baruch's advice.)

Politics as usual decreed no controls until after the November election. The results showed the people prefer the facts of life to economic fairy tales, but still Washington failed to move in any practical way.

With Johnston in office, we've got an able man in charge. If they give him a free hand, he will bring sense to confusion and order from chaos. It's about time.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 21, 1951]

PUSSYFOOTING OUT?

Judging by reports of rapid events in Washington in economic stabilization circles upon the advent of Eric Johnston to replace Alan Valentine as economic stabilizer, quick action seems to be on the way to freeze wages and prices. It seems that Mr. Johnston, thanks to mobilization director Wilson, is being given power to act. Present limitations on the authority of both Price Stabilizer DiSalle and Wage Stabilizer Ching apparently are being moved. Mr. Wilson has gained, according to reports, the immediate action he has recommended and the kind of organization needed to stop constantly rising prices and wages.

As Government statistics were released last week end showing that average wholesale prices had risen to a record high for the tenth successive week as of January 16, the tide of angry complaints from housewives, businessmen, Congressmen, and the press had reached a corresponding zenith. No crystal ball is needed to suspect that it was this deluge of criticism from the people that finally forced President Truman to act on Mr. Wilson's urgings. For months now Mr. Truman has hesitated. There can be little doubt that Mr. Valentine was acting with the President's consent in opposing immediate wage and price controls against Mr. DiSalle's insistence. But public protest finally impelled the President to agree with Mr. Wilson and Mr. DiSalle that voluntary controls are worse than futile and price controls without concurrent wage controls would be equally disastrous. Once the President had accepted the defeat of his wait-and-see policy, it was only necessary to fire Mr. Valentine and, by implication at least, fix on him the blame for pussyfooting.

Because Mr. Wilson, it seems to us, must be credited with finally persuading the President to give a new economic stabilization set-up adequate authority to move quickly to freeze wages and prices, the big boss of economic mobilization should be cleared of any suspicion of having become, too, a servant of the White House politics. Certain Congressmen had expressed this fear last week after his indefinite broadcast speech. But, backed by Mr. Johnston—whose reputation for forthright action has long been firmly established—and the forceful Mr. DiSalle, Mr. Wilson should be able to keep politics out of the Nation's economic mobilization.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Daily News of January 27, 1951]

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY

Economic Stabilization Agency (ESA) is being built into Nation-wide Democratic machine.

Democratic National Committee is in charge; is passing on candidates for every job paying $4,000 and up.

Committee asks Democratic governors, senators, State chairmen, National committeemen, for names, sends them on to Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle.

Party loyalty is a test. No Dixiecrats accepted and no one who opposed President Truman's renomination or otherwise offended top Democrats. Backing from potent party figures is required. Some appointees have price-control experience; most have not. Lists submitted by Republican officials aren't considered.

It's a contrast to procedure in OPA 10 years ago. Politicians weren't consulted, party labels weren't checked. One result: Constant attacks on OPA from Capitol Hill, constant threats to withhold appropriations.

A few Democrats in Congress worry about staffing ESA with party men from top to bottom because it pins responsibility for success or failure of new price-control agency directly on party. They're afraid it may be unpopular by next election. Same men refuse to sponsor candidates for district office, for same reason. But they're the exception.

Pay of new officials isn't fixed. They'll get $50 a day until Congress acts.

Here's sample of how the picking's done.

Regional administrator for Rocky Mountain States will be George Rock, president of Truman-Barkley Club in 1948. Before Alan Valentine was fired, a five-man panel he had named picked another man.

New outfit's a haven for lame ducks. Already slated for jobs: Vernon Dwyer, Indiana State director, defeated Democratic candidate for Congress; Doc O. A. Noland, consultant to DiSalle, and father of a defeated Indiana congressman; Herbert Meighan, defeated for reelection as mayor of Gadsden, Ala.; James G. Lyons, New York regional officer, defeated for re-election to State legislature; Michael Howlett Jr., Illinois tem-

porary consultant, defeated for State treasurer.

Washington's full of party officials elbowing each other in rush to pie counter.

[From the Washington Post of January 28, 1951]

ADMIRAL HOOVER HITS "POLITICS" AS HE QUITS ESA POST

Vice Admiral John H. Hoover, in a terse statement explaining why he resigned as price-wage enforcement chief, declared yesterday "politics has no place in an organization affecting every American home."

The resignation of the retired veteran of World War II became known Friday just as the Economic Stabilization Agency decreed its price-wage freeze.

He issued this statement yesterday.

"It is true that I have resigned as price control enforcement officer of the ESA. It is also true that I believe politics has no place in an organization affecting every American home."

He refused to elaborate.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS McKELLAR AND GEORGE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of our own number who has a birthday anniversary today. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], has served in the Senate for many years with distinction and with faithfulness, as he served in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate. I hope he will have many and happy birthdays in the years to come.

Mr. President, I cannot speak too highly of the senior Senator from Tennessee. Members of the Senate know that he is one of the most faithful Members in his attendance at the sessions of the Senate. He is present when many other Senators are absent, and that in the face of the fact that he has more duties to perform than almost any other Senator.

I also wish to pay tribute to another great Senator who has a birthday today, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He, too, has served this body well and long, and is one of the outstanding Members of the Senate. He is well qualified in the field he has chosen. He is an authority on the finances of the country. I also wish him a happy birthday, and many more years of achievement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague, the leader of the majority, in congratulating the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. He came into the Senate on the fifth day of March 1917, and by 5 years is the senior in service of any Senator in this body.

It is not generally known, but Senator McKELLAR is the father of the public road system of the United States. When Woodrow Wilson was President, the Senator from Tennessee went to him and sold him on the idea of having the Federal Government contribute some portion of the expense of the building of public roads, the first appropriation being in the amount of roughly $16,000,000.

It was my great honor to serve under the Senator from Tennessee when he was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He did a magnificent job. Particularly he did a fine piece of work in connection with the Post Office Department. During the time he was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads there was not always a deficit in the Post Office Department. In fact, at one time the Department actually showed a profit.

I have been impressed, as has our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], by the fact of the constant and faithful attendance of the Senator from Tennessee at sessions of the Senate. I do not believe the Senator from Tennessee missed a single committee meeting when I was a member of his committee. He always arrived in time to help produce a quorum.

I hope he may be with us for a long, long time to come.

THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished and able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] had, by unanimous consent, an article placed in the RECORD. The article which will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow is headed:

IN THE OFFING—A WEEKLY SIZE-UP BY MEMBERS OF THE WASHINGTON STAFF OF THE SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPERS

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY

Economic Stabilization Agency (ESA) is being built into Nation-wide Democratic machine.

Democratic National Committee is in charge; is passing on candidates for every job paying $4,000 and up.

Committee asks Democratic governors, Senators, State chairmen, national committeemen for names, sends them on to Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle.

Party loyalty is a test. No Dixiecrats accepted and no one who opposed President Truman's renomination or otherwise offended top Democrats. Backing from potent party figures is required. Some appointees have price-control experience; most have not. Lists submitted by Republican officials aren't considered.

It's a contrast to procedure in OPA 10 years ago. Politicians weren't consulted, party labels weren't checked. One result: Constant attacks on OPA from Capitol Hill, constant threats to withhold appropriations.

In connection with that, Mr. President, I desire to read another article. This is one which appeared in the Minneapolis Star, and it involved the State of North Dakota, my own State. I rise to speak in protest against what has been done by the national administration. The article is by Wilbur Elston, Minneapolis Star Tribune correspondent.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Four officials have been named to the Minneapolis Regional Office of the Economic Stabilization Agency, it was learned Tuesday night—

From whom, Mr. President? Not from the man who appointed them. Not from the office of Eric Johnston, but—

from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S office.

They are Philip Neville, Minneapolis attorney and Edina municipal judge, regional director; Louis G. DeNayer, Billings, Mont., assistant director; Joseph Robbie, Mitchell, S. Dak., enforcement officer, and Wesley Silvian, Duluth, Minn., chief regional counsel.

The four men will be in Washington Thursday to be indoctrinated in ESA's price policies before taking over their new jobs.

The regional office in the Northwestern National Bank Building was opened last week with temporary officials provided by the regional civil-service office.

Mark this, Mr. President:

Three of the four States in the region, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Montana, are represented by these appointments. North Dakota is the fourth State to be served out of the Minneapolis regional office.

So the State of North Dakota was entirely ignored when the appointments were made.

I read further:

Neville, a graduate of the University of Minnesota Law School, is a member and secretary of the Minnesota State Board of Law Examiners. He has been an Edina municipal judge since 1948.

In 1944 and 1945, he was regional attorney for the Minneapolis War Production Board's regional office, and after that for the Civilian Production Agency.

So he has had a political job for a long, long time, Mr. President.

I read further:

Robbie is a personal friend of HUMPHREY, who is a native of South Dakota. Robbie was the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for Governor of South Dakota last fall.

So we get another politician, Mr. President, but a poor one at that, because he could not even get elected.

I read further:

Silvian is with the Office of Alien Property in Washington, and was with the Labor Department's regional office in Minnesota from 1937 to 1939. He also is a University of Minnesota Law School graduate.

Tentative plans call for appointment of a price administrator for each of the four States in the region, but HUMPHREY'S office said the jobs have not yet been filled.

So we have my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] making the announcements in regard to what takes place in Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota.

However, Mr. President, that is not all. I hold in my hand the Democratic platform. When the great Democratic Party wanted votes, when it was groveling in the dust, when it was making any kind of promise of economy to get the taxpayers to vote for it, the Democratic Party solemnly pledged itself to this platform, from which I now read one paragraph:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, what does the record show? It shows that the Democratic Party says one thing when it wants votes, but does exactly the opposite when it comes to take action. I have before me

now a map which shows the four States in this regional agency. Those States are Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. What is the present plan in regard to that agency, Mr. President? With rubber becoming in short supply, with automobile manufacturers going to be limited, with gasoline going to be rationed, I expect, where is the regional office located? Is it located in the center of the four States, so that the officials of the agency will have not more than 200 or 300 or 400 miles to travel? Oh, no Mr. President; those officials will have to travel all the way across the thousand miles of Montana, that State which is so wide that when one is traveling on a train, if he enters the State of Montana at early dawn and continues to travel through that great State all day, he barely leaves the limits of Montana by midnight. However, Mr. President, the officials of this Agency will have to travel farther than that if they are traveling from western Montana to the regional office in Minneapolis, for they will also have to traverse all of the State of North Dakota and then all of the State of Minnesota. Consequently, Mr. President, it is clear that on the basis of an allowance of nine cents a mile for transportation and on the basis of the per diem allowance, the extravagance involved will amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars every month.

However, that is not the worst of the present proposal, Mr. President. Not only will there be great extravagance and much useless expenditure for traveling the nearly 2,000 miles from the western portion of Montana to the eastern portion of Minnesota to attend the regional meetings, but the officials who have to travel that distance will, consequently, lose a great deal of time, during which they will not be on the job. Therefore, they will be most inefficient.

Mr. President, I, for one, certainly wish to protest against the location of a regional agency of this sort way off in one corner of the region concerned—in this case, very close to the Mississippi River. The State of Montana alone is as large as 5 or 6 of the New England States. Yet, as I said a moment ago, a man who attends one of the regional office meetings will, if he happens to be in western Montana, have to travel all the way across Montana and all the way across North Dakota and all the way across Minnesota, in order to reach the city of Minneapolis.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the regional office could have been located in Miles City, Mont. I am not asking that the regional office be located in North Dakota. There are three or four large cities, anyone of which has sufficient housing to take care of those who will be needed at the regional agency. However, those who decided on the location of the agency did not choose to locate it at Miles City, Mont. They could have located the regional agency at Aberdeen, S. Dak., or at Bismarck, N. Dak., where Fort Lincoln is one-half empty, and where this agency would not have to pay one penny of rent.

However, instead of doing that, the article based on information from the office of my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], states that the agency will have its offices in the Northwestern National Bank Building, in Minneapolis. Mr. President, I happen to know where those offices are located. In that building, very high rents are charged—some of the very highest rents charged in the Northwest. Yet the offices of this agency will be located there, and I assume the agency will take an entire floor in that building, and will pay thousands and thousands of dollars in rent, whereas, as a matter of fact, the agency could be established at Fort Lincoln, N. Dak., where its quarters would be rent free.

Mr. President, what confidence can the ordinary citizen of the United States have in his Government when he finds that those who are running it administer a great agency such as this OPA agency in that manner? I do not know; perhaps Eric Johnston is the great man that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Connecticut, said he was a short time ago. I hope he is. I promise you one thing, Mr. President: Every public action he takes will be watched. Regardless of whether he may be a Republican, if he condones the kind of thing I have just brought to the attention of the Senate, you can be sure, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from North Dakota will call it to the attention of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, taxes are so terribly high now that the withholding taxes deter men from working on Saturday. They do not want any extra pay on Saturday. They work for 5 days a week, and they say, "Why should we work on Saturday in order to help out? The Government is going to keep most of it, anyhow."

I call attention to the fact that it is said we should not bring politics into our discussions. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas recently said we should not even criticize what has taken place in the Foreign Relations Committee, or what has been done by our Government in foreign affairs. But I submit that the American people are entitled to have some criticism of past acts, in order that mistakes may be avoided in the future.

We pick up the newspapers today, and I shall presently discuss something which recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Every Senator upon this floor knows that General Eisenhower has been in Europe, where he has been trying to assemble an army. He has been in France, and he has been in Italy. He spent 3 days in West Germany. I shall in a moment read some of the things he said. While General Eisenhower was in Europe trying to get people to fight, or at least to join with our Army, what has the administration been doing here in Washington? The administration is doing all it can to undermine General Eisenhower as far as West Germany is concerned.

In this country, roughly one-fifth of the population is of Teutonic origin. About 33,000,000 of our people are related to the people of West Germany. They were writing their relatives in Germany, when General Eisenhower was there a few weeks ago, telling them about the ideals of our American democracy. The Americans of German ancestry in this country are great friends of the German people, some of whom are their own sisters, brothers, uncles, or aunts.

Mr. President, how much credit can we expect that the German people are going to give to General Eisenhower's words? What is the situation over there? I made a long and careful study, and I am convinced that there are still certain people in certain branches of our Government who, either through ignorance or through deliberate blunders, apparently resulting from continued hatred, but which may actually be due to more sinister motives, are still carrying on policies which play directly into the hands of the Communists. They may yet bring about the loss of Europe, and thus necessarily imperil the lives of thousands of American boys, unless stopped by this body.

Before going further, let me state the Kremlin master plan for aggression as we now know it to be. The plan requires in all instances carefully prepared campaigns, often subtle, and often indirect; many times using causes which in themselves are good, for evil ends, carried out over long periods of time; plans which have as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe. Let me repeat, the latter part of that statement, so that we will remember it and will see how it is going to tie in with the disclosures I am going to make today. The Kremlin master plan for aggression is to do everything to weaken the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe. Our military men know this. They know that this is the Kremlin master plan. Their primary interest, therefore, lies in seeing to it that everything is done to strengthen the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression. They know that we cannot have a strong Western European defense without that, and they know that the people of Western Germany must play a part in that defense. Yet today I pick up the Wall Street Journal for Friday, January 19, 1951, which contains a display advertisement. That was only last week. I want to call the advertisement to the attention of my distinguished friend from Arizona, the majority leader, because I do not believe he knows what is taking place. If he did, I think he would rebel. I think that when he learns what is taking place he will try to stop it. The advertisement is headlined, "Offer for Sale by the Attorney General of the United States of America." The lengthy subhead continues: "Of His Right, Title, and Interest in and to the Following Described Real Property Situated in the City of Washington, District of Columbia."

Description of property: Valuable downtown location, 1435–41 Massachusetts Avenue NW.

Improvements of brick construction, consisting of 70 rooms, large ballroom, 13 baths and 5 additional toilet rooms, garages, and storage space. Situated on plot containing 20,000 square feet.

In other words, it says, on the 16th day of November 1951, this property is to be sold to the highest bidder. What property is it? It is the German Embassy in Washington. At the same time General Eisenhower says to the German people of Europe, "Come on in; join us. Sooner or later you are going to be a nation again in your own right. Sooner or later there is going to be a peace treaty between the United States and Germany, and we welcome you with open arms to join the community of nations." At that very time, there appears in the Wall Street Journal an advertisement offering for sale by the Alien Custodian, working through the Attorney General of the United States, the German Embassy.

Omar Bradley recently said that the side that controls Western Germany controls Europe. No one is fooling Omar Bradley in any way. In addition, our military men know that everything must be done to weaken communism behind the iron curtain, by going over the heads of their Communist enslavers, directly and indirectly, to the civilian population, with messages of democracy, messages of hope, messages that will strengthen their will to resist, and finally to overthrow their enslavers. Our military men know, as we do, that we must do those things, which are vital, in order to save the lives of American soldiers; which is their primary obligation, along with the winning of any war. They know that these things are vital, and that they may perhaps win a peace without further conflict—which is every American's hope and prayer.

So far as the first part is concerned, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, who had just returned from Germany, stated to the press on January 20 at Frankfurt, as reported in the New York Times, as follows:

I would like to see the German people lined up with others in the defense of the western type of civilization.

When asked by the press whether he believed the Germans should be mobilized to assist in the western defense, he said:

There is no place for neutrality when civilizations are in conflict.

General Eisenhower emphasized, however, that the Germans should be allowed to come into the defense alliance "of their own free will." He further said:

It is silly to think of trying to put them in against their wishes. No soldier loves the front lines. He likes to feel he is fighting for a cause, and no man in the front lines ought to feel he is lacking in that conviction.

We believe that most Americans and all the Members of Congress will agree with the general's statement, especially the following:

It is silly to think of trying to put them in against their wishes.

Mr. President, let us take a look at what we have done and still are doing in Western Germany that would make them wish to join us. Let us take a look and see what we have done and are doing to give them the feeling that their men would be fighting for a cause, as the General said, which means to strengthen their wills to resist Communist aggression.

Let us take a look at the administrative policies with which the military had nothing to do and with which the Congress and the people of the United States had nothing to do—policies practiced in Germany from 1945 up to the present time—and learn whether these policies have given them cause to want to join the western defense alliance of their own free will, and then let us see how they really feel about it.

It is now agreed by the vast majority of the people of the United States and of their elected representatives that the policies put into effect with the complete destruction of Hitlerism were not American policies based on American principles of justice. When stripped of their trappings, they were naked policies of hatred and revenge imposed on an entire people. They were policies in implementing the false theory of mass guilt and mass punishment, contrary to Christian principles of morality on which all western civilization must of necessity stand or fall.

Let us ask ourselves, Why were these policies indulged in? Was it really believed that we must punish all the German people for the crimes of their political leaders, or were these policies planned by the Kremlin and carried out by its agents and dupes to alienate all the German people from true democracy—alienate them forever from the west? Was it planned to weaken their will to resist aggression?

Mr. President, I charge that these were Kremlin policies, because only the Kremlin could gain from them. Let us see how the Kremlin agents and dupes played their part. Remember it was Harry Dexter White, at that time Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who conceived the Morgenthau plan for the harsh treatment of the entire German civilian population. Remember it was the same Harry Dexter White who was an intimate associate of the now convicted Alger Hiss, the same Harry Dexter White who died suddenly 5 days after he was called before the Committee on Un-American Activities, having been drawn into the Hiss inquiry. Remember, the cause of his death was said to have been an overdose of digitalis. It was the same Harry Dexter White who, in the second Hiss trial, in which Hiss was convicted, is named in testimony as having been a secret member of the Communist Party.

He was the same Harry Dexter White who was a close associate of Laurence Duggan, former State Department official and named in the testimony in the second Hiss trial as "in a special category of the party apparatus, not a party member, but maintaining a special liaison with the underground through the divorced first wife of Gerhard Eisler, fugitive, former No. 1 Communist agent in the United States."

Remember, a few days after the FBI man called on Mr. Duggan he died in a plunge from a window of his sixteenth-floor New York office, his body landing so far from the building wall that suicide or murder, not accident, is the choice of tenable theory.

I say, Mr. President, it may not have been suicide; it may have been murder.

Let us ask ourselves whether these plans for the oppression of the German civilian population were merely based on hatred, or, as some said, "Just punishment for the crimes of their political leaders," or whether they had a more sinister background. Was this all planned by the master minds of the Kremlin to get us to do things the Kremlin knew would weaken their wills to resist when the time for such aggression arrived?

The policies of Potsdam and Morgenthauism result in taking from the German people their tools, their factories, needed by them to earn a living, and then, for the most part, turning the same over to the Communists; the policies which not only permitted the mass expulsion of 13,000,000 people of German ethnic origin and then forcibly moving them into already dismembered and overcrowded Germany and then insisting that these people be excluded from the benefits of the International Refugee Organization, over whose constitution neither the people of the United States nor the Congress had anything to say, but to which the American taxpayers made the largest contributions. Who planned that?

Remember, Mr. President, what Winston Churchill said about it in the House of Commons. He said, "It is the greatest tragedy of the age." He was referring to the 13,000,000 persons who were expelled. I say, Mr. President, and I say it with sorrow, where, oh, where, in heaven's name, was the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate? What was that committee doing? The answer is "Nothing," Mr. President. I say to the citizens of America today who want to blame the President or who want to blame the Republicans or the Democrats, that the Republicans are just as guilty as are the Democrats—those who were members of the Foreign Relations Committee—because all through the Eightieth Congress the votes were 13 to 0. Some of the Republicans will, when the damage is done, try to blame the Democrats. But I say look at their votes. They made the record of the Eightieth Congress, Mr. President. They made their record on the floor, and it comes with ill grace now for leading Republicans to throw out their chests and say, "We do not want to send any troops over to Germany," after they helped to get this country into the mess in which it is at this time.

Who planned that these 13,000,000 expellees would be without food, without clothing, without shelter? Who planned to kill their hope that they may have had in western democracy? Remember, Alger Hiss was top policy man in the State Department. Who played the game of the Kremlin to weaken the wills to resist?

Who planned that, Mr. President. In the Eightieth Congress, when I asked the

chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee why German and Austrial children were not included in the International Refugee Organization, why they were to be permitted to starve to death, what was his answer? He said, "They are included."

The next day, when I showed him the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, that distinguished Senator wrote me a letter of apology.

It is to the great credit of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that he said, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, "I am going to vote for all the money necessary to feed those little children in Germany and Austria." I believed he referred to the speech of the late President Roosevelt given on the 23d day of October in Chicago, in which he said, "We are not fighting the German people; we are fighting Hitler. We want all the German people to know we are their friends."

But when the International Refugee Organization began operations, those little children were permitted to starve to death.

Mr. President, I ask again, Who planned it? Who planned that 13,000,000 expellees should be without food, without clothing, and without shelter? Who planned to kill the hope which they have have had in western democracy? Who did it? Let us remember that Alger Hiss was the top policy man in the State Department. Who played the game of the Kremlin? Alger Hiss. Alger Hiss was secretary general of the San Francisco Conference when the United Nations Charter was drafted. It was Alger Hiss who, after that organization came into being, was the principal adviser to the American delegation, the same delegation which approved the IRO charter, which specifically excluded these expellees. Is it any wonder that these 13,000,000 expellees are ripe for communism?

Mr. President, when I walked into the office of John J. McCloy, the High Commissioner, a few weeks ago, there were tears in his eyes. Why? Because on Sunday—I walked into his office on Monday—there had been an election in Wurttenberg-Baden. He had been up all night listening to the election returns. For the first time in Germany's history Wurttenberg-Baden voted for a majority of social democrats, whose chief plank was not to fight with the United States of America. That same day there was another election, in the state of Baden. How did that election go? Again the social democrats, led by Mr. Schumacher and the Reverend Niemöller, won. In discussing the election which was coming up on the following Sunday in Bavaria—an almost solid Catholic country—the prediction was freely made that for the first time in all its history Bavaria would go Socialist by voting for the Social Democrats. Mr. President, a week later I picked up a copy of the New York Times. For the first time in all of its history Bavaria had voted overwhelmingly for the Social Democrats, led by Mr. Schumacher and the Rev. Niemöller. They had voted against the Adenauer cabinet.

Mr. President, what about the 13,000,000 expellees? Millions of them are dead. They starved to death. Under German law, Mr. President, every expellee automatically becomes a citizen of Germany, and every one of them has a vote in Germany. Let us not forget that fact.

Mr. President, Omar Bradley has said that we must have the western Germans with us. Why are these 13,000,000 expellees ripe for communism? I say they were driven to communism by the traitors in our own Government. We now know that the denazification policies were many times carried out in a brutal and stupid manner, in many instances by Communists now masquerading as believers in democracy, whose sole purpose was to get the Germans to hate America.

Mr. President, upon my return from Germany I offered a resolution. If the Committee on the Judiciary will call witnesses—and I will give them names—it will be found that men who worked on the Daily Worker changed their names and were sent over to Western Germany. They were on the payroll of the United States. They were sent over to Germany to carry out the denazification program.

Mr. President, we have their photographs. Up to the present time the Committee on the Judiciary has not seen fit to report the resolution. Under the denazification program these people were denied the right of even earning a livelihood. A teacher could not teach school. A lawyer could not practice law. A doctor could not practice medicine. No one could do anything until he was denazified. There were millions of them, Mr. President. Collier's magazine and the Saturday Evening Post fought against the program. Time and time again we took up the question on the floor of the Senate. We could not get anywhere. What did Russia do? They tried the denazification program for only a few weeks. Then they stopped the program. They invited the scientists into the east zone. There were some 50,000 of them who went to the east zone. Every scientist who had been employed by Hitler was placed on the payroll and given a great deal of money. They helped the Russians finish some of those tools of destruction. For example, they finished the submarine, which our Navy says is one of the best submarines that has ever been manufactured. If there should be a war, our boys will have to bleed and suffer and die because of what was done by the State Department of the United States and what was left undone by this Congress and its predecessors.

The reprisals and repressions were all carried out over there on the theory of mass guilt and mass punishment. Now we know that that is exactly what the Communists wanted the United States to do. In fact, no real attempt was made to teach our American democracy to the German people. I saw some of their schools. The whole thing is abhorrent. Suppose Hitler had said to our school people, "Your theory is all wrong. You should have an emperor in the United States." How many centuries do Senators think it would take before they could educate the people of the United States to believe that we needed an emperor in this country? In Austria-Hungary, the people had the House of Hapsburg. The House of Hapsburg was the oldest royal house in the world. It was over a thousand years old, making it older than even the English royal house. However, at the end of World War I Americans went into Austria-Hungary and said to the people, "You do not want that kind of government." So the 19 nations which composed the Austro-Hungarian empire were separated from one another, and the result was chaos.

In fact, no real attempt to teach those people true American democracy could have been made, because the theory and practice of mass guilt and mass punishment was incompatible with American democracy. While we were denazifying the letter carrier, the street cleaner, the janitor who cleaned the public buildings, or those who had to join a Hitler-controlled labor union in order to eat and live, the Communists behind the iron curtain were making converts of the dyed-in-the-wool Nazis in their territory. Individually and collectively those Nazis were reeducated. They were told, "We welcome you into the Communist fold. You former Nazis and we Communists are all Socialists at heart. There are certain things which we have in common, but your Hitler, the pig, tried to give socialism a nationalistic character and became the tool of western capitalism and imperialism and attacked the mother country, the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Now look at your homeland. Your people are enslaved and your country is dismembered. We Communists are for a united Germany free from Fascist and capitalistic influences. The dictatorship of the proletariat under our great leader Stalin is necessary to free you and people of the world." To which the former Nazis answer, "Heil Marx, heil Lenin, heil the great leader of all peoples, Stalin."

That is the way they operate over there, Mr. President. Fortunately I was one of those who could understand the language. I talked with hundreds of them. I went over there at my own expense, free from the military and the Department of State. I wandered around and talked with the people here, there, and everywhere. I know their attitude. Those people over there made converts to communism. Our policies made few believers in western democracy, except those who already believed in it, but to whom our practices, which were contrary to democracy, were abhorrent. Can there be any question about this? Is there any question that such policies or practices weaken the will of the people to resist aggression?

Let us take a look at what General Eisenhower discovered on his arrival in Frankfurt, Germany, when he was handed a survey made by United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy. Mr. McCloy's office had in recent weeks made a poll-type study to determine the attitude of the West German civilian population as to their willingness "to join the western defense alliance on their own free will" as General Eisenhower would

like to have them do. The quotation is from the Wall Street Journal. Certainly the Wall Street Journal is not a Communist newspaper. I quote from the Wall Street Journal of January 19. When the question was submitted, and the survey was made by United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy, the question was as to their willingness "to join the western defense alliance on their own free will," as General Eisenhower would like to have them do.

How many wanted to join, Mr. President? According to the Wall Street Journal, the news services stated that the results of the survey are being kept secret because they are so shocking.

Think of it, Mr. President. After all the billions upon billions of dollars which we have poured out, we do not dare to make that survey public. But I demand that it be made available to the United States Senate, so that we may learn the true facts and then give them to the American people. Before we send another American boy to Europe, we must insist on getting the facts. If the American people are to be asked to send their sons to Western Europe, they are entitled to know the facts, and it is a crime to keep them from them.

Parts of the survey have leaked out to the press, and the news stories regarding them state:

> The findings are considered so grave that the United States High Commissioner will not allow them to be published in detail.

I understand that after looking at the poll figures, experts say they now believe that no more than 5 percent of Germany's fighting-age men would volunteer for service in the western defense army, and less than 10 percent would serve even if drafted.

Now we know how these policies, planned by the Kremlin and carried out by its secret agents and dupes in our own Government, undermined the will of the people to resist. This is a tragic situation for America. It is a tragic situation for the freedom-loving peoples of the world. America is the country we all love, the country which every Senator swears to defend under our Constitution when he takes his oath. There can be no doubt that to a great extent this attitude, as expressed in the survey, is due to the policies which we pursued against the civilian population of Western Germany, about which the leader of Western Germany, Chancelor Conrad Adenaur, in perhaps the greatest understatement ever made, told the press and the German people some 2 weeks ago, at a time when he was turning down the proposal of the Communist East German government for unification, that, the west made some grave psychological mistakes.

Yet we ask ourselves, "How can this be when we think of what the American people have done for the West German population?" In that question lies the entire answer to what otherwise seems to be an enigma. It is a well-known fact that the American people as a whole are loved by the German population, far more than any other national group. That is because of their forbearance arising from the realization that they were enslaved by their political leaders, and because of our great acts of Christian charity toward them since the end of hostilities; and last, but certainly not least, because of the kindness shown them by our American soldiers. These German people cannot reconcile this attitude on the part of the American people with the opposite policies practiced by their government. They well remember, and will never forget, the hundreds of thousands of tons of food and clothing sent them and still being sent them by individual American citizens, by Christian churches of every denomination, and by American charitable and philanthropic organizations. But they also remember that the policymakers in our executive branch of the Government daily denied that there was hunger and starvation in Germany when they knew it was true, and they kept this up for almost a year and a half after the end of hostilities. Who was responsible for that? Alger Hiss and his co-conspirators in the Department of State and Harry Dexter White, who, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, controlled all matters relating to the Trading With the Enemy Act. At any time he could have issued a general license which would have permitted Americans to write to their relatives and friends in Germany and to send them food and clothing without being subjected to a 10-year penitentiary sentence, which was the penalty still in force and effect, since the war was not officially ended. That was the penalty provided in the Trading With the Enemy Act for unlawful correspondence with the enemy. Remember the smear artists, who were carrying on lies fostered by the Hiss and White gang that there was no hunger and starvation in Germany? Every United States Senator, who brought the true facts before this body and to the American people, was smeared unmercifully. Remember, at that time none of us had reason to suspect Alger Hiss or Harry Dexter White, for they had not yet been exposed and they had the confidence of the President, the Cabinet officers, and Members of Congress. Remember that after a year and a half of fruitless effort on the part of many Members of the Senate to get Harry Dexter White to issue such a general license it finally became necessary for the Congress of the United States to take the matter out of his hands when overwhelming evidence of mass starvation and hunger supplied to us, often secretly by American soldiers in Germany who saw mass starvation all about them, and the complete revulsion on the part of the American people to let even their former enemy starve, forced us to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to permit Americans to write to their relatives and friends in Germany, and to send them food and clothing to keep them alive.

I charge that this conspiracy against our American form of democracy was carried on by these men and their associates even after that.

The German civilian population was thrilled when our Government took a firm position against the plan of the Communists to take over Berlin. They were thrilled by and greatly appreciate the magnificent job done by our soldiers on the airlift, but here, too, because of such contrary policies as those mentioned above, they wonder if the Communists were right when they said, "The American Government is doing this not because they want you to eat but because they do not want to lose face, do not want to suffer diplomatic defeat"; and "that they want Berlin only as a jumping-off place from which finally to launch an attack against Soviet Russia." Is it any wonder that the West Germans are confused and apathetic?

The German civilian population has the highest regard for the American soldier, who in his correct military attitude was nevertheless solicitous of the civilian population, but they were afraid of the political administrators we sent over there, although to some extent this has now changed, but surely not fast enough. But here too they wonder if this change is due to military exigencies or whether it represents a real change of heart to get our policies in line with the thinking of the vast majority of the American people and the vast majority of the Members of our Congress, and with the heads of the executive branch of our Government.

Some will say, "We thought all those things changed when we repudiated Potsdam and all these other policies." But were they changed? To a great extent they were changed only on paper and not in reality. The same men, with few exceptions, stayed on the job in Germany and their attitude toward the civilian population changed but little if at all, and many of the same men and their fellow travelers stayed in the executive branches of our Government here. They were not changed very much, if at all, except those the Un-American Activities Committee caught up with.

Mr. President, time does not permit me to go further into this matter at this time. I serve notice now that I shall finish on Thursday, if possible. I should like to get the entire speech into the RECORD before General Eisenhower addresses the joint session of Congress, which I understand is to be on Friday.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, on Thursday.

Mr. LANGER. On Thursday. I shall try to do so if I can. If I cannot, I serve notice now that immediately after General Eisenhower has talked to the joint session of Congress I expect to take up this matter further.

Mr. President, in that connection I want to say that my mail has been flooded with letters dealing with the matter of what our allies in the Atlantic Pact have as their draft laws. A survey of the 12 Atlantic Pact countries, most of whom are presumably closer to any war that might occur overseas, reveals that young men in France, Italy, Belgium, and Denmark do not enter military service until they are 20 years of age. Not 18, not 19, but 20. Holland and Portugal require men to enter service at 21, while Norway begins its conscription of youth at 19.

Two Atlantic Pact countries, Canada and Iceland, have no conscription system.

England drafts 18-year-old boys, and her term of service is 24 months instead of the 27 months proposed for the United States.

I have prepared a chart dealing with our proposed draft system, compared with those of the North Atlantic Pact countries, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following chart compares the proposed draft system with those of the North Atlantic Pact countries:

Atlantic Pact countries

	Normal age of draft	Period of service
		Months
United States	[1] 18	[2] 27
France	20–21	18
Italy	20–21	12
Denmark	20	12–18
Norway	19	9–12
Belgium	20	12
Netherlands	18	12
Portugal	21	12
England	18	24
Canada	[3]	
Luxemburg	18	
Iceland	[3]	

[1] Proposed age.
[2] Proposed period of service.
[3] Volunteer system.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very fine editorial in connection with what I have said relative to Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White. I want to make it plain again that I do not know whether Lawrence Duggan or Harry Dexter White committed suicide or whether they were murdered. There cannot be any doubt in any honest man's mind that they were Communists in high position, and that they betrayed the United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Sinuous Trail Winds to a Close," published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 22, 1950, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SINUOUS TRAIL WINDS TO A CLOSE

Alger Hiss, the bright young Harvard-trained New Dealer, who rose high in the New Deal State Department, was taken by Mr. Roosevelt to Yalta as his adviser, and became the darling of the internationalists as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, is guilty on both counts of a Federal indictment charging perjury. That is the judgment of the jury.

But before the court of public opinion Hiss and the Roosevelt-Truman administration which sponsored him, fostered his career, and protected him, are guilty of an offense of far greater gravity. Hiss could not have been convicted of perjury if he had not first been a traitor in the service of Russia, channeling the secrets of the United States to Soviet espionage agents. And he could not have engaged in these treasonable activities if the State Department and the whole New Deal had not been honeycombed with men whose loyalties, like his own, were pledged to an alien ideology.

Hiss did not serve the Communists for pay. He served them out of conviction. When he decided that Russia and communism were worthy of his devotion, and that they represented the things that are right, he decided also that the United States and republican economic and political institutional liberties were wrong. What he did, he did with no divided mind and conscience. He made his choice.

Having made that choice, having rejected his own country, where could he be of most service to his adopted cause? Where but in the Government itself? And where within that Government? Obviously, within the most strategic sector of the administration, which happened to be the State Department, and at the side of the men whose office and influence controlled the course of the Nation.

So we find this traitor hobnobbing through the years with the mightiest of the New Deal mighty. He advises the President. He is the favored protege of two men who are kingmakers within the bureaucracy. One of them, Felix Frankfurter, is a man who moves the members of his personal entourage into ever greater posts of power and influence. He is the patron of Hiss.

Another, Stanley Reed, is solicitor general of the United States. Hiss serves him as his right hand man. And in time these men rise to places on the United States Supreme Court, and when Hiss finds himself in trouble, both of them came forward at his first trial to testify to his loyalty and good character. Why? Because their own loyalty and reputation are by now hopelessly compromised.

In more than a dozen years in the New Deal, there is scarcely a man of influence in the upper range of the bureaucracy with whom Hiss is not on the most familiar terms. Secretaries of State Cordell Hull, Edward R. Stettinius, and James Byrnes are his friends, and they vouch for him. The governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, his associate in the State Department, is a character witness. When the investigation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities finally turns up some of the suspicious activities of Hiss, the first man to say that the whole thing is a "red herring" is the present President of the United States.

Under such patronage, Hiss moved from one position of influence to another, his activities always exercising a fateful leverage on the policies which have shaped the Nation's course. He is executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, where the groundwork is laid to place the United States in the United Nations. He is secretary general of the San Francisco conference, where the UN Charter is drafted. When the organization comes into being he is principal adviser to the American delegation.

He enjoys the acclaim of the internationalists, who are always eager to plunge the Nation ever deeper into foreign entanglements, even though the successive descents always prove to be to the country's detriment; and the $20,000 a year post with the Carnegie endowment is their reward for these services. With his outlook and convictions, now proved to the satisfaction of the jury and the public, whom was Hiss serving all this time?

Some judgment can be made on the basis of his associations. One of his intimates was Harry D. White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who conceived the Morgenthau plan for a harsh peace to be imposed upon Germany and who conceived still another of these internationalist schemes—the Bretton Woods World Bank and Monetary Fund. Five days after White is called before the Committee on Un-American Activities, having been drawn into the Hiss inquiry, he dies suddenly. The cause is said to be an overdose of digitalis.

Another man interrogated by the FBI as a result of the Hiss investigation is Laurence Duggan, former State Department official, by then holding the presidency of another Carnegie agency—the Institute of International Education. A few days after the FBI men call, Duggan dies in a plunge from the window of his sixteenth-floor New York office, his body landing so far from the building wall that suicide or murder, not accident, is the choice of tenable theory.

Finally, at the trial resulting in Hiss' conviction, White is named in testimony as having been a secret member of the Communist Party and Duggan as "in a special category" of the party apparatus—not a party member but maintaining a special liaison with the underground through the divorced first wife of Gerhard Eisler, fugitive former No. 1 Communist agent in the United States.

These descriptions of secret allegiance are taken from the notes of A. A. Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State, to whom Hiss' principal accuser, Whittaker Chambers, first related the existence of the Communist spy ring within the New Deal in 1939. But neither then nor in 1945, when Chambers repeated his story to the Department's security officer, was the New Deal willing to proceed against the traitors. Why? Because the New Deal was more than implicated. It was a principal collaborator and codefendant.

Berle's confidential notes said that the role of Hiss in the Communist service was to mess up policy. If that was his role, it was also a reasonable role, highly serviceable to Russia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an advertisement published in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 19, 1951, of the sale of the German Embassy to be made on the 16th day of February, be published at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFER FOR SALE BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Notice inviting citizens of the United States of America to make offers to purchase from the Attorney General all his right, title, and interest in and to the following described improved real property situated in the city of Washington, D. C.:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Valuable downtown location, 1435–41 Massachusetts Avenue NW.; improvements of brick construction consisting of 70 rooms, large ballroom, 13 baths and 5 additional toilet rooms, garages, and storage space, situated on plot containing 20,000 square feet.

This property is ideally located and offers unusual opportunities for development. The neighborhood is improving, with new construction in the immediate area and is within easy walking distance of the best hotels, many Government departments, churches, schools, financial district, good shopping and restaurant facilities. The site has a frontage of 138.6 feet on the north side of Massachusetts Avenue between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets NW., the avenue is 160 feet wide and is one of the main traffic arteries of Washington.

Which property is more particularly described in a certain Vesting Order No. 15004, dated August 14, 1950, recorded on August 25, 1950, in the Office of the Recorder, in and for the District of Columbia in the Record of Deeds of said District of Columbia in folio 41 on page 9282.

Sealed bids addressed to the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., will be received until 10 o'clock a. m. on the 16th day of February 1951, at which time and place said bids will be publicly opened and declared. Each bid must be in duplicate and an irrevocable offer to purchase the property.

Bids will be received only from American citizens and corporations controlled by American citizens and organized under the laws of the United States. Bids must contain an affidavit stating, among other things, that the bidder is not purchasing on behalf of an undisclosed principal, a person not a citizen of the United States, or for resale to a noncitizen.

A bank draft or certified check payable to the Attorney General in an amount equal to 10 percent of the bid price must accompany the bid. Any commission payable must be stated in the bid. The Attorney General reserves the right to reject any or all bids or at his election to waive all defects in any bid. The Attorney General's right, title, and interest in the property will be conveyed by quitclaim deed without covenants or warranties of any kind. Further particulars with respect to the said property and forms for submitting bids may be obtained by communicating with the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Dated at Washington, D. C., this 12th day of January 1951.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

Mr LANGER. Mr. President, I might add that I intend to submit a resolution to keep the German Embassy from being sold. I hope that I may have the cooperation of the appropriate committee, Mr. President, because I can conceive of no single individual act that would do more harm to the friendly relations—because they are friendly—between the people of Western Germany and the rank and file of the people of the United States of America, than the sale of the German Embassy. I sincerely hope that enough Senators will join with me to impress upon the Attorney General of the United States that it would be the height of folly to have the Embassy sold when, at the same time, our representatives in Western Germany are telling the people there that we are their friends and that we are looking forward to the time when they will fight side by side with us if there is war, and that in any event we are trying in every way possible to reestablish them as a nation, when they in turn will have their proper representatives over here again in an appropriate place representing their government in Washington.

I hope I may have the help and cooperation, as I believe I shall, of the distinguished majority leader, who, after he has an opportunity to look into this matter of the sale of the German Embassy, and after he has a chance to talk with the Director of the Office of Alien Property and with the Attorney General of the United States, will, I believe, be very glad to join with the senior Senator from North Dakota in at least having the sale postponed until an appropriate committee of the Senate may have a chance to go into the matter at great length.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1951:

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

Herschel D. Newsom, of Indiana, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, vice Albert S. Goss, deceased.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard H. Adams, of Texas.
Nicholas G. Andrews, of New Jersey.
Marion Augustus Baldwin, of Alabama.
Robert J. Ballantyne, of Massachusetts.
William R. Beckett, of Michigan.
John W. Black, of Washington.
Roger C. Brewin, of Ohio.
William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
Robert R. Brungart, of Maryland.
Edward W. M. Bryant, of Massachusetts.
North C. Burn, of Washington.
Elwyn F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
W. Kennedy Cromwell 3d, of Maryland.
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., of California.
James B. Freeman, of Ohio.
Raymond E. González, of California.
William P. E. Graves, of the District of Columbia.
William P. Harris, of Michigan.
Howard Hill, of Missouri.
Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
Heyward Isham, of New York.
Alan G. James, of the District of Columbia.
Kempton B. Jenkins, of the District of Columbia.
Abraham Katz, of New York.
John C. Mallon, of Kentucky.
Timothy M. Manley, of Connecticut.
Robert J. Martens, of California.
S. Paul Miller, Jr., of California.
John L. Mills, of Georgia.
George C. Moore, of California.
Grant E. Mouser 3d, of Ohio.
Stephen E. Palmer, Jr., of New York.
Arthur W. Purcell, of Massachusetts.
Clifford J. Quinlan, of Minnesota.
G. Edward Reynolds, of New York.
William E. Schaufele, Jr., of Ohio.
Robert T. Schneider, of New York.
Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
Roland C. Shaw, of Massachusetts.
Allen C. Siebens, of Ohio.
Richard C. Simpkins, of Illinois.
Paul A. Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
Joseph F. Starkey, of California.
Jack A. Sulser, of Illinois.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
Robert T. von der Lieth, of New Jersey.
Guy A. Wiggins, of California.
Orme Wilson, Jr., of New York.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Daniel Holcombe Thomas to be United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama vice John McDuffie, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John C. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, vice Oscar Henry Doyle, term expired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

Dwight H. Dexter	Herbert F. Walsh
Lewis H. Shackelford	William W. Storey
Edward W. Holtz	Edwin J. Roland

The following named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Christian R. Couser	Russell W. Thresher
Willard L. Jones	William E. Schweizer
Robert N. Williams	

The following named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

George P. Erwin	Hamlett I. Allen
Wilfred Pantzer	Michael J. Hoosick
Walter G. Davis	David H. Douglas
Martin Lentz, Jr	Theron H. Gato

The following named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Edwin W. Coleman	Raymond J. Evans
Robert S. Capp	Scott P. Berryman
Leslie F. Cool	Willis G. Partridge
John D. Roberts	

The following named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Nelson W. Allen
Roger J. Dahlby

The following named persons to be chief radio electricians in the United States Coast Guard:

August Dannenberg	Frederick Baldwin
Edward C. Brichta	James G. Leadbeater
Gabriel V. Denisov	

The following named person to be a chief gunner in the United States Coast Guard:

Donald A. MacLean

The following named person to be a chief carpenter in the United States Coast Guard:

Milo Taber

The following named persons to be chief pay clerks in the United States Coast Guard:

Harold E. Major	Floyd Bieri
Hobart W. Means	James W. Winchester

IN THE NAVY

The following-named warrant officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF BOATSWAIN

Willard C. Cannaday, Jr.	John B. Jackson, Jr.
Broadus L. Gardner	Clellan K. Keefe
Jack E. L. Carleton	Oscar W. Kihlstrom
Arnold M. Christiansen	Arthur E. Mayle
William L. Gordon	Mark E. McKin
Jasper S. Hardin	Bernard F. Miller
Ambrose H. Holdgrafer	Richard A. Seigler
	Kenneth R. Wolf

CHIEF GUNNER

Fred Q. Gibson

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

William F. McNair

CHIEF ELECTRICIAN

Kenneth G. Armstrong, Jr.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Owen R. Brecker	Walter I. Mitchell
Wiot L. Clarke	Reginald Peterson
Edgar E. Fuller	David W. Snyder
Jack E. Hayes	Reid Wilson
Ovie D. Hixson	James W. Woods
Wilfred R. Jackson	Norman G. Woods
Kenneth C. Mathews	James T. Wright
Claude W. Miller	Guedon E. Zakotnik

CHIEF CARPENTER

Jesse D. Cannon	Jeptha B. Hicks
Gayland M. Copeland	Roy C. Tamez
Wayne I. Egger	Stephen P. Yorden

CHIEF SHIP'S CLERK

Millard T. Baker	Robert W. Palmer
John Borgens	Ronald J. Stafford
Vincent Y. Jones	

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, HOSPITAL CORPS

Ocie T. Adams	Frank L. Maxwell
Stewart K. Blanchard	Cecil J. Peart
Almon Carter	Richard W. Ricker
Robert H. Doud	Bernard T. Stradley
Donald E. Feuquay	Francis E. Sullivan
Ralph T. Goerner, Jr.	Lowell W. Swartz
Robert F. Hoenscheidt	Johnny W. Young

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Joseph H. Turner, Billingsley, Ala., in place of M. J. King, transferred.

Baugh E. Kilgore, Bynum, Ala., in place of B. L. King, deceased.

James B. Martin, Jr., Springville, Ala., in place of E. I. Cox, deceased.

ALASKA

Clarence T. Larsen, Seward, Alaska, in place of C. A. Shelton, retired.

ARKANSAS

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

ARKANSAS-TEXAS

Arthur L. Jennings, Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., in place of A. J. Pryor, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Robert F. Osmann, Escondido, Calif., in place of H. E. Crenshaw, retired.

James B. Michener, Geyserville, Calif., in place of Ray Brackett, resigned.

Glen R. Brewington, Los Alamos, Calif., in place of H. R. Gewe, retired.

Milton I. Espenshade, Jr., Mather Field, Calif. Office established February 16, 1948.

Ellis C. Allsop, Maywood, Calif., in place of G. E. Archer, resigned.

Sidney S. Tucker, Paso Robles, Calif., in place of E. T. Bollinger, retired.

Everett M. Fisher, Rio Linda, Calif., in place of M. M. Wilson, retired.

Virgil M. Ringue, South San Francisco, Calif., in place of J. P. Quinlan, retired.

Fred J. Ishoy, Sunnymead, Calif., in place of E. M. Larson, resigned.

Odessa M. Love, Tupman, Calif., in place of Louise Stine, retired.

William D. Thornton, Watsonville, Calif., in place of Harry Bridgewater, retired.

James V. Breen, Willits, Calif., in place of A. A. Wilson, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Raymond J. Wamester, Middletown, Conn., in place of F. J. Bielefield, retired.

Francis C. Brennan, Milford, Conn., in place of G. S. Clark, retired.

GEORGIA

James L. Cauthen, Milner, Ga., in place of R. A. Martin, deceased.

Sybil M. Vickers, Ambrose, Ga., in place of Melcena Royal, retired.

HAWAII

Zenichi Muraoka, Kaumakani, T. H. Office established April 11, 1949.

IDAHO

Jalma A. Riley, Ashton, Idaho, in place of T. B. Hargis, retired.

INDIANA

Kenneth D. Brunson, Alexandria, Ind., in place of O. N. Hennefent, retired.

Norman A. Richwine, Clermont, Ind., in place of L. C. Swinford, deceased.

Perry W. Foster, Vallonia, Ind., in place of I. S. Turmail, retired.

KANSAS

William P. Halloran, Lakin, Kans., in place of W. B. Burrows, resigned.

LeRoy C. Higgins, Rolla, Kans., in place of J. M. Thompson, resigned.

Willard O. Elliott, Wadsworth, Kans., in place of H. W. Clemmons, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Foster Ratliff, Lookout, Ky., in place of L. E. Ratliff, resigned.

Charles B. Westerman, Pleasure Ridge Park, Ky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1949.

Elmer H. Morrison, Wayland, Ky., in place of T. F. Hatcher, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Robert G. Fitzgerald, Oakdale, La., in place of R. W. Collier, Sr., resigned.

MAINE

Rosaire P. Plante, Jackman Station, Maine, in place of Cyril Cyr, retired.

Harland E. Johnson, Monson, Maine, in place of J. H. Gilbert, deceased.

Joseph L. Cook, Portland, Maine, in place of H. C. Donahue, retired.

Villa M. Snow, Pownal, Maine, in place of F. W. Allen, retired.

Dominick S. DeFilipp, Ridlonville, Maine, in place of C. C. Virgin, deceased.

Leo N. Poirier, Van Buren, Maine, in place of H. J. Saucier, retired.

MARYLAND

Manuel R. Diaz, Luke, Md., in place of C. F. Worgan, removed.

MICHIGAN

Leon D. Wallaker, Arcadia, Mich., in place of F. H. Smith, Jr., resigned.

Hazel D. Harrison, Conklin, Mich., in place of Floyd Harrison, retired.

William O. Kelly, Flint, Mich., in place of D. L. Treat, retired.

Stella A. Ritchie, New Troy, Mich., in place of E. E. Ritchie, resigned.

Willet H. Schmidt, Port Austin, Mich., in place of T. E. Shine, removed.

Valentine R. Smith, Saugatuck, Mich., in place of A. G. O'Neal, retired.

William K. LaCombe, Trenary, Mich., in place of Hilda Webber, retired.

Russell K. Kilpatrick, Vermontville, Mich., in place of M. A. Maher, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Edward J. Stevens, Barnum, Minn., in place of John Gowan, transferred.

John A. Rolig, Center City, Minn., in place of H. H. Gunz, transferred.

Carl F. Ardin, Cook, Minn., in place of O. J. Leding, retired.

Lawrence B. Rothstein, Eden Valley, Minn., in place of C. I. Ackerman, deceased.

Harland E. Stierlen, Elysian, Minn., in place of N. A. Terrell, resigned.

Ruth G. Mueller, Gaylord, Minn., in place of T. W. Comnick, deceased.

William C. Culhane, Marshall, Minn., in place of A. P. Rose, retired.

Joseph D. Folsom, Ogilvie, Minn., in place of F. S. Averill, retired.

Mary E. Lannon, Prior Lake, Minn., in place of J. M. Lannon, deceased.

Mabel V. Lundholm, Round Lake, Minn., in place of V. B. Flentje, resigned.

Cormac A. Suel, Shakopee, Minn., in place of H. C. Mertz, deceased.

Delbert D. Merrill, Silver Lake, Minn., in place of W. O. Merrill, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

James W. Norwood, Amory, Miss., in place of Romie Green, retired.

Alonzo A. Vance, Chunky, Miss., in place of Bessie Puckette, retired.

John M. Allred, Collins, Miss., in place of G. B. McIntosh, resigned.

Julian B. Gardner, Columbus, Miss., in place of G. Y. Banks, deceased.

Leonard C. Gibson, Jr., Crawford, Miss., in place of C. D. Bragg, transferred.

George Martel Bridges, Ethel, Miss., in place of J. H. Middlebrook, resigned.

Rufina W. Gully, Gholson, Miss., in place of M. M. Whittle, retired.

Callie R. Davis, Handsboro, Miss., in place of S. F. Myers, retired.

Grace C. Beasley, Pelahatchie, Miss., in place of B. M. Gallaspy, deceased.

James Q. Pylant, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.

Robert P. Barron, Smithdale, Miss., in place of D. R. Butler, retired.

Zelda M. Dye, Vardaman, Miss., in place of J. E. Morgan, resigned.

Clyde T. Furr, Wesson, Miss., in place of A. E. McGee, transferred.

Ira L. Moore, West Enterprise, Miss., in place of C. L. Wright, retired.

MISSOURI

Pansy B. France, Forest City, Mo., in place of B. W. Brown, deceased.

George M. Lenhart, Higbee, Mo., in place of H. S. Welch, deceased.

Joseph O. Burchfield, Marshfield, Mo., in place of W. T. McMahan, retired.

Cletus H. Burkemper, Old Monroe, Mo., in place of B. M. Bauer, resigned.

Charles E. Dixon, St. Clair, Mo., in place of R. E. Sincox, transferred.

MONTANA

James Roy Cramer, Polson, Mont., in place of G. T. Farrell, retired.

Ralph L. Benjamin, Shelby, Mont., in place of G. M. Cox, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Bertha A. Reese, Pleasanton, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter A. Lammli, Stanton, Nebr., in place of W. P. Cowan, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Anthony W. Raymond, Seaside Heights, N. J., in place of T. F. Cummings, resigned.

NEW YORK

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.

James W. Maloney, Aurora, N. Y., in place of J. L. Purcell, retired.

George W. Dedrick, Bayport, N. Y., in place of J. S. Annable, retired.

John J. Bohuslaw, Bay Shore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Melton, retired.

Fletcher R. Ward, Bemus Point, N. Y., in place of Gerald Aldrich, resigned.

James H. Klingelhoefer, Bethpage, N. Y., in place of H. A. Stolz, resigned.

Aileene D. Schaad, Clarence Center, N. Y., in place of K. M. Raps, deceased.

Arthur L. Rennie, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

James W. Ansbrow, Darien Center, N. Y., in place of E. M. Ortner, retired.

Charles K. Myers, Frewsburg, N. Y., in place of A. W. Stitt, removed.

Robert Axter Gokey, Herrings, N. Y., in place of S. E. Zaremba, resigned.

Harold C. Epke, Holley, N. Y., in place of George Heal, retired.

John D. Allardice, Hudson, N. Y., in place of A. G. Harvey, deceased.

John E. Conley, Marcellus, N. Y., in place of W. T. Conley, resigned.

Carmen Murano, Memphis, N. Y., in place of K. B. Kinne, deceased.

Hannah M. Curtis, Morrisville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Holbert, deceased.

Norman S. Wilber, Mount Tremper, N. Y., in place of H. B. Ecker, retired.

Francis V. Leahy, Newark, N. Y., in place of F. J. Baltzel, removed.

Helena C. Carroll, Oriskany, N. Y., in place of T. F. Carroll, retired.

William J. Cromie, Palmer, N. Y., in place of A. W. Cohan, deceased.

James J. Sullivan, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.

Jeannette L. Moran, Rexford, N. Y., in place of A. R. Knowlton, retired.

Sim S. Garrett, Upton, N. Y. Office established August 1, 1947.

Gerald W. Churchill, Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns, retired.

Thomas A. Brown, Wyandanch, N. Y., in place of C. J. McMahon, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Neva B. Wilkins, Butner, N. C. Office became Presidential October 1, 1948.

Francis H. Powell, Ca-Vel, N. C., in place of L. C. Frederick, declined.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edmond W. Green, Hankinson, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Wipperman, retired.

Peter N. Retterath, Lidgerwood, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Wagner, retired.

Elmer L. Schielke, McClusky, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Hamilton, retired.

Walter Kessler, Martin, N. Dak., in place of V. C. Magnuson, resigned.

Elizabeth N. Fischer, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.

Edward J. Sondag, Sykeston, N. Dak., in place of Lena Kremer, retired.

OHIO

Dory R. Swank, Butler, Ohio, in place of L. P. Beveridge, transferred.

Arnold T. Schoch, Coldwater, Ohio, in place of H. D. Coate, retired.

Florence E. Gerty, Hamden, Ohio, in place of H. C. Huhn, retired.

Oliver C. Metzger, Strasburg, Ohio, in place of C. A. Hostetler, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Martha V. Cowan, Cache, Okla., in place of L. M. Norris, transferred.

Bob W. Johnson, Durant, Okla., in place of Ralph Ownby. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Harold D. Gill, Hooker, Okla., in place of Charles Williams, retired.

Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of F. M. Shaw, resigned.

OREGON

Margaret E. Wirth, Adair Village, Oreg. Office established September 1, 1947.

Alice G. Kavanaugh, Manzanita, Oreg., in place of Anna Tohl, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Warren E. Horrocks, Blooming Glen, Pa., in place of H. R. Shaddinger, retired.

Joseph K. Brown, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa., in place of M. F. Birely, retired.

Michael C. Barone, Bryn Mawr, Pa., in place of P. W. Lukens, resigned.

James H. Taylor, Sr., Canton, Pa., in place of O. S. Williams, retired.

John J. Fox., Ivyland, Pa., in place of A. C. De Hart, resigned.

James A. Barkley, Latrobe, Pa., in place of J. P. Doherty, deceased.

James E. Clark, Leechburg, Pa., in place of J. A. Sproull, resigned.

Frank H. Glenn, Lemont, Pa., in place of J. C. Hillman, resigned.

Keat P. Heefner, Mercersburg, Pa., in place of H. E. Trout, retired.

John H. Reuther, Muncy, Pa., in place of L. D. Sedam, retired.

Fred E. Slick, New Florence, Pa., in place of N. J. Brendlinger, deceased.

Joseph V. McGrory, Norristown, Pa., in place of M. B. Marr, removed.

William Lester Davis, Peach Glen, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary R. Vincenti, Plainsville, Pa., in place of L. M. Bennett, retired.

Freda L. Riley, Salisbury, Pa., in place of D. H. Broadwater, resigned.

Robert Schneider, Scenery Hill, Pa., in place of G. C. Wonsettler, retired.

Sarah V. Webster, Sewickley, Pa., in place of J. D. Webster, deceased.

Pauline E. Rossman, Spring Mills, Pa., in place of R. H. Shook, retired.

Robert C. Powell, Swarthmore, Pa., in place of A. P. Smalley, retired.

John C. Hess, Three Springs, Pa., in place of C. W. Hess, transferred.

Paul C. Klapp, Watsontown, Pa., in place of M. M. Beagle, retired.

Charles L. Johnston, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of W. A. Thompson, resigned.

Joseph F. Sullivan, West Chester, Pa., in place of G. J. Moses, retired.

Henry F. Sickler, Jr., Westtown, Pa., in place of B. S. Farrell, removed.

Thomas G. Wilt, Woolrich, Pa., in place of M. G. Johnston, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Margaret R. Keith, Aguirre, P. R., in place of Jenaro Vazquez, removed.

RHODE ISLAND

Gianuario Spanedda, Georgiaville, R. I., in place of E. E. Russell, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Troy J. Lynch, Coward, S. C., in place of W. L. Miles, resigned.

Mattie Gertrude McCall, Little Rock, S. C., in place of J. C. Norton, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Edward C. Hausmann, Bonesteel, S. Dak., in place of Anna Donohue, retired.

TEXAS

Willard E. Howell, Alvord, Tex., in place of A. J. McDonald, transferred.

Jack G. Holson, Bacliff, Tex. Office established December 1, 1948.

Harry O. Lindeman, Bartlett, Tex., in place of Robert Rowntree, retired.

Harold B. Manry, Corrigan, Tex., in place of Eugene Webb, resigned.

James H. Breeding, Encinal, Tex., in place of Maude Cavender, retired.

Robert F. Henderson, Frost, Tex., in place of C. R. Blake, deceased.

Grace W. Blanchard, Fullerton, Tex. Office established October 1, 1948.

Elbert H. Brown, Hubbard, Tex., in place of C. T. Martin, deceased.

Ruth V. Hestand, Keene, Tex., in place of C. D. Grady, resigned.

VERMONT

George E. McCanna, Hardwick, Vt., in place of W. T. Johnson, retired.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Adams, Appalachia, Va., in place of J. A. Combs, transferred.

WASHINGTON

James S. Bellcoff, Brush Prairie, Wash., in place of N. J. Nance, resigned.

Walter A. Young, Palouse, Wash., in place of J. H. Callison, retired.

John P. McMonagle, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

WISCONSIN

Wayne L. Reader, Almond, Wis., in place of B. J. Walker, retired.

Joseph L. McDonald, Endeavor, Wis., in place of J. I. Sweney, resigned.

John J. Walsh, Lannon, Wis., in place of J. J. Flanagan, retired.

Harry J. Kelley, Manitowoc, Wis., in place of H. F. Kelley, retired.

Walter D. Hansen, Neshkoro, Wis., in place of B. J. Rabbitt, transferred.

Gordon E. Schuler, Plymouth, Wis., in place of A. W. Schiereck, retired.

Ireen L. Kennedy, Shell Lake, Wis., in place of J. S. Kennedy, deceased.

WYOMING

Daniel Gerrard, Evanston, Wyo., in place of F. P. Nelson, resigned.

Oliver J. Colyer, Torrington, Wyo., in place of D. T. Shoemaker, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose all-pervading presence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day, we rejoice that Thy blessings are abundantly adequate for our many needs.

Grant that this moment of communion with Thy spirit may be for each of us a cleansing of heart and a consecration of purpose to serve Thee faithfully and to minister to the welfare of all mankind.

Show us how we may lift the shadows of fear and sorrow from every darkened and burdened land, enlarge our faith in the moral and spiritual forces, and may we never lose the vision of a lasting world peace.

We pray that daily we may include and remember in our prayers our fellow citizens who are out on the far-away battlefields. Make us more truly worthy of their sacrifices as they struggle to safeguard our liberties. We are sending them our thoughts of love through Thee.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the following announcements by the Chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HOUSE CHAMBER

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the committee on plans for reconstruction of the ceiling, redecorations, and other improvements to the House Chamber the following Members of the House: Mr. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; Mr. HEFFERNAN, New York; Mr. JONES, Alabama; Mr. MCGREGOR, Ohio; Mr. GOODWIN, Massachusetts.

COMMITTEE ON THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following Members of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; Mr. RIBICOFF, Connecticut; Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts.

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

Pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. L. 360), the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mrs. BOSONE, Utah; Mr. MILLER, Nebraska.

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas; Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCGUIRE, Connecticut; Mr. MORANO, Connecticut.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. KEOGH, New York; Mr. NELSON, Maine.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. COX, Georgia; Mr. VORYS, Ohio.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DURHAM, North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, California; Mr. PRICE, Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, Texas; Mr. JACKSON, Washington; Mr. COLE, New York; Mr. ELSTON, Ohio; Mr. HINSHAW, California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIANS

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (a) of Public Law 474, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MURDOCK, Arizona; Mr. MORRIS, Oklahoma; Mr. D'EWART, Montana.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. MILLS, Arkansas; Mr. BATTLE, Alabama; Mr. CRAWFORD, Michigan.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, Missouri; Mr. BREHM, Ohio.

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 203, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as Commissioners of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; Mr. BENNETT, Florida; Mr. HORAN, Washington.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; Mr. SASSCER, Maryland; Mr. SIMPSON, Illinois.

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SULLIVAN, Missouri; Mr. HAYS, Ohio; Mr. BISHOP, Illinois.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH, Virginia; Mr. LANTAFF, Florida; Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey.

WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard the following Members on the part of the House; Mr. LIND, Pennsylvania; Mr. BEALL, Maryland.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; and Mr. REED, of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. KERR, of North Carolina; and Mr. TABER, of New York.

FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

Pursuant to the provisions of title V, Public Law 754, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BURNSIDE, West Virginia; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title V, Public Law 754, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CRITICISM OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, these remarks are addressed to those who prefer believing the worst in man rather than the best, who would let cynicism displace faith, who act as dupes for demagogery, defamation, and disunity.

A day never passes but what congressional mail carries letters demanding that Members of Congress deliver some public official's head. Some writer's charges have only the limits of their imagination. On coming to Congress and receiving the first avalanche of such mail I begin to wonder if the Democratic Party had a monopoly on skulduggery but after talking to some of the older Members of the House who have survived previous cries of "Throw the rascals out," I have decided that perhaps baseball is not the national sport, but rather it is a game of let us see who is best at blaming those currently in office in Washington for crop failure, droughts, sickness, or why the Dodgers did not win.

The fellow who is foolhardy enough to offer himself for public office can expect to find himself, family, and friends at the large end of Mt. Wilson's telescope and a galaxy of eyes at the small end with a thousand charges leveled and usually little thought given to substantiating evidence. The results, of course, many well-qualified, capable men refuse to offer themselves for public service. All of this, we the American people had come to accept as a bit of the cross to bear for the privilege and honor of serving these United States.

Back home I seldom heard the charge of liar leveled at any man because it was a serious one and a bluffer could count on his hand being called, but in Washington I find officials, columnists, and others have used the term so often and indiscriminately that headline hunters have had to embellish it with terms such as revolving, congenital, unmitigated, and on ad infinitum before they can hope to crack the front page and receive public recognition of their mudslinging.

Lest it be that I am becoming thinskinned and defending myself I say to you that the folks in my district have been exceedingly kind to me and most tolerant of my shortcomings.

I think it is time we declare a moratorium on hate, bias, prejudice, mudslinging, and personal vilification for the duration. I do not think the times allow us this luxury and extravagance. "A house divided will fall" was never truer than today.

Following World War II America turned to peace and prosperity unlimited and late was the hour that America wakened to find while she stacked the chips, Communist Russia was stacking the deck. The Communists are masters of propaganda, intrigue, and deceit. Whom they would destroy they first divide and turn against each other.

Some public officials, too, have given way to character assassination and have added their stones to the job of confusing, confounding, and complexing the American people as to who can and who cannot be trusted. Communists, moral degenerates, and Johnny Come Lately's to democracy have leveled their charges like shrapnel at high officials—we are in danger of reversing one of the first tenets of our jurisprudence and now, deeming the accused guilty until he proves himself innocent.

Yes, yes, I do not know one of our public officials from Washington to Truman who has not made his mistakes, nor even you and I.

You and I have differed at times with them and perhaps even with each other and sometimes our crystal ball might have been clearer than theirs, but there is cold comfort indeed in saying I told you so now. Monday morning quarterbacks and hindsight prognosticators will not get the job done.

We have taken a real shellacking in Korea, we are going to have to eat some crow, but if we are smart we will not spend our time blaming each other or looking for a scapegoat. We will be tell-

ing the executive department to train Japs, Chinese Nationals, and West Germans, help Franco Spain and anyone else who looks like they will fight Communist aggression. This is a tough war. There are no holds barred. We had better take friends where we find them and worry about their table manners later.

Let us not just criticize policies of government without offering a proposed solution. If you believe, as I do, that we are not taking sufficient advantage of the great manpower reserves available in Japan, Formosa, and West Germany, sound off and say so. We know we cannot combat the manpower under Communist influence with American men alone.

Even with the manpower of these countries we will be outnumbered and outgunned in the trials ahead unless we in this country are prepared to sacrifice and unite. The Communists continue to devote their efforts and industrial production toward a tremendous armed force. For what other purpose if not continued armed aggression with the United States as its ultimate target? Our only escape from world conflagration is peace through strength. We must remember that this time there is no great military power as Great Britain was in World War II to buy us time while we prepared, that this time too little and too late will mean the end of life as we know it today in this country, that we will not have another chance—that this one is for keeps.

This country must prepare to measure up to the rigors of mobilization, price controls, scarcities, and sacrifices on the home front as well as the battle front. In the face of the insatiable Communist horde let us make our solidarity as impenetrable as an ebony thicket. Argue with our policy makers and legislators on the issues, tell them in no uncertain terms when you think they are off course in what is best for the country and if at the next election you think someone else can do a better job, well, "throw the rascals out," but until then they are your elected officials. The sophisticate will possibly call me naive, but I believe the vast majority of public officials to be men and women who are sincere, able, and loyal Americans, doing their best to help save America. Let us make up our minds that we cannot afford politics as usual, that patriotism shall not be a monopoly of the young alone, that those of us this time, who cannot share our countrymen's sacrifices on the battlefront will not comfort the enemy by helping destroy confidence in the Nation's leadership by character assassination.

We worry today about economic bankruptcy, but most of all I am concerned with political bankruptcy. Let the Commies and their subtle propaganda panic us into a run on our bank of confidence in the character, loyalty, and morals of our Nation's leaders and the doors of communism will blot out the light of freedom of mankind for a thousand years. Let not America's heritage be lost in a Gethsemane of libel and slander.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONTROL OF FOOD PRICES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to repeal those provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which prevent effective control of food prices.

The recent wage-price freeze is bitter bread, indeed, for the American consumer. The dilly dallying of the past 6 months has resulted in the highest prices in our history. That these prices have not been rolled back is, indeed, shocking. This situation is the responsibility of the executive branch.

The end, however, is not in sight. Most food prices are not included in the freeze. Food prices can still soar. Forty percent of the average American cost of living is in the cost of food. This means higher prices to the housewife. This means more inflation is on the way. It means serious blows to the consumer.

Congress must take the blame for this condition. Last session the farm bloc wrote into price legislation a ban on ceilings for farm products selling at less than parity. Almost all grains, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and dairy products are included.

Any group seeking special advantage for itself eventually brings on its own downfall. The farm interests have done themselves great harm for the long pull and incurred the antagonism of the consuming public. The consumer cannot continue forever on the bottom of our economic totem pole. Farm products must be treated the same as all other commodities. A long-suffering public cannot long endure such discrimination as to the necessities of life.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

ADMIRAL CLIFFORD A. SWANSON

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, today Rear Adm. Clifford A. Swanson, Medical Corps, United States Navy, finishes his tour of duty as Surgeon General of the Department of the Navy. While Admiral Swanson was fourth youngest in the history of our country to hold this responsible position, he has served with such distinction as to have reflected credit upon the medical profession, the Medical Corps of the Navy, and the administration of medicine and surgery generally in our armed services.

We are most fortunate in this country to have had the services of such an outstanding doctor and surgeon as Admiral Swanson. During his term as Surgeon General he has accomplished a great deal, as, for example:

Establishment of the Medical Service Corps by law, an officer corps which affords opportunity for enlisted hospital corpsmen to secure commissioned rank. It also affords personnel to relieve medical and dental officers of much administrative work.

The establishment by law of officer status for nurses.

Increase in the membership of the Medical Corps Reserve enabling the Navy to lend the Army 570 doctors to meet the emergency of the Korean action.

By strong and courageous action he persuaded the Secretary of Defense to leave open five of the six naval hospitals scheduled for closure. Had all six been closed, we could not have taken care of casualties. The United States Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, in my home district was one of these and it now has 423 patients.

Although head of the Naval Medical Department, Admiral Swanson still took time to perform surgical operations at the Naval Medical Center almost every Friday afternoon.

As a representative of the people, I have been most impressed, however by his sincere desire to carry out the will and purpose of Congress in providing superior facilities for those who serve and have served in the Armed Forces.

Because Admiral Swanson had the character and foresight and the courage to fight for the maintenance of sufficient medical services in the Navy at a time when others in the Department of Defense were slashing without regard to any principle except that of making a showing of economy we are today able to meet the demands for medical facilities for the thousands who have suffered as the result of combat in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I salute this splendid gentleman and say to him that he has done an outstanding job for his profession and for his country and I wish for him great success in his next assignment.

RIGHT OF ACTION AGAINST GOVERNMENT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which gives an individual a right of action against the Government if that individual has been

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

injured by a privileged libelous or slanderous statement made by Members of Congress.

This bill does not attempt to make the Member liable for such statements or publications and, of course, he could not be made liable as article I, section 6, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "for any speech or debate in either House," Senators or Representatives, "shall not be questioned in any other place."

This constitutional provision confers absolute immunity upon Members of Congress for their acts or speech, even though they deliberately make a false statement; nor is it limited to words spoken in debate. It is applicable, for example, to written reports presented in either House by its committees, to resolutions, to resolutions offered, to acts of voting; in short, to things generally done in a session of the House by one of its Members in relation to the business before it.

This constitutional provision simply restates the common law. It was first incorporated in the Bill of Rights. Its original purpose was to prevent the King from arresting and prosecuting members of Parliament who made statements in debate. This had become an abuse at that time. Long experience has demonstrated the necessity for this rule to insure free and unrestricted debate in our legislative halls.

While this privilege of the Member of Congress is necessary, it works a great hardship on a defamed person. He has no opportunity to go to court where it can be determined if the statement was true. Statements made in Congress are given great publicity. They are generally carried throughout the country in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are given wide coverage by the press and radio. Such statements could cause irreparable damage to an individual's reputation, destroy his means of livelihood, and bring disgrace to him and his family.

While this privilege should be granted to Members of Congress, it is not fair that the individual should suffer this loss. While Members of Congress might not be agents of the United States Government in the true legal sense, they are performing a necessary function of government by taking part in legislative debate and proceedings.

Since the individual has been injured by a necessary function of the Government, it is not fair that he should bear this loss. The loss was caused by a necessary act of the Government, and it is much fairer that the Government bear this loss and pay the proven damages.

The Federal Tort Claims Act gives an individual the right of action against the United States Government when he has been injured by a tortious act, but this remedy does not extend to libel and slander. Another statute gives him an action against the Government for malicious prosecution. There is an old legal maxim that "where there is a wrong, there is a remedy." I think a remedy should be granted in this case.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on the bill H. R. 1612, and that anyone desiring to file minority views have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is President McKinley's birthday. We, the Members from Ohio, appreciate very much the uniform courtesy that the Speaker extends to us every year when we ask for recognition to say a few words about that distinguished gentleman. We also appreciate the uniformity with which the Members on the majority side, the Democratic side, wear the red carnations which the Ohio delegation provides for distribution at our annual observance. The red carnation is Ohio's State flower, and it was McKinley's favorite flower.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be said that the greatest work of President McKinley was done in this House when he was a Member of Congress. Several great men have gone from the Congress to the Presidency, and several from the Senate. McKinley did not serve in the Senate. He served in this body about 12 years. I have said repeatedly that his greatest work was not his work as Governor of Ohio or as President of the United States. His greatest work was that which he did as he stood over here on this side of the aisle. William Tyler Page, whom we, who have been Members of the House for several terms, remember with pride and pleasure, told me much about Mr. McKinley. He was here at that time. Mr. Page said that Mr. McKinley's desk was over here on my left and he spoke from that desk, and what he said from that place was what made him immortal.

It is not my purpose to make a long speech. I can say that President McKinley was, as we all agree, a great man. And I can say that he was a great boy also. He found his way into the Union Army at a very early age and distinguished himself on many a battlefield. The large monument erected by the State of Ohio in his honor on the battlefield of Antietam is erected on the spot where young McKinley distinguished himself. He distinguished himself in another way that I want to tell you about.

When Phil Sheridan made his great ride from Winchester up to Cedar Creek, of which the poet has spoken so beautifully, Phil said in his memoirs that he did not do that quite as heroically and enthusiastically as the poet said, because between Winchester and Cedar Creek he encountered several situations that were very discouraging. He found that his ranking commanders had failed to reorganize his army, and that things were in very bad shape.

However, he said, the most capable assistance that came to him at that time was the help of a young captain who could not have been more than 22 years old. His name was William McKinley. General Sheridan cites this incident in his memoirs and compliments young McKinley highly. He did not know when he wrote his memoirs that McKinley was going to be a great Congressman or a great Governor or a great President, but he was a great captain in the eyes of General Sheridan. From this little captain and his ability on the field of battle the great general got great comfort and inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will permit me, I should like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], a new Congressman, who represents the district that was once represented by Mr. McKinley.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is with humility I address the House today. It is my distinct honor to represent the great industrial and agricultural Sixteenth District of Ohio. Seventy-five years ago William McKinley entered upon a distinguished career in this House from my district, and served seven consecutive terms. To follow so illustrious a predecessor, even after 75 years, is an honor with responsibilities.

William McKinley was not only one of the greatest, but one of the most revered of Presidents. He rose to the Presidency at a time when all America was stricken by a great depression; at a time when much of America had concluded that the period of expansion and progress which occurred following the War Between the States was at an end; at a time, in fact, when many Americans were declaring their belief that these United States had reached the summit of progress, and from that time on could go no way but downward.

William McKinley could never subscribe to such philosophy. He believed that these United States had rather just begun to develop. He believed that a strengthened economy and the reestablishment of the faith of the people in their Government was all that was needed to put the United States back on the road to its proper place in the family of nations.

His prompt action in calling a special session of Congress to consider the Nation's fiscal status, and his calm, firm hand at the helm soon restored the Nation's economy and the faith of the people. By the time the new century had arrived, the United States had become recognized as a world power.

It was during his period of service in this very House that William McKinley displayed to men from throughout the Nation those characteristics of honesty, sincerity, and patriotism which were to win him unanimous nomination to the Presidency on the first ballot at the Republican convention of 1896.

He won a smashing victory at the polls that fall over a strong opponent, William Jennings Bryan. His domestic policies as well as his conduct of the war with Spain so endeared him with the people of this Nation that he was reelected in 1900 by an even greater plurality.

But despite all his great work, despite the possible effects of Nation-wide esteem which often verged on adulation,

William McKinley remained the man of the people.

The entire Nation mourned the death of that great President at the hand of an assassin in Buffalo in 1901.

Though he died in that year, McKinley still lives in the hearts of all Americans, and particularly in the hearts of the people of the great State of Ohio.

The people of his home town and mine, Canton, as well as the people of the entire State of Ohio, loved McKinley the man, rather than McKinley the President. This love was firmly imbedded in their hearts long before William McKinley gained the highest office in the land.

Their great affection for William McKinley was easily understood. For William McKinley was a friendly man, a home-loving man, and a religious man. He was a gracious friend and neighbor.

The people of Canton revered him for his never-failing devotion to his wife, who never completely recovered from the effects of the deaths of their two infant daughters. They were proud of the fact that in Canton, Ohio, he would never permit himself to be addressed as "Mr. President." He said, "In my home town I'm still Major McKinley—the same man who came home from the war." Thus he always treated the people of Canton as old friends.

His close friend and noted Senator from Ohio, Mark Hanna, once said:

> An ideal homebody was William McKinley, and the American fireside was a shrine of worship with him.

An Assistant Secretary of State said:

> If the Lord ever breathed the breath of life into a more gracious and amiable man than Mr. McKinley, I have yet to find it out.

Even his opponents regarded William McKinley highly. William Jennings Bryan, in an address following McKinley's death, declared that his party had never found it so easy to concede defeat graciously as when they lost to McKinley.

William McKinley was a devoutly religious man.

Business was never permitted to encroach upon the observance of the Sabbath. Visitors who called at the White House on Sunday afternoons in hopes of discussing affairs of state, instead wound up joining the President and Mrs. McKinley in singing hymns in the music room.

In concluding his last speech at Buffalo, William McKinley said:

> Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the people and powers of the earth.

So were his thoughts always devoted to the welfare of all the people, for William McKinley was a true Christian, who might well be set down as one who loved his fellow man.

It is for those great qualities that we here today pay tribute to William McKinley—soldier, lawyer, and statesman—but above all, to William McKinley the man.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in my service in this House I have had occasion to notice some very warm friendships that have grown up between men on different sides of the aisle. For instance, I remember the fine friendship between Jack Garner and Nick Longworth. They tell me that was the case between William McKinley and Roger Q. Mills, of Texas. They fought each other on the great issue of the tariff, but through the heat of conflict they welded themselves together into a devoted and lasting friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] such time as he may desire; and in doing so I wish to make this comment: Some of you new Members may not know this, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is the ranking Republican of all the Republicans in the House, serving now, I think, in his thirty-third consecutive year.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, after the masterly address by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] I feel a little hesitant about taking the floor. However, I have always been a great admirer of William McKinley, and all I am going to say today in a few words is to give a little picture of the late President McKinley's fighting spirit.

You will recall that after his district had been gerrymandered and the Republican Party was defeated in 1893, the editor of the local paper went down to Mr. McKinley's home and said: "Major, what shall we say to the American people?" McKinley, without a moment's hesitation, replied, "You may say this: 'The Republican Party values its principles no less in defeat than in victory. It holds to them after a reverse, as before, because it believes in them, and believing in them is ready to battle for them. They are not espoused for mere policy, nor to serve in a single contest. They are set deep and strong in the hearts of the people, and are interwoven with its struggles, its life, and its history. Without discouragement our great party reaffirms its allegiance to Republican doctrine, and with unshaken confidence seeks again the public judgment through public discussion'."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member wishing to extend his remarks with reference to Mr. McKinley may be permitted to do so at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Members of the House who are elected as Democrats, I am very glad to join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in paying tribute today to President McKinley.

The office of President is the first office in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States, and the highest office within the gift of our people. Americans of all generations respect deeply not only the office but the man who fills that office.

We in this day and age, and Americans of yesterday, may differ as we do and as they did with the Chief Executive of our country in this position on public questions. That is one thing, but the deep respect for the office and the man is another thing that is never disturbed or affected in the minds of the people of America. President William McKinley in his day and age played a very important part in the progress of our country. We on this side, not only as Democrats but over and above that, as Americans, honor his memory today.

My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] said that "the greatest work of President McKinley was done while he was a Member of the House of Representatives"—while a Member of this distinguished body. That is true from one angle, but I think his leadership during the Spanish-American War as President of our country was outstanding, and I think the results of the Spanish-American War have played a very important part in the life of our country since that great event took place. Under his leadership, while Americans of that day may not consciously have appreciated it, America was compelled to extend itself into other areas of the world. As a result the Philippines came under our jurisdiction and other island possessions became a part of the jurisdiction of our country. I think that one of the greatest effects in the history of our country has flowed from the leadership of President McKinley, and that is our extension and our continued extension into international affairs. To me the Spanish-American War was the turning point in the history of our country in this particular respect and I think that important event which took place in the history of our country while William McKinley was President, and under his leadership, inures to his benefit, and that he should be given proper credit for his sterling leadership that first brought about the successful culmination of the Spanish-American War, and second, the assumption on the part of our country of its duties and responsibilities internationally as the great and powerful Nation we were in those days and which we have developed into since.

Speaking, therefore—I would rather not say on the basis of speaking for the Democratic Members of the House, but speaking for us Americans who are Members of this House and elected as Democrats, and speaking as their leader and as the majority leader of the House, I am very glad not only for myself but also for my colleagues on this side to join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and our Americans who are Members of the House who are elected as Republicans in honoring the memory of this great man, this great American, this outstanding President.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us, especially the delegation from Ohio, appreciate the very statesmanlike utterances of Mr. MCCORMACK, the distinguished majority leader from Massachusetts. It is true that those of us who have had occasion to speak in the memory of Mr. McKinley in times gone by, have taken the position that Mr. McKinley was President at the time when the United States became a world power. From that time up to now we have been

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

increasing in our national and international influence. Our hope is that we will continue to increase in power and influence.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, after listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], it is not out of order for some of us who represent a different school of thought on the international problem, and who come from that section of the country that was most involved in the great war in which Mr. McKinley participated, to say a few words at this time.

I cannot agree that if McKinley were here today he would be in favor of this United Nations that is out to wreck the Republic of the United States and subordinate the American people to the domination of foreign powers.

Coming, as I do, from a Southern State in which McKinley fought during the War Between the States, I also desire to say that, in my opinion, if McKinley were here today he would never favor placing the flag of the so-called United Nations above the flag of the United States.

May I say if any of you really want a new flag, I will be glad to get you a Confederate flag. It would at least be an American flag. But I am not in favor of any other flag being placed above the flag of my country, especially at this time when influences are being used to destroy everything for which our people fought.

McKinley was a great American.

I have noticed here that whenever dangers to this country arise, whenever those undermining influences that are trying to destroy this country, manifest themselves, the Members of this House who are first to fly to the defense of the country are the sons, grandsons, and collateral relatives of those old men who wore the Blue and the ones who wore the Gray in the War Between the States in which McKinley himself fought.

If he were here today, he would be just as strong for the preservation of this Government and the American way of life as any man in this House, no matter from what State he comes.

As I said, McKinley was a great American. When he passed away, when he was murdered by a Communist, by a member of the same gang that is trying to undermine and destroy this country today and has been for more than a generation, his death was mourned throughout the Southern States, because as President, however we might have differed with him on political policies, we found in him the heartbeats of a great American who put the welfare of his country ahead of all other considerations.

God bless his sacred memory.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I wish again to thank the Speaker for his courtesy in giving us time for this our annual observance. We appreciate the efforts of our colleague [Mr. MCGREGOR] for his thoughtfulness in bringing to us these beautiful carnations; one of which every person on the floor including the House attendants is wearing.

ADMIRAL CLIFFORD A. SWANSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas in expressing my appreciation of Admiral Swanson's very fine service of Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy. Everyone who has worked with him or who has come in contact with him realizes his anxiety to have the best possible medical and surgical service for those of the Navy. They all know of his fight to have the best naval hospital facilities for his men. They respected him, all respected him, for his fight to get what was necessary no matter whether it was a popular thing or not. He dared to speak. He had great courage.

SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1951.*

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour following any special orders heretofore entered, and that on Thursday next, and if not on Thursday then on Friday next, an additional hour following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE CHARLES NOEL CROSBY

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the older Members and people throughout the old Crawford-Erie District will mourn the passing of Charles N. Crosby, a democratic Member of this House from January 1, 1933, to January 1, 1939. Mr. Crosby was a distinguished gentleman in his own community and he served faithfully here in this great body.

The Titusville Herald had this to say about our great friend:

Charles Noel Crosby, only man from Crawford County to represent the old Crawford-Erie District in Congress since 1912, died in a Frederick, Md., hospital yesterday from heart disease. He was 75.

He was a Democratic Congressman from January 1, 1933, to January 1, 1939, serving three terms.

Born on a farm near Andover, Ohio, he attended private schools in that State. He was graduated from Western Reserve University, where he was a member of the school's unbeaten football team in the 1890's.

At Linesville he operated a factory which made silos. He later moved that construction and lumber business to Meadville.

Entering politics, he made three or four unsuccessful bids for Congress before he was elected in 1932. That year when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected president Mr. Crosby defeated Milton W. Shreve, an Erie Republican. Mr. Shreve had been in office since 1912 with the exception of one term when Mike Liebel of Erie was in.

In 1934 and 1936, Will P. Rose, Cambridge Springs newspaper publisher, opposed Mr. Crosby on the Republican ticket. The Democrats swept virtually all the offices in the State that year and George Earle was named Governor. In 1936 Mr. Crosby was also nominated on the Social-Justice ticket which backed the Townsend plan for old-age pensions. He endeavored to push a compromise bill on the Townsend plan through Congress but the measure failed.

In 1938 Mr. Crosby was not the Democratic nominee. The congressional post was won by Lew Rodgers, of Erie, who held it until Carroll D. Kearns, of Farrell, was elected to the first of three terms.

Mr. Crosby purchased a 325-acre dairy farm in Frederick County, Md., after leaving the House of Representatives.

Funeral services will be private. Burial will be in a private cemetery at Arlington, Va.

Mr. Shreve, mentioned above, succeeded Arthur L. Bates, of Meadville.

ACTIVE IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Crosby was a member of both Linesville and Meadville school boards when resident of those communities; was president of Meadville Chamber of Commerce in 1922, 1923, and 1924. He was a member when resident in Meadville of the First Presbyterian Church, of Beta Theta Pi, and the Iroquois Club.

Mrs. Crosby, the former Sara Isabelle Fetterman, of Simons, Ohio, died in 1943.

Surviving are five daughters: Mrs. R. A. Donaldson, of Meadville; Mrs. J. G. Campbell, of Butler; Jean Crosby, Bethesda, Md.; Mrs. Crosby McEvoy, Arlington, Va., and Mrs. R. R. Remus, Skokie, Ill.; and four sons: Theodore F., Fairfax, Va.; Charles N., Jr., and Ronald V., who lived at home with their father; and Job B. Crosby, of Long Beach, Calif.

SALES TAX PROPOSALS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, my constant opposition to the sales tax in all its forms is well known.

For years I have fought against this outrageous levy upon the people and I expect to follow this course just as long as I am in Congress.

Now I understand the latest proposal on the taxation subject calls for a Federal sales tax.

Of course, they will probably want to put a tax on bread as soon as Congress approves of this principle, if it ever does.

Sales taxes, in every State they were ever levied sooner or later reached the necessities of life and the man in the street is the victim.

Any tax which hits the vital goods we have to buy, the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and the medicines we must have, resembles a tax which peoples behind the iron curtain have to pay to their Soviet masters.

I am against the sales tax whether it be Federal, State, or local. There is no justice in it.

Some States which formerly saddled themselves with it, are now throwing off its yoke. They are being ruined with it.

Last week Mr. Fred Stein, the distinguished editor of the Binghamton Press, foremost newspaper in the Gannett group, supplied words describing the sales tax better than I can in an editorial on this matter. I am therefore inserting his editorial in the RECORD today, part of which I quote herewith:

Opposition to sales taxes always have been great, because they are regressive. They fall hardest on those least able to pay. * * *

The consumer in the price he pays gets nicked for more than the Government gets in taxes. * * *

A sales tax collected at consumers' or retail level is difficult to administer, because of the thousands of establishments whose collection of the tax must be policed.

MOCK THUNDER FROM THE SENATE

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon be celebrating the birthday of the Father of his Country. I am comparatively a newcomer in Washington. I am able to see the Washington Monument in relief against the rosy glow of the morning sunrise from the window of my apartment. The beautiful dome of this Capitol, whose cornerstone he laid, and within whose walls should be forever ensouled the spirit of freedom, looms vividly against the dawning light of a new day.

I wonder what that august personage would think, if he were able to view what we have done with his beloved country; and doubtless he is. The burden of his prophetic Farewell Message, delivered in tears, was that we should avoid foreign entanglements. Have we? He foresaw all the evils we have already encountered and those which are still immanent in our departure from his advice.

May the aura of that mighty soul, still brooding over this marvelous country he loved, protect us from that foul abortion, conceived in the twisted and psychopathic brain of Alger Hiss, the United Nations.

We are no more his child if we persist in remaining within the United Nations. We have denied his paternity, sold our illustrious birthright for a mess of pottage, and have become the slaves of a congerie of spies and traitors, and fugitives from a New Deal psychology.

May God, in his gracious bounty, decree that we may once again assert our freedom won so dearly, desert the impossible alliance of God's free people with the decadent and time-serving United Nations. We may never hope to raise them to our standard. They will drag us down to their's.

Let us determine that, as for us, we shall remain the militant captains of our destiny, under God, in a revived spirit of America for Americans, so that we may be able to view these monuments of Washington's greatness without covering our eyes because we have basely renounced all for which he wrought.

I want to commend to my colleague and the American people the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Friday, January 26, 1951:

MOCK THUNDER FROM THE SENATE

Both Houses of Congress have now adopted resolutions telling UN to declare Communist China an aggressor. In addition, the Senate has told UN not to admit Red China to membership.

The motive which led to the adoption of these resolves is obvious. The Members know that the people are out of patience with the administration for sending more than 7,000 of their sons to death in the futile Korean War, and for arranging to get into a much more costly and no less futile war in Europe. The voters expected the new Congress to do something to rescue the country from these calamities but the Congress hasn't shown the wit and courage to do what the people want.

Far from it, this Congress has been promising the people exactly what they don't want and don't need, such as an extension of the draft and a huge increase in taxes.

BITTER LETTERS

It is no wonder, then, that the letters from home to the Congressmen have become increasingly bitter. The Members decided they must do something that would look like vigorous action in the hope of cooling off their constituents. Hence these resolutions telling UN to denounce the Chinese.

There is, of course, no doubt that the Chinese are aggressors and that the UN should have denounced them as such long ago. The point to be borne in mind, however, is that the resolutions accomplish nothing even if the advice is followed.

Our problems are how to end the Korean War and, more particularly, how to avoid a similar misfortune to an overmatched American Army in Europe. Declaring China the aggressor won't help on either point.

The only meaning that the resolution can have is to advise UN to declare war on Communist China. If that's what Congress wants it can declare the war itself. If that is what it doesn't want, it should not have passed the resolutions.

RECORD OF FAILURES

Surely, with the long record of the failure of the other nations in UN to join us in the Korean War, there can be no expectation that a declaration by UN that Red China is the aggressor will lead England, France, and the rest to send any troops to fight the Chinese. After declaring North Korea the aggressor, our so-called allies didn't do enough about it to count. They fear Red China much more than they fear Red Korea as they have shown by recognizing Communist China and inviting her representatives to join in UN deliberations.

The Senate's resolutions were directed to UN, which need not heed them and if it does will not follow through in good faith. At the same time the Senate refused to act upon Senator WHERRY'S resolution which was directed to the President who would have disregarded the Senate's counsel at his peril.

SENATOR WHERRY'S RESOLUTION

Senator WHERRY'S resolution had the further advantage of offering some hope of sparing the country a repetition of the Korean tragedy in Europe, for it advised the President not to send American foot soldiers to Europe under the North Atlantic Pact until he had been authorized to do so by Congress.

This sound proposal was sidetracked on the theory that under the Constitution, the President, as Commander in Chief, has the sole right to direct the movement of American troops. If that argument was worth anything, it should have operated to prevent the Senate from offering advice or instructions to UN, for the Constitution entrusts the conduct of diplomatic negotiations to the President.

CHALLENGE TO REPUBLICANS

The Senate's right to tell UN what to do about China is a good deal more dubious than its right to tell the President what not to do with your son in the United States Army.

The behavior of this Congress has done harm, and, we fear, irreparable harm, to the Republican Party. The voters are now very nearly persuaded that the Republican Party offers no real alternative to the Democrats. Both appear to support the Truman policy of rushing this country into futile wars and ruining it with preparations for war on a scale which a sound diplomacy would not require.

MR. HOOVER'S SPEECH

Mr. Hoover's speech electrified the country. Here was sound policy because it was safe policy, because it would not squander American lives, because it was honorable, and because it was within our means. Congress, and particularly the bipartisan Republicans in it, have largely undone Mr. Hoover's good work.

WARNING TO REPUBLICAN PARTY

If the Republican Party can't learn and learn quickly to serve the people, the day will come soon when there isn't going to be any more Republican Party. As matters stand today, vast numbers of Americans—in our judgment a majority of them—have no party to speak for them on the great issue of the day. That situation cannot endure.

SHIPMENT OF GOODS TO RUSSIA

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, in the Detroit Times of January 5 was an article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., which was shocking. I have tried to ascertain its validity and to the best of my knowledge the information is true. In this very month of January England has shipped to Russia $10,000,000 of natural rubber. According to Mr. Lewis' article this natural rubber was shipped on the British steamer *Stanreal* from London headed for Odessa, Russia. The Russians are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stock piling natural rubber for war purposes. On December 28 the National Production Administration ordered a freeze on natural rubber to be bought or distributed in the United States. In other words, our natural rubber is being used to build up war materials to be sent to England, and England at the same time is sending natural rubber to Russia. Americans are disgusted and ashamed of our so-called allies who continue to grease the wheels of the war machine of Russia at our expense.

I beg the Armed Services Committee and our Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate these charges. Certainly no loyal American can vote 1 cent more for the British, either for military or economic aid, until this practice of dealing with the enemy stops.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the control mountain has been in labor and has brought forth a mess. God save the American Republic.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PARITY FOR FARMERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I assume almost every Member of Congress is receiving letters protesting against the provision in the National Defense Price Control Act that we put in there in behalf of agriculture, in other words, protesting against the theory that the farmer is entitled to a wage somewhat comparable to that of the man who is on the payroll of private industry.

I have no apology as a Member of Congress to make for the fact that we do accept the philosophy that people who work on farms are entitled to a living wage the same as those who work in industry. That provision was in the price-control law. Every Member of Congress who was a Member at that time should have known it was in there, and if he voted for that law, he simply comes up here and kicks about the very thing he voted for himself. Incidentally, I voted against that law, but I am in favor of allowing the farm people a living wage the same as that in industry.

KOREA

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a news article from the London Daily Mirror.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as I grow older it is much easier for me to keep my temper, but last week I almost, in the vernacular, "blew my top" when I read in the London Daily Mirror, for January 6, 1951, a news story which would indicate that in Korea our troops had been engaged in shadow boxing, meeting no real opposition, and of withdrawing though no threat exists. That is not what my mail from Korea shows; that is not what the men in Walter Reed say; and I know you do not suffer 50,000 casualties at a Boy Scout jamboree.

I have asked the Department of Defense to give me a full and complete report on this story to determine whether the facts therein stated are as alleged or whether they are false. If England had a bigger stack of chips in the pot, I would not mind it so much, but their stake is comparatively small, and I resent the insinuations and charges in the article which follows:

FAIRY TALES FROM KOREA—WORLD IS NOT GETTING THE TRUTH

(By David Walker)

"For the love of Mike," said men of both British brigades in Korea, as I was leaving Seoul, "tell people at home the real truth about this mucky business."

Well, I'm sorry, but I can't. I can't tell the whole truth for the simple reason that there's a war on—and one of the rules is that you mustn't give comfort to the enemy.

But there are one or two things that ought to be known here at home. You ought to know, apart from any military mistakes, that the picture of actual events in Korea, and especially the fighting, or lack of it, has been dreadfully distorted.

I HAVE BEEN FLABBERGASTED

This is not the fault of British correspondents in Korea, nor indeed of the newspapers at home, but of Alice-in-Wonderland information handed out at a high level—either from Tokyo or from Eighth Army headquarters. Here are some instances.

Britain's Twenty-Ninth Independent Brigade is furious with the papers for their account of what happened around the Communist capital of Pyongyang, where we guarded the retreat of allied forces. I don't blame them.

Here, in London, I have been flabbergasted to read how the brigade was "thrown into action," how "mortar shells fell into the streets," how the brigade "was virtually cut off by large Chinese forces" and how the 52-ton Centurion tanks blazed away with their 20-pounders.

WE DIDN'T FIRE A GUN

I happened to be there with the Twenty-ninth Brigade at the time and the truth is that we were involved in no action, no mortar shells fell in the city, we were not cut off at any time, and the Centurions did not fire one gun in anger.

In fact, up to New Year's Eve, there was not a man in the Twenty-ninth Brigade who had seen a Chinese—although we had retreated more than 200 miles under orders from the high command.

Another example: One day when the Twenty-seventh Brigade (Middlesex, Argylls, Australians) were holding an area about 25 miles north of Pyongyang, I ask Corps for information about them.

I was told: "We have just put in an air-strike on a village ahead of them, killing 500 of the enemy. On their right they are in contact with an estimated 2,000 North Koreans or Chinese."

The Middlesex Regiment confirmed the air-strike. They had at once put a patrol into the bombed village and counted the dead—six civilians.

The Australians confirmed the contact with the enemy—which they estimated at company strength—say 250 to 300 at the outside.

Another example: Eighth Army headquarters in Seoul told us one morning how the Fifth Air Force had successfully attacked an enemy formation in "black and grey uniforms," killing some hundreds of them. On the map this was right in the Twenty-ninth Brigade area at that time.

An officer of the Ulster Rifles told me: "We watched the bombing and it was highly effective. But the victims were all students, in their black and grey clothes, refugees from a northern university, mostly aged about 16 or 17. There was no enemy within miles."

And so it has gone on. The Air Force communiqués have become a total farce. We were given hand-outs stating that "314 enemy were killed." In another instance it was 91. In another it was 50 "in a tunnel."

But a modern 10-year-old boy in short trousers knows that whether it be low-flying jets or high-flying B-29's, no air force can possibly know exactly how many people it has killed.

Today we are retreating again, a large, mechanized, modern, and fully equipped Army—retiring before little men on foot. And the only estimate of their numbers that we have is that given by Tokyo.

MacArthur was criminally wrong in his estimate of a token Chinese force when we started our Christmas advance that was to end on the Yalu River. This token force has suddenly grown to fantastic proportions.

What can we believe?

Are we trying to save face for an evacuation of Korea? Are we trying to fool the enemy—or the public? It it ignorance or dishonesty?

Not only the men of the Middlesex or the Gloucesters, the Argylls or the Australians, but the fighting GI, the Frenchman, the Turk, and the Greek, have a right to be treated better than this. And so have the public.

Our own brigades asked me to tell you the truth. This is only a part of it.

All that the British troops want, in the meantime, is a little less hysteria and a little more realism in the information handed out by the supreme commander's lackeys.

In fact they want the truth. They have nothing to be ashamed of.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I notice the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has requested permission to file a report before midnight tonight. I should like, therefore, to ask the majority leader if he can tell us when the reciprocal-trade bill is coming before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming a rule is reported out today or tomorrow, which is expected, the reciprocal-trade bill will come up Wednesday. My understanding is that there is an agreement for 1 day of general debate. Is that correct,

may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct. The next day will be devoted to consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] told me the same thing. There will be 1 day of general debate, on Wednesday, and on Thursday the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the President has repeatedly told the people that conditions are so serious we must mobilize all our resources to build up our national defense for the protection of our country and to aid other peace-loving nations.

In the Eighty-first Congress he called for much greater powers to aid in carrying out such a program. Billions in additional funds were voted then, and the President has requested a $71,000,000,000 budget from the Eighty-second Congress. He has said:

> We must all work in harmony, we must tighten our belts and sacrifice, and we must be taxed until it hurts.

If the President means what he has said and expects the people to cooperate with confidence, it is absolutely necessary that he see to it that the organizations set up to control and allocate manpower, to administer and enforce price control and to control other agencies, are directed to select employees for their ability to fulfill the positions without any regard to politics from the highest positions to the lowest.

Mr. Speaker, in these critical times no power-hungry political organization should be permitted to control any such appointments and turn these emergency Government agencies brought about for the defense of our country into debauched inefficient political machines.

Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to the American people to note in the press a few days ago an article indicating that the Democratic National committeeman, Mr. Boyle, was about to set up a political committee to screen all employees employed in price control and some other agencies receiving a salary of over $4,000 a year, to make certain that none but Democrats would be employed.

It is further disturbing to note that Vice Admiral John H. Hoover, chief of the new price-control program, a man of exceptional ability and experience in this field, resigned from the job stating in substance, that "he did not believe the distribution of such Federal jobs affecting all of our people should be handed out by a political organization."

It would be reassuring to the people, to the Congress, and in the interest of greater efficiency in government, saving billions of dollars in the future, if the President would issue a directive at once strong enough to stop this vicious and pernicious policy, which unless stopped will continue to degenerate, will continue to expand, the effect of which will be working against the very purpose of mobilization and national defense.

Even more disturbing is a headline in the Sunday Star newspaper which reads, "Tobin and Wilson aides struggle over manpower setup control."

The news article indicates that the struggle is between Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson and Secretary of Labor Tobin. The issue seems to be whether the Labor Department or the Office of Defense Mobilization shall coordinate in manpower policies of the military, defense production, and essential civilian programs.

The story indicates the President may have to make the decision. Secretary Tobin evidently is trying to grab this power and it is indicated that he has taken his case to the President.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that Director Charles E. Wilson who is supported by his chief assistant, General Clay, both feel that the manpower problem should be handled under the direction of Mr. Wilson.

It is reported that Secretary Tobin and Anna Rosenberg, as is to be expected, feel that Secretary of Labor Tobin should have such control. This has a distinct political taint.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who rendered great service during World War II in this particular field, and who showed his great ability as military governor over Germany, who directed the airlift to Berlin winning the cold war, is leading the argument in favor of the Office of Defense Mobilization Director Wilson.

When the President selected Mr. Wilson to this most important job in America, second only to the office of the President, in this emergency, in the order creating the Office of Defense Mobilization the President gave Mr. Wilson authority over manpower as well as policy control on all other phases of the giant mobilization program, including defense production and economic stabilization.

Mr. Wilson was said to feel he must have such control to do an effective job.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Wilson in whom the people of the Nation have confidence, if he feels he should have control of manpower, that the President will back him and see that he gets it.

The record of Secretary of Labor Tobin has nothing in it so far that would justify the confidence of the American people or the Congress to a point anywhere near approaching his selection for this job as Director of the Office of Defense over Mobilization, Charles E. Wilson.

Let us keep demoralizing, wasteful political scheming out of national defense. The gamble now is too great. We cannot afford such a useless destructive luxury.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], a few moments ago in his speech, called attention to one of the great crimes of our times which is the way Britain and other Western European nations, who are supposed to be our allies, are carrying on a trade in war goods with the enemy, Russia, China, and their allies.

The gentleman from Michigan in his speech called attention to a recent shipment from England to Russia of a shipload of rubber, valued at $10,000,000.

I would like to add that in 1949, Britain, France, and Belgium sold Russia and her satellites more than $200,000,000 of such war goods as iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, tin, rubber, automobile trucks, machine tools, ball bearings, and barbwire. This trade still continues.

Where did Russia get the money to pay for these purchases of war goods which she purchased from our allies? Why, some of that money she got from the United States.

In the first 10 months of 1950, January through October, the United States purchased $36,257,431 in goods—mostly luxuries like furs and canned crab—from Russia according to figures I obtained from the United States Department of Commerce. During those same 10 morths we sold Russia only $563,396 of American goods.

In other words, by this unholy trade with the enemy we have been supplying Russia with more than $3,500,000 of cash a month which Russia has used to buy war goods in England, France, Belgium, and other Western European nations.

We ought to insist that our western European allies stop their unholy trading in war supplies with the enemy. We cannot do that effectively, however, until we stop trading with the enemy ourselves, for we cannot very well demand that our European allies stop trading with the enemy when we ourselves are trading with that enemy.

I am hopeful that the Secretary of the Treasury's order of last week closing American ports to the slave-labor-produced canned crab of Russia is the beginning of a turning point in our foreign policy under which we have permitted Americans to trade with the enemy and thereby encouraged our Western European allies to carry on trade with these enemies.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES AMONG THE STATES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was on objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States. In the interest of equal representation and fairness to our citizens this is a matter which should receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution provides that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, excluding Indians, three-fifths of all other persons. The term "other persons" refers to slaves who, of course, were not citizens, and the question of counting slaves was thoroughly discussed in the Constitutional Convention and in the Continental Congress. The problem of aliens was almost negligible and not considered at that time.

Today, the question of slaves does not exist, whereas, the matter of aliens has grown out of all proportions.

The Constitution further provides that the number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000. Let us consider for a moment the result of apportioning Representatives at the rate of 1 for every 30,000 throughout the United States if aliens are to be included in that number. Upon the reapportionment made after the 1940 census a number of States lost Representatives in Congress and other States having alien populations were given additional Representatives because of the large increase in alien population of some States. At that time there were about 5,000,000 aliens who had never become naturalized American citizens in the United States. The taking of 17 or 18 Representatives from States with few aliens and giving them to those States with many aliens was manifestly unfair to the great bulk of patriotic American citizens.

Under the present apportionment, the 435 Members of the House represent more than 300,000 persons each. A State with 600,000 aliens is entitled to two additional Representatives. The last three apportionments resulted in taking twenty-odd Congressmen from 21 rural States and giving them chiefly to a few large cities. Obviously, each Representative in those rural States now has more citizen-constituents to represent than the Representatives in the urban States. As a result, there exists a great disparity in the number of persons represented by each Member throughout the United States in rural and urban districts.

Since the problem of the unnaturalized alien inhabitants of the United States, which did not exist at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, has grown so acute, it is time that this phase of the Constitution be brought into conformity with modern conditions. On what basis can we justify the exclusion of Indians from whom we procured this great land and at the same time include unnaturalized aliens who do not care enough about this haven they have found to dignify it by accepting responsibilities of citizenship?

I was surprised to learn that the State of New York for more than a century has had a constitutional provision excluding aliens from a count of the State population for representation in the legislature. That forthright attitude which has not been challenged in that State reflects an intelligent understanding of the philosophy of representative government which should be carried over into the Federal Government to do away with the present inequities.

I urge the Members to support this joint resolution with the view of submitting it to the States at the earliest moment.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday consent was granted me to address the House tomorrow. The calendar shows me as having been granted permission to address the House today. I ask unanimous consent that that be canceled and that I may be allowed to address the House on tomorrow, as I originally requested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS MEMORIAL ARBOR

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a measure in the House that provides for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia in honor of the gallant Americans who during World War II gave their lives on Italian soil for the cause of freedom. It is fitting that the memorial should bear the name of the great Italian discoverer whose courage and determination made possible the birth of a new world and new and greater freedoms.

The memorial will consist of 52 trees and 52 bronze plaques each inscribed with the name of one of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. All the trees, landscaping, and plaques are to be donated by private citizens without any cost to the United States Government through the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor. It is my understanding that the trees may be made available as a gift from the Italian Government as an expression of the friendship happily existing between the two nations. The memorial is to be established on a suitable site in the Federal park service in the District of Columbia.

This laudable project is sponsored by the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor composed of a group of American citizens of Italian descent. Mr. Anthony Ruffalo is national chairman of the committee, and the honorary chairman is the Honorable Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of New York City. The Honorable Thomas D'Alessandro, mayor of Baltimore, and other distinguished citizens are sponsors of the project. The governors of a number of the States have given their unqualified endorsement to the movement.

I am proud to have even a small part in establishing the Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor as a living tribute to the illustrious explorer and to the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who made the supreme sacrifice in Italy in World War II. I am sure this project will meet with the approval of the people of our country, and I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. BATTLE) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Edward A. Richards.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post of this morning.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article on taxes appearing in the magazine Tax Outlook.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by General Romulo.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution from the New England Council.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorial comment.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some miscellaneous material.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an editorial, in the other a letter from a constituent.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from an outstanding farmer in his district, Mr. Howard W. Greiner.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the untimely death of Capt. Don Gentile.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some remarks by General Marshall.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding that in one instance the article exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $220.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY HAS FAILED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for more than 100 years our Government built a reservoir of good will; we had friends everywhere. Yet at this critical hour we seem to stand alone. In Europe and in Asia our motives are questioned and there is a complete lack of confidence.

If we will take the time to review the history of the past 20 years of our foreign policies under the New Deal administrations, the reason for the suspicion of our motives will be obvious. The moral basis for a sound foreign policy has given way to expediency; it has been the practice to temporize with principle; a double-standard of conduct has prevailed, it was one standard in Asia and another in Europe. So people everywhere have lost confidence in a leadership which has failed to be consistent. How can this administration expect unity now? Our own people are demanding a change.

Where has our policy failed? Let me review some events that have led to the present debacle. At Cairo in 1943 we promised China that all of the territory seized by Japan would be returned. This included Manchuria, Formosa, the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands. At Tehran, in 1944, we double-crossed China by making a secret deal with Stalin about Manchuria and the islands I have mentioned. Not until the end of the war did China learn of this double-deal. No oriental will trust us today, for we not only put over a sneak deal with the Soviets but in 1946 Truman and Marshall placed an embargo on military assistance to the Nationalist Government which led to its downfall. This is the period when the State Department was following the Lattimore policy of letting the dust settle on China; this is the time when we were being told that the Chinese Communists were not Soviet controlled; they were merely "agrarian reformers." China fell and with it 400,000,000 friends. Never again will they trust us.

It was at Yalta, too, Mr. Speaker, that we gave Stalin a blank check to dominate Europe as he saw fit. We agreed to the occupation of Poland by Russia upon the flimsy promise that the Polish people would be afforded a plebiscite to determine its form of government. No free elections have ever been held and the liberty-loving Polish people are today enslaved by the Communists with our help. Here we lost the friendship of the Poles.

It was at Yalta that we double-crossed Mihailovich, that great Yugoslavian patriot, who fought off the Germans for 3 years. We embraced Tito, the Communist, and sent Mihailovich to the gallows. Today no more vicious tryant rules his people than Tito, but he is now "our boy." Do you think we have any friends in Yugoslavia? Have we helped the cause of freedom there?

It was at Yalta and confirmed by Truman at Potsdam that we agreed to the occupation of Germany and permitted Stalin to ring the city of Berlin with Russian troops so that there was no way for our troops to get in or out of the city. This incident was the most stupid blunder, next to Korea, that our diplomats and soldiers have ever made. Both Eisenhower and Marshall were there.

Our foreign policy was fumbled again when we insisted upon unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan. It was Morgenthau who decided that Germany should henceforth be a cow pasture. Then a kangaroo court was established at Nurenberg. Should we not bow our heads when we recall that travesty on justice? We have joined in a precedent that can subject our civil and military men to the same kind of treatment. God help MacArthur if the Chinese Communists or the Russians ever capture him. Already he is branded as a war criminal, as is President Truman.

Is it not a paradox, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding our shameful treatment of the Germans that we are at this moment begging them to join us now in a life-and-death struggle against Stalin. Ironically, it was Hitler who predicted that we would be in this fix if we succeeded in defeating the German armies. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Morgenthau head a delegation seeking support of the Germans to our cause. Friends? We do not have many in Germany. Maybe the State Department planned it that way.

And while I am speaking of friends, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering where our friends are who have been associated with us in the United Nations. A simple resolution is pending before that organization condemning the Chinese Reds as aggressors, nothing more, and suddenly we seem to be standing alone. This is the organization that was to bring peace to the world. Its basic concept was collective security, an organization that would prevent aggressor nations from breaching the peace. In this field it has a near-zero rating. Its appointed commissions have met with contempt in Yugoslavia and Korea and the Middle East. Yet on June 26, 1950, the United Nations asked that we send American boys to fight and die in Korea and they are still fighting and dying there. What nerve they have to ask our sons to die when they refuse to approve the most innocuous kind of action—a resolution of condemnation only.

Mr. Speaker, these fair-weather friends have left us; the principle of collective security has failed. The American people are incensed and they are insisting that we sever our relationship with the United Nations.

In the heart of New York City on the banks of the Hudson River a 40-story building has been erected to house the United Nations. We advanced the money to build it. Now even before occupation, it is destined to remind the American people of their folly in thinking that their friends believed in collective security when commercial and colonial interests got in the way.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should refuse to appropriate one more dollar in support of the UN except one, a nominal appropriation for the purchase of a "For Sale" sign to be nailed on the building. Billions and billions of dollars have been spent by Democratic administrations to buy friends but we have nothing to show for it today. Have we been suckers or bleary-eyed idealists?

Mr. Speaker, the UN organization is close to us and the American people can easily see as one writer has well said that it consists of two hostile camps, one held together by the American dollar, the other the fear of the Soviet Army. It is obvious that neither law, morality, nor ideology is a cementing influence. It seems reasonable to assume that if the American dollar is withdrawn the West will break up and its members will be seen entering new alinements dictated by expediency. Is it true that the high moral purpose written into the Charter of the UN is but a fairy tale as has been

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

charged? As we see the UN today there is every reason to believe that this Organization is incapable of giving the world peace. Many people will deny that this is true and they will continue to have abiding faith in it. The answer may come in the next few days.

Yet those who have been leading us through all these tragic events are again about to take us into another global war and they will find excuses for getting us into one. We are already in with both feet in Korea. This, however, is a private, unauthorized war, as yet. In view of successive failures there is no will or enthusiasm for national unity. I repeat again, there can be no unity behind policies that have failed.

It is not pleasant to talk about our mistakes, Mr. Speaker, but it does serve the purpose of putting us on guard against the same kind of mistakes in the future. We cannot again accept policies that will lead to another global war. Another such war will destroy every vestige of liberty and freedom in this country. It must not happen on the pretext that we are trying to stop communism. Now is the time to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. Speaker, as we look around and try to find friends in a world that seems to be against us I would like to suggest that there is a vital area in this world where people are anxious to be our friends. They do not ask for American dollars. Mr. Speaker, this may sound rather strange but actually all they ask is our sympathetic interest and support in a cause that was the same as our own in 1776. I refer to the countries of the Near East comprising 200,000,000 people, who now demand that years of colonialism come to an end and that they have the absolute right to control their own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department and our Military Establishment are fully aware of the importance of this Near East area to our own security. Here are 200,000,000 people who want to be our friends and it will cost us no dollars. Here are great natural resources of oil—60 percent of the world's oil reserves—together with rich deposits of phosphate, magnesium, and potash.

I have heard military men testify that this area is of great strategic importance to the United States in our effort to arrest the spread of communism. It is centrally located where Europe, Asia, and Africa meet and for centuries it has been the meeting place between the east and the west. Since the Bolsheviks took over the Russian Government in 1917, they have been trying to get a foothold in this part of the world. In this mechanical age if they are to operate their planes and tanks they need large oil reserves. They are not very far from this 60-percent deposit in the Near East and there is little doubt that they have plans to move in by force, if it is necessary. Latest reports are to the effect that great unrest prevails because of an Arab refugee problem, social conditions, and uncertainty in the political situation.

Mr. Speaker, when attention is called to these conditions the State Department is ready with the excuse that it is our policy to refrain from participation or interference in the internal affairs of another nation and I think this is sound policy, but we did not hesitate to do so in the Philippines and Cuba. It is well known that we exercised great influence in Indonesia, India, and other places where we thought the peace of the world was involved. In the Near East, communism can very easily propagandize the discontented elements into seeking an overthrow of present governments. Colonialism in this area should cease and with it would come stability and a perfect barrier to the spread of communism.

I did not realize it, Mr. Speaker, but British troops are stationed in Iraq and Jordan, against the will of the people. They have also occupied important port cities in Egypt since 1882, notwithstanding lofty declarations of intentions in two world wars and the present charter of the United Nations. The Suez Canal is occupied by the British as is the Sudan, the latter by military force.

Mr. Speaker, American soldiers who were stationed in North Africa in the last war can tell us about colonialism in Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco. Here 30,000,000 people are suppressed by the French and denied the right of self-determination, a right which we guaranteed in the last war. Have we forgotten that promise? Are we immune to the plea of human beings who insist that they be granted their inalienable rights, as we do?

I have already alluded to the campaign by the Soviet to gain control of the Near East. At this moment they are appealing to the discontented people who are easy victims of their lying, but we must admit a certain vulnerability. Russia is actively exploiting its economic and political weakness. Especially gullible are the Palestinian refugees. Propaganda barrages are laid down every day. The ultimate Soviet aim is to spread communism, seek an outlet to the warm waters of the Mediterranean and chiefly to gain control of the rich oil fields that contain 60 percent of the world's supply. We are on notice, Mr. Speaker, of just what our enemy is doing in this vital area and we cannot sit idly by. The British and French must be aware of this situation and our Government should be in consultation with them in an effort to solve the problem. The United States must assume leadership and initiate a realistic policy in our own selfish interest.

Mr. Speaker, a program of self-interest in the Near East does not call for men or money. As we consider the drift of our foreign policy since 1945, we know that it has been geared principally to the spending of dollars and the giving of our material resources. It has been a wasteful policy and with precious little to show for this sacrifice. We cannot say that our chief concern is Asia or Western Europe. I submit that the Near East is just as important. We must direct our efforts toward the further prevention of the spread of communism in this area that stretches east from the Atlantic to India. Here is a great reservoir of 200,000,000 people who want our friendship and invite our leadership and at no cost in money, material, or men. We cannot afford to wait; time is running out. If President Truman and the State Department are really serious and sincere in their statements to stop the spread of communism, they can do it here at no cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of America is ahead for us? The people are asking that question—mothers and fathers, young men and women who are in colleges and universities, others who are in business and industries. The present situation is terrifying.

We look back to the days before Pearl Harbor. Remember peacetime conscription, the stepping up of the industrial machine? The cry was "We must prepare for peace." That is the slogan today. Then came Pearl Harbor and 5 years of bloody war finished off with the atom bomb. I agree with one writer who said just a few days ago that war is here again. Korea is just the prelude to the global contest that will surely follow. The tinder box has been prepared; the match is lit.

During war, Mr. Speaker, normal life is suspended; hope, aspirations, dreams give way to the demand for material survival. Social power abdicates in favor of state power, and the identity of the individual is lost.

War does not go on forever, Mr. Speaker, and when it is over, what will then be the American way of life? That is the question the true patriot will keep asking, ever over the din of war. He will propound it day in and day out, not in the expectation that it will be answered but with the prayerful hope that its reiteration will keep alive the concept of human dignity, the very basis of the idea of freedom.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I notice the gentleman calls attention to the importance of the oil fields in Iraq and Iran. Also, we have had called to our attention the importance of keeping the Ruhr out of the hands of the Moscow-Kremlin crowd. Does it not occur to the gentleman that we cannot fight ground wars, all types of wars, all over the world, but that we probably should specialize on air power and, having built up our air power, might it not be well to serve notice on the Kremlin that the next move they make we shall declare war on them and, not through land armies, but through air power, try to devastate those things that make war possible, the great industries, the industrial heart of Russia? I should like to have the gentleman's thought on that.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman that we cannot match Russia's armies on the ground. The free world just does not have enough men to do that at the present time. That is the reason I am so much concerned about this 60 percent of oil reserves which are in the Near East, which are actually in the hands of Russia today, if they ever start to move. So far as we are concerned, I think this next war will be an air war or a naval war and we must have oil if we are to sustain those two branches of the military.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I commend the gentleman for his very thoughtful and very clear exposition of the fallacies and mistakes which have led us to where we are today. Does not the gentleman think it might be well if we could persuade, because I realize we cannot force, the United Nations to move out of the United States and to move into a neutral country where their deliberations could be carried on in a more suitable atmosphere? We know the world today is divided into two camps, one led by the United States and one by the Soviet Union. It seems to me if the United Nations is to perform a useful service, it should be away in a neutral country, such as Switzerland perhaps, where it would be out of the fight which is going on here internally; because after all we realize there is turmoil in our own country at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am willing to subscribe to the statement made by the gentlewoman. I think it is a very important observation, because we know today the United Nations organization is at the mercy of a big-city press. It is at the mercy of politicians who want to use it for their own selfish purposes. I think if the United Nations organization would move out of New York and move out of Lake Success, or wherever they are established, and return to the old League of Nations Building, there they could operate in a better atmosphere.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And that fine building on the Hudson River could be made into a hospital or used for some other humanitarian purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentlewoman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment along that same line?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a few days ago, and after the gentleman spoke, or I think the same day—I know it was the same day—a suggestion was made here on the floor that we might better get out of the United Nations. Then a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House suggested to me that what the gentleman suggests is all wrong, because inasmuch as there were some 4,000 or 4,500 individuals in this organization in New York, and since many of them were spies, and some of them who represented this country were traitors, or might be so classed, we should keep them here where we could control them. To me that seems to be the silliest proposition, and the most absurd suggestion that could be made, because if they are traitors, what do we want them around here for? Why not kick them out and let them go? They are no good to us. They just get us into trouble. They cannot back us up after they have gotten us into the situation which is making so much trouble for us in this war. What do you think of that? Have you any thought, or do you care to express a thought about whether or not we should stay in the United Nations?

I have noticed that while the gentleman is making a very constructive statement, as he did before, on several occasions the other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after the gentleman really gets started, go out. They will not listen to you here. Do they listen to you at all in committee?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not much. But that is all right with me because I have to live with my conscience and that's what counts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know that it would be. Maybe they do not want to be converted.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I thoroughly enjoyed the gentleman's remarks because I know that he puts in a great deal of time and effort, is very conscientious, thorough and he is a scholar of the House.

On yesterday I had the opportunity to see a movie in a local moving picture house entitled, "Why Korea?" It appears to me that it is somewhat an answer to what the gentleman has been saying this afternoon. To me it appears as a defense and justification of the reason why we have gone into Korea. I had interpreted the film as an unlabeled propaganda picture for the administration. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, if he can find time among his labors, that he should see that picture and then give the House the benefit of his reaction to "Why Korea?"

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Where is it playing?

Mr. SADLAK. At the Palace Theater.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Would the gentleman like to comment on the fact that the 31 patriotic organizations of women, representing 3,000,000 people, in their resolution narrowly escaped demanding that we get out of the United Nations completely, which is an indication that the American people would welcome their moving from New York to a more neutral zone, as suggested by the lady from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], rather than to furnish the Soviets a sounding board for their nefarious propaganda over here. I think that is rather important.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think it is important, also, but I think it is also evident that the American people are giving this matter very serious consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, these are the most serious days that have faced our Nation since its beginnings. To gird our defenses, to mobilize our potential while developing our resources is the monumental task facing everyone of us. We can expect that this crisis besetting the world will touch all of our lives.

The responsibilities placed upon the Congress to safeguard our Republic have imposed grave burdens on the membership of the Congress. Many problems will have to be resolved in order that maximum utilization of men and materials may be had. About 4 months ago the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments assigned its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations—of which I have the honor to be the chairman—studies and surveys which I should like to bring to your attention at this time.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations gave its attention to the following Federal programs: (a) disposals of surplus property; (b) the Federal cataloging program; (c) the medical activities cataloging, and (d) utilization of warehousing. Before discussing these various programs and the work of the subcommittee in connection with them, perhaps it would be well to outline the methods employed by the subcommittee in gathering its data. Through the cooperation of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States, key personnel was made available to work with our subcommittee staff for assistance in the evaluation of the information developed. In addition, the Defense Department, the General Services Administration, and other agencies concerned, have been most helpful in aiding the subcommittee.

During the many meetings and hearings conducted by the subcommittee it became very apparent that with the present increased emphasis on defense activity our inquiry would be most productive if directed to those quarters. The subcommittee determined that studies and field surveys in military posts in the Southeast, New England, Midwest- and west-coast areas would be centered in the heaviest defense concentrations, thus providing a representative cross-section. As the Eighty-second Congress embarks on its legislative duties I can now report that the first segment of our field staff surveys have been completed. Our investigators detailed from the General Accounting Office, have spent a minimum of 10 days at the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.; Camp Lejeune, N. C.; Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.; Atlanta General Depot, United States Army, Atlanta, Ga.; Pope Air Force Base and Fort Bragg, N. C. There they analyzed operations of the programs I have outlined. It is contemplated that our subcommittee will study and discuss these reports and follow that up with field visits. In this manner perspective emphasis and considered inquiry can be brought to these projects of such interest to the Congress. It will lay the groundwork for a significant report demonstrating the degree of conformity between policy and operational levels.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSALS

I know the membership of the House is very aware of problems involved in the Federal surplus property disposal programs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In the period following World War II, a vast amount of war-generated surplus of the Federal Government was on hand. Many items of use to the Federal Government had been produced at the cost of denial to the civilian consumption. With the cessation of hostilities great pressure was brought to bear upon the Government and the Congress to release this property, no longer of use to the Government, in order that it might be employed by private industry and individuals.

In the transition from wartime to civilian economy, a period for retooling was necessary. When to this the need to maintain maximum employment during this juncture was presented, the case for surplus-property disposal is made abundantly clear. Such demands from all sides together with the factor of a rapid national demobilization, brought about the huge disposals of war surplus by the War Assets Administration. Gradually the war-generated surplus was, in this fashion, disposed of by the Federal Government. Under the circumstances existing at the time these disposals were generally valid, since they conserved maintenance and warehousing expense, while also making available to private industry much material not available then in the civilian economy. Although by and large, this program administered under great difficulties, was carried out with direction and dispatch, there were brought to light some instances of matters prejudicial to the interests of the Federal Government. It is the intention of our subcommittee that in regard to these matters every appropriate inquiry should be had. Taking a lesson from the past, it is our further hope also to be able to recommend to the Congress remedial steps—steps which will establish more efficient and economical administration of disposal programs arising inevitably out of the present defense effort, while effectively forestalling repetition of any incidents inimical to Federal interests. The surplus disposals on the advent of the Korean war were geared at the policy level toward disposition of obsolete, salvage, and scrap material. This is the normal generation accruing from governmental operations and is quite to be expected. However, at the field level the subcommittee has found some deviations from standards set for determination of what is obsolete, salvage, or scrap. In justice to the Defense Department, and other agencies concerned, it must be stated that after June 25, 1950, a screening order was instituted which pruned material and equipment which could now be usefully employed by the Government in the strengthening of our defense, based on the change in circumstances. Field observations have indicated to the subcommittee membership that a thorough examination of the surplus donations to educational and health institutions should be in order, as well as some of the activities of the State educational agencies for the receipt of Federal surplus property. It is the intention of the subcommittee to examine this problem and make suitable recommendations to the Congress.

More attention must be given surplus property in the future than has been in the past.

More attention must be given to the program of surplus property that will accrue and will be gathered together as the result of a great national defense program that is now necessarily being brought into effect and being enlarged, which is causing and will cause in the future sacrifices from the civilian population of America.

To say that the program has not miscarried at all would be incorrect. There are many instances where the program has come close to being a question for the Department of Justice to investigate. I refer to these fly-by-night veterans' schools—schools that have made a business of receiving and selling war surplus property. State organizations have been set up thinking this thing would go on forever, thinking that property usable by State institutions would be declared surplus by the Federal Government and passed down to the States.

When I first observed this I was greatly surprised and shocked that our States in the financial condition that all are would be looking to the Federal Government for something when the Federal Government needs aid from the States if it ever needed it since the organization and creation of our great Government. We have agencies in the Federal Government that are procuring property, we have agencies in the Federal Government that are declaring surplus and disposing of property. One agency wants to keep its high personnel rolling and going along and naturally it procures all it can procure. The other agency, on the other hand, has got to keep its personnel working disposing of property, giving it away, and, naturally, they are grabbing everything they can to give away and dispose of. It is one end working against the other.

There must be more economy practiced by the leaders of our national defense, and, of course, the Congress wants to give them every dollar that is necessary, but they can practice economy, and there will be, should be, and must be economy practiced by the civilian agencies of our Government. It is high time that every Member of this Congress look into that phase of our national expenditures, because millions and millions of dollars can be saved by such a course.

Next we come to the Federal cataloging program that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has given so much time to.

FEDERAL CATALOGING PROGRAM

Another program of vital interest to the Federal Government has engaged the attention of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for some time. This is the Federal cataloging program. This project is of keystone importance for the real economies it can effect in procurement and subsequent disposal phases. Despite apparent misinformation, there is an agency for Federal cataloging. This organization is known as the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency. Very often in press comment and public discussions, the yeoman task assigned this body is not adequately emphasized. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments placed on the statute books Public Law 152—the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This legislation calls for closest coordination of civilian and military effort, to the end that the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency continue its titanic task.

The Munitions Board Cataloging Agency early in 1947 undertook this landmark program to produce a single Federal catalog for items used by the Government. Briefly, this would mean that an item would bear the same identification mark, designation and name in procurement by all governmental agencies. Recently on this floor the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman RALPH HARVEY, a distinguished former member of our subcommittee, brought out the fact that one single item procured by the Federal Government was known by over a thousand different designations or names with resultant confusion in stocking this commodity.

Mr. Speaker, in my time around the Capitol and as a Member of Congress, I have never known of a more conscientious man than the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY]. I have never had the pleasure of serving with a gentleman whom I enjoyed being with any more. He is a splendid Member of this House, and I regret exceedingly that it was his desire to change and leave the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because the splendid service he has rendered to that committee will be greatly missed.

When to this is added the uncertainty of identification and value when declared surplus, the magnitude of the problem is laid bare. Of the 2,500,000 items in use by the Government and eligible for cataloging, this agency has completed approximately 1,150,000 items. In a comparatively short time the rewards of this far-reaching project will be available to the entire Government with tremendous savings. One further thought should be borne in mind: fullest utilization of this cataloging will call for constant implementing and deletion of items as Government needs and requirements alter through the years.

The Munitions Board cataloging agency has not performed its work in the dark; a most valuable report has been filed with the Congress, and I recommend its earnest consideration by the membership for a thoroughgoing understanding of cataloging efforts.

In view of studies of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the additional appropriations made available during the fiscal year, the Munitions Board cataloging agency may have the single Federal catalog available before the close of 1951. The war crisis we are passing through will have a great impact on the goals in this task and the membership should support and maintain this cataloging program on its merits; its self-evident possibilities are manifold. In this respect also our subcommittee was enabled to visit the naval center at Mechanicsburg

for an evaluation of several phases of this cataloging program. They were impressed with the need and urgency for such a single Federal catalog. They affirmed the present approach as well-founded and capably executed. In our projected field surveys it will be the plan of the subcommittee to bring home to the operations in the field the need that exists for this cataloging and the interest displayed by the Congress, and also to stress that Federal Government activities should be utilized in these quarters so that joint procurement, cross-servicing, and optimum coordination can be had between the Defense Department and other agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are several other special orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the next special order, I think of 10 minutes. Would it be in order for me to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina 5 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That will be all right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield him 5 minutes, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CATALOGING PHASE

Mr. BONNER. I have mentioned in the beginning of my discussion here today that we are making an excursion into the medical phase of the cataloging program. I should like to take a moment to explain the purpose of this inquiry. The Federal cataloging program is being undertaken in segments. The portion dealing with cataloging of medical supplies has been realized. There are approximately 6,000 medical items included in this endeavor. It was the thinking of the committee members that it would be well in the consideration of the entire Federal cataloging program to focus attention on this now vitalized segment. In this way they would have a projected view of the possibilities inherent, in addition to the opportunities presented for fullest utilization. Appreciation by the agencies of the significance attached by the Congress to this vast undertaking could also be had. Many avenues of inquiry are available now to our Members based on our investigative surveys, and it is our intention to fully explore them during the present session.

For instance, medical supplies are procured jointly for the armed services, yet when delivered, are stored at the various service supply locations. The possibility of centralization of distribution as well as procurement should be given close analysis. The cross-servicing or exchanging of materials among the armed services or the executive agencies in a given area should also receive every encouragement.

WAREHOUSING

The field surveys, investigative data, and studies of the subcommittee early disclosed that warehousing was very directly related to the foregoing areas of interest. During World War II appropriate and adequate storage space was a serious problem. Our present situation has again revealed a need for a study in this most important function. The conserving of our equipment and matériel through proper storage takes its place alongside the elements of procurement and utilization. The declarations of surplus property, the retention of property excess to the needs of the Government, the stocking of repetitious inventories all have a bearing on the utilization of warehousing. It is in this guise that the subcommittee will determine the degree of use to which warehousing is being assigned in the activities under study.

I have sought to bring to your attention these very important and challenging projects of the Federal Government. Their direction, approach, and utilization can compensate in economy and efficiency, and can be translated into a reduction of expenditures now during a time when we must analyze well our needs and requirements. During the Eighty-first Congress another subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, is chairman, made a number of interesting studies in these very fields. Its hearings have afforded the committee and the House membership an intimacy of knowledge with these projects. With the joint interest displayed by our subcommittees and the approbation of the full committee under Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, the membership of the House can be assured of a close supervision of this entire program.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve under many committee chairmen since becoming a Member of Congress, and I was privileged to know many committee chairmen prior to that time. May I say that I have never seen a Member of this House more conscientious in his duties, more desirous of keeping harmony in his committee, and more interested in the personnel of his committee, than the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON. He has made a splendid chairman.

He has made a splendid chairman. In just desert, I want to say a word in respect to the ranking minority member of the committee, who has displayed a most cooperative spirit. Oh, yes, some of us joke and laugh about our good friend from Michigan sometimes. I think of him like a fellow down in my home country told me about his dog. "Why," he said, "his bark is worse than his bite."

I get to rowing with my good friend from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and after it is all over, why he is just as good a fellow as anybody in the world, and he will say, "Why, go ahead."

So it has been a pleasure to serve on this committee under the leadership of the chairman, and the assistant leadership of the ranking minority member. I hope he will stay in the Congress a long time, to give us his able cooperation in this and other things that will come before the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I expected you to say something of that kind, and that is why I wanted you to have the 5 minutes so that you would have time to say it. I would like to say something about that dog business.

Mr. BONNER. I was very disappointed when my time ran out, for fear that I would not have the time to say what you are so justly entitled to have said about you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You just keep right on going. I have another 5 minutes, which you can have.

But here is what I want to suggest to you. I recall very distinctly one time speaking at a political meeting, when some fellow back in the crowd said, "Don't you know you are nothing but a yellow dog?"

And the chairman of that meeting got up and said, "Well, even so, he is our yellow dog and don't you start kicking him around."

So, as long as the people of my district elect me to represent them, why, it is all right.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in addition to mentioning the delightful gentleman from Michigan, who has been so generous in letting me have some of his time, I want to place another name in this RECORD, the name of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, who served on my subcommittee. There was never a more conscientious man in this House, and there was never a man whom I have served with who fought more seriously and fairly and squarely or impartially about the matters under consideration than Mr. Rich. I regret very much that he has left the Congress.

Our subcommittee while directing its attention to the scrutiny of the agencies concerned is rather primarily pointing its way to the encouragement, based on merits, of these worthwhile projects so as to acquaint the House membership with the work being done as well as to bring to light any need for beneficial legislation which may be developed as a result of the subcommittee's studies. The membership of our subcommittee and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is to be complimented on the keen interest and industry displayed, and the worthwhile contributions made during the course of the surveys.

It is a pleasure to assure the House membership that the reports which our committee will bring to them on these problems will prove of inestimable aid to the deliberations of the Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CONSUMERS' DOLLARS PURCHASE POLITICAL SUPPORT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, everyone who thinks knows that when dollars outnumber commodities, prices go up.

My first factory job was $3 for six 10-hour days. After being granted a bachelor of laws degree at Northwestern University, taking a shorthand and typewriting course, my first job in a law office was at $6 for a 9-hour-6-day week.

Tough? Not at all. Beef steak, 10 cents a pound; eggs 6 cents a dozen. Other prices comparatively the same. That meant a dollar gave me 16.1 dozen eggs. Today I pay 75 cents for one dozen. Then I got 10 pounds of meat for a dollar. Today a dollar will not buy a pound of round steak. Why? Because now there is less meat, fewer eggs, more dollars. Then there was more of each than there were dollars. It was just that simple.

More recently, say since 1933, the Federal Government has been pumping dollars into circulation at a rapid rate. Production has not kept pace. The cows—beef factory—and the eggs—egg plant—have lost out in competition with the New Deal dollar factory. Many of the dollars the administration has been spending were collected from you by taxation. You know about that. You will know more about still higher taxes soon.

Other dollars, and you did not know too much about that, were borrowed. As interest on those borrowed dollars falls due, you will learn about that.

Having spent so many dollars that prices have gone so high few of us can meet them, the administration is now forced to attempt to stabilize prices by controls.

The administration has finally been forced to admit that if prices are to be stabilized, wages must be controlled. But, even though it has long been aware of that basic truth, Mr. Truman and his political advisers have been giving the go sign to the labor leaders who are his political supporters to increase wages. So it was that months ago Philip Murray's steel workers received a wage increase, steel industry received a price hike thus adding to the price of the knife you would use to cut your steak, if you had a steak. Reuther's UAW-CIO got a wage increase, the motor industry was a little slow—caught a stabilization order. Practically all wage earners who belong to big, politically powerful unions, within the last few months have had their wage increase. All obtained while the Administration looked the other way. But prices went so high that the wage earners, white collar workers and those living on the proceeds of their investments, who received no increase, began to find it impossible to buy the things they must have if they are to eat, have a roof over their heads, sufficient clothing, and a little coal in the bin.

Now comes what is called the price and wage control order—after wages have been hiked. The sensible, honest course would have been to have controlled the price of things, the compensation for services, at some prior normal period. Or still better—but that never occurred to the New-Fair Dealers—quit wasteful, needless spending.

But that would not have bought votes nor the labor leaders support. They wanted higher wages for the services they sold, lower prices for the things they bought—an almost universal desire of all of us. Same idea as the Brannan plan which Mr. Truman is still plugging. High prices for the farmer—low prices for the consumer.

But the Truman political machine, to purchase the labor vote, encouraged high wages, now has slapped price control on a few items, a limited synthetic price control on wages—after the horse has left the barn. That is the way it is. That is why we have price control now, not earlier. The consumer, as he makes a purchase, will help pay for Mr. Truman's vote-buying, will be paying the recent increase in wages which have been passed along to him in everything he buys. It is a slick maneuver if Mr. Truman can get away with it.

And soon will come that old ration book—the black market and a few hundred thousand snoopers on the Federal pay roll. But do not kick—you have Mr. Truman, the New Deal, and world war III. How much can you take?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONDITIONS AT LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time because in the last few days there have been a number of reports in magazines and newspapers as to conditions existing among the recruits at Lackland Air Force Base. There have been some statements issued by Members of the other body with reference to it, and the statement has been made that an investigation will be held by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. I think the matter is one in which the true facts should be known and known immediately, because of the effect these stories are having on the morale of the men in the camp as well as those who are scheduled to go there and the parents of those boys. I am sure you have all read the stories of the prevalence of pneumonia, even suicides and things of that sort, at Lackland Air Force Base. The Lackland Air Force Base happens to be in my district. I have been acquainted with its functions from its very beginning, and have been in day-to-day contact. Yesterday I had a number of conversations with officers and officials of the Air Force, and I had a long telephone conversation with the commanding general at Lackland. I do not say that the situation existing there is ideal. Certainly it is not.

Here is the truthful situation as it now exists. The Lackland Air Force Base has barracks for 28,000 men. At one time, during December and January, because of the great influx of recruits into the Air Force, they got up to 74,000 men at one time in that base. In a period of 11 days they received in that base 56,000 recruits. Here I say there is something definitely wrong. Someone made a serious blunder. Whether it was in the headquarters of the Army Air Force or the headquarters of the air training command, someone should have been coordinating the program so that the men did not come there in larger increments than they could take care of.

This is the only indoctrination center that the Air Force has. What we need now is to have the facts known so that the morale of our people will be righted.

Mr. Eugene Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, was scheduled to arrive at Lackland last night. He has asked some outstanding civilians to meet him there. They are entirely outside the Air Force. They will go over the situation and find the true facts. The Senate committee has sent investigators there. They were scheduled to arrive last night. Those of you who have served in the military service know there are certain criteria by which you can judge the efficiency and morale of any station. Here are the facts about suicides and deaths at Lackland Field. In the past 28 months there have been two deaths. Almost unbelievable. These are young, hardy men. One of those deaths was from cancer and one was the result of an injury sustained in an automobile accident.

The story has been put out that some 70 recruits per day are going AWOL. The AWOL rate at Lackland is zero. They have none. It is true that many of them are living in tents. It is something that we do not want but it is something that has happened.

Here is what has been done. Sampson Naval Base at Geneva, N. Y., has been activated by the Air Force. It will accommodate about the identical number that Lackland will accommodate. In other words, twenty-eight to thirty thousand men can be housed in barracks at Sampson. That will be opened in the spring, I think. It is in the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that they begin with the first thousand on the 1st of February, and gradually build up.

Mr. KILDAY. That will take a big load off of Lackland and will be a great relief to the situation.

In addition to whatever their primary mission may be, whether they are basic flight training or what not, stations of the Air Training Command are taking an increment of these recruits from Lackland as quickly as they can be processed through Lackland, and taken to these other bases. My whole purpose in bringing it up here today is that perhaps

the press will carry it and the mothers and fathers and relatives of these boys will understand that the situation is not as bad as it has been painted.

The sickness rate at Lackland is running far below the service-wide sickness rate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to have this statement from the gentleman from Texas. It so happens that there were enlisted from my district the largest number whoever entered the Air Force at one time from any one community—350, according to the Rochester, N. Y., Squadron. Those boys are all down there. They have heard these rumors, and I am greatly delighted to have this assurance from the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. I can assure the gentleman that I have this information from Maj. Gen. Charles W. Lawrence, who is in command, and who I have known for a long time. He is the type of officer and gentleman that you and I like to see in the service. He is, of course, a strict disciplinarian dealing with recruits, but he is certainly not a martinet. I have had a number of telephone conversations with outstanding citizens in my community, and they assure me that my information is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further just on that point?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In the matter of sickness has the gentleman any figures on pneumonia?

Mr. KILDAY. There is practically none. I am talking off the cuff now, but I think my memory is correct. Throughout the service the sickness rate runs about 23 per thousand; the rate at Lackland is about 13 per thousand.

There have been no suicides, nothing of the kind has taken place there.

There have been but two deaths in 28 months.

This is a temporary situation. These men will be dispersed.

I hope what I have said will be reassuring to people who have boys at that base.

I can in all sincerity assure them that while the situation is not ideal and not what we want, conditions are steadily being improved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEFENSE AIR FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Department of National Defense is at present considering the building or enlargement of air facilities and other military construction within certain areas of our Nation. I have already heard of several instances where announcements have been made to a number of Congressmen that millions of dollars will be spent on such facilities in their districts in the immediate future. This action is being taken only a few years after the tremendous expansion of such facilities during the Second World War. The question arises in my mind as to whether or not proper attention has been given to the use of facilities which we already have and enlarging if necessary, those where the work can be done with least cost. I know the answer the military will give. But in the hope that more than a cursory examination will be made and an offhand report from the Military Establishment that such has been done accepted, I repeat here my experience in the last war. Perhaps it will cause a closer study by the Military Establishment and the committees of the Congress before huge amounts are spent.

During the last war I was a member of the subcommittee handling naval appropriations in the House of Representatives. After the war had gone on for a number of years and when the Army was curtailing some of its training program, the Navy Department came before our subcommittee requesting hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of facilities, much of it for new airfields and aviation facilities — pages 1146 through 1148 of the hearings, fiscal 1945.

As a member of that committee I asked why they were not able to use the fields abandoned by the Army. Admiral McCain, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics, stated that the Army had abandoned no fields. I told him that I knew of one field in my area, not in my district but in north Mississippi, that the Army had abandoned. I then asked him if they had any committee or if there was any liaison between the Army and Navy on the use of facilities, and he stated that they had such a committee throughout the war. I asked him why he did not know of this field, and he answered he did not know. I insisted that Admiral McCain talk to the Army again and after the lunch hour of the same day Admiral McCain came back to the committee with an official statement from the Army that up to that moment they had not abandoned any airfields. This, he thought, would settle the issue and he would get his money. Knowing that the Army had certainly moved out from the airfield in my section, upon receiving this notice from the War Department that they had abandoned no fields I immediately called the then Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, on the telephone and asked if they had not abandoned some air facilities. He stated that the Army certainly had a number of vacant airfields. I demanded then that the sums be held up and that Army witnesses be brought before our committee on naval appropriations. As a result, Under Secretary of War Lovett, a fine public servant who faced the facts, came before our committee. Mind you now, the Navy was then requesting in the name of national defense hundreds of millions of dollars for new construction. When Mr. Lovett came before our committee he stated that this committee on interchange of facilities had not functioned and the type of liaison which they had was for the Navy to send a liaison officer over to discuss the possibility of a specific field and that a certain number of fields under what is called Army Cognizance had been utilized by the Navy. He further testified as follows:

More recently in the month of March, I assume as a result of these hearings, a formal letter was written to the Air Force dated March 18, 1944.

This was the letter to which the Army replied they had abandoned no fields.

In connection with this request from our Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations to the Navy to secure from the Army a statement as to what Army airfields had been abandoned, Mr. Lovett testified that—

The official Army statement that they had abandoned no fields used the word "abandoned" in a technical sense, and the statement which Admiral McCain had presented to our committee, addressed to the Navy from the Army, advising that they had abandoned no fields, while technically correct, did not mean that the Army had not vacated quite a large number of fields, since from the Army viewpoint as long as the Army had caretakers at a large number of fields the fields were not technically abandoned.

Is not that ridiculous?

Mr. Lovett then testified:

Then a second meeting of this group on the 20th of March 1944 made it clear in the light of a communication from Mr. WHITTEN that there was involved a question of Air Force facilities which might be used by the Navy if they met their particular requirements and if the Army would release them for full use.

Continuing, Mr. Lovett said:

The following day, March 21, on the receipt of Mr. WHITTEN's inquiry which put us on notice as to the basic problem as well as the difficulty caused the Navy by the necessary strings we had hoped to keep on these fields until they got out of the planning stage, we arranged a meeting among those respective officers and rather quickly by telephone to the commands and other Army units that had a prior right of user under our regulations to clear a large proportion of these fields. Therefore, on the 23d of March, these meetings having been held virtually daily, we provided the Navy with a list of fields in three categories. In the first category—that is, those facilities which can be made available unconditionally—the total is 46. In the second category—that is, those facilities for which joint use can be arranged promptly—the total is eight. In the third category we would put fields on which the right of reentry must be retained; at present the total is one. I then asked the following question: "And you and your department will be glad at any time to meet with the Navy in regard to any facilities which they may need and work out with them whether or not you possibly can make them available?"

Mr. Lovett's reply was:

Yes, sir; provided we are dealing with surplus fields and not with one of our active units.

Mr. Lovett as Assistant Secretary of War stated that at that time when the Navy was within an inch of securing hundreds of millions of dollars for new facilities, the only knowledge the Army Department had as to what the Navy needed in such facilities was contained in my letter to the Army in which I stated the Navy was requesting the sum of $225,000,000 for such construction—aviation alone. Mr. Lovett stated that there was a full coordination of military effort between the War Department and the Navy Department through the Joint Chiefs of Staff as far as fighting the war was concerned. But he stated that though the committee had been set

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

up since the beginning of the war, the first meeting, the first coordination and interchange of facilities dated from my inquiry of March 18, 1944. All of this is contained in testimony appearing in the records of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, pages 1146 through 1148.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this information our Committee on Appropriations withheld practically all the funds for naval expansion of air facilities and directed the Navy Department to use instead, and they did use, many of these Army facilities. When the Navy Department came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations in 1945 for the next year's appropriations, fiscal 1946, Secretary of Defense Forrestal stated that our action the year before had done a great deal of good. Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates, testified that as a result of our action this joint committee on facilities met weekly for many months until the liaison became so firmly established that it was agreed biweekly meetings would serve the purpose. Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks testified that as a result of this committee action the Navy had used 134 facilities which had been transferred to it by the Army instead of building new ones, and that the value of these facilities was $250,000,000. This information is contained in the hearings for fiscal year 1946, pages 17 through 22. Later an additional $100,000,000 in such facilities were used.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that for me to repeat this matter now might seem to be for the purpose of pointing out how my individual efforts contributed toward bringing about savings, but my purpose in reciting these facts to the House at this itme is because here is a concrete example of where except for personal knowledge of an abandoned, which the Army called vacated, airfield in my area the Navy would have spent $350,000,000 which were saved. In our efforts to save that money it developed that the top military people in wartime had a committee on joint use of facilities which had not met for nearly 3 years of the war, and it developed that the Department of the Army was so technical that they would sign a statement for the Navy's use in getting money for new facilities that the Army had abandoned no fields because they had caretakers in charge of such field, indicating none were available for Navy use, when it was clearly apparent that we were seeking available fields which the Army called vacated.

Subsequent personal investigations which I made disclosed that there would have been further savings if the Army had been willing to release air facilities near the ocean, but because of better climate, and living quarters, the Army would only release those airfields in the interior which did not always meet the needs of the Navy or so the Navy said.

Now you may say this is all corrected by the unification of our services. That is not true. You will note from Secretary Lovett's testimony that "he arranged a meeting rather quickly by telephone to the commands and other Army units that had a prior right of user under our regulations."

Each command had its facilities and just as the Army and Navy were slow to find out what they could turn over to the other, because they might want it some day, my investigation disclosed, that within the Army each command and each unit was just as slow to release anything it had to another command or to another branch of the service. That condition exists today, not only between the Army and Navy but within the Army itself.

Mr. Speaker, certainly at this time when our Nation owes $270,000,000,000—when we are only a few years from the time that these hundreds of military facilities were constructed in our country, Mr. Symington, General Marshall, and all others in charge should see that a most thorough and exhaustive study is made of what we have before those in the Military Establishment should be announcing to Members of Congress that they are about to spend millions of dollars in the Congressman's district building military facilities. We are all for national defense, but today we find that the military too frequently does not give due weight to the impact on our financial structure of the huge amounts which they would spend, in some cases at least, without due regard to whether we can meet our military needs without such expenditures. We are fighting a war for survival but we must see to it that we do not destroy our country at home while our troops fight abroad.

I am no longer a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles national-defense items, having moved on to the chairmanship of another subcommittee, but I hope that we will profit by what happened before. I hope that attention will be given to these statements and that proper action will be taken by all to prevent a reoccurrence of this situation. In 1944 I happened to hit upon this case of faulty planning. I wonder how many similar situations we were not able to find out about. How many are happening right now? Up to the present I have heard only that the Department of Defense is reactivating fields, enlarging them at several times the cost for which other fields they have could be reactivated. There should be set up a board through which all new construction should be cleared, after full study of the facilities available regardless of which branch or unit of the service might have them in hand. In fact the National Security Resources Board should make a full study of this matter and, in addition, though I know the committee will do the best it can, we should have appointed a special committee of the House of Representatives with an adequate staff to ride herd on this situation.

We must reduce domestic spending but if we are going to save real money you have to do it largely on the items where the money is spent. Though it isn't popular to say so, all of us who have dealt with the matter know that the National Defense Department is the most extravagant of all not only in spending money but in the use of civilian manpower; but you cannot afford to cut national defense without concrete proof. We should therefore have a regular staff to keep close check for all such proof. It is my opinion, based on experience, that this way we could save billions and not hurt national defense a bit.

I will not burden you with repeating in detail the circumstances of the Elk Hills Standard Oil contract with the Navy which our committee caused to be broken up, saving untold hundreds of millions, which is somewhat similar to the foregoing experience. These facts were reported to the House in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 89, part 11, page A3244, and part 12, page A5376.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Appropriations starts hearings right away and since I do not know when I will have the opportunity to address the House again, I would like to discuss a somewhat related matter now.

General Bradley recently testified in support of the Defense Department's bill to lower the minimum draft age from 19 to 18 and to increase the term of service from 21 to 27 months. General Bradley states that the War Department's bill is required in order to mobilize all manpower for the present emergency and for establishing a long-range military training program. I am not convinced that this action is necessary. It is tragic in this peace-loving Nation to have to call all American youth into military service, and if that be necessary they should be mature enough to have mature judgment. It is my opinion that the average boy is not mature enough to be called into active combat or overseas duty at the age General Bradley would use them. With a proper use of manpower, in my judgment, such action will not be necessary.

We are not mobilizing to that extent on the home front. Today with this emergency facing us, with the terrible war going on in Korea now, and with our military leaders advocating the drafting of all youth, we find that this Government continues the established regular workweek of only 40 hours which means 8 hours a day for 5 days a week. I know Members of Congress and their official staffs work throughout the week but today all our work on the week end must be within the office, for we cannot get anything out of the departments, with few exceptions, from about 3:30 on Friday afternoon until about 10:30 on Monday morning.

The same situation exists back home at the local offices. Today when our farmers are being called on to produce to the limit notwithstanding manpower and other shortages, agricultural offices are closed on Saturday making it necessary for the farmer to take off from his urgent work during the week to transact his business. The same is true of other Government offices. If this be an emergency is not all this ridiculous? By the 40-hour week we require more employees to do what fewer could do with a 44-hour week. If General Marshall, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, and General Bradley sincerely wish to mobilize all manpower why do they not recommend a longer workweek, not only for Government em-

ployees but for industry as well, at straight pay—not double pay or pay and a half as though to do more than usual in these tragic times would be done by patriotic American citizens only if they received overtime pay.

If the executive department and the Congress and the military leaders really believe that we must mobilize all manpower, and certainly I believe we should mobilize civilian manpower, the first thing that should be done is to extend the normal work week from 40 to 44 hours without overtime pay and even longer if manpower continues short. The responsibility for the 40-hour week at this time must rest with the Government because the Government employees that I know, in the present emergency, when the youth of this land is being called into military service, would be more than willing to work an additional 4 hours a week. This would do much to alleviate our manpower shortage and I hope that if the Government's workweek were enlarged to that extent that it would serve as an example to industry and industrial workers.

It is a sad state of affairs to be insisting on drafting all youth at a time when the Government says that 8 hours a day, 5 days a week is all the work that is expected of civilians. If the powers that be really want to mobilize all manpower let them call on all to work; and so long as the youth of this land is in military service through the compulsion of the draft let us have a 4-hour increase in the workweek. If times are not serious enough for that it is hard to believe they are serious enough to be talking about taking all young men into the military service. If a 44-hour week is not sufficient I truly believe that the American people should extend that time to the point of meeting our manpower need. Certainly those on the home front should do this much and more to back those who carry on the fight under the terrible conditions which exist in Korea.

The Civil Service Commission ought to be working toward this end. Instead of doing something about the 40-hour week they plan to bring 300,000 new people to Washington, taking them away from work back home where they are needed. Instead of recommending an extension of the work week, the Civil Service Commission is spending its time recommending repeal of the rider which I placed on the deficiency appropriation bill last year which attempts to maintain the regular grade levels and to provide for a better use of manpower. I repeat that rider here, Public Law 843, chapter 1052:

H. R. 9526

A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes

(a) In making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel and no employee in the Federal Civil Service promoted, transferred or appointed to a position of higher grade shall be eligible, in the event of separation from the service through reduction in force, to reinstatement at a grade above the grade held by such employee on September 1, 1950; and all reinstatements, transfers or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary and for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to the individual reinstated, transferred or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission;

(b) The names of all persons to be terminated under reductions in force in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be certified as eligible for appointment to positions in agency programs determined by the President to be related directly to national defense, if qualified, at not to exceed the grade and salary last held in the terminating agency or department; and

(c) The Department of Defense is authorized to call on other departments or agencies for such additional personnel as it may require within the limits of its funds.

The Civil Service Commission has made little effort to fully utilize this rider. So far as providing expert manpower to the national defense agencies, this would have been done much more effectively if the Civil Service Commission had not waited months to announce the reemployment rights in their old department for those who transfer to defense work. Even now the Commission has only guaranteed a similar job and not the same one. Such action can only be taken as a half-hearted effort on the part of the Commission to make expert manpower available to the defense agencies.

Regular departments, in my judgment, will take substantial cuts in money and personnel this year. When that happens the provision of subsection (b) will not only help those terminated but the defense agencies as well. However, the provision is certainly working so far as helping to hold steady the permanent grade level in the Federal service and in preventing an increase in the total number of permanent employees of the Government. Contrary to various newspaper reports this provision does not prohibit permanent appointments to vacancies.

During the last war no such provision was in the law, and all national defense agencies gave grades averaging much higher than the average grades existing in the regular departments. Since they were "national defense" they had no trouble getting appropriations. Clerks at $2,000 many times jumped five or six grades or to $8,000 and $9,000 per year. These ratings became permanent and from a study by our committee staff of two regular departments of our Government made since the war, their average grade level for employees is two grades above what it was before the war. If the same situation exists throughout the Government this extravagant upgrading during the last war is costing us at least a billion dollars a year now. That is over and above salary raises voted by the Congress.

According to that the provision or rider which I attached to the appropriation bill will save us a half billion dollars a year.

But the Civil Service Commission would repeal this so-called Whitten rider. They say they must have leeway to meet manpower needs. The rider provides sufficient leeway, but does attempt to hold steady the average permanent grade levels. I say to the Commission, when manpower is short, upgrading will not make it more plentiful. There is only one thing to do and that is for the available manpower to work longer. Our Civil Service Commission is strangely silent on that. Continued silence on their part is to invite more riders, perhaps not the best way to legislate, but certainly an effective way when action is sorely needed.

Federal workers have an interest on my side of this issue, whether they realize it or not. It is not all workers who got this upgrading during the last war, nor would all get it in the absence of this provision now. It is those who jump to other agencies and in the absence of this provision could come back with the higher grade to roll someone who worked many years longer for a lesser grade.

If we continue many more years to spend more than we take in, retirement for Federal workers and others will mean little, as will insurance, and Government bonds may well buy only about 25 cents worth of commodities for each dollar invested. You may say that could not happen here. Already a great deal has happened here, all pointing in that direction.

It is time for all to help maintain financial integrity at home if our system is to be saved. We must work longer if the job is to be done.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We have in New Mexico very few airfields, one in Clovis and one at Hobbs. They are now making inspections of the air facilities and air bases down there for the purpose of reactivating some of them. My question is: Are they reporting the findings of those inspections to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: I am no longer a member of this subcommittee. I point this out as having happened and is borne out by the records and the admissions of the Army itself as evidence of the fact that we should have some special committee, regardless of how good a job this other committee tried to do, to ride herd on the situation. They should have an adequate staff. The problem is so big that unless you do that you will waste hundreds of millions and possibly billions of dollars in the long run.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sorry the gentleman is not on the committee now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the last point brought out is important, that you have to watch the expenditures in the Military Establishment. Each and every one of us wants to give the Military Establishment every dime they need, but at the same time our responsibility to the people of the Nation is to see that there is no waste. The gentleman certainly has done a good job for the Nation

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by urging the establishment of such a watchdog committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. As I say, I am no longer a member of the subcommittee on appropriations that handles national defense items, but I do hope we will profit by what has happened before.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has pointed out to the House one of the reasons why the cost of government has risen so high in the last 10 years. As the gentleman knows, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the Eighty-first Congress, whose duty it was to make a survey of personnel utilization in the executive agencies. We made an extensive study in four agencies: The Federal Security Agency, the Interior Department, the Department of the Treasury, and the General Services Administration. Among other things we found—and this is in line with what the gentleman is saying—that in the personnel sections of those agencies, for instance, the salaries of personnel workers had increased between 1940 and 1950 by 164 percent. The Congress by legislation had increased the salaries by 51 percent, which means that the difference between 51 percent and 164 percent was made up by general ungrading of the employees during the war.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman did a very splendid job in handling that investigation, and I hope that committee will be continued.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FARM INCOME

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said recently about the farmer's share of the profits from the increased cost of living. Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculations reveal, however, that the net income from agriculture to people living on the farms of this country dropped from a 1948 peak of more than $19,000,000,000 to approximately $14,500,000,000 in 1950. This drop is partially attributable to the rise in production costs and to the lower volume of farm marketings, but principally to the fact that the price paid to farmers for food products decreased by more than 10 percent from 1948 to 1950. This decrease in farmers' prices becomes all the more striking when we consider the fact that during the same period average consumer prices decreased by only 7 percent.

While more than 18 percent of our people live on the farms of this country, our farmers received only about 7 percent of the national income in 1950. In 1947 the farmers at the peak of their period of prosperity received about 10 percent of the national income. Not only has the average income of the farmer never been equal to the average income of people living in urban communities, but in the past 2 years we have seen a drop of 30 percent in farm income. This has come at a time when there has been no corresponding drop in the income of our nonfarm population.

When it is said, therefore, that farmers have benefited from increased prices during the last 6 months, only a part of the story has been told. While the farmer's share of the consumer dollar used for the purchase of food increased from 46 cents in June 1950 to an estimated 50 cents in December 1950, the farmer's portion is still below the 54 cents he received in 1945 when price controls were in effect.

The charge that farmers are responsible for the major share of price increases is unfair for many reasons. Certainly the farmer received no part of the income which resulted from inventory mark-ups during the period preceding the 1950 harvest. Certainly, also, he has had no part in price increases which have followed the sale of his 1950 crop.

In many of the basic commodities raised on the farms of this country, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is ridiculously small. For instance, the wheat farmer receives less than 2½ cents for the wheat which goes into a 15-cent loaf of bread. In October the farmer got 22 cents for the farmer's share of a work shirt which retailed at $1.54. His share of a $3.18 pair of overalls was 54 cents. He receives an average of only 15.6 percent of the consumer dollar on all cotton articles.

The price of citrus fruits to the grower is lower today than it has been for a number of years. In one month during the third quarter of the last year from October 1950 to November 1950, the price paid to farmers for oranges dropped from 20.1 cents to 14.7 cents per dozen. This 27-percent drop in the farmer's price took place when there was no appreciable change in the price to the housewife.

To say that we are not living in a dangerously inflationary period would be ridiculous. But to contend that this inflation can be laid at the farmer's door or that the price of food has increased out of proportion to price increases of other articles used by the American family would be equally absurd. During the past 6 months, there has been a 5-percent increase in the cost of food and a corresponding average increase in the cost of living generally. The cost of clothing has increased 6 percent. The cost of electricity has increased about 3½ percent, and the cost of home furnishings has increased about 10½ percent.

During the last two quarters of the calendar year 1950, corporate profits of this country were in excess of a rate of $24,000,000,000 per year after taxes, as compared to a rate of $17,000,000,000 per year during the same period in 1949. While corporate profits have increased at a rate of 41 percent, there has been a decrease of about 8 percent in net farm income during this same period. Farm income in 1950 was less than it was in 1948 and yet income from dividends and personal interest increased from a rate of $16,100,000,000 in 1948 to an all-time high of $19,300,000,000 in November 1950.

It would seem to me to be unfair to compare the cost of food today with the cost at any other period unless we also compare the income of the consuming public and the quantity and quality of food now being consumed. The average housewife has more money to spend for food and is buying better food than ever before in the history of our country. During the prewar years from 1935 to 1939, 23 percent of the disposable income of our people was spent for food. Today the same quantity and form of food can be purchased for 19 percent of the disposable income of the American people. At the bottom of the depression the people of this country were spending 27 percent of their disposable income for food. Today the housewife who spends the same amount of her income for food is receiving far more food and far better food for her family than the average consumer received in 1933.

The point I am trying to make is that our present inflationary situation cannot be justly charged to the farmers of this country. The fact that his share of the consumer's dollar was 4 cents more in December than it was in June last year should not make him the goat of any proposal to roll back prices. It cannot properly be used as an argument in favor of pegging farm prices below the parity level. The farmer is entitled to catch up before he is checked. In June 1950 prices received by farmers were still about 13 percent below the average for 1948 and in December 1950 the farmer's share was about equal to the 1948 average.

The farmer has never considered that he should have any unfair advantage over anybody else in our economy. He is entitled to an even break. His position cannot be properly appraised by simply comparing his share of the consumer dollar in June 1950 to his share in January 1951. The important consideration is whether he is receiving his fair share of the total disposable net income of the people of our country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is the heart of the story that most of these columnists omit or quibble about when dealing with this particular matter.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They do not say, for example, that in 1927 at the time of the top peak in agricultural prices that only 25 percent of the average workingman's income went for food whereas, as the gentleman stated, in 1935 to 1939 it costs 2 percent more.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are in receipt of a circular letter from the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] referring to a letter received by him from Senator BYRD.

The letter contains so many astonishing statements that I am including it as a part of my remarks with comments upon these statements seriatim.

The gentleman from California has been unalterably opposed to the consolidated bill from the beginning and has lost no opportunity to criticize it. But if it is so impractical why does not his own State legislature, of which he was a member, abandon it and return to the old practice of separate bills? Not only California but practically every State in the Union adheres to the consolidated bill. In fact, the principal countries of the world, including England and France, use the consolidated bill. But the gentleman from California opposes it. Every metropolitan newspaper in the United States which has expressed itself editorially on the subject, including all four Washington papers, warmly endorses the consolidated bill. But the gentleman from California says they are all wrong.

Here is his letter:

JANUARY 25, 1951.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in reply to your letter dated January 22, which I received in Tuesday morning's mail. My regard for you personally, and my feeling that you have done an effective job in making the people of the country tax-conscious, particularly as taxes are related to unnecessary employment in government, make me feel that I should do more than acknowledge the letter without comment.

Based on years of budget-making experience, in private industry, in the California State Legislature, and here I was doubtful, when the package budget was first proposed, if it would work. I so wrote Mr. CANNON, about a year and a half ago, when he asked for comments on the consolidated budget idea. What might be successfully applied to the accounting and the budget-making procedures of a corporation, is not always equally successful in government.

You state in your letter, as one of the assets of the consolidated budget, that it shows the people, in a single figure, what the budget total will be for any fiscal year. Senator FERGUSON, in a letter somewhat similar to yours, also made a comment along the same lines, and so did another member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in a telephone conversation. This is exactly what the package budget does not do, and never can do under Government conditions. Witness the fact that the House sent you last year the big appropriation bill, to which the attention of the people was directed, but we also sent you the urgent deficiency bill; the deficiency appropriation bill of 1950; a bill for appropriations for the District of Columbia; and two 1951 supplemental bills. We are about to take up still another supplemental bill for 1951, and it would be little short of a miracle if we did not have at least one other supplemental or deficiency bill in the current fiscal year. Thus the total figure will be the addition of these seven or more bills.

The people are deceived into thinking that they have a figure, in the consolidated bill, representing the cost of Government for a year, when in effect they do not have it, and never could have it. As war conditions increase, we are less likely to have anything like a single figure.

The package budget gives the most accurate figure that can be compiled on total annual expenditure. The urgent deficiency bill and the deficiency appropriation bill of 1950 to which the gentleman refers were a part of the budget for the previous year. As we stated at the time, the consolidated bill was undertaken, the new system would have to run 1 year in order to clear such deficiencies inherited from previous budgets. Contrary to the statement, the total Federal expenditure for the District of Columbia is included in the consolidated bill and the separate bill for the District of Columbia appropriates the District of Columbia revenues and has no relation to the Federal budget.

The other bills to which he refers were the result of war developments which cannot be foreseen in any peacetime budget and which would not interfere with the operation of the consolidated bill in normal years. As a matter of fact during a war period, defense appropriations must always be handled separately from the regular budget and that is exactly what is contemplated for this year. There are to be two consolidated bills, one dealing with nondefense items and the other with defense items.

I was in favor of the idea in the Reorganization Act of trying to set up, in advance of budget making, a figure for a possible budget maximum based on the probable income of the Nation, but I was not too surprised when this idea also proved to be a failure.

Fixing of a total advance figure under the Reorganization Act was impractical from the start, but the objective of the Reorganization Act is achieved in the consolidated budget where the total figure is the aggregate of all chapters of the omnibus bill. The gentleman from California supported a plan which was doomed to failure. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I told the House at the time it was adopted that it would fail, and it did fail. Now the gentleman from California comes in and opposes a plan to secure the same result that will work, as demonstrated by the fact that it has accomplished the very object desired.

There is no substitute for ordinary hard work in a subcommittee room. During the Eightieth Congress the House and the Senate together were able to keep the expenditures of the Government inside its income. We did not have a consolidated budget at the time, and we did not need it.

When the Congress convened in January 1947, the budget received from the President was not only in balance but it was in balance for the first time since it went into the red in 1931. The Treasury was in the black for two fiscal years, 1947 and 1948. Appropriations for 1947 were made by the Seventy-ninth Congress. Appropriations for 1948 were made by the Eightieth Congress and while that year was also in the black, the full result of the fiscal program cannot be measured until 1949, for which the Eightieth Congress also made appropriations, and in which year the reduced tax program first became effective, and then only partially. Deficit in 1949 was $1,800,000,000. Budget expenditures for 1950, first year for which appropriations were made by the Eighty-first Congress were only $100,000,000 more than for 1949, although it was necessary to include $2,000,000,000 for the cost of new legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress, and the deficit resulting from full effect of the new tax program was $3,100,000,000.

In no Congress has the budget been processed more carefully and more in detail than in the last session. Heretofore each Member and every member of the staff, had served on from two to four subcommittees and necessarily had to divide time and attention between two to four different bills. Under the consolidated budget members have had the undivided service of the staff assistants and necessarily have done a much better task than heretofore. This is shown by the fact that there were less amendments offered, or agreed to, this last year than ever before.

We had adequate clerical and statistical and investigating help, and we took the budget items apart, almost dollar by dollar, separated the lean from the fat and arrived at a reasonable figure for the final estimate. The subcommittee on which I serve, Independent Offices, took $1,400,000,000 from that one subcommittee appropriation, and I suggest that no one was hurt, and that few people felt the cut directly.

In the Eighty-first Congress, the chairman of the House committee discharged all of our staff except one minority analyst. Not only have we been without help of that kind, but the number of members on each subcommittee was reduced from seven to five, which threw an almost impossible load on most subcommittees.

This has been repeatedly answered in debate on the floor of the House, notably on December 21, 1943. Any matters pertaining to the staff are beside the question as they can have no relation whatever to consolidated bill procedure. By this extraneous discussion the gentleman endeavors to divert attention from the advantages accruing from the consolidated bill.

The gentleman complains of lack of time to make a proper study of the budget. Of course, he will recall that in the Eightieth Congress he served as a member of both the Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, whereas in the Eighty-first Congress, under the new plan, he was a member of only the Independent Offices Subcommittee and could devote full time and attention to the work of that subcommittee. In other words he and all other members of the committee had twice as much time for their bills as they had under the old system, and of course bills were given much better study and consideration.

I have suggested to one of my senatorial friends that the same amount of effort now being spent to support the error we made in adopting the consolidated budget, if given to an effort to provide both majority and the minority members of the House and Senate subcommittees with adequate staffing, would result in material savings to the taxpayers.

It is discouraging, as you know from experience, for a member of a Subcommittee on Appropriations to sit on one side of a table, with little help if he is on the majority side, and less help if he is on the minority, and face a battery of spending experts from an agency or department, who have been working for months on the expenditures of the agency, and to be expected to meet this expert competition with little time and no help.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Here again the gentleman seeks to avoid the issue by discussing an irrelevant subject in no way connected with consolidated bill procedure. As a matter of fact we have the most efficient system of investigation that has ever been used, and members of the committee were repeatedly urged in the last session to request information on any item about which they had any question. No request from the gentleman from California or any other Member for any investigation or information or other staff assistance has been denied and reports on all requests by FBI operators are now on file in writing in the archives of the subcommittees which requested them.

I have always understood that one hallmark of leadership was the willingness to recognize and acknowledge a mistake, and try to correct it. A year's experience has shown the consolidated budget to be a device for spenders, not for savers.

The gentleman refuses to accept his own maxim. Every national business organization including the Tax Foundation, the State chambers of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others are on record as emphatically approving the consolidated bill because it effects economy. No national business organization disapproves of the consolidated bill procedure. That is a sweeping statement but it is literally true. The gentleman from California is out of step with the best business thought of the Nation.

The gentleman makes the statement that it is a device for spenders and repeatedly asserts that it does not effect savings but at no point does he furnish any substantiating data to support his own bold assertion which still stands as a wholly naked statement unadorned by any factual proof.

The best thing we could do for the taxpayers of the country would be to correct this as quickly as possible, and instead to provide our committees with sufficient staff and whatever else may be necessary, to work intelligently and thoroughly upon appropriation requests.

The question of the staff has been repeatedly and exhaustively debated on the floor of the House. No staff on the Hill is more effective or efficient. It has met every need adequately at a minimum of expense.

Your letter and other comments have made a point of the fact that the Congress was enabled, in the consolidated bill, to instruct the President to cut the final total an amount approximating $550,000,000. I am troubled by that statement. We fought the Revolution with this as one of the principles involved. When our forefathers set up the Government, they not only insisted on keeping the control of the purse in the hands of Congress, as opposed to the President's but they even insisted on keeping it in the House of Representatives as opposed to the Senate, because the lower House was closely in touch with the people. I think this was wisdom, and not accident. Can you think of any greater political influence that we could put in the hands of a President, no matter what his party might be, than to give him the final control over budget items? I suggest to you that the way the cuts were made in the current budget supports my contention. I for one am not willing to surrender the responsibility of the legislative branch given us under our form of government. Wasn't it a Virginian, Senator, who once said that it is better to stick to principles than to be led aside by expediency?

The gentleman voted for the very thing which he decries. On any item he could very easily have offered a motion to cut specific appropriations. Instead of that he preferred to wait and vote for a motion to instruct the President which he now says he deplores. The gentleman should be consistent. The gentleman could have and should have offered any amendment curtailing appropriations on which he wished to retrench or economize. It was not the consolidated bill. It was lack of a desire to economize.

Amendments instructing the President to cut totals could be offered to separate bills just as easily as they could be offered to consolidated bills. The Senate adopted such an amendment to the military appropriation bill in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. So there is no point whatever in that contention.

You state in your letter of the 22d, that "the reductions * * * ultimately totaled about $2,000,000,000, the greatest ever made." I suspect that this must have been a typing error, as the reductions were not that great, nor were they the greatest ever made. Without referring to my notes for the preceding year, my recollection is that the true reduction was something under $1,000,000,000. In addition to that the Railroad Retirement Board reported to us that the retirement fund had a surplus of approximately $136,000,000, so instead of taking back that amount of money in a rescission bill, we simply deducted it from the amount asked, for fiscal 1951. That can hardly be considered a cut in the budget. Again without checking my figures, my recollection is that the cuts in requested contract authorizations would run to something under a half billion dollars, and whether or not that is a true deduction is debatable. Even if we call it a deduction, to reach a two billion figure, it is necessary to include the reductions the President was instructed to make, and if you will run hastily over that list, you will find that quite a few of those were not what we may honestly class as deductions.

The President cut the Railroad Retirement Board another $19,827,800, which I suggest is meaningless, as the amount expended from that fund depends entirely upon the demands upon it and we are obligated under the law to meet those demands.

The gentleman meets himself coming back. He deplores the fact that the Congress failed to rescind one hundred and thirty-six million from the railroad retirement account and berates the President for taking $19,800,000 from that fund on the ground that the action is meaningless. The gentleman berates the method used to effect a rescission of $136,000,000 from the railroad retirement fund and questions its inclusion as a cut in the budget. The facts are that the railroad retirement appropriation is included in budget totals just as other items are, and a reduction against it, whether in the form of a rescission of prior appropriations or a direct cut against the current figure, is as much a reduction in appropriations as any other cut. The cut referred to represented an excessive amount appropriated in the previous year. The procedure used to recapture that excess was identical with that followed in previous years, including the Eightieth Congress.

The amount of $19,800,000 taken out by the President was an identical proposition except that it related to a different fiscal year.

The fact remains that under the consolidated bill we reduced the budget estimates more than $2,225,000,000, the largest reduction ever made by a Congress of the same political faith as the administration, in the history of the Nation. Furthermore, we also prevented the appropriation of vast sums above the budget estimates, so that the national debt is today somewhere between three and four billion dollars less than it would have otherwise been, and all of that reduction in nondefense expenditures.

That is not a true budget cut. He cut the loan fund of the REA $85,500,000, which is pretty much the same class of cut. There are other cuts of the same kind, and as I glance hastily over the memorandum showing the Presidential cuts, I am impressed with the fact that most of them could have been made much better and much more intelligently by the proper subcommittees in the Congress. Finally, I suggest that you take the list of the President's cuts in one hand, and the copy of the newly arrived budget in the other, and then see how many of the items he cut on our percentage instructions were not simply transferred to the new budget, so that in effect we neither saved any money nor saved ourselves any work. It will be just a little bit harder to dig them out of the present budget, particularly if we are to be required again to work without adequate help. In other words, a saving which should have been made by a congressional committee was passed over to the President, in opposition to constitutional intent, and he in turn passed it over presumably to the Bureau of the Budget. Many of the cuts, taken in response to our instructions, will reappear in the 1952 budget.

The actual reduction of the budget was $2,298,000,000, as shown by the official compilation based on the conference report.

Josh Billings said "It is better not to know so much than to know so much that ain't so." That adage fits the gentleman's statement like a glove. The general reduction was effectively and fairly applied. One of the reductions imposed, to which the gentleman refers specifically, is the reduction in Rural Electrification Administration. If what he says about the application of the reduction were true, then one would suppose that the Rural Electrification Administration appropriation would be $85,000,000 higher for 1952 than it was in 1951, whereas the startling fact is that the President proposed for 1952, $221,000,000 less than the final 1951 figures after taking into account the reduction of $85,500,000.

I do not see how you can say that the bill was handled expeditiously. We started hearings in my subcommittee, which has about 33 agencies of Government, the second week in January. There was constant pressure on the committee to hurry the budget, in order to make some kind of a record for getting the consolidated bill to the floor. This is not good budget making. The consolidated bill was reported on March 21. It had been put through the full Appropriations Committee in so short a time that an average of less than 10 minutes

was given to each one of the sections. I do not see how this can possibly help the taxpayers.

No limitation of any kind was placed on the consideration of any section. No section was concluded until everyone had been given an opportunity to offer any amendment which he chose to propose. Not until the Members had been asked if there were further amendments or further debate—and there was no response—did we pass on to the next section.

In the preliminary schedules one entire week was allotted to consideration of the subcommittee reports in the full committee. But the bill had been so carefully processed and so thoroughly considered that few amendments were offered. Everyone had every opportunity to offer amendments or to extend debate as long as he wished. If the gentleman thought further amendment or further debate would help the taxpayers, why did he not take advantage of the opportunity offered at the time?

Actually, fewer Members of Congress, including members of the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the Capitol, knew the appropriation details than in any preceding Congress in my experience.

On the contrary, Members had a better opportunity to study the hearings, and to understand the bill, than ever before, for the reason that the transcripts were published periodically by installments, as hearings progressed, instead of being held until the bill was finished and the hearings finally published in one ponderous volume as heretofore.

The bill was on the floor for about 6 weeks, and we had great difficulty in keeping up the interest of the Members of the House, in order that we might make those savings which we would have been able to make, had the sections of the consolidated bill come to us as individual bills.

The bill was pending in the House about 6 weeks but was under consideration only a part of that time as other business which should not have interfered was permitted to intervene and the Easter recess took a part of the time. Had the bill been considered promptly when reported, as under the rules we had a right to expect, the bill would have passed the House and would have gone to the Senate before the Easter holidays. The decisive consideration is that the bill was reported to the House on March 21, the earliest date in the history of the Appropriations Committee, and it was passed and sent to the Senate on May 10, the earliest date on which all annual appropriations have been sent to the Senate. That is conclusive.

The bill passed the House on May 10 and was reported in the Senate on July 10. It passed your House on August 4 and was sent to conference on August 8 and it did not get out of conference until August 28 and was signed by the President on September 6. Certainly this is the longest time in my personal experience, and I doubt if, in your much longer experience, you have ever known a bill to drag more, nor the details to be less well known by the Members. For the first time in our history it was necessary for the Congress to pass three continuing resolutions, one covering the entire budget, in order to keep the departments and agencies operating. This meant that the agencies and departments were in the second quarter of the fiscal year before they knew the amounts which Congress had finally appropriated for them. Several agencies (known personally to me) were required to make adjustments for the remaining two and a half quarters, which they should have spread, for greater efficiency, over four quarters.

Again, if the committee had had cooperation on the floor the bill would have been approved with time to spare. The filibusters on the floor were so notorious as to occasion reference in debate.

One of the things which came out of this delay was the necessity, on the part of the Senate, of starting hearings before the bill had been reported by the House. The Senate subcommittees held hearings upon a bill which had not yet reached your House, and were compelled to consider in detail many items on which hearings were found to have been unnecessary when the bill arrived on your side of the Capitol. A more intelligent and satisfactory way of making a budget is to follow the procedure of having the individual bills go through the House and come properly to the Senate for the necessary hearings on the actual details of the bills, as in preceding years.

One of the notable advantages of the consolidated bill is that it permits simultaneous consideration by the committees, both of the House and of the Senate. For the first time the House Committee transmitted to the Senate printed transcriptions from time to time as the hearings proceeded. As a result Senate hearings on many sections of the bill were completed by the time the bill was messaged over. Under the old system the Senate could not begin hearings until after the bill had passed the House and had been messaged over. There is no reason why the Senate hearings should not be held within a few days after the House has completed a subject and transmitted the printed hearing instead of waiting until the entire bill has been heard and the proceedings printed in one volume.

It seems to me an unanswerable argument against the consolidated budget is the fact that under that system only one motion to recommit is permissible, while under the separated budget 8 or 9 or 10 motions to recommit are in order, and I say again that the consolidated budget is a device for the spenders, and not for the savers.

The gentleman ignores the fact that as many items of the bill may be included in the motion to recommit as may be desired. But more convincing is the fact that he has not availed himself of even the one motion to recommit when the bill was under consideration. For example, on May 10, 1950, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offered a pro forma motion to recommit and could have included the minority economy program, had there been one, if he so desired. Further, he did not even demand a vote on it. Whether there is 1 motion to recommit or 20 motions to recommit, what advantage is there if not used?

Another thing which impressed me about the consolidated budget was that separate budgets, with greater knowledge on the part of the members of the subcommittees, made it possible for us to direct the light of publicity to items which, in the package job, can be covered up. I still say that the most powerful agent we have toward economy is the light of publicity.

Again the theory does not comport with the facts. Under the consolidated bill, releases were made to the press and to the public periodically from the beginning of the hearings to the close. Under the old system, with executive hearings, neither the press nor the public had access to information on any proceedings of the committee until the entire bill had been disposed of.

I point again to the budget work in the Eightieth Congress, in which you had a part, and of which you should be proud. That Congress saved approximately $7,000,000,000. Cutting out some of the same type of savings to which I objected in reports on the current budget, we might properly call the figure $6,500,000,000. However, that is three times the amount of the saving under the current budget, even including doubtful items. In addition to the $6,500,000,000, we had several billions in rescissions, and the total reduction in the budget estimates, plus rescissions, for that Congress reached approximately $9,000,000,000. I emphasize again that we did not have a consolidated budget in the Eightieth Congress, but we did, by hard and intelligent work and efficient help, keep the expenses inside the income. We are in error in thinking that a consolidated budget per se can do the same thing. It would be very damaging to the taxpayers if we permit the fallacious idea to continue that the consolidated budget is beneficial to them. I think also, in passing, that the "performance budget" has a tendency to hide items under major subjects which could be more easily identified and reduced if they were kept separate. I think it would be pretty hard, for example, for you to prevail in an effort to cut the unnecessary personnel costs of government, in which you are interested, if that detail were to be included in a popular war item like the construction of battleships or the construction of submarines or the construction of planes. In other words, every time we give the spenders a chance to confuse the issue or to hide costs we are giving our spending opponents an advantage.

The claim that $7,000,000,000 was saved in the Eightieth Congress is without substantiation. As far as rescissions are concerned, in a previous Congress we had rescissioned over $64,000,000,000. Such huge decreases naturally follow a drop from the war budget to a peacetime budget.

So far as the performance budget is concerned, that is a matter which is adaptable to neither an individual bill nor an omnibus bill and has no part in this discussion. In other words, here is a notable example of an attempt to confuse the issue. Trafficking in the question of the performance budget could be for no other purpose than to further confuse the issue.

I think there is a psychological objection to the consolidated budget, even if it is a minor one. I felt, and I think other members of all subcommittees felt unconsciously, that it was difficult for us to make what we would call final and well-determined cuts in budget items, until we knew what the policy of the so-called super-duper committee was going to be, and what kind of cuts that committee intended to make.

There were certain agencies before our subcommittee which could well have stood additional cuts, and there were others

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

where we knew, between the Budget Bureau and our own subcommittee, they had taken all the cuts they could well stand. If the super-duper committee were to make an across-the-board cut, in addition to those the subcommittee had already made, damage would be done to some agencies, while additional cuts might have been well justified in others. The central committee finally referred our budget back to our subcommittee with the suggestion that we should go over it again and make further cuts; a general suggestion. Our chairman properly sent back word that we would be glad to do this if we could have some idea of what general cut the central committee had in mind, and what all other subcommittees were doing. We heard nothing further on the subject. There is no telling how many million dollars the consolidated budget has cost the taxpayers of the United States. I think this fact should be made known to them.

The super-duper committee named by the gentleman evidently refers to the central committee. The central committee at no time made an across-the-board cut. As a matter of fact it made no cuts of any kind. It was understood at all times that no one was authorized to cut a chapter but the subcommittee which reported it and the only action ever taken by the central committee was to recommend reductions which could be approved or rejected by the subcommittee writing the bill.

The gentleman makes the surprising statement that there were some agencies where "additional cuts might have been well justified." And still his subcommittee did not make such cuts at a time when we were running billions of dollars in the red. If the gentleman will furnish the list of these items, we will be pleased to help him in the effort to secure rescissions of these funds unless they have already been wasted because of the gentleman's delinquency in not eliminating such unnecessary expenditures. It was not the consolidated budget which "cost the taxpayers of the United States" "many millions of dollars." It was the failure of the gentleman and his subcommittee to make the necessary cuts and savings that "cost the taxpayers of the United States" these "many million dollars."

I think the idea of a coordinating committee may have some merit. It can take the separate bills and keep a running calculation of the probable total for the entire budget, without necessarily having a consolidated budget. The taxpayers can have a total figure at any time by adding up the separate totals just as easily, and more accurately, than by undertaking another package job.

It is always useless to lock the barn after the horse is stolen. The taxpayers, represented by the Tax Foundation, are for the consolidated bill. They have watched it operate.

I could cite other disadvantages of the consolidated budget, but I am afraid I have already exhausted not only the time which you have to read such a letter, but your willingness to listen patiently to my comments. I was fearful, on the basis of professional experience, when the consolidated budget was first proposed; I have seen, in the experience of the eighty-first session, that it will not work and that it is a budget benefiting only the spenders and to the disadvantage of the savers and the taxpayers. I hope that we are courageous enough, in the eighty-second session, to admit that it did not work and that we should return to separate budgets, and that we should give ourselves again, in both House and Senate, adequate statistical and analytical help, to do a thorough and worthwhile budget job.

The gentleman cannot cite other disadvantages. He has included every possible criticism, however inapplicable—none of which are of sufficient weight to have any bearing on the advantages and disadvantages of the consolidated bill. In order to stretch his letter he has been under the necessity of discussing extraneous matters most of the time. If he has "other" disadvantages we would be glad to have him cite them.

I have a feeling that practically every Republican member of the House committee feels as I have indicated in this letter, and that a majority of the Democratic members feel the same way, to the extent that I believe, if this matter comes to a vote next Monday, we will not have a consolidated budget for fiscal 1952. I might suggest, in passing, that such a majority of opinion on the part of the House committee should indicate something to the members of the Senate committee, and that perhaps before we have any more attempts to build up pressure from outside, in order to force it upon us for another year, we should get together, Senate and House, and determine whether there are any commendable features of the consolidated budget which are not presently apparent to those of us who worked most closely with it.

So far as pressure from outside is concerned, much of the antagonism to the consolidated bill has come from outside the committee. Every predatory lobbyist, every pressure group seeking to get its hands into the United States Treasury, every bureaucrat seeking to extend his empire downtown, is opposed to the consolidated bill; and if a plebiscite could be taken, every taxpayer in the United States favors a consolidated bill under which all expenditures can be grouped together and presented at one time in connection and in comparison with our total national revenues.

I think it has already struck you that some of the tax associations which are, perhaps thoughtlessly, supporting the idea of a consolidated budget, are inconsistent. In other recommendations to us they have urged separate votes upon various items, so that a record may be made, and savings encouraged. The consolidated budget is antagonistic to such votes, and is an aid to the spenders who desire, by covering up spending items, to make it difficult for this knowledge to reach the folks at home.

The gentleman would have us believe that in the consolidated budget it is not possible to take a vote on an individual item, whereas the reverse is true. There is exactly the same opportunity to take a vote on an individual item under the consolidated bill as was available under separate bills. The spenders want to cover up by hiding behind a dozen smaller bills which do not attract as much attention as one complete bill.

I think you realize that the efforts to continue this consolidated budget have already delayed the organization of the House committee several weeks and will presumably delay final action on the budget by an equivalent time.

With kindest personal regards and assurances of my appreciation for what you have already done in educating the people to Government spending, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PHILLIPS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the one weakness of our form of government is that Members of Congress are political beneficiaries of Federal largess distributed in their districts and their States. The more money we can vote out of the Treasury and into our respective bailiwicks, the more votes we may expect at the next election. The appalling increase in the cost of the Federal Government in the last few years is evidence of the imminent danger in which the Government finds itself with expenditures exceeding revenues both in peacetime and in war. We can lose by bankruptcy, as well as by invasion.

The consolidated bill offers the only effective means yet devised to remedy this serious situation. It would be a tragedy to give up the only method which has so far resulted in actual economy and go back to the separate bills under which we have piled up the menacing deficit which overhangs the Nation and which is our greatest handicap in maintaining national defense in these perilous times. We are now spending every year for interest on the public debt alone, six times the amount spent for the entire national budget under Speaker Reed. When the newspapers clamored that Congress had for the first time appropriated $1,000,000,000 Speaker Reed replied that this was a billion-dollar country. But is it a ninety-four billion country when we are going deeper in debt every year and the dollar loses purchasing power every day? As late as 1917 the total actual expenditures by the Federal Government in this century had never exceeded $760,000,000 in any one fiscal year. We are now being asked to appropriate at the rate of approximately $94,000,000,000 for 1952. We must adopt every method that promises to hold down this insidious spending psychology that is draining the life blood of the Nation. We must retain the only effective method adopted up to this time—the consolidated budget.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for 4 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

125. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605, approved June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

126. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1950, with compensation payable from the allotment contained in section 202, General Provisions, Department of Justice, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

127. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation entitled "A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers"; to the Committee on House Administration.

128. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of the annexed proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

129. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

130. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 734 (c)) and requesting reintroduction of bills similar to Senate bill 932 and House bill 1951, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure,' to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the fifteenth legislative assembly, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

134. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

135. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to rescind certain details required by law to be included in the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

136. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co., for the calendar year 1950, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

137. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Fair Plain gut and tributaries, island of St. Croix, V. I., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

138. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sacramento River and tributaries, California, with a view to additional improvement of Butte Creek and Cherokee Canal, including consideration of the advisability of reconstructing the Old Debris Dam below the now inoperative Cherokee Mine. This investigation was requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on January 24, 1939, and December 18, 1945, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

139. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $3,125,000 for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 103. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 33. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 74. Resolution to continue the authority of the Select Committee to investigate the use of chemicals in food products; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 78. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 93. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the alleged abuses in the education and training and loan guaranty programs for World War II veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2118. A bill to amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit attempts to commit the offenses therein proscribed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2119. A bill to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2120. A bill to provide a presumption of service connection for certain disabilities incurred by prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2121. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2122. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2123. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Montana for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2124. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Montana control over their tribal funds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2125. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements at Foy's Bend on the Flathead River in the vicinity of Kalispell, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2126. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which prevent effective control of food prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2127. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2128. A bill to grant income-tax exemptions with respect to compensation received for active service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2129. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2130. A bill to provide a remedy for persons slandered, libeled, or defamed by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2131. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2132. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2133. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2134. A bill to provide retroactive promotions for certain postal transportation clerks engaged in military service or service on war transfer during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. R. 2135. A bill to extend pension to widows and children of certain persons whose deaths in service in World War I or World War II were not in line of duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2136. A bill to permit secretaries, law clerks, and secretary-law clerks to Federal judges separated from the service involuntarily to acquire a classified civil-service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2137. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2138. A bill to provide that in certain cases dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied to the payment of unpaid premiums on such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2139. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2140. A bill to name the reservoir to be created by the construction of the Fort Gibson Dam on the Grand River, in the State of Oklahoma, Lake Chouteau; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2141. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2142. A bill to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in the Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2143. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2144. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2145. A bill to allow a widow or widower to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2146. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2147. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2148. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide a reclassification of the custodial service, mail equipment shops, and Division of Equipment and Supplies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2149. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a two-price plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2150. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 2151. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2152. A bill to promote the national defense and security by providing for a temporary program to aid in relieving the shortage of physicians and other health personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2153. A bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations against the forces of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2154. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2155. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2157. A bill to provide out-patient treatment for non-service-connected disabilities for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution requesting the President to answer questions relating to our foreign policy, and for the creation of a Select Joint Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the farm machinery and equipment industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 50; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 101. Resolution calling for a general roll-back of retail prices to the July 1939 level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to amend the rules of the House with request to dual services for investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2159. A bill for the relief of Ina Adams, nee de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Leonida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 2161. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Pfeiffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Uekusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2163. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ura Mae Sahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2164. A bill to authorize the appointment of Joseph E. Robison, Jr., to the permanent grade of major in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 2165. A bill for the relief of Matthew Terry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2167. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Forsmark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrico Rolandi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:
H. R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:
H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:
H. R. 2172. A bill for the relief of C. Paul Phelps; to the Committee on Armed Services.
H. R. 2173. A bill for the relief of Herbert J. Eberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 2174. A bill for the relief of Nissim Salim Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:
H. R. 2175. A bill for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:
H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:
H. R. 2177. A bill for the relief of Desiderio Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:
H. R. 2178. A bill for the relief of Lee Lai Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:
H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Ilona Agoston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H. R. 2181. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Furuya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:
H. R. 2184. A bill for the relief of Henri Suderman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

25. By Mr. PROUTY: Resolution of the Vermont General Assembly, relating to dangers of inflation and providing ways and means to prevent same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

26. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Pearl R. Reed Union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Hughesville, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation to keep alcoholic beverages out of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God of all our days and years, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, we thank Thee for this day so significant in the life of our highly esteemed and dearly beloved Speaker whom we delight to honor and upon whom we are bestowing the diadem of our heartfelt praise and affection for his many years of outstanding service and achievement.

We believe in no man's infallibility of wisdom and judgment but we rejoice with one another as we contemplate the glorious privilege of walking and working with one of our fellow citizens whose integrity of character, lofty idealism, devotion to duty, and humility of spirit inspire us with confidence and courage as we also seek to serve our God, our country, and all mankind.

Grant that his own heart may be filled with joy and peace as he continues to accept the challenge of tasks which demand the consecration of his noblest manhood. We pray that at the close of each day he may receive the benediction which Thou dost give unto the faithful.

In the midst of our rejoicing we would pause to pay tribute to the Christian life and character of one of our associates whose spirit Thou hast called from among us to dwell with Thee in heavenly blessedness. Grant unto the members of his bereaved family the consolation of Thy grace.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise for the joys which cheer us and the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 15. An act to amend section 215 of the United States Code;

S. 27. An act to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 44. An act for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri;

S. 45. An act for the relief of Alfred E. Bosche;

S. 46. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet;

S. 48. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi;

S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen;

S. 52. An act for the relief of Delfo Giorgi;

S. 53. An act for the relief of Vittorio Quilici;

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 56. An act for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu;

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 58. An act for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow;

S. 59. An act for the relief of Vernon Crudge;

S. 62. An act for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans;

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

THE LATE JOHN B. SULLIVAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of our colleague and friend, JOHN SULLIVAN.

Last evening in his apartment, working after dinner as was his custom on his official correspondence—while he was in the act of designating a young man of his constituency to the United States Military Academy at West Point, suddenly, without premonition, his tired brain ceased to function. He was rushed to the naval hospital at Bethesda where he died a few minutes after his arrival.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that he died as he would have wished to die—in the harness—on the job—serving his people and his country.

It is perhaps an explanation of his unexpected and untimely death, in the prime of life, at the height of his power, the zenith of his accomplishments, that he had always worked tirelessly, indefatigably; that he did not spare himself; that he threw himself wholeheartedly and unreservedly, with all of his extraordinary powers, into every task committed to him—in the promotion of every enterprise entrusted to his care. He gave of himself and his resources so prodigally that in the noonday of life, the sun has gone down, ere it is yet night.

His death deprives his State and the Nation of the services of a man who has long been intimately associated and always earnestly active in the political, the commercial, the social, and the fraternal life of St. Louis and Washington.

In addition to every phase of national legislation, and the field of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in particular, of which he was an outstanding member, he was deeply interested in and he had achieved notable progress toward congressional recognition of the development of the Jefferson Memorial on the river front at St. Louis. Although the war had interfered, he had already secured assurances which bid fair to lead ultimately to the adoption of that great development.

He was wholeheartedly concerned and vigilantly cooperative in the alleviation of the slum districts which are indigenous to every city, and to which St. Louis is no exception. And he never failed at any opportunity to work here on the floor and in the committees and in local and national civic organizations and associations in the development of those blighted areas, especially in his efforts to make available appropriate housing at low cost for the workers of his city.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

He was, of course, interested in the war and its effect upon his city and his constituency. His heart was always with those young men who would be called upon at a time in life when they had so much to live for, and his decline in health coincided with the opening of that unhappy struggle. He cooperated and coordinated in every way to meet the needs of the Nation and at the same time preserve as nearly as possible an adjustable status for those men who were approaching the required grades of military service.

JOHN SULLIVAN was one of the most lovable of men. He was a friend, he was a companion, a counselor who will be sadly missed by those privileged to be intimately associated with him. A man of capacity and ability, a successful lawyer, a member of the bar associations of his city, his State, and the Nation, he was a successful businessman, an ornament to his community, an asset to his country.

In that historic conversation which has come down to us from Holy Writ, in the conference between Job and his three intimate friends, they raised the supreme question, "If a man die would he live again?" JOHN SULLIVAN had no doubt, no misgivings, about the answer to that question. He was a man of deep faith. He was a faithful and a devout communicant of his church. He was a member of the Catholic Lawyers Guild, the Holy Name Society, the Layman's Retreat League, and never failed when called upon for any religious duty.

Our hearts go out to his devoted wife. She was his constant companion at home and in business. He told me on one occasion that he never made a political campaign or went out into his district on any business connected with his congressional duties, but that she accompanied him; that he considered his success in politics and in business as largely fostered and supplemented by her intelligent and devoted service.

Mr. Speaker, Missouri has lost a noble son, the Nation a wise and able legislator, and here on the floor we have lost a loyal comrade and a valued friend.

Peace to his ashes.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for the present consideration of all but the last paragraph.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and grieved over the death of my close personal friend, JOHN B. SULLIVAN. I join with my colleagues in mourning his passing. We shall miss him very much.

St. Louis has lost a real friend. Missouri has lost a true son. The Nation has lost a leader who placed service to his country above everything else.

It has been written that no greater love hath a man than to lay down his life for another. JOHN SULLIVAN had that love and that devotion to the people of his district. I met JOHN SULLIVAN when he came to Washington over 10 years ago. He was one of the most conscientious men I have ever known. Through the years, thousands have gone to him with their problems and his help was always generously given, sometimes at the expense of his own health. His legislative service here was marked with meticulous attention to details and fine points. Even his attendance record has no marks of absence and I have on many occasions seen him disregard the advice of physicians by hurrying over to the floor to answer a relatively unimportant quorum call.

Last fall, JOHN SULLIVAN suffered a severe illness but despite this his great devotion to his work led him on. JOHN SULLIVAN's life was dedicated to his country and it is with heavy hearts we must accept the fact that his services are needed in a higher legislative assembly than ours.

It has also been written, Mr. Speaker, that behind the success of every great man is a woman. JOHN SULLIVAN was no exception to this rule. To his good wife, Lee, I give my deepest and heartfelt sympathy. May God sustain her and the members of his family in this, their greatest hour of sorrow.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in simple but telling tribute to the great gentleman from Missouri who has passed on that long trail taken before by other colleagues who, as Members of the House, have literally given their lives in the service of this country. The friendliness of the gentleman from Missouri was outstanding. He was the first person to cross the aisle and clasp my hand when I was seated on January 3. He has in all instances aided his wife in her greatest and in her least efforts; and as former president of the Congressional Club, I would offer her the deep appreciation of the club for all her husband did, and our most profound sympathy. For her comfort I would have her know my faith and my conviction that not even death can take from her the love and strength that has been poured into her life. I would have her carry perpetual pride from the knowledge that he left in the full vigor of his strength, at the height of his service, surrounded by the affection of his colleagues, and bearing with him the favor, affection, and respect which a grateful country gives to those who have served her well.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I come here today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend and your friend, JOHN SULLIVAN.

It had been my pleasure to know JOHN SULLIVAN over a long period of years, many years before I came to this House. I knew him in his service in the city of St. Louis. I knew of the untiring efforts that he had put forth for that city and for the people he represented in that city.

As a representative from his district in St. Louis he was truly devoted to his people in his efforts to carry forward legislation which would benefit those whom he was representing.

I was impressed with the fact that JOHN SULLIVAN was extremely proud of his attendance in the House of Representatives. As my colleague [Mr. KARSTEN] has said, he had a record during the Eighty-first Congress of having never missed a roll call. He was proud of that record. I know that JOHN SULLIVAN was devoted and loyal—loyal not only to his friends, but he was a loyal party man. In our Missouri delegation he felt that we should all stand together at all times, regardless. I appreciate that in a man, and I appreciated it in JOHN SULLIVAN. I appreciated the fact that he felt the helpfulness that was afforded him by his wife, who was with him at all times, in the home, in the office, and in his business. I join in extending my heartfelt sympathy to her in her extreme loss, because in the death of JOHN SULLIVAN we have lost not only one of the outstanding citizens of his district, an able representative from the State of Missouri, a man of great ability here in this House, but a husband and friend whose memory will long be cherished by those who knew him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked last night when the radio reported the shocking news of the sudden death of our colleague from Missouri, Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN.

We had not met until the start of the Eighty-first Congress, but I had known of his distinguished service in this House in two previous terms. Like so many of those here, he represented a city district made up of various types of citizenry, men and women of divergent interests, of different political and social philosophies. In the Eleventh District of St. Louis there are many Catholics, many Jews, many Protestants. Perhaps a third or more of the population is colored. In its confines is a great industrial area. There may be found the ultra rich and the ultra poor—men of wealth and distinction; and lowly men, unknown and unsung.

It is not an easy task to represent such a district. The mail is voluminous. The departmental work is stupendous. The pressure groups are well organized. It is a tribute to our deceased colleague that he was elected four times of the six

that he ran for Congress. In the last election, even though the political tide was against his party, he won by a majority of more than 26,000 votes.

In the Eighty-first Congress, JOHN SULLIVAN cast his vote on every issue that came before the House. He missed no roll calls. He was a faithful attendant at meetings of his committee. He answered his mail promptly and advised his constituents honestly of his stand on the issues.

Early in this Congress, JOHN SULLIVAN expressed to me a concern about his health. He had lost much weight. The usual sparkle was missing from his eyes, and his countenance bore a worried and pained expression. He told me that he expected to go to the Naval Hospital for a physical examination. Then he added: "I am just waiting and trying to figure out a time when I can go and not miss any business of the House." That was so characteristic of John. Duty, he placed first. His own well-being was secondary.

JOHN B. SULLIVAN was a party man, because he believed in the principles of that party; but he was not partisan in a mean way. He conceded to every man the right to believe according to the best dictates of his own conscience. He was strong in his religious faith, but again he respected the opinions and religious beliefs of others. He was kindly and soft-spoken, never prone to criticize or find fault. He was sympathetic and understanding. His heart went out to the underprivileged. He supported labor because he believed that the hand that feeds and clothes the world is the hand of toil. Although he lived in a great city, he was cognizant of the hopes and aspirations and the needs of our farm people. On major farm legislation, he voted with those of us from the rural areas.

If he made mistakes, they were of the mind and not the heart. Truly a man has passed from our midst. We shall miss his quiet and friendly counsel. The downtrodden and unfortunate of his district have lost a champion. His wife has lost a loving, true, and devoted husband. We have all lost a friend.

In a funeral oration of long ago, it was stated: "The evil that men do lives after them. The good is oft interred with their bones." Of course, we know that Anthony was trying to establish a case against Brutus, and perhaps even then there was little truth in those words. Certainly in this enlightened age, we know that such is not true. We do know that the good deeds of our departed colleague will live long after him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in these expressions of sympathy and tribute to our late colleague, JOHN B. SULLIVAN, of Missouri.

I knew him very well. He was a distinguished attorney in St. Louis for many years. He devoted many years of his life to the administration of affairs in the city of St. Louis as associate city counselor and also as secretary to the mayor of St. Louis. From there he went on to represent that great city here in the Halls of Congress and he performed splendidly.

St. Louis has lost a great friend, Missouri has lost a distinguished son, and the Nation has lost a very able public servant. .

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, one by one the Members of the House of Representatives pass on. Last night when I heard over the newscast that the House of Representatives had lost another Member, my good friend and colleague, JOHN SULLIVAN, I was very much shocked and grieved.

In the two short years I knew JOHN SULLIVAN I always found him very considerate, a fine American, a real family man and a very religious individual. I join with my colleagues in extending to his very lovable wife my sincere regrets at his passing.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, when one first hears of the death of a friend, the information comes always as a shock. I learned of the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, JOHN SULLIVAN, when his death was announced on the radio this morning at 7 o'clock.

Congressman SULLIVAN, or John, as his many friends called him, was one of the friendly and helpful Members I met when I first came to Congress. John had served one term previous to that time. His willingness and readiness to share his experience with a new Member was a bright spot in my beginning days here on the Hill.

John was an excellent example for a new Member. He quietly assumed the responsibilities of membership in the United States House of Representatives. The careful attention, effort, and thought which he gave to all matters coming before the House during his years of service has produced a record of which any Member could well be proud.

JOHN B. SULLIVAN was sincere, capable, and industrious. A long and enviable record of perfect attendance is one of many evidences of this fact. During his more than 6 years in the House he has missed very few roll calls. He answered every roll call of the Eighty-first Congress, thus being one of the few Members with a perfect attendance record.

In his untimely passing, the House has lost a valuable Member. The Nation has lost a loyal citizen. His home State has lost a capable public servant. His family has lost a devoted brother, son, and husband. I extend my deepest sympathy to the family in their bereavement and irreparable loss.

To me, his going leaves a deep sense of personal loss for I have lost an appreciated friend.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a terrible shock that I learned at the breakfast table this morning of the passing of my good friend, JOHN SULLIVAN. We were long acquainted and intimately associated in our committee work. JOHN SULLIVAN was first wholeheartedly devoted to his duties, he was a loyal friend and loyal to principles, which is, of course, still more important. JOHN SULLIVAN was the kind of man who illustrated the great truth expressed by Edwin Markham in his poem which reads as follows:

There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
None goes his way alone.
All that we send into the life of others
Comes back into our own.

I am sure, therefore, that the thought that went from JOHN SULLIVAN to his brothers throughout the earth will be more than repaid in full measure to John, his delightful wife, and those close to him. JOHN SULLIVAN was one who thought very much of his friends and was concerned about their welfare. One of the last things he did in his life before he went home last fall was to warn me and urge me to be careful of my own health, about which he was worried. He was the one that should have been worrying about himself. JOHN SULLIVAN was a man among men, as I say, a truly loyal friend. I extend my most sincere sympathy to his devoted wife and to his friends and relatives.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to add my words of tribute to our late friend and Congressman, JOHN SULLIVAN. While I did not know him as intimately as did my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or my colleague, Mr. CURTIS, of St. Louis, I did have many contacts with him when I, as a member of the General Assembly of Missouri, met frequently with him, with the mayor, the city officials and leading citizens of St. Louis, as they appeared on behalf of the interests of their city. I knew him then and have known him since as an able, conscientious public servant. As has so ably been said by the dean of the Missouri delegation, Mr. CANNON, his friends knew him as a lovable man. His city and the State of Missouri have lost a capable official and a good friend. He will be missed, and we mourn his loss.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER].

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected death of JOHN SULLIVAN was a shock and great loss to his host of friends and the State of Missouri. He served his congressional district, State, and Nation capably, honorably and with great distinction. He was devoted to the problems of the men and women who worked hard for a living. In Congress he was in the forefront at all times to represent and defend the interests of the people. He was a kind and devoted husband and although words cannot ease the grief now suffered by Mrs. Sullivan, I join with my colleagues and his many loyal friends in extending to her our deepest sympathy and understanding of her great loss and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

bereavement, and our sympathy is extended with deepest sincerity. JOHN SULLIVAN will forever remain in our temple of memories as an exemplary example of character and true friendship.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, JOHN SULLIVAN'S death was to me a very deep personal shock. My colleagues have well described his deeds. It seems to me well to think briefly of the reason for his deeds. JOHN SULLIVAN was a man of deep and strong spiritual belief; a man whose every act and every thought was governed by his faith. JOHN SULLIVAN was a humble, kindly, Christian gentleman; a man whose loss I feel deeply and very personally, because he was more to me as a help and as a guide in my first year in this Congress than any person living. I have come to know his wife, Lee Sullivan, and respect her for the same reasons I respect him. To her I give my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in our work here, particularly in these difficult and trying days, there is nothing more satisfying to any of us than the spirit of friendship and fraternity which prevails among the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. While we are harassed and worried, the consideration of all our colleagues gives us courage, makes us steadfast, and gives us a will to carry on.

I know of no man in this body who more beautifully typified that feeling toward all of his colleagues than did my friend, JOHN SULLIVAN. JOHN SULLIVAN was gentle. He was considerate. He was lovable. Yet he was aggressive and forthright in behalf of his friends, in behalf of his constituency, and in love of his country.

I came to the House on the same day JOHN SULLIVAN came here. I went out with him, and I came back with him. I shall miss him tremendously. The Nation has lost a great citizen, and his wife has lost a loving husband and a fine gentleman. May God bless and keep him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for one who has lost a good friend to control those tender emotions that well up and overflow from the sympathetic heart when death has caused real friends to be separated if even only temporarily. It is hard for me, Mr. Speaker, under such circumstances to find the right words to express eloquently enough the grief that is being felt by myself along with the thousands of Congressman JOHN SULLIVAN'S friends who are now mourning his sudden and untimely passing. Surely it can only bring to us a fuller knowledge and a deeper appreciation and understanding of the meaning of service. Yes, his life of unselfish service to his fellowmen should inspire those of us in this great body, the United States House of Representatives, to rededicate our lives to worthy causes that he gave so much of his life to, so that men, women, and children here in our own wonderful country might enjoy through our efforts, a freer, finer, and a happier way of life, as well as helping to bring about a more tolerable life for those elsewhere in this troubled world who have not been so fortunate as our citizenry. He would have us carry on his efforts to alleviate their sufferings and miseries, helping them to gain their freedom from the curses of ignorance, slavery, and domination by godless dictators. Yes, Mr. Speaker, all this he gave of his physical strength, beyond the safety limits, never once heeding a stop sign, thereby taxing his heart, mind, and soul with the critical and terrifying problems of the war years and those that have followed. His efforts to help save those still partially free peoples whose lives have not yet been captured by the unconscionable creatures who would push them over the brink in the abyss of everlasting hopelessness, will be recorded and remembered long, long after we, like our friend, have made our worldly demise.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN SULLIVAN was a man of sterling character and unquestionable ability, whose great faith in his Maker and his Lord never let him swerve away from his high ideals nor waver from his noble purposes. Nor could he, Mr. Speaker, be frightened away from these ideals and purposes by those who might attack him maliciously because of their interest only in special privileges or personal power. He truly was a great representative of all the people. The Christian ideals were born a long time ago, but JOHN SULLIVAN had been quietly practicing them, restating them in modern language and, as I have said previously, he was daily translating them into action in a modern world. We cannot here today too loudly praise this strong and good man for his untiring efforts to bring justice to all, actually making of it a reality wherever possible. Does not such a life reaffirm the dignity of human life along with the positive insistence that no longer shall human life be debased by foreign despots with ideologies contrary to the basic freedoms that our forefathers established and that have always been protected by our fighting men? He believed, as you and I, that no further encroachment upon the liberties of any free people anywhere can be tolerated without further endangering our own way of life. These freedoms and liberties are more necessary to us than the food we eat and more precious than life itself. And that, Mr. Speaker, is how I believe JOHN SULLIVAN felt and lived. True, perhaps, that no statue of him may be raised as was at Bolivar, Mo., in 1948 in the memory and honor of Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator. Nevertheless, millions of people should be grateful to him for the good and useful work he has performed in their behalf in the greatest legislative body in the world. And in closing, Mr. Speaker, may I extend to his fine and lovely wife, who we know was his true companion and helpmate in all of his work and deliberations, the deepest sympathy in this hour of need for spiritual comfort. To their relatives a kindly word of sympathy as well. In a humble way I have tried to make an expression of my mental appraisal of a man's life that has been truly noble and deserves all of the praise and tributes that have been given here today by his many friends and colleagues. Not only was JOHN SULLIVAN kind in every act and helpful in so many ways to the new Members of Congress, but this same pattern of life was followed so graciously by his wife in the consideration of the many new and unusual problems that face the wives of the new Members when they are transplanted from their old homes to new ones here in the Nation's Capital, far from their families, relatives, and neighbors. So it is with deep feeling, Mr. Speaker, that I speak so intimately and personally of the lives of these friends. One has departed for a better life. The other has been left to carry on with the great courage that I know she possesses.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it was with a most profound feeling of sorrow and grief that I learned early this morning of the death of JOHN SULLIVAN. He was one of my very dear friends. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] referred a moment ago to those bonds of fellowship and friendship which unite us in the House of Representatives. I think those bonds are particularly strong among Members who serve together on a committee of the House. For several years it has been my pleasure to sit very close to JOHN SULLIVAN on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During that period I learned to know a great many things about him, most of which have been said already by Members of the House from his own State and other States.

Mr. Speaker, no mound of earth can still the voice of JOHN SULLIVAN. I will continue to hear it and to feel the compulsion of his presence on that committee as we deliberate and consider legislation. He was extremely loyal to the work of his committee, as he was to the House of Representatives. It has already been made a matter of record that he had not missed a roll call during the Eighty-first Congress. He was on time always for a hearing of the committee, and whether the committee was in full session considering a bill reported by his own subcommittee, or some other subcommittee, he gave very, very close attention and a great deal of help. Sometimes it is the very small things about a person which endear us to that individual. A year or two ago JOHN SULLIVAN heard me remark in a conversation one day that in my boyhood I tried to have all of my friends and family call me Jim, and from that time on he never addressed me by any other name than Jim. It was something he wanted to do that he thought a friend would appreciate, and he did it from day to day, never failing.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the Members here in expressing our very sincere sympathy to his wife who was such a helpful companion in all the work that he did. Words are rather weak and futile

on an occasion of this sort. In such an hour I like to think of the comfort of those words from one of our great hymns:

Abide with me, fast falls the eventide,
The darkness deepens, Lord with me abide.
When other helpers fail and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, Lord, abide with me.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I was deeply touched when I heard last night of the death of our dear beloved colleague, JOHN SULLIVAN. Quiet and unassuming, a man of tolerance and understanding, his dignity and strength of character impressed him upon all of us. He was an outstanding Member of the House. Not so much by words, but through actions and deeds our late friend, JOHN SULLIVAN, has made his contributions in this body to the best interests of our country, and has left his imprint on the legislative pages of our history. Reference has been made to his deep faith. He exemplified that faith every moment of his life. He was an inspiration to all of us who knew him and who knew of the deep faith of which he was possessed and who knew his fine understanding of his fellow men.

Reference has been made to the few roll calls that he missed, and that he did not miss any roll calls in the Eighty-first Congress. I am satisfied that, while I am not the Great Judge, I have a feeling of confidence that by the noble life he led, when he answers to the final roll call he will be judged "right." The journey through life is only a means to an end, to eternal life in the hereafter with God Himself. If ever a man has taken the journey of life in a manner that he, in the minds of his fellow men will be judged right, in my opinion it is JOHN SULLIVAN.

To his wife who has been an inspiration to him during his life I extend my profound sympathy. To my colleagues from Missouri, the Missouri delegation which has sustained this loss, I also extend my sympathy, and to the people of the district that JOHN SULLIVAN so ably represented. I have lost a personal friend whose memory will always remain with me.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with the sudden and untimely passing of JOHN SULLIVAN, we are reminded again of the uncertainty of life. We know not the day or the hour.

I, like you, was shocked to learn that our beloved friend, JOHN SULLIVAN, had suddenly passed away last night. I, too, came to the Congress at the same time with JOHN SULLIVAN, the Seventy-seventh Congress, following the election in 1940. We had a very close relationship. We became warm, personal friends. During the latter part of that Congress JOHN SULLIVAN became a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, he did not return for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], and myself went on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where we have served ever since. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SULLIVAN] came back to the Congress in the Seventy-ninth Congress. His heart, his interest, and his work were in that great committee, and he again asked that he be permitted to come back on the committee with us. He did return to the committee. During the remainder of the time he served in the Congress he has been an active, forceful member of our committee. Consequently, I had occasion to observe his work and to know something about his loyalty to his work. I have observed his loyalty to the people he represented in his own district. JOHN SULLIVAN had very definite views. He did not hesitate to express himself or let it be known that he felt it deeply and keenly. I have seen him in committee work, subcommittee as well as full committee activities, express his own mind which you will observe from the record he made in Congress was consistent at all times. The members of our committee admired and respected him for it.

I have been on trips on work of the committee with JOHN SULLIVAN and have had occasion to know something about him personally. There is no man with whom I have had the occasion of being associated that I learned to admire and respect more than JOHN SULLIVAN. He was friendly, he was considerate, he respected the views of other men; he showed himself to be not only a very able Representative in the Congress, not only to be loyal to those things in which he believed, but also to be a real American. I was glad mention was made of his appreciation for spiritual values. Not once, but on numerous occasions when we have been together I have observed that at the appropriate time he would arise, and go to mass. He never hesitated or failed to express by his own actions just how much he did appreciate the spiritual side of life.

I join with my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathy to the people of his district, to the fine delegation in Congress from the State of Missouri; and, above all, to his lovely and devoted wife, in their bereavement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN SULLIVAN was a good and great soul.

He was a man of great ability, unsurpassed courage, and unquestioned patriotism.

To his loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I have learned of the passing away of our dear friend and colleague, JOHN B. SULLIVAN, of Missouri.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to be associated with him in the work of this House and particularly in the work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The association with him in the work of this great committee gave abundant opportunity to know the sterling qualities that he possessed. He was a man of strong character. He had the courage of his convictions. He was forceful in the presentation of his viewpoints. Aside from his ability, which was always outstanding, he possessed a lovable disposition. He was always kind and considerate toward everyone. Never have I heard him speak harshly nor unkindly. He had respect for the sincerity of those having differing opinions from his own. He claimed the respect of all who knew him because of his own sincerity. He has truly been conscientious in all that he has said and done. He has been faithful in the performance of all his duties as a Member of Congress. His passing from our midst brings a feeling that the country and the congressional district that he has so faithfully served has each suffered a great loss. His memory will linger long and pleasantly with all who knew him.

I trust that the high regard in which he was held by a host of friends will be a source of satisfaction and strength to the loved ones who mourn his passing and that the knowledge of the faith he possessed will sustain them in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there are some people who, because of the winsomeness of their personality and the strength of their character, win immediate admittance to one's confidence and inner circle of associates. Such a person was our late colleague and friend the Honorable JOHN BERCHMANS SULLIVAN.

I had the opportunity of knowing him only 2 years, but, yet in this short time, I came to look for him on the floor of the House each morning as I always look for those with whom I have become well acquainted and in whom I have reposed great admiration and respect. Maybe it was because of his apparent ill health that I invariably singled him out as among the first to find out how he was feeling on that particular day. In any event, I felt personally privileged in being able to wish him well on each daily meeting with him. I appreciated his friendly interest in me and his willingness always to take at least a brief part of his day to let me know that he recognized my presence.

The world—and, for that matter, the Congress too—has all too few persons with the kindly, human personality of our late colleague. I am advised by those who knew him better than I that his ability in his chosen profession and his services as a public official are as outstanding as was his charming personality itself. These attributes, together with his nobleness of character, his sincerity of purpose, and his acknowledgment of the lordship of his Master, made him one of our finest and best citizens and legislators.

As we miss all good friends, so shall I, together with his host of other friends,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

miss him. To his loved ones, I extend my most sincere sympathy in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Missouri in their expressions of sorrow and in their tribute to a fine friend whose presence we will miss. As one of the four Congressmen from the St. Louis area it was my pleasure to work closely with JOHN SULLIVAN during the Seventy-ninth Congress, again in the Eighty-first Congress and along with other colleagues from his home city I was looking forward to carrying on the same association through the present Congress.

I have known JOHN SULLIVAN for many years. I first became acquainted with him when he came to Washington as a Member of Congress in 1940. I was a secretary on Capitol Hill at that time, but JOHN SULLIVAN was as considerate of me in that capacity as he would have been had I then enjoyed the status of a Member. It was his nature to be friendly and helpful to everyone.

Later on I became closely associated with him in work. Being from adjoining cities we had many of the same problems. He was always a source of help in any emergency and I valued his willingness and his ability to step in and provide the solution for many problems.

JOHN SULLIVAN was a deeply religious man. He had abundant faith in his country and in his fellow man. He was earnest and sincere in everything he undertook. His district has lost a good and faithful servant.

I join every Member of this House in extending most sincere condolences to his wife, who has been so helpful to him in his career.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have known JOHN SULLIVAN for more than 2 years and served on the same committee with him. I like to think that I was with him on two of the happiest occasions of his life. One was when our committee was sent to Europe. We visited Dublin and the President of Ireland, John A. Costello, and the Prime Minister Sean MacBride entertained our committee at a banquet. They agreed that only those members with Irish names such as Sullivan, Linehan, O'Hara, and McGuire could deliver any speeches. I wish I could have a recording of JOHN SULLIVAN's talk. The title of it was "How Proud I Am To Return to Where I Have Never Been." He really was happy to be in the land of his ancestors.

The other occasion at which John was in the very empyrean was in Rome when we met Pope Pius XII and we all received the papal blessing. John was a Catholic gentleman. Nothing finer had ever happened to him. I remember when the Pope asked John where he came from and in a resonant voice John said, "St. Louis" and the Pope said, "Oh, you come from the President's home State."

Then too, I recall going to St. Louis with the committee and John arranged a reception for us. John surely was proud to represent St. Louis, and we found that the feeling was mutual. The people of St. Louis loved JOHN SULLIVAN.

Others have told of John's excellent record in Congress. Most important of all, John lived a good life.

I shall always cherish his memory.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are very sad to learn of the untimely passing of our beloved colleague, Hon. JOHN SULLIVAN.

One of the ways Members really get to know each other well is through the work they do on committees. Mr. SULLIVAN was a great favorite among the members of our committee. He was deeply appreciated by each of us, because of his fairness, his thoroughness, and the valuable contributions he made to each of the subjects we considered during the time he was on our committee. No one could question his motives. No one could ever doubt his sincerity.

John often mentioned to me the fact that a number of his relatives had worked on railroads. He was a true friend to the workingman. The welfare of those who toil he kept in mind at all times. Indeed, the district JOHN SULLIVAN represented was very fortunate to be represented by him. He was true to the people he represented. His district and his great city of St. Louis as well as Missouri will miss his competency and his untiring and successful efforts.

As one enters the State capitol in North Carolina, as I recall, he sees the words "To be rather than to seem." I know of no man these words are more applicable to than to John. He was modest, gentle, and genuine. He was completely without pretense. He acted no borrowed parts.

We all extend to his wife, to whom he was truly devoted, to the rest of his family and friends our deepest sympathy in his passing.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the untimely and unexpected passing last night of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SULLIVAN, I have sustained a real personal loss. JOHN B. SULLIVAN and I have been close friends since the convening of the Seventy-ninth Congress. He was an able, patriotic gentleman, always a credit to his constituency, to the State of Missouri, and to the people of this Nation. I have always found him kindly, tolerant, and intensely devoted to his duties as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of this House of Representatives. To his devoted wife and loved ones, I express my deepest sympathy upon their loss.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been deeply shocked and saddened by the sudden death this last evening of our colleague, JOHN B. SULLIVAN.

My service in the House commenced with him in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and it was my privilege to have served with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It is in committee work that the true worth and value of a Member is often best evaluated. Such experience, and the association which one has in the investigation trips of the committee, affords one the opportunity to know something of the spiritual and mental makeup of our colleagues. In the case of JOHN SULLIVAN, it gave me the opportunity of visiting in his home city of St. Louis, where I learned the affection, esteem, and respect in which he was held.

A year ago last September we were also together on an extensive investigation trip to Europe, involving phases of our committee work. I recall that on our trip we stopped in Dublin, Ireland, and I remember the pleasure of our colleague in being in Dublin and of the speech he made at the dinner given in honor of the committee by officials of that country. His remarks were expressive of an American of Irish descent when he said: "I have returned to whence I have never been."

JOHN SULLIVAN had an excellent legal education. He had many years of active practice, and his training and experience were of great benefit to his constituents and to his colleagues, both in committee and in the House.

He was active, as a World War I veteran, in the American Legion, as well as in the civic, fraternal, and political life of his community.

He was also a devout Roman Catholic and an active member of various lay organizations of his church. He practiced the principles of his religion in his everyday life, and no one could help but be impressed by his conduct and his speech, for his actions were that of a distinguished Christian gentleman.

My sympathies go to his charming and devoted wife, and to the members of his family. To them, and to his colleagues who have served with him, I wish to say that it is a comfort to have had life made richer by knowing and having been associated with JOHN SULLIVAN.

May his soul rest in eternal peace.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I drove up to the Capitol this morning the flags were flying at half staff. JOHN SULLIVAN, of Missouri, although in the prime of life, had left these Halls. No more were we to enjoy his association, his kindly smile, his friendly greeting. I felt as I gazed upon those flags that here was an exemplification of the loss of a friend. Not only was there a personal loss to me but to the district and State he served, and the Nation.

I did not know JOHN SULLIVAN well during the first few years he served here. It was only last year that I was with him to any great extent. In recent months we had on many occasions discussed matters of mutual concern. I always found him to be trustworthy and sincere. He was zealous in the interest of those he served.

JOHN SULLIVAN was blessed by having a charming, gracious, and devoted helpmate. She worked tirelessly as a member of his office staff. Her fine personality was a real asset. Both JOHN SULLIVAN and Leonor Sullivan loved people. They were happiest when together in the company of friends. My heart goes out to her as she continues down life's journey without the helpful counsel and companionship of our beloved colleague.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints on the part of the House to attend the funeral the following Members: Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHORT, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. IRVING, Mr. MAGEE, Mr. MOULDER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

140. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 22, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of channel from Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

141. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

142. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1950, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

143. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Army relative to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the calendar year 1950, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2185. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2186. A bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2187. A bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2188. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2189. A bill to provide that members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States shall be automatically eligible to practice before certain courts and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2190. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2191. A bill to grant certain interests in mineral rights, including oil and gas rights, to persons who have acquired or hereafter acquire land pursuant to homestead entry; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2192. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2193. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2194. A bill to provide for the determination of "peril points" with respect to foreign trade agreements, for the taking of action to incorporate an "escape clause" in existing and future foreign trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2195. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in Michigan to the State of Michigan for use in National Guard, Air National Guard, and other military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2196. A bill to improve our chances of victory by stimulating initiative, encouraging leadership, and rewarding merit among persons in all ranks of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2197. A bill to prevent seizure of property owned by a person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2198. A bill to provide a central recreation and service center for Armed Services personnel in Washington, D. C., for the duration of the national emergency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2199. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (Public Law 439), entitled the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2200. A bill to amend section 174.1, chapter I, title 8, of the Code of Federal Regulations, relating to control pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 of persons entering the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2201. A bill to amend and clarify the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (c. 166, 56 Stat. 143), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2202. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1951, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Res. 105. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 106. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2203. A bill for the relief of Harold Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2204. A bill for the relief of Lamar Calloway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2206. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT (by request):

H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 2209. A bill for the relief of Phil (Triantaphyllos) P. Petrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Hye Pah Kung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2212. A bill to provide for the adjudication of certain tort claims of William

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

P. Novotny, Sr., and others against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Sara Salcer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Leonidas Camarinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Antonino Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2217. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Gatti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Speed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2219. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Hankel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAUGHN:

H. R. 2220. A bill for the relief of Adams Freimanis and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2221. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Manhal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2222. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

27. By Mr. HOLMES: Resolution of the House of Representatives, State of Washington, supporting resolution to be submitted to United Nations branding Communist China as an aggressor in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

28. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha Association of Insurance Agents, affirming faith in the American voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally opposing any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned, socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Reverend Leonard H. Flisher, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Wallingford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, who art the ruler of all mankind, we commend to Thee all who are engaged in the government of this Nation. Let us not forget that this place and power have come from Thee, and that we have a sacred trust to administer in Thy name. We humbly pray that they may be used by Thee to enact such legislation as will promote the welfare of Thy people, the relief of the oppressed, the help for the poor, the correction of social wrongs. Save us from pride and arrogance that we may see Thy purposes clearly and follow Thy will without fear. We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Aandahl	Forand	Nelson
Abbitt	Fulton	O'Konski
Addonizio	Furcolo	O'Neill
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Ostertag
Angell	Gordon	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Grant	Poage
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	Powell
Berry	Leonard W.	Prouty
Breen	Hart	Redden
Buckley	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Budge	Heffernan	Rees, Kans.
Burton	Heller	Rodino
Busbey	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Case	Hinshaw	Rooney
Celler	Hunter	Scott, Hardie
Chelf	Kee	Shafer
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Cole, Kans.	Kennedy	Sikes
Cooley	Kersten, Wis.	Staggers
Coudert	Lane	Stanley
Dawson	Lucas	Stigler
Dempsey	McConnell	Stockman
Dingell	McDonough	Taylor
Donohue	McGrath	Velde
Donovan	Marshall	Vursell
Durham	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Eberharter	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
Elliott	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Morrison	Wolcott
Feighan	Murphy	Woodruff
Flood	Murray, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to kindly take the chair at this time.

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts assumed the chair.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 108) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the felicitations of the House of Representatives are hereby cordially extended to its distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has served in the high office of Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other individual in American history.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby acclaims the manner in which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has steadfastly maintained and added new luster to the high traditions of the great office of Speaker of the House, and has consistently employed his great abilities, his rare parliamentary skill, and his fairness and integrity in the service of this House and his country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for any man to be elected to the House of Representatives by the people of his district is in itself a great honor.

To be elevated by the Members of the House to the Speakership is an outstanding honor, which has been conferred upon only 44 men from the beginnings of this legislative body in 1789.

But to be retained and to serve in that post longer than any other person since the organization of the Congress under our Constitution is the unique and distinctive position which our Speaker attained yesterday.

Such an occasion, which makes this a significant date in the history of the House of Representatives and of our country, cannot be permitted to pass without note. I know that the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the gentleman from Texas, from an innate sense of modesty and his usual dislike for personal glorification, would rather let it pass unobserved. But this is one matter on which the Chair must be overruled by the unanimous desire of the Members.

For he has achieved a record unsurpassed—one to be set down in the annals of our Nation, for the knowledge of all posterity.

And this becomes all the more worthy of special recognition when we realize that the Congress of the United States stands today as one of the few remaining forums for expression of the will of a free people through their democratically elected Representatives.

Until yesterday the record of service as Speaker was held by that distinguished patriot, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, who occupied the office at intervals of the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Eighteenth Congresses, between November 4, 1811, and March 4, 1825. The actual number of days served in the office by Speaker Clay were 3,056½.

The gentleman from Texas, whom we honor, first became Speaker on September 16, 1940, at the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, succeeding the late William B. Bankhead, and was reelected to the office in every Congress since with the exception of the Eightieth. On Monday he tied Mr. Clay's record. As we convene today, his days in office number 3,058, surpassing that record.

It is always the fond habit of historians to speak of the "giants" of an earlier day; "giants," that is, in a political sense. The names of Clay, of Thomas B. Reed of Maine, "Joe" Cannon of Illinois, Champ Clark of Missouri, Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, Martin of Massachusetts stands out among them.

Not in derogation, but in fact, do we claim that the gentleman from Texas who now joins their famous ranks exceeds them in stature of accomplishment.

The burdens of the Speakership today are heavier than ever before in history.

The House is larger in membership. The volume of its business is greater. Its sessions are longer. The pressures are more demanding.

Yet, in the face of this great responsibility, Speaker RAYBURN carries on from day to day through the years with dignity, with fairness, and a calmness under stress which is a marvel of endurance and a tribute to his spirit.

Speaker RAYBURN, in fact, seems to embody in his conduct of the office all of those qualities which Mr. Clay himself laid down as ideal in one who would properly fulfill the duties of Speaker. Those duties, he is quoted in Hinds' Precedents:

Enjoin promptitude and impartiality in deciding the various questions of order as they arise; firmness and dignity in his deportment toward the individual Members, and the best arrangement and distribution of the talent of the House, in its numerous subdivisions, for the dispatch of the public business, and the fair exhibition of every subject presented for consideration.

They especially required of him, in those moments of agitation from which no deliberative assembly is always exempted, to remain cool and unshaken amidst all the storms of debate, carefully guarding the preservation of the permanent laws and rules of the House from being sacrificed to temporary passions, prejudice or interests.

In his administration Speaker RAYBURN likewise meets the specifications laid down for occupants of this office by Representative James Daniel Richardson of Tennessee in offering a resolution of thanks to Speaker David B. Henderson of Iowa at the close of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The position of the Speaker of the House—

he said:

is both judicial and political. It is judicial in this, that the occupant of the chair is at all times bound by and obedient to a code of rules prescribed for the government and control of the House, and in the execution of which he is but its organ and servant.

It is at the same time political. In the very nature of things, he is expected in his position to look carefully to the interest of his party, and while he is to administer the affairs of his great office in a manner to best promote the public weal, it is not expected that he will fail to use all legitimate and proper methods to build up his party and fortify it against attack.

Only two Members here today have served longer in the House than our Speaker. They are the venerable dean of this body, ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, and our other octogenarian friend, BOB DOUGHTON, of North Carolina.

Seven Speakers of the House and five Presidents of the United States have come and gone since SAM RAYBURN first took the oath of office as a Member of this House on March 4, 1913, nearly 38 years ago.

Thus the tenure of the gentleman from Texas—may it long continue—spans whole eras in our history. His role in the service of the Nation is cast against the panoramic background of great events.

His period of service encompasses the Mexican border incidents; the First World War; the so-called period of normalcy which followed it; the dark days of the depression and bonus army march on Washington; the period of recovery and reform; the crisis of Pearl Harbor, the great national defense effort it evoked; World War II and its victories abroad; the post-war era, and now the time of new international tension, and threat of a third world war from another tyrannical force arisen in the east.

It covers the term of President Woodrow Wilson, his New Freedom, his creation of the Federal Reserve System and other notable domestic contributions and America's tragic failure, too, to enter the League of Nations.

It embraces the era of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the "business as usual" calm that prevailed before the storm of economic disaster broke upon the country.

It includes the thrilling and active days of the New Deal under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and latter phases devoted to vital problems of war. It now includes the masterful leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

Few men are accorded the privilege of partaking in the actual making of history over such a substantial and eventful portion of a nation's life. Speaker RAYBURN has played—and is today playing—a significant and influential part in the affairs of our modern times.

Through it all, SAM RAYBURN has served his country faithfully and well with that reticence, honesty, and straightforward dealing which are the stamp of his character. He seeks no publicity, he avoids social glamor, shuns personal vainglory. He indulges in no long speeches. He speaks infrequently, but when he does, what he says is important and eloquent. His accomplishments in statecraft are in the field of action and not of words.

With all of the prestige of his position in the high councils of the Nation, SAM RAYBURN is unchanged, except in the growth of his wisdom and experience, from the young man sent to Washington by the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas. He continues to serve their interests—even as he serves the national interest—as he now begins his twentieth term.

Without affectation, completely devoid of pomp, he reflects the simplicity and directness of both his upbringing in a large family of godly pioneering stock and of the soil from which they sprang. SAM RAYBURN as a boy labored in the fields of Texas and it is to his farm that he loves to return at every opportunity this busy life offers.

I know of no finer tribute that can be paid the Speaker today than to repeat the words uttered by a fellow Texan on the occasion of a testimonial to Mr. RAYBURN last year when the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN said:

The greatness of this man is in his plain dignity, the restraint with which he exercises power, the respect he holds for an opponent's views, the humility with which he carries his responsibilities, and in his deep and abiding faith in our democratic processes and in the collective wisdom of the Congress as the direct representatives of the people.

I believe it was Alexander Hamilton who said:

"The amelioration of the condition of mankind and the increase of human happiness ought to be the leading objects of every political institution, and the aim of every individual according to the measure of his power, in the situation he occupies."

SAM RAYBURN has always acted toward those noble ends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] kindly take the chair?

(Mr. HALLECK assumed the chair.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, our outstanding former Speaker and now minority leader, my dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the majority leader in paying our sincere respects to a distinguished leader who has long been in the public service and who has served his State and country with great fidelity.

While we, of course, occasionally differ with some of his views, there is one common ground of unity for all Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats alike. We all honor and respect him.

The House of Representatives is unquestionably the most powerful legislative body in all the world, and to be elected Speaker of this great legislative body is a tribute, as our majority leader has well said, which comes to very few men in the history of our country, 44, to be exact. To be able to hold the position of Speaker for over 8 years, a longer period than any other individual in the history of our country, is indeed a rare honor. We do well to pause for a few moments in commemoration of this historic event to express our appreciation to the man who has attained this high honor. The man who previously held the record was Henry Clay, one of the outstanding statesmen of our history, a man so brilliant and so widely known that when he came to the Congress he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives during his first term. He was a great Speaker and a great American.

Now we have a new long-term Speaker. The record that has stood for years is gone. A man for whom I have genuine respect and whose friendship through the years I have cherished, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has placed his name on the top of the roll of Speakers. We honor him and pay just tribute. He is broad enough, tolerant enough, and American enough to know that we all cannot be expected to agree with him on all these great questions that are debated in these historic Halls. We all have our opinions; we express them and debate the issues of our times. We offer amendments to legislation, and out of the legislative process in this great representative body comes the final decision. That is the American way of doing business. It is the American way which has appealed to people all over the world, and it is the way in which liberty has been maintained in America. It is a way

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which must be preserved if we are to remain a free people. We can pay our respects and express our devotion to a man, and yet when the time comes for opposition we must express our own convictions. We must fight for what we believe is best for the general welfare of our country. We cannot have, we must not have, a one-party system.

Today partisanship fades; we join with our good friends on the other side of the aisle in tribute to a great leader and a good Speaker. I am sure that in commemorating this day, which may well be known as Speaker RAYBURN's day, now that the record of service in the Speaker's chair has been broken, it will cause no one too much concern if, say, 2 years from now, we usher in a new era—an era in which we will bring new conditions, new marks to shoot at.

I might say that yesterday when they were paying just honors to our beloved Speaker at the White House, I was at a little bit of a loss to understand my presence. I had a little guilty feeling that these exercises might have been held 2 years ago if it had not been for me. But these little conflicts, these little differences and upsets are what make America the greatest country in all the world. While Democrats and Republicans and independents may fight for their own viewpoints, which are so precious to the people of our country, we can pay respect and do honor to a great American and a great legislator. SAM RAYBURN is serving our country to the best of his fine ability in a position of the highest honor with fairness and impartiality. In the final analysis that resolves the great question of whether a man is a good Speaker or a great Speaker—his ability to be fair and impartial and to interpret the rules and do justice to all, even if it be adverse, as it must be at times, to his own party and his own convictions.

In my judgment our Speaker will go down in history as a man who has not only held this post for the longest period of time but as one who has filled his position with ability and distinction. To him on this day go my heartiest personal felicitations, and I am sure the felicitations of all Republicans as well as Democrats.

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I came to this House 44 years ago, in the Sixtieth Congress. I have served under 10 different Speakers. When I came to this House the great Uncle Joe Cannon, who had already attained the reputation and the title "the czar of the House," was the Speaker. His powers were unlimited. He was Speaker as well as chairman of the Committee on Rules. He appointed all committees and only such men were appointed to the important legislative committees as he believed would carry out his policies and his views. The Rules Committee, unlike today, had only three members: Uncle Joe Cannon, as chairman; John Dalzell, a Republican; and John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, the Democratic member—a great statesman. I frequently made the statement on the floor of this House that Uncle Joe Cannon, for some reason or other during the days that he presided, seemed to have bad vision in his right eye. He could never see those on the right—the Democratic side of the aisle—but I can testify to the fact that his sight in both eyes was excellent in the evening. Speaker Cannon served four terms, from 1903 to 1911.

During his last term, in 1910, a great fight took place to liberate the House from the dictatorial domination of Uncle Joe. We succeeded in amending the rules of the House, taking from the Speaker the great power he had been exercising. In fact, there were 25 liberal and progressive Republicans who joined with my Democratic colleagues in insisting that the Members of the House should have a far greater voice in its deliberations; that they should have the privilege and the right to vote on important legislation reported out by its legislative committees, which privilege was formerly denied them under the czarist rule of Speaker Cannon.

It was in this revision of the rules of the House that provision was made for a committee on committees to nominate and recommend the membership of the various legislative committees to the House for its approval.

In 1911 the Democratic Party became the majority party, and that great Roman from Missouri, Champ Clark, noted as a lawyer, statesman, and a great American, and an intimate friend of mine, was chosen as our Speaker. He just escaped the Presidency when he failed of nomination in the convention of 1912. Champ Clark served four terms as Speaker.

He was succeeded by Frederick H. Gillett, of Massachusetts, a splendid gentleman, high-minded and fair. He was typical of that staid New England stock so prominent throughout the years in our national legislative halls. He served until 1925 when he was elected to the United States Senate by the good people of Massachusetts. He was not the first Speaker, however, to be elected to the Senate.

I might say, without intending any reflection on this important body, that I hope our Speaker, if he so aspires, may some day be honored by the good citizens of his beloved Texas by being chosen as one of their Senators in the upper chamber. However, I do not want to infer that we want to lose him as our Speaker. I hope he will remain with us in this capacity for many more years.

Mr. Gillett was followed by that splendid American, Nicholas Longworth of Ohio. Nick, as he was affectionately called by his colleagues, was a colorful presiding officer, efficient, stern at times, a heavy wielder of the gavel during the more hectic hours of debate, but friendly and considerate of all. He was the son-in-law of that colorful and greatly admired President, Teddy Roosevelt. Longworth served three terms.

In 1931, in the interest of the country, the Democrats came into control of the the House again. John Nance Garner, of Texas, was chosen Speaker. He was a true son of the expansive Texas plains. Small in stature but a giant in intellect, his splendid capabilities as a leader and statesman are well known to many today. He became Vice President when the great Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President and assumed office in 1933. Jack Garner is still with us in spirit as he enjoys his remaining years in the sanctuary of his beloved surroundings in Uvalde, Tex. Following the busy hours of the day in which he surveys the activity of his great domain, I understand he still yields to the temptation of joining with his neighbors of an evening in the great American pastime in which I know he was always so proficient.

Mr. Garner was succeeded by Henry G. Rainey, a great man from my own State of Illinois the greatest State in the Union notwithstanding the claims of Texas—the State which gave to the Nation the immortal Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, and many other illustrious statesmen and leaders. A great liberal, possessed of remarkable ability, Henry Rainey was a tower of strength in expediting the progressive legislative program urged and advocated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Henry Rainey, with his shock of long, white hair, his broad-ribboned flowing black bow tie, his kindly face, and his sincere and heart-warming smile, was one of the most lovable characters it has ever been my pleasure to know. I felt honored, indeed, when he asked me to conduct his campaign for the Speakership against the powerful Texas delegation who were behind Mr. McDuffie. These characteristics, coupled with his remarkable knowledge of legislation and legislative procedures, made him one of the truly popular Speakers of all time. His tenure as Speaker was to prove all too short-lived. The grave problems confronting us during the depression years exacted its toll. He was called to his Maker on August 19, 1934, in his second year of the occupancy of the chair.

Mr. Rainey was succeeded by another outstanding Member of this House and one of the most popular Speakers of all time—my close friend Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, a great liberal and a great Democrat. Tall and stately, with an almost sad and wistful expression on his face most of the time, this rugged pioneer from the hill country of Tennessee, came to Congress in 1909, 2 years after my service commenced. He was an indefatigable worker, thorough in every great problem he tackled, laboring diligently in behalf of his constituency, while assuming more and more responsibility in cooperation with the leaders of his party. His great talent and ability was recognized by his Democratic colleagues when they selected him as their candidate for Speaker upon the death of Mr. Rainey. He, too, had given of his strength and vitality so greatly during those trying years that he was called by death on June 4, 1936.

Mr. Byrns was succeeded by the gentleman from Alabama, William Brockman Bankhead, a highly cultured, well-

educated, and splendid American, one of the great intellectuals to hold that office, a man of great ability. He died on September 15, 1940. Thus, in the short span of 7 years three of our Speakers passed away, Rainey, Byrns, and Bankhead.

The present occupant of the chair, our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, assumed that office on September 16, 1940, and has held the position ever since with the exception of the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress which unfortunately brought about a Republican majority in the House. As I view it, the Republican membership could hardly have done otherwise than to elect the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] as their Speaker. He was eminently fair, understanding, and considerate of those of us on the right and a very able Speaker. I hope as I have frequently said on this floor and I repeat here today, that I hope he will continue as minority leader for many, many years.

SAM RAYBURN, our beloved Speaker, now exceeds the record of that great Democrat, Henry Clay. I shall not go into Clay's record or length of service. Historians have recorded his great service in words far more adequate than I can express. In addition to Henry Clay we have had such great Speakers as Taylor, Polk, Colfax, Blaine, and Crisp. Although I did not serve with all of those I have mentioned—I have served with only 10—I can state truthfully and honestly, having known all the 10 well—that they were all fine Americans, and very able and efficient Speakers. Unfortunately I could not agree with all of them at all times. That would be expecting too much in these critical times. However, without in any sense attempting to discount the evaluations of historians of the past or present as to the capabilities of former occupants of this distinguished post, I feel safe in saying that our present Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, in whom is embodied the wisdom, the patriotism, the statesmanship, the ability, and the lofty character of all his noted predecessors, is the greatest of them all. No more fitting tribute to the sterling character and outstanding ability of this great Texan, and the high regard in which he has been held by his colleagues throughout the years, could be paid SAM RAYBURN than the knowledge that he has been retained as their leader and Speaker for a period longer than any man in the history of Congress.

Every Member of this House recognizes the lovable traits of our distinguished colleague: his rare ability to control the flow of legislation; his patient and calm handling of the more turbulent moments of debate; the fatherly advice and the care he tenders the neophyte in our midst; the outstanding leadership he displays when crises arise; his thorough understanding of parliamentary procedures; the expeditious manner in which he renders decisions on the most intricate points of order raised in this House.

Working hand in hand with our President and the duly-constituted leadership today, he has assumed a vital place in carrying forward our complex program in international affairs, in which it has been my privilege and honor to cooperate with him, with the result that legislation necessary to its progress and development has encountered little delay in this body. A stanch advocate of cooperation with our friendly nations throughout the world, he has risen to the heights in the test of real leadership and action.

It is a further tribute to our Speaker that only yesterday the President of these United States called him to the White House for the purpose of commending him upon the attainment of this unusual record, and presenting him with a rare gavel, the instrument of his authority, fashioned from wood taken from the White House during the present remodeling program.

SAM RAYBURN, I salute you. You are deserving in full measure of all the kindly words that are spoken about you on this floor today. You stand as a symbol of the fine democracy that is ours. Those of us who have had the great pleasure of knowing you and working with you throughout the years, as well as the younger Members in point of service in this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, join in wishing you well on this memorable occasion. As our former Speaker, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, so aptly phrased it, you retain the respect and confidence of all the Republican Members.

You have the earnest and sincere wishes of us all for many more years of loyal, able, efficient, and enjoyable service in the Congress of the United States. As I stated earlier, it is my personal hope that you will remain as our Speaker for years to come, and that I might be spared a few more years to serve with you in this Chamber.

May the good Lord continue to bless you with good health, the strength, the courage, and the desire to carry on as a leader of men in these legislative halls for the good of all mankind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues here today in paying tribute to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, for his outstanding, remarkable, extraordinary services as a Member of this House, and also as its presiding officer.

It has been my privilege to serve in this House with as many Speakers as any present Member save and except my dear friend, the grand young man from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who served 4 years under the Speakership of the late distinguished Speaker Cannon. I have served with nine Speakers. I cast my first vote in this House to elect that great American Champ Clark as Speaker 40 years ago the 4th of next March.

Mr. Clark was succeeded by Speaker Gillett; then came Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and again Rayburn.

Mr. RAYBURN has served longer in the exalted position he now holds than any other man in the history of our Government. Few men in the life of the Nation have rendered a service so useful and so outstanding or have fashioned a record so brilliantly and so romantic as that of our distinguished Speaker. He rendered great service in this House before he was elected Speaker, as a member of and chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I understand also that as a businessman back in Texas he is among the most successful. Evidently he must be very popular. The first test of a man's real worth is his standing and his usefulness as a citizen. It is a great tribute to Mr. RAYBURN'S worth and to his ability that he has served as Speaker longer than any man in the history of our country. Those who have visited Texas and have seen his countless acres, his numberless herds and bleating flocks, tell me that he is one of the most successful businessmen in the Lone Star State. So, in every category of life, his standing as a citizen, as a statesman, as a parliamentarian, and as a great Speaker, his record is of the highest order. I cannot say quite so much for him as a father, but he is young, he is handsome, he is popular, and vigorous, and we still have hopes in that respect. The same is equally true of our distinguished and beloved ex-Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

In conclusion I wish to say that Speaker RAYBURN'S kindness to me, his helpfulness in my work in my humble service here has been of great assistance to me in the labors I have endeavored to perform. In my 40 years of public service here no one has rendered a service more useful, more able and outstanding than our great Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. My earnest hope is that he may have many years yet to preside over the deliberations of this House, and that after retirement he may have many years of happiness on his farm back in Texas, and that when his life's work is done, the last chapter of the book in his life is written, the book is closed, and the curtain falls, that he will receive the welcome approbation "Come ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I find myself unable to resist this opportunity to add my brief remarks to the richly merited tributes which have been paid to our esteemed Speaker here today. May I say he is a man with whom I have developed through the years a close personal friendship, a friendship that transcends partisanship, yet a friendship which to my mind is clear proof that while as Democrats and Republicans we may disagree, and on occasion rather vigorously state our positions, we yet may be fine friends in the fellowship that is characteristic of the House of Representatives.

I agree with what our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] said, that it is a high honor and a great responsibility to serve as a Representative of the American people in the Congress of the United States. It is a privilege that comes to comparatively few. How

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

much greater, then, is the distinction when one attains the speakership of the House of Representatives, a position but twice removed from the highest office it is within the power of the Nation to bestow. Add to this distinction a period of service unsurpassed in the history of our Republic and you begin to measure the mettle of the man we honor here today.

If Speakers have been rare in our history, so, too, is the man who combines the qualities necessary in the character of anyone who aspires to this high office. He must be fair and just, a man of impartiality, of integrity, and with a deep sense of honor. He must be a man of honesty and courage, a man admired by his colleagues for his ability, his sound judgment, and his capacity for leadership. He must be a man who, having earned the speakership through an extended display of such qualities in the House of Representatives, yet retains the common understanding so necessary to any Representative of the people.

SAM RAYBURN is certainly such a man. He has won and held the affection and the admiration of his colleagues in this chamber and of his constituents back home in Texas. Down through the years he has demonstrated his willingness and his ability to serve the Nation in his capacity as Speaker of the House while continuing to serve the people of his district with all the energy and the devotion at his command.

The speakership is an emblem of integrity, a badge of honor, and a hallmark of strength tempered by justice.

If to serve your people and your Nation is its own reward, then certainly SAM RAYBURN is today one of the richest men in the Republic.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who represents today the district the distinguished Henry Clay represented in his time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] will have served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man.

Henry Clay was Speaker of the House for 8 years 4 months and 11 days. Mr. Clay held this record for a century and a quarter. He resigned as Speaker to become Secretary of State, an office of equal dignity and difficulty in that day and this.

Since I have the honor to represent the district which elected Mr. Clay to the House of Representatives, I am glad to join in the tributes that will be paid to the Speaker of the House. This district is still called the old Ashland district from the name of Mr. Clay's home place which recently has been made a public shrine through the efforts of the Henry Clay Memorial Association.

The present esteemed Speaker has surpassed but in no way eclipsed the record of the great Speaker of yesterday. Certainly no Kentuckian who enjoys basking in the reflected glory of the fame of Henry Clay will begrudge the honor paid to the distinguished son of Tennessee and Representative of Texas. Mr. RAYBURN has expounded the theory of national unity as truly as did his eminent predecessor who said: "I know no South nor North nor East nor West—only my country."

The Speaker of today has honored in every way and has utilized for the best interest of the country through practical statesmanship this spot that Henry Clay immortalized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, vice chairman of the Texas delegation [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I realize my complete inadequacy in trying to add to any of these tributes which have been paid to our great Texan and great Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN. However, it is a real pleasure to say a few words in behalf of the Texas delegation and, of course, in behalf of myself. It was my privilege to know quite a bit about Speaker RAYBURN long before I came here. I was born in his congressional district. I attended college in one of the towns in his congressional district. Our districts join. Incidentally, I might say it has always been interesting to me that he came to the House of Representatives the year I was born.

I might add it is my privilege to serve on the same committee on which he served for 24 years. Often his name is mentioned in our committee. His policies in running our committee when he was chairman are referred to as the best of examples. I know I have heard Representative CROSSER, our present chairman, and Representative WOLVERTON, our ranking minority member, mention him frequently in terms most favorable.

Speaker RAYBURN is loved most by those who know him best. For twenty-odd years I have heard it said at times by some who might not agree with him—everybody likes him—that they were going to beat Representative RAYBURN. People who had uttered this just do not know the man. They have not seen him in action. It was my privilege back in 1932, as I recall, to hear him making a speech to his people in one of his campaigns. The people in his home area have the same confidence, if not more, in SAM that we here have—complete and full confidence it is. And when he comes to his people to give an account of his stewardship, it requires but a few minutes for any person who might be wavering from the RAYBURN bandwagon, let us say, to be right back in line. Why is that so? Because he is so honest, he is so sincere, he is so able, he is so direct in stating the facts about his work and efforts. He does not hedge; he does not evade issues. His people know he takes seriously their problems, that he never shuns work or his duty. The degree of esteem in which he is held by so many people all over Texas is the very highest. They have the completest confidence in him that people can have in a man. Indeed, he is fully trusted, for his 43 or 44 years in public office establish clearly that he is trustworthy.

I have heard Speaker RAYBURN say something that has impressed me many times. He has said if a man has common sense, he has about all the sense there is. We here know and the people of Texas know that SAM RAYBURN is endowed with the best of judgment and the highest degree of good common sense. Yes, I too, have heard him say in the last day or two that he thanks his God daily that he has confidence in people, and the great reward that he has received thereby is that people have confidence in him. One of the things that has impressed me most, as I have observed Speaker RAYBURN throughout the years is that he has been right on nearly all the big issues that have affected and confronted our country. He has been, in aviation language, on the beam at all times during his many years of public service.

One of the best tests of a truly great man in my opinion is the percentage of the time particularly on vital public issues he has been right. Tried by that standard, SAM RAYBURN certainly measures up to our greatest statesmen throughout the history of this Republic and this is one of the reasons why Texans certainly have great and unusual confidence in the man whom we are all honoring today.

Speaker RAYBURN has been referred to today as a modest man. This is true; he is incapable of acting a borrowed part. As one enters the State Capitol of North Carolina, he observes the motto, "To be rather than to seem." SAM RAYBURN has lived a life as a private citizen and a public servant that in my judgment can be accurately and appropriately described by these words.

Speaker RAYBURN is in no sense a selfish man. His life has been characterized by trying to help people by the thousands, and by the hundreds of thousands. He has helped humanity much. It has been said that what a man does for himself dies when he dies, but what a man does for others lives on after he has gone. I am aware that every Member here knows that there will be benefits people of our Nation will be deriving from now on, which are due to the efforts of our great statesman, SAM RAYBURN. Indeed, if it is true that all a man actually has is what he has given away, what he has done for others, Speaker RAYBURN, as a result of the many years of successful efforts he has put forth in behalf of others, is a rich man indeed, as the gentleman who just preceded me also ably said.

The Texas delegation and 8,000,000 Texans are justly proud that our own Texan, SAM RAYBURN, now has served longer as Speaker than any man ever served. We salute and honor him as you do and we hope and pray that his future years will be as he would have them.

I repeat what I said in the beginning of this short statement, that those who know Speaker RAYBURN best love him most. Texans know him well; they love him much. There are no 20 Members of Congress who respect, love, and appreciate Speaker RAYBURN more than the 20 Members from Texas who are his colleagues and who serve with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Speaker, was interviewed on the radio on the occasion of his passing the record of

Henry Clay as Speaker of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the interview in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Speaker SAM RAYBURN was interviewed on Capitol Cloakroom Tuesday night, January 30, 1951, by CBS correspondents Griffing Bancroft, Eric Sevareid, and Walter L. Cronkite, Jr. Following is the text of the interview:)

Mr. BANCROFT. Speaker RAYBURN, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. And especially welcome on this occasion—for just today you passed the record of Henry Clay, who was Speaker of the House for 3,056 days, between 1811 and 1825. Today was your three thousand and fifty-seventh day in that high office which you first assumed in 1940, after having been in Congress since 1913. So that means you now have been Speaker longer than any other man in our history—and how does that feel to you?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, somebody asked me one day when I first thought I'd like to be Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, and I told him as long as I could remember. And since that ambition has been achieved, I'm happy on the occasion and feel grateful to the Representatives of the people that they have placed this high confidence in me. And to have an ambition satisfied and be as high as you want to go or think you would ever go is very gratifying and very satisfying.

Mr. BANCROFT. You mean you are a politician with no further ambitions. Is that correct?

Speaker RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Speaker, you say that you have had this ambition to be Speaker of the House as lohg as you can remember. Well, I believe you served in the Texas Legislature before you came to Washington. Did you have the ambition to come to Washington and serve as Speaker of the House here when you were first elected speaker of the Texas Legislature? I believe you were one of the youngest speakers of the Texas Legislature.

Speaker RAYBURN. Long before that, Mr. Cronkite. When I was in the cotton fields down in Texas I think I said I wanted to go to the Legislature of Texas and be the speaker of the house, and I was and still am the youngest man (or was the youngest man) who was ever speaker of the Texas Legislature. And I was elected speaker 4 days after my twenty-ninth birthday. And then when I was 30 I was elected here, and I never turned that ambition loose all the years that followed until I achieved this place.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. RAYBURN, President Truman has described the office of Speaker of the House as the second most powerful office in the Nation. What do you regard as the principal duties of your job as Speaker?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, a great deal depends on the power and the influence of the Speakership as to who the man is that occupies that position. The Speaker of the House is a Member of the House. The Vice President is not a Member of the Senate. The Speaker's power comes, I think, very greatly because the old days of pounding the desk and telling people where to head in, I think, have passed. My experience with the Speakership has been that you cannot lead people by trying to drive them. By persuasion and the best reason is the only way you can lead. In this way the Speaker has influence and power in the House.

The committee on committees are kind enough to ask the majority leader and the Speaker about their suggestions for memberships on the various committees. The Speaker has the power of recognition. A great deal of the business of the House of Representatives is done by unanimous consent. And the Speaker is the only one who can recognize a man for that, and then we have on every other Monday what we call recognition for suspension of the rules. That's entirely in the hands of the Speaker. So, adding all these things together, why, the Speakership, of course, is a powerful position if the occupant of it knows how to deal with people.

Mr. BANCROFT. Which we know you do.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, contrary to widespread opinion, the House actually gets through its business with much more efficiency and far greater saving of time than the Senate does, at least to my observation. Is that due to rules of recent time through your tenure as Speaker? What is the main reason?

Speaker RAYBURN. No; I wouldn't think so. The House has had definite rules for many, many years. We do have more definite rules than the Senate. When a bill comes into the House, instead of someone having the right to get on the floor and speak all day, we bring in a rule that provides that the time shall be so many hours, equally divided between the majority and the minority. They yield that time, and no one can speak except in that time under general debate. Then we read the bill for amendment, and anyone can offer an amendment and speak for 5 minutes on that. In that way we save time and expedite the business, because with 435 Members, if we did like they did with 96 in the Senate, why, it would be a pretty long session every year, and it would be impossible to get any legislation through.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. Speaker, we watch you from the news galleries up above your rostrum and watch you wield a pretty heavy gavel sometimes. One thing that I've always wondered about—it looks sometimes like 9 or 10 people are on their feet all at once asking for recognition. How do you decide whom you recognize in those cases?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, there are times when one of the men is on his feet asking to be recognized to promote the legislative program. The others are on their feet just asking recognition to speak for a minute, or 5 minutes or something of that kind. It's one of those things that you have to be selective in.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words you facilitate the legislative process by recognizing the man who is going to tend to business and speak on the legislation.

Speaker RAYBURN. That's entirely correct.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a great deal of your success in pushing through the administration programs in the House is the result of some of the sessions you hold down in your office with some of the other Members of the House. In fact, it's been called—your office has been called—Rayburn's board of education.

Speaker RAYBURN. There was a room in the Capitol way back in the Longworth-Garner days—it was called the bureau of education. I have a hideaway now where I can sometimes go and read a little or dictate my mail and late in the afternoon some of the boys come by or are invited by and we have a session. And usually it's a session in regard to the legislative program, and sometimes Senators are there, and Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. CRONKITE. I believe, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that a Senator by the name of Harry S. Truman was attending a meeting of the board of education the afternoon he learned of President Roosevelt's death. Was that not so?

Speaker RAYBURN. He was on his way to my office by invitation, as he and I had been great friends the 10 or 11 years he was in the Senate and through his Vice Presidency. So that I was in that room and had a call and they said that Mr. Early was very anxious to talk to the Vice President. He came in and I told him that Mr. Early wanted him and he called him and he left immediately, because it was said that Mr. Early asked him to come to the White House immediately and as quietly as possible. A few moments after that we had the flash that President Roosevelt had passed away.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Truman did not know at that time what the message Mr. Early had for him was.

Speaker RAYBURN. He did not.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, you've been now in Congress I think 38 years. Do you have any generalizations or conclusions to offer about any change in that time in the general level of the ability, or however you look at it, of the House as a whole?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, of course, there's a lot of talk about people who remember one outstanding or two outstanding or three outstanding men in a 10-year period or in a 30-year period, like Clay, Webster, and Calhoun in the Senate. But as I say I came here under the Speakership of Mr. Champ Clark of Missouri. Uncle Joe Cannon's time was over. However, he came back to the House during that time. I don't indulge in this thing that the character or the ability of the House of Representatives has gone down one particle since I became a Member. I think generally speaking the intelligence in the House of Representatives is higher than I have ever known it before.

Mr. BANCROFT. How do you think it compares with back in the days of Henry Clay—let's say, when he was Speaker, with your knowledge of history?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, there were very few men then—you take the Constitutional Convention. And there were 59 men as I understand it who attended that convention. And you could name on the fingers of two hands those that were outstanding or supposed to be outstanding at that time and who are remembered in history. And that's no reflection on the man that was in committees and was doing the work. Of course, James Madison was supposed to have written more lines of the Constitution than any other man, than probably all of the men in it and kept notes on it, and he was called the father of the Constitution. He was outstanding. Of course, you had Hamilton, you had Washington, you had the great lawyer, Wilson, from Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, Pinckney, and many men that I could name. But just because those men didn't happen to be in the forefront I don't think was any—well I might mention, Mason, who was another very outstanding man in that convention. But I don't think that because some did not show up in history like the ones I've named is any reflection upon the high degree of intelligence of the others.

Mr. CRONKITE. Hasn't the workload, the daily workload of the average Representative increased quite a good deal over the years?

Speaker RAYBURN. Both in committees, and in the House, and out—I can remember when—I think Mr. Harding was President of the United States—I would imagine I'd get 10 letters a day. And since that time it's grown and grown and grown. Now sometimes some Members get hundreds of letters in their office each day and that's one of the reasons why we've increased so in help in the offices. It just takes it to tend to the people's business and answer their inquiries and try to serve them.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. Speaker, from your long experience let's get back to the No. 1 question in the minds of all the people of the world today and—you have been in Congress through two World Wars starting in 1913—what do you think are the chances of a third world war?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, I want to go back just a little. I think we made a great mistake after the Second World War in taking our Army down too fast and taking our defense plants down too fast. But I don't see enough elements in the situation right now to think that a third world war is inevitable in the near future. And I think the greatest safety or the greatest protection against that is for us, the richest Nation on earth, by far, with its great capacity for production, I think we can avoid a war if we get so strong that international desperados and dictators will fear to attack us. I think that would be the way to avoid it and I think the Congress of the United States, as geared now, is willing to do that very thing if they have the leadership to tell them what that thing is.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Speaker, in that connection do you feel that the House of Representatives should have more voice, a greater voice, in our foreign policy decisions than it has now?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, I don't know many policy decisions that are made in Congress except the ratification of treaties and the confirmation of ambassadors that the House doesn't have at the present time. All legislation of a general nature that passes with reference to foreign affairs has to pass the House of Representatives, the same as it does the Senate. The House of Representatives furthermore has the right to originate appropriations. They can have a great influence on foreign affairs in that way, and then we have to originate tax legislation in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CRONKITE. Isn't it true today, Mr. Speaker, that we can hardly make any move in foreign affairs that doesn't cost money and therefore the House, as you say, has to originate that?

Speaker RAYBURN. I was thinking specifically of the Marshall plan. It's called foreign aid legislation. The legislation for that originates in the House and the appropriation is made first in the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, do you think Congress will approve all the money the President has asked to make us stronger?

Speaker RAYBURN. I do.

Mr. BANCROFT. You think it will.

Speaker RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, what about paying for it. What are the chances of a $16,000,000,000 tax bill?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, I think that the average American thinks that our public debt is big enough, and if it's possible that we should not increase that public debt; we should pay out of current revenues for this preparedness program we're in now. And I think the American people are just like I said about the Congress—I think the American people want to be strong and I think that they are willing to pay for it. We're the most prosperous we ever were in our history. I was thinking the other day about our national income. In 1932, it was $39,000,000,000. In 1950, it was approaching $270,000,000,000. That shows that we do have the capacity to pay if we can arrange it so that we can have taxation that will be fair to everybody and bear equally and equitably on all men in all sections.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, a number of Republicans said when the new budget went up a couple of weeks ago that the President had disguised a good deal of nondefense and in their minds unnecessary expenditures under the guise of defense spending. What about that complaint?

Speaker RAYBURN. I don't think that's true at all. I think the President sent up an honest budget for 1951, just as he did in 1950.

Mr. SEVAREID. Do you think much of it can be cut—is there much water to squeeze out?

Speaker RAYBURN. It's always a hope that that can be done. And we're going to do that just as far as we can and yet keep our civilian matters moving as we think they should move. We just can't quit everything else, and go into this preparedness program alone. I think we've got to keep our economy going. We can never pay this debt that we owe now unless we keep a large and a mounting national income. And our income is the greatest it's ever been. And that's the reason why I think we can do the things here that will make us safe and also keep our economy going.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. Speaker, on the line of getting stronger this big problem of sending American troops to Europe—of course it's being debated at great length in the Senate—but it seems to me in the last analysis the House is going to have to put up the money, if it's decided to do it. What do you think about that? Should we send American troops, more American troops, to Europe?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, I think exactly about that like I do about Marshall aid. I don't want a war fought inside the shores of the United States. I'd like to have some friends in the world, and I think we're encouraging them now by the Eisenhower visit and other things to make themselves stronger so they can stand alongside of us one of these days, if the bad time that we fear does come. And I think that we've got to let them know that we're in this game with them and that we've got to send soldiers over there to give specific evidence of our sincerity in wanting to join with them to fight back communism.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Speaker, one of the prime functions, I gather, of the Speaker of the House is to translate to the President the temper of the House in various matters. How do you feel the House is lining up now on the long-range pull in this matter of keeping us on the internationalist bent, if you please, in our own defense rather than swinging back to some isolationism? As the expenses mount, as the controls come in, isn't there likely to be a pull back toward isolationism?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, some people have said that if the fighting was stopped in Korea that there would be a drift back, probably to isolationism and to say "Let's come back home." I don't think that. I think the average Member of Congress, joined with the President, recognizes and realizes this common danger and that they don't think that this cease-fire in Korea would be the answer to that danger. And I think that the temper of Congress and with the President is better than it's been in the last 3 years, to be frank about it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Is there a real unity in Congress, on the foreign affairs?

Speaker RAYBURN. I would think very much, because we passed a bill over there the other day out of the Committee on Armed Services that called for the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 in naval aircraft, and the Navy, and so forth, and we called the roll on that bill and the ayes were 365, and the nays none. That looked to me like a pretty good index of how our minds are running along on those things.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, you had the same unanimous vote also, did you not, on the branding of Red China as an aggressor and opposing her admission to the United Nations?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, there was no roll call on that, but the ayes were overwhelming and the noes very scattered.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Speaker, if you were asked to sum it up, how would you explain the Democratic losses and the result of the election last November?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, only once in my memory has the party in power not lost membership in an off-year election. And I think that was it, seems to me like that was——

Mr. SEVAREID. That was 1934, wasn't it?

Speaker RAYBURN. Nineteen thirty-four—that's correct. And we usually do that. We lost the House and Senate both in 1946. We came back in 1948 but I don't think anybody that looks the situation in the face was very much surprised that we lost seats in the House of Representatives because the people were bothered and worried and when they get that way sometimes they just vote for a change.

Mr. CRONKITE. Mr. Speaker, there's been a great deal of discussion about a southern Democratic and Republican coalition running the House and running the Senate, particularly on those issues on which they might get together. Do you think that is a real danger to the administration?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, you know, being from the South (Texas, of course, is not southern exactly, it's not West, it's just the great Southwest), that's been talked around here for the last 18 years and I go back and look over the New Deal legislation, so-called New Deal legislation. And a southern man's name is on practically every piece of that legislation.

Mr. BANCROFT. Isn't your name on quite a bit of it, when you were chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, in 4 years I wrote out about six or seven very important bills, and they were passed. Doughton, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; Sumners, of Texas, Judiciary; Steagall, of Alabama, Banking and Currency; Jones, of Texas, Agriculture; Mansfield, Rivers and Harbors; Lanham, Public Buildings and Grounds—you can run right on through it. Now, there are some people from the South, of course, who do not believe in all of this domestic program, and they are not going to vote for it. That's all. They're just not going to do it.

Mr. CRONKITE. Some of the active Dixiecrats have said in the last week, I believe, that they think there is a good chance of a coalition candidate for President. They have even mentioned General Eisenhower as a possibility—a man who could run on the Republican ticket and at the same time win in the South. Do you think there's any chance of that in 1952?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, now, I think General Eisenhower has too much sense to run on a coalition ticket. He might be nominated by the Democratic convention; he might be nominated by the Republican convention. But only once has the South not voted practically solidly the Democratic ticket, and I think it will do it—vote the Democratic ticket—again in 1952.

Mr. BANCROFT. That once was the——

Speaker RAYBURN. That once was the Al Smith campaign. And then, of course, four States in the 1948 campaign.

Mr. SEVAREID. You don't foresee any repetition of the third-party sort of thing such as we had in 1948 in the South this time?

Speaker RAYBURN. I rather think not.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, you look forward from the Democratic point of view to 1952 with great confidence, then. Is that correct?

Speaker RAYBURN. It all depends—a great deal depends just what the situation in the world is at that time, and what our position is, and whom the Republicans nominate, and whom the Democrats nominate.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, we've all seen you presiding over several political conventions, now, and presumably you will preside over one again in 1952. You mentioned earlier in the program that you have no further ambition. Does that mean you are not a candidate for the national ticket in 1952?

Speaker RAYBURN. I'm not and I haven't been because I was born in the wrong section of the country and at the wrong time.

Mr. CRONKITE. That's a little different than your predecessor as the man with the longest tenure in the House of Representa-

tives. I believe Mr. Henry Clay had quite a lot of ambition.

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, Speaker Clay, I think, was a potential candidate for President for about 30 years.

Mr. CRONKITE. He ran two or three times, I think, as an active candidate.

Mr. BANCROFT. I'd like to ask this one thing about the wage and price controls that have just been put on: Do you think they are going to work out all right and really stop inflation, or will the law have to be made stronger by Congress?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, of course, that law has got to be revised because it expires as I think in about June 30, 1951. By that time we'll have the opportunity to look it over and see whether it should be made stronger. I think that the American people, or a vast majority of them, are not hoarders and that they'll be willing to go along, realizing the situation we're in—everybody's got to eat and everybody's got to wear and everybody's got to use just the same as they have.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, you think it was the right thing for the administration to do.

Speaker RAYBURN. I don't think there was any question about it and, frankly, I think it should have been put into effect earlier, and would have been if the machinery for its enforcement could have been gotten into shape earlier.

Mr. BANCROFT. How about this other big problem that's down there in the House right now—this matter of drafting 18-year-olds? How do you feel about that?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, I feel about drafting 18-year-olds just about like I feel about drafting anybody else. Nobody wants to draft anybody to go to war. And we're not going to draft anybody unless we think their services are necessary for our protection and building up the Army. It would be hoped that we wouldn't have to do that. But in many instances, of course, an 18-year-old boy, if he's your son or mine, is mighty young but a great many people believe it would be more just and fair to draft 18-year-olds than fellows 23, or 24, 25, or 26 who have obligations, who have families and a wife and several children. It's a matter that we've just got to work out and make it as fair and as just as possible.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring up here, coming back to this, your having been Speaker now longer than anyone else in history. There are only two living former Speakers in the country and we asked them about this before we got on the air and we have a statement here from the former Speaker, John Nance Garner, a fellow Democrat, and a fellow Texan of yours, who was also Speaker of the House before he became Vice President. And here's what Mr. Garner has to say: "SAM RAYBURN, my old friend and for many years close colleague in Congress, has established a new record for length of service as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. I congratulate him. The fact that SAM RAYBURN has occupied this high position longer than any other man bespeaks integrity of character, fairness as a presiding officer, sound judgment, and great leadership. I have felt and feel now, that the Speakership is not only the most powerful post in Congress, but second most important in our Government. This is particularly so when it is filled by an able man, such as our distinguished and beloved Texan, SAM RAYBURN."

Now the other living ex-Speaker is a member of the opposition party and as you mentioned, in 1946 interrupted your tenure of Speaker for 2 years when the Republicans won control of the House. And we have here a recording from former Speaker, JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

"My most cordial congratulations are extended to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. To him has come the high honor and great privilege of serving as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of our country, surpassing the previous record of Henry Clay, of Kentucky. To be able to achieve such a distinction one must have ability, parliamentary skill, and a sense of fairness. These are possessed by Speaker RAYBURN and have been responsible for his success."

Mr. BANCROFT. These are tributes from the only two living ex-Speakers. Mr. RAYBURN, have you any comment on that?

Speaker RAYBURN. Well, it's most gracious of my old friend and fellow Texan, John Garner, to be fine enough to say what he has said about me, because his friendship and mine run back for 40 years. And to have my colleague in the House, of the opposition party, fine enough and kind enough to say the things he has about me is very gratifying and I am deeply grateful to both of these great ex-Speakers.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I'm afraid that's all the time we have and thank you very, very much, Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a happy privilege to join with other friends and colleagues in paying a justly deserved tribute to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has achieved the distinction of having served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other man in the history of the Nation.

The people of Tennessee, as well as the Tennessee delegation in the House of Representatives, feel a great degree of pride in the great record of service and the outstanding achievements of our beloved Speaker. He was born in Rome County, Tenn., and comes from two of the most prominent and highly respected families of our State. The names of RAYBURN and Waller have long stood as synonyms of honor and integrity among the people of the great Volunteer State. He has many relatives and a host of friends in Tennessee and is greatly admired and highly respected by all of the citizens of the State.

At an early age Mr. RAYBURN moved with his father's family to the State of Texas and there received his education and grew to manhood. As a young man he served in the Texas Legislature and occupied the high position of speaker of the house of representatives of that State. While still a young man he was elected to Congress from the State of Texas and his record of service has been one of brilliant achievement. His advancement in the House of Representatives has been steady and very outstanding. He served for many years as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and occupied the position of chairman of that great committee when he was called to a still broader field of service and elected majority leader of the House. Upon the death of Speaker William B. Bankhead, Mr. RAYBURN was unanimously chosen by the Democratic caucus for the exalted position of Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He has served in this great position longer than any other Speaker in the history of the country and has made an outstanding record for fairness and devotion to duty and commands the greatest possible degree of confidence, respect, and esteem of all of his colleagues. Mr. RAYBURN has succeeded a long line of distinguished Speakers of the House of Representatives, but certainly none of them has ever achieved a higher degree of greatness in service to their country than that which has come to him. He is a man who possesses the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He is a man of recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to public service and justly deserves the high position that he now occupies as one of the greatest Americans of all time.

I am, indeed, glad to have this privilege of paying brief but very sincere tribute to one of the warmest friends and greatest men I have ever known. I certainly join with other colleagues in conveying my hearty congratulations and sincere best wishes to our beloved Speaker for many happy returns and to indulge the hope that he may have many more years of good health and happiness and the very best of everything in life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this resolution may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and also that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the heart of every Texan must have swelled with pride yesterday when their Speaker passed such a memorable milestone in the history of the Nation. It was an important event in the life of SAM RAYBURN and in the annals of the Rayburn family. It was of even greater importance to the State and the Nation.

In these times that try men's souls, it is most reassuring to note the steady and experienced hand of SAM RAYBURN sharing the helm of the ship of state. We may well be thankful for his wisdom and his conservative influence at a time when many are prone to swing to one extreme or the other.

On the personal side, younger Members of Congress are blessed by the presence of this generous man who always has time for those of us who seek his advice. I venture to say that more new men coming into this body choose Speaker RAYBURN as their ideal than any other man. Certainly no one could hope for a life of greater public service nor one of more value to his country.

Those of us who have profited by his wise counsel and who have been blessed by association with him join in congratulations to our Speaker RAYBURN, his family, his colleagues, and his Nation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is one of the most exalted in the world. It has been filled by some of the ablest and most distinguished statesmen in our history—men whose names have become household words, such as Clay, Blaine, Reed, Crisp, Cannon, and Clark.

It is a great honor for any man to have served as Speaker of the House of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Representatives longer than any other. I am happy that our present Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, has achieved this distinction. It is a far greater honor, however, to have filled that office acceptably and well for such a long period. I am sure that everyone who has had the privilege of serving under him feels that SAM RAYBURN has honored his great office. His fairness, his honesty, his outstanding ability as a legislator and a presiding officer, his qualities of leadership are such as to inspire the respect of all of us. His fine human qualities are such as to inspire our affection as well.

In my opinion, SAM RAYBURN will go down in history as one of the really great Speakers of the House, comparable in every way with the greatest of those who have preceded him. May he enjoy many more years of health and happiness and distinguished service to his country.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, it is not important how well a man begins his life, but it is important that he is able to sustain himself from the beginning through the years of his lifetime. SAM RAYBURN has been able to sustain himself. In order to do this, the Speaker of the House apparently has placed value on the right elements of living. The Speaker loves simplicity and sincere humility because he loves honesty and has no regard for sham. The Speaker loves those things with which God has endowed this world—the sunshine, the marvels and beauty of nature, and the soil.

Greatest of all, our Speaker loves mankind and is deeply religious because he has such a keen sense of responsibility of his relationship to and with mankind.

When I was in Utah, before I was elected to Congress, and used to read of Mr. RAYBURN and hear his voice from the Democratic National Convention over the radio, I was impressed with his greatness; but knowing him personally has impressed me even more. I believe he is a great American so worthy of the esteem of his colleagues and fellow Americans.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would be presumptious, indeed, if I thought I could add anything to the tribute that has been paid to our beloved Speaker by the most distinguished Members of this House on both sides of the aisle and from all sections of our country. I do, however, want to say a word on behalf of Oklahoma.

Oklahoma loves SAM RAYBURN. He lives closer to most of Oklahoma than he does to most of Texas. His district borders mine. His home, just west of Bonham, is only a few miles from Bryan County, Okla. Thousands of my constituents once lived in his district. Some of them went to school with him. Others went to school to him. All of them are proud to claim his friendship.

All over Oklahoma SAM RAYBURN is affectionately and, I think, accurately known as Oklahoma's Congressman at Large. We regard him as the No. 1 citizen of the Southwest.

Like all other Members of this House, I love SAM RAYBURN. He is the greatest man I have ever known. He is one of the great men of this day and generation.

On behalf of the people of my district and my State, I am happy to join with Americans everywhere in congratulating him upon the signal honor he has attained this day—the well-earned honor of having held longer than any other man the most important position in the most important legislative body in all the world.

SAM RAYBURN, CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has innumerable facets of character. Many of us honor him as the American who has held for the longest period of time in history the proud title of Speaker of the House of Representatives. Many of us honor him as a man who speaks for the interests of his constituency and his State. Many of us honor him for his unswerving patriotism. Still more of us honor him as a long-time friend and associate.

My firm conviction is that none of us may pay the highest tribute to SAM RAYBURN. Without his being aware of it, SAM RAYBURN has paid that highest tribute to himself by his very life.

SAM RAYBURN is a Christian. His example has helped to bring the great teachings of our Master in the Sermon on the Mount into the Halls of Congress.

SAM RAYBURN is a Christian. I have gone with him when we fished together. I have heard him pray before partaking of God's food. I have watched him ask for God's guidance, on his knees, before going to bed at night.

A Nebraska poet once wrote:

> You made a song of life.
> I lived it. You were wrong.
> You have a life left to live:
> I—a song!

SAM RAYBURN has lived a long life of selfless public service. His vast accomplishments are dwarfed by the principles for which he served and lived. He himself is the noblest tribute to his own greatness.

SAM RAYBURN is a Christian gentleman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in tribute to Mr. RAYBURN. He has the qualities of leadership necessary in this difficult hour. If I had to select one from all of his fine characteristics, I think I would choose fidelity—as meaning more to me than any other—I trust him. Shakespeare said it this way:

> His words are bonds; his oaths are oracles; his heart is as far from fraud as heaven from earth.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, for more than 125 years Kentucky has been proud of her distinguished son, Henry Clay. Among his many outstanding accomplishments was the record of tenure which he established as Speaker of the House of Representatives. The fact that this record stood for a century and a quarter is in itself adequate proof of the significance and importance of that record.

It has been said that coming events cast their shadows before. Last May a magnificent 3-year-old thoroughbred horse came out of Texas and made the long trip to Kentucky. On Derby day, at Churchill Downs in the district which I have the honor to represent, in the greatest classic of the American turf that Texas champion proved his mettle. Tens of thousands of Kentuckians paid just tribute to the new champion, Middleground, of Texas.

Today on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians I wish to extend heartfelt felicitations and best wishes to the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. His distinguished career has made him a vital, living part of the great American tradition. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky yields to Texas.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, as I sat and listened to the remarks which were made about SAM RAYBURN, our distinguished Speaker who has served in that capacity longer than any other incumbent, I could not help but think that here is a man who has walked with men and has won not only their admiration, their homage, but in very truth their warm affection. Such a character is indeed rare and such a personality is generally not met with in a lifetime, and so I consider it a great privilege to have known this man and to have served as a Member of the House of Representatives while he was its presiding officer.

This profound respect felt by all men who have come in contact with him is well understood because it is founded on the firm and everlasting rock of truth. If there ever was a man without sham or without pretense, it is SAM RAYBURN. He thinks honestly and in the great deliberative body which he presides over, he administers justice with impartiality and carries on the tradition of our Republic founded on truth. I think it safe to say that no man has filled this great office of Speaker with more ability, nor has anyone shown greater love for his country than SAM RAYBURN. The Speakers of the House of Representatives have all been men of integrity, honored by their fellow Members in being elected to their position, and all have served their country well, but there are very few men to be found anywhere whom the honor and distinction of high office has not marred and who still recognize that liberty and justice are the cornerstones of our Republic.

All that has been said about him, he deserves; all of the love which his fellow Members bear for him, he merits; and all of the best wishes which well up in our hearts today and go forward to him are his well-earned heritage. It has been a great honor to know him and it has been a distinct privilege to serve under him.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to have the opportunity to serve in this Congress with our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. I came here with the Eighty-first Congress in January 1949 and was immediately impressed with the great charm, the modesty, and the personality of our Speaker. One can readily see why so many people from his home State of Texas idolize him. The high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues on both sides of the House is a tribute to his great leadership, his fairness and ability, and the kindly manner in which he is ever ready to be helpful and cooperative.

It is indeed a privilege to serve in this greatest of all parliaments, but it is an especially great honor to serve under SAM RAYBURN, who, as Speaker of the House, I am sure will go down as one of the great men in American history.

Today we honor SAM RAYBURN for having served as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of our Government, passing the great record of the immortal Henry Clay. With all my heart I join in paying a deserving tribute to one of America's greatest statesmen, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be fortunate enough to serve under a Speaker who is a champion. The unique experience of having served longer than any other Speaker must be very thrilling to SAM RAYBURN. But SAM RAYBURN did not need merely time to demonstrate his worth. His championship qualities as a citizen, a legislator, and a committee chairman were recognized long before today. Mr. RAYBURN is a true gentleman. He is kind, he is tolerant, he is fair, and he has the indefinable attribute known as common sense.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most memorable days of my 16 years of service. I consider it a genuine privilege to be present on the occasion when another milestone in the history of this body has been reached through the record which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has made in having served as Speaker longer than any other individual in history.

The eloquent tribute previously made today by the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, met with my complete approval and I endorse every word which he said with respect to the remarkable talents of Mr. RAYBURN.

It has been a source of genuine gratification to me to have served here during the time in which SAM RAYBURN established this record. Not only has he made the mark of his length of service as Speaker but what is more important, throughout that entire period he has achieved the genuine respect, admiration, and affection of all who have served under him because of his firm fairness, his becoming modesty and his calm counsel. I extend warm and sincere felicitations to him with the prayer that he may continue to enjoy his present health and vigor for many years to come in order that the country may have the benefit of his outstanding talents.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to extend to you my warmest personal congratulations on the distinction that is yours in having served longer than any other as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

This is indeed a great honor which has come to a really great man. But even without this honor, Mr. Speaker, you have made your place in history as one of our country's greatest statesmen and one of our greatest Speakers.

Since taking a seat in this great body I have served under four distinguished Speakers: Byrns, of Tennessee; Bankhead, of Alabama; Martin, of Massachusetts; and our present beloved presiding officer, Rayburn, of Texas. I have always been impressed with the immensity of their job, and I have always been impressed with the ability and patience of those who have served as Speaker.

The reason the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is a truly great Speaker is not alone his length of service as a Member of Congress and as Speaker, nor simply because of his legislative ability and parliamentary skill. He is a really great Speaker because he has at all times protected the rights of the minority. In all his rulings and in his every action he has sought to preserve minority rights in keeping with the highest American traditions, recognizing that in this fine country of ours "every man is king, yet no man dare to wear a crown."

As most of you may know, Speaker RAYBURN as a boy had an ambition to become Speaker of the House. That was his objective in life. He set himself to the task of realizing that ambition. He has done more than that. Today we are congratulating him on having served as Speaker longer than any other occupant of that high office. That in itself bespeaks the ability and character of our distinguished presiding officer.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate the people of your district.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as a friend and neighbor to our distinguished Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, it is with much pleasure that I join my colleagues in commemorating this day to a great American and statesman who has served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States than any other Speaker in the history of our country.

Many of those who have preceded me have pointed out the patriotic service that Speaker RAYBURN has rendered to our Nation. Of his many fine traits and virtues, those that I have observed and appreciated are his kindliness, helpfulness, patience, and modesty.

Always easy of approach, never too busy to give time to any Member, and always ready to advise on any problem, notwithstanding his enormous burden in his position, he has the patience to listen to anyone, no matter how important or trivial the matter may be.

In his modesty I am reminded by what Fielding said, "His modesty's a candle to his merit."

In his high and exalted position he has always been modest, and in his great accomplishments and service, which seem to come so easily and naturally, I think of what Henry Wadsworth Longfellow said:

> The talents of his success are nothing more than doing what he does so well, and doing well whatever he does, without a thought of fame.

Mr. Speaker, fate is so often cruel and capricious that it changes the lives and fortunes of many of us.

I have always thought that had it not been for a quirk of fate a few years ago, SAM RAYBURN, instead of being our Speaker of the House, would have been President of the United States. Who can tell what fate yet has in store for SAM RAYBURN?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, to few men is given the privilege of favorably affecting the lives of millions of people. This privilege has been given to our colleague, SAM RAYBURN. Because he has used this privilege and discharged his responsibility humbly, faithfully, wisely, and prayerfully, we have a better world; we have a stronger country and a greater faith in democracy and its precepts.

I am rich because I have clasped his hand in friendship; because I have felt the warmth of his personal regard and have had the treasure of his advice and counsel. Not because he has served as Speaker longer than any other man in the history of our Republic, but because he has done so exercising all of the qualities that free men admire, I salute him, I thank him, and I honor him.

Mr. Speaker, you are a great man because you have remained simple, humble, and accessible to ordinary men in the discharge of responsibilities that are extraordinary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, not only is this a great day in the life of our illustrious Speaker; it is also a day of significance in the history of the Republic.

This day will be marked by historians as the day upon which our friend and colleague, SAM RAYBURN of the great State of Texas will have surpassed all previous records of tenure as Speaker of the House of Representatives. No man in the history of our Nation has occupied this coveted chair as long as this congenial, efficient Texan.

While we congratulate the Speaker, our real congratulations should be directed toward the Nation itself. The Republic has had the services of Mr. RAYBURN for more than 8 years as Speaker. More than 8 years of service during the most turbulent decades in history and in one of the most strenuous capacities a public servant can fill, is a great monument to this leader of men. Moreover, it is a monument to the American people and the American Government that in times of so much divergence of opinion that one man can hold the allegiance and confidence of those he serves for such a long period.

Speaker RAYBURN has become part and parcel of the useful legislation which has passed through this Congress and is part and parcel of many great economic and political programs which have shaped the history and destiny of this Nation. Millions of people throughout the world have felt the profound impress of the Speaker's career.

We who have heard the strong staccato of his gavel summon the Members of this House to order and to service for these many years pause now to honor this great Speaker. The Nation honors him. But in a larger sense he honors us by his action in remaining in this position of vast power and authority. We, his friends, wish him well as he moves ahead on an untried and unmarked trail leading us as a great nation into the future. We wish him good health and happiness for the many years ahead.

Seldom in history does the tattoo of a leader's gavel command so much respect.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, to be able to add a brief statement on the occasion

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of this signal milestone in the useful life of our beloved friend and colleague, the distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, bring to me much in joy and satisfaction.

At times it is difficult to express our fullest and deepest appreciation of a friend. That is true now as I attempt to acknowledge the great debt of gratitude I owe to our Speaker for his kindly interest, his counsel, and advice.

The leadership of SAM RAYBURN has brought to the young and the older men of this House alike an inspiration.

To know Sam is to love him.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer Members of this House, I grasp the opportunity to add a word of tribute in honor of one of America's greatest citizens. To the newer Members of the House he has been more than a leader; he has been their guardian angel. It has not only been a great pleasure to follow his leadership, but it has also been easy and pleasant to follow his advice.

He has always been extremely helpful to the entire country. On October 13, 1950, the United States News and World Report published an interview with our great Speaker, entitled "What Influences Congress," which I am pleased to submit for the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT INFLUENCES CONGRESS—AN INTERVIEW WITH SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What Congress does is recorded at length, but what influences the action of Congress isn't as well known. To present an intimate view of how Congress operates and what the outside impact is on its legislative policies, the editors of United States News and World Report invited the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, to its conference rooms for an interview. The Speaker's position has been called the second most powerful in the country. Mr. RAYBURN is perhaps the best qualified man to discuss the workings of Congress. SAM RAYBURN was born 69 years ago and elected to Congress 39 years ago. He has been reelected every 2 years—never suffering a defeat. Schooling earned the hard way, a bit of teaching and 6 years in the Texas Legislature preceded his coming to Washington as Woodrow Wilson entered the White House. Only two men have been in Congress longer than Mr. RAYBURN. The Speaker, who is unmarried, has presided over the House of Representatives for eight successive years. During the Republican Eightieth Congress, he was minority leader. He was reelected Speaker of the Eighty-second Congress.)

Question. How much is the attitude in Congress going to change if the war ends shortly, Mr. RAYBURN? When Congress comes back, are you going to feel any urgency, or is there going to be a tendency to take controls off again, or ease them up?

Answer. Well, you know we are funny people. We get to talking excitedly. And, of course, everybody says get up and prepare and vote for these billions in order to set us up. I'm rather fearful, looking at things as I do, that when this Korean thing folds up, a lot of people will say, "Let's retreat." Now I think the best defense money we can spend is to get strong and stay strong, regardless of the cost.

Suppose we spent $25,000,000,000 a year for the next 5 years, getting our country strong enough so that somebody would fear us. Well, that's a bagatelle compared to the waste of war. In 5 years we spent 350 to 400 billion dollars and materials galore, besides the lives and crippled bodies. I just don't think there is any comparison between those.

I think weakness lays us open to attack. I don't think being strong tends toward aggression, especially on our part.

Question. If there is a popular reaction, will Congress not have to go along with it?

Answer. I don't think there will be that popular reaction. There may be some of it, a good deal of it, but I don't think it will be enough to control the situation.

Question. Controls ends automatically and will have to be renewed next year. If things seem better, will the controls be renewed?

Answer. Well, probably the attitude of Congress will be just about what the average fellow thinks, and I'm just the average fellow. I just don't believe that the people want us to get caught short.

Question. Do you think that attitude may depend on which party controls Congress?

Answer. Well, it might or not, as you look at it.

Question. Mr. Speaker, what will be the dominant issue before the next Congress?

Answer. I wouldn't know yet, but we raised a substantial part of the taxes to meet this emergency and we will raise other taxes either in this Congress or the next. If these programs that we have inaugurated go on, why, I don't see any major issues in the next Congress unless isolationism or too much reaction shows up.

Question. Has any real consideration been given to a base for the excess-profits tax?

Answer. Of course, they might use something along the line of the one that they had in World War II, with a different base period.

You know, when you go to fooling with taxes, you are fooling with a very intricate thing. You might in haste do a great group of people a great injustice, and that is not justified. Now, of course, we had the excess-profits tax during the last war and might have repealed it a little too soon, just as we took our Army and Navy down a little too fast and closed up our defense plants too fast. I've always thought that. Of course, I would have been just like any other father and mother. If I had had a boy, I would have wanted him on the way home.

But there were some mistakes made—I won't put my finger on them right now—against which some people cried out very much. But the experts on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue in the House and Senate and the Treasury are working together now trying to fix the proper kind of base and hope that it will be equitable and won't hurt too much. Of course, all taxes hurt.

Question. Does the House of Representatives pretty well represent public sentiment? Do you think they keep ahead of the people?

Answer. They certainly try to, because they have to go back every 2 years.

Question. But things change, don't they?

Answer. If the people back home don't have enough faith in their Representative here to feel that, being in the midst of these things, he knows more about when changes come and situations that have to be met in emergency form than the average citizen, why, they aren't going to keep him here.

Question. They've got to trust him to have judgment?

Answer. That's right.

Question. But aren't some of these problems too big and difficult? You've got so many things to do in Congress—you've got to keep in touch with what people are thinking and analyze these problems and represent and reflect the pressures that are on you. How are you able to resolve all those things—just common sense?

Answer. There isn't any substitute for common sense, you know—that's all the sense there is. When a man has real common sense, he's as smart as anybody can be.

Question. Is a Member of Congress influenced much by the mail he gets?

Answer. I would think so, but I'll tell you a remarkable thing about congressional mail. You'll find, if you'll look over your correspondence for about 6 months, that in all probability from 5 to 10 percent of the people have written 90 percent of the letters. The fellow that's back there and satisfied and things are going all right so far as he's concerned, you don't hear from him. It's the fellow that's discontented or unhappy about something.

Question. Or it's mail inspired by some pressure group?

Answer. Oh, yes. I would think that in all probability 30 percent of the mail that comes to Members of Congress is inspired.

ANALYZING THE MAIL

Question. But does that influence the Congressman much?

Answer. I think the average fellow up there has a pretty good idea of sifting the mail he gets, and what it means, and how to evaluate it.

Question. He knows his district and people pretty well?

Answer. If he doesn't, they'll get someone who does.

Question. Do the Members of Congress read the press a good deal?

Answer. They do—every day.

Question. Do the editorials in the press have an impact on them?

Answer. The editorials from some papers—those they think reflect a very sound view of public opinion.

Question. Would you say that all the factors which enter into the formation of public opinion have a certain amount of influence on the Members of Congress?

Answer. That is certainly correct.

Question. Are Members of Congress inclined to read some of the petitions that come to Congress by mail or in the form of advertisements?

Answer. Oh, yes; petitions signed by constituents and in advertisements.

Question. Do you think that the Members of Congress are influenced a good deal by the leading constituents in their districts who may write to them from time to time?

Answer. Yes. And the correspondence of Members of Congress has increased manyfold since I became a Member of Congress.

OPINIONS THAT COUNT

Question. Do you think Members are impressed by letters that are obviously individual and not a part of propaganda?

Answer. That's correct. To an individual who is a friend they certainly pay a lot of heed.

Question. Or some individual whose opinion in the community counts for something?

Answer. That's right.

Question. We've heard from time to time that some Members of Congress maintain lists of what they call leaders in their community. Is that so?

Answer. Practically all of them do.

Question. In other words, these are people whose opinions they respect or whose opinions they regard as influential?

Answer. And that they seek advice from some of the time.

Question. Do you think a Congressman should try to lead his district, or should he reflect it?

Answer. That's double-barreled. I think that a Member of Congress in the House of Representatives is primarily elected to reflect the sentiment of that one district. He's got to do that, or they've got to have faith enough to believe that he can do that, or they take him out, anyhow.

If a subject is discussed enough and the people know enough about it to have an opinion, and he knows that that's their opinion, unless he is convinced that it is utterly wrong and hurtful, I think he ought to follow it, but I also think that if a man can't

lead the sentiment of his district, he's in trouble.

Question. Isn't it true that the people back home don't know about many of these issues?

Answer. That's correct as to some, but on many they know a great deal.

Question. What is Congress, then, a sort of meeting place where all the local interests meet, with the result a sort of discipline or some solution reached?

Answer. There are so many questions that we have that we can't localize—they're just national and international.

Question. How does a Member of Congress keep informed on all of these very technical subjects?

Answer. Well, he talks to everybody—he has to talk to everybody, including the Members of the House and the Senate and people from all over the United States. Congress is a mighty good cross section of the American people. You look at a fellow sitting in the House and he's just about a general average of the people he represents.

Question. Do you think that in its workings Congress is an efficient organization?

Answer. I certainly do, and I think that's been demonstrated at the beginning of the Second World War and within the last 2 or 3 months. Nobody wanted any controls any more—didn't want any OPA, didn't want this, that, and the other—but Congress jumped right in and in a very short time gave the President power to control inflation, prices, and wages.

Question. When things are fairly stable and people are fairly well satisfied, you don't change so rapidly?

Answer. There's no hurry to change then.

Question. So Congress does reflect public sentiment?

Answer. Well, the job of Congressman has changed, because, as you say, there are more national and international problems nowadays than there used to be.

Question. A Congressman isn't as much a local representative?

Answer. He can't be and be a proper kind of representative.

THE SPEAKER'S POWER

Question. Is the Speaker as powerful as sometimes pictured?

Answer. Well, that's a question that can be answered in a lot of ways. Of course, way back in the Cannon days when they called Reed a czar and Cannon a czar and all that, they took some of the power away from the Speaker—the power to name committees and the power of recognition.

The rules were liberalized in 1911, when the Democrats took Congress in the middle of Taft's administration. But I would think that the average Speaker still has a good deal of influence in naming committees. Of course, he has the responsibility of naming all the special committees and I don't think there's been a Speaker up there for quite a while that hasn't had quite a bit of influence on committees.

The old day of pounding on the desk and giving people hell is gone. We've all grown up now. A man's got to lead by persuasion and kindness and the best reason—that's the only way he can lead people. And a Speaker should be personally popular. He can't crack down on people.

Question. That's been the situation now, hasn't it, for a long time?

Answer. Well, a lot depends on the man that for the moment is occupying the position.

Question. What influences you, Mr. Speaker, in naming committees? How do you choose the members?

Answer. I choose as chairman the first Democrat who introduced the resolution for a special committee.

Question. I was thinking of the standing committees and the new Members of the House—how do they get assigned to committees?

Answer. They all submit their names as applicants for certain committees. They may state first, second, and third preferences. If they can't get the first, then they go along to the second and the third. Sometimes they don't get even the third, but usually a man can get one of those positions. And they take it, of course.

Geographical location has something to do with it. You wouldn't want Members all from the South, or all from the North, or all from the East or all from the West. They like to have a pretty good cross section of the country on all important committees, and since this congressional reorganization bill, the committees are practically all important committees. We used to have 46 committees and now, I think, we have 19.

CHOOSING COMMITTEEMEN

Question. So far as possible, do you follow the Member's own preference for committee service?

Answer. We'd rather do it. But sometimes we don't think that that is the proper committee for him.

Question. But you don't know very much about a lot of these newcomers, when they come in, do you? What test do you apply?

Answer. Well, you know those new fellows don't have any idea how closely they are watched for the first few months. They also have a reputation when they come here.

One man might be a wonderful man for the Committee on Banking and Currency and no good on the Committee on the Judiciary because he isn't a lawyer.

Question. There still are one or two key men on each delegation who inform party leaders of the caliber of newcomers, aren't there?

Answer. That is correct, and the committee on committees listens to them when a new man comes up.

Question. Should there be more party responsibility in the House? Isn't there some way you can maintain more discipline within the party?

Answer. There is a lot of talk about discipline. It isn't a question of whether you get what you want today or not, or whether the Committee on Rules reports a rule today. The sum total is what you are looking for, and that is what I started out to say here a while ago. The sum total in this session, I think, is amazing under the circumstances. A tremendous amount.

As far as the House leadership is concerned, we have accomplished a lot. We have accomplished everything we thought we would accomplish in this session of Congress, and in some instances more. Of course, there are some of these issues that people filibuster about, but that will always be with us.

Question. The Congress and the White House don't always see eye to eye in what the objective is; do they?

Answer. Well, no two men that have got the good, common sense that I was talking about a while ago agree on everything. If they do agree on everything, one of them is doing all the thinking.

Question. The Executive and Legislature don't have to see alike? One shouldn't necessarily dominate the other?

Answer. I don't believe in any sort of domination.

Question. In Great Britain they have a system of government where the executive makes a decision, or the party in caucus makes a decision, and then everybody has to go along; don't they?

Answer. Yes; they do that, or they get thrown out.

Question. Do you think that system over there would work over here?

Answer. No.

Question. Why not?

Answer. It is too rigid. Our Congress is more independent, and our Executive is independent, too, and their executive is not. We elect a President for a definite time, and we elect a Congress for a definite time. I think that is much more responsible.

Question. Why couldn't we have a responsible ministry form of government here?

Answer. I feel that the people of the United States are the dominant power. They know that under the Constitution they are voting for a legislator for 2 years or for 6 years. I think they have the right to try him out for that length of time. And the party in power that would be overturned today might be the proper party to be in power tomorrow when a bigger issue is coming up. You cannot change Presidents all the time.

I don't like the system of splinter parties, either. We have not recognized more than two parties in the House of Representatives since the Civil War. When I came here in 1913, there were Teddy Roosevelt Progressives. But that party was not recognized. Members of the splinter parties in this country go to the party in the majority for assignment on committees.

IS THE 2-YEAR TERM ENOUGH?

Question. Do you think that 2 years is a long enough term for a Member of the House?

Answer. I have always felt that it ought to be 4 years. I don't know whether I think that as much now as I used to. A fellow hardly has a test in 2 years. He has a better test now than he used to have.

Question. How much influence do lobbyists have?

Answer. Well, now, it depends upon what you mean by lobbyists. People are called lobbyists, and, of course, the word lobbyist has a bad sound.

Some so-called lobbyists are men of outstanding ability, honest men who would tell you the truth and are helpful to committees. Now that kind of lobbyist is very helpful because he has studied one question for many years and maybe some of the members of the committee hadn't studied it at all. Members generally want to learn about it in order to have both sides honestly put forward so they can make a sane, sensible judgment.

Also there are lobbyists of the sort usually talked about, but they don't come to see me.

Question. You feel that different groups should get the chance to put their views to Congress?

Answer. Of course. And that will always be true. Some people who hire people to come here to Washington to represent them make mistakes in the type and character of man they get. But, as far as any of this so-called lobbyist influence in any pernicious way influencing Members of Congress, that just doesn't exist, in my opinion.

THE SOCIAL LOBBY

Question. What about the social lobby? Do they pull much weight in Congress?

Answer. No. I'll tell you a story about that. There was a very popular man who represented rivers and harbors groups. He knew a lot about the subject. When he went before a committee he was helpful. He built up wonderful friendships among the membership. When he would invite people out to dinner, they wanted to go because they didn't feel he was going to talk business.

Another fellow, probably with as much ability but not the personality, came here. He wanted to know how he could get to be the same kind of man the other fellow was, because he would like to give dinners and make friends, and so forth. But I said, "You make your friends first and then, if they want to dine with you, that will be fine, but you are not going to buy any friendship or influence around here with a dinner."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Question. Isn't it also true, Mr. Speaker, that Congress couldn't do its work without some kind of lobby?

Answer. Well, take the Committee on Ways and Means. The experts in the Treasury are very helpful to them, and experts on the outside are very helpful to them.

Question. Aren't the experts in the Treasury lobbyists in a way?

Answer. Well, you might say so. But they usually are sent for and are asked to give their views on things and to work with the so-called experts on the committee and get things ready to lay before the committee all the facts.

Question. They must like you in Texas—you've never been defeated——

Answer. I'll tell you something about people. I've been in politics all this time, and a lot of people say that people are unkind, and that they are unappreciative, and you get some pretty deep scars sometimes in politics. I haven't got any scars that I don't forget.

Coming down in the car today we were talking about hating somebody, and I said I didn't have any time for hate. I haven't got enough time to love the people that I'm under deep obligation to, and to think about the people you love is much better than hate.

I think that 98½ or 99 percent of the American people have got more good in them than they have bad, and when the test comes that better element will come up. And I think we will have demonstration after demonstration of that in the United States in years to come.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am moved at this time to associate myself with the expressions of high regard and friendship which have come spontaneously and with deep sincerity from a number of my colleagues for our distinguished Speaker. All of us who are privileged to serve in this House irrespective of political affiliation share in this admiration for the gentleman from Texas. He has won a well-deserved reputation as a gentleman of patience, understanding, and courtesy to even the most inexperienced Member—a gentleman who has contributed greatly to the prestige, dignity, and character of the House—a gentleman with an infinite capacity for making and keeping friends.

We are happy in the knowledge that the Speaker now holds the all-time record for service as a presiding officer of this House and we hope to have the benefit of his guidance and impartial administration of the rules of this body through many years to come.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that some men are born to greatness and that other men have greatness thrust upon them. No one seems to have pointed out that there are men of another character who grow, by their own unrelenting efforts, to a greatness universally recognized by their fellows.

Such a man as this now presides over one branch of the most august legislative body in the history of political society, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Within the dignified walls of this Chamber there have transpired during the last one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years many of the momentous events which shape the course of history. From the floor of this House there arises living, day-to-day evidence that man is the master of his own destiny, vibrant proof that man, in the light of his God-given reason and in conformity with the precepts of the Divine Lawgiver, can effectively act for the spiritual and temporal betterment of himself and his fellow man.

That is why the qualifications of those who serve here are required to be of the highest order. Members of Congress are called upon to be of solid integrity, deeply rooted in moral principles, lucid in thought and expression, wise in their powers of judgment, and profoundly conscious of the responsibilities of their office. Compound these prerequisites a hundred times over, add to them the friendly admiration and devotion of his colleagues and a master's ability to lead and direct the complicated and technical procedures of this House and you describe what is expected of our Speaker.

I am sure that it is the sentiment of this House that the man who now occupies the Speaker's chair has so conducted himself during the tenure of his office as to satisfy these qualifications many, many times over. The most solid proof of this is the fact that he has, as of this year, occupied the Speaker's chair longer than any other man in the history of the Nation.

In Congress after Congress caucuses of his fellow Democrats have named SAM RAYBURN to the highest office this House can offer. The Democratic Party can indeed look with pride to this sterling exemplar of its finest traditions. To a man, we are proud to call him one of us.

This admiration is not, however, rooted in partisanship. The first choice for this office by the Members on the other side of the aisle would naturally go to one of their own number, but when the votes are cast and the tallies made, the waves of applause, as the Speaker mounts the rostrum, resound with equal fervor from all sides of this Chamber.

SAM RAYBURN has indeed grown to greatness. Long ago he determined his life ambition to be the attainment of the high office he now occupies with celebrated distinction. He has discharged the responsibilities of this office in a way that has won him the admiration of each and every man who has had the honor of serving with him. Through every conflict that has raged on the floor of this House he has ruled our deliberations with a fair and just hand. Thus has he won the friendship of every Member of Congress and of many leaders of public life in America. We hear the gavel but we know the man. SAM RAYBURN has grown to greatness in our eyes and in the eyes of the Nation. On this day when he sets a new mark of greatness we extend our felicitations.

In his efforts of the future, made as they will be in the best interests of our country, we say, God bless you, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with the most intent interest to the tributes of my colleagues, paid to the Speaker who has spent the longest time in office in history. Certainly those who have served with him so long, who come from his own great State, have seemingly mentioned every facet of his remarkable, admirable, and lovable character.

Yet to me, coming from the teeming streets of Manhattan's most crowded area, it seems that those of our colleagues who hail from wider vistas have overlooked a dominant note in the legislative symphony of which SAM RAYBURN is the conductor.

For surely it is not to me alone that this firm, sure-footed, solid man seems to embody in his person the majesty and the integrity of this great House.

AS SOLID AS THE CAPITOL

I have seen him, as have we all, on many occasions and in many locales. Wherever he is, though not a large man, he stands out; often he dominates a scene without a word, his own integrity dwarfing the chatter of a social scene.

I have seen SAM RAYBURN walking, solitary and alone, through the great rotunda of the Capitol, and he seems as solid and perpetual a monument to these United States as the Capitol itself. He walks with a measured tread, not pompously but surely, in a straight line; his walk is the walk of a man who knows his own strength, his own mind, his own authority.

Often when I see our Speaker I think how Walt Whitman, the poet of the people, would have loved this man from Texas.

THE NEW DEAL CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE

We forget now that only a little over a decade ago SAM RAYBURN was the New Deal chairman of my own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

With the same unshakeable impartiality and integrity he presided over that committee when epochal reform legislation was being reported out and passed over the vociferous objections of one of the most lavishly endowed special privilege lobbies of all history.

SAM RAYBURN enrolled himself under the bright banners of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932. He has never wavered in his fealty to that leadership, even when some of the late President's most cherished aims flew against deeply ingrained Texas prejudgments.

EARLY ACHIEVEMENTS

SAM RAYBURN came to Congress as the representative of the rich black prairie and valley lands south of the Red River, making the Fourth Congressional District, in the Sixty-third Congress, taking his seat on March 4, 1913.

Early in his congressional career he earned the praise of President Woodrow Wilson by skillfully piloting to passage the Railroad Stock and Bond Act.

In 1931—in the Seventy-second Congress—SAM RAYBURN became chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Under his chairmanship momentous measures flowed to the floor and to ultimate passage. A complete catalog of the public acts of which he was author or a leading proponent would be pointless and exhausting; however, there stand as monuments to his indomitable search for justice such statutes as the Rural Electrification Act, the War Risk Insurance Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, the Federal Securities—Truth-in-Securities—Act, the Stock Exchange

Regulation Act, the Railroad Holding Company Act.

He was a leader in the fight that resulted in the passage of farm-price supports, Federal aid for farm roads, social security, and other important mileposts in the New Deal legislative drive.

At the beginning of the Seventy-fifth Congress, SAM RAYBURN left his committee chairmanship to become majority leader; on the death of William T. Bankhead, of Alabama, the gentleman from Texas was elected to the speakership on September 16, 1940.

THE WAR YEARS

There succeeded the most terrible burdens ever carried by a Speaker of this House.

Before Pearl Harbor, isolationist sentiment was a powerful force, and the Roosevelt program of preparedness for the war that was charging toward our security was often threatened.

Time after time the skilled leadership and the profound confidence felt by the membership in his wisdom saved the defense program from disaster.

Through the war years and into the transition period SAM RAYBURN guided administration legislation with the tactical skill of a general. During the brief period of Republican majority he helped the Democratic Party regain its long leadership.

Perhaps there is no better way to close this brief and inadequate tribute to a man who has proved his manhood, who has shown himself to be a great American, a great Democrat, a great Speaker of the House, jealous of its prestige but sensitive to the needs of the country, than by quoting the letter addressed to him on September 16, 1942, by the late President Roosevelt.

The President wrote:

DEAR SAM: Congratulations on the completion of 2 years of faithful and efficient service in the great office of Speaker. An important post always, the speakership has assumed a special importance because of the gravity of the issues with which you have continually had to deal. Keep up the good work. The country has need of you.

With every good wish,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House are happy to extend felicitations to the great statesman from Texas who has established a new record for length of service as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Length of service is not his only achievement. He is one of the great statesmen of this age. Henry Clay's record is today surpassed. There have been many great statesmen who have filled the exalted position of Speaker of the House. Clay is generally credited with being the man who brought the Speakership to a very high level and made it one of the positions of first importance in our Government. The late Speaker Cannon, of Illinois, served for a long period of time and was sometimes regarded as a czar. In connection with Speaker RAYBURN'S great service to his country, it is interesting to note that there have been only four Speakers from west of the Mississippi River in the period of 162 years since the Constitution was adopted and the Federal Government was put in operation. The late Col. David B. Henderson, of my own State, achieved the honor of being the first Speaker of the House from the great region west of the Mississippi River. His service came around the turn of the century. In the administration of Woodrow Wilson, Speaker Champ Clark, of Missouri—another great statesman—wielded the gavel. In the middle of the Hoover administration the Democrats took control of the House and John Nance Garner, of Texas, became the Speaker. Later on he was elevated to Vice President where he served 8 years. Speaker RAYBURN thus becomes the fourth man from the region west of the Mississippi River who has filled this very important position, and he has established a new record for length of service, but, more important, he has performed a very great service for his country and has, at all times, enjoyed the confidence of the country and the esteem of all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. We hail him and extend felicitations.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pleasure and a sense of high privilege that I join with those who have raised their voices in commendation of our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has capped an illustrious career by attaining a longer period of service in his high office than any other man in the history of this Nation.

As a member of the minority party, I have studiously avoided allowing partisanship to becloud my appreciation of the fairness, tact, ability as a presiding officer, and great parliamentary knowledge, such as are constantly displayed by Mr. RAYBURN. In addition I have had constant satisfaction in the assurance that without regard to politics our Speaker has always been one to whom a Member, new or old, could turn for counsel and advice, knowing that there constantly awaits every appeal that warm understanding which stems from a heart kept attuned to the thinking of the ordinary folks, in which group most of us are pridefully included.

It is my prayerful hope that Mr. RAYBURN may be spared for many more years of outstanding service in the Congress and that we may always enjoy in our legislative deliberations his wise counsel and sound advice.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay my respects to a distinguished leader, who has long been a respected public servant. A man who has been often tried and never found wanting, a great American, our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN is truly a friend of all, regardless of position. He has helped thousands and thousands of people—he has indeed helped humanity.

On behalf of the people of my district and my State of Ohio, I am happy to join with Americans everywhere in congratulating him upon the single honor he has attained, in having served longer than any other person as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

We in Ohio are proud of Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts). The question is on the resolution, and on this vote the Chair demands a division.

The House divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 338, the nays 0. The resolution is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. RAYBURN. Members of the House of Representatives, to all who have spoken and have uttered the generous words about me and my service, I am deeply grateful, and to every Member of this House, regardless of which side of the aisle you sit upon today, I want to thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart for the manifold courtesies and kindnesses of which I have been the recipient at your hands.

It has been a long time since March 4, 1913. It has covered a period in our history when prosperity has been with us, when depressions have been with us, and when national crises have been upon us. Serving with more than 2,500 men and women since I became a Member of this House, I still have the faith to believe that our country, as long as it is served by such men and women as these, is safe, that we will remain free, and that this great democracy will live on to serve. I know—I do not just think I know—as when crises of the past have come, if they come again, when the supreme test of the Nation comes, when its preservation is the question, these men and women of this House of Representatives will think and speak and act together for the preservation and the perpetuity of these priceless liberties that we enjoy.

It is a great thing to be chosen as a Member of this greatest of all popular legislative bodies. One term even for a constituency to trust a man or woman to speak their mind and cast their vote here is something to remember; but by the partiality and the graciousness and the confidence of one's colleagues to have been elevated to the high position that your favor has brought me to is a distinction that should satisfy the ambition of any man. I am one man in public life who has achieved every ambition he ever had.

Let me say to you again that I am grateful from the bottom of a grateful heart and I thank you.

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, due to the untimely death of our late beloved colleague, John Sullivan, of Missouri, the House adjourned yesterday in accordance with custom, transacting no business at all. Because of that situation it was impossible for Members to make their remarks on a very important event that happened 69 years ago yesterday in the birth of one of the outstanding Americans of all time, a man who devoted his entire life in the service of his State and country, both in time of peace and in time of war, and who became the Chief Executive of our beloved country.

Yesterday was the sixty-ninth anniversary of the birth of the late lamented but immortal Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Few figures in the passage of time, in the known history of man, have made their imprint on the minds of men more

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

indelibly than has Franklin D. Roosevelt. Two and more generations from now, when the history of his day and era is written impartially and objectively by historians, projecting my mind into the future as far as it is humanly possible for me to do so, and analyzing the minds of such historians, it is my confident prediction that he will be numbered among the great constructive figures of all minds in the known history of man as a great humanitarian, a man who devoted his entire life to the sick, the oppressed, the exploited, the underprivileged, a man who led our country in time of great economic conflagration and rebuilt it; a man who led our country in time of war; a man whose life of leadership has been marked with the word "success." It is only fitting and proper, as we did before in the case of President McKinley, in honoring that great American, to pause today, delayed 24 hours, to honor the memory of a great man, a great American. No matter how one might have disagreed with him in life, I am sure that everyone who served in this body and every American have deep respect for the high motives that our late President entertained in giving our country the leadership he did during the many years he was our Chief Executive. So I pause to pay tribute to one whom I knew personally. To me it is worth living to have known the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, one whom I deeply respected as a public official and one who, in my opinion, the historians of tomorrow will number among the five greatest constructive figures in the history of all times.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during the session of the House during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks by inserting in the RECORD certain letters and data in connection with the speech he will make on the bill under consideration, H. R. 1612.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution from the California State Legislature.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 103 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immedately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue for 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and now yield such time as he may desire to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make two brief announcements. First, may I say that the following-named Members will be the official objectors on the Democratic side for the Eighty-second Congress for the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

I also desire to announce that a number of Members of the House will attend the funeral of our late friend, John Sullivan, of Missouri. The requiem mass on the occasion of his burial will take place on Friday morning. Due to the weather difficulties now prevailing, arrangements will have to be made for them to leave early this evening in order to be sure they will arrive in time to attend the funeral. Consequently, the general debate on the reciprocal trade agreements bill will take place today, but the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule will be postponed until Monday next.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include an article appearing in the Lowell Sun of Saturday, January 27.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those of you who were listening to Ray Heule's Three Star Extra on the air last night heard Ned Brooks, one of that trio of Three Stars, speak of the fact that the armed services were drafting into the Army and the Navy a large number, over 400 of the Veterans' Administration doctors and over 303 nurses have been called to the armed services; dentists are being taken also.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to take away from the veterans who have given so much for us, the battle-wounded and the ill, the mentally and physically ill veterans, their fine care. This is the second time this sort of thing has happened, because during World War II some of the very best doctors of the Veterans' Administration were drafted into the Army and the Navy. Finally after pleas by the Veterans' Administration and me, the Veterans' Administration doctors were given military status. That plan was helpful.

I have been working on this matter for some time but have been unsuccessful thus far. The Veterans' Administration has the finest medical and surgical service in the world today. It is poor appreciation of our disabled to take that service, that care away from them. The Veterans' Administration doctor should be given the same rank as is given the doctors in the Army and the Navy, and the nurses, too, should have the same rank. Then that very fine care could continue. The interest of Veterans' Administration three star extra should be very helpful in bringing about the results we desire.

Go into any ward today in the hospitals, and you can see the horrible mutilations that have taken place in this Korean War. Certainly when these men are discharged they should receive the very best of care. They should be given their chance to have everything they can to be physically and mentally rehabilitated.

Mr. Speaker, at Walter Reed Hospital there is a boy named Troilo. He was given an ovation in Constitution Hall when he was introduced at the Very Important Persons performance recently which was given for the aid of the veterans. Soldier Troilo is a double amputee. Before leaving Fort Devens in my district for Korea he met and became engaged to a very fine Lowell girl. That man is a Pennsylvanian, but love of a woman is going to make him a constituent of my district. We welcome him and will give him all honor.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of January 27, 1951]

LOWELL WOMAN TO MARRY WIDELY KNOWN ARMY AMPUTEE—JUDY PAGE, 20, OSGOOD AVENUE, ENGAGED TO PFC ANTHONY J. TROILO, KOREAN WAR HERO

LOWELL.—An attractive 22-year-old Osgood Avenue woman sat close by her radio last Thursday night and her eyes sparkled as she heard the tremendous 12-minute ovation bestowed on an Army amputee by President Truman and a group of Washington VIPS.

The occasion was the VIP amateur show of the Women's National Press Club at Constitution Hall and the special guest of the evening was Pfc Anthony J. Troilo, of Norris-

town, Pa., fiancé of Miss Judy Page, of 20 Osgood Avenue in West Centralville.

TOASTED BY NATION'S LEADERS

Her legless husband-to-be was being toasted by the Nation's highest leaders and the wife of the Vice President of the United States, Mrs. Alben Barkley, was pushing his wheel chair onto the stage while the plaudits of the large crowd rang in the ears of the Korean veteran.

She found it impossible to hold back the tears a few minutes later when the soft voice of her beloved began reciting the verse of the Battle Hymn of the Republic. Judy could visualize the emotionally thrilling moments as the President and Mrs. Truman, Vice President and Mrs. Barkley, and Representative Sam Rayburn and a host of other notables sat listening to her boy friend recite the famous verse.

The young couple have been planning their wedding day for almost 2 years. Luck hasn't been with them, until now.

Judy and Tony, a Purple Heart veteran of World War II, met while he was stationed at Fort Devens. During Tony's first Christmas at Fort Devens in 1949, he was invited to the Page home for a holiday dinner, and it was then that a romance blossomed. A few months later after their initial meeting they decided to be married.

The two settled on a date in the following July for the wedding but a month before the wedding was to take place Tony was informed that his outfit would be shipping out for Korea soon.

So the two young lovers decided to postpone the wedding until he was discharged from the service, which he thought would be in a couple of months. Fate had a different view on the matter.

TAKEN PRISONER

It was with his unit, C Battery, Tenth Field Artillery Battalion, Third Infantry Division, while they were racing toward the Manchurian border that they were ambushed and he was captured by the North Koreans.

The second day after his capture, Tony was turned over to the Chinese Communists who held him and many of his buddies prisoners for 20 days before he was finally liberated by units of the Twenty-fourth Army Division.

SUFFERED FROSTBITE

During the time he was captured, Tony was put into a flimsy wooden shack and had his shoes taken away from him. He was kept there for 10 days in freezing weather, and it was during this period that Tony received a serious case of frostbite which eventually led to the amputation of both legs below the knees in an Army hospital in Japan.

When Judy heard of the amputation of Tony's legs, she was naturally pained, not for herself, but for Tony, who she knew had suffered through a tremendous ordeal. She attended church every day and prayed that Tony would recover and be returned to her. God must have heard her pleadings, for Tony will recover and will return to Judy.

Tony was flown from Japan early in December to the United States and the Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D. C., where he will undergo further surgery for the removal of six more inches from both legs.

GUEST OF DREW PEARSON

A few days before Christmas, Drew Pearson, syndicated Washington columnist, heard Tony's story and asked him to appear on his Sunday-night-before-Christmas radio program and, as an added treat, invited Judy and her mother for a 4-day all-expenses-paid trip to the Nation's capital for a visit with Tony.

Judy and Tony continue, as they have since he went overseas, to correspond every day and make plans for their wedding day, which they hope and pray will take place sometime this year. According to Judy, they will make their home in Lowell, where, as Tony told his fiancée, "he feels at home."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, while we may differ in our votes on the bill, I think we all agree that the rule, House Resolution 103, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, should be adopted, and the measure brought to the floor for debate.

I have taken this time this morning, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of correcting an evident misunderstanding. I am a national committee member. In the last few days, there has been a great deal of publicity in the newspapers, and some statements have been made on the floor of another legislative body, relative to the power and influence of national committee members in connection with certain appointments to positions in the new agencies of Government which have been created to meet the grave national emergency which confronts us. So I want to make this statement: I have not been approached by any public official or representative of this administration with the request that I, as a member of the national committee make any endorsement or recommendation of any person who has sought or has been appointed to any of these new positions which have been so lately created.

I have checked with two of my colleagues on the national committee, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], and they advise me they have not been so approached. So after a rather careful, and prolonged study and investigation, I find that if this rule that all patronage matters must be cleared with the members of the national committee, as charged, is in effect it does not apply to the membership national committee to which Mrs. HARDEN, Mr. REECE, and I belong. I wish to make it very clear that we are members of the Republican National Committee, and as such, we have not been bothered at any time, or consulted or contacted, concerning any of these appointments to jobs downtown, as some people may think we have been.

So I hope that those who do seek such appointments in these great war agencies to these new jobs that have been created because of this great national emergency will realize none of the three of us has anything to do with such patronage matters. Whether any other committee member has any influence in connection with selecting these new job holders, I do not know; but, always being very honest and frank with my colleagues, I might say to the gentleman from Tennessee, I am rather suspicious that perhaps there is some foundation for these reports of political influence dominating the employment situation here in Washington, because, bearing a rather honorable but common name, I sometimes get calls actually meant for other Members of the House having names similar to mine, and before the caller finds out from which State I come, am consulted on Federal patronage matters. But I do want to make it clear that it has not been the practice of this administration to consult the members of the Republican National Committee in connection with any dispensation of Federal jobs, as has been so freely discussed in the other body, and in the columns of the press, during recent days.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I represent a heavily populated railroad district in Pennsylvania, where we have hundreds of retired railroad employees or their survivors who are barely existing on a meager annuity or pension. These good Americans are victims of the high cost of living and without fear of contradiction, I can say that some of them are actually hungry.

During the Eighty-first Congress there were nearly 50 amendments offered to the Railroad Retirement Act, all of them providing for liberalization of the existing law and an increase in monthly benefits. I was among the Members of Congress who sponsored these amendments and pleaded for action, only to be informed that the retirement fund would not stand an increase in benefits. In this connection, there was an honest difference of opinion among those who speak for railway labor and among Members of Congress.

Already in the Eighty-second Congress, many bills have been introduced to provide for the liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase monthly benefits. Among these bills are several measures introduced by me which include H. R. 1404, H. R. 1405, and H. R. 1406.

H. R. 1404 provides for a 20-percent increase to all annuitants and pensioners under the Railroad Retirement Act.

H. R. 1405 provides for a 20 percent increase for widows and other survivors of retired railroad employees.

H. R. 1406 is a straight across-the-board increase of $15 monthly to all retired railroad employees.

These bills in my estimation represent a reasonable approach to the plight of the retired railroad employee or his survivors, and at the same time they can serve as a basis for immediate action by this Congress in amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired railroader who is receiving a monthly annuity is 70.2 years. There are 247,000 of them and their average monthly check is $82.81.

The average age of the pensioner is 81.9 years and there are 7,840 of them who receive an average monthly pension of $70.80.

The average age of the widow of a retired railroader is 72.8 years and there are 75,491 of them who receive an average monthly survivor's annuity of $29.59.

Taking into consideration the meager monthly benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act, it is interesting to compare them with the sharp

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

increase in the cost of living since 1937, when Congress enacted the Railroad Retirement Act.

The following information was furnished me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor under date of January 12, 1951. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1951.

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: In response to your telephone request to Mr. Hollander of our office today, I am sending you the following tabulations of consumers' prices indexes for moderate-income families in large cities combined (national average), by major classes, for the years 1937, 1948, and for November 1950, the latest month for which figures are available, and the percent changes for the periods specified.

INDEXES (1935–39=100)

	1937	1948	Nov. 15, 1950
All items	102.7	171.2	175.6
Food	105.3	210.2	209.5
Apparel	102.8	198.0	195.0
Rent	100.9	117.4	125.4
Fuel, electricity and refrigeration	100.2	133.9	143.7
Housefurnishings	104.3	195.8	202.3
Miscellaneous	101.0	149.9	160.5

PERCENT CHANGES

	1937 to 1948	1948 to November 1950	1937 to November 1950
All items	+66.7	+2.6	+71.0
Food	+99.6	−.3	+99.0
Apparel	+92.6	−1.5	+89.7
Rent	+16.4	+6.8	+24.3
Fuel, electricity and refrigeration	+33.6	+7.3	+43.4
Housefurnishings	+87.7	+3.3	+94.0
Miscellaneous	+48.4	+7.1	+58.9

I hope these figures will serve your purpose. Do not hesitate to call on me if I can be of service at any time.

Very truly yours,

EWAN CLAGUE,
Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, since the Railroad Retirement Act was approved by Congress, the only increase granted was the 20-percent increase approved by the Eightieth Congress to annuitants and pensioners. This increase did not include widows or survivors. Yet, the cost of living on all items increased 71 percent between 1937 and November 1950 and, as we all know, is continually rising.

As I said in the beginning, the retired railroader or his survivors are in many cases actually hungry and we are guilty of gross negligence if we continue to ignore their plight.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I paid tribute, along with other Members of the House, to the great service of our great Speaker, as will appear in the RECORD, but at this time I am reminded that today another Government employee rounds out 49 years of service: Mr. Joseph H. McGann, who has been with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for 49 years.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may revise and extend my remarks, and that the same be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration makes in order the bill (H. R. 1612) which is the usual extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which we have had heretofore. The resolution provides for 1 day of general debate. As I understand it, the general debate will continue throughout the day, and the vote will be taken later. I have no request for time on this side, Mr. Speaker.

I therefore move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1612, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the debate will continue throughout the day, with the time equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very much honored by this large attendance here today, since almost the full membership of the House have come here for discussion of this very important resolution under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1612, the pending bill, would extend for another 3 years from June 12, 1951, the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. It will be remembered that the original trade agreements legislation in 1934 was conceived as a basic change in the American tariff philosophy embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which established the highest tariff schedules in our history. At the time of enactment of the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, the most eminent economists in the country warned of the potential dangers from its enactment. Although its sponsors predicted that it would bring about unparalleled prosperity, we were soon to experience our worst economic catastrophe.

It was in this setting that the Honorable Cordell Hull, one of the most honored and revered statesmen and greatest public servants our country has given to the world, conceived the reciprocal trade program for adjustment on a mutually reciprocal basis with other nations of the barriers to world trade. This is the picture which he presented to the Committee on Ways and Means on March 8, 1934—and my colleagues will well remember that he had served for 16 years on the Committee on Ways and Means before he left the Congress. He said:

> Extreme obstructions to international trade inevitably result in serious economic controversies or wars, the minimum of commerce between nations, constant overproduction through lack of facilities for distribution, together with every sort of artificial device to deal with the domestic price situation, vast idleness of labor, and emigration of capital into thousands of foreign industrial plants, to say nothing of the difficulties of effecting transfers of debt service due from one country to another. The alternative policy would appear to comprize a liberalization of the existing obstructions and restrictions by degrees and over a period of time through careful trade arrangements, to a more moderate and reasonable basis.

The Committee on Ways and Means agreed with the policy recommendations of Secretary of State Hull. The committee concluded in its report on the trade agreements bill:

> To meet the present world situation the first feasible step is to enable the Executive to enter upon a program of bargaining agreements with other nations. The very nature of international negotiation requires that it should be in the hands of the Executive; and to meet an international condition where foreign executives are being clothed with ever greater and greater power to effectuate speedy trade agreements, the United States, if it is to regain its lost proportion of world trade, must repose similar confidence in its President.
>
> The proposed bill nevertheless does not remove from Congress its control of policy which must underlie every tariff adjustment. Although the exigencies of present-day conditions require that more and more of the details be left to Presidential determination, the Congress must and always will declare the policy to which the Executive gives effect.

OPERATION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Since the original enactment in 1934, the administration of the reciprocal trade program has been reviewed by the Congress on six previous occasions. Except for the Trade Agreements Act of 1948, enacted when opponents of the reciprocal trade program were in control of the Congress, the legislation on each occasion has been extended in substantially its original form. The procedures under existing law are as follows:

AGENCIES REPRESENTED ON THE TRADE AGREEMENTS COMMITTEE

First. The statute vests the trade-agreements authority in the President, and he is responsible for the decisions involved in making a trade agreement. In making decisions under the Trade Agreements Act, the President is required by

law to consult the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Defense, and the Tariff Commission. In actual practice, the President calls upon not only these departments and agencies, but also other departments represented on the Trade Agreements Committee, including the Departments of Labor, Interior, and the Treasury, and also the Economic Cooperation Administration.

INITIAL SELECTION OF ITEMS FOR POSSIBLE NEGOTIATIONS

Second. The Trade Agreements Committee analyzes our trade with a particular country and selects items which we export to that country upon which concessions might be made and articles imported into this country upon which tariff concessions might be made. The list of articles imported into the United States is submitted by the Trade Agreements Committee to the President for approval.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Third. When the President has approved the list of imports suggested for negotiation, hearings are scheduled to obtain the views of all interested persons and groups. This may be accomplished by filing a written memorandum, although most parties also appear in person. After the hearing is concluded, the record is reviewed by a subcommittee which recommends whether a concession would be justified and if so what the extent of the concession should be. These recommendations are then reviewed by the entire Trade Agreements Committee and the recommendations of the committee, together with any dissenting views, are forwarded to the President for final decision.

A similar procedure is followed with respect to concessions on American exports which may be scheduled for negotiation.

REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT

Fourth. The President reviews the recommendations of the Trade Agreements Committee and, in the event of disagreement, decides what course shall be followed. He then instructs the United States negotiators what concessions they may make, provided they can get from the negotiating country the concessions which are being asked.

NEGOTIATION OF A TRADE AGREEMENT

Fifth. The actual negotiation is conducted by a team consisting usually of representatives of the Department of State, the Tariff Commission, and the Department of Commerce, as well as representatives from other departments with a particular interest in the items being negotiated.

In recent years the United States has taken the lead in arranging for negotiations among several countries at the same time. At Geneva in 1947, the United States and 22 other countries negotiated tariff concessions simultaneously, and all concessions made by one country to another country were also made available to the other nations participating. These concessions are embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Similar multilateral negotiations were conducted in France in 1949 and are in process in England at the present time.

THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

Sixth. In every trade agreement negotiated since 1943, an escape clause has been inserted under which a concession may be withdrawn if it is found that as a result of unforeseen circumstances and of the concession, imports are causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry. It is indicative of the care with which trade agreements have been negotiated that, although the United States has made concessions on several thousand items in trade agreements that contain the escape clause only 20 applications for investigations, covering 17 products, have been filed with the Tariff Commission. Of these applications, only one, involving women's fur felt hats and hat bodies, has been found by the Tariff Commission to justify action.

This is how the Trade Agreements Act was conceived and how it has been administered.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

We now have trade agreements in effect with 45 other countries, with which, in 1949, we carried on about 75 percent of our foreign trade. These countries and ourselves together carry on about 82 percent of the total trade of the world. I believe it a fair summation of the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means that no representative of an American industry presented any convincing evidence that it had either been seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of concessions made under the Trade Agreements Act. As has been the case over the years, the opponents of the trade-agreements legislation rest their case upon the vague and thus far illusory fear that sometime in the future they might suffer some injury.

On the other hand, American industries which rely heavily on export markets have benefited materially by the adjustments made by other nations in trade agreements with this country. Those who express such great concern for the welfare of domestic industry, mining, and agriculture might well take into account that in 1949 the United States exported 39 percent of our production of wheat; 32 percent of our raw cotton; 25 percent of the leaf tobacco and turpentine; 24 percent of the lard; 17 percent of the soybean oil and 10 percent of the soybeans; 13 percent of our condensed, evaporated, and dried milk.

We exported, in 1949, 25 percent of all lubrication oil, 30 percent of our paraffin wax, and 12 percent of our anthracite coal.

Our exports of manufactured articles included 32 percent of all machine tools; 20 percent of all agricultural machinery—1948 figure; almost 10 percent of all cotton cloth and duck; about 9 percent of the broad-woven synthetic fabrics, such as rayon and nylon; and over 8 percent of all iron and steel products, including over 15 percent of the tinplate, 12 percent of heavy structural shapes, and 11 percent of the rails.

The welfare of these exporting industries and of others, with total employment of around 40,000,000, has been greatly enhanced by the concessions which have been obtained through the reciprocal trade program. In 1947 at least 2,400,000 workers were engaged in production for export alone. Moreover, the concessions granted by the United States have enhanced the ability of other countries to purchase the goods which we have to sell.

THE 1948 PERIL-POINT AMENDMENT

Despite this record of achievement, which has been generally acclaimed by organizations representing industry, agriculture, labor, and the American consumer, and which has been approved in editorials of the vast majority of the American press, the following crippling limitations upon these tried and tested procedures were imposed by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948:

First. The President was prohibited from negotiating any trade agreement until he had received a report from the Tariff Commission fixing a peril-point or minimum-tariff level on each article to be considered for possible modification of duties or until 120 days had elapsed. Just what does this mean? The effect is to superimpose the judgment of the Tariff Commission over the collective judgment of the Trade Agreements Committee, consisting of all the interested departments and agencies of the Government in the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements.

Second. The Tariff Commission could no longer be represented on the Trade Agreements Committee and would be precluded from consulting with the President in preparing for trade-agreement negotiation.

Third. In the actual negotiation of a trade agreement with tariff experts of foreign countries, the President was denied the participation and assistance of some of the best qualified personnel in our own Government—the members of the Tariff Commission and their staff.

Fourth, if the President, in the overall national interest, decided to negotiate a reduction in tariff rates below the minimum recommended by the Tariff Commission, whose only concern was the protection of American producers, he had to justify publicly his action to the Congress.

These restrictions were found by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress in 1949 to be both unwise and unnecessary. They are again advanced by opponents of reciprocal trade agreements, who do not dare openly to advocate complete repeal of the legislation.

CONCLUSION

It is my judgment that the expansion of international trade and the elimination of trade barriers provide a stable foundation upon which to build a sound foreign economic policy. The trade-agreements program, in my opinion, is the best method yet devised, tested by the experience of 17 years, of attaining these goals.

I understand that several amendments may be offered to improve the program

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and to perfect the techniques for negotiating trade agreements. I believe that, in addition to the substance of such amendments, it may be well to take into account their sponsorship. I suspect that they may be offered by Members who, over the years, have been among the stanchest opponents of the trade-agreements legislation. Now, like Greeks bearing gifts, they seek to aid us. Having found that they could not kill the reciprocal trade program by frontal assault, they have now embarked on a flank attack.

The record of recent multilateral negotiations bespeaks the success with which the program is being administered. These activities, in turn, help to insure the realization of the greatest possible benefit from our Marshall-plan aid. It would seem fruitless to revive the production of the factories and farms of the war-torn countries, if the most efficient use of this production is to be prevented by barriers to trade. And the maximum collective economic strength of the free nations is now essential to our military security in the days ahead.

It was my privilege to sponsor the original legislation to implement the Hull reciprocal trade program in a period of economic crisis. I am as proud of the sponsorship of that measure and of every genuine bill to extend the life of the trade-agreements program as I am of any bill that I have introduced in my 40 years in the Congress.

It is my earnest conviction that the extension of the program for another 3 years is fully as important to our national welfare as was its enactment in the first instance.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I am very much interested in the splendid talk the gentleman is making, pointing out the possible operation of the escape clause over the last number of years. I should like to inquire of the gentleman if our Government has made use of the escape clause to any considerable extent since these treaties were enacted, in which the escape clause was written.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will be very glad to answer. It is my understanding that dozens of agreements have been negotiated and entered into making concessions on thousands of articles, and only in about 20 instances have there been even a request for consideration under the escape clause, or has there been complaint that any industry was injured or threatened with injury.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will be glad to.

Mr. VURSELL. I happen to be interested in this matter because of the Elgin Watch Co. and other people engaged in the manufacture of jeweled watches who I happen to know have done practically everything within their power in the past to get the use of the escape clause. Does the gentleman have in mind or recalls whether or not the escape clause has yet been applied for the protection of the American watch industry?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe there was no escape clause in the trade agreement with Switzerland until recently. It was in that agreement that the concession on jeweled-watch movements was made. I have not heard of any watch industry that has been in any distress or financial trouble with the exception of the Waltham Watch Co. They have been in trouble for some time. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has loaned them a lot of money, I understand. However, I understand the Elgin Watch Co., in the gentleman's home State, is so successful that it has been paying extra dividends the last few years, so there will not be any occasion for it to apply under the escape clause for any relief.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not happen to know what their progress from a business and financial standpoint has been the last year or two, but I do know that a few years ago they were down here pointing out to many Members of Congress from Illinois, as well as other Congressmen, the devastating effect. They told us they were unable to get any relief whatever from these trade agreements, especially insofar as the application of the escape clause was concerned. I just give the gentleman that for what it is worth.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman know whether or not these complaints are based on the fear of injury, or on an injury that has resulted as an effect of these trade agreements? Before our committee the entire complaint against the program was not based on any serious damage that has been done, with the possible exception of one or two isolated industries that claimed to be adversely affected. They never mentioned the benefits that have come as a result of these trade agreements, but complained about the injuries. Even the complaint, however, usually was that they feared what might occur, rather than what had occurred.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not want to argue the question with my esteemed friend, but I should like to point out that since the last World War we have had only three or four watchmaking concerns in the United States, and from 75 to 85 percent of all the watches used in this country are watches imported mainly from Switzerland. It seems quite evident on the face of it that the watch industry has not fared too well, else there would not be but two or three major watch companies now operating in the country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. As far as I recall, there is no complaint that any watchmaking company in the country has suffered at all under any circumstances, except the Waltham Watch Co. That is my understanding.

I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. It is my understanding that the Waltham Watch Co. went out of business primarily because of the fact that it had been engaged in manufacturing precision instruments, timepieces, and so forth, that were used in the last war. During the time they were so engaged, Swiss watches were permitted to come in to take over their trade. Now that many of our industries are turning to the manufacture of defense needs, is it possible that other watch companies might engage in similar manufacture, such as making timepieces for guided missiles, and so forth, and that, with additional watches coming in during this entire time, whether they be from Switzerland or other countries, these other watch companies might again find themselves in the very same situation the Waltham Watch Co. found itself?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is possible. If that evil day arrives, which we hope it never will, then will be the time to make complaint and apply for relief under the escape clause that has now been inserted in the reciprocal-trade agreement with Switzerland. You cannot anticipate what will happen years and years from now, I am sure. It is hard enough to anticipate what may occur a month or 2 months from now. However, I would think that if manufacturing concerns in this country are now going to shift from making watches to making war implements and other things necessary for our national defense, then it would be fortunate for the watch consumers of this country that some foreign country can supply them with watches. We would have been out of watches, according to what you say, if that had been done.

Mr. SADLAK. When this situation, which is becoming more aggravated daily, is over, our watch companies would like again to revert to the manufacture of watches. There would be no one to whom to sell the goods, and the market would again be flooded.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Every watch company in this country which is operated on a businesslike basis is getting along well. What more could you want?

Mr. SADLAK. I am just trying to look in the future a little bit further. If these treaties continue, what will happen to the other industries, in view of the fact we are rapidly converting to defense work?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does not the gentleman think that we should cross that bridge when we come to the stream?

Mr. SADLAK. Of course a long time is taken up in the negotiation of these treaties.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If we were to legislate in anticipation of every possible contingency which might arise, I do not know what we would have to go by.

Mr. SADLAK. Then the gentleman agrees that the proper protection for this situation would be to make sure that the escape clause is in all of these agreements?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, I understand that it is the present policy of our Government to get escape clauses into existing trade agreements which do not now contain them. A congressional mandate, however, requiring that an escape clause be put in all present agreements which do not contain such a clause would put

our negotiators in the position of being forced to get the clause inserted regardless of the price. The other countries' negotiators, realizing this fact, would simply raise the ante. This is not the best or most intelligent method of protecting the interests of the United States. It would certainly seriously handicap our negotiators.

I do agree, however, that the insertion of an escape clause in all trade agreements is a desirable goal.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman also agress the only time the escape clause was invoked during all the time that these treaties have been in existence was in the case of the fur felt hats and the fur felt hat bodies coming from Czechoslovakia?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. In the other cases, the Tariff Commission has found no basis for recommending that the escape clause be invoked. And I know, on the basis of the hearings before our committee, that those who represent labor, those who represent agriculture, and those who represent industry, are of the opinion that the Reciprocal Trade Agreement policy has been a success and they recommend that it be extended. That is about all that I can tell the gentleman. Of course it is entirely possible that in some isolated case, in some industry, a plant might be adversely affected. But on the other side of the scales the benefits far outweight any damage or hardship or injustice which might occur to some small isolated industry. Consider our exports of agricultural products of tobacco and cotton and wheat and exports of industrial products such as automobiles and tools and a thousand and one other things. If we do not buy something, how are we going to have an export market for the products which we have in excess? Of course, if you could sell everything and buy nothing, that would be fine; but that does not work. We tried that under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and we tried it under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, and it did not work. Now the reciprocal trade policy has been tried, and it has been found to be the most successful policy yet. I do not claim that it is perfect. Nobody claims it is perfect. We have not yet attained a state of perfection in legislation in any field, so far as I know. But as far as it has been tested, the Trade Agreements Act is the most successful and satisfactory and practical method that has ever been devised for dealing with tariff matters.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the agricultural leaders were in favor of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as administered?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Goss, master of the National Grange, was against it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I know; but the American Farm Bureau Federation is for it. The National Farmers Union is for it. Of course there are a few dissenting votes here and there, but the large preponderance of those who express the view of agriculture or represent agriculture favor the continuance of this policy.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Wiser, president of the Farm Bureau of California, is very much against the program as it is now administered.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, but he is in the minority.

Mr. SCUDDER. No, he is the president of the Farm Bureau of California and he speaks for the entire organization.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He may be, but he is in the minority so far as agriculture is concerned.

Mr. SCUDDER. No, I would not say so. I think the Farm Bureau represents agriculture.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman did not hear the testimony as we did, or he would think otherwise.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have lived in agricultural areas all my life. I believe I can appreciate whom they represent, because the Farm Bureau does represent the producing agriculturalists of the country and they are very definitely against the program as it is presently administered. There should be a sound administration of the program.

Last week I had a report from my district where they have lowered the tariff and they are bringing into this country almonds. That is a sizable industry in my district. So far, out of this crop they have brought in 7,200,000 pounds of processed almonds, and it is feared that if this is not curtailed the imports will reach eighteen to twenty million pounds. If they would reduce that to 500,000 pounds it would about equal the amount of consumption together with the almonds produced in this country. It is anticipated that they will bring in from Spain between eighteen and twenty million pounds of processed almonds this year, which will ruin the entire industry in California.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But it has not been done yet.

Mr. SCUDDER. Well, it will be.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is what they all say. They all talk about what might happen. When that time comes, they can invoke the escape clause.

Mr. SCUDDER. Last year it broke the olive business in California.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, they are not all the people in the United States.

Mr. SCUDDER. But they are an appreciable amount.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course, they are. The consumers of this country are also entitled to some consideration. You do not hear a voice raised by those who oppose the reciprocal trade policy in the interest of the consumer.

Mr. SCUDDER. I had an agricultural group listen to me last year when they were investigating these things because of the effect on labor.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman is entitled to his views, but he is in the minority. He is so far in the minority as to be lonesome.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. HERLONG. In connection with what the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] said, I think the record will show that I opposed this legislation at the last session. We, in Florida, have a peculiar problem that is very much the same as that of the gentleman from California, but I have taken the time to call my people down there who are interested in this and explain to them the over-all values of the program, in view of the present international situation. They have told me within the last hour that as good Americans they would not oppose this legislation and would not ask me to oppose it, because of the value to the entire country at this time. I just wanted you to know how they felt.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will yield to my friend, but I know his attitude beforehand, that if he had his way he would kill this program, that he would wipe it out overnight if he had his way.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. My chairman, as always, is direct, as he always is when we deal across the table.

I was pleased a bit ago, though, to hear him imply that there might be some small industries which are hurt, but that because they were small it would not be critical to the Nation's welfare. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I understood the gentleman to say that it might result in some small industries being damaged, but that the over-all good to the Nation is the controlling factor, and that justifies injuries to some small businesses. Is that right?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will answer the gentleman's question by asking him one: The gentleman will recall that we had extensive hearings, giving an opportunity to be heard to those opposed to the bill and to those who favored the extension of the act; was not the overwhelming testimony to the effect—I do not mean of the hired mourners and paid lobbyists, but I mean of those who directly represented industry, agriculture, and labor—that labor, agriculture, and industry favored the extension of this reciprocal trade policy? If not, why has it stood up for over 16 years? It should be remembered that every 2 years we have had the opportunity of changing it, or doing away with it, yet it has stood the test of time. Notwithstanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to emasculate it. Unable to kill it outright, he wants to cripple it by flank attack by offering crippling amendments. I know the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has referred to the great watchmaking industry, the timepiece making industry. He seemed to agree

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that that industry may have been damaged somewhat. I say that the watchmaking industry has been damaged—25 percent of the industry has been eliminated. The great Waltham Watch Co. had to fold up and close up, one of four great companies, had to close up as the result of the reciprocal-trade program. The gentleman justifies that by saying that the over-all economy of the country is helped even though that one industry may be damaged. That is his position. He also believes that other industry, as I understand—the pottery business—it employs only a few people, relatively speaking, and perhaps the general economy can stand the loss of that industry and the country keep going ahead. But with respect to watches and timepieces, in this hour of war when that industry is needed badly, when it is vital to the conduct of the war, we have to go to Switzerland in order to get the instruments we need with which to carry on the war. That is not right. That is why this policy is hurting our economy today.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will ask the gentleman one question: Whether or not he favors, and if so, when he was converted to the reciprocal trade policy dealing with tariff problems? Whether or not he will agree that it has demonstrated itself to be the most effective, most desirable, and most satisfactory method of dealing with our foreign trade? Will the gentleman answer that "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I answer "No." I think the boys in the State Department are trading away the economy of our country by bringing in goods from abroad. The gentleman states that American labor is for this bill. The American Flint Glass Workers Union is opposed to it, the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, the Seafarers International Union, the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders and dozens of others right here in the testimony are opposed to it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If this is an unsound policy why did not the Republicans repeal it in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am willing to do it right now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows public sentiment would have condemned your action if you had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under leave already granted to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following statements, letters, and editorials:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DEAN ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1951, IN SUPPORT OF RENEWAL OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing today in support of H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act for a further period of 3 years. Statements in support of the bill are also being sent to the committee by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, Treasury, and the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

PRESENT SERIOUS SITUATION

I want, first, to place the trade-agreements program in the context of our total foreign policy. The President, in his State of the Union and budget messages, has described the challenge of our times and what we as a people and as a Government must do to meet it. He has explained that this challenge is not only the threat of military aggression. It is also the threat of subversion, of stirring up class strife, of exploiting discontent, of preventing economic improvement. He has pointed out that we must be prepared to meet this threat in both of its aspects.

To do this we must do everything possible to build up the strength of the free world and to give its people a real stake in its future.

There is great need in the world today for expansion of production so that the peoples in the less-developed areas may look forward to better living conditions and have a democratic alternative to the promises of the Kremlin. We will need to continue economic assistance for this purpose.

In other areas where postwar recovery is nearly complete, some countries will need further economic assistance to mount the necessary effort for our common defense.

Another integral part of the process of building strength in the free world has been the effort to expand the flow of trade. Only by a greater exchange of goods between countries can the full benefits of economic development and greater production be maintained.

The trade-agreements program has been a major element in our participation in this process of expanding world trade.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS SINCE THE WAR

In facing the crucial peril of today, we can be thankful that so much has been accomplished since 1945 in rebuilding the economic strength of many areas of the world.

Our own country has higher levels of employment and production than ever before. With the aid of the European recovery program, the countries of Western Europe have made remarkable progress in the restoration of their production and in building up their economic strength. Production in Latin America and in other areas of the world has substantially increased. Considerable progress has been made toward a restoration in balance in the international balance of payments of many countries.

Through the economic-development programs of various governments, the point 4 program and the technical-assistance programs of the United Nations, a concerted effort has been begun to help improve economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The more developed countries have started to share with the people in those areas some of the skills and some of the knowledge which will help them to improve their present unsatisfactory standards of living; which will give them a real stake in the future.

Important steps have been taken for the expansion of world trade. Tariffs have been reduced over a wider area of world trade than ever before. Agreement has been reached limiting the use of various forms of trade restrictions. A wide area of trade in Europe has been entirely freed from quotas. Some important restrictions in the Western Hemisphere have been lifted completely.

Each of these activities has contributed in its own way to building greater strength and greater unity in the free world. Each has produced both immediate improvements and promise for the future. Each has been carried on by many countries working together. None could have achieved comparable results if the various countries had been working separately and alone.

NEED TO MAINTAIN GAINS

It is essential that these gains should be preserved. Wherever possible, they should be carried forward. In mobilizing to defend ourselves, we must not neglect or lose sight of the positive things that we are fighting for.

It is obvious that for some time to come large areas of world trade will be under some kind of control. Some of these controls, for example, will be imposed for security reasons. Others will be imposed to assure an equitable distribution of scarce materials. Yet there will still be a substantial volume of trade moving in regular commercial channels. But we do not want those controls to go beyond what is really necessary. We do not want any unnecessary obstacles to interfere with the flow of needed goods. It is essential to our security and well-being that the objective of expanding trade be kept constantly before us and that the instruments for such expansion be kept available and used wherever and whenever possible.

The Trade Agreements Act is such an instrument. The act has enabled the United States to participate for many years in the practical work of world-wide tariff reduction. It has done more than that. It has become a symbol of United States determination to lead in the cooperative effort to expand world trade.

Renewal of the act will reaffirm that determination. Failure to renew the act would be a symbol of withdrawal from that cooperative effort.

OPERATIONS UNDER THE ACT

The Government agencies which have been administering the act over the past 16 years have rendered an account of their stewardship from time to time in the hearings which have been held before this committee on the occasion of the successive renewals of the act. I would like, however, to summarize briefly the scope of what has been done under the authority of the act and to refresh the committee's recollection again as to the manner in which the act has been administered.

The results of the operation of the trade agreements program to date are set forth authoritatively and in detail in the reports of the Tariff Commission to the Congress. The most recent of these reports covers the period April 1949 to June 1950 and has, I believe, recently been made available to this committee.

During the course of the years in which the Trade Agreements Act has been in effect, we have negotiated trade agreements with 45 countries, with which in 1949 we carried on about 75 percent of our foreign trade. These countries and ourselves together carry on 82 percent of the total trade of the world.

In these negotiations the administration has kept continuously in mind the needs of producers and workers in both American industry and American agriculture. The concessions we have granted have applied almost equally to agricultural products and nonagricultural products. On the other side of the ledger slightly more concessions have been obtained for agricultural products in other countries than for nonagricultural products.

The earlier agreements negotiated under the act were agreements simply between ourselves and one other country. There are now 14 of these bilateral agreements.

Under the 1945 renewal, however, a new approach was used, which was designed to increase the benefits to be obtained under the program and to widen the area of world trade covered by reductions of tariffs and tariff preferences.

This approach was to invite a number of countries to negotiate with us simultaneously and at the same time to negotiate with

each other. The effect was to extend the area of reductions of tariffs and preferences to the trade between the other countries themselves, and thus greatly to increase the potential effect of the negotiations upon the level of world trade. Moreover, the United States becomes entitled to the benefits of the tariff concessions and preference reductions made by the other countries to each other, as well as those negotiated directly with us.

The result of these multilateral negotiations is embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This technique has proved so successful that 32 countries are now parties to that agreement and 7 more are now negotiating to accede to it at Torquay. The products included in the tariff schedules of the general agreement account for somewhat over half the entire trade of the world.

A further reason why the multilateral approach was felt to be more effective in helping to expand trade was that it would mean a far wider application of the general provisions of trade agreements.

These general provisions, as the committee will recall, obligate the parties to the agreement to do such things as give each other most-favored-nation treatment, not to put disguised tariffs on imports in the form of discriminatory internal taxes, to minimize the restrictive effect of customs regulations, to limit the use of quotas, not to increase preferences, permit them to take action necessary for their national security, and so forth. With the large number of countries now parties to the general agreement, these provisions constitute an important body of international commercial policy rules, and have provided a basis for the settlement of a variety of trade disputes.

The periodic meetings of the parties to the general agreement have provided a convenient opportunity for each country to put into actual practice the vital principle of consulting with other countries before taking action which might adversely affect their trade. The atmosphere around the table has been one of mutual understanding, cooperation, and respect. We hope to be able to find ways of strengthening the general agreement and making its operation even more effective.

Thus these trade-agreement negotiations have brought about a substantial reduction of tariffs and of tariff preferences on a very wide area of the world's trade.

It is particularly notable that during the period of this activity the people of the United States have achieved the highest levels of prosperity and real personal income that this country has ever known. This great expansion of employment and consumption is one of the significant factors which enables our economy to make its maximum contribution to the expansion of world trade.

The standards of wages and working conditions of the wage and salary earners of the United States, as well as the standards maintained by our farmers, during this period have been the highest in history. These standards will continue to improve over time. What has been truly remarkable about this improvement has been the generality with which standards have risen—the way in which workers and farmers in all segments of industry have benefited. This phenomenon should put to rest for once and for all the old fear that a lowering of tariff barriers would depress labor standards in the United States. Despite substantial differences in money wages paid to workers in our farms and factories and those paid abroad, the superior efficiency of our industry and agriculture has offset the apparent wage disadvantage. So much so, in fact, that it is United States competition that is feared in many areas of the world, rather than the competition of countries where wages are low and efficiency is equally low.

There are some special cases in which disparities in wages might create some degree of competitive problem, even for United States industry. This is particularly the case in industries where there has been relatively little mechanization and where labor cost is still a very large proportion of total cost. The record of action under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act demonstrates clearly that we have been fully aware of this situation, and that we have carefully acted with respect to situations of this kind in a manner that would avoid serious injury to the industry and the workers involved.

The trade agreements job has been very carefully done.

In the first place, all of these negotiations, whether bilateral or multilateral, have been conducted on a product-by-product basis. This has enabled us and the other countries to take into account the needs and problems of particular industries on the basis of the facts of each case. No country has been obligated to give concessions on any particular product. No country has been expected to give concessions unless it got satisfactory concessions in return. And every agreement negotiated since 1943, including the general agreement, has included a general escape clause. This clause permits the withdrawal or modification of a concession if, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, imports increase in such a manner as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

The procedures followed within the United States Government are carefully designed to permit maximum scope for negotiation and at the same time to guard against injury to domestic interests.

Responsibility for decisions under the act rests upon the President.

Because of the wide variety of interests which are necessarily involved in the tariff problem, the President has entrusted it to a committee composed of representatives from a number of agencies, each of which is directly concerned with important aspects of the problem. These agencies are: the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, State, and Treasury, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Tariff Commission. This committee is known as the Trade Agreements Committee. It is chaired by a representative of the Department of State.

This Committee makes its recommendations directly to the President.

The members of the Trade Agreements Committee attend the conferences at which tariff negotiations are held, such as the conferences at Geneva and Torquay. The negotiating teams, which handle the actual details of the day-to-day negotiations, also include members from several agencies.

During my years of Government service I have been in reasonably close contact with trade agreements work. I think it can fairly be said that the operation of the trade agreements organization over the years has been one of the most effective examples of interagency collaboration developed within the Government.

I have brought with me two statements which describe exactly how a trade agreement is made and the safeguards with which the administration of the act is surrounded. I would like to submit these for the record.

There is one point, however, that I would like to stress. The Congress has wisely required that public notice shall be given before the President concludes any trade agreement, so that anyone interested may be able to present his views and have them considered. Particular efforts have been made to get the largest possible amount of information from the public about products that may be involved in any negotiation. Every product that may possibly be considered for a tariff concession is described in the notice of a prospective negotiation. Written briefs are solicited. Public hearings are held at which people interested can appear to supplement their briefs and answer questions. The information thus obtained is analyzed by the experts of the various Departments and forms an integral part of the basis for the recommendations of the Trade Agreements Committee to the President. Thus every possible effort is made to ensure that those recommendations are based on full and up-to-date knowledge of the facts.

It is indicative of the care with which the program has been administered by the interdepartmental trade agreements organization, that out of all the hundreds, even thousands, of individual United States tariff items which have been reduced or bound in these agreements during the life of the escape clause, there have been only 20 applications for its use. Six of these applications are still pending before the Tariff Commission. Of the 14 that have been dealt with only 1 has been found by the Tariff Commission to justify action. In that case action was promptly taken and the concession in question was withdrawn.

The Trade Agreements Act has become a fundamental part of our foreign policy. Each renewal by the Congress has been a welcome indication to the rest of the world of the desire of the United States to play a leading part in the constructive work of expanding world trade. It is important now, as it has been in the past, that this policy be reaffirmed.

NO LARGE-SCALE NEGOTIATIONS IN PROSPECT

The next 3 years will necessarily be a period of consolidation and adjustment in the trade field rather than of major progress forward.

When the conference now going on at Torquay is over, participating countries will want to have a period of time in which to test and observe the operation of the tariff rates there agreed upon. Moreover, it is obvious that the great uncertainties of the world situation are likely to persist for some time. It is therefore not expected that there will be another Torquay within the life of the extension provided for in H. R. 1612.

Adjustments in existing agreements will, however, undoubtedly be desirable from time to time. It is possible that it may be desirable to negotiate with one or two countries not represented at Torquay, either for their accession to the general agreement or bilaterally. It is possible that some negotiations may develop in connection with efforts to promote greater integration in Europe which will involve some products in which we are interested and in which it would be to our advantage to participate on a limited scale.

Consequently, an extension of the President's authority is essential. The administration does not, however, believe that any change is needed in the limitation now included in the Trade Agreements Act on the permissible range of reduction in rates of duty. It, therefore, fully endorses H. R. 1612, introduced by the Chairman.

In conclusion, I would like to return for a moment to the central idea which I expressed at the beginning. Our primary objective is to build strength and unity in the free world. Our whole program must create immediate military strength and the economic base on which military strength depends. It must create incentives to work to achieve and maintain that strength.

Continued participation by the United States in the cooperative effort to improve the conditions of world trade will be recognized both at home and abroad as one clear indication that behind the shield of military power which we and our allies are creating, the techniques of growth and expansion are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

being maintained intact. Continuation of the trade-agreements program is one way in which we can assure the peoples of the free world that economic expansion and rising living standards for all countries is still the goal of the United States.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 22, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I understand that hearings on renewal for 3 years of the Trade Agreements Act are soon to be held by the Ways and Means Committee. I wish to lend my full support to the renewal of this legislation as being in the best interests of the country and in accordance with the program of the President.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 22, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means has before it for consideration H. R. 1612, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. The effect of this bill would be to continue the reciprocal trade agreements program, which has been in effect since 1934, for an additional period of 3 years beyond the present expiration date of June 12, 1951.

In order to conserve the time of the committee, I understand the Secretary of State will make the sole personal presentation for the administration in behalf of the bill. I wish by this letter simply to add my word of endorsement.

Apart from my direct interest in this legislation stemming from the participation of the Treasury Department in the administration of the trade-agreements program, I am interested in it also because of my responsibility as chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, the interdepartmental body which has responsibility for coordinating the policies and operations of this Government in the foreign financial, exchange, and monetary fields. Since the termination of hostilities in 1945 this Government has undertaken an unprecedented series of measures involving international cooperation with and assistance to friendly foreign countries in an effort to reestablish stable international economic relationships. An important part of this program involved an effort to promote expanding international trade as a contribution toward rising living standards both in our own country and in foreign countries. The policy of reciprocal reductions in trade barriers instituted in 1934 under the wise leadership of Cordell Hull played a useful part in carrying out these policies. A substantial measure of success has attended our efforts to achieve a sounder structure of international economic relationships, and it is important that we hold the gains we have achieved through the new difficult period in which we now find ourselves. For this purpose, it is considered essential to preserve the executive trade agreement authority, and I therefore urge your committee to give favorable consideration to H. R. 1612.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: With reference to the hearings to be held by your committee on H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, I wish to inform you that this Department favors passage of this bill.

The trade agreements program has wide support among American farmers because they realize that they have an important stake in foreign markets. Many United States agricultural products are exported in large amounts. In the last fiscal year, such exports included 37 percent of our cotton, 26 percent of our wheat, 27 percent of our tobacco, 39 percent of our rice, and nearly 35 percent of our dried fruits.

The prospects for maintaining foreign markets of our agricultural products will depend largely on whether or not we succeed in securing comparative freedom for international trade. Failure to do so will cause these markets to become more and more curtailed by the self-sufficiency policies of importing countries designed to protect high-cost production.

The reciprocal trade agreements program has made an important contribution to arresting, in important instances, the world-wide trend toward protection. The United States has, under this program, received tariff concessions from foreign countries on agricultural as well as other products. The importance of these concessions to American farmers will grow with the restoration of more normal conditions in the international economy.

To obtain these concessions, we had, of course, to make concessions on our part. As regards the latter, I would like to note that they were about evenly distributed between agricultural and nonagricultural imports. As the Tariff Commission has recently reported to Congress, import duties were reduced on 44 percent of total agricultural imports as compared with 47 percent of total nonagricultural imports. The duty reductions made average 50 percent for the agricultural and 53 percent for nonagricultural products on which duties have been reduced.

Reduction of duties and other trade barriers is, of course, the primary objective of the Trade Agreements Act and of the agreements negotiated under this act. But, as your committee certainly is aware of, the act and the agreements negotiated under it, such as the general agreement on tariffs and trade, also contain machinery for correcting inequities in the existing structure of tariffs and trade controls.

I would also like to refer to our struggle with the dollar gap in our foreign trade. For several years we were faced with the threat that, when United States foreign assistance comes to an end, this gap might be closed by a sharp curtailment—in United States exports—a curtailment which would threaten to cause depression in important sectors of American agriculture and industry. With the help of the trade agreements program, we have succeeded in expanding our imports and thus in supplying foreign countries with a current source of dollars which they can use to buy the products of American farms and factories they want.

The American people also have come to realize that we must import many products to supplement our domestic resources. This dependence on foreign products has become particularly evident in the present defense effort, but it is also an important consideration under peacetime conditions if we wish to maintain and improve our living standards.

There are also other broad benefits derived from the trade agreements program in which American farmers have an interest. By facilitating the exchange of products which we produce most advantageously for products that other countries produce most advantageously, the trade agreements program helps to link the freedom-loving nations more closely. This is of particular significance in the present critical world situation in which the Communist aggressors are using every means, economic as well as political, to split the free world.

It is also clear that the foreign assistance that we are giving under various programs will bring lasting benefits to us as well as to the recipient countries only if the opportunities for trade among the peace-loving nations are being maintained and enlarged. Continuation of our trade agreements program will give those countries assurance that we will play our part in assuring such opportunities.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Acting Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I am writing you in connection with the consideration by your committee of H. R. 1612, the bill to extend the authority to conclude reciprocal trade agreements.

The purpose of this legislation and the policies and procedures that have been followed in its administration are well known to your committee and consequently need not be discussed in detail. The disturbed conditions of international life make it unlikely that great use can be made of this authority over the next few years. It is, nevertheless, important that the legislation be kept alive as a symbol of the desire of the United States to cooperate with the rest of the free world in the progressive relaxation of tariff and trade barriers.

The procedures which have been worked out for the administration of the act are well designed to protect producers in this country from irreparable injury. At the same time benefits have been received by those industries which are dependent upon foreign sources of supply. Similarly, the concessions received from other countries have been significant for the large number of our producers who are partially dependent upon foreign markets.

Accordingly, I should like to urge favorable consideration by your committee of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: This letter is to express the strong support of the Economic Cooperation Administration for H. R. 1612, the bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

We firmly believe that the reciprocal reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers negotiated under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act have been highly beneficial to the United States both in general and in terms of the specific objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 with which this Administration is primarily concerned. We regard extension of this trade agreements

authority as most important to continued progress toward these objectives.

In the introductory section of the Economic Cooperation Act, 1948, the Congress recognized the vital importance of "the expansion of foreign trade," and "the progressive elimination of trade barriers." Congress declared it to be one of the three main purposes of the Marshall plan to aid European countries in "facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade * * * with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade."

Our experience in ECA has testified to the wisdom of this congressional emphasis on reduction of barriers to international trade in the basic provision for the European recovery program. Apart from the obvious physical destruction and disruption directly caused by the war, the two main problems we found in Western Europe were economic stagnation and the dollar gap. The high level of tariff and other barriers to international trade which had been built up in Europe, in the United States, and elsewhere in the world was a major contributing cause to both of these problems.

By the same token, efforts to reduce these barriers have proved to be a major factor in curing these conditions. By removing some of the shelter which national trade barriers provided to inefficient industries in Europe and exposing them to the invigorating effects of international competition from other European countries and, to some extent, from the United States, we have made a start on getting rid of some of the economic stagnation. European trade liberalization has been one of the major planks in ECA's program for promoting economic integration in Western Europe. As for the dollar gap, it has been clear from the beginning that there were only three ways of solving it: To cut down the level of European imports from the United States below what would be tolerable either for the peoples of Western Europe or for United States agriculture and industry; to raise the level of European dollar earnings by increasing their sales of goods and services to the United States and other parts of the dollar area; or to ask American taxpayers to continue to pay for the deficit for the indefinite future. It has seemed obvious to ECA that the second of these alternatives was by far the most desirable for everyone concerned. We have, therefore devoted considerable attention to stimulating European efforts to sell increased quantities of goods in the United States. Until recently ECA's program in this field was concentrated on encouraging increased European exports of luxury type goods which would enrich American life without competing directly with established American industries. More recently in view of the changed world circumstances, we have been concentrating on efforts to secure from Europe commodities which are in short supply in the United States both for civilian and military purposes.

The program of multilateral negotiations of reductions in tariff and other trade barriers made possible by the Trade Agreements Act has made a highly valuable contribution to the work of ECA both in attempting to secure a liberalization of trade within Europe and to close the dollar gap. This contribution has been made both at the practical and psychological levels. The actual reductions in United States tariffs which have taken place under the authority of this act have acted directly to permit increased imports of desirable European products. The specific tariff reductions negotiated by the United States with each ERP country have been generalized to the others and have thereby directly helped to liberalize trade within Europe. Perhaps even more important has been the psychological effect of the fact that the United States Government was in a position not only to preach reduction of trade barriers but to practice it. This has helped greatly in creating an atmosphere of liberalization rather than economic nationalism in Europe. On the dollar earning program we have found that many European businessmen are most reluctant to expose themselves to the vigorous free competition of the American market, in spite of the urgent need of their countries to earn more dollars. Searching for an excuse for their reluctance, they have often pointed to the high tariff barriers of the United States. Because of the existence of the Reciprocal Trade Act, we have been able to answer this contention by pointing to progressive reductions in the United States trade barriers and to the possibilities of further reductions on a reciprocal basis. We do not think that we could have made nearly as much progress either in European trade liberalization or in developing European interest in increased dollar earnings if we had not had the indirect support of the Trade Agreements Act.

The reasons why trade agreements legislation has been valuable to ECA's program in the past will continue to operate with great force in the period ahead. The need for vigorous economies, liberalized trade, and maximum dollar earnings will be greater than ever if the European countries are to carry the double burden of continued economic recovery and full-speed rearmament. Opportunities for great further strides in European integration may well occur. At the same time the pressures on the European governments and businessmen will be such that they will be strongly inclined to return to manifold governmental controls and protectionism in their own markets and to lose interest in the dollar market. There is great danger that the important achievements which have been made in the fields of trade liberalization and dollar earnings will be lost. Thus the situation could move either toward or away from the desirable short- and long-term goals of European trade liberalization and self-support. Which way it turns will be influenced to an important degree by the ability or inability of the United States to speak forcefully for and participate practically in further liberalization efforts. This ability in turn will be determined by whether or not the Trade Agreements Act is extended.

The bill under discussion provides for no increased authority for reductions in United States tariffs but simply permits further negotiations within the authority already granted. Limited further use of this existing authority can be a great asset in achieving significant progress toward American objectives in Western Europe.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the transmission of this letter since the proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act is part of the President's legislative program.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator.

ANDERSON, CLAYTON & CO.,
Houston, Tex., January 18, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Due to illness in my family I deeply regret that I am unable personally to appear before your committee to urge renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

I believe I have appeared as a witness in support of this program each time the act has come up for renewal.

In the tragic situation now confronting our country and the rest of the free world, the reasons for continuing this program are much stronger than they have ever been in the past.

Communist Russia has divided the world into two parts—the Communist world and the free world.

The peace-loving free world, enormously superior in wealth and industry to the Communist world, but just now disunited and militarily weak, stands before an aggressive, united, and powerful enemy sworn to destroy it—an enemy without conscience, without religion, without decency, without mercy.

Under the leadership of the United States, the free world has united its military strength in the North Atlantic Treaty. General Eisenhower, as Supreme Commander of the military forces of the 12 countries composing the North Atlantic Pact, is now in Europe for the purpose of organizing and leading the armies for defense which these 12 nations will provide.

But military unity alone is not sufficient to create the necessary conditions for the preservation of world peace and freedom.

It would be a great mistake to think that communism is the only obstacle to a continuation of conditions of peace and prosperity in the free world.

Communism is but an outward manifestation of the world revolution now in progress—a revolution of the have-nots—not so much against the haves as against their own lot in life.

When the Premier of Pakistan was here a few months ago, he said that when he thought of the United States, he saw a fabulously prosperous island; but still an island, surrounded by a sea of poverty, of cold and of hunger; and it frightened him.

There are just too many hundreds of millions of people who go to bed hungry and cold every night.

Someone will probably say, "But that has always been true." Yes, of course, but the modern world as we know it today has not always been here.

The first job of the free world is to make itself so strong that the aggressor dare not strike.

To do this the free world has united militarily.

The second job to which the free world must bend its efforts is the raising of the standard of living of hundreds of millions of people in the world.

The United States has also taken leadership in this field.

It is unnecessary to refer in detail to the various steps which have been taken under our leadership to improve economic conditions in the world—conditions in such deplorable state because of two world wars in one generation.

One of the most important of these steps, but the one perhaps least understood, is the reduction, through trade agreements with friendly nations, of the barriers to the movement of goods throughout the world. Much constructive work has already been done here but much remains to be done.

The standard of living of any people is measured by the quantity of useful goods available to them.

Economists agree that substantial reduction of barriers to the movement of goods between countries would greatly enlarge markets, would rationalize production on the basis of comparative advantage, would necessitate a great increase in the production of raw materials, and would enormously augment the volume of useful goods made available to the world's population.

The development of our own country proves this. This development and the consequent very high standard of living here is largely due to the freedom with which goods move across State boundaries.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This matter has unusual importance at the present time due to the fact that our preparedness program demands that we acquire great quantities of metals and other materials from all parts of the world, not only for the enormous increase in production which our program requires but also for stockpiling for future needs.

Not only should these imports be freed of the excessive tariffs which many of these materials now carry but in order to pay for these materials we must be in position to export freely of the products which the United States is in position to produce most effectively. It is, therefore, necessary that trade agreements be made with friendly countries for the mutual reduction of tariffs—our tariffs on the goods we need to import for civilian and defense needs, and their tariffs on the goods we need to export to pay for such imports.

For 15 years or more we have listened to predictions of dire results to flow from any reduction of our protective tariff. Interested parties have thought they foresaw certain ruin from any such action.

No such consequences have resulted from trade agreements already made. No such consequences can be expected to result from future trade agreements.

The care and study given by interested agencies of our Government before action is taken is a guaranty of this.

But, in any case, we face a world situation which makes imperative actions to serve the common good as opposed to individual or special interests.

The preparations which we and our allies are making to restore to the free world the power to preserve its freedom will fall with a heavy hand on some segments of the economy. For example, producers and distributors of luxuries will in many cases undoubtedly suffer great injury and possibly ruin.

In the crisis which we face we must act for the greatest good to the greatest number.

It will avail us little to restore the power of the free world to preserve its freedom if we fail to reorganize international economic relationships in such way that production and distribution will provide the people with more to eat, more to wear, and better homes in which to live.

To this end I strongly urge the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program without crippling amendment. Such a course is unquestionably dictated by our national interest.

Respectfully submitted.

W. L. CLAYTON.

STATEMENT OF MORRIS S. ROSENTHAL FOR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 1612, JANUARY 24, 1951

My name is Morris S. Rosenthal. I am president of Stein, Hall & Co., Inc., New York City.

I appear before you today as a representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to urge strongly approval of H. R. 1612, which would provide for renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. I am a member of the foreign commerce department committee and of the policy committee of the chamber.

I attach a brief description of the Chamber of Commerce.

The chamber in 1913 advocated, by referendum vote, the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission, and in 1921 supported the principle of adjustment of tariff rates by administrative authority, within the limits set by Congress.

Our support of the Trade Agreements Act has been continuous and emphatic since 1933. On May 5, 1933, the national chamber adopted a policy favoring action by our Government in initiating reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries, where such bargaining would be clearly in the public interest, keeping in mind the policy for assuring stability in internal industry and agriculture through reasonable protection. This statement was reaffirmed by the chamber membership in 1934.

The chamber, at the last annual meeting of its membership in May of 1950, renewed its support of the Trade Agreements Act. The members adopted this statement of policy:

"The policy of the Trade Agreements Act should be continued. This policy gives adequate authority for the Government, through its established agencies of negotiation and administration, to reach effective agreements for the reciprocal and selective adjustment of tariffs and other barriers to trade, including quota restrictions and other obstacles to the reasonable flow of goods and services.

"There should be appropriate safeguards in legislative provisions for ample public notice and open hearings, and clauses in the agreements providing, in case of unforeseen developments, for the modification or withdrawal of concessions, in order to prevent serious injury to domestic producers. Neither in the original form nor in practical application by reason of events that were not contemplated should agreements be permitted to cause destructive competition in American agriculture or industry."

The policy which I have just read to you has been in force, in its present form, since 1943, when it was adopted by vote of the membership. Under chamber bylaws this policy had to be considered for renewal in 1946. At that time it was submitted to the membership by referendum. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of continued support.

Prior to renewal of the policy last year, the entire question of trade agreements was again examined thoroughly. A special subcommittee of the foreign commerce department committee, which is composed of outstanding businessmen in the foreign trade field, recommended that the policy be continued. This recommendation was concurred in by the full committee, and then submitted to the board of directors of the national chamber, who also approved. Afterward, it was studied by the policy committee. That group recommended that the policy be renewed again without change, and this recommendation was approved unanimously at our annual meeting.

I have gone into the question of chamber policy at some length because I think it important to emphasize that our continued support of the Trade Agreements Act is based on careful and mature consideration by businessmen representing diverse economic and geographical interests.

Some of you will recall that on May 5, 1948, Earl O. Shreve, then president of the chamber of commerce, appeared before a subcommittee of this committee to urge renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. In June of that year, Clem D. Johnston, a director of the national chamber, took the same position before the Senate Finance Committee. At other times, statements urging renewal of the act have been filed by the national chamber.

Our support of the program is based on the firm conviction that true world peace cannot be attained without world prosperity, that world prosperity cannot be attained without expanded and unhampered international trade, and that such trade cannot be attained without sincere and determined efforts on the part of all nations to reduce the barriers to world trade.

The Trade Agreements Act enables this Nation, with others, to work for the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade. The program is not a panacea for all the ills besetting international trade. It will not, by itself, bring about world peace and prosperity. But, the program is the only logical mechanism of attacking the excessively high tariffs and the pernicious invisible barriers which operate so effectively to strangle trade.

The national chamber does not believe that all tariffs should be eliminated. We recognize the need for, and support, such tariffs as are necessary to provide adequate protection to American agriculture and industry and, also, where needed, for national security. We do not believe that all tariffs should be reduced to a specified equivalent ad valorem duty, for a high tariff on one item will not necessarily be restrictive, whereas a relatively low equivalent ad valorem duty on another may still be high enough effectively to preclude imports.

By the policy which I have read to you, it is evident that the chamber membership recognizes the importance of having available at all times appropriate executive machinery for the prompt adjustment of tariffs through reciprocal negotiations, flexible enough to meet rapidly changing world economic conditions. At the same time, one of the fundamentals of the chamber's position has been, very naturally, that the administrative machinery contain adequate safeguards for the protection of domestic industry and agriculture from destructive competition by foreign goods. The escape clause, established by Executive order, provides this protection.

It seems logical to assume that the reduction of excessive tariffs, with the elimination of other restrictive barriers, will be an important step on the road to unhampered and expanding international trade. The Trade Agreements Act is, so far, the most realistic and practical method of attaining this type of world trade.

Accepting, then, the premise that the Trade Agreements Act will, under normal conditions, permit private international trade to expand, the question to be answered is: "Do we want to encourage such trade?"

The answer is an unequivocal "Yes."

No nation, not even the United States, is self-sufficient. The high standard of living which we enjoy in the United States would not be possible without imports. It is true that our imports represent only a small percentage, generally less than 5 percent, of national income. But without certain products which we must import, our national income, and our standard of living, would be much lower. Where would we be, for instance, without coffee, and sugar, and tungsten? We could get along, but at a much lower standard of living. In the manufacture of the automobile, which is certainly a typically American product, it is necessary to import close to 100 different items.

Other nations, less richly endowed with natural resources and industrial potentialities, are even more dependent than we on imports. Those nations, too, could get along without imports, but the results would be even more drastic than they would be for us. Artificial barriers to trade can be erected, as they have in the past, but out of those barriers will spring the poverty and want of a lowered standard of living, and it is in the grounds of that despair that the seeds of communism are sown. Economic isolationism cannot, in the long run, benefit any free country.

Because the Trade Agreements Act will help to expand international trade, by reducing the barriers, the Chamber of Commerce gives it its support.

There is another factor which must be considered, a factor which can be evaluated in terms of black ink or red ink on the balance sheet. Increased trade means increased business for all segments of our economy. Almost every major industrial group does some export business, and in many cases the export market represents a fairly large percentage of the total business volume. Even if foreign sales represent only a small percentage of total sales, it may mean the difference between profit and loss.

We should not make the mistake of believing that the size of the export market is important only to our manufacturing interests. Shipments of agricultural products and extracted raw materials have formed a large part of our total export market.

There may have been some temporary disturbances in some lines of business as a result of adjustments necessary to meet altered conditions, and there has probably been a greater degree of competition, short of permanent injury, from foreign goods due to reduced American tariffs. It is my opinion, and I think this is shared by many persons who have been intimately associated with the details of the program, that those who have complained about these things have been prompted more by apprehension as to possible future injury than by actual experience of destructive effects. I believe that instances in which actual injury have occurred, and which have been serious enough to warrant recourse to the established machinery for the correction of abuses, have been very few.

On a historical basis, 60 percent or more of our imports come in duty-free. Thus, no more than 40 percent of our total imports could possibly be affected. Actually, only a very much smaller percentage could now be reduced. In many cases duties are now down to the limit which our negotiators feel is wise, and in other cases the duties have been reduced by the maximum permitted by our laws. Thus, the scope of further reduction of our own duties is limited. If we do not now continue the act, there will be no possible chance of getting other countries to reduce their tariffs and eliminate other obstacles.

Before closing I would like to make a few remarks about whether the act should be continued during this period, which has been so aptly termed the "dark-gray period" of mobilization. There is, I am convinced, even more reason now to work for reciprocal trade agreements than there has been in the past.

At the present time, or during a war, there will still be some private international trade, and it is important that every opportunity be afforded for it to continue. The Trade Agreements Act will help provide this opportunity.

To discontinue this program now would be more than a repudiation of our previous policy. It would be a deliberate step which could have no other effect than to raise the present barriers to trade, and that, as we know, leads to economic isolationism, which leads to political and military isolationism.

ADDENDUM

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a national federation of 3,133 trade associations and local chambers of commerce, which, in turn, represent 1,350,000 individual businessmen. Because the chamber in membership and direct interests embraces every important activity in our economy; and, through its membership—small businesses as well as large—it presents the opinion of a cross-section of our entire economy. Thus, it is that policies of the chamber do not represent the views of some special group or particular interest, but are drawn from the diverse interests of the country as a whole and are voted by its membership. This voting, incidentally, is so regulated that no geographic concentration of interests or economic concentration of power can override the broader interests of the entire membership.

Since the Chamber of Commerce is a democratic organization, and since its membership encompasses the widest range of interests, the members retain every right to express themselves as individuals. So, there may be some members who are in a minority disagreement, but the official attitude as approved at the annual meeting, favors the continuation of the Trade Agreements Act.

[From the Washington Post of January 24, 1951]

PERIL-POINT CLAUSE

The Eightieth Congress inserted a so-called peril-point clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act in 1948 requiring the Tariff Commission to advise the President whether proposed tariff reductions would imperil American industries. The President was not compelled to follow the Commission's recommendations, but if he disregarded them, he would have to inform Congress of the reasons for doing so. A move is now under way to include this peril-point clause, deleted by the Eighty-first Congress, in legislation extending the President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade pacts for a 3-year period. Its restoration would unquestionably hamper the negotiators, despite the fact that it is merely a warning signal, not an order to stop. It would also increase the pressure of special interests for favorable treatment.

Experience has shown that the only practicable method of reducing tariff barriers is by executive negotiation. In concluding trade agreements, moreover, the administration has always tried to protect legitimate American interests and there is no reason to suppose that it will be any less vigilant in the future than it has been in the past. Finally, a vote for restoration of the peril-point clause would not only be a retrograde step, it would also create fears, whether justified or not, of a return to narrowly protectionist policies that would reduce the capacity of other countries to earn more dollars from exports to the United States.

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1951]

RENEWING THE TRADE ACT

With the opening of hearings this week on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we may expect renewal of the long battle to curtail existing Presidential authority to lower tariffs. Under the 1949 law, which expires next June, the President may make tariff reductions up to 50 percent of the 1945 rates in exchange for trade concessions from other countries. This law carries on the spirit of all the reciprocal trade acts since the first one was passed in 1934, except for the 1-year extension adopted by a Republican Congress in 1948, which required the President to report to Congress if he set rates below the point considered by the Tariff Commission as threatening serious injury to American producers. Republicans in both Houses have already said they would attempt to restore this peril-point provision, which was eliminated by the last Congress. If they succeed in doing so, they will do damage to the whole reciprocal trade system.

The peril-point provision retains the germ of the protectionist philosophy which the world trading position of this country has long since rendered obsolete. And as a practical working matter, the success of the program initiated by Secretary Hull has depended at least in part on freedom of negotiation by the President's representatives in the tremendously complicated bargaining discussions held periodically with other trading nations. Furthermore, the pressures induced by any proposal to lower tariffs are bad enough; the peril-point procedure only makes them worse. Under existing practice, all interested persons, all businesses that might be affected by a change in the rates, all Government agencies concerned, have ample opportunity to express their views. And most of our agreements have an escape clause for protection in case of serious injury.

Ever since the outbreak of the Second World War, our foreign trade has been carried on under abnormal conditions. But the necessity still remains for the United States to encourage imports, and that condition will persist so long as we are the world's great creditor. The administration's request for a 3-year extension of the existing reciprocal trade law should be approved.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of January 24, 1951]

EXTEND THE TRADE ACT

Although the problems of security for ourselves and our allies overshadow all other legislative issues, the question of renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years will no doubt prove a lively one for Congress. Foreign policy splits between the Republicans and Democrats are never so marked as in the field of trade relations. While it is true that a goodly number of Republican lawmakers are by no means protectionist in their tariff attitude, the GOP as a whole on the basis of its record does not take kindly to the idea of lower American trade barriers.

Thus, it was the GOP Eightieth Congress that hobbled the Reciprocal Trade Act with the so-called peril point amendment, thereby weakening this country's role as a leader in the campaign for freer commerce among nations. The succeeding Democrat-ruled Congress struck out this amendment, which had handicapped the Executive in swapping tariff concessions. Now the Republicans can be expected to try to put it back in the new extension that must be voted before June 12.

The peril point amendment is advanced as a safeguard against a domestic industry being seriously hurt by imports. Yet due protection to industry has not been wanting under the normal reciprocal trade law, which has worked well without such a clause for some 15 years. Actually, by giving the Tariff Commission broad powers of review, this amendment would mean lengthy delays in reaching reciprocal accords. On the whole, it would put needless obstacles in the way of worthwhile tariff adjustment.

"Continued participation by the United States in the cooperative effort to improve conditions of world trade," Mr. Acheson told a House committee this week, "will be recognized both at home and abroad as one clear indication that behind the shield of military power which we and our allies are creating, the techniques of growth and expansion are being maintained intact." To assure that continued participation and indeed to give evidence that this country means to lead the free world to a saner economic order, Congress should extend the Trade Agreements Act with no strings attached.

[From the Boston Herald of January 22, 1951]

TARIFF COMMON SENSE

The House Ways and Means Committee begins hearings today on a bill to extend the 17-year-old reciprocal trade program for another 3 years. There is little doubt that this vital measure will be adopted in some form. But die-hard opponents are mustering their strength against it, and, if they are not watched, they may succeed in entangling it in reservations and amendments.

This must not be allowed to happen.

The principal reservation now being suggested is a return to the peril-point clause, which enjoyed a brief trial during the Eightieth Congress. This clause would simply require the President to consult Congress before lowering any tariff below a point designated as dangerous to domestic producers, and would not be particularly troublesome in itself. It would, however, signal a drawing back on our tariff reduction program at a time when logic and self-interest should be taking us strongly in the opposite direction.

The United States for many years has been a creditor Nation and since the war our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

credit position has become enormously more pronounced. During the 4 years 1946–49 we ran up an export surplus of $29,000,000,000 (excluding $3,000,000,000 of net receipts from investment income), which was nearly half of our total exports. All but a fraction of this was paid for by United States Government grants and loans. This simply cannot go on indefinitely. Eventually we must either stop selling abroad or let our customers pay for what they purchase by selling their own goods here.

It will doubtless be pointed out by the tariff group that the dollar gap of the early Marshall-plan period is now rapidly disappearing under the impetus of renewed United States military buying, and that the argument for tariff concessions is weakened to that extent. The Gray Report on Foreign Economic Policies, however, makes it abundantly clear that this condition is temporary. The moment European rearmament starts catching up with ours, the gap will reappear, and we must work harder than ever at finding solutions that do not involve Government hand-outs.

We are, moreover, looking for long-term as well as short-term solutions. And it is apparent that we cannot hope to get permanent stabilization of trade at the high level our exporters want unless we clear the way for a much freer flow of imports. The tariff conservatives, who would lean indefinitely on Government protection at home and Government handouts abroad, are living in a dream world. They should catch up with reality.

In fact, as the President's economic advisers suggest, we should go beyond mere renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We should also push to speedy enactment the proposed Customs Simplification Act. And we should give serious consideration to the possibility of letting the President reduce tariffs unilaterally, at least during the present emergency, on essential items now in short supply.

But the reciprocal trade program is the indispensable and fundamental first step. Prompt approval of the administration bill will demonstrate our good intentions, and we can build from there. It is important that we do not stumble at the start.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 23, 1951]

RENEW THE TRADE ACT

American leadership for freedom must include leadership in the economic as well as political and military fields. One aspect of this leadership is reflected in American trade policies. This year what the United States Congress does about the reciprocal trade agreements will be watched closely throughout the free world and on the other side of the curtain, too.

It is specially important as hearings on the Trade Agreements Act get under way in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that Americans understand why the trade program for mutual reductions of tariffs should be renewed without restrictive modifications.

In the 17 years since the reciprocal trade program was inaugurated it has proved itself so convincingly that few responsible voices are raised these days for its abolition. Most of the opposition centers on limiting the Government's powers under the act.

For example, it is again being suggested that the peril-point clause should be added to the law. Such a clause would require the President to consult Congress before lowering a tariff below a point considered dangerous to domestic industries.

This is undesirable not so much because of its probable application as because it would preserve protectionist fallacies in a program designed to overcome these very fallacies.

This is no time to advertise any remnants of an American economic isolationism. The tasks of survival demand the broadest readiness among all free peoples to learn how to live together and to strengthen each other. The United States must lead in this, too.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951]

ENCOURAGING RECIPROCAL TRADE

As the world's largest creditor nation, the United States can make the most appropriate sort of contribution toward widening the base for international financial stability by reaffirming its unqualified adherence to the reciprocal trade program. Neither the unsettled state of military affairs nor the temporary use of economic controls here and abroad diminishes the importance of our holding fast to basic objectives. The trade program is a logical part of the total policy we are directing toward the achievement of those objectives. We want to encourage economic self-reliance, not dependence, in friendly nations. We wish private traders and investors to participate fully in international exchange and development. We recognize the necessity of cutting away those barriers and discriminations that have so often invited political chaos and armed conflict.

Neither the trade program nor any other single program can do the whole job. Yet other countries will judge the sincerity of our total intention, and the wisdom of following our lead, by our willingness to take the individual steps leading toward the ultimate goal. For this reason favorable action on trade act renewal is of particular practical and symbolic importance.

One might have supposed that there would be no opposition within the House Ways and Means Committee to the renewal of so constructive an element in our foreign economic program. Not so. The old arguments, despite their having been riddled in the past, are being dusted off again: "American industry needs high-tariff protection. Tariffs will be slashed without warning. American industries will be destroyed. The only way to make the trade agreements safe is to nullify their central principle; no real concessions can be exchanged."

This total argument is contrary to fact and reason. American industry is the most efficient in the world; it does not live by high-tariff protection. Tariffs will not be cut without warning; even without the contradictory and unworkable peril-point provision, the law provides extensive opportunities for all interested public agencies—including the Tariff Commission—and private persons or groups to testify as to the possible results of future tariff concessions. American industry will not be destroyed; 16 years of reciprocal trade experience proves this. The reciprocal trade law is in the Nation's interest; it should be renewed in its present form.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 23, 1951]

THE IMPORT "PERIL"

A drive for the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes when the Nation faces a strain on its resources from a huge military program. No hardy isolationist will claim that the United States can do the job before it without great quantities of imports. The "peril" point that some Republicans worry about when they think of goods coming from other countries seems remote when the United States needs about everything it can get its hands on.

When the reciprocal trade policy was adopted by Congress 16 years ago we had trouble selling our products. We appeared to have more than we needed. If a liberal trade policy was sound then, it is today.

Most high protectionists will agree we need the world's minerals and raw materials in this crisis of rearmament. But some of them are so wedded to their theories that Congress still keeps a tariff on copper, although we desperately need every ounce.

Right now customers are on a buying spree to stock up manufactured goods they fear will become scarce. They are certainly not worrying about the peril of having too much. Every customer will cheer if Europe and Asia are in the mood to send us anything we need.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps this would be the best place to read into the RECORD some of the labor organizations that were opposed to the extension of this Trade Agreements Act without amendment. I refer to pages 298 and 299 of the hearings which show the following labor organizations opposed to it:

Labor organizations: American Flint Glass Workers' Union; Atlantic Fishermen's Union; Seafarers' International Union; Fish Cannery Workers' Union of the Pacific; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America; United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers' International Union; International Council of Aluminum Workers' Unions; National Brotherhood of Operative Potters; United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers' Union; International Chemical Workers' Union; National Match Workers' Council; Greenhouse Vegetable Workers' Union 20557; United Wallpaper Craftsmen and Workers' Union of North America.

Management organizations: American Glassware Association; National Association of Manufacturers of Pressed and Blown Glassware; Scientific Apparatus Makers' Association; National Fisheries Institute: Gloucester Fisheries Association; Massachusetts Fisheries Association; Seafood Producers' Association of New Bedford, Mass.; California Fish Canners' Association; Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.; American Photo-Engravers' Association; The Hat Institute; Wool Hat Manufacturers' Association of America; Reynolds Metals Co.; United States Potters' Association; Vitrified China Association, Inc.; Edgar Bros. Co. (kaolin); Manufacturing Chemists' Association; Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers' Association; American match industry (no association); National Hot House Vegetable Growers' Association; The Wall Paper Institute.

America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference is composed of the following national and international unions affiliated with the A. F. of L.: International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; International Union of Operating Engineers; International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America; Atlantic Fishermen's Union; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association; American Flint Glass Workers' Union; Window Glass Cutters' League of America; United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers' International Union; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America; National Brotherhood of Operative Potters; American Wire Weavers' Protective Association.

Of course, in the eyes of the bureaucrats, these are just little people who have payrolls, people paying for their own homes, perhaps the central industry of a certain town—these workmen who are being sold out. Just kill them off say the free traders with this trade-agreement proposition here and let the communities die in their tracks.

Mr. Chairman, the two issues before the House in its consideration of H. R. 1612 are whether the Congress should again delegate authority to the President to make new trade agreements, and if the Congress does so delegate this au-

thority what should be the terms of the delegated authority.

My position on these two issues can be as simply stated as the issues themselves and it is that: First, no further delegation of authority should be made by the Congress to the President to make new trade agreements; second, if such authority is granted by the Congress, then, as a bare minimum, H. R. 1612 should be amended to provide: 1. That, with certain modifications as discussed below, the peril-point report provisions established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 be reenacted; 2. That the President be directed to prevent the application of reduced tariffs and other concessions made in trade agreements with the free nations to imports from Soviet Russia and Communist China, and to imports from any Communist satellite country (including North Korea) which the President finds is part of a conspiracy against the free world; 3. That, for the purpose of clarification and to facilitate procedures, certain standards be established by the Congress for the guidance of the President in determining relief under the escape clause; 4. That the authority of the President to make new trade agreements be extended for a 2-year period instead of a 3-year period.

These four qualifications on the terms of the President's authority were unanimously recommended by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee.

In 1934 the citizens of the United States were told by unsound propaganda of the State Department that reciprocity would lay the foundation for perfect peace and brotherhood throughout the world. Our people were assured by the proponents of the trade agreement program that there would be no need for further conflict or wars if only we of the United States would agree to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with various foreign countries. This plausible but false idea was exploited to the fullest degree. What was the result as one after another trade agreement was entered into by the United States?

The result was that international trade, commerce, investments, and other economic relationships became more confused with every new trade agreement entered into. Currency depreciation and other forms of monetary manipulation became the order of the day. Exchange control, including clearing and compensatory agreements, were adopted as Government policy in the struggle of many nations to get an economic advantage over the people of other countries. Trade and commerce became confused with a maze of quota restrictions, licenses, permits, and other forms of control. A multitude of different unfair methods of competition became the practice of the day. All manner of foreign discriminations were introduced or resulted from the numerous so-called reciprocal trade agreements entered into by the United States with foreign nations and between various foreign countries. The trade agreement program during the past 17 years has become nothing more nor less than a poorly conceived device for reducing custom duties to let foreign-made competitive goods and other products into our domestic market, to the injury of American labor, the American farmer, American industry, and the American taxpayer.

The truth about reciprocal trade agreements has never been revealed to the public by the State Department. It has resorted to misrepresentations as to the objective of the trade agreements and to false promises with respect to expected benefits to the United States.

The propaganda that peace would be restored and permanently underwritten by the proposed agreement made a powerful emotional appeal to the mothers and fathers throughout the Nation. International peace through trade agreements stirred into action the Christian churches, the women's organizations, and every mother who had suffered a tragedy in her home as a result of World War I. This sham crusade for peace led by the State Department became one of irresistible pressure on Congress to support this New Deal tariff-reduction plan for world peace. This unholy propaganda resulted in the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. It did not result, however, as many a bereaved family knows, in the nations of the earth "beating their swords into plowshares."

I shall show later how it did promote war and also the price our Nation paid in American blood, lives, and treasure.

It was urged by the proponents of the trade-agreement program under the leadership of the State Department that, aside from the promotion of world peace and brotherly love, the adoption of the tariff-reduction scheme would increase our exports and thus bring prosperity to our workers, industries, and farmers. This was another fantastic promise on the part of the State Department that did not materialize from lower tariff concessions.

To fortify this statement's indisputable facts let me point out that the physical quantity of exports during the 5-year period—1935–39—before the beginning of World War II was only 80 percent as much as during the earlier prosperous 5-year period—1925–29. In other words, the physical volume of exports was actually 2 percent less under the reciprocity than under the American system of prosperity at home.

Now then, the assurance given the public that the Trade Agreements Act, if adopted, would bring about peace in the world and that the program would increase exports did not materialize. I state to the Congress, without fear of successful contradiction, that the trade agreements program as carried out by the State Department contributed to the wars in Europe and to the one in the Pacific. Had it not been for the perfidy of the State Department in deceiving the public with reference to exports the United States would not have been involved in a war with Japan. What did the State Department officials do when they found that there was a 20 percent reduction in exports under reciprocity than there had been under the American system of protection? Not only the State Department but also the entire New Deal administration forfeited their promise of peace under the trade agreements program and instead encouraged the shipment of war materials to foreign nations in an effort to build up the promised increased exports.

I shall now show the tragedy for which the State Department has been responsible. Exports became more important to the State Department than human lives. Why not, said these zealous proponents of the trade agreements, furnish the war lords in Japan with our scrap iron, copper, steel, aircraft and plane parts, petroleum, street car rails, the latter removed from in front of the White House, the steel from the elevated railway in New York City and metal junk from all parts of the United States.

Robert T. Oliver, in his recent book entitled "Why War Came to Korea," makes this statement:

> Japan's attack upon China in 1937 was strongly criticized in the United States, but during 1938 we provided Japan with 90.4 percent of her scrap iron and steel, and 76.9 percent of her aircraft and plane parts, 65.6 percent of her petroleum needs and many of her sinews of war. This trade continued to the very eve of Pearl Harbor.

I ask, has any group of persons or any nation by its acts, furnished Russia with more effective propaganda than to point out to the Chinese the fact that the United States armed Japan with the material to make the weapons with which to slaughter the Chinese women and children? The warmongering program of the State Department finally succeeded in preparing Japan for an all-out war against us. There could have been no war in the Pacific and the Far East had it not been for the shipment of war supplies by the United States to a potential enemy.

Let me present the facts to establish the responsibility of the State Department more in detail. The very year—1937—that Japan opened war in China our exports of scrap iron and steel exports to Japan amounted to 2,081,037 tons, or enough to build 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each; 200 submarines of 2,400 tons each; 10 aircraft carriers of 30,000 tons each; and 26 cruisers at 15,000 tons each. Thus the State Department could claim an increase in exports—not in the regular course of commerce—of which to boast, so long as the character of the diabolical purpose of these exports were not disclosed to the public.

The next year—1938—our scrap and steel exports to Japan were 1,463,000 tons; 1939 they were 2,179,000 tons, and in 1940 they were 1,248,000 tons. At this point in this program of claiming an increase in exports as promised by the State Department, the United States foreign trade statistics, normally published by the Department of Commerce, became a military secret. No official figures are available to reveal the amount of metals and war materials exported to Japan in the first 11 months of 1941. The fraudulent claim that the trade agreement program was responsible for an increase in exports was becoming debunked. Protests against arming Japan were being heard in Congress. An inquiry as to why the State Department

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

was suffering and permitting these shipments would have been most embarrassing to the trade agreement proponents. Arming a country to cut the throat of our Chinese friends as a means to claiming credit for increased exports under the trade agreement program would have been indefensible. These war exports to Japan came back with ghastly results.

At 7:55 o'clock on the morning of December 7, 1941—Hawaiian time—100 Japanese planes, built of and equipped with our exports, attacked our United States Pacific Fleet anchored at Pearl Harbor, T. H. To aid in this raid several midget submarines constructed with our exports assisted the Japanese planes in their raid on our men and ships. It was our exports to Japan that totally destroyed the battleship *Arizona*. This raid severely damaged the battleships *Oklahoma, Nevada, California, West Virginia*, and three destroyers, one target ship, and one minelayer. Damaged but finally repaired were the battleships *Pennsylvania, Maryland, Tennessee;* cruisers *Helena, Honolulu, Raleigh;* one seaplane tender, one repair vessel, one drydock. Our loss of airplanes in this raid: Navy, 80; Army, 97.

All of this damage and cost was inflicted by Japan with our exports to her of essential war material.

But here is the ghastly part of this export program. Casualties: Navy, 2,117 officers and men killed; there were 960 missing and 376 wounded. Army, 226 officers and men killed; 396 wounded.

This is the result of an attempt of the State Department to deceive the American people that exports had actually expanded as a result of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Have the American people suffered enough from the perfidy of the State Department? Now after the experience of the holocaust at Pearl Harbor is the same scheme of arming our enemies being suffered and permitted to be continued as a permanent appeasement policy? The shipment of essential war material to Russia and Red China from our own ports has continued since and even before the Korean war.

I call attention to the fact that the State Department, in its mad rush to increase our exports, stripped our Nation of copper, scrap iron, and other essential war materials to the point where the children were asked to save their copper pennies for our war needs. The State Department had a secret meeting with the Ways and Means Committee, urging the removal of the tariff on scrap iron to aid our war effort. The country was so reduced in scrap metal that ships and men had to go to Central America and the Caribbean islands to collect old sugar mills and the rails from abandoned railways to replenish the loss of the material that had gone to Japan to enable her to butcher the Chinese.

It would not be fair to leave this subject without further emphasizing the fact by repeating that during the 5-year period 1935–39 a very large portion of the exports of commodities consisted of materials needed by Germany, Italy, and Japan in their preparations for World War II. They imported from us, not because of trade agreement concessions, but in order to prepare for war. In other words, if I may repeat, not only was the physical quantity of legitimate exports 20 percent less than during the earlier period, but a very large portion of the exports which we did find possible consisted of scrap iron and steel, petroleum products for military purposes, trucks, tractors, and other vehicles, machinery for the making of war instruments of destruction.

It should not be forgotten that much of the exports of farm products were made possible by payment of export subsidies, and not as a result of reciprocal-trade agreements.

Aside from the contribution of the State Department to the death of our boys at Pearl Harbor and the devastating war that followed in the Pacific, the loss in revenue from the reduction in custom duties under the reciprocal trade agreements should not be overlooked.

The rate of duty imposed upon dutiable imports has now been reduced down to the last month for which the official figures—which averaged on 12.4 percent of the value of dutiable imports. So that whereas over a 20- or 30-year period—in fact at the turn of the century—our tariff averaged something like 36 percent. Now, the tariff has been gradually reduced under the trade-agreements program until the last month—as I say—the tariff was on 12.4 percent of the value of the dutiable commodities. The value of imports has increased and they are now up to well over $6,000,000,000 so that even with the low rate of duty the revenue has not increased. Over one-third of all imports are dutiable—just about $2,000,000,000 out of $6,000,000,000 are dutiable. Now during the 5 years since the war closed—there is no use discussing the revenue during the war period—the customs duties have been as follows:

During the year 1945, $391,000,000.
During the year 1946, $498,000,000.
During the year 1947, $445,000,000.
During the year 1948, $417,000,000.
During the year 1949, $374,000,000.

They had been up to a very much higher level than that. During earlier periods the revenue customs duty collected had run up to approximately $600,000,000 a year. In other words, during the 10 years from 1920 to 1930, there had been right around $600,000,000—now they are down to less than $400,000,000. In spite of the fact that our imports have increased from $400,000,000 to $600,000,000, because of the lower rates under the trade-agreements program, the revenue has decreased from an average of $600,000,000 to $400,000,000. The result is that we are now losing $200,000,000 a year in revenue, because of the trade-agreement concessions. Well, if you lose $200,000,000 a year, it only takes 10 years to lose $2,000,000,000. So you could say that during the last 10 years we have lost $2,000,000,000 because of the low rates.

I want to call attention of my colleagues to the fact, and a tragic and indefensible one, that Communist Russia and all of her Communist satellites, including Red China, are getting the benefit of every tariff concession made in every trade agreement entered into by the United States.

Communist Russia and all of the countries behind the iron curtain, including Red China, get all of the tariff concession benefits without granting a single concession to the United States.

This is simply a repetition of arming another foe with the implements to destroy our American boys. Such deadly material exported to Russia and paid for by free imports into the United States from Russia in time of war cannot be successfully defended. To grant Communist Russia and the countries dominated by her the same tariff reductions the United States has made to 45 other free nations is to furnish Russia and her satellites the dollars with which to buy arms, ammunition, and other war materials with which to build tanks, planes, and trucks to prosecute a war against us is unthinkable and preposterous.

THE PERIL POINTS

In considering why it is imperative that the Congress establish some safeguards to the conduct by the State Department of this program I call the attention of every Member of the House to the following statement which was made by the State Department to the Ways and Means Committee regarding the objectives of trade-agreements legislation. The statement is as follows:

> We shall have a clear mandate to broaden the basis of United States foreign trade, to create purchasing power for American exports, and to guide the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible.

I repeat "to guide the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible." Let me ask the proponents of this legislation to point out to me the section of this law or the section of any past extension of the trade-agreements program which gives the State Department authority to "guide the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they cannot do so, because there is no such authority and it was never intended by the Congress that the State Department should be entrusted with the responsibility of "guiding the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible." But, and here is the crux of the matter, State Department officials believe they have this authority and it is for this reason that some safeguards must be established by the Congress if H. R. 1612 is enacted.

Personally I do not feel that the peril point procedure adopted in the Extension Act of 1948 and recommended by the Republicans for reenactment at this time is an adequate safeguard because in the final analysis it means only that the President will have to advise the Congress if the State Department negotiators have reduced tariffs below a point which will result in serious injury to our domestic producers. But it is a step in the right direction. In brief, all that the peril point procedure will do is that—

First. The President will be required to submit the list of articles to be negotiated to the Tariff Commission.

Second. The Tariff Commission must make a factual study of each item and make a report within 120 days to the

President. This report will contain the Tariff Commission's findings as to the limit the President might lower or raise duties without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles.

Third. The Tariff Commission is required to hold hearings.

Fourth. The Tariff Commission is to continue to furnish factual information to the negotiating committees but members of the Tariff Commission may not sit as members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information or the Trade Agreements Committee.

Fifth. If tariff cuts and other concessions are made below the peril point report of the Tariff Commission, the President must identify the articles and state the reasons to the Congress for the action taken with respect to such items.

Sixth. The Tariff Commission is to furnish the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee a copy of its report on only those items which have been cut below the peril point.

Those who oppose the peril-point procedure have been carefully schooled by the State Department in the argument that this procedure deprives the executive department from using the Tariff Commission and its employees in negotiating trade agreements. The answer to this is that the Tariff Commission was never intended by the Congress to participate in the conduct of foreign affairs—it was established as a bipartisan fact-finding commission by the Congress to carry on investigations and to supply information on our customs laws. It is not the function of the Tariff Commission to trade and to negotiate, and in fact it is the very purpose of the peril-point report that the findings of the Tariff Commission be made as a full commission based on facts and not vague international objectives.

The only argument of any possible substance against the peril-point safeguard procedure in the 1948 Extension Act was the requirement that a copy of the complete report of the Tariff Commission, including the items on which concessions did not go below the peril points, was to be furnished the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance. It was alleged by the State Department that some dissatisfaction by foreign countries might arise if they learned that their negotiators had not held out for the maximum reduction which the Tariff Commission reported could be made without serious injury, or the threat of it, to our domestic producers. To remove this objection we recommend a change in the peril-point procedure so that the information to be supplied by the Tariff Commission to the Congress will be limited only to those items on which trade agreement concessions go below the peril points.

It is ridiculous to say as the State Department does that the Tariff Commission cannot establish peril points. The dissenting members of the interdepartmental committee are charged under Executive Order 9832 with the duty of "giving the reasons for their dissent and specifying the point beyond which they consider any reduction or concession involved can be made without injury to the domestic economy." It is not a question of being able to establish peril points, but rather whether the State Department or the expert Tariff Commission is better equipped to do so.

In substance the issue boils down to whether in its calculated-risk policy of guiding the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible, the State Department should have available to it the expert advice of the Tariff Commission. The very stating of the issue must in itself supply the answer to any reasonable person.

THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

One of the most serious defects of this misnamed program is that no provision for an escape from serious injury or the threat of it caused by imports resulting from reduction in tariffs and other concessions is contained in the trade agreement law itself. An escape clause was inserted in the trade agreement with Mexico in 1943 and all subsequent agreements now contain such a clause. Due, however, to the ambiguity of the language of the clause and the failure by the Congress to establish any guiding principle for the President in determining when relief under the escape clause should be granted, only one application for relief has ever been made. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert the record of what has happened to applicants who have applied for relief under the escape clause. As you will see the escape clause is a wholly ineffective remedy—in fact it is no remedy at all.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON

Applications for investigations under escape-clause provisions of trade agreements

Commodity	Name and address of applicant	Date received	Status
1. Marrons	G. B. Raffetto, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 20, 1948	Dismissed without formal investigation, Aug. 27, 1948.
2. Whiskies and spirits	United States Distillers Tariff Committee, Washington, D. C. (application filed on behalf of 28 distilling companies).	Sept. 7, 1948	Dismissed without formal investigation, Jan. 3, 1949.
3. Spring clothespins	The DeMeritt Co., Waterbury, Vt. (6 other producers).	Nov. 10, 1948	Formal investigation ordered Apr. 27, 1949. Completed Dec. 20, 1949. No modification in concession recommended.
4. Knitted berets, wholly of wool	The American Basque Berets, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 11, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, July 8, 1949.
5. Crude petroleum and petroleum products	Independent Petroleum Association of America, Washington, D. C.	Feb. 15, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, May 3, 1949.
6. Hops	United States Hop Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.	Mar. 28, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, May 11, 1949.
7. Reeds, wrought or manufactured from rattan or reeds, cane wrought or manufactured from rattan, cane webbing, and split or partially manufactured rattan, n. s. p. f.	American Rattan & Reed Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 20, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, Feb. 17, 1950.
8. Narcissus bulbs	Northwest Bulb Growers Association, Sumner, Wash.	June 9, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, Jan. 13, 1950.
9. Sponges, n. s. p. f.	Sponge Industry Welfare Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Board of City Commissioners, Greek Community, all of Tarpon Springs, Fla.	June 14, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, July 22, 1949.
10. Knit gloves and knit mittens finished or unfinished wholly or in chief value of wool; gloves and mittens embroidered in any manner, wholly or in chief value of wool; gloves or mittens, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton.	Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers, Gloversville, N. Y.	Aug. 5, 1949	Action deferred to study further developments, Nov. 22, 1949.
11. Knitted berets, wholly of wool (2d application)	The American Basque Berets, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 23, 1949	Dismissed without formal investigation, Jan. 13, 1950.
12. Woven fabrics in the piece, wholly of silk, bleached, printed, dyed, or colored, and valued at more than $5.50 per pound.	Textile section of the manufacturers division of the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, Paterson, N. J.	Jan. 5, 1950	Dismissed without formal investigation, Sept. 21, 1950.
13. Women's fur felt hats and hat bodies	The Hat Institute, Inc., United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union, New York, N. Y.	Jan. 24, 1950	Investigation completed. Certain of the concessions withdrawn.
14. Stencil silk, dyed or colored	Albert Godde Bedin, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Jan. 30, 1950	Pending.
15. Beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen	Western States Meat Packers Association, San Francisco, Calif., and Washington, D. C.	Mar. 16, 1950	Dismissed without formal investigation, June 30, 1950.
16. Aluminum and alloys, in crude form (except scrap); aluminum in coils, plates, bars, rods, etc.	Reynolds Metals Co., Louisville, Ky.	Mar. 24, 1950	Dismissed without formal investigation, Nov. 21, 1950.
17. Aluminum and alloys, in crude form (except scrap); aluminum in coils, plates, bars, rods, etc.	Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Washington, D. C.	Apr. 7, 1950	Do.
18. Lead-bearing materials, lead and lead scrap	Emergency Lead Committee, New York, N. Y.	May 11, 1950	Dismissed.
19. Lead-bearing materials, lead and lead scrap	New Mexico Miners & Prospectors Association on behalf of lead producers of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	May 16, 1950	Do.
20. Hatters' fur, or furs not on the skin, prepared for hatters' use, including fur skins carroted.	The Hatters' Fur Cutters Association of the U. S. A., New York, N. Y.	June 22, 1950	Formal investigation ordered Jan. 5, 1951.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON—Continued

Applications for investigations under escape-clause provisions of trade agreements—Continued

SECTION 22–AAA

Commodity	Name and address of applicant	Date received	Status
Edible tree nuts			Investigation ordered Apr. 13, 1950.
Harsh or rough cotton having a staple of 1⅛ in.			Investigation ordered June 30, 1950. Hearing held July 18, 1950. Report to President Aug. 14, 1950.

SEC. 336

Grape wines containing more than 4 percent alcohol	National Association of Alcoholic Beverages	June 30, 1950	Dismissed Sept. 15, 1950.
Almonds	Almond Growers Exchange, California	July 8, 1948	Report to President November 1949.

SECTION 337

Pistol-simulating cigarette lighters	Gunlite, Inc., New York City	July 26, 1950	Dismissed Sept. 15, 1950.
Rubber catheters	Davol Rubber Co., Providence, R. I.		Dismissed Nov. 28, 1950.

To correct this deplorable situation it is imperative that the Congress establish certain criteria which will be recognized as a presumption that a serious injury or the threat of it has occurred. This will greatly expedite the procedure under the escape clause and give assurance to all segments of the economy that it is not futile for them to apply for relief. This problem will be discussed more fully as the debate develops, and for that reason I pass now to the question of imports from Russia, Communist China, and their satellite Communist countries.

IMPORTS FROM RUSSIA, COMMUNIST CHINA, AND OTHER IRON-CURTAIN COUNTRIES

As the result of the most-favored-nation principle, reductions in duty and other concessions made by the United States with all countries under the trade-agreement program are automatically extended to Russia, Communist China, and all other Communist-dominated countries. We now have trade agreements with approximately 45 free countries, covering literally thousands of imported items, and the benefits of all these concessions contained in these agreements are now benefiting Russia, Communist China, and their satellite iron-curtain countries.

In the case of Russia, for example, approximately 88 percent of its dutiable imports into the United States benefit from reduced rates provided in trade agreements by us with free countries, and 92 percent of the tax-free imports from Russia consists of products bound on the free list in trade agreements by us with free countries.

In the case of Communist China, 72 percent of the dutiable imports into the United States from that country benefit from trade-agreement concessions granted by us to free countries, and 75 percent of the duty-free imports of that country benefit from our concessions to the free nations.

Briefly summarized, similar figures for other iron-curtain countries are as follows:

Poland, 80 percent of the dutiable imports and 79 percent of the free imports.

Hungary, 73 percent of the dutiable imports and 69 percent of the free imports.

Bulgaria, 97 percent of the dutiable imports and 30 percent of the free imports.

Manchuria, 99.8 percent of the dutiable imports and 98 percent of the free imports.

Rumania, 96 percent of the dutiable imports and 84 percent of the free imports.

It is outrageous that our American soldiers should be fighting the Communists in Korea while at the same time all the Communist countries are enjoying the benefits of concessions made by the United States to the free world without—except in the case of Czechoslovakia—having given the United States a single concession in return. This rank and preposterous inconsistency in our foreign policy must be removed at once by the denying to Russia and Communist China, and to any Communist satellite country—including North Korea—which the President finds is part of a conspiracy against the free world, the benefit of the reduced rates which we have granted to the free world.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, House bill 1612, was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means by a vote of 18 to 7. It is very gratifying that three of our Republican colleagues on the committee joined with the solid majority in voting to favorably report this bill.

The purpose of the pending bill is to extend for 3 years from June 12, 1951, the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The original Trade Agreements Act was approved on June 12, 1934, and has been extended six times.

As is shown on pages 14 to 19 of the report the various extension acts are there listed and it shows that the act was extended on March 1, 1937, again on April 12, 1940, again on June 7, 1943, again on July 5, 1945, again on June 26, 1948, and on September 20, 1949. It has always been the policy under this legislation for Congress to frequently make a review of this program. It was originally enacted for a period of 3 years, and the purpose expressed at that time was that Congress should periodically review the accomplishments under this type of program and retain control of the program by making these frequent reviews of the effects of the program, and that has been done throughout the years since the beginning of this program. The trade-agreement program is a very important part of our foreign policy and should be continued. The trade agreements resulting from the negotiations of the past 16 years are now in effect with 45 other countries. In 1949 about 75 percent of our foreign trade was carried on with these countries. The most important agreement made thus far under the program is the general agreement on tariffs and trade which was entered into first at Geneva, and then later negotiations were carried on at Annecy, France, and now negotiations are under way at Torquay, England. The first negotiations at Geneva were in 1947, and 23 countries participated in the negotiations. Over 100 negotiations took place; over 45,000 separate tariff rates were dealt with. At Annecy, France, in 1949, nine more countries negotiated with the original countries and became parties to the general agreement. When the negotiations now going on at Torquay, England, are completed, it is expected that seven more countries will become parties to the general agreement. Therefore it will be seen that this program has been systematically and carefully built up throughout the years of the existence of the program.

The general agreement is the most successful effort ever made to negotiate tariff reductions over a wide area of world trade. The products included in the tariff schedules in the general agreement account for over one-half of the entire trade of the world. The fact that so many of the trading nations of the world are parties to this agreement means that its general provisions have a much wider application than the general provisions of any of the earlier bilateral trade agreements that were ever entered into. These general provisions now constitute an important part of the international commercial policy rules that apply between all of the commercial trading nations of the world. Thousands of our American businessmen are today profiting very materially by these rules governing commercial policy throughout the world. Why, it has been brought to our attention on many occasions that one of the most discouraging things encountered by American businessmen is the various trade restrictions that they have to encounter when they go to other countries of the world to try

to dispose of their products, and among other things are the many restrictions with respect to getting their money out of those countries after they have sold their goods and their products there. These and the various other restrictions that apply to trade throughout the world are dealt with in these trade agreements in a scientific and effective manner, and the best results thus far accomplished in the field of foreign trade and commercial policy between the peoples of the different nations of the world have been accomplished under this trade agreements program. The program has been administered with great care. All negotiations have been handled on a product-by product basis. All negotiations have been handled under safeguards adequate to meet the needs of particular industries or groups of producers. The procedures followed in the administration of the act include provisions for wide public hearings and public notice to secure the fullest possible information in dealing with these various commodities proposed by the different countries of the world.

They provide for making concessions to meet the particular situation of particular producers, so as to permit the proper degree of imports into this country and to avoid injury to domestic interests. They include the escape clause, which provides for the withdrawal of concessions should they cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry.

As an indication of the care with which the authority to reduce the tariffs by the trade agreements has been administered, it should be pointed out that out of all of the hundreds and even thousands of tariff rates which have been reduced in agreement since the escape clause was first introduced in 1943 only 20 applications have been made to the United States Tariff Commission for its use, and thus far only one has been recommended by the Tariff Commission to justify action. We were told that only 20 of these applications for the application of the escape clause had been made throughout all this period of time, and that six of those applications are still pending before the Tariff Commission. All the others except one had been dismissed as not meeting the requirements laid down by the Tariff Commission, and in only one instance had the application been approved.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that during the period covered by this program the people of the United States have achieved the highest level of prosperity and real income ever known in the history of this Nation. The standards of wages in the United States, as well as the income of our people and our farmers during this period, have been the highest in all history. The expansion of world trade brought about under the trade agreements program has contributed substantially toward this degree of prosperity.

It is not claimed by anybody that this program has been solely responsible for these gratifying results, but certainly it has made a material contribution in this direction.

Let us just remind ourselves for a moment in passing of the tremendous importance of foreign trade to the business of this country as well as agriculture. We know in ordinary times that we produce about 20 to 25 percent of our wheat as a surplus, about 55 or 60 percent of our cotton, about 40 percent of our packing house lard, as well as many other livestock products; and about 40 percent of our tobacco, as well as vast quantities of many other agricultural products.

We produce that much more in this country than we consume. Unless we can find a market throughout the world to dispose of these agricultural surpluses there can be only one result, and that is they will remain on the markets in this country and beat down the prices that our farmers receive for the products of their toil. Likewise it is true with reference to our manufactured products. We produce vast quantities of surplus products of many industrial items in this country. Unless we can find markets throughout the world to dispose of these surpluses they can have but one effect, and that is to curtail business in this country and produce results such as existed during the period of time when the doors of the markets of the world were closed under the operation of the embargo tariff provisions provided under the Tariff Act of 1930. This program has worked well. It is the most constructive effort that has been made thus far in the history of the country to carry on world trade on a scientific basis so as to keep secure the maximum degree of benefits and at the same time permit the least possible degree of injury to any industry in the country or any product produced by our people.

So we feel the splendid results accomplished under this program justify further confidence and support, and we ask for your support of the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, once again we are debating a bill to extend the reciprocal trades agreement for another 3 years. I want to go on record as opposed to this extension for 3 years.

I believe in reciprocity in its broad sense but I do not believe that under the law which has been on the statute books for many years it even begins to add up as a reciprocity act. To me, reciprocity is not a one-way street but that is what the act has been in my humble opinion.

If the act has to be renewed, it would be far better to extend it for a period of 1 year in order that a thorough review be had during the coming 12 months. It would be well for the Congress to appoint a joint committee composed of not only members of the Ways and Means Committee but also members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. This committee, in the joint study of the Reciprocal Trades Agreement, should go into the question of its effect not only on our domestic economy but its importance to our foreign policy.

There should most certainly be a part of any bill passed by this House a provision for an escape clause. Further, the Tariff Commission should be required to publish its reasons for dismissing any application and investigations.

In the Thirty-first Congressional District of New York, the district I have the honor to represent, we have a large segment of our economic life devoted to the manufacture of fine ladies' and men's leather gloves, fabric gloves, and knitted woolen gloves. This industry is one of the oldest in our country. The requisite skills in cutting and sewing leather gloves have been handed down by generations from father to son and in one county of the Thirty-first District of New York, my own home county of Fulton, practically the entire economy of over 50,000 people is directly dependent upon the welfare and progress of this industry. This is also true of many communities in the Middle West, throughout Wisconsin and Michigan.

On June 9, 1950, I appeared before the members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information and gave to them the above facts and followed with further information on our industry. A survey shows that almost 70 percent of the workers are in the age group of 36 to 87. By and large they own their own homes, have families, and are skilled workmen. I do not believe it was the intention of Congress in 1934, when the representation of the people delegated certain power to the executive branch of the Government, to negotiate with other nations from time to time on the question of raising or lowering the rates in our tariff structure, to force people to break up their homes and start life anew as unskilled laborers at lower wages. That is the prospect they face at being thrown into competition.

Back in 1929, Congress conducted extensive hearings as to tariff rates to be set on every item in the schedule. It was conceded then that the rates so set were to be in a measure a protection for American industry and American working men and women and to equalize, as far as possible, the difference between the cost of direct labor abroad and similar costs in this country.

One constantly hears that tariff is a form of subsidy but that is not so. A subsidy guarantees to a producer a fair return for his product. The tariff does not guarantee any producer anything.

Our industry cannot compete with foreign-made gloves, either leather or woolen gloves. Today, knit wool gloves coming from Japan, with practically the same design as ours hand-made, are being sold at retail much cheaper than we can make them. Today we are importing more than we ever did and, barring a war or depression, we shall continue to import as much or more. In our economy we certainly have a place for both imports and exports. But the fact that we have no control over the standard of living in foreign countries makes it necessary that we in the Congress protect, as far as possible, our own industries. Today, more than ever, the welfare of our people should be the adopted policy.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the question of the protective tariff is as old

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

as our country and really a little older. You know, before the Constitution was written the States built up trade barriers, in a way, against each other and for the protection of themselves. And all that time Great Britain was trying to keep us as an agricultural country and nothing else. They wanted us to produce raw material for their manufacturing plants. When the Constitutional Convention was called the members of that Convention wrote a Constitution which cemented us together. The Constitution provided that one State could not levy a duty against the importation into that State of the products of another State. Ever since that time the protective tariff has been a live issue, and sometimes it has been more alive than others. Our country quite consistently has protected its industries against the importation of competitive articles from cheap-labor countries. So the program has been carried on, and today we naturally claim that it is a Republican doctrine because in the early days when the products of the North and South were more distinctively different than they are now, naturally the South was an agricultural section and was inclined to free trade, and the North, being an industrial section, needed and demanded protection.

So the writers of the Constitution put a provision in it which is very positive. Here is what it says in effect: It says that the Congress shall have the right and the power to levy duties and imposts, and so forth. That also puts the responsibility upon the Congress. That is our responsibility. We should write the tariffs and impose the duties. Today our good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, stands in the well of the House and tells how prosperous we are, and so forth. Well, I do not fully agree with him, especially his implications, but I do not have the time to go into details and argue with him on that proposition.

But this is what I am trying to suggest to you. We, the Congress of the United States, have in effect surrendered up a right which the Constitution gives us. More than that we have surrendered a duty and responsibility which the Constitution imposes upon us. We do not write the tariff laws any more. We have but very little to do with it. It is a case of where we have yielded an inch and they have taken a mile.

We have down here in Washington the trade agreements set-up, and that group writes the tariffs, and they write all the concessions that we surrender up to the other countries. All they have to do is make a finding and tell the President just what they found, and he can do just what he pleases. The practical writing of tariffs today is in the hands of the President and those he appoints. I am not speaking of the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission is a dignified, bipartisan commission, made up of four Democratic and two Republicans. This Commission was set up to render a great service which was demanding attention. This Commission was given great responsibilities under the law. They have a responsibility under the law, but now they have been supplanted they have practically nothing to do with the writing of tariffs. That has been transferred over to the President, and the President does it through the groups and agencies that he appoints. I think that few if any of these appointments are confirmed by the Senate. I say that this departure is a usurpation of the power of Congress, a surrender of the power of the Congress that I have never supported and I do not intend to support. It is not necessary for us to give up this constitutional privilege and it is not consistent with good government for us to voluntarily surrender it by passing legislation permitting the executive department to usurp and to supplant the prerogatives of the Congress.

Let me give you the history of the tariff, as far as the Republican Party is concerned. The Tariff Commission was established for the purpose that its name implies—to deal with tariffs. In order to do it effectively we did what we have done several times before—and it is perfectly constitutional—the Congress has surrendered certain of its powers to the executive department but within definite and certain limitations. Congress has surrendered to the Executive some executive functions that the President and his executive staffs can and should do but these functions have been given to be exercised strictly within limitations. We the Republican Party passed the first reciprocal trade agreements, but we established them within limitations. We said, in effect, that the Tariff Commission shall study all these tariffs and trade matters and then make recommendations to the President, and the President then could go up or down, and increase or decrease the tariff rates within the limitations prescribed by the law passed by Congress. He could not exercise any congressional functions except those which the Congress had given to him. We gave him his responsibility and his power, but we said he can go only that far. But today he can do just about as he pleases, because the Democrats have amended the laws so as to make the fixing of tariff rates and the regulation of the flow of imports and exports to and from our country an executive function to be exercised by the executive branch of the Government. The President has now practically the whole power; all the tariff fixing agencies are responsible only to him.

They talk about the law providing for an increase or a decrease in tariff rates. They say that the President is yet bound to raise and lower duties but I think I can say that in practically only one instance has the President or his group ever increased any tariff duty. Just think of it. The President in every instance but one has reduced the tariff duties and never increased them. It is by increasing duties he protects our industries and by reducing the duties he opens the doors of our ports to the great flood of foreign-made goods that fill our stores and take the markets away from American producers and American makers.

They say, "Well, how about the industry of the country?" I see my good friend who sits on the front seat on the Democratic side, right down in front of me, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. He comes from a coal-producing county. I dare say that the coal producers in his county are not satisfied with the importations of oil, a million barrels of oil coming in every day. This is not a million barrels every week or every month or every year, but a million barrels a day coming in. What effect does that have on the coal industry? Ask any coal producer or any well-informed coal miner—and there are thousands of them—they will say that these importations of oil are very disastrous to the coal-mining industry.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to agree in your statement. I do come from a coal-producing State and a coal-producing section, and this residual oil problem has created quite a problem for the coal fields.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad for the comment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. His mining industries are affected as are all other coal mines. It is a very serious problem. They say the coal business is a big business. It is but it has been curtailed dangerously. You can allow your feelings with reference to the producers and miners of coal to prejudice you against the industry generally but there are hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children dependent upon the coal industry. Today the coal miners of the country in 3 days a week can produce all the coal that the coal industry can sell in this country.

Many miners are idle 3 or 4 days a week and many the whole year round. What is the reason? The reason is this million barrels of oil that is coming in every day. It finds its way into the furnaces and into the heating plants of the whole Nation. You cannot blame this situation onto the miners. This is another industry that you cannot say is prosperous. I do not know anybody who wants to invest money in the coal mining business. They are not listed on the stock exchanges in New York. Nobody is falling over himself to get into that business, because it has gone down about 50 percent. I can cite some other industries also that are suffering because of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements.

But getting back to my real point, it is the duty of Congress to levy tariffs and we should again assume it. We can do this if we will vote to put into effect real reciprocal trade agreements that are considered fairly and made fairly and enforced fairly.

We the Republicans first established reciprocal trade agreements, and they were truly reciprocal. What was then our basis? Mr. Chairman, the basis was a very simple little formula, very easy to remember. Here is what it was: The difference between the cost of an article at the port of entry and the cost of production of the same article in our country. That is how simple it was, and it worked well.

About 65 percent of all commodities that come into our country today come in duty-free. We by this action give a

tremendous concession to practically all the countries of the world. But as I say, under the Republican administration we provided a system of sliding scales that would rise or fall only with the cost of production. That is what we applied against Japan when Japan paid wages of about 10 or 12 cents an hour and we were paying a dollar or a dollar and a half an hour. Nevertheless we told them and told all the countries of the world that they could bring their goods to our ports and we would admit them to the country if they would pay a duty equal to the difference between their cost of production and our cost of production.

We talk about the Tariff Commission today, our Tariff Commission might just as well be out of business as far as anybody's paying any attention to it unless it be a professor or somebody who wants to get some figures. That is about all they do. They are competent individuals, expert men in their fields, nonpartisan, but that has nothing to do with it because the President and his men have taken over the matter of fixing all tariff rates.

Some say that you can go down there before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and get fine service. This is not in line with much testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee. The same can be said of the Trade Agreements Committee. These Committees operate under the guidance of the State Department with the purpose of pleasing the New Deal administration. They are creatures of the New Deal and are thorough in their knowledge of New Deal technique. The treatment that the average producer who wishes to complain receives is not in tune with the average business ethics of our country; it is not fair, it is not honest, it is not sincere. Some of you are lawyers. When you go into court and present your case and file your brief you expect an opinion some time and you expect the court to say why he did this or why he did something else. And you usually get an opinion which is decisive and the court will give a reason for what he has said and done. But the businessman who appeals to these executive agencies seldom gets any report and never any reasons. He does not know who reads his application and who passes on it. It goes to the President eventually and the President does just about as he pleases with it. That is about what happens, the complainant gets no serious consideration. That is not American, it is not fair, it is not decent. Something ought to be done about it but you cannot do anything about it unless you restore the Tariff Commission to the dignity which it ought to have. This proposed legislation should be amended severely and if not amended to restore the tariff making functions to Congress it should be defeated.

I remember well the time when Mr. Cordell Hull came before the Committee on Ways and Means with his reciprocal trade agreements bill. He was then the Secretary of State. He had been a Member of Congress and also a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was an ardent free trader.

I want to respect him for his patriotism and for his ability, and all that; but when he came before the Ways and Means Committee in 1934 I was a member of the committee then. At that time he was not too anxious to observe all the amenities and to show the courtesy that a Secretary of State is usually expected to show. He took a position of infallibility and showed some impatience when anyone questioned the soundness of his arguments. His whole argument was that his method of dealing with foreign trade was the only method and that if we failed to follow his course war would be inevitable. He practically maintained that the only way to prevent a world-wide war was to adopt his so-called reciprocal trade agreements bill. He thought that the only way to prevent war was for us to give our markets away to the other countries, many of which were opposed to us in every way. The New Deal administration put every publicity agency of the country that it could control to work boosting the Cordell Hull trade agreements as the great preventive of war. Many people are still inclined to believe this fallacious piece of advertising in spite of the fact that nearly all the time since Mr. Hull presented this fallacious theory our country has been in a war or been operating under threatening war clouds.

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of seeing the resources of our country wasted on impractical experiments. I tell you, I have about come to the place where I am tired of giving everything away. This situation is more serious than many think it is. We have about come to the end of the road with these expensive and insecure policies.

They tell us that there is no industry that has ever suffered by reason of the discrimination of these trade agencies. Come out into my country and visit the potteries in my State and tell some of those people that trade agreements have done them no harm and wait to hear what they say. Or better yet read the testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee by a number of industries that have been driven well-nigh into bankruptcy. If the tariff had been effective and beneficial those industries would not be in such distress as they are today. But I realize that such arguments to New Dealers are just like sowing seeds on the rocks; there is no soil in which they can germinate.

Come out to my State and meet the glass people, if you will. You will find them to be typical Americans who love their country and would like to make a living, as they have always done. You will find there company after company folding up and going out of business. They have worked and planned, but the Government that they have and yet respect has taken from them this opportunity and has given it to the people of some other countries that are killing our boys in a war. These glass and pottery workers are fine American citizens who live in their own homes, but they have to compete with Czechoslovakia and other communistic countries. They have to compete with China and all the other countries of the world that make chinaware, many of whom are now at war with us in spirit if not in actual combat.

Let me give you an illustration of how this trade-agreement plan fails to work. A man told us a story in committee the other day. He is the greatest producer of tableware in America. He is a great man, very intelligent, a good fighter, but his business has gone down. He told us one day he went through Pittsburgh and noticed in a big department store there a fine dinner set. He thought it was one of his make. So he decided to go in and get acquainted with the man who was selling his dinner sets. He went in and said, "I see you have a fine dinner set in your window." The man said, "Yes."

"How much do you get for it?" the manufacturer asked.

I do not know the exact figures involved, but we will say $125.

The store operator said, "$125." The visitor then said, "Why, that is my production cost. You could not sell it at that price. They should sell for about $200."

The department-store man said, "Let us go down and see."

They went down and found that the dinner set had been made in Japan. It had been made to imitate the product of this American manufacturer. It was the same pattern. The manufacturer did not know it from his own product. But, of course, he was chagrined to see the deception that was tending to put him out of business and his men out of work.

What are you going to do about cases like that? Those of you who support this New Deal deception cannot honestly say that nobody has been injured by this system, because I say to you there have been many injuries. You ask me to prove it. Well, that is like I said before, why go before a packed group or board to prove a thing when you know that board will not pay any attention to you, you know they will not give you any consideration. They have repeatedly done so. We have testimony, an abundance of it, to prove what I am saying.

Let me go on to watches. There are no watches produced in my part of the country, so I can speak about that only from what they tell me. If you want to read a masterful presentation of the injustice that has been done to the watch industry of the Nation, read the testimony in the RECORD of the hearings on this bill. Other members of the committee will touch on that subject and no doubt will go into detail with facts and figures.

Last year the fisheries came in before our committee. They came from both coasts, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and protested vigorously.

There is a general protest rising up in a great crescendo all over the country. But our little President puts his foot down and refuses to yield the power that has improperly been given to him. There are some who say, "It is all right; this is all right." But it is not all right. Somebody is suffering every day.

Mr. Chairman, I will not have time to discuss the peril points nor these other very important propositions, but they will be ably discussed by others who will address this body. I want to say most

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

emphatically again that this wrongful assumption of power by the Executive is a very important matter. We, the Members of Congress, have the duty to hold for Congress the rights that the Constitution gives it. This is our day and generation. We should not by reason of blind partisanship or political expediency yield the power to protect the rights of the people, which is our plain duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to advise the Members of the House that the announcement heretofore made that this bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule on next Monday has been changed to next Wednesday. There are certain circumstances I was not aware of at the time the announcement was made. So I repeat, the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday next.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest advances this country ever made in its history was in 1934 when the Congress passed and the President signed the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Since that time the influence of the Congress of the United States has tremendously increased in all areas and portions of the world, since that time we have had greater prosperity in the United States. since then business has prospered more than ever before and since then we have accomplished and achieved better relationships and more good will throughout the world. That is an important consideration, Mr. Chairman, and if we did go back to what some have suggested, to this sort of behind the iron curtain, where our expanding business would have no markets in other areas of the world where they could sell their products, it would have an effect upon every business in this country; it would have an effect upon the workingmen of this country, and it would have an effect all over the world in bringing us down to a lower standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about a suggested amendment, an amendment which was sought to be put into effect 2 years ago, which was known popularly as the so-called peril point amendment. This amendment will be offered, I understand, by one of my colleagues on the Republican side of the House. This afternoon I would like to take just a little bit of time to tell the membership of the House, and perhaps the country as a whole, why I think the peril-point suggestion is not a good one.

The fact is that this so-called peril-point proposition would bring into operation of the reciprocal trade-agreements program rigidities which would cripple and hamstring a proper administration of the program. It would be in effect giving notice to the world that the United States does not favor a continuation of a policy of good will and good neighborliness and expanding trade with other nations of the world. The peril point amendment would introduce a number of rigidities into the method of formulating recommendations to the President about proposed tariff concessions.

One of the first rigidities is that in practical effect the extent of the recommendations would be controlled by one agency of the Government. That agency would be the Tariff Commission. At the present time the trade agreement committee is made up of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Tariff Commission, the Agricultural Committee, and others. I think there are about seven different agencies of the Government involved. So when that trade agreements committee meets we have a broad sweeping knowledge brought to the conference table of what effect the trade concession might have, not only the effect on imports, but the effect on our exports.

We cannot in these days, Mr. Chairman, go back to the system that was in effect during the days of President McKinley and build a stone wall around this country and not export anything, and that is exactly what would happen if we repeal this trade-agreement program. What country is going to buy products of our great manufacturers when we do not buy any products from them? What businessmen could go into business and simply sell things and nobody buy anything? That, in effect, is what those who are opposing this program would have us do.

Now, another rigidity in that so-called peril-point amendment is that the Tariff Commission would be required to fix, mind you, accurately and with precision the exact point below which a tariff rate could not be reduced or the exact point a tariff rate would have to be increased in order to prevent the causing or threatening of injury to a so-called domestic industry. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is simply a practical impossibility for a single agency of this Government to fix a precise and exact point wherein tariffs could not be lowered any further.

Another rigidity is that the Tariff Commission decision on the peril point would have to be made without the benefit of discussion or consultation with other agencies of the Government, some of which agencies, like the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Agriculture, really have particular knowledge of the facts. They have the qualifications to make the judgments on the probable effects of a tariff concession on particular products. They have fields of interest where they know very, very many times more than the Tariff Commission could ever hope to find out about various products. So it just would be an impossible factor for a Tariff Commission alone to arrive at.

Another rigidity in this peril-point determination is that it must be made by the Tariff Commission in advance of any consultation, in advance of any negotiation, without the benefit of any facts that may be developed around the conference tables with the different countries. We all know that when negotiations are held we get the benefits of the advice of the experts of other countries, and we get the benefit of the advice of experts in this country, people who have special qualifications to understand the effects of them. As I said before, we have all these various departments that have special knowledge of the facts in their field.

Another rigidity, Mr. Chairman, is this: In cases where the Tariff Commission would fix a so-called peril point, what would actually and practically happen? The Tariff Commission would always fix a point that was extremely safe. They would not want to take a chance and perhaps fix a point that was low, for fear of being criticized, so they would play safe. The result would be, as I think I indicated a few minutes ago, that some of these countries that are selling us some goods would simply become discontented with our trade methods, they would refuse to buy any of our goods, and our export business would decline, with a bad effect on every working man and woman in this country, because you cannot let the economy of a country deteriorate without affecting practically every business in this country.

Another rigidity, Mr. Chairman, is that if the President should go beyond this so-called peril point which was fixed by the Tariff Commission he would be compelled to publish that to the Congress. The result of that would be that the country which had a peril point fixed to its disadvantage would feel hurt, it would be disappointed. The consultations would become public. The negotiations would be open to all the world. If these negotiations become public, it puts the United States at a disadvantage and you perhaps put other countries at a disadvantage. As we all know, negotiations that are held prior to the making of a contract or an agreement are not permissible in court. Some people say, "We will make these consultations public," but you can see that if the jury knew of all previous negotiations, if it had the benefit of all the negotiations and proposals and counterproposals and propositions that were made, it would not be in a position, perhaps, to render a true and a just verdict. It simply would not work in actual practice. Under the amendment which was in effect, if one peril point was discarded the President would be compelled to publish the entire list of peril points. This would upset our trade balance tremendously. I wish I had before me a list of the business organizations and a list of the outstanding businessmen in this country who feel that this trade-agreements program is really one of the things responsible for the United States being the leader in the world today. It helped that situation to come about. When we started this program in 1934 it helped us out in South America with our good-neighbor policy and it helped in all the European countries, and is still helping today.

I wish you would keep in mind, if you can, that we cannot put a barrier around this country and manufacture a lot of material and sell it to the outside world unless we buy some items from the outside world. That is the stark, naked fact that everybody should have in mind

when we come to the final vote on this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, this peril-point proposition was advocated in the first place by those who have always opposed this program in its entirety. It is just one of those suggestions which will hamstring the proper operation of the act. It will be notice to the world that the United States is changing its foreign policy and does not have the intention of spreading good will and spreading our products all over the world.

I sincerely trust that when the vote comes on the so-called peril-point amendment, that the amendment will be defeated and the bill be passed so that our foreign affairs and our foreign relations can continue to make the progress that has been made in the last 17 years.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman referred to experts who sat down and arranged these tariff duties for the United States. Who are these experts?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the State Department, and the Department of Commerce are represented, and on these committees are persons who are specially qualified to know about these different businesses and to know what impact a change in the tariff rates would make.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What committees are you referring to?

Mr. EBERHARTER. To the trade committees.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I understand you are talking of the group that sits down and meets with the foreign country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Trade Agreements Committee, yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Or are you referring to the group that actually negotiates with the foreign country?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, my understanding is that that group is actually meeting right now in Europe to see whether they can obtain any more concessions from their countries so that our businessmen can export more and perhaps in return we will give them a consideration or two.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I understand that they meet. But what is surprising to me about your statement is that you said they are experts. I wish you would put in the RECORD the name and address of these so-called experts, what they are expert in and something of their history which makes them an expert.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think I can obtain that detailed information for the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I am referring to those individuals who actually negotiate with the foreign countries.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman mean those who are at this meeting now in Europe?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I do not care when they meet. If they are experts I would like to have that information, and you qualified them as experts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That information is as follows:

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THIRD SESSION OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, AND TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS (ANNECY, FRANCE, APRIL 8 TO AUGUST 26, 1949)

Chairman: Woodbury Willoughby, Chief, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State, and Chairman, Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements; Vice Chairman: John W. Evans, Director, Commodities Division, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Delegates: Philip Arnow, economist, Department of Labor; Prentice N. Dean, Division of International Programs, National Military Establishment; Laurence Harris, Chief, Trade Section, Office of the Special Representative, Economic Cooperation Administration, Paris; Iver Olsen, Assistant Chief, Commercial Policy and United Nations Division, Department of the Treasury; Robert B. Schwenger, Chief, Regional Investigations Branch, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture.

Advisers: George Bronz, special assistant to the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury; Honore M. Catudal, advised, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Carl E. Christopherson, Foreign Service office, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; Floyd E. Davis, acting head, Livestock and Wool Division, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture; Walter Hollis, assistant to the legal adviser, Department of State; Lionel C. Holm, Executive Assistant to the Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture; William R. Johnson, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury; H. P. MacGowan, adviser on Trade Agreements Policy, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; F. A. Motz, Attaché, American Embassy, Paris; Vernon L. Phelps, adviser on European Commerical Affairs, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; George B. Rogers, agricultural economic statistician, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Lt. Col. Lester F. Schockner, United States Army, Civil Affairs Division, Department of the Army.

Tariff negotiating teams:

Denmark and Finland: Prentice N. Dean (head), Division of International Programs, National Military Establishment; Julean Arnold, Jr., Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; H. P. Macgowan, adviser on trade agreements policy, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Sweden: Avery F. Peterson (head),[1] counselor, American Embassy, Stockholm; H. Arnold Quirin, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Grant Olson, analyst, Scandinavian Section, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Italy: Homer S. Fox (head),[2] counselor, American Embassy, Ottawa; John M. Kennedy, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Carl E. Christopherson, Foreign Service officer, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; Howard F. Shepston, analyst, Italian Section, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Greece and Liberia: Horace H. Smith (head), first secretary, American Embassy, Athens; C. Thayer White, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Samuel Goldberg, Acting Chief, Near East-Africa Section, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Dominican Republic and Haiti: Daniel M. Braddock (head), first secretary, American Embassy, Madrid; Amelia Hood, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Albert J. Powers, Chief, Caribbean Section, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Colombia, Uruguay, and Nicaragua: Howard H. Tewksbury (head),[3] Chief, Division of River Plate Affairs, Department of State; Elizabeth McGrory, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; William F. Gray, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; Anthony J. Poirier, tariff and trade agreements specialist, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; Frederick R. Mangold, Foreign Service staff, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Consultants: Ben Dorfman, chief economist, United States Tariff Commission; G. Patrick Henry, economist, United States Tariff Commission; Adolph B. Horn, American Embassy, Habana; Willard W. Kane, commodity specialist, United States Tariff Commission; Hyman Leikind, commodity specialist, United States Tariff Commission; Allyn Loosely, principal economist, United States Tariff Commission; David Lynch, principal economist, United States Tariff Commission; Edwin G. Martin, General Counsel, United States Tariff Commission.

Commodity specialists: Nathan D. Golden, Chief, Motion Picture-Photographic Branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; Thomas C. Mason, commodity analyst, Forest Products Branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; William H. Myer, Assistant Chief, Machinery and Motor Products Branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; Nathan B. Salant, Chief, Economic Program Section, Textile and Leather Branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; George A. Sallee, Chief, Dairy, Poultry, and Fish Products Section, Office of International Trade Department of Commerce.

Secretariat: Special Assistant to the Chairman: Arthur C. Nable, Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

Technical: Technical secretary: James H. Lewis, Acting Assistant Chief, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State.

Trade Agreements Committee staff: Robert W. Shaw, Committee Secretariat Branch, Department of State; George C. Spiegel, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; M. Marguerite Dotye, International Trade Economist, Department of Commerce; M. Margaret McCoy, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; technical assistant: Dorothy M. Quilty, administrative officer, United States Appraisers Office, Department of the Treasury; statistical assistant: Evelyn F. Brooks, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State; administrative: administrative secretary, John T. Forbes, Division of International Conferences, Department of State; administrative assistant, Leonard H. Brody, Division of Central Services, Department of State; document assistant, Helen L. Brewster, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State; security officer, Richard T. Ewing, assistant attaché, American Embassy, Paris; fiscal officer, Robert B. Stitt, Division of Finance, Department of State; fiscal clerk, Mildred C. Trescot, Division of Finance, Department of State; code clerk, William L. Black, Division of Communications and Records, Department of State; George R. Bobby, American Embassy, Copenhagen, Denmark; Robert E. Morrell, American Embassy, London, England; Robert W. Nichols, Division of Communications and Records, Department of State.

[1] During the latter part of the negotiations, after Mr. Peterson's departure, H. Arnold Quirin was head.

[2] During the latter part of the negotiations, after Mr. Fox's departure, Iver C. Olsen was head.

[3] During the latter part of the negotiations, after Mr. Tewksbury's departure, Philip Arnow was head.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand, this committee on reciprocal trade is made up of interdepartmental experts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. The question I want to ask is when do the businessmen appear before the interdepartmental committee to state their case—after the London meeting or is it before they go to London?

Mr. EBERHARTER. A list is published of the various items on which the United States might be willing to negotiate. That list is published. Then any interested business can appear before a committee and present its case in the best light possible, to show whether or not any harm would be done to that particular industry in case a concession is made.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is before they meet with the other nations.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very glad to know that. I know there are two meetings. There is a meeting in some foreign country, either France or England, and there is also a meeting down in the department where the businessmen of the country are called in to state their case to the interdepartmental committee. Has that interdepartmental committee met with the businessmen and held that meeting?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The list is published about 4 months before the actual meeting in the foreign country, and in that 120 days businessmen can appear before the committee here in the United States, present the facts concerning their particular industry or their particular product.

Mr. STEFAN. Has that meeting already been held in the United States?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. And therefore the businessmen of the United States have been put on notice that the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is going to be extended for 3 years?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. And they appeared before the interdepartmental committee and stated the various problems they are up against or have been during the past 2 or 3 years, and the businessmen have made their case before the committee, and then the interdepartmental committee and their experts have gone to Europe to see what trades they can make in the foreign country? Is that the mechanics of it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is the mechanics of it.

Mr. STEFAN. So that the businessmen of the United States have already had their day in court?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, yes. That is set out rather completely and in detail in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has again expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, the issue before Congress at this time is not what it is labeled; it is not reciprocal trade which concerns us, but a further lowering of protection for American workers and American industries.

The title of the legislation is a sham. There has been no reciprocity in this ill-advised program. As is customary in all our dealings with other nations—we give and they take. Higher trade barriers are being erected by other countries while we lower ours. They disguise their trade restraints as import quotas and licensing agreements. We make concessions and other nations make it more difficult for us to trade with them.

The Trade Agreements Act is a sell-out by the Democrat Party to big business and the free traders of the South. The workingman and the small-business man are pushed aside—and their interests are forgotten. Let us remember that the worker and the small-business man paid the bulk of the taxes to finance ECA and other relief programs. These programs rebuilt the industrial capacity of foreign nations who are now privileged to compete in both domestic and world markets with cheap or slave labor. We are asked to compete against our own tax money, and to grant favored treatment to our competitors.

Czechoslovak rubber footwear—hats and pottery produced by slave labor are sold in America more reasonably than they can be produced here. Russian furs and Red Chinese dried eggs find ready markets in the United States because they are cheaper than the domestic variety. English and German steel and cutlery manufacturers can undersell the American producer.

Many big business firms support this trade program as they export much of their production. The small firm confined to the American market suffers because its plight goes unheeded.

Proponents argue that we must import to survive. This simply is not true, as we now import more than we export. In both August and October of 1950 imports exceeded exports substantially. This happened even while tremendous shipments were being made under Government sponsorship in connection with ECA, Army civilian supply, and mutual defense assistance programs.

I have in the past fought for "peril point" and "escape clause" amendments feeling that with them the trade program might be workable. Sufficient evidence has now been gathered to demonstrate clearly that even with these amendments the trade program will not benefit the citizens of the United States.

The Fair Deal administration has no intention of safeguarding the working people of this country, and I shall not support this ill-conceived program.

Many of our economic ills can be traced to this program. Expansion of industrial capacity for this Nation's growth has been stymied because of it. The sole beneficiaries are the monopolies and cartels abroad. I am not in Congress to acquiesce in the liquidation of American industrial life—but to assist in preserving jobs for the people of this Nation. Let others concern themselves with subsidies for foreign industries—I want the American worker to have a square deal first.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have been told this afternoon of the great prosperity which exists in this country. It has been stated that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program plays a substantial part in the measure of prosperity which some may enjoy. We all know that the prosperity, factual or fancied as it may be, which we have today rests upon the blood of American youth who have died and are dying overseas, and on the preparation for further war, and on the expenditures to repair the damage brought on as the result of war. So long as this type of expenditure continues we will have the false prosperity we have today.

If the Democratic Party favors this type of prosperity and expects the country to engage in wars periodically, and will agree to keep this country continuously preparing for war, and will agree to continue repairing the damages of future wars, we will continue to have the same kind of prosperity we have today. Prosperity through war and inflation has wiped out the real value of the savings of the American people. No, Mr. Chairman. This reciprocal-trade-agreement policy, sold to the American people by the internationalists as a solution to international discord, has today turned about and is one of the causes of why we are not properly prepared today.

The trade-agreement program has failed utterly to wipe out the restrictions and the limitations imposed by foreign countries upon free trade which appears to be the goal of the internationalists in our State Department today and the announced purpose of the trade program. Today, 17 years after this law began to operate, there are more limitations, more restrictions upon the free interchange of manufactured goods and agricultural products between nations than there were 17 years ago. This program has failed. Its failure is proved by the fact that when expenditures for war and associated purposes decreased, the effect of imports was immediately noted, and severely damaged certain of our important industries. Only about 1 year ago our unemployment amounted to almost 5,000,000, and loud cries were made to curtail imports. Labor was greatly concerned, and dozens of labor organizations, at that time and at the present time, oppose the administration and extension of this act. Representatives of these men who lost jobs prior to the resumption of war preparations came before our committee last week pleading for relief from this insidious policy under the Trade Agreements Act. They ask that the Congress of the United States do something to assure their industries, wherein skill is the first requisite, be preserved.

I said earlier that the trade-agreements policy has brought us to a point where our defenses are inadequate. In one of those areas real suffering prevails. In Korea today, because of our trade-agreement policies, young men are freezing in subzero temperatures; their legs and arms have had to be amputated because of the shortage of proper clothing; because wool was not available to them in the form in which it could be used to keep men warm, and because the great wool industry, in which millions upon millions of the sheep which provided that wool, has been liquidated under the trade-agreement policies. Today more than two-thirds of the wool we need comes from abroad. Today the flocks of sheep from which we formerly got our wool are at the lowest point in all history; and those trade agreements cutting down the price of wool below a level at which the sheep could be profitably grown here. This is the result of the negotiations of our Department of State, headed by Mr. Dean Acheson, who has been wrong before with respect to the question of war, and who I submit is wrong again. After our killing this industry here, the foreigners on whom we depend have raised the price of wool to its highest price in history.

Consider other industries—and these about which I am going to speak employ only a few hundred thousand men, if that many—but consider their strategic importance today as we prepare for war. Without the production of these industries we must import vital war materials from overseas. Consider the watch and clock industry, and remember that in time of war skilled specialists manufacture the timepieces without which no airplane can fly, without which guns cannot properly be fired, producing thousands of units which are used for the detonation of certain of our shells, and so on; and realize that that industry has been traded down the river to such a degree that one-quarter of the industry has been eliminated within the past year or two. Today we need skilled men capable of manufacturing an important type of mechanism that is delicate and very much needed. The craftsmen of this dying industry are the men to do it. I realize it is true that our remaining companies manufacturing watches show a profit in their dollar profit-and-loss account, but the industry has not expanded at all; on the contrary it has been reduced by 25 percent, and today we have to turn abroad and risk the hazards of overseas transportation in order to secure watches and the various time mechanisms we need. Right there the trade-agreement program is hurting us seriously in connection wth this question of preparation for war.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. As the gentleman knows, I come from a district in which 20,000 people are engaged in the manufacture of shoes. About 6 months ago the State Department came forward with an idea that proposed the scrapping of what is known as the American selling price and substituting in its place a foreign selling price, thereby enabling Japanese shoes to be shipped in for about 35 cents a pair in competition with shoes which the people in my district could only produce at 95 cents a pair. This is also true as applied to countries behind the iron curtain.

May I ask the gentleman if there is any disposition in this bill to scrap the American selling price in favor of another system which would enable Japanese shoes and shoes made behind the iron curtain to be shipped in here in competition with the people who work in my district?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I know of nothing that would make the change to which the gentleman refers. I do know, however, the practice is to permit the Japanese, at their hourly average wage of perhaps 20 to 25 cents, to ship into this country all kinds of any goods they care to ship in competition with American produced articles. That is the policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order until the gentleman has concluded his statement.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I referred to two items on the critical list, both of which have been and are adversely affecting our war effort, one being timepieces and the other being wool.

Another one is the great chemical industry. Gentlemen appeared before our committee and testified that if cuts are made in the items now before the negotiators abroad the expansion of the chemical industry here in our country, so vital for the further conduct of the war, will be curtailed. That industry will be hurt to such an extent we will be dependent upon imports for essentials in the manufacture of our own munitions, clothing for our soldiers, and many other items important in the conduct of war. That industry is so alarmed that in response to direct questions it was stated they could not get capital with which to expand their industry from private individuals in order to increase production they know will be necessary in time of war. They will have to turn to the Government for money, turn to the taxpayers, to build and to expand that industry, instead of depending on the American way of doing it through the free-enterprise system.

A trade agreement today is threatening that industry with substantial extinction because they can and do produce those chemicals in Germany and other countries just as well as they do here. The great German chemical industry is revived by ERP funds and is taking over the American market.

I come now to a fourth critical industry for war purposes. The representatives of that industry, the industry composed of companies that manufacture binoculars, microscopes, range finders, and many other precision optical items in time of war told us that since the threat of war the industry has been asked to expand 40 times in order to make sufficient of these items. They do not have the trained men to so expand.

The trade agreements as administered in the past several years have so cut the tariff protecting this vital industry that in the past year 68,000 binoculars were brought in from Japan, many thousands from Germany, and other thousands from other countries. These could have been made here. It is a sad commentary that our Government purchased thousands of dollars worth of these products made in Italy and elsewhere overseas by cheap labor. This has the effect of cutting down planned expansion of the industries in question, of creating again the hazardous circumstances wherein we in this country are again dependent upon imports for the necessities to conduct our war, imports which our skilled men here can make better than they can be made abroad if given a chance.

I charge that, with respect to our four great industries, producers of timepieces, producers of chemicals, growers of wool, and producers of optical glass items, the trade-agreements program is directly responsible for the shortages of these products so vital in the conduct of war. We are in a dangerous situation and are forced to depend on imports now and, at great expense and inefficiency, to expand these industries. The negotiating boys from the State Department, untried in the business and military world, acting under congressional powers delegated to the President, evidencing a complete lack of realism to the welfare of our country, are responsible for the critical position of the country due to a shortage of these items. Congress should never have delegated this authority to the President which he, in turn, entrusts to Mr. Acheson. The risk to our country is too great, and Congress should recall this delegation immediately by defeating the bill now before us.

Should an enemy to our country seek effectively to damage us and seek to make us impotent in time of war, he would do it by striking us in the critical materials area. There have been men in our Government service concerned with the making of the trade agreements to whom the welfare of the United States did not come first. One of those instrumental in making these agreements, representing our Department of State, was Alger Hiss. Is it not significant that among all the complainants of the ill effect of the trade-agreements negotiations these four critical industries are the most outstanding and have suffered the greatest injury proportionately?

This is too dangerous a power to rest with the Executive and to be delegated by him to others.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HAND. I would just like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, to my distinguished friend, that while he is talking about the optical glass industry, he might well talk about the entire glass industry in this country, which has a total value of approximately $250,000,000, which is highly strategic and highly necessary to the war effort, because, among other things, the manufacturers of ampules for the retention of medicine and antibiotics and the entire glass industry of this country, 9,000 workers of which are employed in my congressional district, have been and continue to be threatened by these reciprocal trade acts which are improperly administered by representatives of the State Department.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michgan. The gentleman has made a very instructive statement and has shown how this program is interfering with American production. Now, am I correct in assuming that under point 4 as urged by the President we would be furnishing the dollars to instruct these people abroad to improve their methods of production, and that the competition will become greater yet than the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes, and after they build their plants with our dollars they impose embargoes so that we can no longer ship into their country, while we have reduced our tariffs to permit them free access to our markets.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to utter the fact that Poland, behind the iron curtain, is shipping in glass, paint and processed meats so low in the cost of production that our people do not have a chance, no matter how much they improve their technology.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, as I said, it is not only the optical glass industry, but the entire glass industry of this country which either has, or will, be adversely affected by the policies of our State Department, carried on under the authority of law which is now sought to be extended.

I have repeatedly argued this question before, and there is little use in presently laboring the point. It is no exaggeration to say that the present attitude of the State Deparment is to let American businesses die, if they cannot compete with low wage scales abroad, while at the same time we pour millions into those same foreign industries to enable them successfully to compete.

I woul l like to call to the attention of the committee the excellent review of this whole subject, published by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, Chairman of the National Labor-Management Council of Foreign Trade Policy. It is worthy of the attention of all Members before we consider this bill again next week.

At that time I hope I will have a further opportunity to discuss this subject, and particularly my bill which is designed to restore at least some measure of congressional authority with respect to tariff problems.

In its present unrestricted form, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abbitt	Fulton	O'Neill
Addonizio	Furcolo	Patten
Allen, Ill.	Garmatz	Philbin
Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Poage
Angell	Gillette	Powell
Barrett	Gordon	Prouty
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Ramsay
Bennett, Mich.	Granahan	Redden
Berry	Hall,	Ribicoff
Boykin	Leonard W.	Rodino
Breen	Heffernan	Rogers, Tex.
Brehm	Heller	Rooney
Bryson	Herter	Sabath
Buckley	Hill	Scott,
Budge	Hinshaw	Hardie
Burnside	Holifield	Shafer
Burton	Jenison	Shelley
Busbey	Kee	Short
Celler	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Chelf	Kersten, Wis.	Spence
Chiperfield	Kluczynski	Springer
Cooley	Lane	Staggers
Corbett	Lucas	Stanley
Coudert	McGrath	Stockman
Cox	Magee	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Miller, Calif.	Thompson,
Denny	Miller, Nebr.	Tex.
Dingell	Mitchell	Velde
Doyle	Morrison	Vinson
Eaton	Moulder	Whitaker
Fallon	Murphy	Willis
Feighan	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Forand	Nelson	Woodruff
Fugate	O'Konski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEMPSEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1612, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 335 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in this debate regarding the method of negotiating trade agreements with foreign countries. This principle is not new, and in fact the trade-agreements policy or program has been endorsed by some of the greatest leaders and experts on this subject. President McKinley advocated trade agreements. President Theodore Roosevelt was an outstanding advocate of reciprocal trade agreements. It has come on down to us through several decades of thoughtful men who were experts on foreign trade. This method of negotiating a trade agreement has been worked out and is a scientific one.

In making decisions under the Trade Agreements Act, the President is required by law to consult the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, State, and the Tariff Commission. In practice, he gets a broader range of advice, for he has, by Executive order, set up the Trade Agreements Committee, which includes not only the agencies that he is required by law to consult, but also representatives of the Departments of Labor, Interior, the Treasury, and the Economic Cooperation Administration. From time to time other departments and agencies are consulted when problems of particular interest to them arise.

The first thing done in preparing for negotiations with a particular country is for the Trade Agreements Committee to appoint a country committee composed of officers of the different agencies which have members on the Trade Agreements Committee. These officers are selected because they are experts on our trade with that country. This committee then carefully studies the statistics of this trade and eventually picks out for possible tariff negotiation the products which we import from that country and for which that country is the principal supplier. The committee also chooses those items which that country imports and for which we are the chief supplier. The decisions of this committee are then presented to the Trade Agreements Committee, which sends the list of products to the President for approval.

When the President has approved the list, it is published and a date is set for public hearings to obtain the views of all interested persons and groups as to whether concessions on any of the items should be made. These hearings are held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is composed of the same agencies and the same individuals as the Trade Agreements Committee.

I have had occasion twice since I have been a Member of this body to go with constituents of mine before this Committee for Reciprocity Information. On one occasion we had a product from our district which is only produced in our district. As a matter of fact, I think more than 75 percent of that product that is used in the United States is produced in my district. That product was in the list to be used in negotiating a treaty with Italy and with Spain. Both Italy and Spain produce this same product. I found that the members of the committee were most interested when I made that statement to them, and asked many questions, and went very carefully and very thoroughly into the cost of that product in my district, and what it meant to my district economically. I am very glad to tell you that when the trade agreement was made they did not disturb the tariff on that product.

The Tariff Commission member acts as chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Right there I want to make another statement. If this peril-point consideration is adopted, the Tariff Commis-

sion member will not be sitting there, and the group that negotiates the treaty will have lost the benefit of his intricate knowledge of our tariff. The tariff consists, as you know, of hundreds and hundreds of items, and those gentlemen are experts who study the meaning of the tariff as it applies to the economics of these different items.

As I say, the Tariff Commission member acts as chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. After the hearings are concluded, the information received, both orally and in the form of briefs submitted, as well as the information in Government files with respect to each product, is studied by the country committee. The committee makes a recommendation as to whether a concession would be justified. These recommendations are presented to the Trade Agreements Committee, which reviews them item by item and approves, modifies, or rejects them. The Trade Agreements Committee is very reluctant to recommend a concession which any one of its members feels strongly would be likely to result in serious injury. If any member of the Trade Agreements Committee, including the Tariff Commission member, disagrees with the majority decision, he is required to report his dissent, together with the reasons for the dissent, to the President. Consequently, the President actually does obtain, in effect, a peril-point finding in cases where there are serious misgivings in the mind of the Tariff Commission member of the committee or any other member as to the effect of a particular concession.

This system has worked well for 16 years. As I have shown, great care is exercised during every step of the preparations. The final recommendations represent the best judgment of qualified experts in all the branches of the Government which have anything to do with trade agreements. No one agency dominates the proceedings. In every case every member of the Trade Agreements Committee has the duty and is, in fact, required, if he disagrees with the majority view, to file his minority opinion.

If, in spite of all the care which is taken, unforeseen circumstances arise which result in increased imports of an item upon which a concession has been granted, there is the remedy of the escape clause, with which you all are familiar. Action under the escape clause permits us to modify or withdraw entirely any concession previously granted. Such an action recently took place in connection with women's fur-felt hats. This escape clause is administered solely and entirely by the Tariff Commission. Here again, then, the Tariff Commission is in a position to act to prevent injury to a domestic industry.

Under the present system, the Trade Agreements Committee is not required by law to give a guaranty such as the peril-point theory would require of the President in good conscience to give him its best collective judgment. And that judgment, as given in the past, has almost without exception proved to be right.

XCVII—52

SAFEGUARDS EMPLOYED UNDER THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM TO PREVENT INJURY TO UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES

Measures to assure that no United States industry will suffer serious injury or threat of serious injury through a United States concession in a trade agreement are provided for: First, in the procedure followed before a trade agreement is negotiated; second, in the individual concessions themselves; and third, in the general provisions of the agreement which apply after the agreement becomes effective.

SAFEGUARDING PROCEDURES EMPLOYED BEFORE AGREEMENT IS NEGOTIATED

Before any concession is even offered by the United States in a trade-agreement negotiation, the following procedures are required either by the Trade Agreements Act itself, or by Executive order of the President.

First. The Tariff Commission, a bipartisan, expert body responsible to the Congress, makes a thorough study of the possible effects of a concession, including competitive factors, with regard to each item on which a concession is being considered.

Second. A list of all items on which concessions may be considered is made public.

Third. Public hearings are held at which any interested person has opportunity to present his views, both in writing and orally, on whether any concession should be offered.

Fourth. Opportunity is given for informal consultation with interested persons or groups.

Fifth. Facts and opinions developed through the Tariff Commission studies, the hearings, and any other available means are closely examined by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, which includes a member of the Tariff Commission, a representative of the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and representatives of the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, Treasury, Labor, Defense, and the Interior. This committee was established by Executive order.

Sixth. After considering all available information on each item, the Trade Agreements Committee decides what recommendations it will make to the President as to concessions which might be offered in negotiations. More than 99 percent of these recommendations have been unanimous. If any agency disagrees with the majority recommendations, that agency submits its dissent, in writing, with its reasons, to the President along with the majority recommendation.

Seventh. After examining all available information regarding a given item included a published list, the Trade Agreements Committee may decide not to recommend any concession whatever on that item.

Eighth. The concessions which the President approves form the basis of United States offers in the actual negotiations. No United States concessions are actually made unless adequate concessions from foreign countries are obtained in return.

Ninth. Concessions granted and obtained in the negotiations must be approved by the President before they can be put into effect.

SAFEGUARDS "BUILT INTO" INDIVIDUAL CONCESSIONS

In recommending concessions the Trade Agreements Committee tailors each one to fit the situation of the product concerned and of any domestic industry with whose product the imported article might compete.

First. On certain items the concession may be only the binding of the existing duty rate or existing duty-free status. "Binding" means agreement not to increase the existing tariff on a dutiable item or to impose a duty on a duty-free item. It involves no change in the tariff treatment of the item.

Second. On certain other items the recommendation may be to reduce the duty only 10 percent or 20 percent instead of the full 50 percent which would be possible under the President's authority.

Third. The duty may be reduced on only a specified quantity of imports of the product in question. On any imports over this "tariff quota" the original rate remains in effect. Sometimes a concession provides that only certain quantities of the tariff-quota product shall be admitted at the low rate of duty per month or quarter. This prevents the market from being flooded by large imports under the quota at any one time.

Fourth. The duty may be reduced on only specified types, grades, or value classes of the product in question, the rates on other classifications remaining unchanged. On cotton textiles, for example, the United States has reduced tariffs on high-quality goods which are normally imported from Western Europe, but not on goods of lower quality produced in Japan.

Fifth. In some cases, such as that of fresh vegetables, a reduced duty may apply only during a specified season when domestic products with which they might compete are not being marketed—a seasonal quota.

SAFEGUARDS EMPLOYED AFTER TRADE AGREEMENT IS IN EFFECT

Ever since the Trade Agreements Act was proposed and all through the administration of the trade agreements program, there have been industries which have claimed that they would be injured by the program. There is clear evidence, both in the hearings that precede negotiations and in the congressional hearings in connection with renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, that in very few cases have the fears of injury been justified. However, there are adequate means for preventing or remedying any such injury if it occurs after the agreement has gone into effect.

THE STANDARD ESCAPE CLAUSE

All the trade agreements which have been signed since 1943, including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, have included an escape clause under which any party to the agreement may modify or withdraw an individual concession if it is found that, as a result of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

unforeseen circumstances and of the concession, imports of the item in question are occurring in such increased quantity and in such circumstances as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. Under this clause the concession may be either partly or wholly withdrawn, a quota imposed on imports, or a rate of duty even higher than that in effect before the concession may be put into effect.

By joint agreement a substantially identical clause was included on October 13, 1950, in the trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland, concluded in 1936.

For the United States, the escape clause action is administered by the Tariff Commission, which makes its recommendation to the President, directly and without participation of any other Government agency.

An industry claiming injury or threat of injury resulting from a trade-agreement concession applies to the Tariff Commission for an investigation and public hearing. If, in the Commission's opinion, a preliminary examination reveals facts warranting a formal investigation, the Commission conducts one and recommends to the President the action, if any, which should be taken.

Although the United States has made concessions on several thousand items in trade agreements that contain the escape clause, only 20 applications for investigations, covering 17 products, have been filed with the Tariff Commission. Five of these are still pending. Of the 15 which have been disposed of, only one—involving women's fur felt hats and hat bodies—was found by the Tariff Commission to justify action. In that case the Tariff Commission recommended withdrawal of the concession and this was done.

The careful application of the safeguards observed before concessions are made and the way concessions are tailored to particular needs are primarily responsible for the fact that need for using the escape clause has been minimized.

REMEDIES OTHER THAN STANDARD ESCAPE CLAUSE

Several trade agreements concluded by the United States before the general agreement contained clauses under which a concession could be modified or withdrawn if it was found that its major benefits were going to some country other than the one to which the concession had been granted, and if serious injury to a domestic industry was occurring or threatened.

The 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland, containing this clause, included a United States concession on certain types of embroidered handkerchiefs. In 1940 it was found that large numbers of such handkerchiefs were being imported from another country and were threatening injury to a domestic industry. The concession was withdrawn.

The 1939 agreement with Canada included a United States concession on linen fire hose. In 1947 it was found that such hose was being imported in large quantities from another country and the domestic industry was being threatened. That concession, too, was withdrawn.

The 1939 agreement with Canada included a United States concession on live black and silver foxes and on fox furs. On the outbreak of World War II several large European markets for furs were closed, and there were considerable increases in shipments of furs to the United States. A supplementary agreement, limiting the number of furs to be admitted to the United States, was negotiated.

In the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the United States granted to Canada a reduced-duty quota on potatoes and agreed to increase the quota if United States potato production should fall below 350,000,000 bushels per year. In 1950 the United States sought and obtained from Canada, with the approval of the other contracting parties to the general agreement, a waiver under which the United States is not obligated to increase the Canadian potato quota unless United States production should fall below 335,000,000 bushels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, on June 23—a scant few days before President Truman ordered our troops into Korea—I was nominated as the Republican candidate for Representative from the Second District of Connecticut.

In accepting that high honor, I said:

Unemployment—in the city, on the farm, and all the evils that unemployment breeds under its dark shadow—is our most serious domestic problem here in eastern Connecticut. Our every effort must be directed toward the proper solution of this problem. If elected, I shall analyze the issues as they are debated in the Congress with this thought always in mind: Are we helping to provide a job for the man who wants to work? Are we helping to provide job security for the man who is working?

The present abuse of the existing reciprocal trade agreements has resulted in the flooding of the American market with goods made by slave labor behind the iron curtain. This abuse of a principle, which, in its proper form I support, is directly responsible for the shutting down of many of our mills in eastern Connecticut. This abuse must be corrected if we are to provide proper employment for our people.

With this pledge to my people in mind, I rise to discuss the issue before us today. Certainly the times are different now than they were last June. Mothers instead of watching the papers for announcements as to how many days' work would be available for their men or for themselves at the mill, now watch for the latest draft call, and for the latest casualty list.

Certainly now is the time, not only to provide for the lives of our people but also to provide for the livelihood of our people in the days to come.

To do this—to provide for better livelihood for our people—I believe that the present reciprocal trade agreements must be improved. They must be improved in at least three respects.

First. I believe that the peril-point-report provisions as established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 should be reenacted.

These provisions originally were adopted in order to do certain things:

1. To furnish competent and expert nonpartisan information for the guidance of the State Department as it determined our foreign-trade program.

2. To safeguard the economic health of industries essential to the national defense.

3. To prevent serious cut-backs in jobs for our workers.

Under the terms of these provisions, the Tariff Commission was required to specify certain points below which, in the judgment of the Commission, it would be perilous to go in making further tariff cuts.

This procedure in no way interfered with the President's authority as delegated to him by Congress to make future trade agreements. This procedure imposed no obligation on the State Department to adhere to the Commission's finding.

I believe that the President should be required to advise the Congress and the people of those items on which tariff cuts have been made if the cuts go below the point the Tariff Commission found would result in serious injury to our domestic workers. The President should be required to tell us exactly why he believed it advisable to go beyond these points.

Second. I believe that the President should be directed to prevent the reduction of tariffs or other trade concessions made in trade agreements with the free nations to imports from Soviet Russia, Communist China, and any Communist satellite country.

I have said before on the floor of the House that I regret that while all the partners in the Atlantic Pact are supposedly uniting to build up defenses against Soviet aggression, some are still supplying the Communist empire with critical and strategic war materials.

In this same vein, I cannot for the life of me see why we should allow our American soldiers to fight and die fighting the Communists in one part of the world while many of the Communist countries enjoy the benefits of our trade concessions made to the world without making a single concession in return.

It is reported that—and I quote:

In the case of Russia, approximately 83 percent of its dutiable imports into the United States from that country in 1949 benefited from reduced rates provided in trade agreements with other countries and 92 percent of the tax-free imports from Russia consisted of products found on the free list in trade agreements with other countries.

We cannot, we must not, tolerate a condition of our own creation which results in our fighting the Communists in Korea on the one hand and encouraging on the other hand imports from Communist countries which compete with the products of our own domestic labor. The least we can do is to insist that imports from behind the iron curtain pay a full rate of duty. We are asking our boys in Korea to pay their full share of duty, are we not?

Third. Certain standards should be established by the Congress to guide the President in providing relief under a so-called escape clause.

In 1934, the Congress delegated to the President the authority to enter into trade agreements with other nations. At this time, no provision was made for escape from serious economic injury to our own domestic industries. Since 1943, however, practically all trade agreements contain a so-called escape clause.

As has been stated here on the floor before, by others, the peril-point report helps prevent anyone setting the barn on fire; the escape clause provides some hope for those inside the burning barn to get out and survive.

As we face the difficult days that lie ahead, I hope that our friends will like us, not just for our money, but more importantly, for the principles in which we believe.

I believe in and shall support the principle of the reciprocal trade agreements. I recognize that since this principle was first adopted by the American people we have had very little opportunity to study its workings under any peacetime economy. I can support this measure with much better conscience if the suggested amendments I have listed above are adopted. If these amendments are defeated, I hope that those in charge of our foreign-trade program will carefully consider why these amendments were offered.

Certainly this is the time for a clear statement of fact and principle.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill, H. R. 1612, now before the House, is to extend the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, for an additional 3 years from June 12, 1951.

Trade agreement resulting from negotiations of the past 16 years are now in effect with 45 foreign countries. The purpose of the law as it was originally presented to Congress for enactment was to encourage trade between our country and the other countries of the world. This basic principle was praiseworthy. However, the administration of the law by the State Department has been in many respects very unsatisfactory. There have been too many instances under the agreement entered into, where industries of this country have had to meet the competition of products manufactured or produced by underpaid labor in foreign countries. This has resulted in hardship for the affected industries and the workmen of our own country. We cannot maintain our standard of living and successfully compete with foreign products that result from the low-scale wages prevalent in foreign countries. In all our efforts to assist foreign countries we should be realistic and consider the effect on our own workmen and their standard of living. To do otherwise is to improve conditions abroad at the expense of the standards prevailing in this country. The fact that the officials of the State Department charged with the administration of the law, have not always recognized this fact is in my opinion a just cause of complaint.

Severe criticism has also been directed to the administration of the law for failure to permit interested parties, including representatives of workers in affected industries from having full opportunity to appear and argue their case before determination is made. Under the procedures followed interested parties are kept in the dark. They do not know what is claimed by their foreign competitor, or, in some instances do not know what articles are being considered by the State Department. This procedure, with respect to American manufacturers and workers, is not applied by foreign countries to their nationals. According to my information all interested parties in other countries are given full and free opportunity by the officials in their respective countries to be heard. They are given every consideration before any determination is made or treaty entered into. The attitude of foreign countries toward their nationals is not only reasonable but right and just. There should be similar consideration given to our citizens by our officials in our State Department. Right and justice should prevail in this country's administrations of the law at least equal to that which is observed in foreign countries.

Another feature that has never seemed justified to me is the application that is made of the so-called most-favored-nation clause of the reciprocal trade agreements. Under this clause whatever reduction we make in our tariff rates with respect to any nation with whom we enter into an agreement immediately becomes available to every other nation regardless of whether or not that nation has made any concession to us. It seems to me that this sets at naught the whole purpose of reciprocal agreements. The fundamental purpose of such agreements is to give some concession to us in return for concessions we give to other nations. When nations who have made no concessions to us can obtain the same benefits as other nations who have made concessions, there can be no justification from the standpoint of reciprocity. It destroys the very basis of reciprocity. Such nations get benefits without giving benefits.

Nowhere is the injustice of this principle more apparent than in its application to Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the iron-curtain countries.

The minority report filed by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee clearly and forcibly emphasizes this fact in the following language:

> As the result of the most-favored-nation principle, reductions in duty and other concessions made by the United States with all countries under the trade-agreement program are automatically extended to Russia, Communist China, and all other Communist-dominated countries. We now have trade agreements with approximately 45 free countries covering literally thousands of imported items, and the benefits of all these concessions contained in these agreements are now benefiting Russia, Communist China, and their satellite iron-curtain countries.
>
> In the case of Russia, for example, approximately 88 percent of its dutiable imports into the United States benefits from reduced rates provided in trade agreements by us with free countries, and 92 percent of the tax-free imports from Russia consists of products bound on the free list in trade agreements by us with free countries.
>
> In the case of Communist China, 72 percent of the dutiable imports into the United States from that country benefits from trade-agreement concessions granted by us to free countries, and 75 percent of the duty-free imports of that country benefits from our concessions to the free nations.
>
> Briefly summarized, similar figures for other iron-curtain countries are as follows:
>
> Poland, 80 percent of the dutiable imports and 79 percent of the free imports.
>
> Hungary, 73 percent of the dutiable imports and 69 percent of the free imports.
>
> Bulgaria, 97 percent of the dutiable imports and 30 percent of the free imports.
>
> Manchuria, 99.8 percent of the dutiable imports and 98 percent of the free imports.
>
> Rumania, 96 percent of the dutiable imports and 84 percent of the free imports.

It is outrageous that our American soldiers should be fighting the Communists in Korea while at the same time all the Communist countries are enjoying the benefits of concessions made by the United States to the free world without—except in the case of Czechoslovakia—having given the United States a single concession in return. I believe that this preposterous inconsistency in our foreign policy should be removed at once by the denying to Russia and Communist China, and to any Communist satellite country—including North Korea—which the President finds is part of a conspiracy against the free world, the benefit of the reduced rates which we have granted to the free world.

In addition to what I have already mentioned as defects in the administration of the law, there are other conditions that should be rectified.

One of the most important of these is to prevent serious injury or the threat of it to our workers, farmers, and productive enterprises resulting from unwise tariff cuts and concessions by the administrators of this law. This is often referred to as the peril point. I am in favor of an amendment to the law that will require the Tariff Commission to study all contemplated cuts in tariff rates to foreign countries and ascertain what cuts would in its opinion go below the peril point and thereby endanger the affected industry in our own country and its workers. Reports would be made to the President or to the Congress of the cases where the contemplated concessions would go below the peril points. This would provide a signal against the danger ahead if such concession should be made. This would, in my opinion, prove of great advantage to our producers and our workers.

Another feature that needs attention by way of remedial action relates to what is termed the "escape clause." A peril-point clause, to which I have just referred, is to warn us of danger, and the escape clause is to save us in the event that a situation develops that shows we have made a bad bargain. Thus, the peril point and the escape clauses are closely related. The adoption of adequate provisions to accomplish the purposes designed for each of them respectively is with the sole thought of protecting American industries and their

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

workers from what might be found disastrous to American interests. Clauses of this character should have the approval of the Congress.

In conclusion, I think it would be much wiser to limit the operation of the act to 2 years instead of 3. The uncertainty that exists in the world today admonishes us to go carefully. We should not commit ourselves too far in the future. We need to exercise caution.

I trust that the suggestions I have made to improve our reciprocal trade-agreement policy will have the support and approval of the Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we have considered periodically the method of tariff reduction provided for in the present bill.

I rise today as I have risen before to urge the adoption of the so-called escape-clause amendment, the so-called peril-point amendment, and for that matter any other amendment which may be offered to protect American labor.

I rise particularly to support the so-called escape-clause amendment which is to be offered, and to express the hope that the Democratic majority of this House will see fit to accept it.

This amendment will permit suspension, withdrawal, or modification of concessions by the President whenever any industry in America may be jeopardized as a result of any trade agreement.

Frankly, I cannot see why or how any Member of this House, who has at heart the best interests of the great body of patriotic, hard-working men and women in this country who compose our labor force, can oppose this amendment.

I appreciate fully the importance of international trade. Under present world conditions, confronted as we are by the menace of world-wide communism, international trade is vital.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, we have not only the right but the solemn obligation to safeguard American labor from the loss of its means of livelihood—from being thrown into the army of the unemployed—if the administration misjudges the effects of any particular trade agreement under existing policy.

We talk of a "reciprocal" trade-agreement policy. The policy under consideration, Mr. Chairman, has never been truly reciprocal. Every man and woman in this House today knows that once a concession is made to one country, that concession, generally speaking, applies to every other country on the face of the earth, whether or not behind the iron curtain, which produces the commodity in question.

Who can tell what the adverse effects under any trade agreement may be under these conditions?

It cannot be denied that great damage has been done to certain industries under the present trade agreements policy. Those of us in New England will not forget the fate of the Waltham Watch Co., and the American watch industry generally, despite repeated appeals to the State Department and the Tariff Commission.

Why not require an escape clause in all trade agreements as a safeguard for our workers in the future?

An escape clause has in fact been included in certain agreements from the outset. Still other agreements have been renegotiated for the purpose of including an escape clause.

The amendment which will be offered will simply make it mandatory that every trade agreement hereafter shall include a proper escape clause.

I am for international trade, Mr. Chairman, but I am also for the protection of the men and women in this country who labor in our plants and who contribute to the industrial success of this Nation.

They are entitled to and must have jobs at real American wages, under decent working conditions, if we are to produce what must be produced to meet our tremendous obligations at home and abroad.

In the name of American labor, in the name of American industry, essential in time of war, I appeal for the overwhelming approval of the escape-clause amendment when offered and for the approval of any other amendments which will safeguard the jobs of the rank and file of labor.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, almost 2 years ago today when H. R. 1211 was under consideration, which repealed the peril point and escape clause and extended the Reciprocal Trade Act for 3 years, I opposed this bill and gave warning to the effect that it would be hazardous to American agriculture and industry. I cited a number of industries in my district that would be jeopardized through the reduction of tariffs. I cited from a speech of Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, and of Mr. Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, substantiating my position in opposing this legislation.

One year later, on February 9, 1950, I addressed this House on the effects of the Reciprocal Trade Act during the past 12 months, and I am sorry to say that my predictions were coming true. Among the industries that were being injured through the unrealistic administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act were lumber, fishing, and many agricultural crops, including hops, walnuts, olives, almonds, prunes, grapes, cherries, and many other industries in my own district, besides an untold number of industries throughout the United States.

The tariff on hops had been reduced from 24 cents to 12 cents a pound and Czechoslovakian hops from behind the iron curtain wrecked the hop market in this country. Olive oil from the Mediterranean, where labor is paid $1 a day as against $1 an hour in California, had completely ruined that industry. The Waltham Watch Co., a hundred-year-old firm, had just closed its doors, throwing 1,231 employees out of work on 1 day's notice.

In June of last year I appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor to give testimony in order to stop the negotiation that was being planned for the reduction of tariff on dry wines. Vineyard labor costs in the United States an average of from $8 to $9 per day, while comparable labor in France ranges from a low of $1.84 up to $2.50 a day in harvest periods. Seventy-two cents to a dollar per day in Spain and Portugal, and from $1.12 to $1.26 per day, plus a quart of wine in Italy. It costs $105.18 to farm 1 acre of grapes in California, while the average cost in foreign countries is $26.56. Therefore, if the grape growers and the manufacturers of wine are to survive in this country they must have adequate tariff protection.

I could name many other industries that were folding up at that time because of the effect of the reciprocal trade agreements entered into. The constant threat to American agriculture and industry of the present unrealistic tariff law administered according to the whims of international theorists can only mean disaster to our American way of life. The United States of America became great because of individual initiative which had the protection of an adequate and proper protective tariff system that permitted our economy to develop and expand, and is responsible for the high standard attained for the farmers, labor, and industry.

Only a few months ago hearings were being held at the request of organized labor here in Washington, protesting the reduction of tariffs which were closing American factories and throwing men out of employment. Millions of men at that time were out of a job. Then came June of 1950 and another war. Must we continue indefinitely to depend upon war bailing us out economically with the sacrifice of thousands of our young men and the hardship that goes with it? I say that we should solve our economic problems in a realistic manner. We continue to win the wars and lose the peace. I believe it our duty to write into the reciprocal trade agreement the peril point and the escape clause in order to lend stability to our agriculture and industry.

I would like to quote from a letter I received today from Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation:

> We also recommend that any extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should carry a provision setting definite minima beyond which tariffs could not be lowered. These minima should be set by an investigating agency after careful review of all the pertinent facts.
>
> It is apparent that the whole mechanism of tariff rate determination is now geared to accomplish reductions in tariff rates. It is our belief that by legislation or policy, provision should be effected whereby adequate consideration can be given to agricultural industry requests for tariff increases where such industries are hard hit by increasing imports.

I also have word from the almond growers of California that imports of almonds in the past 60 days have been greater than any like period during the past 25 years. It is estimated that 5,000,000 pounds of shelled almonds, together with those produced in this country, will serve the American market. Al-

ready this season the imports exceed 7,240,000 pounds, and unless curtailed will reach eighteen to twenty million pounds. This will spell ruin to this industry.

Without a doubt many other industries in this country are facing the same problem. I am thoroughly in agreement with the principle involved in the Reciprocal Trade Act. It is fine in principle, but its application, however, has proven disastrous to many of the industries throughout the length and breadth of our country, and the attitude of those who have been effecting our agreements for the past 20 years is that industry must be sacrificed in order to pacify producers in other countries.

I have introduced H. R. 2194 to restore the peril point and the escape clause to our foreign trade agreements. I expect to have ready for introduction the principles of my bill to be amended into the pending bill. I cannot see how we can continue to maintain our American standard and our American wage scales and continue to purchase competing articles from foreign countries where their labor costs are so greatly below ours.

The application of the tariff law has not been reciprocal. It is a one-way, downhill, twisting road, with supers sloped the wrong way, and at every turn we lose one of our important industries, or one of our American agricultural producers.

I plead with you to amend this bill to provide for the peril point and the escape clause to give some semblance of protection to our American workingman and our American industries.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there are many Members of the House who are not in accord with the theory or the principles of the reciprocal-trade legislation. The controversy over the subject deals chiefly with the administration of the legislation and the results which have been brought about because of that administration. It seems to me, therefore, that the legislation should contain some provisions which are designed to correct in some measure the administrative errors. Along with other Members of the House I believe amongst those provisions should be one dealing with the so-called peril point.

A number of domestic industries have been seriously injured because of the almost utter disregard had for their welfare in the lowering of tariffs on the imports of competing foreign products. I should like to point out one such industry to the Members of the House, namely, the Pacific Northwest fishing industry. Permit me to refer to one or two segments of it.

For instance, the halibut industry in the North Pacific normally employs 559 vessels and 3,084 fishermen, and products of that fleet grossed $34,000,000 in 1948; the North Pacific otter trawler industry—excluding vessels operated from California—normally employs 300 vessels and 1,350 men and produced a gross of $3,667,100 in 1948.

This important segment of our national economy is now in trouble because of imports of vitamin A from Japan—which cut 1950 liver prices to one-fourth of the 1948 level—and imports of groundfish fillets from Canada and Iceland at prices so low that they have undermined the United States market to such an extent that Washington and Oregon vessels faced with United States costs no longer can compete in the market.

Cod fillets produced by United States fishermen cost raw fish dealers from 20 to 24 cents a pound under present-day costs—while similar fillets imported from Canada and Iceland sell in the same market for from 18 to 21 cents a pound. This differential in price resulting from lower costs for foreign fishermen closes out our markets to our own fishermen. I cite the case of the Eardley Fish & Fillet Co., of Seattle, as an example of the damage done to local fishing industry as a result of imports. This company had 32 vessels under contract in 1947 and employed 70 to 80 people in its plants at that time. Today, only six vessels are being used and shore workers number only 30 to 35. And, whereas in 1947 the 32 vessels were operating without limit, the vessels now are limited to 2,000 pounds each—while the same vessels were averaging from 60,000 pounds to 100,000 pounds each in 1947.

Imports of vitamin A and groundfish in the halibut and otter-trawl fishing industry—including the allied shark industry—have destroyed the full-time jobs of 200 soupfin shark drift netters—destroyed the off-season employment of 450 halibut fishermen—reduced the incomes of 3,000 halibut and shark fishermen by $3,200,000 annually and have overburdened the already overcrowded halibut industry by the addition of 50 boats and 300 men from other branches of the fishing industry, and destroyed 586 jobs in the otter-trawl industry and reduced the incomes of those employed in that field.

The only remedies suggested by Government officials have been to increase imports, reduce exports, continue to send money to other countries to give them funds to pay for United States goods and provide cash benefits for those hurt by increased imports. It is my view that the best long-range solution is to limit imports to a fair percentage of domestic consumption and then allow our economy to adjust itself to this policy. The payments of benefits to those hurt by unlimited imports is an unsatisfactory remedy. We remember the difficulty encountered by OPA in the fish business during the war and the difficulties of subsidy payments would be 10 times as great.

The Northwest fishing industry is being injured mostly in the vitamin-A field by imports from Japan. The market for vitamin A produced by Northwest fisheries is the entire United States, while that area's fillet market generally is limited to the western half of the country. One Seattle firm that formerly obtained its bottom fillets from fishing vessels at Seattle now buy their supplies from British Columbia where a big fillet industry has been developed.

Fishing is also a vital part of the Alaskan economy and now is being seriously threatened by foreign-fish imports in the United States. Fishing generally supports the Alaskan economy; without it, Alaska would be severely injured. The otter-trawl industry normally employs about 1,500 men—employment in that industry now is down to 800 men. This employment drop represents about a 40-percent decrease in employment in that branch of the industry and is a fair example of the situation in the entire industry.

A peril-point provision in the pending legislation could be the means by which some protection would be afforded to the Pacific Northwest fisheries. The fishing industry is an old and important segment of our national economy and should not be permitted to be destroyed. I sincerely trust that the House will see fit to support the peril-point amendment which will be offered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, the interest of the laboring men prompts me to take the floor in their behalf. In this very important measure we must have two considerations: One, academic, and the other practical. From the theoretical point of view the chances are that all of us are agreed that a reciprocal trade agreement honestly and fairly administered might have equal results on all member parties. Unfortunately, however, and especially from reports received from my own district, it has not been fairly administered and the result is that it has endangered the opportunities of laboring men to feel secure in their present employment.

This brings us to the serious consideration of the very practical aspect of this measure. The working men and women should be considered as one of the very important factors because they are entitled to continue in their employment and this cannot be accomplished if cheap foreign imports will close the factories in which they are employed.

Speaking for just one industry in my district in Indiana, I would like to refer to the clay tile group. There is a very serious threat to the American tile industry. This industry is not large but there are 37 manufacturing plants in this country that employ approximately 9,000 people and represent an invested capital of around $35,000,000. These plants are located in 12 States and raw materials come from 22 States. In addition, tile is distributed through some 4,500 tile contractors to consumers in every State in the Union. In all, the industry provides employment for some 30,000 people and makes possible higher living standards for millions of Americans.

Now the deplorable condition that has developed in this one particular industry is illustrated by the fact that the imports of clay tile in this country are increasing by leaps and bounds. Two thousand four hundred and three percent more foreign tile was imported from low-wage countries in the first quarter of 1950 than in the first quarter of 1949. To place this in actual figures, from all countries the 12 months

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of 1949 showed an import of 424,000 square feet. In the first 10 months of 1950 this import had climbed rapidly to 1,135,000 square feet. Now these tiles are the kind that are used in making more practical and modern bathrooms, floors, and for similar purposes in the building industry. Thus you can see that this is a very considerable figure.

If this practice continues the very existence of the American tile industry is threatened. The fact of the matter is that the best grade of tile is made in these United States and the quality of the tile imported from abroad is far inferior to the product which is demanded by the American consuming public.

One of the largest consumers is the United States Government itself and, by this very process, our own Government faces a loss of the only reliable source of supply of genuine ceramic floor and wall tile of high quality due to these unwise tariff policies. In this particular industry, which is semiskilled, 70 percent of the cost of making tile is direct labor costs. Thus it is very evident that the high wages which the workingmen in this country enjoy would make it impossible for any manufacturer to compete with foreign imports.

The letters that have been coming to me are from the employees in the factories rather than from the management. These laboring folks are very much concerned and worried about their future. They have seen the manner in which these cheap foreign ceramic tile imports have reduced the sale of the products of their own factory and they can envision the time when they will be forced to abandon their years of experience and training and seek another livelihood.

Another glaring danger in the lack of protection to this specific industry is indicated by the effect which the devaluation of the British pound sterling produced upon the sale of tile. Following the devaluation of the British pound sterling in terms of the dollar in September 1949, imports consisting largely of British glazed wall tiles increased immediately and have continued to represent the major competition. Export prices of British glazed wall tiles in terms of dollars declined about 30 to 35 percent through the devaluation of the pound sterling.

These are only a few of the conditions that have caused the people in one of the large cities in my district to become alarmed and to write so many letters of protest. To substantiate these statements, Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein certain letters:

ANDERSON, IND., *January 26, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: As I understand it, the House Ways and Means Committee is now holding hearings in reference to lowering the tariffs of foreign countries. This will, of course, vitally affect the tile industry, in which I am employed.

I am opposed to any reduction in tariffs on tile coming into the United States from foreign countries.

Having heard that the foreign-made tile is not the high quality tile made in the United States, it will not only affect the tile manufacturers here and employees but also the consumer.

I sincerely hope that you will do everything in your power to prevent this lower tariff on imports idea.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE ROBERTSON.

ANDERSON, IND., *January 26, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: I would like to take this time to write you in regard to the problem of the possibility of lowering the tariff rates on imports to the United States from foreign countries, such as England, Spain, Italy, etc.

If the tariff is lowered, it will very definitely affect the smaller industries, such as the manufacture of tile, and since I am employed by a tile concern, it is of great interest to me.

I urge you to do everything in your power to see that this tariff is not lowered, but raised.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE POORE.

ANDERSON, IND., *January 25, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN BEAMER,
Congressman, Fifth District of Indiana, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: Although there is much discussion in regard to foreign affairs and national defense, there is one thing that I would like to call your attention to that will affect us eventually, and that is the low tariff on imports of foreign tile. Tile is coming into this country and sold at a price much cheaper than the American manufacturer can make it. This foreign tile coming from England, Spain, Italy, and Belgium is not the high-quality tile that is made in this country.

On just a plain visual inspection the foreign tile may appear to look as good as American-made tile, but after the foreign tile is installed, it is apt to craze (check), and not hold up nearly as well as the American tile. If we permit this foreign tile to come in and take the place of a higher quality tile, it will have a tendency to reduce our output of tile from the American factories, and thus reduce work for the American people. Although this has not been much of a factor in the past 4 or 5 years, if we allow this tile to come in with a low tariff rate, it will have a damaging effect upon our own country. The low-priced foreign tile will force the tile manufacturer to reduce his prices in order to meet this competition even though his quality is much superior to the foreign product. By reducing his prices, it will reduce profits or wages, or will gradually have to go out of business.

The tile business is a necessity to the American people and to all manufacturers. The engineers in the tile industry do develop some basic ideas in regard to the manufacture of tile and the silicate industries. These ideas are exchanged with men in the refractory, the dinnerware, and the brick industries. A number of times the refractory men obtained information from the other silicate industries in order to make better refractories so that it is possible to process iron, steel, copper, etc., through the melting furnaces at a cheaper rate. In other words, they can make refractories that will last longer.

Therefore, I would urge you to do everything in your power to see that the tariff on tile is increased, namely: (1) To protect one of the small American industries; (2) to insure a higher wage for the people working in this industry; (3) to insure that the American people will get a better product by not allowing the foreign inferior product to replace the American product; and (4) to insure the build-up of more technical information for general use in all industries in order that we may have a higher standard of living.

Sincerely yours,

EARL E. BALDAUF.

NATIONAL TILE & MANUFACTURING CO.,
Anderson, Ind., January 26, 1951.

Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER,
Congressman, Fifth District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Louis S. Jones has called my attention to a letter from you under date of January 18 in reply to one from him in which you ask that he supply you additional information in reference to imports of clay tile from low-wage countries under present tariff rates and its effect upon the tile industry in this country.

Mr. Jones has asked me to send you some material on the subject which I am very glad to enclose herewith.

These so-called reciprocal trade agreements seem to be formulated upon the basis that they are helpful to foreign countries without consideration of the harm they bring about here in the United States. As an example, such a reciprocal arrangement was made with Mexico a few years ago—this was repealed in December 1950—that established a duty of 10 cents per square foot on tile coming from that country to the United States. Mexico reciprocated by establishing a duty of 40 cents per square foot plus an additional 40 percent of the value of all American tile shipped to Mexico which arrangement effectively cut off shipment of any tile to that country from here and permitted tile made by the very cheap Mexican labor to be sold here at prices much lower than domestic production cost.

Imports of clay tile into this country at this time are increasing by leaps and bounds. Two thousand four hundred and three percent more foreign tile was imported from low-wage countries in the first quarter of 1950 than in the first quarter of 1949. Continuation of this practice threatens the very existence of the American tile industry which, as a matter of fact, is the only reliable source of supply for this material in the entire world. Other countries supply the United States only with special items in large demand leaving the more difficult and unprofitable items to be supplied by domestic manufacturers.

The American consumer, largest of whom is the United States Government itself, faces the loss of the only reliable source of supply of genuine ceramic floor and wall tile, due to these unwise tariff policies. Since as much as 70 percent of the cost of making tile is direct labor cost, every increase of foreign imports means a direct threat to the tile industry in this country and to the jobs of 7,000 Americans employed in tile manufacturing plants.

I enclose herewith a very comprehensive study of this situation prepared by the Tile Council of America. I believe you will receive another similar booklet being mailed about this time by the Anderson Chamber of Commerce to its members.

I assure you we will appreciate any effort you make to bring about higher, rather than lower, tariffs on clay tile.

I hope you and Mrs. Beamer are becoming acclimated to your new surroundings in Washington, and with best wishes to you both, I remain,

Sincerely,

R. H. ALEXANDER,
President.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the New Deal tariff policy, known under the nice-sounding name "reciprocal trade agreements" has been in effect during the past 16 years. If it were not for the Korean war and the Nation's rearmament program now getting under way, we would have a greater unemployment problem on our hands today than the Nation had back in the boondoggling and leaf-raking days of the 1930's. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in June. It is now before the House for consideration and action. Should it be extended for another 3-year period?

Mr. Chairman, the tremendous imports that are flooding our markets today have already dealt damaging body blows to the following American industries: Fishing, glassware, pottery, jeweled-watch, fur, glove, and textile. Large imports of these manufactured goods are flooding our markets and destroying the jobs of American factory workers.

The fallacy of importing millions of dollars' worth of goods when we have surpluses of our own seems not to have penetrated the minds of our "do-gooders" who have control of our imports. We import millions of bushels of potatoes while destroying and dumping millions of bushels of our own. We import millions of dozens of fresh eggs—and millions of pounds of dried eggs—yet our own surplus of eggs is so large that it has become a public scandal. We import millions of pounds of beef and pork, millions of bushels of wheat, corn, barley, and oats, and at the same time force the American taxpayer to dig deep in his pockets to pay the cost of supporting the prices of these same products that our own farmers raise. At the present time our Federal Government owns or controls through price-support operations over half the total feed grain stocks in the entire United States.

How can we maintain high wages for American workmen and high living standards for American people when we permit goods manufactured by foreign workmen working for low wages, and farm products raised by farmers who for centuries have been living like serfs, to flood our markets and destroy the jobs upon which our workers depend?

Mr. Chairman, the results of the reciprocal trade agreements and other tariff concessions should be reexamined. The administration has been risking, almost inviting, the bankruptcy of important American businesses in order to build up the foreign trade of other countries. We have been courting unemployment for millions of American working people. We have been playing right into the hands of other nations—at the expense of our own.

At one time or another during the past half century some 50 American corporations have made jeweled watches. Today only two of them are operating, the Elgin and the Hamilton, the other 48 jeweled-watch companies have been run out of business by the Swiss watch importations.

Recently union officials joined with glass manufacturers of New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio in presenting to Members of Congress the troubles of the glass industry of America. Employment in plants making better-grade glassware is now only 30 to 50 percent of normal, and thousands of men are out of work. The reason? The recent flood of foreign glassware into American markets at prices much lower than the labor cost of producing similar ware in this country. Reciprocal trade agreements reducing tariffs on glassware, and special arrangements made by Mr. Hoffman under the European recovery program, are blamed for the situation. Incidentally much of the glassware now reaching American markets from abroad is made behind the iron curtain. Leaders of American labor and industry are becoming increasingly aware of the grave dangers of the administration's free-trade program—and it is about time.

Mr. Chairman, when first created by the Congress the United States Tariff Commission was a bipartisan, expert, nonpolitical, fact-finding body set up as an agent of the Congress, and responsible to the Congress. In 1934, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed, the Tariff Commission was subordinated to and buried in the executive department, and from then on ceased to be an agent of the Congress. The Eightieth Congress, in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, placed a provision in the law—the peril-point provision—that in effect reestablished the United States Tariff Commission as an agent of the Congress, but provided that the Commission make a report to the President for his guidance in making future trade agreements. If for any reason he disregarded the findings of the Tariff Commission as to peril points, then the President would be required to make available to the Congress the Tariff Commission's report, along with his reasons for disregarding the recommendations of the Commission as to peril points.

This action of the Eightieth Congress was repealed by the Eighty-first Congress, so once again the United States Tariff Commission became the agent of the executive department, subject to the political decisions of the President, and dictated to by the State Department—a State Department more interested in the welfare of other governments and other peoples than it is in our own Government and our own people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States adopted its reciprocal-trade program in 1934. The program has been in operation 16 years. Its objective is to reduce or remove world trade barriers and permit the free flow of goods between countries, thereby removing one of the principal causes of war. That is an excellent objective, a very worthy purpose. How has it worked out? Testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee at recent hearings brought out the following very disappointing facts:

First. After 16 years, world trade barriers are greater today than ever before.

Second. We have experienced World War II, and the world today is in greater fear of war than when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was adopted.

Third. American industries are being injured, American workers have lost their jobs, even though the full impact of the program upon our American industries has not as yet fully materialized.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Clair Wilcox, a former Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the State Department, and one of the best posted men in America on our foreign trade program, made the following statement before the United States Chamber of Commerce Institute on June 15, 1948:

> The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace. The tariff is the old-fashioned method of restricting trade. It is the mildest method of restricting trade that exists at the present time. As a matter of fact, a nation that confines trade restriction to the use of a tariff today can be said to be pursuing a liberal trade policy.

The June 1948 monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York contained the following statement:

> Foreign producers criticize our protective duties on certain articles. Nevertheless, the United States market generally is freer of access today than practically any other market in the world.

Mr. Chairman, embargoes, quotas, preferences, import license restrictions, currency manipulations, subsidies, state trading, and other restrictive trade devices have been adopted by foreign nations to control the movement of trade. They are much more restrictive than simple tariff barriers. Our feeble tariff barriers are as nothing when compared with the trade barriers set up by governments that have entered into reciprocal trade agreements with us.

Mr. Chairman, we built up a watch industry in the United States that did give employment to scores of thousands of workers. These workers were paid a reasonably high wage that enabled them to live decently upon a standard of living that is the highest in the world. Switzerland, under our reciprocal trade agreements program, has been dumping millions of watches on our American market at far less than it costs to manufacture them here. This has forced our factories either to go out of business or to go on part-time production. What is the difference between importing cheap labor to compete with our American labor—which our immigration laws forbid—and importing the products of cheap labor to compete with the product of our factories—which our reciprocal trade program permits—thereby robbing our factory workers of their jobs?

Mr. Chairman, since 1941, when we entered the war, a total of 75,000,000 Swiss watches have been imported. During the last 6 years, 1945–51, an average of more than 9,000,000 Swiss watches were imported each year. This importation of Swiss watches under our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has seriously damaged our American watch industry.

Mr. Chairman, after 16 years of experimentation with reciprocal trade agreements, it is time for us to stop, look, and listen; it is time for us to analyze, to weigh, and to measure the results of the reciprocal-trade program before we extend it for three more years, without the safeguards that were placed in it by the 1948 act. A careful analysis

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the results of our 16 years' experience convinces me of the following:

First. The program has not contributed to international good will.

Second. The program has not removed nor reduced world trade barriers with the exception of our own.

Third. The program has not prevented war nor removed the threat of war.

Fourth. The program has already damaged some American industries and thrown thousands of American workmen out of work, even though the impact of the program upon our economy has not as yet fully materialized.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 1612 without proper and necessary safeguards being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the trade agreements program is a program sponsored by the United States since 1934 to expand international trade by reducing international trade barriers.

The program is premised upon the American conception of a dynamic and constantly growing economy. It attempts to establish trading conditions for the world in which free private competition can stimulate the production of more and more goods at constantly lower prices as has happened so successfully in the United States.

Initially the program consisted of a series of negotiations between the United States and one other country in which reciprocal trade agreements were concluded providing for either the freezing or reduction of tariff rates on a number of individual commodities on the part of one country for equivalent concessions on the part of the other. Up to the outbreak of World War II, some 20 countries had concluded such trade agreements with the United States. More were added in the Western Hemisphere during the war.

In the realization that there would be need for drastic action to expand trade after the war, the program was adopted to permit quicker and more extensive action. Instead of negotiating with one country at a time, we negotiated with 22 simultaneously, the result being the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, concluded at Geneva in 1947 and covering at one stroke barriers to over half the world's trade. Tariffs were reduced on some goods; preferences were reduced on others; undertakings were made on still others not to raise tariffs; and wherever preferences existed it was agreed that they would not be increased. All agreed also to create no new preferences and it was generally agreed that quotas would be outlawed as soon as conditions permit.

As a result of further negotiations carried on at Annecy, France, in 1949 and of the current negotiations at Torquay, England, 39 countries have or soon will become contracting parties to the general agreement. A number of countries having prewar bilateral agreements with the United States have joined the general agreement and in such cases the old agreements have been either superceded or terminated. There are still, however, 14 bilateral agreements in effect in addition to the general agreement.

These agreements represent a very substantial achievement in reducing world-trade barriers both between the United States and other countries and between these other countries themselves. Despite the fact that World War II, its aftermath, and now rearmament have seriously distorted world trade, the program has been successful in holding trade barriers to a much lower level than would otherwise have been possible.

The program is considered a significant symbol of American economic leadership throughout the free world. It is recognized as a concrete example of intelligent American self-interest and the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy.

The relationship between the trade-agreements program and the United Nations:

Although the trade-agreements program is older than the United Nations, it is entirely consistent with the aims and policies of the UN.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies represent an effort to create the international institutions necessary for a free and prosperous world.

The United Nations already has specialized agencies in the fields of foreign exchange, banking, health, food and agriculture, labor, and aviation. It does not, however, have a specialized agency in the vital field of trade, and thus there exists a large gap in its structure. To some extent this gap is filled by the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

We are committed to unfaltering support of the United Nations. We have participated in the building and establishment of the International Monetary Fund to deal with the problems of international exchange. The purpose of the fund is to promote by international action reasonable stability and convertibility of currencies. Clearly, trade must be brought into balance if currencies are ever to be and remain stable. Regulation of exchange controls is futile if nations are free to use quantitative restrictions instead. To solve the problems of international trade, international cooperation with respect to exchange controls and currency valuation must go hand in hand with international cooperation with respect to other forms of trade barriers and the expansion of demand in international trade.

We have participated in the creation and operation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, another organ of the UN. We also are interested in encouraging United States private investment abroad. Clearly, loans cannot be repaid or earnings on investments received if international trade is not fostered and freed.

The trade-agreements program by reducing the barriers to world trade is helping the specialized agencies and the UN itself in the work of building a more prosperous world. The periodic meetings of the parties to the GATT provide a forum for the discussion and solution of trade problems. It is to be hoped that this work and that of the UN can be brought into closer relationship as experience develops.

The relationship of trade-agreements program to our commercial treaty program.

Both the trade-agreements program and our commercial treaty programs are efforts to expand international trade. This requires (a) that more goods be produced; (b) that there be more demand for goods; and (c) that it be easier to exchange goods.

Our commercial treaty program helps stimulate production by encouraging investment through agreement with other countries on the treatment they would give our investors and businessmen and vice versa.

The trade-agreements program helps make it easier to exchange goods by lowering the trade barriers and improving world trading conditions.

The relationship of the trade-agreements program to the European recovery program.

The trade-agreements program is a complement to the European recovery program, a short-term measure to assist Western European countries to produce in greater amounts and to give them time to become going concerns in the world economy. This assistance toward recovery, important as it is will be ineffectual unless world trade continues to expand to the point where all the recipient countries are able to sell their own goods and services to each other and to the outside world in sufficient amounts to pay for the imports they need and desire.

Consequently, in American self-interest, the long-run trading policies of the United States and the rest of the world must provide the best possible conditions for a full revival of international trade. The maze of restrictions, bilateralism, and discriminations must be eliminated so that trade may flow more freely. To help accomplish this result is the purpose and function of the trade agreements program. The full implementation of the trade agreements program will help Western Europe to stay on its feet after American financial aid ends, and make it more likely that the original American investment in Europe will pay future dividends in terms of expanding economies and allies able to improve their living standards and to pay for their own self defense.

The relationship of the trade-agreements program to the point 4 program.

Both the trade-agreements program and the point 4 program will contribute to the development of underdeveloped countries.

Point 4 is a program by which the United States will make available to other countries know-how and skills that will help them to develop their resources on a sound basis. It is also designed to help promote the flow of capital to productive work in underdeveloped countries.

The trade-agreements program helps in this process in two ways: (a) by helping to create world trading conditions in which it will be easier for the underdeveloped countries to get things they need and sell things they produce; and (b), by recognizing in the general agreement on tariffs and trade that the special circumstances of underdeveloped

countries may require some deviations from the general rules which the contracting parties have agreed to follow in order to foster new industries.

The purpose of the point 4 program is to stimulate production in countries where an increase in production is most needed. It is a direct approach to the problem of low productivity in these countries. However, an increased capacity to produce is not enough. Larger markets are required to absorb the increase. The trade-agreements program by reducing barriers to trade can help to widen the markets, thus buttressing the point 4 program at a very vital point.

The relationship of the trade-agreements program to European economic integration: European integration is completely consistent with the trade-agreements program and the program can help the European countries in working toward integration.

The purpose of European integration is to create a large area in Europe in which there are a minimum of trade barriers and in which the competitive forces of the market place can operate as freely as possible.

The purpose of the trade-agreements program is to help get down trade barriers and release competitive forces over as wide a part of the world as possible.

The end objectives are thus completely consistent.

The general agreement on tariffs and trade clearly recognizes in its provisions about customs unions and free trade areas that it may be possible for certain groups of countries to go further than others in eliminating barriers between themselves, and that this process is desirable if it is a genuine step in the creation of wider markets and not just a way of giving preferential treatment in special cases, or of raising higher barriers against other countries.

Thus, any genuine steps toward real economic integration of Europe are consistent with the specific terms of the general agreement.

Moreover, by creating a wider acceptance of liberal trading rules all over the world, the trade-agreements program is helping to establish the kind of world trading conditions in which the process of genuine economic integration in Europe could go forward faster and have a better chance of sticking.

Specifically, Europe's problem is not just one of developing a larger and freer market inside Europe itself. Integration alone cannot solve the problem of European recovery. Densely populated and dependent upon overseas areas for raw materials and food, Europe can at best achieve no more through integration than an increased productive capacity and an increased ability to export. There still remains the problem of finding overseas markets for the expanded output. The trade-agreements program can help obtain for Europe better access to these markets.

The relationship between the trade agreements program and the customs simplification bill:

Both the trade-agreements program and the customs simplification bill are designed to expand international trade by reducing trade barriers.

The customs simplification bill is primarily concerned with indirect barriers to trade known as customs red tape which some times are more burdensome to trade than tariff duties themselves. The bill proposes a number of changes in our custom administrative and internal revenue laws but would make no changes in tariff rates as such.

The trade-agreements program, on the other hand, is designed to expand trade by reducing tariffs as well as other trade barriers. Under the program, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has been negotiated and put into provisional effect by 31 of the leading trading countries of the world. Passage of the customs simplification bill would enable the United States to make fully effective certain principles set forth in the agreement and thus make it possible for us to press for reforms in customs procedures in foreign countries.

The relationship of the trade-agreements program to the North Atlantic Treaty program and to our national security:

The task of creating defense against aggression is not exclusively a military task. The ability of the United States and other free nations to resist aggression is fundamentally dependent upon the maintenance of our joint economic strength and upon our taking measures to promote the growth of this strength.

In essence, the North Atlantic Treaty states that an armed attack against one or more of the parties to this treaty shall be considered an attack against them all. This undertaking presently necessitates accelerated defense programs in the United States and the other member countries. Production for defense, when conducted on a large scale, means greatly increased economic activity. There is greater employment, and more money comes into circulation, creating a larger total demand for goods and strong inflationary pressures. To the extent that the trade-agreements program has been successful in achieving tariff reductions, thereby increasing United States imports, it will add to the supply of goods and help to restrain the inflationary pressures we shall encounter.

The North Atlantic Treaty also requires the parties to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and to encourage economic collaboration among themselves. Valuable as has been the contribution of the general agreement toward the reduction of world tariff barriers, many will argue that the general agreement made an even more important contribution by providing a forum where the world's major trading nations can come together and discuss their trade problems. Among its members, the general agreement can count all but two of the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty—Iceland and Portugal.

The North Atlantic Treaty is a part of our program of collective security. Our own national security depends not only upon our participation in such collective measures but also upon our building up our individual strength. Although we possess the greatest industrial plant in the world, we would actually be able to produce very few of the present-day marvels of machinery if we were unable to import certain essential raw materials. In fact, without imports many products which are part and parcel of the American standard of living, such as radios and automobiles, at their present state of perfection, would be unobtainable. The steel used in making jet engines must have added to it small amounts of certain metals which do not exist in the United States in adequate quantities. Today, when our need for such materials is great, we can count on a full measure of cooperation from countries which have recognized our good faith through our leadership in the world trade field.

Mr. Chairman, over the past months many questions have been propounded concerning the theory and operation of the trade-agreements program in addition to those which I have already discussed.

During the remainder of my time I desire to state some of these questions and to suggest what appear to me to be logical answers.

What can be done under the trade-agreements program about all these bilateral agreements we see countries everywhere signing? Are not they quite inconsistent with the GATT?

The trade-agreements program is designed to help remove the conditions which cause most of these bilateral agreements, and in the general agreement there are provisions designed to prevent those that are purely protective or discriminatory.

Bilateral agreements are a symptom of the kind of world trading and economic conditions which the trade-agreement program is intended to help improve. The usual reason why countries enter into bilateral agreements is because their currencies are not convertible, because they do not have enough goods to sell to earn all the foreign currencies they may need, and because other countries' currencies are not convertible. So they make these agreements to be sure that if they send their goods to another country they will get back goods in return and not just currency that they cannot use.

The trade-agreements program contributes to this problem of restoring currency convertibility by helping to make it easier for countries to exchange their goods with each other. As unnecessary restrictions on international trade are cleared away, allowing it to expand on a multilateral basis, the balance-of-payments position of countries all over the world will tend to improve and there will be far less incentive to use bilateral agreements.

There are some cases in which bilateral agreements have highly protective elements in them and make it possible to dispose of goods which are too costly to compete freely on world markets. Agreements of this character are contrary to the provisions of the GATT.

Why are not the present import promotion efforts adequate to enable other countries to earn dollars without any further tariff tampering?

Export promotion plans in other countries and import promotion programs within the United States can help foreign exporters to learn about the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

American market; they can teach exporters what sorts of products sell well here, and how to package them; and they can make the American public better acquainted with other countries' goods. They can also provide incentives to sell in the United States such as the Netherlands plan. They cannot, however, overcome the basic price problem which arises from the fact that the tariff rate must be added to the cost of foreign goods sold within this market. Reductions in the United States tariff can help foreign exporters to compete in this country just as reductions in foreign tariff barriers can help the American exporter to compete abroad.

Where is the peace this program was going to bring?

It has never been contended that the trade agreements program would insure peace. It would be unreasonable to expect the program to meet all the problems raised by aggressive communism. However, the facts are that an expanding world economy is an indispensable factor in the maintenance of the political stability of the countries of the free world, that a high and expanding level of international trade is of vital importance in increasing world production and world living standards and that the trade agreements program is a real assurance that the United States will exert, commensurate with its importance, leadership and influence in expanding international trade.

The trade agreements program, by removing barriers to international trade, has strengthened the economy of the free world and has been a factor in the increased economic efficiency of Western Europe. The rising living standards and growing military potential of the countries of Western Europe can in some part be attributed to the effect and influence of American leadership in liberating and expanding world trade.

In the long run, it will be the economic and social conditions which will determine how the millions in Asia and throughout the world will choose sides in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. If we are to create the situations of economic and political strength, which will successfully check Russian expansion and ultimately assure peace, we must not only arm ourselves and our allies but also continue programs such as the trade agreements program which effectively demonstrates America's belief in an expanding and more prosperous world.

Most foreign countries with which we have signed trade agreements require that they be approved by their parliaments. Why should our Congress not pass on these trade agreements?

Under the parliamentary form of government the executive and legislative branches have a different relationship from that of the two branches in the United States. The executive in such a government has practical certainty of legislative approval for what it does—otherwise "the government would fall." The evidence of this is that in no case has the parliamentary or legislative body of the other country failed to ratify a trade agreement after its negotiation by the executive. In this country the legislative branch can and frequently does fail to ratify treaties and other acts of the Executive.

More importantly, none of the legislative bodies of the countries with which we have made agreements had granted to their executives in advance, the specific authority to negotiate trade agreements, hedged and qualified by standards and guides and limitations. This specific prior authority has been granted to the President by the United States Congress in the Trade Agreements Act.

Why can criteria not be adopted by the trade agreement organization or written into the Trade Agreements Act by Congress for determining the extent by which tariff rates should be cut?

The trade agreement organization does have criteria for determining the extent by which tariff rates shall be cut. These criteria are the degree of competitiveness of the domestic and imported article—what particular types and grades of the commodity meet in competition; in what areas does the competition exist—is it centralized in one locality or well dispersed; what is the extent of the competitive impact; cost of production, cost trends, prices and wages; seasonal factors (to what extent the products compete in different seasons and to what extent these seasons overlap); questions of raw materials and sources of supply; extent to which the United States market is of vital importance to a particular foreign country or countries; domestic consumption and the extent it has increased or decreased; and foreign control of prices and markets. All of these factors are carefully weighed.

The weight to be given any of these factors varies immensely from product to product. It would obviously be almost impossible to write all these criteria into the act. If such an attempt were made, the result would be much too rigid and inflexible for practical administration.

Under the Constitution treaties do not become effective until ratified by the Senate. Why should these trade treaties not be submitted to the Senate for ratification as required by the Constitution?

The question has been carefully and thoroughly studied by the Congress time and again. The conclusion each time has been that there is neither legal nor practical warrant for requiring Senate ratification, as treaties, of the individual agreements. These agreements are concluded under a prior grant of authority from Congress, with clear and adequate standards and principles for the guidance of the Executive.

On the practical side of the question history has demonstrated that reciprocal-trade agreements affecting tariffs are almost never ratified by the Senate because of the pressures brought to bear on the Members of that body by interests seeking tariff protection. Numerous Senators have themselves declared that they do not wish to return to the log-rolling involved in general tariff rate making by a legislative body. It is, moreover, much more difficult to negotiate with foreign countries for concessions on American products if there is no certainty that concessions which we offer can actually be made. Under such circumstances foreign countries would be far less willing to grant us concessions for which we are asking.

Why object to an amendment providing for judicial review of failure to withdraw or modify concessions under the escape clause upon the complaint of domestic producers?

There is nothing for the court to review. The Supreme Court has stated categorically that "no one has a legal right to the maintenance of an existing rate or duty"—*Norwegian Nitrogen Co.* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 294) and *Bush & Co.* v. *United States* (310 U. S. 371)).

The individual citizen is entitled to his day in court through procedures whereby he has an adequate opportunity to present his case for or against tariff protection. He is assured of this. Thus, during congressional revision of the tariff, domestic producers, importers, and others present their views to the appropriate congressional committees. But such an individual may not institute litigation in the courts in case Congress fails to adopt his views and either raise or lower duties as the case may be. This is also so in cases where tariff changes have been entrusted to an administrative agency. For example, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to impose additional duties under section 303 of the Tariff Act upon a finding that goods are being imported under a subsidy, and under the Antidumping Act of 1921, upon a finding of dumping. Under section 336 of the Tariff Act—the so-called flexible tariff—the President is authorized, after investigation and report by the Tariff Commission, to increase or decrease duties in order to equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic and imported goods. The purpose of each of these provisions is to provide protection for domestic producers who might be injured by imports, but in no case is provision made for judicial review of failure to increase duties on complaint of a domestic industry that it is being injured by imports under conditions of dumping, subsidization, or lower cost of production.

Here, as in section 336 cases, the individual gets his day in court by the right given him under the Trade Agreements Act to present his case for or against tariff reductions in trade agreements to the interdepartmental trade agreements organization through the Committee for Reciprocity Information. In addition, the President has established in Executive Order No. 10082 a procedure under which the Tariff Commission makes investigations whether articles are being imported under trade agreement concessions in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, and if it so finds, to recommend to the President for his consideration in the light of the public interest the withdrawal or modification of the concession.

The determination of what constitutes injury to a domestic producer as well as

whether it is in the national interest to afford relief by withdrawing or modifying a trade agreement concession are matters peculiarly suitable for determination by an administrative agency having regard to all the relevant circumstances in the particular case, rather than a matter for judicial determination or review. Increased imports, the trend of imports as compared with domestic production, price and cost trends, conditions of supply and demand, changes in production, employment, wages, and profits are some of the factors to be taken into consideration in particular cases, but no one criterion or set of criteria can be laid down to determine injury to a domestic producer in all circumstances.

The procedure under Executive Order No. 10082 for investigation by the Tariff Commission of alleged injury by domestic producers, and giving the responsibility to the President for taking action upon its recommendations "in the light of the public interest," is, in the light of experience in tariff matters, a wholly satisfactory procedure that will on the one hand provide adequate protection for well-founded complaints and will, on the other hand, permit trade agreements negotiations to be continued.

Why is the publication of peril points undesirable?

First. Publication of peril points is undesirable in the first place because it would immediately indicate to the other countries with which we had negotiated how much further we had been willing to go. It would give away any future bargaining position on the products in question and cause some friction and hostility with the countries which we had out-bargained.

Second. It has often been so that the United States had no intention of lowering a rate to an extent anywhere approaching a conceivable peril point. Publication of peril points would thus give a wrong impression to foreign countries of what our actual negotiating position had really been.

Third. Publication of peril points would give the impression, erroneous to be sure, that there is an exact and scientific way of establishing them in the first place.

Fourth. Publication of peril points would create a rigid limit on all future action under the program even when conditions had so changed as to make the original limits more meaningless than they were at first.

Why is a 3-year renewal of the Trade Agreements Act needed? Why not limit renewal to 1 year?

All past renewals of the Trade Agreements Act have, until the 1-year extension in 1948 by the Eightieth Congress, been for periods of 3 years except for the 2-year renewal agreed to in 1943 when we were actively engaged in World War II. The 3-year period has proved satisfactory and there is no need to change unless it is intended to kill the program.

Renewal for only 1 year could lead foreign countries to feel that we are vacillating on a basic foreign policy issue. It would be an indication that there is little continuity assured for the trade-agreements program. It would expose the entire program to short-term political considerations and would not create the essential basis of confidence which is a prerequisite to continued participation by other countries in the general agreement and in our whole program to expand world trade.

It is a waste of time and energy to have renewals every year. The basic purpose, the well-established procedures and the underlying philosophy of the program have been exhaustively reviewed in six renewals. Public understanding and public support has been widespread and consistent. No new departures from the way the program has been administered in the past are envisioned. There are many other vital matters which require the attention and consideration of both the executive branch and the Congress. A 1-year renewal would be difficult to justify to the American public and to the free world.

Why should not Congress restore to American producers the right to litigate matters arising out of the trade agreements which is denied them under the present act?

It is assumed that reference is being made to section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, under which a domestic producer has the privilege of intervening in transactions between an importer and the Government to which he is not a party, and to the fact that the provisions of this section do not apply to products on which tariffs have been reduced in trade agreements.

The Supreme Court has held that no one has a legal right to the maintenance of any particular rate of duty.

Experience has proved that this section, which invests certain private interests with extraordinary privileges, has resulted in delays in entry of thousands of items and has proved to be a serious obstruction to American businessmen attempting to do a legitimate import business.

Why is not the Tariff Commission as a Commission represented on the Trade Agreements Committee?

First. The staff of the Commission does function fully before the Trade Agreements Committee and on its subcommittees.

Second. Whether the representative of the Tariff Commission should participate in decisions of the Trade Agreements Committee only after he has received the approval of his position from the majority of the Tariff Commissioners, is of course for the Commission to decide.

Third. The procedure which has been developed over 17 years has worked well. The representative of the Tariff Commission obviously knows the views of his colleagues although he does not get a formal vote. Furthermore, the representative of the Tariff Commission has not been a single individual or from a single party. In the 1947 Geneva negotiations four commissioners were involved over the 7 months' period of the negotiations—two from each party. In both the Annecy and Torquay negotiations only a Republican commissioner has been present.

Why should an entire industry rather than a single producer have to demonstrate injury before a tariff concession can be withdrawn?

Any industry consisting of a number of producers will undoubtedly experience different degrees of efficiency in the production of the commodity concerned by the different producers in that industry. Some producers will be highly efficient, producing at relatively low cost and being able to put their product on the market at a price not only lower than that of their domestic competitors but also lower than that at which any foreign supplier could profitably sell. Other producers may be grossly inefficient, manufacturing at high costs and unable, without special protection, to meet either domestic or foreign competition. Other producers, perhaps constituting the bulk of the enterprises in the industry, will fall somewhere in between these extremes.

While present policy is to avoid tariff cuts which would cause or threaten serious injury to the industry as a whole, it hardly seems reasonable to avoid reducing tariffs where a few individual high-cost producers may be hurt but where the bulk of the industry remains healthy and strong and able to take on all comers without any special assistance. In these circumstances to protect even the inefficient high-cost producers by maintaining high tariffs is grossly to penalize the domestic consumer without sufficiently significant gains in domestic production and employment. The domestic consumer will be forced to pay exorbitant prices merely to protect a selected few.

It should not be assumed from the foregoing argument that tariff cuts will necessarily injure even a particular producer. It may merely force that producer to become more efficient and eliminate wasteful practices in which he had previously indulged at the expense of the American consumer.

The United States has the highest standard of living in the world, due to our system of protective tariffs. Do you favor reducing our tariffs and forcing our labor to compete with the cheap labor of foreign countries such as India, China, et cetera?

The height of the United States standard of living is not due to a high protective tariff system. Tariff reductions such as those which have been made under the trade-agreements program have not forced United States labor to compete with the low-standard labor of foreign countries such as India, China, and the rest.

The United States standard of living is based upon many things much more important than protective tariffs. These include vast natural resources, ingenuity, know-how, and enterprise on the part of American industry, agriculture, and traders, adequate capital and a generally vigorous domestic economy. Our foreign trade has been an important contributing factor to this situation. Our exports have made jobs and buying

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

power in this country; our imports have supplied necessary materials for maintaining our industries and innumerable commodities which go into our standards of living.

Only a small proportion of the people of the United States who are engaged in gainful occupations could be affected by competition from foreign goods even if their tariff protection were withdrawn. They are far outnumbered by American producers who depend upon and benefit from our foreign trade, including imports. This applies especially to industries which are on an export basis, which are and have been successfully meeting competition from everywhere in the world and selling American goods in countries with far lower wage rates and living standards than those of the United States. Wages in these industries range generally much higher than wages in highly protected industries and the number of people who have jobs in them is far greater.

If we help backward nations to build their own industrial plants, do we (a) lose them as markets for our manufactured goods, (b) strengthen them as competitors in the world market, at our cost, and (c) tend to destroy the technological advantages we now have over other nations?

In helping underdeveloped countries to build their own industrial plants the American economy benefits and does not suffer if the industries established abroad are efficient and well suited to the countries in which they are set up. On the other hand, if economic conditions in the country in question are not adapted to the new industry neither this country nor the other benefits from its establishment.

To be economically efficient an industry in any country must have adequate access to raw materials, capable manpower and management, enough capital, and access to a sufficiently wide market with buying power. If it does not have these things it will either fail or be afforded "protection" through high tariffs or other means by its government. In that case the market is narrowed for efficient industries in the same line in other countries; the cost of the product is higher for the consumers in the country where the industry is located; and the volume of production and consumption are reduced. Everybody loses.

However, if a new industry does have the necessary advantages, it creates employment and buying power in the country where it is established and increases the demand for other imported products. That may mean a shift in the character of imports, but it also means an increase in the total market for imports. Even if a newly established industry does compete with us in the world market for certain products it enlarges the market for other of our exports. These advantages offset the possible disadvantages of sharing our capital and technological knowledge with other countries.

United States trade with the highly industrialized countries is and always has been far larger and more profitable than our trade with underdeveloped countries. It will continue to be so if the foreign industrialization is on a sound economic basis.

Have the trade agreements been used to help big business at the expense of small business?

No; trade agreements do not favor big business at the expense of small business.

It is not the size of a business, but its efficiency and adaptation to economic realities, that determine whether it can stay in business as far as competition with imports is concerned. The little fellow's market is almost invariably the domestic market. Exports by other industries, large or small, put men in jobs and give them buying power which makes them better customers in the domestic market for the products of either big or little concerns.

Trade agreements directly improve and enlarge foreign markets for all United States export products—whether made by large or small American businesses. This is true of many individual items such as filing cases, shoe polish, incubators, and so on. It is even more strikingly true in the case of agriculture—in which, probably, are engaged more American individuals and small operators than in any other industry. Whether a particular bushel of wheat, pound of tobacco, bale of cotton, or box of apples actually is sold abroad makes no difference in the fact that export sales of these commodities help to maintain the prices and markets for every grower of every unit produced. A major result of the trade agreements program has been the reduction of foreign barriers against American agricultural products.

Assuming that lower tariffs open foreign markets for American manufactured products, is this result achieved at the expense of American agriculture?

No. Proportionately, American farm exports have benefited more from reduction of foreign tariffs than have manufactured products. Foreign countries have provided concessions affecting over 65 percent of our agricultural exports, compared with only 40 percent of our nonagricultural exports. Among the agricultural products where substantial tariff and trade concessions have been made are leaf tobacco, wheat and wheat flour, canned and dried fruits, apples, pears, grapes, lard and pork, dairy products, and canned asparagus. Many countries have agreed to keep cotton on the free list. Furthermore, several major agricultural enterprises, such as the growing of cotton, tobacco, and wheat, usually export larger percentages of their production than do manufacturing enterprises.

Outstanding benefits for agriculture, obtained through trade agreements, have included reductions or eliminations of numerous tariff preferences on farm products. These preferences are extended by some British countries to the products of other British countries but denied to United States farm products. Removal or reduction of these preferences puts American farm products in better competitive position with British products in the markets of the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and some of the British colonies. Some of them apply to such important United States farm products as wheat, pork and lard, and fruits, among others. For example, before January 1, 1948, apples from the United States imported into the United Kingdom from August 16 to April 15 each year, paid a duty of 3 shillings per hundredweight, while Canadian apples entered free. In the Geneva negotiations free entry into the United Kingdom for United States apples was obtained. In the 1939 agreement with the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom tariff preference on Empire wheat—6 cents a bushel—was eliminated.

In the Geneva agreement French and other tariffs on American wheat were sharply reduced. There were substantial reductions in foreign tariffs on American canned milk, dried eggs, tobacco, and cigarettes; all kinds of fresh, canned, and dried fruits; and many kinds of fresh, canned, and dried vegetables.

As important as foreign tariff cuts on American agricultural exports is the indirect gain to American farmers whose best customers in the domestic market have jobs in industries making manufactured goods which demand export markets. Foreign concessions on American manufactured products mean more job holders in American industry—more paying customers in the domestic market for American farm products—especially fresh fruits, vegetables, meats, and dairy products.

Tariff reductions from 1934 through January 1, 1950, averaged 50 percent for agricultural products and 53 percent for nonagricultural products. In 1947, average tariff duties for products actually imported and on which duties were paid were 20.6 percent for agricultural and 18.2 percent for nonagricultural products. This calculation, however, excludes tariff rates which were such as to prohibit imports.

Dutiable agricultural imports subject to tariff concessions including bindings of present rates from 1934 to the present amounted to 94.6 percent of total dutiable agricultural imports based on 1947 import statistics. Dutiable nonagricultural imports subject to concessions amounted to 96.7 percent of total dutiable nonagricultural imports.

A quota may limit imports far more than a tariff, yet it cannot be calculated quantitatively in the same way as average tariff rates. This particularly affects the comparison of agricultural and nonagricultural average tariff rates, since most of the quotas are applied to agricultural products. • • • In view of these quotas, it is only possible to conclude that the average restriction on imports appears to have been reduced less for agricultural than for nonagricultural products. In other words in negotiating the agreements the State Department and other Government representatives have been particularly conscious of agriculture and while negotiating approximately equivalent tariff cuts have provided safeguards through quotas which have reduced the effect of the tariff cut. (Source: Agriculture, Trade and Reciprocal Trade Agreements, by Lawrence W. Witt, published by Michigan State College, June 1950.)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

How serious has been the decline in United States exports and what have been the principal causes?

United States exports have been declining consistently for the past 4 years.

	United States exports	Decline from previous year
1947	$14,252,000	
1948	12,494,000	$1,758,000
1949	11,885,000	609,000
1950 (computed on the basis of 11 months)	10,000,000	1,885,000

The principal reason for this decline is, of course, the recovery from World War II and its aftermath on the part of many foreign countries which enabled them to either produce some of the goods they had been buying from the United States or buy these goods from some other country.

However, an appreciable portion of the decline in United States exports is accounted for by the fact that foreign countries prevented their citizens from buying United States goods because we were not buying sufficient goods from them to provide the necessary dollars. In other words, despite the large grants under the European Recovery Program during this period which supplied billions of dollars, most countries found it necessary to restrict their purchases from the United States because the United States was not buying from them. United States exporters and United States workers employed in export industries suffered heavily during this period because the country as a whole had still not learned that if we want to sell we must buy.

In view of the shortage of goods, why bother about trade agreements?

There will, of course, be goods to import. When people say there won't be any goods to import, they are merely loosely suggesting that compared with the present availability of goods there will be a shortage of many commodities in the future.

It is true, of course, that we are likely to experience increasing shortages of many commodities in the future. It is precisely under such circumstances, however, that lower tariffs may make a significant contribution. For, to the extent that lower tariffs increase the volume of imports into the United States, or decrease the costs of such imports in our domestic markets, they will contribute to restraining the antiinflationary pressures with which we have to deal. Lower tariffs may thus help materially in meeting our shortage problems.

Furthermore, the trade agreements program in which the United States is now engaged involves not only reduced tariffs on our part but also reduced tariffs on the part of a great many other countries, including most of the countries of Western Europe. Such lower tariffs promote economic cooperation among these countries and stimulate their productivity—objectives we have labored hard to achieve. Under present circumstances where the free world is mobilizing to meet the threat of aggression measures strengthening the economic capacity of ourselves and countries friendly to us are ever more important.

We have heard a great deal about the dollar gap and the need for increasing our imports. Now that the dollar gap has disappeared, why should we bother about trade agreements? Are we not more likely to be concerned about keeping our exports high enough to pay for our imports, rather than the other way around?

In the first place, it is a misconception to believe that the dollar gap problem has disappeaed. Despite the large increase in imports, chiefly raw materials for stockpiling and defense purposes, United States exports are still larger than imports at the present time. For the first 11 months of 1950 our exports were running at an annual rate of $10,000,000,000 and imports at $8,700,000,000. In fact, in only 2 months of the 11 of 1950 for which data are available did our imports exceed our exports. These were August and October. In November our exports again exceeded our imports by $127,000,000, or by $108,000,000 more than our imports had exceeded our exports in the preceding month. As the defense effort of the western democracies intensifies, the demands for goods from the United States are likely to increase while the capacity of other countries to export to us is likely to decline.

Our exports are still limited by controls imposed as the result of shortages of dollars. As these controls are lifted, the demand for our exports which they have restrained will be released.

Why should we endanger the home market which accounts for over 90 percent of our sales in order to take care of our exports which amount to less than 10 percent of our sales?

Although it is true that only about 10 percent of our total national production of all kinds of goods goes into exports, that 10 percent can make the difference between profit and loss for the national economy, just as a 10-percent share of its total trade can make the difference between success or failure for a given business or firm. The 10-percent ratio, furthermore, applies to the national total. There are much larger percentages for many of our most important and prosperous industries, such as the machine-tool industry, manufacture of agricultural machinery, trucks, and other products. The same thing is true about major agricultural enterprises, such as the production of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and pork.

There is a further aspect to this question as it is phrased—the implication that foreign trade endangers the domestic market. The fact is that foreign trade benefits and enlarges the domestic market. Exports provide jobs and buying power for American producers of export products, making them better customers in the domestic market for all kinds of American goods. Imports come into the United States only when and because American industry or consumers want them and need them and can buy them to better advantage than they can buy domestic products. Such imports cannot be said to endanger the home market.

The State Department usually contends that we should increase our imports so as to enable other countries to pay for our exports to them. Why should we not export just enough to pay for our imports?

The total prosperity of the United States would be considerably greater if both exports and imports were at the highest possible level rather than at a low level.

If we want to maintain our present high standard of living in the United States, we must maintain high levels of employment and of business activity. In order to do this, it is essential that we maintain exports at the highest possible levels. Every section of the United States produces quantities of goods seeking world outlets. New England supplies textiles, fine machinery, and hardware. The Middle Atlantic States export electrical goods, manufactures of metal, and medicinals. The South has greater supplies of cotton and cotton cloth, tobacco, lumber, and rayon manufactures than can be consumed within the United States. The Middle West efficiently produces an abundance of corn, pork, lard, dairy products, automobiles, and trucks. The West produces an ever-increasing variety of goods in tremendous volume, including aircraft, petroleum, motion pictures, fruits and vegetables, and merchant vessels. A high level of exports benefits the American economy by providing markets for certain industries seeking essential outlets abroad for their products, and also by giving American consumers the benefit of lower prices made possible through an increased scale of operations.

Of course, people in other countries are also very interested in seeing United States exports maintained at high levels. They look upon this country as the source of many essential items which are either unobtainable elsewhere or are of inferior quality when produced elsewhere. It is well known that foreigners would buy much more from this country if they could afford it.

In short, a high level of United States exports is essential not only to continued high levels of prosperity in this country, but also to supply peoples abroad with the goods without which, in some cases, they would find it difficult even to survive, and without which, in any case, they would be reduced to depressed standards of living.

Have trade agreements created United States jobs or thrown American workmen out of employment?

By stimulating exports of American products in past years and by increasing imports, trade agreements have been directly responsible for creating new jobs. To the extent that trade agreements have enlarged old markets for American goods or secured new markets, to the same extent they have created new jobs for American workers.

It is sometimes said that the additional employment created by exports will be offset by the displacement of workers through an increase in imports.

This line of reasoning is based on the assumption that all imports compete with domestic production, which they do not. A large part of our imports are necessary to maintain existing production or are complementary rather than competitive. Some foreign goods do compete with similar American goods because they sell for less. If we attempt to produce these goods rather than import them, the price will be higher, consumption curtailed, and employment reduced. There is little doubt that the jobs gained by expanding exports will outnumber any jobs lost because of imports. Further expansion of foreign trade diverts labor and capital to more efficient uses and thus should enlarge the return received by both.

As everyone knows, our standard of living and our expanding economy are based largely on more and more efficient methods of production. Increased efficiency has increased wages and lowered prices so that this country is able to maintain a standard of living unequaled by any other country, and at the same time to provide well-paying jobs to an ever-increasing population. International trade is simply another means of producing a greater quantity of goods more efficiently.

The importance of exports as a creator of jobs in the United States has recently been dramatically illustrated. United States exports declined from $14,252,000 in 1947 to $11,685,000 in 1949. This decline in the sales of American goods abroad was accompanied by a decline in employment in this country. It was estimated by the Department of Labor that 2,400,000 Americans in 1947 were directly or indirectly employed in nonagricultural industries in producing goods for export. To this number should be added the many farmers producing cotton, tobacco, wheat, and so forth. In 1949 it was estimated by the Department of Labor that as a result of the decline in exports only 1,700,000 Americans were directly employed in nonagricultural industries producing export goods—a decline of 700,000 job opportunities. Furthermore this decline occurred in industries generally paying the highest wages in the entire United States economy.

If as a result of unforeseen circumstances and of a tariff concession imports do increase so as to threaten serious injury to domestic industry, action can be taken under the escape clause to modify or withdraw any concession to the extent necessary to prevent the injury.

What specific United States industries were affected by the decline in United States exports and to what extent were they affected? What unemployment was caused?

The decline in United States exports which occurred from 1947 through 1949 did seriously affect certain domestic industries. To some extent and in some cases the loss of sales abroad may have been absorbed by greater sales on the domestic market, but generally speaking the period in question was one of declining economic activity. The following statistics may give an approximate picture of what actually happened to some of the job opportunities in several industries:

Industry	Decline in exports 1947–49	Estimated decline in number of jobs attributable to exports 1947–49 [1]
	Percent	
Primary metal industries	32	65,000
Fabricated metal products	14	15,000
Machinery (including electrical)	16	60,000
Transportation equipment	48	100,000
Stone, clay, and glass products	31	10,000
Fuel and power	43	25,000
Chemicals	[2] 13	
Lumber and furniture	44	35,000
Wood, pulp, paper, and publishing	33	25,000
Textiles, apparel, and leather	47	125,000
All other manufacturing	34	60,000
Transportation		40,000
Trade and services		100,000
		660,000

[1] Computed on basis of releases issued by the U. S. Department of Labor showing estimated number of workers attributable to exports for first 6 months of 1947 and for the year 1949.
[2] Increase.

Why has not the program been successful in lowering prices to benefit the public as it has been advertised to do?

One cannot claim that the effect of the trade-agreements program in all cases actually lowered the prices of imported commodities. One can say that the whole effect of tariff reductions is to make possible lower prices of imported products. This is true for two reasons. The removal of high tariff charges by trade agreements removes charges that would normally have been passed on to the consumer. Secondly, lower tariff charges permit greater importation, with resulting lower prices which is especially important in periods of short supply, such as the present.

It is not realistic to have expected the price of imported commodities to have fallen in recent years. Since the beginning of the trade-agreements program, the level of national income and, therefore, the general demand has steadily risen. The outbreak of fighting in Korea and the resultant expanded defense program has reinforced the demand for many commodities. For some of these, especially raw materials such as natural rubber, raw wool, tin, and copper, the supply cannot be increased as rapidly as the new levels of demand warrant, therefore, the prices of these goods rise sharply. These increases in prices, however, for the reasons stated at the outset, do not mean that the trade-agreements program has been ineffective in keeping down the prices of imported commodities, only that other, more basic determinants of prices have outweighed the price-reducing effects of the trade-agreements program.

What has the United States gained under the general agreement?

The United States has gained the following benefits from the general agreement:

First. We have obtained tariff concessions which open up foreign markets for the products of United States industry and agriculture.

Second. We have obtained assurances of nondiscriminatory treatment in the application of tariffs and other trade restrictions against American goods. New tariff preferences discriminating against the United States are prohibited; existing preferences may be continued but not increased.

Third. We have obtained agreement that quotas, the most objectionable barrier to international trade, cannot generally be used. Certain exceptions to this rule have been permitted, such as quotas for balance-of-payments reasons, but the general agreement puts careful limitations on these exceptions and the parties have agreed to drop these restrictions when they are no longer justified under the terms of the agreement.

Fourth. We have also obtained safeguards on the use of internal taxes and other internal measures which are used to discriminate against our products and protect local industries abroad.

Fifth. The general agreement also attacks invisible barriers to international trade. Commitments designed to eliminate unnecessary and unduly complicated customs formalities and arbitrary systems of customs valuation have been secured.

Sixth. We have obtained a safeguard for our domestic industries in cases of possible serious injury from increased imports by the inclusion of an escape clause which allows us to withdraw tariff concessions, suspend other obligations of the agreement if necessary to prevent or remedy the injury. Also, there are provisions in the general agreement which allow us to use import quotas in connection with our domestic farm programs and export and import controls where our national security is involved.

Seventh. Finally, the general agreement has provided us with an international forum for the settlement of trade disputes. Insofar as it establishes a code of fair practices in the international trade field and encourages the settlement of differences by consultation rather than economic retaliation, the general agreement has eliminated a source of friction in international relations.

Does the GATT allow a country to keep itself perpetually in balance-of-payments difficulties so that it could continue to discriminate against us as long as it wanted to?

I presume you are referring to article 12 (3) (b) (i) which says that no contracting party shall be required to withdraw or modify restrictions for balance of payments reasons on the ground that a change in domestic policies would eliminate the balance-of-payments difficulties and thus render unnecessary the restrictions.

I think the answer to your question is that, as a matter of strict legal right, if a country wanted to pursue employment or development policies which would keep itself in balance-of-payments difficulties, the other contracting parties could not object under the agreement. How-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ever, the contracting parties also undertake to have regard to the necessity of establishing a sound and lasting equilibrium in their balance of payments, and, in dealing with their employment and development problems, to follow methods which will expand rather than limit international trade.

Moreover, no country can afford to keep itself in balance-of-payments difficulties. To do so means that it must deny its people the right to purchase things they want where they want to buy them. It means that it must deny its people things they want. Therefore, I am convinced that the natural national self-interest of countries will lead them to every effort to get themselves out of balance-of-payments difficulties as rapidly as they can. Certainly the efforts now being made by the OEEC countries to restore their international trade indicate that they are working hard to get out of these difficulties.

Finally, I do not think there is any country, including the United States, which would recognize the right of other countries to question its basic domestic policies.

What authority did we have to enter GATT and are we exceeding that authority?

We believe that the provisions to which we have agreed in the GATT are provisions which the President has authority to agree to under the Trade Agreements Act and his general power in the field of the conduct of foreign relations.

The provisions to which we have agreed were necessary to safeguard the tariff concessions that we obtained at Geneva. Otherwise these tariff concessions could have been nullified. The provisions in GATT are similar to those contained in the earlier bilateral agreements, which were inserted for the same purpose. The main difference is in the fact that GATT is a multilateral agreement rather than a bilateral agreement and the provisions are consequently more elaborate. In addition, world conditions have greatly altered since negotiation of the last bilateral agreement necessitating some further elaboration to meet these specific developments. In essence, however, precedents may be found for almost every general provision of the GATT in the provisions of the prewar agreements.

In some cases the provisions of the GATT differ from our own laws. In these cases we are not fully applying the GATT since it is in effect only provisionally and to the extent not inconsistent with the existing legislation of the parties to it.

There is nothing in the Trade Agreements Act which even suggests that the authority to enter into trade agreements with other countries is limited to merely bilateral agreements. If we have the right to enter into a multilateral agreement, the authority is certainly broad enough to permit us to agree to general provisions which safeguard the concessions obtained in the general agreement.

What happens to the concessions we obtained in the general agreement now that action on ITO has been indefinitely postponed?

The concessions we obtained in the general agreement remain intact for the present. However, under article XXIX of the agreement, the contracting parties agreed to meet to consider whether the agreement should be amended, supplemented, or maintained if the charter of ITO had not entered into force by a certain date.

It appears unlikely at the present time that the contracting parties may wish to terminate the entire agreement under the provisions of article XXIX.

Other countries may, under the provisions of this article, propose modifications to the general agreement. Whether or not these modifications are accepted will depend upon the results of negotiation and the attitudes of the other contracting parties at the time the proposed modifications are made.

Such amendments as may be proposed under this article are not likely to directly affect the actual tariff concessions but may seek to change one or more of the general provisions of the agreement. To the extent that these general provisions safeguard the tariff concessions, such modifications might affect the tariff concessions we have obtained under the agreement.

Is the President trying to get the escape clause in the trade agreements that do not have the clause now?

Yes.

In October 1950, the Swiss agreed to the inclusion of the escape clause in our trade agreement. As a result of the Torquay conference three more countries with which we now have bilaterals will assume the escape-clause obligations, namely, Peru, Turkey, and Uruguay.

Now that it is clear that there will be no large-scale negotiations for accession to the general agreement during the next several years we will be able to move ahead in obtaining the inclusion of the clause in our bilateral agreements. In this connection two points may be made. First, one of our bilaterals, with Argentina, now contains a provision which allows escape in that it provides for termination of the agreement if the Government of either country feels that the other has adopted measures which have the effect of prejudicing the commerce or industry of the country desiring to consult. Second, it should be noted that because of the nature of trade between the United States and certain of the countries with which we still have bilaterals, the inclusion of the escape clause in those agreements is likely to be of greater benefit to the other countries than to the United States—for example, agreements in which we have given primarily duty-free bindings—cocoa, coffee—in return for duty reductions by the other country.

The countries with which we have bilateral agreements not containing the escape clause—assuming accession to the general agreement by Peru, Turkey, and Uruguay—are as follows: Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, and Venezuela.

How much remains of the President's authority to reduce rates of duty by 50 percent from their level on January 1, 1945?

Statistically, using 1947 as a basis no reductions have been made in the level of duties prevailing on January 1, 1945, on 37 percent of United States dutiable imports, while on 44 percent of dutiable imports in that year less than 50 percent reduction has been made. The full 50 percent reduction has been made on 19 percent of 1947 dutiable imports. The following table shows the data:

United States dutiable imports for consumption in 1947, total and by extent to which rates have been reduced below Jan. 1, 1945, level

	Millions of dollars	Percent of total
Total dutiable United States imports	2,206	100
Rates reduced below Jan. 1, 1945, level	1,383	63
Reduced full 50 percent	422	19
Reduced less than 50 percent	961	44
Rates not reduced below Jan. 1, 1945, level	[1] 823	37

[1] Also includes products on which the Jan. 1, 1945, rate of duty was bound in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A list of the principal items on which the duty has not been reduced below the 1945 level is attached.

In using these statistics it should be appreciated that they do not show the amount of bargaining power remaining under the authority nor should they be taken as an indication of the amount of trade on which duties will be reduced 50 percent or less than 50 percent in future negotiations.

The negotiating process is such that a binding of a rate at its existing level whether or not that level has been reduced in past trade agreements is a concession for which other foreign countries may be willing to give concessions in future negotiations. Similarly a small reduction in the tariff on one item may offer greater opportunity for trade expansion than a much larger reduction in the tariff on another item. The relative size of different imports in total United States import trade is also an unreliable measure of the importance of an item since a product which bulks small in our total trade may be of primary importance to the export trade of some smaller country.

On the other hand, the figures indicating how much authority to reduce tariffs has not yet been used cannot be taken as equivalent to an indication of how much usable bargaining power remains. There are items which would not be reduced unless some change were to occur in existing circumstances and conditions, including some which have not been reduced at all up to this point. Others which have been reduced only a little may already be at the lowest point which would be consistent with domestic welfare at the present time or in the foreseeable future.

Principal dutiable import items on which no reduction has been made from 1945 level of duty

Tariff paragraph and commodity	1947 imports ($1,000)	Principal supplier (1947)
1733. Crude petroleum	161, 535	Venezuela.
1528. Diamonds, cut but not set, suitable for jewelry, except from Cuba	[1] 52, 622	Belgium.
367a. Watches and watch movements	40, 471	Switzerland.
1733. Residual fuel oil	35, 086	Venezuela.
392. Lead pigs and bars	[1] 33, 886	Mexico.
783. Raw cotton (principally 1⅛ inches or more)	[1] 33, 525	Egypt.
762. Castor beans	24, 666	Brazil.
772. Tomatoes in natural state, except from Cuba	19, 862	Mexico.
1507. Bristles, sorted, bunched or prepared	10, 003	China.
502. Molasses not to be used for human consumption, from Cuba	14, 954	Cuba.
38. Quebracho extract	13, 905	Argentina.
393. Zinc bearing ores, except pyrites	[1] 11, 816	Mexico.
394. Zinc blocks, pigs, or slabs	[1] 11, 517	Canada.
1116a. Oriental hand-made woolen rugs at minimum ad valorem rate.	[1] 10, 977	Iran.
92. Vanilla beans	[1] 9, 194	Madagascar.
706. Canned beef, including corned beef, at minimum ad valorem rate.	8, 683	Argentina.
1401. Uncoated book and printing paper.	[1] 7, 912	Canada.
391. Lead ores, except from Cuba.	[1] 7, 844	Mexico.
1205. Woven fabrics, all silk; over 30 inches wide; not jacquard; in the gray (except bolting cloth n. s. p. f.).	6, 997	Italy.
701. Dairy cows, over 700 pounds.	[1] 6, 597	Canada.
19. Casein	6, 240	Argentina.
1803 (1). Maple (except Japanese), birch and beach lumber, except flooring.	5, 920	Canada.
717b. Cod, etc., filleted, etc., under quota (ground fish fillets).	[1] 3, 985	Do.
367 (d). Jewels for watches	3, 985	Switzerland.
369 (b). Motorcycles	[1] 3, 945	United Kingdom.
1504 (b) (1). Palm leaf hats (Toquilla) not sewed, not bleached, etc.	3, 736	Equador.
783. Tulip bulbs	[1] 3, 571	Netherlands.
367 (f). Watch cases	3, 443	Switzerland.
718 (a). Tuna fish in oil	3, 241	Peru.
1101 (a). All other wools not finer than 40's in the grease: Combing (worsted) type.	3, 171	Argentina.
1530 (c). Vegetable tanned goatskins.	[1] 3, 076	India.
1529 (a). Synthetic textile hat braids, valued at more than $1 per pound at minimum ad valorem rate.	3, 035	Switzerland.
1102 (a). Wool, finer than 40's, not finer than 44's in the grease: Combing (worsted) type.	[1] 2, 941	Argentina.
1019. Jute bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, etc., not bleached, etc., weighing 16 to 32 ounces, per square yard.	[1] 2, 514	India.
757. Filberts, shelled	[1] 2, 243	Turkey.
1803 (1). Mahogany, sawed, not further manufactured than planed, and tongued, except from Cuba.	2, 215	Mexico.
1530 (c). Reptilian upper leather.	[1] 2, 027	India.
718 (a). Anchovies in oil, valued more than 9 cents per pound.	2, 027	Portugal.
367 (c). Watch parts	1, 946	Switzerland.
741. Dates, fresh or dried, with pits removed, in packages over 10 ounces.	1, 685	Iraq.
1203. Thrown silk	[1] 1, 684	Canada.
1548. Moss peat, poultry and stable grade	[1] 1, 248	Do.
1530 (c). Women's cemented shoes.	1, 259	Argentina.

[1] To be considered at Torquay.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, and other members of his committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, have fully and completely presented this measure—so-called the Cordell Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act extension—for our consideration today.

I wholeheartedly support the extension of the Trade Agreements Act as called for in the measure we are now considering. To feel otherwise would be contrary to my deep and abiding belief that the setting up of extreme obstructions to international trade only results in barriers of friendship between nations which can lead to war—and it is likewise my belief that in destroying, so far as it is possible and feasible, barriers of commerce and economic friendship among nations we are promoting and encouraging peaceful relations among the nations of the world.

As is generally known, Mr. Chairman, that great statesman, Judge Hull, of Tennessee, devoted many years of his life to a study of the problems affecting our trade and commerce with other nations and the reciprocal-trade-agreements program was and is the product of his handiwork and statesmanship.

Judge Cordell Hull was and is one of the greatest champions of peace of modern times. It was through the efforts of Secretary of State Cordell Hull that our great country was removed from the realm of the economically isolated and brought into the community of nations. This instrument, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, has fostered peace, trade, and commerce among many nations, regardless of what others say to the contrary. I am pleased to support this measure and to urge its renewed adoption.

I recall some years back when the distinguished chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON, appeared before the committee to urge approval of a previous extension of this act that he said:

> If Cordell Hull in all his long public career ever said or did an unwise thing, I never heard of it.

And the distinguished chairman has enjoyed a long and fruitful friendship and association with Mr. Hull and knows whereof he speaks.

The Congress first approved the Trade Agreements Act more than 17 years ago. The soundness of that program has been proved over and over again by the fact that, with very few changes and alterations, it is today the same program as envisioned by Mr. Hull, its author.

Under the operation of the act, this nation—despite the intervening tragedy and misfortune of a world war—has attained a prosperity never before achieved by any nation on the face of the earth. The contribution to our economic prosperity which has been made possible by this great act cannot be estimated alone in dollars and cents—though the statistics which may be presented show such economic gains to be tremendous. The full estimate of the accomplishments made possible under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act must also be measured in terms of international good will and friendships which our Nation has earned—friendships which have developed into alliances in our military interest.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for the farmers of my district, the manufacturers, and all the people, when I strongly urge the approval of a further extension of the Trade Agreements Act. It has meant so much—it will mean so much more in the future for commerce, for good will and for the prosperity and well being of the people of the United States. I trust this measure will be speedily approved and the Cordell Hull reciprocal trade agreements program extended.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has always stood for just reciprocal trade agreements, agreements that give reciprocal benefits to both sides. We still are for this doctrine, but we want it to be conducted openly, and with full consideration for the interests of the working people of this country.

The basic and all-important problem to be considered in lowering and adjusting tariffs is the question of what we are doing to our own people and what we are doing to their security and their jobs. World trade should be encouraged, but the reciprocal trade program should be managed in the interests of the American people. In reducing tariffs to help economic prosperity throughout the world we must not take the lining out of the pocketbooks of the American people.

When the reciprocal trade law is extended by Congress it must contain provisions to safeguard and protect the jobs, the homes, and the high living standards of the American workers, male and female. Legislation extending reciprocal trade must contain the peril-point provision to protect American labor and industry.

The Republican Eightieth Congress enacted a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which contained the peril point. This gave workers protection against losing their jobs through the importation of competing foreign manufactured goods, either duty free or at such a low tariff rate as to enable the importer to undersell comparable and better made American products.

We all know what happened to many segments of American industry in 1949 and 1950 when the American producers lost the protection of the peril point amendment.

Unemployment was widespread in many sections of the country, all caused by the flood of cheap goods coming from abroad. The watch industry of the United States was practically wiped out. Thousands in the pottery industry, in hat making, in shoe manufacture, in rubber goods, in the textile manufacture, lost their jobs in 1949 and 1950. New England was particularly hard hit by the influx of foreign made goods, and the damage of the administration's cheap and unprotective tariff policy swept across the Nation to the Pacific coast, affecting the lumber, fishing, and fruit and nut industries with their thousands of employees.

There is hardly anyone in the United States who does not want to see Europe, Asia and the other parts of the world

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

restored to the positions they once occupied, and their people again enheartened by hope and faith. American taxpayers through their toil and effort have spent billions of their dollars for the rehabilitation of the war-torn globe. Surely no one can accuse the United States of failing in this objective. But how can the United States help the world unless we ourselves are prosperous? Reciprocal trade legislation which is not reciprocal to the United States could wreck American trade and economy. The administration's management of the reciprocal trade program in 1949 and 1950 proved the dangers to the future of American industry. If the United States is wrecked, to whom then will the rest of the world turn?

The reciprocal trade policy of the administration is filled with fallacies. The United States is engaged in a global fight against communism, and the people have generously put up their money to carry on this battle. But while we are trying to curb the Reds on one hand, we turn around and build up communistic countries with the other. A large percentage of the cheap foreign imports which caused the doors to close on American factories come from countries behind the iron curtain.

This extension of the reciprocal trade law is for 3 years. Under the administration's program for the next 3 years, the workers and manufacturers in foreign lands are to be favored at the expense of a large segment of American industry.

We can continue our world trade program without the menace and fear of unemployment at home. We can do that by adopting the peril-point amendment. This is a simple provision but a most important one to hundreds of thousands of our workers. The peril-point section merely provides that the Tariff Commission must certify to the President tariff reductions which have reached the point where they imperil American jobs and American industry. Then it provides that if the President decides to go ahead and lower the tariff, he must so notify the Congress and explain to the Congress and the American people and those whose jobs will be imperiled the reason why he is taking such action.

Certainly Congress, the people, and above all thousands whose jobs will be threatened, have a right to such information. This is a wise and sound provision that should be restored to the Reciprocal Trade Act.

We are considering a tariff act designed to last for 3 years. None of us knows what these years will bring, peace or war. The administration is most anxious to aid world economic recovery and increase trade with other nations. I ask why the administration is not as anxious to make sure within the next 3 years that goods manufactured by slave labor behind the iron curtain will not cause the collapse of American industries and the loss of employment to our workers?

I understand, of course, that with allocations and controls in effect a reciprocal trade issue right now is academic. We can sell all the goods we can manufacture. But these war conditions may not last. I hope they do not, because they would ultimately bring destruction to all of us. And when this feverish war preparation abates, we may well find that we have legislated ourselves into a situation where factories will close and millions of people will be thrown out of work. We must take the necessary safeguard now.

Why is it too much to ask the President to tell Congress why he is lowering tariffs? Congress, under the Constitution, was entrusted with the establishment of tariffs. It should and must for the benefit of our workers retain control of these constitutional rights.

This is not a partisan fight. It is an American fight. It is a fight that must command the interest of scores of little industrial concerns in New England. It is a fight that must appeal to the coal and pottery workers of West Virginia and Ohio. It is a fight of vital concern to the agricultural sections of the West and the dairy farmers of the North. It is a fight of deep interest to the lumber, fishing, and fruit industries of the west coast. It is a fight of concern to the sugar, cotton, peanut growers, and other industries in the Southland.

Yes; it is an American fight, and what we do here now may well fix the responsibility for the prosperity or lack of prosperity of the American people 2 or 3 years hence.

Hundreds of thousands of American boys and men are being drafted into the armed service to hold back the menace of Communist aggression. These servicemen will need jobs when they come home. We all have the responsibility to see that they have work, and adoption of the peril-point amendment is the best means of assuring them that they will again have jobs at American wages.

It will benefit these men very little if they turn back Communist aggression abroad only to fall victims to economic aggression at home.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the demands of today, the uncertainties of the future, make a sound economy a "must" for America. This is no time for economic experiments. To depart too far from sound procedures is to invite disaster.

If we are to be the bulwark of civilization and the protector of world democracy; if we are to succeed in setting up on adequate defense pact for the free nations of the world, we must realize that our armed strength will be no better than the economic strength we can and must put behind our efforts.

In the consideration of H. R. 1612, to provide for extending certain trade agreements, which will expire in June 1951, we are dealing with one of the vital factors of our economy. When we lower import duties, we curtail Government revenues. To say nothing of our loss of purchasing power and the ability of our workingmen to pay a greater part of their income into the Federal Treasury as a tax. An idle man is an economic liability not an asset.

In 1945 and again in 1949, when these trade pacts were up for periodic renewal, I carried on a losing battle on the floor of the House to protect the interests of the industries and the workingmen of my district, particularly those employed in handmade glassware, pottery, and woodworking plants.

West Virginia has suffered more from this legislation than any of the other 48 States. It is the center of the glass and ceramic industry which was among the first to feel the brunt of foreign competition. In the past few years our two most basic industries, coal and crude oil are threatened. Other industries, too, are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain wage levels, working hours, and many other conditions of employment.

I have said and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I object to the State of West Virginia being made a guinea pig for further experiment. The experiences learned in 16 years since the inception of the reciprocal trade idea in 1934 is such that one is forced to the conclusion that my own State's economy will be destroyed by the extension of the existing act. Particularly, is this true, if the renewal carries the authority to any Government agency to grant further tariff cuts and if the so-called escape clause, now the figment of someone's imagination, is not liberalized and legalized by being written into the language of the basic act itself.

At no time since the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, has our Nation, or for that matter, the world itself, functioned under normal conditions. Things were abnormal in the early thirties because of a world depression. They were abnormal in the early forties because of a great world war. They are abnormal in the early fifties because of the dire threat of a third world war. What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is that the Reciprocal Trade Act has not demonstrated that it is an asset to our national economy. It has never had to meet the impact of normal world competition under normal conditions.

If our national economy is to be a sound economy, we must maintain a favorable trade balance. Our exports must exceed our imports. Only on 2 occasions in the past 16 years, have we approached periods of normalcy. In the years just prior to World War II, we witnessed a sudden increase in foreign imports. American-made goods were in some instances, driven out of the markets. We then had more imports than exports. This was the first test of our reciprocal trade policy. Conditions were rapidly approaching normal. Prewar and wartime defense activities in the late thirties halted this trend and a new cycle of abnormal conditions gripped this country.

Another approach to normal levels, came in mid-1950, only to be again interrupted by the Korean War emergency. It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that in both these instances as we came near to normalcy, we were faced with a gradual shift in our trade balance. In the month of October 1950, we faced an unfavorable trade balance when imports exceeded exports for the first time since 1939.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the Committee's attention to the fact that had we not taken credit for approximately $100,000,000 monthly of exports synthetically created by the use of the Marshall plan funds, we would have encountered an unfavorable trade balance for most of the year. What is the answer when ECA funds stop flowing to Europe? The answer is plain—a continuing trade deficit.

I wish to protest the use of ECA funds as direct aid to foreign industries in modernizing their plants that manufacture goods for import into this country. The extent of this practice cannot be determined at present. Here are two instances as proof of what is going on in the ECA. The first is a project in Germany, where the Glaswerke Ruhr, Essen-Karnap, which produces 20 percent of all hollow glassware in the Republic of Germany. A direct grant of $1,837,000 plus $212,000 in ocean freight has been made from Marshall plan funds. Modern American machinery and equipment is being installed and will be in direct competition with the products of three glass plants in the city of Weston in my district. Two thousand workers are employed in the German plant. Their hourly wage is 31 cents per hour as against an average wage of $1.42 per hour in American plants. This plant is exporting 6,000 tons annually and most of it is intended for the American market.

Another project, also in the field of glass production, is underway in Greece, where a grant of $1,832,000 has been made to the Hellenic Chemical Products Co. This is for the purpose of boosting the output of this plant by 70 percent and a huge surplus above local needs will be available for exports.

Plans are also underway for a similar project to modernize and rehabilitate the French glass industry. How much more of this kind of competition which is made possible by the American tax dollars can our industry endure? I am getting d—— well tired of voting money to create jobs for the workingmen in Europe and in so doing cause unemployment in this country.

England has been able to restore the British pound and to stabilize her economy by exporting double the amount of her imports. If we are to have a sound dollar and a stable economy, we could well follow Britain's policy. Her position in the United Nations Council in opposition to economic sanctions against Red China is in line with her policy of placing economic greed above political obligations. Yet, we go on extending her trade concessions and direct economic aid under the Marshall plan.

Official statistics of the United States Commerce Department for the year 1949 show 12,071,000 pieces of table and art glassware were imported into this country. The total foreign value of these imports was $2,940,400, or a monthly average of 1,006,000 pieces of glassware. Now, let us see what happened in the last half of 1950. For the month of June the total pieces imported jumped to 1,646,000 and by the month of August had leaped again to 2,895,800 pieces. Where did these imports come from? Czechoslovakia and Poland, both of which are behind the iron curtain, were the worst offenders out of a total of 15 countries that import this type of glass into our country.

Typical of this kind of business is the pottery industry. Rates of duty on nearly all of our products have been decreased a full 50 percent below those in the 1930 Tariff Act. The rates in that act were wholly inadequate to enable us to meet foreign competition, as witness the steady and rapid increase in imports of all types of dinnerware from 1931 to 1938. During all those years and before the rate reductions in the British treaty had any effect Japanese china of good quality was selling at retail at less than the cost of production in American factories.

Since then, in spite of our protests, duties on both china and earthernware have been lowered in trade treaties with Great Britain, Mexico, Italy, Czechoslovakia, and France. All such reductions have, of course, applied to our imports from Japan and Germany since the war. The inevitable result has been that imports of dinnerware and fancy goods from all of these countries have increased just as fast as they have been able, with the use of our money, to get productive facilities back into operation.

Just as inevitably did production and employment in American factories show a steady decline from early 1949 to August 1950. Since early in July of last year, evidently as a result of the Korean War, sales of nearly all civilian goods and particularly housewares have increased substantially and the potteries generally have been reasonably busy. It must be admitted that this is an abnormal situation and through our experiences of 1949 and early 1950, we have no delusions of what is going to happen to us when we are really at peace.

Statistics, which I have received from the United States Department of Commerce on household chinaware and kitchen articles and on earthenware and china art and decorative articles, are more alarming. In these two categories, imports for 1949 were 9,392,000 dozen with a foreign value of $14,943,000. The average monthly rate was 773,000 dozen. Let us see what it was in the last half of 1950 when we had more imports of all kinds than we had exports. In October, imports jumped to a total of 1,636,000 dozen. This was 2½ times above the monthly average for 1949.

Total sales of all domestic potteries were $77,500,000 in 1948. In 1949, they were $64,000,000, or a drop of 17 percent. During the same period, imports of competitive products increased 24 percent.

For the first 6 months of 1950, our sales were down more than 25 percent from 1949, and imports were up over 30 percent.

During the last 3 months reported by the United States Department of Commerce, August, September, and October of last year, imports of all dinnerware and fancy goods were 65 percent above the same 3 months of 1949. China dinnerware alone increased nearly 79 percent and art wares increased 72 percent; and practically all of this increase came from Japan and Germany. Without the sudden upsurge of buying by the American public during the past 6 months, it is not hard to see what would be happening to our pottery industry. Because in directly comparable ware, the retail price of the Japanese product is less than one-half the American.

It is interesting to note in this connection, that the British Pottery Board of Trade just recently wrote directly to General MacArthur, urging that he do something to decrease the Japanese exports of china to the United States or increase the prices; or the American market for British china would be ruined.

One other instance in which my State of West Virginia is being harmed in this manner is found in the spring clothespin industry. We have the largest plant of this kind in the world. Let us look at what happened in the year 1950 when the Korean War emergency came on. The country of Sweden is our main competitor. In the year 1949, she imported 614,000 gross of this type clothespin. In the month of October 1950 the rate of imports was 193,000 gross or an annual rate of above 2,000,000 gross.

Highly tempered steel is required in the manufacture of these clothespins. Now that we have frozen steel for essential use, our domestic producers are handicapped and lose their market to Swedish producers. This happened in World War II when imported clothespins sold for 49 cents a gross and it cost 83 cents to manufacture the same article in our plants in my district.

I want to cite another instance where my State's producers are handicapped in the recent freeze order on cobalt. This material is used by glassware producers for coloring. It is grossly unfair to permit the use of this product by foreign producers who are in a positon to take over the American market. These two instances are, I think, a strong argument for the imposition of import quotas so as to protect American producers from the loss of their market.

Another sector of my State's glass industry is now feeling a sudden impact of imports. I now refer to the sheet glass—window glass—industry where we are facing increased imports of Belgium glass as high as 400 percent. Czechoslovakia has in recent months flooded our domestic market with lightweight sheet glass used for scientific and pictorial purposes. Here the imports are 50 percent above the total domestic production of this type of glass.

Coal is king in West Virginia. It is our State's major industry. Our greatest source from which to get taxes for the support of our lesser governmental units. Anything that harms the coal industry harms our economy. The same can be said of the oil industry, another of my State's basic industries. The major part of our oil is independently produced and it is here that we find this industry threatened with extinction by the mounting and uncontrolled imports of crude oil from the Near East, Mexico, and Venezuela. Importations are in excess of 1,000,000 barrels daily. Imports in excess of 450,000 barrels daily causes a curtailment of domestic production. This causes unemployment and a loss of purchasing power of thousands of employees in the industry. Profits are wiped out and a stable sector of our economy crip-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

pled with a resulting loss in tax revenues to the Nation and to the several States.

Coal is affected indirectly in that it is losing its markets to cheap residual fuel oil produced from the crude oil that is flooding our markets through import duty concessions granted under these reciprocal trade pacts. For years, my State has enjoyed a lucrative market for coal in New England and on the eastern seaboard. In the year 1948, we sold 21,000,000 tons. As the result of competition from these cheap oil products, our sales in 1949 were down to 13,000,000 tons. In 1950, the trend was still downward. During most of 1950, a large part of our mines were either idle or working on a part-time basis. The Korean War emergency by creating added demand for fuel, has improved this situation, but this is only temporary relief. The basic danger still remains as a threat when the emergency passes and we get back to normal.

We cannot escape the fact that this situation is brought on by the activity of five of our major American oil companies, who hold and operate the concessions abroad. Testimony taken before a House subcommittee of which I was a member, showed that the cost of producing a barrel of crude oil on these concessions in the Near East, was 41 cents per barrel as compared to $2.65 the cost of production in this country. Out of this 41 cents of original cost residual oil represented 17 cents per barrel after the gasoline, lubricating oils and other distillates were removed. This residual oil was sold under contract for $1.60 per barrel. Four barrels of this oil has the same B. t. u. as one ton of West Virginia coal. Now this means that four barrels of oil sold at $1.60 a barrel or $6.40, displaces a ton of coal that cost to produce in our mines in West Virginia, plus transportation costs, a total of $10.95.

It is easy to understand the earnings report of those large oil companies when we see the profit coming from a product that costs 17 cents per barrel, being sold for $1.60 per barrel. Yet, we go ahead with a trade treaty that allows these monopolies to make millions annually while exploiting and controlling the domestic oil industry to the detriment of all independent producers. If we are to extend these trade pacts for another 3 years, then we must in justice to our own producers, find some way to limit these imports.

Mr. Chairman, when the initial Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was adopted in 1934, the administration had the active support of the Nation's three great labor groups and at least a tacit acceptance from the country's leading industries. That situation does not exist today. As a member of a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, taking testimony on the effects on employment in this country as a result of mounting imports of oil from the Near East and Venezuela and Mexico, I heard our reciprocal trade policy roundly denounced by representatives of both the oil industry and the coal industry. They were joined in this denunciation by both the oil workers union and by the United Mine Workers Union.

Only recently, the Nation's largest union group, the American Federation of Labor, at its national convention, Houston, Tex., adopted resolutions of protest against unfair wage and labor conditions as a result of the operation of our Reciprocal Trade Act.

A danger to our basic economy, as well as to our national existence, is found in the so-called favored nations agreement which not only extends concessions granted to one member of the reciprocal family and to other members, but also permits a nonagreement nation to take advantage of our tariff concessions.

As a result of the most-favored-nation principle, reductions in duty and other concessions made by the United States with all countries under the trade-agreement program are automatically extended to Russia, Communist China, and all other Communist-dominated countries. We now have trade agreements with approximately 45 free countries covering literally thousands of imported items, and the benefits of all these concessions contained in these agreements are now benefiting Russia, Communist China, and their satellite iron-curtain countries.

In the case of Russia, for example, approximately 88 percent of its dutiable imports into the United States benefit from reduced rates provided in trade agreements by us with free countries and 92 percent of the tax-free imports from Russia consists of products bound on the free list in trade agreements with free countries.

In the case of Communist China, 72 percent of the dutiable imports into the United States from that country benefit from trade agreement concessions granted by us to free countries, and 75 percent of the duty-free imports of that country benefit from our concessions to the free nations.

In conclusion may I impress upon my colleagues the fact that the so-called escape clause now in use, and which is not a part of the basic Reciprocal Trade Act, is nonworkable and unfair. If we are to renew these trade agreement pacts, it is essential that the act itself spell out in plain English what avenues of relief are available to harassed domestic producers. At present the State Department has abrogated the authority extended the President to provide safeguards by writing into existing reciprocal pacts an embargo on setting up of import quotas on all products except certain agricultural products. In doing this they have acted without the authority of law, and any remedy aimed at relieving any domestic producer injured by the operation of the trade pact must be a part of the basic act itself.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if his statement is correct that there is no provision in Public Law No. 316 spelling out the escape clause.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no provision in the basic act for an escape clause.

Mr. PERKINS. What cooperation has the gentleman received of the State Department in considering a basic industry such as coal when residual oil is in competition with such a basic industry?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I have never gone to the State Department with it, but I tried it out in the case of clothespins, and I got a royal brush-off, and I assumed I would get it in regard to oil just the same as I did with clothespins.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I could call the attention of my colleagues to the necessity of abrogating at once the existing trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. No defense can be offered by the Congress for our continuing favor to a Russian satellite nation. I shall, Mr. Chairman, if the opportunity affords, offer amendments aimed at strengthening the escape provisions of this legislation and to direct the President to terminate the existing treaty with Czechoslovakia on the terms and in the manner set forth in the act itself.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a few realistic comments in regard to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Our own position as a Nation and our national security are at stake. It is time that we stop theorizing and take a look at the facts.

The reciprocal trade agreement program was sold to the American public as a program which would promote trade and world peace. In my opinion the trade agreements during the thirties, prevented the recovery of the American price level and kept the United States in a state of depression. With the United States in a depression the world could not get back to a state of prosperity. The poverty created by low prices made it possible for Hitler, and his ally, Mussolini, to lay the groundwork for World War II. Instead of promoting peace the trade agreements promoted war.

In the period following World War II our price level has increased about 80 percent and the hourly wage of our industrial labor has increased in proportion. On the other hand much of the world has come under Soviet influence and England through its socialistic policies and devaluation of the pound has held their wage level to about one-third that of the American worker. This differential in prices is very dangerous to our national security and a policy of free trade without any protection for our national economy is the best aid and comfort that we can give to communism.

Just before the close of the Eighty-first Congress, I made a brief statement as to the need of equity in trade and pointed out that we cannot have peace when one neighbor cheats another—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, pages 15141–15142.

Let us briefly examine our own economy. Our national income is created by our unit production of goods and services times the price per unit. In the last quarter of 1950 our national income was running at a level of $254,000,000,000. At the present time a drop of 10 percent in our price level would mean a loss of $25,000,000,000 in national income.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Under a free-trade policy, Russia by dumping her products on the world market can break our price level and bring about the economic chaos that will destroy our American system from within.

At the present time we are engaged in a program of military preparedness. We find ourselves short of strategic materials—copper, lead, zinc, manganese, tin, and so forth. Why are we short of these products? We are short of these products because we destroyed our own production under a concept that we could import them cheaper from other nations. After World War II, the price of our domestic strategic materials was permitted to drop, and our domestic mines closed by the thousands. They could not compete with cheap foreign labor. Even, at this moment, the administration has not taken definite steps to produce these materials for national defense. Our whole economic structure is being threatened by shortages and our military program is faced with dangerously small stockpiles of these critical materials.

In case of war, Russian submarines can, and no doubt will, prevent the importation of a mighty lot of these materials—just as Hitler did in 1941 and 1942—and without them we would be unable to defend ourselves. The Eightieth Congress passed legislation to provide for the production and development of strategic materials in the United States. The President vetoed the bill. Other attempts have been made to pass similar legislation and such legislation has always been sidetracked because it conflicted with the theories of the reciprocal trade agreements. Because of our we-give-and-you-take trade-agreements policies we have been prevented from producing the very things so vitally needed to defend the United States let alone the jobs and income that could have been created by the production of strategic materials.

Speaking frankly, the result of their operation is clearly that of economic suicide for the United States.

Let me next point to what is taking place under these trade agreements. We find England engaged in an economic war with Argentina. The low-wage level in England requires cheap products if they are to buy from other nations. England at the present time is trying to force Argentina to sell chilled beef for 17 cents per pound. Think of it in comparison with American prices. To bring Argentina to her knees, the British Government has rationed her people to about one-half of a pound of meat per week and the issue threatens the stability of the English Government.

On the other hand, England is making us pay through the nose for rubber and tin, the production and sale of which is controlled by the British Government. This policy of buy cheap and sell high, is the very source of communism and socialism.

We cannot expect to sell American products to Argentina produced with industrial labor at $1.51 per hour and then have other nations buy their meat for 17 cents per pound. They cannot possibly trade with us even though we remove the few tariffs that remain.

Therefore I hope that this Congress will take steps to discontinue the present trade-agreement program and give the world a program which will promote equity of trade. How can we do this? It is not a complicated program. We should notify the rest of the world that we are going to protect our price and wage level at the point of national solvency. Second, that we are willing to trade with any nation in the world and pay them a comparative price for such products as we may need.

For example, if a tractor produced in the United States sells for twice the number of dollars that it sold for in 1925–29, the last period of any semblance of world stability in foreign exchange, then we should stand ready to pay twice the price level for existing imports at that time.

China, India, South American countries, or any other nation does not like to be cheated in trading their products because of currency devaluation or low prices such as England is trying to force Argentina to accept.

As a Member of Congress, I want the American worker to have a good wage in line with the American cost level for goods and services. I am also willing that we agree to pay a comparative price for anything we may need in the way of imports.

During the past year, in the third quarter September to October, our foreign trade was in balance for the first time in many years. What brought about this balance? It was not the trade-agreement program but a price for world raw materials at the American level. Other nations by selling us their products at a proper price level were able to earn their dollars, which we have been forced to donate under the Marshall program mainly because they are forced to sell their commodities at starvation prices.

In my opinion the nations of the world would welcome this kind of program. After centuries of exploitation they would welcome a price for their products that will permit progress, economic development and a higher standard of living.

Had we followed such a policy, our domestic mines would be in production and our stockpile of strategic materials would be ample for our needs. We would not be in a position of shortages which tend to disrupt our domestic economy and force many business institutions to curtail their production even to the point of closing up entirely and throwing our wage earners out of work by the millions, except during periods of war production.

With such a program we could give the world true economic leadership in building a foundation for world peace. A continuance of our present trade agreement policy will continue the exploitation of weaker nations and undermine both our national income and the domestic production we will need in the future to protect our Nation and our American system.

Why permit politics and past mistakes to continue a program that has so utterly failed to achieve any of the glowing promises which its proponents made 15 years ago? A continuation of the program will perpetuate the economic confusion in the United States and the world. To me it is the greatest threat to the future of your Nation and mine.

In closing, I want to repeat again that a drop of 10 percent in our price level means a loss of $25,000,000,000 in income. We cannot afford to risk that loss nor the loss of production through unemployment that would result. We can have national security by tariff protection up to the American cost level and we can buy all the things we need in addition to our own production by paying a price for our imports on a basis of equity with the price of things we wish to sell to other nations.

If we deal fairly with our neighbors in trade relations as I have here suggested, we will make good and lasting friends all over the world, instead of giving them hand-outs which belittles them and will bankrupt America.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the present authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act expires June 12, 1951. If enacted into law, H. R. 1612 will extend the authority of the President for 3 years from the expiration of the present authority. Because of the importance of reciprocal trade as an issue before our Nation, I voted in committee in favor of bringing the bill, H. R. 1612, before the House for consideration, but I do not want anyone to think for one minute that I approve of all the provision of the present law.

I vigorously support the views that the peril-point provisions established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 be reenacted; that certain standards be established by Congress for the guidance of the President in determining relief under the escape clause; that the President be directed to prevent the application of reduced tariffs and other concessions made in trade agreements with the free nations to imports from Russia and Communist China and to imports from any Communist satellite country, including North Korea, which the President finds is part of a conspiracy against the free world, and I believe sincerely that the Eighty-second Congress should not extend any trade-agreement authority of the President more than 2 years as we should leave the extension of authority beyond June 12, 1953, to the Eighty-third Congress.

The determination of the peril point and the furnishing of such information by the Tariff Commission to the President, together with the President's report of any concession going below the peril point and the reasons for going beyond the peril point, all combine to furnish our people with information to which they are most certainly entitled.

I can see no valid objection to the establishment of some standard of safety for the guidance of the President in determining relief under the escape clause. No change in the escape clause is suggested, but the people of the United States affected by the trade agreements

have a right through Congress to name standards that are fair and effective guides for the President in the matter of securing relief under the escape clause.

It strikes me as utterly absurd to extend the so-called most-favored-nation treatment to Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the Communist satellite countries at this time. The antagonism of these countries for the United States and their determination to inflict all possible damage on the free world clearly disqualifies them for any reduction in tariff or other concession on imports from those countries. In fact, I personally would go further and deprive any country of such trade advantages if that country persists in supplying strategic and critical materials to Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the Communist satellite countries.

The record of shipments of rubber to the Soviet bloc is of particular interest on this point, and I include here a statement dated January 19, 1951, that I have today received from the State Department. I hope the Members of the House may have time to analyze the fallacious reasoning indulged in by the State Department in support of their surrender to foreign-trade policies of other countries inimical to our defense.

SHIPMENTS OF RUBBER TO THE SOVIET BLOC

JANUARY 19, 1951.

Since statistics concerning shipments of rubber to the Soviet bloc are public information and readily available, the question often is asked why the shipments are not halted. This is a perfectly natural reaction but overlooks very practical problems.

At the present the rubber trade is entirely in private hands in all major producing territories. News stories dealing with shipments of rubber to the Soviet Union frequently are somewhat misleading to their use of the term "British" since there is an implication that the British Government is the exporter of the rubber in question when, as a matter of fact, the shipments are made by private traders.

Although to date the Soviet bloc has bought almost entirely from Malaya, other countries of southern and southeast Asia, any one of which produces sufficient rubber to meet the estimated needs of the Soviet Union and its satellites, remain as potential alternate sources not controlled by the British or any other Western European country.

If either the British or the Malayan Government acted alone to restrict rubber shipments to the Soviet Union, it might only penalize its own trade without causing the Soviet bloc any significant inconvenience. It would be extremely difficult politically for either Government to impose export controls if the only effect of such controls were to drive Soviet and Chinese buyers to other markets. It also is true that controls confined to Malaya would provide Communists there with an opportunity to claim that because of the country's colonial status Malaya was being prevented from participating in the prosperity which Soviet purchases of rubber were bringing to other territories free of foreign control.

Controls imposed unilaterally by Malaya would be difficult to enforce. Each month, on the average, approximately 5,000 long tons of rubber are smuggled from Indonesia to Singapore as a matter of routing to evade Indonesian export taxes, and the direction of smuggling might be reversed if it became profitable to do so. Measures to prevent rubber from reaching the Soviets would require intergovernmental agreements among at least 5 governments which would have to control exports from the major natural rubber markets of the world. Enforcement measures required to make the agreements even moderately effective would include export controls in producing and marketing centers and intensified police activity throughout the rubber-producing territories and their surrounding waters.

It should be pointed out that even if measures of export control should be adopted in all major producing or marketing areas, it still would be extremely difficult in the absence of open hostilities to prevent the USSR and its satellites from receiving natural rubber. The efficacy of such measures in at least certain of the rubber producing areas is a matter for serious doubt. The Soviet bloc purchases not over 10 percent of the world's annual production; and if necessary in the face of control measures by exporting countries, it probably could obtain rubber by a smuggling operation of only moderate size for Southeast Asia.

The Soviet Union itself and, more recently, China have been the principal buyers of natural rubber for the Soviet orbit. Estimated receipts by these countries may be summarized as follows in long tons:

Year	U. S. S. R.	China	Total
1939	30,000	4,586	34,586
1947	35,000	22,188	57,188
1948	100,000	21,000	121,000
1949	105,000	27,500	132,500
1950 (January to September)	53,250	24,009	77,259
1950 (January to November)	76,750	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

Monthly statistics concerning direct shipments of natural rubber from Malaya to the Soviet Union, China, and Hong Kong during 1949 and 1950 are shown in the attached table. Hong Kong is included because much of the rubber it receives is transshipped to China. The figures in the table differ from those shown in the preceding paragraph because there is a time lag of approximately 2 months between shipments from the Far East and imports into the Soviet Union. The lag between shipments from Malaya and receipts by Hong Kong or China is, of course, smaller.

TABLE 1.—*Natural rubber: Shipments from Malaya to the U. S. S. R., China, and Hong Kong, by months, in 1949 and January to October 1950*

[In long tons]

Period	U. S. S. R.	China	Hong Kong	Total
1949				
January	3,652	5	815	4,472
February	9,352	596	823	10,771
March	7,038	1,952	846	9,836
April	12,814	735	509	14,058
May	0	392	432	824
June	2,258	347	1,880	4,485
July	10,077	0	1,880	11,957
August	8,611	1,651	4,815	15,077
September	5,977	10	1,416	7,403
October	0	545	5,582	6,127
Subtotal, 10 months	59,779	6,233	18,998	85,010
November	1,075	657	3,559	5,291
December	2,560	100	731	3,391
Total	63,414	6,990	23,288	93,692
1950				
January	3,675	----------	1,076	4,751
February	3,825	----------	955	4,780
March	10,599	----------	817	11,416
April	5,800	250	707	6,757
May	7,450	----------	486	7,936
June	4,448	----------	878	5,326
July	12,175	1,490	2,976	16,641
August	10,815	3,513	4,755	19,083
September	4,635	4,772	5,931	15,338
October	1,272	12,061	11,791	25,124
Total, 10 months	64,694	22,086	30,372	117,152

Source: Rubber Study Group.

Our ability to secure the strategic and critical materials we need for war from other free nations is today seriously impaired by the continued trade of those free nations with the Communist dominated nations of the world. This impairment of our security is revealed both by the short supply and the abnormally high prices of such materials resulting from the limitless competition furnished by the iron curtain nations in the free world markets.

The Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means state on page 3 of House Report No. 14, to accompany H. R. 1612:

> Today our greatest concern is the maintenance of our national security in cooperation with other nations.

I do not contend that this statement is in error but I do contend that the impact of the most-favored-nation concession upon the national security should not be condoned as it is by the present national administration and the Democrats of the Committee on Ways and Means. The persistence of some free nations in selling strategic and critical materials to iron-curtain nations is not cooperation that will lead to our national security.

Much is made by the Democrats on page 3 of House Report No. 14 of the fact that a representative of the Department of Defense is a member of the Trade Agreements Committee that makes recommendations to the President, but in my opinion the perpetuation of the bottleneck that has long existed in skilled workers of the watchmaking trade, the condition that today exists in the markets of the world in wool, rubber, and tungsten, lead me to believe that the Department of Defense has not been adequately represented on that committee. It is high time that Congress stop writing

a blank check, and stop handing over all control and authority in foreign-trade policy making to the President and the Department of State without congressional control or legal standards of any kind. Yardsticks and guides must be placed in the law if we are to build our national security strong enough to guarantee our continued existence as a Nation in this war-torn world. The day of the blank check and the rubber stamp must end or the very existence of our Nation will be seriously jeopardized. The amendments suggested by the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means are all sound steps in the right direction.

The use of the adjective "reciprocal" in this legislation does not prove the existence of reciprocity. In fact, there has been so little reciprocity in our trade agreements throughout the past 16 years that today we as a nation have permitted our own defense self-sufficiency to bog down to a dangerous level. Countless mines have closed; our wool supply and the number of sheep in America have sunk to the lowest level since the end of the Civil War; the Government stockpile of strategic and critical materials was limping along at 38.4 percent at the time the war in Korea broke, and the supply of many essential skills has not been maintained. Domestic production of many strategic and critical materials such as tin, tungsten, and manganese has not been encouraged and all too often has been discouraged by our reciprocal trade program including inadequate tariff rates.

I do not predict disaster for our Nation, but I do charge the present national administration with responsibility not only for our entry into the Korean War without adequate logistical preparation, but I charge them also with complete misunderstanding and lack of comprehension of the impact of our foreign-trade policies upon our Nation's security. The time to change our trade policy is now at hand. Let us either amend the bill before us today or end completely the present authority to bargain away the remaining security we must now conserve if we are to survive.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, the untimely death of Capt. Don S. Gentile, on Sunday afternoon, January 28, 1951, deprived the United States Air Force of one of the most colorful personalities and effective fighter pilots of World War II.

To him belongs the distinction of having destroyed more enemy planes than any other American pilot in the European theater of operations during the late war.

During the early days of World War II his determination for a flying career was undeterred, notwithstanding his inability to meet the requirements of the peacetime cadet training program of the United States Army Air Force, and he volunteered for duty in the Royal Air Force.

After heroic action over Dieppe he was commissioned in the United States Air Force where he made a record that will long be remembered. His superb skill, his daring leadership, and his unswerving devotion to duty distinguish him among the great American aces of World War II.

Although he has finally soared away "into the wild blue yonder" he will be an inspiration forever, to the defenders of freedom everywhere. For his country he, too, gave his last full measure of devotion.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I express to his devoted wife and three sons, and to his parents, sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I append to my remarks the biography of Captain Gentile as furnished to me by the United States Air Force:

CAPT. DON S. GENTILE

Capt. Don S. Gentile, 30-year-old fighter ace, destroyed 19.80 German planes in the air and 6 on the ground during 3 years' service with the RAF and United States Air Force in Europe.

At one time the leading fighter ace of the United States, he was born in Piqua, Ohio, June 12, 1920. Learning to fly while in high school, he had a total of 300 hours flying time when he became a Royal Air Force cadet in July, 1941.

The following December he was appointed an RAF pilot officer and flew with various RAF squadrons out of England until June 1942, when he joined the famed Eagle Squadron.

On August 1, 1942, during the Dieppe raid, Captain Gentile destroyed his first German aircraft, an FW-190 and a JU-88, within 10 minutes of each other, for which he was awarded the British Distinguished Flying Cross.

The next month he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army and assigned to the Three Hundred and Thirty-sixth Fighter Squadron, Fourth Fighter Group, of the Eighth Air Force in Europe. At the same time, another young American pilot, Capt. John T. Godfrey, transferred from the RAF to the Air Force. Also assigned to the Three Hundred and Thirty-sixth Fighter Squadron, he became Gentile's wingman and the two formed a combat team which Gen. H. H. Arnold, former commander of the Air Force, praised as the greatest of any war.

Unlike the usual wingman, Godfrey alternated with Gentile as leader and they took turns shooting down planes and protecting each other. Together they destroyed more enemy planes than any other two American fighter pilots, and prompted the remark from Hermann Goering that he "would gladly give two of his best Squadrons for the capture of the Italian Gentile and the Englishman Godfrey."

Referred to by Winston Churchill as Damon and Pythias of the twentieth century, the two aces were sent home together in June 1944 to stress teamwork to the American people. After a series of war-bond tours, they were separated, Gentile being assigned to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, as a test pilot, and Godfrey returning to Europe, where he was shot down by the Germans and taken prisoner. (He was later liberated and returned to the United States.)

During his service with the Air Force in Europe, Captain Gentile, who had 20-10 vision, flew 182 combat missions, totaling 350 combat hours.

Captain Gentile remained at Wright-Patterson AFB, testing conventional type fighters and F-80's, until April 1946, when he received an honorable discharge. In December 1947 he was appointed a captain in the Regular Air Force and assigned to the Training Division at USAF headquarters in Washington, D. C., for work on fighter gunnery projects. He entered the University of Maryland in June 1949 for a 2-year study of military science.

The tall, dark-eyed hero, whom the late President Roosevelt called "Captain Courageous," has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross with seven clusters, Air Medal with three clusters, and the Presidential Unit Citation with two clusters. His foreign decorations include the Military Order of Italy, Belgian Croix de Guerre, British Distinguished Flying Cross, British Star, British General Service Decoration, Canadian Volunteer Medal, and the Italian Croce Al Merido di Guerra and Medaglia d'Argenti Al Valor Militaire. He also wears the Eagle Squadron Crest awarded by the King and Queen of England.

He received the honorary degree of Doctor of Aeronautics from Ohio Northern University at Ada in January 1946.

Captain Gentile is survived by his wife, the former Miss Isabella Masdea, of Columbus, Ohio, three sons, Don S. II, Joseph, and Patrick, and his parents.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, may have until midnight tonight to file reports from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what reports does the gentleman want to file?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Illinois did not advise me as to that. He just asked me to obtain this permission for him, to have until midnight tonight to file certain reports from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why is that necessary? We are not going to meet tomorrow, and we have practically no program that I know of on Friday. I cannot see why this permission is necessary. If we do not know what reports the gentleman wants to file, I will have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following the address of Mr. MEADER.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 38) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 100) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That clause (a) 14 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause (1) (n) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause (2) (a) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" where it appears in the said clause and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause 1 of rule XII is amended by striking out "Public Lands" where it appears in said clause and inserting in lieu thereof "Interior and Insular Affairs."

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 80) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 28) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

BIPARTISAN TAX CONFERENCE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when I sat down to breakfast this morning, I picked up a morning paper with one hand and a cup of coffee with the other hand, and nearly choked on the first swig, not due to the quality of the coffee, for Mrs. Gross makes fine coffee, but because of the headlines announcing that President Truman invited members of the House Ways and Means Committee, including the Republicans, to take part in a tax confab at the White House.

According to the paper, it was hoped that this touching love scene would lead to what was called a bipartisan tax policy.

Does not this proposition have a familiar aroma? Whenever the President finds himself in a hole, he talks "bipartisan."

Now, after telling the people he intends to tax them until it hurts, he wants the Republicans to bail him out.

Is not this much like putting the cart before the horse? If not, why did not the President call in Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, and other committees, months and even years ago to consult on administration spending bills and establish, shall we call it, a bipartisan spending policy, inasmuch as increased taxes are necessitated, at least in part, by administration squandering of public funds and debauchery of the currency through Truman inflation?

As obvious as the whole deal is, Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee fell for it, as near as I can ascertain, answering the Truman beck and call, and trod the primrose path to the White House.

By so doing, and for all practical purposes, they identified the Republican Party with the staggering increase in income taxes that will follow. They fell into a booby trap rigged and indeed worthy of the Pendergast school of politics.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 29, 1951.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1951: Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE, Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 29, 1951.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard

Academy for the year 1951: Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

EDW. J. HART,
Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of official committee business.

To Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks notwithstanding that it is estimated to make 4⅓ pages at a cost of $355.34.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Dean Rusk, Assistant Under Secretary of State.

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to include certain extraneous matter in connection with the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. MILLS) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to include certain tables in the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to include certain tables as part of the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SCUDDER (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to include a letter as part of the remarks he made today.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. GROSS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. GROSS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain letters addressed to him.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole, and include extraneous matter at that point immediately following the address made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Department of Education of Puerto Rico.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 15. An act to amend section 215 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 27. An act to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 34. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 44. An act for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 45. An act for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 46. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 48. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 52. An act for the relief of Delfo Giorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 53. An act for the relief of Vittorio Quilici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 56. An act for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 58. An act for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 59. An act for the relief of Vernon Crudge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 62. An act for the relief of Stefanos Stefanou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 63. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, February 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

144. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Cos., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1950, in compliance with chapter 1628, acts of Congress, 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

145. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

146. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a letter recommending the enactment of legislation to provide protection of persons from lynching, and including a copy of a bill introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 4683; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

148. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Ninth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

149. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for free transmission of official mail of members of certain United Nations commands"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

150. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Federal Security Agency under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 28. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 38. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 80. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 100. Resolution to amend certain clauses of rules X, XI, and XII of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the House Calendar.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2223. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2224. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2225. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and to revive the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2226. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2227. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2228. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2229. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2230. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2231. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2232. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2233. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134), so as to provide additional compensation to postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2234. A bill to promote and sustain amicable relations between the Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and the employees in the field service of the surface and air postal transport by the establishment of a board of arbitration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withhold certain wildlife-restoration project payments in the case of any State which unreasonably discriminates against nonresident hunters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2236. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special 3-cent stamp in commemoration of Portland Head Light, Casco Bay, first lighted on January 10, 1791; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2237. A bill to strengthen national defense by establishing a hunters' corps to guard the home front; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2238. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2239. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2240. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2241. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2242. A bill to authorize the President to make available for immigration purposes certain unused immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2243. A bill to amend paragraph 1615 (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2244. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2245. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned naval and marine officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2246. A bill to grant an option of overtime in lieu of compensatory time to postal employees for work performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2247. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2248. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2249. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2250. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2251. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2252. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2253. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2254. A bill to authorize payment after June 30, 1951, for unused annual leave accumulated by employees of the Federal and District of Columbia Governments during the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2255. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 2256. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit certain employed persons to be paid annuities under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2257. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2258. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2259. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2260. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 2261. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2262. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights, Mass., and the evacuation of Boston, Mass., by the British, to be held in South Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2263. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2264. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2265. A bill to repeal paragraph (b) of section 4 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2266. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2267. A bill to provide a widow's annuity upon death of employee prior to attainment of age 50 of surviving widow; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2268. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2269. A bill authorizing preliminary surveys and examinations to determine necessary improvements to prevent wind and tidal effects on the exposed shore of Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2270. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2271. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2272. A bill to amend the China Area Aid Act of 1950 to extend to selected citizens of Korea the educational aid provided certain citizens of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2273. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2274. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to seek development of the United Nations into a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. Res. 109. Resolution providing for the establishment of a branch of the House of Representatives restaurant in the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 110. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the use of facilities and manpower by the Department of Defense and by other departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to declaring Solano County, Calif., a critical defense area for the purpose of obtaining financing of housing construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to taking action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed, and other pertinent matters in relation thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to requesting not to include meat or meat products in any price or rationing controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relating to dangers of inflation and providing ways and means to prevent same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 2275. A bill for the relief of J. Alfred Pulliam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amalia Grass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Mary Doyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Rachmiel Tawer and Ida Kawer, nee Grodner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Mario Alberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Ella Henriette Nielsine Bonnerup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Carlo Parrella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Leon D. Cotomatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Peter Schoenwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazell Thrall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Giovita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Jai Young Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2293. A bill for the relief of the estate of Willie H. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Governali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Maiolatesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Philippe C. Chin-Ten-Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2298. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Ambrosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Biagio Poidimani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Sister Mariannina Silipigui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Nestor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Elena Masciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Giulio Carone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Aniela Buczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Joseph Girardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2309. A bill for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

29. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Williamsport, Pa., branch of the American Association of University Women, against any form of compulsory health insurance or any form of Federal bureaucratic control to the application of medical science and/or medical services to the people; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

30. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., urging approval and support of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

31. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry X. Dietch, village president, village of Park Forest, Ill., requesting the extension of rent control to the village of Park Forest, Ill., in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

32. Also, petition of John Dillon Fitzgerald, chairman, United Irish Societies of Washington, D. C., relative to the Irish question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

33. Also, petition of Edward P. Malley, chief clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Md., requesting an appropriation of sufficient funds for the prompt rebuilding of the Hawkins Point ammunition pier; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and Almighty God, who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgments as the noonday, in the presence of ageless realities we pause in reverence and, with a deepening sense of obligation as servants of this great people, pray for courage to attempt, power to achieve, and patience to endure.

Grant that with these virtues we, who hold the birthright of democratic traditions, may meet the crisis of our time with avowed faith in it, praying as we work:

Faith of our fathers, we will strive
To win all nations unto Thee,
And through the truth that comes from God
Mankind shall then be truly free.
Faith of our fathers, holy faith!
We will be true to Thee till death.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 29, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. John B. Sullivan, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 2 weeks, because of official business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF SENATE BILL 101

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Monday next we shall take up for consideration Senate bill 101, which is the bill amending the Reorganization Act of 1949, reported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROPOSED SALE OF GERMAN EMBASSY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce to the Senate that the protest which was made on Monday last to the Attorney General against the sale of the German Embassy has resulted in the postponement of the sale, the Attorney General having notified me that he will hold up the sale for at least 2 months. In view of the address made this morning to Members of Congress by General Eisenhower, I am sure that will be good news to the people of Western Germany.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Morse
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Benton	Hendrickson	Murray
Brewster	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hill	Nixon
Bridges	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chapman	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	McClellan	Welker
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Frear	McMahon	Williams
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young
George	Malone	
Gillette	Martin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as an observer from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, attending conferences between the Governments of the United States and Mexico regarding agricultural labor contracts.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, submit reports of committees, and introduce bills and transact routine business, without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

COMMISSION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WASHINGTON - LINCOLN MEMORIAL GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] a member of the Commission for Construction of Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard.

DIRECTOR OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] a Director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

DIRECTOR OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] a Director of the Columbia Hospital for Women.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Leslie L. Biffle and E. R. Ballinger members of the Federal Records Council.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WAIVING OF REQUIREMENTS OF PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CERTAIN COAST GUARD CONTRACTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirements of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITORIES ACT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to rescind certain details required by law to be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SALE OF POST ROUTE AND RURAL DELIVERY MAPS, ETC., BY POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LAW ENACTED BY FIFTEENTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Fifteenth Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (9 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth semiannual report of the Commission, dated January 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to declare Solano County, State of California, a critical defense area for the purpose of obtaining financing of housing construction

"Whereas numerous military and naval installations are located in Solano County in the State of California, including the Travis Air Force Base, the Benicia Arsenal, the Overseas Radio Station at Dixon, and those at Mare Island; and

"Whereas the mounting defense activities of the Nation have already caused and will continue to occasion a vast expansion in the activities of these installations; and

"Whereas as a concomitant of such expansion, a serious shortage of housing for the military, naval, and civilian personnel required at these installations has developed; and

"Whereas this situation cannot be rectified without the assistance of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to declare that an acute housing shortage exists in the county of Solano, State of California, which impedes the national defense activities and which cannot be alleviated without Federal assistance; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, and to the Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator."

A joint resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for military access roads to Travis Air Force Base

"Whereas the Travis Air Force Base is located in Solano County in the State of California; and

"Whereas the mounting defense activities of the Nation have already caused and will continue to occasion a vast expansion in the activities of this installation; and

"Whereas the Travis Air Force Base at present is not adequately provided with means of ingress and egress, especially in conjunction with the State and National highway system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to provide for the construction of military access roads leading from the Travis Air Force Base and connecting with the State and Federal highway systems, and especially a military access road connecting with United States Highway Route 40; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relating to the All-American Canal project

"Whereas the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057) authorized the construction of the All-American Canal and made provision for Imperial irrigation district, a political subdivision of the State of California, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof; and

"Whereas said act also granted the right to said district to utilize the power possibilities on said canal, the net proceeds therefrom to be applied against the district's obligation to repay to the Federal Government the construction cost of said canal; and

"Whereas pursuant to the provisions of said act, before any moneys were expended by the Federal Government on or for the construction of said canal, Imperial irrigation district entered into a contract with said Government under date of December 1, 1932, by the terms of which said district was granted the right and required to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof and also the right to develop the power possibilities thereon; and

"Whereas the main All-American Canal has been completed and has been in operation for a number of years and the Secretary of the Interior has transferred the care, operation, and maintenance to Imperial irrigation district of all of said main canal except the upper section thereof, being that section from and including the diversion works on the Colorado River at Imperial Dam down to and including the Pilot Knob check and Pilot Knob wasteway; and

"Whereas Imperial irrigation district has proceeded to develop the power possibilities on the section of the All-American Canal which it is operating and in connection therewith has acquired and is operating a complete power system serving the needs of all consumers of electric power in Imperial County and in Coachella Valley, Riverside County, Calif., served with water by the said canal but to date said district has been prevented by certain Federal departments from developing the power possibilities at the Pilot Knob site on said canal, which is the most important and valuable power site to said district on said canal; and

"Whereas over the past years, Imperial irrigation district has requested the Secretary of the Interior to keep faith with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932, and turn over the care, operation, and maintenance of the upper section of said canal to said district and grant permission for said district to develop the Pilot Knob power site (without expense to the United States); and

"Whereas the water treaty between the United States and Mexico dated February 3, 1944, grants to Mexico the right to receive a portion of its water by means of the All-American Canal and Pilot Knob waterway, such water to be carried from the point where

the latter empties into the old Alamo Canal to the delivery point on the international boundary; and

"Whereas the amount of such water to be so delivered to Mexico is but a relatively small proportion of the total annual flow of the All-American Canal and need not interfere with the district's operation of the canal nor the development of power at the Pilot Knob site; and

"Whereas the United States does not have the right to the use of any of the capacity of the All-American Canal for such supplying of water to Mexico but Imperial irrigation district does have surplus capacity in said canal down to Pilot Knob which it proposes to use in connection with the development of power at that point; and

"Whereas to remove any question as to possible conflict between said treaty and said district's contract, and also in a spirit of cooperation, said district has, by a proposal submitted to the Secretary of State in December 1947 offered to make available without cost to either the Federal Government or the Mexican Government capacity in the All-American Canal down to the end of the Pilot Knob wasteway and to transport to that point the water necessary to fulfill the requirements of said treaty under rules and regulations therefor to be promulgated by the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the upper section of said canal is turned over to said district and it is permitted to develop the Pilot Knob power site, as provided for in said district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

"Whereas after concurrence by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, the Secretary of State accepted said district's proposal in principle, subject to a clarification of wording, and did so notify said district by letter dated August 4, 1948; and

"Whereas for reasons unknown to this legislature, despite such acceptance the Secretary of State has recently turned the matter over to the Secretary of the Interior to decide who shall operate the upper section of the All-American Canal and the latter has announced that the Bureau of Reclamation will handle such operation, without giving any valid reasons why and in total disregard of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

"Whereas Imperial irrigation district has already suffered large financial losses caused by the Federal Government's refusal to permit said district to develop the Pilot Knob site and the Nation has lost hundreds of thousands of barrels of fuel oil used to generate power which otherwise would have been supplied by the Pilot Knob plant had the district been permitted to build it, which situation should be remedied without further delay; and

"Whereas this legislature believes that the Federal Government should take every reasonable means to observe and keep faith with the contracts it makes with its people and that this principle is particularly important at this time of world crisis when our form of government is on trial before the world; and

"Whereas this legislature believes in the principle of local control of public works to the greatest extent practicable, subject only to such reasonable rules and regulations by the Federal Government as may be necessary to protect the Government's investment in such works: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State of the United States be memorialized to uphold the principles of our form of government in its dealings with Imperial irrigation district under the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the contract with said district of December 1, 1932, and the treaty with Mexico dated February 3, 1944; and be it further

"Resolved, That said two Secretaries be memorialized to proceed under the principles of the proposal made to the Secretary of State by Imperial irrigation district in December 1947, in accordance with the acceptance thereof by said Secretary as stated in letter of August 4, 1948, to said district, to the end that said district be permitted, without further delay, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of all of the main All-American Canal and to proceed with the development of the power site at Pilot Knob; and be it further

"Resolved, That the attorney general of California, the State engineer, and all other officers of the State of California be and they are hereby directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution and to assist Imperial irrigation district in accordance therewith; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to the rights of the State of California to tide and submerged lands lying along the coast of California

"Whereas there is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States an action entitled *"United States* v. *California"* in which a master has been appointed for the purpose, among others, of determining the location of the mean low tide line along the coast of California; and

"Whereas a stipulation was entered into by the Attorney General of the United States and attorney general of California on August 21, 1950, relative to the disposition of rentals, royalties, and other payments received by the State of California from certain leases in the tide and submerged lands along its coast; and

"Whereas a demand has been made by the United States that there be deposited in the Treasury of the United States all moneys received from said leases on the tide and submerged lands along its coast; and

"Whereas the Legislature of California is considering enacting a law, being assembly bill No. 1878 of the 1951 regular session, providing for the transfer of all moneys received from the said leases after October 1, 1950, to the Treasury of the United States as provided in said stipulation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California declares that the sole purpose of said act, herein referred to as assembly bill No. 1878, is to provide temporarily for the efficient and economical development and production of oil and gas from tide and submerged lands along the coast of California pending final determination of the rights of the State of California in and to said lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State of California hereby reasserts its claim to absolute ownership of all such tide and submerged lands and of the minerals and oil and gas therein and expressly reserves all of its rights thereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That nothing in said assembly bill No. 1878 as enacted shall be construed as a waiver or relinquishment of any right or interest now held or claimed by the State of California in or to such lands, minerals, and oil and gas; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby requests and urges the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation confirming the ownership of the State of California of said tide and submerged lands and of the minerals and oil and gas therein; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two assembly joint resolutions of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States

"Whereas until recently it was generally recognized that all of the coastal States owned a belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

"Whereas in 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States held that those lands were not owned by the States and that the Federal Government rather than the States has paramount rights in and power over the 3-mile belt of land; and

"Whereas the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court was to divest the States of valuable oil rights; and

"Whereas State ownership of the 3-mile belt of land is not inconsistent with the Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore the ownership of the 3-mile belt of land beneath navigable water adjacent to the coasts of the coastal States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of a coastal State in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to acquisition of land by the United States

"Whereas the United States, acting through its several agencies, acquires land in the several States for public use; and

"Whereas if an owner of the land does not desire to sell it in such an instance, the United States can obtain it by condemnation; and

"Whereas the decisions of the United States to acquire land, administrative in nature, are made by the executive branches of the agencies of the United States and are held to determine public use in the courts of the land; and

"Whereas the owners of the lands, local governmental agencies, and other interested persons and organizations have no voice in those administrative decisions even though they believe the validity of the decisions questionable; and

"Whereas the policy of disregarding opinions of the interested persons and organizations in making the decisions relative to methods and amounts of land to be acquired by the United States is considered undemocratic; and

"Whereas this undemocratic procedure can be avoided by holding hearings to permit the interested persons and organizations to voice

any objections or suggestions that they have with regard to each proposed purchase: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take such action as is necessary to insure that owners of lands which the United States proposes to acquire, and all interested persons and local governmental agencies, are given an opportunity to express their views on each proposal of the United States to acquire land, at a public hearing held for that purpose after due notice; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to materials and equipment necessary for air-pollution control

"Whereas many of the industrial plants in Los Angeles County are devoted to the production of supplies for the national defense; and

"Whereas the full production of industrial plants in Los Angeles County is necessary during the present national emergency; and

"Whereas it is essential to the health and efficiency of the defense workers that the atmosphere be as free from pollution as possible; and

"Whereas the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District is now requiring the construction of installations necessary to reduce the air pollution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to permit the acquisition, uninterrupted by priority or other restrictions, of the required materials and equipment necessary to permit the execution of the requirements of the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to take action for protection for civilian injuries or deaths resulting from acts of war

"Whereas the possibility of war is imminent; and

"Whereas it is probable that if such war occurs, the civilian population of this Nation and of this State will be subjected to injury and death resulting from sabotage, bombing, and other acts which are concomitants of modern war; and

"Whereas large numbers of those killed or injured would receive their injuries while performing their usual work in the course of their usual employment; and

"Whereas the possibility exists that such persons or their dependents might successfully assert claims based on the workmen's compensation laws of this State against either the State compensation insurance fund or private workmen's compensation insurance carriers; and

"Whereas should this occur, such fund and such carriers might be bankrupted, leaving the worker who receives industrial injuries without protection; and

"Whereas should this result, it would create untold hardship upon this and other States, their workmen's compensation agencies and private insurance companies and insurers and also upon the workers themselves; and

"Whereas injuries and deaths resulting from such acts of war are properly the concern of the National Government and should not be left to the State of California, which is one of the most vulnerable of all States to probable enemy attack, or to other States similarly situated; and

"Whereas there are several measures pending before the Eighty-second Congress of the United States to provide protection to the States and their people from such eventualities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to take appropriate action to protect the States from eventualities resulting from acts of war as hereinbefore set forth; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

A resolution adopted by the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Finance.

A translation of a letter from the National Congress of Honduras, approving the motion of Deputy Joaquin Palma Oyuela, at United Nations, to join with the United States in declaring Communist China an aggressor in the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Sons of the Revolution of the State of New York, at New York, N. Y., branding Communist China as an aggressor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of David Darrin, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the policy of not hearing witnesses before a joint session of the Congress, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition signed by L. J. Reed, and sundry other citizens of the State of Illinois, relating to communism in Government departments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the United Irish Societies of Washington, D. C., relating to the partitioning of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of businessmen and community leaders of Arlington, Tex., relating to the strengthening of the United Nations, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Greater Lynn Council of Churches, East Lynn, Mass., favoring the repeal of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Education Committee of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C., favoring the improvement of the quality of schools under the program of mobilization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the United Nations did create the Republic of Korea; and

"Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are now engaged in armed combat in Korea, all as a representative of the United Nations; and

"Whereas Communist China has either directly or indirectly sent armies and/or soldiers into Korea and is now openly fighting the United Nations forces in Korea; and

"Whereas the United States has submitted, or is about to submit, to the United Nations a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in Korea: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do support the principles involved in such resolution now submitted, or about to be submitted to the United Nations and do respectfully request Your Excellency to take every appropriate step in support of such resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in Korea; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relating to the inclusion of meat or meat products in any price or rationing controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to include meat or meat products in any price or rationing controls

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein)—

"Whereas experience has proven that the imposition of price controls on meat has the effect of curtailing production of livestock on the farms and ranches and removes incentive to increase production; and

"Whereas livestock production of all species is on the increase, beef production having increased 36 percent and hog production 50 percent since 1939, and predictions are for more hogs, cattle, and sheep to be produced in 1951 than in the year 1950; and

"Whereas the surest way to control prices is to increase production to meet the demand; and

"Whereas the imposition of ceilings and rationing on meat is an incentive to black marketeers, that many thousands of black marketeers flourished in the slaughtering phase of the meat business during OPA; and

"Whereas during the year 1946 many legitimate packers were practically closed because of inability to purchase livestock at legal prices due to the fact that livestock was being drained off by black marketeers, resulting in bare counters in the meat markets; and

"Whereas many people are now living who have had an intimate knowledge of black-market operations and who are ready and willing to again enter into black-market operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the thirty-second session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do urge and recommend that the Congress of the United States do not permit the inclusion of meat or meat products in any price or rationing controls, and that the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be within its power to prevent the inclusion of meat and meat products in any move to control prices or rationing of commodities; be it further

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairmen of the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress, to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE (United States Senators from South Dakota), to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY (Representatives in Congress from South Dakota), and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota relating to the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed and other pertinent matters in relation thereto; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States, to take action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed, and other pertinent matters in relation thereto

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein)*—

"Whereas the Missouri River development program will permanently inundate thousands of acres of fertile farm land; and

"Whereas many farm families of long-established residence will be dispossessed; and

"Whereas many other farm acreages will be reduced so greatly that their operation would not be economically sound; and

"Whereas the land involved in this development program is adapted to livestock raising; and

"Whereas livestock raising requires programs extending over a long term of years to provide sufficient feed and equipment for this type of agriculture; and

"Whereas the families affected are required to dispose of their property on a closed or forced market and are required to secure replacements on an open market at a time when it is recognized that farm lands are selling at inflated values: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the thirty-second session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to require that in all land appraisals that these facts, including the good will of the people involved, be considered and that the appraisal report of the values of the properties be made available to and be known by all parties in the transaction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the requirement that the money received from the sale of dispossessed land be reinvested in land within 1 year or requiring the payment of income tax be extended so that the parties involved will not be required to purchase land during a period of inflated values; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of Congress, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

HAWKINS POINT AMMUNITION PIER, BALTIMORE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, recently the Hawkins Point ammunition pier in Baltimore was severely damaged by fire. It is the only pier in Baltimore City on which ammunition may be loaded and unloaded. It is of considerable importance to the defense effort.

On January 22 the City Council of Baltimore adopted a resolution requesting Federal aid in rebuilding this important installation. This matter is of extreme importance to the Nation as well as to the city of Baltimore. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2558

Resolution relative to the burning of the Hawkins Point ammunition pier

Whereas a very destructive fire totally destroyed the Hawkins Point ammunition pier and either destroyed or damage some important vessels; and

Whereas this is said to be the only pier in Baltimore City on which ammunition may be loaded or unloaded; and

Whereas Baltimore City ranks second in the ports of the country; and

Whereas, under the present circumstances, it is highly desirable that this pier be rebuilt as promptly as possible; and

Whereas it is of great importance in the defense program of the country that these facilities be restored without delay: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That the United States Congress be and it is hereby requested to appropriate sufficient funds for the prompt rebuilding of the Hawkins Point ammunition pier; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the city council be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland, to Governor McKeldin, and to Mayor D'Alesandro.

ADEQUATE BOXCARS FOR EARLY SHIPMENT OF DURUM GRAIN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota relating to the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of durum grain.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution F

Concurrent resolution requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to take such action as may be necessary to insure the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of durum grain

Whereas the State of North Dakota produces 85 percent of the durum raised in the United States, and the bulk of such production is in the northerly portion of the State; and

Whereas late summer rains and early snow came before a large portion of such durum could be threshed, with the result that much of such durum contains more than 15 percent moisture; and

Whereas such grain cannot be safely stored on the farm nor in the grain elevators because of the danger of heating and it is necessary that such grain be sent to terminal markets where it can be properly dried and stored; and

Whereas the marketing and shipping of such grain is being prevented by a shortage of boxcars, and if such grain cannot be shipped before warm weather starts, a great deal of such grain will spoil, with great financial loss to the farmers and great loss of human foods; and

Whereas by reason of the aforesaid facts an emergency exists: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to take such action as may be necessary to insure the furnishing of adequate boxcars for the early shipment of such grain; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the North Dakota Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

MILTON RUE,
President pro tempore.
W. J. TROUT,
Secretary of the Senate.
LEO STICKA,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

FEDERAL FUNDS UNDER HOUSING AND SLUM CLEARANCE ACT—RESOLUTION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL OF ST. LOUIS PARK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Village Council of St. Louis Park, Minn., in connection with Federal funds under the Housing and Slum Clearance Act of 1949.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution waiving and assigning village rights to claim Federal grants by the Housing and Slum Clearance Act of 1949

Whereas the Congress of the United States has provided funds for slum clearance to the respective States and their political subdivisions therein; and

Whereas the village council, the governing body of the village of St. Louis Park, Hennepin County, Minn., determines that no slum clearance program is available for said village of St. Louis Park at this time; and

Whereas the neighboring village of Fridley, Anoka County, Minn., has by its governing body determined that it has an extensive

slum area requiring considerable Federal financial assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the village council of the village of St. Louis Park, Hennepin County, Minn., That such sums as may be available to the village of St. Louis Park under the above stated program for years of 1949, 1950, 1951, be and the same are hereby, released to the beneficial interests of said village of Fridley, Minn., and the Federal director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is hereby authorized to make a transfer of said Federal Capital grant funds; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all persons concerned.

O. B. ERICKSON,
Mayor.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 82. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 74); and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 75).

GRACE ELIZABETH BEVERAGE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, approved unanimously by the committee, and request its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Grace Elizabeth Beverage, widow of Albion P. Beverage, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 59), was considered and agreed to.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with the unanimous approval by the committee, Senate Resolution 42, with an amendment, and request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 42) submitted by Mr. SPARKMAN on January 22, 1951.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may explain that the committee is in effect a standing committee of the Senate; and it will be noted that the amendment would provide funds to enable the committee to carry on its work until the 30th of June, when this matter will be taken up by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the name of the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is the Select Committee on Small Business.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 4, after the word "basis", to strike out "during the Eighty-second Congress" and insert "through June 30, 1951", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in performing the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, agreed to February 20, 1950, the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through June 30, 1951, such technical, clerical, and other assistance as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with the unanimous approval of the committee, Senate Resolution 28, with amendments; and I request its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 28) submitted by Mr. BRICKER on January 15, 1951, reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments at the end of the resolution before the word "Joint", to insert "the"; after the word "Energy", to insert "(to be selected by said members)"; and in the last line, before the word "and", to strike out "Development" and insert "For the development", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the table contained in subparagraph 6 (a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (to be selected by said Members).	"For the development and Utilization of Atomic Energy"

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY AND SURVEY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 39, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 39) submitted by Mr. MURRAY on January 17, 1951, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 273, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950 (providing for study and survey of health insurance plans in the United States, the activities of State and local governments in the field of health services, and related matters), is hereby continued until March 31, 1951.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 54, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 54), reported by Mr. O'CONOR from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on January 29, 1951.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "on", to strike out "February 1" and insert "January 31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending on January 31, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $19,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

INVESTIGATION OF EXPORT POLICIES BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution No. 56. The resolution provides for increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 365, of the Eighty-first Congress, providing for a study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement by Government departments and agencies of the export policies and control regulations of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 56), reported by Mr. O'CONOR from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 29, 1951, and reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, in line 6, after the word "by", to insert "$23,000", and in line 12, after the word

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"resolution", to strike out "on or before" and insert "through January 31, 1952", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 365, Eighty-first Congress (providing for a study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement by Government departments and agencies of the export policies and control regulations of the United States), agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $23,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balance of the sum previously authorized to be expended under such resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolution through January 31, 1952.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee established by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 3, 1950 (creating a special committee to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities), is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate to carry out the purposes of Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, $50,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The committee shall make an interim report to the Senate on or before February 28, 1951, and a final report to the Senate on or before March 31, 1951, with respect to the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think we should have an explanation of the resolution. Sometime ago the chairman of the special committee gave out an interview in which it was stated that the special committee was not to be continued. May we hear from the junior Senator from Tennessee in regard to this matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. This resolution would not continue the committee, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. What would the resolution do?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution provides for an extension of time for the committee, so as to enable the committee to make its report; and the resolution provides for an additional sum of money until that time amounting to a total of $50,000. The 31st of March is the final date.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a fixed date, is it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is a fixed date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 60) was considered and agreed to.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

DECEMBER 31, 1950.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 311, AGREED TO JULY 27, 1950)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Gross annual salary	Rate of annual salary, base	Total salary received	Terminated
Anderson, Victor H., investigator	$7,022.16	$4,500	$3,511.08	Jan. 31, 1951
Aultman, Bruce, investigator	6,153.14	3,900	1,982.67	Jan. 15, 1951
Grefe, Charles A., investigator	6,153.14	3,900	2,820.18	Dec. 15, 1950
Johnson, Grace E., clerk	7,022.16	4,500	3,511.08	
Machugh, Jos. V., investigator	6,153.14	3,900	871.69	Do.
McDermott, Edward A., special counsel	9,351.40	6,180	1,662.46	
Rader, Le Roy, counsel	9,434.35	6,240	4,717.14	Jan. 31, 1951
Reid, Oliver F., investigator	6,153.14	3,900	2,136.49	
Sharfsin, Joseph, special counsel	9,351.40	6,180	1,714.41	
Wright, Fielding L., Jr., investigator	7,022.16	4,500	1,170.36	Aug. 31, 1950

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$75,000.00
Amount expended:	
Salaries	24,097.56
Expenses	6,689.62
	30,787.18
Balance unexpended	44,212.82

CARL HAYDEN, *Full Committee Chairman.*
G. M. GILLETTE, *Subcommittee Chairman.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEM:

S. 729. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Koch Haden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 730. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MUNDT introduced Senate bill 731, to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 732. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 733. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Sangroniz-Equiluz;

S. 734. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Aguirrechu y Zuazo;

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh; and

S. 736. A bill for the relief of Fidel Arciniega Basterrechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, by request of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CORDON (by request):

S. 737. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; and

S. 738. A bill to provide for a final settlement of individual shares in the tribal estate and assets of the Klamath Indians through voluntary withdrawal from membership in the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 739. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Colonial Laundry Co.;

S. 740. A bill for the relief of Albert Walton; and

S. 741. A bill for the relief of Samuel Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 742. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 743. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the landless Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON):

S. 744. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Montana for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; and

S. 745. A bill to transfer to the Indian tribes of Montana control over their tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 746. A bill to exclude certain lands from becoming a part of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 747. A bill for the relief of Florence Elizabeth Ann Coons;

S. 748. A bill to permit Chinese students to remain in this country for a period of 3 years;

S. 749. A bill for the relief of George F. Willis; and

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAGNUSON also introduced Senate bill 751, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 752. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 753. A bill designating the week beginning with the first Sunday of August of each year as National Vegetable Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; and

S. 755. A bill for the relief of Frank Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 756. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 757. A bill for the relief of John David Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 758. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 759. A bill to extend to screen vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay;

S. 760. A bill to provide that the hours of work (exclusive of overtime) in any one calendar day of officers and employees subject to section 604 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 shall be limited to a period of not more than 10 consecutive hours; and

S. 761. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of charwoman working part time in the appropriate grades of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Alexander Urszu; and

S. 763. A bill for the relief of Henri Suderman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 764. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 766. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing a domestic supply of soft fibers from kenaf and ramie; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 767. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 768. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 769. A bill to provide for the acquisition of McCornack General Hospital, Pasadena, Calif., by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 770. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 771. A bill for the relief of Livius Venetu de Gatterburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WILEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. THYE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HILL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 27, approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BRICKER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 28, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to make a study of the problem of allocating television frequencies for use by educational institutions for the purpose of nonprofit educational programing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and appears under a separate heading.)

COMMISSION ON COOPERATIVE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is the same as a bill Representative MANSFIELD, of Montana, and I introduced at the last session of Congress. It provides for a Commission on Cooperative International Relations and for a study of the United States information and educational program and its expansion.

The bill (S. 731) to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CLAIMS FOR BASIC AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the provisions of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 751) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON TO ACCOMPANY BILL "TO CONFER JURISDICTION UPON THE COURT OF CLAIMS TO HEAR, DETERMINE, AND RENDER JUDGMENT UPON CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR BASIC AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION"

I have just introduced a bill to waive the 6-year statute of limitations with respect to certain claims of Government employees for overtime compensation. All of these claims arise under section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934, which provided a 40-hour week for wage-board employees of the Federal Government, and overtime at the rate of time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours a week.

The wage-board employees of the Federal Government are those engaged in the manual trades and occupations, such as carpenters, painters, electricians, and the like, whose pay is fixed by wage boards on the basis of rates prevailing in private industry. They do not include any employees who are under civil service, who are engaged in administrative or policy-making positions, or whose pay is otherwise fixed by statute. To obtain wage-board employees, the Government must compete with private industry, must also pay wages which are comparable with those paid in private industry, and must provide similar working conditions.

Throughout private industry, the 40-hour week and time and one-half for overtime have prevailed for many years. Accordingly, section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934, provided a 40-hour week and time and one-half for comparable wage-board employees of the Federal Government. The great majority of these employees have been paid on that basis ever since.

Unfortunately, a few isolated groups were mistakenly excluded from the benefits of section 23 by rulings of the Comptroller General. Among these were floating-equipment employees of the Panama Canal, and employees of the Alaska Railroad. In the *Townsley* case (101 C. Cls. 237; 323 U. S. 557), and the *Hearne* case (107 C. Cls. 335) the Panama workers established their right to the benefits of section 23.

During the first session of the last Congress, we enacted and the President approved Public Law 440, which waived the statute of limitations with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad. The test case, which will govern the claims of all employees of the Alaska Railroad, was recently decided by the Court of Claims, which held that these employees were likewise entitled to the benefits of section 23. Because of Public Law 440, all of these employees will now be able to recover the overtime compensation of which they were wrongfully deprived by an erroneous decision of the Comptroller General.

The only other large group of wage-board employees who were deprived of the benefits of section 23, of which we have definite knowledge, were the employees of the Alaska Road Commission. These employees are typical wage-board employees. However, they were deprived of the benefits provided under section 23 by administrative action. About 2 years ago one of these employees made demand on the Department of the Interior for overtime compensation under section 23, and the Solicitor of the Interior Department ruled that he was entitled to recover. Thereafter, several claimants filed claims with the Comptroller General, who

likewise ruled that they were entitled to the benefits of section 23. These claims were certified to Congress for appropriations. Apparently because of the pendency of the Alaska Railroad case, however, the House Committee on Appropriations refused to approve an appropriation to pay these claims, and advised the claimants to sue in the Court of Claims. The controlling statute of limitations gives the court jurisdiction to hear only claims which have accrued within 6 years of the date of filing in the court. Practically all of these claims accrued during the early thirties and were terminated by the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, which provided a 40-hour week and time and one-half for practically all Federal employees. The situation with respect to the Alaska Roads Commission employees, therefore, is as follows: Congress will not appropriate funds to pay claims approved by the Comptroller General, but recommends that the claimants sue in the Court of Claims; the Court of Claims cannot hear the claims because of the statute of limitations. It is manifest that here is an injustice, resulting from a procedural statute, which Congress should correct.

The bill I have introduced would correct that injustice. It would simply authorize the Court of Claims to hear these claims, and to award these employees the compensation to which they were clearly entitled. However, the merits of the claims would still have to be decided by the court, and my bill would not compel the court to adjudicate them in favor of the employees. It would simply provide them with their day in court.

Since Congress has already waived the statute with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad, there is certainly no sound reason why Congress should, by inaction, discriminate against the employees of the Alaska Road Commission.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "BASIC DATA RELATING TO ENERGY RESOURCES"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Basic Data Relating to Energy Resources," printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT TO THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TAFT to the Republican Club of the District of Columbia on January 29, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S POTENTIAL WATER POWER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Development of the Nation's Potential Water Power, delivered by him at the REA convention in Cleveland, Ohio, January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARTHY AT KANSAS DAY REPUBLICAN BANQUET

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McCARTHY at the annual Kansas Day Republican banquet, at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF THE NAVY IN WAR CRISIS—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by him before the annual meeting of the Norfolk-Portsmouth Chapter, American Institute of Banking, at the Monticello Hotel, Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, A Government of Laws and Not of Men, delivered by Senator SMITH of North Carolina before the Maryland State Bar Association, in Baltimore, Md., on January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

OBLIGATION OF AMERICANS TO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the obligation of Americans to America, delivered by former Senator Albert W. Hawkes on January 25, 1951, before the American Coalition of Patriotic and Civic Societies of the United States, at its annual meeting, in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAY OF JUSTICE THE ROAD TO PEACE—SERMON BY THE MOST REVEREND JOSEPH F. FLANNELLY, D. D., AUXILIARY BISHOP OF NEW YORK

[Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Senator McCARRAN) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the sermon delivered at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, at the Catholic University of America, on January 14, 1951, by the Most Reverend Joseph F. Flannelly, D. D., auxiliary bishop of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN STAKE INSIDE EUROPE—ARTICLE BY JOHN GUNTHER

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The American Stake Inside Europe," written by John Gunther, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRIMINALS WHO GET AWAY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Criminals Who Get Away," written by Donald P. Wilson, and published in the February 1951 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEWIS SCHWELLENBACH—ARTICLE BY HARRY J. MARTIN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Secretary," published in the Roosevelt American for December 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION AND MEDICAL CARE—LETTERS FROM HARLAN M. CALHOUN

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters from Judge Harlan M. Calhoun, of West Virginia, one having to do with inflation, the other with medical care, which appear in the Appendix.]

NORTHWEST POWER DEVELOPMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE IDAHO DAILY STATESMAN

[Mr. WELKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Governor Speaks for Idaho," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALE OF SURPLUS SHIPS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Selling the Ships," published in the New York Times of January 29, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIANS SEE PERIL IN RULE ON LAWYERS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Indians See Peril in Rule on Lawyers," written by Dorothy L. Pillsbury and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPAIN EXPECTS LARGER DEFENSE ROLE—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Spain Expects Larger Defense Role," published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GOVERNMENT LOBBY—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Powerful Lobby," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of January 25, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN TAX RATES—LETTER FROM OSCAR H. CURRY

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 15, 1951, relating to the proposed increase in income-tax rates, written to him by Oscar H. Curry, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Basis for Foreign Policy," published in the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF BOOK, THE PURSUIT OF PLENTY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, over the entire world unrest and wars are tied to the desire of hungry millions for food, clothing, and shelter.

Even inside our own country we are met on every side with shortages which imperil us in peace and in war. Solutions for this besetting problem are sought by scholars, statesmen, and public figures everywhere. The citizens of our own country are deeply concerned as to the future of the resources on which our prosperity depends.

Senators will, therefore, be particularly interested in a very recent study of this most basic of all problems, a book entitled "The Pursuit of Plenty," written by A. G. Mezerik, the author of The Revolt of the South and West, which did so much to clarify the problems of two of our great regions inside this country.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In The Pursuit of Plenty, Mr. Mezerik has produced a program as well as an analysis which, if adopted, would benefit all of us in the United States and indeed create the conditions for abundance and peace throughout the entire world.

Newspapers, fellow Senators, and leading figures in this country and abroad have already commended the book. My own great interest in the development of the Missouri Valley, which in Mr. Mezerik's mind is so important, has given the book special significance to me. The Pursuit of Plenty is well described in the review written by the eminent professor of economics at Harvard, Mr. Seymour Harris, which recently appeared in the Sunday New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this review be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURSUIT OF PLENTY: THE STORY OF MAN'S EXPANDING DOMAIN (BY A. G. MEZERIK; 203 PAGES; NEW YORK; HARPER & BROS.)

(By Seymour E. Harris)

This is an absorbing, instructive, important, and angry book. Having once opened it, few will find it possible to drop it or dismiss its message. The book is essentially a defense of the rights of the public against those of private interests which block the full development of our resources. In the author's view, we can have both 2,500,000,000 people in the world and a high standard of living.

Man is not outmoded. Research, planning, integration of programs, use of public funds to develop resources that must escape private exploiters——these are the paths to a fuller life for all the people. This is the answer to the Neo-Malthusians who seem to multiply now.

In the opinion of Mezerik, author of The Revolt of South and West, it is necessary to restrain despoilers and obstructionists: Timber barons who by cutting indiscriminately bring floods and erosion; corporations which introduce synthetic scarcities of oil and fertilizers; the utilities which block river development in order to maintain high prices for power; Army engineers who rely on dikes and levees and sandbags, thus corseting the river, instead of attacking the problem at its source (e. g., deforestation); professional economizers who prefer pollution of the air—smog—to purification.

The book is buttressed by facts of great interest which are not easily marshaled. Thus Texas, first in oil and gas, is forty-eighth in the control of pellagra (disease of malnutrition), thirty-eighth in public school systems, forty-seventh in public library systems.

The Missouri Valley development is the author's great interest. Here is an area of 500,000 square miles which contains 90 percent of the phosphate ore in the United States, or one-half the world's supply; a trillion tons of lignite in South Dakota alone (enough to cover the Nation's needs for 6,000 years); 400,000,000,000 tons of lignite and bituminous coal deposits in Montana, and 850,000,000 tons of manganese lining the Missouri River from Pierre, S. Dak., to the Nebraska border; one-half the Nation's wheat and rye and a large part of the livestock. Although power and water are required to maintain and develop this area, the Pick-Sloan plan proposes the development of but one-third of the 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours potential.

In his discussion of permanent (renewable) resources awaiting development, Mezerik is especially eloquent. He speaks of wood for sugar and algae of fresh and salt water for additional food; utilization of energy of the sun (the two-trillionth part our planet receives is worth about $2,000,000,000 a minute); synthesization of chlorophyll for plants; the great advances in using solar heat; desalting salt water.

Compare this volume with the statements of the opposition and make up your mind. We owe a great debt to Dewey Anderson, of the Public Affairs Institute, and James Patton, of the Farmers Union, and the Railroad Brotherhood for sponsoring this rich volume.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks in the body of the RECORD a letter dated January 20, 1951, which my colleague from California [Mr. NIXON] and I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, relative to Senate bill 75, dealing with the so-called central Arizona project. The letter requests that certain questions annexed to it be answered. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter written on the same day by my colleague and me to Mr. Frederick J. Lawton, Director, Bureau of the Budget, raising certain questions.

I may say, Mr. President, for the information of the Senate that the bill dealing with this project, the cost of which will run well over $700,000,000 and perhaps over $1,000,000,000, was, as I understand, ordered reported on yesterday or the day before by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without a hearing.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1951.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are informed that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has requested you to submit a report on the bill S. 75, Eighty-second Congress, first session, which was introduced by Senator MCFARLAND on January 8, 1951, and referred to the committee.

Although differing in some respects, the bill above referred to is substantially the same as a bill, S. 75, which was passed by the Senate on February 21, 1950. It would authorize the so-called Central Arizona project.

The only report on this proposed Central Arizona project by the Department of the Interior is that submitted to the Congress on September 16, 1948 (Project Planning Report No. 3-8b, 4-2, dated December 1947), which was subsequently printed in part in House Document No. 136, Eighty-first Congress, first session. The bill S. 75 now pending and referred to you for report would authorize a project which is different in certain important respects from that presented in the Department's report above referred to.

The reports which you have heretofore submitted on the bill S. 75 pursuant to previous requests, viz: Letter of March 18, 1949, to chairman of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and letter of April 20, 1950, to chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, have not presented any facts and figures on the project which the bill would authorize under the terms provided therein. The result is that neither the committee nor the Congress, in considering this legislation, have had the benefit of a feasibility report by the Secretary of the Interior on the project which the bill S. 75 would authorize.

Attached hereto is a list of questions with respect to the proposed central Arizona project. It is respectfully suggested that answers to these questions be incorporated in your report on S. 75, Eighty-second Congress, first session. It is requested in any case that you furnish us with specific answers to the questions sufficiently in advance to the Senate hearings so that we will be fully prepared to discuss the problem before the committee.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
RICHARD M. NIXON.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATORS KNOWLAND AND NIXON TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR WITH RESPECT TO CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT AS PROPOSED TO BE AUTHORIZED BY SENATE BILL 75, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (ACCOMPANYING LETTER OF JANUARY 20, 1951)

1. (a) What features, works, and facilities would be authorized by the bill S. 75, and in what particulars do these differ from those proposed in the Department's report on the central Arizona project (H. Doc. 136, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)? (Specify and describe all features.)

(b) What specific works and facilities would be authorized under the general authorizations provided in the bill, including page 2, lines 12 and 13, and lines 19 to 21, inclusive, and on page 3, lines 5 to 11, inclusive?

2. What are the estimated construction costs (at current prices) of the entire project and the individual units thereof that would be authorized by S. 75?

3. What are the estimated annual costs (at current prices) of operation, maintenance, and reserve for replacement (by units and in total)?

4. What are the estimated allocations of construction costs and of annual costs (by units and functions)?

5. What are the amounts of power output and water supply that would be furnished by the project (by units)?

6. What are the estimated revenues of the project, separately for power, irrigation, municipal water supply, or other sources, and the bases and derivation thereof?

7. What are the financial aspects as to repayment ability of the project? (Please furnish detailed financial analyses.)

8. In the hearings on S. 75 (81st Cong., 1st sess.) before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator MCFARLAND made the following statement (printed hearing, p. 35):

"According to the report, if this water supply is made available for the project, 73,500 of the 105,790 acres formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of irrigation, can be irrigated. In addition to this amount, as shown in table B-5 of the report, it would be possible to sustain irrigation of an additional 152,520 acres which would otherwise have to be retired from irrigation. This would mean a total of 226,020 acres, which would otherwise be compelled to remain forever idle, could be maintained in production by this project."

(a) Does Senator MCFARLAND'S statement correctly and accurately summarize the statements and figures appearing in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation (Project Planning Report No. 3-8b, 4-2, dated December 1947) on the central Arizona project, including tables B-5, B-23, and B-24 and pertinent statements in the text?

(b) Based upon the Bureau's estimates, what is the construction cost of the central Arizona project allocated to irrigation, per acre, on the 226,000 acres of land that would be maintained in production by the project?

9. In accordance with the statements and figures submitted in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the central Arizona project, viz, pages C–41 and C–48 of the appendix of the report (not printed) and page 140 of House Document 136 (81st Cong., 1st sess.), what is the reasonable value of general crop farming land in the project area with a full irrigation supply?

10. Based upon the figures set forth in the Bureau's report on the Central Arizona project, which show (table B–24 and p. B–85, appendixes) that water would be made available by the project for the irrigation of 73,000 acres of lands formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of water, in the amount of 418,000 acre-feet, or about 39 percent of a total of 1,070,000 acre-feet a year that would be furnished by the project for irrigation, what is the amount of the project construction cost allocated to irrigation that is attributable to the 73,000 acres, and the corresponding cost per acre?

11. What part of the construction cost allocated to irrigation is to be paid by the irrigators?

12. How much of the construction cost is to be repaid from revenues from sale of commercial power?

13. How much of the cost allocated to irrigation features is to be repaid by the use of the interest component on cost of power features?

14. Under section 5 of the bill, would the same rate for irrigation water be charged to areas now possessing distribution systems as to those areas for which distribution systems must be constructed, or would the farmers for whom distribution systems would be constructed have to pay an additional charge over the $4.75 rate per acre-foot shown in the Secretary's report on the project?

15. Does S. 75 provide for repayment by the farmers of the construction cost of distribution and drainage system under repayment contracts as required by the reclamation law?

16. What is the estimated construction cost, and the annual cost (including amortization, annual carrying charges, operation, maintenance, and replacement reserve and all other costs) in total and per kilowatt-hour, for the power to be used for project pumping delivered at pumping plants?

17. What is the commercial value of the power to be used for project pumping?

18. How is the power to be used for project pumping to be financed or paid for?

19. Without upstream storage for river regulation and sediment control, what is the estimated useful life of the Bridge Canyon Reservoir and power plant?

20. What would be the annual firm power output of Bridge Canyon Power plant, without use of any downstream capacity to firm up Bridge output, and without upstream reservoir storage in operation for river regulation and sediment control?

21. What would be the annual firm power output of the Bridge Canyon Power plant with Glen Canyon Reservoir, as currently proposed, constructed, and in operation?

22. In view of the Secretary's statement that no sediment should be allowed to enter Bridge Canyon Reservoir that can be prevented, and of the recognized dependence of Bridge Canyon Power development upon Glen Canyon Reservoir for sediment control as well as necessary river regulation, should not Glen Canyon Reservoir be constructed and placed in operation concurrently with the Bridge Canyon Dam and power plant?

23. Will you please submit a financial analysis of the irrigation, power, and other features of the project that would be authorized by S. 75, conforming to the recommendations in the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission?

24. Will you please state the amendments to S. 75 which would be required to bring it into conformity with the recommendations of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission?

JANUARY 20, 1951.

Mr. FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAWTON: On January 8, 1951, a bill, S. 75 (82d Cong., 1st sess.), was introduced in the Senate, which would authorize the so-called Central Arizona project. This is substantially the same as the bill, S. 75, which at last year's session of Congress passed the Senate but failed to receive favorable action in the House Public Lands Committee.

We are informed that the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has requested the Secretary of the Interior for a report on this bill. It is presumed that the Secretary's report, before transmittal, will be referred to you for consideration and comment.

The most recent communication of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to S. 75 and the Central Arizona project appears to be your letter of April 19, 1950, to the chairman of the House Public Lands Committee. In that letter, you state:

"The Budget Director has commented on the Central Arizona project in previous letters: To the Secretary of the Interior, on February 4, 1949; to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on February 11, 1949; and to the Secretary of the Interior, on April 20, 1949. Copies of these letters are attached for convenient reference. These letters raised two main questions about the project.

"The first question raised was whether there is enough water in the Colorado River, available for use in Arizona, to satisfy the needs of this project on a permanent basis. The President has stated many times that he would like to see a definitive settlement of the rights of the various States to waters of the Colorado River system, in order that decisions on projects to be developed in the public interest may be made on a firm basis with respect to water rights. The President consistently has indicated his unwillingness to take any position favorable to authorization of the Central Arizona project until settlement of the water-rights controversy has been brought about.

"S. 75, in its present form, is intended to provide one means by which this controversy might be settled. I am unable to express to the committee at this time any views concerning the efficacy of the bill for this purpose.

"The second question raised in the previous letters of the Budget Director, particularly the letter of February 4, 1949, related to the economic feasibility of the project as outlined in the report of the Secretary of the Interior.

"S. 75, as passed by the Senate, would authorize a project which is different in certain respects from that outlined in the Secretary of the Interior's report on the central Arizona project. The bill provides for a tunnel and canal between Bridge Canyon and Cunningham Wash, and emits authorization for construction of a dam at the bluff site on the San Juan River. It omits certain nonreimbursable cost allocations. Taking these changes into account, the comments on economic feasibility made in the previous letters of the Budget Director still apply to the project which would be authorized by S. 75."

The Budget Director's letter of February 4, 1949, contains the following statement:

"From an examination of the report, of the comments of the affected States, and of the remarks of other interested Federal agencies, it is apparent that there are a number of important questions and unresolved issues connected with the proposed central Arizona project. The provision of adequate water supply, if found to be available, is admittedly a high-cost venture which is justified in the report essentially on the basis of an urgent need to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Even so, the life of certain major parts of the project is appreciably less than the recommended 78-year pay-out period. The work could be authorized only with a modification of existing law or as an exception thereto. Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the 'extremely important element' of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes.

"The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy."

It would be greatly appreciated if you would inform us whether the views of the Bureau of the Budget, as expressed in the foregoing, still apply to the project proposed to be authorized by the pending bill, S. 75.

In your letter of April 19, 1950, to the chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, you also refer to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and the president's position in his budget message to the Congress in January 1950 as affecting authorization of projects involving basic policy questions. Will you please advise us whether, in your opinion, the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission changes the views of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to economic feasibility of the central Arizona project as proposed to be authorized by S. 75 (82d Cong., 1st sess.).

There is enclosed a copy of our letter to the Secretary of the Interior, stating several questions with respect to this project. We suggest that the subject matter of these questions be covered in the Department's report on S. 75. Whether that is done or not, we request that the Secretary furnish us with specific answers to these questions. It would seem appropriate that his reply be routed through the Bureau of the Budget, in view of the previous connection of your office with this problem.

You will note that some of our questions are intended to bring about a presentation of the project which accords with the recommendations of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. Consideration of S. 75 by the Congress would appear to be premature until the recommendations of that Commission can be translated into legislative proposals and the policy questions determined on a Nation-wide basis instead of by piecemeal project legislation, as was so well pointed out in the President's budget message of a year ago.

We would appreciate an early reply to our letter so that we will be fully prepared to discuss the problem before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
RICHARD M. NIXON.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, at the point where appear the prior insertions made by me today in regard to the

central Arizona project, a copy of a letter which I addressed so the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, enclosing copies of correspondence which my colleague the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and I addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to Senate bill 75. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the same point in the RECORD a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, passed by the Legislature of the State of California, in regard to this matter.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am enclosing copies of correspondence which Senator NIXON and I have directed to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to S. 75.

I would appreciate it if the committee would withhold scheduling hearings on this bill until replies to the attached correspondence are received and Senator NIXON and I have had the opportunity to study the answers. As you know, California and Nevada feel that a Supreme Court decision should be rendered, interpreting certain of the basic documents affecting the Colorado River, before Congress takes any action to authorize a project which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and where the question of water rights of all of the parties concerned are not crystal clear.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relating to the central Arizona project

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill which would authorize construction of the central Arizona reclamation project; and

Whereas no provision is made for payment by the project of any part of the interest on the national debt, which would be incurred to construct the project; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has reported that he estimates the cost of the project at $708,000,000 and the time for the recovery of the principal at 75 years and, therefore, that the project would cost the taxpayers of the United States for interest alone, at 2½ percent per annum, in excess of $2,000,000,000; and

Whereas the taxpayers of California would be required to pay in excess of $172,000,000 of such interest; and

Whereas the central Arizona project is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost to grow common field crops, with the result that additional taxes would be required to pay Government subsidies on such crops and such project would not, therefore, enhance the national welfare; and

Whereas the central Arizona project would require the use of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually (the equivalent to the use of 2,500,000 barrels of fuel oil) to pump irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet, and such use would be an economic waste of an urgently needed public resource; and

Whereas the construction cost of the irrigation features of the project alone would be many times the value of the land, when irrigated and the irrigators would not repay any part of such construction cost; and

Whereas such central Arizona project is, therefore, economically unsound; and

Whereas sufficient water for such central Arizona project could be secured only by diverting to that project water now needed to serve authorized and existing projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River; and

Whereas the diversion of water from such existing projects would jeopardize the water supply of over 4,000,000 residents of California, who, in reliance on their contracts for water executed by the United States Government, have invested more than $500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of water and power from the Colorado River; and

Whereas the rights of California to the use of Colorado River water have been established by prior appropriations and by contracts with the Secretary of the Interior under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Secretary of the Interior has declared that "If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse passage of any bill authorizing the central Arizona project as proposed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation consenting to the joinder of the United States in an interstate suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the water rights of the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River; and be it further

Resolved, That the Colorado River Board of California and all other agencies and officers of the State of California are directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to the chairmen of appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

CONTRIBUTION OF KANSAS TO LEADERSHIP OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today Members of the Senate had an opportunity to get first-hand information regarding the European situation from a former Kansan, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. General Eisenhower is not only a great soldier, a great diplomat and statesman, but he is also an outstanding educator.

The State of Kansas is proud to have been able to furnish recently Presidents for three leading universities of our Nation. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower is president of Columbia University; Dr. Milton Eisenhower is president of Penn State, and last week Cornell University came to Kansas and selected the chancelor of Kansas University, Deane Mallot, for president of their great school.

I think, also, I should mention that these three outstanding presidents were reared in the same city, Abilene, Kans.

It is only natural that we in Kansas regret to see these outstanding men leave our State, but we are proud that we as a State are able to give the Nation this type of leadership.

Columbia University, Penn State, and Cornell are to be congratulated on the wisdom shown in selecting such clear-thinking men, with high principles based on a sound spiritual background. In Kansas we produce this type of leadership.

The rugged pioneers of New England who settled in Kansas helped to give our State a great heritage of indomitable faith. The free open spaces filled with the Kansas ozone still produce such rugged individuals.

We Kansans are proud to have been able to preserve through these many years the culture and leadership of the New England fathers.

Now we are honored to send back to this same section of the country men who will revitalize and reemphasize those principles which will keep this Nation a land of free men with vision, courage, and character.

IMPROVEMENT IN GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING—STATEMENT BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT, AND THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the most vital requirements for the future administration of the Federal Government, if it is to cope successfully with all the vast problems confronting it, is an improvement in the handling of its finances.

It is a pleasure to report that great progress has been made on one front in this field, under a joint program of the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget to improve accounting in the Federal Government.

A joint statement detailing some of the progress already made in this respect is contained in the attached statement, which I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, and Budget Director Frederick J. Lawton, meeting today, discussed major accomplishments under their joint program to improve the Government's accounting. Policies and objectives of the program, carried on since December 1947, are embodied in the new Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. The officials said this act authorizes the most fundamental kind of improvements in the Government's budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, and auditing. The President cited it as the most important legislation in the budget and accounting field since the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

Accounting improvement and red-tape cutting under the program have been greatly accelerated by this and other legislation, such as the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950. Mr. Warren called attention to abolition of GAO's Accounting and Bookkeeping Division last month, with an annual saving of nearly $1,000,000 in GAO alone. The Postal Accounts Division of GAO was abolished last November 15, and its accounting work for the Post Office Department turned over to the Department. "The GAO should never have been given those duties in the first place," said Mr. Warren. He has set up a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Postal Audit Division to audit the Department. Review of GAO's organization and operations is continuing in the light of the joint program and the new accounting law.

Mr. Warren stated that he and Mr. Snyder had issued their first joint regulation under the new accounting act. It simplifies accounting for repayments to appropriations, eliminating warrants previously issued by the Treasury and countersigned by GAO. This not only saves paper work but avoids weeks of delay in making collections available for disbursement. All other phases of the warrant system are under examination for possible simplification.

Mr. Warren emphasized expansion of comprehensive on-the-site GAO audits with broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington. He named 16 agencies, in addition to Government corporations, for which comprehensive audits have been undertaken. These are in addition to hundreds of other on-the-site audits of vouchers and other fiscal documents. The central receipt and appropriation accounts of the Government, under recent arrangements, are being audited where the accounts are maintained in the Treasury Department.

Mr. Snyder stated the Treasury Department and the GAO are collaborating in a top-to-bottom review of Treasury accounting. This is aimed at providing the Department with the best possible system of accounting and internal control and means of producing central financial reports for the Government as required by the new accounting law. Agreement on the underlying principles is an important factor in consistency, proper disclosure, and increased understandability and usefulness of these reports.

Mr. Lawton stated that Budget-Treasury regulations dealing with apportionments and status reports on each appropriation have been completely revised.

Duplication and conflicts in reporting have been eliminated by revision of this regulation and related GAO requirements. He announced virtual completion of a joint review of agency budgeting and accounting practices undertaken at the request of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He also pointed out that through accounting improvements better financial information is becoming available for evaluating budget estimates and appraising performance under agency programs.

The three officials stressed that the key to lasting improvement is the cooperative work being done with all Federal agencies in improving their accounting. A report of results to date cites "truly remarkable progress" in work with 40 agencies or major subdivisions. Numerous examples of improvements are listed, including reductions in accounting costs. For the first time in law each agency is now responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate systems of accounting and internal control for its own operations.

Mr. Warren, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. Lawton cautioned, however, that the greatest value of the program lies not so much in economizing in accounting itself as in contributing to more efficient and economical management through better accounting results. They summed up progress under the program in this statement: "The improvements in accounting in individual agencies and in the Government as a whole being achieved under the joint program are basic to the President's program for the improvement of management in the executive branch. Likewise, progress under the program is providing a basis for improvement in service to the Congress by establishing a generally more reliable foundation of financial information for legislative action and an improved structure for control of the public funds."

REPORTS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement regarding reports issued by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures today suggested combined action by the National Security Resources Board, the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress to conserve the use of civilian manpower by the Federal Government.

In support of this proposal the report, entitled "Federal Civilian Employment, 1950," presents facts and figures, including hitherto unavailable breakdown of Federal personnel by localities and agencies, with the following conclusions:

1. A post-World War II plateau of Federal civilian employment numbering nearly 2,000,000, with duty stations in every county of the Nation except one (Armstrong County, S. Dak.), has now become the base for post-Korean outbreak increases which, by the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year 1951 (September 1950, 90 days after Korea), were averaging more than 1,000 a day.

Unless there is a checkrein requirement for more efficient use of manpower in the Federal Government, efforts will be made by executive branch agencies to accelerate this rate of civilian employment increase for the foreseeable future. (Estimates cited by Civil Service Commissioner Frances Perkins in speech prepared for delivery October 19, 1950, at Roosevelt College, Chicago.)

Semi-war-economy demands for industrial production and the preparedness build-up requirements for Armed Forces, already have resulted in official indications that the bottom of the manpower barrel is in sight. (Statement on employment by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, November 3, 1950.)

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND COSTS

2. Original budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 (beginning last July 1) were based on calculations that Federal civilian payrolls for the current year would cost $6,700,000,000, but by the end of the first quarter in September they were running at an annual rate of approximately $7,500,000,000.

By the end of the current fiscal year, next June 30, the Federal payrolls, reflecting pay increases since 1945, will be running at an annual rate in excess of the World War II peak of $8,300,000,000. If World War II peak civilian employment were reached by the Federal Government, payrolls in the executive branch would cost $13,000,000,000.

FEDERAL MANPOWER AND SECURITY

3. Congress, in the National Security Act of 1947, anticipated the recurrence of need for conservation and coordination to meet civilian and military requirements under military emergency and war economy conditions and establish the National Security Resources Board with this as its primary concern.

It is fundamental to the purpose of the National Security Resources Board that it be informed as to the military requirements. Under current and foreseeable conditions, the Board is concerned with civilian manpower—its potential supply and the potential requirement for it; its most effective mobilization and its maximum utilization.

Under current and foreseeable conditions, the Board is concerned with Federal departments and agencies—with unifying their activities pertaining to production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products.

Under current and foreseeable conditions, the Board is concerned with the civilian economy—its adjustment to war needs and conditions.

In brief, the National Security Resources Board, under the law and under current and foreseeable conditions, must be cognizant of the requirements for the most efficient use of manpower, adjustment of the civilian economy, and the principal activities of the Federal Government for which civilian employment is used; and therefore it should be the most competent agency to determine the need and justification for increased Federal civilian employment and its relative priority.

FEDERAL MANPOWER AND EFFICIENCY

4. Close surveillance over the activities, proposals, and practices of Federal departments and agencies with respect to the matters which are of concern to the National Security Resources Board should be an effective and constructive approach to determining what is currently essential, to the registration of changed or changing conditions, to stimulating efficiency in operations, and to signifying other developments.

The findings of the National Security Resources Board in connection with activities, proposals, and practices of Federal departments and agencies should be additional evidence on which the Director of the Budget, under the Appropriations Act recently passed, could act to reduce expenditures whenever possible through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, and other developments.

This would be in the interest of national security at any time, but it would be especially desirable when the solvency of the Nation is the object of sinister attack by its potential, if not actual, military adversary.

The purpose of the report is to be helpful to legislative committees of Congress and agencies of the executive branch which, in the current semi-war-economy and preparedness build-up, are concerned with vigilance against nonessential Federal civilian employment and the conservation of the Nation's manpower through most effective use and distribution to assure the required armed force and vital industrial production.

Facts developed by the report are in three parts: (1) Pre-Korea, (2) Post-Korea, and (3) In prospect.

Pre-Korea facts show Federal civilian employment in the period just prior to the outbreak in Korea by (a) over-all coverage; (b) post-World War II low; (c) assignment inside and outside continental United States; (d) category, distinguishing between those employed for industrial-type work and those employed for clerical, professional, and other nonindustrial work; and (e) spread throughout the country—areas of concentration, degree of dispersal, and extent to which various agencies and departments were decentralized or engaged in field activities—and by payroll costs.

Post-Korea facts show increases in Federal civilian employment by major groups and categories as of September 1950—90 days after the outbreak in Korea— and increase in payroll costs as of the same date.

In-prospect facts show (a) an estimate of Federal employment increases in prospect incident to the current semi-war-economy and preparedness policies and programs and others; (b) an official estimate of the manpower situation; (c) a calculation of Federal civilian payroll costs in terms of prospective increases; and (d) statutes already enacted and administrative interpretations already made which could be invoked as measures for more efficient use of manpower by the Federal Government, and its conservation

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

through maximum productive utilization, with reduction in cost.

In the course of developing the pre-Korea facts the report for the first time compiled reports by Federal agencies on their civilian employment in all of the localities of the Nation. These figures were officially reported by the various agencies of the Government, but in many instances the information was not available at the departmental level in Washington. Under the circumstances, latest available reports were accepted from the field to save money and time. While the locality figures do not add to a firm total due to variations in reporting dates, they may be regarded as guides to employment density during the period immediately preceding the Korean outbreak.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is composed of Members of the House and Senate appropriations and tax committees from the legislative branch, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget representing revenue and spending agencies of the executive branch. In individual views the representatives of the executive branch concurred in the facts presented in the report, but declined to concur in the recommendations.

A report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures today called for complete and regular reports of all real property owned and occupied by executive branch departments and agencies to centralized government-wide records, and for control and allocation of office space, at least in emergencies, by a single agency.

The purpose of the report, entitled "Federal Office Space 1950" is to be "helpful to committees of Congress and departments and agencies of the executive branch, which, in the current semi-war-economy and preparedness build-up, are concerned with the conservation of office and related-use space and its cost through maximum utilization and effective distribution."

Facts and findings contained in the report, indicating the level and expanse to which Federal agencies occupied office and related-use space prior to the outbreak in Korea; indicating Federal rent and utilities costs; and pointing up the fact that this post-World-War II plateau has now become the base from which increases are rising in response to the new demands, may be summarized as follows:

1. Executive branch departments and agencies of the Federal Government before the outbreak in Korea were occupying at least a quarter of a billion square feet of office and related-use space spread out through virtually every community in continental United States.

2. The area of office space reported to centralized Government-wide records before the impact of the outbreak in Korea would average more than the office space area of an Empire State Building for each State. And more space was excluded from the centralized Government-wide records of the General Services Administration than was reported to them—the result of major exceptions made in Reorganization Plan 18 of July 1, 1950, providing for centralization of Federal space records and control.

3. As the second quarter of fiscal year 1951 began, 90 days after the outbreak in Korea, the General Services Administration was finding difficulty in supplying demands which had already developed at that time. In the face of increasing demands for office and related-use space under the current semi-war economy and preparedness build-up policies and programs, the General Services Administration, as of November 1950, found space in federally owned buildings outside of Washington to be practically nonexistent; that good privately owned space with few exceptions was not to be had in any large or moderate-sized cities, and that practically all space in first-class office buildings under construction has been spoken for by private interests.

4. Prices for rent were found to be mounting with no sign of leveling off.

5. Information on the cost of rents and utilities for the Federal Government on a centralized Government-wide basis was just as inadequate as it was for the office and related-use space itself, but apparently the Government before the outbreak in Korea was spending more than $100,000,000 for rent—office space and otherwise—and utilities, exclusive of $90,000,000 in Military Establishment expenditures for these items.

6. Even under ordinary conditions, and especially under emergency and preparation for emergency conditions, centralization of records and control of office and related-use space is inadequate to assume conservation through allocation on the basis of need, requirement of efficient use, or economy in acquisition and maintenance.

FEDERAL SPACE BY METROPOLITAN AREAS

Facts developed by the report were in three parts: (1) "Pre-Korea," (2) "Post-Korea," and (3) "In Prospect."

In developing the pre-Korea facts the report presents a breakdown by metropolitan areas all over the United States insofar as possible from centralized Government-wide records. However inadequate information precluded such a breakdown of space occupied by Federal agencies on military reservations, special purpose reservations such as veterans' facilities, scientific laboratories, etc., and much of the space occupied by the post office.

Post-Korea facts developed by the report indicate: (1) The supply and demand situation with respect to acquisition of additional space for office and related purposes as of November 1950; (2) the cost situation with respect to property being rented by the Federal Government as of the same date; and (3) the increased level of Federal civilian employment as of the beginning of the second quarter of fiscal year 1951 (October 1950) 3 months after the outbreak in Korea.

In prospect facts developed by the report indicate: (1) The probable increase in demands for office and related use space incident to the current semiwar-economy and preparedness policies and programs, as well as other policies and programs; (2) the rising cost of rentals to the Federal Government; and (3) the rising level of Federal employment, which in some measure is related to requirements for office and related-use space.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is composed of members of the House and Senate appropriations and tax committees from the legislative branch, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget representing revenue and spending agencies in the executive branch. In individual views the Secretary of the Treasury concurred in the facts presented in the report, but declined to concur in the recommendations. The Director of the Budget concurred in the facts and found the recommendations to be sound. In a letter expressing additional views General Services Administrator Jess Larson went further than the report to advocate centralized control and allocation of space at all times rather than in emergency periods only.

A VOLUNTEER FREEDOM ARMY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to comment on the proposal which has been made for establishing a volunteer freedom army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is my hope that our State Department and our Defense Department will give serious consideration to two bills introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and six of his colleagues to utilize foreign anti-Communist volunteers in the building of our defensive army in Western Europe. One of them is simply a modification of the existing law which I supported when it was passed. It extends the program from the present terminal date of 1953 to 1955 and increases the authorized ceiling from 2,500 to 25,000 men. That group will be very carefully selected men competent to be officers and noncommissioned officers and after 5 years of honorable service in our army abroad will be eligible for American citizenship. Members of that group can be used in any assignment designed to promote the best interests of the United States.

The second bill authorizes the creation of a volunteer freedom group of 250,000 men. They will be recruited for wartime service only and perhaps for use in Europe only. They would not have the same privileges of pay or status as those in the first bill. When it is recalled that a private in the French Army is paid about 3 cents a day and the pay in all European armies is notoriously low, the tremendous savings to us in the recruiting of the proposed volunteer freedom corps of 250,000 men is apparent. In fact, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] proposes that the limit be fixed at a million men. Many believe that more than a million volunteers could be secured from the satellite countries.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he introduced these two bills stated:

> One vital element of the struggle for existence in which we are now engaged relates to the question of who does the fighting. It is made especially acute by the fact that our opponent fights without expending his own manpower. We Americans, on the other hand, have been required to shed the blood of our own young manhood in order to combat those who fight at our opponent's bidding. One of the most urgent questions of our time is therefore: How long we can tolerate an arrangement in which we, in terms of manpower, can never win, and they, in the same terms, can never lose?

Of course, it must not be assumed that the adoption of the above plan would relieve us of the necessity of training our own boys, but I am firmly convinced that in a joint effort to defend the freedom of democratic nations our major contribution should be a powerful Navy, a powerful Air Force, and a productive capacity which we know cannot be met by the Soviets even though they control some 800,000,000 people of the world. In terms of material things we are by far the richest people in the world but our greatest treasure is our manpower.

VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS AND THE DRAFT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, Soviet use of satellite troops and the impend-

ing presentation of the bill for compulsory military service and training are two events which have brought the matter of enlisting aliens in the United States Army once again to the fore.

I have received many queries from Senators and others in the past few weeks reflecting their keen interest in this subject. It is pertinent, therefore, to give a review of the history of this topic and give a clear idea as to just what results can and what results cannot be expected to flow from it.

The first legislation proposed on this subject since World War II was the bill which I proposed in November 1947 authorizing the enlistment of aliens in the United States Army. The Senate, by a vote of 43 to 33, incorporated this proposal as an amendment to the 1948 Selective Service Act, but it was dropped in conference. In August 1949 the Senate again approved a similar bill authorizing the enlistment of 25,000 aliens, providing eligibility for American ctizenship at the end of a 5-year enlistment. These men were to be very carefully selected and would be, it was hoped, material for noncommissioned and commissioned officers. It was the plan to take these young men and train them as artillerymen, tankmen, and infantrymen so that with their professional knowledge, and their knowledge of languages and customs, they would be able to integrate and regiment the mass of stateless anti-Communist young men in the event of war. The figure in this Senate-approved bill was reduced by the House to 2,500 from 25,000 and last June 1950 it was signed by the President.

This proposal was always completely nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The cosponsor with me was Representative PHILIP PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, a Democrat, and the bill was signed by the President. It was strongly supported by the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Collins, who appeared before both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees to testify for it.

On January 8, at this session of the Eighty-second Congress, a group of Senators from both parties, including the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and myself, introduced two bills. The first is S. 239, which would expand the category under the Lodge-Philbin Act from 2,500 to 25,000 men. This same group also sponsored another bill, S. 238, which would set up a Volunteer Freedom Corps of 250,000 men, to be enlisted abroad, to train abroad, to serve abroad, and to be discharged abroad, whose enlistment would be for only 2 years, and who would not have the citizen privilege, except by being selected for inclusion in the first category under the Lodge-Philbin Act. Of course, in that event they would have the citizen privilege. The men who would be selected for the Volunteer Freedom Corps obviously would be more hastily enlisted and could not be so carefully screened.

On January 22 the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced a bill, S. 609, which is identical in language with many parts of the bills introduced by our group of Senators on January 8. However, differences do exist, and the provisions of the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado do not seem so good or so satisfactory as those in the bill which the group of Senators, mentioned by me, have sponsored. I should like to point out some of the differences. The principal differences between our bill and that of the Senator from Colorado are as follows:

First. The Johnson bill provides for 1,000,000 men, all in one category. Our proposal, based upon the existing authorization of 2,500 men, would expand the officer category to 25,000, and would have a Volunteer Freedom Corps, serving only abroad, without citizenship privileges, and a 2-year enlistment of 250,000 men. We do not propose the figure of 250,000 because we think there are only 250,000 eligible men. We think there are 2,000,000 anti-Communist stateless young men in Europe. However, we do not provide for a milion, or 2,000,000, because the administration has not yet been able to take in even the 2,500 which the law now permits, apparently due to some doubt concerning the effect of the McCarran Act on the Lodge-Philbin Act. Moreover, there is no point in having a huge unorganized and unassimilated mass of young men, which would inevitably result if we did not first create the officer leadership.

In World War II the German Army, and this is an interesting and little-known chapter of World War II, had the services of a very able anti-Communist Russian general, General Vlasov. There were several million anti-Communist Russians available for service in the German Army, but General Vlasov could take only a small number of them because there was not a sufficient number of qualified German officers available to integrate and organize them.

Another reason for not enlisting more than 250,000 men in the United States Army is that there is a real psychological value in having many of these young men join the proposed European army. The reason for having 250,000 in the United States Army as soon as possible is that the United States Army is very much a going concern, whereas the European army, as distinct from the Atlantic army, is still only on paper. It should be possible, however, by next year to have a European army which was sufficiently well established to take many of these young men, and this might be more in accord with the long-range interests of the United States.

Second. The legislation proposed by us sets no limit on nationality. It is based on the principle that the United States should be enabled to accept the services of any anti-Communist young man, whether he is a Chinese Nationalist or a Chinese guerrilla in the Far East, or whether he is an anti-Communist stateless Slav in Europe. We do not care what his nationality is provided he meets the other requirements. The bill of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], on the other hand, is limited to Germans, Poles, and Czechs.

The provision with respect to the Germans is of particular interest. I understand that it is not practical because there is pending a revision of the German penal code which would make it a penal offense to solicit a German to join a foreign army. Certainly, the Germans have made it very clear, and the news coming from Europe has made it very clear, that in the building of the Atlantic army the Germans must be taken in on the basis of equality. General Eisenhower this morning called it "earned equality," and he said he did not want to have any unwilling soldiers in his command. This principle has been accepted even by nations which have had a very unhappy relationship with the Germans. The Germans would regard a proposal to put them into a foreign army as an attempt to make second-class citizens of them. There seems to be no doubt that good results cannot be obtained from the Germans on any basis other than that of equality. To do otherwise would bring about the exact type of resistance which we are now trying to overcome.

The limitation in the Johnson bill to only three nationalities also very drastically restricts its use as a possible vehicle for setting up an underground among satellite nations. Certainly one vital purpose of this type of legislation is to afford encouragement and help to all those who are now yearning for freedom and to assist the democratic element behind the iron curtain.

Our bill does not look to a military contribution only. The young men could make a very effective political contribution. To limit the bill to the three nationalities proposed in the Johnson bill would very much restrict the opportunity for accomplishment of such a purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I presume it would be appropriate to incorporate in the Senator's remarks at this point the report of General Eisenhower to the effect that the question of equality for Germans should be considered as vital. Such consideration certainly is not contemplated in the Johnson proposal, for it would seem to prescribe a very definite limitation in that respect.

Mr. LODGE. I think the able Senator from Maine is entirely right. He has put his finger on what I regard as an important weakness in the Johnson bill.

Third. The age limit in both bills is the same.

Fourth. Our bill provides for single men with no dependents but the bill of the Senator from Colorado authorizes married men and dependents which I think adds a great many needless complications. The provisions for single men was not in my original bill in the Eightieth Congress. It was inserted by the Senate Armed Services Committee in the last Congress, after careful consideration, for reasons which I thought were sound.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Fifth. The prize of citizenship in our bill is only for a highly selected group, including transferees from the Volunteer Freedom Corps to this more special class. Under the bill of the Senator from Colorado it is for all, including their families. The bill of the Senator from Colorado, on the other hand, provides that no one shall be enlisted "until it has been determined after careful investigation that such persons will render loyal service to the United States, and will not constitute a questionable risk from the standpoint of national security."

This provision seems to me effectively to nullify the Johnson bill. We could not hope to enlist a large number of troops abroad if we had to first make a careful screening of every individual. Even the United States Army does not make a security check on every man in the Army, for the very simple reason that such a task would be impossible. Yet, certainly, a person should not be admitted to citizenship without a careful screening. The proper course is to screen those in the first category, whom we hope to make into noncommissioned and commissioned officers, and to whom we intend to give citizenship. At the same time we should give an opportunity to the outstanding young men in the other class to get into the first, or top, group. Then we should set up the relatively unscreened mass of the Voluntary Freedom Corps abroad, and keep it abroad.

Sixth. The enlistment period in our bill is for 5 years for the officer group, and 2 years for the Volunteer Freedom Corps, whereas in the Johnson bill there is only one classification, and it is for 5 years for everyone.

Seventh. Our bill requires the concurrence of the State Department, whereas the Johnson bill does not contain such requirement for the enlistment program. Obviously it would be necessary to have the cooperation of the State Department, because there could be no greater interference with the foreign policy of a sovereign state than to start enlisting its manpower in our Army. Large questions of foreign policy are involved. It would be impossible to do what we propose to do without the cooperation of the State Department. In fairness it should be stated that delay in the administration of the Lodge-Philbin law is not because of any dilatoriness on the part of the State Department, but is being caused by the Justice Department. The State Department has already approved the program.

Eighth. In our bill pay in the Volunteer Freedom Corps is at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, and cannot exceed the pay of United States citizens. Under the Johnson bill it is the same as for United States citizens. I do not think we need to pay such men compensation nearly so high as we pay our own citizens, and I do not think we should.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is true that practically all the other armies in the world, particularly European armies, have very much lower pay scales than we have in this country. From their point of view they are entirely accustomed to a very different standard of pay than that which has developed in this country under our conditions.

Mr. LODGE. There is no question that that is true. Of course, the pay of a soldier is a reflection of and is integrated into the whole civilization and society from which he springs. In my opinion, the argument for paying the men in the Volunteer Freedom Corps the same as United States citizens is not a sound plan. I think the Senator from Maine is absolutely correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think we might say that it is not typical of the prudence which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] himself usually exhibits in these matters. That is why I feel rather confident that he may concur with our viewpoint, that it is unnecessary and extravagant.

Mr. LODGE. I am sorry that the able Senator from Colorado is not present in the Chamber, because he could contribute a great deal to this debate. He has always been so willing to be influenced by good arguments and facts that he might come around to the point made by the Senator from Maine. I think it is quite likely that he would.

Ninth. Our bill authorizes citizen-appointees, while Senator JOHNSON's does not. We include citizen-appointees because, as I have already said, we consider that this legislation is not solely of military value, but that it has great political possibilities. It might be extremely desirable to take in a prominent civilian political leader—a man who is above military age, let us say—of one of the iron curtain countries in order to use his experience, knowledge, and planning ability. This proposed legislation provides the only way to feed him and maintain him while we are getting the benefit of his services. These services, incidentally, can mean a great deal and pay big dividends, both in saving our money and, what is more important, in saving our lives. If we can accomplish something big politically in one of these areas, we may avoid the expenses, in money and in human lives, of a military campaign later.

Tenth. Summary discharge authority in our legislation is specifically granted which is not the case in the Johnson bill.

Eleventh. The jurisdiction of the Articles of War is specifically mentioned, which is not the case in the Johnson bill.

That concludes the comparison between the various bills.

There is naturally keen interest in the effect which this proposed legislation will have on pending draft legislation. There is no doubt that, if we had enacted legislation of this character in 1947, we would by this time have a splendid corps of young officers and noncommissioned officers who would know all the Slavic languages and who would be professional soldiers besides. We would thus be able today to organize a Volunteer Freedom Corps abroad, and we might, therefore, be in a position today to deduct the number of men in that Volunteer Freedom Corps from the number of men which it is required to draft now. But we did not pass this proposed legislation in 1947. All we did was to authorize a mere 2,500 in June 1950 and we have not yet taken in one man under the authority of that legislation. The whole scheme is therefore still only on paper. So at present, there is no deduction which can be made and none of the measures providing for enlisting alien soldiers in the United States Army can be regarded as a substitute for drafting and training our own manpower. Such measures can be and will be a great help to our own manpower which is in the service in the event there should be an all-out war, because they would, of course, share in carrying the load.

But we can and should get started now in enlisting aliens, and, if we do get started now and all goes well, it is quite likely that in a year or two we will have a force in being which will enable us to make deductions from the total to be raised here in this country and which certainly will be a very big help when it comes to curtailing the American load of combat in case full-scale war breaks out.

I have requested that the Armed Services Committee set these bills down for hearings as soon as possible and that the affected departments make their reports promptly. This is a vital matter which has been delayed far too long. It is extraordinary that we read every day in the newspapers about the loss of American lives in Korea and yet we allow proposed legislation such as this to languish. I hope Senators who feel as I do will let me know and help to get something done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed after my remarks, an editorial from Life magazine which shows, in a particularly forceful fashion, the far-reaching implications of this project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine of October 2, 1950]

AN ARMY OF THE FREE

GUARANTY OF WELCOME

In our editorial we comment on Senator LODGE, JR.'s proposal to create a voluntary army of the free out of the thousands of young anti-Communist refugees from East European countries inside the iron curtain. Would such an army be welcomed by the exiled leaders of East European democracies?

Says Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier of Poland, in his The Rape of Poland: "I believe the time will come when * * * a planned offensive, strengthened by truth, righteousness, and a faith in victory, will intensify a current of freedom that will push back the waves of communism and meet the mighty longing for freedom that lies in the hearts of * * * people living under the yoke of Red fascism. The counterwave can, and must, break down the prison bars, not only of the nations behind the iron curtain, but also of the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union itself."

Says Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary, in The Struggle Behind the Iron Curtain: "In reenforcing and marshaling the strength of Western Europe, it must be clearly recognized that a defensive policy against the Soviet Union's dynamic thrust is destined to defeat; only a policy intent on

liberation and designed to insure an ultimately united Europe could successfully confront the Soviet Union."

This ought to be enough to show that the Lodge proposal would have a wonderfully reviving effect on the exiled East European democratic leaders who have been living practically without hope ever since the day the world was carved in two by short-sighted men at Yalta.

ANTI-COMMUNIST REFUGEES SHOULD BE WELCOMED TO ITS RANKS

It has taken a long time for the Western World to wake up to the fact that 190,000,000 Russians and some 600,000,000 serfs in the Soviet satellite states are organized, not for peace, not even for static defense, but for violently aggressive war.

The sudden shock of the realization that a tremendous avalanche of crude manpower could be thrown at a moment's notice against the free world has caused a flurry of excited stock taking. Secretary of State Dean Acheson has set forth a plan for designated armed forces on UN call in each UN country outside the Soviet orbit. Winston Churchill, among others, has called for some 60 divisions to defend Europe.

It is a burdensome thing to raise 60 divisions in an industrial economy that must keep strong to avoid trouble from local Communists. But with all the old Western Allies—England, France, the Low Countries, the United States—contributing, the job can be done. Moreover, a 60-division minimum can be supplemented by permitting Germany and Japan to raise divisions for their own defense.

The very fact that western civilization is at last talking of defending itself is a vastly encouraging thing. But there is one shortcoming that must be eliminated from the official attitudes toward rearmament—and that is the tendency to think of defense in purely static terms. It is good to think of Americans and Englishmen, Frenchmen and west Germans, all contributing to the defense of freedom. But if France and Germany, for instance, are really to be free, the defense of Europe cannot forever rest on an arbitrary line somewhere along the river Elbe.

What is really needed to dramatize and inspire the unity of the west is an army of the free that will include thousands of young men from countries inside the iron curtain who wish to rescue their homelands from the grip of a terrible tyranny. None of the official plans for a western army contemplates the use of freedom-loving Poles and Czechs, Lithuanians, and Hungarians. But one man has a plan for forging an army out of the violently anti-Communist refugees from iron-curtain lands. That man is HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Lodge plan is to enlist under the United States flag a voluntary army from among the million or more potential soldiers who are refugees from the east European satellite states. The political and propaganda value of such an army would be incalculably great. Raised by voluntary means, it would truly dramatize the idea of free devotion to a cause. With such an army in existence, the Voice of America would really begin to speak to the enslaved populations of Poland and Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

The problems involved in the voluntary recruitment of an international legion to serve under the American—or the UN—flag are no doubt considerable. But there would be plus factors working to mitigate the difficulties of training, officering and integration. To begin with, the potential soldiers who are refugees from iron-curtain lands hate Stalin with a fierce and bitter hatred. All of them speak one or more of the languages of central and eastern Europe—Polish, German, Czech, Slovak, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Rumanian, or Bulgarian.

Since they are people who have known the horrors of Soviet occupation from close up, they would fight to the death to keep Stalin from catching up with them in their new western homes or billets. But since they are also people who have been deprived of their old homes in the east, they are the very people the western democracies need to carry the war against Stalin once he has started his eventual great retreat to the legitimate Russian borders.

An army of the free raised by voluntary enlistment from among the displaced nationals of Central and Eastern Europe would be extremely effective in promoting the ultimate defection from Russia of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Such an army, raised in time to provide it with officers who come up from its own ranks, would eventually go home to the enduring cheers of thousands of oppressed people who don't want to fight for communism. No Polish, Rumanian, or other satellite troops fighting under Russian officers could oppose such an army with any real conviction in their hearts.

The Lodge idea for raising a voluntary army of the free has had a brief mention on this page before (Life, August 14). A year ago the Senate passed a bill authorizing the enlistment of aliens in the United States Army, with a promise of citizenship after 5 years' service. LODGE hoped originally to get the figure for enlistment set at 25,000, but Congress ultimately trimmed the number down to a paltry 2,500. On September 14 of this year the Senator from Massachusetts returned to the subject. He still wants to see the United States enlist 25,000 aliens under the American banner. But he also would like to have the United States Army authorized to enlist up to 250,000 aliens for 2 years' overseas service in a voluntary freedom corps. That would be a beginning toward organizing a voluntary army of the free from among those with the greatest stake in the overthrow of communism. Eventually, as it must be seen, the Lodge idea can be applied to Asia as well as to Eastern Europe. Only free Chinese armies can reconquer China for freedom.

Why is it that the Senator from Massachusetts has had such meager support for his idea? In the American Revolution the Colonials enlisted the voluntary aid of men named Lafayette, Kosciusko, von Steuben, and so on. They were professional soldiers, but they were also amateurs (i. e., lovers) of freedom. Freedom is a banner that knows no boundaries. It attracts ardent souls everywhere, as Americans have recognized in the past. When the Lodge idea finds lodgment (no pun intended) in the popular imagination, as it must do once journalism has performed its proper function, we look to see United States citizens take it to their hearts in a way that is in keeping with their own American past.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to express my very profound appreciation, which I think will be shared by many other Senators as they give study to this problem, for the work which the Senator from Massachusetts has done in his long study of this subject over many years. As we cut our international eye teeth we come to realize that we are now a very definite part of the world. The contribution which legislation of the character to which the Senator from Massachusetts has given such careful study and consideration can make is profound and significant.

I wish to say also that I am satisfied that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], with whom we have cooperated in similar matters, and for whom we have such high regard—I am sorry I could not see him before the subject came up for discussion today—will welcome the material which has been developed and will appreciate the considerations which have affected the formulation of this proposed legislation. The Senator from Maine looks forward with confidence to the wholehearted cooperation of the Senator from Colorado in developing sound and practical legislation which will make available the tremendous potential in the free world of individuals who, for a variety of reasons, perhaps, are not able to contribute in any other way to the great objective of liberty-loving citizens everywhere.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Maine for his very kind observations about me. He himself has a great deal of imagination with respect to the relationships which the United States has with the rest of the world. He realizes that it no longer does any good to think in the old-fashioned, formalized, dry-as-dust fashion. We must be imaginative and do things differently, using the services of human beings.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Maine for his observation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for presenting to the Senate today this clear explanation of a well-thought-out piece of legislation. Frankly, I think that it offers a very practical way in which we can approach the type of aid and assistance which the enlarged world responsibility we are assuming places on our doorstep.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I desire to associate myself with him in this most important piece of legislation. I am hopeful that we can see its enactment very soon in this session.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I appreciate his offer of help. I know that it will mean a great deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution to approve the agreement between the United States and Canada, relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national strength and security and the continental defense of the United States and Canada, and providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. I introduce the joint resolution not only for myself, but on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior

Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], my colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is a matter of great urgency and I am pleased indeed that, this early in the new Congress, there are so many Senators ready to join with me in offering proposed legislation whose adoption will make the construction possible. Senators who have joined in introducing this joint resolution come from both sides of the aisle and many sections of the country, and include some of the most experienced and wisest Members of this body. We who now offer this joint resolution do so with the conviction that the course of events has after many years made the benefits of the dual-purpose project so apparent, even to the most skeptical, and has so increased the urgency of our realizing those benefits, that the proposal will receive the congressional approval which it has so long and so vainly merited. For we have arrived, Mr. President, at a stage where, in addition to its basic advantages in the fields of both transportation and power, the dual-purpose project must be built as a strategic requirement of our national security and the continental defense of the United States and Canada.

The joint resolution seeks the approval, with certain exceptions and qualifying provisions, of the agreement entered into March 21, 1941, by the Governments of the United States and Canada. Some of the modifications are necessary on constitutional grounds, and others, in order to assure appropriate policy with regard to seaway tolls and power allocation. In all these the joint resolution introduced today follows closely the language of joint resolutions in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, with appropriate changes to reflect the fact that the Niagara Treaty has now been signed and ratified.

The original purpose of the agreement—and of the underlying proposal, which had its origin long before 1941—is, by completing the work begun by nature eons ago, to open up the Great Lakes to ocean-going ships and simultaneously to harness the power of the St. Lawrence for the generation of electricity. Both these purposes have long been firmly grounded in the facts of geography and of the industrial development of the North American Continent. Both these purposes have become justified as each passing year has demonstrated how our growing economy demands the great advantages of transportation and power which the dual-purpose project can confer. And both these purposes have been heavily underscored by our experience in the recent war and by the requirements of mobilization today.

These considerations were very fully developed in the course of hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, during the Eightieth Congress, and before the House Public Works Committee last spring. In brief, the dual-purpose project would in effect add 4,000 miles to our coast line, giving the port cities and shipyards of the Great Lakes access to the Atlantic, and would provide a magnificent block of power—700,000 kilowatts of dependable generating capacity—in a region that for years has suffered chronic shortage. These benefits to the United States would be matched by those to Canada, in whose industrial and military strength we ourselves have a direct interest.

With respect to the power, there is no doubt whatever that it is needed, that it can be supplied at exceedingly low cost, and that the New York-New England region will, indeed, require over the coming decade several times as much additional power as can be provided even by this magnificent development.

With respect to transportation, controversy lingers, not untouched by the special interests of competing systems of transportation. Even here, however, the case has become so strong that all reasonable men must, I think, concede its basic merits.

Conservative estimates of the traffic which the seaway would carry have been prepared by transportation experts in the Department of Commerce. These indicate that under a reasonable and realistic schedule of tolls, such as is contemplated by the joint resolution, the investment in the seaway can be completely amortized in about 50 years. Such a period is, of course, far shorter than the expected life of the works themselves, so that the seaway could be deemed self-liquidating even if these estimates of traffic were further reduced in the interest of ultraconservatism.

The importance of the seaway does not rest, however, entirely upon its manifest value as an element in our national transportation and power systems, together with the additional fact that it can be put on a solid commercial basis. Equally important under present circumstances is the fact that only by construction of the seaway can we assure ourselves of a safe and efficient route for the importation of iron ore.

Because the huge reserves on Lake Superior are now, after 50 years of mining, approaching exhaustion, we must in the years ahead depend more and more upon imported ores. There are tremendous reserves of high-grade ore in South America and these are being developed by United States interests. To bring this ore to our shores, however, involves a transit of from 1,400 to 2,000 miles through sea lanes which, as we found during the recent war, are the natural habitat of hostile submarines. The protection of ore shipments would put a high and unnecessary burden on the Navy. In Labrador and Quebec, however, on this continent and not too far inland from the gulf of the St. Lawrence, lie great deposits of high-grade ore, development of which is now under way. Like the Mesabi ore, this ore lies near the surface and is readily mined. After it has been brought to the St. Lawrence, its transportation through the seaway to the steel mills on the Great Lakes will be vastly safer than any other alternative route of importation.

When these facts were entered in the record last spring, the prospect was that by 1960 our steel industry would have a capacity of 110,000,000 ingot-tons. To operate at this capacity would require 124,000,000 tons of ore a year, of which about 25,000,000 tons would have to be imported.

Since the outbreak of war in Korea this prospect has been shortened. We now expect this capacity of 110,000,000 ingot tons to be reached some time in 1952 rather than in 1960. Although no one can now speak with any assurance about the latter year, this is roughly the outlook. In order to meet our full requirements of steel the capacity should probably be expanded by that time to about 125,000,000 tons. Such capacity will be provided, of course, only if the iron ore which it would require can in fact be obtained. This is a very large accomplishment because, in addition to the requirements imposed by the increase of capacity, there is the further fact that supplies of scrap cannot proportionately be expanded. As a result, still further iron ore will be needed to make good the deficiency of scrap. In consequence of both these factors, steel capacity of 125,000,000 ingot tons in 1960 would require roughly 160,000,000 tons of ore. Of this total, about 70,000,000 tons would have to be imported, almost all of it being from the new sources now being developed. We thus face a growing dependence on foreign sources, which by the end of the decade will probably be called on to supply more than 40 percent of our total requirements. We also face the need to bring as much as possible of this imported ore over a protected route rather than on ocean routes more open to attack. That is what makes it urgent that the seaway be begun at once.

Mobilization has increased the importance of the power phase of the project

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

as well. Even prior to mobilization it was estimated that by 1960 there would be needed in the St. Lawrence region, in addition to plants already planned, nearly four times as much electricity as can be furnished by this project. Under mobilization, sharp increases are necessary in the production of aluminum and magnesium, of ferro-alloys, explosives, and chemicals, and of other products whose manufacture requires large amounts of cheap electric power. Both for transportation and for power, therefore, the St. Lawrence dual-purpose project is more urgently needed than ever before. It should be delayed no longer.

Mr. President, the joint resolution to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project deserves to be considered promptly and fully. I intend to press for early hearings on the measure so that the record, already voluminous, may be brought up to date and the Senate be made fully aware both of the importance and of the urgency of this great international dual-purpose project for the economic and military strength of our country and this entire continent. On the basis of the full record, I am confident Senators will vote to approve the 1941 agreement and thereby open the way for this dream of half a century to be translated into a solid achievement to strengthen and safeguard our country in peace and war.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement on the joint resolution which has been introduced today by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] approving the St. Lawrence agreements and the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be associated with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and many other Members of this body from all sections of the country in sponsoring the joint resolution for the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

It has been one of my fondest dreams for 20 years to see this great dual-purpose project, with all its vast benefits for the Nation and for New York State, become a reality. During all the years when I was Governor of New York State, before that and since, I consistently and vigorously supported this undertaking.

It is now a source of great satisfaction for me, as a Member of the Senate, to cosponsor this proposed legislation. In the months ahead I shall do everything within my power to bring to the attention of the Senate the great benefits of this proposal.

So far as New York State is concerned, both the seaway and the power project offer great benefits. In this present period of our national history when our very survival depends upon the mobilization of all our resources and the development of all our potentials for the strengthening of our country and of the free world, it is inconceivable that the proposed legislation on this subject will not be speedily enacted.

The rights of New York State are adequately protected in the joint resolution. After the power project is completed it will be turned over to the State of New York under terms of sale which will recompense the Federal Government for its expenditures and will at the same time assure to the people of New York State, of the New England States, and perhaps other areas within economic transmission distance of the St. Lawrence power project, a new source of badly needed power at one-half the cost of equivalent steam-generated power.

This will be a blessing, not only to the people of New York and to the people of the Nation, but will reduce the cost of defense items and commodities manufactured with the use of this power. One such commodity, of course, is aluminum. It will make available to the United States and Canada 13,000,000,000 additional kilowatts of power annually—cheap hydroelectric power—making use of the energies of the waters of the St. Lawrence in the International Rapids section.

We can develop 2,200,000 horsepower from this project, the largest quantity of undeveloped waterpower in North America, except for the contiguous Niagara development. The St. Lawrence project will develop more power than any existing power project in America, with the exception of the Grand Coulee Dam. The Niagara project, of course, promises even greater power than the Grand Coulee.

Market studies show that the power from the St. Lawrence, as well as that from the Niagara, can be readily absorbed. Indeed, all this power will be absolutely required by the national mobilization effort both in the United States and Canada. Should we fail to develop this power, and waste the potentialities which are thus available to us, we will be guilty of the most arrant kind of wastefulness. Failure to use the potentialities of the seaway would be equally wasteful.

The seaway will reduce the growing congestion at our east-coast ports, will extend our coast line for a distance of 4,000 miles, and will permit vast areas of our interior to contribute more adequately to the national effort by linking these areas more directly with the foreign sources of raw materials and the foreign ports to which the sinews of increasing strength must be brought.

Actual construction—digging and dredging—will be required over a distance of 114 miles, both in the United States and Canada. Much of this work has already been done, as in the Welland Canal, although this canal will need to be deepened. This is a major undertaking, but it is an essential one.

I have every confidence that the joint resolution will be approved at this session of Congress. I cannot see how it can longer be delayed. Once the joint resolution is approved, we can and should proceed speedily with this undertaking.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to comment on the necessity for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has today introduced a joint resolution for the approval of that project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I call attention to a copy of the November 11 issue of Business Week. On page 136 there is a story of the development of hydroelectric power on the Volga River in Russia. They are planning to construct two plants, one in Kuibyshev and one near Stalingrad. The yearly production of these two plants will total 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, almost twice as much as the power to be developed by the St. Lawrence project, and nearly twice as much as the power developed at the Tennessee River dams. The Russian Government is initiating these now, for completion in 1955 and 1956.

Mr. President, there are two things to be noted about this program: First, the importance attached by the Russian Government to hydroelectric power; and, second, the time schedule they have set up. The construction of these plants will be going on during the next 5 or 6 years. It proves, Mr. President, that the Russians have a long-range program for the development of their industrial might. They know that in the long run it is the productive capacity of nations that wins in the crucial struggle for survival.

In this country we are in the habit of thinking of defense production in terms of deduction from civilian output. The mobilization program will last a long time. We must set our sights at least a decade ahead, in undertaking the necessary developments to add to the strength of our Nation. I can think of no sound foreign or military policy that disregards the fundamental fact that our survival as a nation and the defense of western civilization depends upon the productive capacity of the United States and Canada.

It is for this reason that I urge all my colleagues—particularly my neighbors from New England and New York—to consider earnestly and speedily the St. Lawrence seaway as a means of removing the limitations upon the productive capacity of Canada and the northeastern and middlewestern parts of the United States. This program is necessary for the expansion of the steel industry, the aluminum industry, and other defense establishments. It is important for the growth of population and production in Canada, which is of vital interest in our continental defense.

I urge that approval of this great development, which could conceivably mean the difference between victory and defeat for democratic government, be given without further delay.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared relative to the introduction today of the new Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the body of the

RECORD, together with certain matters attached to my statement.

There being no objection, the statement and attached papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

WE MUST COMPLETE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NOW

I have today joined in cosponsoring a joint resolution to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I take this step fully conscious of the significance of international developments which place upon this country the necessity of preparing for a long struggle for survival against forces of barbarism which have been let loose upon the world by Communist ideology.

We are preparing for a struggle that may well last 10 years or 20 years or more. Our preparation must be undertaken in terms of the total strengthening of our people, our resources, our technology, and our productive capacity.

In entering this long period of mobilization, we must consider the resources and the welfare of our good neighbor and ally, Canada, as well as those of the United States. Why? Because these two countries constitute the bastion of defense of western civilization. Without their help, the European front would crumble.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project is designed to strengthen this country and Canada by providing low-cost, labor-saving transportation and low-cost, labor-saving hydroelectric power for defense industries. In addition, it will open up new sources of raw materials absolutely essential for industry, particularly iron ore. It will also safeguard our shipping from enemy submarine attack on the high seas.

In considering the St. Lawrence seaway project, Congress in actual fact, is confronted with a major issue of strategy—namely, whether (a) we should develop our resources within the continental limits of North America in order to permit us to produce the weapons of defense for our Armed Forces and our allies abroad; or (b) whether we should expose our supply lines to enemy action on the high seas.

On this major issue all Americans—whether they live in the East or West or South—should support the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development as a means of making North America an atomic-age arsenal of democracy.

NO POSTPONEMENT JUSTIFIED

I full well realize that the opponents of the seaway will say:

"Now is not the time to build this great project."

Well, Mr. President, according to the opposition, 1925 was not the right time, nor 1930, nor 1935, nor in fact is any year the appropriate time in their mind. In other words, they do not seek to postpone this project, they seek to kill it. A year from now they will have another reason for suggesting postponement; 5 years from now they will raise more phony objections. They will issue more base appeals to the most selfish interests of particular groups and regions.

There has been enough stalling, enough delays, enough pigeonholing, enough repetitious prolonged hearings. The case for the seaway is as solid as Gibraltar. It has been built for many years, it stands undisputed and unrefuted. The seaway has been praised by every American President since 1920, by countless Members of Congress, by outstanding leaders of business, agriculture, and Government, and, yes, by our highest military and naval experts.

SINFUL TO WASTE THIS RESOURCE

It is an absolute sin for us to continue to waste this precious resource. It is utterly fantastic to build up Continental Europe's transportation arteries and hydroelectric power and to fail to do so here in our own blessed continent.

I appeal most earnestly to all those groups which have opposed us in the past to cease their opposition and join with us for this great national endeavor.

AN ANSWER TO SPURIOUS OPPOSITION

I speak on the basis of having fought for this project ever since my entrance to the Senate. During the Republican Eightieth Congress it was my pleasure to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which considered the seaway proposal. We heard testimony from the highest officials of the United States Government, including our former President, the Honorable Herbert Hoover. The opposition has contended that somehow there is some socialistic feature to this proposal, but that contention is seen as absolutely ridiculous when one reviews the list of conservative leaders of America who have endorsed the seaway.

The opposition has contended that the seaway would be particularly vulnerable to enemy attack, but obviously it is no more vulnerable than a TVA dam or the city of Washington, or the Hanford, Wash., plutonium plant or a hunderd other targets. Obviously if America has sufficient radar protection, sufficient interceptor planes, sufficient guided missiles, and the other weapons necessary for modern defense, we will be adequate to defend this and other targets. On the other hand, if we are not adequately defended, then not only the seaway but every other target on this continent will be hit.

It is absolutely nonsensical to infer that we must be weak in order not to set up possible targets for attack. If one were to follow that line of reasoning we might just as well close down the city of Pittsburgh because obviously the steel mills are an inviting target.

The opposition will contend, too, that the seaway will divert manpower and materials. Well, Mr. President, when one considers the fact that actual construction of the project will take quite a few years and when one prorates the cost in manpower and materials over the construction period, it turns out that the seaway is just a drop in the bucket compared to other great construction projects which will be initiated.

THE REAL ISSUE

Let us cut behind the masquerade. Let us get beyond the ridiculous phony arguments which are constantly raised. The seaway issue boils down to a fight between certain selfish railroad interests and certain selfish port interests on the one hand versus the people of the United States—present and future generations—on the other hand. Throughout the 1948 fight, we saw this issue very clearly and I stated it on the floor of the Senate. Who is to persevere? Who is to succeed in this struggle? A few selfish, blind, obstinate men of the same type who have opposed every single advance in transportation? Or will the American people succeed and persevere? The same sort of fantastic jibberish which has been spewed against the seaway was spewed against the Panama Canal back in the early part of this century. They said it would never be used or they contradicted themselves and said that it would be used so much that it would harm native American labor. They said it would be a hard installation to defend. They said that it was extravagant. They said that our budget could not stand that sort of expenditure. Well, history has rendered the verdict and has shown that this fearmongering was completely baseless.

And so I appeal to the highest judgment and reason of those of my colleagues who according to their own convictions may not in the past have seen the same way I have on this issue. I appeal to them as the honest, conscientious legislators which I know them to be. I appeal moreover, to the groups in the respective States which have heretofore opposed us and respectfully urge them in the cause of patriotism to cease their activities.

I attach for printing at this point in the body of the RECORD certain materials relating to the seaway as received from my State.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 26, 1951]

SOO TONNAGE HIGHER IN 1950—THIRD HIGHEST IN PEACE

SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.—Freight shipped through the American and Canadian Soo locks in 1950 totaled 106,196,562 tons, an increase of 11 percent compared with 1949.

United States engineers said Thursday that the tonnage for the 1950 Great Lakes shipping season was the third highest for peacetime. It was exceeded by the 115,000,000 tons shipped through the docks in 1948 and the 110,000,000 tons in 1947.

An all-time record of 120,000,000 tons was set in the war year of 1942.

Iron ore down-bound through the locks in 1950 totaled 79,976,650 tons and accounted for the major share of the freight. Other leading products included 5,704,496 tons of wheat and 2,380,535 tons of other grain, 63,201 tons of flour, 301,976 tons of general merchandise, 443,120 tons of pulpwood, 163,204 tons of manufactured iron and steel, 122,356 tons of scrap iron, 58,084 tons of stone and gravel, and 750 tons of lumber.

The bulk of the westbound cargo consisted of 13,301,019 tons of soft coal. Other totals were 1,508,624 tons of stone and gravel, 826,093 tons of petroleum products, 524,946 tons of general merchandise, 295,504 tons of hard coal, 81,108 tons of manufactured iron and steel, 75,599 tons of automobiles, and 46,956 tons of salt.

RESOLUTION OF ALUMINUM WORKERS UNION NO. 19489 IN MANITOWOC, WIS.

Whereas the Great Lakes region has the greatest concentration of steel manufacturing and the greatest reservoir of skilled workmen in the world; and

Whereas the boats and other seacraft that are so abundantly built in this area must of necessity be limited in size because of the fact that there is no outlet to the ocean sufficiently large and deep enough to float ocean-going vessels; and

Whereas experience during the last war indicated that it was necessary to raise the facilities on the Great Lakes for the construction of combat service and ocean vessels for the armed services; and

Whereas the larger vessels had to be floated to the open sea via the Mississippi River system with the aid of pontoons fitted at great expense of time, manpower, and material; and

Whereas the interior of the North American continent is in great need of better low-cost ocean shipping facilities; and

Whereas the industrial area of the Great Lakes suffered critical power shortages in both World Wars I and II, and larger shortages are anticipated in the case of another war; and

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project would be a large factor in helping to solve the problems that now confront us: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Aluminum Workers Union No. 19489 in regular meeting assembled request our representatives in the Congress of the United States to work for and seek early enactment of the St. Lawrence seaway power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Honorable JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and the Honorable JOHN BYRNES.

Dated this 18th day of January 1951.

EXCERPTS FROM PAMPHLET PUBLISHED BY WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

NOW, MORE THAN EVER BEFORE, WE NEED THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

"The nation that provides lines of communication from its best protected or least vulnerable inner reaches to its coasts, best insures its security in wartimes." (Milwaukee Journal editorial.)

For defense

"When considered along with support activities that are vital to national defense, such as industrial production, power development, transportation, and so forth, the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project commands a high priority.

"Experience during the last war indicated that it was necessary to use the facilities on the Great Lakes to their maximum capacity for the construction of small boat and bulk-type lake carriers. Insofar as facilities were available, they were used for construction of combat service and ocean vessels for the armed services. Vessels constructed in the Great Lakes shipyards designed for ocean service were routed to the open sea via the existing 14-foot St. Lawrence channel which limited the size of those which could be built in the St. Lawrence area or, with the aid of pontoons fitted at the expense of time, manpower, and materials, had to be floated to the Gulf of Mexico via the Mississippi River system.

"The provision of additional transportation facilities would remove to some extent, in time of emergency, the strain on existing transportation facilities. A saving in manpower and speedier delivery to points of destination would be effected by loading at Great Lakes ports for final discharges.

"For the above reasons, therefore, the project has the approval and strong support of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, I urge its favorable consideration." (Frank Pace, Jr., Secretary of the Army.)

For conservation

"Construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project is needed to assure a high grade, rapidly expansible iron ore supply from nearby foreign sources—ore which in an emergency could be moved to existing consuming centers over routes inside the continent. It is needed to provide substantial, additional quantities of electric power, and to augment the capacity and flexibility of our transportation system.

"Special importance attaches to the availability of the seaway for the importation of iron ore. Within a very few years our steel industry, basic to a strong national economy in both peace and war, will be regularly importing ores to meet a substantial proportion of its peacetime needs. The seaway would provide the most economical route for the importation of ore * * * need to supplement and conserve our dwindling Lake Superior ore supplies.

"The project would furnish large quantities of additional power to an important industrial area which suffered critical shortages in both World Wars I and II. In the absence of the power project, correspondingly large or larger power shortages are anticipated in this area in case of another war. The avoidance of such shortage is vital." (National Security Resources Board.)

For low-cost transportation

"The development of the navigation and power resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has been envisioned for half a century by the United States and Canada as a joint international enterprise. It is frequently said that the St. Lawrence seaway will add a fourth coastline to the United States.

"It will indubitably open the interior of the North American Continent to ocean shipping and will harness 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy now running unused into the Atlantic Ocean.

"Those parts of the United States and Canada served by the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence system are not only great in population, but are great in agricultural and industrial resources.

"The seaway will furnish an important new trade route for the United States and Canada. It should go far to aid in achieving our mutual objectives of expanded foreign trade, full employment and a healthy merchant marine. The full economies of mass transportation can be achieved by bringing deep-water shipping into the Great Lakes." (Daniel W. Hoan, former mayor of Milwaukee.)

For progress

"The St. Lawrence seaway and power project has from the time it was first proposed offered this Nation a magnificent opportunity for economic progress. As the true strength and promise of our economy have become more fully realized, the importance of this dual-purpose project has grown in proportion. Without it we shall continue our neglect of a great source of economic strength and a vitally important factor in our national security. With it, the entire country will benefit, not least some of those who are most concerned lest it somehow infringe upon their immediate interests.

"The plain fact of the matter is that this is a big and powerful country and it has got that way not only by possessing great resources, but by knowing how to use them. Those who would have us turn our back on opportunities such as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project now offers us would have us turn our back on the very thing that has made America great and the only thing on which we dare base the continuation of our national strength and our national security." (Hon. Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce.)

For expansion

"Development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project jointly by the United States and Canada would give to the world a shining symbol of international cooperation. It would be an enduring example of the ability of two great nations not only to live side by side peacefully, but also to develop harmoniously their natural resources.

"The joint development of a great foreign-trade route by two nations for the express purpose of sharing the benefits of new commerce would be a landmark in the history of international relations.

"The seaway would be an important factor in expanding world trade and promoting friendly commercial relations. It would strongly reinforce the Bretton Woods Agreement and the economic objectives of the United Nations.

"If we are to succeed in developing a new era of peace and mutual understanding between nations, there could be no better beginning than the immediate undertaking of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project." (Great Lakes Harbors Association.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who joined as a cosponsor of the bill for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, introduced in the Senate today by Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, presented the following statement to the Senate in support of the measure:

"I have joined in supporting the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for the following reasons:

"1. We must be prepared to defend freedom and resist Communist aggression over a considerable period of time and make our plans in terms of at least 10 or 15 years. Therefore, we must select for development those natural resources which will make the maximum contribution to our power, navigation, and other defense needs in that period. I believe the St. Lawrence project essential by that test.

"2. The St. Lawrence seaway project is necessary in order to maintain and expand our iron and steel industries. Without it, dangerous depletion and shortages may well develop.

"3. The St. Lawrence power project is necessary to supply low-cost power to defense industries. Expansion in the Northeastern States will be seriously limited without this new source of power.

"4. The present legislation makes the St. Lawrence project self-liquidating by the charging of tolls on navigation and by receipts from sale of power. The project, therefore, is not so much a public-works project as an investment which will be repaid. To that extent it will not be an ultimate burden on the taxpayer and instead will be a great new asset, not only for national defense, but also for the national economy in general. While this point, by itself, would not be enough to justify the construction of the St. Lawrence project now, when joined with the other considerations it speaks strongly in its favor. The economic justification for this project is also much clearer than it is for many of the other currently authorized developments, some of which I have opposed.

"5. In a long-range defense program it will be helpful to increase industrial capacity and productivity of labor in such a way that the standard of living of our people will not have to be diminished too greatly. Prerequisite to this expansion is additional steel capacity. Official studies disclose that to increase steel capacity to 125,000,000 tons—25 percent above the present level—this country will have to import 64,000,000 tons of iron ore. In addition to developing the low-grade ores in Minnesota, this gigantic undertaking requires that we do everything within our means to make new sources of iron ore like those in Labrador available to our steel mills. The St. Lawrence project is necessary to achieve this. Otherwise, if we allow such large raw-material shipments to be dependent wholly upon open-sea transportation, they would be vulnerable to enemy submarine attack.

"6. The navigation features of the project will also make possible the expansion of the iron and steel industry in the Great Lakes area of the Middle West and lead to a better balanced location and dispersal of the industry and of the metal fabricators which it supplies. It is to the Nation's interest that this dispersal take place and that new steel capacity should not be concentrated solely in the already heavily industrialized eastern seaboard States.

"I hope the Congress may review these plans at an early date and give its approval to the historic project this legislation would authorize."

Mr. BENTON obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a brief statement, without losing his rights to the floor?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to do so.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the people of Minnesota will be pleased to learn that a joint resolution is being introduced today to authorize the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, both the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and the power project. I am proud to be a cosponsor of that joint resolution, which today has established bipartisan support. It is my hope and expectation that hearings will soon be held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and that the joint resolution will be approved by this Congress.

The Great Lakes waterway is the lifeline of our area's industrial wealth. It is particularly crucial to meet our current defense emergency. We learned from the last war that strategic materials resources are not limitless. The great iron ore deposits of Labrador must be exploited and ore brought to the United States by the safest, shortest, and cheapest route—through the St. Lawrence River.

The St. Lawrence seaway project provides for a 27-foot channel from Duluth and the heart of the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence and out to the Atlantic Ocean, a distance of 2,400 miles. It would open Minnesota and our whole midwest region to the trade of the world. When the seaway becomes a reality, Minnesota products will be sent into the markets of the world. Our wheat and flour, flaxseed, dairy foods, lumber, farm machinery, and other manufactures will compete in the world markets. Our cities on the shores of Lake Superior—Duluth and Two Harbors—will become busy ocean ports. This will, in turn, benefit our inland cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul for example, and our whole State. The people of Minnesota cannot help but benefit from our cities' growth in agriculture, manufacturing, and shipping.

Not only will the St. Lawrence project assist our agricultural and manufacturing trades but will also stimulate our iron ore industry. High grade iron ore from our Lake Superior region supplies nearly 85 percent of America's steel industry. From these reserves in World War II, steel for the weapons of our victory were forged. Once again our iron and steel will go forth to protect our way of life.

Furthermore, the St. Lawrence project will develop supplementary ores to relieve the superior ores now being depleted. This will save our fine cities of Hibbing, Virginia, Coleraine, Buhl, Ely on the Mesabi, and Crosby and Ironton on the Cuyuna. The seaway would stabilize the economy of our State and resolve our uncertainties about the future. The seaway will stimulate the development as well of a very vital ore, Mr. President, one which may be the difference between life and death of this Nation, namely taconite, a product which is found in limitless quantities in the northern section of Minnesota. Our interest in the St. Lawrence seaway is not a selfish interest, however. Our entire Nation needs the seaway. It will reduce the cost of defense items and commodities manufactured by the use of power projects. It will make available to the United States and Canada 13,000,000,000 additional kilowatts of cheap hydroelectric power every year.

The State of Minnesota has supported this project since 1919. The State of New York and New England States expect to receive electric power from the dam on the St. Lawrence River. We in Minnesota want to see them get it. We want their electricity bills to drop and their standard of living to rise. When easterners are prosperous they buy of our products—particularly those shipped over a cheap water route. Any great economic development that is helpful to one region of the United States will result in national benefit, and so it is with the St. Lawrence seaway. The St. Lawrence seaway is a vital national defense project and should be considered as such.

The St. Lawrence seaway is as vital to the defense of this Nation as is the expansion of steel-producing plants. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, if we are going to expand the steel production of this country some 15,000,000 tons, we had better be sure that we have the raw material from which that steel can be made—namely, the iron ore—and we should be equally sure that that iron ore can be transported at reasonable cost over a safe and short route of transportation.

The St. Lawrence seaway is the key to Minnesota's future. It holds opportunity, development, and wealth. Our industries are entitled to the expansion brought by low transportation costs. The Middle West is entitled to send its products forth to world markets.

It is time for Congress to recognize the needs, not only of the Middle West and of our great State of Minnesota but of the whole Nation, insofar as transportation is concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter from one of the most distinguished citizens of the Midwest, one of the fine and great citizens of my State, Mr. Julius H. Barnes. Mr. Barnes is an eminent industrialist and merchant and an economic statesman. He has spent many years of his life promoting the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. I know of very few men in this country who know more about the facts and the engineering studies respecting the St. Lawrence seaway route than does Mr. Barnes. In his letter he has given testimony as to the value of the project. He has also presented—and I think this is to the benefit of the entire Congress—an evaluation as to the estimated operation rates and earnings possible for a normal 8 months of shipment on the Great Lakes by the use of the St. Lawrence seaway. I ask that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and also ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Kenneth Crouse and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press under date of January 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *January 18, 1951.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My personal appreciation of the real statesmanship evidenced by you in two recent actions.

First, for being a cosponsor for the ideal of international relations, presented by Owen Roberts and his associates.

Second, for your convincing message to the AFL meeting in Detroit which I hope will persuade that great labor body and its subsidiaries to recognize, under today's conditions, the great national value of the St. Lawrence opened after 50 years paralysis of the usual American enterprise for enlarged facilities, lowered transportation costs, and the generation of electric power in an electrified Nation.

Thank you especially for both actions.

In 1941 the record of hearings on the St. Lawrence agreement before the House committee will show that the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, an organization of business men largely screened into national prominence by their native ability and enterprise, testified through an employed engineer. His testimony, I remember, was a statement that the 1940 generation of all America in electric power totaled 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours and he added the opinion that this was adequate for any foreseeable requirements. Today, only 10 years later, we are using substantially 360,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours and we still need more in this electric era. This illustrates how good judgment can be warped by misinformation, by local prejudice, to the discredit of their really large national confidence for the future.

I venture to enclose you a tabulation of what it would mean to Duluth-Superior and to the ports of Chicago and Milwaukee when the miracle, new-type bulk freight carrier of the Great Lakes is operating, of which a number are now under contract for building, and what it could do in low-priced transportation when two-way cargoes ore and grain may meet. Out of my long years as a grain exporter and a ship operator, I am not afraid to have this tabulation submitted to any competent fleet operators.

What it would mean to the whole agricultural West to have access at such economy of transportation cost for the products of the West does not require more than a recognition of world history of commerce following the channels of economical movement. And the phase of prosecuting better a great war in which we may be forced into introduces a human element that would appeal to every American, in the safeguarding of American lives.

I know your heart is in this project. You are warranted in appreciation of its great economic, political, and human significance. More power to you.

Sincerely,

JULIUS H. BARNES.

ESTIMATED OPERATIONS, RATES, AND EARNINGS POSSIBLE FOR NORMAL 8 MONTHS ON LAKES

New ships designed transport on 27-foot proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence channels—20,000 tons ore, 600,000 bushels grain, 16 miles speed.

Reliable estimate 8 months' freight earnings, $1,000,000, would provide reasonable net earnings over 12 months.

(NOTE.—J. H. B. feels earnings should be substantial on large private investment to provide construction (estimated $5,000,000).)

Water distances basis these calculations:

	Miles
Duluth to Buffalo	980
Duluth to Montreal	1,334
Duluth to Seven Islands	1,985
Duluth to New York, all water	1,383
Chicago to Montreal	1,241
Montreal to Seven Islands	650
Buffalo to Seven Islands	1,000

Estimate I

600,000 bushels grain at 8 cents, Duluth to Seven Islands	$48,000
20,000 tons ore at $2, Seven Islands to Lake Erie ports	40,000
Earnings this round trip, 18 days, including 3 days light Lake Erie port to Duluth	88,000

Estimate II

(Probable seasonal adjustment grain carriage (no grain 2 months))

9 trips, 162 days, at $880,000 per trip	$792,000
7 trips, ore only, 70 days, at $40,000 per trip	280,000
Season, 240 days, this scale grain and ore	1,072,000

Estimate III

Ore only, 26 trips, 9 days' turnaround each, at $40,000	$1,040,000

[From the Duluth News-Tribune of January 18, 1951]

HUMPHREY ASKS AFL SUPPORT OF SEAWAY

(By Kenneth Crouse)

WASHINGTON.—The American Federation of Labor was urged yesterday to give its support to the St. Lawrence seaway.

In a message to an AFL conference in Detroit, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of Minnesota, called on the labor group to back the project as a matter of grave importance to our national security.

The AFL has for many years been opposed to the waterway. At its 1950 convention, however, it was decided that because of defense and other developments the AFL should reexamine its position. Heading the conference of State and local AFL leaders now under way on the issue is George Haberman, president of the Wisconsin Federation of Labor.

In his message Senator HUMPHREY declared that if the United States and other free nations of the world are to triumph in the struggle against barbarism, we must open the St. Lawrence seaway as a matter of highest priority.

Even with existing ore reserves in northern Minnesota and all-out development of low-grade ores, the Senator said, the steel industry will still have to import a substantial amount of iron ore. He added that this could best be shipped to steel mills through the St. Lawrence waterway.

He concluded, "By developing the St. Lawrence Basin, we shall have provided our Nation with an economic asset beyond dollars-and-cents calculation. We shall have opened a route which bestows the advantages of cheap transportation of the products of our midwestern farms and factories and one which will stabilize the entire steel industry.

"Although we cannot ignore the peacetime considerations, we must set them aside for the time being because we face the plain fact that lives and strategic materials depend on our getting this project through."

DETROIT.—President Truman said the St. Lawrence seaway should be built as quickly as is physically possible to do so in a message here to AFL leaders.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, having been born in Minnesota, and having lived there until I was 18 years old, I take particular interest in the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Minnesota. I congratulate him on it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is on his feet, and, if I correctly understand the deaf and dumb language, the Senator has, by use of that language, indicated to me that he wishes me to yield to him for 2 minutes. I am glad to yield for 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I placed in the RECORD a statement which I had expected to deliver in relation to the measure which has just been commented upon by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I wish to say that I am sure that Senators now will take a "new look" at this very important project.

It was my good fortune the other day to be at the White House and to hear Mr. Wilson, who heretofore, as Senators will remember, was very much opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway, speak favorably of it, showing that he has gotten the "new look," and views the project with a new look. Likewise, I trust that Senators who heretofore have been provincial, who have been looking at their own particular segments of the country, can no longer refuse to raise their visors and see that now we are involved in a serious question of survival.

That issue, I believe, must be apparent to all of us who heard Mr. Wilson, General Pick, and Secretary Chapman state how in the course of 5 or 10 years, unless this project is undertaken and completed, our country could well become a second-class Nation.

So I trust that the hearings will be brief, and that the one point will be stressed, namely, the matter of national security and national defense; and that those who were against us the last time we were privileged to advance this idea, will now, as I say, get the new look, raise their visors, and see that this is a matter of national survival.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for yielding to me.

A WARNING TO THE SENATE

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to utter a brief but very solemn warning. This week I called on former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Secretary Hull honors me by permitting me to visit him every few months, and it has been my custom to do so since even before my service as Assistant Secretary of State.

As I entered the room Secretary and Mrs. Hull were watching on the television the proceedings at Lake Success. I wish every Member of the Senate could have been with me and could have heard Secretary Hull's wise and penetrating discussion of the vast problems with which we are faced today. I am sure Secretary Hull will not mind my reporting to his old colleagues in the Senate that he is deeply concerned because we here are devoting so much of our time to matters of relative insignificance, while the world is trembling on the edge of catastrophe. I am sure he will not mind my repeating his distress at the Senate's political partisanship in these tragic days.

As I left Secretary Hull, he escorted me to the door; and in shaking hands he referred to these days as "days of chaos and unspeakable danger." I made a note in my notebook of that phrase, and I asked Secretary Hull's permission to use it, because it reminded me of his eloquent statements during his years of service in the Senate and as Secretary of State. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will remember these words of our wise and experienced leader, Secretary Hull, as I make my point in this speech and sound my warning.

Mr. President, I speak now because this is the first opportunity I have had to get the floor since we last recessed; and I speak because it is my considered judgment that since we recessed, the Senate, through the processes of its own internal and party machinery, has added immeasurably to the chaos and the unspeakable danger of today's world.

I refer specifically, Mr. President, to the appointment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the Senate Appropriations Committee's subcommittee which is responsible for the budget of the Department of State. I think that even in normal times we could question a procedure which would give the potential power of life or death over any Government department — the power to grant or withhold funds, or to allot them in detail—to any Senator who had proved himself an implacable and, in this case, I may add, an irresponsible enemy of the Department concerned.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I decline to yield until I have finished my brief statement. It will not take more than 5 or 6 minutes.

In these days of chaos and unspeakable danger, we must question an appointment which gives over to a ruthless propagandist such enormous potential control over the destiny of the Department of State.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the violation by the Senator from Connecticut of rule XIX, paragraph 2, of the Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut will take his seat.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Connecticut be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, anyone who has appeared countless times before the Appropriations Committees, as I have, knows the great powers which rest in these committees and in the hands of each and every member of them who

wishes to concern himself with the problems at issue before them. This enormous potential power over the destiny of the State Department is now in the hands of a man who is an announced foe and enemy of this Department.

I think the general principle I am enunciating would be applicable even if the warfare of this particular Senator against this particular department sprang from sincere and carefully considered conviction. However, there is more to the warfare in this case, as all of us in the Senate know. Senator McCARTHY's is a kind of guerrilla warfare. Each of us may have his own adjectives to describe Senator McCARTHY's attacks against the State Department on the floor of the Senate last year; but there is no doubt about what the adjectives add up to and what our private consensus is though few have chosen to state it publicly. Senator McCARTHY's performance can perhaps be summed up in the slogan: If you can't make one libel stick, try another, and then try another.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I again call the Senator from Connecticut to order, and in that connection I cite rule XIX, paragraph 2, of the standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would make inquiry as to the manner in which the Senator from Connecticut has caused an infraction of the rule referred to.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator from Connecticut has directly and indirectly, by words, inferred malicious and bad conduct to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, by imputing to him conduct and motives unworthy of a Senator in this Chamber.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Connecticut be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not satisfied that the statements made by the Senator from Connecticut constitute an infraction of the rule. Unless they do constitute an infraction of the rule, it would appear to the Chair that the Senator who has uttered the words is not out of order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the rule which has been referred to gives a Senator the right to make the motion which has been made. The procedure which has been followed in the past is to move that the Senator be permitted to proceed in order. I make that motion at this time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to make an observation. The Chair has no doubt that the statement made by the majority leader is correct; but the Chair has raised this question because he thinks it is about time for the Senate to give earnest consideration to a change in the rule, in cases in which no evidence is adduced in regard to an infraction of the rule itself, and in which discretion lies exclusively with one Member of the Senate to determine whether the Senator who has been speaking has been guilty of an infraction of the rule and is out of order.

The Chair wishes to give notice that, as a Member of the Senate, he will bring this matter to the attention of the Senate in the hope that consideration will be given to a change in the rule, which it seems to the Chair is not conducive to orderly procedure in this great body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will take his seat.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Connecticut be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I would not willingly or knowingly violate rule XIX.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield. I fear that if I yield to my friend the Senator from Minnesota, I shall feel under obligation to yield to other Senators. I prefer not to yield until I finish this brief statement.

I did go over this statement with a Member of the Senate of long years of experience, so that I would protect myself against the danger of violating either rule XIX or any of the other myriad rules of the Senate with which I am not sufficiently familiar. I wish to make it clear that, if there is an infraction of the Senate rules in anything I am saying, it is not because I did not try to stay within the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will proceed in order.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I myself have been the victim of Senator McCARTHY's attacks or libels. He came into my State three times during the recent election, to speak in the three largest cities of Connecticut. He attacked my colleague [Mr. McMAHON] and me, after resorting to his standardized assaults upon the Secretary of State and the State Department. In New Haven, he charged that Senator McMAHON and I supported policies which gave aid and support to Communists everywhere. Of course, I could, and did, publicly defend myself. The members of the State Department, however, who have been subjected to equally false and irresponsible charges, are helpless. In his speeches in Connecticut, Senator McCARTHY again and again sneered at Dean Acheson, about whom I hope to speak on the floor tomorrow, as "The Red Dean of Fashion." I, myself, listened to Senator McCARTHY on the radio and heard this phrase, this sneering phrase, "The Red Dean of Fashion." Here is a phrase to rival the best from the propaganda mill of the Kremlin. This kind of phrase is a perfect example of the worst and most terrifying aspect of the Russian propaganda.

In the future, State Department officers must suffer not only in silence, but, with this Appropriations Committee appointment, suffer in still another way. They will find their budgets manipulated by their tormentor, activity by activity, and division by division, behind closed doors, and for no reason they can fathom or refute. The junior Senator from Wisconsin is to be the judge, the jury, and the prosecutor of the State Department. He becomes his own kangaroo court. He is to share in the vast and almost unlimited inquisitorial power of this Appropriations Subcommittee. He is to help decide who gets what, and when. The attention he expects to give to this assignment, we do not need to guess. We read it in the Times-Herald this morning. The Times-Herald announces that Senator McCARTHY is "elated"—"elated" is the verb—is "elated" at this appointment; and, Mr. President, no wonder. For the first time, he has a big and powerful lever in his hands, and a ready-made platform on which to exploit it. And this occurs, to use Mr. Hull's phrase, in these days of chaos and unspeakable danger. The Republican Committee on Committees, under the Senate practice by which each party makes its own designations to committee and subcommittee assignments, is responsible for this action.

Is it to be wondered that whole sections of the American people tend to lose confidence in their representative form of Government? If the public understood the significance of this appointment, a quiver of revulsion would run from one end of the country to the other. Decent people everywhere would experience shock, surprise, amazement, and distress.

Further, I ask whether this is the way to inspire the best efforts of the hundreds of able and devoted people who hold key positions in the State Department. Who among us now would urge any friend to take a major position in the State Department, if he is to be subjected to unverified and unverifiable, silent, behind-closed-doors charges when he comes up for his budget? I ask whether any Member of the Senate would want to subject himself to the indignities and to the attacks upon his character, the strain and tension with his friends and his subordinates.

Only last night I had dinner with a group who were discussing, case by case, men of top ability who had refused to come to Washington to help Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston, or to enter the Government service at this time, because they were unwilling potentially to subject themselves to this kind of treatment and attack.

I should like to call upon the responsible leaders of the Republican Party to re-examine this appointment, and to re-examine it in the terms of the national interest in a time of crisis. I ask for the right to meet with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and his 14 associates of the Republican Committee on Committees. I ask the privilege of presenting to them my views on the potential consequences of an action I choose to think was not adequately considered. I am told that such a request has not been made heretofore on the floor of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senate. In that sense it is a most unusual request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am almost through, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield on the point he is making about the Republican Committee on Committees?

Mr. BENTON. I am almost through. I had refused to yield to other Senators before the distinguished minority leader came into the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not aware of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. BENTON. I prefer to wait a moment or two longer, until I shall have finished.

But, Mr. President, if mine is an unusual request, this is certainly a most unusual problem, and we are living in most unusual times.

Let me read the list of the 14 members of the Republican Committee on Committees. They are: Senators BUTLER, chairman; BRICKER, CAIN, ECTON, FLANDERS, IVES, JENNER, KEM, LANGER, LODGE, MALONE, MCCARTHY, M. C. SMITH, WATKINS, and WILLIAMS.

It so happens that I am the only Member of the Senate who has served as an operating executive of the State Department; and I think the distinguished occupant of the chair at this moment, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and I are the only two Members of the Senate who have served in the State Department. I am told that I am the only one in decades to have come into the Senate after experience as an operating executive in the State Department. I am sure from my own experiences, and from my own first-hand observations of the problem that is involved in this appointment, that many of the Senators, whose names I have just read, would not approve it. I cannot even believe that the appointment was discussed by this committee, because I feel sure that some of those Senators would have objected to it. And here we have the most important appointment of the year, yes, by far the most significant appointment of the year. Yet I doubt whether it was discussed by this key group of important Republican leaders. I am surprised that only the Washington Evening Star carried the news of this appointment on its front page. This shows how little the grave danger is understood, not only in this body but outside of it.

Mr. President, and fellow Members of the Senate, my warning is this: If this appointment cannot be reversed, all of us in the Senate, all of us who cherish the sober, judicious, and honorable traditions of the Senate, must now be doubly vigilant to speak up against the first signs of the new and worse siege of irresponsibility which I predict lies ahead of us. The American public, to whom a subcommittee may have little meaning, and the organs of information and opinion which serve the public, must now be prepared to watch and judge the performance of this subcommittee in the light of its extraordinary and dangerous composition. If we fail to do these things, the chaos can only be heightened, the unspeakable danger can only be deepened.

Mr. President, unless there are questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRICKER, and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the Senator from Connecticut declined to yield to me, I should like to make an observation. The Republican Party——

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, are the Senator's remarks about to be directed at me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are certain rules by which we operate. Those rules have absolutely been maintained in connection with the appointment of Senators to committees, legislative committees and otherwise. I am quite satisfied that the members of the Republican committee on committees did not interrogate anyone with reference to his feelings about the State Department or how he felt regarding the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority. Of course there were some disappointments in connection with membership on some committees. For example, last year the Republicans attempted to place on the Small Business Committee certain Senators who had had long service in that connection, and we very humbly made suggestions to the majority party. But what happened? They were all ignored; their service did not count for anything. Oh, no; they had been somewhat hard on the administration, and, therefore, there would be new faces on that committee.

I am not saying, Mr. President, that the membership of the committee is not of a high standard, but the facts are that when we attempted to help straighten out the situation and endeavored to have members appointed to the committee who we thought would be very efficient and would help the Senate of the United States, the Democratic Party turned us down. It did a thing that had not happened before in 9 years—it wiped out the entire personnel and appointed other Senators over the suggestions of the Republican members.

Only recently the Vice President appointed to the Small Business Committee five Republican members, in spite of what we thought was a proper proportionate representation. When the matter was called to the attention of the Vice President he changed his decision, which I think was the proper thing to do, and appointed a sixth Republican Senator in lieu of one Democratic Senator who retired from the committee. But it required efforts on the part of the minority to have that done. We did not have any help then. Whenever we have attempted so to organize committees that they would promote the efficiency of the Senate we have not received cooperation from the Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, further to strengthen the remarks of the able minority leader on this question, let me say that I was present in the Appropriations Committee when the subcommittees were named. The very able and distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is now the Presiding Officer. There was no question raised as to whether this Senator or that Senator should be seated on the various subcommittees. I was present when the Republican group was developing the various committees and subcommittees and discussing seniority rights of Members, because seniority rights of members of committees are recognized. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] gave consideration to each and every Senator in accordance with the seniority rights which he had earned, and each one was given consideration for appointment on the subcommittee of his selection. There was no deliberate attempt to pack committees, nor were there any deliberate attempts on the part of the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to exercise his influence over any Member of the Senate. He received recognition in the appointments.

I look upon the distinguished Senator from Connecticut as a friend. He is not only distinguished, but is an able Senator; he is not only a former student of Carleton College, which is located in my own home town, but he is a member of the board of trustees of that college, and I should not like at any time to cast a reflection upon his ideals, because I have a high regard for him; but in this instance, I think the Senator from Connecticut has drawn upon his imagination with reference to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who merely exercised his seniority right.

Mr. President, I am sorry that such remarks have come into the discussion on the Senate floor this afternoon, because I fear they will further confuse the public and further cause mistrust of this very able body, the United States Senate, insofar as the public is concerned.

I say again, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wisconsin earned his right to his seat on the committee because of his seniority.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations, which are absolutely true. I should like to say that I think the Republican Committee on Committees is represented geographically and with ability by some of the finest Members of the Senate. I paid a tribute to them in the conference, and I do so now. I think they did a masterful job in connection with our conference rules and seniority rules in placing Members on committees in such a way as to bring about the most efficient and the most able service which could be provided for the legislative committees and the special committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, I did not hear all the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut. He said there was difficulty in getting men to take office in the Government in Washington. My understanding has been, with reference to the formation of the Office of Price Stabilization, that even the Democratic Party itself has turned thumbs down on the appointment of many efficient men because they did not come through the proper channels of patronage. If we are to have a proper house cleaning, we need to bring able men into the organization of the Government. Such men should not be turned down because they belong to the Republican Party.

Mr. President, I do not know about those who are thin-skinned with reference to criticism. Certainly I myself, having been for 9 years a Member of the Senate, have been severely criticized; and I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that he will be criticized in the same way. The only thing to do is to live and to perform so that over the years criticism will be of no avail so far as a man's own leadership and service are concerned. Let people criticize if they want to. Always be right, and then let people criticize.

Mr. President, with reference to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], he can be criticized from coast to coast, and he can be criticized around the world, and it can be said that he caused confusion; but I think he has done more to establish confidence in the hearts of Americans than has any other man I know of in the past 2 years. He is giving the people of America new heart in cleaning out the infiltration of communism in the United States. The Senator from Connecticut can stand on the floor of the Senate and insult the Senator from Wisconsin and be directed to take his seat; but when the service of the Senator from Wisconsin shall be concluded, I predict that he will go down in a blaze of glory. He has performed a great service to the people of the United States.

ALLOCATION OF TELEVISION FREQUENCIES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution providing that the Federal Communications Commission be directed to make a study of the problem of allocating television frequencies for use by educational institutions for the purpose of nonprofit educational programs.

The word "education" does not appear in the text of the Constitution of the United States, but the people of the country have realized since the birth of our Nation the necessity for education as the cornerstone of democracy. Thomas Jefferson once said that the risk of losing our freedoms is small if reason is left free to combat error. Daniel Webster phrased the same principle in the following words: "On the diffusion of education among the people rests the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions." As early as 1798, Thomas Robert Malthus, a great English supporter of improved public education, answered the argument that broader public education would lead to the infiltration of dangerous ideas among the general public, by saying that, in his judgment, "an instructed and well-informed people would be much less likely to be led away by inflammatory writings, and much better able to detect the false declamation of interested and ambitious demagogues than an ignorant people." In fact, he continued, "those who object to the instruction of the people may be fairly suspected of a wish to encourage their ignorance, as a pretext for tyranny."

Despite the lack of mention of education in the Federal Constitution, the National Government has recognized since its inception a responsibility for assisting the several States in providing free public educational institutions.

The first specific example I would like to cite strikes very close to home, for the establishment of a land-grant policy by the Federal Government for the support of public education really began in 1803, with the admission of Ohio to statehood. By the act of Congress enabling the admission of Ohio to the Union, the sixteenth section of land in each township was reserved to the inhabitants thereof for the support of schools. Subsequent admissions to the Union contained similar, and later even more generous, land-grant provisions.

The passage of the so-called Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890, also known as the Morrill Acts, extended the policy of granting Federal lands for the specific purpose of the establishment by the States of colleges for the development of agriculture and the mechanic arts, which are now known as land-grant colleges. Today there are some 69 of these colleges in the United States, and the graduates stand among the foremost citizens of our Nation. In later years, through the media of grants, loans, and matching funds, the Federal Government directly assisted the States in the field of education, proceeding on the eminently sound premise that, since a republic is a popular government, an informed electorate is essential to our continuing prosperity and progress. In terms of land grants alone, approximately 100,000,000 acres of the 1,450,000,000 acres constituting the area of the continental United States, excluding Alaska, have been granted to the States or subdivisions thereof for educational purposes. In Alaska, over 21,000,000 acres of that Territory have been reserved for educational use. So the relationship of education and democracy is not only a close one, but is interdependent, and that principle has found expression throughout the history of our Nation.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Ohio have a list of the land-grant colleges? I think the insertion of such a list in the RECORD would be of value to all of us.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall get such a list and insert it in the RECORD.

The principle of setting aside grants of land for educational purposes is strikingly akin to the well-established principle of reserving a part of our natural resources for future needs. There is a parallel between the great natural wealth of this Nation and the education of our citizens. In a world of crisis, we must rely entirely and completely on these two assets, and, in my judgment, we cannot survive without judicious attention to our resources in nature and in the minds of Americans.

The development of communications by radio wave brought Congress face to face with the problem of disposition of national resources, for the frequencies in the radio spectrum were early recognized to belong to all the people, jointly and in common. As guardian of the public right and interest in this vital resource, the Federal Communications Commission was established by the Congress in 1934. Recognizing the importance of education to democracy, the Congress provided, in section 307 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, a requirement that the Federal Communications Commission study the needs of educational institutions and radio frequencies, with a view toward allocating or setting aside frequencies for educational purposes. As a result of this direction on the part of Congress, the Commission held hearings and a Federal Education Committee was formed in 1935. The then head of the Office of Education, Dr. John Studebaker, was appointed Chairman of the Committee. The task of that Committee was to meet with members of the radio industry and insure that educational needs were met, but the efforts of the Committee showed little real achievement.

Some educational institutions were allocated AM channels for educational purposes. The Ohio State University, in my home town of Columbus, Ohio, operates the AM and FM radio station WOSU on a nonprofit basis. I should like to mention briefly the success of the operation of Station WOSU. Purely for educational purposes, the station has programed what is known as the Ohio School of the Air for over 20 years. This program was the first of its kind in the Nation, and a recent study indicates that two out of three elementary classrooms within the 20-county primary listening area of the station listen to one or more programs of the station.

There were, during the thirties, a number of suggestions, in both Congress and the Commission, to assist these nonprofit educational radio stations. These suggestions included requiring networks to service educational stations on public service programs, requiring each commercial station to devote a certain percentage of time to educational programs and the allocation of high-power, clear-channel stations, on a ratio of one for every three States, to be devoted entirely to educational programing. None of these suggestions bore fruit, and, by and large, the records of educational purpose radio stations have not been as satisfactory as that of WOSU. Some have turned to commercial operation, although they are still operated entirely, or almost so, by students and faculty. One example of this is Station WWL, owned and operated by Loyola University of the South, in New Orleans, La.

On April 1, 1947, the Commission set aside the 88–92 megacycle band of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FM spectrum for use by noncommercial educational stations, primarily to meet the requirements of those stations in that group who were unable, due to conflict with commercial stations, to broadcast during evening hours. This action on the part of the Commission was a further acknowledgment of the propriety of reserving for public educational purposes a part of the natural resources of the Nation.

The advent of television on a large scale poses new problems for the Congress and the Commission. In the few years since the war, millions of families have acquired television receivers. I have seen estimates that, within 3 years, there will be six to eight times as many television stations broadcasting as we now have. The impact of this new communication medium has already been felt in the schools. In some areas, children spend more time before the television screens than they do in the classrooms.

Educators know that the audio-visual approach of television provides one of the most effective methods of teaching. It is up to the Congress and the Commission to insure that at least a proportionate part of this great and newly developed resource is reserved for the use of all the people. If education by radio can be as successful as WOSU has shown it to be, then the same principle is applicable many fold to television.

It is further the duty of the Congress to indicate to the Commission its deep interest in the problem of the inter-relationship of education and television. For that purpose, and mindful of the well-established precedents which I have already cited, I am today introducing a joint resolution directing the Federal Communications Commission to make a thorough study of all aspects of the problem and to report to the Congress thereon. I am aware that the Commission has already made commendable steps in that direction. By the adoption of this resolution, however, the Congress will lend an added impetus to the action of the Commission, and, will impress upon the Commission the necessity for affording the American people, who are, after all, the true proprietors of the television frequencies, the choice of using at least an equitable part of this resource for educational purposes. Such action by the Congress is consistent with the American tradition and recognizes the affinity of education and democracy. It is in full accord with the principle, so well established throughout our history, of reserving natural resources for the benefit of what has proved to be our greatest resource—the intelligently informed minds of free American citizens.

Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution and ask that it be published in full at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to make a study of the problem of allocating television frequencies for use by educational institutions for the purpose of nonprofit educational programing, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Communications Commission is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the problem of reservation of television frequencies for use by educational institutions for the purpose of nonprofit educational programing. The Commission is further directed to give consideration to the allocation of at least one frequency within each State or suitable geographic region to educational institutions for the purposes of educational programing. The Commission is further directed to report to the Congress as soon as practicable the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

FOOD AND FIBER FOR DEFENSE

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, under the emergency declared by the President of the United States, this country has now embarked on a huge defense program. First and foremost such a program requires ample food and fiber both for the military and for the public. In order to insure that such supplies will be available at all times it will be necessary:

First. To safeguard the farm-labor supply at the production level.

Second. To allocate materials to agriculture which will insure adequate machinery and repairs to maintain production.

I believe that a farm-policy council should be set up by the leading farm organizations of the United States, to alert and advise with the proper governmental authorities on these two pressing needs of agriculture.

An excellent editorial in the current February issue of the Country Gentleman very aptly states the need for such a farm-policy council, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STRENGTHEN AGRICULTURE'S POSITION

Farming needs to be better safeguarded under the defense production program. The farm labor situation, which could become critical by next summer, is an example of what can happen unless the interests of agriculture are properly looked after.

It isn't a matter that affects farmers alone. The public, which will have to do without some other things, will want plenty of food and the defense program requires ample supplies of food and fiber. But neither fact assures prompt attention to farm needs for all-out production. Somebody will have to take the responsibility for getting that kind of attention.

The Defense Production Act, passed by Congress, did fairly well in protecting farm prices. But it left the Department of Agriculture with little authority over the workings of the defense program. The Department can advise and can present claims for materials necessary for farm production. But this does not mean they will be granted. It will be only one of a number of interests pressing claims for materials, some of them with a stronger backing than agriculture now has in Washington.

Not only vigor in pressing farm requirements but an alertness in anticipating them is needed. The farm labor situation, reported in the Roundup columns on pages 4 and 10 of this issue, shows how important this can be. Such a loss of experienced farm workers, as now seems certain, may seriously handicap the heavy production program that has been called for. Farming is in a much different position than at the outbreak of World War II. At that time a surplus of farm workers had been backed up on the farms by the depression. Even then a farm manpower shortage soon developed. There is scant surplus of farm manpower now and farming is mechanized to twice the extent it was in 1941. Just any kind of worker won't do now.

This makes it imperative also that a shortage of spare parts be averted in the future. Many farmers keenly recall the time they spent and the distances they traveled trying to find needed parts during the last war. A far more highly mechanized agriculture couldn't stand that sort of experience again. Somebody will have to see to it that it doesn't happen.

Agriculture isn't in a position to do much about such things now. Outside the Department's services it has been represented only by a consulting committee on the National Resources Security Board, now superseded by the Office of Defense Mobilization. This committee was not fully representative of farming and has been of little effect.

Something is needed to strengthen the position of agriculture. For that purpose Country Gentleman suggests a farm policy council, set up by the leading farm organizations. Its job would be to keep watch over the needs of farming and to press them vigorously when they arise. Labor has such a council, and there has been no lack of vigor in presenting labor's case in Washington. A council, fully representative of agriculture, could be an effective voice in its behalf. It could cooperate with the Secretary if he were willing, as he should be, and reinforce his claims for needed farm help and materials. And it could work along the same lines with the two agricultural committees of Congress.

But before any such council can be set up, two things will be necessary. The various farm organizations will have to submerge their differences and work together for the common good of the farmers they represent. And there will have to be less thinking in terms of commodity groups and more in terms of agriculture as a whole.

This lack of unity and the struggle for special commodity gains together make up one of the reasons why agriculture isn't in as strong a position as it should be. The effects are felt both in Washington and in the attitude of the public, which isn't any too friendly toward farming and is inclined to take its food supply for granted.

These disadvantages should be removed. In this emergency farming requires a single effective medium through which its needs can get attention. It ought to have a responsible channel through which it can reach the public with the facts about agriculture. A farm policy council could render both these services. The farm organizations should see the opportunity and act upon it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Gilbert J. Fortier, of New Orleans, La., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New Orleans, La.; and

Calvin E. Wright, of Rupert, Idaho, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Barbour C. Stokes and several other officers for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Dwight H. Dexter, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Coast Guard; and

Joseph P. Adams, of Washington, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George P. Baker to be representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leroy D. Stinebower to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas D. Cabot to be Director for International Security Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John D. Erwin, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Monnett B. Davis, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanton Griffis, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think it would not be amiss if I were to say a word about Mr. Stanton Griffis of Connecticut, whose nomination as American Ambassador to Spain has just been confirmed.

Mr. Griffis is a resident of the State of Connecticut. His service to the Government of the United States, both in Poland and in Egypt, as well as in the Argentine, has been of the highest quality. I think it is particularly appropriate that a man of his ability, experience, and patriotism should be named as Ambassador of the United States to Spain. When he departs to undertake his duties, I am sure that we will all wish him the greatest success.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Horatio Mooers to be consul general of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William N. Fraleigh to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Whitaker to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry F. Arnold to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur G. Lund to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Reed P. Robinson to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Girvan Teall to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jack C. McDermott to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Forney A. Rankin to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles A Thompson to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Morris Fay to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dalton T. Pierson to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur Maguire to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Antonio C. Baza to be United States marshal for the district of Guam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE, DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with the approval of the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. WELKER], I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Calvin E. Wright, of Rupert, Idaho, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Calvin E. Wright to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like to tell the distinguished majority leader and my colleagues in the Senate that I have nothing but praise for the appointment of the man whose nomination has just been confirmed as collector of internal revenue for the State of Idaho. I know that the people of Idaho will rejoice in the appointment of this distinguished native son to be their collector of internal revenue.

It was my privilege to attend school with this man; and though he be of opposite political faith, I find much to admire in him.

In conclusion, let me say again that the people of Idaho generally, both Democrats and Republicans, will rejoice at this very fine appointment.

I thank the majority leader.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the same request with regard to the nomination of Gilbert J. Fortier, of New Orleans, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gilbert J. Fortier to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 101, Calendar No. 44. If agreed to, the motion will make the bill the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 101) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I do not intend to proceed today with the consideration of the bill. It will go over until Monday. I merely wish to make it the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with an amendment, on page 2, line 17, after the words "period of", to strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 203) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. During the time that this title is in force, and for any of the following purposes, but only in matters related to the national security or defense, namely, any of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) hereof; the promotion of the national security or defense; the support and maintenance of the Armed Forces; the better utilization of resources and industries; the more effective exercise and the more efficient administration by the President of his functions as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; or the better coordination of agencies and their functions; the President is hereby authorized to transmit to the Congress, under this title, reorganization plans which shall, except as provided in this title, be governed by the provisions of titles I and II of this act.

"SEC. 302. Each reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress under this title shall—

"(a) be certified by the President in his message of transmittal to the Congress as submitted under this title;

"(b) be identified as being temporary;

"(c) become effective in accordance with the provisions of section 6 hereof, except that a period of 12 days prior to taking effect shall obtain in lieu of the 60 days specified in the said section 6; and

"(d) remain in force only until the termination of this title or until otherwise made inapplicable by or pursuant to law.

"SEC. 303. (a) In addition to the matters specified in titles I and II hereof, any reorganization plan under this title may provide for either or both of the following, which shall for the purposes of this title be deemed to be reorganizations:

"(1) The extension of any function of any agency to any other agency; and

"(2) The utilization of the facilities, services, or personnel of any agency.

"(b) The President may include in any reorganization plan transmitted under this title provisions for the appointment of officers and other personnel in such manner as the President shall specify.

"(c) There may be omitted from the message of the President transmitting any reorganization plan under this title reference to the probable reduction of expenditures to be brought about by the plan (provided in section 3 of this act).

"(d) No reorganization plan under this title shall provide for, and no reorganization under this title shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or

"(3) abolishing, transferring, or consolidating the whole or any part of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

"SEC. 304. Upon the termination of this title, all functions, agencies, property, personnel, records, and funds affected by any reorganization plan then in force under the provisions of this title shall have such organizational status as may heretofore or hereafter be provided by law or by reorganization plan under titles I and II hereof.

"SEC. 305. This title shall terminate on June 30, 1952, or on the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or on a termination date designated by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever date is the earliest.

"SEC. 306. This title may be cited as the 'Defense Reorganization Act of 1951'."

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN B. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 104) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KEM and Mr. HENNINGS the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Allen, Wallace Burns, 15390A.
Atchison, Frank Kester, 15400A.
Baggaley, Thaddeus Stevens, 15466A.
Baker, Ellis Crain, Jr., 15468A.
Barnhart, Harley E., 15488A.
Bates, Thomas Lawson, 15404A.
Bauman, Norman Joseph, 15481A.
Benkoski, Ernest Felix, 15443A.
Bernier, Norman William, 15480A.
Berry, Robert Earl, 15478A.
Berryman, Delbert Quinton, 15514A.
Bice, John Ward, 15498A.
Biles, Howard Kenneth, 15426A.
Bolen, George Oliver, Jr., 15453A.
Bond, Byron Franklin, 15434A.
Brady, Wendell Darrell, 15396A.
Buckwalter, Charles Quimby, 15515A.
× Buie, James Campbell, 15442A.
Cairns, Oliver William, 15411A.
Campbell, James Milton, 15519A.
Campbell, Warren Franklin, 15418A.
Canant, Orion Paul Davidson, 15464A.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Carrington, Richard Thompson, Jr., 15384A.
Childress, James Brack, 15527A.
Christian, Harold Winfield, Jr., 15462A.
Clark, Lester Earl, 15425A.
Cox, Frank Leroy, Jr., 15509A.
Cron, Rodney Leonard, 15483A.
Curfman, Arden Blain, 15427A.
Currie, Donald Archibald, Jr., 15491A.
Curtis, Jack Franklin, 15473A.
Davenport, Ernest Eldon, Jr., 15484A.
Davis, Burton Alfred, 15490A.
Davis, Harold Elmo, 15516A.
Deem, Ray Howard, Jr., 15416A.
DeSaussure, Hamilton, 15486A.
× de Wolski, Constantine Taddeus, 15448A.
Diehl, Alfred James, 15461A.
Dienst, William Lewis, 15415A.
Edwards, Dewey Fortner, 15497A.
Elliott, Merle Munson, 15525A.
Erbe, Robert Frank, 15394A.
Fleming, Lawrence John, 15459A.
Fritts, Robert Erwin, 15482A.
Frost, Murl, 15429A.
Gardner, Alfred James, 15465A.
Garner, Lynn Ellis, 15397A.
× George, Amin, Jr., 15454A.
Glover, Henry Atkins, 15508A.
Griffith, William Walters, 15492A.
Grissom, V. F., Jr., 15440A.
× Hallas, Gerald Edward, 15458A.
Hamilton, Jeff Lee, Jr., 15524A.
× Hanson, Junior Ole, 15409A.
Harnly, Merlin Wrightsman, 15446A.
Hart, Bernard David, 15511A.
Hatch, John T., 15517A.
Hatton, Sam James, 15513A.
Hennessy, Thomas Berchman, 15471A.
× Henshaw, Daniel Stewart, 15441A.
Hickcox, Harold Jennings, 15410A.
Hickman, Robert Gardner, 15403A.
Hicks, William, 15438A.
× Hinman, Richard Horace, 19541A.
Hoffman, Wesley Kammerer, 15502A.
Holdsambeck, Herbert Snead, 15476A.
Holley, Hazil Lee, 15398A.
Howard, Waldon A., 15507A.
Howel, Howard Dempsey, 15402A.
Hutchins, Raymond Henry, Jr., 15421A.
Jackson, Ralph Frederick, Jr., 15496A.
× Jacobsen, Raymond George, 15444A.
Johnson, Herbert Justus, 15457A.
Juhn, Kenneth Paul, 15452A.
Jureka, John Francis, 15432A.
× Keal, Thomas Lee, 15406A.
Keeffe, James Herbert, Jr., 15401A.
Keegan, Robert Emmett, 15505A.
Kerr, Frank Ross, 15423A.
Kimberlin, John Isham, 15463A.
Klinikowski, Walter Paul, 15512A.
Krieger, Andrew Warren, 15433A.
Lake, Gordon Wentworth, 15431A.
× Lansche, Robert Louis, 15500A.
Libell, Robert Warren, 15522A.
Marlow, Robert Dean, 15439A.
Marshall, William Edgar, 15424A.
Marxen, Edward Henry, Jr., 15393A.
McClelland, Robert Cornelius, 15435A.
McElroy, Sam Medford, 15437A.
McKay, Robert Barr, 15499A.
McKenna, William Wilfred, 15391A.
Meyler, Walter Patrick, 15494A.
Michels, William Nicholas, 15392A.
Miller, Edward Ashley, 15477A.
Miller, Frank Edward, Jr., 15479A.
Mimnaugh, Walter Edward, 3d, 15503A.
Mitchell, Vance Fitzgerald, 15528A.
Moullen, Roy Frederick, 15470A.
Nelon, Claude Rufus, 15417A.
Nicely, Gelvin Smith, 15414A.
Nixon, Floyd George, 15407A.
× Orrison, Charles Davidson, 15493A.
Partin, George Garrett, 15449A.
Pedracine, Patrick Charles, 15495A.
Peterson, Carl Herbert, 15456A.
Pickron, William Henry, Jr., 15395A.
Plame, Samuel, Jr., 15529A.
Porter, Philip Barton, 15520A.
Prow, Emmett McCormack, 15467A.
Quail, Donald Eugene, 15469A.
Richardson, Ned West, 15489A.
Robertson, Leslie Caroll, 15531A.
Rodgers, William Asklow, 15405A.
Ross, Marvin Turner, 15413A.
Roswurm, Richard Carl, 15530A.
× Ruggles, Bertram Leon, 15388A.
Salter, George Metz, Jr., 15451A.
Sampley, Troy Allen, 15455A.
Schaffner, Donald Raymond, 15526A.
Schroeder, Howard Richard, 15510A.
Scott, Gordon Holborn, 15445A.
Scott, Leon Luck, 15412A.
Seller, Wilbur Western, Jr., 15422A.
Sherrard, James Lamar, 15504A.
Smith, George Kitchen, 15506A.
Smith, John Carlyle, 15430A.
Smith, Robert Perry, 15386A.
Spears, Simms Memory, 15501A.
Spencer, Allan M., Jr., 15419A.
Spencer, Earl Wilber, 15436A.
Spencer, Glen Harding, 15408A.
Stevenson, Robin, 15485A.
× Swan, Algernon Gordon, 15472A.
Thompson, Raymond Farris, 15387A.
Trautwein, Donald Frederick, 15474A.
Van Dyke, Wallace Ford, 15428A.
Venable, Calvin Houston, 15521A.
× White, Gerald Harn, Jr., 15447A.
White, Miller Grieve, Jr., 15385A.
Wilson, Clarence Edgar, 15518A.
Witham, Melvin Warren, 15475A.
× Wolfe, Donald Jack, 15450A.
Wright, Lawrence Chester, 15420A.
Yurcina, Thomas, 15399A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Darling, Kenneth Perry, 19523A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Bialock, Woodrow Wilson, 18297A.
Jenks, Harford Perry, 18299A.
Lockridge, Clarence Reynolds, 18298A.
May, Edward Stanley, 18301A.
Palmer, William Joseph, 18304A.
Peters, Earl William, 20684A.
Plowden, Douglas Randolph, Jr., 20685A.
Reid, Addison Taylor, 18303A.
Sharp, David Martin, 18293A.
Shiver, Morris Eugene, 18294A.
Smith, Gayle LeRoy, 20683A.
Snyder, John Thomas, 18302A.
Tannenbaum, Leon Marvin, 20687A.
Thompson, Lawrence A., Jr., 18295A.
Toothman, Byron Rimbey, 20686A.
Trommershausser, John, 18300A.
Walter, Harvey Peter, 18296A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Lubrant, Anthony John, 21627A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress.

To be captain

AIR FORCE NURSE

Loyd, Eddie Ruth, 21131W.

To be first lieutenant

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

Deming, Elsie L., 20901W.

NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to captain and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of March 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Adm. Ingolf N. Kiland, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

Leroy D. Stinebower, of Michigan, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic, Employment, and Development Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years.

DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Director for International Security Affairs.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John D. Erwin, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service as indicated:

To be consul general of the United States of America

Horatio Mooers

To be consuls of the United States of America

William N. Fraleigh
Charles H. Whitaker
Henry F. Arnold
Arthur G. Lund
Reed P. Robinson
Girvan Teall

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Jack C. McDermott
Forney A. Rankin
Charles A. Thomson

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George Morris Fay, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

Dalton T. Pierson, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Arthur A. Maguire, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Antonio C. Baza, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Calvin E. Wright, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Gilbert J. Fortier, of New Orleans, La., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Norman Shands, pastor, First Baptist Church, Spartanburg, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in this quiet moment we pause to recognize Thy presence in our midst and to seek the power, cleansing, and guidance of Thy holy spirit in our minds and hearts. We thank Thee for the great causes to which Thou hast called these Thy servants to address themselves, and for the confidence that must be in their hearts that their labors are always in vain except they be established by Thee.

We pray that Thou wilt enable us, not only here, but throughout our Nation as people of Thine, to discipline ourselves that we may be useful to Thee in achieving in the world the peace for which Thy Son lived and died, for we ask it in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 31, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 62):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN B. SULLIVAN, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, Senator KEM and Senator HENNINGS were appointed on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PROCEEDINGS AT AUDITORIUM OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the proceedings that took place yesterday at the auditorium of the Library of Congress, the introduction by the Vice President of General Eisenhower, and General Eisenhower's address on that occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the paper the general said there had been a misstatement about one year. Does the date appear there as it should be?

Mr. McCORMACK. This has been sent to the general to look over, I would inform the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this address may be extended at this point, notwithstanding it may exceed the limit of an ordinary extension.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER TO AN INFORMAL MEETING OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES HELD IN THE COOLIDGE AUDITORIUM, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, VICE PRESIDENT BARKLEY PRESIDING

Vice President BARKLEY. Ladies and gentlemen of the two Houses of Congress, I wish to congratulate the Members of the two Houses on their full attendance here today to hear General Eisenhower report to us on one of the most important missions ever undertaken by any American. I regret that there will be no opportunity for questions to be propounded to General Eisenhower in view of the fact that his talk to us here will consume probably an hour or more and we have got to get back to our respective Houses for the 12 o'clock session, and in view of the further fact that he is to appear this afternoon before a joint session of the Committees on Foreign Relations and the Armed Services of the Senate, and tomorrow before similar committees of the House, and is to address the American people over the radio tomorrow night. It was felt that it would be impossible and inadvisable under these circumstances for him to be submitted to interrogation from the audience today.

With this preliminary statement I have the great pleasure of presenting to you a man of distinction, who needs no description, one who has just returned from this important mission to the Atlantic Pact states of Europe and is here to report to us as fully as he feels advisable to report to us here, and to report later to the committees and to the American people, General Eisenhower. [Applause, the Members rising.]

General EISENHOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very deeply aware of the distinction implicit in the invitation to appear before the elected representatives of the people. I am also keenly aware of the responsibility that rests upon me in accepting such an invitation, a responsibility that is not, of course, easy to discharge.

The very great problems involved in the defense of the free world are so vast and so complex that no man could hope in a lifetime of study and reflection to solve them all. He can certainly not be sure of the accuracy of his conclusions. In my own case, to a lifetime of professional study I have recently been able to add the observations of a very hurried trip to 13 capitals, but that is most obviously a meager foundation upon which to base the conclusions that I have formed and am about to present to you.

So, aware as I am of this responsibility, I do assure you that I approach you in very deep humility and ask from you only this much on faith, that you do believe in the sincerity of my convictions. I have no end to serve, as I know you have no end to serve, except the good of the United States; and that is the reason I am talking here. [Applause.] And that is the reason I am back in uniform, and it is the reason I have the courage to appear before this body to express my convictions.

I am also aware of the very big responsibilities devolving upon you gentlemen. You will be forced from time to time, and soon, to make decisions that are going to be far reaching. In my opinion, they may determine the course of our civilization, whether or not free government is going to continue to exist upon the earth safely, and with all of the rights and privileges that devolve upon the individual citizen under that protection.

As I start this talk I think it would be well to establish a platform of understanding. Let us make certain assumptions. Now, the first, I have already made, that the Members of Congress here assembled and I have one object in common view, the good of the United States.

The next assumption I would like to make is that we are concerned not only with the protection of our territories of our rights, of our privileges, but we are also concerned with the defense of a way of life. Our own way of life has certain factors that must persist if that way of life itself is to persist for example, the freedom of the individual, his political freedom, his freedom of worship, and that he will have an economy based upon free enterprise. In other words, our system must remain solvent, as we attempt a solution of this great problem of security. Else we have lost the battle from within that we are trying to win from without.

I do not believe, for example, that the United States can pick up the world on its economic, financial, and military shoulders and carry it. We must have cooperation if we are to work with other nations. [Applause.] The results of the effort to be the mutual, the common good, the common security of the free nations of the free world.

Military defense is made up of many things. The things that defend the nation or that act for it on the field of battle are many and varied, and as complex as the nation itself. The fighting forces are but the cutting edge of a very great machine, the inspiration and the power for which are found in the hearts of the citizens. All of the various mechanisms that are necessary are represented in our industrial capacity, our economic processes, and so on, so that when we talk about defending the free world we are not merely talking about defense in the terms of divisions and battleships and planes. We are talking about what is in our hearts, what we understand with our heads, and what we are going to do as a body. And let me here say, gentlemen, that unless this assumption is correct I am out of place.

We are not attempting to build a force that has any aggressive, any belligerent intent; we are concerned only with one thing. In a world in which the power of military might is still too much respected, we are going to build for ourselves a secure wall of peace, of security. [Applause.]

This very moment I think is a good time to bring up this one thought: What we are trying to do cannot honestly be considered by any other nation as a threat to its existence, as a threat to any peaceful purpose it may have. If any such charge is made in the propaganda of the world, it is for a nefarious purpose, and any kind of attempt or announcement to move against us because of the simple modest actions we are trying to take is merely an excuse. I must say to you that that purpose would have been executed anyway if we did not do it, if that is the only reason they have for moving against us.

The NATO organization foresees and plans for the common defense of the free world with specific reference to those nations on the border of the North Atlantic. Since we are approaching this problem from the welfare of the United States, I think it well to pause just for a moment to review certain factors with you. These factors are: What is the importance of Western Europe to us? There are, of course, ties of sentiment; they are the people from whom we drew originally our genius, our blood stream; they are our relatives, and there are other bonds beyond those of sentiment that appeal to us in this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

job of protecting ourselves. We must look at all the common factors.

Behind our faith in them, since that is the basic assumption of the NATO organization, first of all in Western Europe there exists the greatest pool of skilled labor in the world. In western Europe exists a great industrial fabric that is second in its capacity only to that of our Nation. There are more than 200,000,000 people who are related to us. If we take that whole complex with its potential for military exploitation and transfer it from our side to another side, the military balance of power has shifted so drastically that our safety would be gravely imperiled, grossly imperiled. The significance of the Western European group of nations to us is even greater than that. They have with many areas of the world close blood, political, and economic ties. It is scarcely possible to imagine the fall of Western Europe to communism without the simultaneous fall of certain of these great areas, particularly those, and first those, areas which have a political dependency upon the European powers, the very areas from which we draw the materials which are absolutely essential to our existence, our way of life. No matter how strong we prove in keeping open routes of communication, we must always keep open, clearly we must keep open the areas, keep them open to us when we need their trade in order to exist. Take such items only as manganese, copper, uranium. Could we possibly ever exist without access to them?

I believe that such things as this are tied up in our concern with the western European complex in our determination—our decision that as I understand it has already been made—that we must defend them. But I refer again to the statement I have made, we cannot do this thing alone. All we would be doing would be to disperse our strength throughout the world unless we were sure first that we were being given full cooperation; and, second, that this strength of ours properly placed in other countries will there inspire the growth of still greater power and multiply every single effort that we make by comparable effort on the part of our friends.

As I said a moment ago, military strength is made up of various things of which the fighting forces are merely the cutting edge. One of the greatest factors in this whole thing is morale, and, ladies and gentlemen, almost the rest of my talk will be made up directly or indirectly in discussions of this question of morale, because morale involves understanding, it involves heart, it involves courage, fortitude, basic purpose.

Where my trip comes in is this: What have I been able to find out about the basic intent, the basic purpose, the basic morale of Europe? It is a complex question; and, again, certainly I do not consider that there is anything sacrosanct about the conclusions I have reached. Again I can only say they are honest.

We have heard for many years, five at least, much about the destruction of the European nations, about their material destruction, but above all about their loss of spirit, their loss of will, their unreadiness to do something for themselves. Of course, I think that Americans in general have not really tried to blame Europeans for this failure as we have seen it. They have tried merely to explain it. After all, Europe was occupied for 4 years; its industries were destroyed and its people lived in fear of the informer next door. They were crushed; their systems of government were overturned and they lived according to the dictates of an invader.

The effects of the Marshall plan have been marked and have been important to the partial rehabilitation of Europe, but it would be false and idle to say that there does not exist in many strata of society pessimism bordering upon defeatism.

But there is likewise evidence, ladies and gentlemen, of a rejuvenation, a growth of determination, a spirit to resist, a spirit again to try to live the lives of free men, to hold their heads up in the world, to do their part and to take the risk. I am going to quote to you a few examples, because I do not ask you to accept such a statement as that at face value I would rather give you a few examples of the things that influenced my own judgment.

On my arrival in France I talked with the Government there and found this: That to their conscription law they have now added a proviso that permits almost no exemption for any cause whatsoever. They have made it one of the strictest, most inclusive conscription laws that would be possible to devise. As of this moment their tour of service is 18 months, but they pointed out to me the very many factors that have limited it from being greater, and indicated that one of the most important of these was lack of instructors, capable instructors. They cannot get instructors because they are losing many of them each month in Indochina. But as that is relieved and they get more equipment, they will go further and extend the tour to 2 years.

They are determined to stand against communism both internally and externally with courage in their hearts. Most of it has been inspired, at least it has been strengthened by the consummation of the NATO Treaty. There is no question about that.

I moved into Belgium and found similar determination. In Holland I received statements of the increased military preparations that they are going to make.

Denmark, exposed as it is way out between the Baltic and North Seas, likewise is going to do everything that represents their maximum effort.

In Norway there is no question about the determination of their will to resist. Their attitude is that resistance to the point of destruction is preferable.

In Rome it was quite clear that there is a stiffening resolve to meet this issue face on. While they are limited in the amount of their military force by treaty, they have determined to make that force efficient and to put it unreservedly at the command of the NATO powers.

I am not even going to mention my several conversations in Germany and for a very specific reason. I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved and an understanding reached that will contemplate an eventual and earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of an army. I, certainly, for one commander, want no unwilling contingent, no soldiers serving in the pattern of the Hessians who served in our Revolutionary War, serving in any army I command. Therefore until the political leaders, the diplomats, and the statesmen find the proper answer, it is not for a soldier to delve in too deeply.

In little Luxemburg I had an unusual experience. I think you would like to hear about it as illustrating the readiness of the nations today to try to cooperate. They are very small; there are only 300,000 people there, but they set their jaws and said: "We will have universal military service with no exemptions." They said: "We are very badly handicapped; we have equipment for one battalion only. What we particularly need is more artillery equipment."

When I stopped in Ottawa I told the Canadians about this trouble and the Canadians said: "Why, we have some artillery; we can ship it tomorrow." When I got to West Point a few hours later, I was greeted with the information that the Canadian Government had approved of the transfer and just left the red tape to me and my staff to look after.

What I am trying to say is that out of these conferences I sensed the feeling that there will be a rejuvenation of spirit if we can put ourselves into this thing, not only with the sense that we must do it because there is no acceptable alternative, because standing alone and isolated in a world with the rest completely dominated by communism, our system would have to wither away, our economy could not thrive.

Just stop to consider, ladies and gentlemen, that there are in the free world today—and not counting all of the outlying segments in such places as Australia, New Zealand, South America, and other parts of the free world—in Europe and the North American Continent alone there are 350,000,000 people who represent the highest culture man has been able to achieve upon this earth. They are responsible for every advance of science, the arts, and culture; they possess great reservoirs of leadership that have not been touched; they possess on the average a higher understanding than any other people in the world; they have the greatest productive capacity. Thanks to our great wisdom in keeping the proper strength upon the sea and in the air we have access to the raw materials that we need. Why, then, are we frightened of totalitarian government? For only one reason, because they have a unity of purpose. True, it is a unity achieved by ignorance, by force, by the NKVD.

What we have got to do, the only thing we have to do, is to meet that unity with a higher type of unity, the unity of free men that will not be divided. Someone in achieving that unity has to take the leadership, and I mean some one nation, not some one individual. We cannot either individually or at the national level afford to look over our shoulders with a suspicious thought that our friend is not doing as much as we are. We must by example inspire and insist and get everybody to do his maximum. The fullness of his performance will be limited by his capacity only. All of us must make this problem that of the highest priority.

I do not say, ladies and gentlemen, that that has been achieved. I merely say that, if the presentation I have made of the military situation, the possibilities of development in the whole economic world based upon the loss or the retention of Western Europe within our own wall of security, if those presentations are only reasonably accurate, then it is clear that we must do this. What nation is more capable, more ready for providing this leadership than the United States? We have been spared much of the discouragement, the defeatism, the destruction that has been visited upon Europe. We are younger, we are fresher, and a further important point is that we are farther removed from the immediate threat. We do not dwell in the gray zone. This strength, as I see it, must grow up in the rear and be pushed out. I do not mean pushed out in the sense that as soon as we produce units they must be deployed all over the world. I mean financial, moral, military, and material strength.

Our friends must know it. Inspired by it and living with it they must produce equal amounts of their own, far more than equal in particular areas. Our view in the central position must be directed to many sectors. We cannot concentrate all our forces in any one sector, even one as important as Western Europe. We must largely sit here with great, mobile, powerful reserves ready to support our policies, our rights, our interests wherever they may be in danger in the world.

The point I make is that Western Europe is so important to our future, our future is so definitely tied up with them, that we cannot afford to do less than our best in making sure that it does not go down the drain.

I repeat that, given the premise that we must produce, there is, then, one element left, time. We must accept, we must always accept this disadvantage militarily, inter-

nationally, that goes with peaceful intent and defensive purpose only. Any aggressor picks a day on which he intends to strike, and he builds everything to that point. We have to devise a scheme that we can support, if necessary over the next 20 years, 30 years, whatever may be the time necessary, as long as the threat, the announced threat of aggression remains in the world. That means we must be ready at any time. One of the important times is today, and from here on. As long as we are determined to secure the peace we have to use, employ, or resort to force and military power. In so doing let us not forget that there is not a moment to waste.

This brings me to a very important point: One of the great deficiencies in Europe is equipment, military equipment. Not only was all of this taken away from them in the war, but their facilities, destroyed, damaged as they were, have since that time been all occupied in trying to restore some semblance of a decent standard of living to their millions. They have little in the way of munitions productivity, although it is growing, and some of it, indeed, is very good.

I believe that the transfer of certain of our units should be in direct ratio to what Europe is doing so that we know that we are all going forward together, and no one is suspicious of the other.

The great need of the moment, as I say, is equipment. The great, the crying need today, as I see it, is equipment, the impedimenta of armies, of navies, of air forces. It must be furnished quickly and properly, adjusted to this purpose of ours, the purpose of peace and security, to our ability to carry it forward without insolvency for year after year. I believe that within those limits we must now go into the production of equipment exactly as if we were preparing for the emergency of war.

We must remember that in World War II we used a system we called lend-lease, and I heard often in my headquarters people criticize this scheme of lend-lease. I never could feel that way about it, and I will tell you why, ladies and gentlemen. It took a rifle and a man to go out and advance the cause of the Allies against the enemies we had. If the United States could provide merely the rifle and get someone else to carry it in order to do the work that was necessary, I was perfectly content.

I believe in this thinking, particularly today. If we can put munitions in the hands of people that we know will serve on the side that is essential to our future security, to the kind of life our grandchildren are going to live, the only thing we need to know is that they are going forward with us. They are not lagging in their hearts or in their efforts.

I would say that in this particular subject of equipment the United States faces again the great proposition of transferring so much of its great productive capacity into the terrible business of producing munitions of war. You gentlemen are going to find it one of your most difficult, but at the same time one of your most important and immediate, tasks.

I believe as of now that with that equipment we will find a great rejuvenation in western morale. What we are trying to do, ladies and gentlemen, is to start a sort of reciprocal action across the Atlantic. We do one thing which inspires our friends to do something, and that gives us greater confidence in their thoroughness, their readiness for sacrifice. We do something more and we establish an upward-going spiral which meets this problem of strength and morale. The only thing that can defeat us is to establish a descending spiral born of suspicion, unreadiness on the part of each of us to do his job, the job that he knows in his own heart he must do.

I should like to bring to your attention a few things that I think are important to remember. Enemy propaganda has among other things, as it is reflected in the European press, tried to make it appear that the whole job is hopeless. He has shouted it from the housetops. If they say it is hopeless, they must have a purpose. Let us not believe too freely enemy propaganda, or the propaganda of somebody who wants to defeat our peaceful, our sane, our utterly just purposes. Let us not forget the strength of America, its great people, its history, its broad acres, its productive capacity, its great capacity for leadership. And then let us keep in our minds the kind of organization we sha.. have when we bind that up heart and soul and in material ways with our frien is across the sea.

I come back again for a moment to the question of morale. Nobody can defend another nation. The true defense of a nation must be found in its own soul, and you cannot import a soul. We must make sure that the heart and soul of Europe is right. That is one of the obligations, gentlemen, that is imposed on me and my staff. I cannot conceive that the United States ever consented to accept the responsibility for acting in Western Europe except with those two reservations, that their representatives would do their utmost to see that they were all advancing together and that the United States was not being made merely an Atlas to carry the world upon its shoulders. I can see that each one of you in your great responsibilities as the lawmakers of this Nation has an element and a part of that responsibility individually. But we must not watch that so closely that we fail to get out in front to provide the leadership that will make this thing a complete success.

So this faith in America is one that lies at the bottom of this whole thing. Faith that the leadership she can provide will inspire the same kind of feeling, the same kind of effort in our friends abroad. And there I am sure we must exercise a bit of patience. It takes some time for our purposes—no matter how plainly we think they may be written upon the wall—it takes some time for others to understand those purposes and to gain faith in them. Remember, we have our own doubts and divisions, and we have our own debates. Think how that is multiplied in Europe where there are 10 of these nations in this organization, and they have all of the nationalistic factors to increase the intensity of the debate. We must have patience. Some of their problems are very, very serious. France, in the war against communism in Indochina, is losing monthly more than half of the men she can produce as instructors, the instructors they need to produce the army in France which they are so desperately trying to do. They have promised in spite of that to have by the end of the year 1953 roughly 25 battle-ready divisions. That is the kind of effort they are making.

Britain has similar things to face. Others, too, have problems. So while we may get a bit impatient when we think they do not see instantly what we are trying to do and what they should do in order to have the effort mutual and equal, we must have patience, ladies and gentlemen. Leadership must have patience or it cannot succeed.

And now there is one other point. I tried desperately to bring to you gentlemen specific types of comparisons that would convince you today of Europe's intent and of Europe's accomplishments, but when I tried to take such items as the proportion of gross national product that is turned into military purposes, when I tried to take the terms of enlistment, or the terms of service under conscription, when I tried to take the number of men that are actually in uniform or the kind of force they were trying to produce, the amount of their national budget that is put into military purposes, I found it impossible to make such comparisons. I started to talk about it in one nation and a man said to me, "General, we are amazed at the amount of your national product that you can devote to this great purpose. We understand that you are going to put about 20 percent of your gross national product into military or semimilitary purposes. Come with me, come out to the villages and come to the farms and see what a 5-percent reduction in our standard of living means." I looked at that squarely in the face.

I would like to bring you specific criteria, and I find myself disappointed in being unable to do so. I do come back to this, however, the defense of freedom is exactly like the appreciation for freedom, it is in the heart. It is a job that each of us here can do.

And though I cannot bring you back specific criteria by which you may judge for yourselves in the materialistic way, I do hope earnestly that each of you will take the opportunity to go to Europe and see whether you appreciate and sense this coming rejuvenation, this great determination that I think I sense. I assure you that when I get a headquarters established every one of you will be welcome there. Some of you were in my headquarters some years ago. It will be a nice return visit if you come back.

The cost of peace is going to be a sacrifice, a very great sacrifice individually and nationally. But the total war is tragedy; it is probably the suicide of civilization.

I came back, ladies and gentlemen, with the purpose of rendering just a report. It is not my proper role to be exhorting the Members. I am trying now to make my words those of education; I am trying to make them those of deep conviction that the world, our world, has arrived at a moment of decision. I have come to the conclusion that we can go on following the basic principles of our system safely and surely, subject to the tasks that I have here so briefly tried to outline. We can do it without constituting of ourselves or of our forces a threat to any other nation. Any attempt so to describe it would be for propaganda purposes only.

I close, ladies and gentlemen, on one note only which I have not to this moment mentioned, because it does not lie completely within my province, but it is important. That is our own efforts to let the world understand what we are about, what we are, and sometimes our own efforts to have our own people understand what we are trying to do. In any event, I believe that the United States needs a very, very much stronger information service. In our case I would not call it propaganda, because the truth is all we need. We do not have to falsify the record nor our intentions. [Applause.]

I think most of you know it has been my invariable practice when I appear before a body such as this to ask for a question period. As has been explained to you by your Presiding Officer, it was decided that it was impossible today. But I am, I believe, going to be in joint meetings with four committees of the Congress. I assure you that, so far as it lies within my power to do so, I will answer as honestly and sincerely as I know how every single question which you may choose to ask me.

This has been a very great honor, ladies and gentlemen. I cannot tell you how much it means to me that you have assembled to hear the conclusions that I have drawn and the beliefs that I hold with respect to this very, very great task.

Thank you very much. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Vice President BARKLEY. General Eisenhower, I am sure I express the views of every Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, and of all those who have been here this morning when I say I thank you not only for the information which you have conveyed to us but for the sincerity, the obvious, transparent sincerity with which you have done so.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

We have been under great obligation to you; and we know that under your leadership the cause of democracy in Europe, America, and the world will be advanced.

The meeting is now adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a. m., the meeting adjourned.)

INVESTIGATION OF EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS OF VETERANS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed, effective January 3, 1951, to conduct a full and complete investigation, evaluation, and study of the alleged abuses in the education and training and loan guaranty programs of World War II veterans, and of action taken, or the lack of action taken by the responsible officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and State approving agencies to prevent abuses under Public Laws 16 and 346 (78th Cong.) as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, evaluation, and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or had adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof or any member of the committee staff may administer oaths to witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file a privileged report for printing in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 95, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may the gentleman from Ohio inquire what is the privileged report?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk read the report. The Clerk will reread it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 95, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. COX rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a question.

Mr. COX. For a statement. The gentleman violates an agreement we had on the floor.

Mr. SABATH. I did not violate any agreement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asked unanimous consent to have until midnight to file a report from the Committee on Rules. That was day before yesterday. The request was objected to. There was no agreement the Chair knows anything about.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I had an agreement with the gentleman myself. The Committee on Rules reported this resolution when a quorum was not present.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I approached the gentleman on the floor and made a statement to him. He said he would not offer this resolution until the committee had had opportunity to act on it again. Now, that was fair of the gentleman. Of course, I do not mean to say the gentleman intentionally violates an agreement, but he has violated an agreement.

Mr. SABATH. No. Wait a minute. Mr. Speaker, to make matters clear, two of the Republican Members left the committee—the committees remained in session—to answer a roll call. We had seven Members and there was no objection.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is mistaken. There were six. I counted them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution has not been properly reported by the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. It has been reported.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think an inquiry by the Chair will determine there was not a quorum present, and that the resolution was not before the committee at that time.

Mr. COX. That is right. That is a correct statement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I must protest, Mr. Speaker, and I must make the point of order inasmuch as I regret to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, even if a quorum was not present, no point of order has been made. But a quorum was present, and I can give you the names of the seven Members who were present. They were Mr. COX, Mr. COLMER, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LATHAM, and myself. Seven of twelve makes a quorum. But I withheld it because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] objected due to some misunderstanding with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Since that time I have learned that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has agreed with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] on the assignment of committees and because the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] assured me that an agreement has been reached with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] as to the number of subcommittees, I present it today. A quorum was present. The committee had jurisdiction.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield there, the gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Texas were not present. There was not a single Republican present.

Mr. SABATH. There was a Republican present.

Mr. COX. Not a single Republican was present. This was not on the agenda but it was called up after the Republicans left, and there was not the majority present.

Mr. SABATH. I will ask the gentleman whether Republicans were present or not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot make any unanimous-consent request at this time. The House cannot transact business unless the point of order of no quorum is withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. By request I withhold the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot withhold it. He must withdraw it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I will withdraw it then. I understand I can make it again pretty quick.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman certainly can.

Mr. SABATH. I withdraw the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 33 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1951, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government, or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served

through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the solution of the problems of small business during the continuance of the existing national emergency.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, strike out "to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to offer an amendment?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, lines 2 and 3, strike out "nine Members" and insert in lieu thereof "eleven Members."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution—House Resolution 33—deserves the wholehearted support of every Member on both sides of the aisle. There is nothing partisan, nor is there anything controversial, in the proposal to reconstitute the committee of this body which has devoted constant attention to the problems of small business for nearly a decade.

Throughout my connection with the House Small Business Committee—and I have served on the committee since its inception—all of the committee members have worked together harmoniously and in a spirit of sincere cooperation. The committee has approached the problems of small business without partisanship or a desire to make political capital out of them. Whatever differences of opinion the committee members may have in other fields, they are agreed that small, independent business must be preserved as the bulwark of our economic system. They are agreed that private enterprise must be kept free and competitive. And they have worked together toward those objectives.

I am confident that there is no Member of the House who does not share these views. The most important action which this body can take to demonstrate its interest in small business is the continuance of the small-business man's own committee in the House.

HISTORY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The House Small Business Committee was created by the Seventy-seventh Congress just 3 days before the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor. Its value to the Nation has been attested by the fact that each succeeding Congress has unanimously continued the life of the committee. Throughout the past decade, encompassing the World War II years, the postwar readjustment period, and now the period of mobilization against another menace to our way of life, the House Small Business Committee has given unlimited attention to every major problem confronting small business.

There is not sufficient time for me to recount the accomplishments of the committee during this period, but I should like to call your attention to a few highlights. In the early years of World War II, when many thousands of small businesses throughout the Nation were closing their doors through inability to obtain scarce materials or defense contracts, the committee conducted hearings which led to the passage of the Smaller War Plants Act.

After the war the committee gave invaluable assistance to small-business men undergoing the difficult experience of reconversion to a civilian economy. It was instrumental in the passage of legislation providing thousands of small businesses opportunity to handle war-surplus materials. It gave continuing attention to such problems as credit facilities for small business, Government competition with private enterprise, and the many problems involved in Government procurement.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

In recent months the committee has centered its attention on the problems of the current mobilization period. It successfully sponsored and supported small-business amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950. It was instrumental in the establishment of small-business offices in the Department of Defense, the National Production Authority, and the Economic Cooperation Administration. It was successful in expanding the number of outlets for Government procurement information from 65 to approximately 6,000 throughout the Nation. It is acting as the protagonist of small business over Government procurement policies, and it has drafted legislation to create a special Government agency to assure small business full participation in the mobilization program. In addition, the committee has aided hundreds of individuals and firms with specific problems through Members of the House.

These are only a few of the results which the House has obtained by creating a special committee to study the problems of small business.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Every Member realizes that these problems will increase in number and complexity as we go further into the mobilization period. It will be impossible for individual Members to handle the problems brought to them by small-business men in their districts in the ensuing months. Other committees of the House are fully occupied in dealing with various phases of mobilization, but not specifically with its impact upon small business. The small-business man's only hope that he will receive adequate consideration by the House is through the House Small Business Committee. It is my hope that the House will adopt House Resolution No. 33 by a unanimous vote.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the House Small Business Committee is one of the most necessary committees of the House because of its almost unlimited opportunities for service to the largest business increment in the American economy. The old adage, "Great oaks from little acorns grow," applies to our business enterprises. Three score and 10 years ago the economy of our country consisted of only small businesses. Today these have grown into huge industries which produce and supply us with the major products used by most of the 150,000,000 people in our Nation. If conditions change to such an extent that small-business units cannot be formed and cannot prosper, the future industrial expansion and development of business would be endangered.

Recently a distiguished engineer wrote a brochure on progress in America which I have seen since the 1880's. He pointed out that in the last decade of the nineteenth century there were no electric lights, no telephones, no streetcars, no motor vehicles, no carbon steel, and no engine-driven ships. Within a period of less than 25 years dozens of vast industries were developed by inventions in the fields of public utilities, transportation, and communication. Most of our great present-day inventions, most of our great industries, and our entire economic structure were begun, continued, developed, and expanded to their huge proportions in little more than a half century.

We have tremendous industrial strength—great laboratories, thousands of technicians, and a considerable number of billion-dollar corporations. We should not permit our economic structure to become top-heavy with powerful combinations which tend to weaken the foundation of smaller enterprises. We must not forget the small-business producers, wholesalers, distributors, and retailers who would be swallowed up by the giants if not wisely protected and preserved. Both the big and little people should have definite functions and opportunities in the American competitive system.

There are serious competitive handicaps which small business must overcome even in normal times: inability to obtain equity capital and long-term financing; shortages of certain raw materials and finished products; unequal opportunity to compete in markets; lack

of credit for development and expansion; and others too numerous to mention. The mobilization program increased and intensified these handicaps to such an extent that many small concerns may be forced to quit doing business.

At this time the most acute problems facing small business are in the field of procurement. The Small Business Committee has already begun the fight for realistic recognition of the rights and resources of small manufacturers who should be given greater opportunities to contribute a proportionate share to the defense program. Results of World War II should be a warning to us as we enter this period of accelerated preparedness for possible world war III. The closing down of a large number of small businesses was a great wastage of capital, materials, and manpower. At the same time economic concentration increased by leaps and bounds. Although big corporations are expected to produce a great amount of war matériel, it is not best for the whole economy to have large corporations controlling an unreasonably high percentage of production. Such control makes it difficult, if not impossible, for small firms to obtain contracts on which production costs can be met and materials essential for both military and civilian production.

The Small Business Committee has an unprecedented opportunity to keep procurement officials aware of the abilities and facilities of small business which should be integrated in the national defense program. The officers and staff of the committee will continue to maintain an open forum where small-business men can be heard and appropriate action taken to give all possible assistance. Many of us send our constituents to this committee for information and guidance. Its services will be needed more in the biennium ahead than in any period since its creation at the beginning of the last World War.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives was established in 1941 3 days before Pearl Harbor, when our effort in World War II was just beginning. The advent of war caused an immediate and serious crisis for small business. The very life of small business was threatened. Unjust economic conditions arising out of mobilization of industry seemed likely to deprive the small and independent business units of the very opportunity to survive.

During the previous war and the difficult postwar years the committee rendered an invaluable service to the small-business men of this country and to the country as a whole. By its efforts procurement policies were modified to make it possible for small business to participate in the war effort. It was instrumental in enacting legislation which assured small business of a fair share in war contracts. It helped the little fellow in making readjustments both to war and to peacetime production after war.

The present crisis confronting small business is no less severe than it was 10 years ago. The events of the past year point to the extinction of thousands of firms unless our mobilization program is redirected. Few of these firms are today participating in the war effort. Many lack materials for civilian production. Small business has been begging for contracts which have gone to large concerns. It is the story of 1941 all over again.

No one will challenge the assertion that we need the producing facilities of these small businesses in the war effort. In the aggregate they far exceed the facilities of our industrial giants. It will be impossible as it was in World War II to attain our maximum effort unless we utilize to the fullest extent the resources of small business. The loss of this essential productive capacity would be a great tragedy.

Small business lies at the roots of the American economic system. It is the bed rock upon which our whole economy is built. It is the very basis of the American way of life. Without it the competitive system will fail and freedom as we know it will disappear. We are fighting totalitarianism just as we were in 1941. The essense of totalitarianism is regimentation and control. It thrives on bigness, on subservience, and on special privilege. We must convince the world that a free economy operating under a democratic Government is more efficient and more capable of building a high standard of living than totalitarianism.

This demands the continued prosperity of independent businessmen. A free and competitive system in which there is freedom of opportunity, a constant spur to efficiency and prompt penalties for inefficiency will produce more wealth not only for the war period we are now entering but in the days of peace to come.

It was once said, "The only way to enrich America is to make it possible for any man who has the brains to get into the game. No system is renewed from the top; it is renewed from the bottom. Limit opportunity, restrict the field of originative achievement, and you have cut out the heart and root of all prosperity." We must not cut out the "heart and root" of our economic system.

The Small Business Committee has a vital part to play in this great task of preserving our free institutions. It has already demonstrated its usefulness in the nearly 10 years of its existence. A review of its accomplishments during the Eighty-first Congress indicates the importance of its work. Among these the following are the more outstanding:

First. Investigation: The committee has instituted several important investigations of problems pertaining to small business. Among these are its study of identical bidding on Government contracts. This led the General Services Administration to issue a regulation making it incumbent upon all civilian agencies to award a contract to a small-business concern when two or more equal bids are received. The committee's investigation of consumer-credit controls was instrumental in securing a relaxation of regulation W in 1947. It has made notable studies of the steel industry, of oil imports, of cement distribution, and of the fur industry. It has placed on a continuing basis an investigation of the operating effectiveness of the antitrust agencies. This has already begun to pay dividends in the form of increased operating efficiency of these agencies. It has prepared a 50-year history of antitrust legislation which has been widely acclaimed.

Second. Assistance in legislation: The Small Business Committee is not a legislative committee of the House. Nevertheless, it has rendered very valuable service in enacting legislation. Some of the measures upon which it has been active are: recent amendments to the Economic Cooperation Act, amendments to the Sherman and Clayton Acts, a uniform statute of limitations in treble damage suits under the antitrust laws, Public Law 280 eliminating premium payments on contracts for the purchase of Government royalty oil, the Small Business Act of 1950, Public Law 776 granting technical aid to small business, and many others.

Third. Assistance in procurement: The committee has been very active in helping small-business men who are trying to become Government contractors. It has made much information accessible to small producers and has helped in the latter's dealings with procurement officers. It has lifted a heavy load from our shoulders in taking care of the many inquiries and complaints from the public. More than this it has spurred the procurement officers themselves to a greater awareness of the needs of small business and to an increased willingness to make use of the latter's facilities.

Because of its past record and promise of continued usefulness I believe the life of the committee should be extended through the Eighty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1951, the select committee created by House Resolution 323 of the Eighty-first Congress is authorized to continue the investigation and study begun under authority of such House Resolution 323 and for such purposes shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such House Resolution 323. The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will continue the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I observe that the resolution continues the so-called Delaney committee, which started its operations late in the Eighty-first Congress, in the second session. The committee has done exceptionally good work. It has a rather important task ahead of it for the protection of the health of the people of America. On both sides of the aisle there seems to be general agreement that the committee must and should carry on.

Mr. MITCHELL. The resolution would continue the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products.

Under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], the committee, which was established just last year, has filed an interim report. This report, in the opinion of the Rules Committee, outlines a field in which further investigation should be conducted. There are many indications that this study will result in suggestions of legislation which may be necessary if the public is to be protected adequately by the food and drug laws.

This, in my judgment, is a very important task especially in view of the fact that the average citizen takes it for granted that Federal law does protect him fully from the presence of harmful ingredients in foods.

The committee report states that while 704 chemicals are used in the preparation of foods, only 428 are known to be safe. This need not indicate that the other 276 chemicals are harmful when used. It does mean, however, that the safety of these 276 chemicals has not been established to the satisfaction of the Food and Drug Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such rearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the subject being dealt with and of the background of the great Committee on Armed Services, and the experience that it has had in this field, the Committee on Rules was happy to report the pending resolution. The adoption of this resolution will, in my opinion, result in practically all of the committees of the House asking that they be given subpena powers, and a denial of this request to any single committee will be a difficult thing to do. I am convinced, however, that these are matters which should be cleared with the leadership, and where they are related to national defense, they should likewise be cleared with the leadership of the majority, for there are on foot schemes to use the investigatory powers of committees to perpetrate gigantic frauds upon the American businessman, who ought not to be put on the griddle just for the sake of getting all the grease that his hog contains. He ought, however, to be held to a strict accounting and made to keep faith with the Congress and the country and live up to all of his engagements.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was glad to see party lines melt under the rays of the genuine affection that this body bears for the great man who presides over it. The gentleman who occupies the high position of Speaker of the House of Representatives is no political accident. The high station which he holds he earned by patient toil. He is no counterfeit because the coiner who stamped him is God. That which I say of our presiding officer I can say and do say with equal earnestness of his distinguished predecessor, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I say it with the same earnestness as regards the most moral man I ever knew, the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]. I say it of the brilliant CHARLEY HALLECK, LES ARENDS, faithful PERCY PRIEST, and of the noblest Roman of them all, BOB DOUGHTON, and particularly do I say it of HOWARD SMITH, the "Old Ironsides" of the fleet that sails the sea of this, our little legislative world.

Mr. Speaker, this is the country of every one of us, and in dealing with matters affecting its welfare it is of tremendous importance in these times of stress that we present a solid front. Soon we will have coming before us a question that will test our metal, a question which has to do with the drafting of the children of the country into the armed services. Protest is arising all over the country to the drafting of 18-year-old boys.

I appreciate the objections that are raised. They are strongly persuasive, but our situation is most serious. I believe it to be vastly more serious than most of the country realize. I fear that to hesitate in the following of our military leaders would be taken by people in other parts of the world as an indication of an indisposition to go all out in the endeavor to save this, our beautiful America, which we call our home.

I hope the House will accept this resolution without a single dissenting vote. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the great committee over which he presides with supremely great distinction are entitled to this vote of confidence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I feel that all of us, regardless of political affiliation, can join with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] in the remarks he has just concluded on this floor as to the patriotism and capabilities of the men and women in this House. It seems to me it is also proper to say that the strong leadership, the great patriotism, which the gentleman from Georgia described, pertains on the minority side of the House as well as to the majority, and that all of us, whether we call ourselves Republicans or Democrats, are vitally and deeply concerned with the welfare and security of this great Nation.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the membership of the House is entitled to know the full content and portent of this resolution and something of the discussion which took place in the Rules Committee, which has original jurisdiction over this particular resolution, at the time it was considered and reported favorably.

This is indeed a very important resolution, placing upon one of the great standing committees of this House perhaps the heaviest burden and the greatest responsibility any legislative committee has been asked or instructed to assume in all the years we have had a Congress. I regret that the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], is not present, but I am sure he will agree with that which I am about to say as being a true reflection of that which has gone on, and of the expressed desires of the members of the Rules Committee as to what can and should be the purpose and accomplishments of his committee under this resolution.

In the budget which the President submitted to the Congress a few weeks ago one section provides that more than $41,000,000,000 of American funds be expended upon national defense. The authorization of most of these expenditures, certainly the planning of these expenditures, will come under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Most of the members of that great committee have had many years of experience in connection with military matters.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This resolution places upon the Armed Services Committee the responsibility, as well as the power and the authority, to investigate and to study plans, expenditures, and proposed laws for all military purposes, and the actions of our military authorities under them. This committee not only has to pass upon the authorizations for expenditures, but it also has jurisdiction over such legislation as selective service, and many other similar activities closely associated with our national defense.

There has been voiced and expressed by many Members of the House the thought and belief that the Congress, which is calling upon the American people to assume the highest burden of taxation at any time in our history, to submit to lower living standards if necessary, to embark upon a period of austerity, and to make many sacrifices, not only of manpower but of wealth as well, has the responsibility to see to it that the tax moneys paid in by the American people are spent properly, wisely, and well; and make certain the laws as enacted by the people's representatives in the Congress dealing with the national defense are carried out according to their intent and purpose.

This statement is not in any way made with the thought that it will reflect upon our military leaders. Instead, I want to make clear the feeling that I think is in the hearts and the minds of every one of us here—that we must accept our responsibility to make certain that which we are doing to prepare for the defense of America and to make our Nation secure is done wisely and well, and as economically as possible, under all circumstances.

Some of the Members have suggested we establish a special committee to keep track of all of the matters that come within our national defense structure. But it appealed to the reason and the logic of the Committee on Rules that perhaps the one committee best equipped, which has had the greatest knowledge of all these military matters and of the problems that will come up—and there will be a myriad of them—was the Committee on Armed Services.

There is a strong feeling that there should be a committee to which the membership of this House could turn with their national defense problems, some committee that would see to it the complaints which reach us will be adequately investigated and a prompt report made on them, even though many of these complaints are unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, we had recited, in the Rules Committee meeting on this subject, the experience of some members of the committee, wherein they had written letters of inquiry to branches of the Defense Department, and months later have not received any reply, or answer. So it did appeal to us of the committee that it is necessary, as it will become more and more apparent in the days ahead, that we must give the power and authority to some committee to represent all of us, as well as all the American people, in a carefully prolonged and continuous study, if you please, and, if necessary, by investigations, of all of the activities of our defense establishments, or of any of them.

This resolution gives to the Armed Services Committee the power and the authority to subpena witnesses and to compel the production of records.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee is a terribly busy committee. There was some question in the minds of members of the Rules Committee, when this resolution was before it, as to whether the committee could or would have the time to devote to these studies and investigations that may become necessary in the future, or to give the service to the other Members of Congress to which I believe, and the Rules Committee believes, all Members are entitled.

We talked this whole situation over very frankly with Chairman VINSON and other members of the Committee. I have personally consulted, as have other members of the Rules Committee, with many members of the Committee on the Armed Services. They have an exceptionally able staff in the Armed Services Committee, but that staff is now kept busy about 14 to 16 hours a day with legislation and other matters that come before the committee with great regularity. It does seem to some of us—and I say this as a matter of record, and I hope perhaps as a matter of guidance to the committee—that certain policies should be carried out by the Armed Services Committee in connection with the authorities granted it under this resolution. It seems to many of us, for instance, that it will be necessary to name a subcommittee or a series of subcommittees to investigate and to carry on the studies and investigations that are or will be necessary.

It is the hope, the express hope, and the thought, of many of us that in naming these subcommittees care be taken that, if possible, the membership of these subcommittees be selected from among those Members who do not have military installations in their home areas or in their districts which may be affected by any investigation one way or the other. As I said a moment ago, we discussed these things very frankly.

It seems that the regular staff of the Armed Services Committee as now constituted, has been so burdened, and is still so busy with regular committee matters, that they should not be given this extra burden, but that instead the Armed Services Committee should be furnished and should be given an adequate and able special staff to devote its special attention to the particular problems and the work of study and investigation. I say this adequate special staff will be needed, because, as I mentioned in the beginning, through this Armed Services Committee will flow some forty-one, perhaps fifty to sixty billion or more dollars of the American taxpayers' money each year for some time to come. It is only reasonable that we spend, if necessary, a very small portion of 1 percent of the great amount to be spent on national defense to be certain that the intent and the purpose of the Congress is carried out. I believe such action, under able leadership, can and will result in a better military structure and in great savings for the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution with the thought and with the hope that the work assigned to the committee, or authorized under this resolution, will be carried out in the spirit in which the Committee on Rules considered the resolution, and in which the membership of the Committee on Armed Services, discussed the whole problem with us; that the Committee on Armed Services not only be given this broad authority, but will accept this great and grave responsibility in a humble spirit, will cooperate with the other Members of Congress, will establish a proper staff, and will thus perform an outstanding patriotic service to the people of the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I quite fully concur in the thought expressed by the gentleman from Ohio not only with respect to the need for prompt and effective investigations of these varied and innumerable complaints that come to all of us, and that the staff of this committee is already burdened with a tremendous amount of legislative work. However, I should not like to have the gentleman's remarks with respect to the appointment of the members of the full committee or the subcommittees making the investigations to be construed as an agreement that Members who have a military installation in the district which they represent should be excluded from participation in subcommittee assignment. I think that would be a mistake. I think it would be denying the Member representing that district under investigation his responsibilities to that district. It would be denying to the subcommittee making the investigation the benefit of that Member's information. I quite agree that care should be taken in the selection of the members of the subcommittee but I cannot concur that as a matter of policy no member of the subcommittee should be on an investigation of an installation in his own district.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is not the gentleman correct in the observation he made, and can the gentleman not accept the suggestion?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that I have made my suggestion as a result of many discussions that have been held with other Members and with the thought that it certainly would not be embarrassing to any member of the Committee on Armed Services. I question very much that there are any members of the Committee on Armed Services who would desire to serve on a subcommittee which is investigating military installations in their own districts. Such might be embarrassing. At the same time I am absolutely certain there is no member of the Committee on Armed Services or any Member of the House, as far as that is

concerned, having any military installation of any type in their district that would not frankly and fairly and honestly administer their duties and responsibilities and furnish the Committee on Armed Services, or any other committee of the House, with all the information they might possess that would be helpful to the Congress. My suggestion was made only with the thought that it would relieve many members of the Committee on Armed Services from embarrassment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say to the gentleman if he could find it possible to modify his statement as suggested he will have the complete support, in my judgment, of the entire membership of the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think my statement has now modified that. I shall certainly check my remarks to be certain there is no misinterpretation of the intent and the purpose of that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course the gentleman realizes, in making the observation which I did, I have no military or naval or air installation whatsoever in my district, so I was not speaking from my own personal standpoint.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say that I concur generally with the remarks the gentleman has made as to the need for this resolution. I particularly emphasize to the Members of the House that we have great confidence in the Committee on Armed Services and, often our only recourse in connection with certain matters which come to us as individual Members of Congress is to go to individuals on the committee and ask them, by reason of the great position they hold, to investigate these matters. So I do hope the members of the great Committee on Armed Services will assist us when we as Members of Congress appeal to them, because often they are only ones to whom we can appeal with confidence to have something investigated. I hope the gentleman will agree with me that probably some investigations should be held at this time as to certain things which are going on.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that the committee have been conducting some investigations, as best they can, with the rather limited and terribly busy staff they now have. We have been assured, of course, that the services to other Members of Congress will be furnished to the capacity of the committee, if this resolution is adopted.

Let me also say to the gentleman and to the House very frankly that I have made this rather detailed statement and expressed these thoughts and purposes on the floor of the House to strengthen, not cripple, but strengthen, the arm and the position of the Committee on Armed Services in meeting a very great and a very grave responsibility. Certainly, notice is herewith and hereby served on all those connected in any way with our nonpartisan attempt to strengthen the defenses of America, that the Congress of the United States through this properly and duly constituted committee will be on guard at all times to see that the laws we enact, and our intents and purposes we have had when we enact those laws for the security of our country, are carried out.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman at the outset indicated that the appropriations for defense will run around $41,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or more.

Mr. STEFAN. He also indicated that there will be a myriad of defense projects constructed, and that it is very important that the Comimttee on Armed Services be staffed with competent help and have subcommittees to go out in order to see first-hand what is really being done and how this money is being expended in order to bring about efficiency and economy.

At one time the Committee on Military Affairs and other legislative committees not only worked on authorizations but appropriated the money therefor. That has been changed, and there now is a Committee on Appropriations divided into various subcommittees, one of which is the Committee on Armed Services. It has to do with passing upon the requests of the defense agencies for expenditures. I am not a member of that subcommittee; however, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I know of the necessity for this resolution. It is long past due.

The Committee on Armed Services in these perilous times must have at its command the best possible staff obtainable. However, knowing the meager staff that is available to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Affairs, I wonder if the gentlemen of the Committee on Rules, in your deliberations, have given some thought in this resolution to take into consideration the obstacles confronted by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with these very same matters, and whether or not there is going to be closer liaison between this organization of investigators and the Committee on Appropriations in order that the Committee on Appropriations will be at least furnished some assistance in order to better come to the proper decisions when they write or mark up a bill making appropriations for our national defense. What have you done about that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I certainly hope and assume there will be full cooperation between the Committee on Armed Services and the appropriate subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. I certainly hope and assume that, regardless of whatever the Committee on Armed Services may do, the membership of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with military appropriations will use its own judgment and likewise do everything within its power to see that we have the proper kind of appropriation bills before us. However, I did point out, or attempted to point out, that the Committee on Armed Services deals with the authorizations not only for appropriations, but with other legislation which does not come before the Committee on Appropriations directly, such as selective-service legislation, in which there is a great deal of interest throughout the Nation and which is of the greatest importance to our national defense and national security. So that the first responsibility rests with the Armed Services Committee, and, secondly, the responsibility, of course, rests with the Committee on Appropriations. There should be no conflict and there should be team play. I hope there is.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not intend to indicate that there would be any conflict, but I am asking for cooperation. I am familiar with the duties of the legislative committee, and also familiar with the duties of the Committee on Appropriations, which has to deal with every item of our national defense; and they should be armed with an adequate staff equal to that which you are setting up today, or they should have some advantage of that staff in order to make proper decisions as to appropriations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I again say to the gentleman in all frankness and candor, that it is my hope, and I assume it is the intent and purpose of the Committee on Armed Services, to cooperate. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as I said a moment ago, will address the House on his own time and, I am sure, will answer many of these questions and make his position clear. Certainly there is no intent or thought on my part, or on the part of the Committee on Rules, in any way to infringe on the rights, prerogatives, powers, and authority of the great Committee on Appropriations. Indeed we are looking to that committee to be a safeguard and protection for all of us. Of course we have the highest respect and regard for the abilities and capacities of that committee. There should not be any conflict, and I hope I have expressed it—there will be no conflict—and there should not be. I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that there should be cooperation and not conflict.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to thank the Rules Committee for acting favorably on this resolution. It is highly important. I think the emergency of the situation requires it.

Immediately after the 25th day of June 1950, I introduced a bill dealing with renegotiation, and had long hearings before the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means. That committee promptly, during this session, under the leadership of its able chairman, passed that bill. In my judgment, there are two things absolutely necessary to be done

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

when we are spending such large sums of money as will be involved in the defense appropriations. One is that there should be a renegotiation law, and the other is that there should be a resolution giving authority to the Armed Services Committee to make investigations.

The mere fact that those two things have happened will bring about a tendency on the part of industry and on the part of officials of the Department to be more cautious and more careful in their acts, in their contracts, and in their transactions.

So much for that.

The Armed Services Committee has always been nonpartisan. It was the same during the days when we had separate committees for the Army and the Navy. Let me say to the Membership that whenever, in my capacity as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I address a communication on an official matter to any member of the Department of Defense, a copy of that letter which I write is always sent to the ranking minority member. If there is any committee in Congress free of politics, where politics does not enter into any of its deliberations, it is the Armed Services Committee. We do not know Democrats. We do not know Republicans. We are only actuated by one impulse and one desire, and that is to do our job and see that the country has an adequate defense.

I am glad you reported this resolution from the Rules Committee for consideration by the House, because we do have an immense amount of work that can be done. This resolution embarks on a fertile field, and I want to ask the cooperation of every Member of the House. When you get information, have no hesitancy in sending it to the Armed Services Committee so we may investigate.

A few days ago our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] made some observations. As soon as I read it in the RECORD, one of the members of the committee staff went to see him to get full information. The same thing has just happened again as a result of a statement made in the press. When it was called to our attention an inquiry was made. You gentlemen will get an immense amount of information and it is going to be information that will be run down and verified. So have no hesitancy in sending it to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with information we receive, much of it is misinformation, sent in good faith, but when the charge is made the truth never catches up with it, and it brings about some misunderstandings on the part of the people. Of course, no Member is bound by it, but as far as I am concerned I always take it up with the gentleman and ascertain the facts before I make any charge.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, and I think that is the proper thing to do. For instance, a statement was made in the paper that over a million uniforms were being ordered for the women in the Navy and Marine Corps. The truth of the matter is this: A general survey of the capacity of every plant in America is being made to see what they can do in case of an all-out mobilization. The services have to do that. So this manufacturer, when they made the survey of his plant and he said he could make a million uniforms, immediately thought he had an order for a million uniforms. As a matter of fact, there have been only a few uniforms ordered. So we run down all those things.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. On that particular story which has given us an example of things that might be investigated in the discussion in the Committee on Rules, at that time the statement was made that no one knew anything about it except the newspaper reporters.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; it should have been investigated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Georgia informed the committee that he had already ordered a report on the story; that he had been ahead of everyone else.

Mr. VINSON. No; I told the gentleman we would do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought the gentleman said he had ordered it.

Mr. VINSON. I knew nothing about it until I heard the gentleman's statement, and half an hour afterward we started on it and a letter went from me to the gentleman giving information about it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But as the gentleman from Georgia has explained on the floor, the Navy Department advises that the original story came from the manufacturer and that the reporters were not entirely wrong in printing it. They presumed the manufacturer knew what he was talking about when he said he had the order.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; but the Navy had not even offered a contract. All it had done was to make a survey to see if that plant could handle a certain type of business and what its capacity was in manufacturing dresses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. But if the chairman of this committee had been contacted about it he would have ascertained——

Mr. VINSON. Oh, now, I am not going to get into that argument.

Let me say this: Here is what we are going to do. I discussed this matter yesterday with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. We have in the Armed Services Committee what is known as a policy subcommittee where matters of this kind are discussed. We will ask the Committee on House Administration, if this resolution passes, to make available $50,000, and then we will agree on the special attorney to handle this business. Then we will set him up as special counsel and really go to work and we will make the necessary investigations.

I have been through this thing twice before. I was here in World War I, I was here during World War II. The Committee on Naval Affairs conducted investigations of every Navy contract during World War II and as a result of our investigations and as a result of renegotiation, over $3,000,000,000 was turned back to the Treasury. So this resolution is a step in the right direction and it is the proper thing to do. The five percenters are probably already on the warpath, as the gentleman from Michigan has already said on the floor of the House, and we have got a fertile field for investigation.

So trust the committee and if we do not do a good job then get up on the floor and criticize us and, if we don't correct it, we will hand it over to some special committee to do it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman should also point out that the Armed Services Committee returned almost half of the money that was allotted to it to make these investigations in the last Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Last year we had this same authority. However, the field was not as fertile then as it is now.

We are very anxious about these matters. We had some very important investigations. We had the B–36 investigation and we had other investigations and we filed our report in accordance with the resolution with the Speaker of the House and it is available to everybody. We will appear before the Committee on House Administration when this resolution is adopted and ask that we be given $50,000, and then we will go to work.

The House can trust us. We will do a good job.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While it is not necessary, I would like to confirm what the gentleman said about three cases in my own district which have been reported to me. The chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has sent his investigators to my office. We have discussed these matters in detail and I have written specific and pressing letters to those constituents in my district who submitted that information to me, requesting them to submit it to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I grant that these matters cannot be cleaned up unless the people of this country stand together with the committee and help them clean house when these bad things develop.

In my opinion, it is not a matter for a Member of Congress to make the investigation; it is up to this committee. We are appropriating the funds to make the investigation and set up the machinery with which to make it.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately following the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of bills on the Consent Calendar for Monday next be dispensed with, there being only one bill on that calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to determine the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there will be no legislation on next Monday. A bill has been reported out of the Ways and Means Committee today, I think unanimously, and in the event the committee gets a rule on that bill it will be brought up for consideration on either Tuesday or Thursday of next week. If it is brought up on Tuesday it will be with the understanding that if there is any roll call, which I do not expect, the roll call will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there is no opposition to that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I so understand. But in the event there should be a roll call, it will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. REED of New York. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are to finish up the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act next week and I hope we will not spend too much time with other legislation on that day because we will devote a full legislative day to that bill alone.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am referring to a bill that was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee today relating to E bonds. I understand there is no objection to that bill.

Mr. MASON. That really should come up by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that, but we do not want to make it the practice too much of calling up bills by unanimous consent unless they appear on the Consent Calendar. The leadership on both sides appreciates and realizes that the great Committee on Ways and Means would want to set a general example to all other committees by compliance with the rules which provide for going to the Rules Committee and seeking a rule. I shall suggest to the chairman of the committee this course of action be taken in reference to the bill to which I referred.

On Wednesday next consideration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be continued.

It is not my intention to call up any controversial legislation on Thursday or Friday of next week or on the following Monday and Tuesday. I know of no legislation now, but if there is any controversial legislation called up it will not be done until a week from next Wednesday because of Lincoln Day celebrations to take place throughout the country.

If a controversial measure is considered on Wednesday of the week after next, if there is a roll call it will be with the understanding that the roll call will take place on the next day, Thursday.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have arrived at such an understanding which becomes binding upon me. If we have any legislation on Thursday or Friday of next week it will be of a noncontroversial nature.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 78 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without continental United States, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "United States", insert "its Territories and possessions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 28 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Clause (a) 14 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause (1) (n) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause (2) (a) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" where it appears in the said clause and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

Clause 1 of rule XII is amended by striking out "Public Lands" where it appears in said clause and inserting in lieu thereof "Interior and Insular Affairs."

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I merely want to say, Mr. Speaker, that House Resolution 100 was approved unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It provides for the change in the name of the Committee on Public Lands to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There are many reasons why this change in name is desirable, one of the principal reasons being that the title of the committee now makes it the same as the title of the corresponding committee in the other body of the Congress. So, Mr. Speaker, it is with the approval on this side of the aisle as well as the other side that this resolution is presented.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 111) to implement the resolution just adopted, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That those Members of the House elected to the Committee on Public Lands are hereby elected to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and all records and papers of the Committee on Public Lands are hereby transferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

That all bills, resolutions, communications, papers, documents, petitions, and memorials heretofore referred to the Committee on Public Lands are hereby referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 80 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "or outside."

Line 9, after "States", insert "its Territories, and possessions."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: On page 1, line 1, strike out "Public Lands" and insert in lieu thereof "Interior and Insular Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED TAXATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the January messages to the Congress, I stated my intention of making further recommendations on a number of important matters. One of the most urgent of these is the need for increased taxation.

The budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, which was transmitted to the Congress, included estimated expenditures of 71.6 billion dollars, and estimated receipts under present tax laws of 55.1 billion dollars.

It is my firm conviction that we should pay for these expenditures as we go. A balanced budget now is just as important a mobilization measure as larger armed forces, allocations of basic materials, and controls over prices and wages.

This is true for three main reasons.

First, we should pay as we go because that is the way to keep the Government's finances on a sound footing.

We are now strengthening our national security, in order to increase our ability to meet whatever situation may arise in the future. Our Government financial policies, like every other part of our national effort, must be designed to leave us stronger, not weaker, as the years go by. If in this period we pay for our necessary expenditures as we go along, rather than adding to the public debt, we will obviously be better prepared to meet our future needs whatever they may be.

There is a question as to how high we can push taxes without having serious effects upon the productive growth of our economy. But I am sure that we could increase Federal revenues by considerably more than enough to cover the expenditures now anticipated without reaching those limits. During recent years we have taxed ourselves at high levels—and during those years our economy has bounded forward: incomes have risen rapidly, new plants and industries have sprung up, and the standard of living of our people has increased steadily. The growth in the strength of our economy that has occurred under these tax rates gives us confidence that we can safely pay the estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year out of taxes.

Second, we should pay for defense as we go because that is the way to distribute the cost of defense fairly.

We cannot escape paying the real cost of defense now—the cost in materials and days of work that are devoted to defense purposes. Whatever we do about taxes, the amount of goods available for consumers to buy is only going to be what is left over after defense needs are met.

We could try to escape the financial cost of defense by borrowing—but that would only transfer the financial problems to our children, and would increase the danger of inflation with its grossly unfair distribution of the burden.

The sensible and honest thing to do now is to tax ourselves enough, as we go along, to pay the financial costs of defenses out of our current income.

Our Federal tax system can spread the cost of defense fairly among our people. There are many ways in which the fairness of the present tax system can and should be improved, but on the whole we have a good system. It recognizes differences in incomes and in family obligations. It protects incentives for initiative and effort. It takes account of the special needs of new undertakings and the expansion of existing businesses.

I am convinced, after studying the matter thoroughly, that the people of our country—and I am thinking primarily of the average family of modest income—will all be better off if everybody pays his fair share of the financial costs of defense in taxes now. If we don't do that, we will only be putting off the evil day, and making matters worse for ourselves in the future.

Third, we should pay as we go to help prevent inflation.

If we do not tax ourselves enough to pay for defense expenditures, the Government will be spending more than it takes in, and the extra money it spends will add to total purchasing power and inflationary pressures.

Inflationary pressures will be strong, of course, even with the budget balanced. Military production results in wage payments, and buying materials, long before the goods are produced and paid for by the Government. Businessmen who build new plants spend money well in advance of producing any goods for the Government or consumers to buy. Furthermore, consumers have accumulated large amounts of cash and other liquid assets which they are free to spend if they so choose.

Thus, inflationary pressures will be strong even after taxes are increased enough to balance the budget. We will still need direct controls over prices and wages. But it may not be possible to make those controls effective unless we tax ourselves enough. Certainly, those controls will be far more effective if we pay for expenditures through taxes as we go along.

During World War II, taxes were not high enough, and the Government was forced to borrow too much. As a result, when controls were taken off after the war, prices skyrocketed and we paid in inflation for our failure to tax enough. The value of people's savings was cut down by the higher prices they had to pay.

We must not let that happen now. We must have both an adequate tax program and proper controls on prices and wages if we are to prevent inflation and preserve the value of savings and fixed incomes.

For these reasons, the case for a pay as we go tax program is conclusive at the present time, and I urge the Congress to continue to keep that goal before it.

I believe that the wisest and most practical approach to this goal is to enact

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the tax program we need this year in two parts rather than enacting the full tax program all at once.

Government expenditures will be increasing very rapidly during the next few months. We will have to act fast if our revenues are to keep pace with rising expenditures.

I recommend that as rapidly as possible the Congress enact revenue legislation to yield additional taxes of at least 10 billion dollars annually, and later in the year enact the remaining amounts needed to keep us on a pay as we go basis.

If we follow this course, our revenues will keep pace with increasing expenditures, and we shall have some months in which to observe economic developments and to consider the several serious questions that will need to be resolved before all parts of this year's tax program are enacted.

For example, we will have better information on exactly how much we shall need to balance the budget. As I explained in the Budget Message, our estimates of military expenditures are still tentative. In particular, the amount we spend for military equipment will depend on how fast the production lines are geared up and the equipment is actually turned out. If our military production program can be got under way faster—as we hope it can—expenditures will, of course, be larger than the budget estimates.

Moreover, the Congress has not yet had an opportunity to act on the budget. I believe the Congress will find that the budget is sound, and provides only for the essential needs of our Nation in this time of world crisis. Nevertheless, the appropriations actually enacted by the Congress will, of course, control the actual expenditures.

Furthermore, the economic developments of the months ahead—the impact of the defense effort and of tighter controls on prices and wages and profits—should be considered before the balance of our tax program for the coming fiscal year is completed.

These uncertainties, however, do not affect our obvious need for much larger taxes—and our need for the bulk of them very soon. I am therefore transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress at this time, my recommendations as to the best way to raise at least 10 billion dollars now.

I know the Congress will want to consider these problems very carefully, and to review my recommendations in the light of their own independent analysis. The Secretary of the Treasury is prepared to discuss these matters in detail with the committees of Congress.

I believe we should meet our immediate objective by increasing existing taxes. The present Federal tax structure, while marred by imperfections, contains the most equitable types of taxes we have been able to devise. Under these taxes, our economy has demonstrated a surge in productive power to increasingly higher levels.

I recommend an immediate increase in personal income taxes to bring in 4 billion dollars in additional revenue.

The personal income tax is the mainstay of our Federal tax system. It should be the major source of the additional revenue we need.

This is true because it is the personal income tax that allows us the greatest opportunity to be fair. It is the personal income tax above all else which takes account of differences in ability to pay—both differences in income and differences in family obligations. It allows an exemption of $600 per person, and deductions for charitable contributions, extraordinary medical expenses, and other expenses as provided by law. Under present law, a single person earning a net income of $3,000 a year pays a tax of about 16 percent of his income, or $488, while a married person with two dependents and earning the same net income pays a 4 percent tax, or $120. The average rate of tax reaches 50 percent at about the $45,000 income level for a single person and the $90,000 income level for a family of four.

In increasing the yield of the personal income tax, everyone should realize that the higher taxes cannot be limited to the upper income groups. To obtain revenue commensurate with our defense expenditures, all taxpayers must contribute, because the bulk of the income in this country is received by persons whose incomes are between $2,000 and $10,000 a year. We should tax the upper income groups—and tax them heavily—but it will also be necessary to tax people with moderate incomes.

I do not believe that the personal exemption of $600 should be lowered at the present time. Although the exemption was $500 during World War II, the present $600 exemption is less generous, in terms of present costs of living, than was $500 six or eight years ago.

I recommend, second, an increase in corporation income taxes to yield an additional 3 billion dollars.

The corporation income tax is the major supplement to the personal income tax in our present Federal tax system. Basic corporation tax rates now begin at 25 percent on corporation profits less than $25,000, and increase to 47 percent for larger corporations. Those corporations covered by the excess profits tax pay more—up to a maximum set by law of 62 percent of net profits.

In the light of high and rising corporate profits, the increase in corporation taxes I propose will leave corporations generally able to maintain the dividend and reinvestment policies of recent years.

The first tax returns under the new excess profits tax law will be received later this spring. We shall then be in a position to consider what changes in the excess profits tax law are desirable to obtain more revenue from that source. I believe, therefore, we should defer this matter until later this year.

I recommend, third, increases in selective excise taxes to yield 3 billion dollars. Under present circumstances, these increases should be concentrated upon less essential consumer goods, and upon goods which use materials that will be in short supply.

In addition to the tax increases recommended above, I recommend that the Congress carry further the program it started last year to close loopholes in the present tax laws.

The revenue to be gained by closing these loopholes is not large in comparison with our needs. But in terms of fairness, and willingness of people to pay their share of taxes, closing these loopholes is worth a very great deal.

Those required to bear higher taxes for defense are entitled to the assurance that others will not be permitted to avoid them. The last Congress closed several important loopholes. But a number remain.

I have previously called attention to the gross undertaxation of the oil and mining industries, to the broad loopholes in the estate and gift taxes, and to the undue preferential treatment granted to capital gains in comparison with ordinary income. I urge the Congress to examine these provisions of the law very carefully, together with those relating to life insurance companies and to holders of securities now exempt from income taxes, and to review the tax status of organizations now exempt under present law. I do not believe any of us, in good conscience, can take action to increase taxes on the man, with a wife and two children, who earns $60 a week—an increase I am now recommending—without at the same time taking action to reduce the glaring inequities in present law—some of which permit a man with one hundred times as much income to avoid paying any taxes at all.

In addition to the changes in the law that are needed to close loopholes, we shall continue to improve our enforcement efforts to make sure that the taxes which are due under present laws are actually paid.

The tax program I am proposing will require higher rates in some cases than those paid during the last war. I believe our people understand that if we had paid higher taxes then we would be better off today. I believe our people are ready and willing to pay the taxes needed to cover essential Government expenditures in this time of danger.

I am convinced that the average citizen in our country will be best served by fair tax laws which will balance the budget. He will be better off now, because he will pay his share of the cost of defense now, once and for all. He will be better off in the future, because his savings and his future income will not be dissipated by inflation.

The American people understand that the cost of freedom is high at a time when aggression has been loosed on the world. I urge the Congress to act rapidly so that we can pay that cost as we go.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1951.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented us with a suggestion involving staggering increases in taxes. He promises still more are on the way.

Admittedly there is no cheap and easy way to buy our national security. Concededly also, to prevent wild inflation

and the imposition of a still greater burden on the backs of our children and grandchildren in the form of national debt, we should strive, so far as possible, to finance our defense effort on a current basis.

But there are at least three immediate steps we should take, two having to do with effecting substantial economies and the other involving a matter of principle more than dollars and cents.

Before we administer another wallop to the wallets of the taxpayers, before we assault their pay envelopes again, we should cut out of the budget those items, nondefense in character and properly termed nonessential, which are designed to initiate some of the pet projects of the administration and fulfill political, vote-buying promises made to various pressure groups. Good illustrations of this type are the proposed appropriations to socialize farming and medicine.

Then we should drastically reduce other recommended expenditures, laudable in purpose and justifiable enough as representing a legitimate governmental activity, which cannot be properly classified as indispensable to the success of the primary defense effort to which we are now committed. Under this heading come rivers and harbors, reclamation, soil conservation, and a host of similar items.

We must wait on tidying up the parlor and repapering the guest room until we have plugged the hole in the roof and shored up the foundations where the floor is sagging.

A second step we must take is to serve notice on the component services of the Defense Department that unnecessary waste, duplication, and inefficiency will not be tolerated. The figures contemplated to be spent by the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not sacrosanct. They must be carefully scrutinized. Then their actual expenditure, reaching such astronomical figures, must be the subject of continuing and constructively critical review.

No one for a moment wants to deny our fighting men the best in training, equipment, and care. No one wants to scrimp on weapons or ammunition, on planes or tanks, on the essential research to improve and perfect military equipment or on any of the essential items which comprise the framework of a sound defense structure. But the soldier and the sailor are not noteworthy for their financial prudence. They need to have applied to them the cooperative, but firm hand of those whose responsibility it is to total up the bill which is to be submitted to the people. Without intending to imply criticism of our Nation's great military leaders, most of them dedicated to their task and deserving our profound gratitude, I am satisfied that there are wide areas of opportunity for savings, without impairment in any degree of the soundness or efficiency of our defense structure.

To illustrate, there are the rather shocking disclosures that the Quartermaster General has been contracting to purchase such items as butter, potatoes, and cheese at current high prices at the very time adequate investigation would have disclosed that another arm of the Government, the Commodity Credit Corporation, was selling these same foodstuffs for a nominal sum or, in some cases, giving them away. Proper liaison between Government agencies should have prevented this inexcusable waste of public funds.

Then there is the story of the lost airport out in Kansas, where the Air Force is said to have advocated the purchase of the airport in Wichita as absolutely essential for its purposes at the very time it had another airport nearby which could serve the purpose.

I appreciate the fact that mistakes are bound to occur when mobilization preparations are necessarily hurried, as they are at this time. My only point is that the constant vigilance of appropriate congressional committees can do much in this field to protect the public purse.

Finally, when the President and Congress are talking about equality of sacrifice, they should match their words with action. This is peculiarly true when their personal interests are involved. The second bill which was passed when the Democrats took over power in the Eighty-first Congress was to increase the salary of the President to $100,000 a year and give him a $50,000 tax-free expense account for which he was required to make no accounting. In the case of the Vice President, his salary was increased to $30,000 and he was given a similar $10,000 tax-free expense account. The Speaker of the House was given a like allowance of $10,000 for which no accounting was required.

In the previous Democrat Congress, the Seventy-ninth, the Congress had voted to each of its Members a $2,500 tax-free expense account, also not subject to any accounting.

No one else among our taxpaying citizenry enjoys a comparable concession. No doubt, at least in the case of Members of Congress, each one could show necessary expenses incident to his job in excess of $2,500 a year. Perhaps the same is true of the President and Vice President. It is the principle involved in this preferential treatment which I am attacking.

With complete justification, it seems to me, the people who are being loaded with additional taxes are inquiring why it is that the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress continue to enjoy a privilege, which, at least, appears to be a tax advantage which is denied to other taxpayers who must justify in detail a showing of expenses in connection with their employment before it will be allowed.

I am not disposed to quarrel with the actual salary increase which was given the President and Vice President in 1949. Theirs are onerous responsibilities. But it seems to me inexcusable for us to conceal the true income of the President through the device of granting on top of his salary an additional allowance for which he need not account.

I am informed by the Legislative Reference Service that the President's salary of $100,000 plus his $90,000 tax-free expense account—he had a $40,000 expense account before the additional $50,000 was granted him in 1949—is the equivalent of a salary for the ordinary taxpayer of about $530,000 a year so far as the net return is concerned.

Then, of course, on top of his take-home pay he is granted at Government expense some 42 facilities for travel, vacationing, and entertainment, including planes, 35 White House automobiles, the yacht *Williamsburg*, a private pullman car, and vacation retreat in Key West, Fla., and Maryland.

The estimated annual cost of the staff and upkeep for these items is about $1,500,000.

Obviously if we eliminated, as we should, the President's and Vice President's free-from-tax-scrutiny allowance, we should take the same step regarding the $2,500 a year allowed to us as Members of Congress.

We have no right to be parties to bamboozling the public. If we wish to increase salaries, we should do it in a forthright fashion.

Furthermore, I know of no group of our people who need more to be reminded that their compensation is subject to tax than do the President and Members of Congress. A case could be put up for everyone in the country, high-salaried executives and workingmen and women alike, to be allowed a tax-free sum for expenses. Everyone incurs such expenses in connection with his work, for which he is denied any tax exemption. A simple illustration is the bus fare or street-car fare or automobile expense which almost everyone incurs in going to and from his work. There is no reason at all why this peculiar tax advantage should be accorded to those in high official position.

For that reason I have introduced today a bill to amend the pertinent statutes relating to compensation to provide that these tax-free expense accounts shall be added to the salary of the President, Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress so that the total compensation will be subject to income tax.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1951.*

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I, as well as all other Members of Congress, received a letter from the Comptroller General, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, giving a most startling account of the economies practiced in the General Accounting Office. Mr. Warren, as one of the Nation's great administrators, throws out a challenge to all other administrators.

The people of the country are demanding economy in the nondefense Government agencies as well as discretion in the Department of Defense. There are many expenditures carrying grants and aids to the States that the Appropriations Committee could drastically reduce. I hope such funds will be cut to the bone.

I have a particular reason to be very proud of Mr. Warren's accomplishments, and the example he has set.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Warren's letter may be published at this point in the RECORD together with an editorial which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News of Greensboro, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 29, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With the many vital problems before the Congress today, I know you don't have time to read annual reports of Government agencies. Anyway, ours is still in the process of printing. But, knowing of the interest of Members in the General Accounting Office, an agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch, I believe there are certain facts you will want to know. That is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is an independent and nonpolitical agency. It is a part of our system of checks and balances. It audits and settles the accounts and claims of the Government, and advises and assists the Congress and the agencies on matters relating to expenditures.

The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

During recent years, when it seems the Government has been expanding beyond all reasonable comprehension, the GAO has proved that it is possible to reduce employees. In April 1946 the number of employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 7,063 employees on January 1, 1951, a reduction of 7,841 in the last 5 years, of whom 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department. This has been accomplished through constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present conditions.

For example, just recently I abolished the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division of the GAO. This division employed 325 people. Certain of the work formerly carried on by that division has been transferred to other divisions. However, it will be possible to carry out the work transferred with 61 people, making a reduction of 264 people and an annual salary savings to the GAO of nearly $1,000,000. There will be no loss of control of public funds. In fact, the revised procedures should enable the GAO and the Government generally to do a more competent job.

While practically every agency of the Government will ask for increased funds for 1952, the GAO will request less money than was made available to us for 1951.

A few statistics on our work in the last year: 25,300,000 vouchers audited; 492,000 claims settled; 318,000,200 checks reconciled; 12,400 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made of 945 different Government offices; 34 comprehensive audits submitted to Congress (for the first time since the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 audits of Government corporations were up to date); 685 reports made to Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to inquiries from individual Members of Congress.

The GAO is one of the few agencies that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1950, total $718,100,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would have ever been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Collections are impressive, but also important is the prevention of illegal or improvident use of funds without waiting to collect back what has been paid out illegally.

The joint accounting program inaugurated in December 1947, by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and myself, is achieving remarkable success. As a result of the program and of legislation enacted by the Congress, accounting improvements and red-tape cutting are going forward with rapid acceleration.

The GAO is expanding comprehensive, on-the-site audits which bring about broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the GAO supported the enactment of a number of laws which made possible some of the improvements just mentioned. Probably the most important are the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950. The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act, among other things, permits the elimination of certain procedures upon determination that the interests of the Government are otherwise protected. This made possible the abolishment of the accounting and bookkeeping division mentioned above, but this is only an example. Many other benefits have resulted and will continue to come about. The revisions of procedures and improvements made have reached into every agency of the Government.

The Post Office Department Financial Control Act made possible the abolishment of the postal accounts division of the GAO last November 15. The administrative accounting work which had been done for the Post Office Department has been turned over to that Department. The GAO should never have been given those duties in the first place. I have set up a new postal audit division which will make comprehensive, up-to-date audits of postal financial transactions.

It is essential to our economic survival not only that the national defense be strengthened, but that it be done as effectively and economically as possible. On this score, the GAO bids fair to make a real contribution. We will not only audit defense spending, but will also concentrate to seek out excesses, waste, and extravagances in the defense program. At the same time, we will continue to keep a watchful eye on civilian spending to ferret out those extravagances and frills which our country should not and cannot now endure.

This letter is for your own information and no reply is necessary.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of February 1, 1951]

MERITORIOUS

Long and ardent admirers of Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, the Daily News was deeply pleasured from reading in the Raleigh News and Observer's Washington correspondence, that Beaufort County's chief current contribution to the State and Nation is forging straight ahead in his well-nigh single-handed campaign for cutting down waste in Washington expenditures.

From a wartime high employment of 15,000 persons Mr. Comptroller Warren has reduced his own pay roll to 7,000. This sort of thing has made him friends in Congress from which he holds his office, it is said; we are confident it has also made several Republican votes among those whom he has divested of the public teat.

But, as if this economy on his own premises were not enough, he has extended said premises to help others economize. He offers two floors of the new building constructed to house his personnel to Stabilizer Charles E. Wilson. This, we would insist, is the final demonstration of cooperative endeavor. When have you ever heard of a public official or department which had any working space voluntarily shared with any other official department or agency?

If it were not that we believe Lindsay would protest against the expense and time involved, we would suggest an award for the Federal workingman of the quarter century.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative business and any other special orders.

THE ARLINGTON RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read to the House a resolution which has been mulled over, debated, and adopted by a group of serious citizens of Arlington, Tex. It is entitled "The Arlington Resolution," and I take great pride in it because its authors are well known to me, and truly, I take a special pride that from among the people of my district there should spring such a clear and resounding affirmation of these principles of patriotic Americanism.

This resolution, I believe, is not only a challenge to us but all Americans. It reads as follows:

THE ARLINGTON RESOLUTION

Whereas we, the citizens of Arlington, Tex., recognize the grave situation that threatens our American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we will support with our every effort every member of our national administration and of the Congress who will put aside all party politics and remember that his first duty in this crisis is to America and the American people. To this end, we

stand ready to do our full share, pay our part, and give our lives, if need be; and be it further

Resolved, That we expect our Congress to take immediate steps toward revitalizing and strengthening the United Nations into an effective force to halt aggression and establish and preserve world peace, with each member nation contributing its fair and proportionate share; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our neighbors throughout our Nation to support the principles embodied in this resolution so that, through our united efforts and our prayers to Almighty God, our way of life will be preserved for our children and our children's children.

Authorized this, the sixteenth day of January 1951.

A. E. Betzel, Chairman, Owner-Manager A. E. Betzel Engineering Co.; B. C. Barnes, Mayor, City of Arlington, Tex.; E. H. Hereford, President, Arlington State College; Bob Cooke, President, Bob Cooke Motor Co.; Duncan Robinson, Head, Publicity Department, Arlington State College; J. E. Vernon, President, Southern Industrial Steel Corp.; George W. Hawkes, Editor, Arlington Citizen, President, Arlington Rotary Club; D. S. Hood, Owner-Manager, Hood Auto Supply Co.; C. Albert Oltroegg, Jr., Editor, Arlington Journal; T. J. Vandergriff, President, Chamber of Commerce; W. R. Wimbish, Superintendent, Arlington Public Schools; Frank A. Raines, Manager, Midway Inn; Josheph H. Elder, Jr., Police and Fire Commissioner, City of Arlington, Tex.; J. E. Ferguson, Owner-Manager, Ferguson Lumber Co.; O. B. O'Dell, City Manager, City of Arlington, Tex., Committee.

SIZE OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a brief article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as one of the authors of proposed legislation pertaining to the size of the Marine Corps, I desire to invite the attention of the House to an enlightening letter from a Marine Corps officer which appears in this morning's Washington Post. I hope that all Members will study carefully all available information on this very vital subject:

MARINE RUN

Your editorial Marine Run of January 27, contains so many misconceptions that, in all fairness to the country and the corps, it must not go unanswered. If 58 bills to increase the strength of the corps have been introduced in Congress there must be some merit to the changes they propose.

Your charge, that by increasing the corps the Army will be deprived of the men it needs, is obviously fallacious. Any increase in the corps of a couple of hundred thousand men is peanuts when compared with the mass millions in the planned expansion of the Army and would not deprive it of any significant numbers. The size of the Marine Corps should be based on the contribution it can make to national security.

Time and again the Marine Corps has demonstrated that it can provide more combat power per individual and per taxpayer's dollar spent. Percentagewise it cost the taxpayer about 20 percent more to maintain a soldier than a marine in 1939 and 38 percent more in 1948.

The Marine Corps is the Nation's force in readiness. It is prepared to go anywhere on a moment's notice, with a full force of combined arms, including its own air support. The utility of this force has been demonstrated time and again; in the occupation of strategic Iceland, in the invasion of Guadalcanal, and again in Korea. In these actions the marines were the only force available which was ready, well trained, and toughened.

You say that giving the Commandant of the Marine Corps a seat on the Joint Chiefs of Staff would give the Navy two votes. Louis Johnson, when Secretary of Defense, stated explicitly that, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff do not vote; neither do they decide." When members cannot agree the matter is referred to higher authority. Fundamentally, of course, the issue is not one of voting. It is, contrary to your opinion, a matter of what contribution the Commandant can make to the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There are strong arguments that the Commandant should be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In modern war every operation is a joint undertaking of more than one service. The Marine Corps occupies the unique position of having 175 years' experience in joint military operations and in the past three decades has pioneered the development of close coordination of land, sea, and air arms in amphibious warfare. From time to time it has operated with complete selflessness with and under the Army and with and under the Navy.

The country and the Joint Chiefs of Staff need the benefits of this rounded professional experience and cross education. At the present the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not getting the full benefit of this experience and knowledge. The Members of Congress who in the fall of 1949 gave the closest study to the problems of unification, namely, the House Armed Services Committee, unanimously recommended that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Your editorial correctly states that the Marine Corps operates under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy. This is so because the Marine Corps is a separate service within the Naval Establishment enjoying coequal status with the United States Navy, and has been so recognized since 1798. Whether the Marine Corps is ably represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Chief of Naval Operations is really beside the point.

While recognizing the great abilities of Admiral Sherman and his fondness for the Marine Corps, much more is involved than the matter of Marine Corps representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the legal right of the corps to have such representation. It is, in spite of your opinion to the contrary, a matter of what contribution the Commandant can make to the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It certainly has nothing to do with the comparative size of the Marine Corps as the smallest of the four services.

P. B. NIHART,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Marine Corps.
QUANTICO, VA.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are bewildered by the administration's price-control order, which designated a period of the highest possible prices at the point at which to freeze them. The prices which prevailed during the pre-Christmas buying spree of 1950 certainly do not provide a basis for a control order, unless we are willing to assume that it is impossible to roll prices back to a level less artificial and more in keeping with the earning capacity of the consuming public. The present order is a mere mockery. Just as in the last war, the price-freezing intention was telegraphed well in advance so as to encourage the most greedy elements in the economy to hasten to hike up their prices and horde their inventories in advance of the freeze, enabling them to make a "quick killing" at the expense of the consuming public and in utter disregard of the welfare of the Nation.

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, we have witnessed a sickening orgy of selfishness with too many groups shunning the path of true patriotism, and striking out for themselves to carry on profiteering in the same manner as in World War I and World War II. This cynical and sinister attitude bodes only ill for the Nation. We cannot create and sustain the morale we must have to achieve victory and to navigate the arduous course ahead, unless everyone is willing to curb his selfish inclinations and accept his full responsibility as a citizen of this free but imperiled Nation.

Extortionate prices have cumulative effects. They increase defense costs, thereby necessitating higher taxes, but at the same time they destroy the ability of a large part of the population to pay increased taxes or even to pay current taxes without reducing their standard of living below what would be necessary if defense sacrifices were equitably shared. Our people are willing to defray the cost of defense on a pay-as-you-go basis in order to prevent destruction of our economy through inflation, but they insist, and they have a right to insist, that we stop sending some to the battle lines, and some to the bread lines, while rewarding others with undeserved financial security and opulence. The job of saving America is a job for everybody, and when we consider starting to draft 18-year-old boys for almost 3 years' service in the Army, we had better be certain that others, whether willingly or through compulsion, are required to contribute their share to the defense effort.

I can very well remember the way many of us felt after long years in New Guinea, when we heard reports of great prosperity and free spending at home, mostly made possible by the building up of a national debt with which to saddle us upon our return. We must not now do this to another generation of Americans. Those of us who are fortunate enough to remain at home must pay the bills and pay them now. This will be more difficult because of the necessity of paying interest on the debt for the last

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

war, but we should not compound the felony by adding more debt onto the existing one.

Getting back to the question of prices, I have today introduced a bill which would remove the prohibition which now prevents control of food prices below the parity level. Surely the patriotic individual farmers of the Nation are willing to accept the same controls placed upon everyone else in spite of the attitude of the farm lobby. The restrictions favoring the farmers, placed in the Defense Act of 1950, make it appear that farmers expect special treatment and are not willing to take their chances on controls being fair, along with everyone else. I do not believe that farmers wish to be singled out for special treatment. They are one of the most sound, hard-working, and deserving groups in our Nation. We all want to assure them a fair share of the national income, but in doing this there is no necessity for the exception, supposedly for their benefit, written into the Price Control Act. The farmers are not a selfish group, and they should not be made to appear selfish by the special treatment accorded them in the matter of price control.

Some of the gentlemen who insist upon special governmental assistance for farmers are the same ones who brand every attempt to help other segments of the population as socialistic. Republican leaders almost never make a public statement without emotionally denouncing the administration for sponsoring what they call socialistic schemes, but few Government-assistance programs are actually as directly socialistic as the farm price-support program of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Yet the market manipulations of this agency are not considered socialistic by the Republican leaders who desire to hold the farmers' vote. Incidentally, it might be a good idea to suspend some of the wasteful activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the duration of the emergency. It is hard for people to understand why one agency of Government is compelled to bid prices up, thereby making purchases by consumers and the Armed Forces more costly, while such agency, at the same time, actually destroys some of the food it purchases. I want to emphasize that this financial manipulating by the Government, and this entry of the Government into the field of food finance is certainly just as socialistic as the programs the Republicans denounce. How can they contend that it is right for the Government to help the farmer obtain high prices for his products, but socialistic to set a minimum wage for workers, or to provide assistance for the blind, the aged, the disabled, and needy children. If the Republicans are so anxious to curtail the so-called socialistic domestic expenditures in the interest of national defense, why do they not also propose curtailment of farm subsidies, price supports, and other costly farm programs.

It is evident to all that the cry of socialism, the malicious name calling, the petty faultfinding, the fight for special consideration, the scramble for high profits, the willingness to take advantage of the emergency—all of this must end, if we are to move forward, united and resolute, toward the better day that will only come if we are willing to equally share the necessary sacrifices to bring it about. When everyone feels that everyone else is doing his part, when we are not ashamed to reaffirm the ideals of our forefathers, when we raise our sights to a high spiritual plane, with faith in God and the laws governing the universe, then only can we create the high resolve required during this critical period. We desperately need inspiring leadership, and the inspiration that comes from high ideals. We cannot defeat communism by reducing ourselves to the ugly and sordid level of animalistic materialism. We can defeat it, and we will defeat it, by proudly, unselfishly, and confidently moving forward together, united in defense of our way of life.

WAGE-PRICE FREEZE ORDER

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days, I have received, from the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, numerous letters that I believe are expressive of the views of the average workingman and housewife in America.

I know that the people in my district are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to adequately prepare America to resist Communist aggression. However, it is not fair to require one group of people to make sacrifices, and, at the same time, take action to insure that another segment of our economy is guaranteed all of the principles of business as usual.

As I have said before on the floor of this House, it is imperative for the Government to have the confidence of the people, if we are to realize our maximum effort. We cannot possibly have that confidence, if the people are forced to continue to pay highly inflated prices for the necessities of life. The Eighty-first Congress authorized price and wage controls, but I am sure it was not the intent of that body to freeze prices at the highest level they have reached since June of 1950. As one of my constituents has written me, we have put a ceiling on Cadillac automobiles so that they sell today for the same price they sold for in February 1950, but we have frozen the necessities of life at their highest, inflated levels. Another writes me:

> On or about January 22, 1951, I purchased a 1-pound can of sodium perborate manufactured by Merck & Co., manufacturing chemists, at a Miami drug store for 59 cents, which is the price I have been paying for several years. Yesterday, January 29, I purchased the same article, and paid the new control freeze price of 98 cents; an increase of 39 cents, or approximately 70 percent over the former price.

On Monday, January 29, 1951, the Miami Herald, a prominent newspaper in my district, published a pertinent editorial on the wage-price freeze order. I would like to quote from that article:

> The war with Korea began on June 25, 1950.
>
> Almost immediately, there was a demand for official action against inflation—another way, in this instance, of saying shoddy patriotism and boundless greed.
>
> Almost immediately, too, there began the feared upward spiral in prices of most commodities.
>
> As quickly as it could Congress gave the President the power to act by legislation completed on August 31. * * *
>
> The Government found itself paying sharply raised prices for its war-needed and other goods.
>
> The taxpaying consumer found the cost of articles already manufactured, and in many instances already on the shelves awaiting purchase, being marked up.
>
> These boosts were not made once, or on some regulated or justifiable scale, but steadily and as often as the trade would allow.
>
> Further, the desire to get prices up to a fantastically artificial level in order to create a compromise area of high values in which to negotiate once a price fix was ordered helped to achieve the sky-high price brackets. * * *
>
> The order by Price Director Michael V. Di Salle, announced last Friday, essentially fixed prices at the high level which they had attained between December 19, 1950, and midnight of last Thursday.
>
> That means at the xenith; at the point to which they had been driven by all the considerations of greed and of compromise-area fiction.
>
> With one fell swoop, it sheared Congress, evidently, of any power to bring about renegotiation of those contracts which the Government has had to make while the cost rampage ran.
>
> In Key West last week, Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate, said he hoped to save and recover billions of dollars for the Government through such renegotiations.
>
> But you cannot renegotiate when there is no arbitrary lower, established price level at which to settle.
>
> The renegotiated contracts would have saved the taxpayers those billions of dollars at a time when they are confronted with the biggest budget in our peacetime history, the highest taxes they have ever been called upon to bear, with Presidential warnings of even higher exactions; at a time, too, when the President is futilely seeking to inspire or win them with phrases closely approximating Winston Churchill's "blood, sweat, and tears." It is a mockery.
>
> The taxpayers must now supply the money to pay for the billions exacted in the artificial spiraling of prices of articles and materials needed by the Government, and he must supply it while himself paying highly inflated prices for many of the things he needs.
>
> And, if he be a wage earner, he must produce the money from dollars that have shrunken mightily in value and the number of which have been frozen to him.
>
> For the decree approving prices at the high level of the December 19 to January 15 period fixes his wages at the date of his last adjustment.
>
> The price fix will evoke no criticism from the uninhibited profiteer.
>
> By Government fiat, he has gotten his—more than he thought was coming to him—and now is assured that he will continue to get it.

On behalf of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, I appeal to Price Director Michael V. Di

Salle to reconsider the recent freeze order, and roll prices back to the pre-Korea level, in order that the housewives of America will not have to deny their families the necessities of life.

THE LOWLY GROUND HOG

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House that the Punxsutawney ground hog took the "freeze" spotlight from the Government today by forecasting six more weeks of winter weather.

Precisely at 8:41 a. m. today the seer of seers cast a shadow as black as the world's outlook for peace and then announced to his millions of anxious followers that the severe winter weather would continue until mid-March.

The forecast was made before loyal followers of His Chuckship who gathered at the Weather Works on Gobbler's Knob for the momentous occasion. Heading the contingent of officials from the Punxsutawney Ground Hog Club who gathered at the weather capital for the famous seer's appearance was Dr. F. A. Lorenzo, club president, who was the only one permitted to interview the great weather prophet.

Immediately after casting the shadow that portends six more weeks of winter weather, the groundhog exclaimed: "If you think the Government's freeze on wages and prices is something, wait till you see the freeze you're in for from the weather. You'll have cold, snow, rain, ice, slush, and wind—everything that goes to make up 6 weeks of the darndest weather you've ever seen."

After the chuck's shadow had been recorded by official shadowgraphers of the Punxsutawney Ground Hog Club, the ground hog was asked if there were any thing in particular he wanted to get off his chest. He paused momentarily and then launched into a tirade against the National Geographic Society and the report that it has moved to discredit him as king of the world's weather prophets.

"Why, I was forecasting the weather—and accurately—before some of those boys were out of knee pants. Their scientific explorations are all right, I guess, but they had better stick to their geography and leave this business of forecasting the weather to an experienced head who has been giving out the right dope for more than 50 years."

The seer of seers then launched into a castigation of his mortal enemy, the Quarryville polecat, and all other pretenders, opportunists, interlopers, and nature fakers of a low degree that live in reflected glory and who are wont to intrude on the sacred tradition of the Punxsutawney ground hog.

"Why, that squeal pig in Quarryville is even using a Geiger counter to help him," he asserted. "And, even then, he'll filch my forecast by means of a telegraph spy system," he said.

His Chuckship was apologetic as he turned to his followers and said: "I'm sorry, fellow. I couldn't forecast an early spring. The Lord knows you deserve it after all this severe weather and recent price and wage freeze. But it just was not in the books for an early spring."

And as he ambled off into the woods he turned and said, "As for that editorial in the morning paper entitled 'Exposé,' ordinarily I would not dignify it with a reply, and all I can say is puf, pooh-pooh, and phewie."

[From the Washington Post of February 2, 1951]

Exposé

This, as no doubt you have been reminded in other quarters, is ground hog day, one of the more notable festivals of American journalism; but the best advice we can give you is to ignore the whole business. If, however, you feel that you must celebrate something, why celebrate the nine hundred and ninety-eighth anniversary of the coronation of the Holy Roman Emperor Otho I or the memory of the great composer Giovanni Palestrina who died 365 years ago. (This date has other and even better-known associations which, out of deference to the sensibilities of certain readers, we forbear to mention; though doubtless they could be ascertained by discreet inquiry or by a little research in a good reference library.)

But as for the ground hog, we regret to inform you that trained investigators have been working on his case for some time. The accumulating evidence in their files indicates that he is not to be trusted at all. In the first place he has been operating all these years under an assumed name. His real name is woodchuck, although he has been called contemptuously marmot by the Europeans (which shows you how they talk about Americans behind their backs) and Marmota monax by snobbish Latinists. Secondly, it has been discovered that, notwithstanding the lying hypothesis foisted upon generations of innocent American school children, he never chucked so much as a twig in all his life, or ever lifted a paw in any kind of useful labor. He prefers, like all his worthless kind, to live at the expense of the hard-pressed American taxpayers, either in luxurious zoological gardens or in the wild state by devouring grains and vegetables that honest and hard-working American farmers are subsidized for raising. To put it bluntly the ground hog is cadger, a dead beat, a bum; and if he doesn't relish being called such names, let him sue us for libel and we will prove what we say up to the hilt in any unprejudiced court.

The first thing we shall do is to have our attorneys subpena the files of the National Geographic Society. The Geographic Society, it may interest you to know, has had its operatives at work looking into the shady history of this woodchuck, alias marmot, alias ground hog. These files support everything we have said about the various sinister rackets with which he has been identified, the vast sums he has cost the taxpayers and his scandalous neglect of his family responsibilities. The Georgaphic Society is known all over the world for the scholarly objectivity and restraint of its reports; but here is the sort of terms it uses to describe the character of this woodchuck-marmot-ground hog: "A phony prophet * * * a menace to America's food supply." Brothers, let us tell you that when the Geographic Society finds its necessary to use language like that, it is time for freedom-loving, law-abiding Americans to wake up.

Happily, this woodchuck fellow is as ignorant as he is vicious. He wouldn't know an isotherm from an isobar, or chile-mac from chile-con, or barometric pressures from beer posters. Those who are satisfied to take his word over that of the loyal, decent civil servants of the United States Weather Bureau are victims of one of the most outrageous propaganda hoaxes ever perpetrated. So our advice is to snub him; for if you don't he will certainly snub you. He won't even know or care whether it's clear or cloudy today. He will be sound asleep in the cozy little den or the swank little zoo cage for which in either case he pays no rent while you and we are out in the weather trying to scratch together one honest dollar for ourselves and another for the collector of internal revenue.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully call to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services that in meetings such as the one arranged by the committee to hear General Eisenhower in executive session, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs also has a deep interest. Our committee would greatly appreciate the chance to have all the information possible to help it in its work. We would appreciate very greatly an invitation to join with the Committee on Armed Services or any of the other committees when there are to be meetings which would be helpful to the members of our committee. Our committee has the care of the men and women who serve the country. We have the care of the men and women who pay the greatest price—the men and women who are the casualties of war. I believe it would be a great comfort and satisfaction to the veterans and future veterans to know that their committee was invited by other committees to listen to testimony which might help us to understand the great problems involved in their care and help.

Yesterday we were tremendously impressed with the excellent and inspiring report of General Eisenhower on the situation relating to the free nations of the world. We know the meaning of his sincerity, courage and positiveness. He has undertaken the most difficult job ever given any soldier. He is equal to his responsibility. The free world has complete confidence in him. I do not believe there is anyone, anywhere, who can successfully do the great work that is ahead other than General Eisenhower. I trust, and believe he will have the complete cooperation and support of the Congress. To win out, and we can win out, we must work together, all of the nations of the free world behind the brilliant and confident leadership of this top soldier-statesman of the century. I know our prayers and good wishes go with him as he marshals the forces of the free world together.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN FUND

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the friendship that I show to my Republican friends from time to time and the advice I give them was probably responsible for the receipt by me several days ago of a letter from the Illinois Republican State Central Committee, signed by Mr. Campbell, its chairman, in which he pleaded for a contribution to their magnificent souvenir program. He offered me a 50 percent reduced rate—the only reduction available to any group.

In my reply to Mr. Campbell I stated briefly why it was impossible for me to contribute. I can fully understand their need for all the funds they can collect, but unfortunately I was in no position to be of help to them. My heart and conscience would not permit me to make such a contribution to the Republican Party.

The letter from Mr. Campbell and my reply are as follows:

ILLINOIS REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., January 24, 1951.

DEAR MR. SABATH: Plans for our fifty-fifth annual Lincoln Day dinner are progressing splendidly and all indications point to the most successful event of this type we have ever staged. Tickets are going more swiftly than in any previous year and Senator TAFT's announced desire to use our platform for an address of major importance promises to bring our program into millions of homes via radio network.

We are, however, disappointed at having had no assurance from you that your county will be represented in our magnificent souvenir program. In order to encourage participation we offered your county organization a 50-percent reduced rate, the only reduction available to any group. A number of counties have already taken their space, but we must have complete support from our county chairmen so that by deadline date, February 3, our roll call will show all present.

Time is short. Please let us have your space contract, check, and copy by return mail.

With best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,
CARLOS W. CAMPBELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 29, 1951.

Mr. CARLOS W. CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Illinois Republican State Central Committee, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am in receipt of your form letter of January 24 stating that you had not heard from me as yet, indicating your disappointment at my negligence in failing to contribute to your magnificent souvenir program.

As a lifelong admirer of the great Abraham Lincoln and his espousal of the cause of the common man, my recollection is that he defeated the Whigs, the Tories, and the reactionaries in 1860. The fact is that at heart he was a Democrat, and were he alive today he would still be a Democrat and a leader in the fight against the reactionary Republican Party policies.

I am sure you will understand why I cannot participate in, or give any assistance to, the present Republican Party's activities because they are so far removed from the principles laid down by Abraham Lincoln.

Sincerely yours.

WILLIAM H. AYRES

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, now that we have done everything to the ground hog except fumigate him, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has all but helped the Republican administration along financially, let us recur to the regular routine of legislative procedure and let me say something nice about a real man. About one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WILLIAM H. AYRES, who is one of the new Members of Congress of whom we are all proud.

Mr. AYRES has just recently been given a very distinguished honor in his home community and by his home people. Mr. AYRES lives in Akron, Ohio, which is no mean city; it is the rubber capital of the world. Mr. AYRES has been recognized as the outstanding young man of the year in that community. Ohio has produced a great many political leaders, but one of our greatest political leaders, Senator Charles Dick, once said that one of the finest guaranties of successful public life is that one much be popular at home. Mr. AYRES has achieved that distinction for the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Akron has selected him as the outstanding young man of the year. To quote the Akron Beacon Journal, one of Ohio's leading newspapers, they say among many other complimentary things that—

A man who lifted himself by his own bootstraps was hailed as Akron's outstanding young man of the year for 1950.

Further quoting, they say, "We choose him because he is representative of the successful small-business man" and because "he is willing to work."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, because I know that he and all the other Ohio Members are glad for the distinction that has come to a capable and successful young man.

Mr. VORYS. I wish to join in extending congratulations to Mr. AYRES.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION POLICIES IN GERMANY—EISENHOWER AND McCLOY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution calling for a bipartisan Presidential commission to investigate American occupation policies in Germany. I do this because of the sharp conflict between the views expressed by General Eisenhower as to the Germans and the actions of High Commissioner McCloy who yesterday felt, in reducing and commuting many sentences of war criminals, including, I emphasize, those involved in the Malmedy massacre of American soldiers, that wooing the Germans was the right policy to pursue.

This is what General Eisenhower told the Congress yesterday about our occupation policy in Western Germany:

I am not even going to mention my several conversations in Germany, and for a very specific reason. I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved, an understanding that will contemplate an eventual and an earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of army. Certainly I, for one commander, want no unwilling contingents, no soldier serving in the pattern of the Hessians, serving in our Revolutionary War, in any army of my command. It would only be a source of weakness. Therefore, until the political leaders, the diplomats, and the statesmen find proper answer to that one, it is not for a soldier to delve in too deeply.

On the same day we read the news that High Commissioner McCloy has granted or there has been granted within his jurisdiction, commutations, reductions in sentence, and the discharge of German war criminals convicted and sentenced by the Nuremburg courts and other United States courts in Germany, including Krupp, who laid the industrial base for German aggression and the remaining criminals in the Malmedy massacre, whose sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. This was done on the advice of a distinguished board of advisers, and is one of a series of actions under the High Commissioner's power of executive clemency as our proconsul in Germany.

The New York Times comments editorially today on this decision of High Commissioner McCloy under the heading "Compromise at Frankfurt," as follows:

There is politics—or, if one likes, diplomacy—in these decisions.

I think that the family of every United States soldier who died fighting Hitler's Nazi legions, the family of every soldier who was a victim of the Malmedy massacre, the families of the millions who died in concentration and extermination camps under the Nazis have a right to ask whether this represents appeasement, German style, or normal justice, American style. This is especially true as this decision comes from Frankfurt the day after the great victory for morality in international affairs in the condemnation—under United States leadership—by the great majority of the nations in the General Assembly of the United Nations, of Communist China as an aggressor in Korea, all those who counseled appeasement and delay to the contrary notwithstanding. It is also an appropriate time to emphasize that the Russians are steeped in the immorality of traffic with former Nazi leaders and have employed them openly and brazenly in

organizing the East German army—thinly disguised as a police force—and in other tasks behind the iron curtain. At least, Mr. McCloy's decision has proceeded in the fundamental and moral assumption that vast and grave crimes have been committed and that punishment is due.

General Eisenhower has struck the note of realism which was missing up to now in all our considerations about making Western Germany an integral part of Western Europe's reconstruction and unified defense against the Soviet Communist bloc. We do not want unwilling allies, he implies, for the very hard reason that they are undependable and likely to prove ineffective. The fundamental problem with Western Germany, therefore, is to win a willing and cooperative ally and a dependable ally for Western Europe, for us and for the cause of freedom everywhere. This cannot be done by appeasement and that is what raises the grave question about the High Commissioner's policy in general quite apart from and without going into the details of the disposition of each particular one of the war criminal cases. For we must answer the question whether our wooing of the Germans, relaxing rapidly the restrictions of the occupation statute, the vast money and material support to maintain German living standards at a tolerable minimum basis, enhancing their prestige by letting the Bonn Government open consulates and establish direct diplomatic relations with other nations and now leniency to the war criminals, has been effective. The reaction to this policy has been, I do not doubt, factually and without any desire to evaluate, nevertheless expertly stated by General Eisenhower. The Germans, in his judgment, still remain outside the class of willing allies in the struggle for freedom.

This must be contrasted with the course of our occupation policy culminating in decisions on the war criminals which certainly have the capability of being very disillusioning to the tens of millions in Western Europe who suffered the tyranny, executions, and police action of Nazi occupation and whom we count on now to be our allies in fighting communism. We should also ask ourselves the question whether it does not have the capability to make the West Germans themselves cynical and embolden further the former Nazi elements, who already have a tradition established in 1939 of combining with the Communists against the free peoples, while discouraging and setting back the position of the democratic and liberal elements in Western Germany.

Yet Western Germany has the potential for playing a vital, perhaps even a determinative, part in the defense of freedom in Europe. For one, there is her geographical location; for another, her own division between a democratic West Germany and a Communist East Germany. The Germans are a people who know the military art and have the greatest industrial capability in Europe—a capacity of almost half the steel production, for instance. The very violence of the reaction of the Soviet—expressed especially to the British and French in an effort to intimidate them—to the suggestion that German military contingents be incorporated in the NATO forces would be calculated almost alone to motivate the normal citizen of the United States in favor of it.

But General Eisenhower's calm appraisal that we do not want German contingents as unwilling allies has also high lighted a fundamental difference in approach. This difference is between concessions and appeasement in Western Germany which appear to be producing little result either in the rehabilitation of the German democratic spirit or in firming up the will of the people in West Germany to join with the other people of Western Europe in the defense of their liberties and putting the Germans on their mettle and reciprocating with concessions when they have been earned and deserved. This fundamental difference of view demands, it is my conviction, a revival of the proposal there should be an investigation of our whole occupation policy in West Germany by a Presidential bipartisan commission with a full disclosure of the facts and the results achieved and that kind of airing of the situation which has always proved so useful in crystallizing United States public opinion and in determining United States action. For this purpose I am introducing today a resolution for the appointment of such a commission.

TELEVISION FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution in the House directing and authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the possibility of allocating certain television wave lengths for educational purposes. This same resolution was introduced yesterday in the Senate by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I believe the matter should be brought to the attention of this House also, as well as the other body.

I should like to add that the only educational television station now in operation in the United States is the one at Iowa State College, at Ames.

The authorities of that institution some months ago saw the educational possibilities in the utilization of television for educational purposes and they secured a license and have erected a station there, I might say, without any direct tax expense to Iowa. For a good many years the radio station operated by Iowa State College, WOI, has rendered splendid service to the great Midwest, especially to the farm people. Operating through amplitude modulation and frequency modulation in daylight hours, and by frequency modulation only at night, WOI has given its listeners news coverage and farm market coverage not equaled by any other radio station that I know about.

In addition, its musical, educational, and informational broadcasts are outstanding. Without derogating or reflecting in any way on any of the other fine radio stations in our State, both commercial and educational, I pay tribute to the service rendered by the radio broadcasting service of WOI at Iowa State College, Ames.

The television broadcasting of this station is relatively new. But from all reports it is developing in a manner creditable to the college and the people of Iowa. Since it is now the only television broadcasting service in central Iowa, all the television for the middle part of that State comes from WOI-TV. Fortunately, through the energy and foresight of the college administration, the license for television was applied for, granted, and the station erected before the Communications Commission discontinued the issuance of further licenses for TV.

Iowa State College is thus an experimental and proving ground for the use and effectiveness of television as an educational medium. I sincerely hope and expect that WOI-TV will show to the Communications Commission and to the public generally that a portion of the wave band for television should be allocated for educational purposes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PAY OF GI'S SHOULD BE TAX-EXEMPT

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a long treatise and report on the part of the President of the United States, and we heard a great many recommendations as to the tax program.

I agree with Mr. Truman that we ought to tax the higher bracket incomes. The Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States enjoys a considerable tax-free salary. The boys in Korea are going to have a difficult time this year as they lay in their foxholes in the subzero hills of Korea, scraping up enough dollars to pay taxes. They are going to have a difficult time to scrawl their names on their income-tax returns. Today I am introducing a bill entitled "To make all GI salaries tax-free, excluding commissioned officers. Be it enacted that all salaries of the enlisted personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be tax-free."

What is fair for the Commander in Chief is fair for the buck privates.

If the Commander in Chief can enjoy the tax-free privilege, then the rank and file of GI's should enjoy the same privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

WILL THE FCC PROHIBIT THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, how many here know that it may soon be impossible for any church or religious group to obtain a license to operate a radio station in the United States? This will happen if the FCC does not act before February 6 to reverse a recent decision of one of its hearing examiners.

On December 29, 1950, Examiner J. D. Bond declared that the Mormon Church could not be given a license to operate a noncommercial radio station because of the first amendment of the United States Constitution, which provides:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

It is my contention that in this instance the FCC would violate the first amendment not if it granted the license, but rather if it failed to grant the license. It would be an obstruction of the free exercise of religion to deny a license solely because the applicant is a religious organization. This authoritarian abuse of discretion is a result of the false totalitarian belief that the Federal Government is the complete and sole proprietary owner of all the airwaves, and not merely a regulator of their use.

The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the legal name for the Mormon Church, applied for a permit almost 2 years ago. In the initial decision rendered by hearing examiner J. D. Bond, on December 29, 1950, Mr. Bond found that this Mormon Church was financially and technically qualified to operate a radio station. He found that the church, except for the fact that 1 of its 18 officers was an alien, was legally qualified to operate a station. And in the case of this one alien he did not deem this a sufficient deficiency to warrant a denial of the church's application. Mr. Bond found that the proposed radio programs would serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

He found that—

> The program service proposed by the reorganized church as typified by its program schedule exhibit and the testimony of its witnesses evidences an analytical recognition of, and a plan to fulfill, the diverse radio broadcast needs of the community's religious, civic, charitable, governmental, agricultural, labor, and industrial interests. * * * we therefore conclude that its proposed programs in these respects would serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

But, Mr. Bond further found "because the Constitution so requires, the reorganized church application should be denied, even though it might be otherwise legally qualified to hold a broadcast station license."

This conclusion of the hearing examiner was preceded by the following statement:

> The hearing examiner has carefully considered the constitutional principles herein discussed in relation to the applicant's proposed program service and the purposes which the broadcasts are intended to serve. They are inseparable. He concludes that the Commission has not been, and could not be, empowered to find that the public interest or convenience or necessity would be served by licensing this applicant to use the proposed broadcast facilities to foster its religious objectives. This constitutional limit is no less compelling even though the public interest concepts of the applicant may wholly coincide with ours and might be wholly adhered to in a diversified program structure of balance and impartiality. * * * The hearing examiner is convinced that this Commission may not and should not license, and thereafter necessarily regulate as required by law, the applicant reorganized church to construct and operate the station as proposed because an intended use thereof—be it even a small portion of the entire purpose—is to further the religious interests of the applicant.

I have faith and confidence that the FCC will not abide by this illogical decision of its hearing examiner but will take action to reverse it before the February 6 deadline. However, I wish to point out the type of dangerous thinking that appears to be infesting more and more of our bureaucratic administrators.

An unexpressed but totally false premise of the hearing examiner in this case is the concept that the Federal Government is the complete and sole proprietary owner of all the air waves. That the Federal Government owns the air waves and can dispense them to whomever it sees fit. This is an authoritarian and totalitarian idea which is foreign to our history.

Naturally, it is true that the air waves must be subject to Federal regulation and that they are affected with a public interest, as indeed is all property. And in the case of radio waves, Federal regulation is an absolute necessity because of the fact that the unregulated use of the air waves would result in a hopeless jumble of sound which would benefit neither the broadcasters nor the listeners. But regulation by the Government does not mean complete control.

As the terms of the law creating the Federal Communications Commission indicate, the primary purpose of regulation of radio stations is to see that those who are licensed to operate, serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity. As long as the public interest, convenience, and necessity is served, the FCC has no right to deny a license to an applicant, unless, of course, such a granting would cause hopeless radio interference with other stations already operating. In this present case of the Mormons, it must be remembered the examiner had already determined that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served by this station and that there would be no interference with other operating stations, and yet the examiner denied the license because he believed that to grant it would violate the first amendment.

I contend that the FCC has no right whatsoever to deny this license. On the contrary, it has a definite duty to grant this license, and I further contend that the FCC, if it denies this license, is acting in violation of the first amendment. Part of the first amendment prescribes that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. What greater violation of this amendment by Congress could there be if Congress so created the FCC, that it would have the power to deny a radio station to a church or religious group solely because it was a church or religious group?

The free exercise of religion necessarily implies a free right to propagate and teach that religion. Christ himself admonished his apostles "go ye therefore and teach all nations." A religion by its very nature impels its followers to spread its gospel to others.

In upholding this right to teach, our Supreme Court has protected the right of various creeds to preach on the streets and to distribute its literature—*Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania* (319 U. S. 105, 109); *Martin* v. *Struthers* (319 U. S. 141); *Jamison* v. *Texas* (318 U. S. 413); *Marsh* v. *Alabama* (326 U. S. 501); *Tucker* v. *Texas* (326 U. S. 517). The Court in these cases has recognized this right to preach in the streets to be of "the same high estate under the first amendment as worship in the churches and preaching from the pulpits."

In this age of mechanical and scientific advance, the radio is an ordinary and normal means of projection of one's ideas and thoughts. To a large extent it has replaced the street preaching of old. What would be freedom of the press without a pen or a pencil, or in this day and age, without a printing press? What then, too, is the right of freedom of religion or freedom of speech without a radio channel?

Further error in the examiner's decision lies in the fact that he assumes that the mere licensing of a radio station is "a law." A law, as we lawmakers should know, is a broad rule of action to govern society, not a specific license. If the FCC issues a license to a church or religious body for a radio station, can that be construed to mean that Congress thereby is making a law respecting an establishment of religion?

The act of issuing a permit to construct and operate a radio station is a mere license. To extend this erroneous application of the FCC examiner to other regulatory bodies would apparently mean that no church could get a building permit from any city or State to construct a church. It would mean that no religious group could get an automobile license to operate a motor vehicle.

Extending the equal protection of the laws to a religious group by issuing to them a license upon the same terms as it would be issued to any other applicant, can by no means be construed as establishment of religion. Further evidence of what our founding fathers meant by establishment of religion can be found by consulting the Annals of Congress.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is interesting to note therein that Representative Huntington of Connecticut feared that the words of the amendment might be taken in such latitude as to be extremely hurtful to the cause of religion. That "others might find it convenient to put another construction upon it." To assure Huntington that such was not the intent of the amendment, James Madison suggested that the word "national" be inserted before religion—volume 1, Annals of Congress, pages 730, 731.

Certainly, it is unfortunate that our founding fathers did not add the word "national." They saw no necessity to add it for they could not believe, as Huntington feared, that someone like the present FCC examiner would make such a distorted interpretation of this amendment.

Remember, the license was not denied in this instance because the examiner thought that the public would not be interested in hearing the programs to be put on by the Mormons. The proposed station planned its program to be divided as follows:

	Percent
Entertainment	62.8
Religious	13.9
Agricultural	3.6
Educational	3.7
Discussions	1.2
News	4.8
Talks	10.0

The Commissioner found that these programs would be in the public interest. Some of you might conclude that this station would be even more in the public interest than most since it was to be operated on a nonprofit basis, without the constant clamor of singing commercials. But in any event the listener should still be the final determinant. If he does not like the program, he can still swing the dial.

Strangely enough, to support his position, the FCC examiner quoted the Supreme Court in the Everson case, as stating that James Madison eloquently argued that a true religion did not need the support of law.

The long litany of martyrs throughout history bears witness to the truth of James Madison's statement. But does that justify the persecutions? Certainly Madison in making this statement was not trying to justify the state in obstructing the practice of religion.

In the present instance the Mormons are not asking for the support of law. They are merely asking that they should be treated equally in the law; that they should not be discriminated against and obstructed in the free exercise of their religion; and most particularly here, that our Government itself does not violate the first amendment by prohibiting their free exercise of religion.

I make no brief here for the Court's arguments in the Everson case—*Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1 (1946)). The Court in that case did not take a very sympathetic view toward religion. But even so in that case the Court said that the first amendment requires the state to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.

How in the light of the above decision, which the hearing examiner contends supports his position, can it be concluded that this decision not to grant a radio license to the FCC does not handicap religion? This whole dispute can be brought down to one simple requirement of justice, fair play.

In connection herewith I wish to include an excellent article by Edward J. Heffron, director of community relations for the firm of Johnson & Johnson, which appeared in America, a leading Catholic periodical, on February 3, 1951:

THREAT TO RELIGIOUS BROADCASTING

(By Edward J. Heffron)

The fat—of "separation of church and state," I mean—is in the fire again. This time it is not religious education, however, but religious broadcasting that faces a roasting in the oven of the first amendment. Let me spell out what has been happening.

On February 6, 1947, a group that is known as the Kansas City Broadcasting Co., headed by the Reverend Wendell Zimmerman, pastor of the Kansas City Baptist Temple, filed an application with the Federal Communications Commission for a license to operate a standard radio station in Kansas City, Mo. On March 3, 1949, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints applied for a license to operate a station on the same frequency, only 7½ miles away, in Independence, Mo. Since the applications were conflicting, they were consolidated for purposes of consideration by FCC.

By the Communications Act of 1934 Congress reserved the control of all radio and television channels to the Federal Government. This act provided for the creation of the Federal Communications Commission to exercise such control. It specified that the Commission might grant or renew broadcasting licenses only for limited periods of time—now 3 years—and only to those who undertake to serve "the public interest, convenience, or necessity."

An applicant for a broadcasting license is entitled to a hearing. He is usually heard by an FCC hearing examiner, who then hands an initial decision up to the Commission. This the Commission may reject, remand, or affirm; except that if nothing is done about it—if the Commission does not take contrary action and if no objection is entered—the initial decision becomes the final and official decision of FCC 40 days from the time of public notice.

An initial decision was first handed up in this consolidated case on December 9, 1949. Hearing Examiner J. D. Bond ruled against the Kansas City Broadcasting Co.—originally a partnership, later incorporated—on the ground that the officers and directors were not possessed of an understanding of business and accounting practices sufficient to enable them to operate a radio station in the public interest.

This left the application of the reorganized Mormons to be disposed of. To understand Mr. Bond's startling conclusions in their respect, we need to know one or two facts about a third case then pending (and still unresolved) before FCC.

On February 23, 1949, the radio commission of the Southern Baptist convention and the executive board of the Baptist general convention of Texas filed a petition with FCC. This petition asked FCC to amend its rules, which reserved a certain band of FM frequencies for educational stations, in order to permit religious organizations to share that reservation; or else to reserve an additional band for religious organizations. On October 21, 1949, FCC set this petition down for hearing on two specified issues. One of these was "Whether the Commission may, consistently with the provisions of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, establish a specific category of religious broadcast stations." Shades of Vashti McCollum.

It was pointed out at the time that if the first amendment were held a bar to reserving a band of frequencies to religious licensees, it must by the same logic be a bar to reservation of a single frequency to a religious licensee; and that if it were considered a breach of separation of church and state to permit full-time religious broadcasting on Government-controlled radio frequencies, it could be held that part-time religious broadcasting was likewise unconstitutional. In other words, if FCC held contra on the aforementioned issue stipulated in the Southern Baptist case, all religious radio stations, and indeed all religious broadcasts, would be in danger of being held unconstitutional.

The Commission had not yet decided this issue when J. D. Bond handed up his initial decision re the reorganized Mormons on December 9, 1949. Mr. Bond held that "the application of the reorganized church * * * is wholly in compliance with the Commission's rules and standards of good engineering practice. * * * This applicant * * * possesses the legal qualifications requisite to the assumption and performance of the duties of a broadcast station licensee * * * the applicant is financially qualified * * * its proposed programs * * * would serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

But, said Mr. Bond: "It is suggested * * * that a favorable consideration of the application * * * would result in a grant of these facilities to an organized minority religious group in aid of their church objectives. * * * We are thus confronted with a serious obstacle to favorable action upon the independence proposal * * * because of that provision of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States which directs that, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'"

Referring then to the pending issue in the Southern Baptist case, Mr. Bond declared:

"We, therefore, conclude that, although the proposal of the Reorganized Church is in all other respects acceptable, its application must be denied at this time because of the presently undetermined applicability of the first amendment to licensing radio stations for religious purposes."

On December 30, 1949, the Southern Baptists amended their petition. Instead of asking for a reservation for "religious organizations" it now sought the reservation for "all recognized nonprofit organizations, including charitable, civic, fraternal, and other such organizations in addition to religious groups." This seemed to take the Commission off the hook as far as the constitutional issue was concerned.

As a consequence of this amendment of the Southern Baptist petition, FCC remanded the Reorganized Mormon case to Hearing Examiner Bond, instructing him to write another initial decision. The Commission stipulated certain issues—whether the Reorganized Mormons were citizens within the meaning of the Communications Act, whether their program undertakings promised to subserve the public interest, etc.—but nothing about the constitutionality of their request.

Bond entertained some amended pleadings, heard some additional testimony, and finally handed up a new initial decision on December 21, 1950. As indicated, the Commission stipulated no issue of constitutionality. Bond nevertheless managed to find that question implied in the issue of the "public interest, convenience, or necessity."

After making a finding adverse to the Reorganized Church on the question of whether all the officers and directors of the applicant association were citizens as required by law, Bond went on to the issue of "whether the program proposals of the Reorganized Church * * * would be in the public interest." After analyzing the concept of "public interest" as it had always been understood by the FCC, he decided that the application of the Reorganized Church satisfied the requirement.

This would seem to have disposed of the question. But not for Mr. Bond. No, sir. Since the Supreme Court erected the wall of separation between church and state in the Everson and McCollum decisions, Mr. Bond was determined to see that it was not breached. "One of the applicant's purposes," he wrote, "is to exercise its rights under that license to foster its religious interests. * * * There may be present correlation in all respects between those interests and the public interest, but we cannot decree that this applicant shall be empowered by license to construct and operate the proposed station under its stated concepts."

True, as he said, this stated concept merely includes the purpose of fostering the church's religious interests. But even if [that purpose] be even a small portion of the entire purpose, he declared, the license must not be issued. Bond was telling FCC not merely that it ought not grant the license, but that it could not. He even undertook to tell the Congress that it could not authorize FCC to grant such a license.

Bond supported this thesis with three arguments, based on the premise of the Everson decision that the founding fathers sought a government which was stripped of all power to tax to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the beliefs of any individual or group.

1. His first argument was merely implied, i. e., that for a Government agency like FCC to grant a radio license to a religious group for religious purposes, even though such purpose be secondary and inconsequential, would be to put the Government in the position of supporting or otherwise assisting any or all religions.

2. His second argument was more ingenious. When FCC grants a license, it is under obligation to regulate its use in the public interest, convenience, or necessity. But for FCC to regulate operation of a station owned by a religious group would be, in the words just quoted from the Emerson case, to interfere with the beliefs of [an] individual or group.

3. Bond derived his third argument from an excerpt he quotes from the McCollum case. He argued:

"We may not so commingle the religious interest of the Reorganized Church with the public interest as to find harmony and thereupon ignore the first amendment. Else we might * * * find discord in the dual concepts and precipitate the church-state imbroglio which the Constitution was designed to avert."

A religious station becomes unthinkable because antireligious groups might not like what it proposes to broadcast and start an imbroglio.

These three arguments, I submit, bear with equal force against all stations operated by religious groups. Bond would presumably qualify this by saying provided only that they broadcast religious programs. But such a qualification is obviously meaningless. A religious group wouldn't have a radio station if it didn't mean to use it, in some slight measure at least, for religious broadcasting. The last time I checked there were 33 such stations, counting AM and FM operations separately, 8 of them operated by Catholic educational institutions.

But the mischief of this initial decision goes even deeper than that. In my judgment it affects religious programs on commercial stations as adversely as it affects religious stations. If this decision becomes final it will, in my opinion, outlaw all such broadcasts. That seems to be a large order, too exorbitant to be credible. But let us see.

The Federal Government would be giving unlawful assistance to the Reorganized Mormons, Bond says, if it enabled them to broadcast Mormon doctrine by granting them a radio license. But FCC is just as truly assisting the National Council of Catholic Men in enabling them to broadcast Catholic doctrine by granting the National Broadcasting Co. its several licenses and permitting NBC to give radio time to NCCM for the Catholic Hour. Let it be remembered that FCC does not cease to be responsible for the use made of every minute of broadcasting time simply because it delegates that time to NBC in chunks of 18 hours a day.

According to Bond, if FCC granted a license to the Reorganized Mormons to broadcast religious programs, its obligation to regulate in the public interest, convenience or necessity would compel it to interfere unconstitutionally in the affairs of this religious body. But FCC's regulatory duty follows all radio time into whatsoever hands it may be delegated or subdelegated. If FCC permits NBC to delegate a half-hour a week to NCCM, FCC still has the statutory duty to regulate use of that time, meaning that it must regulate NCCM's use of the time. The latter is just as truly interference with a religious group as the former.

The applicability of Bond's third argument to religious programs on commercial stations is even clearer. If it is constitutionally incumbent upon FCC to avoid religious imbroglios by keeping Morman programs off Mormon stations in Independence for fear antireligious groups may kick up a fuss, it would seem to be at least equally incumbent upon it to keep Catholic programs off Nation-wide networks for the same reason.

Is it unthinkable that this initial decision should become final? I'm not so sure, certainly not any more sure than I would have been, prior to July 1946, that the opinion handed down in the Robert Harold Scott case was unthinkable; or than I would have been, prior to March 1948, that the McCollum decision was unthinkable. All I know is what is undeniably the fact at this writing, that is, that J. D. Bond's initial decision in the case of the Reorganized Church, et al., will automatically become final and effective 40 days after its release date, December 29, 1950, or on February 6, 1951, unless some objection is filed or FCC takes it up on its own motion. Very likely the Reorganized Mormons will object. But they objected a year ago, and now they get exactly the same dose, only more elaborately spelled out. They should not be left to carry the ball alone. And besides, were they now to give up in disgust and allow the initial decision to become effective by default, who could blame them?

THE LATE ALFRED S. BUDGE

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago there passed away one of the grand old men of Idaho. I might say he was the father of our colleague, Mr. HAMER BUDGE. Alfred S. Budge was 83 years old at the time of his death. He was a grand old man, a grand old-timer. He was justice of the Supreme Court of Idaho for a great many years. He had a numerous family and one of the best families in Idaho.

I wish to express my appreciation of the fact that we might have such a life in Idaho, and, if I may, also to tender the sympathy of this House to my colleague, HAMER BUDGE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ESCAPE CLAUSE IN RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, I introduced H. R. 2194 which, if enacted, will be known as the Trade Agreements Regulation Act of 1951.

I shall endeavor to have the principles of this bill amended into H. R. 1612, which will be before the House this week. I can see no reason why the Tariff Commission should not establish the point below which a tariff should be reduced, and that the Congress should be notified if such reduction will be fatal to an American industry.

Too many of our industries have been ruined and employees thrown out of work because of ill-considered tariff reductions. An escape clause should by law be a part of all trade agreements. But for the war in Korea, and preparation for war, millions of our American people would be idle today. We should not permit our leadership to get us into a position from which only a war can extricate us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PRODUCTION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a press release from the National Petroleum Counsel and the text of a House resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous action of the National Petroleum Council on January 29, upon the request of the Department of Interior to take action toward meeting the requirement of an additional 1,000,000 barrels daily of petroleum products, was correctly characterized by Mr. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the council, as one of the most important assignments that the National Petroleum Council has been called upon to undertake.

The current estimate of a requirement for an additional 1,000,000 barrels daily

is most significant. It should be considered in terms of the estimate made by the council on January 26, 1950, as reported in the progress report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce May 15, 1950—House Report No. 2055—at page 5, as follows:

The National Petroleum Council estimates that taking into account all factors, including drilling activities in 1948 and 1949, a reasonable figure for the availability of all petroleum liquids is 6,300,000 barrels daily for the year 1949 and 6,450,000 barrels daily for December 1949.

Domestic demand for all petroleum liquids in 1949 of 5,789,000 barrels daily, accordingly, was some 510,000 barrels less than the average available producing capacity.

The council concludes that at the end of 1949 there existed a substantial reserve crude oil productive capacity of some 700,000 barrels daily, and that productive capacity of some 1,000,000 barrels daily probably will prevail in the period 1950–53 in the absence of any new developments tending to upset the present outlook for supply and demand.

This action also points up the imperative necessity of the immediate continuation of the comprehensive survey of this country's petroleum resources undertaken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the Eighty-first Congress under its authority and responsibility through the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That authority could well be supplemented by prompt enactment of House Resolution 107, which I introduced on January 30 and which is now pending in the Committee on Rules.

The many related problems as to the availability of steel, the forecast as to the possibility and the terms of rationing, and as to the question of use of alternative fuels, as well as the present status of the development of synthetic fuels are matters of grave importance not only in terms of national defense, including our productive capacity, but in terms of the economy of the country and the health, welfare, and safety of the American people. I urge that we insure that our responsibilities shall be met by taking immediate action.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a release of yesterday from the National Petroleum Council covering this development:

Preliminary steps toward meeting a military and civilian need for an additional 1,000,000 barrels daily of petroleum products were taken today when Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Council, announced the appointment of a committee on capital and materials requirements for increasing availability of petroleum products.

The action was taken after the Department of the Interior informed the National Petroleum Council that preliminary studies indicated that in the event of war there would be a sharp increase in the demand for petroleum products to meet military and essential requirements which would require large quantities of capital and materials.

Hallanan said: "This assignment bears a close and immediate relationship to the problems of national defense. Certainly this is one of the most important assignments that the National Petroleum Council has been called upon to undertake." He added that: "The council at its meeting in Washington, D. C., January 29, unanimously approved the Government's request. I have today appointed Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Chicago, Ill., as chairman of the committee."

Other members of the committee as appointed today are: H. T. Ashton, Western Petroleum Refiners Association, St. Louis; Howard A. Cowden, Consumers Cooperative Association, Kansas City, Mo.; Fayette B. Dow, National Petroleum Association, Washington; J. Frank Drake, Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh; R. G. Follis, Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Jake L. Hamon, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Dallas; B. A. Hardey, Shreveport, La.; Eugene Holman, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York; A. Jacobsen, Amerada Petroleum Corp., New York; B. Brewster Jennings, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., New York; J. Paul Jones, National Stripper Well Association, Bradford, Pa.; W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co., New York; A. C. Mattei, Honolulu Oil Corp., San Francisco; L. F. McCollum, Continental Oil Co., Houston; Joseph E. Pogue, Chase National Bank, New York; Frank M. Porter, American Petroleum Institute, New York; M. H. Robineau, the Frontier Refining Co., Denver; W. S. S. Rodgers, the Texas Co., New York; Roland V. Rodman, Anderson-Prichard Oil Corp., Oklahoma City; P. C. Spencer, Sinclair Oil Corp., New York; J. Ed Warren, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Midland, Tex.; W. K. Warren, Warren Petroleum Corp., Tulsa; and L. S. Wescoat, the Pure Oil Co., Chicago.

Following is the text of House Resolution 107:

Whereas, in order to achieve and maintain supplies of petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, and for the duration of the current mobilization period, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, and for the duration of the current mobilization period, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies; and

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

THE EFFECT OF CONTROLS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration, despite its frequent protestations of love and affection for the small-business man, is proving once again that it cares nothing at all for the fate of the little fellow who has put everything he has—time, energy, and savings—into a small-business enterprise.

Orders now being issued by the National Production Authority controlling the end use of aluminum and other so-called critical materials will force many small-business concerns into bankruptcy and leave their thousands of employees without jobs. To the business which has invested in it everything the owner has saved, plus everything he can borrow for equipment and machinery which can produce only consumer goods, and which cannot be used for war production, these orders are a death sentence.

The control-happy bureaucrats who are issuing these ruthless orders are doing so without having before them anything resembling a program. One of these officials, appearing recently before the Senate Small Business Committee, did not know, for example, how much bauxite—the basic raw material from which aluminum is produced—is available; what our aluminum-production capacity is; how much is now on hand; how much will be needed for the defense effort now, on April 1, or 6 months from now, or at any time. He did not know how much will be required to maintain some semblance of a civilian economy. In short, he is issuing orders which will inevitably cause serious financial dislocation and large-scale unemployment, without even knowing whether there is any necessity for so doing. He appears to be acting more from fright than from necessity.

Large corporations and big businesses, with their unlimited capital and great flexibility, are not hurt by such orders. They have the experienced staff and contacts that enable them to get war contracts, while the little fellow is faced with an insurmountable mass of red tape and administrative indifference. The big boys can buy or lease new equipment and convert their plants, while the little fellow has neither the money nor the priorities to do this.

Military procurement officials would rather deal with a few big corporations than to go to the trouble of working with a lot of small producers—this despite the urgent military need to dis-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

perse our war production so that it will be less vulnerable to air attack.

Mr. Speaker, all of this proves once more that the Truman administration's oft-repeated concern for what it calls the little fellow is synthetic. Its actions continually tend to make big business bigger and to squeeze the little fellow out.

THE RAILROAD DISPUTE MUST BE SETTLED WITH EQUITY AND DISPATCH IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST—DYNAMIC LEADERSHIP WOULD BRING ABOUT HARMONY AND UNDERSTANDING—AMERICAN WORKERS ARE ENTITLED TO CONSIDERATION OF THEIR JUST GRIEVANCES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for any strikes in our transportation lines when men are dying in Korea, but I do remember that one of the things for which they are dying is fairness and justice.

The Government took over the railroads some 4 months ago, many months after the men in certain branches of the work had asked for a readjustment of their wages and their hours. Nothing has been accomplished during these months of Government control. Small wonder that an end came to their endurance.

Life has taught me that there are always two sides to every question. Certainly at this point it would seem as if Government should give an accounting of its inaction, which in itself is one of the main causes for the action of the railroad workers.

They are men who are just as good Americans as you and I, who have been brought near the end of their endurance after many months of inaction on the part of Government.

As far as I can see, they are asking no more than has been granted many railroad workers, and most of industry otherwise. It is a sad commentary on our understanding that we must let things drift to the point where good Americans are put in the position of defying Federal court orders over questions that should have been resolved months and months ago.

When the Federal Government took over, the men felt there might be a settlement of the problem. But thousands are still working at wages established more than 2 years ago. Many work from 56 to 60 hours a week, with no adequate basis for overtime. Only a very few have been put on a real 40-hour week, with overtime pay for 48 hours or more.

Surely, if there is to be any fairness in the wage-price structure the yardmen, the switchmen, the men who work out of doors in all kinds of weather, who protect us from accident and keep trains moving safely—certainly they who are skilled workers in their field, who have waited far more patiently than skilled workers in industry at large have done—are entitled to consideration.

This is in no way intended to condone their defiance of the Federal Government and of their own unions. But it should make us all wonder as to the methods of a government that can let so vital an issue drag on month after month, its only tactic that of procrastination over a problem which affects the very heart of our productive capacity.

Under the unanimous consent granted me I shall include an editorial from last night's Washington Daily News, They Are Wrong. It expresses the very general feeling that railroad strikes at this time simply must not be.

In addition, however, the editorial gives something of the picture of the conditions that have continued to exist under the nominal Government takeover of the railroads—conditions that have finally brought the men to the end of their endurance.

Are these men the only ones who are wrong, Mr. Speaker, or do we not share that wrong?

Do we not all have a definite responsibility when we permit situations such as exist today in our railroads to continue? Certainly no settlement can be made without all of us recognizing the obligation that is ours as Americans to create an atmosphere in which unity of purpose will bring understanding.

Many of you had opportunity yesterday, as I did, to talk with some of these railroad workers who have come to plead their case. They are loyal Americans—coming to us who represent them in the Congress to plead for understanding and for a fair adjustment of wages and working hours. These men have waited 23 months. They are discouraged and deeply troubled, knowing full well that to continue such a strike will injure many, including themselves.

I am convinced that these men would go back to work instantly if they felt we would act in their behalf. They do not want special privileges, but they do want adjustments comparable to those the men in other industries have had, comparable even to those already granted some of the branches of the railroad industry.

Perhaps there is a 44-hour week in theory, as the News editorial says, but these men are working—some 56 hours, some 60 hours a week. What family life can they have? What can they know of their children? One man, now on a real 40-hour schedule, who spoke of being "in luck," said to me yesterday, "Until 2 years ago I was practically a stranger to my two children."

I have said before that I am not condoning this strike, but a middle way can be found if one tries to find it. These men came to us as a last resort to ask that we find some way to that middle road, where there may be an equitable solution.

I know, as every man and woman in America must begin to realize, that we as a Nation must prove our right to the freedom and the way of life about which we talk so much and do too little. This is a struggle for survival—no less—and no country whose people are divided will survive.

And we need do so little, Mr. Speaker. Is it so impossible for us to sit down together? Can we not talk together about our common problems? Can we not at least attempt to understand each other?

I have talked with these men who drove all night from Cleveland to lay before us as a last hope their plea for understanding, and no one can tell me that this strike cannot be settled.

There is no problem in all of life that has but one side, Mr. Speaker; and if my life has taught me anything, it is that my side is not always right.

Dynamic leadership must be found to settle this dispute in the national interest and in justice to our railroad workers.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of February 1, 1951]

THEY ARE WRONG

Again, as in mid-December, unauthorized strikes by railroad yardmen in Washington and other key centers threaten the Nation with a disastrous tie-up of rail traffic.

This newspaper repeats what it has said before—that the strikers are good Americans who feel they have a great grievance.

But, no matter how great their grievance, they are gravely injuring their own cause as well as their country.

They are affronting public opinion when they greatly need its sympathetic understanding.

They are striking against their Government, for the roads are under Federal seizure and Army operating control.

They are defying the President of the United States, who termed their December strikes unlawful and called on them to return to work.

They are violating a Federal court restraining order, issued at Chicago last month, and risking severe punishment of their unions.

They are disobeying their union leaders, who have disowned the strikes and instructed the strikers to get back on their jobs.

At the time of the December strikes, the Scripps-Howard newspapers advised the yardmen to return to work and promised, if they did so, to help them put their case before the court of public opinion.

Last week we kept that promise by publishing an article written by W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Mr. Kennedy made some impressive points.

The yardmen and switchmen got their last wage increase in October 1948. Since then most workers in other industries have had repeated raises. Many organized workers, including a million nonoperating railroad employees, have the 40-hour week with premium pay for overtime. Yardmen and switchmen do not, and their current wage rates are much lower than those of other skilled workers in many industries.

Their present wage controversy with the railroads began almost 23 months ago. Last June their unions rejected—as they had a legal right to do—the recommendations of a Railway Labor Act fact-finding board appointed by President Truman. On August 27, Mr. Truman ordered Government seizure of the roads to head off a threatened strike for better terms.

After the unauthorized strikes in December, union officers and management representatives were called to the White House for new negotiations. They signed, finally, what the public certainly understood to be a firm agreement for settlement of the long controversy.

Under it, the yardmen were to get a raise of 25 cents an hour, bringing their average hourly wage to about $1.83. An escalator clause guaranteed further increases if the cost of living kept rising. The 40-hour week was accepted in principle, though its actual application was to be deferred until the manpower situation improved. The four unions involved were to observe a 3-year, no-strike moratorium on new-wage-and-working-rules demands.

Mr. Kennedy and other union negotiators now contend that the agreement was merely tentative. Governing bodies of their unions have rejected it. And the yardmen, still on wage rates fixed more than 2 years ago, are trying to paralyze the railroads with their country at war and in danger of greater war.

Their impatience is understandable, but their strikes are wrong.

Public opinion might support them in an effort to obtain further concessions through renewed negotiations. It will be dead against them unless they stop these strikes without delay.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on next Friday, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S REPORT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning as a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services to listen to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower give a detailed explanation of his findings based on his recent tour of Europe.

Without doubt, General Eisenhower's observations were the most complete and factual report that has ever been presented to the House Committee on the Armed Services since I became a member of that committee following my return from World War II.

I am convinced after hearing General Eisenhower that the rearming of Europe is essential to world peace, and that while it presents a risk that America must assume there is no other solution than to accept the task.

With the information that General Eisenhower has given us we have a clear picture of the risk, and I feel after hearing him that as a Member of Congress I am better qualified to legislate in the best interest of the American people.

Now that we have the authoritative review of conditions in Europe and understand the risk that lies ahead I urge President Truman to order Gen. Douglas MacArthur to return immediately and submit a similar report on Asia. In the opinion of millions of people General MacArthur knows Asia as General Eisenhower knows Europe, and his views are vital at this moment so that Congress and the American people may have a complete picture of what we are faced with in Asia and Europe.

The problem confronting us today from a world standpoint is not clearly understood by the American people and by many Members of Congress. We have heard from General Eisenhower now let us hear from General MacArthur.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S REPORT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He said the Armed Services Committee has a comprehensive statement by General Eisenhower. Certainly we who went to the Library of Congress yesterday got no comprehensive statement from Eisenhower.

I hope that the Armed Services Committee at the earliest opportunity will advise the Members of the House, and all of them, what is contained in that comprehensive statement. I for one was very disappointed and very disillusioned by Eisenhower's performance yesterday.

STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and I am sorry she went out, with reference to this wage-hour controversy between the union men and the railroads, one thing is sure, and there is no doubt about it, and that is this Nation cannot carry on a war if the transportation workers or the coal miners or any other group or organization whose members are engaged in activities essential to that work are to be permitted to strike every time they feel like it. I know nothing about the merits of this dispute. I do know it was once, I think twice submitted to a board appointed by the President. If we are to draft 18-year-old boys, if we are to draft married men with children, or men who have once served, I say it is time that strikes stop.

There is a way to stop them. The unions exist today, and they have the power they exercise because and only because of special privileges given them by the Congress of the United States. If they will not play fair, if they will not be good, if they will not use decently the powers we have given them, let us take these powers away from them. When men can be conscripted to be shot, they can also be conscripted to work.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief statement by a citizen of Texas.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an analysis of the escape clause as it applies to reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include part of a letter on price control.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters and an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. BRYSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. GRANGER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. GRANGER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from a St. Petersburg, Fla., newspaper of January 30, 1951.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short sketch from the Washington Post.

Mr. PATTEN and Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short editorial from the Knoxville Journal.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each instance to include some articles.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Alf A. Landon.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement on the subject by Senator BYRD.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include three editorials.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial from the Ashland Times Gazette, of Ashland, Ohio.

Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Chico Enterprise of January 24.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the California Alumni magazine.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Dr. C. O. Watkins.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from testimony given by General Eisenhower and from other papers from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances, in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RENEGOTIATION

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 23, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 1724, the renegotiation bill. During the debate, under the 5-minute rule, I offered an amendment to strike from the bill the authority for the Renegotiation Board to grant permissive exemptions from renegotiation, and supported my amendment by a brief discussion.

Because this bill may again come before the House after conference, in case the Senate version of the bill differs from the House version, I believe the RECORD should contain a more complete and a stronger presentation of the facts and considerations bearing upon the wisdom of the amendment I offered.

I also believe that I owe a duty to the Members of this House, upon whom I urged a certain course of action, to amplify the facts and reasons bearing upon the question. This may serve to dispel any impression that the amendment, which I offered for the first time on the floor of the House, was proposed lightly or in a casual fashion.

My failure to make this more complete presentation at the time the bill was before the House results, primarily, from the rapidity with which this far-reaching proposal was brought before the Members of the House for their consideration and vote. Until the morning of the Saturday preceding the Tuesday on which this bill was passed, I had no knowledge that this measure was to be considered by the House. This provided me with only one business day in which to study the bill, and to make preparation for any position I might take with respect to it.

Furthermore, although I requested a copy of the hearings from the committee, none was available. It was only after the bill had been passed that I was able to persuade the committee staff to loan me a committee copy of the hearings, so that I might familiarize myself with the evidence on which the committee had acted.

In passing, I want to register a vigorous complaint against this blitzkrieg procedure. I realize that every one of us in the House of Representatives must assume responsibility for the national policies which emerge from this body. I am no magician, and I don't think any of the rest of you are. I do not believe we can adopt wise policies on hunches, emotions, or headlines. We must have the facts, and we must be aware of the arguments and reasons for and against proposals on which we are obliged to take a position.

One day's study, without the record of the committee available, was not enough time for me to explore this important subject to my satisfaction, particularly when my time also was required for study of two other important measures passed by the House that same week—the Armed Services insurance bill and the reorganization of the Air Forces—and, in part, for the problems of my constituents and of the committee of which I am a member.

I do not want to dwell on this complaint at this time, but it seems to me that the Congress could do much better in informing itself of the facts and considerations without which wise policies can be decided only as a matter of accident. This is particularly necessary if the Congress is to strengthen itself and if it is to recall the legislative power it has permitted itself to lose to the executive branch of the Government in the past two or three decades.

I have some views on this subject, which I will want to present at greater length to the House at a later date. For the moment, I only want to call attention to this situation to explain why the remarks I am making today were not made a week ago Tuesday when the bill was before the House.

I have embodied a more complete statement of the reasons why the power to make discretionary exemptions should not be vested in the Renegotiation Board, created by H. R. 1724, in a letter addressed to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. I have sent a copy of this letter to each of the members of that committee. I will present those reasons to the House by reading from that letter.

However, before doing so, I think it is in order to explain that in this particular instance my study of the question was not limited to the brief time which has elapsed since I had notice that this bill was to be considered by the House. It was my good fortune to have had some intimate contact with renegotiation problems through my service as counsel for the United States Senate War Investigating Committee. I have drawn upon that experience, upon the testimony of experts in the renegotiation field, and upon the documentary evidence received by the Senate War Investigating Committee on that subject, as well as on unrecorded conferences with renegotiation officials and with war contractors subject to renegotiation.

It is because of that experience, and the views which evolved therefrom, that I feel confident that my recommendation that permissive exemptions be stricken from the bill is clearly in the public interest. Since the passage of the bill, I have reviewed the reports and the hearings of the Senate War Investigating Committee and the record of the House Ways and Means Committee on which this bill is based.

I have also conferred further with a former renegotiation official, in whose judgment I have confidence, with the result that my conviction of the soundness of the proposition I urged has been fortified. This review also has persuaded me that this evidence should be placed before the Members of the House and should appear in the RECORD.

I will not read the letter I have written to Senator GEORGE:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1951.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I call your attention to a provision in H. R. 1724, renegotiation of war contracts, which passed the House on January 23, 1951, by a unanimous vote. I refer to section 106, subsection C, which vests in the Renegotiation Board authority to grant certain permissive exemptions, in addition to the statutory and mandatory exemptions from renegotiation.

I called the attention of the House to this authority to grant permissive exemption by offering an amendment to strike it, which amendment was defeated. The discussion on the floor of the House on this point was quite brief and appears on pages 631-632 of the RECORD for Tuesday, January 23, 1951. If I had had a little longer notice that this legislation was coming up in the House, I believe I could have made a more effective presentation and, perhaps, might have persuaded the committee to accept my amendment. I was informed by the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and by a member of the staff, that this particular matter had not received any specific consideration by the Ways and Means Committee. I have subsequently reviewed the hearings of the committee and find that there was no testimony on this point justifying its inclusion in the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I am attaching for your information a copy of the report on renegotiation filed with the Senate by the Senate War Investigating Committee on February 20, 1948. This report appears as an appendix to the final report of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and I have marked passages on page 229 and 234 of that report, which show that both the War Department renegotiation officials and the committee were unanimously of the opinion that all of the discretionary exemptions from renegotiation, and most of the mandatory exemptions, should be eliminated in any future renegotiation law.

You may recall that Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, became—during World War II—probably the outstanding authority on renegotiation. I believe that I can say that he was very highly regarded by those Members of the Congress who were familiar with his work and, particularly, by the members of the Senate War Investigating Committee. On Friday, January 31, 1947, General Hirsch testified before the committee on the renegotiation law, and his testimony appears, beginning on page 23255 of part 39 of the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program of the United States Senate. General Hirsch was most emphatic in opposing the discretionary exemptions. I would like to quote two passages from his testimony:

"Senator FERGUSON. Now, this may have been one of the cases, which I think we ought to cover here this morning if possible, of the exemptions, where the Government made a contract where they did not renegotiate. Was there any standard set up as to why they made contracts not requiring renegotiation?

"General HIRSCH. The Senator has put his finger right upon one thing, which, based on the question of the chairman, I should like to make response to. Those of us in renegotiation do not believe that there should be in the law the privilege of granting any such exemptions.

"Senator FERGUSON. But there was.

"General HIRSCH. That was entirely apart from our operations.

"Senator FERGUSON. But after the law provided for those exemptions, were there standards established so that they would only be granted in cases anticipated under the law?

"General HIRSCH. I am sure, sir, that the procurement authorities in those cases felt that they were operating correctly, but I cannot answer for them because you see we did not grant those specific contract exemptions.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, as I understand, you are firmly of the opinion, and those associated with you in renegotiation, that any such discretionary powers——

"General HIRSCH. In procurement, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. That it is not wise.

"General HIRSCH. That is our opinion, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is based on your observation and experience of the last 4 years?

"General HIRSCH. It definitely is."

On page 23270, General Hirsch further testifies:

"The CHAIRMAN. We will appreciate whatever report you may want to furnish, and then we will want to ask you in later. I think the benefit of your recommendations on the over-all picture in the event of another emergency is what this committee wants to direct its attention primarily to, and you may want to take a month or two in order to think that over.

"General HIRSCH. I have been thinking it over, and the one real recommendation that I would like to make is the elimination of exemptions. That is the one recommendation that I would make.

"Senator FERGUSON. That is any exemptions?

"General HIRSCH. Yes; because there ought to be enough incentive with the kind of profit that the ones in renegotiation would accord, that ought to be enough incentive for a contractor to do his work well.

"The CHAIRMAN. You mean over the $100,000?

"General HIRSCH. Yes, because under that it is too small.

"Senator FERGUSON. What is the highest profit to your knowledge, of anyone who was exempt? I do not mean by the statute, but under renegotiation.

"General HIRSCH. I do not recall, sir, but the thing that impresses me about it is—

"Mr. MEADER. We have heard that profits might be as high as 40 percent.

"General HIRSCH. I do not know of any such. But a 15-percent profit might be outrageous if it is with reference to $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 of business, where the difference between what might be accorded—now talking percentagewise—of 7 or 8 or 9 percent and the 15 percent amounts up to a lot of dollars.

"Mr. MEADER. Your organization has records of those exempted contractors, I believe, does it not, which can be furnished to the committee?

"General HIRSCH. Well, the departments have. I do not believe that we have. Of course, if that is a segment of the business of a contractor, then it would be reflected in our report, but that is something that we had to look at just as if it was civilian business, and frankly it has distorted a great deal of the picture in those instances where a substantial segment of the contractor's work was excluded by exemption.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that renegotiation provisions probably would be an essential part of any future emergency, that there is no other way of meeting this particular problem?

"General HIRSCH. I have carefully scrutinized so many of the things that have been presented, particularly in the earlier days, and I am convinced that it is the best of the methods that have been suggested."

I would also like to call your attention to hearings of the Senate War Investigating Committee, held in October 1947. Mr. John R. Paull, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board (successor to General Hirsch), likewise opposed authority in the act to grant permissive exemptions from renegotiation. See part 42, Hearings, Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, page 25499.

Unfortunately, although the committee sought repeatedly to do so, specific instances of excessive profits on exempted contracts were never obtained from the military services. That information would be extremely pertinent to the present consideration of the provision in the bill before your committee.

It seems to have been generally recognized that renegotiation officials in World War II were of exceptionally high caliber. We cannot be certain that we shall be as fortunate in the membership of the Board created by the new bill. Should this extremely broad power be vested in a weak Board, the consequences might be disastrous. In this connection it should be noted that the power to delegate and redelegate such authority remains in the bill, as drafted.

As far as I know, only two arguments have been advanced in favor of authorizing permissive exemptions. Neither of them appear to me to be valid.

It is argued that renegotiation entails a great deal of bookkeeping and auditing work, both on the part of the contractor and renegotiation officials, and that, by exempting specific contracts from renegotiation under the discretionary authority, this administrative burden can be minimized. Where all of a particular contractor's war contracts are exempted this would be true. However, it is more likely that a contractor will have some contracts which are exempted under the discretionary exempting power, and some which are not exempted. In this situation the administrative burden is not lessened but increased, for the reason that renegotiation officials must look more closely into the contractor's costs to ascertain whether or not the contractor has sought to throw costs, properly chargeable to the exempted contract or contracts, against the contracts which are renegotiable, whereas, if all of the war business of the contractor were renegotiable, such a segregation of costs would be wholly unnecessary.

I am informed by a former official of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, in whose judgment and reliability I have great confidence, that this argument that the administrative burden can be lessened through the allowance of permissive exemptions is wholly without merit.

The second argument advanced in favor of permissive exemptions seems to me to prove too much. This argument is that contractors do not like to be renegotiated and do not like to have their excessive profits taken away from them and, accordingly, would enter more eagerly into the production of war goods if their contracts were exempted. This principle, if true, would seem to apply equally to all war contracts and would lead, logically, to the proposition that there ought not to be any renegotiation whatever. If we accept the basic philosophy that renegotiation is the proper technique for the prevention of exorbitant war profits, it would seem logically to follow that it should be uniformly applied, without discrimination or favoritism. To the extent that the inhibition against exorbitant war profits adversely affects the morale of our production system, it would seem logical to assume that the damage to morale would be least where all contractors were confident that they would be treated alike, and would be greatest where there is knowledge or belief on the part of war contractors that some, with inside connections, are being favored.

I assure you that I have no interest in this matter, except that I believe that the legislation should be passed in the light of as complete factual information as can possibly be collected within the time within which legislators have to act, and I feel that this phase of the bill was not given as close scrutiny by the House of Representatives and its committee as it deserves.

If there is any further way I can be of assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWNSON. Under ordinary circumstances I would believe that the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle were equally interested in the nonpolitical administration of affairs pertaining to the war. Having learned from my own State of the method by which economic stabilization personnel are being employed, I am somewhat in doubt as to that point. On the basis of your best investigative experience, would you say that partisan politics would be more apt to play a part in this procurement program under the bill as submitted, than if the permissive exemptions were removed?

Mr. MEADER. I think it is clear that if the authority did not exist in the Board there would be no opportunity for them to play partisan politics with such power. But nobody knows what they will do. The Renegotiation Board during the last war seemed to be made up of very high caliber men. However, the

selection of administrative personnel is always important. No law can be passed which will insure its good administration. If weak or politically minded persons are appointed to the Renegotiation Board set up by this bill, who are allowed to redelegate that permissive exempting authority down the line to procurement officials, and if there should be weakness or political inspiration in any of those to whom this power is to be redelegated, the opportunity for political favoritism, or other kinds of favoritism, would be great. If this authority were stricken from the bill they could not play politics with power they would not have.

I only want to add this thought to the remarks I have made: The Senate War Investigating Committee during World War II, under the leadership originally of Senator Truman, now President Truman, and subsequently under the leadership of former Senator Mead, now chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, both loyal Democrats, conducted an investigation of this particular method of preventing exorbitant profits in wartime.

After the end of the war, the committee, in its continuation under the chairmanship of Senator BREWSTER, reviewed renegotiation as one of the very many subjects they reviewed in seeking to draw out of the experience of World War II all of the knowledge that was gained then, and to epitomize the work of that committee in its final report.

Both Democrats and Republicans unanimously recommended that in any future renegotiation law permissive exemptions should be eliminated. They were supported by the best thought in the War Department itself, by the views of men, who had had experience working under the permissive exemptions that existed in the 1943 act.

Are we going to do again in this emergency the same thing we did at the beginning of World War II, namely, overlook and neglect to notice all of the experience and hard thought that had been given to the similar problems that had existed in previous wars and previous emergencies?

I say the Congress of the United States ought to be guided by the experience, which is so recent, that we had in World War II. I say that the recommendations of the experts in the military services and the experts on the War Investigating Committee, steeped in all phases of this particular war activity, ought to be given due weight. We ought not to act in ignorance or disregard of the experience of the past.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on the splendid statement he has made. He, being a new Member of this body, deserves a special compliment for this splendid address.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced House Joint Resolution 52.

This resolution is nonpartisan, having been adopted by both major parties in their national platforms. For this reason it is receiving support from many Members on both sides of the aisle.

At a time when women are likely to be drafted and have already proved that they are willing and able to serve their country whenever called, it would seem only just that they should be made first-class citizens. Something they are not today.

The women of this country and the two major political parties ask simply that this amendment be submitted to the several States for ratification and are willing to abide by their verdict.

Let us stop hypocrisy in this matter and either give the people of the several States the right to vote on this amendment or else drop it from our national platforms and tell the world that the women of the United States want security, not freedom, and that they prefer special privileges for the few rather than equality for all.

All this amendment does is to state this very simple proposition:

SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification.

The equal-rights amendment has been a plank in the Republican platform since 1940 and in the Democratic since 1944. In 1948 it was in the platforms of the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive Parties.

It is, therefore, a matter that is entirely outside and above party politics and it seems rather cynical not to say plain dishonest, that after all these professions of policy and planks in the platforms, nothing has been done to carry out these solemn promises.

I would like to quote from the speech of a woman attorney, Helen Elizabeth Brown, before the Lawyers Civic Association of Maryland, because she answers specifically the question that is always brought up by the opponents of the amendment: "In what way are women, under the law, inferior to men?"

Men, aliens and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country; American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Now all the nonsense about seats in factories for women and maternity benefits are so much "eyewash."

There is no more reason why women should not have seats if they need them than that the GI's should not have special educational advantages that are not open to ordinary civilians. There is no reason why a woman should not have maternity benefits, any more than that a veteran should not have a bonus. She is doing just as much for her country as the soldier, and in both instances they are each doing something the other could not do.

If women have the right to vote they certainly have the right to be considered equal under the Constitution.

The fight for suffrage was more intense and vehement than this one, but this amendment will be written into the Constitution in time. It is the last step on the long road toward freedom for women in the United States. We want equality, not protection. We want justice, not privilege.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for having reintroduced the resolution this year and to say, as I think she already knows, that I am in complete support of her resolution. I do not know whether she includes me in the 101 or 102 but I hope she does. I want to say further that I have again introduced a similar resolution and I am very glad indeed to support hers. I think she should add that in addition to the national parties' platforms of 1940, 1944, and thereafter, the State platforms have also included this same provision. I know in my own case that the Republican platform in California held to it as far back as 1940. I am glad indeed to support the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to assure him that he is listed among the sponsors and supporters of the resolution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Ever since the gentlewoman from New York first came to the House of Representatives she has led the fight in this House and in the Congress in the interest of the equal rights amendment for women. I want to take this opportunity to compliment her for the wonderful job she has done and for the splendid representation she has given her own district and also the women of America. She is deserving of the greatest praise. It is my personal opinion that this great issue would not have the fervor or the fire in this House if it were not for the energetic and vigorous action which the

gentlewoman from New York has exerted in its behalf.

May I also say in passing that I join with the gentlewoman from New York in her fight for this equal rights amendment and to assure her that in the event the resolution comes to the floor of the House for consideration, which I am sure it will, I will go down the line for this amendment and for the resolution. I think it should be passed and I believe if it should come up for consideration during the present session with the gentlewoman as its sponsor it stands the greatest chance it ever has in passing.

It is not so far back since suffragettes were going about the streets agitating for women's right to vote. As a small boy I remember seeing them considered somewhat brazen and out of the usual manner when they agitated allowing women to vote in our elections. Today it is an accepted fact that women vote, and it is well known that the women have cleaned up to a large extent the political mess which the men were responsible for, and I am sure that the same thing will apply if the gentlewoman's amendment and resolution is passed sponsoring the equal rights amendment. I want to compliment her on her distinguished remarks at this time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his very kind and encouraging words. He has always been very stanch in believing in this amendment and has supported it as long as he has been in the House. I welcome his support and I am looking forward to his help when this amendment finally comes to the floor of the House, for final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there are many Members in this House on both sides of the aisle who are very favorably inclined to this amendment but who have not yet seen the light enough to come out for it as sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the names of all the sponsors of this amendment:

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN, CARL ELLIOTT, LAURIE C. BATTLE.
Arizona: JOHN R. MURDOCK.
Arkansas: WILBUR D. MILLS, BOYD TACKETT, W. F. NORRELL, OREN HARRIS.
California: HUBERT B. SCUDDER, CLAIR ENGLE, JACK Z. ANDERSON, ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER, ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, NORRIS POULSON, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, DONALD L. JACKSON, CARL FINSHAW, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, JOHN PHILLIPS, CLINTON D. MCKINNON.
Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS.
Connecticut: JOHN A. MCGUIRE.
Delaware: J. CALEB BOGGS.
Florida: CHESTER B. MCMULLEN, A. S. HERLONG, JR., DWIGHT L. ROGERS.
Idaho: JOHN T. WOOD.
Illinois: WILLIAM L. DAWSON, RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, EDGAR A. JONAS, LESLIE C. ARENDS, SID SIMPSON, WILLIAM SPRINGER.
Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, EARL WILSON.
Iowa: HENRY O. TALLE, H. R. GROSS, PAUL CUNNINGHAM.
Kansas: CLIFFORD R. HOPE.
Kentucky: THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, BRENT SPENCE, THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD, CARL D. PERKINS, JAMES S. GOLDEN.
Louisana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN.
Maine: CHARLES P. NELSON.
Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, GEORGE H. FALLON.
Massachusetts: WILLIAM H. BATES, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.
Michigan: ROY O. WOODRUFF, RUTH THOMPSON.
Minnesota: HAROLD C. HAGEN.
Missouri: MORGAN H. MOULDER.
Nebraska: A. L. MILLER.
New Jersey: HARRY L. TOWE.
New York: ABRAHAM J. MULTER, RALPH W. GWINN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, WILLIAM T. BYRNE, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, WILLIAM E. MILLER, EDMUND P. RADWAN, DANIEL A. REED.
North Carolina: THURMOND CHATHAM, CHARLES B. DEANE, MONROE M. REDDEN.
North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK.
Ohio: ROBERT T. SECREST, FRANK T. BOW, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WAYNE L. HAYS, GEORGE H. BENDER, FRAZIER REAMS.
Oklahoma: WILLIAM G. STIGLER, TOM STEED, TOBY MORRIS, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.
Oregon: LOWELL STOCKMAN, HOMER D. ANGELL.
Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, EARL CHUDOFF, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., HARRY P. O'NEILL, JAMES F. LIND, LOUIS E. GRAHAM, CARROLL D. KEARNS, ROBERT J. CORBETT, JAMES G. FULTON.
Tennessee: CLIFFORD DAVIS.
Virginia: HOWARD W. SMITH.
Washington: RUSSELL V. MACK, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.
West Virginia: HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, M. G. BURNSIDE, E. H. HEDRICK.
Wisconsin: GARDNER R. WITHROW.
Hawaii: JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE TAX MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the President of the United States, demonstrating, in my opinion, a high degree of statesmanship, invited for the first time in my memory the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means to his office to discuss the tax message which he was then preparing to submit to the Congress. I believe the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means were in attendance, and in all humility the President proceeded to discuss his budget and the tax message about to be submitted. He invited criticism, and during the course of perhaps 1 hour there was hardly a critical word offered by those in attendance either from the membership of the Republican Party or our own.

Today the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means issued a statement that has now been delivered to the press which, Mr. Speaker, is not only unkind and disrespectful, but is, in my opinion, a statement as subversive to the well-being of our country as anything I have read from a recognized and respected Member of either House of the Congress in my tenure of 9 years as a Member. I am going to quote in part from this statement:

> Either the administration has no such over-all program to raise the $16,000,000,000 or the President's tax message is so politically clever as to amount to downright dishonesty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read from the President's message a statement that I believe demonstrates the manifest sincerity of the President in inviting the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means to confer in the preparation of the tax message. I am quoting the President now:

> I know the Congress will want to consider these problems very carefully, and to review my recommendations in the light of their own independent analysis. The Secretary of the Treasury is prepared to discuss these matters in detail with the committees of Congress.

Surely this reflects a candor and frankness on the part of the President which are the antithesis of dishonesty.

Mr. Speaker, in times such as now confront us, with problems accumulating to a point that has never before been equaled in our country's history, taxation of our citizens, as necessary as it may be, is at best now becoming a disagreeable and distasteful task. To have Representatives of a major party in our country seek to shake the faith of our people in the honesty of the President gives aid only to the Communists of the country—and frankly, this is precisely what they are doing; they are attempting to shake faith, to make people who do not know better of their own knowledge believe that their country is being run by people who are "downright dishonest"—is wrong, it is bad. The statement by the distinguished minority member of our committee that the President of the United States is lending himself to a tactic that is downright dishonest will be circulated widely throughout all our land before midnight tonight.

A few minutes ago reference was made on this floor to the splendid speech of General Eisenhower, effectively dedicated to the strengthening of the morale, the courage, and the faith of the free world. In contrast, the intemperate statement I have just quoted, intentionally or inadvertently, must have only the opposite effect. This is not the time to have men of rank make reckless statements which undermine the faith of the people. Even if it were the honest opinion of the minority party that downright dishonesty was in the minds of the men who worked for months building the budget and preparing the tax message, we have the equipment and the machinery and the capacity here within the Congress to make any necessary corrections. In fact, the President reminded the committee, upon the occasion of our visit, and again in his message, that it is the job of the Congress to review his recommendations in the light of our own independent analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly the necessity for my remarks here today, particularly when they involve directly or indirectly the gentleman from New York, for there are few men for whom I have greater regard and of whom I am so personally fond. It is well known that his diligence, his patriotism, and his attendance to his duties are excelled by none.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Utah.

Mrs. BOSONE. May I ask the gentleman from California if the speaker whose remarks the gentleman has quoted had the opportunity to interrogate the President of the United States?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KING. I am pleased that the gentlewoman has asked that question. All the Members who visited the President had ample opportunity and were invited to offer suggestions in connection with the tax message to be presented by the President of the United States.

Mrs. BOSONE. Did that gentleman ask any questions?

Mr. KING. I do not recollect that any questions of a critical nature, or that could be interpreted as critical, were presented to the President at any time during the interview.

Mrs. BOSONE. Then the gentleman would say there was a misinterpretation of the President's attitude throughout?

Mr. KING. Completely so; precisely so.

Mrs. BOSONE. It looks as though there is a certain pattern being followed, such as we had to face in the last campaign. Is not that the same pattern?

Mr. KING. It is.

SIZE OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several bills have been introduced in the House, one at least in the Senate, to increase the size of the Marine Corps.

Such legislation may or may not be necessary or helpful. As the question of the roles and missions of the Marine Corps was given consideration when the National Security Act of 1947, since amended, was written, excerpts from the testimony of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on the subject and excerpts from the exchange of views of General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz as carried in the Joint Chiefs of Staff 1478, may not only be of interest but informative. The excerpts of testimony read as follows:

(From the testimony of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower testifying before a House Committee on May 7, 1947, on the proposed National Security Act of 1947, the following is taken—page 273:)

Mr. Chairman, I have little to add to the general statement I have made, except there is one thing I would like to make clear. I have found around this town in the last year that I have been accused of being an enemy of the Marine Corps.

I want to give you some facts:

Long before I came back from Europe, the President had given us an order in all of the services to try to get together on a military program which would be a truly unified one, which could be sent to Congress, as a unified program of security for the country.

I inherited the War Department part of that chore.

It was very difficult to find ways, means, and methods of getting together on this thing. I finally adopted the method of making concrete and specific proposals.

Only recently I have looked up my own statements to see what I said.

This exchange of letters between the Navy and ourselves was merely a way to get something started. I found it necessary, as was reflected in my papers of that time, to mention the Marine Corps, and certainly no hostility was shown toward it.

I proposed what at that time seemed to me to be a very decent sort of figure from which to start. I proposed a strength for the Marine Corps that was approximately three times as big as its maximum peacetime prewar strength, and that was put in the paper.

I am nonplussed to find out why I have been considered an enemy of the Marines or why the Army should want them in the Army.

There is one other point with respect to the Marines I would like to clear up:

The War Department has been accused of a certain unfriendly attitude by reason of omissions of their names in certain documents.

I will confess to this; that up until a very recent discussion which came about, I had always looked upon the Marines as part of the Navy, an essential part like their battleships, their carriers, or anything else.

When I have referred to the Navy I have meant the Navy with all of its parts and I have never by implication meant to ignore the Marines, because I was not aware of the fact that I should say "naval armed services" in order to use a term inclusive of the Marines. I have always meant when I spoke to the Navy, to include the Marines.

Those are the only two points in addition to my written statement that I wanted to clear up. That is merely for a matter of record to show exactly what I meant in the things I have said and the things I have tried to do.

I should like to repeat that I earnestly believe that the purpose of this bill, the effect of this bill, would be to give us a single civilian with an appropriate group of assistants, who would be enabled each year to study the continuing and changing needs of national security, and who would be in a position to come down and give you a rounded and integrated picture.

I see nothing in the bill that attempts to get into the business of Congress, that of maintaining and supporting armies and determining what they shall do.

I do believe that the great step forward of this bill is to give you a civilian who comes down and gives you each year the rounded picture, either when you take up enabling legislation or the budget. I personally think that is the greatest forward step of this whole thing.

Those were the three points I wanted to make.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever recommend a reduction in size or in the functions of the Marine Corps at any time?

General EISENHOWER. No, sir. I should make this clear:

I have said in papers and everything else that we should be very careful about not getting into each other's hair, that the Marine Corps should no more attempt to establish a big land army than we should attempt to have destroyers and cruisers, or that sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. I had reference specifically to a memorandum which was said to have been written to Admiral Nimitz.

Was such a memorandum written?

General EISENHOWER. I checked and found that in that memorandum I said, as a point to start, suppose we take a Marine Corps of 50,000 or 60,000 men. I looked up the strength of the Marines before the war. In 1939 there were 18,000 and in 1940, their strength was 24,000.

I thought I was starting with a reasonable figure. At that time I did not know that by law the Marines have an authorized strength of 20 percent, I believe, of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that the Marines may be employed on the beaches or to furnish shore parties, signal men, furnish commando-types for raiding operations?

General EISENHOWER. I believe they should do that.

I think we have been a bit remiss and one of the reasons I am anxious for all of us to get together very closely is we have always had to resort to improvisation when we went to this business of landing. Someone must give special attention to this whole business, even including boat crews, the business of shore parties, keeping everybody in touch, and particularly and, above all, signal communications.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you consider that a limitation?

General EISENHOWER. No; I have also said that the Marines should be sufficiently strong to seize advance bases where only the Navy was interested. The Marines, to my way of thinking, have no principal function when you take a great land operation such as was in Europe, in contradistinction to that in the Pacific.

There, if you made good your landing in the Pacific, you knew the battle was won. The enemy could not reinforce and the battle was won.

The landing in Europe was merely an incident to the whole campaign. It was merely a start.

I also said that the Marines should be equipped to seize those forward bases in which the Navy held primary or single interest.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, was it suggested that the Marines be used as crews for the landing boats?

General EISENHOWER. Yes; I asked why they should not do that. I found out later that in naval conception that is wrong. The bluejackets actually provide these crews. We had this experience in the beginning of the war, Mr. Chairman. We were trying to develop landing craft as early as 1942. It was perfectly clear that if you didn't begin early to develop landing craft and get ready for amphibious operations we were not going to win the war.

The Navy was vitally interested in restoring the fleet and combating the submarine.

When we wanted to start this, one of the things we ran into was that the Navy had no men to train as crews for these small landing boats and the Army had to do it. General Somervell undertook and did provide engineering brigades to man these boats. It took a long time before we could transfer them to the Navy. They did not logically belong to us but it seemed to us in retrospect that the job that had not been done in advance should be specifically charged to someone.

I found out that the Navy considers that specifically their job and the Marines had nothing to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it also suggested that our marines follow the pattern of duties of the British marines?

General EISENHOWER. I cannot recall that. I may have at times used the British marines in comparing records, but as a matter of fact, I am not sufficiently familiar with the organization of the British marines to use that as a specific reference.

The CHAIRMAN. The only purpose of my question, may I say, was to remove any fear that someone in the Navy or elsewhere might have that there was an attempt being made by this legislation to limit in some way the marines.

General EISENHOWER. I think we should all be limited. That is one reason for putting us all together so we do not do each other's job. Each should be limited, but if they have a specific job that they do better than everybody else, each of us should have that responsibility.

I do not mean to diminish those things they do that everybody knows they do better than others.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have no objection to writing some safeguard of that kind into this legislation?

General EISENHOWER. When you came to the business of writing things into legislation, Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that if we go into the job of writing detailed legislation, we get on dangerous ground.

I took this problem to myself: Suppose you should ask me to go back and write the missions of the Army. I tried to correlate that in my mind with what the Army had to do

during the war. We had to do everything; we had amphibious operations, we provided boat crews for a time, we had airborne divisions and mountain divisions, infantry and armored divisions. We had to conduct civil government and military government in occupied territories.

I am afraid, really, of writing too many of these things into the bill.

On the other hand, I say this: Whatever the Congress decides to do on this thing is perfectly acceptable to us. It is not my job to be writing legislation. I prefer to see the intent of Congress stated very clearly as to what they intend, and charge the various departments, under the President, with the duty of carrying it out, and to go ahead on that basis, and Congress to keep correcting year by year, both through the budget and such amendments to the act, as are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. General, of course while it is the duty of Congress to write the legislation, many of us are so unfamiliar with the subject that we must have dependence upon the judgment of you gentlemen who are in charge.

Now the question is this: There is a widespread fear on the part, perhaps, of some in the Navy and perhaps elsewhere, that this legislation is designed to limit the duties and functions of the Marine Corps beyond the limitations heretofore imposed.

Now to dispel that fear, whether it is founded or unfounded, would you or your associates be willing to have written in there a broad, general provision that the Marines should carry on, exercising the same functions that they have heretofore?

General EISENHOWER. I should think, sir, that a suitable preamble to that bill could state the intent of Congress so clearly that the detailed amendments all through the bill should be unnecessary.

Excerpts from the Joint Chiefs of Staff papers give the following exchange between General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz.

In the memorandum forwarded by General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, United States Army, among other things we find this:

The conduct of land warfare is a responsibility of the Army. Operationally, the Navy does not belong on the land; it belongs on the sea. It should have only technical and administrative functions on land in connection with its headquarters, bases, or other naval installations. The emergency development of the Marine forces during this war should not be viewed as assigning to the Navy a normal function of land warfare, fundamentally the primary role of the Army. There is a real need for one service to be charged with the responsibility for initially bridging the gap between the sailor on the ship and the soldier on land. This seems to me properly a function of the Marine Corps. I believe the Joint Chiefs of Staff should give serious consideration to such a concept. The need of a force within the fleet to provide small, readily available, and lightly armed units to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries is recognized. These functions, together with that of interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments, comprise the fundamental role of the Marine Corps. When naval forces are involved in operations requiring land forces of combined arms, the task becomes a joint land-sea, and usually Air Force mission. Once Marine units attain such a size as to require the combining of arms to accomplish their missions, they are assuming and duplicating the functions of the Army and we have in effect two land armies. I therefore recommend that the above concept be accepted as stating the role of the Marine Corps and that Marine units not exceed the regiment in size, and that the size of the Marine Corps be made consistent with the foregoing principles.

To that view, Admiral Nimitz, under date of March 30, 1946, replied:

The basic and major issues considered in Joint Chiefs of Staff 1478/10 and Joint Chiefs of Staff 1478/11 comprises a proposal on the part of the Army (a) to eliminate the Marine Corps as an effective combat element, reducing it to the status of a naval police unit with possibly certain ancillary service functions in respect to amphibious operations, and (b) to abolish an essential component of naval aviation which operates from coastal and island shore bases. To these ends these papers propose to discard agreements on these matters which have been arrived at between 20 years and which have resulted in a responsibility for functions proven highly effective in World War II.

In matters so vital both to the Marine Corps and to naval aviation, I consider it appropriate and desirable that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should have the benefit of the views of General Vandegrift, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and of Vice Admiral Radford, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air. Their comments are attached as enclosures A and B, respectively.

* * * * *

I agree with the Chief of Staff, United States Army, that further exchange of papers on the subject of the missions of the land, naval, and air forces will serve no useful purpose. It is further apparent that the question is part of the larger one of the merger of the War and Navy Departments, which proposal was, at the Army's insistence, referred to the President and which is now before the Congress. Thus the matter now under consideration has already reached levels higher than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Spaatz, commanding general, Army Air Forces, wrote:

I recommend therefore that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments.

General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army, also wrote:

The following is proposed for consideration: * * *

1. That the Marine Corps is maintained solely as an adjunct of the fleet and participates only in minor shore combat operations in which the Navy alone is interested.

2. That it be recognized that the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army and consequently the marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war.

3. That it be agreed that the Navy will not develop a land Army of a so-called amphibious army; marine units to be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps therefore limited to some 50,000.

Report by Army members of Joint Staff planners proposal:

Provide landing parties with the fleet to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries in operations short of war, and in time of war to conduct raids and small-scale amphibious demonstrations.

* * * * *

Perform necessary functions aboard ship, at naval installations, and in the ship-to-shore phase of amphibious operations.

THE BUDGET SITUATION

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING]. I know his sincerity as well as I know his ability. I also have a very high regard for the gentleman from New York, to whom he made refernce. I know nothing of the statement by the gentleman from New York to which the gentleman from California referred, and I know nothing of the circumstances of the consultation in the White House, but I would like to ask my friend the gentleman from California whether this situation might not have been involved: The committee upon which he serves and the committee upon which I serve have a great deal in common. It is necessary that between these two committees the taxpayers of the United States must bear the great burden that they are to be called upon to bear. I think, therefore, that the gentleman from New York may have felt—and I ask this as a question of the gentleman from California—the gentleman from New York may have felt, as we feel, and as the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, a member of his own party, feels that not enough consideration has been given in this budget or in the tax program to a practical reduction in the cost of government which, in the words of the Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, could go as far as $7,000,000,000, and would, therefore, reduce the tax burden to that amount. Is not that the problem before all of us, rather than any desire on the part of the gentleman from New York either to speak disrespectfully of the President—which I am sure he would never do—or, as the gentleman from California and the gentlewoman from Utah intimated, to incite controversy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) until February 19, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

151. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

152. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a statement

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1950, pursuant to chapter 2510 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1133); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

153. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend chapter 213 of title 18 of the United States Code relative to the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the passport laws and the laws relating to the falsification of evidence of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

155. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Administrator's report, which is the first part of the annual report of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

156. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, concerning the progress made in the improvement of Federal-aid highways and other information, pursuant to section 10 of the act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Public Works.

157. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the detail of officers of the Armed Forces to any duty or position with the Department of Commerce in connection with the work of promoting civil aviation"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

158. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-sixth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

159. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 212 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

160. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on all reservations made during the calendar year of 1950, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

161. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities relative to the disposal of foreign excess property under title IV, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2311. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Person County, N. C., in the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2312. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2313. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 2314. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2315. A bill to provide an allowance for uniforms for certain officers recalled to active service with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2316. A bill to extend the requirements for fixing the minimum number of deck officers on steam vessels to certain additional vessels of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 2317. A bill to provide that certain vessels shall be subject to the laws relating to steam vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2318. A bill to grant total and permanent disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2319. A bill relating to the salary and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2320. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2321. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2322. A bill to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2323. A bill to convey a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Santa Rosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2324. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2325. A bill to authorize the dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2326. A bill to provide a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2327. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2328. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), relating to the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2329. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2330. A bill to establish the strength of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2331. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2332. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 2333. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to authorize the President to control food prices under that act to the same extent as other commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2334. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2335. A bill to grant certain educational, loan, employment, and other benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2336. A bill to establish a United States Peace Academy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2337. A bill to make all GI salaries tax-free, excluding commissioned officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 2338. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2339. A bill to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 2340. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2341. A bill authorizing the transfer of that portion of Camp Joseph T. Robinson known as the Baptist College tract to the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 2342. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 2343. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to make the 1951 tax rates under such act applicable to future years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2344. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on

public buildings, to extend coverage to architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2345. A bill to amend Public Law No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to make a study of the problem of allocating television frequencies for use by educational institutions for the purpose of nonprofit educational programing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution favoring an organization for far eastern cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the attendance of a joint committee to represent the Congress at the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights, Mass., and the evacuation of the British from Boston, Mass., to be held in Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1951; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Res. 112. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate circumstances relating to issuance of the order of the Postmaster General restricting mail deliveries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 113. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 114. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 115. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn W. Cheatham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Andrew Louis Mastellone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2349. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Johanna Antonia Steinhaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Towa Tanoue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Kazuyoshi Hino and Yasuhiko Hino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Ariel Ta-wei Char; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Sokan Ueoka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Lucia Adamos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2359. A bill for the relief of Lillian Taylor (nee Rose Mary Lillian Walker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Edna Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Anthony Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Aprea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2364. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Venus Sarkisian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. McMaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Maly Braunstein and her daughter, Aurelia Rappaport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2367. A bill for the relief of Libuse Chalupnik Pavlish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 2368. A bill for the relief of Warren Simon Johansen, Nicholas Glent Johansen, and Eric Rolff Johansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Kolintza Karkalatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2370. A bill for the relief of Carl Schmuser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2371. A bill for the relief of James Gordon Burgess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2373. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir as a colonel, Adjutant General's Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

34. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Women's Auxiliary to the Rock County Medical Society of Wisconsin, passed at a meeting held in Janesville, Wis., on February 23, 1951, in regard to socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

35. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jack Harrison, county judge, Angleton, Tex., relative to the Eighth Air Force application for the establishment of a permanent danger zone in the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to Matagorda Peninsula; to the Committee on Armed Services.

36. Also, petition of Bombola M. Ali, Camp Keithley, Dansalan City, Philippines, relative to "honest claimants of Lanao"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Kiyoshi Tanimoto, minister, the Nagaregawa United Church of Christ, Hiroshima, Japan, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the great blessing Thou hast granted America in enabling her to build in this last decade the greatest civilization in human history.

We thank Thee for America's great spiritual heritage expressed so beautifully in her sacrificial rehabilitation of human life throughout the war-torn countries; thus halting the ravages of postwar conditions which would have been greater than the destruction of war itself.

We remind ourselves, O Father, how mercifully American officials and humanitarian leaders have treated the defeated nations and exemplified to them the true way of democracy.

We thank Thee, too, O Lord, for the policy-making achievements of this Senate which graciously stands behind these American leaders around the world.

We thank Thee, God, that Japan has been permitted to be one of the fortunate recipients of American generosity. We thank Thee that our people have been given the gift of freedom, enabling

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

them to rise from the ashes of ruin and be reborn. Under the leadership of the United States we pray Thee, our Father, that Japan may receive a new birth of freedom and take her place with the Christian democracies of the world.

God, bless all Members of this Senate and grant unto each Member of it Thy abundant blessing, Thy spirit, Thy wisdom; and lead them in their great tasks of turning this confused world into the final goal of Thy kingdom, of the oneness of the human race, and the peace of Thy dear Son, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 1, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under an order of the Senate made many years ago, it devolves upon the Chair to appoint a Senator to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d day of February. Such appointments alternate between the two sides of the Senate. Inasmuch as a Democrat was designated last year, the Chair now designates the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to read the address this year.

TAXATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On last Friday, February 2, the President sent a message to the House of Representatives on the subject of taxation which was read and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. In view of that fact, the Chair does not deem it advisable to have the identical message just received from the President printed in the RECORD as of today. It is sufficient that reference be made to the fact that it appears on pages 884–885 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, February 2, as presented to the House of Representatives.

The message will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hendrickson	Murray
Brewster	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Eastland	McClellan	Tobey
Ecton	McFarland	Watkins
Ellender	McKellar	Welker
Flanders	McMahon	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	
Gillette	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, to submit reports, to introduce bills and present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1951.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESERVATIONS FROM APPROPRIATION LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations from appropriation lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects had been made during the calendar year 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, together with a confidential statistical supplement to the stockpile report (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed by the Department of Justice during the period July 1 to December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Agency for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Department relating to the disposal of foreign excess property for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

FREE TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL OF CERTAIN UNITED NATIONS COMMANDS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for free transmission of official mail of members of certain United Nations Commands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF ARMY EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY LOCATED OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property disposal for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the Administration for the fiscal year ended

June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on war contract terminations and settlements, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the company, for the year ended December 31, 1950, together with a list of stockholders (with an accompanying report and document); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the village of Park Forest, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to include the village of Park Forest in any system of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the National Music Council of New York, N. Y., offering its services for use in musical activities in the Armed Forces and throughout the Nation for the stimulation of the people in the national emergency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 1

"Resolution calling upon Congress and the President to withdraw our troops from Korea, develop a strong home defense, and unify American views on foreign policy

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota*, That the Congress and the President of the United States are respectfully urged to take immediate action for the following purposes:

"1. To withdraw all troops and military personnel from Korea;

"2. To recognize the principle that no political or military commitment with respect to foreign policy that may involve the lives of Americans is binding upon the people of the United States unless it is first approved by the Congress;

"3. To strengthen our continental defenses and prepare for effective action when the safety of our Nation is imperiled;

"4. To provide leadership on foreign policy in which the people may have the utmost confidence;

"5. To provide the people of the United States with realistic information so that public opinion may crystalize in the form of a unified and unselfish foreign policy that history will applaud; and

"6. To disassociate ourselves from the Korean policy, a policy which has brought to our youth the tragedies of war without a candid recognition of the existence of a state of war, a policy which has made us the policeman of the United Nations without the United Nations assuming full responsibility for the eventualities of police action, a policy which risks war without first determining whether the objects sought are worth the risk, or a willingness to accept the risk when encountered. That a copy of this resolution be signed by the president and secretary of the senate and sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to each Congressman and Senator from North Dakota.

"RAY SCHNELL,
"*President of the senate.*
"W. J. TROUT,
"*Secretary of the senate.*"

DRAFTING OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS—RESOLUTION OF GRAND ISLAND (NEBR.) POST, NO. 53, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Grand Island Post, No. 53, the American Legion, of Grand Island, Nebr., relating to the drafting of conscientious objectors.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of Grand Island Post, No. 53, the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, that there is a problem facing the local draft boards of various counties in the State of Nebraska, regarding the deferment of conscientious objectors; and

Whereas it is our considered opinion that the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948, pertaining to conscientious objectors, are being abused and used as a loophole for draft evasion, and that such abuses are hampering these local draft boards to the extent that they are unable to meet their monthly quotas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend the existing Selective Service Act of 1948, so that the conscientious objectors shall be drafted or accepted into the Armed Forces of the United States, and assigned to duties therein, as consistent as possible with their objections, in order that they shall be given the privilege and opportunity in aiding in the maintenance and defense of our freedoms.

Done at Grand Island, Nebr., this 10th day of January 1951.

E. C. ALCORN,
Commander.

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY—RESOLUTION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Department of Maryland, calling for outlawing of the Communist Party.

The views expressed in the resolution will appeal, I am sure, to every patriotic American.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Department of Maryland, call upon our National and State legislators to outlaw the Communist Party which heretofore has enjoyed the privilege of using the elective processes of our freedom-loving Government.

We are convinced that the Communist Party has no place in our democratic way of life. We believe it to be inspired by Soviet direction and policy; its existence here in our Nation is a sham and a fraud; a hypocrisy and deceit.

It is a crafty stratagem to keep Soviet ideology before our people and intends to destroy and demolish every basic principle which we hold dear and precious.

We brand the Communist Party of America as a dangerous menace to our institutions; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our brother veteran organizations, the public press and all high officers of Government now entrusted with leadership and responsibility.

Attest:

SAMUEL M. MICHELSON,
Adjutant.

REDUCTION IN FEDERAL NONDEFENSE SPENDING—RESOLUTION OF BALTIMORE (MD.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce adopted, on January 26, 1951, a resolution calling for reduction in nondefense spending by the Federal Government, which is so much in line with the thinking not only of our own citizens in Maryland, but of millions of citizens throughout the country, that its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will serve a sound purpose, I am sure. Therefore, I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Baltimore Association of Commerce believes that not only accelerated military preparedness but a sound budget is essential to our survival in these critical times; and

Whereas businessmen, like all Americans, are willing to make all proper sacrifices necessary for the common defense, but at the same time believe that new socialistic experiments and other projects masquerading under the false pretense of promoting the national defense—or having but a remote and indirect connection with it—should and must be exposed and eliminated from the Federal budget; and

Whereas the nondefense items of the budget should be drastically reduced so as to provide in part the funds and manpower so desperately needed for military purposes; and

Whereas the association believes that such proposals as that of Senator BYRD to reduce the national budget by $7,000,000,000 should be supported, and that Congress should assert its constitutional powers over appropriations, and should not in this crisis blindly follow the proposals of the executive department; and

Whereas it will profit us little to build up the necessary military defense and yet to suffer defeat through inflation and national bankruptcy; and

Whereas this association takes great pride in the fact that our Maryland delegation in Congress, in accordance with our Maryland traditions and irrespective of party, has consistently supported efforts to prudently manage our national fiscal affairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association earnestly urges our Maryland Senators and Representatives to make a determined effort to eliminate from the budget all waste and all new socialistic experiments and other projects not necessary to the defense effort, and to reduce where possible nondefense items, to the end

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that our country may remain financially strong and that we may thus back up our military forces with a sound economy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent (1) to the Maryland delegation in Congress; and (2) to the members of the Association of Commerce and commercial and trade organizations throughout the State.

DISPERSAL OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the people of Maryland in the area adjacent to the District of Columbia are very much interested in, and somewhat concerned over, the pending proposals for the dispersal of Government departments and agencies.

A great deal of time and thought has been expended, with very beneficial results, in the planning of the newer developments in that area and it is sincerely hoped that any further developments, whether by the United States Government or within the limits of private enterprise, may be integrated with the long-range plans of the area.

I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, dealing with this whole question of planning, which thoroughly deserves the attention of the Congress in connection with any plans for dispersal of Government agencies.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now under consideration by the Congress of the United States a bill (S. 218) (H. R. 1728) to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia and for other purposes; and

Whereas the proposed bill appears to be an essential measure to provide for Federal building in dispersed areas to permit continuity of important governmental functions in case of an attack on the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas the said bill provides not only for acquisition of sites by the Administrator of General Services but for appurtenant and accessory facilities, such as utilities, roads, highways, bridges, and other off-site facilities, as may be necessary, and authorizes the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts with State and local bodies for such purposes and to such extent as he may find to be in the public interest; and

Whereas one of the stated policies of the bill is to provide "for the sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas"; and

Whereas any program for dispersal will necessitate the immediate and rapid extension of plans to guide the development of the outlying areas and will require coordination and integration of proposed new facilities with others existing and presently planned in the area, including highways, utilities, and other public facilities and services; and

Whereas the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, a bicounty agency of the State of Maryland, is authorized by chapter 992 of the Laws of Maryland, 1943, and amendments thereto, to make and adopt and, from time to time, amend, extend, and add to a general plan for the physical development of the Maryland-Washington regional district, embracing some 320 square miles of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, adjacent to the District of Columbia; and

Whereas this general plan is for the purposes of guiding and accomplishing the coordinated, comprehensive, and systematic development of the said Regional District and the coordination with public and private development of other parts of the State of Marylard and that of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Commission is authorized to act in conjunction and cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, is designated by the State of Maryland as its representative, and is empowered to act in conjunction and cooperation with other representatives or officers of the United States Government; and

Whereas the Maryland Commission is further authorized and empowered to exercise any of its functions in portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties outside the said Maryland-Washington Regional District upon the request of the governmental agency having jurisdiction over the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission hereby endorses in principle the said dispersal bill, since it appears to be essential in the interest of defense of the seat of government and the vital functions thereof concentrated in the Washington area; and be it further

Resolved, That, for the purpose of carrying out the intent of Congress in the provision for sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas, an amendment be inserted in the said bill to accomplish the following purposes:

1. To designate the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a central planning agency for Federal operations and for the coordination of Federal plans with local plans;

2. To allocate, from the funds appropriated for the purposes of the said bill, a reasonable allotment to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the purpose of extending its studies in the dispersal area and surrounding communities; and

3. To make provision for the reallocation by the said National Commission to local planning agencies of such funds as may be required to assure and expedite local planning coordination with the dispersal program; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the chairman and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Buildings; to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works and to the chairman and members of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds; to the Honorable HERBERT R. O'CONOR and the Honorable JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Senators from the State of Maryland; to the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD and the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Honorable LANSDALE G. SASSCER, Representative from the Fifth District of Maryland, and the Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Representative from the Sixth District of Maryland; to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, Representative from the Eighth District of Virginia; to the Administrator of General Services; to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the county commissioners of Prince Georges County, Md., and the county council of Montgomery County, Md.; and to the Upper Montgomery County Planning Commission, the Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission, the Arlington County Planning Commission, the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Falls Church Planning Commission, and the city of Alexandria Planning Commission.

IRWIN I. MAIN,
Chairman, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 508. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; without amendment (Rept. No. 78); and

S. Res. 55. Resolution extending the time for investigation of problems relating to the airline industry, the United States merchant marine, domestic land and water transportation, and radio, telegraph, and telephone communications; with an amendment; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—INTERIM REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE RELATING TO FAVORITISM AND INFLUENCE (S. REPT. NO. 76)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress, to conduct a study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an interim report relating to favoritism and influence, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

MATERIAL SHORTAGES—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 77)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report on material shortages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO BANKING AND CREDIT LEGISLATION, SMALL BUSINESS, AND ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original resolution, to investigate problems relating to banking and credit legislation, small business and economic stabilization, and I submit a report (No. 79) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-second Congress, until February 15, 1952, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) adequacy of banking and credit legislation, including (A) international banking

matters; (B) encouragement of venture capital investment in new enterprises; (C) problems relating to the Federal Reserve System and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, such as credit policies, bank reserves, marginal requirements, merger of Federal Reserve banks with State banks, and deposit insurance; and (D) adequacy of present monetary system; (2) small business, including matters exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, (A) financial aid to small business enterprises, (B) financial aid to veterans operating small business enterprises, and (C) adequacy of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authority and extensions thereof; and (3) economic stabilization, including (A) construction of housing, (B) permanent and temporary war housing, and (C) proposed amendments to the rent control act and administration of rent control legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, until February 15, 1952, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 772. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to hear and determine the claims of the Aetna Insurance Co. and others; and

S. 773. A bill for the relief of Lee Oy Gum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 774. A bill for the relief of Abdul Whab, Abdul Kadir, and Khushad Ullah;

S. 775. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso; and

S. 776. A bill for the relief of Loyab Uddin, Loyhaid Ali, and Ambulla Mohamed (also known as Mohamed Ambulla); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 777. A bill for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; and

S. 778 (by request). A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 780. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 781. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 782. A bill providing for civil suits against the United States by persons suffering damage as a result of defamations committed by Members of Congress in the course of their official activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 783. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Nabiha Elias Audi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 786. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Person County, N. C., in the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 787. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of President James Buchanan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 788. A bill for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner; and

S. 789. A bill for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Guiseppe Veic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 790. A bill for the relief of Roton Point Corp.;

S. 791. A bill for the relief of Arthur Cleveland Taylor; and

S. 792. A bill for the relief of Yamaguchi Michiko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 793. A bill for the relief of Capt. Merton Jesse Clark; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 795, to prohibit labor espionage, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 796. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 797. A bill for the relief of Winifred Margaret Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 798. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research and experiments with respect to methods of controlling and producing precipitation in moisture-deficient areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 799. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Daisuke Kitagawa; and

S. 800. A bill for the relief of Marit Haugom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 801. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to subsistence allowance to be paid to veterans pursuing apprentice or other training on the job; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 802. A bill to establish parity in the rates of disability and death compensation payable for disability or death resulting from service-connected disability; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 803. A bill to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 804. A bill to rescind certain details required by law to be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 805. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 806. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of Indians, North Dakota, and for other purposes; and

S. 807. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the issuance of visas authorized by section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF LABOR ESPIONAGE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit labor espionage, and I ask unanimous consent to make a few remarks in connection with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 795) to prohibit labor espionage, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MORSE), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MURRAY. Approximately a minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill to prohibit labor espionage. Senators NEELY, HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, and MORSE have joined me in sponsoring this measure. If enacted, it would make labor espionage in interstate commerce a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment.

It came as a great surprise and shock to me to learn that such legislation is needed. The very term "labor espionage" recalls the jungle of violence in which labor existed prior to enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, and other progressive labor legislation.

Many years ago in Montana I had personal experience with labor espionage. At that time, during the great Montana mining boom, when miners were subjected to pitiless exploitation by ruthless mine owners bent on quick riches regardless of the cost to humanity, labor unions began to spring up spontaneously in the mining camps. They were met by every form of resistance from subtle propaganda to murder. Thugs, strike breakers, and labor spies were im-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ported and paid to destroy unionism by crime and oppression. Of them all, perhaps the most dangerous and revolting was the labor spy.

While paid to do everything in his power to prevent self-organization, it is the function of the labor spy to pretend to believe in unionism, to infiltrate the ranks of the workers, to agitate for unionism and thus ascertain those most sympathetic to it, to appear in the guise of friend so that he may the more effectively destroy; and, by earning under false pretenses the confidence of his fellow workers, place himself in the most effective position to betray them.

Many times the practices of labor espionage have been exposed, by Congress and courts, in factual studies and even in fiction. The last great exposé was that of the LaFollette committee during the middle thirties. And since it had been so completely exposed, we supposed that it had thereby been annihilated. But we were wrong.

Mr. President, during the last year the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, has found that labor espionage still flourishes in some American industries. Most decent employers have long since abandoned it for the loathsome thing it is. But in some of our industrial byways, it still sprouts and poisons labor-management relations. We have found it in the textile industry, in the furniture industry, and elsewhere. The most shocking system of labor espionage we discovered in the marine divisions of some of our great oil-tanker companies.

It is only fair to say that once we exposed it the responsible officers of American industry have disavowed it and suppressed it. But it still presents a challenge to Congress.

Mr. President, in time of international emergency our maritime industry is at once vulnerable and of paramount strategic importance. Since it is almost exclusively interstate commerce, it is peculiarly the problem of Congress. It is the duty of Congress to take every possible step to promote stability of labor relations in the maritime industry and to prevent sabotage by excluding, so far as possible, criminals and subversives. Labor espionage, of course, is an unfair-labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the act carries no deterrent other than condemnation by the Board and courts. It is quite clear that the type of character who would engage in labor espionage is more apt to be deterred by punishment than by public censure.

For these reasons the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations has unanimously recommended the introduction of a bill to punish labor espionage as a crime, and the standing committee on Labor and Public Welfare has unanimously adopted the report of its subcommittee. I assume my bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION OF MOTOR-VEHICLE TIRES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 629) to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION AFFORDING EQUAL RIGHTS TO WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on January 8, 1951, I introduced a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 3, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to announce the names of Senators who desire to cosponsor the joint resolution, and I ask that their names be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution. I further ask that I may be permitted to address the Senate for 2 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. O'CONOR. The purpose of the joint resolution is to afford equal rights to women.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the joint resolution, the purpose of which is to submit to the States of the Union a proposed amendment to the Constitution affording equal rights to women, is cosponsored jointly by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

It would seem to be a late day to have decided the simple and single issue of whether such a great proportion of our population should be guaranteed similar rights and privileges as are enjoyed by the remaining citizenry. Yet better late than never it is imperative that the Constitution proclaim to all the fundamental guaranty that no discrimination because of sex shall be legalized.

Especially at this period of conflicting ideologies should it be declared in unmistakable terms that American citizens of both sexes are accorded equal rights.

Those who espouse foreign ideologies point critically to the fact that women are denied certain privileges in the United States while members of their sex are entitled to every right guaranteed to men under foreign flags. We should tolerate no such condition which is seized upon by our enemies to decry our democratic institutions.

Singularly enough this proposal has been before the Congress since 1923, and has never received an unfavorable report. But session after session it has failed to achieve approval by both Houses of the Congress.

The equal rights movement began at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848—over 100 years ago. It was just after the conclusion of the First World War that the women of America won national suffrage for the first time. Their contribution to victory in that conflict was great, but the production miracle of the Second World War, for which women of our Nation were also partly responsible, has earned them, at the very least, equality of economic opportunity and equal rights under the laws of our land.

Can we ignore the remarkable progress which women of America have made, particularly in recent years, in all fields of endeavor, the professions, the industries and the arts—yes, and in public office—and tell them that even these accomplishments are insufficient to warrant removal of the discriminatory restrictions under which, and despite which, they have made such outstanding progress?

Certainly, in the field of government there is not only wide opportunity but great need for the peculiar talents and abilities which the women of America can bring to bear upon today's problems. In my own State of Maryland, during the 8 years in which I was privileged to occupy the governor's chair, we found it desirable, and in many cases I might even say necessary, to call upon outstanding women of the State for assistance in matters of government, and particularly in matters affecting the welfare and safety of our people during the emergencies of the war years.

We can no longer tolerate discrimination against American women either in the Nation as a whole or in the several States. The equal rights amendment is the instrument by which this discrimination can be eradicated.

FIGHTING INFLATION—STATEMENT BY LIFE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Fighting Inflation," published by the Life Insurance Association of America in January, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRIKE OF SWITCHMEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strong Words Are Not Enough," having reference to the pending Switchmen's strike, published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARTINSVILLE SEVEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Martinsville Seven" published in the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNWANTED CRITICISM — EDITORIAL FROM THE JAMESTOWN (N. Y.) SUN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unwanted Criticism," dealing with the subject of Government expenditures for public assistance, published in the Jamestown (N. Y.) Sun of January 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

"PERFECTIONISM" AND THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY BENJAMIN V. COHEN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "'Perfectionism' and the United Nations," written by Benjamin V. Cohen, former Counselor to the State Department, and published in the Washington Post of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KOREAN WAR—LETTER BY DALE D. DORMAN, JR.

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the Korean War, written by Dale D. Dorman, Jr., of Graham, Mo., to the editor of the Maryville (Mo.) Daily Forum, and published in that newspaper, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LETTER TO MR. TRUMAN—ADDRESS BY RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Letter to Mr. Truman," delivered by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, at the Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, on December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PROTEST AGAINST DEFEATISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK STAR-LEDGER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Protest Against Defeatism," published in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPRISONMENT OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—SERMON BY REV. JOHN L. BAZINET, S. S.

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon paying honor to His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary, by Rev. John L. Bazinet, S. S., which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX-FREE INCOMES—ARTICLES FROM UNITED STATES NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tax Till It Hurts—Whom?" published in a recent issue of United States News and World Report, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT DESHON, PA.—EDITORIAL FROM THE BUTLER (PA.) EAGLE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Deshon Hospital Takes It on the Chin," published in the Butler (Pa.) Eagle of February 2, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM NEWSWEEK

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "An Irresponsible Budget," written by Henry Hazlitt, and published in Newsweek for January 29, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR LODGE'S EXPOSÉ OF SOVIET PLANNING—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLESTON (S. C.) NEWS AND COURIER

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Too Clever for Vishinsky," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of November 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TELEGRAM BY SENATOR THYE TO THE PRESIDENT REGARDING THE PRESENT TRANSPORTATION CRISIS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram which I have addressed to the President of the United States:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 5, 1951.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The transportation crisis must be ended. Supplying of food, ammunition, and medical supplies for American boys fighting and dying on the battlefields in Korea, as well as meeting the general public health and welfare needs of our people, must not be further jeopardized by continuation of the slowdown on our railroads brought about by the absence of railroad workers in large numbers reporting illness. Mr. President, I appeal to you to use every power of your great office to bring an end to the present crisis. If there is a real epidemic among the workers, have the medical resources of our armed services and the agencies of the Public Health Service been utilized to the fullest extent? As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, have you used every power to prevent absenteeism of civilian employees of the railroad, now under Army control, which menaces life and health? Have you used the powers of the Executive to bring about arbitration of the dispute that will assure our workers a fair wage but will not permit shutdown of vital transportation? If you need additional powers, what steps have you recommended that Congress take to help you deal with this situation? Severe winter conditions throughout the Nation, but especially in Northern States, which have experienced the worst winter in years, have accentuated the shortage of fuel shipments on the railroads to the point where an emergency situation exists. Hardship and suffering are certain to result to many of our people. Our men in uniform, already making the greatest of sacrifices, will feel the dire results of our failures at home. A supreme obligation rests upon the Government to end this intolerable situation. I urge you to take every necessary step open to you as President and as Commander in Chief to meet this grave crisis.

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS—LETTER FROM FORMER CZECHOSLOVAK AMBASSADOR

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Dr. Juraj Slavik, former Czechoslovak Ambassador, concerning the proposed legislation which has been introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and myself, providing for the enlistment of aliens in a Volunteer Freedom Corps.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1951.

Mr. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I am hastening to congratulate you and your colleagues who signed the bills S. 238 and S. 239. I hope that the Congress of the United States will enact very soon this very important legislation. Your statement gives very good arguments for such an action, which would be welcomed not only by the anti-Communist refugees from behind the iron curtain, but also by the peoples of the enslaved satellite nations of Soviet Russia. I am convinced that those nations, and especially my compatriots of Czechoslovakia, would be happy to join the glorious Army of the United States in securing freedom and giving hope and encouragement for the victims of Communist aggression. I am further convinced that, in spite of the fact that the Kremlin masters and their Czechoslovak gauleiters are purging constantly the Czechoslovak Army and especially the officer corps—which seem to them unreliable—the Czechoslovak Army as well as the other armies behind the iron curtain are basically opposing the Communist doctrine and practice in the same percentage as the population in general, and that therefore—should these armies be used against the western democracies—they would gladly go over to the western armies so as to be able to fight communism and get rid of their oppressors and tormentors. Such situation would need at least cadres for national armies, and I therefore think that the Volunteer Freedom Corps should be—fighting under the American flag—the nucleus of such national units. I would therefore prefer that the different nationalities enrolled in the Volunteer Freedom Corps should be organized in special units and should be allowed also some distinction in the national colors of the respective nationals. That would facilitate in a later state to form national units, including those anti-Communist forces that would come over in great numbers from the Soviet lines. Such national units would form a great attraction to all Czechoslovak nationals in exile, but even a greater one to those who would be forced to fight against the allies in the satellite armies. Mass desertion would result, and the existence of national units abroad would be the most important driving force to join these national units.

I am sure that thousands of my young compatriots would take the opportunity to join the Volunteer Freedom Corps. I got hundreds of letters from Czechoslovak political refugees—many of them veterans of World War II—in Germany, Austria, and in free countries after the Korean aggression, who offered their services for military serv-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ice against the aggressor. So did also former Czechoslovak airmen who served in the RAF in Great Britain. There are more than 45,000 Czechoslovak refugees who escaped from the country after the Communist coup. Many thousands of them are young men, eager to fight communism.

I have another suggestion, which would necessitate a slight change in the bill—section 6. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to appoint civilian citizens of the United States and of other nations to serve with the VFC. I agree, of course, with this provision, but I suggest to authorize the Secretary of the Army to appoint also former officers of other nations and to change therefore the words "civilian citizens" to "persons" or only "citizens," as to enable to employ in such future national armies, as I suggested above, also Czechoslovak, Polish, Hungarian, etc., generals, colonels, and other officers who are, of course, more than 35 years of age.

I would be very grateful should you consider it possible to discuss this problem with me or with Czechoslovak military experts, who are at your disposal in Washington.

Very sincerely yours,

JURAJ SLAVIK,
Former Czechoslovak Ambassador.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, immediately following the letter which I have just had printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial from the Boston Post bearing on the same subject, and an article from the Washington Post, in which it is stated that the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans also favors this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post of January 31, 1951]

ANTI-RED SLAVS

With all the emphasis placed on raising manpower for the defense of Europe, it is surprising more has not been done toward mobilizing the 2,000,000 anti-Communist Slavs that could be made available for military duty with a little effort. Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., mentioned this number in a recent speech and also revealed that he has been doing what he can to make it possible to employ the services of these men, who are so eager to oppose the Reds on personal and spiritual grounds. They certainly should be given their chance to join the ranks of the defenders of freedom. As Senator LODGE pointed out, these men cannot fight in the armies of their own countries, since those countries are already under Communist rule, but that should not mean they ought not to be given an opportunity to oppose the forces that took freedom from their homelands. On the contrary, they can be depended upon to be counted among the most valiant defenders of a way of life that they can truly appreciate.

[From the Washington Post]

VOLUNTEER ALIEN ARMY CORPS URGED

The national commander of the Catholic War Veterans last night urged Congress to speed legislation that would permit enlistment of aliens in an Army "volunteer freedom corps."

Commander Donald J. McQuade called for the action at a testimonial dinner in his honor sponsored at the Elks Club by the District department of Catholic War Veterans.

McQuade pointed out that thousands of qualified Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, and members of other nationalities would rush to enlist in such a corps as haters of communism.

"These men," McQuade said, "would be welcome additions to the comparatively few American, French, British, and Italian divisions now available for the defense of Western Europe.

"They would also conserve American manpower and, in case of war, unquestionably would save many American casualties."

McQuade said he supported Senate bill 238, introduced by Senator LODGE, Republican, Massachusetts, for this purpose.

Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, was represented at the dinner by the Reverend Philip J. Hannan, vice chancelor of the archdiocese. Thomas R. Callahan was toastmaster. Other speakers included Commander Edward Peters, of the District department of Catholic War Veterans, and the Reverend James H. Brooks, department chaplain.

RECRUITMENT OF AN AMERICAN FOREIGN LEGION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on this day, when a series of Lincoln Day observances is beginning throughout the country, I should like to read a letter which has come to my attention, bearing the endorsement of Abraham Lincoln. It will take but a moment to read the letter into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Maine may proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. This letter came to me only this morning. It deals with a matter bearing on the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and several other Senators, regarding the recruitment of a foreign legion. The letter, which is from the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, reads:

FEBRUARY 2, 1951.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I like to bring to your kind attention the following historical event, which I beg you to use in some way at the Lincoln Day celebration. This would help our resistance movement and also encourage the Americans of Slovak origin to participate wholeheartedly in our fight.

On February 4, 1861, the following letter was sent to President Lincoln by Capt. G. Mihalotzy, who as a Slovak fled his native country after the revolution in 1848:

"To the Honorable A. LINCOLN.

"DEAR SIR: We have organized a company of militia in this city composed of men of Hungarian, Bohemian, and Slavonic origin. Being the first company formed in the United States of said nationalities, we respectfully ask leave of your excellency to entitle ourselves 'Lincoln Riflemen of Slavonic Origin.'

"If you will kindly sanction our use of your name, we will endeavor to do honor to it, whenever we may be called to perform active service.

"Respectfully in behalf of the company,

"G. MIHALOTZY,
"Captain."

To this letter, the Great Emancipator responded in his handwriting:

"I cheerfully grant the request above made.

"A. LINCOLN."

I am enclosing a printed copy of that letter.

In this connection I like to inform you that the chairman of this committee, Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, who is an exile of Slovakia overridden by communism maintains the position that now is the time to organize freedom militias—as it was during the Civil War—from all the descendants of all those countries under Communist domination. Since we have thousands of exiles like Mihalotzy, his memory and heroic deeds will inspire everybody for the liberation of countries behind the iron curtain.

That is the end of the letter which I received. It seems to me it has a very interesting bearing on the proposed legislation which is now being considered by the Congress, regarding the possibility of forming an American foreign legion.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA—STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION BY SENATOR HILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is National Boy Scout Week, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement of appreciation of the Boy Scouts of America and their fine work.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISTER HILL

The Nation's Capital, because of its very significance, has received hundreds upon hundreds of distinguished visitors over the years. Kings, princes, potentates, prime ministers, and other men of responsibility have come and gone in the everyday transactions of world affairs.

Last night (Sunday) there arrived in Washington an American citizen who holds a distinction rare among his fellowmen. He is just completing 41 years of service as scoutmaster. I refer to Charles A. Kelso of Troop 55, Boy Scouts of America, St. Louis, Mo. Scoutmaster of that same troop since 1910, a unique record in the annals of Scouting.

Scoutmaster Kelso is coming here as part of a Nation-wide observance of Boy Scout Week, an observance in which more than 2,000,000 Scouts and leaders will participate in every part of the United States.

President Truman will officially open Boy Scout Week when he receives at the White House 12 young men, all Eagle Scouts, who will travel from the various regions of the Nation, representing the entire membership of the Boy Scouts of America. Scoutmaster Kelso, who will be a member of the official party, will represent 78,716 fellow scoutmasters, cubmasters, and explorer leaders, all of whom are giving their services on a voluntary basis.

These Eagle Scouts when calling upon the President, will leave with him a Report to the Nation, indicating not only the steady growth of the Boy Scouts of America, but their remarkable record of service on a community and national basis. Hundreds of thousands of Scouts have lived up to their slogan, "Do a good turn daily."

This Boy Scout Week we are celebrating the forty-first anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. From a small beginning in 1910 the movement grew steadily, enrolling over the years a total of 17,500,000 boys and leaders in all parts of the Nation. Today's membership of 2,750,000 is the all-time high in the history of Scouting.

The Scout program and its code of high ethical living has enriched the lives of many of today's leaders in the Nation's business, for numerous Boy Scouts of yesterday are now to be found in high places everywhere, yes, even this distinguished assembly may count among its members men who were Boy Scouts in their teens.

A listing of prominent business executives, judges, bishops, college presidents, leaders of the Armed Forces, scientists,

United Nations representatives, and other successful men—all former Boy Scouts—would be formidable. Yes, gentlemen, the Boy Scouts of America has taken its rightful place in our national life and is recognized everywhere as one of our greatest assets.

Scouting is teaching our boys to be honorable, to be self-reliant, and to be participating citizens when they attain manhood. Through its program of camping, hiking, swimming, life saving, and other skills, it is preparing our young men to take care of themselves and to help others in time of emergency. Many a veteran of the last world war, yes even in Korea today, has survived or has been able to save the life of a fellow serviceman, because of his Boy Scout training.

Boy Scouts do their best to live up to the Scout oath and law. Before he may become a Scout, a boy must promise: "On my honor I will do my best: to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

What a challenge that is for all of us. What a world this would be if every boy in every nation could be a Scout and as a man conduct his family, business, and civic affairs on the basis of the Scout oath. What a lesson we legislators may learn in meeting our various responsibilities, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Scouting is organized in 47 different freedom-loving lands. It is not permitted in Soviet Russia and has been suppressed in countries now under control of the Kremlin.

The Boy Scouts of America were instrumental in reestablishing the Scout movement in Korea after 1945. Boy Scout handbooks in the Korean language were donated by our Scouts and large shipments of uniforms were sent to the Scouts of that nation. Much of this has been destroyed, but the Korean Scout leaders are prepared to reorganize as soon as peace comes to that unhappy land. Since the overthrow of the former government at Peiping, nothing has been heard from the Chinese Boy Scouts Association. Communism will not tolerate the Boy Scout movement anywhere.

One of the significant events in the history of the Boy Scouts of America was the great national jamboree held at Valley Forge, Pa., last summer. A total of 47,163 Boy Scouts and leaders camped together for 1 week on ground hallowed by the memory of George Washington and his faithful band of men who suffered so much for our freedom and liberty during those winter days of 1777–78. Scouts traveled to Valley Forge from all parts of our great Nation; and were thrilled when President Truman, as honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, officially opened the jamboree on the evening of June 30. They were again enthusiastic hosts to General Eisenhower on the evening of July 4. The national jamboree was a great assembly of brother Scouts dedicated to their 2-year crusade to "strengthen liberty." It was a great patriotic pilgrimage, and profoundly enriched the Scouts' appreciation of their own United States. This national jamboree was the largest gathering of boys in the Western Hemisphere.

As Scouting completes its forty-first year, let us be thankful that we have in our Nation's life a movement which is dedicated to the character building and citizenship training of our boys and young men. The Boy Scout movement deserves the wholehearted support of the American people. It is a most effective program in preparing tomorrow's men for their duty to God, to other people, and to themselves in their Nation and the world.

ADMINISTRATION OF BLACKFEET RESERVATION IN MONTANA

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a news release issued today by George Pambrun, a full-blooded Indian, of Browning, Mont. He is chairman of the Tribal Council of the Blackfeet Tribe of Montana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN BUREAU INCITING MONTANA RANGE WAR

(Statement of George Pambrun, chairman of the Tribal Council of the Blackfeet Tribe of Montana)

The Indian Bureau is doing its best to stir up an old-fashioned cowboy-and-Indian war on the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana. I predict that the Indian Bureau will not be successful in its efforts to persuade white sheepmen and cattlemen to run their stock on Indian lands and to ignore Indian protests. The Blackfeet Council has run a series of public advertisements in leading Montana newspapers warning sheepmen and cattlemen to keep their stock off tribal lands unless they secure tribal consent. The advertisements point out that the Indian Bureau is violating the law by issuing grazing permits for the use of Indian land without tribal consent and in violation of the Federal law requiring "the consent of the tribe."

Indian Bureau bureaucrats are selling grazing permits on our Blackfeet tribal land over the protest of the tribal council. They are doing this in defiance of the Federal law requiring the "consent of the tribe" for grazing permits on Indian land. They are fooling some cattlemen and sheepmen by telling them that the Blackfeet Council has consented to the sale, when in fact our council has adopted several resolutions—all by unanimous vote—withholding consent to such sales of grazing permits. After all, this land belongs to us Indians. The Indian Bureau bureaucrats charge us with being "picketers" because we warned bidders that the auction was unauthorized and illegal.

Since when does an American citizen become a "picketer" just because he wants to hold on to his own land and refuses to allow a Federal bureaucrat to lease his land without his consent? We Blackfeet may have red skins but we believe in private ownership. The Indian Bureau is now using methods of Communist dictatorship against our people. We are now denied the right to lease or use our own lands as we see fit. Indians, especially veterans, who are running small herds of our own cattle on our own lands are now being liquidated by a 100 percent increase in rentals that the Indian Bureau is imposing, despite the protests of the tribe. The Indian Bureau grazing experts say they know best how our lands should be used, but in fact they are using their control over our Blackfeet lands to reward their friends. Stalin could learn a lot about how to run a dictatorship just by watching the Indian Bureau.

Bidders stayed away in droves from the "phony" Indian Bureau auction of Blackfeet grazing leases last week.

There was active competition on only about 1 percent of the grazing units. On about 39 percent of the range units only a single bid was received, in many cases from friends of Indian Bureau officials. The Indian Bureau wants to dispose of about 50 percent of the grazing units on its own terms to nonbidders. On another 10 percent of the range units the Indian Bureau could not find any bidders or non-bidders to take good Blackfeet land on Indian Bureau terms.

We are asking Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman to set aside the phony Indian Bureau auction and to see that the Federal laws guaranteeing our own rights to our own land are observed. If that is done, we are prepared to auction off grazing permits to the public on the land we don't need for our own Indian cattle.

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter dated February 3, 1951, from Oakes, N. Dak. The letter reads as follows:

OAKES, N. DAK., *February 3, 1951.*

Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Producers are receiving 25 cents for eggs in Oakes while our relatives and friends in Twin Cities—referring to Minneapolis and St. Paul—are paying 69 cents to 72 cents a dozen.

Eggs cannot be produced for 30 cents a dozen. What's to be done about this?

Yours truly,

B. A. STEVENS.

I have also received a letter from Pingree, N. Dak., dealing with the price of eggs, and enclosing a slip showing the price for which the farmer sold eggs. I ask unanimous consent that the sales slip be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sales slip was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name: C. E. Brady.

	Dozen	Eggs	Price	Amount
PB's	2	1	.0.33	$0.69
No. 2		4	.23	.08
B (Large air cells)	4	7	.26	1.19
Tota. amount				1.96
Total	6	12		

Date: Jan. 12, 1951.

PETERSON-BIDDICK CO.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that while farmers are receiving only from 21 to 25 cents a dozen for their eggs, the prices of things which the farmer buys have greatly risen, as is indicated in a letter I have received from George Schonberger, president of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota. He says:

In 1945 a swather canvas cost me $16. I replaced it in 1949 and it cost $32.50. John Sinner bought the same one in 1950 and paid $51.50, and none compared with the one I bought in 1945.

So we have a situation in which the price of a canvas for a swather jumped from $16 in 1945 to $32.50 in 1949 and $51.50 this year. That is a striking example of how the price of everything the farmer must buy has gone up, while the price of the things he sells remains about the same.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Enforcing of Controls in Dispute," written by Marshall Andrews, and published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENFORCING OF CONTROLS IN DISPUTE—LANGUAGE OF ACT LEAVES DOUBT OVER HANDLING OF CASES—OPS HALTS RECRUITING

(By Marshall Andrews)

An apparent discrepancy in the Defense Production Act yesterday threatened a dis-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

pute over wage and price enforcement which may have to go to the White House for settlement.

The act under which the Office of Economic Stabilization was set up specifically provides that all litigation arising out of it must be conducted by the Justice Department. But elsewhere it says enforcement of controls cannot be "delegated" to any other agency.

This seeming conflict in the law came to a head Wednesday. F. Joseph Donohue, installed Monday as enforcement officer for Michael V. DiSalle's Office of Price Stabilization, called DiSalle's attention to the language of the law after studying it closely. He told DiSalle OPS apparently was unable to enforce its orders and recruiting of an enforcement staff was temporarily halted.

The Justice Department, meanwhile, had announced formation of a special unit to handle price-control litigation under the Production Act. In some quarters this move was interpreted as a move by Justice to seize powers which should belong to OPS.

This view was rejected flatly last night by Peyton Ford, assistant to the Attorney General. Ford told the Washington Post the Justice Department normally handles all litigation for all but a few Federal agencies.

"We have charge of all litigation under the Defense Production Act," he said, "and we intend to do our duty."

He added that he thought court action by the Justice Department on the basis of investigation by OPS would enforce controls "more effectively than under the old Office of Price Administration," which handled its own civil litigation during World War II.

Civil cases under the act are those in which the Government sues for damages, seeks court orders to obey its rulings, and the like. Criminal cases are those in which an individual or a firm is charged with violations of the act which carry fines and jail sentences as penalties.

One price-control official suggested two methods by which the differences arising from the apparent contradiction in the law might be ironed out:

1. Let the Justice Department redelegate civil prosecution to OPS by appointing several OPS lawyers acting assistant attorneys general.

2. Have Congress amend the act to permit OPS lawyers to appear in court to prosecute civil cases.

Ford said last night that such authority had been redelegated to "many" agencies as suggested by the OPS official. He did not say that this action was contemplated in the present case.

Unless some amicable arrangement is reached, OPS officials fear paralysis of the price-control effort by lawyers for defendants challenging in court the authority of either OPS or the Justice Department to prosecute.

In any event, it seemed clear that somebody will have to decide, at least for the time being, what Congress meant when it wrote a seeming contradiction into the law.

MAYORS' AID ASKED

No doubt Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston or Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson can decide whether OPS will surrender prosecution of civil cases. But only President Truman can resolve the difference if the stabilization agency insists on its interpretation of the law.

DiSalle, meanwhile, opened a Nation-wide drive for citizens committees to stimulate voluntary observance of control orders. He telegraphed mayors of 1,523 cities asking them to appoint committees whose task would be to keep citizens informed of control measures.

At the same time he promised "relentless prosecution" of price-control violators and told businessmen, who complied with voluntary price ceilings in December, they would be given higher ceilings when compulsory orders go into effect.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a 2-minute statement with regard to the article which has just been placed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on the first page of this morning's Washington Post there appears an article headed: "Enforcing of Controls in Dispute." The article was written by Mr. Marshall Andrews. It pertains to a controversy which has arisen between officials of the Office of Price Stabilization and the Department of Justice. The difference of opinion stems from what Mr. Andrews calls "an apparent discrepancy" in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Mr. President, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I recall the hours and the effort which went into the drafting of this legislation. As the author of one of the sections to which this newspaper article refers, I feel some responsibility for defending it and for resolving, if I can, the current misunderstanding. There may well be discrepancies in the Defense Production Act, but there is none in the sections now in dispute. From their language, and from the report of the Senate on the bill, I believe the intent of Congress is as clear and unambiguous as words can make it.

The first section in question is section 403 of the act, which prohibits the delegation of enforcement powers. It reads in part as follows:

> At such time as the President determines that it is necessary to impose price and wage controls generally * * * he shall administer such controls * * * through a new independent agency created for such purpose. Such agency * * * shall not delegate enforcement of any of the controls to be administered by it under this section to any other agency or department.

This language was drafted by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, and was accepted by the committee of conference to achieve and preserve a close interrelationship between the price- and wage-control programs, and to insure that the over-all responsibility would lie in the hands of a single administrator, to whom the Congress might address itself. In the words of the Senate report:

> The committee was fearful that the delegation of Presidential authority to various executive agencies might lead to the dispersion of the price authority, for example, to two or more agencies with different standards of treatment for different classes of producers; or that the authority to control wages might be too far removed from the authority to control prices. In such cases the coordination by the President could be only nominal because of the great burdens borne by the President. The committee therefore provided that a single, new, independent agency should be responsible for the enforcement of all aspects of the program.

The new and independent agency to which the report refers is, of course, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and the man who is firmly responsible for its operations is Mr. Eric Johnston. So much of the congressional intent was apparently clear and was acted upon accordingly.

Mr. President, were the act otherwise silent on this matter, there would be merit in the contention of the official of the Price Stabilization Agency quoted in the news article in this morning's Post. But the act is specific and detailed with respect to litigation arising under it. Section 706 (b) of the act provides in part:

> All litigation arising under this act or the regulations promulgated thereunder shall be under the supervision and control of the Attorney General.

Again, I do not see how the intent of the Congress could have been made more clear. Mindful of the abuses which arose during the administration of price controls during World War II, and anxious to avoid a repetition of such miserable administration, the Congress wisely exempted the power to appear in court from the enforcement powers granted to the price and wage control agency, and vested that power where it belongs—in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States. This salutary action on the part of Congress represented no lack of confidence in Mr. Johnston or Mr. DiSalle or Mr. Ching. At that time they had not been appointed, and no one imagined who the personnel would be. It represented, rather, a demonstration of the recognition by Congress that court appearances on behalf of the Government of the United States are peculiarly the exclusive province of the Attorney General. It represented the confidence of the Congress in the integrity of the Attorney General and the United States attorneys throughout the Nation. It represented a protest against and a safeguarding against the methods used during the last attempt at enforcing price and wage controls by a centralized agency in Washington. Finally, it represented a firm belief on the part of the Congress that this law, as any other law, should be finally enforced in court by the properly constituted local representative of the Government of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I was struck by the suggested remedies for the situation, as reported in this article, attributed to an unnamed official of the price control agency. They are, first, to let the Justice Department redelegate—although there was no delegation in the first place—the powers assigned it to the Office of Price Stabilization, from whom Congress withheld those powers. The second suggestion is that Congress amend the law. At the risk of seeming to propose a revolutionary change, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest a third alternative, namely, that the price-control agency comply with the law as enacted by the Congress of the United States.

REDUCTION OF BUDGET PROPOSALS—ANALYSIS BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an analysis with recommendations as to the reduction of budget proposals.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS BY SENATOR BYRD

In a letter to the President on December 22, 1950, I suggested reductions in nonessential

spending totaling $7,600,000,000, based largely on estimated expenditures during the present fiscal year.

On January 15 the President submitted his budget for next fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, recommending domestic-civilian expenditures totaling more than $1,000,000,000 in excess of the estimates for this fiscal year. For this reason I am now revising my proposal to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures by $9,100,000,000 in comparison with the President's budget for next year.

Conditions confronting us make an austerity budget imperative, and that is what I propose. At a time when our survival depends upon national sacrifice I would strike pet projects and political spending not essential to defense. Even then my figure would allow more for domestic-civilian purposes than we spent in 1946 when we were descending from peak defense requirements.

For 1952 the President lumps foreign military and economic aid in a total of $7,500,000,000 and it is difficult to determine whether a large part of it is for military or economic assistance. I propose to eliminate all economic aid except that in the so-called pipeline. Previous estimates indicated economic aid this year would approach $4,000,000,000. If economic aid expenditures next year are comparable my proposal would save some $3,500,000,000. We can't send butter and guns.

I agree with the President that we must tax until it hurts and I would go further and reduce nonessential spending until it hurts. Without this combination we cannot hope to balance the budget or curb inflation, and we would impose an impossible burden on the free-enterprise system. We would start a series of deficits which may end in financial disaster.

The free-enterprise system is a greater deterrent to world conflict and a more dependable guardian of peace than a United Nations organization ever will be. It is the only force in the world today that Russia fears. It must be preserved.

Summary of the budget for fiscal year 1952—Receipts and expenditures

[In billions]

Receipts	1950 actual	1951 estimate	1952		
			Present rates estimated by President	New taxes proposed by President	Total
Direct taxes on individuals:					
Individual income	$17.4	$21.6	$26.0		
Estates and gifts	.7	.7	.8	$16.5	------
Direct taxes on corporations	11.0	13.6	20.0		
Excise taxes	7.6	8.2	8.2		
Net employment taxes	.8	.8	.9	[1] 2	------
Customs	.4	.6	.6	------	------
Miscellaneous receipts	1.4	1.3	1.3	------	------
Deduct: Refunds	−2.2	−2.3	−2.7	------	------
Total receipts [2]	37.0	44.5	55.1	16.7	$71.8

[1] $275,000,000 in new payroll taxes requested by President for socialized medicine. 1952 expenditures from these receipts, not shown in regular expenditure items, are estimated to begin at $35,000,000. Net receipts from these new taxes are estimated at $240,000,000.

[2] Figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding.

Summary of the budget for fiscal year 1952—Receipts and expenditures—Continued

[In billions]

Expenditures	1948 actual [3]	1950 actual	1951 estimate	1952	
				Requested by President	Proposed by Senator Byrd
1. Legislative and judicial	$0.1	$0.1	$0.1	$0.1	$0.1
2. Interest, claims, etc	5.2	5.8	5.7	5.9	5.9
3. Veterans	6.6	6.6	5.7	4.9	4.7
4. Defense (including military, stockpile, NACA, Selective Service, Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, Alaska, Panama, Atomic Energy)	11.6	13.8	22.4	43.4	42.9
5. Foreign assistance (military and economic)	4.6	4.6	4.7	7.5	4.0
6. Domestic-civilian (excluding stockpile NACA, Selective Service, Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, Alaska, Panama, Atomic Energy) [4]	6.1	9.3	8.6	9.8	4.9
Total expenditures	34.2	40.2	47.2	71.6	62.5

[3] Fiscal year 1948 is included in this table because it comes most nearly representing the post-World War II peacetime era and peacetime prosperity.

[4] See tables which follow.

TAXES

Within the past year Federal taxes on income of individuals and corporations have been increased $8,000,000,000.

In his January budget message the President asked for $16,500,000,000 more in taxes during the coming year.

If these should be imposed Federal taxes would be increased more than 60 percent since last year.

EXPENDITURES

The President's expenditure budget proposes increases in every major category except veterans, and there the reductions are principally in World War II adjustment programs which are expiring. There are increases for interest, defense, foreign assistance, and domestic-civilian programs. Interest is the only category in which reductions are impossible.

The President has proposed domestic-civilian expenditures totaling $9,800,000,000, exclusive of defense, foreign assistance, interest on the debt, veterans, and exclusive of military supporting activities such as stockpiling, NACA, selective service, Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, Alaska and Panama development, and atomic energy.

This is an increase of $1,300,000,000 over estimated expenditures for domestic-civilian items for the current year. It is $500,000,000 more than we spent for domestic-civilian items last year. It is $3,700,000,000 more than we spent for domestic-civilian items in 1948 when postwar peace and prosperity were thought to be inclined toward stability. It is $6,200,000,000 more than we spent for domestic-civilian items in 1946 when, as now, we were in a semiwar economy.

Just as in the World War II period, agencies all over the Government are again attempting to increase their expenditures on the grounds that they are contributing to national defense.

Actually the proposed domestic-civilian items in the President's budget include all the major socialistic programs of recent years—socialized housing, agriculture, and medicine, and federalized education. This year we are told they are imperative to preparedness and national defense.

While the domestic-civilian programs include the so-called defense production and civilian defense items, many of them are both priced excessively in the budget and are open to boondoggle exploitation by Federal, State, and local agencies. For instance there would be enough so-called "defense production business loans" available to fill the woods with Lustron corporations.

DEFICIT

When the budget appeared there were increases in more than half of the domestic-civilian programs, decreases in about a third, and the remainder were about the same as estimates for this year.

The President said we must be taxed until it hurts. He did not propose that we reduce domestic-civilian expenditures until it hurts. Instead he relies on last September's $4,000,000,000 tax increase twice doubled to provide a balanced budget. This of course would assume:

1. Enactment of such tremendous new levies on individual and corporate income;

2. Our free enterprise system, already taxed nearly to confiscation, can expand plant, production and employment sufficiently to generate the income to produce this additional revenue; and

3. We shall remain in a "short of war" status.

Failure of any or all of these "ifs" to materialize would precipitate deficits which might easily go to $25,000,000,000 annually, unless we reduce expenditures.

DEBT

We entered World War I with a Federal debt of little more than $1,000,000,000. We started preparation for World War II with a Federal debt of little more than $40,000,000,000. We start the present military-defense-preparedness build-up with a Federal debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. On this plateau of debt we shall pile the deficits we create from now on.

Like Samson's locks, our free enterprise system is the source of our strength—economic and military. The free enterprise system has absorbed an awful lot of hurtful taxes, but it cannot survive in insolvency, or even in an atmosphere of fiscal weakness.

SUGGESTED REDUCTIONS

Obviously our strength and preparedness in all respects depend upon reduction in nonessential spending.

To this end, in a letter to the President on December 22, 1950, I suggested reductions totaling between $7,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000 in the expenditure budget for the coming year, beginning next July 1.

These reductions included a relatively small amount in Veterans' Administration and nonessential veterans' programs, excluding, of course, veterans' pensions and medical services; a half billion dollars through reduction in civilian employment by the military establishment; $3,500,000,000 from reductions in foreign economic assistance; and $3,600,000,000 from reductions in domestic-civilian programs.

Now that the President has submitted his requests for expenditures in fiscal year 1952, beginning next July 1, I restate my reduc-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tion suggestions in comparison with his new proposals. My suggestions may be summarized as follows:

	Billions
1. The Veterans' Administration, now employing nearly 200,000, uses manpower excessively and it has been my observation that its administrative costs could and should be reduced without impairment of any services for veterans to whom the Government is obligated for bona fide war-connected sacrifices. Under terms of the recent single appropriation bill the Director of the Budget has demonstrated the accuracy of this observation and the President's budget proved still further reduction can be made. I suggest additional reductions in administrative costs and nonessential programs to the extent of	$0.2
2. The Armed Forces are notorious for extravagant use of civilian manpower. They have been employing approximately 1 civilian for each 2 men in uniform as compared with 1 civilian for each 5 men in uniform at the World War II peak. The military effort would be strengthened if, through greatly needed efficiency, the Military Establishment's projected civilian employment of more than 1,250,000 were reduced by at least 150,000 with a saving of	.5
3. In my Dec. 22 letter to the President I proposed a reduction of up to $3,500,000,000 in foreign economic aid. This suggestion was based on the estimate then that $4,000,000,000 would be spent in foreign economic aid in the current year. When the President submitted his budget he failed to disclose his complete estimate of the foreign economic aid expenditures in the coming year. Instead he combined foreign economic and military aid. His estimate for the combined aid in the current fiscal year was a total of $4,700,000,000 and his request for the combined aid in the coming year totaled $7,500,000,000. Such detail as is available in the budget document indicates that military assistance in the current year may be estimated at up to $1,000,000,000, leaving up to nearly $4,000,000,000 in foreign economic assistance. The budget detail reveals only $2,500,000,000 for military assistance in the estimates for the coming fiscal year, leaving up to $5,000,000,000 in foreign aid and other expenditures connected with foreign relations not specifically earmarked for military assistance. The budget message said the preponderance of aid in Europe will be military, but economic aid, through point 4 and other programs, around the rest of the world, with emphasis on Asia, Near East, and South America, was discussed at length. The foreign economic assistance policy was originally adopted by this country on the assumption that it would expire next year. Military assistance is already overlapping economic aid in most recipient areas. Foreign economic aid in the new budget should not exceed commitments already made. Pending clarification and more specific estimates on expenditures for economic foreign aid I suggest reductions in economic assistance expenditures of up to	$3.5
4. With reductions suggested in detail in the tables which follow, expenditures for domestic-civilian programs, including the postal deficit, should be reduced under the President's latest proposals by	4.9
Total reductions under President's Jan. 15 expenditure budget requests	9.1

The following table summarizes:

The suggested reductions under the President's Jan. 15 budget requests in domestic-civilian expenditures by major functions

[Compared with war, postwar, and new emergency years]

Expenditure categorie	Fiscal years (in billions of dollars)					
	War peak 1946 actual	Postwar 1948 actual	New emergency		Truman request 1952	Byrd proposal 1952
			1950 actual	1951 estimate		
DOMESTIC—CIVILIAN						
1. Social welfare, health, and security	1.0	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.6	1.6
2. Housing and community facilities (including mortgage purchases)	−.2	.1	.3	.4	−.1	−.2
3. Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.1	.5	.1
4. Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.7	.6	2.8	1.0	1.4	.8
5. Natural resources	.3	.6	1.0	1.3	1.2	.4
6. Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	.4	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.1	.4
7. Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.1	.2	.4	1.5	.4
8. Labor	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	.2
9. General government	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.2
Total domestic—civilian [1]	3.6	6.1	9.3	8.6	9.8	4.9

[1] Figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding.

Figures in the preceding domestic-civilian expenditure table, and in the more detailed table which is to follow, are exclusive of all military and related expenditure objects such as atomic energy, merchant marine, stockpile, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Panama Canal, Coast Guard, and Alaska construction and transportation projects. They do not include any foreign military or economic aid expenditures. They do not include any veterans costs. They do not include any interest on the debt or refunds of erroneously collected taxes.

STATE AID

Expenditures for State-aid programs, now totaling nearly $3,000,000,000, account for about 25 percent of the domestic-civilian budget. They are to be found running through virtually all of the so-called major functions in this category—public assistance and health, housing, education and research, agriculture, resources development and recreation, transportation (including highways and civilian airports), business promotion, employment, etc.

In this critical period when the Federal Government must arm this Nation and meet its commitments to prop up half the world, the question of merit under ordinary conditions is not the paramount consideration. The degree to which they support the defense effort must be the controlling factor. These State-aid items must be reached if we are to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort, as the President promised in his address to the Nation on December 15, 1950. Most of them are tied to long-term statutory commitments.

Changes in State budgets would be necessary in some instances and many would require new basic Federal legislation for repeal, amendment, or suspension. It was to be hoped that the President in his budget message would recommend such legislation. But such recommendations were conspicuous by their absence. The States are now better able than the Federal Government to determine and finance the irreducible minimum of public assistance, public construction, resources development, and public health within their borders. If we are to take action in this matter, as we should, the States should be given notice immediately in order that they may conform.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Although the figures are scattered throughout many items in the budget document with no summary, it appears that the President has requested up to approximately $3,000,000,000 for so-called defense production loans and subsidies and for so-called civilian-defense projects exclusive of atomic energy, merchant marine, etc. In this $3,000,000,000 total there are included $265,000,000 for civilian-defense preparation including grants to States and localities for air-raid shelters, etc., something under $200,000,000 for defense housing and community facilities, $164,000,000 for dispersal of Government activities, and about $300,000,000 for economic-stabilization programs, including the cost of controls. The biggest item of all is $1,100,000,000 for so-called defense production loans and subsidies to business. The remainder of the civilian-defense and defense production money is scattered through numerous agencies and programs, including CAA, reclamation, highways, etc.

I suggest that the funds for defense production loans and civilian defense be reduced to not more than $1,500,000,000.

The principal difference between this suggestion and the President's budget proposals would be in the so-called defense production business loans and subsidies and in the virtual elimination of the proposal to disperse Government activities. I suggest elimination from the defense production loan and subsidy funds of all of the money proposed to be used as a club or blackjack over private business as a Government threat to establish plants in competition with private industry. I suggest that, as in the rest of the Nation, only those Government records and activities vital to the continuity of essential Government functions be removed to especially protected and secluded areas.

My suggestions leave adequate money for the civilian-defense program in terms of State and local shelter loans, essential emergency housing in defense areas, administration of necessary controls, and short-term business loans for defense plant expansion.

DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN PROGRAM

As I have shown in the preceding table, domestic-civilian expenditures may be grouped into 9 major functions. My suggested reductions cover nearly 100 domes-

tic-civilian programs within these 9 major functions. In addition to the more detailed discussion of the State-aid and civilian defense programs already given, my suggested reductions within the programs should be considered in view of the following explanations:

1. With respect to the social welfare, health and security function and programs: Most of the reduction proposals would be in public assistance and institutional construction grants to the States. The contributory social security system of course would not be affected. The original purpose of other public assistance grants was to fill gaps in the social security program. Social security insurance has been broadened this year. The war effort will require the labor of all who are able to work. Scarcity of materials automatically will curtail or halt nondefense construction. After the reductions suggested in this item it would still be a quarter of a billion dollars higher than it was in fiscal year 1946 when World War II ended.

2. With respect to housing and community facilities (including mortgage purchases): Adequate war effort precludes nonessential housing construction. This program already has been curtailed. It should be eliminated with the exception of essential defense housing. No new money would be provided, but returns from previous loans should meet the cost of housing for the war effort and finance State and local shelter grants. Repayments in these programs during fiscal year 1943, when the war ended, exceeded expenditures.

3. With respect to education and general research: This item includes an increase for scientific research directed to the war effort which is not evident in the rounded figures. Other items remain virtually unchanged from the present except a reduction in funds for the census.

4. With respect to agriculture and agricultural resources (including Commodity Credit Corporation): Reductions in this item are principally in Commodity Credit Corporation price supports and nonessential rural electrification construction. Price support receipts this year are exceeding expenditures. If food subsidies have to be imposed, such as they were in World War II, price support receipts should meet the cost as they did at that time. The reduced figure contemplates expenditures for rural electrification construction essential to the war effort.

5. With respect to natural resources: Major reductions in this item would be in nonessential public works by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. But funds remaining for these projects would be 25 percent more than was available in fiscal year 1946 when we had both war and postwar conditions.

6. With respect to transportation and communication (including the postal deficit): Decreases in this item would be in nonessential highway, airport, and Army engineers construction, and the postal deficit. As in other categories of construction scarcity of materials automatically will halt or curtail all nonmilitary effort construction. The postal deficit should be wiped out under any circumstances. Those who use the mails should be willing to pay for the service. It disappeared during World War II. It should be eliminated now. Funds are provided for navigation aids and facilities, and regulation of transportation and communication necessary to the war effort.

7. With respect to finance, commerce, and industry: Reductions are made in expenditures for ordinary activities under this item but increases would be provided for export and domestic controls along with others provided for in the General Government function. Funds are provided also for short-term capital loans to industry for defense production expansion, but not for establishment of Government plants.

8. With respect to labor: The figures in this item contemplate the 1946 level of activity with an increase provided for labor training.

9. With respect to General Government: Provision is made for increased immigration control costs. It is assumed that some of the civilian controls incident to current conditions will be reflected in the cost of General Government functions. The suggested reduction takes into account increased costs of Federal civilian retirement.

SEMIWAR ECONOMY

It may be worthy of note that the following tables include comparative figures for fiscal year 1946. In that year we were descending from peak military requirements, and a good many wartime controls and activities were still in being, although curtailment was in progress during most of the year. In the coming year we shall be ascending in the direction of peak military requirements with controls and war-economy activities building up. Under my suggested reductions total expenditures for domestic-civilian programs in the coming fiscal year would be 30 to 40 percent higher than they were in fiscal year 1946.

Reductions suggested in domestic-civilian expenditures by programs within major functions are shown in the tabulation which follows:

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures—By programs within major functions

[In millions of dollars]

	Functions and categories	Fiscal years				
		1946 actual	1950 actual	1951 estimate	Truman request 1952	Byrd proposal 1952
	A. SOCIAL WELFARE, HEALTH AND SECURITY					
1.	Public assistance (FSA)	436	1,125	1,282	1,302	440
	Aid to special groups:					
2.	Vocational rehabilitation (FSA)		20	22	24	25
3.	School lunch program (Agriculture Department)	50	83	83	83	83
4.	Indian welfare and other (Interior)	(1)	29	41	43	8
5.	Other (FSA)	13	1	1	1	1
	Retirement and dependents' insurance:					
6.	Railroad Retirement Board	294	583	598	646	646
7.	Federal Security Agency and other	24	9	7	7	7
	Promotion of public health (FSA and other):					
8.	Federal, State, and local health services and medical education	179	242	349	380	225
9.	Crime control and correction (Justice)	78	91	107	106	68
10.	Accident compensation (Labor)	10	24	30	33	25
	Total social welfare	1,084	2,213	2,520	2,625	1,553
	B. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT					
11.	Defense and civil defense housing (FCDA and RFC)	34		15	430	2 (500)
	Aids to private housing:					
	Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
12.	Federal National Mortgage Association		579	189	−530	−530
13.	Federal Housing Administration	−13	−30	−6	−5	−5
14.	Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−275	−242	−80		
15.	Other		5	7	−11	−11
16.	Veterans' Administration: direct loans			73	−5	−5
17.	Farm housing (Agriculture Department)		12	28	23	
18.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−45	−25	−40	−20	−20
	Other housing and community development programs:					
	Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
19.	Public housing programs	43	−37	158	−138	−138
20.	Loans to educational institutions			1	36	
21.	Slum clearance and urban development			10	65	
22.	Advance planning loans and other		4	32	15	
23.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3	−6	14	24	
24.	Other (including Interior)	73	1	8	14	
	Total housing and community development	−180	261	409	−102	−209
	C. EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH					
	Promotion of education: Office of Education:					
25.	General aid for operating elementary and secondary schools				290	
26.	Vocational education	27	27	27	27	50
27.	Education of children on Federal property and emergency areas			15	100	40
28.	Other programs		14	1	8	5
29.	Educational aid to special groups	13	3	7	8	8

[1] Indian funds not set forth in these functional categories in 1946.
[2] No new money to be provided. Expenditures to be exclusively out of receipts from previous housing operations

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures—By programs within major functions—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Functions and categories	Fiscal years				
		1946 actual	1950 actual	1951 estimate	Truman request 1952	Byrd proposal 1952
	C. EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH—continued					
30.	Library and museum services	6	9	11	12	6
	General purpose research:					
31.	National Science Foundation	[3] 34			3	[2] 40
32.	National Bureau of Standards		9	12	11	[2]
33.	Seventeenth decennial census (Commerce)	8	42	32	10	5
34.	Other (including Census Bureau)		8	7	8	
	Total education and general research	88	114	143	483	134
	D. AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES					
	Stabilization of farm prices and income:					
35.	Commodity Credit Corporation, price support supply and purchase programs (net)	−1,329	1,606	−296	238	
36.	Removal of surplus commodities	25	96	92	75	50
37.	International wheat agreement		76	117	115	115
38.	Sugar Act	54	60	61	70	70
39.	Federal crop insurance and other	−285	7	8	6	
40.	Financing farm ownership and operation	30	146	157	141	15
41.	Financing rural electrification and telephones	85	294	312	269	100
	Agricultural land and water resources:					
42.	Conservation and use (including administrative expense accounts)	311	275	309	304	300
43.	Soil conservation service and flood control	39	61	65	63	25
44.	Research and other agricultural services	137	163	161	148	150
45.	Food subsidies (CCC and RFC)	1,634				
	Total agriculture and agricultural resources	701	2,784	986	1,429	825
	E. NATURAL RESOURCES NOT PRIMARILY AGRICULTURAL					
	Land and water resources:					
46.	Corps of Engineers: Flood control	89	438	469	412	90
	Department of the Interior:					
47.	Bureau of Reclamation	62	298	349	265	75
48.	Power transmission (Bonneville, Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations)	9	36	54	65	55
49.	Indian land resources	[1]	26	41	25	2
50.	Bureau of Land Management and other	10	10	9	9	5
51.	Tennessee Valley Authority (net)	5	19	171	236	100
52	International Boundary and Water Commission and other	1	4	7	14	1
	Forest resources:					
53.	Forest Service and other (Agriculture)	40	75	86	93	50
54.	Department of the Interior	3	3	2	4	1
	Mineral resources:					
55.	Bureau of Mines and other (Interior)	21	34	29	33	25
	General resources surveys:					
56.	Geological Survey	12	16	18	22	18
	Fish and wildlife resources:					
57.	Fish and Wildlife Service and other		23	28	31	14
	Recreational use of resources:					
58.	National Park Service	5	22	36	33	5
	Total natural resources	257	1,004	1,229	1,242	441
	F. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION					
	Provision of navigation aids and facilities:					
59.	Corps of Engineers	93	190	193	217	150
	Promotion of aviation:					
60.	Civil Aeronautics Administration	62	159	182	199	125
	Provision of highways:					
61.	Bureau of Public Roads	90	472	466	468	100
62.	Regulation of transportation	22	16	15	15	25
	Other services to transportation:					
63.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	−43	−11	−3	−5	−5
64.	Coast and Geodetic Survey	17	12	11	12	12
65.	Postal service (deficit)	161	593	632	160	
66.	Regulation of communication	11	7	7	7	7
	Total transportation and communication	413	1,438	1,503	1,073	414
	G. FINANCE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY					
	Defense production and economic stabilization:					
67.	Expansion of production (net)			260	1,100	200
68.	Allocations, price and wage controls	184	22	36	276	200
69.	Rent control		4	13	24	22
70.	Export control			3	4	4
	Business loans and guaranties:					
71.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation (net)	111	166	26	90	
	Business promotion and regulation:					
72.	Department of Commerce	11	26	19	17	10
73.	Antimonopoly programs	15	8	8	8	5
74.	Other	−2	6	6	6	
	Promotion, regulation of financial institutions:					
75.	RFC (net receipts)	−72	−12	−10	−8	−8
76.	Other (including Securities and Exchange Commission)	5	7	7	7	5
	Total finance, commerce, and industry	30	227	368	1,524	438
	H. LABOR					
	Placement and unemployment-insurance activities:					
77.	Department of Labor	146	214	165	165	75
78.	Railroad Retirement Board	13	13	7	10	10
	Labor standards and training:					
79.	Department of Labor	1	11	14	14	100
80.	Mine safety (Interior)	6	4	4	4	4
81.	Labor relations	18	13	13	13	13
82.	Labor information, statistics, etc	8	8	9	9	9
	Total labor	192	263	212	215	211

[1] Indian funds not set forth in these functional categories in 1946.

[2] No new money to be provided. Expenditures to be exclusively out of receipts from previous housing operations.

[3] 1946 budget included large expenditures within the "education and general research" category for wartime scientific research and development, and these therefore are accounted for in the 1952 proposals for expenditures in this category.

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures—By programs within major functions

[In millions of dollars]

Functions and categories	Fiscal years				
	1946 actual	1950 actual	1951 estimate	Truman request 1952	Byrd proposal 1952
I. GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
83. Dispersal of government facilities			6	164	
Federal financial management:					
84. Bureau of Internal Revenue	350	227	248	254	274
85. Customs collection, debt management and other		129	139	134	120
86. General Accounting Office and other	47	35	33	31	31
Other central services:					
87. Central property and records management (mainly GSA)	152	118	139	164	[1]104
88. Civil Service Commission	9	16	18	20	9
89. Legal Services (Justice)	5	8	9	10	5
90. Government Printing Office	9	9	10	11	10
91. Government payment toward civilian employees general retirement system	245	302	305	320	315
92. Executive direction and management	8	7	12	8	[2]100
Other general government:					
93. Immigration control (Justice)	35	31	33	36	35
94. Public buildings construction (GSA)		9	38	9	([3])
95. Weather Bureau	25	24	25	26	25
96. Claims and relief acts (Treasury)	50	71	96	50	50
97. Other	33	58	67	41	30
Total general government	968	1,044	1,178	1,278	1,148
Grand total, domestic civilian	3,553	9,348	8,618	9,767	4,960

[1] Includes emergency construction funds.
[2] Includes emergency civilian defense funds for Government agencies.
[3] Included in item I (87).

EFFICIENT OPERATION OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 or 4 minutes at this time, in making a statement for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in this time of expanding and wasteful Government, I desire to pay public tribute to a man and an agency for proving that efficient economy can be practiced—even here in Washington. It only takes the will to do it.

I refer to Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the General Accounting Office which he heads.

I understand every Member of Congress received a copy of the letter of Mr. Warren dated January 29. The letter mentioned several important facts, including the reduction in personnel achieved by GAO in the past 5 years. In April 1946 the agency reached a peak of 14,904 employees. This number was whittled away, until it was down to 7,063 by the beginning of 1951. This was a reduction of 7,841 persons. It was done by increasing efficiency.

However, there are some figures which were not included in Mr. Warren's letter. I asked for them. I have just received the information, and want to call it to the attention of the Senate. It is further proof of the remarkable job done by Mr. Warren.

The salaries of the 14,904 employees in 1946 totaled $39,236,900 for that year. If there had been no reduction in staff during the past 5 years, the various salary increments to Federal employees in that period would have brought the total salaries up to $61,702,560 for this year.

But the General Accounting Office's budget for the new fiscal year asks only $30,325,000 for salaries. Thus, the saving in personnel will mean an important dollar saving for the taxpayers in the 1 year. It comes to $31,377,560.

Let me go further and remind the Senate of another point. In the past several years, most Federal agencies have grown in staff size. They have not reduced. Consider the millions of additional dollars it would cost our citizens if the General Accounting Office had been growing.

The GAO is an example of how big cuts can be made in the civilian personnel of the nondefense agencies; and I am sure greater efficiency and economy could be brought into the defense agencies, as well.

The saving of 7,841 persons in personnel is the equivalent of more than two full regiments of infantry.

If this kind of efficiency were spread all across the Government, we would have hundreds of thousands of civilians who could be used for the Armed Forces and for essential jobs. It would go a long way toward reducing the manpower squeeze. The saving could bring many divisions to the armed services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Mr. Warren's letter, a copy of which was received by every Senator.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 29, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR: With the many vital problems before the Congress today, I know you don't have time to read annual reports of Government agencies. Anyway, ours is still in the process of printing. But, knowing of the interest of Members in the General Accounting Office, an agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch, I believe there are certain facts you will want to know. That is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is an independent and non-political agency. It is a part of our system of checks and balances. It audits and settles the accounts and claims of the Government, and advises and assists the Congress and the agencies on matters relating to expenditures.

The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

During recent years, when it seems the Government has been expanding beyond all reasonable comprehension, the GAO has proved that it is possible to reduce employees. In April 1946, the number of employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 7,063 employees on January 1, 1951, a reduction of 7,841 in the last 5 years, of whom 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department. This has been accomplished through constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present conditions.

For example, just recently I abolished the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division of the GAO. This Division employed 325 people. Certain of the work formerly carried on by that Division has been transferred to other divisions. However, it will be possible to carry out the work transferred with 61 people, making a reduction of 264 people and an annual salary savings to the GAO of nearly $1,000,000. There will be no loss of control of public funds. In fact, the revised procedures should enable the GAO and the Government generally to do a more competent job.

While practically every agency of the Government will ask for increased funds for 1952, the GAO will request less money than was made available to us for 1951.

A few statistics on our work in the last year: 25,300,000 vouchers audited; 492,000 claims settled; 318,000,200 checks reconciled; 12,400 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made of 945 different Government offices; 34 comprehensive audits submitted to Congress (for the first time since the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 audits of Government corporations were up to date); 685 reports made to Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to inquiries from individual Members of Congress.

The GAO is one of the few agencies that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES DIGITIZED

Treasury. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1950, total $718,100,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would have ever been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Collections are impressive, but also important is the prevention of illegal or improvident use of funds without waiting to collect back what has been paid out illegally.

The joint accounting program inaugurated in December 1947 by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and myself is achieving remarkable success. As a result of the program and of legislation enacted by the Congress, accounting improvements and red-tape cutting are going forward with rapid acceleration.

The GAO is expanding comprehensive, on-the-site audits which bring about broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the GAO supported the enactment of a number of laws which made possible some of the improvements just mentioned. Probably the most important are the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950. The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act, among other things, permits the elimination of certain procedures upon determination that the interests of the Government are otherwise protected. This made possible the abolishment of the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division mentioned above, but this is only an example. Many other benefits have resulted and will continue to come about. The revisions of procedures and improvements made have reached into every agency of the Government.

The Post Office Department Financial Control Act made possible the abolishment of the Postal Accounts Division of the GAO last November 15. The administrative accounting work which had been done for the Post Office Department has been turned over to that Department. The GAO should never have been given those duties in the first place. I have set up a new Postal Audit Division which will make comprehensive, up-to-date audits of postal financial transactions.

It is essential to our economic survival not only that the national defense be strengthened, but that it be done as effectively and economically as possible. On this score, the GAO bids fair to make a real contribution. We will not only audit defense spending, but will also concentrate to seek out excesses, waste, and extravagances in the defense program. At the same time, we will continue to keep a watchful eye on civilian spending to ferret out those extravagances and frills which our country should not and cannot now endure.

This letter is for your own information and no reply is necessary.

With best wishes, I am,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Mr. Warren's memorandum to me setting forth these figures.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriation for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1946, when a peak of 14,904 employees was reached	$39,236,900
Had reductions in personnel not been made in the past 5 years and 14,904 were required for the fiscal year 1952, and taking into consideration pay raises that have been given employees by law since 1946, there would be required for the General Accounting Office for 1952 an appropriation of	$61,702,560
Budget estimates for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1952 are	30,325,000
Projected cost on the basis of 14,904 for 1952	61,702,560
Actual budget estimates for the fiscal year 1952	30,325,000
Difference	31,377,560

NOTE.—The amounts shown are for salaries only. Additional amounts were included and will be included for 1952 for housekeeping functions such as rents, rental of equipment, supplies, etc.

WILLIAM THE SILENT AWARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two matters I wish to have inserted in the RECORD, but I should like to have unanimous consent to read two pages of explanation of one, and unanimous consent to take not more than 2 minutes to explain the other.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the people of the Netherlands established an annual journalism award, known as the William the Silent Award, to commemorate 14 brave American correspondents who were killed in an airplane crash near Bombay on July 12, 1949, on their return trip from an assignment in Indonesia. The first annual award was presented to Daniel L. Schorr, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, at a reception and dinner at the Waldorf Astoria on November 2, 1950. The President of the United States, deeply moved by this gesture of friendship on the part of the people of the Netherlands, gave his blessing in the following message:

I am indeed happy to take note of the gracious gesture which the people of the Netherlands are making through establishment of the William the Silent Award, in memory of the 14 distinguished American correspondents who were killed in a plane crash while returning from Indonesia a year ago. In terms of money the award is most generous, but even more impressive is the spirit which prompted it. There could be no more suitable memorial to the newspapermen who so tragically lost their lives than this splendid contribution to a better understanding among the peoples of the world.

By way of digression, Mr. President, I desire to say that it is not at all surprising that the President of the United States should send such an inspiring message to the banquet at the Waldorf Astoria on the occasion of the awarding of this particular award. One has only to read the great inspirational speech of the President last Saturday at Philadelphia in dedicating the memorial to the four war hero chaplains honored at that service to understand the deep human feelings and human understanding of the President of the United States. In this particular message which he sent to the meeting at the Waldorf Astoria in connection with this award, he again demonstrated that depth of human understanding.

Also at that meeting Dr. William Drees, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, expressed his fullest approval by the following message:

I warmly approve of the establishment of the annual William the Silent Award for Journalism in memory of the American journalists who lost their lives in the line of duty on their return from Indonesia.

The bonds between Holland and the United States of America are centuries old. Netherlands initiative has contributed to the establishment of the first settlements on the North American Continent. During the formation of the American Republic, Benjamin Franklin testified how much Americans and Dutch had in common in their pursuit of freedom. This the William the Silent medal will commemorate.

The Second World War, during which America contributed so much to the liberation of the Netherlands, has forged new ties. May this award, which through its name and its symbol is dedicated to the great founder of Netherlands freedom, further fortify these ties between us.

This event, Mr. President, is, in my considered opinion, one of great international import and deserves to be recorded in the annals of human relations. In these troublous times, when the world democracies seek to draw closer together to form an impenetrable ring against the threat of totalitarian aggression, any gesture which aims at cementing friendships between those democracies with a common goal, becomes by itself a project for the advancement of human welfare and the attainment of world peace.

The United States, Mr. President, is now facing formidable enemies whose plan and purpose are to attack the very foundation of our democracy and the concept of human dignity to which our Government and Nation are dedicated; but the United States can proudly count upon the friendship of many nations whose devotion to a common democratic ideal is well-known to everyone. Among these nations is the Netherlands. I was deeply moved, Mr. President, as were the President of the United States and many other Americans prominent in every walk of life, by the noble example of the people of Holland in connection with this award.

Although I knew casually many of the newspapermen who lost their lives in the crash in Indonesia, I had two very close personal friends among them, Frederick W. Colvig, of the Denver Post, formerly of the Portland Oregonian, and George Moorad, of the Portland Oregonian. As an Oregonian, I desire to join in my expression of deep appreciation to the officials of the Netherlands for the tribute and recognition they have given to these great newspapermen, in memory of their heroic services in Indonesia on the mission which ended in their deaths. With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an account of the proceedings of the presentation of the William

the Silent Award, together with the text of the article which won the award.

There being no objection, the account of the proceedings and the text of the article which won the award were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST WILLIAM THE SILENT AWARD PRESENTED AT WALDORF—FOURTEEN AMERICAN CORRESPONDENTS WHO DIED IN BOMBAY CRASH HONORED IN SILENT TRIBUTE—FOUR HUNDRED GUESTS PROMINENT IN GOVERNMENT AND JOURNALISM ATTEND PRESENTATION DINNER—DANIEL L. SCHORR, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR CORRESPONDENT, WINS FIRST ANNUAL AWARD

At a reception and dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on November 2 the first annual William the Silent Award for Journalism was presented to Daniel L. Schorr, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. Four hundred guests prominent in journalism, education, and government witnessed the presentation of a gold medal and $2,500 in cash by Albert Balink, chairman of the award committee, to Erwin Canham, editor of the Monitor, who accepted the prize for Mr. Schorr, who is now in Amsterdam.

The award was given to Mr. Schorr for having written, in the opinion of the judges, the best article published in an American newspaper or magazine during 1949 on United States-Netherlands relations.

His article was a simple story of the reciprocation of a small Netherlands town to a town in Arkansas when it was struck by a tornado in January 1949. The town was Borculo, Holland, which in 1925 had suffered a similar catastrophe, and the American people contributed to the rebuilding of the town. Mr. Schorr's article told how the whole town of Borculo devoted all its limited resources toward the restoration of the grassroots American town.

The national committee for the award consisted of John C. L. Andreassen, Director of Administration of the Library of Congress; Herman B. Baruch, former United States Ambassador to the Netherlands; Elliott V. Bell, publisher of Business Week; Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; George T. Cameron, president of the San Francisco Chronicle; Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; Fred S. Ferguson, president of N. E. A. Service, Inc.; Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post; Julius Klein, brigadier general, United States Army; John S. Knight, publisher of the Chicago Daily News; James A. Linen, publisher of Time; Henry R. Luce, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune; E. B. MacNaughton, president of the Portland Oregonian; J. Howard McGrath, United States Attorney General; Curtis McGraw, president of McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; Eugene Meyer, president of the Washington Post; Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador to the United States; Walker Stone, editor of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance; Theodore C. Streibert, president of radio station WOR; Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan-American World Airways System; and Alan Valentine, Economic Stabilization Administrator.

Judges of the competition were Peter Edson, president of Overseas Writers; Radford E. Mobley, president of the National Press Club; Thomas L. Stokes, president of the Gridiron Club; and Esther Van Wagoner Tufty, Washington correspondent. Members of the executive committee were Albert Balink, chairman; J. A. de Lanoy; Jan Hoven; and J. T. Pianje.

Chairman of the evening was Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, who introduced the other speakers. Mr. Balink addressed the gathering in his capacity as chairman of the executive committee. Following is the text of his remarks:

"We are gathered here in tribute to 14 American newspaper reporters who died in an airplane crash in Bombay, India, on July 12, 1949, on their return home from an assignment in Indonesia, which cut short their productive lives. These reporters went half way around the world seeking the truth in a complicated, explosive situation, from which emerged the new country of Indonesia. From the typewriters of these American newspapermen came neither the so-called 'Dutch' side nor the 'Indonesian side.' They only wrote the truth as they saw it. The people of the Netherlands understood and respected that.

"When the news of the death of these Americans reached Holland, the Dutch people were plunged into sorrow. The Honorable Dr. Herman Baruch, at that time the American Ambassador to the Netherlands, will tell you personally how the Dutch people took these Americans to their hearts.

"So that we may never forget them, and so that we may also honor the colleagues of these American newspapermen who are carrying on their work, the Netherlands people have established an annual award, to be called the 'William the Silent Award.' This award will be given to some member of the American working press for excellence in writing Netherlands-connected stories.

"In selecting the name 'William the Silent' the people of the Netherlands, who spontaneously made the award possible, reflect their grateful respect upon the 14 correspondents and the tradition of American journalism they represented. William the Silent was the kind of personality any newspaper writer would like to cover. He was the father of his country. He was to the seven provinces of the Netherlands what Washington is to the United States. He also might be called a 'Dutch' Thomas Jefferson. Born 400 years ago, William the Silent grew up in the perilous days of feudalism. Democracy was an unestablished ideal. But William the Silent believed in the democratic way of life, whether he called it that or not. Born a prince, he defied those of the ruling class who usurped unfair privileges. In the Netherlands history books he is quoted as saying: 'When a prince violates the peoples' right and tramples their liberties as if they are slaves, then he is not a prince but a tyrant.'

"Towering far above the times he lived, William the Silent was one of the first and one of the most valorous leaders in modern times who led the march toward the democratic way of life. He was intolerant of just one thing—intolerance. He gave all his wealth and all his inherited lands to the struggle for liberation of his country and, in a broader sense, to the cause of freedom of worship. As a result of his fight, Holland in subsequent years became the proverbial haven for the persecuted peoples of all Europe, whether they fled to this palladium of freedom because of religious or racial suppression.

"History also proclaims William the Silent as a brilliant conversationalist, and one of the most outspoken men of his time, although he was called 'William the Silent.' Some reporter of that time probably called him that because he kept his public speeches short and his secrets were kept secret. With silent strength he fought dictatorship and brought to his country freedom of worship and speech at a time of caste and prejudice. No wonder the people of Holland drafted him to be their king. Symbolically, he refused to wear a crown. So the people of Holland today put the name of their most beloved and revered national heroes upon the award honoring the American press.

"In honoring those 14 people, they aim to honor the idea of freedom of the press. Also, they humbly hope it may help two friendly countries become more friendly through a deeper mutual understanding. That's why the $2,500 annual award is to be given 'to encourage recognition of democratic kinship between the Netherlands and the United States of America.'

"The Netherlands Government, I want to make it clear, although warmly approving of this tribute, has not been asked to contribute. The sponsorship of the William the Silent Award for Journalism comes entirely from private sources—from the people of the Netherlands themselves. Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, signers of our Declaration of Independence, credited the Netherlands with holding the torch for what became the Republic of the United States. William the Silent first held that torch. The two countries have been friends ever since. They have helped each other. The Netherlands was the first to grant a loan to the fledgling Republic. The Netherlands was the first to salute the American flag. In more recent times, the two countries have fought on the same side in world struggles for freedom * * * and have worked together through the aftermath of rebuilding.

"We are honored tonight by the presence of many distinguished members of the American press who carry on the work of the men we commemorate today. We are honored tonight by the presence of many distinguished members of the Netherlands press whose reports about America to the people of the Netherlands account greatly for the admiration the Dutch people have for the people of the United States. We are honored tonight to have with us distinguished members of both Governments. We are honored to have in our midst almost all the distinguished members of the Netherlands delegation to the United Nations. We are honored tonight to have with us many distinguished leaders in business who keep going the machinery and the economy of the democratic countries.

"But all of us, as we are gathered here, whatever the exaltation or modesty of our way of life, we belong to the people. As such we are all vitally interested in the truth. Indeed, there is no one among us whose happiness does not depend on the truth. These correspondents knew it. And the newspapermen who are carrying on their work know it. They do not merely have a job. They are men dedicated to truth. They serve truth, for truth is democracy's strongest atom bomb. This constitutes a very good reason for the establishment of this journalism award. But there is another compelling reason.

"The pyramid of world peace is built by individual nations firmly working together. They build peace with the cement of truth. It is therefore, the belief of the Dutch founders of this living memorial, that there is nothing limited, that there is nothing provincial in the outspoken friendship between two democratic nations. In associating themselves with the William the Silent Award (this living memorial dedicated to truth), they are strengthening the lofty structure of the United Nations.

"The President of the United States said: 'There could be no more suitable memorial to the newspapermen who so tragically lost their lives than (the William the Silent Award) this splendid contribution to the better understanding among the peoples of the world.'

"And now in tribute may I ask you to rise while I read the names of those we honor today: Nathaniel H. Barrows, Chicago Daily News; James H. Branyan, Houston Post; Frederick W. Colvig, Denver Post; Elsie B. Dick, Mutual Broadcasting Co.; Thomas A. Falco, Business Week; Charles Edward Gratke, Christian Science Monitor; S. Burton Heath, Newspaper Enterprise Association; Bertram D. Hulen, the New York Times; H. R. Knickerbocker, radio station WOR, New York; Lynn C. Mahan, vice president, Theodore Swanson & Co.: Vincent Mahoney,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

San Francisco Chronicle; George L. Moorad, Portland Oregonian; William R. Newton, Scripps-Howard newspapers; John G. Werkley, Time, Inc."

The 400 guests while standing, listened to the roll call of the correspondents in a silent and solemn tribute.

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR VAN ROIJEN

Following Mr. Balink's address, Dr. Gideonse introduced Dr. J. H. van Roijen. Following is part of Dr. van Roijen's speech:

"The Prime Minister of the Netherlands, Dr. Drees, some months ago sent a message of encouragement and appreciation to the William the Silent Award Committee. The Netherlands Minister of Education recently announced that the designing of a medal had been decided on by the Government as a means of expressing their sympathy with and appreciation for the establishment of the award. I consider it a privilege to be here tonight, as the representative of and spokesman for that Government and to be able to add my personal tribute to theirs. The original idea of establishing the William the Silent Award was born in the minds of one or two private individuals and the funds necessary to finance the prize in this year and the coming years were donated by private persons and groups. To state this is not to reveal a secret, this fact is known and has been published before. I mention it again, however, to call special attention to what in my opinion is a very important aspect of this award and its background.

"It is fair to say that it is the Netherlands people who through some of their citizens have undertaken clearly to show that they wish to promote an ever growing consciousness of the democratic affinity between the United States and the Netherlands and that they consider the press to be one of the most effective media to achieve this end. * * *

"It is not only through governments * * * that foreign relations between nations are maintained, strengthened or weakened. There are many other media for affecting the relations between peoples. I am thinking of international conferences of scientists and experts in many fields, of exchange of professors and students, of visits of tourists, of the conduct of armed forces of occupation or of liberation, of literature and newspapers * * *. In all this, honest information is required and even essential. The press is one of the most effective means of disseminating collective information. And the press means the journalist.

"We are not here tonight however to think only about peoples and their relations. The William the Silent Award has been established to encourage journalists and authors to bring about better appreciation of the democratic affinity between our two countries. The generous donors of the award apparently assume that this affinity exists.

"I believe they are right.

"We have the testimony of American GI's who took part in the liberation of Holland. We also know, that Dutch immigrants in this country in almost all cases adapt themselves quickly and make happy and successful citizens. The affinity however goes deeper than the level of behavior and of getting along well with each other. It shows itself in a similar concept of government and nation * * *.

"The affinity between our two nations * * * is probably shown best in their conception and vindication of the right of a people to national independence even by revolution, as laid down in our Abjuration of the King of Spain in 1581 and in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776. It is a debatable point whether the text of abjuration by the States General of the United Netherlands was or was not actually used 200 years later by Thomas Jefferson when he drafted the Declaration of Independence, an interesting question for historians. However this may be, the similarity in the considerations and even in the wording of the two documents is very striking. This last example of our affinity leads me to say a few words about the man who must be considered as the founder of the Netherlands as a tate and who bore the name, given to the award which has brought us here together tonight.

"William the Silent, Prince of Orange, was the leader of the Dutch people in their struggle for independence. In that struggle he was called upon to sacrifice his son, his personal fortune, and, finally, his very life. William was also the man who gave first expression to the right, the duty even, of a people to depose a king if the king does not govern them according to justice and does not love and support them as a father his children or a shepherd his flock * * * but on the contrary oppresses them * * * exacting from them slavish compliance * * * particularly when this is done deliberately. It is apparent to all that a prince is constituted by God to be ruler of a people, to defend them from oppression and violence, as the shepherd of his sheep. This is what the law of nature dictates for the defense of liberty.

"These quotations are taken from the Dutch Abjuration. The climate of thinking and the basic principle shows a striking similarity to those laid down in the Declaration of Independence: 'All men created equal * * * endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men * * * that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government * * * it is their duty to provide new guards for their future security.'

"The words of the Abjuration of King Philip of Spain were not written by William the Silent, but by the States General of the Netherlands. They were, however, inspired by him and followed by only 7 months the publication of William's 'Apology.' In this remarkable document, read before the States General on December 13, 1580, the Prince of Orange explained why he had accepted to lead the Dutch nation in its struggle against the King of Spain. King Philip incidentally had just drawn up a ban against him (March 15, 1580), proclaiming him an outlaw and the chief disturber of the whole state of Christendom, forbidding all his subjects to communicate with him openly or privately, to administer to him victuals, drink, fire or other necessaries and allowing all to injure him in property or life. As a refutation of the statements and implications of this ban, William of Orange wrote his 'Apology,' renunciating openly Philip's sovereignty. The document was laid by him before the States General with an accompanying letter, in which he wrote: 'Je vous reconnais seuls en ce monde pour mes supérieurs.' With good reason it is said by the award committee that William the Silent was an exemplar of democratic ideals 400 years ago and that he first held the torch in the Netherlands for what later became the Republic of the United States.

"Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have perhaps dwelt too long on some phases in the history of our two peoples. A few words on the present time and on our world of today. A bronze plate is set in the wall of the main corridor of the Jay H. Neff Hall, one of the buildings of the University of Missouri, and the home of the oldest school of journalism in the United States. The bronze plate carries a description of what is considered as essential in a good journal and in a good journalist by Walter Williams, the first dean of that school. He called it: 'The Journalist's Creed.' This creed contains a few statements from which I quote the following two. First: 'I believe that a journalist should write only what he holds in his heart to be true,' and further: 'I believe that the journalism which succeeds best—and best deserves success * * * is profoundly patriotic while sincerely promoting international good will and cementing world comradeship.'

"Better understanding among peoples is needed now more urgently than ever. The truly ambitious and far-reaching plans and treaties with their almost global implications, which the Governments of the great and smaller nations have concluded and are in the process of implementing, can achieve the underlying purpose of peace and prosperity only when understood and supported by their peoples. Knowledge and correct information must precede understanding. The press is an indispensable channel to bring full information, not only on domestic matters but in no smaller degree on international issues. Here lies the responsibility of the newspaper and of the individual journalist.

"When on July 12, 1949, the 14 American reporters so tragically crashed near Bombay they were returning from a fact-finding tour, during which they had reported and intended to continue to report only what they held in their hearts to be true. The subject happened in this case to be Indonesia, but they would with the same honesty have reported on situations in any other part of the world. It is a fact that they all had been living up to the standards laid down in Dean Williams' credo: * * * 'I believe that the journalism which succeeds best—and best deserves success—is profoundly patriotic while sincerely promoting international good will and cementing world comradeship.'

"Wholeheartedly do I join those who have paid tribute to those 14 men and women.

"Finally, in stressing once more my deep appreciation for the establishment of the William the Silent Award for journalistic work on the Netherlands and the United States, I wish to express my profound conviction that bringing about a better insight into the democratic affinity between our two countries is to be looked upon as an aspect—be it to one of the highest importance—of the urgently needed strengthening of ties between all the members of the greater family of nations. In other words, as the President of the United States has written in his letter of July 11, 1950: 'The donors of the award have made a contribution to a better understanding among the peoples of the world.'

"The 14 American journalists cannot be better honored than by continued reporting on world affairs by others according to the standards formulated by Dean Williams and applied and lived up to so fully by those 14 men and women themselves."

Dr. Herman Baruch, former United States Ambassador to the Netherlands, who was accompanied at the dinner by Mrs. Baruch, in a moving speech described how the people of the Netherlands had taken the American correspondents to their hearts. He paid glowing tribute to the deep-rooted friendship between the United States and the Netherlands.

Announcement of the award winner was made by Mr. Truman Felt, chairman of the board of the National Press Club, on behalf of the committee of judges. Presentation of the award was made by Mr. Balink, and it was accepted by Mr. Canham for the absent winner. Mr. Truman Felt said that Americans were particularly impressed by the fact that the Dutch people had insisted that the award winner should be selected by a committee of American judges.

Present on the dais during the dinner, in addition to Mr. Andreassen, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Streibert, Mr. Ferguson, Dr. Baruch, Mr. Canham, Dr. van Roijen, Mr. Balink, Dr. Gideonse, Mr. McGraw, Mrs. Tufty, Mr. Felt, General Klein, and Mr. Planje, were Larry Laybourne of Time; William Ucker of the United States State Department; Mrs. Helen

Rogers Reid, president of the New York Herald Tribune; Jack Lockhart, assistant general manager of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance; Turner Catledge, assistant managing editor of the New York Times; and Kenneth Kramer, executive editor of McGraw-Hill publications.

AMERICANS APPLAUD AWARD

Numerous letters and telegrams of congratulations from persons prominent in Government, journalism, education, and business were received by the executive committee of the William the Silent Award for Journalism.

President Truman wrote:

"I am indeed happy to take note of the gracious gesture which the people of the Netherlands are making through establishment of the William the Silent Award, in memory of the 14 distinguished American correspondents who were killed in a plane crash while returning from Indonesia a year ago. In terms of money the award is most generous, but even more impressive is the spirit which prompted it. There could be no more suitable memorial to the newspapermen who so tragically lost their lives than this splendid contribution to a better understanding among the peoples of the world."

Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall wired:

"I regret exceedingly that pressure of duties precludes my joining you in honoring the free press of America through the William the Silent Award. The people of the Netherlands in sponsoring the award in memory of newspapermen who lost their lives while returning from assignments in Indonesia are making a valuable contribution to freedom of the press and to understanding and peace among the people of the world."

From the White House, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, wired:

"This occasion is an extraordinary one. It is a reminder of the ties which unite Holland and the United States—ties which go back to the early days of this country when Dutch settlers brought with them a spirit of tolerance, a spirit of democracy, and a spirit of freedom that left a deep imprint on our American culture and our American heritage. It is a reminder, too, of the part which William the Silent played in the creation of these conceptions as we know them today. In these troublesome days we have rediscovered their true meaning and have united to defend them, for the great struggle of our times centers around these ideals.

"From those early days to the present, the people of Holland and of the United States have had close and friendly relations, based on mutual respect and a common attachment to these cardinal principles.

"The decision of the people of Holland to establish this award on behalf of the American press is not only an act of generosity and friendship, but an act of wisdom and insight. For in this struggle of ideas, a free press plays a major part and the men and women of the press have a special responsibility to inform, to explain, and to educate, so that our faith in these conceptions will remain strong and our determination to defend them firm.

"This simple act of establishing the William the Silent Award is an act of deep significance. It is a reminder of the past and an inspiration to the present. We are deeply grateful to the people."

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath said in a telegram:

"I heartily join with you in honoring at the William the Silent Award for Journalism dinner, the American correspondents who lost their lives in the search for truth."

Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, sent the following communication:

"One of the greatest contributions that can be made in the interests of peace and the spreading of democratic ideals throughout the world must come from the printed word with the peoples of all nations being informed factually and accurately of current events.

"This grave responsibility rests on the shoulders of the courageous and aggressive members of the fourth estate who, since the beginning of our great country, have been the molders of public opinion in helping to shape the destiny and future of our democracy.

"The tragic accident near Bombay more than a year ago removed from this earth 14 renowned American journalists who linger in our memories as twentieth-century pioneers in spreading the gospel of freedom and democracy on a global basis.

"As we pay tribute to their memory and the great ideals they represented in their lifetime, we also hail the accomplishments of the present in bringing to the attention of all the achievements of an outstanding American journalist who has pointed up his writings with the shining light of democracy and the spirit of all for one, and one for all.

"On such a momentous occasion we pay deserved honor to a member of that great body of men and women, often unsung and anonymous in their great endeavors, who have contributed so much to what has become known throughout the civilized world as the American way of life. May your great work continue to go forward with unlimited success in cherishing the heritage of freedom of the press and expression handed down to you over the years."

Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, wrote:

"The William the Silent Award, in the years to come, can be an important influence for peace. Peace rests on understanding among peoples, and the foundation of understanding is truth.

"American journalism has strong roots in the free traditions of the Netherlands. History is evidence that the press of both of our countries has shown great courage on behalf of the truth in times of wars and oppressions, when the penalties for reporting the truth were imprisonment and sometimes death.

"The first William the Silent Award strengthens courageous journalism dedicated to the truth, at a time when truth itself is under ceaseless attack throughout the world. The newspapermen whose tragic death promoted the creation of this award (some of whom I knew personally) would rejoice in such a memorial."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey wired:

"It is a wonderful thing the people of the Netherlands have done in establishing this award to commemorate the 14 American correspondents who were killed in an airplane crash near Bombay on July 12, 1949. Two of these reporters, Burt Heath and Fred Colvig, were personal friends of mine, and I want to join with you in paying tribute to their memory and to the others who died in that tragic accident. Won't you also please extend my very best wishes to the winner of the award."

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN wrote as follows:

"I applaud the double purpose of the William the Silent Award to pay homage to the memory of 14 distinguished American writers and to assert our traditional friendship for the Netherlands.

"Men in public life, particularly at election time, may be suspected of other than pure objectivity when they undertake to speak in a complimentary vein about the 'fourth estate.' However, I feel I must say, with pride, that we in this country possess the best informed press in the world. Its development has paralleled the growth of our industrial power. Our papers, press services and periodicals send their correspondents to every corner of the world, risking the dangers that are the lot of all missionaries.

"The 14 American correspondents whose memory you are honoring lost their lives in a plane crash after returning from a survey of Indonesia, sponsored by the Government of the Netherlands. The establishment of an annual prize for journalistic achievement is not only a most generous homage to their memories but also a most friendly gesture to our country.

"We need no special occasions, such as this, for reasserting the historic ties of devotion that bind us to the Dutch people. As Senator and former Governor of this first State settled by the Dutch, I would paraphrase a compliment once paid by the great French writer Voltaire to a nation friendly to France: each New Yorker has two loves in his heart, one for his own land and one for the Netherlands.

"The whole Empire State is dotted with geographic reminders of the influence of the Dutch in this region. Many of you will not be surprised when I say that if the Dutch had done nothing more than contribute the name of Roosevelt to the American scene, that would have been a sufficient achievement.

"I am sure this first award will be only the forerunner of a long line of distinguished ones."

Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, wired:

"Congratulations on establishment of William the Silent Award for Journalism. It should further strengthen the bonds of friendship between the American people and those in the Netherlands and enhance the journalism profession."

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, said:

"It is very fine of the people of the Netherlands to establish the William the Silent Award for the best article by an American journalist."

Dwight Young, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, wrote:

"I wish to commend the spirit and the thinking back of this unique undertaking. I quite agree with Mr. Truman in the opinion that the establishment of this award can be a splendid contribution to a better understanding among the peoples of the world. One of the hopeful signs today is the number of efforts in various fields of activity to bring about a better understanding between peoples and peoples."

Edwin S. Friendly, president of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, sent the following message:

"It seems to me most fitting that the people of the Netherlands, who, like ourselves, have long been lovers of freedom and who have been willing to sacrifice in order that their freedom might be retained, should establish an award for American journalism, which has also fought for its own freedom and the freedom of the peoples which it serves.

"This award, established in memory of those 14 American correspondents killed in a plane crash near Bombay on July 12, 1949, is a splendid tribute to American journalism, and in itself should do much to bring about a better appreciation of the democratic affinity between two great peoples, who believe in and have fought for their freedom."

Curtis W. McGraw, president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., wrote:

"As you must know, we of McGraw-Hill are deeply and particularly touched by the action of the people of the Netherlands in establishing, on your initiative, the William the Silent Award in memory of the 14 American correspondents who were killed in the line of duty while returning from Indonesia just over a year ago. We look upon it as helping to keep alive the spirit of our own Tom Falco who went down in that plane crash near Bombay.

"It seems to me highly fitting that the award should take the form of an annual prize for the best article or series of articles by an American writer in an American newspaper or magazine aimed at bringing about

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a better appreciation of the democratic affinity between the Netherlands and the United States. I know that Tom Falco and his companions must have hoped that the assignment on which they died would contribute to a better understanding of what the people of both countries could do together to keep their common democratic objectives clear in meeting the test of history in Southeast Asia."

Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, wired this message:

"The presentation of the first William the Silent Award for distinguished service in journalism to further understanding between two great nations, the Netherlands and the United States, is an important occasion. In these days of trial and fear, international understanding is the greatest single good that can come between nations. It is so essential and so hard to promote that many of us have thrown up our hands in despair from time to time. I know this award is being given for a really great contribution to human freedom and enlightenment. I know that that is what the newspaper men and women to whom this award is dedicated would have wanted. Fred Colvig would have wanted that, and I am sure he and the others are here with you in spirit tonight."

JACOB K. JAVITS, Member of Congress from the State of New York, wired:

"Congratulations and best wishes to the award winner. * * * Kindest regards."

Dr. Willem Drees, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, cabled:

"My congratulations for the first winner of the William the Silent Award. His work and that of his colleagues who have the task to interpret the Netherlands to the American public is considered here as an important contribution toward the strengthening of the existing ties between the two countries."

John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, sent this communication:

"I join most heartily in this salute to the winner of the William the Silent Award, an honor to the recipient, a recognition of the warm friendship between the Netherlands and the United States and a lasting tribute to the group of fine correspondents who died in the tragic airplane accident in India. By means of this award, they will live on ever more vividly in our memories. I add my thanks also to those warm-hearted people of the Netherlands who have made possible the award and this notable occasion. I know that Mr. Barrows, whose loss we continue to feel, would give his enthusiastic approval to the award. May it gather luster with the years."

[Schorr's prize-winning article]

PEOPLE OF LITTLE BORCULO RALLY TO AID ARKANSAS—NETHERLANDERS BUILD FURNITURE FOR WARREN TOWN HALL

(By Daniel L. Schorr)

BORCULO, THE NETHERLANDS.—Two tornadoes—23 years and 3,500 miles apart—have united the peoples of Borculo and Warren, Ark., in a spontaneous gesture that provides the man-bites-dog story of the winter.

The 6,200 of this town and surrounding villages are working like beavers, selling baked delicacies and holding benefit meetings, to finance the building of furniture intended for a recreation room in Warren's new town hall.

Not one of the inhabitants, most of them farmers, ever has been in the United States or knows exactly what sort of town Warren is. Few even know its location, because they haven't been able to find it on their maps of the United States. But that doesn't matter.

They only know that the strange, far-off town suffered a disaster like the one they remember so well. They know just how these Arkansas people must feel. They remember the aid that came to them from American organizations in 1925. They know how much the United States helped their country during and after the war. So they want to help, insofar as they are able.

These are simple people, these residents of Borculo in the "Achterhoek" (back corner) of Gelderland Province, in eastern Holland, only 10 miles from the German border. Few of them have the organizing ability to conceive the scheme or the eloquence to explain it. It was worked out by the burgomaster and a committee of communal leaders, but the people responded with enthusiasm.

HOW IT ALL BEGAN

And not even the local intellectuals know just how it will work out.

They have gotten as far as arranging that their two furniture factories will build caneseat oaken chairs and a table, with the coat of arms of Borculo carved into them. The local parchment factory will fashion a lamp. All this will be done by the factories at cost. How the furniture will be transported to Warren they do not yet know, nor how the presentation will be made.

Here is how it all began:

Borculo is unique for having suffered a tornado, on August 10, 1925, in an area where such storms are rare. The disaster of Borculo is still a byword in this country. It was a freak storm in that it struck only at this town, stopping almost at the city limits and leaving every other populated place unscathed.

REBUILT WITH UNITED STATES AID

Within a year and a half, Borculo was rebuilt, with the aid of a Nation-wide collection and gifts from the United States. Its furniture plants and its parchment factory—believed to be the only one in Western Europe—were restored to operation.

Because the Borculo catastrophe is remembered so well by the Dutch, it seemed natural that when Warren was hit by a tornado, Willem Cnoop-Koopmans, Netherlands consul general in New York, wrote his friend, Burgomaster Paul Drost, telling him about it, as a matter of interest.

Burgomaster Drost reacted promptly. He sent a cable to Mayor Jim Hurley, of Warren, on January 7, saying "Sincere sympathy of town of Borculo in Holland with tornado Warren. Struck by cyclone in 1925, ourselves realize this disaster so much the more. May Warren soon rise from this as Borculo at that time, for which our best wishes."

Mayor Hurley replied, "Your message was very much appreciated and we are confident that our city will recover from this disaster shortly."

The spare-haired Burgomaster Drost thought the matter over further and decided sympathy wasn't enough. He called together Protestant pastors and the Roman Catholic priest, factory managers, trade-union representatives, farmers, and the Union of Women Volunteers to decide what to do next.

WOMEN PITCH IN

The idea of sending food was ruled out as impractical. Agreement was quickly reached that whatever was sent should be made by Borculo hands. Finally the furniture plan was formulated.

To open the drive the town crier went through the streets shouting the news of the Warren disaster.

Then the women went to work baking local specialties like bolussen (cookies) and oliebollen (doughnuts). The oil was contributed by an oil factory, butter by local farmers, raisins by someone who had a supply of them. The women volunteers pitched in and started baking.

Working in 6-hour shifts all through one Saturday, the women baked 8,000 oliebollen and hundreds of bolussen. It took 5 hours just to knead the dough.

Interest in the sales campaign was literally drummed up. The parchment factory contributed a drum, and a drummer beat this as he accompanied the volunteer saleswomen from house to house.

ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAM

The next step was to organize a series of entertainments—one in Borculo and one each in the three adjoining villages. Oliebollen and bolussen were also sold there, with special kosher delicacies for the 41 Jewish inhabitants of the town. The admission charge was 25 cents (about 10 cents United States).

The program bore the slogan "Borculo Helps Warren," and included all that local talent could offer in the way of folk dances, a gymnastic performance, choirs, a demonstration by Boy Scouts, the accordion society, and comedy. The local band was asked to open the proceedings by playing the Dutch anthem, Wilhelmus, followed by The Star Spangled Banner. The score of the American anthem was not available on such short notice.

The band leader found some copies of Sousa's Stars and Stripes Forever, which was substituted, with no appreciable damage to the spirit of the occasion.

The programs for the occasion were provided gratis by the local printer and were sold for the benefit of the Warren fund. They bore the slogan, "Minimum price: 10 cents; maximum price: wide open."

The series of four entertainments, attended by 1,400 persons, brought the Warren kitty up to 2,100 guilders, and this was still not enough.

"We are considering what to do next," said Burgomaster Drost. "If necessary we will hold a house-to-house collection. But first we will confer with the furniture manufacturers and find out how much is needed. We want furniture that will be comfortable but typical of what is produced in the Achterhoek. We don't know how it will be transported. We have not yet even been in contact with Warren to find out the size of the room in which it will be placed. As a matter of fact, we haven't yet officially informed Warren that we are sending anything."

BURGOMASTER EXPLAINS

Among those to whom I spoke, the burgomaster was clearest as to why the move had been made for a gift to Warren.

"We have always received from America," he said. "Holland has received, and specifically the town of Borculo. We received American help after our tornado. We received packages from America after the war. And then there was the Marshall plan. Now we want to send something back. We know that we really can't do much for Warren, but we can make a gesture."

Less articulate, but no less enthusiastic were some of the townsmen.

Jan Arend Kolkman, a venerable farmer, whose family has lived in this area since the sixteenth century, was puzzled by my question when I visited the farmhouse, where his family shares quarters with the livestock under the same roof.

DOT ON A MAP, BUT—

He showed a toothless grin and scratched his head when asked about Warren, and in the explosive Gelderland dialect he said, simply, "They must be having a hard time over there in America after that big storm. Glad to help if I can. And the dances the other evening were pretty good."

Unexpected American cooperation for the committee came in the form of Mrs. Albertina de Schepper, a native of nearby Lochem, who immigrated to the United States 14 years ago and now lives at Ketchum, Idaho. Mrs. de Schepper had been visiting at Lochem when she heard about the Borculo Drive, and now she is spending most of her time here helping with the sale of cookies.

Mrs. de Schepper served another useful function. She was able to tell the townsmen something about the United States and what Arkansas is like. She even managed to dig up a map that showed Warren, a little spot south of Little Rock.

And now, as the town gets ready to fashion table and chairs for the far-off American town, the inhabitants have as their inspiration a dot on a map—and the remembrance of how Americans helped when they suffered their tornado 23 years ago.

The late Charles Ross wrote:

"I think this award represents a very fine gesture on the part of the people of the Netherlands. President Truman made no overstatement when he described it as 'a splendid contribution to a better understanding among the peoples of the world.'

"Very sincerely yours,

"CHARLES G. ROSS,
"Secretary to the President."

Hon. Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, wrote:

"Your organization is making a great contribution to the free-press traditions between two countries and is thus spreading freedom of press and the access to news throughout the world. I sincerely hope that this year's ceremony is successful in every possible way.

"Sincerely,

"CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
"Secretary."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take the time now to discuss the other material, because I do not think it would be fair to those who are awaiting to deliver major speeches to take even the 3 or 4 minutes necessary for an explanatory statement of material that I seek only to have inserted in the RECORD. When I get the floor later this afternoon, I shall do that, as a preface to a major speech I wish to make on another subject matter. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for permitting me to take the necessary time to introduce into the RECORD the material on the William the Silent Award.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. There appear to be no further routine matters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the distinguished majority leader wanted to request the confirmation of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar at this time, and we desire to cooperate with him in so doing, if it may be done without interfering with other matters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is one nomination on the Executive Calendar which it is very important that the Senate confirm because of the situation which exists in the Civil Aeronautics Board. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, consider the Executive Calendar at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph P. Adams, of Washington, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the President will be immediately notified.

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL BROADCASTING AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, Eighty-second Congress, first session, the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the final protocol thereto, which were signed in the English, Spanish, and French languages at Washington on November 15, 1950. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement and protocol, and the agreement and protocol, together with the Presidents message of transmittal will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the texts, as certified by the Government of Canada, of the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the Final Protocol thereto, which were signed in the English, Spanish, and French languages at Washington on November 15, 1950, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the Territories in the North American Region (Bahamas and Jamaica), Canada, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the instruments above-mentioned. For the reasons indicated in that report and in the memorandum enclosed therewith, I urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement, with the Final Protocol thereto.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 5, 1951.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Secretary of State, with enclosure; (2) North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement, signed at Washington, November 15, 1950.)

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Massachusetts desirous of being recognized to make an address?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make an address not to exceed 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that inasmuch as the unfinished business is the amendment of the Reorganization Act of 1949, the Chair should recognize the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that Senate bill 101 is now the unfinished business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was taken up last Thursday and is now the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, two or three Senators wish to make brief addresses. I have no objection to their proceeding. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the bill whenever the Senate is ready to consider it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair felt that the Senator from Arkansas was entitled to some preference, due to the fact that he is in charge of the bill. If he does not care to claim his privilege at this time, that is all right.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR BURIAL OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF MILITARY FORCES OF COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas that I call up Calendar 79, Senate bill 82, and to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business in order to consider that bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection, if it can be disposed of within a reasonable time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the Chair has recognized the Senator from Arkansas as having the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Senator from Arkansas was not anxious to obtain the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if he would permit me to call up the bill to which I have referred, which I think will lead to no debate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the consideration of which the Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 82) to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 82), to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish a flag to drape the casket and to pay a sum not exceeding 150 Philippine pesos for the burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body (including preparation of the body) of any person who served in the organized military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who dies, or has died, after separation from such service under conditions other than dishonorable. Payments under this act shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, except that in case any such person has died heretofore, the time for filing claim for reimbursement of such expenses shall be extended until 2 years after the date of this enactment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy extended by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the report of the Committee on Finance with reference to the bill. It is very brief. It invites special attention to the fact that an identical bill was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

There being no objection, the report (No. 74) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 82) to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under the terms of this proposal, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish a flag to drape the casket and to pay a sum not exceeding 150 Philippine pesos ($75) for the burial and funeral expenses of any person who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941. Included in such forces would be those who served in organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or recognized by the commander in chief of the Southwest Pacific area or other competent authority in the United States Army during World War II. A separation from the service under conditions other than dishonorable would be a prerequisite for benefits under this proposal. Payments would be made subject to the applicable provisions of Veterans' Regulation 9 (a), but the time limit of 2 years from death for filing of claims is extended with respect to those persons who died heretofore to 2 years after the enactment of this legislation.

Although the committee's action was on the bill S. 82, it is noted that an identical measure, S. 377, was sponsored by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York. This type of legislation and the proposal generally follows the recommendation of the President on this subject made to the Congress in July 1947.

It is estimated that the maximum ultimate cost of this bill would be approximately $26,430,000. No firm estimate can be provided as to first-year cost.

The Veterans' Administration report on an identical bill (H. R. 8576, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) is as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1950.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: This is in reply to your letter of August 7, 1950, requesting a report by the Veterans' Administration on H. R. 8576, Eighty-first Congress, a bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941.

The general purpose of the bill is indicated in the above-quoted title. The bill provides as follows:

"That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to furnish a flag to drape the casket and to pay a sum not exceeding 150 Philippine pesos for the burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body (including preparation of the body) of any person who served in the organized military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the commander in chief, Southwest Pacific area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who dies, or has died, after separation from such service under conditions other than dishonorable. Payments under this act shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, except that in case any such person has died heretofore, the time for filing claim for reimbursement of such expenses shall be extended until 2 years after the date of this enactment."

Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, which would be applicable to payments under the bill, authorizes burial benefits for eligible veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States and provides that claims for reimbursement must be filed within 2 years subsequent to the date of burial of the veteran. In the event the claimant's application is not complete at the time of original submission the Veterans' Administration advises the claimant of the evidence necessary to complete the application, and if such evidence is not received within 1 year from the date of the request therefor no allowance may be paid. With respect to persons who have died prior to the enactment of the bill, it is provided therein that the time for filing claim for reimbursement shall be extended until 2 years after the date of enactment.

Under the provisions of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946), eligibility for benefits under our laws predicated on active military or naval service was taken from Philippine Army veterans who served pursuant to the military order of July 26, 1941, except as to those providing compensation for service-connected disability or death (which are paid on the basis of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized), and benefits of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, under contracts entered into prior to February 18, 1946. The Rescission Act was amended by the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 241, 80th Cong.), so as to restore benefits under the Missing Persons Act, as amended, for such veterans. By a military order of the President, effective midnight June 30, 1946, the organized military forces of the Government of the Philippines were released from the service of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Upon approving the Rescission Act, the President voiced exception to the restrictive language therein with respect to Philippine Army veterans and requested that a study be undertaken. As a result of this study, remedial legislation (H. R. 6508 and S. 2235) was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. S. 2235 was passed by the Senate but was not enacted prior to the adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Thereafter, further study of the matter was made by an interdepartmental committee appointed by the President, consisting of the then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the United States Ambassador to the Philippines. In accordance with the recommendation of the interdepartmental committee, the President on July 1, 1947, transmitted to the Congress proposed legislation which was introduced as H. R. 4073, Eightieth Congress.

In addition to a provision similar to that contained in H. R. 8576, H. R. 4073 contained provisions for other benefits, including aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines for subsistence allowances and tuition incident to courses of institutional training pursued by eligible veterans in the Philippines, and grants for the construction and equipping of hospitals in that country for the medical care and treatment of eligible Philippine veterans and expenses incident to such care and treatment. The bill, as reported by the Committee on Veterans'

Affairs of the House of Representatives, retained only those provisions relative to hospitalization and medical treatment. However, this report (H. Rept. No. 2304) stated:

"There are other matters affecting veterans of this campaign which need attention, but the committee feels that adequate hospitalization is so necessary and pressing that it should receive immediate attention. The other matters will have to be delayed until more adequate study can be given them."

S. 2361, a bill similar to H. R. 4073, as reported, was passed by the Congress and became Public Law 865, Eightieth Congress, on July 1, 1948. That act authorizes the President to furnish financial aid to the Republic of the Philippines with respect to the medical care and treatment of the mentioned Philippine veterans in the form of grants for the construction and equipping of hospitals and also for expenses incidental to hospitalization. For the purpose of construction and equipping, the act provides that grants may not exceed $22,500,000 and for expenses incident to hospitalization a limitation of $3,285,000 for any fiscal year is provided for a period not to exceed 5 years. By letter dated August 16, 1948, the President delegated to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs his authority under Public Law 865 and requested that an agreement with respect to the authorized program be negotiated with the Philippine Government. A formal agreement was thereupon entered into on June 7, 1949, between the United States Ambassador and the President of the Philippines. Subsequently, regulations to implement the law and agreement were promulgated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with the approval of the President, effective October 18, 1949. Progress is being made with plans and details of the construction program as well as reimbursement procedure for interim hospitalization in available existing hospital beds.

As heretofore indicated, the matter of granting veterans' benefits to former members of the organized Philippine Army and recognized guerrillas has been the subject of numerous proposals in three different Congresses since the mentioned Rescission Act of 1946, and the extent to which certain benefits have been granted has been noted. The question of whether additional benefits, such as the burial allowance proposed by H. R. 8576 should be authorized, is one involving broad public policy and is believed to be primarily for determination by the Congress in the light of the various factors which have from time to time been brought to its attention.

In view of certain indeterminate factors, it is not possible to estimate accurately the first year's cost of the bill, if enacted. Based on the latest information available to the Veterans' Administration, and bearing in mind that deaths occurring during service would not be covered by the bill, it is estimated that approximately 13,500 claimants would be potentially eligible for the benefits as a result of deaths occurring to date. It further appears that there are approximately 315,000 living veterans of the Philippine Army, including recognized guerrillas. Assuming that proper claim for the benefit is made in each case, and assuming that the maximum expense is incurred, the maximum ultimate cost of providing flags would be approximately $1,800,000 and the maximum ultimate cost of the burial allowance would be 49,275,000 Philippine pesos. Under the current official rate of exchange the ratio of the peso to the dollar is approximately 2 to 1. With respect to the deaths occurring heretofore, it is probable that claim for the flag and for reimbursement of the burial expenses in each case will be made within the 2-year period of limitation provided by the bill.

Advice has not as yet been received from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this legislation to the program of the President. A supplemental letter on this matter will be furnished your comimttee when such information is received.

Sincerely yours,

O. W. CLARK,
Deputy Administrator, for and in the Absence of the Administrator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by me before the Finance Committee in support of Senate bill 82, which has just been passed, providing for reimbursement for the burial of certain members of the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR LEHMAN BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON PHILIPPINE BURIAL BILL

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to appear before your committee and to urge, with all the conviction at my command, the approval of the pending proposal to pay burial benefits to the beneficiaries of Filipinos who served in the Armed Forces of the United States as Regulars or as recognized guerrillas.

There are two bills pending before the committee which are, by no strange coincidence, exactly alike. I introduced a bill similar to this last year. The courteous and distinguished chairman of this committee saw fit this year, in his wisdom, to sponsor this proposal for which I am grateful. I also introduced mine. I am happy to support his bill.

I expect that the committee will receive in evidence testimony showing the moral, if not legal claim, which the Filipino veterans have for this benefit. I will not go into that in any detail. In my judgment, the Filipino veterans have moral backing for much more extensive benefits than those provided in the pending measure.

Some of the Filipinos who would be affected by this legislation were members of the United States Armed Forces of the Far East, by formal proclamation and Executive order of the President of the United States. They were as much a part of the Army of the United States as your sons and mine in the last war. They were mustered in under American command, and fought in American units on Luzon, on Bataan, and on Corregidor, and on many other battlefields which I cannot name or pronounce, up to the time of the surrender by General Wainwright in the spring of 1942. They were promised, but never got, the same pay scale and the same benefits to which continental American troops were entitled.

In addition to that group of Filipinos, there was another and larger group—the recognized guerrillas, of which heroism stories will be told as long as heroism is honored anywhere in the world. For three long years these men fought, in their units and even armies, harrying the Japanese, pinning them down in the Philippines and inflicting great casualties upon them, while also performing invaluable intelligence and espionage work for General MacArthur.

These men, in some instances under immediate American command, but in almost all cases, under the specific orders and directions of General MacArthur, then stationed in Australia, fought and functioned, under the American flag and in the American cause, during those dark years when the American flag had been officially hauled down in the Philippines, following the surrender.

These men paved the way for MacArthur's return to the Philippines, supplied the intelligence which made possible the liberation of the Philippines at the lowest cost in American lives of any major military operation in history, and joined the American liberation troops in a unified combat effort which overwhelmed the Japanese and redeemed the pride and glory of American arms in the Far East.

At that time, if my facts are correct, the official ruling was that these men were to be entitled to every benefit which American troops were getting. All during the time the fighting raged, the guerrillas and the other Filipinos who joined MacArthur's forces fought under the impression that they were to be entitled, among other things, to the benefits of the GI bill of rights.

There is on record an official ruling by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as late as October 1945, that the Filipinos were so entitled.

Of course Congress had the legal right—and exercised that right—to cut the Filipinos off from these benefits. The Congress did exactly that in 1946. It was not, in my judgment, a proper thing to do. The Congress might have diminished those rights somewhat, in the light of Philippine independence and in view of the fact that the Filipinos would not be contributing in taxes to these benefits. But Congress, I believe, was wrong to eliminate those benefits.

But that is all history. Now we face not a theory but a fact. It is too late to try to measure out exact justice in this matter. But Congress can and should do whatever is practicable and feasible, just as President Truman promised that he would recommend that Congress do. That recommendation was made in 1946, and President Truman, as I understand it, has been trying ever since to get Congress to rectify the injustice that was done.

Today there are reasons more pressing than ever before, for action in this matter. Today the Far East is again menaced by new tyrannies, new aggressive forces. Those forces are centered not only in Soviet Russia but in Red China. Those forces hold out false promises to the hundreds of millions of people in the Asiatic area. Those promises are heard throughout the Far East. They have convinced some of those people—less in the Philippines than anywhere else—but still there are some Communists in the Philippines.

The Philippines is the chief representative of western democracy in the Orient. It is the only country whose form of government is an exact prototype of our own.

We have given and are continuing to give considerable economic aid to the Philippines. We will be asked at this very session of Congress for more. It is a sound investment in peace, security, and democracy.

But here is a group of Filipinos who have a special claim on American consideration and American generosity. Here is a group who proved, beyond doubt or question, their devotion to democracy and to the United States. Here is a group who should be given every recognition and preference that the American Government can properly give to a group of nationals of another country. Here is a group with a moral claim. I believe we should honor that claim generously and immediately.

I think that the passage of this measure is in the interests of the United States, as well as of the individuals involved. The passage of this measure will not only raise our prestige in the Philippines but throughout the Far East. The word will be passed that the United States Government has recognized its obligation—its moral obligation—to a considerable group of Filipinos who fought for democracy in the last war. That word will have its effect not only in the Philippines, but in Malaya, in Indochina, in Indonesia, and even in China.

I do not wish to exaggerate the importance of this. I do not wish to make any extreme statements. But from the letters I have received from the Philippines and from reliable reports I have received, I am deeply impressed as to the great importance of this legislation in the entire Philippine picture.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It does not matter, and should not matter, what else we are going to do for the Philippines as a whole, or for the Filipino people as a whole. What does matter is that we give adequate recognition to the claim of these individual Filipinos who were among the bravest of the brave, and whose devotion to the United States, a Nation which was sovereign in the Philippines at the time, and which is generally considered a Caucasian country, provides one of the brightest pages in the history of heroism.

I know that all these fine sentiments may seem a little high-pitched when applied to a bill for the payment of burial benefits. But I am told that the occasion of death is the most important in the life of the Filipino, and that the burial ceremony is the most significant ceremony in family and community life in the Philippines. That is why so much importance is attached to this bill.

I, myself, expect to propose another bill for other benefits—educational benefits—for the Filipino veterans. But whether my other measure meets with congressional approval or not, I certainly hope and urge that this pending proposal be given the favorable consideration of this distinguished committee, and that it be sent to the floor of the Senate for early passage.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I have been endeavoring to understand the budget document which the President has submitted to the Congress. This document includes the supplementary figures for the fiscal year 1951 as well as the new figures for the fiscal year 1952. Even with all the publicity which has been given to the tremendous amounts with which the President proposed to conduct the Government for the next 18 months, I am very much in doubt that our people are even yet aware of the weight of the Government load which they must carry.

The President in the budget document justified—or to put it in another way, recommended—the details of $21,800,000,000. He left a total of $87,600,000,000 to be proposed for later transmission. This $87,600,000,000 is divided into a sum of $10,900,000,000 to be proposed in 1951 supplemental budget messages and $76,700,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952 to be later proposed. In other words, the budget message gives justification for only approximately one-fifth, or 20 percent, of the total appropriations for 1952. The balance the President proposes to transmit at a later time. It may be put in this way: The total appropriations either already granted or to be later asked for the fiscal year 1951 amount to $91,800,000,000, and the requests for 1952 fiscal year amount to $98,500,000,000, or an over-all total for the two fiscal years of 1951 and 1952 of $190,400,000,000.

Mr. President, I quote these figures to show their enormity. Of course these amounts will not all be spent in the 1951 or 1952 fiscal years. In fact, it is planned to spend only $47,200,000,000 in 1951 and $71,600,000,000 in 1952 and, of course, some of this is from prior years. But, for a comparison, if we add these two figures together and subtract them from the over-all total proposed for 2 years, we find that it is proposed to spend $71,600,000,000 in the years to follow the fiscal year 1952, and actually the expenditure will be greater, again because of prior years' appropriations. By coincidence this is the same figure which the President estimates will be spent in 1952. In other words, $71,600,000,000 would be spent in 1952, and $71,600,000,000 would be spent in the years following 1952.

We who are the Members of Congress cannot, until justifications for these requests are presented, be in a position to pass judgment on them. We do know that we cannot in the coming years afford to spend a penny on any project, no matter how meritorious, which is not either vital for the national defense, or does not concern the health and well-being of our people, or is not to be used to complete a necessary project already under way which will be wasted if it is not finished or put into operation. I use the word "vital" deliberately because we cannot afford to start or continue marginal projects. Furthermore, we must scrutinize with intense care every project to which the word "defense" is attached because our experience in World War II showed how many projects were started which could only vaguely apply to our "defense."

The importance of the calculations which I have just tried to state very briefly is this: The Congress of the United States is asked to appropriate for the next 18 months in this session upwards of $71,000,000,000 to be spent in future years. Naturally for the fiscal year 1952 there will be many more supplementary requests.

This means that we, ourselves, our sons, and daughters are asked to pay in future years in taxes for the enormous appropriations which we are making in 1951 to be spent in those future years without knowledge of the problems which will then have to be solved and without knowing of the further demands for other appropriations in those years. We are putting our present load on them to carry in addition to the loads they must carry for their own needs in the years to come. That is a fair and proper course so far as pure defense needs are concerned. If we cannot keep this country secure, they will not be able to live in it as free men and women. But it is wrong and unfair insofar as we appropriate funds now to be spent in those years for objects not absolutely necessary, and ask them to pay for these appropriations in the years to come, when they will know so much better what their own actual needs for Government spending will be.

Let me emphasize again that only $21,800,000,000 of the $98,500,000,000 for 1952 have been justified at the present moment. All the rest will be transmitted at a later date. Of these amounts to be transmitted at a later date, $62,500,000,000 are for defense; $300,000,000 are for aid to schools; $35,000,000 are for medical education and local health service; $20,000,000 are to start the St. Lawrence seaway, which incidentally will cost almost a billion dollars; $200,000,000 are needed for a reserve for contingencies without any statement as to what type of contingencies the amount covers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I interrupt the able Senator from Massachusetts, who is, I believe, making a very fine address, to ask a question. As the Senator knows, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am chairman of the subcommittee which handles appropriations for Labor and Federal Security Administration. Does not the Senator think that unless the members of the Committee on Appropriations delve into the matters to which the Senator refers, conditions will be much worse than they are actually known to be by the public at the present time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In my opinion, there is no question that that is the fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that every appropriation request can be cut 10 percent without hurting the efficiency of the Government. Such a cut should be made at this time. Let me give the Senator an illustration, which can be multiplied thousands of times. The Senator from Massachusetts knows that we have established several new emergency agencies. I have been asked by people in my own State for permanent positions in such emergency agencies. Persons now holding a civil service classification of grade 8 have expressed a desire to be transferred to a new agency, not with their present classification of grade 8, but with a change in their classification to grade 11 or grade 12. Does the Senator feel it would be fair to the American people to grant such requests, particularly under present conditions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my colleague and friend that it would be one of the most helpful things he could do if he could have persons who are now working for the Government in one department transferred to an emergency department, where they are needed at the present time, and thus cut down expenses in the other departments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the persons to whom I refer do not wish to be transferred to an emergency agency unless their classification is raised by three grades. That is the point I desire to make. For instance, a person who is connected with a permanent agency of the Federal Government wishes to be transferred to an emergency agency, but he insists that before he is transferred to such emergency agency his classification be raised by three grades. It would be all right to change his employment from one agency to another agency if he retained the same classification. When we established the new agencies we did not have in mind increasing salaries. When we established the Office of Price Stabilization, for instance, we did not intend to increase the salaries of the Federal employees who would be employed by such agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Absolutely not. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I continue with the enumeration.

One billion dollars are proposed for the Export-Import Bank; $9,500,000,000 for international programs; $150,000,000

to start defense housing; $330,000,000 for the administration of controls.

This is along the line of the remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars for civilian defense; $1,000,000,000 for stockpiling; $180,000,000 for Government relief of occupied areas and the governing of those areas.

This is only a partial list, and, Mr. President, I ask to have a complete table inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fiscal year 1952—Proposed for later transmission

To build up free world's defensive strength, as well as amounts to carry forward other international programs	$9,500,000,000
Defense housing	150,000,000
Administration of controls	330,000,000
Expansion of defense production	1,200,000,000
Federal aid to schools	300,000,000
Medical education and local health services	35,000,000
Export-Import Bank	1,000,000,000
Selective Service	50,000,000
St. Lawrence seaway	20,000,000
Hell's Canyon power	8,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	200,000,000
Civilian defense	450,000,000
National science foundation	10,000,000
Stockpile	1,000,000,000
Maritime ship construction	125,000,000
Federal airport claims	4,400,000
Government relief occupied areas	150,000,000
To govern occupied areas	30,000,000
Military functions	62,510,000,000
Total	77,072,400,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would also like at this point in my remarks to insert another table, which attempts to show some of the larger items which have been justified in the President's budget included in the $21,800,000,000 appropriations which he has so far recommended for fiscal 1952. This does not pretend to be a complete list but endeavors to include most of the larger construction and program items. To me it gives a very quick, rough, overall look at the $21,800,000,000 and I think it is appropriate to include it at this point.

Actually the amount is $21,793,000,000.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—*Some of the larger items which are justified in the $21,800,000,000 appropriations so far recommended in the President's budget for fiscal 1952. This does not pretend to be a complete list. It takes in most of the construction and program items*

Interest on debt (permanent indefinite)		$5,800,000,000
Veterans		4,400,000,000
Atomic energy		870,000,000
Railroad retirement (permanent indefinite)		613,000,000
Grants to States:		
Federal Security Agency, payments to States, fiscal 1952:		
Surveys and school construction	75,000,000	
Vocational rehabilitation	23,000,000	
Health assistance to States	16,084,000	
Water-pollution control	1,000,000	
Hospital construction (of which to liquidate construction authorized $120,000,000)	195,000,000	
Public assistance	1,300,000,000	
Maternal and child welfare	33,000,000	
Total		1,643,084,000
Department of Agriculture, includes authorization to expend from public debt receipts:		
Commodity credit	$427,000,000	
Farmers Home Administration loans	130,000,000	
Farm housing	23,000,000	
Rural electrification	109,000,000	
Total		689,000,000
Department of Commerce, grants to States:		
Airport program (of which to liquidate contract authorizations, $30,000,000)	53,440,000	
Air navigation development (of which to liquidate contract authorizations, $1,500,000)	8,000,000	
Ship construction (all of this to liquidate contract authorizations)	105,000,000	
Ship construction obligated prior to 1950 (all of this to liquidate contract authorization)	14,000,000	
Postwar highways (all to liquidate contract authorizations)	420,000,000	
Forest highways (all to liquidate contract authorizations)	25,000,000	
Total		625,440,000
Department of Interior:		
Reclamation Bureau, construction	223,690,000	
Alaska construction, public works and roads	23,700,000	
Total		247,390,000
Civil functions, Army engineers:		
Flood control:		
General	328,365,000	
Mississippi	61,000,000	
Maintenance and improvement of existing rivers and harbors	220,240,000	
Total		609,605,000
Appropriations for liquidation of prior contract authorizations		1,260,000,000
Grand total		16,757,519,000
Balance for operation of Government departments exclusive of defense for general functions or programs not listed		5,035,481,000
Total		21,793,000,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, every item vital to the national defense must surely be appropriated. Every other item must be appropriated only if it can be properly justified.

When we consider the requests for the Defense Department we should carefully scrutinize the detailed justifications for the enormous spending necessitated for the national security. We certainly should continue to appropriate all that is possibly needed for defense. At the same time requests for new construction of housing and buildings at the camps must be analyzed as carefully as possible if money is not to be wastefully spent because of haste and urgency.

Of course, we must have civilian controls. In fact, their application was delayed far too long. Such controls must be carefully, fairly, reasonably, and economically administered.

Of course, we must have civilian defense. We want our people to understand what they must do to take care of themselves if an attack comes. We know that it can happen here.

But these two great services must be built up to serve our needs without regard to politics. I hear a rumor that civilian defense alone will employ over 50 people in a regional office in Boston. I already have many applications for positions in these regional offices. We had no such civilian-defense office in World War II. The distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. HUNT], who is a former Governor of the State of Wyoming, knows that there were no such offices in his State. Is it necessary now to have them? Must we set up elaborate regional offices in order to determine the extent of the Federal contribution for bomb shelters?

I shall never forget my experience as a governor at a dinner given by the Boston Chamber of Commerce during World War II. Except for the presiding officer, I was the only local civilian at the head table. There were at least 12 regional heads of this and that Federal agency. Most of them I knew because they had come to see me at my office. But very few of them knew each other or knew what the others were doing in New England. So, I spent much of that evening introducing the regional heads of the various Federal agencies to one another and listening to them discuss and argue as to how their work crisscrossed among them. Who did what, they never did entirely clear up. In view of our experience in World War II, I hope we can eliminate now much of the waste and inefficiency of such administration.

It is the responsibility of the Congress within the time allowed us to do so to study the requests for money made by the President. It helps him as the head of our Government to have us do so. We cannot allow the agencies of the Government to become extravagant, wasteful, and bureaucratic under a disguise that they are doing defense work. Our people are willing to sacrifice to the highest degree for the security of the country and for the safety and proper equipment of our boys who are fighting for us. But they will not tolerate waste in preparing the national defense. I feel confident that if the administration and the Congress properly publicize the reasons why the services our people have been receiving from their Government must be reduced or eliminated, they will be only too willing to give up those services. But, they are not willing to do so, and become disgusted when asked to do so, if at the same time they see their Government wasteful and extravagant. We must never forget that we are asking them to reduce their way of life in their homes and asking them to give up little luxuries which they and their children have enjoyed over the years.

We only know now that the President intends to propose for later transmission for 1952 some $77,000,000,000. We only know that he has justified in his present budget document some $21,800,000,000 for 1952. Consequently, until we know for what these proposals are to be and for what services they are to be spent, we cannot say correctly that they can or cannot be eliminated or reduced. But we do know that the greater the national expenditures are and the more the Government's balance sheet becomes unbalanced, the higher the taxes surely will be. Certainly there is no social evil that is so great as uncontrolled inflation. The more we ask of the Government the greater the chances are that our way of life and our freedom will be lost through inflation. Surely we can and must find ways to cut the President's requests as substantially as is practical and wise.

Mr. President, I would like permission to place in the RECORD at this point a table based upon the total authorizations proposed for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $98,500,000,000. That is table 2.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Approximate amount each State would pay based on a total of $98,500,000,000 appropriations recommended and proposed for the fiscal year 1952 in the President's budget*

State	Percent borne of taxes	State's share of 1952 budget
Alabama	1.15	$1,132,750,000
Arizona	.38	374,300,000
Arkansas	.67	659,950,000
California	8.29	8,165,650,000
Colorado	.82	807,700,000
Connecticut	1.64	1,615,400,000
Delaware	.46	453,100,000
Florida	1.42	1,398,700,000
Georgia	1.45	1,428,250,000
Idaho	.32	315,200,000
Illinois	7.51	7,397,350,000
Indiana	2.27	2,235,950,000
Iowa	1.48	1,457,800,000
Kansas	1.09	1,073,650,000
Kentucky	1.21	1,191,850,000
Louisiana	1.27	1,250,950,000
Maine	.44	433,400,000
Maryland	1.79	1,763,150,000
Massachusetts	3.44	3,388,400,000
Michigan	4.79	4,718,150,000
Minnesota	1.81	1,782,850,000
Mississippi	.67	659,950,000
Missouri	2.71	2,669,350,000
Montana	.34	334,900,000
Nebraska	.81	797,850,000
Nevada	.13	128,050,000
New Hampshire	.28	275,800,000
New Jersey	3.36	3,309,600,000
New Mexico	.32	315,200,000
New York	14.72	14,499,200,000
North Carolina	1.64	1,615,400,000
North Dakota	.31	305,350,000
Ohio	5.73	5,644,050,000
Oklahoma	1.14	1,122,900,000
Oregon	.98	965,300,000
Pennsylvania	7.20	7,092,000,000
Rhode Island	.55	541,750,000
South Carolina	.77	758,450,000
South Dakota	.32	$315,200,000
Tennessee	1.39	1,369,150,000
Texas	4.47	4,402,950,000
Utah	.35	344,750,000
Vermont	.18	177,300,000
Virginia	1.54	1,516,900,000
Washington	1.62	1,595,700,000
West Virginia	.87	856,950,000
Wisconsin	2.08	2,048,800,000
Wyoming	.18	177,300,000
District of Columbia	1.16	1,142,600,000
Hawaii and Alaska	.48	472,800,000
Total		98,500,000,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This table shows that my State of Massachusetts will have to pay approximately $3,400,000,000 as its share. That is just over half of the total assessed valuation of real estate in Massachusetts—and the assessed valuation in Massachusetts is made at the full value. The full valuation of real estate in Massachusetts is $6,544,571,174. In other words, Mr. President, the amount which the citizens of Massachusetts will be asked to pay in support of this Federal program for 1952 is in excess of 50 percent of the total assessed valuation of all real estate in our Commonwealth. And this is only what we are to be asked to appropriate for 1952 in this present session of Congress, and there will undoubtedly be more.

I cite this illustration because to me it emphasizes the size of the problem which we face. It serves to bring home to us the importance of our efforts to reduce Government spending just as far as we possibly can without injuring the defense of the country and the welfare of our people.

Truly, Mr. President, Congress has a tremendous responsibility this year to see first that the enormous expenditures demanded by the security effort are well justified and wisely spent; and second, that we do not load on our children burdens from which we benefit and for which they pay, unless they are absolutely needed for the protection and security of our future.

It may be necessary to change some laws in order to reduce the commitments of the Government. It will be wise for the Committee on Appropriations to have a study made or a report from the Bureau of the Budget to all outstanding authorizations for which appropriations may be asked, to see if some of the authorizations, not for defense purposes, may be reduced or eliminated. I feel that we should set our sights on a minimum cut of $5,000,000,000 from the President's proposals. I shall do all in my power to try to gain this objective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at the end of these remarks a table from the budget for fiscal 1952 entitled "Résumé of New Obligational Authorizations," which sets forth very clearly the figures to which I have just referred. That is table 3.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III

[In millions]

Description	1950 enacted	1951		Total	1952		Total
		Enacted	Proposed for later transmission		Recommended in this document	Proposed for later transmission	
By type of new obligational authority:							
Appropriations	$40,312	$75,087	$10,951	$86,038	$20,232	$75,711	$95,943
Reappropriations	551	790		790	1		1
Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts	7,470	1,834		1,834	939	1,000	1,939
Reappropriations of authorizations to expend from public debt receipts		6		6			
Total authorizations for expenditures	48,333	77,717	10,951	88,668	21,172	76,711	97,883
Contract authorizations	4,915	3,085		3,085	621		621
Reappropriations of contract authorizations		103		103			
Total	53,248	80,905	10,951	91,856	21,793	76,711	98,504
Less portion of appropriations for liquidation of prior contract authorizations	3,026	4,370	27	4,397	1,260	2,815	4,075
Total new obligational authority	50,222	76,535	10,924	87,459	20,533	73,896	94,429
By function:							
Military service	14,883	44,181	10,000	54,181	101	60,870	60,971
Veterans' services and benefits	6,898	5,653	88	5,741	4,426		4,426
International security and foreign relations	7,104	8,885	100	8,985	276	10,680	10,956
Social security, welfare, and health	2,472	2,423	3	2,426	2,517	35	2,552
Housing and community development	4,735	752	80	832	418	600	1,018
Education and general research	130	173		173	158	310	468
Agriculture and agricultural resources	3,324	1,322		1,322	1,483		1,483
National resources	1,985	3,212	9	3,221	2,103	8	2,111
Transportation and communication	1,805	2,130	193	2,323	1,751	1,337	1,414
Finance, commerce, and industry	67	686	210	896	38	1,530	1,568
Labor	224	236		236	225		225
General government	1,076	1,160	191	1,351	1,140		1,140
Interest	5,819	5,722		5,722	5,897		5,897
Reserve for contingents			50	50		200	200
Total new obligational authorizations	50,222	76,535	10,924	87,459	20,533	73,896	94,429

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made an admirable statement. He has placed his finger upon two things which are absolutely essential if we are really to do something toward cutting the budget.

First, we must examine even the military requests, and be sure that something is not wrapped up in the term "national defense" which will thereby obtain access to the Federal Treasury when it does not deserve that kind of essential rating.

Second is the emphasis upon the necessity of reexamining some of the

Government's contractual commitments with the States. If we are really going to reduce the Federal budget, we must examine those things. I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has made a real contribution to the debate on Federal economy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate very much the remarks of my colleague and friend from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall support the pending bill to authorize the President to reorganize certain of the defense agencies. I was a member of the committee which framed the bill. I think it is a workable bill. It will give the President the authority which he requested, while reserving to the Congress the authority which, in my opinion, it should not relinquish.

I have supported all our defense efforts. Naturally I should be glad to see the President have the power to increase the efficiency of defense agencies if he can do so under this bill, because, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, we are faced with a very costly undertaking, even on the most efficient and economical basis.

CONQUERING THE WORLD BY WINNING ITS ESTEEM

Mr. President, the problem which weighs heaviest today on my mind is not whether we shall bring to rapid fruition a military establishment capable of conquering the world by force, but rather whether or not we are giving sufficient thought to the utilization of our inherent powers to conquer the world by winning its esteem.

Yesterday I attended the morning services of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation. The scriptural lesson was taken from the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, in which St. Paul said:

> Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

It will be recalled that in the original Greek Paul used the word "philo," meaning the philosophical approach to love. We have no exact word to translate that Greek word, so the scholars who gave us the King James version of the Bible used the word "charity." But it means far more than we usually attribute now to that word.

Then the pastor of the church took as his topic "What the World Needs," and proceeded to outline four outstanding needs of the world—men that the world can trust; moral courage; freedom in its highest sense; and a conception of God.

Then, Mr. President, I attended today the opening of the Senate, and was inspired by the fact that a former resident of Hiroshima, Rev. Kiyoshi Tanimoto, a distinguished Methodist minister, whom we tried to kill with an atomic bomb, came to the Senate floor, and offering up thanks to the same God we worship, thanked Him for America's great spiritual heritage, and then he asked God to bless every Member of the Senate.

The atomic bomb did not kill him. It did not break his will. It did not convert him to our way of thinking, to our religion, and to our democratic principles based upon the teachings of the Bible. That was done by a devout Methodist missionary in Japan.

So, Mr. President, I could not help but feel that if a miracle of that kind could be worked in his heart, it might be possible that a power stronger than the atomic bomb will rend the iron curtain behind which millions of misinformed people look upon us as enemies bent upon their destruction.

I am willing to concede everything that our leaders have said about the evil intentions of those who control the Soviet Union. Certainly they are not men the world can trust. They are not men who know the meaning of moral and spiritual courage and force. They do not subscribe to our meaning of freedom in its highest sense, nor do they recognize our God. But, Mr. President, human nature is much the same in all races and throughout all recorded time. I am therefore constrained to believe that behind the iron curtain in Russia, as well as in the satellite countries, there must be many people who are good in the sense that we use the term here, who are kind hearted, who are peace loving, and who would gladly cooperate with us in a program of preserving the peace of the world if we only knew how in our dealings with other races to conquer them by earning their esteem.

A worthy example, Mr. President, was set during colonial times in my home county of Rockbridge, which was created by the General Assembly of Virginia during the Revolutionary War and its county seat of Lexington, in which I live, named for the Battle of Lexington. On August 7, 1801, the Lexington Gazette was founded and has been continuously published for nearly a century and a half, being one of the oldest weekly newspapers of continuous publication in the Nation.

In each current issue it republishes items of 100 years ago, 75 years ago, and 50 years ago. In its issue of January 31, under items of 75 years ago, I find one entitled "A Rockbridge Monument," which reads as follows:

> In front of the Baptist Church at the Natural Bridge stands a column about 6 feet high of white Italian marble, with this inscription under a wreath: "In memory of William J. Routon who lost his life in a most heroic effort to rescue a little servant boy from drowning in James River, April 27, 1856, aged 27." (On the opposite side is a short sermon.)
>
> Mr. Routon was a poor laboring man and the only son of a poor widow, who lived in Lynchburg. The little servant boy belonged to William Paxton, Esq.

That incident concerning a white man who lost his life in an effort to save that of a slave boy, while unique and outstanding, was but one evidence of many concerning race relationships since the settlement of the Valley of Virginia by conscientious and freedom-loving Scotch-Irish Presbyterians during colonial days.

The first thing to be done by the Scotch-Irish settlers of the valley was to build a log cabin. The second thing was to build a church, and it was usually a good one, built either of cut stone or brick, because they built a church to endure. In those days Thomas Jefferson had not won his fight for religious freedom but a colonial Virginia Governor who persecuted nonconformers agreed not to molest the Presbyterians in the valley in return for their willingness to defend the lowlanders east of the Blue Ridge from Indian raids.

The first church to be built in the new village of Lexington was a Presbyterian Church. Since the slaves and free Negroes of the town had no church the white Presbyterians provided a gallery for them in their church and a Sunday school room. In later years one of the Sunday school teachers of those slaves was the immortal Stonewall Jackson, then a professor of military science and tactics at the Virginia Military Institute.

When Stonewall Jackson left Lexington his body-servant went with him and was his constant companion from the first action of the Virginia Militia at Harper's Ferry to the fateful night at Chancellorsville. After Jackson's death that body-servant returned to his home in Lexington and 2 years later, although apparently still in sound health, died. It is generally believed that he died of a broken heart.

Through the unfortunate conflict of 1861–65 and the even more trying days of the reconstruction period, when a vindictive Congress officially declared Virginians to be incapable of self-government and designated Virginia as Military District No. 1, to be ruled by an army and plundered by carpetbaggers, the loyalty of Lexington and Rockbridge County former slaves to their former masters, who had made a fight not to perpetuate slavery but to preserve States' rights, never wavered.

Some years ago through popular subscription a granite monument was erected on the Courthouse Square in Lexington and on it inscribed in bronze a tribute to the loyalty of those former slaves. I never see that monument but that I recall the words of Daniel Webster, who said:

> If we work upon marble, it will perish. If we work upon brass, time will efface it. If we rear temples, they will crumble to dust. But if we work upon men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with the just fear of God and love of their fellowmen, we engrave on those tablets something which no time can efface, and which will brighten and brighten to all eternity.

That was the thought, Mr. President, that I had in mind when I recently said to our breakfast group that there was no record in history of any military establishment that had been able to preserve a permanent peace, and that while in this emergency I recognized the necessity of our creating a defense establishment capable of defending our homes from arson and plunder, I felt that if we ever hope to see again the day, described by Patrick Henry after the Revolutionary War, "when Peace hath spread her white wings above our fair land and contentment lies down at every door," we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

should employ in our peace program spiritual as well as physical force.

The example of what we need in this country and in every Christian country now arming to defend itself against possible aggression was set by the early Presbyterian settlers of Lexington when they shared with their slaves their Christian faith, their Christian hope, and their knowledge of ethical conduct based upon the Sermon on the Mount. As a result, when war came, there was no Fifth Column. "To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest," said Woodrow Wilson. "To conquer the world by earning its esteem is a permanent conquest."

SUGGESTIONS FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on November 27, 1950, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] inserted in the RECORD an exceedingly able paper written by the former Senator from North Carolina, the distinguished Dr. Frank P. Graham. His paper is entitled "The Need of a United America Confronted With the Threat of Totalitarian Tyranny in Global War."

Mr. President, in my opinion the statesmanship of that great paper written by the former Senator from North Carolina, Dr. Graham, needs to be contemplated very carefully by those in charge of America's foreign policy in these days. It should be read not only by every Member of Congress, but by citizens generally. It is a clear, concise, eloquent statement of the meaning of the crisis which confronts us.

Recently I received from the editor of the Durham Morning Herald, of Durham, N. C., a letter containing an enclosure in the form of another great statesmanlike paper written by Dr. Graham. The paper is entitled "As a Step Toward Preventing World War III—Recommendations for Action." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the letter which I received from the editor of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL,
Chapel Hill, N. C., January 16, 1951.

To Senator MORSE.

MY DEAR SIR: I am aware of the tremendous pressures on your time and thought. Still—as a citizen and on my own initiative, and in the interest of decent, honorable peace in this world—I want to suggest and urge that you read the attached statement by Dr. Frank P. Graham, and that you use it in any way you may think best.

I am deeply impressed with the statement's sweep through history; its clear, logical analysis of the dangerously explosive war potentials which face people everywhere; its practical suggestions for dealing with the Korean problem; and its emphasis on revealing and using the moral power of the United Nations General Assembly for peace.

Several Senators have said this statement by Dr. Graham is a timely supplement to his stirring plea for national unity and the unity of the free world, made on the day he left the United States Senate and printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 18, pages A7286-A7290.

This complete reprint was made through the generous interest of the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald. The substance of the statement appeared on Christmas Day in the Washington Post and the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, and later in the New York Herald Tribune and the Raleigh, N. C., News and Observer.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN S. LANIER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I ask unanimous consent also to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement made by Dr. Graham, I wish to make these comments about it: As we know, Dr. Graham was the American representative on the international commission which worked out what might be described as the mediation settlement of the Indonesian conflict of many months ago. That settlement was finally based upon what has become known as the Renville principles. In the statement, sent to me by the editor of the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald, Dr. Graham again, in an inspiring style which is characteristic of his writings, and with a penetrating analysis which is typical of his exceedingly high intelligence, discusses the meaning of the Renville principles, and leaves with the reader the suggestion that probably we should consider the Renville principles in connection with the problem of trying to settle the Korean issue. In the course of his paper he says:

The Renville principles already approved by the United Nations in the Indonesian situation are a possible starting point for the consideration of principles and procedures for the Korean situation.

Mr. President, let me make clear that, as I read Dr. Graham's statement to which I have been referring, it is not his suggestion that the Renville principles constitute the solution of the Korean situation; but, rather, it is his suggestion, as the words I have just read make very clear, that they constitute a possible starting point, and only a starting point, for a consideration of principles and procedures for settling the Korean problem.

He says:

The Renville principles are substantially the following: (1) military provisions for cease fire, a truce, a demarcation line, demilitarized zones on both sides of the line, and the withdrawal by stages of all non-Korean armed forces under the supervision of the United Nations; and (2) political principles with provision for internal security, civil liberties, free trade, transportation, communication, economic rehabilitation, plebiscites or other forms of free elections, and convention of delegates elected on the basis of population, for framing a constitution for a free, independent, and united Korean nation under the supervision of the United Nations for the self-determination of all the Korean peoples and their admission as an independent member nation into the United Nations.

These Renville principles and procedures, modified and adapted to meet the Korean situation, could be the ways and means of substituting ballots for bullets and of substituting law and the self-determination of peoples for war and the self-extermination of peoples.

Mr. President, it is not for me to say that ex-Senator Graham, former president of the University of North Carolina, has outlined an architect's blueprint for the settling of this great international problem; but it is for me to say that after reading his keen analysis, I believe he does lay down some principles which should receive the careful consideration of the officials of the State Department and of our representatives in the United Nations. We cannot escape the fact that what we seek is peace in Korea upon honorable terms, peace in Korea under the supervision and authorization of the United Nations, peace in Korea without appeasement.

One cannot read Dr. Graham's statement without recognizing that he is unalterably opposed to appeasement, just as, as a member of the International Commission in connection with the Indonesian affair, he refused to be a party to appeasement in that dispute.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the article entitled, "As a Step Toward Preventing World War III—Recommendations for Action," by Dr. Frank P. Graham, former Senator from North Carolina. As I have said, the article was printed in the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald for January 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A STEP TOWARD PREVENTING WORLD WAR III—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a revised reprint of an article by Dr. Graham which appeared in the Durham Morning Herald on January 7, 1951. The Durham Morning Herald Co., Inc., Durham, N. C., is pleased to reproduce this article.)

(By Frank P. Graham)

CHRISTMAS AND THE NEW YEAR

Christmas 1950 and the New Year 1951 have come with their heritage from a great past and their hopes amid the darkness which broods over the peoples of the earth.

In the nearly 2,000 years since the first Christmas there have been transmitted to the keeping of our generation the Hebraic, Greek, Latin, Catholic, Protestant, Scientific, Industrial, Democratic, European, and American heritage of human freedom and humane hopes yet unfulfilled and now imperiled in this world.

In the reorientation of the American as part also of the Pacific-Asiatic world, it is of concern to us that in the East the spiritual heritage of the oldest civilizations is being uprooted by conquerors who would exalt the ideology of one generation and the quick ruthless methods of the police state above the wisdom of hundreds of generations. The need for reform is large and insistent in the East and the West. The East and the West need the values of creative cooperation in reform. This cooperation will be more creative when based on a mutual respect for the deep spiritual heritage of historic peoples, a decent regard for the truth above the falsehoods of hate as the basis for fair relations, the freedom of the human mind as the creative source of progress, and the dignity of the individual and the moral autonomy and enterprise of the human spirit as the basis of enduring freedom and reform in this critical age.

In the womb of the mid-twentieth century are a-borning the ideological, economic, social, political, scientific-atomic-cosmic, and spiritual forces which mayhap determine the destinies of peoples for generations.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The modern economic framework of production and communication, which encompasses the earth with its dynamic power, catches up ideas, depressions, and wars anywhere and involves, and sometimes engulfs, peoples everywhere.

Dictatorships have risen through and for the concentration under one central political control of the police state all the powers of production and communication (1) for its mastery over the bodies and minds, the work and life, the hopes and the spirits of the people; (2) for the subjugation of the free peoples; and (3) for the domination of all the peoples of the earth.

The spiritual heritage of a great past and the humane hopes for a freer and better world in the west and the east are both now in peril. In two hemispheres the peoples, with both despair and hope, look from the background of centuries gone into the years ahead pregnant with war or peace, freedom or slavery for hundreds of millions of people across the earth. The world-wide crusade for freedom and peace must climb from the valleys of weakness and fear into the hills of courage and power.

In the midst of the global gloom of the closing days of 1950 Christmas came with its ray of hope in a darkening world. Nearly 2,000 years ago a child was born in a lowly manger in a little country in Asia near the sea which yet joins with hope the east and west. Glad tidings came in the darkness before the dawn. With the child was born the hope of peace on earth and good will toward men. The child became man and lived and died for the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God. Jesus and the prophets and saints, east and west, taught the Golden Rule and human brotherhood: one God, one family, and one world of freedom, justice, peace, and good will among men, unfulfilled to this hour.

I. THE YEARNING OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

1. In the United States

In the United States today the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines, and upon the seas, the people in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, in schools and churches, want peace. They would have peace, they are sure, if only the cruel dictators of the Soviet Union would stop their aggressive tyranny and let the people have peace.

2. In the Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union, the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters, who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines, and upon the seas, in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, want peace. They would have peace, they have been led to believe, if only the Fascist warmongers in the United States would let the people have peace.

3. In other nations

In other nations of the earth the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people everywhere as they work and love, dream and hope, want peace. They would have peace, hundreds of millions of them believe, if only the Soviet Union and the United States would let the people have peace.

4. The people of all colors and creeds, races and regions

The yellow, brown, red, black, and white peoples want peace. The Buddhists, Hindus, Confucianists, Shintoists, Moslems, Jews, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Protestants, believers and unbelievers, want peace. The people of North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia and the islands of the oceans and seas, want peace. All the peoples of the earth, who in this generation, have suffered through a world war, a world depression and another world war, yearn and pray for freedom and security, justice, and peace.

II. THE UNIVERSAL YEARNING OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE CONFRONTED WITH THE HIGH POTENTIALS OF THE WORLD FOR WAR

Against this time for universal good will, in the face of the universal desire of the peoples for peace, and despite the unresting efforts of the Government of the United States and other governments, the nations are confronted with dictatorship, imperialism, and aggression.

1. The ways of dictatorship

The Communist dictatorship has made war on religion, subjugated the freedom of the mind, the freedom of representation in parliaments, the freedom of association in churches, corporations, labor unions, cooperative societies, fraternal and civic organizations, has broken treaties; blocked the unification of Germany and Korea; subjugated by methods of the police state nine nations and parts of two nations; sought to sabotage the recovery of Southern and Western European nations; stripped Manchuria, poisoned the minds of hundreds of millions of people with falsehoods and hate; crushed the freedom to struggle for freedom; enslaved increasingly more millions of people in enforced bondage than were ever held in slavery at any time in history; segregated 200 million people behind the iron curtain; vetoed the international control and inspection of atomic power; blocked the international efforts and procedures of the United Nations for peace; and has gone far in a program of aggression and imperialism for the domination of the world.

2. The ways of freedom

With all its unfair but decreasing discriminations, injustices, failures, and frustrations of freedom and democracy, the United States has preserved the freedom of religion, the freedom of the mind and the freedom of association; has advanced the freedom to struggle for freedom by which more millions of Negroes in the last 85 years in the United States have made more progress than any like number of people in any like time in modern history, revealing, against many handicaps, the innate capacities of a great people for self-development in an advancing democracy; liberated the Philippines; has, against both the Dutch and Communist imperialists, thrown its weight on the side of the independence and freedom of the 70,000,000 Indonesian people; has, against both the French and Communist imperialists, favored the autonomy of the Indo-Chinese people; has favored the self-determination of peoples in Israel and the Near East, in southern Asia, Korea, and Japan; has helped toward the self-recovery of the peoples of Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, West Germany, Northern and Western Europe and Great Britain; has projected a program for the technical assistance and self-development of peoples in both hemispheres; offered to give up its then monopoly of atomic power for international control and inspection; helped to facilitate the procedures and cooperated with the purposes of the United Nations against aggression as the best hope of freedom and peace in the world.

3. No appeasement of aggression

Standing on the brink of the abyss of another possible world war between dictatorship which, with all its pretenses, would crush the freedom to struggle for freedom—and the democracies, which, with all their faults, would preserve the freedom to struggle for freedom, some free nations are still torn by the opposite pulls of appeasement and resistance to aggression. In the present complex world situation resistance to aggression in Korea or anywhere may lead to global war. Appeasement of aggression leads no less surely and even more disastrously into another world war.

4. Not backward from a Dunkirk to a Munich, but forward

In resisting aggression in Korea the United Nations risked the military disaster of a Dunkirk to avoid the moral disaster of a Munich. If the recently victorious United Nations forces should be driven off the peninsula, the way would not be backward to Munich but forward with the United Nations for the ultimate triumph of freedom, self-determination of all peoples, justice, and peace under the laws rather than by the wars of nations. In the present situation whether we appease or resist, drift or plunge, or stand aside in isolation, the world potentials are so heavily charged that a local spark may become a global conflagration.

In the global dilemma of the universal yearnings of the people for peace and the high potentials of the world for war, it is only through heroic efforts of the Government of the United States in cooperation with the other governments in the United Nations, persistent against great odds, that a way may be found to make effective the people's passion for peace against the aggressors' will for war.

The free peoples must stand resolutely together against appeasement of aggressions and any surrender to the universal domination of a world totalitarian state.

III. MEANTIME, MOBILIZATION OF THE FREE WORLD FOR COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Meantime the United States and all the nations of the free world, east and west, must mobilize their economic, military, scientific, democratic, human, and spiritual resources for the cooperative self-defense of their democratic existence and the self-determination of peoples. Denunciations, armaments, plans, and pacts—essential as they are—are not enough. The American people, in democratic and moral answer to fascism and communism, must relentlessly keep up the struggle against imperialism, privilege, monopoly, and discriminations, and take the next step toward fulfillment of our American dream and our spiritual hopes for the freedom and equal opportunity for all people in a free and federated world.

The free peoples must stand together in defense of their commitments to the freedom of the human mind, the dignity of the human being, and the moral autonomy of the human spirit against a monstrous tyranny which seeks to subjugate all peoples in the expanding dominions of a world police state.

IV. THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In such a complex and desperate situation where may the people of the earth look for the implementation of their universal aspiration for peace? Not to the capital of any one or two nations. That way alone is the isolated way to war. Rather to the capital of all the nations. The way of international cooperation is the only way to enduring peace. The only international agency available for the balanced information and action of the peoples of all nations is the United Nations. With all its failures and frustrations, with all the need for amendment to its Charter for a federated world, the peoples of the earth still look in hope to the United Nations dedicated by the noble principles of its Charter to stopping aggression, preventing war, promoting freedom, and maintaining peace in the world.

1. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations:

More democratically and organically the people now look to the General Assembly with new hope in the recently and overwhelmingly adopted procedures for uniting for peace. In the General Assembly are represented 60 nations which include the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the

continents and islands of the earth by their own self-determination.

In the midst of the almost unsolvable dilemmas on the edge of a world catastrophe, whose burdens are now heroically borne by the statesmen of the free world, time does not wait for amendments to the Charter, for stronger ways, better days, more democratic governments, or nobler people. To amend the Charter the United Nations must now save the Charter and itself from destruction. To become more democratic the people must save the freedom to be a democracy. Freedom and democracy begin at home but without resistance to the aggression and tyranny of the totalitarian police state, freedom and democracy would have no home in which to grow. The people of the world, as imperfect as we all are in our human and inhuman ways, are the only people available in this fearful time. Now and soon is the only time left. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations. The Assembly of the delegates from 60 nations is the most representative of the organs of the United Nations. It is not subject to the veto in its own jurisdiction. It is the only agency in existence in this confused and yet hopeful world which has a chance of enlisting the attention of most of the peoples of the earth for making effective their hopes for peace.

2. A majority vote of the Security Council on a procedural matter not subject to the veto can lift the dispute from the Council agenda and free the Assembly to make recommendations:

It is recognized that, in accordance with article 12 of the Charter, the General Assembly cannot make a recommendation concerning any matter on the agenda of the Security Council. Nevertheless, since putting a dispute on the agenda of the Council is a procedural matter not subject to the veto, a majority vote of the Council can remove a matter from the Council's agenda and thus make it a matter regarding which the Assembly can make recommendations.

Now is the time and the General Assembly is the agency to make findings and recommendations for the principles and procedures toward the settlement of a crucial dispute. This further attempt to settle this dispute is another effort to prevent a total global war, which would engulf the peoples of the world in the killing of scores of millions of people across the earth and the fateful destruction of the civilization accumulated from all ages and inherited from all peoples. As a starting point of the discussions for settlement of the dispute in Korea, the Renville principles themselves suggest their own applicability to the Korean dispute.

V. THE RENVILLE PRINCIPLES

The Renville principles already approved by the United Nations in the Indonesian situation is a possible starting point for the consideration of principles and procedures for the Korean situation.

The Renville principles are substantially the following: (1) Military provisions for cease fire, a truce, a demarcation line, demilitarized zones on both sides of the line, and the withdrawal by stages of all non-Korean armed forces under the supervision of the United Nations; and (2) political principles with provision for internal security, civil liberties, free trade, transportation, communication, economic rehabilitation, plebiscites or other forms of free elections, and convention of delegates elected on the basis of population, for framing a constitution for a free, independent, and united Korean nation under the supervision of the United Nations for the self-determination of all the Korean peoples and their admission as an independent member nation into the United Nations.

These Renville principles and procedures, modified and adapted to meet the Korean situation, could be the ways and means of substituting ballots for bullets and of substituting law and the self-determination of peoples for war and the self-extermination of the peoples.

VI. THE REJECTION OF FAIR PRINCIPLES AND OPEN PROCEDURES FOR THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLE WOULD REVEAL TO THE PEOPLES OF THE EARTH THE DESIGNS OF DICTATORS FOR AGGRESSION AND WORLD DOMINATION

If, in the face of the publication of the findings and recommendations for the truce and the principles and procedures for the settlement of the international dispute, any nation, and specifically the dictatorship behind the puppet government which refuses substantially to accept them but determines heedlessly to go on its way of defiance, aggression, and war, would thereby make its position of recalcitrance and aggression dramatically known to the great majority of the peoples of the earth, above the false propaganda of dictators and beyond the reasonable question of free peoples, such a position would make clear which government is recklessly bent upon aggression and war for the domination of the world. Any such government, in flagrant disregard of the yearnings of the people for peace and in rejection of the recommendations of the only existing international agency based on full and open discussions in the only world forum, brands itself as an outlaw before the judgment bar of mankind.

Such an outlaw nation, exposed before the world, would have to take the consequences of the combined economic, political, military, and moral self-defense of a free world in carrying out the principles and purposes of the United Nations as the best hope of fulfilling the yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom, justice, and peace under law.

While some wait for universal disarmament, a limited world federal government, world law, and a world police force, for the prevention of aggression and war, there must be mustered now on the side of human freedom against aggression not only more people and more bombs but also a greater faith. In the moral potentials of the United Nations fully utilized is more ultimate power than in the explosive force of atomic bombs.

The muster of the effective power of the General Assembly for human freedom and the self-determination of peoples might prevent war and thereby avoid the use of atomic bombs against aggression. The world's potentials for war and self-destruction of peoples must be brought under the control of the United Nations' potentials for peace and the abundant production by peoples. To the large executive power and influence of the Security Council, presently subject to the paralysis of the veto, must be added more promptly and effectively the moral power of the General Assembly of all the nations, which can, without a veto, make recommendations to the Security Council and to member nations—with the peoples of the world looking on with their hopes and listening in with their great moral power.

The yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom and peace are universal. The potentials for war and self-destruction are world-wide.

The time to save freedom and peace is desperately late. The only agency which can now possibly express and muster the moral power of mankind for freedom and hope and peace is the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The peoples of the world, under God, to save themselves and their civilization, shall have a rebirth of freedom and faith in the effective power of the moral opinion of mankind, mobilized by the General Assembly of the nations of the earth against tyranny, aggression, and war.

VII. THE ULTIMATE TRIUMPH OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE MORAL LAW THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION BY WHICH DICTATORS MUST FALL, EMPIRES CRUMBLE, AGGRESSION FAILS, AND FREEDOM PREVAILS IN GOD'S GOOD TIME

Undergirding the power of the free world and the principles of the United Nations would be the universal yearnings of the peoples of the earth for peace and the world-wide assertion, through the General Assembly, of the moral sovereignty in the minds and hearts of the peoples as a part of the structure of God's universe. False propaganda in the face of the truth will eventually become as chaff which the wind driveth away. All peoples will yet rise in self-determination through the knowledge of the truth which will make them free. The light of liberty will yet shine through the iron curtain of men's minds. The warmth of human brotherhood will yet melt away the iron curtain of men's hearts. The people's hopes for freedom and peace still fly their flags high in the Western World and across the eastern seas. Against the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law which runs through the universe, the history of nations, and the minds and hearts of the people who pray for freedom, justice, and peace, empires will crumble, dictators fall, and aggressors make war no more.

The birth of the Child

With the birth of the Child the idea of the fatherhood of one God, the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law, and the brotherhood of all men, became flesh in Jesus, Son of God, brother of men, scourge of wrong, and Prince of Peace. He was Son of man who had not where to lay his head, lived among men, ministered to the poor in body and sick of heart, was crucified and rose again in redemptive and spiritual power to resist aggression, tyranny, and injustice, and to bring peace and brotherhood on earth in the great adventure of the human spirit in our earthly pilgrimage toward the kingdom of God.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly interested in these recommendations by former Senator Graham, because on July 28, 1945, I pleaded on this floor for a recognition of the provisional Government of Korea at that time, in carrying out the principles of self-determination of the San Francisco Charter. I said that if we did not follow such a course of action and place Korea under a mandate or trusteeship of the United Nations until such time as a free election could be held in Korea, there was danger that Korea would fall as a ripe plum into Russia's lap. It seemed clear to me then, as we recognized the Russian pattern as it spread itself over satellite countries, that unless we stood up and fought for the freedom of Korea, then Korea would become a threatened area, so far as the peace of Asia was concerned, and I so pleaded at that time upon the floor of the Senate.

There were only a few of us at that time who were willing to put into practice immediately the principles of self-determination of the San Francisco Charter as they applied to Korea. Instead of following that course of action, what did our Nation do? It does not serve us well to ignore the great mistakes we make in foreign policy. We joined with Russia in the partition of Korea; and the pages of history must record that when we did that we joined in the partition of the freedom of Korea.

Mr. President, in view of the tremendous sacrifices which American boys are making in Korea, I think we need pause to examine and study and carefully consider every possibility of ending hostilities, short of appeasement, every possibility short of surrender, every possibility which offers an honorable peace in Korea. Former Senator Graham, in an article which has been sent to me by the editor of a paper in his home State, has offered to the officials of our Government a statement of principles deserving of their most careful consideration, and also deserving from them an explanation as to any weaknesses in the Graham proposals. I believe the American people are entitled to know that authorities in charge of our foreign policy are taking advantage of every possible honorable proposal which seeks to bring to an end the ghastly and costly holocaust in Korea.

Mr. President, I am no quitter, but I happen to be one of those who believe that unless we can follow a military course of action in Korea backed up by adequate United Nations support, a course of action which we can defend without high casualties on the part of American boys in Korea, we should withdraw from Korea to such a line in the Pacific as we can defend against the Red Chinese. We should stretch that line of defense and maintain it by all of the means of military force at our disposal, until such time as Red China rejoins the free nations. That, Mr. President, includes our giving support to whatever guerrilla forces there may be in China, on Formosa, or elsewhere, as an aid to maintaining that line of defense in the Pacific.

We cannot continue to make the sacrifices of American lives which are being made in Korea unless our military authorities can show us in the near future that there is a chance of military success without unreasonable casualties. I think the proposals offered in this statesmanlike article by the former Senator from North Carolina are entitled to the very careful consideration of the State Department. The country is entitled to a clear statement from the State Department as to what steps are being taken within the United Nations to try to negotiate an honorable peace based upon the principles which former Senator Graham discusses in this article if those principles are feasible of application to the Korean War.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to another matter for a brief time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand it has been announced on the radio that I would discuss today the railroad strike. I suppose that the announcement was the result of an offhand remark I made on Saturday to several persons that on Monday, if I obtained the floor, I expected again to make a very sincere suggestion as to how I think the administration should move in connection with the railroad strike.

It is not a new suggestion for me. It is a suggestion which I made to the White House in connection with this same case last spring. It is a suggestion which I saw work successfully in a great many emergency cases during World War II. It is a suggestion which I think the President of the United States is in a stronger position today to carry out than he was last spring, because of the much greater seriousness of the emergency which confronts our country. It is a simple suggestion. It is a suggestion that in this great emergency the President of the United States use his war powers, as war powers were used during World War II, to call upon the parties to the railroad dispute to submit their case on its merits to an arbitrator appointed by the President of the United States for final and binding determination. It should be understood by all concerned that in the meantime, and immediately, there be a full and complete resumption of work on the part of the railroad workers now on strike.

I hope the Senate will permit and will forgive this personal reference, but, as the enforcement officer of the War Labor Board during World War II, and as one who had to deal with a great many emergency disputes, I wish to say that I do not know of a single instance of failure when the President of the United States exercised his inherent war powers in time of war—and we are at war—calling upon the parties to submit their case to an arbitrator who would be appointed by him, and whose decision would be final. Such an exercise of the President's inherent war powers is bound to succeed, because back of such an appointment is the recognition on the part of the American people that it is a fair and just and reasonable procedure for the settlement of a dispute in an hour of great crisis.

There is, I fear, a great deal of misunderstanding in America at this hour in regard to the present railroad dispute. Do not misunderstand me; I hold no brief for the strike. In my judgment, the workers cannot justify the strike, I care not how legitimate their claims may be in respect to the merits of some of the issues involved in the strike. The fact is that in this hour of crisis every American, I care not from what group he comes, must be willing to subordinate his selfish economic interest to the common welfare. That goes for railroad workers, as well as for all other groups in America. But when we start from that major premise, it is very easy then to adopt an emotional attitude which makes us intolerant of any proposal which may be based on the merits of the particular case.

Mr. President, no labor dispute is permanently settled by using the kind of duress and coercion which stirs up public opinion as the result of invective against a group of fellow citizens. It is impossible permanently to settle a labor dispute and bring harmonious labor relations into an industry until there is a decision on the merits of the issues involved.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what has happened in this case. In the first place, Mr. President, it is some 22 months old. In the second place, the case has been at the doorstep of the White House for many months. I happen to be one who believes that the case should be a rare one in which the White House steps into the picture and takes jurisdiction. Whenever the White House takes jurisdiction over a labor case, there is only one end result the White House should seek and that is a final decision on the merits of the issues. I stated many times to the President of the United States during the war, "You have taken jurisdiction over this case. Now we must take it through to a decision on the merits, because, until the issues are settled on their merits, the case is not solved in the interest of the war effort which is the justification for White House jurisdiction." Let us see if it is true, as it is being represented by some of the press throughout the country, that this case has gone to a decision.

Mr. President, as in every other litigious dispute, when we deal with the merits of a labor dispute, we must not lose sight of the procedures involved and of the rights of the parties under those procedures. In this case, what the public is not giving due weight to, in my judgment, is the fact that no final decision on the merits of the case has ever been reached or issued by the White House. The question is asked: "What about the Emergency Board?" That emphasizes one of the great misrepresentations which have been fed to the American public by some of the outstanding newspapers, who have had a duty, it seems to me, to educate their readers as to the true meaning of the procedures under the Railway Act of 1926.

An emergency board, Mr. President, is not an arbitration board. An emergency board does not render decisions on the issues of a case. An emergency board is a hybrid type of tribunal. It is an advisory board. It acts somewhat in the capacity of a mediation board. Mediation is always based upon the principle of compromise, taking into account the economic power of the disputants at the time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish this analysis of procedure in the interest of continuity, and then I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield at the moment.

Mr. MORSE. An emergency board, Mr. President, is not an arbitration board. If it is desired to make an emergency board an arbitration board, the junior Senator from Oregon is ready and willing to give very careful consideration to the merits of such a proposal, along with certain procedural safeguards which I believe will always have to be established if we ever reach the point when we think any segment of the economy of the Nation should be brought under compulsory arbitration. But I quickly point out that it seems to me that if we ever come to the point where we want to subject the railroad industry, so far as labor relations are concerned,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to compulsory arbitration, we must vest in the Board jurisdiction over the question of rates.

I know whereof I speak as to the importance of that position, because in 1941, as the Chairman of the National Railway Emergency Board, in a Nationwide dispute, I sat in the office of the President of the United States with that Board, and also in the presence of the then Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There was a frank discussion of the recommendations of the Emergency Board in regard to wages, hours, and conditions of employment, and in behalf of that Board, and under its authorization, I pointed out to the President of the United States that although we thought that on the merits a higher wage should have been recommended, and that a more favorable set of rules, from the standpoint of the railroad workers, should have been recommended, we could not make those recommendations, in all fairness, because we did not believe many of the railroads involved in the dispute had the ability to pay those wages and grant those conditions of employment because of the limitations of rates upon them.

The record is clear, Mr. President. There followed the rejection of the Emergency Board's report in 1941. There was a mediation settlement that granted some more favorable conditions. I shall not bore the Senate with the details, because the report of that case is a matter of public record. The point I desire to emphasize is that it is interesting to note that shortly thereafter the Interstate Commerce Commission granted substantial increases in rates in order to adjust them to the recommendations of the mediation settlement of that dispute which necessarily involved increased operating costs for the railroads. In other words, we had the experience in the 1941 case of seeing how difficult it is to render even recommendations on the merits of a railroad labor dispute when the tribunal which makes the recommendations has no jurisdiction at all over the determination of the ability of the railroads to pay because of the rate restriction requirements which are imposed upon them.

We cannot undertake a solution of a problem like the one now confronting us by halfway measures. If we are to say to the workers in public utilities "We are going to restrict your freedom in handling emergency disputes, by requiring you to accept a decision as final and binding, upon the merits of the evidence," then the tribunal making the decision must also have within its jurisdiction power to determine the rates the railroads can charge, in the interest of seeing to it that they pay fair wages and grant proper working conditions to the workers.

So I say, Mr. President, that I happen to hold the view that compulsory arbitration as a blanket procedure, even in the case of public utilities, is a very dangerous procedure, and I happen to believe that compulsory arbitration as a blanket procedure for handling disputes has within it the seed of a development which eventually will lead to the nationalization of public utilities. I am so opposed, Mr. President, to a state economy, I am so opposed to the nationalization of basic industries in this country, that I prefer to follow the procedure which I recommend today of having these cases—and they will be few in number when we consider all the disputes which may arise—settled on an individual basis, case by case, when the machinery for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes within a public utility industry, be it the railroads or any other public utility, breaks down. That is the procedure we followed in World War II.

I desire to refer again, Mr. President, to the nature of an emergency board. To argue now, as White House spokesmen do and as many newspaper editors in their editorials do, that a decision was rendered in this case many months ago by the action of the emergency board, is contrary to fact. It involves a type of misrepresentation of the case to the American people. The average citizen does not understand these highly technical but substantively important procedural matters. If he once sat on an emergency board he would know full well that it does not function as a judicial tribunal for the purpose of settling disputes on their merits in accordance with the preponderance of the evidence. They have many of the characteristics of an arbitration tribunal but they are not in fact or by jurisdiction an arbitration tribunal.

It is my opinion that emergency boards do a remarkably fine job in making recommendations to the President and the American people on the basis of the facts as they find them or believe them to be. However, Mr. President, you would function entirely differently on an emergency board if you sat on it in the purely judicial capacity of an arbitrator, because when you walk into an arbitration courtroom you walk into a judicial process. There is one rule of primary concern to an arbitrator, and that is the rule of the preponderance of evidence on the merits of each issue involved in the dispute.

Mr. President, I have been a stickler for the application of the rules of judicial process to arbitration, and I have been very proud of the fact, as one who has presided over a great many arbitration courtrooms, that lawyer after lawyer has said to me, "So far as the process of this arbitration courtroom is concerned, I find no difference between it and the rule of preponderance of evidence as it is applied in any Federal court." That is the way it should be. The parties should know that when they come before an arbitrator for a judicial determination of the issue involved in a dispute, the record, and the record alone, speaks for itself.

Mr. President, that is not the way an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act of 1926 works. Let us read the act. The function of the emergency board is advisory only. The Board makes recommendations. The act specifically provides that the parties to the dispute are not bound by the recommendations. In my opinion it is unfair for the White House, and for that portion of the press which has been engaging in this form of misrepresentation, to tell the American people that there has been a decision reached on the merits of the dispute by way of an emergency board report. It is true that an advisory opinion or set of recommendations have been suggested to the President. All parties to the dispute, including the President himself, must know that the emergency board report has no binding effect whatsoever, and is not a judicial decision.

I happen to be one who believes that the railroad brotherhoods have done themselves, as well as the public, great injury by the attitude which they have taken toward the Railway Labor Act of 1926 by following a course of rejecting such a large number of emergency board reports. They have a right to reject reports; the law gives them that right. Unless and until the Congress of the United States provides a different procedure, which will impose different obligations on emergency boards, the railway brotherhoods have the right to continue to reject them.

After the rejection in the present case, what happened? A mediation procedure was started in the White House. The President did not take personal jurisdiction over the dispute. He did what he certainly had the right to do. I do not quarrel with the policy he followed, because the policy he adopted was discretionary with him. He selected a very able and nationally known mediator, who is a close personal friend of mine and for whom I have an exceedingly high regard, both personally and professionally. I refer to Dr. John R. Steelman who attempted to mediate a settlement. The mediation went on for a great many days.

Mr. President, I am not concerned or interested in the little personal differences which almost invariably arise in a hotly contested labor dispute. They happen to be a part of the whole picture. We are hearing a great deal these days on both sides about petty personal differences and personal dislikes which developed in this case. I am not concerned with such differences. I am interested in keeping the record straight as to what happened. I think the record shows that the very able mediator, John R. Steelman, met with a negotiating committee representing the carriers and with four presidents of the railroad brotherhoods in an endeavor to mediate the dispute.

A great deal of complaint has been made by the railroad brotherhoods that at no time has the White House ever called the president of a railroad company to sit down and discuss the controversy. I have some understanding and some sympathy with that point of view taken by the railroad brotherhoods. However, I do not think that the complaint ought to be considered to be very controlling or to be a very vital criticism of the White House. I say that because, again, that kind of procedure was discretionary with the White House. Speaking only for myself, I have observed in a great many instances that a case can be settled much more quickly if the top men are brought in, instead

of subordinates. We discovered that to be so during the War Labor Board days, when serious national emergency disputes occurred. We found that it was possible to settle a dispute much more quickly when we brought in the president of a corporation, and had him sit down and at least be a party to the negotiations.

The White House did not see fit to do that, and it was within its discretion not to do it. The record shows that after prolonged mediation conferences the presidents of the brotherhoods and the negotiating committee for the carriers signed a so-called mediation settlement, but with the distinct understanding, which is clearly established by the news releases at the time, that the settlement was only tentative, and had to be taken back to the membership of the workers committee of general chairmen for ratification. Anyone who has dealt with railroad-labor disputes knows that to be the common practice. Under the constitutions of the brotherhoods, the presidents of the brotherhoods have no dictatorial power to bind the brotherhoods to any mediation settlement into which they enter.

I have checked into the newspaper releases of the day on which the mediation settlement was made known to the American public. I have read the account of it written by Louis Stark, and published in the New York Times. Mr. Stark is recognized as one of the most able and accurate labor relations reporters in the country. His account, as do the accounts of other reporters, makes it very clear that when the mediation settlement was announced to the public, all of the parties to the mediation knew that the presidents of the brotherhoods had to take the settlement back to the membership for approval. Therefore, Mr. President, I say that it is unfair and not completely honest reporting of the facts for the White House to seek to give the American people the impression that the brotherhoods have reneged on an agreement which they entered into on or about December 21. The spokesman for the White House, the representatives of the carriers, and the representatives of the brotherhoods knew at that meeting that the paper which was signed could not represent any final agreement binding upon the brotherhoods until it was submitted to the brotherhoods for approval.

What did they do? When it was submitted to the committees of general chairmen they unanimously disapproved of the proposed settlement. It is not for me to say that they followed a proper course of action. I wish only to say that they had a right to reject the settlement; and I think the White House owes it to the American people to report the facts about the procedural obligations and rights of all parties to the dispute. The White House cannot justify giving to the American people the impression that the railroad brotherhoods have not kept their word under a mediation settlement, because no agreement binding upon the brotherhoods could be reached until the proposed settlement—and that is all it was—was ratified by the brotherhoods.

Following the rejection of the mediation settlement the case hung fire. I am at a loss to understand that delay, Mr. President. I should think that the moment it became public knowledge that the proposed mediation settlement had been rejected by the brotherhoods—which they had the procedural right to do—the White House would have gone into action, because it took jurisdiction in the first place, and it should have seen the case through to final solution without any delay or interruption in the transportation service if further negotiations could prevent it. But many days passed. Again let me make clear that no one can be more critical than I am of the course of action which the brotherhoods followed. Nevertheless, I am talking also about the obligations of the White House in this matter.

At the time of the rejection of the proposed mediation settlement the White House part in this dispute was characterized by inaction, not action. Then certain railroad workers resorted to what everyone knows, as was stated in the Star editorial yesterday, I believe, was a dishonest strike. It is a dishonest strike. The brotherhoods are not kidding anybody about who is sick. I will tell them who is sick. The American people are sick and tired of the way this case has been batted around on the part of all concerned; and they are particularly sick and tired of the resort to strike action on the part of the brotherhoods in an hour of great national crisis.

No matter how irritated we may become in our feelings, no matter how incensed we may be over the injury which is being done this country, and the great impairment to the defense effort, as well as the danger to our boys in Korea which is resulting from this strike, that does not change the fact that this case ought to be settled on its merits. I do not know how it is going to be settled on its merits unless we get a judicial decision on the merits; and we have not had one. I do not know how we are going to settle it on its merits unless the President now—and he has the power to do it—notifies the parties that he is appointing a judicial officer, an arbitrator who will proceed to sit at such and such an hour, and who will expect the parties to appear before him and submit their case on the merits for final determination.

Someone may say, "That will involve both a great deal of face saving and loss of face." Again, I am not interested in those personal factors. I am interested in some of the basic principles, however, which I think are involved in the kind of procedure which has been followed in this case; and I wish to say that it does not augur well for the future of labor disputes during this defense period.

Mr. President, I have received, as have other Members of this body, a great many telegrams saying, "Draft them into the Army. We draft doctors into the Army." But, of course, the senders of those telegrams again do not look into the matter of legal power. To do that we would have to change the law. To do that would, in my opinion, raise some very fundamental questions of public policy. To do that would, in my opinion, constitute a misuse of the American military uniform. To do that would abuse the basic principle of patriotic service in the Army of the United States.

I have never looked upon the use of the American military uniform as a means of penalizing wrongdoers in America. I have always thought that service in the American uniform was on a plane high above that level.

Likewise, I believe that the use of the American uniform for that purpose would raise some very fundamental questions of freedom. After all, the Selective Service, as it is presently devised, functions on a democratic basis in accordance with fixed legal standards. I would hesitate a long time before I would ever vote for a law which would empower the President of the United States to throw into the Army, by way of penalty, workers who in his opinion are acting against the public interest. No matter how strong our feelings over wrongdoing, we must keep our eyes on fundamental principles of government, even in time of emergency. As the Supreme Court has said so many times, in so many historic decisions, we can never permit any emergency to jeopardize or destroy fundamental American liberties. There are other ways of penalizing these men, by legislation, rather than desecrating the uniform of the American Army by using it as a cloak of penalty.

I point out, too, that that principle, once applied, can work as a two-edged sword, not only against individual workers, but against employers, too, as well as against all others who do not act in accordance with the desires of a President. It is too much power to give any President.

So I would advise today that we resort to judicial processes, and not to shortcut penalty procedures such as the drastic actions which are being proposed in some of the telegrams we receive. I would advise today that in this case we exemplify once again the superiority of government by law. I would urge again, as I did last spring in a suggestion to the White House, that the President exercise the power which I think inherently is his under the war powers he possesses in times of great emergency, to rise above the personal attitudes which have developed in connection with this case and say to both parties to the dispute, "We are now going to submit this dispute to a judicial tribunal of arbitration.

"We will let the chips fall as they may in accordance with the evidence presented. We will follow the sound judicial principles of letting the preponderance of the evidence rule."

I think it will be discovered, Mr. President, that the case will then be settled for the first time by way of a decision which will bear a direct relation to the facts involved and in accordance with the merits connected with each of the issues.

Mr. President, I think that while such an arbitration is going on the President should make clear to the railroad strikers that he expects them back at work at the next shift. If he gives them that kind of a judicial tribunal for a determination

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the merits of this issue and they then tarry from going back to work with any dishonest pretense of being sick, when we know that they are only angry and enraged, then I, for one, say that all the processes of the law should be exercised against them, including contempt procedures and all that contempt procedures mean by way of enforcement.

Oh, yes, I know if one even suggests these days in connection with this case that some course should be followed other than the one which has been followed to date, he runs the danger of being labeled as one who aids and abets this strike. I do not aid and abet this strike. As a patriotic American, Mr. President, I resent this strike. But labor disputes are not solved by way of expressions of resentment. Labor disputes as serious as this one are solved finally by taking them to a judicial tribunal so fair in its procedure that no one on either side would get to first base, so to speak, with any criticism of the decision, even though he may not like the decision because it goes against him. I have seen it work so many times, Mr. President, that today I felt I would be derelict in my duty as a Member of this body if I did not once again make the suggestion that I am satisfied, would work in fairness to all concerned, and express the sincere hope that the administration will find it possible to follow the suggestion.

Although I do not in any way condone the railroad strike which is now crippling the transportation system of our country, I think we all need to be on guard against substituting emotional reactions for a fair consideration of the merits of the dispute. I think we should recognize that labor relations within the railroad industry would have to become very unsatisfactory and provocative before men such as our railroad workers would resort to a strike. We should not forget that railroad workers are among the most substantial and conservative workers in our country. We often hear the descriptive term used about someone's being "a typical American citizen." I think that in fairness to railroad workers it should be said in discussing this situation that railroad workers generally come about as near to meeting the description of the phrase "typical American citizens" as any group of people in our country.

Who are these railroad workers who are on strike today and against whom so much feeling is being expressed? They are our neighbors. In the typical American town they live on the same street with the rest of us. Their children go to the same schools and play in our own backyards with our own children. They attend the same churches. They belong to the same lodges and clubs. They participate in the same community activities. They are recognized and accepted as substantial patriotic American citizens, who play a very important part in the economic, social, and political life of every community of any size throughout our country.

Although at the present time they have been angered in this dispute to the point of exercising what I think is some very bad judgment, as far as the method they are using in an endeavor to obtain a fair settlement of their grievances, nevertheless fairness should cause us to recognize that they represent a very substantial and desirable element within our citizenry. Railroad workers have always been recognized as being good citizens who perform very important skilled and essential labor for the American economy. It is my opinion that the railroad carriers will regret it very much in the future if they stand by and permit railroad labor to become the whipping boys of public indignation as a result of the situation which has developed in this dispute.

I would respectfully advise the railroad carriers this afternoon that the good will of their workers in the years to come will be worth much more to them from the basis of any standard of values they may wish to set up, including dollars and cents, than any satisfaction they may get out of licking railroad labor in this dispute, as a result of the fact that public opinion is against railroad labor in this dispute. I have seen employers in other cases take advantage of their workers when a situation somewhat similar to this have developed, only to wish sometime later that they had not bought their victory at the price of the bitter resentment of their workers. The carriers may think now that only these workers who are out on strike are dissatisfied with the policies followed by the carriers in this case to date, but I am sure that they are wrong in any such thinking. Although there are great rivalries between and among the railroad brotherhoods, there is also a strong professional camaraderie among them, and a very long memory on the part of all of them as to any unfair advantage taken by the carriers of any group within railroad labor.

I am satisfied that the carriers have made their fair share of mistakes in judgment in connection with this case, too, but their mistakes have not had the effects upon the public that those of the strikers have had. Therefore as a result the carriers are not in disfavor with the public in this dispute, but they are fooling themselves if they think they are not in disfavor within the ranks of railroad labor, including those groups which are not out on strike.

As I see this case, it offers to the carriers a great opportunity to substitute a policy of industrial statesmanship for the temptation of taking advantage of this situation in order to discipline their workers, and "get even" on some industrial dispute scores. If their case on the merits is as good as they claim it is, then they should be perfectly willing to submit their case to judicial arbitration with the understanding that the arbitrator's decision will be final and binding. They should be willing to submit their case to an arbitrator appointed by the President, who in turn should of course appoint someone to arbitrate the case who has had nothing to do with the case up to the present time. What this case needs is the judgment of some fair-minded arbitrator, who will hear it in a strictly judicial capacity and render his decision on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, based upon a formal record made before him by the disputants, in an arbitration courtroom.

The workers should accept such a procedural solution to the case if offered to both the carriers and the brotherhoods by the President, and they should return to work immediately. Of course they should return to work immediately anyway, but anyone who knows anything about labor relations problems knows that when a case reaches the bungling mess this case has reached, it is necessary to offer the parties a procedure for settlement so fair that no party to the dispute can resist the verdict of public opinion in support of an arbitration procedure. I am sure that public opinion will call upon the parties to accept the arbitration procedure I suggest, if the President offers it to them.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the President in this case too. I do not think he has been dealt with very fairly by the parties concerned. I do not think it should be expected that the President would be fully aware of all of the overtones and undertones of conflict and industrial strategies which have been involved in this case. I think it is clear from press reports that he has assumed all along that settlements have been reached in the case and that the workers have walked out on these settlements. It does not appear that he has fully understood the procedure and rights of the parties to the dispute under either the Railway Labor Act of 1926 with its emergency board procedure or the mediation negotiations which were consummated in a tentative proposal for settlement on December 21. However, as I said earlier in this speech, it seems perfectly clear from the press reports at the time that all parties to that tentative settlement were well aware of the fact that it would not be binding upon the brotherhoods unless and until ratified by the full membership of the negotiating committees of the brotherhoods, commonly known as the general chairmen. Those general chairmen, as I have said before, unanimously turned down the tentative agreement, and I think when the White House learned of that fact, that action should have been taken immediately, either for further mediation or for arbitration. In any event it appears clear now that the White House should recognize that it cannot create the type of labor relations which should prevail in the railroad industry by adopting the course of action it has been following. It probably can get the men back to work by pressures and penalties but it will not establish sound labor policies in the industry that way. Government by law is always preferable to government by force. Decisions by judicial processes are always preferable to decisions either by economic force or executive edict.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the unfinished business of the Senate is Senate bill 101, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949. The bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. On December 18 the President of the United States sent a message to the President of this body requesting that titles I and II of the War Powers Act of 1941 be amended so as to make the provisions and the powers granted under titles I and II of the act applicable to the national emergency which the President by proclamation declared on December 16.

Title II of the War Powers Act of 1941, to which the President's message referred, authorized amendments and modifications of contracts which had been entered into, where modifications and amendments were necessary, to provide the supplies and materials and equipment necessary for the war effort. Immediately after the President's message was received the then majority leader, Senator Lucas, of Illinois, introduced a bill to grant to the President the powers he had requested, and to amend titles I and II of the War Powers Act in conformity with the President's recommendation.

It became immediately apparent that there was opposition to extending the powers in title I of the War Powers Act so as to make them applicable and serviceable in the present emergency. There seemed to be no pronounced opposition to the President's request with respect to revision or extension of title II of the War Powers Act. That bill was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. As chairman of the committee I immediately introduced a separate bill which would grant to the President the powers he requested with reference to title II. The latter bill, together with the one introduced by Senator Lucas, became the subject of hearings before our committee. The committee unanimously reported the bill which I introduced conferring the powers under title II, and later the Congress enacted that bill into law. The President signed it on the 12th of January of this year. So the powers the President requested with respect to title II have been granted. Appropriate legislation has been enacted conferring those powers.

At the time we reported the bill we pointed out that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would make a further study of the President's request with regard to title 1 of the War Powers Act. We did undertake to make a further study and, as a result, on January 8, on behalf of myself and other members of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, constituting a majority of the committee, I introduced Senate bill 101 which is now the unfinished business before the Senate.

On the 23d of January the committee held hearings on the bill. We offered an opportunity to a number of persons to appear before the committee. Included in the number were Mr. Wilson, who is the head of the mobilization program, and also representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and various Cabinet members. After hearings the committee unanimously reported Senate bill 101 as introduced, with one amendment which would change the time from 15 days, as it was contained in the original bill, to 12 days, in which the Congress would have an opportunity to review reorganization plans the President might submit under the bill and either reject them or approve them.

Mr. President, so far as I can determine there are only two approaches to the question of giving to the President of the United States extraordinary powers in the period of the emergency. One is to give him the powers he requested by reactivating, so to speak, title 1 of the War Powers Act. That is one approach, granting to the President the powers necessary to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, to establish agencies and powers to carry out the emergency functions which are incident to the rearmament program, and to the general emergency condition with which the Government is confronted today. That is to grant him reorganization powers as were granted in title 1 of the Reorganization Act of 1941. The other approach is as the committee has made it in Senate bill 101.

The committee was unanimous in favoring the approach provided in Senate bill 101, which is simply this: To date we have a Reorganization Act which is in force. It is the Reorganization Act of 1949, and it gives to the President of the United States the power to submit to Congress reorganization plans, involving the realinement of agencies or the transfer of functions of agencies. In other words, Mr. President, we might say that the Reorganization Act of 1949 relates to plans for streamlining the executive branch of the Government

Under that Reorganization Act, which is the general act, and to which I shall refer as the general Reorganization Act, the President may submit a plan for the abolition of functions of any agency of the Government, for the transfer of those functions to another agency, and for various forms of reorganization. When the plan is submitted, it is referred to the appropriation committee, which in most instances is the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

After the plan has been before the committee for 10 days or has been referred to the committee for that length of time, any Member of the Senate may submit a resolution of disapproval, under the act. That resolution is referred to the same committee to which the plan has been referred. After 10 days, if the committee does not act on the resolution and report it, any Member of the Senate who favors the resolution may move to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the resolution; and the matter then becomes a privileged one, and can be brought up at any time.

When a resolution of disapproval is brought up in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if a constitutional majority of the Members vote in favor of the resolution, that defeats the plan. Unless that occurs within 60 days from the time when the plan was submitted, the plan will go into effect and will become law.

Mr. President, our committee felt that the same general procedure should be followed with reference to reorganizations in the period of this emergency. If we were to reenact title I of the War Powers Act, that would simply mean that the President could do all the things and could exercise all the powers under that Act, without any supervision or review by the Congress of the reorganizations which the President would undertake to effect for this period of emergency. We felt there was no justification for the Congress of the United States to abdicate completely its responsibility to review reorganization plans. We believe that Congress should have the opportunity and the right, regardless of whatever law we enact on this subject, to reject the plans if they do not meet with congressional approval. So, Mr. President, we have made the approach in that manner.

Senate bill 101 simply adds another title to the regular Reorganization Act, and permits the President of the United States to submit any plans which will do anything that the original Reorganization Act would permit to be done under plans thus submitted to the Congress, so long as they come within those provisions. This measure reads, in that connection:

> But only in matters related to the national security or defense, namely, any of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) hereof.

That reference is to the original Reorganization Act.

Under this measure, if it becomes law, the President may submit to the Congress any plans providing for doing any of the things which he is authorized to do under that language, so long as they apply to or are related to the national security or defense.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I note that on page 9 of the committee report, in the discussion of the Reorganization Act of 1949, reference is made to the fact that that act provides certain limitations on the power of the President in respect to such organizations.

When I refer to page 3 of Senate bill 101, I note there certain limitations. Is it the understanding of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas, that the limitations set forth in the pending bill in any way affect the limitations or restrict the limitations in the Reorganization Act; or are they supplemental to those limitations?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the provisions to which the able Senator from Ohio refers are further restrictions and limitations on the President's power to make temporary reorganizations. They do not repeal the powers granted in the original Reorganization Act to make permanent reorganizations.

Mr. BRICKER. That is what I wished to understand clearly.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. However, we felt that there should be certain restrictions in respect to temporary reorganizations which were not covered by the original act.

Mr. BRICKER. They apply only in that case; is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; only in that case.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, perhaps I may point out a little further what this measure undertakes to do.

I have already indicated the purpose of the bill and how it is related to the original Reorganization Act.

As we find by reading section 302, the bill reported by the committee would require that—

> Each reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress under this title shall—
> (a) be certified by the President in his message of transmittal to the Congress as submitted under this title.

The purpose of that provision is to distinguish between plans which may be submitted to the Congress, so as to make clear whether the procedures provided in this bill would apply to such plans, whether they are intended to be for permanent reorganizations or for temporary reorganizations, and whether they come within the provisions of the title which we are undertaking to enact.

I read further:

> (b) be identified as being temporary.

They must be identified as being temporary, Mr. President. Then, when a plan is submitted to us, there can be no question as to whether it is a permanent reorganization plan or whether it is simply a plan intended to be related to the war effort and the present emergency.

I read further:

> (c) become effective in accordance with the provisions of section 6 hereof, except that a period of 12 days prior to taking effect shall obtain in lieu of the 60 days specified in the said section 6; and
> (d) remain in force only until the termination of this title or until otherwise made inapplicable by or pursuant to law.

Mr. President, when the original bill was introduced, we set 15 days as the time limit, primarily because of the provision in the Reorganization Act which this bill would modify in making it applicable to temporary reorganizations. We did so because the original act provides that the committee shall have a right to consider a resolution of disapproval for 10 days before a motion to discharge the committee will be in order. As we held hearings on this measure, the administration, I may say, as represented by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, was very anxious that we take the other approach and simply reenact title I of the War Powers Act. However, the committee was unwilling to do so. On the other hand, we did not wish to impose such a period of time for committee consideration that would make this approach to the matter unworkable.

The present act gives Congress 60 days within which to act on a permanent plan. We have felt that we should confine consideration to the minimum period of time within which the Congress could properly consider any plan proposed, and determine whether it should disapprove it or permit it to go into effect.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking as one of the minority members of the committee, I wish not only to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee for his able speech upon the bill today, and his discussion of the differences between it and the original suggestions which came to us from the White House, but I also desire to call attention to the fact that the committee believes that there should be a difference between the War Powers Act of the last war and the War Powers Act in the present situation. The War Powers Act of the last war was in effect during an era when the country was in a state of war, declared by Congress, and known to be such by everyone. Today we are not in that precise position. There has been no declaration of war by the Congress. We are in a state of war, and are engaged in actual war, as the result of a Presidential proclamation and a Presidential decision. We felt that there should be a distinction between a situation growing out of an action of Congress declaring war and a situation which is variously described as being a police action or a Presidential action, or a growing involvement in war, without the constitutional process of declaration of war.

I desire to congratulate the chairman of the committee on the leadership he demonstrated in making it clear that the Congress proposes, in a period of history when there is no declaration of war, certainly, to retain its maximum control over the functions and prerogatives which it normally has. I believe a study of the bill will demonstrate that it has been so framed as to reduce to a minimum interference with the functions of Congress and the delegation of power to the Executive if it be proposed to grant any additional authority to the Executive for purposes of expediting any action deemed necessary.

I simply wanted to convey my appreciation publicly to the chairman of the committee for looking to the development of a unanimous action on the part of the committee, which grants the necessary authority to the executive, and yet retains in the hands of Congress the right of complete determination of the major issues, which provides that all the decisions under the bill shall be temporary in nature, and also provides an automatic repealer and date of termination within the body of the measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator, and I wish to express my appreciation of the contribution he as a member of the committee has made to the development of this bill in committee. I may say to my colleague that we felt that some middle ground between what the President requested and what are the inherent rights of the Congress in normal times of functioning should be taken. We undertook to set the minimum to which we would be justified in reducing the 60-day period for permanent organizations, reducing it to a minimum which would still give us time to review the plans, to the end that if there is anything wrong with them, we can reject them. It is possible to make the period 60 days, if there is any emergency at all; and I think there is a serious emergency.

As the Senator from South Dakota says, we are not operating under a declaration of war, but we have a rearmament program under way, and we are in war for all practical purposes, because American boys are dying in battle. We feel that the President should be given some power to reorganize and streamline, and to bring about the greatest efficiency and effectiveness in the present situation.

At the same time, we do not feel that the emergency is such as to warrant or necessitate complete abdication by the Congress of its responsibility. In the bill we have provided that the Congress shall have time and opportunity to pass on any proposal, but we shall have to expedite our work. Both in the executive branch of the Government and in the Congress we are working under stress today. In fixing the time at 12 days, we felt that we had lowered it to the very minimum possible without undertaking to amend the whole basic act. I believe the period of time is fair and reasonable, and I believe we can all function under it, and that the interests of both the executive branch and of the Congress in the discharge of their respective responsibilities will be amply protected.

I may say that the matter finally resolves itself into what I suggested in a question I propounded. After the matter was discussed, and after the Director of the Budget had testified, I asked him this question:

> It sort of resolves itself, insofar as the Congress is concerned, into two approaches to the problem. One grants more flexibility—

And that is what the witnesses stressed all the way through, that the executive branch needed the flexibility to make it possible to do things quickly and to get them out of the way.

> One grants more flexibility, and the other provides the greatest safeguard.

Mr. President, the plan suggested provides, I believe, an adequate safeguard, and certainly provides a much greater safeguard than would be provided if we merely reenacted title I of the War Powers Act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I note in section 301 the following language:

> During the time that this title is in force, and for any of the following purposes, but only in matters related to the national security or defense.

Is it not true that practically everything that is being done by the Senate relates to national security and defense?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would not say that everything we do relates to national

security and defense. Life goes on, government goes on, the same as if there were no threat to our national defense. Many of the things we do of course are related to our existence. They relate to necessary functions of the Government, but they do not necessarily relate to national defense, except that keeping the Government organized and going is incidental to national defense, as well as incidental to normal operations.

Mr. LANGER. By the passage of this bill, would not the Senate and the House practically abdicate all their powers?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. LANGER. Would they not turn those powers over to the President of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. LANGER. On page 2 of the report, I find this:

> The main provisions of S. 101 are:
>
> * * * * *
>
> (4) Authorizes the President to make appointments of officials under this title without Senate confirmation—

Certainly, although the Constitution provides that appointments shall be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, that power, under the pending bill, would be surrendered. Again, on page 3 of the committee report, I read:

> It was the view of the committee that the bill as drafted is specifically limited to matters related to the national security or defense and that this essential purpose should be maintained. If any reorganizations which will result in the reduction of nondefense expenditures are to be submitted they should be submitted in the form of permanent reorganizations.

Time and again the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has submitted to the President of the United States letters and suggestions by which he could cut nondefense expenditures; yet under the pending bill the Senate would be given a period of 12 days within which to act. In the prior bill we were given 60 days.

I will concede that the average Senator who is a member of one of the committees and who can sufficiently familiarize himself may be able to act in 12 days. But I submit that a Senator possessing even the ability of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, if a new proposition were before him relating, for example, to the Judiciary Committee, in view of all the other work he had, would be unable, within a period of 12 days, to familiarize himself sufficiently with this kind of a proposition and be willing to turn the power over to any President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As the Senator from North Dakota very well knows, no Senator upon this floor could completely familiarize himself with everything that goes on and everything on which he votes. It is a physical and mental impossibility. Therefore we have to rely, as I often do, and as I am sure the able Senator from North Dakota does, upon the committee practice and procedure, under which one committee handles one character of legislation and another committee handles another character of legislation. Bearing this in mind, the War Powers Act, which we were asked to reenact and reactivate to apply to the emergency, had none of these provisions in it. It governed all through the last war. Powers were completely abdicated under that act.

The committee has tried, in reporting this proposed legislation, to make it possible for the President, if he finds reorganizations are needed, expedient, or justified, to submit reorganization plans. If we were to allow a longer period of time, if we were not going to shorten the 60-day period fixed under the permanent Reorganization Act, there would be no reason for the act at all. But I can well appreciate that in the present period, when we are trying to establish agencies to handle functions in connection with the emergency and rearmament programs, some power is needed, because Congress simply cannot pass legislation covering all these questions.

We do not have time to make a thorough study. The history has been that from time to time we passed a reorganization bill giving the President power to reorganize the executive branches of the Government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Since the 3d of January, ever since we have been in session, the Senate has adjourned for 2 days at a time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from North Dakota will have to take as much responsibility for that as I take.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. If the Senate is to do its duty by the people of the United States, there is no reason why we should not be in session every day; and if there is the terrible emergency about which the Senator speaks, there is no reason why we should not hold night sessions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the able Senator contend that we are not in an emergency?

Mr. LANGER. I take the same position as that which has been taken by the President. He says we are not at war. He sent over a few troops to Korea to serve as a police squad——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let us deal with realities.

Mr. LANGER. I am taking the President's own words.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Men have been sent over there and they are getting killed. We are in a war, as I see it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. One reason for my objection is that we saw the Office of Price Stabilization established recently, which is operating about 2,000 miles away from a portion of the eastern boundary of the State of Montana, and instead of placing the regional office in the center of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota, it placed it in Minneapolis, away off to one side. If we are going to abdicate and turn all this power over to the President, we shall be in very poor shape to criticize the waste of money, as the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is doing at the present time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to the fact that the reason why the Senate is not having more than 2 or 3 days of sessions a week is that we are giving committees an opportunity to work and prepare legislation which will come before us. If we should meet every day, or at night, as the distinguished Senator suggests, instead of speeding up legislation, we would slow it down, so long as we have our committee system. I should not want a false impression to go out that the Senate of the United States is not working, merely because it is not meeting more than 2 or 3 times a week. The Senators are working; they are working in their offices and in the committees. The reason why we have not had sessions more often is that we want to give the committees an opportunity to have meetings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that. It is also known that it takes time to draft legislation. As this emergency continues we cannot draft legislation to meet it in a few minutes' time. Some of it is highly technical. I dare say there is no Senator on the floor of the Senate who could draft legislation to meet all the contingencies arising in this emergency within any reasonable time whatsoever.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Democrats ought to be in excellent shape to prepare this kind of legislation overnight. Every time they have been in office there has been a war. We got through with one only a short time ago. They should be able to draw up this type of legislation by heart.

Referring to the words of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], he said Senators are busy drawing up legislation. I ask if that is any reason why we should authorize the President to make appointments without Senate confirmation. I recently pointed out that I was the only Senator on the floor who voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Anna Rosenberg——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, no; the Senator is not the only one.

Mr. LANGER. In any event, I voted against her confirmation. I reserve the right to vote against the confirmation of anyone appointed by the President of the United States to a position which, under the Constitution, requires confirmation by the United States Senate. I think that is a duty and a right which the Senate should jealously guard. I certainly do not want to vote at any time to turn the future of the soldiers of America, or the economy of America, over to someone nominated by the President of the United States, with the Senate's waiving its right of confirmation.

I might add, Mr. President, that I want to offer an amendment to the bill, striking out the provision waiving the right of confirmation on the part of the Senate as to any new positions. I ask

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

at this time that at the appropriate place in the bill——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not yielding at this time for the purpose of having amendments offered. I yield to the Senator for questions if he wishes to ask any questions.

Mr. LANGER. I am not going to ask any questions. In my own time I shall offer my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the Senator is entitled to offer an amendment in his own time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. On pages 2 and 3 of the bill, beginning in line 24 of page 2, I find this language:

Any reorganization plan under this title may provide for either or both of the following, which shall for the purpose of this title be deemed to be reorganizations:

(1) the extension of any function of any agency to any other agency—

And so forth. Will the Senator explain what that means?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My understanding of it is simply this: Under some acts, possibly the Navy is authorized to do certain things which the Army has not been authorized to do, in connection with the purchasing of certain equipment, for instance. The purpose is not to take away an important function from the original agency, if it is found to be working efficiently and satisfactorily, but if it is desirable to have the function performed in another place, the purpose is to enable another agency to handle it.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the idea is that when Congress has granted a certain power to one agency, it would enable two agencies to exercise the same power. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, if it is found expedient and advisable to do so, in order to get more efficient operation.

Mr. TAFT. I somewhat question the Senator's interpretation of the language. If the Navy has power to buy a battleship, I doubt very much that under the language of this particular section the President could extend the power to the Army to buy a battleship. It seems to me that the bill does not create any new power; it simply authorizes the extension of a function to do a particular thing so that two agencies may have it instead of one.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. That is the purpose. I understand that the Navy has some power with reference to procurement which the Army does not have. It was found to be a satisfactory way of handling such matters. That is one specific instance. Such an example will be found in the report at page 6:

An example of a transaction of this nature may be found in connection with the duty-free entry of materials under the authority of 34 United States Code 568. That provision of law authorizes the Navy Department to bring in materials free of duty and without customs inspection. Such authority was extended as follows under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941: To various agencies by Executive Order No. 9177; to the United States Maritime Commission by Executive Order No. 9495; to the Department of Commerce by Executive Order No. 9768; to the Atomic Energy Commission by Executive Order No. 9829 (still in effect).

Of course, if the pending bill passes, instead of a transfer being effected by Executive order, it will be done under a reorganization plan which must come before Congress.

Mr. TAFT. That is the only reason why I do not feel too strongly about it. Otherwise, I would oppose it. Congress might well think that the Navy could properly exercise certain powers in situations dealing with naval matters, whereas it might well think that the Army should not exercise such powers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If they went beyond the powers of reason, or beyond what Congress wanted them to do, Congress could stop what they were doing.

Mr. TAFT. The statute to which the Senator has referred authorizes the Navy to buy ships' stores for naval ships stationed abroad, and to bring the stores into this country without reference to the tariff when the ships return to our shores.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I never could see under what authority in the previous Title I of the War Powers Act the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could import copper without the payment of duty. That has seemed to me to be stretching the provisions too far. I am not sure that we ought to do it. However, if we retain the power to criticize or veto, I do not greatly object to granting the additional power referred to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator from Ohio and to other Senators that in the approach made in the bill we have undertaken to make certain that Congress does retain the last look and does have the final say, or veto, if we wish to use such a term. Under the War Powers Act all the President had to do was to issue an Executive order. Congress had no look at it. The power was completely delegated. The responisbility of Congress was abrogated. Many reorganizations were effectuated without any congressional supervision.

I do not say this bill is perfect. We worked on it when it came before the committee in the closing days of the last session. Two bills were introduced. One of them was introduced by the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas, which would have granted all the powers which the President requested. At the time I made an announcement on the floor in which I invited all Members of the Senate to make suggestions to the committee.

We introduced the bill now pending, and I again invited all Members of this body to make recommendations to the committee. We did not approach the subject in any partisan sense. That is not the sense in which we have worked on it. We have been confronted with the request of the President. Speaking for myself, since I was unwilling to grant such blanket powers to the President, and since Congress did not grant them to the President in the closing days of the last session—although we granted the powers requested under title 2—I felt that the next move was up to Congress. Under the circumstances I felt it was up to Congress to offer its version of the powers that should be granted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator on the approach now made. I think it is reasonable and right. Some of the language seemed to me to be rather ambiguous, and I wanted to get an explanation of it. I raised some question about the wisdom of including in a reorganization plan the kind of power granted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was placed in the bill at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, which felt that there would be occasions when such power would be needed. I have no objection to it so long as we retain the power of control.

Some other limitation are placed on authority. For instance, the permanent Reorganization Act gives the President the power to establish a new department of Government. That was attempted twice, as I recall. It was first attempted by Reorganization Plan 1 of 1949, and then by Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950. Congress rejected the proposal. I feel—and I know the majority of the committee feels the same way about it, because we were unanimous—that there is no necessity in the world for creating an emergency department of Government with Cabinet rank. The President does have the power under the regular Reorganization Act to submit a reorganization plan for the establishment of a permanent department, if he chooses to do so. He still has the power, and he can still submit such a plan for the establishment of a new department. However, we felt that the temporary powers should not go that far, and therefore we excluded such authority from the pending bill.

Mr. President, I now refer to the last section of the bill. The regular Reorganization Act of 1949 continues in force until April 1, 1953. We felt that the period of reorganization under the temporary powers which we would grant under the proposed legislation should not continue that long. So, we made the cut-off date June 30, 1952. Therefore all powers and every action under the powers granted in the bill, as well as every reorganization plan under those powers which goes into effect, will automatically terminate on that date. Thereafter the reorganizations will revert back to their present status, unless Congress takes further legislative action. That means that Congress will have the opportunity to review the whole program and to determine how those powers have been exercised under the act. It can then extend the powers, if such extension is needed or necessary. If we decide to extend the powers we can extend them with such modification, restriction, amendment, or limitation as we may find advisable.

Mr. President, I wish to comment upon subsection (b), on page 3, of the bill. Some question has been raised with reference to it.

Subsection (b) reads:

The President may include in any reorganization plan transmitted under this title provisions for the appointment of officers and other personnel in such manner as the President shall specify.

Mr. President, personally I have no objection. In fact, I have always supported the policy of having the President's appointees confirmed. I recall that some 4 or 5 years ago the distinguished present occupant of the chair [Mr. McKELLAR] introduced a bill requiring all Presidential appointees who received a salary of $4,500 a year or more to be confirmed by the Senate. I supported that bill. I still believe in that general principle. I am not so averse to such an amendment being adopted.

However, all legislation is somewhat a matter of compromise. It was felt that in making some of these appointments a controversy might arise involving a period of time for hearings, with considerable delay. Perhaps some important functions might be involved, such as the enforcement of controls and such things with which we have to contend. My general inclination is to require all Federal officials, if they have enough authority to be called officials, and not merely hired hands doing routine work of some kind, to be confirmed. But the committee has reported the bill as it is before the Senate; and aside from that proposed amendment, I shall certainly support the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment to make these appointments subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has indicated that he will support such an amendment. I have not talked with the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], but I understand that he proposes to offer such an amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I have four amendments which I wish to submit, but I desire to discuss the bill at a little later time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that an amendment such as I have suggested has been offered by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not say that. I said that I understood that other Senators, including the junior Senator from Ohio, were contemplating offering such amendments. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has already made such an announcement on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think my distinguished friend from Colorado agrees with me. As I understand, he proposes to offer such an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not concerned with who offers it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it does not make any difference to me who offers it. I am not anxious to be the author of the amendment, but I am anxious that such an amendment be offered and voted upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply mentioned that other Senators had indicated their intention to offer such amendments, so that the Senator from Colorado might know that other Senators are thinking along the same lines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is this the appropriate time to offer the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is only one committee amendment. After that the bill will be open to further amendment.

Let me say in conclusion that, in the time we have had, and under the exigencies of the situation, we have given this measure very careful consideration. As I stated, it is not perfect. It is not all that the administration wanted. The administration wanted more flexibility and more expedition, but we felt that the Congress should not give up its responsibility. We feel that this measure, by prescribing the time and the procedure, affords the executive branch of the Government adequate opportunity to present such reorganization plans as may be needed. The bill will afford adequate protection to the legislative branch of the Government to review such reorganization plans and to reject those which are found to be unjustified, unwarranted, or faulty in their structure.

Mr. President, in my opinion this bill gives every conceivable power to the President which he needs, subject to the safeguards of congressional review and the right of Congress to reject and disapprove.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, after the words "a period of", it is proposed to strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "12."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. For what purpose?

Mr. BRICKER. I have some amendments to offer to the pending bill. I also wish to move to reconsider the vote just taken, by which the committee amendment was agreed to. Following that, I wish to speak for about 10 or 15 minutes on the provisions of the bill. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, I should like to ask unanimous consent that, without his losing the floor, I may be permitted to speak at this time.

Mr. MALONE. With that understanding, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, first of all, for the record, I move that the vote just taken, by which the committee amendment was agreed to, be reconsidered. Then I have four amendments to the bill which I wish to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as the parliamentary situation now stands, I think the Senator from Ohio would be precluded from offering his amendment to extend the period of time. If the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote, I think there will be no objection.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the reason why I made my motion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote just taken, by which the committee amendment was agreed to, be reconsidered, in order that I may offer an amendment on page 2, line 17, providing for a period of 30 days rather than 12.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered and the Senator from Ohio may offer his amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I realize that it may be impossible to obtain an amendment to the bill as it has been recommended by the committee, which is held in such high regard. I know that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has given serious consideration to the provisions of the bill, and it is with a great deal of temerity that I offer the amendments which I wish to discuss. I realize also that the bill was reported from the committee unanimously, so there is no partisan approach either to the bill or to the amendments which are being considered.

I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee upon the fine presentation which he has made of the provisions of the bill, and his arguments in its support. It is much better than the bill which was introduced at the last session of the 81st Congress, providing for a complete abdication of the power of Congress and the extension or reenactment of the War Powers Act, giving the President, in this so-called emergency, the same powers which he had in the midst of the World War.

Mr. President, I believe that the time has come for Congress to reassert some of its authority. The power to make both foreign and domestic policy has become dangerously centralized within the executive branch of the Government. Recent events offer ample proof that policies must be formulated by the elected representatives of the people, and not by the hasty and sometimes secretive action of the Chief Executive. The pending bill, S. 101, affords the Eighty-second Congress its first opportunity to regain a part of the legislative authority which, by the Constitution, is inherent in the Congress.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Reorganization Act of 1949 was approved on June 20, 1949. Thirty-four reorganization plans have been submitted by the President under the authority of that act, not including Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1949, which became moot with the passage of the National Security Act amendments of 1949. Congress has approved 26 of these reorganization plans. None of the 34 reorganization plans submitted by the President promised any significant economies.

In its present form the Reorganization Act of 1949 represents an unwise abandonment of vital legislative powers. Although many of us believed that the President would use his reorganization authority to carry out the money-saving recommendations of the Hoover Commission, we had no right to abdicate our constitutional responsibilities. The Reorganization Act of 1949 was intended to enable the President to shift lines of administrative responsibility and to create or abolish offices in the interest of economy and efficiency. Contrary to this intent, the President has used his reorganization power to alter substantive policies established by Congress. The President's reorganization plans of 1949 and 1950 have not achieved any significant reduction in expenditures. They have centralized many new powers in the executive branch of the Government.

As Members of Congress we must blame ourselves as well as the President for the undesirable legislation which has been initiated under the Reorganization Act of 1949. It may be, Mr. President, that the Chief Executive can act more quickly, and perhaps more efficiently, than the legislative branch. However, the plea of efficiency is no excuse for relinquishing important legislative functions. Efficiency has always been the siren call of totalitarian philosophies. It is my hope, Mr. President, that Congress will never again forget what a great judge once said:

> The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787 not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was not to avoid friction but by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments to save the people from autocracy. (Opinion of Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52).)

Our experience under the Reorganization Act of 1949 convinces me, Mr. President, that the act and the bill now before us should be amended.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Organization of the executive branch is a legislative function entrusted to Congress by the Constitution. That fact is undisputed. The Constitution, article I, section 8, gives Congress the power:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

In the absence of authorization by Congress, the President cannot create offices or change the structure of the executive branch prescribed by Congress. Therefore, any grant of legislative power to the President, even though intended to be limited to organizational matters, breaches to some degree the constitutional separation of powers. The doctrine of threefold separation of powers is not a technical legal doctrine nor is it an outmoded concept of government. The merger of legislative and executive powers presents the same threat today as it did over 160 years ago when Madison said:

> The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny. (The Federalist (1788), No. 47.)

Mr. President, I do not venture to predict whether the Reorganization Act of 1949 would be approved by the present Supreme Court. The chances are that it would, although the Court has never passed on the validity of an act similar to the Reorganization Act of 1949. In recent years, the Court has been a strong influence in the trend toward centralizing more and more power in the executive branch. However, Members of Congress, no less than Justices of the Supreme Court, have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution. In my opinion, the Reorganization Act of 1949 cannot be squared with the separation of powers demanded by the Constitution.

It is true, of course, that Congress may delegate some of its legislative power to independent agencies, to the President, or to some arm of the executive branch. However, no such delegation is constitutional unless some reasonably definite standard is set forth in the statute. Where some standard controls the legislative power which has been delegated, the delegee of that power has been regarded as exercising sublegislative or administrative power within the framework of a policy defined by Congress. The Reorganization Act of 1949 contains no such standard. Within a limited field, the President, unrestricted by any standard or policy of Congress, is given the power to initiate legislation. Because no definite standard or policy controls this delegation of power, Congress found it necessary to retain a veto power over the President's action. The power which Congress reserved in the Reorganization Act of 1949 is not a legislative power. Congress may veto reorganization plans but it may not amend them to effectuate or to clarify its intent.

IS CONGRESS COMPETENT TO PARTICIPATE IN REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH?

The lack of any opposition to the bill which became the Reorganization Act of 1949 may be attributed to two factors. First, other Presidents had been given reorganization authority and the power had not been abused. Secondly, and more important, the Hoover Commission reported that its plan could not be made effective unless Congress transferred virtually complete reorganization authority to the President. In its concluding report, the Commission said:

> The President should be granted continuing authority to submit reorganization plans covering all agencies of the executive branch without exception, such plans to be presented to Congress and to become effective unless disapproved within 60 days by concurrent resolution of both Houses. This authority is necessary if the machinery of government is to be made adaptable to the ever-changing requirements of administration and if efficiency is to become a continuing rather than a sporadic concern of the Federal Government (pp. 8–9). (The recommendation of the Hoover Commission was followed except that plans may be disapproved by a resolution of either House.)

Mr. President, the Hoover Commission gave us a magnificent blueprint for eliminating the inefficiency, extravagance, and duplication which prevail throughout the executive branch. In my opinion, however, the Commission was mistaken in its belief that its plan required Congress to give the President such sweeping legislative power. The progress of reorganization in the past 2 years proves that Congress, and not the President, has been responsible for initiating action on those recommendations of the Hoover Commission which promise substantial savings.

Congress enacted the National Security Act amendments of 1949 in the form of substantive legislation. These amendments provided for greater unification of the armed services and have been estimated to involve a potential saving of $1,000,000,000 annually. Congress also passed the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Under this act, all Federal housekeeping functions were consolidated in a new agency, the General Services Administration. This consolidation is expected to save $250,000,000 a year. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report estimated potential savings from 1949 reforms at $1,250,000,000 a year. In other words, the only savings achieved in 1949 arose from substantive legislation initiated by the Congress and not by the President under his reorganization authority.

During 1950 only one of the major money-saving recommendations of the Hoover Commission was adopted. Congress enacted the Budgeting and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 which modernized the Federal budget and accounting system along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission. None of the 27 reorganization plans which the President submitted to Congress in 1950 specified any probable reduction in expenditures.

IS THE PRESIDENT BETTER ABLE THAN CONGRESS TO REORGANIZE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH?

The chief opposition to past reorganization efforts has come from the heads of executive departments and agencies. The Hoover Commission warned Congress to be prepared for strong bureaucratic opposition. The Commission said in its concluding report:

> It is natural to expect vigorous opposition to reforms from agencies and groups, each of which approves heartily of reorganizations that do not affect its own immediate interests. The Congress must be prepared to accept this fact and give careful attention to the validity of arguments of those who would seek to escape reorganization, as many have so successfully done in the past (p. 47).

The Reorganization Act of 1949 did not insulate Mr. Truman from the bureaucratic pressures about which the

Commission warned. It is hardly surprising that President Truman's reorganization plans have not included any of the major money-saving recommendations of the Commission which could be achieved by the reorganization plan method. All of those recommendations have been bitterly opposed by the department or agency which would lose some of its existing power, functions, or personnel.

Theoretically, the President can reorganize the executive branch more quickly and more effectively than can the Congress. As a practical matter, only a very strong President can dismember bureaucracy in the face of the inevitable opposition within his own official family. President Truman has yielded before this opposition.

The President's plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture is typical of a number of other plans submitted in 1949 and 1950. The Hoover Commission report on the Department of Agriculture contained recommendations estimated to save $44,000,000 a year. All of the Commission's economy proposals were opposed by Secretary Brannan. None were included by the President in Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950. The Hoover Commission also recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture be given two additional assistant secretaries, an administrative assistant secretary, and increased authority over constituent units of the Department. None of these recommendations involved any economy. They were endorsed by Secretary Brannan, and were included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950. The Senate rejected plan No. 4 without a record vote, when it discovered that Secretary Brannan was unable to say how he would use the increased authority which he would have under the plan.

Economy was the main goal sought to be achieved by the Reorganization Act of 1949. Section 3 of the act requires the President to "specify the reduction of expenditures—itemized so far as practicable" in each reorganization plan submitted to Congress. Not one of the 34 reorganization plans submitted during 1949 and 1950 itemized any probable reduction of expenditures. The best that the President was able to promise was modest savings to be achieved, if at all, at some unsuspected future time. The Hoover Commission labored mightily, but the President's reorganization plans have not brought forth any results in savings, or any provable results in efficiency.

A number of the President's reorganization plans made no significant change in the organizational structure of the executive branch, and were unopposed in Congress. For example, one type of plan merely gave the head of an executive department full authority over his own department. Where virtually complete authority already resided in the department head, there was obviously no reason for opposition and no reason to anticipate any economies. Plans of the type mentioned include: Plan No. 3 of 1949—Post Office Department; plan No. 2 of 1950—Department of Justice; plan No. 3 of 1950—Department of the Interior; and plan No. 26 of 1950—Treasury Department.

Other reorganization plans transferred such minor functions that no savings were predicted or expected. For example, plan No. 20 of 1950 simply transferred the duty of preserving certain public records from the State Department to the Administrator of General Services. Twelve other reorganization plans submitted in 1949 and 1950 did not involve changes substantial enough to arouse the opposition of a single Member of Congress—Reorganization Plans Nos. 4, 5, and 6 of 1949 and 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 25, and 26 of 1950. In addition, several plans were opposed for technical reasons not related to the merits of the plan. See plan No. 7 of 1949—transfer of Public Roads Administration to Department of Commerce—and plan No. 18 of 1950—transfer of public building management functions—both of which were approved. While these miscellaneous plans made an attractive box score on reorganization, they did not touch the substance of the Hoover Report.

Fifteen of the President's reorganization plans encountered strong opposition either in the House or Senate. None of these plans involved any economy. All of them substantially increased the power of the President contrary to some well-established congressional policy. Eight of these plans were rejected, and seven were approved. It is this group of plans which proves that laws should be made on Capitol Hill, and not at the White House.

DANGERS INHERENT IN LEGISLATION VIA REORGANIZATION PLAN

I am not yet convinced, Mr. President, that the Reorganization Act of 1949 should be repealed, but I am thinking very much along that line. The President knows, or should know, more about the organizational deficiencies of the executive branch than Congress can know. It is proper, in my opinion, for the President to have the power to initiate proposals to reorganize the executive branch. In view of our financial condition, Government spending should be reduced as quickly as possible. Economy could be achieved under the reorganization plan procedure more quickly than by normal legislative processes. The present national emergency seems to require continuation of the reorganization procedure with respect to defense agencies. However, our experience under the present law has pointed out the dangers inherent in legislation via reorganization plan. The four amendments which I intend to offer to Senate bill 101 are designed to minimize these dangers insofar as possible.

1. REVERSAL OF SUBSTANTIVE LEGISLATION

When the Reorganization Act of 1949 was passed, every Member of Congress believed that Presidential action would be confined to organizational matters. No one believed that the President would employ the act to nullify the intent of Congress expressed many times in substantive legislation.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 is one of the best examples of the misuse of reorganization authority. That plan would have abolished the statutory office of general counsel of the Labor Board, and would have transferred his powers to the Chairman of the Board. The plan represented an attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act by indirection. Plan No. 12 was not recommended by the Hoover Commission, nor was it proposed for reasons of economy. Although plan No. 12 of 1950 would have largely nullified the Taft-Hartley Act, it was perfectly legal. It is true that the Reorganization Act of 1949 was not intended to permit the President to change substantive legislative policy. Unfortunately, the distinction between substantive policy, on the one hand, and organizational matters, on the other, cannot be clearly drawn in statutory language. Moreover, administrative and organizational arrangements often determine the content of substantive policy. There is hardly any law which cannot be at least partially nullified by the reorganization plan procedure. For example, the President could completely wipe out all independent regulatory commissions by transferring them to the executive branch and giving all their functions to officers of the executive branch. It is futile to argue that the Federal Communications Act, for example, means the same thing regardless of whether it is administered by an independent, bipartisan commission, or by the President's own press secretary, or that the Taft-Hartley law would have the same meaning if administered and interpreted by Secretary of Labor Tobin.

Because legislation by the reorganization-plan method can be used to reverse substantive policies established by Congress, any reversal of policy should be approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. The Reorganization Act of 1949 provides that a reorganization plan may be disapproved only by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of either House. At any given time a considerable number of the Members of Congress may be unavoidably absent. It is possible, therefore, for a reorganization plan which changes a well-established policy of Congress to become law even though the vote in both Houses is 2 to 1 against it—Senate: 72 Senators present, 48 opposed, 24 for. House: 325 Members present, 217 opposed, 108 for. This danger is increased by section 302 (c) of Senate bill 101, which allows certain plans to become effective in 12 days unless disapproved by a constitutional majority of either House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not recall the Senator's position on the General Reorganization Act of 1949; but, as the Senator will probably remember, there was a controvery here during the processing of that legislation.

Mr. BRICKER. I recall that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At that time we were asked to give the President powers to reorganize every agency of the executive branch of the Government; in other words, to give him a clean bill, with no exemption of any agency or of any power whatever. The original bill provided that those plans were to go in-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to effect within 60 days, unless both Houses of Congress, by majority vote, disapproved them. In the course of that controversy, the committee, of which I was a member at the time, reported the bill. I was chairman of the committee to which the bill was referred. We reported the bill, providing that either House might veto a plan by majority vote. The Senate passed the bill in that form.

At that time there was great clamor for reorganization. Everyone thought the Hoover Commission had solved all the problems, and that we would save billions upon billions of dollars if we would but empower the President adequately. Strong advocates of economy in the Senate were willing to delegate the power to the President, in the hope of effectuating great economies in Government.

The Senator from Ohio will recall that the bill passed by the Senate provided for disapproval by a simple majority vote of either House, which was in fact the result of a compromise in committee, so that a simple majority of either House might veto any plan; but, after being deadlocked in conference for over 2 months, during which time repeated meetings were held, as other members of the committee will verify, and certain Members of the Senate were becoming impatient because the conferees did not report, we were finally able to bring back this safeguard of a constitutional majority of either House having the power to exercise the veto.

Mr. BRICKER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas, has clearly outlined what took place. I remember very well the pressure the Hoover Commission people activated back in the States during the period of 2 months, when the bill was in conference, and the pressure they were bringing upon the Senate in order, finally, in the name of economy, to have the bill passed. That was the prompting call, that we might have economy, that we might have efficiency.

The wording of the Hoover Commission report was as strong as possible in urging the necessity of the reorganization plan, and it was under the impetus of that report, and the desire of everyone for economy, and the public pressure from back home, that the bill was finally passed. I think the Senator from Arkansas did a remarkably fine piece of work in conference, in order to get as good a bill as he did.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that as a member of the Hoover Commission, I had to go against the wishes and influence of a majority of the Commission, by fighting a battle in order to get the right even of a constitutional majority of one House to veto a plan. I stood almost alone. I think there was only one other member of the Hoover Commission who supported the position I took. I was successful in getting the bill reported as I have indicated; and in conference, I had to take the compromise referred to, otherwise there would have been no bill at all.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate that, and I think the Senator is to be commended for his patriotic stand along that line.

Mr. President, Senate bill 101, in my judgment, should be amended to provide that reorganization plans submitted under both titles I and III may be disapproved by a simple majority of either House of Congress. That is one of the amendments I have submitted.

2. IMPOSSIBILITY OF AMENDING REORGANIZATION PLANS

The greatest defect in the present law is that Congress is unable to amend reorganization plans. This inability to amend makes rather a mockery of the legislative process. Without the right to amend proposed legislation, neither House of Congress can act as a deliberative body.

Reorganization plans are prepared by the President. The contents of those plans are kept in strictest confidence until they are submitted to Congress. These plans may vitally affect thousands of people both in and out of the Government. Individuals and groups affected by a reorganization plan can make their views known only to the Congress, but Congress is not permitted to amend the plan to satisfy legitimate objections. All other proposed legislation is embodied in bills and joint resolutions. Very few of those which are of any importance emerge from committee in the form in which they were introduced. Inability to amend plans submitted under the present law has already resulted in some remarkable absurdities.

Many Senators objected to plan No. 5 of 1950 because they feared that the independence of the Patent Office might be jeopardized. At the same time the desirability of giving the Secretary of Commerce full power over all other subordinate units in his Department was widely recognized. Many Senators found themselves in an absurd position because of their inability to amend the plan. By voting for the plan, they relied on Secretary Sawyer's promise to preserve the independence of the Patent Office in its quasi-judicial work. By voting against the plan to insure the independence of the Patent Office, Senators were voting against an otherwise desirable plan. There is no reason in the world why Congress should deny itself the right to improve the President's reorganization plans by amendments.

In Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, the President took full advantage of Congress' inability to amend his legislation. The Hoover Commission had recommended that the executive functions of the Maritime Commission be transferred to the Department of Commerce but that its quasi judicial and quasi legislative functions remain independent of the executive branch. The President abolished the Commission and placed all its functions within the Department of Commerce. As a result, the vote on plan No. 21 was in part a vote for the Hoover Commission plan and in part a vote against the Hoover Commission plan.

Reorganization Plans 7, 8, 9, and 11 of 1950 transferred certain functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and Federal Communications Commission to the Chairmen of those agencies. Opponents of those plans contended that they would transform these independent regulatory commissions into one-man agencies subject to domination by the President and subject to influences of partisanship and favoritism. Senators who supported those four plans denied that they would have any such effect and claimed that they were in accord with the Hoover Commission's recommendations. Whether by accident or design, the language used in plans 7, 8, 9, and 11 was very ambiguous. If Congress had had the right to amend these plans, almost all objections could have been satisfied. Having no power to amend, the Senate defeated plans 7 (ICC) and 11 (FCC), but approved plans 8 (FTC) and 9 (FPC) which involved exactly the same principle of reorganization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in my remarks the amendment which I intend to offer giving both Houses of Congress the right to amend any reorganization plan which the President may submit either under title I of the existing act or under the new title III proposed by Senate bill 101.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, after line 15, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 6 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That if during such 60-day period either House of Congress shall pass a resolution referring the reorganization plan back to the President with amendments thereto, such reorganization plan shall not become effective but the President may retransmit the plan embodying such amendments; and if he shall retransmit the plan with such amendments, it shall be deemed to be a new reorganization plan.

"(b) Section 202 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a resolution of either of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which (1) is as follows: "That the ——— does not favor the reorganization plan numbered —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ——— 19—," or (2) is as follows: "That the ——— refers the reorganization plan numbered —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ——— 19—, back to the President with a request for the following specific changes in said reorganization plan, to wit: ———," the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a resolution which specifies more than one reorganization.'

"(c) Section 205 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'but it shall be in order to include in any resolution referring a reorganization plan back to the President pursuant to the proviso in section 6 (a) of this act, any amendment to the plan proposed by any other resolution (then on the Calendar or which was introduced at least one Calendar day prior to the date it is so

included) relating to the same plan, or germane modifications of any amendment proposed to the plan.'"

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, briefly, this amendment would give either House of Congress power to adopt a resolution referring a reorganization plan back to the President with amendments thereto. Passage of such a resolution would give the President three options: (1) He could resubmit an amended plan with the assurance that it would be approved; (2) he could resubmit his original plan, stating his objections to the amendments proposed, although in most cases Congress would probably reaffirm its position; or (3) finding the amendments not acceptable, the President could consider his plan as rejected. This amendment preserves the concurrence among the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives which all other laws, except those passed over the President's veto, require. In addition, if the President knows that his plans can be amended, there is less chance that he will submit reorganization plans which contravene some well-settled policy of the Congress.

3. INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR DEBATE

Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment to title III of the Senate bill 101 to provide that defense reorganization plans become effective after the expiration of 30 rather than 12 days. On March 13, 1950, President Truman submitted to Congress 21 reorganization plans. It is obviously impossible for the Senate Expenditures Committee to give adequate consideration to as many as 10 or more plans within a 12-day period. Section 205 (b) of the act guarantees 10 hours of debate on any resolution of disapproval. If the President should submit 21 defense reorganization plans on the same day it would be difficult to guarantee even 1 hour of debate on each plan. If any plan should require more immediate action, Congress could, as pointed out by the committee's report, "adopt a joint resolution fixing an earlier effective date, as has frequently been done in the past."

IMPORTANCE OF REORGANIZATION LEGISLATION IN A NATIONAL EMERGENCY PERIOD

Mr. President, the amendments which I intend to propose to Senate bill 101 are even more important in the light of the present national emergency. Last December, Congress was asked to give the President emergency reorganization powers similar to those given to President Roosevelt by title I of the First War Powers Act. The Eighty-first Congress denied that request because the President's reorganization powers would not have been subject to review or approval by Congress.

Only one of the reorganization plans submitted in 1949 and 1950 created new agencies of Government, plan No. 21 of 1950. In any period of war or defense mobilization many new defense agencies will probably be created. The Reorganization Act of 1949 is the only law on the statute books which gives the President a general power to create new agencies. The President may, of course, without authorization by Congress, establish fact-finding commissions to advise him. The most recent advisory commission is the new Loyalty Board, of which Admiral Nimitz is Chairman. However, the right of the President to create new agencies having more than purely advisory powers must be found in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Before and during World War II, President Roosevelt created many so-called defense agencies as part of his Executive Office. The most important of these were the War Manpower Commission, the National War Labor Board, the National Housing Agency, and the Office of War Information. President Roosevelt attempted to justify the legality of many of these offices and commissions under the language of title I of the First War Powers Act. However, neither the First War Powers Act nor the Reorganization Act of 1949 authorized any agency created by the President to exercise any function not provided by law. Section 5 (a) of the present law provides that no reorganization plan shall have the effect of—

(4) Authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress.

The orders of many World War II agencies created by the President were treated as purely advisory. For example, directives of the War Labor Board were held by the courts to be judicially unenforceable and unreviewable because they simply stated the equities of each industrial dispute. Actually, the War Labor Board was not a purely advisory body. On occasions when the Board's so-called advice was not taken, the President seized plants, withdrew service by the Post Office, and threatened workers with loss of "maintenance of membership" guaranties.

The War Manpower Commission was also created by an Executive order which cited the reorganization law as its authority. Without any specific authorization by Congress the Commission issued work-or-fight orders to labor. Employers who failed to comply with the directives of the Commission were threatened with the cancellation of labor referrals and Government contracts.

The Roosevelt-created war agencies were supposedly advisory bodies. Nevertheless, they exercised tremendous powers. For example, President Roosevelt ordered each executive department and agency to use its powers as the War Manpower Commission might direct. Executive Order 9370 of August 16, 1943, provided that priorities might be withdrawn from any employer who failed to comply with National War Labor Board directives. This same practice is apparently authorized by Senate bill 101 which provides that "the extension of any function of any agency to any other agency" shall be deemed to be a reorganization—section 303 (a). That is the section to which the senior Senator from Ohio referred a short time ago. While I do not agree with the political and judicial precedents established during the last war with regard to the President's right to create powerful new war agencies, those precedents do exist.

Accordingly, if President Truman decides to create by Executive order a war manpower commission, a war labor board, or some other new defense agency, he may be able to give those agencies tremendous powers to enforce their so-called advisory directives. Among the more important powers which could be transferred to any new defense agency are power to deny priorities and allocations, power to requisition facilities and property, and power to deny work on Government contracts.

Any new defense agencies which the President may create under the Reorganization Act of 1949 may be vested with vast powers already authorized by law, particularly those provided in the Defense Production Act. I do not seek to deny the President the right to create any new defense agency, nor would I deny him the right to give some of those new agencies powers now exercised by other departments and agencies. We must recognize, however, that some of these new agencies may be much more powerful than several of the Cabinet departments. To guard against any abuse of power the reorganization law must provide:

First. That the reorganization plans creating powerful new defense agencies can be amended by either House of Congress;

Second. That either House of Congress can act by simple majority as in the case of bills and joint resolutions;

Third. That Congress has sufficient time for debate; and

Fourth. That the principle officers of any new defense agencies must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, the four amendments which I intend to propose to Senate bill 101 are designed to accomplish those four objectives.

Mr. President, I am fearful that in the consideration of this bill there is another effort on the part of the administration to use the crisis in which we now find ourselves as an excuse for grabbing more legislative power, and that there might be a further depressing of the authority and responsibility of the Congress of the United States. It is one of the characteristic tenets of all those who believe in totalitarian or socialistic forms of government that the representative legislative branch of the government must be depressed and suppressed to the advantage of the executive branch. This looks like such an effort on the part of the administration.

Already almost unlimited power is exercised by the President of the United States. It was exceeded only in war days when powers were given to the late President Roosevelt. Is it exercised in the public interest, or is it being utilized and used for the enhancement of the political power of the Chief Executive and the administrative branches of the Government.

At this very hour we see a minority group of persons who are breaking down the transportation system, threatening seriously to destroy the industrial production of the Nation which is needed to carry on the war in which we are engaged. When the administration stands palsied and powerless against a minority group which is inconsiderate and which is discarding entirely any consideration

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the public interest, it is no time to give the President more power, but it is a time, rather, for him to exercise the power which he already possesses.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield provided I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] have worked out an agreement respecting amendments to Senate bill 101, and I ask if the Senator from Nevada will yield for 5 minutes so the bill may be acted upon and passed.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to yield for 5 minutes if I can obtain unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the majority leader I have agreed to call up but two of my amendments. The first one deals with the authority of the President to nominate officers and other personnel without Senate confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive; on the same page, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; and on page 3, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio includes the change of the letter "(c)" to the letter "(b)", on page 3, line 11, and the change of the letter "(d)" to the letter "(c)" on page 3, line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so advised.

The second amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the word "twelve" and in lieu thereof to insert the word "eighteen."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada yielded for the purpose of agreement being had on two amendments and a vote being had on the bill, but did not yield for debate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Nevada does not agree to a vote being taken on the passage of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, that was not the statement made by the junior Senator from Nevada. He was told that there was to be action taken on two amendments and on the bill, but that there was to be no debate, and that the entire action would be finished in 5 minutes. Two minutes still remain.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not undertaking to debate the bill. I am trying to keep the parliamentary situation straight and get the bill passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, one amendment relates to confirmation by the Senate of heads of divisions and agencies appointed by the President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, they must be confirmed by the Senate. There are no further amendments to be offered, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 101) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the able Senator from Nevada for yielding.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE HAGERSTOWN (MD.) HIGH-SCHOOL BAND

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is in the gallery this afternoon the high-school band from Hagerstown, Md. It is an outstanding organization. The members of the band, who are seated in the gallery, have been listening to the very able address of the Senator from Ohio. It has been suggested by Representative BEALL, of Frostburg, Md., and by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] that I call the presence of these visitors to the attention of the Senate. I wish to extend to them a cordial welcome. They have honored us by their presence this afternoon.

I may say to the members of the band that I wish them well in the concert they are to give tonight, a concert which has to do with a certain box supper, which I think is going to be very popular.

PROPOSED REMOVAL FROM OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE THIRD DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me so that I may send a resolution to the desk and make a brief statement with reference to it?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada may yield to me so that I may send a resolution to the desk, and make a brief statement on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what does the Senator from Delaware mean by a brief statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the request had been granted. However, I do not expect to take more than 8 or 10 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today, possibly more than ever before in the history of this country, the question of taxes has become of foremost and vital concern to almost all of our citizens. The sacrifices which each of us makes in the cause of freedom throughout the world in a large measure is represented by the taxes we pay—or our obligations to pay in the future.

Never in our history has the integrity, efficiency and competency of the persons who collect our taxes been of greater importance. And yet it is doubtful if it has ever been much worse.

For some time I have been studying this problem and I am convinced that it is one which merits the attention of the United States Senate. It is my opinion that a careful, complete, and constructive investigation by the United States Senate of the whole system by which taxes are collected would be in the public interest. It would serve two important purposes in determining, first, whether the Government is getting paid all it is entitled to be paid, and, second, whether the tax laws are fairly and honestly administered.

I believe that the public has, in many cases, lost respect for those who collect Federal taxes, and consequently they have lost a large measure of respect for the Federal tax laws and our Government.

It is my belief that in many cases throughout the country the morale, efficiency, and even the honesty of some of those who collect our Federal taxes are distressingly bad. There is a clear, unmistakable reason for this. The reason for such a state of affairs is that our system of tax collection is shot full of cheap, inexcusable, political manipulation.

I say this not as a blanket indictment against all employees in the tax service, many of whom are honest and efficient men. However, the fact that certain incompetents, through political protection, are allowed to continue in office unquestionably is breaking down the morale of the entire force.

I plan to devote a large part of my time in the days ahead in bringing to the attention of the public what I consider a deplorable situation in the hope that it will result in some improvement. For if ever the taxpayer needed a fair deal from the politician it is today.

Today let me discuss briefly the present situation in one of the largest single districts in the United States, namely, the third New York district.

We would expect, would we not, an efficient, honest, and hard working force in this office, which is one of the largest in the United States? Certainly those in responsibility, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, should insist upon nothing less.

Now let us look at the facts. The administration and operation of the collector's office in the third district is disgraceful and is almost a duplication of the exposure which I made of the state of affairs in the collector's office in Wilmington, Del., some years ago.

I want to begin by reading the record of the deputy collectors in the third district who have been convicted of criminal offenses in that district alone since 1946:

Abraham Heller, October 28, 1946, suspended pending investigation; January 25, 1947, removed from rolls. (Failed to refute charges of solicitation and acceptance of bribe.) Sentenced to 2 years and fined $10,000.

Jesse Miller, October 28, 1946, suspended pending investigation; January 25, 1947, removed from rolls. (Failed to refute charges of solicitation and acceptance of bribe.) Sentenced to 6 months.

Julius J. Friedman, July 12, 1946, suspended pending investigation; October 5, 1946, removed from rolls. (Jury returned a two-count indictment, charging him with demanding and accepting a bribe.) Received suspended sentence and 3 years probation.

James A. Bessell, June 20, 1949, suspended pending investigation; August 26, 1949, removed from rolls. (Solicitation and acceptance of a bribe.) Put on probation 10 years.

William A. Ganey, September 28, 1949, suspended pending investigation; May 9, 1950, removed from rolls. Sentenced to 5 years and fined $14,350.

Anthony V. Fiscella, September 28, 1949, suspended pending investigation; May 9, 1950, removed from rolls. Sentenced to 2½ years and fined $2,500.

John A. Galgano, September 28, 1949, suspended pending investigation; May 9, 1950, removed from rolls. (On charges of bribery, sentenced to 2 years; fined $2,850. Imposition of sentence suspended and 5 years probation to commence upon completion of sentence currently being served.)

Thomas J. Cannon, September 28, 1949, suspended pending investigation; May 9, 1950, removed from rolls. (On charges of demanding and accepting a sum a money.) Sentenced to 18 months; fined $2,500.

That record alone is a pretty sad commentary on those in responsibility. Such widespread corruption is usually the result of widespread mismanagement, and this case is no exception.

The whole administration of the business of collecting taxes in the third district has been unbelievably bad. Yet those responsible have not been disciplined or removed.

On February 27, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue reported to the Secretary of the Treasury that conditions in 1947, 1948, and 1949 had become steadily worse. The Commissioner stated that the collector in charge of the district lacked the administrative ability to get the job done. Yet today, almost a year later, that collector is still on the job.

In reviewing the records of that district, I quote the following facts which are taken from the annual reports of the investigators:

1. The difficulty in the Third New York District may be attributed to two major weaknesses: (1) Substandard supervision and direction, and, (2) poor discipline and low employee morale.

2. Many phases of the every-day workload became sadly in arrears.

3. Washington correspondence backlogged and complaints regarding delays on the part of the office in processing these claims, returns, and correspondence were numerous.

4. The Wage and Excise Tax Division neglected much of its highly important work. For example, it failed to prepare and issue delinquency notices covering social-security and employment-tax returns due and not filed for various periods; it failed to keep current the addressograph plate file (covering employers subject to the filing of withholding and social-security-tax returns) by removing plates representing employers who had gone out of business and in preparing and inserting plates representing new employers. It did not follow through to obtain excise-tax returns from employers who were delinquent in reporting and paying this class of tax.

5. In the Comptroller's Division postings to taxpayers accounts on the assessment lists were allowed to become increasingly in arrears making it extremely difficult to keep the taxpayer ledgers in balance with the general ledger accounts. This delay in posting also resulted in the issuance of many erroneous bills and warrants and delayed the actual service of warrants covering accounts which had not been paid, causing much additional and unnecessary field work.

6. The problem of poor employee morale and the apparent inability to secure the best possible efforts of the collector's employees throughout the office was well demonstrated by a list furnished to show the large number of employees who had taken leave without pay; that is, leave in excess of the liberal annual- and sick-leave allowances granted to Federal employees. For the period from June 1, 1948, to May 31, 1949, exclusive of maternity leave, the list showed leave without pay taken by 58 employees. Of this number, 34 had taken in excess of a hundred hours, 10 had taken over 500 hours, and 2 were shown as having taken over a thousand hours of such leave during this period. During the 12-month period ended May 31, 1949, leave without pay (including maternity leave) taken by the employees of this collector's office aggregated 18,807 hours, or 2,351 man-days. During the 5 months from June 1 to October 31, 1949, such leave was taken in the total of 8,796 hours. This was indicative of an attitude that would not be tolerated in an ordinary business office. Indifference to tardiness, the taking of excessive lunch periods and early departure from the office were inexcusable and, in view of the condition of the work, was especially reprehensible. It was indicated that efforts of the collector's office to correct the indifferent attitude of the employees to their duties and responsibilities had been weak and ineffective.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know what important cities are located in the third district?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The third district is comprised largely of the City of New York, although a portion of New York City comes under the jurisdiction of the second district. The third district is comprised largely of metropolitan New York.

Mr. President, early in 1950 supervisors from Washington were sent to that office and they reported that conditions were worse than previous reports indicated. They reported that only one division in the entire office was functioning even in a fairly satisfactory manner. But the collector who is responsible for such an amazing state of affairs is still in charge of the office.

I think that the collector unwittingly gave the answer to this serious problem when he complained that the whole responsibility should not rest entirely with him, by pointing out that there were factors in the collector's office which were peculiar in that such an office is composed of a lot of political personnel and there was probably no office in the country containing more of them than his own. The inference that politics is given prior consideration in the selecting of our income tax collectors is a most damaging indictment and cannot be condoned.

The record shows that the collector on November 30, 1950, was asked to submit his resignation. To date this has not been received and no further action has been taken.

How bad do conditions have to get before some action is taken? If the Government expects the taxpayer to cooperate wholeheartedly in its huge tax problem it must put its own house in order. I think that a thorough investigation of the whole system of tax collection should be considered at the earliest possible moment. There is a great opportunity here for constructive action which will redound to the public interest—and we should take action at once.

As a first step in this direction, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should remove James W. Johnson from the office of Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York, on the grounds that the said James W. Johnson does not possess the necessary administrative ability to direct satisfactorily the operations of the collection district.

I hope this resolution will be acted upon, and that appropriate steps will be taken to clean up and put this office in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder why the distinguished Senator does not submit a resolution calling for the investigation of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

all the collectors' offices. Why pick out this one?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because this is the only one with respect to which I had any information at the time. I made the suggestion in my speech that I thought it would be well for us to look into the entire tax collection facilities of the country. I think we should check at the same time in all offices to see whether or not too much political influence is being used in the Federal tax-collecting system. I did not not think it would be fair to single out any other office when I did not have any information with respect to it. I thought there might be an unfair reflection on an office which was being properly conducted.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS was received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY—THE FAR EAST AND EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I intend to discuss briefly No. 4 of the 10 suggested approaches to our international problems discussed on December 14 in my address to this body.

NATION FOUNDED UPON COURAGE

This Nation was founded on courage. Its great industries and institutions were built on courage. We have become great because we have never feared anything but the God we worship.

Our forefathers landed on Plymouth Rock more than 300 years ago with axes and muskets and their bare hands and, because they were without fear, laid the foundation for the greatest nation the world has ever seen.

THE WILL TO WIN

We have never lost a war, for the very simple reason that we have never gone into one unless we were led to believe that our ultimate safety depended upon it, and we never once doubted our ability to win. When our people lose that spirit, our servicemen will lose the will to win. That is what we are witnessing in Europe today.

What is the source and the reason for the fear and doubt continually being peddled by the administration and their spokesmen? Is it to soften up the people so that their excessive and often unnecessary taxes will be accepted with less opposition?

FOLLOWING THE 100-YEAR-OLD EUROPEAN LINE

What is the reason for our State Department's following the European line. Why do we follow England's 100-year-old policy and continue to support the small, straggling, independent, disorganized nations of Europe, and the colonial slavery system in the Far East and Africa? What has been England's objective in preventing any European nation from becoming really strong?

Is it that England and other European countries are living in the past, and do not realize that Russia has become strong already, that her influence reaches from Asia to Eastern Europe, that a disorganized Europe cannot hope to cope with Russia, and that, under present conditions, Russia could move through Europe almost overnight?

Does she not realize that an integrated Europe, a United States of Europe, or some effective economic union of all of the nations of Europe, is necessary for them to reach their maximum of economic and military strength? A European union of states with which this Nation may deal effectively is an absolute necessity to win.

ASIA AND THEN EUROPE

Do not England and all of Europe realize that if Russia is successful in dominating China and Asia, her potential power from that source would complete the destruction of opposition in Europe and that the individually supported and disorganized nations of that area would inevitably fall under Communist Russia's domination?

We should recognize, before it is too late, that we cannot support the dead hand of colonial slavery in the Far East and Africa—that those long in slavery are on the move, and, with all of our resources, we cannot stop it any more than England with all of her resources and hired soldiers could stop our small colonies in 1776.

Our Nation is in great danger. The greatest danger, however, is in Washington and at Lake Success, not in Korea.

Our people have been shaken by a demonstration of misinformation, miscalculation, and misjudgment at the highest levels of decision and command.

WE MUST DIRECT OUR OWN DESTINY

Let us be done with this devastating fear of what Russia, or any other nation, is going to do.

Let us regain the initiative that we lost, first through the destruction and disintegration of the greatest defensive and offensive force the world ever saw, following World War II.

Let us realize that we must break up Russia's march through Asia and her resulting control of that great area with its more than 1,000,000,000 manpower.

Let us realize that Europe, with its divided, bickering nations, can never successfully oppose a Russia on the move, even if we bankrupted ourselves in her behalf.

Let us then take stock. Let us regain control of our own destiny.

TWO WORLD WARS—AND A POLICE ACTION

We came through both wars without mortal injury because of great industrial strength.

It has taken a so-called police action in Korea to teach us what may happen unless our actions are based on accurate information, clear thinking, and a sense of restraint.

And we had best take the lesson to heart.

RESULTS OF DIPLOMAT BLUNDERS

It is time that the people of this Nation, through their Congress, brought to task the persons responsible for the long series of diplomatic mistakes causing the present unfortunate situation they call a police action—and place it in the hands of the United Nations. What is this thing in which we find ourselves?

First. We have an army in the field fighting an enemy. We have lost nearly 50,000 men killed, wounded, and missing.

Second. We are on a war basis by Executive order of the President.

Third. We are drafting men and freezing prices.

Fourth. General Eisenhower says it may last 20 to 30 years.

Fifth. The Congress has lost its authority to declare war.

Sixth. We are in the hands of an organization, the United Nations, which has neither authority nor ability to defend itself.

Seventh. The President is now demanding authority to draft 3,500,000 boys for a professional Army, with a minimum of 8 years' Reserve service, which he can send to any foreign nation anywhere at any time to fight or train.

Eighth. We are defending the colonial slavery system of European empire-minded nations, from the Far East to the Mediterranean, and in Africa, forgetting that we ourselves broke away from the system in 1776.

Ninth. At the end of the 7 months of war in Korea, we find ourselves in a politically and militarily weak and untenable situation.

Tenth. Because Congress put in the hands of the executive branch its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade, State Department representatives are right now in Torquay, England, in a supersecret conference, completing the job of wrecking our national economic structure under cover of war.

NO. 4 OF 10 SUGGESTIONS

Suggestion No. 4, in my list of 10 suggestions for the survival of the United States of America, as given in my December 14 address in the Senate, has to do with what could be done about Korea and Asia. We could do one of three things in the immediate crisis:

(a) We could take the reasonably expected action, namely, arm Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army and guerrillas, so that, together with the South Koreans, they could furnish the foot soldiers for the war against the North Korean and Chinese Communists, and we could then make the most efficient use of our air power and our Navy, including submarines, to blockade, and to destroy the war-making power of the Korean and Chinese Communists; or

(b) We could withdraw from Korea and arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops and guerrillas to do the job; or

(c) our last choice, we could completely abandon Korea and China, establishing our line of defense for the Western Hemisphere through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia, using ground troops recruited in those countries.

MILITARY, FOREIGN, AND DOMESTIC POLICY

Our debate, here on the Senate floor, on foreign policy is on the question of the military policy that can most efficiently and economically assure our national security. Neither an adequate foreign nor an adequate domestic policy can be effectively established until we have a military policy based upon our defensive powers, actual and potential and upon the knowledge of what areas we must currently defend for our own ultimate security.

Who is making our military policy?

One would assume that the Department of Defense would control the military strategy, once the decision is made as to the areas to be defended. That assumption is a hold-over from the days when we followed a constitutional government procedure, when Government agencies possessed clear-cut functions, resting on statutory powers and duties, and respected the appropriate limitations.

A VERY GRAVE AND DANGEROUS SITUATION

As we are reminded in an article by Edna Lonigan in Human Events, we do not live under that form of government any more. We live under a pyramid type of executive government, in which all money is at the disposal of the President, under loose grants of powers—and policy making is determined by the current favorites in the White House, the State Department boys.

They decide for the President not only our foreign policy, but also our military policy. This is a dangerous situation in which the survival of our Nation is at stake.

Military strategy should be left to military men, after the general policy has been established, but the State Department has arrogated to itself the sole responsibility for military strategy.

SUPPORT FOR A PRECONCEIVED PLAN

General Eisenhower was not sent on his quickie trip to Europe by our military men, but by our State Department. The purpose was obviously to secure support for a decision which was fully decided upon beforehand. I do not believe that anyone is naive enough to think that a week or two jumping from one European capital to another, could accomplish any purpose other than that of propaganda for the preconceived decision of the State Department to send our boys to make up a Maginot line in Europe.

This matter of having our military strategy decided by a State Department which has made such a colossal failure of diplomacy could mean disaster for this Nation.

This same State Department, through the discovery of those agrarian reformers in China in 1946, has succeeded in turning a 100-year-old Chinese civil war into a war between this Nation and China.

Quoting from Human Events:

A nation can spend billions, keep millions of men under arms, build atom-bomb plants and Maginot lines, but if it follows bad strategical concepts it will be defeated. In fact, an unwarranted rush for more men and spending, spells military sickness, not health.

Congressman WALTER JUDD tried, without success, to get to the root of the matter. When representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to testify for foreign aid, JUDD put this question: Are you giving us what in your judgment is the best military plan for our defense? Or are you giving us merely the best military means to implement the plan the State Department has already decided upon? The defense officials only hedged.

ADMINISTRATION BYPASSING CONSTITUTION—ALL ESTABLISHED PRACTICES

One may ask how it is possible that our defense officials have fallen into such a trap. The reason is the total change in our Government; the administration is bypassing the Constitution and the established practices under which this country grew in a comparatively short time to be the greatest Nation on earth. But early in the New Deal, Hopkins, Wallace, Morgenthau, and their like, moved in.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S ADDRESS

Let us see just what General Eisenhower has said about the defense of this country.

The general told his national radio audience, following his address to the joint meeting of Congress, that he had an "Allied assignment and he lived up to it." He pointedly did not say that he had an American assignment.

He told the joint meeting of Congress on February 1 that he found evidence that the European countries would do what was necessary to cooperate with this Nation in the defense of Europe.

In 1945, following his trip to Russia, General Eisenhower, being the good soldier he is, said that he had "seen nothing to indicate cooperation with Russia is impossible."

Mr. President, there is considerable similarity between those two trips by General Eisenhower. They were of about the same duration, and they have had about the same results.

As long as he is a general in the United States Army, I suppose he could hardly do otherwise without resigning and then telling the American people what he had actually found out.

General Eisenhower supported the program that was decided upon by the State Department even before the Vandenberg resolutions were introduced in the Senate on July 11, 1948. That program is followed by the Marshall-Rosenberg universal military service bill, which has been substituted in committee for the Russell-Malone universal military training bill, under Senate bill 1.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Senate bill No. 1 was retained as the number of the bill, but a complete substitute was made, although the country still believes that the hearings held by the committee are being held on the Russell-Malone universal military-training bill.

The universal military-training bill is sponsored by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations. The universal military-service bill is sponsored by the State Department.

The Marshall-Rosenberg-State Department bill, upon which hearings have just been completed by the Armed Services Committee, agrees in almost exact detail with General Eisenhower's address before the joint meeting of the Congress, to wit, and these are the provisions of the bill:

First. That the President must have unlimited authority to send any number of troops to any foreign country at any time to train or fight.

Second. That no further authority from the Congress must be necessary.

Third. The Marshall-Rosenberg universal military service substitute for the Russell-Malone universal military training bill turns the provision for a trained civilian army into a provision for a standing professional army, and a proposed 4 to 6 months' training course into a 27 months' continuous service, with an additional 69 months' Reserve obligation, starting with 18-year-olds.

General Eisenhower approves the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute.

Mr. President, the general's address was advertised, in the advance billing, as a factual report to the Congress, upon which the Members could rely to crystallize their position with reference to the question of sending troops to Europe in the absence of a declaration of war.

However, several times the general, in his extemporaneous remarks, referred to the permanent headquarters which he has already set up in Europe; and, in closing his address, he invited the Members of Congress to visit the permanent headquarters at any future time, just as they used to visit him during World War II. That statement is an indication beyond any question that he considers the entire matter already decided and under way, subject only to the passage of the Marshall-Rosenberg universal-military-service bill, now masquerading under the label Senate bill No. 1, as a substitute for the Russell-Malone bill, which was introduced on the first day of the present session.

The 18,500,000 veterans and their friends in this country mistakenly believe that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate held hearings on the Russell-Malone bill, Senate bill No. 1, providing for a trained civilian army, when, as a matter of fact, through a ruse old in legislative circles, a fast switch was made in substituting the Marshall-Rosenberg professional army bill as Senate bill No. 1, and the hearings were actually held on the professional army bill.

BILLIONS IN FOREIGN AID TO COVER PAST DIPLOMATIC MISTAKES

Our military men must be permitted to plan their own strategy. They must be permitted to protect us from the mess which the State Department got us into, without being hampered by that same State Department. Defense is the last line that protects us against all miscalculations and mistaken foreign policies.

The State Department's strategy, which has been such a miserable failure, was based on the assumption that spending was defense. Lavish spending was actually to cover up past diplomatic errors. The administration took the position that our own military rearmament should not be allowed to interfere with Marshall plan spending and giving, and the President's current budget reflects that conviction.

We still have no military strategy to outwit Soviet military planners. In a global war, as in Korea, in line with our present strategy or lack of it, our Armed Forces will have to fight on Stalin's terms—in the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with only the shaky timbers of the United Nations for military and diplomatic support.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ECONOMIC UNION OF EUROPE NECESSARY FOR DEFENSE

If we withdrew our support today, Mr. President, England's Government would fall in the morning.

Let us stop this folly of supporting 16 separate governments whose areas total little more than one-half the area of this Nation, and make further aid to them of any nature contingent upon an economic union of the nations of Europe.

EUROPE AND ASIA FURNISH FOOT SOLDIERS

Europe could furnish one to ten million foot soldiers if they have the will to defend themselves. The same is true of Asia.

We can furnish air power and a submarine fleet to (a) control the air over any area important to our ultimate safety, and (b) blockade any nation that seeks to move into such areas.

We could serve notice on every nation in the world that, in the event of Asia and Europe furnishing the foot soldiers for their own defense, and the United States furnishing the air power and the submarine fleets, if any nation begins to move into such areas, important to them, areas whose integrity is also important to our ultimate safety, we shall destroy its war-making potential, including all fuel and industrial operations. This amounts, in fact, to an extended Monroe Doctrine.

Our boys are natural technicians and mechanics, with generations of background in getting things done in new and better ways. Let them fight in the way that they are the most effective.

WHO ARE OUR NATURAL ALLIES?

It is time that we took stock and determined just who our natural allies are, and then did something about it.

In the Pacific, Asia, and the South Seas areas, our natural friends are: Formosa, the continental Chinese Nationalist guerrillas, Pakistan, Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand.

In the Atlantic and European areas, they are Spain, Turkey, and the unwilling captive states of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. We have friends in Poland, too.

The Turks, who are our first line of defense if Russia should start to move on Middle East oil areas, will fight our potential enemy to the death. And yet we practically ignore them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator did not mention Western Germany. In what category does the Senator place Western Germany?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from North Dakota brought up that question. I am glad to give him my personal opinion, which is all that is possible under the evidence available.

It is the personal opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that we in the United States cannot buy the products of Western Germany, such as coal, steel, chemicals, and many other manufactured and processed articles, because to do so would mean that we would merely displace the jobs of our own people to the extent of such importation; and the European nations will not buy her products, because of their fear that Germany may be built up they fear her economically and militarily; and the Germans, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, will fight and will work. That has been proven over the years. Who, then, are the friends of the Germans? What markets are open to them? It is a well-known fact that the markets which are being held out now to the people of Western Germany, upon condition that they will not rearm and fight against Russia and China, are the Chinese Communists markets and the Russian markets, which cannot be supplied within less than 25 or 50 years. They can use all that Germany can manufacture. They can purchase all the products of every kind that Germany can manufacture. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it has been the practice of the junior Senator from Nevada for many years not to accept lip service, but to look beneath the surface, to see where the interests lie; and he has stated where, in his belief, the interests lie.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator answer a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator, if he has another question.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whether Western Germany will become an ally of the United States?

Mr. MALONE. I thought I had answered the question. In fact, their interests lie with Communist China and Russia. It is my earnest opinion that at this moment the Germans will not fight with us. Of course, we believe—at least, we lead the citizens of this country to believe—since we have supported Germany ever since World War II, that the Germans are sitting on the edges of their chairs waiting for our decision before they determine what they will do.

Mr. President, more brains never existed in any nation than in Germany. The people of Germany are a little bit ahead of us. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, in particular, they are way ahead of our State Department.

COMMUNIST GROWTH COINCIDES WITH EXECUTIVE POWER EXPANSION

It is interesting to observe that the change from our historic methods of foreign policy-making coincided closely with the growth of pro-Soviet influence in our foreign and military policy.

The State Department now is a combative, aggressive agency which builds its own political following through propaganda produced by use of large funds. It would amaze the Senators if they could see stacked up in one pile just one copy of each publication put out as propaganda by the State Department. These beautifully bound books and brochures sell State Department ideas, many of which have not been adopted officially by our Government, and many of which never should be adopted. At the taxpayer's expense, they are bombarding the taxpayers with propaganda for their unsound ideas. They have been able to push to the top places in our Defense Department men and women who go along with their policies.

Today, there is no question that the State Department, including satellite agencies such as ECA, is the strongest influence in the palace guard. And this is the same State Department which has been exposed as being too friendly to traitors and too weak morally.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I was very much interested in the Senator's statement that there are many of these publications which are not even official. Will the Senator give us a list of them?

Mr. MALONE. The list would be so lengthy that I would again be accused of taking up an undue amount of space if I were to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but I think a list can be furnished the distinguished Senator. The junior Senator from Nevada did not say they were not official; he said they had never been adopted as official by the Congress of the United States, or by anyone else in authority. They are officially paid for by the State Department with public funds, and they are published as beautifully engraved documents containing speeches, addresses, and directions to all organizations in the United States of America.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator, when we meet on Thursday, bring one of those volumes with him?

Mr. MALONE. I think they can be brought there in a wheelbarrow, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator bring them in, in a wheelbarrow, next Thursday, or have them brought in at that time?

Mr. MALONE. It has been some time since the Senator from Nevada pushed a wheelbarrow, but I shall be glad to get some of them, in order to accommodate the Senator. Perhaps it would be better if we merely brought them to the Senator's office, because we would not later have to remove them. The Senator could read them there.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to see some of them.

Mr. MALONE. All the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has to do is to open his own mail some morning. He will then see plenty of them. Perhaps the efficient secretary of the Senator from North Dakota is a good deal like my own. Secretaries find out how to separate the wheat from the chaff, and very little of such literature gets through to Senators.

Mr. President, as I have said, the State Department has been able to push to the top places in our Defense Department men and women who go along with their policies.

Today there is no question but that the State Department, including satellite

agencies like ECA, is the strongest influence in the "palace guard." And this is the same State Department which has been exposed as being too friendly to traitors and too weak morally.

If our military men were permitted to say what they really think, and not what the State Department wants them to say, we might have some better advice.

SAFETY OF THIS NATION PARAMOUNT—UNITED STATES CAN WIN

One thing is crystal clear: We must stop running around without any sense of direction, like a chicken with its head chopped off. We must decide what is vital to the ultimate security and well-being of the United States of America, and then govern ourselves accordingly.

The United States can win any war with any nation or group of nations under a definite foreign policy based upon our own ultimate safety as the objective.

We cannot compromise with plans or deeds dangerous to this Nation.

Let us face it—we are in our present unhappy situation because we departed from concepts so ably set down in our Constitution; we abandoned the very principles the free exercise of which caused this Nation to stand out above all others.

The American people have proved their resourcefulness, Mr. President. We can reach any reasonable objective that we set for ourselves. Not only do we have the resources, but we have the manpower to protect our reasonable objectives, and we have the industrial production capacity. In other words, we have the ability to win.

First, we must know what areas we are going to protect, how we are going to protect them, and why.

We must establish a definite foreign and domestic policy and know exactly what our objectives are.

If we take stock of our position and fix an intelligent foreign policy with the security and welfare of our people in mind—if, in other words, we fulfill our responsibility to the people we represent—we will come out of this crisis with flying colors.

CONGRESS MUST MAINTAIN ITS CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

We have heard it said here on the Senate floor, and by those radio commentators who strictly follow the State Department line, that the President has the authority to send an Army to Europe even though war has not been declared, that the President has this authority by reason of the fact that he is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

I wonder if it would not be well to remind these propagandists for State Department ideas that the Constitution of the United States of America gives the Congress the responsibility to do a number of things, namely: To provide for the common defense; to declare war; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth of the militia; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

No one has questioned the President's authority to send a small armed force to protect American citizens or American property or to maintain the Monroe Doctrine, but nothing in the spirit of the Constitution permits the President to declare war and to send our troops abroad in great force.

Assuming, for a moment, that the President, as Commander in Chief, possesses the constitutional power to send troops where he may see fit, it would still be highly imprudent for him to make an important policy decision, such as the commitment of considerable American forces to Europe, without assuring himself of the backing of the majority of the American people.

Under our representative form of Government the only effective means of testing public sentiment is by full, frank debate in Congress and the expression of the wishes of Congress.

The risks of sending more troops to Europe, or not sending more troops to Europe, should be weighed and balanced in the light of the most authoritative available testimony on all the factors involved, military, political, and economic.

CONGRESS IS THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

Clearly, Congress, which at the moment has a better mandate from the country than has the President, should find a better means of cooperation than to "consult" with the President in the casual sense in which he interprets the word. He must be brought to realize that there is a widespread public distrust in his judgment.

We must not forget that there are those in our Government who have caused the United States to take practically every wrong step possible since the close of World War II, and that these are the people who are now recommending that we spread our forces thin over the entire world. If they are serving the Kremlin consciously, they are doing a thorough job, in pushing a program so reckless and hopeless for the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Have we not a Senate Foreign Relations Committee? Has that committee ever protested? Is it not a fact that during the Eightieth Congress the vote was unanimous, 13 to 0, the Republicans voting with the Democrats?

Mr. MALONE. On what questions?

Mr. LANGER. On all questions dealing with foreign relations, and involving what the Senator has referred to as a crisis.

Mr. MALONE. Congress has not passed on the question of sending unlimited numbers of troops to any nation on earth to be trained or to fight. I think it is up to the Committee on Foreign Relations to have hearings upon that question.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the Senator's attention to my question. We became involved during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, and, so far as I know, not one Senator who was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, either Democrat or Republican, rose on the Senate floor and protested. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONE. I think what the Senator says is correct. The junior Senator from Nevada has deplored that fact from the time he arrived in the Senate from the State of Nevada. I do not agree that Congress has passed on the question of the President's right and power to send in his discretion, unlimited numbers of troops to any nation in the world at any time. I do not think Congress has passed upon that question, unless, inherent in the adoption of the United Nations Charter, it was included in that document. I am not able to determine that question at the moment. I know that the junior Senator from Nevada has voted against all this type of legislation, and shall continue to do so.

HOOVER VERSUS ACHESON

It is unsound, and confusing to the public, to try to classify every man in public life as in either the Hoover camp or the Acheson-Dewey camp of national security.

Mr. Hoover's great service was in crystallizing the debate. Secretary Acheson is merely continuing his one-economic-world theory.

I cannot agree with those who recommend that we withdraw all defense to the Western Hemisphere. Neither could I agree with those who recommend that we prepare to go to war against aggression anywhere and everywhere in the world. The latter is utter folly. Is it not about time we got our feet on the ground and quit talking about the impossible?

SHOULD LEARN BY EXPERIENCE—PREPARE NOW

In the first place, no military aid which the United States could possibly supply to Western Europe in less than 3 years, plus the utmost the other North Atlantic nations could contribute, could prevent the Russians meanwhile from conquering the remainder of the Continent. Any aid program to the separate European countries, now envisaged or feasible during those 3 years, would be inadequate and could merely provide a supply depot for the Russians if they wanted to acquire it.

I say again, Mr. President, that no maximum military or economic strength can ever be acquired by Europe in view of the separate maintenance of their small nations. There must be some kind of an economic union, so that they will not be fighting each other continually as they have been doing over many generations.

I cannot agree with those who say that Russia is not likely to attack. I do not believe that the military leaders of Russia will sit back and politely wait for us to prepare to fight them.

If we stop them in Asia, as they must be stopped, they may turn to Europe within a comparatively short time.

The situation, in broad terms, is as follows: The Soviet Union has 175 active divisions which, in a few months, could be raised to over 300 divisions. On the assumption that only half of the active divisions could be used in Europe, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Russians can still launch over 80 divisions without any further mobilization.

Of the active divisions, one-third are said to be mechanized or armored, which would mean that at least 25 are available in the west. On the western front, the Russians have 4,000 or 5,000 tanks in organized formations. Against this, the British, the French, the Belgians and the Americans have a total of 12 divisions, of which less than two are armored. The odds against us in ground troops on the western front are at least 4 to 1, and it may be as much as 9 to 1. These odds will be but little affected by added American troops of the number being suggested.

The number of lives squandered in Korea without a real objective is negligible compared with the number that would be sacrificed in a vain attempt to hold Europe with ground troops against a Russian attack.

The State Department "generals," wrong about everything in the past, now want our boys to form another Maginot line in Europe, to be side-stepped just as the other Maginot line was side-stepped.

The Chicago Tribune commented, in an editorial of December 26, 1950:

> According to members of the committee who heard him, Mr. Acheson said that a Russian advance into Europe within the next 2 years could not be stopped. But he insisted that a couple of hundred thousand more American boys should be sent to Europe at the earliest possible moment. To do otherwise, he said, would be to adopt a policy of "unutterable national shame."
>
> The futile adventure in Korea has already cost us more than 40,000 casualties and Mr. Acheson cries "Encore!" He invites a repetition of the catastrophe on a grander scale.

The junior Senator from Nevada joined with other Senators in the preceding Congress in voting the President sufficient appropriations for a 70-group air force, while the President said that 58 would be enough. Although the appropriation for the high number was voted, the President did not build even a 58-group air force.

Of course, Mr. President, it makes no difference whether we discuss a 58-group air force or a 70-group air force unless we take into consideration the type of planes, their range, and what they can carry. That is what counts in a discussion of air groups.

So we find ourselves destroying practically all our planes—B–24's and B–29's—which we had available following World War II. They are still the best planes for carrying freight which any nation has available at this time. At the same time we are not building a sufficient number of other aircraft.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is that not a repetition of what took place during World War II, when Mr. Churchill said on the radio, "All we want is guns and supplies, because we have the men"? Then, after Secretary Hull returned, we had the Connally resolution, under which we were to assist a little bit. However, of the 116,000 casualties which were sustained in crossing over to Normandy, 86,000 were American boys; is that not correct?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I do not have the figures before me at the moment, but I assume that the distinguished Senator's estimate is correct. I am very glad that he brought up the subject. There is simply a repetition of what happened before. The furnishing of three and a half million boys we are to put into the Army, as well as the four divisions which General Eisenhower asks for, is merely a foot in the door. Once we adopt a policy of furnishing foot soldiers for service in Europe and Asia, we will end up as we did in World War II. I am told that at the end 73 percent of the allied soldiers in Europe were Americans. It is a question of taking one step at a time, and doing as Mr. Churchill suggested.

I take my hat off to Mr. Churchill. He is one of the finest and ablest men it has ever been my pleasure to listen to. I hope that while I am still a Member of the Senate we will be able to develop a few persons in the United States of America who will be for the United States of America as much as Mr. Churchill is for England. It would be wonderful. Then we could sit down and make a deal with England, or any other nation. I must say that we are making very slow progress in that direction.

Mr. President, we stand on the Senate floor and apologize because our appropriations are not larger. We apologize because we do not give large appropriations of money to other nations without any conditions attached. We merely aggravate and build up the hundred-year-old prejudices and feuds between the nations of Europe. It is within our power to attach conditions, and they should have been attached long ago.

THE POLICY OF CONTAINMENT THROUGH SPENDING—A MYTH

Instead of adequate defense preparation, the President went all out for the so-called containment of Russia through the financial aiding of European countries, without any conditions attached; our money has been thrown away on the socialistic program of division of our wealth with the world.

The policy of containment was always unrealistic.

ULTIMATE SECURITY OF THIS NATION

Mr. Hoover was certainly speaking for every responsible American when he opposes "rash involvement of our military forces in hopeless campaigns." We cannot afford to risk losing Alaska for lack of forces which may be fighting futile holding actions in remote places around the Soviet perimeter. It would be folly to neglect the radar screen and other devices which help to protect our centers of industry and population, while dispersing effort in driblets far away.

All these questions, and many others, deserve the fullest and most careful factual examination. All that now matters is the most effective deployment of American resources for the safeguarding of America's independence and survival as a free nation.

Mr. President, all our actions in preparing our defensive and offensive power should be predicated upon our ultimate security as a Nation.

We are now scattering our efforts in the preservation of a disunited Europe, and in the preservation of the colonial system. General Eisenhower in his talk to the Congress mentioned the importance of maintaining the dependence of large areas of the world on Europe in order to make available to the United States the necessary strategic and critical minerals. Here I beg to differ most emphatically with the general. In the first place, helping European colonial empire nations hold large areas of the world in slavery will be no lasting guarantee of an adequate mineral supply. Secondly, the Western Hemisphere can easily become almost completely independent from outside sources for most of the needed strategic items. There is more manganese in Brazil than we could use in the next 50 years. It would be possible to keep our lines of supply open if we were getting manganese from Brazil, whereas it is not possible to keep them open to the place where we have been getting manganese.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that there is enough manganese in New Mexico, Arizona, and South Dakota, but that our Government has taken no steps to develop it?

Mr. MALONE. I will not go so far as to say that there is all we need, but there is a great deal of manganese in Nevada, New Mexico, and in the Dakotas. However, Mr. President, for us to get the manganese in our own country it would be necessary for us to pay the difference between the $1.50 or $2 a day paid to labor over there and the $10 or $11 a day paid in our country. Our administration has never been quite ready to do it. Of course, private money would go into the development of our own minerals, and we would not need to appropriate the taxpayers' money for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. It is not worth sacrificing the life of a single soldier for, is it?

Mr. MALONE. I would certainly say that it would not be worth sacrificing the life of a single soldier. I would also say that if the administration is as much for the workingman of America as it says it is, it would be willing to pay the differential of cost between the sweatshop labor of Europe and the decent wages which we pay in the United States of America. However, the administration is not willing to do it, and that is the reason why 75 percent of our mines are closed down, I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

All our actions in preparing our defensive and offensive power should be predicated upon our ultimate security as a Nation.

Upon that question alone we could name the areas of the world important to the ultimate safety of the United States.

Walter Lippmann says:

The new doctrine will have to found the defenses of the United States and of the Atlantic community upon air power and sea power—and, along with them, upon a diplomacy which is conceived and is planned by men who know the limitations and also the advantages of sea and air power.

Mr. President, we are preparing now to fight with the weapons we used in World War II, and a good many weapons which we used in World War I. Apparently we have not yet realized the full significance of long-range air power and submarines. I suppose we shall have to learn that after the war starts, just as we had to learn it in World War II after our fleet was sunk at Pearl Harbor.

THE ULTIMATE SECURITY OF THIS NATION MUST BE PRESERVED

If the administration program of huge military and relief expenditure is continued, it means the economic collapse of this Nation, and, with it, the western world.

The American people have had far too much of our squandering internationalists, who have diminished the resources of the country by scattering our wealth and our goods to unappreciative and ungrateful nations of the world, without any conditions of behavior attached to the gifts.

We have poured billions upon billions of dollars into foreign countries. Our national economy will simply not permit our continuing to do this. Anyone who recommends the continuation of this giveaway spree is recommending the collapse of our economic system and our great industrial potential, which has twice saved us in world wars.

General Eisenhower said a very significant thing. He said that the emergency might last 20 or 30 years.

The junior Senator from Nevada said in July 1950, when the President asked for the first $10,000,000,000 for Korea, that the domestic budget could be trimmed that much, and showed then how it could be done.

I agree thoroughly with the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that $9,000,000,000 can be trimmed from the President's $71,000,000,000 budget.

Few realize that the President has recommended seven and one-half billion for European aid and assistance—arms and direct aid—without any conditions attached, such as a European economic union, free exchange of currencies, halting colonial exploitation, or, in fact, any of the obvious sound principles without which Europe cannot long survive even with our all-out support. That is a very revealing item. Some of us would do well to read it several times.

TAXPAYERS SAVED ADDITIONAL BILLIONS

Few realize that the destruction of our national economic structure goes forward under cover of war.

Approximately 100 State Department and other Government officials are conferring with representatives of 35 or 40 nations on approximately 100 trade treaties, affecting thousands of products, in a supersecret economic conference, at Torquay, England, with the avowed purpose of further lowering the floor under wages and investments in this country.

They agree to the lowering of tariffs and import fees without regard to the differential in the cost of production, due principally to the difference between the wage-standard of living here and in the competitive nations.

It is the one-economic-world theory of the extreme one-world enthusiasts.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that therein lies the secret of the answer to this question. With the lowering of the tariffs and import fees on the minerals, textiles, and other products, out the window goes the private capital which is invested in those industries. So long as that policy continues, new private capital is prohibited from entering those industries. So when we suddenly discover that we must produce minerals and other products, we find no private capital being invested. All the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has to do is to check with every hotel in Washington. The hotels are again bulging at the seams with people standing in line to get rooms. Why? They are coming to the Nation's capital to get Government money to invest in businesses in which they invest their know-how. So Uncle Sam is their partner, and they lose his money and not their own when the emergency is over, and they will lose it because there is no floor under the investment, represented by a tariff or import fee.

Because Congress, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, transferred to the executive branch of Government its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade the State Department has effectively stopped the investment of private capital in any business affected by this continual dabbling by the State Department in the foreign trade field.

As a direct result of stopping or slowing down this investment of private capital in a large sector of the business structure of the Nation, including textiles, crockery, watches, precision instruments, minerals, fisheries, gloves, and hundreds of other products, the Congress appropriates taxpayers' money for investment in such enterprises through the RFC, the Import-Export Bank, the World Bank, and the General Services branch of the Government.

The investments are approved haphazardly, and, I am sorry to say, to a great extent on a political basis, by bureaus and departments, many of which have mushroomed during the emergency, and which are handling the money of the taxpayers. Billions of dollars will be squandered by such agencies, when no investment of Government money in such enterprises would have been necessary if there had been an adequate floor under wages and investments, so that private investors would know that after the emergency was over there would be a tariff or import fee maintaining a level below which the price of the product was not likely to go.

FREE TRADE—THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Additional billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money may now be saved by the simple procedure of allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire in June of this year. I am speaking of billions of dollars in addition to the amount which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated could be saved, namely, $9,000,000,000. These additional billions could be saved by making unnecessary the loans of government funds to domestic industries and businesses.

What is being done about the 1934 Trade Agreements Act? Hearings have been completed in the House on a bill, H. R. 1612, which is being reported to the House, and which is expected to be passed in a very few days. That bill will then be before the Senate Committee on Finance.

After the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was allowed to expire and the flexible import fee principle substituted therefor, based on "fair and reasonable competition," Congress could take back its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade. Private capital would then flow into the business streams of the Nation, and investments would not be destroyed when the emergency is over.

CLEAR OUTLINE OF SUCCESSIVE BLUNDERS

Today we are involved in precisely the type of war which we can never win, a land struggle on the Asiatic Continent in a theater where no decision is possible against the hordes of Asia. The mistakes that brought us to this present crisis were numerous and major; some of them date back to World War II.

According to the Boston Daily Record, Eisenhower's "major problem is going to be the people of the United States, who have been awakened to the fact that they have been tricked, fooled, deceived, and lied to since November 1943."

I read from the December 21, 1950, issue of the same newspaper as follows:

It took 7 years, but now everybody is suspicious, particularly of those great statesmen and generals who, at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and other conferences, laid the basis for the present fighting in Korea and for our going, for a third time, to Europe to rescue the nations of the west.

I read further from the December 30, 1950, issue as follows:

To recognize the gangsters of the Politburo as a responsible government was bad enough. To throw away the victory of American arms by toadying to the extortionate demands of Stalin was incredible folly. To substitute American goods and dollars for hardheaded bargaining did not give us strong allies, but weak and greedy dependents. To surrender Asia to communism by ill-informed, frivolously naive diplomacy was an unforgivable folly. No wonder, then, that suddenly confronted with the accumulated consequences of this reckless gamble of 17 years, the American people have lost confidence in their national leadership. No wonder that public opinion now acknowledges and deplores the ugly fact that while the national emergency bears its bitter fruit in Korea, its roots are in Washington. By great good fortune and the grace of providence, this Nation still has the valor, brains, and skill to emerge victorious from any ordeal imposed by alien military aggression. Now it must summon up its traditional and unfailing intelligence of patriotism to secure its own safety at home.

INEFFECTIVENESS OF UNITED NATIONS

We have a combination of a lack of willingness of most of the member nations of UN to send troops and of the UN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

willfully refusing to receive aid from Chinese Nationalists.

MAC ARTHUR IN A WAR WITH HIS HANDS TIED

Had MacArthur been permitted by the UN to make reconnaissance flights into China, the extent of the Chinese forces could have been discovered by him. But the UN refused this permission.

Mr. President, this was a most unheard of thing happening to a great general in a war. The United Nations said that he could not go beyond the northern boundary of Korea. They said he could not fly his planes beyond the northern boundary of Korea. They said he could not destroy the supply lines or the depots beyond that boundary. So, Mr. President, the United Nations, in its wisdom, sitting in its great building in New York City, said that General MacArthur must stand there on the line, on the northern boundary, and watch the Chinese Communist troops form, watch the supplies and material coming up the supply lines, and, when those troops hit his line, stop them at the line of scrimmage, as would be done in a football game.

Mr. President, the United Nations finally figured out something by which even the great MacArthur could not win. It is quite a job to figure out anything by which MacArthur cannot win. Having been with him for a time in New Guinea during World War II, and having visited him in Japan and having watched him operate over a period of years, I know that it takes a considerable amount of figuring to keep General MacArthur from winning, if he is given anything at all with which to fight.

He has been fighting with one hand tied behind him. It seems universally admitted also that MacArthur could bring consternation to the Chinese forces by sending bombers to destroy military targets in China and Manchuria. But UN has refused permission.

Mr. Truman, at a press conference January 4, said that he had no intention of again asking this permission of UN. He has obviously bowed to the European line of compromising with the Chinese Communists.

UN METHODS, MURDER NOT WAR

General MacArthur should be freed from UN control, and allowed to destroy the Chinese Communists' capacity to wage war throughout Manchuria and China, or the troops should be removed from the area. The United Nations method is murder—it is not war.

Many believe that since the Chinese Communists have actually attacked our troops we should destroy their war-making capacity in Manchuria and China so that their usefulness to Russia would be delayed by perhaps several years. It could be, Mr. President, that the opportunity has presented itself, as a result of their aggression, to do what should be done in that regard.

Our boys have been fighting in Korea under orders from the United Nations. Other nations have been deciding whether Americans boys should live or die. The business of running a military action from the debating tables of the United Nations organization already has reaped its whirlwind of death, tragedy, and despair.

A majority of the cease-fire committee influencing our troop action against Communist China have recognized Communist China.

Korea is not the most important thing in the world to us. Korea is a peninsula off the coast of Asia which the Joint Chiefs of Staff long ago said was militarily untenable.

So in an area of that kind we witness our troops fighting a Communist nation and being controlled, and the cease-fire committee made up of men the majority of whose countries have recognized Communist China. I should say it was a wonderful decision for us to make to put our own troops in the hands of people who not only want us to recognize Communist China but who have themselves recognized Communist China.

General MacArthur favored support of Chiang Kai-shek's efforts on the mainland of China, which would have occupied a large part of Mao Tze-tung's Communist army so that it would not be free for expeditions into Korea, Burma, French Indochina, and Tibet. This was rejected by the State Department.

MacArthur and most of our military men opposed the employment of ground forces in Korea, expecting that the Air Force and the Navy could do a better job. The final instructions of June 25 ordered an unready and ill-supplied token ground force to go into Korea, calling it a police action.

The whole picture is humiliating to America.

American casualties are nearly 50,000. These men and their country are paying the bitter price of a military pushing around that could have been avoided.

We must face the situation as it is today and try to devise a strategy that will extricate us from an untenable position.

THE OBVIOUS APPROACH IN KOREA AND CHINA

The first alternative in my suggestion No. 4 provided for air and sea warfare in the Korean struggle, while letting the Chinese Nationalists and the South Koreans provide the foot soldiers.

The people of North America can never meet the armed masses of the Eurasian continent on their own terms and win. It is nonsense to suppose that the smaller number of ground troops can encircle and contain the larger, and that this can be done across two oceans.

THE FOOT SOLDIERS OF CHINA

Many thoughtful Americans feel that we should take advantage of the offer of the troops of Nationalist China.

There are in Formosa 700,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops, a greater number than the combined total of the UN forces in Korea, the French forces in Indochina, and the British forces in Hong Kong and Malaya. There are more than 1,600,000 anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland of China.

It is believed that if the remainder of the funds which Congress appropriated for military equipment in the general area of China at the discretion of the President is permitted to be used for this purpose in Formosa, and if the Nationalists are permitted to aid the guerrillas and attack the Communists they can cut communications and can involve the Reds to the extent of preventing them from sending large reinforcements to Korea or Indochina, and may ultimately drive the Reds out of China.

We should push aside prejudices of State Department personnel—prejudices based upon their procommunistic ideas. We should make friends where we can find them. We should accept friendships offered to us.

We should get America's foot soldiers out of the fruitless and futile war in Korea, in which we became involved by blundering and muddling politicians, and in which we have suffered an agonizing and humiliating reverse because of incompetence at the highest levels of national responsibility.

WE MUST WIN OR GET OUT

Mr. President, why have not our troops been recalled or allowed to destroy the war-making potential of China and Manchuria?

The answer to this can be given in three words: Lack of guts.

We must either win this war with China or get out. It is the only way we can proceed without a disastrous loss of American prestige and resulting panic among our allies.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT "GENERALS"

Mr. President, how long can Congress entrust our survival as a Nation to the military planning of the State Department "generals"? The cure is simple, if Congress has the will to take hold. It must divorce the State Department from all economic and spending programs, which are the sources of its power to compel other agencies in the administration to do its will. Only thus can our defense planning be divorced from the State Department's ideological windmills.

When they have cleaned house in the Defense Establishment, Congress can turn the ECA over to the Defense Department. All of ECA which is not defense can be liquidated.

AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST CONTROL

Mr. President, it is time for the American people to wake up and bring their Government to its senses. They can do it. The Congress, at last realizing the futility of supporting Europe, or, in fact, any nation on its own terms, is ready for all the cooperation it can get from private citizens.

Let the Congress be aware of its duty and worthy of its trust. The test of the awareness and worthiness of the Congress will be found in the sincerity and integrity and patriotism of its efforts to make American interests its major concern.

How long, Mr. President, can the American public and Congress itself continue to be lulled to sleep through a double-talking administration?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Britain in Asia Plays Divide-and-Rule Game," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on January 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN IN ASIA PLAYS DIVIDE AND RULE GAME—OLD TACTICS THAT WORKED IN EUROPE DUG UP FOR A TRY-OUT IN FAR EAST

(By Parker La Moore)

Britain is using the same divide and rule tactics in the Korean situation which British diplomacy employed for two centuries to manipulate the politics of Europe.

British policy used to play the Germans against the Russians, the French against the Germans. The Turks were used against the Greeks, the Greeks against the Turks.

Then in World War I Britain supported the Arabs to break the power of the Ottoman empire in the Middle East. Through such manipulations Britain achieved a balance-of-power position in continental Europe.

In the present situation British diplomacy appears to be seeking a so-called "third force" position between the United States and Russia. This has been the announced objective of the left-wing element of the British Labor party, and that element has moved into a commanding position in British affairs in recent months.

This tends to explain why Britain has one policy toward communism in Europe and an altogether different policy toward communism in Asia.

The American alliance through the North Atlantic pact serves to hold Russia in line in Europe, or at least it was so designed. But in the Far East Britain is supporting a partnership between India and Red China which eventually might be used to checkmate either the United States or Russia.

Of course the United States would feel the first impact of such an association—indeed, we are feeling it now in the United Nations. And since Red China doesn't seem to be anything more than a Soviet puppet, an Indian-Chinese Communist working arrangement might boomerang against both India and Britain.

The possibility also exists that if the radical Laborites get more firmly in the saddle in Britain the extreme left-wing Socialists may get completely out of hand and go all the way over to the Russian camp.

The leaders in this bloc do not have the same attitude toward communism that we do. To them it is a form of socialism more acceptable from their viewpoint than American capitalism. American assistance has been useful to them, and aid in similar proportions could not have been obtained from Russia. But our bounty has been accepted with ill grace.

The speeches in the last 2 years by Aneurin Bevan and Emanuel Shinwell have reflected the hostile feeling of the left-wingers toward the United States. Mr. Bevan recently became Minister of Labor and the director of manpower mobilization, while Mr. Shinwell is Minister of Defense.

It would be taking a lot for granted to assume that they would go all out for us in a showdown between the United States and Russia.

When the British position on the Korean problem was questioned in Parliament recently, Winston Churchill warned against the dangers to Britain if a serious divergence should arise between British and American policy. Premier Attlee replied he sought unity with the "Commonwealth, the United States, and all peace-loving nations."

In this instance he was defending the British refusal to support economic sanctions against Red China. In placing unity with the "Commonwealth" ahead of unity with the United States he was speaking of India. And by indirection he was accusing the United States of a reckless, thoughtless course in seeking punitive action against the Chinese Communists. All of this was well understood in the House of Commons, where he was speaking. And his statement was greeted with cheers.

In the report to the New York Times it was remarked that the part of Mr. Attlee's statement that received the warmest reception was "that in which he informed the House that Britain's chargé d'affaires had been received by the Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs on January 21 and was informed of the conditions under which Communist China would agree to a truce."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, February 3, 1951, which to some extent explains the action of our genial General Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN 200,000,000 FRIENDS AT NO COST

General Eisenhower took to the air waves last night to give the taxpayers an imitation in shorter form of the persuasion he attempted upon Congress the day before.

So far as we have been able to learn up to this writing, nobody was thunderstruck.

There may have been citizens who thought it possible he would say of his European jaunt: "I went. I saw. You wouldn't want any."

But of course not. Even a child knows that Mr. Truman made very sure of the general before leading him up to be commander in chief of the international defense forces.

The general has now performed accordingly. He comes back with the novel suggestion that there is no doubt about the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the Truman program in foreign affairs. And then he proceeds to talk against people daring to have doubts.

If the taxpayers and Congress are locked up, then why all the jawing? When the customer is sold, you just hand him the pen. Certainly you don't tell him that he has no doubts and that if he does they are beneath him.

It is indeed worth reflection that the general himself, in spite of his frontal positiveness, has dragged in plenty of hems and haws on the side.

Last night's speech was notable for the use of the big if. In one single sentence of 80 words, the general found it necessary to protect himself six times with if.

A clue to this necessity shows itself when one reads his detailed text. In rummaging around for evidence to support his claim of France's will to resist, he mentions the war in Indochina. When the British are his example, he cites Malaya.

In view of the fact that Britain's Government is a Socialist bartender for communism and the Communists are the largest single section of seat holders in the French Chamber of Deputies, it may be argued that the general had no choice. He had to look half way around the world away from them for a likely story.

But to the world itself he could hardly have offered a more unhappy evidence of that ignorance, to call it by the best possible name, which inflames against America so many people who would gladly be our friends and allies if we would let them.

It would profit the general, at least we hope he is capable of it, to read an address to the House of Representatives on Monday last by Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH of the First Wisconsin District.

Mr. SMITH made it plain and clear how the United States can gain the support of 200,000,000 people living around the edges of the Mediterranean Sea in important regions as much threatened by Communist aggression as any in the world.

A REAL PROGRAM

Furthermore, he showed how this can be done without spending a dollar of taxpayers' money, and for that matter it can even be done in honor.

He proposes that the United States throw its sympathies with these exploited people against, not for, British and French colonialism. And, why not?

General Eisenhower, in his speech to Congress, made much of the danger that would follow Communist seizure of various places where raw materials lie that we might want to buy.

Well, in the Near East and north Africa there are enormous deposits of material wealth, of which 60 percent of the world's proved oil supply is just one.

The people who live there are not fooled. They know why the British and French denounce communism in the colonies and swallow it at home. And so it is no wonder these suppressed and exploited victims of colonialism grow more and more interested in what Russia has to say to them.

Communism is an enemy they have yet to know, but colonialism they can hate with certain knowledge born of bitter experience.

The American people, whether General Eisenhower will or no, have something to think about in the observation by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, commander of the Marine Corps department of the Pacific, that colonialism is through in Asia and in other parts of the world as well.

We can think about the fact that a committee for the freedom of north Africa complained to President Truman of French police action in Morocco even as French Premier Pleven and Mr. Truman were discussing anti-Communist measures.

We can think about the fact that in Asia, it is independent, self-governing Thailand that stands up to the Soviets. General Erskine says Thailand is the only place in southeast Asia where a white man can walk the street without fear of being knocked on the head.

No wonder General Eisenhower's sales talk suffered from hems and haws. He should have listened to Representative SMITH, instead of expecting a Nation to listen to him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Why Do They Sneer?" from the Boston Evening American for January 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DO THEY SNEER?

Why do the British treat us Americans as an inferior people? That's the question which we all must be frank enough to face and answer.

We have given the British billions of our money to squander on socialism.

We have obligingly bailed them out in two World Wars.

We have put up with a State Department which has been notoriously subservient to British opinion.

Gratitude would seem to be in order.

But, as every newspaper reader knows, we are more apt to get sneers.

Why?

There are those that maintain that this is all due to the traditional British snobbishness.

More likely, however, it is merely contempt for those who govern America.

Never was this disdainful attitude more forcefully demonstrated than in the pending peace treaty with the Japanese.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The power of Japan in the Pacific was broken by the American Army, Navy, and Air Force, assisted mainly by Nationalist China under Chiang Kai-shek.

The Japanese broke the British power in Asia and whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur did come back, the British did not.

General MacArthur conquered Japan and then established it as, in effect, a protectorate of the United States. Drawing upon his genius as an organizer and administrator, he gave the Japanese a new life.

Now he is about to negotiate a treaty with them, restoring to them their independence and guaranteeing the United States a true friend in the Orient.

So what happens?

The British barge into the picture with a series of spiteful attacks on General MacArthur.

With the help of Americans shortsighted enough to do their bidding, they conduct a smear campaign against MacArthur, even within the borders of the United States.

And then, wholly unmindful that Soviet China is murdering Americans in a shameless war of imperialist invasion, these Britishers have the gall to demand that Soviet China should be invited to participate in the negotiations with the Japanese.

Can the British statesmen guarantee that once Mao Tze-tung has seized Korea, he will not make war on Japan?

Will the British stipulate now what they will do if and when Mao moves on Japan, or will they say that after Mao has again double-crossed them, they will let America fight to the last man?

They pledged themselves to support the United Nations. They were among the most vigorous and vociferous of its members prior to the Korean trouble. But after the bullets began flying, they let Americans do 90 percent of the fighting and 90 percent of the dying. They contended with token forces.

We are a proud and self-respecting people, no matter what the British choose to think about us.

Clearly, therefore, the time has come for us to say that Japan is our problem, that we shall make whatever arrangements with Japan we desire to make, and that we shall back General MacArthur to the limit.

And all the while, we should keep uppermost in our minds the hard-to-take fact that the British would not have had the impudence to force their sponsorship of Soviet China upon the United States if they were not openly contemptuous of the conduct of our foreign policy.

We have given them the handsome sum of $5,900,000,000 in the past 5 years alone. We have taxed our people till it hurt for their benefit.

We have every right in the world to expect some show of appreciation from them; but if we do not get it, there is no reason why we should tolerate more sneers and smears.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Chiang Repeats Offer of Army To Save Korea," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on January 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG REPEATS OFFER OF ARMY TO SAVE KOREA—CAN RETAKE CHINA "WITHOUT GI AID"

TAIPEI, FORMOSA, January 10.—Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek said today that his offer to the United Nations of Chinese Nationalist combat troops for use in Korea or any other part of the world still holds good.

He also said that his forces could liberate the Chinese mainland from the Communists without the help of United States troops.

American troops are not wanted or needed as sacrifices to communism in China, he said.

Chiang told the United Press that he stands by all his past declarations, both as to military help to the UN and liberation of the mainland.

Nationalist China offered 33,000 troops last summer for service in Koren. The offer was relayed to General of Army Douglas MacArthur as UN military commander. He declined it on grounds that the Nationalists needed their forces to safeguard Formosa.

Whether General MacArthur will reconsider the offer in the light of the deteriorating military situation in Korea was not known.

Mr. MALONE. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement of the 10 suggested approaches to our international relationships, which were outlined on December 14, 1950, by the junior Senator from Nevada in an address before this body. Let me say that I intend to discuss at a later date the remainder of the ten recommendations.

"There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN SUGGESTIONS IN PRESENT EMERGENCY

1. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for world war III.

2. Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

3. Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

4. Three suggested approaches to the war in Korea and Asia:

A. We could do the obvious thing—arm Chiang Kai-shek's nationals and guerrillas to furnish the foot soldiers for the job, then under General MacArthur make the most efficient use of our air power, our Navy, including submarines, to destroy the war-making power of Communist Korea and the aggressor Communist China troops.

B. We could withdraw from Korea, arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops, and let him do the job. It would require a longer time, but he would engage the Communist forces to the extent that it would be doubtful if they could harass us for a considerable time.

C. We could completely abandon Korea and China with all of its possible consequences and repercussions.

D. We can then establish our first line of defense through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia.

E. If all of these suggestions are discarded, then we can come home and defend the Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to defend this continent in any case. The one thing that we cannot do is to continue the present course of indecision and nervous jittery attitude.

5. Inform the governments of Europe which still maintain political and economic agreements with the Soviet Union that these should be terminated at the earliest possible date as a prerequisite to the continued friendship and assistance of Europe in the United States.

6. Give no more money as loans or gifts to any government, but if necessary loan such funds to private business in strategic areas without weakening our own economy, in the same manner that the RFC loans such funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

7. Build as rapidly as possible a military force, spearheaded by an adequate submarine fleet and an air corps of whatever number of groups may be called for, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere.

8. If the European people will enlist in their own armies and furnish the ground troops, then serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with an aggressive aerial attack on their means of making war, using every means at our command to defeat their purpose of controlling Europe.

9. In every possible way, protect and strengthen our national economy; while making all possible speed toward proper preparedness, guard well our national economy; stop wasting the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers through Marshall plan and other give-away schemes; inaugurate a businesslike fiscal policy.

10. Clean up our own Government, throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness, and other dangerous security risks.

The Armed Services Committees of the Congress should immediately institute a thorough investigation to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war.

YALTA AND POLAND

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on tomorrow, February 6, six years will have passed since Prime Minister Churchill, President Roosevelt, and Generalissimo Stalin announced to the world their signed pledge at Yalta to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity guaranteeing the holding of free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot.

Six years have passed since Poland was promised that in these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates.

This was a glowing commitment, full of hope and promise for the people of the country which was the first to resist the invading Nazi legions. What was not known in February 6 years ago was that the western democracies had, coincidentally with these great promises to Poland, secretly agreed to many other things. We did not know then that it had been secretly agreed not to apply the principles of the Atlantic Charter to countries which the Kremlin had absorbed, that it had been secretly agreed greatly to modify the Curzon Line in order to give the Soviets possession of the important city of Lwow and other strategic areas of Polish territory, that it had been secretly agreed to recognize the Ukraine and White Russia separately in order to give the Kremlin three votes in the United Nations, that it had been secretly agreed to accept the Soviet proposal for the fatal veto, that it had been secretly agreed to award the Soviets one-half of Germany's $20,000,000,000 reparations bill, and that it had been secretly agreed to sign away to the Kremlin Outer Mongolia, the whole Kurile chain of islands, half of the important island of Sakhalin, and in Manchuria exclusive occupation of the Port Arthur naval base, and a half share with China in control of the commercial port of Dairen.

These concessions involved the very existence of millions of human beings, including the people of Poland; yet Poland was not consulted. The Congress of the United States, traditional friend of the Polish people, was not consulted,

even though the Constitution explicitly entrusted to the Senate the ratification of treaties. The affected nations of Eastern Europe were not consulted. Small wonder that many say that apparently only the Politburo was consulted.

Here is how the President of the United States, reporting to Congress on March 1, 1945, referred to these world-shattering secret agreements:

> There were, of course, a number of smaller things which I have not time to go into on which joint agreement was had. We hope things will straighten out.

Unfortunately, things have not straightened out, at least not insofar as the Polish people are concerned. Things have straightened out for the masters of the Kremlin, of course. But what became of the solemn pledge for "free and unfettered elections" in Poland, for "universal suffrage" and the "secret ballot," in exchange for which such vast concessions were made at Yalta 6 years ago?

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] properly characterized the Polish elections of 1947 as a "vicious travesty upon the promised freedom and democracy to which we pledged our support." Even the State Department had to admit that the Provisional Government of Poland, recognized at Yalta, had "employed widespread measures of coercion and intimidation against democratic elements which were loyal to Poland."

The net result of Yalta, so far as Poland is concerned, is that she was relieved of her sovereign territory in the east, promised free elections, and promptly abandoned to the scourge of implacable totalitarianism.

Little wonder it is that history has recorded the tragic verdict that Poland was truly sold down the river at Yalta.

Everlastingly tragic is this verdict to those who recall the fury of Polish resistance during those 35 days when the Warsaw radio played Chopin's immortal music, a stirring and unforgettable chapter of history. Even when Warsaw fell, Polish courage never faltered. Thousands made their way to France and England, seeking an opportunity to carry on the fight, which they did, on land, on sea, and in the air. If Yalta is the record of Polish betrayal, World War II at least is the record of Polish courage, the courage that flamed up everywhere—on and above the North Sea, in frozen Norway, in the deserts of Libya, on the slopes of Monte Cassino, wherever the freedom-loving peoples of the world fought for liberty and decency.

It was my unforgettable privilege to serve alongside of the Polish troops in Italy in 1944. We were together in the Fifth Army. I was present at one of the early attacks on Monte Cassino in March 1944—an attack which failed in spite of 7 hours of continuous air bombardment and artillery barrage. Monte Cassino, as you know, controlled the whole Liri River valley and the approach to Rome. Many had tried to reduce it, but none had succeeded. But the Polish troops captured it, opened the road to Rome, and changed the whole course of allied battle in Italy.

I was present in Rome on a sunny August morning in the beautiful Piazza Venezia when the American General Devers decorated that gallant and dynamic soldier, Gen. Wladislaw Anders, with the Order of Commander of the Legion of Merit. Much later in 1945, on a wintry day in eastern France, I saw General Anders decorate General Devers with the Polish War Cross—the order of Virtuti Militari, with its blue and black ribbon. During a long evening with General Anders we talked about his troops who last year were included in the displaced-persons legislation as eligible to enter the United States.

These things have given me a close personal interest in Poland, which I know is shared by many Americans who have not had a personal contact with Polish people. For every American, after all, knows about Kosciusko and his contribution to American independence and we all appreciate what Americans of Polish descent have brought to the development of our common country.

Flowery resolutions and pious words about Poland are scant measures of consolation for the millions of brave people condemned to existence behind the iron curtain. I want my country to realize that in the Latin phrase which adorns the Polish medal "Polonia Restituta" there is a message for us that we are obligated to honor.

It is a constant reminder that the terrible consequences of Yalta, to which this country was regretfully a party, exhort us today so to conduct ourselves that the debt is repaid—that "Polonia Restituta" shall become more than words on a medal, but a basic and never-to-be-forgotten objective of our whole national policy.

I yield the floor.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of the introduction of a bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not wish to introduce a bill, but to ask to have one considered.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand there are four amendments to be offered to the bill by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on Monday last when this bill was called on the Consent Calendar, the able Senator from North Dakota asked to have it go over, and I joined in the request at that time, in order that we might study the bill. I merely say this by way of introduction. We have gone over the bill, and I have four brief amendments, about which I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader. I should like to offer them, and to discuss the bill very briefly. The amendments are self-explanatory, and I shall not discuss them, but I merely want to say a few words in connection with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind having the amendments agreed to first?

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] offers certain amendments, which will be stated.

The first amendment of Mr. CASE was, on page 3, line 24, after the word "salary," to insert "to be fixed by the Commissioner but."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, after the word "assistants", to insert "the chief of each integrated division and his assistants."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after the word "reports", to insert "except that any commissioner may present his own or minority views or supplemental reports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 15, after the word "during", to insert "a national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress and during."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 23, between the words "such" and "war," insert "national emergency or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on the whole, it seems to me that this bill will greatly improve the Federal communications law. In reading the report I was impressed by the efforts of the author of the bill, the distinguished majority leader, and the committee to dissipate some of the fog surrounding some of the activity, or lack of activity, in the area in which the Commission has jurisdiction or responsibility.

Over a period of years, the Commission has moved from looking over a radio station's over-all program content to specific programs to which it objects. It has been unwilling to cancel the license, or to fail to renew the license for a station, for example, that is engaging in give-away programs and broadcasting horse-racing information, but it has proceeded to make rulings as to whether such programs are in the public interest, and, at the same time, it renews the station license. Hence a body of law seems to have been growing up with reference to specific programs, rather than the over-all program content of a given station. If this practice should continue over a period of years, the Commission will have specifically approved or disapproved various specific types of programs, notwithstanding the provision of the act, that "No regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

As a matter of fact, of course, the Commission does not make rules and regulations with reference to the specific programs to which it objects, but it makes decisions containing such criticisms as obiter dicta in an opinion renewing the license of a station. The courts, in interpreting other sections of the act, have followed the line that opinions have the same status as rules and regulations of the Commission, and that rules and regulations of the Commission have the same effect as statutes. By reasoning, then, the decisions with reference to specific programs might be argued to have the same force and effect, by indirection, as if they had been enacted by statute. That would make such decisions a contravention of section 326.

From my reading of the bill and the committee's report thereon, it is my understanding that the bill is not intended to repeal section 326. I make this statement as a part of the legislative history of the bill.

Mr. President, I desire to thank the majority leader, who introduced this bill, for his consideration and patience in giving me an opportunity to study the bill to some extent, and to offer these amendments. I appreciate the consideration which has been given them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "Communications Act Amendments, 1951."

SEC. 2. Subsection (o) of section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(o) 'Broadcasting' means the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received directly by the general public."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding after subsection (aa) the following:

"(bb) The term 'license', 'station license', or 'radio station license' means that instrument of authorization required by this act or the rules and regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this act, for the use or operation of apparatus for transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio, by whatever name the instrument may be designed by the Commission.

"(cc) The term 'broadcast station', 'broadcasting station', or 'radio broadcast station' means a radio station equipped to engage in broadcasting as herein defined.

"(dd) The term 'construction permit' or 'permit for construction' means that instrument of authorization required by this act or the rules and regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this act for the installation of apparatus for the transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio, by whatever name the instrument may be designated by the Commission."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such Commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, profession, or employment but this shall not apply to the preparation of technical or professional publications for which reasonable honorarium or compensation may be paid. Any such Commissioner serving as such after 1 year from the date of enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1951, shall not for a period of 1 year following the termination of his services as a Commissioner represent before the Commission in a professional capacity any person, including all persons under common control, subject to the provisions of this act, except that this restriction shall not apply to any Commissioner who has served the full term for which he was appointed. Not more than four members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party."

(b) Subsection (f) (1) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, (1) the Commission may appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the salaries of a secretary, a chief engineer and not more than two assistants, a chief accountant and not more than two assistants, a general counsel and not more than two assistants, and counsel temporarily employed and designated by the Commission for the performance of specific special services; and (2) each Commissioner may appoint and prescribe the duties of a legal assistant at an annual salary to be fixed by the Commissioner but not to exceed $10,000 and a secretary at an annual salary not to exceed $5,600. The chief engineer, the chief accountant, and the general counsel shall each receive an annual salary of not to exceed $11,200; the secretary shall receive an annual salary of not to exceed $10,000, and no assistant shall receive an annual salary in excess of $10,000: *Provided*, That on and after 1 year from the date of enactment of Communications Act Amendments, 1951, the secretary of the Commission, the chief engineer and his assistants, the chief accountant and his assistants, the general counsel and his assistants, the chief of each integrated division and his assistants and the legal assistants to each Commissioner shall not, for the period of 1 year next following the cessation of their employment with the Commission, represent before the Commission in a professional capacity any person, including all persons under common control, subject to the provisions of this act. The Commission shall have authority, subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint such other officers, engineers, accountants, attorneys, inspectors, examiners, and other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (g) of section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Commission may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, law books, periodicals, and books of reference, for printing and binding, for land for use as sites for radio monitoring stations and related facilities, including living quarters where necessary in remote areas, for the construction of such stations and facilities, and for the improvement, furnishing, equipping, and repairing of such stations and facilities and of laboratories and other related facilities (including construction of minor subsidiary buildings and structures not exceeding $25,000 in any one instance) used in connection with technical research activities), as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the Commission and as from time to time may be appropriated for by Congress."

(d) Subsection (k) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(k) The Commission shall make an annual report to Congress, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain—

"(1) such information and data collected by the Commission as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the regulation of interstate and foreign wire and radio communication and radio transmission of energy.

"(2) such information and data concerning the functioning of the Commission as will be of value to Congress in appraising the amount and character of the work and accomplishments of the Commission and the adequacy of its staff and equipment: *Provided*, That the first and second annual reports following the date of enactment of Communications Act Amendments, 1951, shall set forth in detail the number and caption of pending applications requesting approval of transfer of control or assignment of a station license, or construction permits for new stations, or for increases in power, or for changes of frequency of existing stations at the beginning and end of the period covered by such report;

"(3) information with respect to all persons taken into the employment of the Commission during the year covered by the report, including names, pertinent biographical data and experience, Commission positions held and compensation paid, together with the names of those persons who have left the employ of the Commission during such year: *Provided*, That the first annual report following the date of enactment of Communications Act Amendments, 1951, shall contain such information with respect to all persons in the employ of the Commission at the close of the year for which the report is made;

"(4) an itemized statement of all funds expended during the preceding year by the Commission, of the sources of such funds, and of the authority in this act or elsewhere under which such expenditures were made; and

"(5) specific recommendations to Congress as to additional legislation which the Commission deems necessary or desirable, including all legislative proposals submitted for approval to the Director of the Budget."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) The member of the Commission designated by the President as Chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the Commission. It shall be his duty to preside at all meetings and sessions of the Commission, to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports, except that any commissioner may present his own or minority views or supplemental reports, to represent the Commission in all matters requiring conferences or communications with other governmental officers, departments or agencies, and generally to coordinate and organize the work of the Commission in such manner as to promote prompt and efficient disposition of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. In the case of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman of the Commission, or the absence or inability of the Chairman to serve, the Commission may temporarily designate and appoint one of its members to act as Chairman until the cause or circumstance requiring such service shall have been eliminated or corrected.

"(b) Within 60 days after the enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1951, and from time to time thereafter as the Commission may find necessary, the Commission shall organize its legal, engineering, and accounting staff into (1) integrated divisions, to function on the basis of the Commission's principal workload operations; and (2) into such other divisional organizations as the Commission may deem necessary to handle that part of its workload which cuts across more than one integrated division or which does not lend itself to the integrated division set-up. Each such integrated division and divisional organization shall include such legal, engineering, accounting, administrative, and

clerical personnel as the Commission may determine to be necessary to perform its functions. The general counsel, the chief engineer, and the chief accountant and their respective assistants shall carry out their respective duties under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe. The Commission shall establish a staff, directly responsible to it, which shall include such legal, engineering, and accounting personnel as the Commission deems necessary, whose duty shall be to prepare such drafts of Commission decisions, orders, and other memoranda as the Commission, in the exercise of its quasi-judicial duties, may from time to time direct: *Provided*, That no member of such staff shall participate in a hearing or represent the Commission, directly or indirectly, in any prosecutory or investigatory function or proceeding.

"(c) Except as provided in section 409 hereof, the Commission, when necessary to the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business, is hereby authorized and directed to assign or refer any portion of its work, business, or functions to an individual Commissioner or Commissioners or to a board composed of one or more employees of the Commission, to be designated by such order for action thereon, and by its further order at any time to amend, modify, or rescind any such order or reference: *Provided*, That this authority shall not extend to duties otherwise specifically imposed by this or any other act of Congress. Any order, decision, or report made or other action taken pursuant to any such order or reference shall have the same force and effect and may be made, evidenced, and enforced as is made by the Commission: *Provided, however*, That any person aggrieved by any such order, decision, or report may file a petition for review by the Commission, and every such petition shall be passed upon by the Commission. The secretary and seal of the Commission shall be the secretary and seal of such individual Commissioners or board.

"(d) Meetings of the Commission shall be held at regular intervals, not less frequently than once each calendar month, at which times the functioning of the Commission and the handling of its work load shall be reviewed and such orders shall be entered and other action taken as may be necessary or appropriate to expedite the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Commission with the objective of rendering a final decision (1) within 3 months from the date of filing in all original application, renewal, and transfer cases and (2) within 6 months from the final date of the hearing in all hearing cases; and the Commission shall promptly report to the Congress each such case which has been pending before it more than such 3- or 6-month period, respectively, stating the reasons therefor."

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 307 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No license granted for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be for a longer term than 3 years and no license so granted for any other class of station shall be for a longer term than 5 years, and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed 3 years in the case of broadcasting licenses and not to exceed 5 years in the case of other licenses if the Commission finds that public interest, convenience and necessity would be served thereby."

SEC. 7. So much of subsection (a) of section 308 of such act as precedes the second proviso is amended to read as follows: "The Commission may grant instruments of authorization entitling the holders thereof to construct or operate apparatus for the transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio or modifications or renewals thereof, only upon written application therefor received by it: *Provided*, That (1) in cases of emergency found by the Commission involving danger to life or property or due to damage to equipment, or (2) during "a national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress and during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged and when such action is necessary for the national defense or security or otherwise in furtherance of the war effort, the Commission may grant and issue authority to construct or operate apparatus for the transmission of energy or communications or signals by radio during the emergency so found by the Commission or during the continuance of any such national emergency or war, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe, and without the filing of a formal application, but no such authority shall be granted for a period beyond the period of the emergency requiring it nor remain effective beyond such period."

SEC. 8. Section 309 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"HEARINGS ON APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSES; FORM OF LICENSES; CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO LICENSES

"SEC. 309. (a) If upon examination of any application provided for in section 308 the Commission shall determine that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served by the granting thereof, it shall authorize the issuance of the instrument of authorization for which application is made in accordance with such finding.

"(b) If upon examination of any such application the Commission is unable to make the finding specified in subsection (a) of this section, it shall forthwith notify the applicant and other known parties in interest of the grounds and reasons for its inability to make such finding. Such notice, which shall precede formal designation for a hearing, shall advise the applicant and all other known parties in interest of all objections made to the application as well as the source and nature of such objections. Following such notice, the applicant shall be given an opportunity to reply. If the Commission, after considering such reply, shall be unable to make the finding specified in subsection (a) of this section, it shall formally designate the application for hearing on the grounds or reasons then obtaining and shall notify the applicant and all other known parties in interest of such action and the grounds and reasons therefor, specifying with particularity the matters and things in issue but not including issues or requirements phrased generally. The parties in interest, if any, who are not notified by the Commission of its action with respect to a particular application may acquire the status of a party to the proceeding thereon by filing a petition for intervention showing the basis for their interest at any time not less than 10 days prior to the date of hearing. Any hearing subsequently held upon such application shall be a full hearing in which the applicant and all other parties in interest shall be permitted to participate but in which both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence upon any issue specified by the Commission, as well as the burden of proof upon all such issues, shall be upon the applicant.

"(c) When any instrument of authorization is granted by the Commission without a hearing as provided in subsection (a) hereof, such grant shall remain subject to protest as hereinafter provided for a period of 30 days. During such 30-day period any party in interest may file a protest under oath directed to such grant and request a hearing on said application so granted. Any protest so filed shall contain such allegations of fact as will show the protestant to be a party in interest and shall specify with particularity the facts, matters, and things relied upon, but shall not include issues or allegations phrased generally. The Commission shall, within 15 days from the date of the filing of such protest, enter findings as to whether such protest meets the foregoing requirements and if it so finds the application involved shall be set for hearing upon the issues set forth in said protest, together with such further specific issues, if any, as may be prescribed by the Commission. In any hearing subsequently held upon such application all issues specified by the Commission shall be tried in the same manner provided in subsection (b) hereof but with respect of all issues set forth in the protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the protestant. The hearing and determination of cases arising under this subsection shall be expedited by the Commission and pending hearing and decision the effective date of the Commission's action to which protest is made shall be postponed to the effective date of the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the authorization involved is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service, in which event the Commission shall authorize the applicant to utilize the facilities or authorization in question pending the Commission's decision after hearng.

"(d) Such station licenses as the Commission may grant shall be in such general form as it may prescribe, but each license shall contain, in addition to other provisions, a statement of the following conditions to which such license shall be subject: (1) The station license shall not vest in the licensee any right to operate the station nor any right in the use of the frequencies designated in the license beyond the term thereof nor in any other manner than authorized therein; (2) neither the license nor the right granted thereunder shall be assigned or otherwise transferred in violation of this act; (3) every license issued under this act shall be subject in terms to the right of use or control conferred by section 606 hereof."

SEC. 9. Subsection (b) of section 310 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No instrument of authorization granted by the Commission entitling the holder thereof to construct or to operate radio apparatus and no rights granted thereunder shall be transferred, assigned, or disposed of in any manner, voluntarily or involuntarily, directly or indirectly, or by transfer of control of any corporation holding such instrument of authorization, to any person except upon application to the Commission and upon finding by the Commission that the proposed transferee or assignee possesses the qualifications required of an original permittee or licensee. The procedure for handling such application shall be that provided in section 309."

SEC. 10. Section 311 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. The Commission is hereby directed to refuse a station license and/or the permit hereinafter required for the construction of a station to any person (or to any person directly or indirectly controlled by such person) whose license has been revoked by a court under section 313."

SEC. 11. Section 312 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"REVOCATION OF LICENSES; CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDERS

"SEC. 312. (a) Any station license may be revoked (1) because of conditions coming to the attention of the Commission since the granting of such license which would have warranted the Commission in refusing to grant such license, or (2) for violation or failure to observe any of the restrictions or provisions of a treaty ratified by the United States, or (3) for violation of or failure to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

observe the terms and conditions of any cease-and-desist order issued by the Commission pursuant to subsection (b) hereof. The Commission may institute a revocation proceeding by serving upon the licensee an order to show cause why its license should not be revoked. Said orders shall contain a statement of the particulars and matters with respect to which the Commission is inquiring and shall call upon the licensee to appear before the Commission at a time and place therein stated, but in no event less than 30 days after receipt of such notice, and give evidence upon the matter specified in said order: *Provided*, That where safety of life or property is involved, the Commission may by order provide for a shorter period of notice. If, after hearing, or a waiver thereof by the licensee, the Commission determines that a revocation order should issue, it shall make a report in writing stating the findings of the Commission and the grounds and reasons therefor and shall cause the same to be served on said licensee, together with such order.

"(b) Where any person (1) has failed to operate substantially as set forth in an instrument of authorization, or (2) has failed to observe any of the restrictions and conditions of this act or of a treaty ratified by the United States, or (3) has violated or failed to observe any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this act, the Commission may institute a proceeding by serving upon such person an order to show cause why it should not cease and desist from such action. Said order shall contain a statement of the particulars and matters with respect to which the Commission is inquiring and shall call upon such person to appear before the Commission at a time and place therein stated, but in no event less than 30 days after receipt of such notice, and give evidence upon the matter specified in said order. If, after hearing, or a waiver thereof by such person, the Commission determines that a cease-and-desist order should issue, it shall make a report in writing stating the findings of the Commission and the grounds and reasons therefor and shall cause the same to be served on said person, together with such order."

SEC. 12. Part I of title III of such act is amended by adding the following new section:

"MODIFICATION BY COMMISSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMITS OR LICENSES

"SEC. 330. (a) Any station license granted under the provisions of this act or the construction permit required thereby may be modified by the Commission either for a limited time or for the duration of the term thereof, if in the judgment of the Commission such action will promote the public interest, convenience, and necessity, or the provisions of this act or of any treaty ratified by the United States will be more fully complied with: *Provided*, That no such order of modification shall be final until the holder of such outstanding license or permit shall have been notified in writing of the proposed action and the grounds and reasons therefor, and shall have been given reasonable opportunity, in no event less than 30 days, to show cause by public hearing, if requested, why such order of modification should not issue: *Provided*, That where safety of life or property is involved, the Commission may by order provide for a shorter period of notice.

"(b) In any case where a hearing is conducted pursuant to the provisions of this section or section 312, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the Commission."

SEC. 13. Part I of title III of such act is amended by adding the following new section:

"LIMITATIONS ON QUASI-JUDICIAL POWERS

"SEC. 331. No license granted and issued under the authority of this act for the operation of any radio station shall be modified by the Commission, except in the manner provided in section 330 (a) hereof, and no such license may be revoked, terminated, or otherwise invalidated by the Commission, except in the manner and for the reasons provided in section 312 (a) hereof. When application is made for renewal of an existing license, which cannot be disposed of by the Commission under the provisions of section 309 (a) hereof, the Commission shall employ the procedure specified in section 309 (b) hereof, except that in any hearing subsequently held upon such application the burden of proceeding with the evidence and of substantiating the grounds and reasons specified by the Commission in the formal notice of hearing issued pursuant to section 309 (b) hereof shall be upon the appropriate division established by the Commission under the provisions of section 5 (b) hereof or upon any party or parties who may oppose such renewal; but as a condition precedent to the renewal the Commission shall affirmatively find that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served by such renewal. Pending such hearing and final decision pursuant thereto the Commission shall continue such license in effect."

SEC. 14. The heading of section 401 of such act is amended to read:

"JURISDICTION TO ENFORCE ACT AND ORDERS OF COMMISSION; DECLARATORY ORDERS"

and such section is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) The Commission is authorized, in its sound discretion and with like effect as in the case of other orders, to issue a declaratory order to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 (d) of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 239) declaratory orders shall be issued only upon the petition of, and after notice to and opportunity for hearing by, persons who are bona fide applicants for, or the holders of, construction permits or licenses, or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, and shall not bind or affect the rights of persons who are not parties to such proceedings. Such orders shall be available to declare rights and other legal relations arising under the provisions of any treaty ratified by the United States, under any provision of this act, or under any order, rule, regulation, term, condition, limitation, or requirement issued, promulgated, or adopted by the Commission, whether or not involving failure to comply therewith."

SEC. 15. Section 402 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. (a) The provisions of the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 992), as amended, relating to the enforcing or setting aside of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission are hereby made applicable to suits to enforce, enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend any order of the Commission under this act (except those appealable under the provisions of subsection (b) hereof), and such suits are hereby authorized to be brought as provided in that act. In addition to the venues specified in that act, suits to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, but not to inforce, any such order of the Commission may also be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

"(b) Appeals may be taken from decisions and orders of the Commission to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in any of the following cases:

"(1) By any applicant for any instrument of authorization required by this act, or the regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this act, for the construction or operation of apparatus for the transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio, whose application is denied by the Commission.

"(2) By any application for the renewal or modification of any such instrument of authorization whose application is denied by the Commission.

"(3) By any party to an application for authority to assign any such instrument of authorization or to transfer control of any corporation holding such instrument of authorization whose application is denied by the Commission.

"(4) By any applicant for the permit required by section 325 of this act whose application has been denied by the Commission or any permittee under said section whose permit has been revoked by the Commission.

"(5) By the holder of any instrument of authorization required by this act, or the regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this act, for the construction or operation of apparatus for the transmission of energy, or communications or signals by radio, which instrument has been modified or revoked by the Commission.

"(6) By any other person who is aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected by any order of the Commission granting or denying any application described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) hereof.

"(7) By any person upon whom an order to cease and desist has been served under section 312 (b) of this act.

"(8) By any party to a proceeding under section 401 who is aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected by a declaratory order entered by the Commission.

"(9) By any radio operator whose license has been suspended by the Commission.

"(c) Such appeal shall be taken by filing a notice of appeal with the court within 30 days after the entry of the order complained of. Such notice of appeal shall contain a concise statement of the nature of the proceedings as to which the appeal is taken; a concise statement of the reasons on which the appellant intends to rely, separately stated and numbered; and proof of service of a true copy of said notice and statement upon the Commission. Upon filing of such notice, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceedings and of the questions determined therein and shall have power, by order, directed to the Commission or any other party to the appeal, to grant such temporary relief as it may deem just and proper. Orders granting temporary relief may be either affirmative or negative in their scope and application so as to permit either the maintenance of the status quo in the matter in which the appeal is taken or the restoration of a position or status terminated or adversely affected by the order appealed from and shall, unless otherwise ordered by the court, be effective pending hearing and determination of said appeal and compliance with the Commission with the final judgment of the court rendered in said appeal.

"(d) Upon the filing of any such notice of appeal the Commission shall, not later than 5 days after the date of service upon it, notify each person shown by the records of the Commission to be interested in said appeal of the filing and pendency of the same and shall thereafter permit any such person to inspect and make copies of said notice and statement of reasons therefor at the office of the Commission in the city of Washington. Within 30 days after the filing of an appeal, the Commission shall file with the court a copy of the order complained of, a full statement in writing of the facts and grounds relied upon by it in support of the order involved upon said appeal, and the originals or certified copies of all papers and evidence presented to and considered by it in entering said order.

"(e) Within 30 days after the filing of an appeal any interested person may intervene and participate in the proceedings had upon said appeal by filing with the court a notice of intention to intervene and a verified statement showing the nature of the interest

of such party, together with proof of service of true copies of said notice and statement, both upon appellant and upon the Commission. Any person who would be aggrieved or whose interest would be adversely affected by a reversal or modification of the order of the Commission complained of shall be considered an interested party.

"(f) The record and briefs upon which any such appeal shall be heard and determined by the court shall contain such information and material, and shall be prepared within such time and in such manner as the court may by rule prescribe.

"(g) At the earliest convenient time the court shall hear and determine the appeal upon the record before it in the manner prescribed by section 10 (e) of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 243).

"(h) In the event that the court shall render a decision and enter an order reversing the order of the Commission, it shall remand the case to the Commission to carry out the judgment of the court and it shall be the duty of the Commission, in the absence of the proceedings to review such judgment, to forthwith give effect thereto, and unless otherwise ordered by the court, to do so upon the basis of the proceedings already had and the record upon which said appeal was heard and determined.

"(i) The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for costs in favor of or against an appellant, or other interested parties intervening in said appeal, but not against the Commission, depending upon the nature of the issues involved upon said appeal and the outcome thereof.

"(j) The court's judgment shall be final, subject, however, to review by the Supreme Court of the United States as hereinafter provided—

"(1) an appeal may be taken direct to the Supreme Court of the United States in any case wherein the jurisdiction of the court is invoked, or sought to be invoked, for the purpose of reviewing any decision or order entered by the Commission in proceedings instituted by the Commission which have as their object and purpose the revocation of an existing license or any decision or order entered by the Commission in proceedings which involve the failure or refusal of the Commission to renew an existing license. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of an application therefor or notice thereof within 30 days after the entry of the judgment sought to be reviewed, and in the event such an appeal is taken the record shall be made up and the case docketed in the Supreme Court of the United States within 60 days from the time such an appeal is allowed under such rules as may be prescribed;

"(2) in all other cases, review by the Supreme Court of the United States shall be upon a writ of certiorari on petition therefor under section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended, by the appellant, by the Commission, or by any interested party intervening in the appeal, or by certification by the court pursuant to the provision of section 239 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

SEC. 16. The heading of section 405 of such Act is amended to read:

"REHEARINGS BEFORE COMMISSION"

and such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 405. (a) After a decision, order, or requirement has been made by the Commission in any proceeding, any party thereto, or any other person aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected thereby, may petition for rehearing. Petitions for rehearing must be filed within 30 days from the entry of any decision, order, or requirement complained of and except for those cases in which the decision, order, or requirement challenged is necessary for the maintenance or conduct of an existing service, the filing of such a petition shall automatically stay the effective date thereof until after decision on said petition. The filing of a petition for rehearing shall not be a condition precedent to judicial review of any such decision, order, or requirement, except where the party seeking such review was not a party to the proceedings resulting in such decision, order, or requirement, or where the party seeking such review relies on questions of fact or law upon which the Commission has been afforded no opportunity to pass. Rehearings shall be governed by such general rules as the Commission may establish: *Provided*, That, except for newly discovered evidence or evidence otherwise available only since the original taking of evidence, no evidence shall be taken on any rehearing. The time within which an appeal must be taken under section 402 (b) hereof shall be computed from the date upon which orders are entered disposing of all petitions for rehearing filed in any case, but any decision, order, or requirement made after such rehearing reversing, changing, or modifying the original determination shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to rehearing as an original order."

SEC. 17. Section 409 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 409. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 (a) of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 241), all cases in which a hearing is required by the provisions of this act or by other applicable provisions of law shall be conducted by the Commission or by one or more examiners provided for in section 11 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 244), designated by the Commission. The officer or officers presiding at any such hearing shall have the same authority and duties exercised in the same manner and subject to the same conditions specified in section 7 of that act.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 242), the officer or officers conducting a hearing shall prepare and file an intermediate report. In all such cases the Commission shall permit the filing of exceptions to such intermediate report by any party to the proceeding and shall, upon request, hear oral argument on such exceptions before the entry of any final decision, order, or requirement. All decisions, including the intermediate report, shall become a part of the record and shall include a statement of (1) findings and conclusions, as well as the basis therefor, upon all material issues of fact, law, or discretion, presented on the record; and (2) the appropriate decision, order, or requirement.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 (c) of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 239), no officer conducting a hearing pursuant to (a) and (b) hereof shall, except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law, consult any person or party on any fact or question of law in issue, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate; nor shall such officer be responsible to or subject to the supervision or direction of any other person engaged in the performance of investigative, prosecuting, or other functions for the Commission or any other agency of the Government. No person or persons engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the Commission or for any other agency of the Government shall participate or advise in the proceedings described in (a) and (b) hereof, except as a witness or counsel in public proceedings. The Commission shall not employ attorneys or other persons for the purpose of reviewing transcripts or preparing intermediate reports of final decisions, except that this shall not apply to the review staff provided by subsection 5 (b) and to legal assistants assigned separately to a Commission member who may, for such Commission member, review such transcripts and prepare such drafts. No intermediate report shall be reviewed either before or after its publication by any person other than a member of the Commission or his legal assistant, as above provided, and no examiner, who conducts a hearing, shall advise or consult with the Commission with respect to his intermediate report or with respect to exceptions taken to his findings, rulings, or recommendations."

(b) Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of section 409 are amended to read subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively.

SEC. 18. Section 414 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except as specifically provided in this act the provisions of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 237) shall apply in all proceedings under this act."

SEC. 19. Chapter 63 of the Criminal Code, title 18, is amended by inserting a new section as follows:

"FRAUD BY RADIO

"SEC. 1343. Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, shall transmit or cause to be transmitted by means of radio communication or interstate wire communication, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, or whoever operating any radio station for which a license is required by any law of the United States, knowingly permits the transmission of any such communication, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 20. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the committee on the bill, so that the legislative history and the viewpoint and intent of the committee will be clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report (No. 44) on the bill (S. 658) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee desires to emphasize that the bill (S. 658) here reported is identical with bills heretofore passed by the Senate unanimously on two occasions. These two bills were S. 1973, previously reported by this committee on July 21, 1949, and passed by the Senate on August 9, 1949, by unanimous consent; and H. R. 4251 which was reported July 25, 1950, and passed the Senate amended on July 26, 1950, by unanimous consent. The legislation deals solely with structure of the Commission and its administrative and appellate procedure. This entire field long has been the subject of severe criticism by special and select investigating committees of the Congress and currently is the subject of study by a subcommittee of this committee as well as by a House committee.

The provisions of this bill here recommended received the unanimous approval of every broadcasting interest who testified before this committee when open hearings were conducted on S. 1973, and at the same hearing the majority of the provisions here

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

recommended were also favored by the Commission itself.

It should be noted that no attempt has been made in this legislation to deal with any changes in policy affecting radio or television broadcasting, nor policies affecting common carriers by radio or telegraph. Your committee is well aware that extensive testimony has been offered in the past and numerous recommendations made, including some by this committee, with respect to such policy matters. While the committee does not close the door to such policy provisions, it desires to point out that studies on these points are being further pursued; in the field of radio the subject of most pressing importance today is the functioning of the Commission.

It is important to note that this bill is the end product of more than a decade of congressional investigations, studies, hearings, and reports by committees in both Houses of Congress. This committee alone, in the past 7 years, has held more than 45 days of hearings on the general subject of changes in the Communications Act, during which 145 persons have testified and some 800 others submitted statements. Those hearings cover more than 3,700 pages of printed testimony. Moreover, a majority of the committee have been personally closely identified with extended hearings and legislative recommendations herein referred to. Because of the long history of hearings and legislative recommendations herein referred to before it, the committee was strongly of the opinion that additional open hearings were not necessary at this time. They unanimously endorse the bill here recommended as a necessary first step in any changes in the Communications Act of 1934.

The committee desires to call particular attention to the amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. This proposal has been urged by the Commission as being particularly necessary now because of the current international situation. The Federal Communications Commission's radio monitoring activities are of foremost importance in periods of international tension and they have pointed out that the immediate extension of this activity is deemed essential by the defense forces. The Federal Communications Commission, on January 10, 1951, forwarded a letter to the United States Senate requesting "urgent and immediate consideration of the Senate for an amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act which would authorize the Commission to expend funds in connection with its radio monitoring services." The reasons for the Commission's recommendation that section 4 (g) be amended to authorize the Commission to purchase land and to construct buildings for monitoring and research activities is that the Commission has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that the present language affords insufficient authority for making expenditures for such activities, and that consequently any authorization for activities in the Commission's budget was, in the absence of special authorizing legislation, subject to being stricken by a point of order. Accordingly the Commission's budget for the last 3 years, including that for the fiscal year 1952, contained no authorization for improvement of the Commission's monitoring activities. The Commission contends that strategic territorial placement of monitoring stations is at a minimum. For example, the United States operates only one station in Alaska and one station in the Hawaiian Islands. The committee is convinced of the need for this authority and believes that enactment of this provision should be expedited.

The bill here recommended is, in the committee's opinion, an essential legislative step forward in bringing about improvements in the administrative functions of this vital agency and the committee believes that immediate action is necessary in order that the Federal Communications Commission can competently and adequately execute its functions under the Communications Act.

The sections of this bill were carefully analyzed in Senate Report 741, which accompanied S. 1973 and Senate Report 2119 which accompanied H. R. 4251, and the appropriate text of these reports unchanged are appended herewith.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The principal objective of the bill as amended is to clarify the meaning and intent of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. It is designed to remove ambiguities; to make definite and certain administrative and legal steps and procedures in the interest of the expeditious handling of both license applications and the rule-making function; to separate, as far as is administratively possible, the prosecutory and judicial functions of the Commission; to provide for administrative reorganization of the Commission in the interest of more effective and speedy handling of cases; to better arm Commissioners to handle decisions by providing personal legal assistants; and generally to make clear and definite administrative actions and appellate procedures in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

Your committee is strongly of the opinion that enactment of the bill is a major step forward in the evolution of the regulation of radio and wire communications, both broadcast and common carrier. It believes that the legislation will be of inestimable value in making more certain that regulation of the industry shall be in "the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 1

This section gives a short title to this act, merely for purposes of reference to the dates of enactment of provisions herein proposed to be incorporated in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Section 2

This section amends subsection (o) of section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 by redefining "broadcasting." The new definition defines "broadcasting" to mean "the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received directly by the general public." In the existing law, the term is defined to include radio communications intended to be received by the public "directly or by the intermediary of relay stations." Testimony has been offered that these so-called relay stations might be considered to be broadcast stations within the meaning of the act. The new definition clarifies this ambiguity, but the committee does not intend that such relay stations, when used in broadcasting shall be classified as common carriers under the law. The new definition also conforms with the provisions of the Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunications Convention (Atlantic City, 1947).

Section 3

This section adds a number of new definitions to the Communications Act of 1934.

Subsection (bb) defines "license," "station license," or "radio station license" to mean the instrument of authorization required by the act or regulations for use or operation of radio-transmitting apparatus, and the terms are intended to include all forms of authorizations, temporary or otherwise. When considered in connection with other sections of the bill, this will limit the power of the Commission to grant special or emergency types of authorization to the cases specifically provided for in the bill.

Subsection (cc) provides a definition of "broadcast station," "broadcasting stations," or "radio-broadcast station." None of these terms is now defined, and all are used either in the present law or the amended section.

Subsection (dd) defines the terms "construction permit" and "permit for construction," which have not heretofore been defined, to clarify reference to such authorizations in procedural provisions.

Section 4

This section proposes several revisions of the existing section 4 of the act, which deals with the make-up of the Commission itself, top staff personnel, and matters to be included in the annual reports to Congress. Specifically, the provisions are as follows:

Subsection (a) makes a minor change in existing law which prohibits Commissioners from engaging in any other business, vocation, or employment by exempting from this prohibition the preparation of technical papers. Commissioners have pointed out that existing law might be interpreted to prevent such wholly meritorious publication of papers. The most important provisions of this subsection, however, would add to subsection (4) (b) the requirement that 1 year after the enactment of this act no Commissioner, if he resigns before his term of office has expired, may for 1 year thereafter represent before the Commission any person or corporation who comes within the jurisdiction of the Communications Act. This provision, the committee believes, is a most desirable one. It is intended to halt the practice by persons and corporations, who have business before the Commission, of employing Commissioners with the obvious purpose of benefiting themselves, perhaps unfairly, through the influence that such a Commissioner might have with employees in the agency. It is also intended to restrict a growing practice of using appointments to high Government posts as stepping stones to important positions in private industries which have business before the Commission. The recommended amendment would not prevent a Commissioner from resigning his post at any time, but if he resigned after 1 year following enactment of this provision and before his term of office had expired he could not for 1 year thereafter represent anyone who comes within jurisdiction of the Communications Commission.

Subsection (b) is a revision of section 4 (f) (1) of the act, a subsection which deals with the employment of certain top staff personnel and their salaries. It should be noted that the Civil Service Classification Act of 1949 made changes in the salaries originally provided by this subsection, and the committee in rewriting the language has written in the new salary schedules provided by that act last year.

Thus, it should be emphasized that while it was necessary to rewrite the section for other reasons, no changes have been made in salary schedules from those already provided by law. The important changes in the subsection made by the committee include authority for the employment of a personal legal assistant to each Commissioner at a salary not to exceed $10,000 annually, a reduction in the number of assistant general counsels, assistant chief engineers, and assistant chief accounts from three to two; and a prohibition against the general counsel, the chief engineer, the chief accountant, and their assistants from representing any licensee under the Communications Act for 1 year following termination of their employment with the Commission.

The committee believes some explanation of these and other minor changes in this subsection is pertinent. It is of the opinion that provision for the employment of a personal legal assistant to each Commissioner is one of the important features of the bill here recommended. The plain facts are that the Commission is tremendously behind in its work, one reason therefor being the necessity for each individual Commissioner to personally review each decision. Several of the Commissioners are not lawyers; even

those who are find it difficult to give the time necessary to familiarize themselves with all pertinent points in a proposed decision. The result has been that all too frequently decisions coming up from the staff have not had the close personal attention they should have. When it is realized that such decisions frequently are of vital economic consequence to citizens as well as important to the public interest, it will be realized that too much attention cannot be given to such decisions. The employment of a well-trained lawyer who will be the personal legal assistant to a Commissioner will not only relieve the burden of work on each Commissioner but will permit close study of both proposed decisions and rules and should expedite materially the speed of Commission action on its backlog of cases. The committee desires to emphasize that it believes Commissioners can obtain, at the recommended salary, competent, trained, and well-experienced lawyers who know the administrative process, will adhere to orderly legal actions, and advise the non-legal-trained Commissioners in such matters.

In reducing the number of assistant counsels, assistant engineers, and assistant accountants the committee has followed the suggestions of individual Commissioners who believe that the employment of personal legal assistants will permit reduction in these posts. Moreover, the saving thus obtained will reduce the extra cost of seven legal assistants to Commissioners.

Another major feature of this subsection is the provision which would prohibit the chief engineer and his assistants, the chief accountant and his assistants, the general counsel and his assistants, and the secretary of the Commission from leaving their post with the Commission to represent a licensee until 1 year has elapsed after termination of their employment with the Commission. The committee believes that this provision is a necessary corollary to a similar provision applying to Commissioners themselves and that it will tend to curb an exceedingly unfair and occasionally improper practice. The ability to influence people in the Commission is reported to have been of great value in numerous instances; this provision should aid in building up a career service within the Commission and halt further efforts to woo key personnel from the Commission for the purpose of influencing subsequent actions by the agency. The committee also has tightened the language pertaining to the employment of temporary counsel to make clear that such temporary employees cannot become in effect permanent employees in the guise of holding temporary appointment. Such temporary counsel hereafter are to be employed for specific special service and no other.

A provision of this section of the law which permitted the appointment of a director of each division of the Commission has been eliminated; such posts have not been filled for years and there is no necessity for such positions under the organization of the Commission proposed by this legislation.

Subsection (c) of this section amends the first sentence of section 4 (g) of the law which deals with the authority of the Commission to make certain expenditures, including expenditures for purchase of land for the erection of monitoring stations. While the Commission has exercised this authority for years under specific appropriation acts annually, such provisions constituted legislation in an appropriation bill and are subject to a point of order. The Bureau of the Budget recommended that this point be clarified so that clear legislative authority to justify such appropriations would exist.

Subsection (d) amends section 4 (k) of the present act with the purpose of making more clear and definite what shall be contained in the annual report filed by the Commission with the Congress.

Briefly, the Commission is to furnish the Congress each year (1) information and data bearing on the problem of regulation of interstate and foreign wire and radio communication; (2) information on the general administrative operations of the Commission so that Congress may readily understand what it has done or failed to do; (3) information concerning new employees hired during the year, their experience, and those resigned or discharged; (4) information in detail of all sums expended by the Commission, for what purpose, and under what authority; (5) specific recommendations on necessary additional legislation.

The committee is aware that the information required by clause (4) is furnished to the Appropriations Committee of the Congress annually. But it is of the opinion that the legislative committees of the two Houses which are directly concerned with the functioning of the Commission also have a real interest in these matters. Moreover, such information will permit the legislative committees to examine under what authority expenditures were made.

Section 5

Section 5 of the bill is a revision of section 5 of the law which deals with the organization of the Commission. The existing section of the law is an anachronism in that it provides for a permissive divisional organization of the Commission, which was adopted briefly shortly following enactment of the law in 1934 and then dropped. In recent weeks the Commission has again undertaken a functional reorganization similar to that herein proposed but the committee is satisfied that in the absence of specific mandatory provisions, no effective change ever will be carried out. Section 5 therefore has now been rewritten into four brief subsections which set forth the duties of the chairman; provide for a functional reorganization of the Commission; provide for necessary delegation of certain specific duties (now a part of the present law); and designate time-limit objectives to be met by the Commission in processing cases with the added provision that Congress shall be promptly informed when cases have not been acted upon within certain fixed periods.

The most important subsection, and in the committee's opinion one of the most important of the entire bill here recommended, is subsection (b) which would reorganize the Commission into a functional organization. To make clear what the effect of this subsection would be, it should be explained that the Commission has been organized into three principal Bureaus—Engineering, Accounting, and Legal. It also has, of course, other subsidiary sections and units but the bulk of its licensing work flows upward through these three Bureaus. Regardless of the type of case involved, each of these three Bureaus must independently, or occasionally in consultation, pass upon applications and other types of cases. Whether or not this system is responsible, the fact remains that the Commission's backlog of cases has continued to mount to alarming proportions. Hearing cases rarely get out in less than 2 years; some have been before the Commission as long as from 4 to 7 years.

Citizens and taxpayers are entitled to greater consideration and better service from their Government than this.

Moreover, under this system, the three Bureaus have become self-contained and independent little kingdoms, each jealously guarding its own field of operations and able to exercise almost dictatorial control over the expedition of a case. They can, and have, set at naught the best efforts of individual Commissioners to spur action.

The committee has, therefore, written into law by subsection (b) a mandatory reorganization provision but on the recommendation of the Commission has allowed wide flexibility to accommodate possible changes in the nature and volume of the Commission's work in future years. The Commission would be required within 60 days after enactment of this bill to organize its Legal, Engineering, and Accounting Bureaus into such number of integrated divisions as are deemed necessary to handle the Commission's workload problems. Under existing circumstances, these are expected to number three—broadcasting, common carrier, and special and safety service. Each of these divisions would include all necessary legal, engineering, and accounting personnel to handle the work but would operate together as a team rather than as separate professional groups. The Commission also would have authority to establish whatever additional divisions may be necessary to handle that part of its workload which may cut across the divisional organizations or which may not lend itself to handling by an integrated divisional unit.

Coupled with this divisional set-up, the committee also has provided for the establishment of a review staff, consisting of legal, engineering, and accounting personnel, whose sole function shall be to prepare and review decisions, orders, rules, and other memoranda as the Commission shall direct. The review staff shall be directly responsible to the Commission, and its personnel shall not engage in the preparation or prosecution of cases. Neither the general counsel, the chief accountant, nor the chief engineer shall have any authority over it. Its purpose is clear; it is to separate with finality the prosecutory and judicial functions of the Commission so that the same individual who prosecutes a case in behalf of the Commission before a hearing examiner shall not later be found preparing the final decision or advising Commissioners or the Commission as to the final decision. The records and facts well known to your committee and to the industry have proved beyond question that applicants have not always had the most equitable judicial treatment under the existing type of administrative judicial process. The committee believes that its proposed amendment will correct this situation.

Subsection (a) of this section sets forth the duties and responsibilities of the Chairman of the Commission, providing that he shall be the chief executive officer of the Commission and shall represent it in all matters relating to legislation and in dealings with the Congress as well as be responsible for the general organization and functioning of the Commission as a whole.

Subsection (c) is a revision of the existing subsection 5 (e) dealing with certain necessary delegation to the Commission's work to individual Commissioners, a board of Commissioners, or to employees. Such delegation is subject to the provisions of section 17 of this bill (sec. 409 of the act is revised by this bill) and to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act as described in section 17.

Subsection (d) is a new provision specifying that the Commission must meet at regular intervals but not less than once a month for the purpose of reviewing and expediting its work. The committee has set as fair time limits, for final Commission disposition of cases, a period of 3 months for nonhearing cases and 6 months from the final date of hearing on all hearing cases. The Commission is instructed to report to Congress promptly all cases pending before it longer than these periods stating the reasons for delay. The Congress will thus be currently apprised of the progress of Commission actions.

Section 6

This section amends subsection (d) of section 307 by deleting the phrase "but action of the Commission with reference to the granting of such application for the renewal of a license shall be limited to and governed by the same considerations and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

practice which affects the granting of original applications." Once a license has been granted, there appears to be no good reason why the Commission should be required to take into consideration many of the factors which it should and must take into consideration in granting a license in the first instance. Such matters as the character and ability of the applicant to operate a broadcast station or his financial ability to construct and maintain a station are important factors for the Commission to consider in evaluating original applications for a broadcast station; they no longer may be pertinent factors when the Commission is giving consideration to renewal of a station license. It should be emphasized that while the recommended amendment does eliminate the necessity for the type of involved and searching examination which the Commission must make in granting an original license, it does not in any way impair the Commission's right and duty to consider, in the case of a station which has been in operation and is applying for renewal, the over-all performance of that station against the broad standard of public interest, convenience, and necessity. This authority of the Commission is made explicit by specifying that such renewal grants are subject to findings by the Commission that the "public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served thereby." This section, the committee desires to emphasize, is not intended to nor shall it be interpreted as modifying in any degree the high qualifications required of a licensee; rather, the objective of the recommended changes is to expedite the administrative consideration of the renewal process and to reduce the work load and expenditure on both the licensee and the Commission.

Section 7

This section amends subsection (a) of section 308 of the present act. It is designed to make more definite the procedures to be employed by the Commission in the exercise of its radio-licensing functions. This section fixes and determines the conditions under which the first step in the exercise of the licensing function is taken; it makes positive and a part of statutory law that which has heretofore been the subject of dispute and controversy. There has been confusion under the terms of existing law over the basic question of when and under what circumstances a written application must be filed as the initial step in license proceedings and when, by the device of calling a license by some other name, the Commission, and applicants with the acquiescence of the Commission, have avoided this step.

The amendment recommended herein would make the filing of a written application a necessary condition precedent in all cases except those arising out of emergencies involving danger to life or property or damage due to equipment breakdowns or when the authorization is required by emergency or security reasons during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged. The proposed new language does not change the substance of existing law; it merely makes certain that which has heretofore been uncertain. Moreover, the amendment is directed against the administrative practice of issuing special service authorizations, which have been held not to be licenses, and therefore persons affected by their issuance were precluded from relying upon them or challenging their propriety.

Section 8

This section amends section 309 of the present act, which deals with the procedural steps involved in obtaining a license. It is the purpose of this section, as a necessary corollary of the preceding section, to make definite and certain the procedural rights and remedies of those who oppose, as well as those who apply for, a new instrument of authorization. The necessity for definite provisions of this character has been clearly demonstrated by experience.

Specifically, the amendment here proposed will make it possible, as at present, for the Commission to grant any application without hearing if convinced from ex parte examination that the statutory standard will be served thereby. It will, however, provide a method whereby any person, who has the right to challenge the legality or propriety of such a grant by appeal from the Commission's decision, can make his complaint first before the Commission—a guaranty which the present law does not contain. Provisions also are included which are designed to guarantee that any hearings held before the Commission upon any application will be conducted upon the basis of issues clearly defined so that the Commission will act as an arbiter.

Subsection (a) is merely a restatement of the present subsection (a) making clear that the standard of judgment which applies in issuing an authorization is in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Subsection (b) sets forth in specific terms what the Commission shall do with respect to notification of the applicant and known parties in interest, both prior to and after setting an application for hearing; the specification of issues; opportunity for an applicant to reply; who may participate, under what circumstances and how.

Subsection (c) provides for what is commonly known as the protest rule. This provision merely insures that if the Commission grants a license or other type of authorization without a hearing, the grant will remain subject to protest under oath for a 30-day period by any party in interest. Thereafter, the Commission is required within 15 days to make a finding as to whether the protest meets the requirements of the section and if it so finds the matter shall be set for hearing under conditions specifically set forth to insure fullest judicial protection to citizens involved in such proceedings. Some question has been raised in earlier hearings on proposed Communications Act amendment bills with respect to the meaning of the term "parties in interest" as used in this subsection and in other sections of the bill. Fear has been expressed that use of "parties in interest" might make possible intervention into proceedings by a host of parties who have no legitimate interest but solely with the purpose of delaying license grants which properly should be made. The committee does not so construe the term "party in interest"; "parties in interest" because of electrical interference are fixed and defined by the Supreme Court decision in the KOA case (319 U. S. 239) and the Commission's rules and regulations; "parties in interest" from an economic standpoint are defined by the Supreme Court decision in the Sanders case (309 U. S. 470).

Subsection (d) is the present subsection (b) of section 309 of the act unchanged and merely sets forth the form of the license and the conditions attached to its grant.

Section 9

This section amends subsection (b) of section 310 of the act which deals with the transfer of licenses granted by the Commission. The existing provisions are indefinite in nature with respect to the procedure to be employed by the Commission in considering such transfers and this has led, in some instances, to differences in the treatment of applications for transfer of facilities. The recommended new language is designed to make certain that no construction permit or station license granted by the Commission may be transferred without the Commission's approval; to make definite the procedure to be employed by the Commission in passing upon transfer applications; and to clarify the standard to be applied by the Commission in passing upon the merits of such applications.

One of the purposes of the proposed new language in this subsection is to annul the so-called AVCO procedure adopted several years ago by the Commission to prevent a licensee from selling his property to a proper person of his choice but requiring an opportunity for others to make bids for any radio station proposed to be sold. The committee believes that there is no provision of present law which authorizes the Commission to employ such a procedure and it deems such a procedure an unwise invasion by a Government agency into private business practice.

The committee regards it as significant that the Commission dropped the so-called AVCO procedure several months ago as unsatisfactory and a cause of undue delay in passing upon transfers of licenses. It should be emphasized that the Commission's authority to see to it that stations are operated in the public interest and to determine whether the proposed transferee possesses the qualifications of an original licensee or permittee is not impaired or affected in any degree by this subsection. In fact, the latter requirement is expressly stated. The committee also desires to emphasize that the language recommended in this subsection specifically refers to construction permits as well as licenses. It is of the opinion that this lack of reference to construction permits in the present law may have led to some of the abuses which have taken place under the transfer provisions.

Section 10

This section amends section 311 of the present act which relates to the application of the antitrust laws of the United States. The existing law contains two sections (secs. 311 and 313) which deal with this subject. Section 313 of the present law makes clear that all licensees under the Communications Act come within the provisions of the antitrust laws and that if any licensee is found guilty of a violation of antitrust laws the court may, as an additional penalty, also revoke the license of the person or group found guilty. Section 311 of the present law specifically directs the Commission to revoke any license which the court has ordered to be revoked under the authority of section 313 and authorizes the Commission to revoke the license of a person found guilty of antitrust violation if the court itself has not ordered such revocation.

Licensees have consistently contended during various hearings before this committee that these two sections considered together as now written constitute an unfair discrimination against radio licensees and that such a double penalty is not imposed upon other classes of business by any other statute.

The committee is impressed with the legal validity of the protests which have been made against this type of double jeopardy. It believes there is merit in the contention that citizens should not be subject to trial for the same allegations before two different tribunals. Moreover, such an argument is particularly pertinent in connection with alleged violations of the antitrust statutes which are the particular province of the Department of Justice, and do not, by any other law, come within the jurisdiction of any independent quasi-judicial agency of government.

The committee has made no change in section 313. That section, which makes all licenses amenable to the antitrust statutes and specifically grants the court authority, if a licensee is found guilty of an antitrust violation, to order revocation of his license in addition to all other penalties which may be imposed under authority of the antitrust laws, stands unchanged and unimpaired. It has, however, modified section 311, which gave to the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to institute license revocation proceedings in those cases where a licensee has been found guilty in

court of an antitrust violation but where the court did not order revocation of the license issued by the Commission. The modification proposed merely prohibits the Commission from instituting its own antitrust proceeding. It retains the specific authority to refuse a license or permit in those cases in which a court under section 313 has ordered revocation of the license or permit.

The committee desires to emphasize that the Commission's existing authority under law to examine into the character of a licensee or permittee in granting a license or a renewal is in no way impaired or modified by the change here recommended in section 311. The Commission's authority to determine whether or not the public interest, convenience, or necessity will be served by the granting of a license remains paramount and if it finds that the conviction of a licensee under the antitrust laws or under section 313 has materially affected the character of standing of such licensee so as to warrant refusal of a renewal, or grant of license, it may so proceed. Thus, the Commission's power to protect against monopoly control of radio licenses remains unaffected by the changes herein recommended; it is merely estopped from initiating and proceeding with an antitrust case of its own.

Section 11

This section amends section 312 of the present act which deals with revocation of licenses. Under existing law a station license may be revoked for false statements either in the application, or in the statement of fact which may be required from time to time, which would warrant the Commission in refusing to grant a license on an original application; or for failure to observe any of the restrictions or conditions of the act or of regulations of the Commission authorized by the act or a treaty ratified by the United States. It is clear, therefore, that revocation is the sole administrative penalty in the case of violations ranging from the most serious to the least minor and affecting those who may innocently violate regulations of the Commission on technical matters.

The committee feels that this is not a satisfactory situation for two reasons: The Commission is reluctant to revoke a license for a minor offense and therefore minor offenses may be committed almost with impunity, and there exists no clear distinction between types of offenses. It is felt that some method of procedure short of revocation should be provided for minor or less serious violations. It is, therefore, provided that the Commission may issue cease-and-desist orders for such less serious violations.

The revocation penalty would remain in effect only (1) for those situations in which the Commission learns of facts or conditions after the granting of a permit or license which would have warranted it in refusing the grant originally had it known those facts; (2) for violation or failure to observe provisions of a treaty ratified by the United States; and (3) for violation or failure to observe the conditions of any cease-and-desist order issued in accordance with the provisions of this section. As in the case of cease-and-desist orders, the Commission must first issue an order to show cause why a license should not be revoked.

The cease-and-desist action would apply to those cases where a licensee has (1) failed to operate substantially as set forth in his license; (2) failed to observe the restrictions of this act or of a treaty ratified by the United States; and (3) violated or failed to observe any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this act.

It will be seen that violation of conditions or restrictions of a treaty may be proceeded against initially either by a revocation proceeding or the less onerous cease-and-desist proceeding, thus allowing Commission discretion as to the seriousness of the alleged offense. Moreover, the recommended language clothes the Commission with power to prevent persistent minor violations by making violation of a cease-and-desist order cause for a revocation action.

The cease-and-desist procedure is a time-tried and wholly successful one in many administrative agencies and the committee believes that its adoption by the Federal Communications Commission will be salutary. The language here recommended has had the approval of all witnesses who testified on the bill.

Revocation and cease-and-desist proceedings are, of course, subject to proper hearing procedures and are appealable to the courts. The burden of proof in all such proceedings is upon the Commission.

Section 12

This section provides for a new section (sec. 330) but its provisions are virtually identical with the present section 312 (b) of the law. In the interest of clarity and consistent order, the revocation and cease-and-desist provision has been assigned the number 312 and the provisions of the old section 312 (b) have been transferred to a new number.

The recommended language provides that modifications of licenses may be made where it will promote the public interest or where the provisions of the act or any treaty will be more fully complied with. This provision is identical with existing section 312 (b) except for language spelling out that a licensee whose license the Commission proposes to modify may on request secure a public hearing on at least 30 days' notice. This period of time may be shortened, however, where safety of life or property is involved. The section also provides that the burden of proof in all revocation, modification, and cease-and-desist proceedings is on the Commission.

Section 13

This section, entitled "Limitations on Quasi-Judicial Powers," adds a new section (sec. 331) to the present act dealing with miscellaneous provisions relating to the procedures to be followed in modification, revocation, and renewal proceedings. It has been endorsed by all witnesses and has the general approval of Commissioners.

The intent of this section is to spell out in definite detail the authority of the Commission with respect to modification of licenses, and termination or revocation of licenses, and to provide a guide for the Commission in dealing with renewals of licenses.

The language makes clear that modification can be undertaken only in accordance with the provisions prescribed by section 330 (a) of the law (sec. 12 of this bill) and that revocation or termination of a license can be undertaken only for the reasons and in the manner provided by section 312 of the law (sec. 11 of this bill). It makes clear that Commission consideration of a renewal of license is also premised on the public interest, convenience, and necessity but the intent of the committee here is to separate more definitely and clearly the prosecutory functions and duties of the administrative staff of the Commission from the quasi-judicial functions of the Commission membership itself.

Section 14

This section amends section 401 of the present act by adding a new subsection (e) dealing with declaratory orders. The declaratory order method of procedure has received the direct approval of Congress in the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, which provides for issuance of such orders by administrative and independent agencies. The committee believes this type of procedure is an extremely beneficial one, both for the Government and for those having business before a Government agency.

The first sentence of the recommended section is substantially the language of the Administrative Procedure Act. However, the committee is of the opinion that because of the problems with which the Communications Commission deals it is necessary to provide additional safeguards in the issuance of declaratory orders by the Commission. The Commission should not be in the position of entering fiats to the industry under the guise of unsolicited declaratory orders. Moreover, such orders should be binding only on those who are parties to the proceeding.

This section provides that the Commission may issue declaratory orders in cases of actual controversy or in order to remove uncertainty. Such orders would be issued only upon petition and after notice and opportunity for hearing and such orders would, of course, be subject to judicial review.

One of the frequent criticisms of governmental procedure, particularly that of the quasi-judicial agencies, is that in order to test the legality, or even the meaning, of a rule or regulation, it is necessary to violate it and incur the penalties that go with such violation. Such a condition results in a particularly difficult situation in the case of radio broadcasting, involving as it does highly technical and specialized rules applicable to engineering and other technical equipment and operations most complicated in character. The proposed new section would make it unnecessary to incur the risk of violating the law in order to secure an authoritative ruling.

Section 15

This section amends section 402 of the present act, which deals with the subject of judicial review of the Commission's decisions and orders. The subject of appeals from quasi-judicial agencies to the courts and the legal remedies under such appeals are most important. Since the changes in existing law which are to be effected by the enactment of these subsections are several and substantial, detailed consideration is presented in this report.

Subsection (a) deals only with judicial review of Commission orders by specifically constituted three-judge courts. It substantially restates existing law with necessary clarification, and a provision is inserted which would give parties plaintiff, other than the Government, an option of venue for such suits, either in the appropriate United States district court or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Subsections (b) through (j) deal with the subject of judicial review of decisions and orders of the Commission which are entered in the exercise of its radio-licensing functions.

Subsection (b) attempts a more precise and comprehensive definition of the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in cases appealed from the Commission. The language of this subsection, when considered in relation to that of subsection (a), also would make clear that judicial review of all cases involving the exercise of the Commission's radio-licensing power is limited to that court. Under present law, confusion and controversy have arisen concerning what decisions and orders of the Commission might become the subject to judicial review and in what court. This has been carried to the point where the time and effort of both litigants and courts have been too much taken up with jurisdictional problems rather than with the merits of particular cases. Enactment of this subsection is designed to obviate this difficulty.

Subsection (c) deals with the time for and the manner of taking an appeal from the Commission to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the duty of the Commission with respect to the filing and certification of the record in the event that such an appeal is taken. The appellate period is made 30 rather than 20 days as at present, and provision is made

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that the appellate period will run from the date of the entry of the order appealed from rather than from its effective date.

This subsection also definitely fixes and prescribes the nature and extent of the jurisdiction of the appellate court after a notice of appeal has been filed. It confers upon that court, by specific language rather than by inference, authority to grant temporary relief, which may be either affirmative or negative in its scope and application. The necessity for language of this sort in the statute itself can hardly be exaggerated in view of the controversy and confusion which have arisen concerning this subject. The language here is believed to be stronger and therefore preferable to that found in section 10 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Subsection (d) would continue in effect, substantially, the provisions of section 402 (c) of existing law. It does, however, attempt to settle certain ambiguities. The Commission would be compelled to file with the court both the record and its written decision within a period of 30 days after the filing of an appeal. Present provisions of law are susceptible of an interpretation which would require the filing of the Commission's decision 30 days after the filing of the record.

Subsection (e) is a redraft of section 402 (d) of existing law, with minor clarifying amendments.

Subsection (f) specifically confers upon the appellate court the right to fix by rule the material to be included in any record upon which an appeal is to be heard and determined. While this is now the practice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, questions have arisen concerning that court's power to take such action due to the peculiar language of the statute. This is a matter which obviously should be clarified.

Subsection (g) merely adopts the language of section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act as the procedure to be followed in the hearing and determination of the appeal.

Subsection (h) contains provisions which are intended to confer upon the appellate court a measure of control commensurate with the dignity and responsibility of that tribunal, requiring the Commission to give effect to the judgment of the court in the absence of proceedings to review. The committee points out that under the language of this subsection the appellate court would have ample authority either on its own motion or upon the petition of the Commission or any other litigant, to provide, either as a part of its original decree or supplementary thereto, that new parties and new issues may be introduced and a new record made after remand to the Commission. This authority stems from the phrase "and unless otherwise ordered by the court."

Subsection (i) carries forward without change provisions of section 402 (f) of existing law relating to the assessment of costs on appeal.

Subsection (j) contains important amendments to existing law. Under present law, review by the Supreme Court of decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is limited to certiorari proceedings and to certification by the court of appeals. This subsection provides that, in a limited class of cases, appeals may be taken directly and as a matter of right to the United States Supreme Court.

Experience to date has clearly demonstrated that it is extremely difficult for private litigants to secure an ultimate Supreme Court review of Commission action by the certiorari method. Since 1927, only one such petition has been granted upon request of a private litigant, whereas only one such petition has been denied when filed by the Government. The result has been that many cases involving Commission action on applications for renewal and modification of licenses have, during this period, been reviewed by the Supreme Court upon request of the Government, and only one has received such consideration upon petition of a private litigant. Since either revocation or renewal proceedings may result in absolute or final loss of license, the committee believes that adequate opportunity should be given the parties affected in such cases to litigate their claims; and that, in this limited class of cases, opportunity should extend to and include review by the highest judicial tribunal. Such appeals, as a matter of right, are given in practically all cases involving decisions and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and are given under section 402 (a) of the Communications Act in cases such as the network cases (*National Broadcasting Company, Inc., et al. v. U. S. et al.* (319 U. S. 190)) which involve the exercise by the Commission of its legislative, as distinguished from its judicial powers.

The committee sees no basis in substance for the distinction made so long as the result reached is determinative and final in either case and goes to the right of a litigant to remain in the business of his choice. The inclusion of such a provision should impose no undue hardship upon the Supreme Court because of the limited number of such cases. On the contrary, it would make possible the development of an authoritative body of law upon a subject vital to those engaged in the communications business and of substantial importance to the public generally.

Section 16

This section amends section 405 of existing law which deals with rehearing procedure before the Commission. Since the rehearing step is the final stage in the administrative process, the committee is of the opinion that clarity and definiteness are of paramount importance here. The new language recommended in this bill is intended to make more definite and certain the rights and remedies of the parties concerned.

Any party affected by a decision, order, or requirement of the Commission, or any other person aggrieved or adversely affected by it, is granted the right to petition for a rehearing. In order to expedite the rehearing process and prevent it from being used as a delaying action, the recommended new language specifies that, except for newly discovered evidence or evidence otherwise available only since the original taking of evidence, no evidence shall be taken on a rehearing. This is also intended to make such rehearing procedures conform to court practice, on appeal, in view of the fact that a rehearing conforms in many respects to an appeal to a higher court, where only the evidence already introduced is considered.

The recommended section also would eliminate uncertainties in existing appellate practices by providing that the time for appeal under section 402 (b) (sec. 15 of this bill) will run from the date upon which the Commission enters its order disposing of all petitions for rehearing filed in any case.

Section 17

This section amends section 409 of the present act, which deals with the hearing procedure before the Commission. The proposed new language replaces the present subsection (a) with three new subsections. These are designed to make definite and certain the procedure to be employed by the Commission in all cases where a public hearing is required by the provisions of the Communications Act or other applicable provisions of law.

The subject here dealt with is that of judicial or quasi-judicial hearings held by the Commission and is one of the most important of any dealt with in the entire bill. The changes recommended in this bill are prompted by what is believed to be an abundance of caution and a desire to prevent conflicts or misunderstandings due to the presence on the statute books of other provisions relating to the same subject. Since section 12 of the Administrative Procedures Act provides that subsequent legislation shall not supersede or modify the provisions of that act, unless specifically stated, it has been necessary to make specific references to that act where the subject matter requires a different treatment. The section consists of three subsections, which will be dealt with in order.

Subsection (a) will, in effect, require all hearings of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature conducted by the Commission to be held either by the whole Commission or by one or more examiners appointed by the Commission. It will not permit the conduct of a hearing by a single Commissioner, as is now sometimes done. This is important because it is impossible for the Commission to review the preliminary or intermediate report of one of its members with the same degree of objectivity or fairness with which it reviews the report of an examiner. Since section 7 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is so phrased as to permit a continuance of present practices, specific references to it were regarded as necessary in order to effect a change.

Subsection (b) relates to the procedure which shall be followed by the officers conducting a hearing and what shall be included in the record. Here again certain provisions of section 8 of the Administrative Procedures Act seem to be ineffective or inappropriate, and specific reference to section 8 of that act was required.

Subsection (c) has further reference to the conduct of hearing officers and certain other employees both during the hearing and subsequent thereto, but before final decision. While provisions of this type are not found in the Administrative Procedure Act, the committee believes that the clearest and most detailed separation of the prosecutory and judicial functions must be maintained in the interests of equity and fair treatment to those having business before the Commission. An exemption has been made with respect to the review work that may be carried on by the review unit provided for in this bill (sec. 5 (b) of the act and this bill) and by the Commissioners' personal legal assistants. But the committee insists that citizens shall be safeguarded in the administrative process so that unfair and improper influence shall not be brought to bear in their cases without their knowledge and without an opportunity for them to rebut in accordance with American juridical standards.

In providing for the establishment of a special review unit, the committee does not intend it to act as a panel designed to screen or modify examiners' proposed decisions before they reach the Commission. On the contrary, the principal function of the review unit is to digest and analyze proposed decisions—or rules and regulations—for the Commission to save individual Commissioners' time and expedite their handling of cases and the rule-making procedure. Such review board does not have and is not intended to have any authority to revise, modify, amend, or alter any proposed decision by an examiner nor to recommend to the Commission changes in such decisions. It is expected to act as a clearinghouse to make certain that both law and fact have been correctly applied and to digest, analyze, and note the scope and purport of the proposed decision.

Apart from the authority expressly granted the review board, and the duties laid upon the Commissioners' personal legal assistants, every safeguard is written into this section to prevent examiners, lawyers, or other employees from advising or consulting with the Commission with respect to its action.

These three subsections are amendatory. In the interests of clarity, these additional

subsections are retained in the act, and renumbered so that the present subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), will become subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l), respectively.

Section 18

This section amends section 414 of the present act, which provides that nothing in the Communications Act shall abridge or alter the remedies existing at common law or by statute. The recommended new language to be added is: "except as specifically provided in this act, the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply in all proceedings under this act."

The purpose and intent of the amendment is to make clear that all of the pertinent provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are applicable in all procedural and appellate matters involving cases and controversies before the Communications Commission, except where specific procedural and appellate provisions are set forth in this bill. It will be noted that section 409 (a), (b), and (c) (sec. 17 of this bill) specifically refer to the Administrative Procedure Act and specify that, notwithstanding provisions of that act, the procedures set forth in those subsections are to be employed. The committee is well aware of the salutary provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and has no desire to vitiate or impair the rights granted under the provisions of that act to private citizens doing business with a Government agency. It believes, however, that circumstances and conditions involved in procedures before the Communications Commission, particularly radio-broadcast cases, which differ from common-carrier principles, are such that special recognition must be given to the problem. The Administrative Procedure Act, which is a general statute covering procedure in all administrative agencies, does not meet all of these conditions and circumstances.

Section 19

This section is a new provision of law which adds a new section to chapter 63 of the Criminal Code dealing with fraud by radio. This provision has been recommended by the Federal Communications Commission on several occasions, and the committee has heard of no opposition to it from any source.

It is intended merely to establish for radio a parallel provision now in the law for fraud by mail, so that fraud conducted or intended to be conducted by radio shall be amenable to the same penalties now provided for fraud by means of the mails. The Commission has pointed out that the loophole now in the law leaves not only citizens at the mercy of some clever schemer but actually places an innocent licensee at a serious disadvantage, since the only recourse the Commission has under existing law is to revoke a license. Of course, should a licensee be found to be involved in such a fraud, the Commission's power to revoke his license is not affected by this new section. It does, however, provide a means to reach a nonlicensee who may make use of the radio to defraud.

Section 20

This section is the usual separability provision to make certain that if any provision of the bill is found invalid it will not invalidate the remainder of the provisions of the bill and their applicability to persons or circumstances affected by the act.

JOSEPH P. ADAMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for approximately 30 seconds?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Washington. I understand he has an appointment at Uline Arena.

Mr. CAIN. That is precisely where I intend to go, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Joseph P. Adams, of Washington, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1956, was confirmed by the Senate in executive session this morning. When the appointment of Mr. Adams was before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I responded to the chairman's request to express my views on the appointment by addressing a letter to the chairman under date of January 21, 1951.

For the reason that a number of my political associates and some lay persons will be interested in my position, and to make it clear that I wish Mr. Adams well in his responsibilities and difficult undertakings, I ask unanimous consent that the letter in question be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In response to your request I am writing to offer my view concerning the nomination of Joseph P. Adams of Washington to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1956.

I am but very casually acquainted with Mr. Adams. I know him in a general way to be a prominent Democrat in Washington State, who has unsuccessfully sought public office on several occasions. I know Mr. Adams more particularly for his interest and activity in aviation matters over a period of many years. I also am aware that Mr. Adams has been the Washington State department commandant of the Marine Corps League and president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association. I do not know Mr. Adams as a personal friend or close associate for I do not recall having seen or met him on more than a dozen occasions.

I am now and only concerned with Mr. Adams because of his appointment to an important national office. If I knew of any single reason why Mr. Adams was not qualified for or not likely to succeed in the work to which he has been appointed I would strenuously oppose his confirmation. On the basis of what I do know about Mr. Adams' work in the field of aviation, and from what I have been told about the excellence of that work, I have reason to believe that Mr. Adams will be highly competent in his assignment and reflect credit on the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest.

A Republican friend of mine, Mr. H. G. Jones, of the air express division of the Railway Express Agency has recently written to me from Wenatchee to say:

"I have been active in State aviation circles in the State of Washington for over 20 years and regardless of his politics Joe Adams did more for the State of Washington in aviation in his years as director of aviation than we have ever had."

Another Republican friend, Mr. Clay Nixon of the firm of Nixon & Hove in Seattle, has written to say this about Mr. Adams:

"I have known Joe, know all about his family, know him to be a man of outstanding integrity and abilities and as evidenced by the fact that he is one of the senior colonels of the Marine Air Reserve despite the fact that he is a reservist, indicates the loyalty he has had to his country over these years. It was certainly a deserved appointment when he was made head of the State aeronautics division here in Washington, and as you probably know he did an outstanding job. Any connection with Wallgren certainly should not be held against him on that score."

I have received critical letters about the appointment of Mr. Adams. All of these criticisms have been directed at Mr. Adams' political activities and at his several failures to be elected to public office. I have advised such persons who wrote in this vein that the appointment belonged to the Democrats and that the appointment could only be opposed for cause but not on the grounds of prejudice or emotion. I have pointed out that Mr. Adams' aviation background entitles him to consideration and support.

I wish to submit a comment from Mr. A. Elliott Merrill, chairman of the Washington State Aeronautics Commission, for it bears directly on the abilities and knowledge of the nominee. In part Mr. Merrill had this to say:

"Joseph Adams was our first director of aeronautics for the State of Washington, serving from late in 1946 until November 1949. During this period I had the opportunity as chairman of the commission to become well acquainted with his ability to handle and administer the work of such an office. Without going into details I can stanchly vouch that our office was well organized and the work program that was carried out was exceptionally well done with a minimum of funds available.

"The State of Washington now has a very fine reputation in the National Association of State Aviation Officials, as well as with our own organizations such as the Washington State Flying Farmers and the Washington State Aviation Operators Association.

"I personally consider this appointment an opportunity that the Pacific Northwest should unite on and wish by this means to let you know my own views on the matter."

This letter ought to be concluded with an attached editorial headed "Adams for Adams" which appeared in the Washington Post of January 29. This editorial judges Mr. Joe Adams' background and knowledge to be promising while it reflects on the causes which led to the dismissal of Mr. Joe Adams' predecessor. I trust that the committee will permit this editorial to be made a part of the committee record.

In being a Republican I would have preferred that a qualified Republican had been named for the pending appointment. That feeling is, however, quite beside the point at issue. My colleague and the administration have named an individual who appears to possess the qualifications required by a very demanding assignment. I am pleased to say that if Mr. Adams is confirmed, that I shall wish him well and cooperate with his office in every way for the good of my State and our Nation.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on January 8, I introduced Senate bill 141,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which is a bill designed "to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to the manufacture and distribution of goods; to strengthen small business in its economic struggle for survival; to promote competition by prohibiting a manufacturer from engaging in the retail field and by prohibiting a retailer from engaging in manufacturing; and for other purposes." That bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Two years ago I introduced a similar measure, then known as Senate bill 1709, which also was referred to the same committee. I later offered the substance of my bill, Senate bill 1709, as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 640, which had been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A similar situation again confronts us. On January 23 last a bill was introduced as Senate bill 629, to provide for the distribution of motor vehicle tires and for other purposes. I now offer as an amendment to Senate bill 629, in the nature of a substitute, the substance of Senate bill 141, which is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask that my amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 629 be printed and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if and when hearings are held on Senate bill 629 by the Committee on the Judiciary, I feel that the entire subject should be examined. I see no reason why the manufacturer of motor vehicle tires is in any different position, when it comes to selling tires through the manufacturer's own retail outlets, from that of manufacturers in other fields. That is why I feel that we should clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to the manufacture and distribution of goods, and that is the subject which is covered by my amendment.

Mr. President, I pointed out to the Senate on May 10, 1949, how the reasoning of Judge Minton, a distinguished former member of this body, had been set forth in the seventh circuit court case of United States against the New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., and others. I have had occasion in the past few days to demonstrate on the floor of the Senate that the A. & P. is the biggest egg handler in the country, and how its egg-buying operations usually set the pace. I said then, and I now repeat, that it is ridiculous for the farmers to receive only 21 or 22 cents a dozen for eggs when the consumer is obliged to pay anywhere from 70 cents to a dollar a dozen for eggs. I quoted then an article describing how the A. & P. orders its traders to buy up all the eggs in sight, and continues the feverish buying until A. & P. gives the signal to stop, and then buying ceases and the prices drop.

Such things go on, Mr. President, as to eggs, as to meat, as to milk, and as to other produce from our farms. The economic struggle for survival affects all walks of life. It affects manufacturers and farmers. It affects wholesalers and consumers. Obviously, Congress has to legislate for the greatest good of the greatest number, and, as a result, Congress long ago took its place on the side of the people and against monopoly. We passed the Sherman Antitrust Act. We added to it through the Clayton Act. Through the Robinson-Patman Act we legislated further in our efforts to lay down proper rules for competition.

While Judge Minton was on the seventh circuit court, where he wrote his famous opinion in the A. & P. case, he also wrote the opinion in *Standard Oil Company* v. *the Federal Trade Commission* (173 F. 2d 210). The Federal Trade Commission in that case had found that the Standard Oil Co. was selling gasoline to four comparatively large jobber customers in Detroit at a lesser price per gallon than the price at which it sold similar gasoline to many comparatively small service-station customers in the same area. The Commission ordered the company to cease and desist from that price differential, and the court of appeals required its enforcement.

What happened after that case was won, Mr. President? The Standard Oil Co. brought the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it was argued during the October term of 1949. The issue was not then settled, and the case was reargued before the Supreme Court during this term.

On January 8, 1951, the Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals, but Mr. Justice Minton could take no part in the consideration of the case, for he had written the opinion of the court below. Justice Reed, Justice Black, and Chief Justice Vinson dissented.

Mr. Justice Reed said that the action taken by the majority "would permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers, for the seller could give to the large retailer a price lower than that charged to small retailers, and could then completely justify its discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods. This is the very type of competition that Congress sought to remedy."

Accordingly, I think that if we are to go into these subjects at all, we ought to examine the situation right across the board. Therefore, I offer my amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 629.

Mr. President, for a quick summary of the Supreme Court's opinion in the Standard Oil case I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Post of January 9, 1951, entitled "Double Pricing Wins Supreme Court Test."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE PRICING WINS SUPREME COURT TEST

(By Murray Marder)

A business firm can sell its goods at a lower price to one customer than it does to another if it is acting in good faith to meet competition.

This issue of long standing was resolved yesterday by the Supreme Court in a 5-to-3 decision. The Court's majority said "good faith" was the test to determine whether such double-pricing methods are illegal.

The decision was the only written opinion delivered by the Court yesterday, and the second in 2 weeks on a major question of price competition. Last week the Court held that it is just as illegal for manufacturers to try to set price ceilings on their products as to establish minimum resale prices.

STANDARD OIL INVOLVED

The "good faith" test for competition came in a case in which the Federal Trade Commission challenged the right of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana to sell gasoline to four large jobbers in the Detroit area at 1½ cents a gallon less than it charged retail service stations.

The jobbers at some time have also resold some of their gasoline at retail levels.

FTC ruled in August 1946, that Standard must discontinue its double-pricing method. It was insufficient to argue, FTC said, that Standard's actions were taken in "good faith" to meet an equally low price offered by competitors.

Even if they were, said the FTC, their effect, nevertheless, was to "injure, destroy, and prevent competition with the retail stations," as interpreted under the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act of 1936.

FTC was upheld by the seventh circuit court of appeals, in April 1949, in an opinion written by the present Justice Minton of the Supreme Court. He did not participate in yesterday's decision.

OPINION BY BURTON

Justice Burton, delivering the majority opinion for the high Court, said the Robinson-Patman Act did somewhat after the issue involved as stated in the Clayton Act of 1914, but:

None of these changes, however, cut into the actual core of the defense. That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price.

"The heart of our national economic policy," Justice Burton said, "long has been faith in the value of competition. In the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as in the Robinson-Patman Act, 'Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent'."

FTC was ordered to comply with the opinion and it will determine whether the record showed good faith on the part of Standard Oil.

Justice Reed wrote the dissent, and was joined by Chief Justice Vinson and Justice Black.

"The court's interpretation" of the Robinson-Patman Act, Justice Reed said, "leaves what the seller can do almost as wide open as before."

DISCRIMINATION OPENING SEEN

Action of this kind, he said, "would permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers, for the seller could give to the large retailer a price lower than that charged to small retailers, and could then completely justify its discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods.

"This is the very type of competition that Congress sought to remedy," Justice Reed declared.

Congress sought to resolve the same issue last year in a section of the basing-point bill that President Truman vetoed in June. The good faith determination was in that bill, while the major part of that legislation would have permitted firms to absorb freight charges and quote uniform delivered prices for goods regardless of the distance they were shipped.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I offer. I wish to say once more that so long as I am a Senator I intend to vote for the small-business man, who, in my opinion, has been harmed by the decision to which I have referred.

SUGGESTED INCREASE OF EXEMPTION ON PERSONAL INCOME

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which was passed by the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly at their last regular meeting on January 10, 1951, which was sent to me by Dan Olsen, secretary and treasurer of the assembly, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government in meeting the war crisis will need to continue to impose heavy taxes; and

Whereas the ability-to-pay principle should be the measuring rod in the imposition of income taxes; and

Whereas 2½ percent of the total Federal revenue in the 1939–40 fiscal year came from individuals with incomes of less than $5,000 a year, and increased to 25 percent by 1950, while the percentage of revenue from corporations during the same period increased only from 26 to 30 percent; and

Whereas despite an average 80.7 percent increase in wages for union wage earners from 1939 to 1950, while living costs were rising 74.8 percent and Federal income taxes for those earning less than $5,000 a year, increased to an average point of 10 percent of their gross income, the wage earner in 1950 finds himself with less real wages than in 1939; and

Whereas the Nation is more prosperous than at any time in history, the typical or average wage earner in 1950 with the dollar worth 57 cents of the 1939 dollar, has not only failed to advance, but has fallen behind his 1939 standard in amount of real value; and

Whereas the wage earner with wife as dependent who received $34.30 a week in 1939 and paid no Federal income tax, and who in 1950 receives $62 a week and pays $5.70 weekly taxes, has take-home pay of $56.30, which on the present 57-cent dollar, equals $32.30 of the 1939 dollar, and is $2 weekly less than the $34.30 take-home pay of the same worker in 1939; and

Whereas social and economic justice demands alleviations of the tax burden of those with dependents, who now pay most of the heavy excise taxes; and

Whereas an increase in the exemptions in Federal income-tax returns from $600 per person to $800 a year would give the average wage earner, with wife as dependent, a savings of $69.60 a year or about $1.33 a week; and

Whereas such an $800 exemption would reduce the tax load on individuals $4,000,000,000 a year, a drop from $18,000,000,000, to $14,000,000,000; and

Whereas corporations, paying $12,000,000,000 a year, or two-thirds of what individuals pay, are the only group better off today in comparison to the values of 1939, should be levied increased taxes to make up the $4,000,000,000 reduction resulting from increasing the exemptions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved this 18th day of December 1950, in the city of Duluth, Minn., That the executive boards of teamsters joint councils, 32 of Minneapolis, 34 of St. Paul, and 48 of Duluth do hereby go on record urging Congress at the next session in January 1951, act to increase exemptions on personal income tax returns to $800 per person, and to increase corporation taxes to offset any reduction resulting from the rises in exemptions; be it further

Resolved, That each of the three participating teamster joint councils work jointly and separately to enlist other organizations to support actively this resolution.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from Bowman, N. Dak., dated January 19, 1951, which I think is very interesting, and which I think every Senator should read. It is from an honest-to-God dirt farmer, Mrs. Rose M. Hansey, and it reads as follows:

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *January 19, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am writing to you in regard to farm product prices, especially eggs. We raise high-priced pullets, expecting the eggs to get our groceries, but so far eggs are so cheap, they don't even pay for the feed the chickens eat. And wheat should be at least $3 per bushel. Farm machinery is so high can't even buy what we need. Need a new linoleum, blinds, etc., but feel that we can't afford it. Taxes are so high we had to borrow money for the time being to pay them, in hopes that grain prices would go up, especially wheat, as that is our main crop.

And another thing we aren't in favor of drafting 18-year-olds.

We had two boys in the other war, and it spoiled their health and our home has never been the same since. We have the one boy left at home; he is soon 15 years old and all we have to look forward to is that he will have to go to war as soon as he is old enough. Future isn't very bright. The only bright thing we have is our Bible and family. We would like to keep them if we can.

There are many more things I'd like to write about, but the price on eggs was the main thing. Don't know just what the stores pay now, but it must be below 20 cents. Haven't taken any to town lately. The last time I got 27 cents a dozen. And a pound of coffee was 91 cents or rather 93 cents with tax.

Hope you can help wake them up down there, so we can make both ends meet.

Sincerely,

ROSE M. HANSEY.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished majority leader listened very carefully to that letter, because, after all, the Democrats are in the majority and they are to blame. If anyone is to blame, it is the Democratic Party, led by my distinguished friend from Arizona. Only a short time ago, we could buy a can of salmon for 19 cents. Today it is 79 cents. During all the time the Democratic Party has been in control it has done nothing, apparently, to regulate the prices of the goods which poor persons must buy. This poor farm woman writes to me telling me she is receiving less than 20 cents a dozen for eggs. She cannot even buy linoleum, or any of the necessities of life. Coffee is 93 cents a pound.

I hope my distinguished friend and colleague from Arizona, for whom I have a very high regard, will read the letter very carefully. I know that a man of his great ability, and holding the great position which he holds as Democratic leader, will take steps immediately to see that farm prices are protected.

Mr. President, I now wish to make some brief comments on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial which was published in the Daily Oklahoman, of which Mr. E. K. Gaylord is editor. It is one of the outstanding newspapers of the West, and is published every morning by the Oklahoma Publishing Co. The editorial is entitled "While the People Sleep." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks. It is one of the most thought-provoking editorials which has been published in any newspaper in the past 50 years. It shows that by the adoption of the United Nations Charter, against which I am proud to say I voted, we are now in a war without Congress ever having voted for war. The editorial refers to the fact that the Appellate Court of California in rendering its decision in a case was guided by action taken by the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE THE PEOPLE SLEEP

In article VI, section 2, of the Federal Constitution it is provided that "All treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land." It further provides that the "judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The Charter of the United Nations was presented to the Senate as a treaty and ratified as a treaty. Its provisions are therefore superior to any American law and even to the Constitution. All American judges are bound to recognize the Charter as the supreme law of the United States.

That Charter provides specifically that no nation that approves the charter shall enact any law that makes any distinction as to "race, sex, language, or religion." All of our existing laws and ordinances that make any such distinction are therefore invalid, since they violate the terms of the ratified charter, which the Constitution recognizes as the "supreme law of the land."

In conformity with that provision of the charter the Appellate Court of California has declared invalid the California statute which denies to orientals the right to own land. That statute has been upheld by the Supreme Court of California and by the Supreme Court of the United States. But the law is now declared void by the Appellate Court of California on the ground that it violates a treaty that was not even written until 25 years after the law was enacted.

If one State law that violates the Charter of the United Nations can be declared void,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

every law enacted by Congress, legislature, or municipal council can be nullified for the same reason. Laws that have gone unchallenged and undisputed for 150 years can be declared void if that decision of the California Appellate Court is permitted to stand.

The country thought that the San Francisco Conference was designing a fabric to render future wars less probable. Now the country is informed by a California court that the conference actually wrote an agreement that is superior to every law ever enacted in America and superior even to the Constitution of the United States. Now the people learn that when the Senate approved that Charter it accepted as the supreme law of the American people an instrument not written by Americans but by the nations and tribes and tongues of two hemispheres. Russians and Chinese and East Indians and other aliens enacted for the American people the supreme law of the American people.

Meanwhile there is pending what is known as the Genocide Convention. This is an instrument written by the Assembly of the United Nations which forbids all attacks on races as such. It leagues all the nations together to administer punishment to any nation or individual that attacks or abuses or oppresses any race or any member of that race.

That convention provides that any nation or any individual charged with the crime of genocide shall be tried in the nation where the crime has been committed or tried by a tribunal to be set up by the United Nations. If that convention is ratified by the Senate, it, too, will become the supreme law of the land, the "Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding."

Under that new "supreme law of the land" it would become at least possible to force any American citizen to trial before an alien court in Geneva or Moscow or Rome or Tokyo, where cruel and unusual punishment is not forbidden and where the privilege of a trial by jury is unknown. If the Senate makes that convention the supreme law, every liberty enjoyed by Americans will become subject to the wishes and whims and passions of Mongols and Slavs and Hindus the wide world over.

THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few years ago when I was Governor of my State, North Dakota owed very little money, only about $42,000,000. During the drought period we reduced the debt to roughly $21,000,000. We cut the debt in two, and cut the expenses of our State Government 54 percent. We cut them from $11,700,000 to $5,400,000. would be interesting to know what t[illegible]bt of North Dakota is today.

I hold in my hand an article which was published by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association. It says that North Dakota's share of the Federal debt—the Federal debt, Mr. President—is much greater than the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the State. Each individual's share of the $256,598,297,426 of Federal debt amounts to $1,708. That is what every North Dakotan—not every family, but every individual—owes. Mr. President, I have before me a list of every county in the State, showing the population, the county's share of the Federal debt, and the net taxable valuation in 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

North Dakota's share of Federal debt is much greater than total taxable value of all real and personal property in State

[Each individual's share of the $256,598,297,426 Federal debt amounts to $1,708]

County	Population, 1950	County's share Federal debt	Net taxable valuation, 1950
Adams	4,891	$8,353,828	$4,659,425
Barnes	16,822	28,731,976	16,134,965
Benson	10,618	18,021,544	10,685,428
Billings	1,769	3,651,452	2,552,297
Bottineau	12,091	20,828,428	12,236,154
Bowman	3,998	6,267,584	4,260,661
Burke	6,597	11,130,676	7,319,443
Burleigh	25,252	43,898,416	17,826,697
Cass	57,903	98,971,324	52,551,326
Cavalier	11,693	19,484,644	12,794,204
Dickey	9,066	15,484,728	10,428,079
Divide	5,977	10,318,716	6,450,961
Dunn	7,212	12,318,096	6,611,827
Eddy	5,361	9,557,588	6,244,652
Emmons	9,694	16,005,352	7,879,929
Foster	5,301	9,954,108	6,835,722
Golden Valley	3,487	5,935,796	4,153,306
Grand Forks	39,190	66,936,520	30,777,683
Grant	7,109	12,022,172	6,093,366
Griggs	5,414	9,147,112	6,936,639
Hettinger	7,086	12,502,888	5,611,526
Kidder	6,154	10,011,032	6,661,298
LaMoure	9,471	16,176,468	10,224,453
Logan	6,345	10,837,260	5,387,407
McHenry	12,556	21,445,648	11,970,079
McIntosh	7,591	12,965,428	5,724,150
McKenzie	6,840	11,682,720	6,401,960
McLean	18,770	32,059,160	11,641,182
Mercer	8,676	14,818,608	6,814,786
Morton	19,242	32,865,336	13,739,567
Mountrail	9,399	16,053,492	9,001,109
Nelson	8,655	13,787,940	9,538,100
Oliver	3,077	5,255,516	3,252,447
Pembina	13,944	23,816,352	13,080,697
Pierce	8,259	14,106,372	8,888,549
Ramsey	14,334	24,482,472	15,830,950
Ransom	8,838	15,095,304	8,052,989
Renville	5,388	9,202,704	5,616,626
Richland	19,738	33,712,504	19,017,396
Rolette	11,094	18,948,552	5,346,531
Sargent	7,568	12,926,144	8,080,145
Sheridan	5,226	8,926,008	4,870,378
Sioux	3,709	6,334,972	1,616,010
Slope	2,308	3,942,264	2,647,915
Stark	16,121	27,534,608	11,677,794
Steele	5,131	8,763,748	6,837,959
Stutsman	24,089	41,058,612	20,241,619
Towner	6,329	10,809,932	8,844,535
Traill	11,330	19,351,640	12,588,027
Walsh	20,485	34,986,380	15,545,378
Ward	34,631	59,149,748	25,014,286
Wells	10,384	17,735,872	10,992,828
Williams	16,402	28,014,616	13,555,793
Total	617,965	1,055,484,220	559,647,225

Sources: Valuation, State tax commissioner; Federal debt, U. S. Treasurer's Report, November 1950; population, Bureau of Census.

UN MEMBERSHIP

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of every Member of the Senate that as the senior Senator from North Dakota I voted against every appropriation of money to be sent to foreign countries with one exception. I voted only for UNRRA. I voted for the two billion dollars which we sent abroad to feed the hungry, naked, and needy all over the world, regardless of religion or nationality. I voted against every other appropriation of money to be sent to foreign countries. Some of the $12,000,000,000 we sent to Russia is now being used against us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "United States Could Cut UN Ties," written by David Lawrence, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COULD CUT UN TIES—RELEASE FROM OBLIGATION TO ACT IS POSSIBLE IN EVENT OF AGGRESSION IN EUROPE OR ASIA

(By David Lawrence)

The United States is beginning to ask various governments whether their attitude of procrastination in the United Nations means that, in the event of an aggression committed against their respective territories, America is to be released from obligation to act promptly in branding and punishing such aggression.

To say that the American Government is astonished by the strange behavior of various member governments of the UN is to put it mildly. It is doubtful if some of these governments themselves realize the extent to which they are jeopardizing the prospect of American protection for their interests in the future.

The United States went into Korea and has suffered 46,000 casualties in the belief that the members of the UN who voted to resist aggression in North Korea were sincere in that vote. If they did not mean what they said, then, in all candor, a resolution should be adopted at once rescinding and revoking that step and announcing to all the world that the members of the UN do not intend to resist any aggression in Europe or in Asia. This would give the United States a free hand.

The American taxpayer would be relieved, moreover, to discover that the $200,000,000, for instance, which India wants from our Government for food is something that need not be spent, after all, because India's Prime Minister, having allied his Government with the Moscow Government, presumably could receive such aid from the Soviets.

The policy of the American Government has never been one to tie in its financial or economic aid with any military alliance, but the 46,000 casualties in Korea in the face of the willingness of India to write off that entire adventure as an American blunder, and not a UN action at all, has aroused Members of Congress. It is unlikely that India or any other nation will find Uncle Sam generous hereafter to governments that are unwilling to risk their troops in support of American troops.

The speech of Indian delegate Rau at the UN declaring that, since a lull in the fighting has occurred, there should be more and more palavering with the Chinese Communists produced a sickening impression here. It could not have been worse if India had openly stated her intention to become allied with Moscow.

Allied sea power has, temporarily at least, upset Communist China's strategy in Korea. This, more than any intentional suspension of hostilities on the battlefront, accounts for the lull in the fighting.

The Chinese face the prospect of an amphibious landing or the threat of such a maneuver, and they recall that a large number of North Korean troops were caught in a similar trap before.

As long as Allied warships can move freely up and down the west coast of Korea and interfere with the landings of any supplies from Chinese ports and destroy not only port facilities but vital roads along the coast, the Chinese high command must face a serious menace to its rear.

Our naval power, incidentally, is not confined to bombardment from cruisers. Plenty of planes are flying from the decks of aircraft carriers, and their bombers are inflicting damage to supply lines as they operate alongside United States Air Force land-based planes which range the northern area, too. The Air Force is doing a wonderful job.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The average American who has been gathering defeatist impressions from the recent headlines about the strategic withdrawal of UN forces does not have a real conception of the extent of the damage done by sea power and air power in the last 5 weeks. The optimism which has been emanating from Washington and Tokyo in the last few days about the improved situation of our forces is based primarily on the tremendous losses being inflicted on the supply lines of the enemy.

In the course of reoccupying some of the areas which have been recently abandoned by the Communists, an opportunity has been afforded to make an actual count of some of the soldier dead of the enemy. In one place alone 2,200 dead troops were accounted for, and hence the belief has developed that Red China cannot indefinitely atand the losses, especially since she has her crack field army in Korea.

The UN can win in Korea, but the battle now is with the faint hearts and the craven intriguers in its own ranks.

THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I offered a resolution asking that the Postmaster General's order cutting daily mail delivery be rescinded. We have been told a great deal about the deficit in the Post Office Department. I hold in my hand an article entitled "Railroads Settle Old Mail Claims," written by Joseph A. Loftus, and published in the New York Times of September 24, 1950. It says:

Agreement with postal heads for $150,000,000 covers rates for 4-year period.

I say now, as I have said on former occasions on the floor of the Senate, that this amount includes the cost of hauling empty mail cars from one end of the United States to the other. The Post Office Department has cut the pay of the men who work for the Department. When I tried to get a decent rate of pay for some of the veterans who are mail handlers, it was said that nothing could be done about it.

Mr. President, some of the employees of the Post Office Department get as little as $1,900 a year. They are expected to support wives and children on that. Finally, after great effort, I got their pay raised to $2,400. Some of the men are veterans who served on Guadalcanal, and many of them were wounded during the war. Some of them are getting small pensions, while others are getting nothing at all. When I tried to get them a raise, it was said that it could not be done. It was said that the Post Office Department did not have enough money. According to the article in the New York Times, the railroads are being taken care of. They got $150,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROADS SETTLE OLD MAIL CLAIMS—AGREEMENT WITH POSTAL HEADS FOR $150,000,000 COVERS RATES FOR 4-YEAR PERIOD

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—The railroads settled old claims for higher mail-carrying rates today for about $150,000,000.

This is a rise of about 19 p rcent. It covers a period of nearly 4 years ending next December 31. The railroads are asking further increases to take effect January 1.

The agreement with the Post Office Department is subject to approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Hearings on the settlement and proposals for a new rate structure are set for November before the Commission.

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson announced a three-point agreement with the carriers. The three points are:

1. Elimination of the round-trip provision of the present rate schedule which requires the Post Office to pay for the return of empty cars on the same basis of pay as the movement of outbound loaded mail cars. This applies only to regular railroad equipment, which can be used for other shipping purposes. It does not apply to railway post-office cars, which are special equipment dedicated to the postal service.

This will place the Post Office Department for the first time on the same basis as other shippers. The round-trip c arge was instituted many years ago, when about 80 percent of the cars used for mail-carrying were special equipment. The growth in the volume of mail, particularly of parcel post, has permitted the use of more regular equipment. Only about 24 percent of the mail-carrying cars now are special post-office cars.

Government estimates of the payment for empty returns are $30,000,000 a year. Not all of that will be saved. The cost of empty cars that may be necessary to the transportation of mail will be included in the one-way rate, as it is in the case of other types of shippers.

2. Agreement on a proposed rate structure for the future whereby line-haul costs and terminal costs will be calculated separately. The Department said this was a more realistic approach to the problem of the individual roads. Under the present system there is a flat, country-wide rate which is supposed to cover haul and terminal costs. Terminal costs vary greatly among the carriers. The new method will take these factors into consideration.

The actual level of rates is not embodied in this section of the agreement. Actual rates would be set by the Interstate Commerce Commission after hearing.

3. Agreement on a lump sum cash settlement of claims by the railroads for additional revenue for transporting the mails during the 4 years the case has been pending before the ICC.

The railroads received $227,500,000 for transporting the mails in the fiscal year of 1950. The settlement of 19 percent would be applied to this and to the three previous years. Rail transportation payments in those 3 years were lower than they were in the fiscal year of 1950. An authoritative source estimated the settlement cost for the 4 years at about $150,000,000.

The pending applications of the railroads before the Interstate Commerce Commission seek a 95-percent increase over the rates in effect when the case was filed in February 1947. An interim increase of 25 percent in mail pay was granted by the ICC on December 1, 1947.

Hearings on the proposed settlement of the claims for the 4-year period will begin November 8. Hearings on the proposed new rate structure will begin November 29.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I listened with interest this afternoon to the address of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the subject of the railroad strikes which are now in progress. I think he did it unintentionally, because I know the Senator, and I am satisfied that he did not speak with malice aforethought, or with any intent to criticize the railroad strikers, but, as I remember, he referred to the employees as a group of men who are looking out for their own economic interests.

Some persons may get an impression contrary to what I believe the junior Senator from Oregon had in mind. I know he agrees with me that during World War II there was no other organization which compared in patriotism to the railroad brotherhoods. To say that the men who are on strike—men who have sons in Korea, and whose sons are being drafted—are unpatriotic is untrue, because the record made by the members of the railroad brotherhoods during World War II speaks for itself. We are all familiar with that record. We know that 21 percent of the young people who worked on the railroads and belonged to the brotherhoods were in World War II—21 percent, Mr. President. With machinery, tools, and equipment growing older and older as the war progressed, the fact remained that the railroad brotherhoods hauled twice as much freight—twice as much, Mr. President—as was ever hauled in the history of America. That is their record, Mr. President. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon gave the record as to what the White House is doing.

Under a Democratic administration headed by Woodrow Wilson we were at war. We have had two wars since. We are in one now. We had World War II. All this time the Democrats have been in power. It seems to me that they ought to have the laws ready so that they could handle strikes, so that the price of food could be kept at a fair level, and so that wages could be kept at a fair level. Yet month after month went by. The price of food rose to the highest point it has ever reached in all the history of the country. Then we found the automobile companies, with unheard-of profits, adding another 5 percent. When the prices were rolled back all they took off was the last 5 percent.

Mr. President, I have received letters from some of the strikers. I have received some from Fargo, N. Dak. I am sorry I do not have them with me. Those letters show the budgets of the workers, and establish conclusively that a worker cannot live decently and support a wife and children on the pay which he is receiving.

For 22 long months, nearly 2 years, this question has been before those in control of our Government. After all the experience which the Democratic Party has had with war, one might suppose that it would not be necessary to wait for 22 months to give either the railroads or the employees justice. One might suppose that by this time the administration could have figured out some formula so that it would not be necessary to have the terrible strike which is now affecting people all over the country.

Mr. President, I should now like to refer to an editorial on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

SUGGESTED WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM KOREA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Change in Attitude," published in the Kildeer (N. Dak.) Herald of January 18. The editorial states that the Legislature of North Dakota has passed a resolution urging that we withdraw our troops from Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

The Senate of the State Legislature of North Dakota has passed a resolution that we withdraw our troops from Korea. The Congress of the United States is all worked up over our foreign policy which involved our troops in the battle in Korea.

Like 95 percent of the rest of us they figured we had done the right thing when we decided to step into the Korean affair under the banner of the UN. It looked like a pretty simple matter to push the North Koreans across the thirty-eighth parallel from whence they had come. No one figured we'd be fighting a million Chinese before the fracas was over. Since that has taken place, our President, Harry Truman, has turned from hero to scapegoat.

It takes a lot of people to make a world, but I don't see how they all got into the United States.

FARM PRICES—LETTER FROM O. S. ELLEVOLD AND ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week on the floor of the Senate I took up the matter of the German Embassy being sold. Before I go into that question I should like to introduce another letter into the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is dated February 2, and it is written by a farmer at Williston, N. Dak. It is so important that I shall read it.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *February 2, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just read the enclosed article by Mark Sullivan and it is enough to make any farmer's blood boil when he reads that kind of stuff. Either the man is a hope-pin-head or he is a malicious cur. I get 3½ cents per pound for No. 1 wheat at the elevator and a loaf of bread which sells for 22 cents contains about 1 pound of dry wheat flour. And when you start figuring breakfast food for instance it is 10 times worse; 4 ounces of puffed wheat retails for 15 cents, that is 60 cents per pound. I get 3½ cents for producing the wheat at high expense and somebody else gets 56½ cents for shooting that wheat through a popping machine, putting it in a paper box, handing it to the customer, and then they brand me the villain and profiteer.

I wish you would take that guy to task and trim him down to size; I know you can do it if you make up your mind to.

It has been very cold up here now for a week, but is warming up this morning, and it looks nice outside.

Thanking you for your kind attention and all past favors, I am

Sincerely yours,

O. S. ELLEVOLD.

P. S.—I would appreciate very much if you would send me a copy or two of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of January 17, 1951.

Mr. President, I do not know of any better way to bring this matter to the attention of my friend Mark Sullivan than by reading this letter on the floor of the Senate and asking unanimous consent that the article which he published, which aroused the ire of my friend in North Dakota, be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATOR IS SEVERE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—In a rush of hurrying developments during several days past, the Government has set ceilings over many prices and is setting them on more. To fix the prices and enforce them it has set in motion several new agencies, among them a kind of over-all one, the Economic Stabilization Agency, administered by Eric Johnston. Associated with Mr. Johnston is Michael DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization.

All this is portentous. It means, as a matter of course, that there will be ceilings over prices of a larger number of commodities. Further than that, it has created an impression that the rising cost of living is to be checked and inflation also. This, in fact, is generally assumed to be the official purpose and expectation of the administration. Whether it is likely to be achieved is a subject of much discussion. Some light may be found by inquiry beneath the superficial aspect of crowded and hurrying developments.

The basis and authority for all that has so far been done is a statute passed by Congress last September, the Defense Production Act of 1950. The act is very long, intricate, and technical. Two sentences of its mass of verbiage throw rather deeper light on it than all the rest together. They are sentences of limitation. Stating what Administrator Johnston and the agencies under him cannot do, they raise a question about how much he can do at all, certainly a question whether he can stop rising cost of living and inflation. The two sentences compose most of subsection 402 (D) (3) of the act: "No ceiling shall be established * * * for any agricultural commodity below the highest of the following prices: I. The parity price for such commodity, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture * * * II. The highest price received by producers during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950 * * * as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

This means that as to putting ceilings on farm crops, Administrator Eric Johnston, of the Economic Stabilization Agency, is in effect displaced by Secretary Brannan of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Johnston can put no ceiling on a farm crop that is below the parity price determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or, alternately, the other standard likewise determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the highest market price during May 24–June 24, 1950. While it is true that Mr. Johnston can put a ceiling on a farm crop that is above the parity price, he is here again subordinated to the Secretary of Agriculture, for it is the Secretary who determines the parity price.

The limitation on Stabilization Administrator Johnston is severe. He can at will put ceilings on prices in nearly all the country's industries but not on prices in agriculture. He can at will put ceilings on automobiles and other manufactured products, through a wide range of heavy goods and household appliances, practically the whole field of manufactured goods; but he cannot at will put ceilings on wheat and other grains or on eggs or poultry. Before he can put ceilings on these and other farm products, the ceiling price must be below standards determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This is a momentous condition. The farm crops which are kept out of the Stabilization Administrator's discretion and authority are many and important; in the aggregate they compose a material part of the whole economy of the country. It is questionable whether the immense and complex mechanism of ceilings and regulations and controls now under way can function successfully with a material part of the country's economy not under its authority.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter dated January 17, 1951, from Grand Forks, N. Dak. The letter reads in part as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *January 17, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Reading tonight's Herald, date January 24, 1951, where you talking about price of eggs 21 to 30 cents a dozen to farmers—well here goes to tell you what I paid for eggs at Xmas 25 a dozen at Cavalier and here in Grand Forks I paid 70 cents for pullet eggs. Of course, we all know it cost to have them brought to town, but not that much.

Also I see by my union paper from post office where you are in favor of 17 percent increase in pay for all post office employees.

Well, here goes to tell you what I receive for year—$3,050. Take out my income taxes, which is $65; taxes on my home, $203.60; interest on my investment, $235; Parson Prot. $14, total of $526 for taxes without trying to keep a family of five with an aged mother of 86 years old that can only get $10 per month from the welfare board. Of course, one should not complain about their parent. But I think and know this outfit in power are awful therefore I hope as you one my best friend in Washington I hope you stand up and give them heck down there in (D. C.) * * *

As ever,

NORMAN C. WILKEN.

P. S.—Hoping you and your wife very happy New Year as I received your welcome card for the New Year.

I bring that letter to the attention of my distinguished friend from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the majority leader.

Mr. President, I have another letter from Heimdal, N. Dak.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield until I get through telling the distinguished Senator all about the egg prices.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry, Mr. President, that I cannot yield now. Inasmuch as the Senator is interested in the subject, however, I hand him two letters so he can read them at his leisure and then, if he will be so kind, return them to me. I shall identify the letters, so the Senator will know from whom they were sent to me. One is from Iven K. Wilkins, of Heimdal, N. Dak., and the other is from a very dear friend of mine, Julius Lemke, of Bentley, N. Dak. If the Senator will read the letters and digest them I am sure it will be greatly to his profit.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. I simply do not have the time. I have considerable more to present, and I am already late. The Republican meeting and box supper begin at 6:30 and it is now 6:20. The place of meeting is nearly a mile and a half away, and there still is a speech I wish to give. After I complete it, even though I am short of

time, I shall be glad to answer questions if the Senator from Arizona desires to ask me questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

PROPOSED SALE OF GERMAN EMBASSY IN WASHINGTON, AND DEFENSE ALLIANCE WITH WESTERN GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I said I wanted to complete my speech in relation to the proposed sale of the German Embassy. At that time I exhibited to the Senate an advertisement which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Friday, January 19. It was an offer for sale and began as follows:

Offer for sale by the Attorney General of the United States of America.

Then it described the property known as the German Embassy in Washington. It was proposed to sell that property at the very time when General Eisenhower was in West Germany trying to get the Germans of that area to rearm. General Eisenhower told the people in Germany they would again become a great nation, and that we would recognize them again. It is very strange that the Democratic Party cannot have the Department of State, the Attorney General, and General Eisenhower all work together. On the one hand the people of West Germany are told we are going to welcome them as a nation, while a department of the administration is proposing to sell the German Embassy so that if the German people do become a great nation again their representatives will not have a place in which to hang their hats when they come here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "offer for sale" of the German Embassy be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the offer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFER FOR SALE BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Notice inviting citizens of the United States of America to make offers to purchase from the Attorney General all his right, title, and interest in and to the following described improved real property situated in the city of Washington, D. C.

Description of property: Valuable downtown location, 1435-41 Massachusetts Avenue NW., improvements of brick construction, consisting of 70 rooms, large ballroom, 13 baths and 5 additional toilet rooms, garages and storage space; situated on plot containing 20,000 square feet.

This property is ideally located and offers unusual opportunities for development. The neighborhood is improving, with new construction in the immediate area and is within easy walking distance of the best hotels, many Government departments, churches, schools, financial district, good shopping and restaurant facilities. The site has a frontage of 138.6 feet on the north side of Massachusetts Avenue between Fourteenth and Fifteenth Streets NW., the avenue is 160 feet wide, and is one of the main traffic arteries of Washington.

Which property is more particularly described in a certain vesting order No. 15004, dated August 14, 1950, recorded on August 25, 1950, in the office of the Recorder in and for the District of Columbia in the record of deeds of said District of Columbia in folio 41 on page 9282.

Sealed bids addressed to the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., will be received until 10 o'clock a. m. on the 16th day of February 1951, at which time and place said bids will be publicly opened and declared. Each bid must be in duplicate and an irrevocable offer to purchase the property. Bids will be received only from American citizens and corporations controlled by American citizens and organized under the laws of the United States. Bids must contain an affidavit stating, among other things, that the bidder is not purchasing on behalf of an undisclosed principal, a person not a citizen of the United States, or for resale to a noncitizen.

A bank draft or certified check payable to the Attorney General in an amount equal to 10 percent of the bid price must accompany the bid. Any commission payable must be stated in the bid. The Attorney General reserves the right to reject any or all bids or at his election to waive all defects in any bid. The Attorney General's right, title, and interest in the property will be conveyed by quitclaim deed without covenants or warranties of any kind. Further particulars with respect to the said property and forms for submitting bids may be obtained by communicating with the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Dated at Washington, D. C., this 12th day of January 1951.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

Mr. LANGER. As I previously said, in my opinion the Communists will howl with glee over the proposed sale. How the leaders of the democratic Western Germany must feel when they hear the gibes, "See, you West German leaders won't even have a place to hang your hats when you are in the United States talking about your joining in the western defense." Is it any wonder, then, that United States High Commissioner McCloy's survey says that most West German newspapers refer to the proposed German Army units almost unanimously as "Himmelfahrtkommandos," which means "legions headed for heaven," or extermination? Is it any wonder, then, that General Eisenhower found Mr. McCloy's report so disappointing and so disheartening, for the general knows that such stupid blundering, which is the kindest expression that can be used for such chicanery, unless stopped at once, will most likely cost American lives under his command, for which he carries the responsibility.

This chicanery is not an isolated instance in the operation of the Office of Alien Property administering the Trading With the Enemy Act in conjunction with foreign funds control of the State Department. This is the one agency of government in the United States that could perhaps do more than any other to forward the policies of our military leaders, who in the end carry the responsibility for the people, namely, to prepare the way for the successful integration of Western Germany in the defense alliance of their own free will, and, in addition, influence the civilian populations of all national and racial groups behind the iron curtain to think of America and Americans as their friends, which policies, if not further sabotaged, may yet prevent a spread of war to Europe, and thus save innumerable American lives.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 19, 1951, entitled, "Reluctant Germans—Most Would Refuse To Serve in His Army, Eisenhower Will Hear—West German Public Is More Opposed to Rearmament Than Ever, Poll Shows."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELUCTANT GERMANS—MOST WOULD REFUSE TO SERVE IN HIS ARMY, EISENHOWER WILL HEAR—WEST GERMAN PUBLIC IS MORE OPPOSED TO REARMAMENT THAN EVER, POLL SHOWS—"LEGIONS HEADED FOR HEAVEN"

(By Edward Hughes)

BONN, GERMANY.—It will be fairly easy to get Germany's ex-Wehrmacht generals back into uniform. Recruiting the privates and corporals will be another matter.

That is what United States officials here in the West German capital will tell General Eisenhower when he arrives in Germany next week on his inspection tour of Western Europe's defense set-up. The new chief of the North Atlantic forces will be told: Most German men today would refuse to serve in a new army, and the public's antimilitary sentiment is trending upward—not downward.

THE HIGHLY DISAPPROVING MALES

The United States High Commission here has been conducting a series of poll-type studies in recent weeks. The findings are considered so grave the Commission will not allow them to be published in detail. But after a look at the poll figures, it's safe to say experts here now believe that:

No more than 5 percent of West Germany's fighting-age men would volunteer for service in a Western defense army. Less than 10 percent would serve even if drafted.

Nearly half of all West Germans—including the women, the crippled, and the men too old to draft—oppose participation in such an army, even if the Germans were granted full equality in it and full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

What's more, many people who used to favor some sort of German participation in a Western defense force have apparently changed their minds. In mid-August, for example, almost two-thirds of the population appeared to favor such participation—compared with the present figure of about 50 percent.

West German newspapers refer to proposed German Army units almost unanimously as "cannon-fodder" and "Himmelfahrtkommandos" (legions headed for heaven). Thousands of Germans gather around a nonpartisan group in Hamburg which is distributing neutrality cards pledging the holder to fight neither for West nor for East.

The prevailing antimilitary sentiment in this Nation today throws an eerie light on the important discussions of remilitarization now taking place in this capital.

PARLEYS AND BICKERING

Two separate parleys are being conducted—one in Bonn and the other across the Rhine at the old Hotel Petersberg, where Neville Chamberlain once bargained with Hitler for "peace in our time."

One United States-British-French group is dickering with German Government agents on over-all political concessions to be granted Germany if she actively joins the military build-up against Russia. At the same time another crowd of experts has opened discussions of the technical military problems Germany will face if agreement is reached on the political problems.

The swing of public opinion in coming weeks will have much to do with the success of the parleys. However, some United States

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Army officers are inclined to dismiss with an air of impatience the apathy toward rearmament. Says one general: "These fellows are waiting for orders. Naturally, they'll drift so long as we keep asking them if they want to be soldiers. They'll fall in line once we get a concrete agreement and plan in effect and start telling them what to do."

BUT WILL THE PUBLIC GO ALONG?

Since some of the tradition of obedience of the individual to high authority probably still exists among Germans, there may be some validity to this argument. But the big question is whether a hostile civilian public will permit the German Government ever to agree to such a concrete plan in the first place. Chancelor Konrad Adenauer's government is not as secure politically as it once was. It will not want to risk a parliamentary defeat on the question.

Chancelor Adenauer refused to bow to public opinion this week when he rejected the proposal of the East German Government for talks looking toward the unity of all Germany under one democratic government elected freely for the entire population. But he won't risk his neck by rushing swiftly into acception of the Western allies' request for German remilitarization.

Millions of Germans think there's still a chance to avoid rearmament if the United States, Britain, and France are able to sit down with Russia at a Big Four conference on the matter. So observers think Bonn will probably delay the end of the current talks as long as possible in the hope of some last-ditch compromise that might turn up between East and West.

While the French are mostly in favor of such a course, the general United States-British feeling in official quarters here is that it's loaded with dynamite. The High Commission poll of West German sentiment shows that a lot of people would unite with East Germany and, as a neutral nation, stay out of the East-West conflict—rather than join the West in fighting Russia.

DESIGN FOR SOVIET EXPLOITATION

For this reason, American political officials fear Russia would exploit this sentiment at a Big Four meeting. They figure the Soviets might come forth with a spectacular offer such as the dissolution of the East German People's Police (a Red-run army), coupled with free elections—in exchange for a standstill in plans for rearming Western Germany.

"Even though such a suggestion might be an obvious trap, it would be exceedingly embarrassing for us to have to reject it," an American official points out. By this simple maneuver, Russia could add thousands of people to the already sizable anti-Yankee element in occupied Germany, and could put forth new evidence that Soviet Russia is Germany's real friend. That's one big reason why the Western allies won't agree to the Big Four talks unless the agenda includes subjects other than Germany.

Such a Soviet proposal would look very good to a German public which is inclining toward neutralism. Carrying with it the implication that all Germans could unite and step aside to let the East and West fight their war, this term has become an increasingly popular catchword in recent weeks.

Impetus to the "neutralist" movement is provided by an active group of people who follow the guidance of the well-known Pastor Martin Niemoeller, leader in Germany's Evangelical Church, and of Prof. Alfred Noack, of the University of Wuerzburg.

WHAT NIEMOELLER DEMANDS

A few days ago, the 59-year-old Pastor Niemoeller went off to Berlin to confer with Communist officials in the East German Government. He came away renewing his oft-stated demand that all foreign occupation powers leave Germany immediately and be replaced by a neutral occupation force of the United Nations.

Professor Noack, who maintains regular contact with the east zone, highlighted a New Year's speech with a similar call for the removal of "outsiders" from Germany and the sealing off of Germany as a "peace zone" to permit free elections in all parts of the nation.

Despite many loud catcalls which have greeted these gentlemen, the German press is devoting an increasing amount of space to their utterances. The "neutralists" have also undoubtedly attracted thousands of average Germans who see the neutral alternative as a faint ray of hope in a black future.

Critics, on the other hand, maintain that it is futile for Germany to hope to avoid being a part of an East-West fight. Says a Bonn Government spokesman: "The bombs are going to fall on us no matter what we do. At least we must have the moral decency to choose the side of right and fight for it."

Convinced that the neutralists and other antirearming groups are playing into Russia's hands, Allied officials here have become increasingly irked by the cautious attitude which public opinion is requiring Chancelor Adenauer and his representatives to take in the current rearmament talks.

Seeing how slowly Chancelor Adenauer is moving, Allied observers are now predicting that under the most favorable circumstances it will be 6 months or more before the first German dons a uniform. Even at top speed, it would take another year to convert 100,000 to 200,000 recruits into trained soldiers—even if they were willing.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let us see what the Office of Alien Property has done and is doing up to date. Let us see how that office is tied in with the Hiss-White crowd. The announced sale of the German Embassy building, and so forth, is typical of its actions after Harry Dexter White got control of it. How did this happen?

Mr. President, with the outbreak of World War II, even before we were involved in the conflict, the President of the United States created the Office of Foreign Funds Control so that the assets of all potential enemy countries in the United States could be controlled. Every American agrees that this was right and proper. This office was placed under the Secretary of the Treasury; and who was in charge? You guessed it—Harry Dexter White, as Assistant Secretary.

In January 1942, shortly after Pearl Harbor, the President of the United States established the Office of Alien Property Custodian. The President chose a man of impeccable character to head it, for he wanted no scandals, because he well remembered the scandals uncovered in an investigation of that office after World War I. He placed the office under the eminent leadership of Leo T. Crowley. He established the Office of Alien Property Custodian as an independent agency directly responsible to himself. It was the work of that office to take over all enemy assets and to hold them until the war was over, as was done in World War I.

I wish to congratulate my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Arizona, the Democratic majority leader, on the fact that Mr. Crowley and his staff did an admirable job under almost intolerable conditions, caused by Harry Dexter White and the Office of Foreign Funds Control, who immediately began their work to get control. They succeeded after Mr. Crowley resigned.

Let us not forget that Harry Dexter White had been in control of foreign funds since 1938. The Harry White crowd finally succeeded in securing an Executive order eliminating the Office of Alien Property Custodian as an independent agency and meshing it with the Office of Foreign Funds Control under Treasury jurisdiction. It became a siamese twin with Foreign Funds Control. Under whose control? Under the control of Harry Dexter White. Then came the infiltration of the Office of Alien Property with White's men, hand picked, to carry out White's policies in that agency. Now, as planned, the time for permanent confiscation of these properties was at hand. Yet they realized that the American people and the Congress of the United States were always opposed to confiscation of private property even in time of war.

They knew that the United States Chamber of Commerce publicly announced that they were unequivocally opposed to confiscation of all types of private enemy property in the United States. They knew that most of the leading members of the American Bar Association, students of international law, were also opposed to such confiscation, but there were many members of the Lawyers Guild who supported the Hiss-White policies.

I may say that I shall be unable to use the badge I have received for the dinner this evening, so I will hand it to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], Mr. Republican, so that he may have one in each coat lapel, and so that he may represent me when he goes to the dinner and meeting. I know how well he will be treated and how graciously he will be received there.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's kind offer. I think the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who now is presiding in this body, should be allowed to go to the meeting. Does not the Senator from North Dakota think so?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, that I understand the meeting will last until midnight, whereas at the present time it is only 6:30. So I shall be able to conclude well before the meeting has ended.

Mr. TAFT. Then I return to the Senator his badge, and I hope he will be able to attend the meeting at a later hour.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much indeed.

Does the Senator wish me to yield to him for some other matter?

Mr. TAFT. No, thank you.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. President, the Hiss-White-Duggan crowd knew that the American public as a whole was opposed to confiscation. So, even before they got control of the Office of Alien Property, they prepared the groundwork for such confiscatory legislation. Who did it? The Treasury Department, Foreign Funds Control, under the brilliant leadership of Harry Dexter White. How was it planned? They

knew that they would have to create a semblance of legality, even if that had again to be put on the false principle of mass guilt and mass punishment. What better arguments and what better semblance of right and legality could they bring before the United States Congress in their efforts to change the law so that all German civilian properties would be confiscated, than to see to it that even neutral countries first confiscated such properties? So they set out on a campaign, directed by Harry Dexter White, with agents from Foreign Funds Control, and they went into every neutral country and forced them to violate their own laws and give them lists of every German property owner.

Think of it, Mr. President; just think of it. They went into every neutral country and forced those in charge of the government there to violate their own laws and give them lists of every German property owned. Little Switzerland was forced by Foreign Funds Control to violate its own banking law, and did so after threats of trade restrictions, after having protested without success for many months to the Hiss crowd in the State Department, and finally gave them the lists of every piece of property and every bank account of every German civilian. Thus it was made to appear that the United States led the way in confiscation, and that other countries followed, when in truth and in fact they did not come before this Congress to get confiscation legislation passed until they had accomplished it in the other countries in the world. This confiscation of properties even in neutral countries was done on the theory that "we do not want the Nazi war criminals to gain from the loot they might have placed in neutral countries." In truth and in fact, it worked out just the other way, and they knew it would work that way. The German civilian who opposed Hitler and who did not want Hitler to use his savings in a war, and who violated Hitler's foreign-exchange laws, at the risk of being placed in a concentration camp, to get his few savings out of Germany into a neutral country, was stripped of those possessions; and there were vast numbers of such German civilians. Did Harry Dexter White and others plan to drive them from their friendship to the United States into the Communist camp? Did the Hiss crowd in the State Department, working hand in glove with White, and who turned down every protest of every neutral country against such blackmailing, also plan to drive the German civilian population into the Communist fold? There simply cannot be any question about it. So the stage was set for such confiscation in the United States. But even this pretense of justice and legality was not enough. They knew that they could not bring about confiscation of such property here unless they tied in a good use of the funds to be confiscated. So they came up with the idea that the funds so obtained were to be used to compensate Americans who were injured by violations of the rules of war. Such compensation was to be made by the use of alien-enemy property. That meant that all such property had to be confiscated first, before the compensation could be made. They knew that anyone who would object would be branded a Nazi or a Fascist, the scum of the earth, if he objected to confiscation and to the use of those funds for that purpose; and there is no doubt that every American, no matter how much he may be against confiscation, would want to see that his American neighbors who were thus injured were fully compensated, as much as it is humanly possible to do so. But the Hiss-White crew knew all along that the German civilian population and the Japanese population abhorred the crimes for which compensation was planned for the American victims, and if given a chance, they would have done it themselves. Let us not forget that immediately after the close of hostilities in Europe the first thing the German civilian population did was to take steps to make restitution as much as possible to all victims of Hitler persecution, Jews and Christians alike. They did make restitution, for they abhorred the crimes for which they got the blame.

Yes, Mr. President, the Hiss-White crew and their followers knew full well that no one would object to such confiscatory legislation. So once again those who ordinarily would have come forward to tell the Congress that the plan was wrong, were effectively silenced for fear of being smeared by the followers of the Hiss-White crowd, who were active in some fields of the public press and the radio. As a consequence, the American Chamber of Commerce kept silent; leaders of the American Bar Association kept silent; Americans of German and Japanese birth, who tried to provide for their relatives in enemy countries after the war was over, by gifts, or legacies, kept silent, and saw their properties also confiscated, for they knew that they would be smeared in the public eye even if they only came forward to ask that a distinction be made between property basically and intrinsically American property and that which is basically and intrinsically enemy property. The Hiss-White crowd knew at the time, as they know now, that the properties thus to be confiscated were far greater than all possible war claims provided for under the War Claims Act. Who did the Hiss-White crowd unknowingly and unwittingly use, Mr. President, to carry out their purpose? Certainly there can be no further doubt as to what effect these policies would have and have had on the civilian population of Germany and Japan. They used the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veteran organizations; they fooled them, just as they fooled the Congress of the United States, and used it as a cat's-paw to further the master plan of the Kremlin—to weaken the will to resist. Yes, the Hiss-White crowd achieved their purpose to strip every German civilian, every widow and orphan of everything, even take the property of American citizens of German birth who were foolish enough to try to provide for their mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, and other kin in Germany through gifts, bequests, trusts, some of them created long before the war. The very men and women in the German civilian population most closely affiliated with ideas and ideals of American democracy, which they learned from their American relatives, the very ones who were the greatest thorn in Hitler's skin during the war; the ones who were subject to discrimination and repressions of all sorts, and who at best were listed by the Gestapo as politically unreliable; the very ones whom we now hope will lead the way in getting the Western German civilian population to join the western alliance of their own free will, were treated in that way. All those things were done before we knew or suspected any disloyalty on the part of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Laurence Duggan, and the rest; and it all happened while Gerhard Eisler, German Kremlin Communist agent No. 1, was operating in the United States, pulling all the strings, and watching the puppets jump.

Yes, Mr. President, the Office of Alien Property was careful that the legislation which confiscated all these properties made provision for a return in part, under certain conditions; but the fact remains that the language used in the act was the language wanted by the Office of Alien Property. The Congress had a right to rely upon the integrity of its representations, and did so. Now it turns out that the language of the act is drafted in such a manner that a German civilian or a Japanese civilian, unless he lost his citizenship by decree or unless he was a Communist, would practically have had to sit in a concentration camp from 1940 to the end of hostilities in order to qualify for the return of his property. The Alien Property Custodian knew that as the act was drafted, it would even take the properties of Christian churches, hospitals, orphanages, and would take the gifts and bequests made by Americans to such charitable institutions. Yet no one in the Office of Alien Property told the Congress that would happen. Thus, those who lost their citizenship by Hitler decree—Jews and Christians alike—can have their properties returned, which is right and proper. But, in addition, any Communist is in a position of being ipso facto considered a persecutee who was denied substantial rights of citizenship by reason of religion, race, or politics, and can have such property, held by the Alien Property Custodian, returned to him. So now we have the Attorney General of the United States, into whose jurisdiction the Office of Alien Property was transferred by another Executive order, in the position where, on the one side, he is to enforce anti-Communist legislation passed by the Congress, but through another agency he returns confiscated enemy property to Communists. Not even the Nazi's confiscated American properties located in Germany, because fearless German lawyers, many of them now taking leading parts in the West German Government, risked their very lives in opposition to such a move, and succeeded in getting Hitler to recognize that private property of American citizens situated in Germany should be held in trust for those American citi-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

zens by the German courts; and that was done all during the war.

Mr. President, ask yourself whether such policies make the position of the democratic leaders of the West German Government more secure when they plead for cooperation of the civilian population with western democracy or whether such policies make their position untenable.

Now, let us see how the Office of Alien Property was transferred to the Justice Department, now under Attorney General McGrath, who formerly was one of our colleagues in the Senate. It seems that the unrelenting work of the House Un-American Activities Committee slowly but surely was closing in on the subversive elements in our Government. What better time to bury the Office of Alien Property than in a period when a reorganization of many executive departments was taking place. So the Office of Alien Property was transferred by Executive order to the Department of Justice. What better place could be found to bury injustice than behind the fair shield of justice?

Now let us look at the situation of the national groups behind the iron curtain, and let us look at the present position of all American citizens and nationals of Polish, Czechoslovakian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, or Ukrainian birth; and let us see what they have to look forward to in regard to their relatives behind the iron curtain. But let us first look at their record of Americanism, and then let us see what is planned for them. The records of the FBI disclose without a doubt that of the 50,000 active members of the Communist Party in the United States and of, perhaps, 10 times that many fellow travelers, the great majority of the membership is made up of native-born persons, those who should know better. The records of the FBI disclose that it is not the citizen of foreign birth, who immigrated to this country, who is the Communist. The Polish-American, the Czech-American, the Rumanian-American, the Bulgarian-American, the Hungarian-American, the Lithuanian-American, the Latvian-American, the Estonian-American, the Ukrainian-American, yes, the Japanese-American, the Chinese-American, the Korean-American, will seldom be found in the ranks of the Communists or in subversive organizations; and the records of the FBI in World War II disclose that the same thing was true about the German-Americans. They were not Nazis; they abhorred Nazi policies; they gave their sons in the fight for freedom, just as every other good American did. Now let us take a look at what is planned for the Polish-, Czech-, Rumanian-, Bulgarian-, Hungarian-, Lithuanian-, Latvian-, Estonian-, Ukrainian-, Japanese-, Chinese-, or Korean-American and for others who came to our shores to become American citizens, from lands now behind the iron curtain.

While we are spending millions of dollars on our Voice of America Freedom, to reach the people behind the iron curtain, to teach them something of American democracy and American ideals; while we are planning to reach those people, who never had any contact with western democracy, what is planned for those who have had contact with western democracy through their relatives and friends in the United States?

In the political, ideological, and psychological warfare now going on between the free nations of the world and those under communistic dictatorship, the friends and relatives of these American citizens—friends and relatives now living behind the iron curtain either in Europe or in Asia—can play, and are playing, an important part for democracy. Stalin knows this, just as Hitler knew it. Make no mistake about it, Mr. President; the relatives and friends of the above-named national groups, living behind the iron curtain, are in a serious situation, and their American relatives here are deeply concerned about them. The Communists know that the contacts those persons have with their American relatives and friends makes them at least politically unreliable and subject them to the greatest personal risk; and yet we know that in them lies our best hope for eventual, successful resistance, if we can give them the will to resist. These people, who have learned something of western civilization, western democracy, its aspirations, ideals, and principles from their contacts with their American relatives and friends here, hope and pray that all Americans will stand behind them in their hour of trial, ready to assist them in every way possible in their fight for freedom, when the time comes. Stalin has not forgotten that he lost Italy due almost completely to the campaign put on by Americans of Italian birth and descent, coupled with our decent human treatment of the Italian civilian population, which included a return of their properties taken by the Office of Alien Property.

The Czechs, the Poles, the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, the Hungarians, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, the Ukrainians, the Chinese, and the Koreans know that their relatives are in peril. They know they will need their help more than ever if they survive a war. They also know that the way the Trading With the Enemy Act reads now, their American money, their American property, and any trusts, they may create in order to feed and clothe their relatives behind the iron curtain after they are freed from Kremlin enslavement, will be confiscated by the United States. This is to be their repayment for the sacrifices they as American citizens are making and will make in the fight for freedom, for justice, for humanity, just as it has been the payment to all citizens of German birth and, I may also say, to all Japanese living in America. This is the repayment to be made to the people behind the iron curtain, whose relatives and friends are American citizens. Yet they are the very ones who are our greatest hope if we can only strengthen their will to resist.

Mr. President, why has not the Office of Alien Property integrated its functions with our military thinking, as far as Western Germany is concerned? Why has not the Office of Alien Property integrated its functions with the program established by this Congress, namely the Voice of America, in reaching the people behind the iron curtain? Why have they continued to keep Congress in the dark? There are only two possible answers: Either they are blunderers; or someone is still pulling the strings for the Kremlin, someone is still carrying out secret Communist member Harry Dexter White's plans. Let those who are responsible for the policies in the Office of Alien Property, who did more than anyone else to alienate the West German population from western democracy, who did more than anyone else to weaken the will of these people to resist Communist aggression, come forward and take a position now; let them tell us now whether, in the event the war spreads to Europe, they are in favor of confiscating the properties of Americans of Czech, Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Ukranian, yes, even Chinese or Korean birth, which those Americans may wish to leave to their relatives who are behind the iron curtain, to be delivered to them after they are free, and thus help keep them alive. Let those officials tell us whether they think that property should be confiscated, as has been done in the case of the property of Americans of German or Japanese birth. The officials of the Office of Alien Property know that will happen unless the law is changed. Let them come forward now and tell the Congress, while it may yet do some good, while it may strengthen the will of these people to resist, that they want those properties held in trust until the end of hostilities. If they really want the law changed, let them come forward now before the conflict actually swings from Asia to Europe, and before hysteria takes over. When they do come forward, will they still continue to do everything in their power to punish the Western Germany population by discriminating against them in a return of the property about which the Senate of the United States in its last session unanimously said:

> Such property is not enemy property within the strict sense of the word nor is it enemy property within the spirit of the Trading With the Enemy Act. It is intrinsically and inherently American property. Said property was amassed and earned in America by American citizens. It remained in this country to aid and abet the Government in the way all property does, to a successful fruition of the war. Certainly, and no one would contend otherwise, it was not the desire of Congress, or the people of this country to seize such property.

If those who favor such a change fail to do this, will they accept the consequences—perhaps a loss of Western Germany and the resultant—but unnecessary—loss of American lives of boys, who otherwise would not have to be sent there, or at least not in such great numbers. In accepting that responsibility, will they be in favor of returning those confiscated funds to the American donors or to the heirs of such American donors over here, so that they could then use the funds to help their relatives to help save Europe and help save ourselves; or will they want to punish Americans for being of German extraction? The same thing can be said of the property of Americans of Japanese descent.

It is time to let the West German civilian population know that Potsdam and all the other policies of oppression were not the policies of the President of the United States or the members of his Cabinet; and surely they were not the policies of the Congress of the United States, which was completely bypassed. Neither were they the policies of the American people. Let us tell these civilians frankly and honestly that while we were engaged in a war against their political leaders, and while Communist Russia was a cobelligerent, we let our guard down, and the things that happened to them were the result of a Communist conspiracy in our own Government, aimed as much against us as against them, by persons who had as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of those civilians to resist. They will understand this because they have had more experience with Kremlin intrigue than have we. Only last week the democratic government of Greece arrested two of its cabinet ministers as secret Communist spies. Let us tell those civilians that we are ferreting out the Communists and their fellow travelers, and that every policy that may be giving aid to the Communists, but which may be weakening the will of those civilians to resist aggression, will be changed immediately. I, for one, will not vote one more cent for the defense of Western Europe, and I will vote against sending one more American boy to Europe, unless there is a complete clean-up of this mess. I believe that the Members of the Senate will join me in this, and that the American people will stand behind us in this position, for the Members of the Senate know and the American people know, as do I, that unless these things are changed, we will not only lose our money, which we are asked to appropriate for a western defense, but we will lose the lives of American boys who will be sent to join the Himmelfahrts Legionen—legions destined for Heaven—as the German newspapers in the western zone refer to their own boys who are asked to join in the western defense.

The relentless work of the House Un-American Activities Committee in ferreting out the subversives of our Government finally gave courage to those who knew these policies were wrong to come forward and bring the facts to the Congress of the United States.

During the session of the Eighty-second Congress, Senators HERBERT O'CONOR, of Maryland, KENNETH WHERRY and HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, and myself, recognizing the injustices and wrongs that had been done in confiscatory legislation, introduced a bill in the United States Senate, known as S. 2929, providing for the return of seized properties to German civilians, where such property arose by gift, devise, bequest or inheritance from an American citizen, and where such persons proved they were not members of the Nazi Party. The bill was sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of the great American Senator, PAT MCCARRAN. The committee held extensive hearings, and, of course, the principal objectors were—you know who. Mr. President—the Office of Alien Property; and they used the patriotic members of the War Claims Commission as their stooges.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, consisting of the Honorable Senators Pat McCarron, of Nevada, chairman; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; and myself, carefully considered all the objections of the Office of Alien Property Custodian and of the War Claims Commission; and that committee, in its report to the Senate, unanimously waved aside these objections as meritless. The committee had voted unanimously for this amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act.

When the bill came before the Senate, this body discussed it, adopted the committee report, and then passed the bill by unanimous vote. The Senate said to the Office of Alien Property, "You never should have confiscated these properties," for the committee report said:

> That such property is not enemy property within the strict sense of the word, nor is it enemy property within the spirit of the Trading With the Enemy Act. It is intrinsically and inherently American property. Said property was amassed and earned in America by American citizens. It remained in this country to aid and abet the Government in the way all property does, to a successful fruition of the war. Certainly, and no one would contend otherwise, it was not the desire of Congress, or the people of this country to seize such property.

Now if it is true—and it is true—that it was not the policy of the Congress of the United States nor of the people of the United States to confiscate such property, then whose policy was it? I charge it was the policy of Harry Dexter White, still carried on in the Office of Alien Property.

Any other agency in the Government, after having been turned down unanimously by the United States Senate on a position that it took on legislation, would have stopped right then and there, would have reexamined its position, and would have tried to get itself in line with the thinking of the Congress and with the thinking of the American people. But what did the Office of Alien Property do? After the Senate passed this legislation unanimously, they stopped it in the House of Representatives. They kept it from even getting onto the floor of the House, for they knew that the Members of the House of Representatives could and would take no different position than was taken by the United States Senate, and no different than the position of the American people. How did they do it? When the Senate bill reached the House, they succeeded in having it sent to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Why? Because they originated their confiscatory legislation in that committee, and they used the chairman of that committee. Representative ROBERT CROSSER, of Cleveland, as a cat's-paw. After hearings they persuaded him to pigeonhole it, they prevailed upon him to keep it even from a vote in his own committee. They did this, knowing the bill would die with the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress. Now, I know that Representative CROSSER and the other members of his committee certainly do not want to play the game of Alien Property Custodian, which is weakening the will of our friends in Western Germany to resist Communist aggression.

When the Office of Alien Property first came forward with its objections to the Senate bill, which was drawn in such a way and was so fair and so just that it was almost impossible of belief that anyone could object to it, I began to wonder whose game was being played in the Office of Alien Property. What I have said here today is the result of my studies and discoveries, made since that time. What did the Office of Alien Property say, in effect, to the position taken by the Senate, that these properties should never have been confiscated, and that they were American properties? The Office of Alien Property said, in effect, "The United States Senate be damned, the will of the people of the United States be damned; we will carry on with our policies as long as we can keep the House of Representatives in the dark." Certainly, there can be no doubt about it that they are playing the Communist game, they are undermining the will of the people who are yet free to resist, and they are setting the stage and undermining our program which is to create in the people behind the iron curtain the will to become free.

At the time the Office of Alien Property Custodian objected to this legislation in the Senate I, for one, did not know all the facts about the connection of Hiss and White with all these things. I am frank to admit that I did not realize that they were playing a game which could have no other effect than to weaken the will of the German people to resist Communist aggression. And now let us observe how the Office of Alien Property is pushing the blame on Congress and on the American people. Their files are full of letters which they get from Western Germany, of letters from Christian German charitable institutions, hospitals, homes for the aged, homes for the blind, and orphanages operated by every Christian religious denomination in Germany. They get similar letters from Japan, asking about gifts, requests and trusts set up for them by their American friends, confiscated by the United States, and held by the Alien Property Custodian. If we investigate the Office of Alien Property we shall find that the Office replies to such letters about as follows:

> The bequest left you by American citizen * * * to carry on your worthy work of taking care of the blind (or the orphans, as the case may be) was confiscated by the United States Government as enemy property under Vesting Order No. ____. We do not believe that your organization qualifies for a return under the law enacted by Congress, unless you can establish that your

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

organization suffered denial of substantial rights of German citizenship from the period 1941 to the end of the war by reason of racial, religious, or political persecution. We realize that your organization is an instrument of immense good to humanity, but unfortunately we are bound by the law.

Thus, they are now putting the blame on the Congress of the United States and on the people of the United States. They have not the courage to admit, in the same letter, that they are responsible for this situation, and that they do not want the bequest returned. I ask, who in the Office of Alien Property Custodian is doing work similar to what was done by Laurence Duggan, liaison man to Gerhard Eisler, No. 1 Communist, "to mess up policy, which was Duggan's job, in carrying out the policies for the Kremlin, to weaken the will of the German people to resist Communist aggression"? A Senate investigation of the Office of Alien Property will show innumerable cases of that type.

That is not all. Take the situation of the young men, who, not liking Hitler's policies, immigrated to the United States shortly before the outbreak of World War II, joined the United States Army, and were killed fighting for the United States. The Office of Alien Property has confiscated the GI insurance which they left to their mothers in Germany, and when these mothers write to the Office of Alien Property, they receive replies about as follows:

We deeply sympathize with you. Your son died in the fight for freedom, which we know must be a great source of consolation to you. This office realizes that you depended upon him for support, and also that he intended to bring you to the United States; but we are sorry that we cannot send you his GI insurance, which was confiscated by this office under Vesting Order No. —— because unfortunately the law will not permit it.

Once again, they do not have the courage or the guts to tell these mothers of American soldiers that they are responsible for the state of the law. Once again, they put the blame on the Congress of the United States, and on the American people. One asks himself whether there is in existence a deliberate policy playing directly into the hands of the Communists. And they get other letters, which read about as follows:

I worked in the German underground movement to overthrow Hitler. I can prove that conclusively. I was ordered to become a member of the Nazi Party to carry on underground work inside the party. I can prove that beyond a doubt. You have withheld the legacy left me by my American aunt. I would like to have it returned.

How does the Office of Alien Property answer those letters? They answer them about as follows:

The United States of America greatly appreciates your efforts on behalf of freedom, but unfortunately you were not caught by the Nazis, you were not substantially deprived of rights of citizenship by reason of religion, race, or politics, so this office is unable to return your legacy.

They again put the blame on the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States. They cover up the fact that they are responsible for the state of the law. Who is playing the game to weaken the will of these free people to resist Communist aggression? Mr. President, you know the answer, and we all now know the answer to this question.

As I have said before, the Trading With the Enemy Act was administered in part by the Office of Alien Property, in part by the Office of Foreign Funds Control, and in part by our State Department. Let us observe how Foreign Funds Control is playing into the hands of the Communists. Two weeks ago, they finally issued a blocking order freezing Chinese funds in the United States. Why did they not block these Chinese funds where ownership was in the hands of persons on the Chinese mainland under the control of the Communists, a year and a half ago, when Chiang Kai-shek was finally driven to Formosa? We know that the State Department had a hand in that. How many millions of dollars came into the control of Chinese Communists because Foreign Funds failed to Act? And what about the $50,000,000 released by Foreign Funds Control to the Polish Communist Government, control of which rightfully belonged to the democratic Polish Government in exile, actual ownership of which was in the Polish people, those who had relatives and friends in the United States, and who are our best hope in a resistance movement?

I should now like to return once more to a restatement of the policy of the Kremlin master plan of aggression, as we now know it to be. The plan requires, in all instances, carefully prepared campaigns; often subtle and often indirect; many times using causes, which in themselves are good, for evil ends; carried out over long periods of time; campaigns which have as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe. In view of this master plan and in view of the fact that the Congress of the United States, because of these conspiracies and because of the work of fellow travelers, can no longer have confidence in agencies of Government that come before it sponsoring legislation, it becomes the duty of every Senator and every Representative to judge every request for specific legislation or every objection to legislation which the Congress has under consideration, on the following basis: Will what is proposed, or what is objected to, by these Government agencies tend to strengthen the will of the free people to resist, and strengthen the will of the people behind the iron curtain to resist, or will it weaken their will, as called for in the master plan of the Kremlin? I do not believe that we can from now on make any decisions without first asking ourselves that question and getting the true answers. In that regard, I shall offer a resolution which resolves that it is the desire of the Senate of the United States and of the people of the United States that the Office of Alien Property forthwith turn over to the West German Government the German Embassy Building and its grounds here on Fourteenth Street, in Washington, D. C., which that office confiscated, and which it proposes to sell to the highest bidder within 2 weeks; and that $50,000 be appropriated from the general funds of the United States to put the embassy in usable condition. This, for the reason that I understand the Office of Alien Property has deliberately let it run down to such an extent that it either has been or is scheduled to be condemned as a fire hazard. I am sure it can be put into a good state of repairs. Also, $25,000 should be appropriated from the general funds to refurnish the German Embassy. It has been suggested to me by economy-minded Senators—and I think their suggestions may be good—that we save the $25,000 for furnishings by taking the fine furniture from the Office of Alien Property, the office responsible for this mess.

Let us show the West German people that we intend to strengthen their will to resist, and that the Office of Alien Property does not speak for the Congress of the United States or for the people of the United States. I shall ask the United States Senate to take immediate action on this resolution, and to let the west German people know the facts, before the Communists use the proposed sale of the German Embassy Building as another means of weakening the will of the German people to resist.

A few weeks ago Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, Democrat of Maryland, Senators BUTLER and WHERRY, Republicans of Nebraska, and myself, reintroduced legislation to return American properties, seized by the Alien Property Custodian, arising out of gifts, bequests, inheritances, and trusts created by American citizens. It is known as Senate bill 172. The bill has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committe for consideration, the same committee that unanimously approved it in the last session of Congress. However, in view of these new discoveries, I should like to recommend to the Judiciary Committee, with the consent of the Honorable Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, from Maryland, and the consent of the Honorable Senators KENNETH WHERRY and HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, to amend that bill, so that the thing which happened to German-Americans and Japanese-Americans will not happen to Czech-Americans, Polish-Americans, Rumanian-Americans, Bulgarian-Americans, Hungarian-Americans, Lithuanian-Americans, Latvian-Americans, Estonian-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Chinese-Americans, and Korean-Americans.

I should like to suggest that, in view of the gravity of the situation, and while there is yet time, such amendments may be of help in strengthening the will of the West German people to resist, and in strengthening the will of our friends behind the iron curtain to resist, the Honorable PAT MCCARRAN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, call for a joint meeting with the House Judiciary Committee to immediately take steps to remedy this situation through proper concurrent legislation in the two Houses.

With the consent of the co-sponsors of Senate bill 172, I believe that, in view of all these disclosures, the bill should be amended to provide that all properties, or proceeds thereof, heretofore seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act,

by the Office of Alien Property, or by any other agency of government, be returned to all persons of whatever national groups, and to all nations where such property rights arose out of gift, bequest, device, inheritance, or trust of an American citizen or national, provided that such claimant establishes that he or she did not willfully and intentionally become a member of the Nazi Party, the Communist Party, or any other subversive organization, does not believe in the overthrow of duly constituted government by force, and at no time was guilty of war crimes or crimes against humanity; the burden of proof to be upon said person. The amendment should provide further that hereafter, in any present or future conflict, in which the United States may find itself involved, the right of American citizens and American nationals to create any interest by gift, devise, bequest, inheritance, or by any trust for the benefit of any enemy alien, shall be held inviolate, and that such property shall not be subject to confiscation by the United States, but that such property shall be held in trust for such enemy alien by the courts having jurisdiction thereof, or, if there be none, then by an agency of government named by the President of the United States, subject to being used by the United States for the benefit of the United States for the successful ending of hostilities, at which time delivery shall be made to such enemy alien or his successor in interest; provided, that such enemy alien shall not have been guilty of war crimes, or crimes against humanity, during any such conflict, and shall not willfully and intentionally have been a member of the Communist Party or of any other subversive group, which said enemy alien shall prove by a preponderance of the evidence; and when a return of property is denied, said person shall have the right to appeal to Federal courts of the United States for final determination.

Mr. President, you will note I suggest that the same test be applied to an enemy for a return of his property as we have provided in the immigration bill. The test is that willful and intentional membership in a subversive organization bars immigration to the United States, and it should also bar the return of enemy property. When an individual can be admitted to the United States for eventual citizenship of the United States, even though he had belonged to a subversive organization, provided he can establish that his membership was not willful and intentional, but under duress and compulsion, then certainly the same test should be provided for a return of his property.

In view of the present situation, and in view of the fact that I am sure it is the intention of the Congress to do everything to strengthen the will of the West German population to resist Communist aggression, the Congress of the United States may also wish to give consideration to the matter of private trademarks and other properties taken by the Office of Alien Property; but there should be no delay in returning property, intrinsically and inherently American, to the German civilian population, and there should be no delay in protecting American citizens who came to this country from nations now enslaved by the Kremlin, by having their properties held inviolate in event the conflict spreads once again, in order to strengthen the will of people behind the iron curtain to resist communism.

This would not mean that we would return the properties of the Germans in the Russian zones, nor the properties of Rumanians, Hungarians, and Bulgarians, which was left them by their relatives in the United States. These should be frozen by foreign-funds control until the persons become free, and foreign-funds control should be prevented from turning these properties over to the Kremlin-controlled Communist governments. That is the way in which both the relatives in the United States, who have provided this property for them, and the people behind the iron curtain, who will eventually get it, want it to be.

The enactment of this legislation will do immeasurable good in the case of the Japanese and the Chinese people, who have property here. Let us thank God that we had General MacArthur in Japan, who prevented the carrying out of the Communist policies of oppression on the Japanese people as planned by the Kremlin. As a result of MacArthur's fight, the Japanese people have become democratic, and they now have the will to resist Communist aggression.

We all know how great the pressure was on General MacArthur, pressure to carry out the Kremlin's master plan in Japan, exactly as it has been carried out in Western Germany. The American people and the Japanese people will forever be grateful to General MacArthur for his stand.

I believe Members of the Senate will agree with me that an investigation of all agencies of Government having to do with the operations of the Trading With the Enemy Act is necessary and should be instituted immediately. We all remember that after World War I a Senate investigating committee turned up great scandals in that office. Those scandals had to do only with mismanagement and misappropriation of funds of that office. From what we know now, an investigation of that office will disclose chicanery of the gravest nature—chicanery, if not outright sabotage, which has furthered the plans of the Kremlin. I shall therefore submit a resolution tomorrow providing that the United States Senate immediately appoint a Senate Investigating Committee to examine every phase of the operations of the Trading With the Enemy Act, the Office of Alien Property, and the Office of Foreign Funds Control. I also include the State Department, whose policies were made by Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White—to the present time, in order to find out those responsible for the policies that are playing into the hands of the Kremlin, with particular attention given to the effects its policies have had on the civilian population of Western Germany, its effects on the Japanese people, its effects on the friends of America behind the iron curtain, and last, but not least, the effect on American citizens, of all national groups, who have relatives in those countries. My resolution will call for the appropriation of $100,000 to carry on this investigation.

This does not mean, and I do not wish the people behind the iron curtain or the people of Western Germany to think that it means, that the Congress will not immediately take steps to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, while there is yet time. Such amendments would show these people once and for all that the policies of the Office of Alien Property, the policies of Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss were not the policies of the American people.

I should like to see the Honorable Senator RICHARD M. NIXON, whose work on the House Un-American Activities Committee did so much to uncover the Communist agents and their fellow travelers in our Government and to expose their Communist plans, become a member of this committee; and I should also like to see the Honorable Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, who has done such admirable work in ferreting out Communits plans fostered by certain people in our Government, become a member of this committee.

We owe it to those men in the Office of Alien Property who have wanted no part in the plans of Harry Dexter White, many of whom resigned because they did not like what was going on, and many of whom stayed on, hoping for the day when things would change, to immediately begin this investigation, to find the guilty parties, and once and for all turn that agency away from policies which can only help the Kremlin, to truly American policies. I ask for an early consideration of this resolution. In closing let me repeat just once more the Kremlin master plan of aggression—to do all things, through carefully prepared campaigns, often subtle and often indirect, many times using causes, which in themselves are good for evil ends, carried out over long periods of time, which have as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of the free people to resist Kremlin Communist aggression when the time is ripe.

Mr. President, I wish now to take up another subject, which is connected with the matter of resolving differences in diplomacy, and the need of unceasing effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

THE NEED FOR UNCEASING EFFORT TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES BY DIPLOMACY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the tragic events of recent weeks, and which are now unfolding on the field of battle, have initiated a debate on our foreign policy. Though this process, fundamental to a democracy, presents an aspect of disunity, I venture to say that it is fortunate for our country that the policy of the administration is being thus sharply questioned.

For a policy of exclusive or primary reliance on the accumulation of arms and armies has never served to maintain the peace. It has invariably culminated in war, and is likely to do so again. I believe that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is correct in saying that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"the course which we are pursuing will make war more likely."

It is not my purpose to attempt to discuss the whole range of administrative foreign policy. I am concerned here only with its attitude toward the conduct of negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As I understand that policy, it is one which holds that negotiation must await a time when we have attained what is referred to as situations of strength—when we have a certain number of divisions and tanks and planes, and when our Allies are similarly situated. An essential part of this plan involves the rearming of Germany.

But this vast effort may bring on countermeasures even including the world war which we all agree it is our prime purpose to avoid. Certainly there is reason to believe that an attempt to rearm Germany would have that effect. And recent events have made it quite clear that in the decisive area of the land army—the divisions in the field—we can hardly hope to establish a situation of relative superiority or even equality in the foreseeable future. The truth appears to be that while we have been suspending the practice of diplomacy during the past year, the balance of strength has not shifted in our direction.

The present course has not stopped local wars. It has not diminished the danger of a general holocaust. It has created the impression in many places that we are reluctant to attempt negotiations with the Soviet Union toward a peaceful settlement of differences. And now, in connection with the discussions in progress looking toward a four-power conference, the impression is created that we had to be forced by France and Great Britain into an agreement to participate in negotiations on any terms, and that we expect nothing to come of such a conference if it takes place.

Ferdinand Kuhn, the Washington Post reporter said to be close to the State Department, put it this way in a discussion of the proposed four-power conference, on Sunday, January 7, 1951: "If a conference is the price to pay for western unity, then Acheson will pay it. He cannot put the United States in the position of refusing a conference when his partners and his adversary want one."

I do not say that this is actually the attitude of the State Department. But it is the impression given to our people and the world. It also seems consistent with what the Secretary of State has been saying in the past, and with what the President said and omitted saying in his state of the Union message. The discussions concerning a four power conference were nowhere mentioned by the President. The President did say "We are willing, as we always have been, to negotiate honorable settlements with the Soviet Union." But this is a negative statement, suggesting that we will take no initiative. As I read it in the context of the President's message, and what the State Department is doing, it means essentially that if the opposing side will accept our terms, which it has already rejected, we will make agreements.

This policy, I submit, provides no basis for hope that we shall have a relaxation of tension and that the practice of effective diplomacy is suspended in favor of policies which seem to be founded on the view that war is inevitable.

I say that such a policy can only lead to disaster whether or not an agreement consistent with the aims of the United Nations and the interests of the United States can be reached through negotiation in good faith pursued with utmost energy and determination. For the American people and the people of Western Europe must know that every possible effort has been made by the United States to avoid war by diplomacy before they can be expected to give their wholehearted support to full-scale preparation for defense, and the war which may come if the present terrible tensions are not relieved.

I do not say that we must not arm for defense. That is, of course, necessary. But I do say that we must rely as much upon diplomacy as upon force. We must seize the diplomatic initiative from the Soviet Union. We must launch a great diplomatic campaign for peace. We must seek every opportunity to work for agreements in and out of the United Nations on any or all issues.

I do not suggest appeasement. I do not propose the abandonment of any fundamental principle. I do propose what negotiation has always meant—give and take on both sides.

It has been said that the word of the Soviet Union is no good; that it will not keep any agreement it makes. What is the good of making such agreements, we are asked? Even granting the total validity of this assertion as it applies to the readiness of the Soviet Union to break an agreement which no longer conforms to its interests, I believe that it does not justify a policy of continuing to suspend the effective practice of diplomacy.

I would point out first that we are prepared to enter into any agreements with the Soviet Union if it will accept our terms. It is then a question of terms and not of morality. For the less an agreement seems to the Soviet Union to conform to its interests, the sooner it can be expected to break it.

Moreover, I think it is correct to say that historically nations have made international agreements because they considered that the terms, taken as a whole, brought benefits, even if temporary, worthy of having rather than because they trusted the constancy or moral principles of the other party. It is equally true, I believe, that agreements concerning matters of great importance have been adhered to by governments because the interests which dictated their execution, or other national interests, continued to dictate their practical validity for the states concerned. The real question is whether it is reasonably possible to find a basis of agreement which conforms to the fundamental interests of both the Soviet Union and the other states concerned.

I think it is perfectly clear today that in a war involving the Soviet Union and the United States there could be no victor nation. At best there would be survivors. All notions concerning a push-button or mechanical war are by now fully exploded. Both sides will either find a way to live together in peace, or they will go down together in death and devastation.

The Soviet Union already knows that even with the few divisions we have, we can deliver terrible blows. They know now our vast potentiality for increasing our destructive power and delivering it many thousands of miles from our shores. To avoid that consequence of an effort to resolve differences by armed conflict, it is reasonable to expect that the Soviet Union would make and keep an agreement which did not involve surrender or appeasement on their side, because such an agreement would accord with their interests, if for no other reason.

That I believe is a basis for hope in negotiation. That is the hope which I believe we must explore endlessly, with utmost vigor and sincerity, and with a readiness to meet the Soviet Union halfway, if they display an equal disposition. I do not mean to minimize the difficulties and obstacles in the way of successful negotiation. They are undoubtedly enormous. They may well be insurmountable. But I say that there is no achievement open to mankind in our time which could equal the value of success in this effort. And I am unable to conceive of anything that could be lost if we now begin and continue this effort with a resourcefulness, determination, and tenacity at least equal to that we will now bring to increasing our military strength.

Today mankind demands statesmanship as never before. The function of statesmanship is not to make war but to avoid it.

Let us welcome the prospect of a four power conference and work for its realization, not deplore it. Let us go to the conference not warning of its futility, but determined to make it a success.

Our people want peace. The peoples of the world want peace. Let us exercise our historic role of leadership in such a manner that no man can ever say we failed in this critical hour to act as the preeminent champion of the fight for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled, "West Germans' Melting Pot a Failure So Far," from Bonn, Germany, which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Monday, January 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST GERMANS' MELTING POT A FAILURE SO FAR

BONN, GERMANY, January 28.—West Germany's 9,000,000 refugees from the east feel they are being treated as second-class citizens and are showing their resentment.

They feel they have been discriminated against socially and politically in trying to get jobs or a place to live in and in education. They form a large proportion of the unemployed.

LACKED REPRESENTATION

Until recent elections in five states, the refugees had no parliamentary representation because the occupying nations would not allow them to organize politically. That decision was based on the belief that it would be better for them to become assimilated

with the rest of the population and take their place within existing political parties.

But in the state elections the refugees put up candidates—largely right-wing Nationalists—and showed their power by polling a sizable vote. In refugee-crowded Schleswig-Holstein, where more than one-third of the population are refugees living in misery, they scored a resounding success by winning almost one-quarter of the vote in competition with both main established parties and special-interest splinter groups.

CHILLING RECEPTION

The failure of the refugees to merge with the local population is ascribed to two main reasons:

1. Their reluctance to give up hope of one day returning to their homelands in the east.

2. The chilling reception they have had in West Germany.

As the refugees comprise about one-fifth of the population, assimilation was bound to be long. But so far it has scarcely begun. Even the children have been unable to forget their origin and regard themselves as persons apart from the local people.

In the cities, places where refugees can meet have sprung up everywhere, usually in cafes. They can talk over their troubles, drinking East German schnapps such as Bears Tooth, Nikolaschke, or Pillkaller and eating their Koenigsberger klops and other regional dishes.

LIKE SOCIAL OUTCASTS

In small towns, villages, and the countryside, the contrast between refugees and local people is even more striking. Differentiated by dialect, religion, customs, and even clothing, they stand out almost as social outcasts.

When a refugee and a local workman go after the same job, it almost invariably goes to the local man. Refugee children have found that the local children obtain most of the places in the crowded secondary schools.

Especially unfortunate are the farmers. Thousands of skilled East German farmers are either unemployed or doing laborers' jobs.

Mr. LANGER. I yield the floor.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ellsworth Bunker, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina, vice Stanton Griffis.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as Assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. Franklin A. Hart, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as Commandant of the Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 29) 1951:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Joseph P. Adams, of Washington, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1956.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be captains

Dwight H. Dexter	Herbert F. Walsh
Lewis H. Schackelford	William W. Storey
Edward W. Holtz	Edwin J. Roland

To be commanders

Christian R. Couser	Russell W. Thresher
Willard L. Jones	William E. Schweizer
Robert N. Williams	

To be lieutenant commanders

George F. Erwin	Hamlett I. Allen
Wilfred Pantzer	Michael J. Hoosick
Walter G. Davis	David H. Douglas
Martin Lentz, Jr.	Theron H. Gato

To be lieutenants

Edwin W. Coleman	Raymond J. Evans
Robert S. Capp	Scott P. Berryman
Leslie F. Cool	Willis G. Partridge
John D. Roberts	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Nelson W. Allen
Roger J. Dahlby

To be chief radio electricians

August Dannenberg	Frederick Baldwin
Edward C. Brichta	James G. Leadbeater
Gabriel V. Denisov	

To be chief gunner

Donald A. MacLean

To be chief carpenter

Milo Taber

To be chief pay clerks

Harold E. Major	Floyd Bieri
Hobart W. Means	James W. Winchester

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be ensigns, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law

Barbour C. Stokes, Jr., effective January 18, 1950.

Robert E. Williams, effective March 7, 1951.

Michael C. Fox, effective March 18, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast blessed our beloved country so abundantly, we thank Thee for our Christian democracy which we have received and are enjoying as a priceless heritage.

We pray that the voice of America may bear clear and convincing testimony to men and nations everywhere that our democracy is not a self-centered, provincial, and political ideal but a dynamic spiritual principle and a way of life, bringing the richest blessings of freedom and opportunity to all mankind.

Grant that as fellow citizens we may feel that America's great hour has come when we must revive and strengthen the moral and spiritual foundation and qualities of our Republic if we are to survive and be an effective force in building a nobler civilization.

May all who hold positions of leadership and responsibility in church and state, during these days of world crisis, daily have the guidance of Thy spirit in their deliberations and decisions as they seek to do the will of God.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 2, 1951, was read and approved.

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] as a member of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a proclamation by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that the coming week is Boy Scout Week. We have many Members in this House who were Scouts themselves and many more who have been engaged in Scout work for many years. I hope the membership will find time to read the remarks which I will place in the RECORD, and especially the proclamation of the President regarding this important week.

From Maine to California, the Great Lakes to the Gulf, in every city, town, village, and crossroads, the forty-first anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America is being observed. To Boy Scout units, not only in the United States, but in Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Guam, and other American territory, President Truman sent the following message:

To the Boy Scouts of America:

In sending you warm greetings and hearty congratulations on the occasion of Boy Scout Week, February 6 to 12—your forty-first anniversary—I speak for all patriotic citizens who believe Scouting is a bulwark against the evils of our time.

Scouting's determination to give to every boy the chance to absorb the benefits of the movement's program for physical, mental, moral, and spiritual development promises well for our Nation. In the days ahead we will need, as never before, men of high character, resolute purpose, and unflinching courage to meet successfully the problems of a challenging future.

Your enrollment of 17,500,000 members since 1910 and your present active membership of 2,750,000 as disclosed in official records is a great achievement. It speaks eloquently for our democratic way of helping boys through devoted volunteer leadership.

Your determination to continue with your campaign to strengthen the arm of liberty is most reassuring and merits sustained public approval. One and all, you have earned the confidence of our people and I salute you for your patriotic and selfless service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The President has written eloquently of this great movement and all of us, I am sure, heartily concur with his timely and inspiring birthday greetings.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Yes, the Boy Scouts of America has earned the confidence of our people and has in these 41 years become deeply rooted in our national life as a great patriotic movement. Scouting is for all boys everywhere regardless of race, color, or religious belief. To the boys Scouting is fun, outdoor adventure, and fellowship. Boys become Scouts because they like to hike, to camp, to play, to learn how to do things. They like to belong to a gang, which in Scouting is the patrol. They like Scouting, too, because it is a man's life cut down to boy size, because they themselves are men in the making and are anxious to grow up.

Scouting gives a boy healthful outdoor adventure through its program of camping and hiking. A boy develops the ability to find his way in open country, to set up a shelter, build a campfire, and do many other things that develop self-reliance. Scouting also trains a boy to help other people in emergencies.

Over and above this program of skills is the Scout oath or promise by which a boy affirms his duty to God, his country, his fellow men, and himself.

Scout units are sponsored by the Nation's churches, schools, service clubs, veterans' posts, and other community institutions. Religious bodies of all major faiths, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Mormon, sponsor Scouting on neighborhood basis; in fact more than half of the 78,716 Boy Scout units are sponsored by churches or synagogues. Scouts are trained to respect the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion.

The leadership of these units is in the hands of volunteer cubmasters, scoutmasters, and explorer advisers, and thousands of women are giving effective service as den mothers of Cub packs, for the younger boys.

The American people have come to recognize Scouting as a distinct asset to the community and their support of the movement has strengthened it in every part of the Nation. Scouting works closely with the home, the church, the school, and other basic institutions of our American life. The Boy Scouts of America is a ready and eager partner in every community effort to build boys into men of character and train them to be participating citizens. It is a program which develops physical fitness, courage, and high ideals of service to God and country.

As the President has stated in his Boy Scout Week message:

> In the days ahead we will need, as never before, men of high character, resolute purpose, and unflinching courage to meet successfully the problems of a challenging future.

Believe me, gentlemen, the Boy Scouts of America is doing an outstanding job in producing men of character trained for citizenship in our world of today. On the occasion of this forty-first anniversary we, too, salute the great patriotic service being given by the thousands upon thousands of volunteer leaders who are making this program so effective in the lives of American boys.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BRITISH ADVICE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in London they are worrying about American visitors who are coming there. From the Financial Post, of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, comes an interesting article bearing a London date line:

LONDON CALLING—HOW WILL BRITISH INDUSTRY GET ALONG WITH UNITED STATES ARMS PRODUCTION EXPEDITER?

(By Adelphi)

(While Adelphi is on holiday this column is being written by another distinguished British commentator.)

LONDON.—We will be glad to welcome Mr. William Rogers Herod from the United States next month for we are always glad to welcome any distinguished American, and Mr. Herod is an old friend who spent 3 years here in the thirties.

Nevertheless, there is just a little uneasiness about his visit. He comes here with an official title, long and cumbersome, and sinister. It is "Coordinator and Expediter of the North Atlantic Defense Production Board."

Well, now, that's quite a mouthful. But what is he going to do? The worry is that he is going to tell us what we are to do.

We are only too pleased to have anyone give us good advice on running our industries, but we are an obstinate people. We may listen politely and even nod agreement, yet we are still inclined to think we know best.

WHERE WILL EISENHOWER FIND HIS TROOPS?

We are, of course, getting used to American visitors. We have General Eisenhower who has been spinning round Europe like a tee-to-tum.

A few hours in every capital city of Western Europe and a hasty visit to Iceland and—hey presto—the thing is done. That was General Eisenhower reviewing his troops. The reason he gets through it all so quickly is that the troops are not so numerous as to engage a lot of his time. Having had a look around Europe no wonder he is going peering into the igloos of Iceland to see if he can find some chaps there.

I imagine the General will return to the United States a somewhat worried man. For in present circumstances it is not easy to raise a European army comparable to the 60 or 70 divisions which the Russians have on our western front.

Meanwhile the dispute goes on as to whether to mobilize the Germans or not. This is likely to be an exhausting discussion when it is realized that the Government here has not yet made up its mind about mobilizing our own manpower.

The men released from the services at the end of the last war remain on a reserve. There is talk of recalling some of them for a refresher course. But the people here have a marked reluctance to wearing uniform in peactime; the Germans love it. So it may be that they will get the first army after all.

DEFENSE BILL HAS CHANCELOR WORRIED

No less important than men is money. How are we going to pay for all these defense preparations? This is what is worrying young Hugh Gaitskell, the new 44-year-old Chancelor of the Exchequer.

It is worrying a lot of other people too. Yet there is a cheerful resignation about it all, for the tax-ridden public metaphorically shrugs its shoulders and says "Well, they can't get any more out of me; they are taking the maximum already."

A year or so ago when Mr. Gaitskell was Minister of Fuel he burst into tears at a miners' meeting. He was crying at the failure of his beloved nationalization to produce coal. A very natural reaction for anyone who had grown up with the kind of adolescent hang-over which led him to suppose it would.

Now at the time of the last budget the conservative opposition warned the then Chancelor Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Gaitskell (who had become his right-hand man) that they were using up all the national resources on their socialism and that in an emergency there would be no slack to take up.

Did Cripps and Gaitskell listen? No. They knew better, just as Gaitskell did about coal nationalization.

It would be all right if it ended there. Unhappily it does not. I could leave Mr. Gaitskell sobbing quietly in a corner by the hour. But he has got to make up his mind whether he is going to raise this money out of taxation or by a new defense loan.

Obviously a loan is the answer but he knows as well as the next man that the cheap-money days are over. He could not get a loan now at less than 4 percent. And then what would happen? He would have his old crony, Dr. Dalton, the apostle of the cheap-money policy, booming at him. And that is enough to make anyone cry?

Indeed, if the doctor starts having a finger in our financial pie then we shall all have good reason to cry.

HOW SOCIALISTS SWEEP EXPERT ADVICE ASIDE

It was Oliver Lyttleton, member of Parliament and a wartime Minister, who led the shouts of warning to the Treasury of the dangers ahead.

But the planners took no heed of him. He was just a financier and a leading industrialist and a great figure in the city of London. He had been in trade, industry, commerce, and the money market all his life. Worse still, he had made a success of it. So what could be possibly know about? They swept him aside.

PERSONAL TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the drive to increase taxes there should be no attempt to lower the personal exemption from $600 to $500 or any figure below $600. To do so would put an unjust burden on millions of fine self-supporting Americans who have always had to work hard and manage well to make ends meet. I am opposed to lowering the personal exemption. It was raised to its present level by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

A lowering of the personal exemption from $600 to $500 would increase the direct taxes about $10 per month for the individual who has a family of three or four children. This should not be done.

We are told that we are in an emergency and that sacrifice is necessary. In that case let those connected with the Government set the example. In times of high taxes we should make every attempt to be fair. Politicians should certainly not have an advantage. I favor the repeal of the tax-exemption status for part of the income paid to the President and Members of Congress. Let the rules for determining business deductions be applied to these officials in the same manner that it is applied to taxpayers back home. They should have the same treatment but no more.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless people in every community who because of their strong character have always been self-sustaining in spite of great odds. They have never been relieved by the Government or anyone else. With the high cost of living brought about largely by Government spending policies and by high taxes, both direct and indirect, these people are finding it most difficult to get along. Unless balance and sanity are brought into our spending and tax programs, great numbers of these splendid citizens will be removed from the role of self-sustaining individuals. Recently I received a letter from a working girl in one of the towns in my district. I want to quote portions of that letter, as follows:

DEAR MR. CURTIS: It appears that it is going to be necessary to raise more taxes this year, and the solution most commonly advanced is to lower the income tax exemption. I thought perhaps you would be interested in seeing how one typical Nebraska stenographer's pay is spent, and perhaps you will agree that while the income tax laws do need a revision, it is not in the manner suggested.

I earn $25 a week which is a very ordinary and usual wage for stenographers and salesgirls in Nebraska. My weekly deductions are as follows:

Income tax	$2.30
Social security	.38
Health insurance	.75
Life insurance	1.20
Contribution to support of dependent brother	3.50
Board and room (2 meals a day)	12.00
Lunch at noon (sandwich and coffee on weekdays and 60 cents on Sundays)	2.10
Balance left for clothing, dental bills, entertainment, Christmas gifts, personal tax and all other incidentals	2.77
Total	$25.00

And there you have it. I wonder how many Congressmen would enjoy such a prospect, multiplied by 52 weeks. You will note that I contribute $3.50 per week to a dependent brother. This represents my proportionate share toward his support, taking into consideration my income and other expenses. The amount I contribute represents 14 percent of my gross income, but I am allowed no income-tax exemption for this expenditure because it does not represent "chief support." While it is true that this amount does not represent his chief support, it is equally true that a deduction of $3.50 makes a very big hole in $25. * * *

I realize I could earn much more money if I changed my position but for personal reasons it is impossible for me to do so. * * * I have studied over my expenditures very carefully and have come to the conclusion that I have a choice between going without any noon lunch and cutting out my life insurance and health insurance. Inasmuch as my health is poor and I have quite an investment in the life insurance policy, I would like very much to keep both my insurance policies, but on the other hand since I am already 25 pounds underweight, I would also like to have a noon lunch. Apparently I cannot have both. My position is no different from many other persons existing (not living) on a small fixed income, and certainly there are many of them. I am not a believer in "taxing the rich," on the contrary, I believe every citizen should pay his fair share toward maintaining his Government, but I do not think that taxes should be increased on low income groups when its effect will be to deny them the necessities of life, while the only effect of raising taxes on the higher income groups would be to deny them some of the luxuries of life. Surely a noon lunch is more important than a television set, is it not? * * *

I am writing you because I know it has always been your policy to work for fair tax legislation. I can assure you that I and many other persons earning only a small salary will appreciate anything you can do in our behalf.

Respectfully yours.

There are those who will say that individuals working for $25 a week or less should be paid more. The facts are that whether it is desirable or not many, many people must live on a fixed income of wages, or savings, and rents in these small amounts. It is easy to say that an employed person in such circumstances should go elsewhere to work. There may be good and valid reasons for not changing their location and their employment.

As one member of the Committee on Ways and Means whose responsibility it is to recommend taxes to this House, I do not propose to see this great group of splendid citizens destroyed.

TRAIN THE BOYS BEFORE SENDING THEM TO COMBAT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to read to the House a small news item from one of the newspapers I publish. It contains a story that I believe is of most vital importance to every Member of this body. I read:

Pvt. Wilbur Sweney, 22, youngest son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Sweney, of Lebanon, Route 2, who had been wounded in action in Korea, died January 16, in a hospital in Japan. Private Sweney had been in service only 3 months and 3 days, his family reports. He is the third Warren countian to die in the Korean conflict. He left Lebanon October 13 for induction.

Mr. Speaker, this boy was taken from the Warren County farm, sent by bus to Cincinnati, where he was inducted into the Armed Forces on October 13, presumably sent to some training camp, shipped across the continent to the west coast, then across the Pacific to Korea, sent into battle where he was wounded, and transferred to the hospital in Japan, where he died on January 16, 3 months and 3 days after his induction.

I am wondering just how much military training this boy had. How well he was prepared to engaged in battle. I am also wondering just how sincere and honest some of our military leaders are when they attempt to tell us here in the Congress they will see to it every boy taken under the draft is given adequate and complete training in preparation for military service before they are sent overseas.

I say to you, sirs, such situations as I have described are an outrage.

REDUCE LEAVE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if the President and this Congress really want to make savings in the cost of the Government by reducing nonmilitary expenses, I am introducing a bill that will make it possible to save $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 in the next fiscal year and every year thereafter during our present emergency.

My bill will cut back the present 26-day annual leave for all Federal civilian employees in the executive department of the Government to 15 days' annual leave with pay, on and after June 30, 1951.

This will affect only about 1,500,000 civilian employees who are now receiving 26 days' annual vacation leave with pay. It will not affect the 500,000 postal workers who have never received more than 15 days' annual leave with pay.

Based on the approximate 1,500,000 civilian employees it would make a saving of from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 during the coming year. It would probably reach $250,000,000 because doubtless 500,000 new additional employees will be added to the payroll between now and the end of fiscal year 1952.

If those now enjoying 26 days' annual leave are cut back to 15 days, they will, in fact, receive 3 weeks' leave with pay because Federal employees work only 5 days a week, 8 hours a day. It should be pointed out that those who work more than 40 hours a week receive increased overtime pay.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that a Nation-wide study made by the Civil Service Commission and other departments of the Government to determine leave without pay granted throughout the Nation by private business and industrial firms over a year ago reported 15 days' leave with pay is the customary standard policy of such firms and private businesses.

If this legislation is enacted it will keep leave of Federal employees in line with employees in private business.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that something be done to lower the load on the Government which derives its taxes from the people who are, in fact, the Government.

Federal civilian payrolls are now costing the people $7,500,000,000 a year based on 2,000,000 employees. Thousands are being added to the Federal civilian payrolls weekly. The number of employees may soon reach a peak of 3,000,000 which would increase the cost of civilian Fed-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

eral employment alone to over $11,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, for 52 weeks of the year the average workweek is 40 hours or a total of 2,080 work hours a year including legal holidays.

About 10 percent of all this working time is allocated to annual leave. At present the cost of annual leave—for which no compensatory work is done—amounts to approximately $750,000,000 a year.

In these trying times no one working for the Government should object to working at least 95 percent of the time for which he is paid.

I think it is not asking too much if this reduction in leave is written into law.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation also provides that beginning July 1, 1951, all leave thereafter accruing during the year must be used during the fiscal year in which the same is earned.

This will stop the unwise practice of allowing annual leave to accrue. It may be interesting to the Congress, and I am sure will be to the people, to know that accrued annual leave which has not been used up by the employees in the past has now reached the amount of $581,000,000, a liability the Government will have to pay.

My bill does not affect or prevent the payment of this annual leave already accrued under existing statutes.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 26 days' annual leave at present, these Federal employees are entitled under the present law to 15 days' annual sick-leave allowance, which is also not affected under this proposed legislation. It is not proposed at this time to reduce the 15-day annual sick-leave allowance, but it might be well to tighten up the regulations governing it to make the abuses of malingering impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this legislation may have the endorsement of the executive department of the Government and the approval of the Congress at an early date so that it may go into operation with its benefits to the Government in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951.

212 WORKDAYS

If a Federal employee takes advantage of the 8 holidays, the 26 days' vacation, the 15 days' sick leave, and the great majority of them do, they only work 212 days out of 365. Their net working time is only 1,688 hours, and on a 5-day-week average, instead of 40 hours, they work 32 hours and 27 minutes a week.

It figures out this way. There are 52 Sundays and 52 Saturdays they do not work, unless occasionally and then they draw overtime for the amount they do work over 40 hours a week. Add to this 8 national holidays, 26 days' leave with pay, and 15 days' sick leave and you have a total of 153 days that are not worked. This subtracted from 365 days in the year leaves 212 workdays in the present setup.

In addition to a steady job and sure pay, the Federal worker has the benefit of a liberal retirement, a part of which is paid for by the worker and a part of it by the Federal Government drawn from taxes of all of the people. In fact, millions of dollars each year is added by the Federal Government to the trust fund out of which Federal workers receive their annual retirement when they leave Government service. The President has said, and wisely so, that all of us must make sacrifices in higher taxes and in tightening our belts so that we may pay the expenses of Government without adding further to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if approved, will help to keep down appropriations from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year. It does not reduce salaries, and it throws no one out of employment.

I believe the great majority of the patriotic Federal workers will be willing to make this light sacrifice, and it is light compared with the sacrifice our soldiers must make, to help to protect the solvency of our Government.

This is only one of hundreds of departments of Government that must make their equal sacrifice. The retirement Federal workers have helped to pay for along with Government which they hope to draw in future years after being separated from the Government, will all be lost and there will be no retirement checks coming in the future if we continue to pile up this national debt till we destroy the purchasing power of the dollar and wreck our Government financially.

The Congress has voted for many raises for Federal employees. It is not my purpose to single out one group of our good American citizens, the great majority of whom have been doing a splendid job for the Government, asking them to make the special sacrifice.

All groups and all American citizens are going to have to make equal, and in many instances, much greater sacrifices in the trying days ahead.

I am inserting herein a copy of the bill I have introduced:

A bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after July 1, 1951, and during the continuance of the present national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, annual leave with pay shall be granted and allowed to civilian officers and employees of the Government of the United States whose appointments are on an annual or monthly basis at the rate of not to exceed 15 working days per annum. No such annual leave shall be accrued and carried forward from one fiscal year to another fiscal year, but shall be taken and used during the fiscal year in which the same shall be earned from and after July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting any annual leave that has heretofore been or shall be accrued to and including June 30, 1951.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby suspended during the continuance of the existing national emergency proclaimed by the President by Proclamation numbered 2914 of December 16, 1950.

RESULT OF POLL CONDUCTED BY RADIO STATION KSUM, FAIRMONT, MINN.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, radio station KSUM at Fairmont, Minn., has just rendered a significant public service. Over a 1-week period ending January 30, this station submitted a poll of two questions to the people of the area it serves:

Question No. 1: "Should we pull out of Korea?" received 1,323 answers. One thousand one hundred and seventy-five, or 89 percent, said "Yes."

Question No. 2: "Who should determine whether American troops be sent overseas, Congress or the President?" received 1,291 answers. One thousand two hundred and fifty-one, or 97 percent, said Congress should make the decision.

Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be an expert on foreign thinking and foreign morale, but I do claim to know something about American thinking and American morale.

Mr. Speaker, to those who lead nations or armies, morale is the greatest factor in victory or defeat.

Now is the time that all who love and are charged with preserving this country do some realistic thinking, before it is too late.

POLL CONDUCTED BY THE SANTA MONICA INDEPENDENT, SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago one of the newspapers in my district, the Santa Monica Independent, initiated a poll of its readers to determine, if possible, the thinking of people in the area covered by the Independent on several vital foreign-policy matters. The results of the poll have been communicated to me by the editors of the paper, and I think that they are interesting enough to merit inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It should be remarked that the Independent is not a partisan publication, nor do the editors generally take any position with respect to the implementation of foreign policy which might be construed by its readers as evidencing a bias in either direction on controversial issues. There is every reason to believe that the publication sought to obtain an honest and objective round-up of current thinking on the questions posed.

The outcome of the poll represents no surprise to me, but rather confirms my convictions as expressed so often here on the floor of the House, both before the Korean expedition and following the Communist counterattacks. For many months I have pointed out time and again that Korea was the last spot on earth that we should have chosen for a test of strength with the military forces of communism. Geography, topography, communications, logistical

factors were all weighed against this Nation in reckoning the chances of ultimate success for our arms; and even assuming ultimate success, recorded military and naval testimony before the committees of Congress has invariably indicated serious doubts in the minds of qualified witnesses as to the value of the operation. That Korea did not figure in the concept of the defense of the United States was admitted publicly by no less an authority than the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, who placed Korea outside the perimeter of our defense line in the Pacific.

The operation in Korea has not been a military success. Our forces have suffered severe losses to this time, and the end is by no means in sight. An ever-mounting wave of public opinion is demanding withdrawal of United Nations forces from the Korean peninsula.

The Independent's poll consisted of seven questions, as indicated below. I think that it will be interesting to the Congress to see how readers responded, and for that reason the final results follow:

First. Should the United States withdraw from Korea? Yes, 78.16 percent; no, 21.12 percent; no opinion, 0.72 percent.

Second. Should the United States send more troops to Europe? Yes, 60.56 percent; no, 37.32 percent; no opinion, 2.11 percent.

Third. Should the United States withdraw to the defenses of the Western Hemisphere and build them up? Yes, 50.70 percent; no, 41.55 percent; no opinion, 7.75 percent.

Fourth. Should the United States launch an all-out attack against Red China, including the use of the atom bomb? Yes, 19.01 percent; no, 78.88 percent; no opinion, 2.11 percent.

Fifth. Should the United States abandon Formosa and allow Red China into the United Nations? Yes, 46.48 percent; no, 50.71 percent; no opinion, 2.81 percent.

Sixth. Should the United States rearm Germany? Yes, 36.17 percent; no, 52.48 percent; no opinion, 11.34 percent.

Seventh. Should the United States quit the United Nations? Yes, 43.67 percent; no, 54.22 percent; no opinion, 2.11 percent.

LENTEN SERVICES

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in this hour of decision the fate of mankind mostly rests on our moral strength and spiritual faith and understanding.

As we approach this Lenten season the Christian world is faced with great challenges which will be successfully met through faith and a close adherence to the deep spiritual traditions upon which our Nation is founded.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members the daily 20-minute Lenten service for the Capitol Hill community at the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library. These services have been conducted for some years and have given new inspiration and understanding to those of us on the Hill who have attended them.

The church is within quick walking distance of the House and Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol. The service is held each weekday from 12:10 to 12:30 except Saturdays. Speakers each day will be ministers of the various Protestant denominations of the Washington area. Everyone will be welcome.

I commend these services to my fellow Members of the Congress for their personal attendance. I also would like to suggest that we make it possible for our staff members to attend. The services start on Ash Wednesday, February 7, and continue through Lent.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and the American people were sold a bill of goods that General Eisenhower toured Europe and ascertained whether we have allies in fact as well as in name.

He returned without specific information, as he blandly admitted before the joint meeting of Congress. And his radio speech to the Nation last Friday evening was saturated with "ifs."

According to Eisenhower, if England, if France, if Italy, if Holland, if all the rest can rise to the patriotic grandeur of their forefathers, we might get some help.

Does he mean the kind of help we are not getting in Korea?

In other words, and according to the Eisenhower formula, if we provide the ham, we will be sure to have ham and eggs—if we also provide the eggs.

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY LAWS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and it is my desire at this time to draw the attention of the House and of the American public to this important legislation. It is long overdue and its introduction and enactment has been urged by every interested branch of Government, by the legal profession, and by numerous social and religious groups helping the new immigrants and concerned with the civic education of our future fellow citizens.

My bill is similar but not entirely identical with the bill, S. 716, introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Nevada. It represents the final product of painstaking research and careful drafting done in cooperation with the Department of State and the Department of Justice. It certainly is not the last word of what we would like to see on our statute books. In many respects it does not even reflect my own views and no department of the administration has officially reported on it at this time.

My purpose in introducing it is to provide for a companion bill in the House, thus permitting us to hold joint hearings with our colleagues from the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. We intend to open hearings in about 4 weeks and we invite every interested person and organization to give us the benefit of their views.

My bill is designed to supersede a true maze of laws and amendments as they have accumulated through the years and to write a single, comprehensive and modernized Immigration and Nationality Code without departing from the basic thought governing our immigration policy since 1917, namely, the quota system based on the principle of national origin.

It appears to me that the present world situation is being rather satisfactorily reflected in this proposed legislation. While on the one hand we intend to correct certain shortcomings of our immigration and naturalization laws hampering the free and highly desirable international exchange of skills, scientific experiences, and professional abilities by the free nations of the world, on the other hands we have taken notice of the activities of subversive element inspired and directed by our enemies and we have tried to the best of our abilities to strengthen the safeguards protecting the internal security of this Nation. We believe that we are providing in this bill for more equitable means of preventing the separation of families. We have also incorporated into this bill certain legislative proposals hereto favorably acted upon by the House, such as the bill sponsored by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Dr. WALTER H. JUDD] repealing the remaining racial exclusion clauses of our immigration laws and granting minimum immigration quotas to every independent nation of the Orient. I can assure the House that an effort will be made to have this vital legislation extensively debated by the public and by the Congress but it is our earnest desire to expedite our work so as to be able to take final action on a bill, which I hope will emerge in improved form and shape from the Committees on the Judiciary of both Houses before this session of Congress adjourns.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise my colleagues that H. R. 1612, legislation to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, will be up on Wednesday in the amendment stage. In this connection I would like to call the attention of all Members of the House to the RECORD of last Friday on page A557 of the Appendix, where you will find a critical analysis of the existing so-called escape clause in these trade pacts. I trust everyone will have an opportunity to read it because it will concern an amendment on Wednesday. I propose to offer an amendment to provide an avenue of escape for all harassed industries, particularly during this period when the American Government is freezing so many critical materials, and therefore not available for domestic manufacture.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] be granted leave of absence for several days to attend a funeral in his district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a young marine lieutenant, here for the week end, asked me to do him a favor. He desired to send a marine lieutenant's trench coat to one of his friends who in a few days will be on his way to Korea. During the past few days, we have experienced cold weather here in Washington. From the reports coming to us from Korea, it is much colder there. I gladly agreed to send the coat to the young marine. This morning I went to the post office, after having had the garment properly packed, and requested that it be mailed first-class and insured. The package met all the postal requirements as to size and weight but was not accepted for mailing by reason of the railroad strike and embargo. Surely this is a deplorable plight. It is a concrete example of how this strike is impeding and interfering with the progress of the war. How anyone could condone or justify such acts is beyond my comprehension. I believe that there is adequate legal authority for dealing with such treasonable acts. Of course it is incumbent upon the executive department of the Government to see that the laws are enforced. If it appears that there is not sufficient legal authority to deal with a situation such as this, then we should immediately proceed with the enactment of proper legislation. Let it not be said that those of us who are calling young men from their homes daily for military service in foreign countries failed to make provision for their comfort and safety.

MILITARY MANPOWER DEMANDS

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, the most difficult question that confronts Congress today in its preparedness program is manpower, which involves the critical decision of drafting either 18-year-olds or veterans and fathers.

This decision—the most difficult of all—will require deep courage on the part of every Member of Congress.

Our present draft program of 19 to 26 is not sufficient to meet manpower demands.

It will not be sufficient to meet military manpower demands under any proposal yet submitted.

The great area of dispute, as I see it, lies in determining the best means of halting Russian aggression. Three major proposals have been offered.

One is the proposal of complete mobilization and combat with the enemy. This is the proposal of Governor Dewey, the titular leader of the Republican Party.

Another is the proposal to abandon Europe and Asia to the Communists, and leave only outposts in England and Japan. This is basically the proposal offered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, our only living ex-President and a Republican elder statesman. Mr. Hoover, in the eyes of many in his party, has more claim to leadership than Governor Dewey. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, referred to in the press as "Mr. Republican," subscribes to this policy, and is an active advocate of it in the other body. It has also found vocal support from the Honorable Joseph Kennedy, a former Ambassador to Great Britain and a leading Democrat.

Finally there is the policy of the administration. A policy of containing Russia; of bolstering the ability of allies to resist Russia; and of building up areas of strength from which to bargain, or, if full-scale warfare is required, areas from which to attack Russian military forces and strategic positions.

While the specific proposals of former President Hoover, former Ambassador Kennedy, and Senator Taft differ somewhat in detail, they are essentially identical. I do not believe they meet the test of what is best for the United States. If the recommendations of Mr. Hoover or Senator Taft are adopted, I believe we would be forced to withdraw even from Japan and England—especially from England. This would return our defense line to the limitations suggested by Mr. Kennedy, so the major distinctions between these positions become more or less academic.

What would be the result of the Taft-Hoover-Kennedy program? It would immeasurably strengthen Soviet Russia. Her strategic position would be greatly enhanced. Russia could get at the United States much more easily. If war comes—and I believe it would be an inevitable result of the Taft-Hoover-Kennedy proposals—our ability to wage it would be greatly weakened.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time to list in detail the military advantages which would be Russia's if she controlled all the world except the Western Hemisphere and the few Pacific and Atlantic islands which would lie within our defense perimeter. This has been done enough times in our Congress and in our media for public comment to be familiar to all. Russia's manpower and industrial resources would be greater than ours.

If "pulling in our horns"—so to speak—as proposed by Mr. Hoover, Senator Taft, and Mr. Kennedy, and those who support their position, were a guaranty of lasting peace, I would support that position. I would support it even though it strengthens Russia and means living in a domestic economy, calling for a tremendous military budget and a tremendous number of our people in uniform.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that proponents of this program set forth the theory that we need only strong sea-air forces, but relatively little in the way of ground forces. In my opinion, this is an absolutely false premise. If we were to grant—and I do not so grant—that we would not require ground forces to aggressively engage the enemy in combat, we would still have to maintain a large standing army. In order to properly patrol our perimeter, we would need advance bases. These bases for sea-air power would have to be protected by ground forces. Perhaps in the case of our naval bases, protection could be afforded by marines—but these would still be ground forces, and would be a drain on our manpower.

Mr. Speaker, my main reason for opposing this proposal is that I believe it will make war with Russia—a stronger and even more formidable Russia—inevitable.

History has shown us that no aggressor ever stops of his own accord. He must be stopped. Sometimes it has been possible to halt aggression by strong diplomatic measures. Generally, aggression has had to be stopped by force of arms.

Diplomatic measures have been effective, only when an aggressor realizes that his diplomatic opponents are backed by military strength.

By turning over all of Europe and Asia, and probably losing England, we would be permitting Russian aggression to reach a point where our diplomatic overtures for peace would have no weight whatsoever. We would be forced to fight or surrender.

There is, Mr. Speaker, still another reason for opposing the proposals of Mr. Hoover, Senator Taft, and Mr. Kennedy. If we follow this course, we shall be playing right into the hands of Russian diplomacy—the goal of which is to drive a wedge between the United States and the Western European powers.

I should be the last person on earth to imply that the honorable and patriotic gentlemen who propose this course are motivated by any desire to play into the hands of Russia. To these distinguished gentlemen, I attribute only the highest of patriotic motives. In my opinion, they have reached their positions

only after serious and sober weighing of all facts at their command. But—I also believe what they proposed would be as helpful to the grand strategy of the Kremlin as any proposal by the Politburo itself.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, if we lost Europe, we would also lose most of our Western Hemisphere allies. It is human nature to want to be on the winning side. Once a bandwagon is rolling, it gathers passengers as it goes on. I am firmly convinced that the hard core of Communists in some of our neighboring lands would find their tasks made easier with the compelling bandwagon argument to back up their nefarious propoganda.

Before proceeding to analyze alternative courses, I believe a word of explanation is due Members. I have emphasized the political affiliations of the principal advocates of the foreign policy proposal just discussed. I shall also emphasize the political affiliation of advocates of alternative policies. I do this, Mr. Speaker, to highlight that thinking is not along partisan lines.

Two leading Republicans and one leading Democrat have given voice to the proposal just discussed. Both Republicans and Democrats are found as leading advocates of alternative proposals. Whatever course is followed, we find bipartisanship in its advocacy.

The policy, Mr. Speaker, which I believe best meets the test of what is good for the United States, is the policy of containment being followed by the administration. It has become known in the public press as the Truman-Acheson policy, but it is a continuation of the bipartisan policy in which the distinguished Senator VANDENBERG and our beloved colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, had so much a part.

The Honorable John Foster Dulles, a former Republican Senator, had a hand in its formulation, and assists in its implementation. By roll call votes in this House, and in the other body, many other Republicans have indicated their support. It too is bipartisan, although it does not have the support of all Democrats, and it does not have the support of all the Republicans.

This is a policy aimed at halting Russian aggression. To do this, we have embarked on a program of building up those nations who will fight Russian aggression. We have had some notable successes. Greece and Turkey are two outstanding examples. The Marshall plan of building up the economic strength of anti-Communist Western Europe has been, and is continuing to be successful.

We were effective in stopping the rise of communism in Italy. We have driven a breach in the iron curtain by weaning Tito—himself a Communist—from the lap of the Kremlin.

Its chief aim is to build up areas of strength from which to bargain with Russia. It is predicated upon building the United Nations into an effective vehicle for maintaining world peace. If successful, this policy will bring peace. If it fails in its primary mission, it has the collateral benefit of building up the war potential of our allies to assist in military operations.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, offers no guarantee of peaceful settlement of problems arsing from Russian aggression. But it most assuredly strengthens the hands of the United States and our allies in dealing with these problems through diplomatic channels. And if war comes, we are in a better position for prosecution than if we follow the Hoover-Taft-Kennedy alternative.

There is a third alternative proposal. It was given voice by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. Briefly, Mr. Dewey wants full mobilization now—to the extent of 200 divisions. In effect, this means war with Russia now. Mr. Dewey does not suggest actual combat, but I believe that would be the direct result.

I shall not discuss this proposal, because I believe it is merely an extension of our present program. It merely presupposes that diplomacy will not do the trick, and that our sole hope lies in military measures.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to a second set of serious decisions Congress must make. As I see it, no matter which way we move, no matter which of the three proposals for dealing with Russian aggression we adopt, we must mobilize to a greater extent than we at present find ourselves.

Even the Hoover-Taft-Kennedy proposal of tightening our perimeter, and depending largely on sea-air power, calls for manpower. Even if we do not maintain Ground Forces for offensive combat, we must have large numbers of ground troops to protect the advance bases. None of the proposals will do other than make heavy demands on our Treasury. Industrial capacity must be diverted to military production in greater proportion.

The die has been cast on taxes, but the end is not yet in sight. The die has been cast on controls over our economic life. In fact, the people have demanded faster action than has been displayed so far—and, firmer action.

The manpower decision is the one which Congress must make. This choice is going to be the most difficult of all. Our present draft program of 19–26 is not sufficient to meet manpower demands. It will not be sufficient to meet military manpower demands under any proposal yet submitted.

Congress must decide whether we shall take 18-year-olds, or whether we shall take veterans and fathers. Many of the veterans were called up when they were 18. If total mobilization becomes necessary, we must take all, and we shall have no choice.

Mr. Speaker, the decision I must make shall indeed require courage on my part. I believe this can be said of every Member of the House. I do not know, at this time, how I shall vote when the issue is drawn. I constantly think of the two alternatives. I read, I think, and I search for a third alternative. One which will meet the necessities of the crisis we face. I find none. No alternative which will relieve me of this distasteful decision. It must be "either-or." Either 18-year-olds, or veterans and fathers. Which shall it be?

I do not want to draft 18-year-olds. Congress does not approve this course, but we may reluctantly authorize it. How easy it would be, Mr. Speaker, to say "No" to this proposal, and thus ease the minds and hearts of millions of American mothers. If we follow the dictates of our emotions, that would be the vote each of us would cast. It would be an easy way out; it might win votes.

Such a course would be beneficial, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have to meet manpower requirements from another source—this other source being veterans and fathers. A "Nay" vote to this alternate proposal would be easy also, and one we would make, if we followed our emotions. What a great relief this would be to millions of American mothers, whose sons served during World War II—many of them going to the colors at the age of 18. Again—what a great relief this would be to millions of American wives of these veterans with small children. Again, too, such a course might win votes.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot say "No" to both propositions. This would endanger the lives of every American, and indeed risk the homes and security of every American—mothers, wives, and children all. Our emotions must not guide our decisions.

We must take care that our decision on this matter, and all others, is not guided solely by pure, cold reasoning and logic. When America is governed by reasoning and logic, America will cease to be.

It is the fact that ours is a Government of people, whose decisions are tempered with warm emotion, and are subject to human frailties, which makes our democracy a living, vibrant force. All hope for the world would be lost if the lawmakers of this Nation could subvert their human emotions to cold logic. I find it impossible to accomplish such a subversion. I believe this to be true of all Members of the House. In approaching this or any other problem we must seek to achieve a careful balance between cold logic and warm emotion.

I know, Mr. Speaker, this body will courageously face this and other grave issues in the ensuing months. I know that decisions will be reached only after a collective soul searching—as great as any recorded in this country.

Finally, I know that whatever decision is reached, that decision will be supported 100 percent by all the people.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate this week during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TO REQUIRE A YEA-AND-NAY VOTE ON ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing my resolution requiring a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriation bills passed by this House. I introduced this same resolution last year, but the Rules Committee never granted a rule for its consideration by the House. I have never introduced a bill that received more favorable response and aroused more public interest than I got from the introduction of this resolution.

There are 38 States in the Union that require a yea-and-nay vote on appropriations. There is no rhyme or reason why the Members of Congress should not be required to stand up and be counted in appropriating the taxpayers' money, irrespective for what purpose it may be appropriated. I know that our taxpayers desire to know how their Congressmen vote when it comes to spending their money. In the Eighty-first Congress, first session, we passed appropriations of $29,000,000,000 in the House without a record vote, and the people cannot tell who voted for or against a single appropriation bill.

It appears that we will do away with the omnibus appropriation bill this year and will be called upon to pass a number of appropriation bills, and the requirement of a yea-and-nay vote could be the means of making each Member consider seriously his vote on each appropriation bill and possibly could be the means of bringing about some economy.

This is a period when we want to economize. I do not know whether or not this will bring about economy, but I believe it will have a tendency to do so. I think our constituents have a right to know how we vote on spending their money. I hope the Committee on Rules will grant a rule to bring this resolution up for consideration and give the membership an opportunity to work its will.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, does the bill apply to the Senate?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This is a House resolution amending House rule XXI and applies to the House only. I am quite sure if the House sets this good example by passing this resolution, the Senate will follow. However, that is their business.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in the armed services when a man faked illness he was branded a gold bricker and usually wound up in the guardhouse. This illegal, wildcat, unpatriotic strike on the part of certain railroad employees is nauseating to the American people. My information is that many of those men who are now out on strike have been deferred by their draft boards solely because of the fact that they were engaged in an industry or occupation which was essential to the national defense. This strike is paralyzing the commercial life of our Nation and is impeding the war effort.

I am today introducing a bill which provides that the selective service law be amended so that whenever any man who has been deferred because of occupation or employment for any reason stops working he must immediately report to his draft board and go into the Army of the United States. I hope I have the support of every Member of the Congress to see that this bill becomes law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

OUR ARMED FORCES NEED SKILLED RAILROAD MEN

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of fine boys in Korea. I understand there is a possibility that they may run short of ammunition. We have a lot of fine, patriotic folks in this country who are being terribly handicapped in whatever war effort they are putting forth. Some time ago the House of Representatives and the Senate acted in a situation which was of great interest to the people. It was declared that there was a shortage of doctors in the Army and Navy. So, in the public interest, and the interest of national defense, and in the interest of our country which is at war, we passed a bill and singled those men out, and said, "You are specially trained to render special service to this country in this great emergency." And we drafted them. There has never been a time that I know of when this Nation needed some skilled trainmen and skilled engineers and trained railroad men more than we need them this morning. Are we going to rise to the occasion, or are we going to permit the war effort to lag behind, to the detriment of the country? Personally I cannot help but feel somewhat as a fine American wrote me this morning, and I quote:

> When this country is at war the hands and minds of everyone able to move and think effectively should either voluntarily channel themselves or be involuntarily channeled into essential tasks in the Nation's defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPEAKER RAYBURN HONORED AT WHITE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a transcript of the proceedings of the White House recently in honor of our distinguished Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there was an extraordinary and historic event at the White House on January 30, 1951, when President Truman honored our Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, on the occasion of Mr. RAYBURN's setting a new record for tenure of the Speakership.

At the President's invitation, there were many notables present, including Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson and Vice President Alben W. Barkley, both from the State of Kentucky, which had held the Speakership record through Henry Clay.

The majority leader of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., also of Massachusetts, and former Speaker, and the Texas delegation, including Senators TOM CONNALLY and LYNDON JOHNSON, were present.

Mr. Truman also had as his special guests at the ceremony of presenting to the Speaker a gavel made of wood that had been placed in the White House in 1817, the Speaker's sister, Miss Lucinda Rayburn, and his brother, Dick Rayburn, both of Bonham, Tex., and his nephew, Robert Bartley.

The White House was kind enough to let me have a transcript of the proceedings on that occasion, as follows:

President TRUMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, I have a very pleasant duty to perform this morning, to congratulate the Speaker of the House of Representatives on having served longer as Speaker of the House than any other man in the history of this Republic and in order to show him that I feel very kindly to him, if he has to be shown that, I had a gavel made of wood from the White House that was used in 1817 to rebuild the White House after the British burned it. But this is to SAM RAYBURN who has served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any man in the history of the Republic, with honor and devotion to his country, date January 30, 1951, and it is signed by the President. Mr. Speaker. [Applause.]

Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. President, to me this is a great occasion for many reasons; to be here in your presence and with you and to receive this presentation, evidence of your friendship and your trust. I appreciate every colleague of mine and every friend from the Hill, including the newspapermen and photographers and television people, whom sometimes I have a little trouble with. To everyone from the depth of a grateful heart I thank you. This is a great day to me. It means much to me. It means much to my family and to my friends back in Texas who have so long trusted me by voting for me and making me their representative. Here again, Mr. President, again I thank you most sincerely. [Applause.]

President TRUMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present you with a gavel. This was made of wood that was used in the reconstruction of the White House in 1817.

Speaker RAYBURN. I shall treasure it all the days of my life.

President TRUMAN. I would like the Vice President to say a word.

Vice President BARKLEY. In 1824, President Monroe gave many a great reception in the White House here out of which this gavel

came. Everybody wanted to attend one reception and everybody wanted to meet General Lafayette. Two men came to the reception unaccompanied and when they were presented to Lafayette he said to one of them, "Are you married?" He said, "Yes; I am married, I have a wife and three children." He said to the other one, "Are you married?" He said, "No, I am a bachelor." He said, "Lucky dog." [To Speaker] You are a lucky dog.

President TRUMAN. Chief Justice Vinson.

Chief Justice VINSON. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I ought to be happy or not being a Kentuckian. We must concede that the record set by our great Henry Clay has been broken. I tell you it took a long time to do it and it took Texas and a great Texan to do it. [Applause.] I tell you the truth. Even though I am a Kentuckian I am happy that my good friend SAM RAYBURN holds the all-time record for service as a Speaker of the House of Representatives, where he has performed a duty, where he has performed tasks, where he has been a great pacificator many, many times over. Clay you know was known as a great pacificator. He may have pacificated once or twice but this man RAYBURN has been pacificating for almost 40 years.

President TRUMAN. I would like to ask the former Speaker of the House and the minority leader to say a few words, Hon. JOE MARTIN.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Speaker RAYBURN, friends of Speaker RAYBURN, it is with a little misgiving that I join in these ceremonies. I, unfortunately, held them up. They would have taken place 2 years previously but for me. Nevertheless, I am happy to come here and join in wishing my good friend of many years, SAM RAYBURN, the very best of wishes. Mr. RAYBURN is a very great parliamentarian and a great American, and I know I express the words of everyone who has come in association with him that we love him and honor him.

President TRUMAN (to Speaker). Do you want to thank these people for the kind words they said to you?

Speaker RAYBURN (banging gavel). I think, Mr. President, it is about time to bring the speaking to a close. But first I want to say thanks to my friend Fred Vinson, who was my manager when I was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives and to my successor and predecessor JOE MARTIN for his kind words.

President TRUMAN. I think the majority leader ought to express his opinion.

Majority Leader MCCORMACK. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker RAYBURN, Chief Justice Vinson, the association between Speaker RAYBURN and me during his years as Speaker has been very, very close, not only on the personal level, but because of our relationship as Speaker—he as Speaker and I as majority leader of the House during the greater part of the period that Speaker RAYBURN has been Speaker. He may come from Texas, he might be termed a Texan, but, in the hearts of all Americans, he is an outstanding American and one of the greatest men of this era.

President TRUMAN. This has been a great day for me. Way back in the early days I tried to get out of the way and let SAM RAYBURN be nominated for Vice President. I didn't have any luck, and now I am privileged to present him with this memento of a long term of service. I have had no greater pleasure in any time I can remember.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S CONTROVERSY WITH UNITED STATES TREASURY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, before any Member takes the side of the Federal Reserve Board in the controversy with the Treasury Department, I hope he seriously considers what the result will be here in the event the Federal Reserve Board should win in this contest.

During the past year the Federal Reserve Board has deliberately caused an increase in short-term paper up to 300 percent in interest. The Federal Reserve Board is now trying to greatly increase interest rates. We are paying this year $500,000,000 additional interest on our national debt by reason of the policies of the Open Markets Committee of the Federal Reserve Board, which the Federal Reserve Board is responsible for.

I certainly urge you to consider the fact that the Federal Reserve Board, if it should win—and I certainly hope it does not—will increase interest charges on our national debt from $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 by next year, and price control, I submit, should apply to banks and the Federal Reserve the same as to the people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATION WHIP SET-UP

Mr. ARENDS. I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the organizational set-up of the Republican whip.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Republican whip, LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; deputy whip, RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York.

Eastern regional whip, W. STERLING COLE, New York—8 States, 50 members: Maine (3), New Hampshire (2), Vermont (1), Connecticut (4), Delaware (1), A. N. SADLAK; Massachusetts (8), W. H. BATES; New York (22), KATHARINE ST. GEORGE; New Jersey (9), T. MILLET HAND.

East central regional whip, HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio—6 States, 54 members: Pennsylvania (20), LEON H. GAVIN; Michigan (12), GEORGE DONDERO; Ohio (15), HARRY MCGREGOR; Maryland (3), Tennessee (2), Kentucky (2), J. GLENN BEALL.

Midwest regional whip, CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa—8 States, 56 members: Indiana (9), RALPH HARVEY; Illinois (18), C. W. BISHOP; Wisconsin (9), Minnesota (5), North Dakota (2), South Dakota (2), GLENN DAVIS, of Wisconsin; Iowa (8), Missouri (3), CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa.

Western regional whip, A. M. COLE, of Kansas—9 States, 39 members: Kansas (6), Colorado (2), Nebraska (4), Oklahoma (2), A. M. COLE of Kansas; Washington (4), Oregon (4), Montana (1), Idaho (2), Wyoming (1), WALTER NORBLAD; California (13), ALLAN HUNTER.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] as to what the House would do about the railroad strike, I am no prophet, but I probably know as much about future events as some fellows who talk over the radio, and my prediction is that we will not do anything about it. It is a simple problem, as has been said so many times before. These gentlemen, who are on strike, who are preventing the support of Armed Forces abroad, have that power and they have special privileges only because of legislation that the Congress has enacted. I would not want to vote to take away the right of any man to strike, but I would like very much to have an opportunity to vote upon a bill that has been before this House several times in years gone by which would deprive these union men of the special privileges which the House has granted them, when they misuse those privileges, when they interfere with national organizations, like the transportation system, or the telephone, light, and water companies in such a way as to endanger the public. When they cut off those things which the people must have and interfere with the war effort, there is no reason why we should not take away the authority granted them and which has enabled them to do these unpatriotic things.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are looking to the Republican Party for leadership today. They have lost confidence in this administration. If we were to hold an election today, the Republican Party would win an overwhelming victory.

Our people cannot understand how the strongest nation in the world has gotten itself so mixed up that it does not know whether it is afoot or on horseback. This is the time of the year when we remember two of our country's greatest heroes. They were men who stood for fixed principles. They knew what they had to do. The Republican Party knows what must be done today. We are not afraid of the Soviet Union. The administration is quaking in its boots in fear of Russia. That is the key to its whole policy—fear. Let us make the situation clear. Our people abhor war, but if any nation drives us into war, we are not going to sell America short. This should be our position—America is strong. The Republican Party will make it still

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stronger. We shall make America impregnable. Our party today stands for the biggest, most modern air force in the world. We want the aircraft carriers the administration vetoed not so long ago. We want the Marine Corps, which this administration called a police force. When we have these things, the Soviet Union will know that America means business. When this is known, we shall have peace.

PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, along with everybody else in this House, I voted to create the Office of Price Stabilization. I was shocked last night when I heard Drew Pearson say that the only thing which kept this Office from rolling back prices was a phone call which supposedly came from a powerful industrialist.

I make the statement here that the Office of Price Stabilization should not be guided in its decisions by telephone calls either from industrialists or labor leaders, or any other highly placed individuals, except the rank and file of the people of the United States. For that reason, I believe that the statement made by Mr. Pearson should be looked into and investigated. If things like that are going on, they should report the information for the welfare of the people of the United States.

To freeze prices at levels they are today would be a drastic mistake, although it would be better than to let them go unchecked.

The real way to give the people their money's worth of a costly price-administration program is to roll back price levels to 1939.

I said prices, not wages. And I mean food prices at retail, not on the farm. I also refer to all the other items which go to make up the average consumer's needs.

Roll them back to 1939, leave wages high, and let us get down to the serious business of shouldering our responsibilities in the current crisis.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a particular note of unrealism exists in the whole wage-price freeze in that due to section 402, paragraph (3), subsection (d), of the Defense Production Act of 1950 the price freeze does not apply to many agricultural commodities selling below 100 percent of parity. Wheat and corn are excluded as selling under 100 percent of parity, while cotton, beef, veal, and lamb are selling far above parity and are included. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 1778, to correct this situation and to provide that the 100 percent parity price standard should give way to the actual support-price standard, thus making the freeze immediately applicable.

Though retail products like bread are frozen in price, the fact that the basic ingredient is permitted to rise further inevitably results in exceptions for these end items, and the freeze order makes such exceptions, or they would soon disappear from the retail shops. Undoubtedly there are certain middlemen and processors making hay out of the situation; the way to fix attention on them and get that corrected is to cure the obvious defect in the law as it relates to the freezing of prices of farm products at the farm. The same is true regarding the point made—of such great importance to all of us—that a small proportion of farmers—those who need it least—are collecting most of the Government-support money on agricultural commodities. A thorough investigation is needed on both matters.

The problem raised by section 402 of the Defense Production Act is fundamental to the relations between the people in the cities and the people on the farm. Food represents 40 percent of the normal family budget and city consumers just cannot understand why it continues to far outstrip the rise in the BLS Consumer's Price Index generally, an increase for example to a record of 220.5 for foods as of January 15, 1951, on the 1935–39 average as 100, and an increase of over 5 percent from November 15 alone, against 178.4 in the BLS index for all items as of December 15, 1950, last available date. Is it not time to ask whether those who believe they are protecting the farmer are straining the situation to a point where it may prove to be impossible to maintain proper and advisable floors under farm prices—which I am for—because consideration of the consumers' needs have seemingly not been given enough weight at this time.

In view of the statements of the leaders of the great farm organizations, city people question, too, whether the rank and file of the farm people themselves want this super-maximum protection. Perhaps they are themselves caught in the squeeze of being the beneficiaries of something they know ultimately to be against their best interests as it is not in the national interest in the present situation. Certainly the Banking and Currency Committee ought to look into this situation without delay, as I am sure it would if the administration gave the lead on it.

KOREAN CONFLICT AND PETTY POLITICS

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that our serious predicament in Korea is being used by a few within the minority party of this Congress for the selfish purpose of fostering their own individual political ambitions; while, in effect, such criticism is serving only to disunite our people at a time when unity is essential. They appear daily upon the floor of this House to arbitrarily denounce every personal, business, or political activity of the leader of the majority party. They gleefully speak with vim, vigor, and vitality of our unsuccessful military efforts; and one is impressed by their happiness to report disaster to our Armed Forces.

The absence of the I-told-you-so approach in these daily words of criticism is distinctly obvious and glaringly noticeable. They have failed to offer any constructive approach and would just as vigorously be criticizing any other course that might have been followed. These critics were not heard at the time denouncing the idea of defending South Korea, or even crossing the thirty-eighth parallel; but, to the contrary, most of them were openly insistent that we defend South Korea and were critical of hesitancy to cross the thirty-eighth parallel. Most of these same Members have been hollering ever since I have been in Congress for us to tie up with Chiang Kai-shek in order that we could more quickly find ourselves in military conflict within Asia.

The minority party has always taken great pride in referring to the foreign spending program as a bipartisan matter; in fact, the Marshall plan was the brain child of the Republican Eightieth Congress. They have strongly insisted upon infiltrating with our wealth in an effort to buy with money that which Russia is attempting to take with force. They should not now be surprised to find the results of their so-called bipartisan efforts to stick the nose of the United States into the business of every other country, resulting in the warfare that has continuously been predicted by a few of us who have attempted to put country above petty politics.

The hindsight of an illiterate is usually more reliable than the foresight of an intellectual. It is a simple political maneuver to criticize the activities of an opponent without mentioning the critic's predictions at the involved time. One of this group has just announced to this House that the minority will get together tonight at the Uline Arena for the purpose of criticizing our situation in Korea. I am just wondering how much time will be devoted at this parley to criticizing mistakes made by General MacArthur, the pride of the minority party.

Considering the over-all foreign situation, none of us can now look upon the Korean conflict as the proper solution for difficulties in the Far East. It must be conceded that our military and executive leaders guessed wrong; but it is unknown whether any now criticizing the movement would have acted to the contrary. Most of us are good "Monday morning quarterbacks" who might have called the same plays we later criticize

had we been dealing with a like situation under similar circumstances.

We now know that perhaps the immediate cause of our country's becoming entangled in the Korean conflict at the time was due to a sudden reversal of our policy concerning Korea. Knowing Communist philosophy and ulterior motives as we do, I doubt that a different policy would have definitely precluded similar conflict at some place within that area. All of us now know that a definite and ironclad decision should have been made on the proposition of whether South Korea was vital to our defense and should or should not be defended. These factors were questionable within all ranks, and no doubt the indecisions which culminated in a couple of complete reversals of policy hastened the conflict in Korea. These were mistakes to which all are susceptible. It is difficult to find a present-day critic of the Korean affair who suggested at the time that we not enter Korea. It is still debatable whether we should have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel when it was reached. Some of our military leaders contend that such act was detrimental to our welfare there, and even to our internal security; while other such experts contend that we would have found ourselves in the same critical situation had our forces not crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. Of course, all the answers now available to questions concerning our difficulties in the Korean conflict would be in reverse and the picture there would be quite different, but for the fear of so concentrating our efforts in that campaign as to weaken our defense on more vital fronts.

Therefore, our position in Korea is similar to one man wearing boxing gloves fighting 10 men armed with knuckles—we are restrained to a limited warfare while the Communist opposition has no limitations. We are fighting a war while not being permitted to fight a war. Our appeasement policy precludes us from bombing the enemy's vital production facilities within China and Manchuria, while our enemy is in no wise restricted concerning our defense supplies.

Because of restraining policies, we refuse to use millions of Chinese Nationalists who are anxious to combat communism upon the theory—which is possibly justifiable—that we cannot afford to aggravate and antagonize the Chinese upon the mainland for fear that we would find our defenses divided, a part in the East, a part in Western Europe, and a part in Alaska, should Russia take advantage of our divided situation. Under such restrictions, our possibilities for a successful conclusion are doubtful; and it would not take a military tactician to know that if such is to be our continued rules for warfare in that area, we should immediately evacuate Korea. If it be decided that we continue the fight in Korea, certainly we should not be restricted in our warfare if we expect a successful conclusion to that conflict.

Those believing contrary to my thinking will suggest that our leaving Korea will injure our prestige and that, actually, we are merely assisting and should continue our efforts on behalf of the United Nations. Well, I do not go for that face-saving stuff when young American manhood is involved in a lost cause; and even though I am a strong advocate of the United Nations as an eventual international agency for lasting peace, it so happens that 95 percent of the efforts in Korea are by the young men of the United States of America. We have lost other battles without losing face or disgracing ourselves, and can leave Korea in pride for having gone all out in the defense of democracy, and to save a division of our forces at a time when areas more vital to our defense are in peril.

We must gain and maintain additional dependable allies, never forsaking them or thinking of withdrawing our defenses to the borders of this country; and we should never forget those who furnished us a place to fight and assisted us to defeat our enemies during World Wars I and II, precluding conflict from our homeland, preventing the destruction of our material possessions, and prohibiting the suffering of our families.

There is no doubt in my mind but that we can defeat our Communist enemies in Korea, or the whole of Asia, in a short time and with a minimum of casualties, provided an all-out warfare in that area be determined feasible and justifiable in face of Communist threats adverse to our security elsewhere. We must depend upon our military leaders for this vital decision.

Whether we are in accord with all foreign policy activities in the past, the world crisis today has passed the point where academic and rhetorical discussion is in order. Common sense and practical action, uninfluenced by political considerations, party alinement, political indebtedness, or personal ambition, should be our foremost objective. Political demagoguery has no place in our decisions; the welfare of our country should be uppermost in our minds—even above true party alliance and devotion.

To daily publicly denounce proven mistakes that you might have made had the decision been yours to make in no wise contributes to the security of our democracy and to the settlement of the world crisis. This arbitrary criticism has even reached the infamous stage of suggesting the impeachment of the leader selected by the people of the United States. This is just another underhanded method of promoting discord to the detriment of our people. None of these critics suggests that the President is guilty of any of the crimes upon which he might be impeached constitutionally; they do not even intimate that mistakes or errors constitute impeachable grounds, and I am not acquainted with any person—including all the arbitrary critics to whom I have referred—who are free from susceptibility to mistakes and errors. Any of us can justifiably find fault with and strenuously debate policies, philosophies, and advocacies of most any person; but to prominently promulgate the congregated activities with which we do not agree without taking into consideration activities with which we are in accord is to dissimilate the true picture and fail to properly evaluate the advisability of such actions.

The people elected our President in 1948; he is the same man with like ability as when elected. We knew him then as we know him now. To suggest his impeachment upon the advance complaints is to suggest an impeachment of the people's rights. Even though I am not in accord with many of the policies and philosophies of our leader, I could not and I would not, even if he were a Republican, suggest his removal from office merely because he is not in full accord with my beliefs or because he may have been in error. No doubt a few in high-ranking positions with the present administration have considerably dampened the popularity of our leader. They are burdensome to the administration, and I wish they were not so connected; but to remove them at this time is impractical and could well lead to defeat on the diplomatic front.

There is nothing more honorable than the admission of blunder and bungle. No doubt I have made a lot of them, but I am, indeed, grateful for my willingness to admit and acknowledge a cognizable error or mistake; and I am thankful that my Good Maker endowed me with the ability to realize that only constructive action, rather than arbitrary criticism, serves to benefit mankind.

In order to further promote discord, disunity, and lack of confidence in our leadership, some of these critics would have the world believe that there is a Communist behind every bush in this country awaiting his time to practice his beliefs, which is no less than encouraging Communist Russia to feel that a majority of the people in this country are communistically inclined and want liberation at the hands of Russia. No doubt there are a few Communists in this country, but it would be known to any intelligent person that those few people know nothing about the principles of democracy or they would not be followers of such a wild-eyed, fairy-tale, utopian idea.

Believers in democracy need not worry half so much about the people throughout the world knowing the ideologies of communism as Russia needs worry about their knowing the true democratic principles which have made these United States into the greatest nation on the face of the globe. Our systems are in no wise comparable, as different as night and day; and there is no question which system would be selected by those who know both systems of government.

I have daily listened to these arbitrary critics and have never heard one of them utter a constructive suggestion; they just criticize and don't seem to know which one of their fellow party members to follow. All are divided on the Korean conflict as well as everything else; just anything to be arbitrary. Some advocate the Taft doctrine, which is a doctrine of indifference even to the extent of suggesting the draft of 18½-year-old boys rather than the draft of 18- or 19-year-olds—just anything to be different. Others are for the Wherry philosophy, which is just a couple of words different to the Taft doctrine. Still others are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stringing along with me-too Dewey; and, too, others are preaching the praises of Hoover whose theories, ideologies, philosophies, and policies once led this Government into its most despicable dilemma.

My short experience in this Congress convinces me that there is no lack of intelligence in this legislative body, but it is regrettable that many of the Members do not exhibit more individual courage and place their Government above petty party politics, follow the wishes of their people and the dictates of their conscience rather than act as poll parrots to a few so-called party leaders.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 95, Rept. No. 24), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (l) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

CREDIT AND INTEREST RATES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has raised the issue found between the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Far too long this country and its people have been subjected to the feud which has been running between the Secretary of the Treasury, the White House, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The gentleman from Texas has cautioned us on taking a position. I hope to use my 20-minute special order today discussing this very question.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I wish to announce a new departure and experiment in committee procedure which I hope will further legislative participation in the formulation of United States foreign policy. This new procedure has been agreed upon after consultation with Chairman KEE, who is temporarily absent for a routine physical check up, and careful study by the committee.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has unanimously approved this plan and has voted to call in the authors of all bills referred to the committee and give them an opportunity to speak for 15 minutes on behalf of their proposals. Most of these bills and resolutions touch on some phase of the foreign policy of the United States. Special hearings for this purpose will begin Tuesday, February 6, and run through Thursday, with additional meetings to follow later.

This will give Members of Congress an opportunity to be heard before the committee's legislative schedule is made up for the session. Boiled down to its essentials, it means that the thinking of Members of Congress will be weighed and their reasons for sponsoring bills taken into consideration before establishing priority of committee action.

Members of the committee have long been conscious of a growing need for more adequate presentation and consideration of the general legislative viewpoint. The area of legislation coming before the Foreign Affairs Committee has a peculiar relationship to the power of the Executive that does not exist with any other legislative committee. It is clearly the function of the Executive to proclaim and conduct the foreign policy of the United States. It is the function of the legislative to implement this policy when considered advisable or necessary.

In recent years the State Department has established the growing and happy custom of conferring with the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate before, and not after, formulating proposals for legislative action to implement foreign policy. In other words, the legislative is now to some extent being taken into the confidence of the Executive in foreign-policy matters.

Now we propose, in view of the critical international situation and the acute interest of every Member of the House in foreign affairs, to go one step further and bring the membership of the House closer to the Foreign Affairs Committee and its problems before, and not after, we begin to formulate the momentous legislation effecting foreign policy that we are bound to consider in our committee during this session.

Formerly the usual practice has been to receive views of Members of Congress only after regular hearings commenced. Along with witnesses from the executive branch, or private life, they presented their testimony for or against bills. There was a significant difference however in the relative positions of congressional and executive committee witnesses. On most major bills, the hearings had been scheduled at the request, direct or indirect, of the executive branch and some Members of Congress have felt that the stew had already been seasoned and cooked before they were invited to partake of the repast.

The new procedure will put consideration of legislative views of the rank and file of the House on foreign-policy questions on a more equitable basis by assuring their study before firming up the order in which bills will be listed for regular legislative hearings. A lot of Members of Congress have come up with some pretty good ideas which have been very helpful in the past, and we want to make sure that in the pressure of work we do not miss any good bets by not hearing from all the Members who have sponsored foreign-affairs legislation.

A glance at the work record of the committee would show how the need has increased for a new method of screening bills. In past years it was possible for the committee to give full attention to bills sponsored by the executive branch and still have plenty of time left over for hearing Members who requested to be heard on measures of their own sponsoring.

However, during the Eighty-first Congress the Foreign Affairs Committee was almost continuously occupied, holding 273 meetings on 115 of the 405 bills referred to it, and hearing 659 witnesses in the process. Although as much time as possible was devoted to congressionally sponsored legislation, the committee was so busy with many urgent and major measures sponsored by the executive branch that the need became more and more evident for a system that would provide the fairest and most efficient possible method of pre-schedule screening. It had not even been possible to give consideration to all of the administration-sponsored proposals because of various factors relating to timing, relative degree of urgency, and so forth.

The Eighty-second Congress is little over a month old. Already 80 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee. They embrace over 40 different subjects and cover practically all phases of the critical problems that face the world today. Included are questions involving use of atomic weapons, our membership in the United Nations, the situation in the Far East, disarmament, communism, assistance to other countries, both military and economic, and even international efforts to discover a cancer cure.

PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON SERIES E SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 2268) to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 25), which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

WE ARE TOO CLOSE TO DICTATORSHIP

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks recently made by the gentleman from Arkansas concerning the opposition party holding a meeting in Washington and criticizing the party in power. Now, that is just too bad, is it not?

If the situation ever develops in this Nation when the opposition party cannot complain about the party in power, God help the Nation. I know the gentleman does not represent and he is not expressing the views of the majority of his party. Certainly it is a matter of general debate across the Nation as to the Korean crisis, the Korean war, the Korean police action, or whatever you wish to call it.

I doubt if that is going to be the predominant note at the Republican meeting to be held at Uline Auditorium this evening. I do not like the majority party crying when they are in power about the opposition party saying anything against what the majority party may be doing because, God knows, this country will never advance or progress if such condition is ever brought about in this Nation. We are too close to dictatorship in this country right now. What do the Democrats want? Do they want the right to do as they please without opposition from any source. When the party in power cannot stand opposition or criticism there must be something radically wrong in the administration that should be revealed and brought to the attention of the public.

I, for one, shall never yield my right to speak out and criticize the faults of the party in power when I think they are wrong and to suggest, recommend, and propose improvements in the administration of the Government in the best interests of the public welfare. That is what the people of my district sent me here to do.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PREPAREDNESS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I just listened to my very good and able friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], asking why and what we would do about Korea. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that we never had an opportunity to determine what we would do about Korea.

I would like to ask my distinguished friend what his party did when we, in the Committee on Armed Services, recommended a national defense program of $17,000,000,000 and the administration cut it back to $14,000,000,000? At that time they were going to take off a little of the fat and none of the muscle. But when the administration got through with it, they not only had taken off the fat and the muscle but severed a couple of main arteries as well and the patient—the national-defense program—almost expired.

I might ask the gentleman from Arkansas why something was not done about national defense at that time. I do not recall hearing any protest. It was a great program of a great American, Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

That great and able Secretary of Defense was retired; the 70 air groups were cut back to 48; they moth-balled the fleet; canceled the carrier; fired Admiral Denfeld; cut back the ground forces; cut back the Navy Air; and skeletonized the Marine Corps; all of which scuttled the defense program.

We were then precipitated into the Korean situation totally unprepared and our boys were rushed to Korea to fight tanks with carbines. Why does not the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas comment about that?

The Committee on Armed Services prepared a very comprehensive program of national defense to give this Nation strength to meet any demands that might have been made upon us and had this program gone through as was authorized by the Congress, we might not have had a Korea.

The gentleman asked what we did. Well, I might say the Committee on Armed Services did their part. However, no action was taken by the administration on the defense program. That is the reason we found ourselves in a desperate position when the Korean situation broke.

STAYING ON THE JOB

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the order of the day today to criticize and complain about people not doing their full job during this emergency, and it occurs to me that perhaps we who are connected with the Government are somewhat guilty in that respect. I am becoming a little impatient every Saturday morning to come to my office and find, in connection with these innumerable problems that the people are sending to us and asking for help, that every time we call up some department or agency very rarely is a person on the job. It makes us wonder just how important this national effort is. It seems to me that the Government itself, especially the administration, could do well by setting an example and have its people on the job some time between Friday afternoon at 5 o'clock and Monday morning at 9 o'clock. Full speed in defense production cannot be had by taking the week end off for pleasure—either by industry or Government.

AUTOMOBILE TAX

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was rather shocked a few minutes ago to pick up the Washington News and find that in the headline today there is a proposal by the Secretary of the Treasury to impose another 20-percent tax on automobiles. Part of the economy, a very large part of the economy of this country, is represented by automobiles. They are no longer a luxury. They are an absolute necessity, and our national defense depends a great deal upon the use of trucks and automobiles in the moving of goods and men and women to their places of employment. I have in mind thousands of men residing in my State, and they also reside in your State, who are employed not only in the actual making of the automobiles in the factories, but in the preparation of material that goes into those automobiles. I know of one firm in the city of Detroit making automobiles that has 7,000 contributors in the way of small corporations in every State of the Union.

If automobiles become too expensive to buy, there will be no work for those who now make them and our economy would be injured by the loss of a vast amount of tax money now being poured into the Treasury through this source. This loss of revenue would impose a greater burden upon the Government than could possibly be offset by imposing another tax upon a commodity already paying more than its just share. Such a tax would injure our economy rather than help it.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if this Congress has the courage, the patriotism, and the decency to deal effectively with the railroad workers now treasonably on strike against our soldiers who are fighting, bleeding, and dying in Korea.

JERE COOPER, JR.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the sad news that one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], has lost his only son, Jere Cooper, Jr., who passed away rather suddenly at his home in Tennessee on yesterday.

He was one of the finest little fellows I have ever known. His untimely death was a great shock to all who knew him.

I ask unanimous consent that the House extend to Mr. COOPER our heartfelt sympathies in his great bereavement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper statement showing that the profits of the farmer are less now than on most items in 1947.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of Sunday, February 4, concerning appointments being made by the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter written by the chairman of the Recreation Board, District of Columbia.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PROUTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, commissioner of social welfare, State of Vermont.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a press release.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three short articles from the Washington Post.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Col. Justice M. Chambers, and to include with it the citation read by the President of the United States.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief statement.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to include with the remarks he previously made a bill to which he referred.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I had thought it was axiomatic that we cannot have our butter and our guns too. Yet that is exactly what is proposed in the President's recommendation for the proposed St. Lawrence waterway-hydroelectric project. At a time when we are faced with perhaps the greatest crisis ever to confront this country, at a time when our young men are being taken from their homes and their schools, at a time when record-breaking taxes are to be imposed upon the people, we are asked to embark upon this fantastic undertaking whose ultimate costs, you can rest assured, will total more than a billion dollars; which would require the diversion of materials and labor so badly needed for defense, and which, if the claims of its proponents even approximate the truth, would bring about an economic dislocation to a great part of our country. I say it is preposterous.

Mr. Speaker, long before I came to Congress, long before most of my colleagues came, this project was being agitated. Until a few years ago, the agitation for this project was largely confined to a relatively few civic boosters, with more civic enthusiasm than logic or economic sense, who dreamed of making ocean ports of the Great Lakes ports. In their enthusiasm they even visualized the *Queen Mary* docking at Duluth.

In those days it was sought to arouse the interest of Midwest farmers with arguments that they could ship their wheat abroad more cheaply. An even earlier argument was that bananas from Latin America would be delivered to midwestern markets more cheaply. As regards wheat the argument was that Liverpool controlled the world market, that it even influenced the price which the farmer received here at home. There is no evidence that the Midwest farmers were ever greatly aroused although some farm organizations have given perfunctory support to the project down through the years.

Well, the wheat argument is now out. No one contends any more that Liverpool controls any markets, and the fact is that the amount of wheat which the farmers can ship abroad and the price they receive is now fixed by international agreement.

In more recent years the moving argument for the waterway is that it is essential to national defense. We have successfully fought two World Wars without it but nevertheless it is now brought forward as essential to the present emergency. Yet it would take 7 years to build it and when constructed would be icebound 5 months of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is generally understood that there is at present a 14-foot waterway in the St. Lawrence which permits smaller foreign vessels, mostly Scandinavian, South American, and Russian, to come into Great Lakes ports—Cleveland, Detroit, Toledo, Chicago, and so forth. This waterway has a capacity of some 15,000,000 tons a year. With a relatively small expenditure, this capacity could be increased several million additional tons. Yet the highest tonnage ever handled was 9,500,000, and this figure dropped in 1948 and 1949 to 7,500,000 tons, although I understand the figure for last year is back up in the neighborhood of 9,000,000 tons. So it is proposed to build another and deeper waterway of 27 feet depth. I want to say in passing that when the New York State barge canal was being agitated it was claimed it would handle 25,000,000 tons a year. The largest it has ever handled is 5,000,000 tons.

The propaganda of the proponents has long been that just a little bottleneck in the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River, just about 50 miles long, is all that prevents the Great Lakes ports from becoming a New York, a Boston, a Baltimore, a Philadelphia or a New Orleans, and is a blow at the democratic processes—that a few "selfish interests" on the Atlantic seaboard will not permit this little obstruction to be removed.

Mr. Speaker, every port on the Great Lakes is an additional bottleneck in that there is not one with a harbor depth sufficient to accommodate the shipping which a 27-foot waterway depth that is proposed would invite. Millions of additional dollars would have to be spent at every one of these ports using the new waterway in the deepening of entrance channels, harbors, slips, and the like.

Then what would be accomplished? The American merchant marine on which we have spent $19,000,000,000 would have been given a stab in the back. Larger foreign, cheaply manned vessels would be able to use this depth than those which now use the 14-foot waterway, but less than 9 percent of American-flag tonnage, because of the size of American-flag ships—and the trend, for economic reasons, is toward still larger ones—would be able economically to use the 27-foot depth.

These statements, Mr. Speaker, are not subject to dispute. They are substantiated by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, by General Fleming, head of the Maritime Administration. The late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, in endorsing the project, nevertheless pointed to its limited use by American-flag vessels. Naturally I am referring to loaded vessels.

It is contended, however, that the proportion of American-flag ships that could use the waterway would be considerably

enlarged if they carried only part loads. That, I submit, is a splendid proposition to put up to our American ship operators. They are having their troubles enough to compete with foreign shipping for world commerce because of their higher costs of operation, and no doubt vessels are frequently moved with part loads. This is manifestly not a desirable situation and certainly a situation becomes impossible, when a part load becomes a capacity load and they have to scramble to fill even that.

This is the reason why 30 of this country's leading oceangoing operators have testified they could not use the waterway and are vigorously opposed to it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, for whom are we being asked to build the waterway? Is there any question in anybody's mind that if the waterway would be profitably available to American ship operators, they would be for it?

What is being proposed is that after the taxpayers of this country have put up $19,000,000,000 to develop and maintain an American merchant marine, we throw them to the mercy for 7 months in the year—the waterway would be icebound for the five other months in the year—of cheaply manned, lower operating cost foreign vessels. It costs an American-flag vessel at least $500 a day more to operate than a comparable foreign vessel.

Mr. Speaker, our merchant marine depends to an inestimable extent upon the commerce that moves from the Midwest down to the Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast for reshipment abroad. Is it conceivable that we want to wreck this set-up?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I frankly do not know, and neither does anyone else know, to just what extent these smaller and more leisurely moving foreign vessels would come into the Great Lakes. I doubt there would be many more than come in now. It is not an inviting proposition even to foreign vessels because it would take about 18 days to make a round trip between Quebec and Duluth or about 17 days between Quebec and Chicago. Thus it would take any sizable vessel longer to make either of these trips than it would to cross the ocean.

Mr. Paul M. Zeis, of the Department of Commerce, in his report on "potential" traffic for the waterway, issued in 1948, estimates this "potential" traffic at from fifty-seven to eighty-five million tons annually. He does not say this amount of tonnage would be handled; indeed, he admits that the locks in the Welland Canal would have to be duplicated to handle this amount. But he is charged with showing that enough tolls would be available to make the project self-liquidating. More realistic previous estimates of tonnage that would be handled were 25,000,000 tons, or roughly 16,000,000 more than is now handled.

But interestingly enough, Mr. Zeis and more practical proponents of the waterway do not visualize any great fleet of oceangoing vessels, foreign or any kind, moving between Great Lakes ports and Europe. What they have in mind is that cargoes moving from the Great Lakes would be transshipped at Montreal instead of at Buffalo and other United States transshipping points as is now the case. What a project for the United States Congress to authorize and appropriate for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with this proposition as it was originally justified, and as it has been justified until here recently. A new angle has been added. To the ranks of the civic boosters who have primarily visualized the waterway as making it possible for citizens of Duluth, Detroit, and others, to go down to the wharves on Sunday and see European vessels, have been added a small but very influential and financially well heeled steel operators. Six of the smaller Midwest steel companies, vociferous private enterprisers and vigorous opponents of the waterway in the past, have invested in the Labrador-Quebec ore project. So this subsidized project, because no serious student of the subject thinks it would, in fact, be self-liquidating, becomes essential to national defense.

These gentlemen have hooted in the past at the promise of moving the Atlantic seaboard to the Midwest and they chuckle privately over such a dream even now. But they have a justification of their own.

It is, and they have just come to belated realization, coincident with their investments in Labrador-Quebec, that the waterway would extend the Great Lakes system to Montreal, not to Europe, just to Montreal. And above Montreal, on the Bay of St. Lawrence, is a place called Seven Islands which is to be the port for their ore which they are to bring down from the Canadian wilderness over a 360-mile railroad that must be constructed through tunnels, up and down grade and over about as barren ground as you can imagine. So if the taxpayers will just build the waterway and extend the Great Lakes system to Montreal they will be in a better competitive position with their ore at the Midwest steel centers.

This, I insist, Mr. Speaker, is a cost problem of theirs, not a matter of national defense or of national importance.

The situation in regard to this country's ore supply is this:

For several years steel producers have been looking around for foreign sources of high-grade ores to supplement, not replace, the lower grade ores of the Lake Superior area which are being developed to serve as the new ore of this fabulous area now that its high-grade ores are running out. I want to emphasize that these Lake Superior ores are still to be the steel industry's main reliance. Foreign supplies from all sources foreseeable in the next 20 years are less than one-third of what the industry's needs are expected to be at that time.

Of the three main foreign sources which American steel operators are working, Labrador-Quebec is only one and its promoters promise to bring in 10,000,000 tons annually in 1955. The other two sources are the Bethlehem and United States Steel operations in Venezuela, and that of Inland Steel and the Cyrus S. Eaton enterprises at Steep Rock, Ontario, only 140 miles from Port Arthur on Lake Ontario. Of equal importance, the Labrador-Quebec project is the only one of the three whose promoters would be helped by the waterway. Bear in mind there is no question of this ore coming in; its promoters have said that without the waterway, it will be brought to Midwest steel centers on presently available transportation facilities on favorable competitive terms. Manifestly, if this ore is so essential to our national well-being, its promoters would not have a worry about competitive terms.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that three of the steel companies asking for this subsidized waterway, have low-grade or taconite ore deposits in the Lake Superior area and their representatives have been down here negotiating with the RFC for a loan with which to develop them. It strikes me that this group of private enterprisers are becoming mighty dependent upon the Government, yet I have heard expressions of fear in the steel industry that the so-called bureaucrats are trying to move in on that industry.

It strikes me that there have been a lot of irresponsible statements, in the agitation for the waterway, about Detroit, Chicago, and other Great Lakes cities becoming ghost towns, because, unless they do get the waterway, the steel industry will move to the eastern seaboard. Certainly the 10,000,000 tons of ore which are promised from Quebec-Labrador, just about one-tenth of this country's present consumption and the only foreseeable ores that would move over the waterway, would not prevent such a calamity.

Furthermore, these statements appear all the more ridiculous when they are uttered at the time of the greatest expansion ever to take place in the Midwest steel industry, and in Great Lakes steel construction. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Midwest steel industry has no idea of moving to the seaboard or anywhere else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another phase to this project. It is proposed to construct a power works in the International Rapids. The power generated would be divided equally between the United States and Canada. It is from this phase that the waterway derives much of its strength. The adjectives applied to this power project have reached the grandiloquent stage. It would unquestionably be a big power plant, Mr. Speaker, but the power available to the American side, 570,000 kilowatts of firm power, would be no more than that produced by any one of four privately operated plants at present in New York State. It would produce no more than 10 percent of the State's present consumption. I am not trying to minimize the size of this project, I want simply to put it in its true perspective. It is wrapped up in all sorts of romance and accomplishment of a free and progressive people. This St. Lawrence undertaking, propagandized as an eighth wonder of the world, to repeat, would be no more important, no bigger, for the American side, than any one of four plants in New York now operating.

I doubt that I have heard any more hysterical statements than those re-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cently made by Governor Dewey who has sought to make political football of this proposition. In one outburst he claimed that his reelection was a mandate for New York State to enter into an agreement with Ontario to build the hydroelectric works of this dual project, in order that he could give the people of his State cheaper electricity. The denial of this great beneficence to his people, he said, constitutes a monumental fraud.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Dewey has contended that this plant operated by the State of New York would save consumers of New York State $20,000,000 a year. These alleged savings would come from the fancy bookkeeping fact that the State-operated plant would not be subjected to taxes and other costs which the private utilities have to bear. But even in this way, these alleged savings would mean to the average household consumer of electricity one-twentieth of 1 cent a kilowatt-hour or a saving on the monthly bill of 5 cents a month.

The claims of its proponents that it would bring a new day to all New England, except for Maine, are denied by the former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Nelson Lee Smith. In a letter and staff memorandum to Senator SALTONSTALL, it was stated that its effect on New England power rates and on the needs of the area would be negligible.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard, time after time, these advocates lamenting the tremendous amount of power that is going to waste because the St. Lawrence goes undeveloped. I have heard this project likened to the labor of millions of Chinese coolies.

But Mr. Speaker, I hear no grief expressed for the billions of tons of coal that are lying undeveloped in the ground. This is unutilized energy, Mr. Speaker, just as much as an unharnessed river.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 18 months, the private utilities of New England, excluding Maine, have built practically the power equivalent of the St. Lawrence project. Notwithstanding the continued clamor of the public power advocates about an alleged power shortage in New England, the facts are that this region has a margin of 20 percent of reserve capacity. On schedule between now and the end of 1952, these private utilities plan to provide an additional 450,000 kilowatts, privately financed. Taken with the 500,000 kilowatts added in the past 18 months' period, these private utilities will have added in 3½ years, one-half the time it would take to build the St. Lawrence works, only 190,000 kilowatts less than twice the firm power capacity of those works. Yet we are told that the St. Lawrence is needed as a defense project.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that a recent Federal survey showed that only one section of the country is better off than New England in power reserve capacity and that is the South Central region.

On the question of its being a defense project, Mr. Speaker, I quote from a recent speech by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Mobilization. He said:

> The development of the St. Lawrence would take a long time. There are much more pressing problems if we are to win the war of production.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say this. If the claims of the proponents as to what the waterway would accomplish are not true, then certainly there can be no justification for it. But if they only approximate the truth the waterway would wreak an economic revolution in this country.

For 7 months in the year when the waterway is open, there would be an almost complete demoralization of the present transportation system, by which goods move from the Middle West to the Atlantic and Gulf ports for export to Europe, and imports from Europe for the Middle West come into these ports for inland distribution. This intended bypassing of the Atlantic and Gulf ports would, as I have said, do irreparable harm to our merchant fleet and it would do irreparable harm to the Great Lakes fleet which is not adapted to deep-sea navigation because of fog, ice, and other navigational hazards.

The railroads estimate their annual loss in revenue at between $100,000,000 and $250,000,000. The foreign traffic through the port of New York would be cut more than half or more than 3,000,000 tons a year. Other Atlantic and Gulf ports would suffer proportionately. The coal industry would be rendered another blow which in its present state it can ill afford to take. We in the anthracite mining area in Pennsylvania recall the mid-thirties when British, Russian, Indochinese, German, Moroccan, and other foreign anthracite invaded our New England and Canadian markets to the extent of more than 2,000,000 tons per year. What the opening of new Lake States markets may entail to the anthracite industry bewilders the imagination. A great portion of this tonnage entered the United States duty-free because of either reciprocal trade agreements or most-favored-nation clauses in our treaties. It is estimated that approximately a half-million persons in the Atlantic- and Gulf-coast areas whose livelihood rests directly or indirectly upon this traffic would be adversely affected. Millions of dollars of investments would be wiped out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 1 hour.

LUSTRON CORP.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that defense housing occupies No. 1 priority in our defense program. A few days ago, one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, made some timely statements concerning this important subject on the floor of this House. Since then, I have spent considerable time and effort in an intensive investigation of this vital project. My investigations have disclosed some startling facts, which I would like to present as an aid to our defense effort.

As my honorable colleagues know, the Lustron Corp., formerly one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of prefabricated houses, is located near Columbus, Ohio. This great plant has been shut down for over a year.

Through loans made by the RFC, the Lustron Corp. owes the Federal Government some $37,500,000. Lustron officials have come up with a proposal to reactivate the plant, reschedule payments of this loan, and repay the moneys over a period of 6 to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned that certain high Government officials are planning to scuttle Lustron and give it to the Navy to convert into an assembly plant for airplane frames.

Now, I am not concerned with the issue of whether or not Lustron should have had the loan granted them in the first place. The fact still remains that here is one of the most modern plants equipped to produce critical housing ever constructed, equipped with $15,500,000 worth of valuable and modern machinery, standing idle.

While our defense production lags all over the United States because of housing shortages, here is a plant that can be reactivated and turning out 100 units of housing a day in less than 3 months.

To my mind, any responsible person or persons in the employ of the Federal Government who can advocate destruction of a plant whose admitted salvage value is not more than $5,000,000, should be examined by a board of psychiatrists.

The acute housing shortage throughout the Nation has affected not only much-needed defense workers, but our fighting men as well and by that I mean our men training in camps all over the country.

Their morale has hit a new low and something must be done for them now.

I have in my possession photostatic copies of letters on surveys on housing conditions made late in 1950 by civilian and military authorities in various parts of the country. Their contents are an unbelievably accurate portrayal of conditions which have no right to exist in this Nation today.

Here are excerpts from several of them:

Scott Air Force Base, Ill.:

> We have 439 quarters and 2 trailer parks of 40 trailers for airmen and 20 trailers for officers. Of a population of approximately 14,000, some 4,000 are eligible for quarters. You will readily see that our capacity is limited and, therefore, the personnel who are not quartered at the base must find housing within a radius of 30 miles.

United States Atomic Energy Commission, Richland, Wash.:

> For permanent operating personnel on the project, we have need for 800 rental houses within the next 2 years. Several hundred Army personnel will also require housing in the same area.

Castle Air Force Base, Calif.:

> The latest survey revealed 1,215 families were without housing or living in substandard housing.

George Air Force Base, Calif.:

> Of the 1,000 families represented by personnel stationed at this base, which require

dependent accommodations, it is estimated that 300 families will require quarters locally. Inasmuch as this base is situated on the Mojave Desert, 50 or 60 miles distant from communities which are capable an appreciable amount of rental possibilities, it is evident that the personnel of my command are seriously restricted for adequate housing.

Camp Breckinridge, Ky.:

Comparison of rents being charged before this post was reactivated and the present rate: Four families live in a converted barn. There are 11 two-room apartments available. Four are occupied by servicemen. The other seven are vacant. No modern facilities, no plumbing of any type, outside toilet with shower, walls of plasterboard, paint coming off. Occupants must use a coal stove for heat and hot plate for cooking. Rent, $50 a month for two rooms. Previous civilian occupants were paying $15 per month.

I might say I have made some personal investigation at some of the other camps, notably Camp Pickett in Virginia, and I found down there that many apartments, which are substandard by any set of standards you can apply, are renting at $100 and $125 a month to Army personnel.

I have endeavored to show how seriously the Government is in need of immediate housing. Manpower shortage is an item to be considered. Actual figures show that in erecting a Lustron house, a saving of 80 percent manpower is made, as against the building of conventional houses.

My investigation shows that the Government has need of better than 800,000 units, averaging 1,000 square feet per unit.

Here is some pertinent information about Lustron houses that I know will interest you all. During the course of his remarks recently, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] placed a letter in the RECORD from General Shepherd, former commanding general at Quantico, now in command of the Marines in Korea. In it, the general gave lavish praise of the 60 Lustron houses that had been erected at Quantico. They had been constructed at a saving to the taxpayers of the Nation of some $6,000 per unit.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said over and over again that housing is our No. 1 priority. That means housing both in the United States and on bases outside continental United States. Without adequate housing we cannot expect to do very much in our defense efforts.

Are you honorable gentlemen aware that the Federal Government is at present paying $39 per square foot for housing, outside continental United States? Lustron will erect their houses in Alaska and other out-of-country bases of the United States for $25 per square foot. A mere saving of some $14,000 a unit.

A Lustron house is one of the finest labor-saving structures this country has ever known. The Lustron house is prefabricated, made up in sections, and shipped to their destinations ready for erection. Any man who can handle a screw driver or wrench can erect a Lustron house.

If the Government will reactivate the Lustron Corporation, they can start production of a minimum of 100 houses every 24 hours. These are the very type of houses the military wants so urgently. Houses that may be used over and over again. And should it ever become necessary to dispose of surplus property as we do after every war, the Lustron house has both real and potential surplus value. I know of many instances where it has been necessary for the Government to dispose of conventional houses at virtual give-away prices.

A Lustron house will not deteriorate. It does not have to be painted, and there is practically no upkeep. And should it ever become necessary to dispose of these houses, they can be stored indefinitely and maintained for future needs.

I should like to make an interesting point of comparison at this time. I would like to compare a Lustron house with a can of beer.

The annual consumption of steel used in construction of Lustron houses, at the rate of 100 units per day, 365 days a year, is 300,000 tons. While the annual consumption of steel used by the beer industry in beer cans is 285,000 tons. This figure excludes the amount of tin used annually in these cans.

Reactivation of the Lustron plant will enable the taxpayers of the Nation to recover the $37,500,000 already loaned to the corporation. Not to mention a saving to the Government of from $6,000 to $14,000 per unit for each house constructed. Lustron could save the Federal Government annually better than $500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, has indicated that there was skulduggery and strange maneuvering involved in the attempted foreclosure of the loan to the Lustron Corp., and in view of the evasiveness and run-around I have been getting in trying to collate this information, I am convinced there is entirely too much covering up.

Why should the Navy wreck a plant that can be of such immediate aid to our defense production? The only use the Navy would make of the entire plant is to sell the machinery for salvage and use the bare walls as an assembly plant for airplane frames.

According to the record, Lustron has 23 acres of buildings occupying 200 acres of ground. There is ample space to build an assembly plant for the airplane factory without destroying Lustron. It is my understanding that the Government has been building some warehouses similar to the type of building required for an assembly plant for $3.50 a square foot. Further, I am told the airplane factory needs approximately 1,000,000 square feet for an assembly plant. In other words, construction of a new plant would cost the taxpayers no more than $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. But certain unscrupulous persons in the Government propose to destroy $15,500,000 worth of machinery and salvage the entire Lustron project at a total of $32,500,000 in order to expend another few million dollars to use the Lustron plant as an assembly plant. This is criminal.

The type of Government officials who will advocate such expenditures are men who should be removed from office. Our Government leaders must be men of sound judgment, of ability, of stature, with vision, a desire to cooperate, and a realization of the necessity for action. Unless we can be assured of this type of leadership, I fear that the huge appropriations this Congress has already made, and the additional appropriations that will be made in the years to come, will avail us just about as much as hair under the barber chair which is swept away each night.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress should demand that our Government officials discontinue their wrangling and get on with the business on hand. I propose to go into the matter of the Lustron corporation with some of the highest authorities in this Government, and, if for any reason some of our high-minded bureaucrats are permitted to junk such a magnificent plant, I, personally, will carry the message to the far corners of our country and demand that the taxpayers exact their pound of bureaucratic flesh.

These are perilous times. There is need for action. I hope that the Members of this illustrious body will become interested in this matter and join with us in reactivating Lustron Corp.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful to the gentleman for bringing out the facts about the housing necessity of the Armed Forces. On January 12 I made a speech on the floor of this House stating that there was skulduggery in the RFC and that I would at a future date name names and places, and also bring out the facts about the closing down of the Lustron Corp., and refer also to Kaiser-Frazer and some others, the facts of which should be brought out.

On last Saturday, I believe it was, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency put out an interim report in connection with its investigation of the RFC for the past 2 years. This report, when I made the speech last week, I asked the Members of the House to get when it came out on January 31.

I hold in my hand a confidential subcommittee print which will be released day after tomorrow, according to my understanding, in reference to this matter, and I hope each Member will get one of these reports because it bears out exactly what I said on January 12 in reference to the skulduggery, the almost criminal action of certain high officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the skulduggery of Young, Jacobs, and any other number of people to whom I referred on the floor last week.

It is also interesting to note what the gentleman from Ohio said about the photostatic copies he has from the armed services, and it is interesting to me particularly to note that it is the Navy, according to General Harrison, that wants this plant and that they want only the four walls. He says it is absolutely necessary that they have these four walls even though there are $15,500,000 of machinery in there which is good for nothing except the building

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Lustron prefabricated houses. He said this is absolutely necessary even though it would cost over $15,000,000 to tear down the plant, resulting in the further loss of $15,500,000 of machinery, plus the fact it will take 12 to 14 months to clear it out and put it into operation.

General Harrison, who is president of I. T. & T., told me at a meeting I had with him that his company had just completed a warehouse for $2.50 a square foot; yet he wants to rid the taxpayers of this $15,500,000 worth of equipment, he wants to destroy this Lustron plant, because the Navy wants it, so he says.

I called Captain Reynolds of the United States Navy and he says they are in dire need of this plant. I also talked with some people at Columbus, Ohio, some of the underlings out there, not the top men, because they said they had orders from Washington to keep quiet. One of their highest-ranking officials told me: "I cannot discuss Lustron with you, because I have orders from Washington not to talk about it."

I talked with some of the other people and they say: "We do not want the Lustron plant destroyed, we need their houses. We could have a plant of four walls completed in shorter time and it would cost the taxpayers less money if some of the people down in Washington would let us go ahead and build an assembly plant."

They tell us it is the Navy that wants to bring about this wholesale destruction. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to me to note some of the photostatic copies of communications I have from departments here in Washington.

Here is a photostatic copy of a speed letter from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Chief of Naval Personnel dated August 21, 1950—the latter part of 1950—which in part says:

Request continental naval activities be directed advise personnel ordered Pacific area not to bring or have dependents come to San Francisco area unless private arrangements in advance have been made for housing. Present housing shortage for Naval personnel is critical and is of increasing seriousness. The foregoing does not apply to hotel accommodations as there is no shortage at present.

That is from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Bureau of Personnel here in Washington, D. C. Yet it is strange that the Navy itself, according to General Harrison, wants to take this plant over and do away with housing that the Navy is so direly in need of.

Here is another letter from the commandant of the Eleventh Naval District:

A representative of your office has requested that I forward to you a statement on the housing situation in the San Diego area insofar as naval personnel are concerned.

The housing situation in the San Diego area is critical, both in private housing and in Navy and Federal housing. Motel rates are gradually increasing and housekeeping rooms for couples are very scarce. My housing office has over 500 applications for this last type of accommodation. Medium priced private rentals are rapidly decreasing while the listing of rentals in the $100 price per month bracket is increasing.

The Navy has 745 Homoka housing units in this area. There are over 200 applicants waiting for vacancies in these units. The Navy has 3,492 units in permanent housing projects in this area. There are approximately 300 shore based personnel awaiting assignment to these units. In an attempt to make space available in the permanent housing projects, 300 eviction notices have been served to tenants who have completed 3 years tenancy as of August 1, 1950. In many instances, extensions have been granted where tenants were found to be building or buying homes. Most of these extensions are to be terminated on February 1, 1951.

The shortage for housing for families of personnel at sea (in aircraft squadrons and ships) is extremely critical. There are over 1,000 applications on file for two-bedroom units in Federal projects for which these people are eligible. In an attempt to alleviate the situation for sea personnel with large families, the hardship cases in this group are being assigned to Homoja housing. There are many instances of personnel with two preschool age children being housed in one bedroom Federal units. Vacancies in the Federal housing projects are very, very scarce. It is believed that this is due to the increased labor and employment in local defense concerns as well as civil service personnel in Government activities.

Here is another letter: Headquarters, Ninth Naval District, Great Lakes, Ill., from the commandant to the Chief of Naval Personnel:

Forest Park, Ill., area. Military personnel assigned to the activity, married civilian personnel transferred from other stations, and married civilian personnel who must reside in the general area of the plant for reasons of economy are compelled to pay exorbitant rentals if they are successful in locating apartments, houses or housekeeping rooms in the general geographical proximity of the plant. A sampling of the rentals assessed reflects that 1-room unfurnished kitchenettes, when available, are rented for $62.50 monthly, a 4-room furnished house is available in nearby Maywood for $200 monthly, a 5-room unfurnished dwelling in Oak Park can be rented for $175 monthly, four four-room unfurnished flats will be available in River Forest on December 1, 1950, for $125 monthly, housekeeping rooms are sometimes available but the rentals range from $12 to $16 weekly and single rooms alone rent for $9 to $14 weekly.

Realtors who handle rentals in the Forest Park, Maywood, Berwyn, Cicero and Oak Park communities, all near the plant, mutually term conditions with respect to availability of rental units as poor with no foreseeable prospects of relief. There is no public housing in the area and there is none proposed at this time.

A reasonably accurate barometer of area housing conditions is the number and nature of inquiries received by the employee counselor, this activity. Efforts to alleviate the problem, by making counseling service available to military and civilian personnel, have met with little success. This is due to the total absence of listings for rental units for families. Some of the plant's 1,400 civilian personnel have purchased dwellings in the vicinity. In contrast, however, the housing plight of others has frequently had direct effect upon the station's personnel requirements. A notable example occurred recently when an employee transferred to NOP Forest Park from the Central Torpedo Office, Newport, R. I., was compelled to return to Newport after the transfer had been consummated, due to his inability to find housing for himself and family.

There is no other rental housing, public or private, available in the immediate area of Crane, Ind., and housing conditions in the Bloomington, Bedford, Bloomfield, Washington areas (20–35 miles from NAD, Crane), are critical.

Great Lakes, Ill., area: The housing situation is now critical. There are long waiting lists for all Navy and other Government-controlled housing. Naval personnel concerned should be strongly advised against transporting their families 'nto the area prior to making definite housing arrangement, unless they are prepared to pay in excess of $75 per month for rent. Civilian rentals are available in very limited number in small communities 10 to 20 miles from the Naval Training Center. Motel and trailer camp accommodations are very limited in number.

Omaha, Nebr., area: There is an acute shortage of housing of any description. Rental property is particularly scarce. Rents are exorbitant. Children are not welcome.

Any person with dependents in the Naval Service, officer or man ordered to this area for duty and for whom public quarters on this Reserve Center are not available will have extreme difficulty in locating a place to live suitable or otherwise.

St. Louis, Mo., area: No Navy or Government-controlled housing is available in this area. There is an acute shortage of private rental units and rents for furnished apartments are from $100 to $150 per month.

It is virtually impossible to rent an apartment, either furnished or unfurnished, for a short-term period.

Denver, Colo., area: In the Denver area housing is critical. It is extremely difficult to find homes to rent and those that are available usually rent for $125 per month and up. Small unfurnished apartments, when one can be found, may be rented from $75 and up. There are numerous motels in this area where two rooms with bath and kitchen may be obtained during the winter months from about $100 per month and during the summer for $50 per week and up. In general, hotel rooms are exceedingly scarce and are remote from the station.

Olathe, Kans., area: The housing conditions for the local Olathe, Kans., area are regarded as poor and immediate housing is not available. There are housing possibilities in the smaller towns 20 to 30 miles distant from NAS, Olathe.

Housing in the Kansas City area is regarded as critical, unless personnel are prepared to pay $90 to $100 per month for rent. Desirable housing for rent under the above figures is extremely hard to find.

Naval personnel concerned are advised not to transport dependents into the Olathe, Kans.-Kansas City area prior to making definite housing arrangements.

Indianapolis, Ind., area: The housing situation is not good and rental housing is not within the means of the average naval or civilian person.

Reopening of Army installations in the area is making the situation worse.

Here is another photostatic letter from the commandant, Eighth Naval District, New Orleans, to the Chief of Naval Personnel:

1. The housing situation in New Orleans is still somewhat critical, and civilian housing is quite expensive.

2. Enlisted personnel with children will have a varying period of delay, 1 to 4 weeks, depending upon their needs, before assignment in the Bienville homes (low rent) housing naval housing project. These apartments are unfurnished except for stove and refrigerator.

3. Officers and enlisted personnel without children are not assigned quarters in Bienville homes at present.

4. Civilian furnished housing is available at rates of $50 up for one-bedroom apartments, and $90 up for two-bedroom houses. Unfurnished civilian housing is very scarce.

5. Hotel accommodations are practically impossible, except by very early reservation, and then limited to a maximum of 5 days. Auto courts are available at $5 up per day.

6. Families should not be brought to the New Orleans area until housing has been secured unless sufficient personal funds are available to cover the waiting period.

Yet the Navy still wants this for an assembly plant.

Here is the headquarters Eighth Naval District, saying the same thing, that housing is critical.

Headquarters Thirteenth Naval District, Seattle, Wash., the same thing.

Fifth Naval District, commandant to the Chief of Naval Personnel: Housing is critical.

Commandant, Third Naval District to the Bureau of Naval Personnel: Housing situations are critical.

All the way through, Mr. Speaker, you find the same thing. I could quote from every naval district in the United States, with the exception of two, and they all say that defense and servicemen housing is critical, and they are pleading and begging for housing. Why should the Navy, according to General Harrison, want to destroy a plant that could produce 100 houses a day, houses that we are in dire need of, at a minimum cost, when the commandants of the naval districts insist that they are in dire need of housing and that the housing situation is very critical?

This morning I called Mr. Foley down at the Housing Administration and asked him if the Navy had requested any housing. He said, "No." I said, "Is it your expectation that they will?" He said, "Yes." He said, "The housing that we are in dire need of is for 6,000 families." That is where the new hydrogen plant is being erected. They are in need of houses for 3,000 families at Paducah, Ky., for the Atomic Energy Commission. He said, "We need them fast." Yet my friends, to erect a plant where we could produce 100 houses a day at $6,000 a unit savings to the taxpayers seems criminal to me, because if we could get these houses at Savannah and the houses at Paducah in nothing flat, then we could go ahead with our atomic-energy program at a fast pace, which we need to do. The economy and savings in Lustron houses has been proven at Quantico. They had three bids on houses down there, and the Navy could not buy most of the houses because they cost too much. They wanted $13,000 for them. We did not appropriate enough money for them to buy those 68 houses at $13,000 a unit. So, the Navy put in another call for bids. Lustron houses were sent down there for $7,200, which saved the taxpayers of this country $6,000 on each one of those houses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman says that Lustron houses were sent down there for $7,200 per unit. What did it cost to get those constructed per unit?

Mr. SUTTON. Of course, I have not gone into what it would actually cost to get them constructed. Does the gentleman mean to manufacture them or construct them? Seven thousand two hundred dollars was the price at Quantico put up.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman mean Lustron would erect the houses for $7,200?

Mr. SUTTON. Erect the houses for $7,200 a unit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A turnkey job?

Mr. SUTTON. A turnkey job. It saved the taxpayers $6,000 a unit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the situation in that locality so that organized labor would permit Lustron to do so?

Mr. SUTTON. I believe you will find organized labor is behind Lustron 100 percent, because I have telegrams from all over Ohio and all over this country admiring the stand I took on January 12 when I condemned the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for trying to close down this plant. Manpower is a shortage as well as housing right now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] referred, if I am not mistaken, to the saving that could be effectuated by shipping Lustron production to the Alaska bases, as an illustration.

Mr. SUTTON. I believe the gentleman will find that there are two of them in Alaska now. The house the Government has been buying to put in Alaska was costing $39 a square foot, according to their own figures, and the Lustron house costs $25, which was a saving of $14 a square foot in Alaska, erected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A friend of mine who constructs fabricated dwelling quarters spent $75,000 of his own funds to try to break the combine in Alaska. He could put in completed two-bedroom dwelling units for around $11,000, as against about $45,000 that we are paying for two-bedroom dwelling units there at Anchorage and Fairbanks. After he had sunk the $75,000 and had put in three or four units, he found himself cold-bloodedly up against the rules and regulations of the Federal Housing Administration and organized labor in Alaska, and he has had to withdraw from the field, although he is in position to continue to make those shipments provided he can get the support of the Federal Government and organized labor in letting him install those units at the two bases at Anchorage and Fairbanks.

There is a combination up there that prevents him from doing so by reason of the fact that there is so much gravy in the $45,000, $55,000, and $75,000 homes that are being built there. So I personally do not believe, after watching this thing for a number of years and having been up in the Territory and held hearings all over the Territory, that if Lustron were equipped with a billion dollars of capital it could necessarily break the combine in Alaska and get these low-priced units up there.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I might say to the gentleman that he perhaps knows more about the situation in Alaska than any other Member of the House. I certainly think he knows what he is talking about. On the other hand, may I say that the Government needs a lot of houses in Alaska. It seems to me that if the Government cannot buy houses where it wants to, if it cannot get houses at a price that will save almost 50 percent to the taxpayers in taking the houses up there and erecting them, then the whole situation needs extensive looking into.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent in that observation. That is the reason I am trying to make this little contribution here.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I can see no reason or sense to this high cost in Alaska, except that the Federal Government agencies have let those combinations in restraint of trade proceed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That might be a good place for the Committee on Armed Services to begin an investigation. As I recall, we gave them authority to do that, just last Friday. In trying to check on these procurement agencies, I think the Armed Services Committee has a very fertile field to work in. I believe there is plenty of work ahead for them to do, from the little bit of looking into it I have done, not only in the construction field but in procurement generally.

Mr. SUTTON. May I say to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that his aims are the same as mine, in that if we can get houses into Alaska, not for $42,000 or $45,000 but for $25,000 or even $10,000, I am interested in saving the overburdened taxpayers that money.

The case I had brought to my attention was through my investigation of the RFC before the talk I made on the floor of the House on January 12. When I got into the investigation of the RFC I got into Lustron. I thought an injustice had been done there in the closing down of that factory by certain people who wanted to take over Lustron for their own measly lust of gold, including some of the directors of RFC that I mentioned before—Mr. Dunham, for example. If we can save the taxpayers $1,400,000 a day in producing houses for national defense to go to Alaska, regardless of what company it is, I am wholeheartedly in favor of it. If we can clean out a Government agency, whether it is Democratic or Republican—and I being a Democrat it is hard to condemn my own administration—where skulduggery exists, I believe the taxpayers should not be robbed, and we should not let that skulduggery go on. That is why I took the floor to help in cleaning out the RFC. I made the talk on the basis that the taxpayers want it because it is a $2,000,000,000 corporation of the Federal Government, and at the same time we would get these houses which are so badly needed for our defense and get them as cheaply as we can and as fast as possible, as well as getting the best for the least expense, for the armed services.

That is my sole purpose in this matter. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio has the same intention, and I am positive that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has the same idea in mind.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not know anything about the background of the RFC dealings with Lustron. As I said earlier in my speech the $37,500,000 that the RFC loaned to Lustron is water over the dam. They received it, and whether the money should have been

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

loaned or whether it should not have been loaned is beside the point now. Now the point is, as I see it, that there is at least $15,500,000 worth of expensive, almost brand-new equipment out there which cannot be used for anything except to build this particular type of house. The question now comes up, are we going to go ahead and lose $37,500,000 and write that money off the books and, as the Navy has been quoted in the press as saying, send bulldozers in and just bulldoze that machinery out of there and destroy it so that the value of the machinery is absolutely destroyed, except for what it is worth as junk, or are we going to use the machinery for something that we need? As I see it two wrongs do not make a right, and if it was wrong to lend them the money in the beginning, that is neither here nor there. The point, I reiterate, is are we going to destroy this $15,500,000 worth of machinery which cannot be used for any other purpose when we so badly need housing at Army bases and all over the country, at our atomic energy plants, and so forth? I have personally gone to some of these Army camps to observe the situation at first hand. I tell you it is no wonder that the morale of some of these troops at some of these camps is very low when they see their families coming down there to exist in the kind of places that they are living in around these camps, because the Government has not met its obligations and has not provided quarters for them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It stands to reason that American genius can produce prefabricated houses at low-unit cost if it can produce automobiles and flying machines and railroad cars and what-not. Here is the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House holding hearings now on the very far-reaching so-called defense housing bill with apparently every intention of going out and spending literally hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of acquiring low-unit cost dwellings for our people at those places where defense bases are to be built, that is, for the workers, the structural workers, or the permanent residents of the base; and for permanent homes throughout the country. I agree with the gentleman; I think it is getting awfully close to treason against our people to throw out fifteen or twenty millions of dollars of newly designed and recently built up-to-date equipment when there is so much need for its use. There just is not any sense to that kind of performance. I do not care what the argument on the other side of the question might be. It takes time, labor, and precious material to build these wonderful machines. That machinery should not be destroyed. As the gentleman says, it is not a question now whether the loans were good loans or bad loans. That is beside the point. The question is how you are going to get low-cost housing for the benefit of the fellow who buys it or for the benefit of the taxpayer if it is used in a public manner. Why not use the equipment that was built for that purpose?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. In my opinion he is 100 percent right. The only argument I have heard from General Harrison against reactivating this plant is that the plant went bankrupt. The General may be a good businessman. I do not know. I understand he has been president of the I. T. & T. for some time. It so happens that my father and I have owned some stock in that corporation for perhaps the past 20 years. And the only thing I have ever gotten from them so far is a bunch of explanations as to why they have not paid any dividends. So I do not think he should be throwing any rocks at a corporation simply because it went bankrupt. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] hit the nail on the head when they said that the essential thing is that this $15,500,000 worth of expensive, hard-to-get, hard-to-manufacture machinery ought not to be junked.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman ought to know that last year we built in this country 1,500,000 housing units. Now this department of Government has fixed it up so that we will not be able to build half a million this year. You are right about the need for more houses, but if we have the Federal Government making it so that no one can build a house, what good will it do to fix up Lustron or anybody else?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman raises a point that I would like to answer. After all is said and done, if we do not get so wrapped up in our daily tasks and the requests of our constituents, we are the ones who can do something about it. That is why I am trying to bring it out on the floor today.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman mentioned General Harrison. I was talking with him the other day on this subject. I went to the White House, and I was sent from the White House to see the genial and capable Administrator of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Charles E. Wilson, and from there I was sent to General Harrison. Last Saturday at 10 o'clock I was in General Harrison's office talking to him about this matter. In our conversation I brought out the fact which the gentleman brought out this afternoon, because he told me that they used 385,000 tons of steel for beer cans, excluding tin. I knew it took only 300,000 tons of steel to make 100 houses per day of prefabricated houses. When General Harrison told me that he was recommending that Lustron be turned over to the Navy, I said, "Which is more important, 385,000 tons of steel for beer cans or 300,000 tons of steel for housing?" I wish you could have seen the expression on his face. He blew up. He said, "Beer is essential for the morale of the American people." I ask you Members of this Congress which is more essential for these boys in the service, a beer can or a house.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If anyone cares to go out here to the rack in the Speaker's lobby and get yesterday's paper—I just came back from Ohio about 12:15, and I had with me the Cleveland Plain Dealer. There is a quarter page of ads of companies in Cleveland that are offering steel, asking for inquiries about steel. Some of them list the amounts of steel, the sizes and shapes and the strips that they have on hand. I thought there was a shortage of steel. In fact, I was amazed when I read that yesterday. I do not know whether this is gray-market steel or European steel or what kind of steel it is, but anyone knows when there is open traffic going on in steel, they advertise in the papers, the big Sunday metropolitan papers like the Cleveland Plain Dealer; these dealers are not covering up the fact that they have steel.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That is a question I was about to ask. Is this black-market steel? and what is the price of it? You can buy steel in Chicago today at 24 cents a pound if you want to pay for it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I think he has a point. I think perhaps some of these regulators downtown ought to be doing a little more regulating along that line instead of the kind of regulating they are doing. I am getting a little tired of it all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was going to address an inquiry to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON], but I see he has been called from the floor. However, he made a remark to the effect that private home construction is limited to about half the units built last year. I think that limitation—and this is what I wanted to verify—I think that limitation is based on the amount of material that is allocated for the use of the private citizen who wishes to build. That does not mean to say within the concepts of the military program there is not a lot of material which can be used for building dwelling units. That is the point I want to clear up, but my friend has been called off the floor.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think the gentleman is exactly right, and, of course, I think too many of us take for granted that the military is so sacrosanct that their conclusions and opinions are not to be questioned, but it so happens that I have been around the world a bit since the last war. I have seen literally thousands of planes sitting all over the world being destroyed by the elements. I am not in position to say that the Navy should not have so many planes or that it should have so many, but I think we ought to look into the matter carefully before we give them authority to purchase 50,000 planes or any other great number of planes when we find thousands of planes sitting out in the waste places rusting out. I have seen them in Egypt, for instance, as far as the eye could reach; there they were. I was told by people who should know that some of them had never been in the air except to be flown from the United States to that

point. I think the whole problem is that some of these people downtown seem to me to be rushing into the thing pell mell and without enough thought.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I wish to state to the gentleman from Ohio that before they carry out the decision made by General Harrison on wrecking this plant, which to me is criminal, notwithstanding the fact the decision was made by a general of the United States Army, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is going out to Columbus next Monday and Tuesday to investigate, because they think something smells pretty bad.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am glad to hear that the Senate is to make an investigation. I think it would be a good thing if some committee of the House were to go out there and take a look at this situation also.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This has nothing to do with the sale or disposition of the Lustron Co., but the gentleman may recall that the RFC refused a loan to the Waltham Watch Co., a loan which would have kept that plant in operation and enabled it to fill Government orders for precision instruments which are so vitally needed in our national defense, and also to prevent a great industry from being killed.

Mr. SUTTON. The trouble is they did not have Merle Young on their side or Rex Jacobs.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What the gentlewoman from Massachusetts states is true. The thing I am interested in at this point is not trying to dig up all the past errors of the RFC; I am just interested in trying to investigate and prevent the destruction of $15,500,000 worth of machinery that the taxpayers paid for that is sitting there in Columbus idle now; another arm of this bureaucracy proposes to destroy it. One arm of the bureaucracy created it, another now wishes to destroy it.

I know that the Congress and the individual Members of the Congress do not have time to check every one of these stupendous projects which are being undertaken, but I think when one is brought to our attention that we might do something about it and it might make an example and might, to use a cliche, put the fear of God into the hearts of some of the bureaucrats downtown, and make them think twice before they get to issuing these mandatory orders: "Do this; do that" without any regard to the amount of money involved or the people who will have to pay for it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It all fits into the same picture. The Waltham Watch Co. is now back in operation making precision instruments, but only after having wasted a lot of precious time. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from Report No. 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, an excerpt from the January 2, 1951, daily statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, quotations from the February 4, 1951, issue of the Washington Sunday Star, and perhaps two or three other quotations I may wish to include.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, when General Eisenhower made his report to the Members of the House last Thursday, among other things he said:

> The very problems involved in the very expression "defense of the freeworld" are so vast and so complex that no man could hope in a lifetime of study and reflection to solve them all. He can certainly not be sure of the accuracy of his conclusions.
>
> The next assumption I would like to make is that we are concerned not only with the protection of our territories, of our rights, of our privileges, but we are also concerned with the defense of a way of life. Our own way of life has certain factors that must persist if that way of life itself is to persist, for example, the freedom of the individual, his political freedom, his freedom of worship, and that he will have an economy based upon free enterprise. In other words, our system must remain solvent, as we attempt a solution of this great problem of security. Else we have lost the battle from within that we are trying to win from without.
>
> Now, military defense is made up of many things. The things that defend or that act for it on the field of battle are many and varied and as complex as the Nation itself. The fighting forces are but the cutting edge of a very great machine. The inspiration and the power which we find in the hearts of citizens and all of the various mechanisms that are necessary are represented in our investment capacity, our economic processes, and so on, so that when we talk about defending the free world, we are not merely talking about the divisions and groups and battleships and planes. We are talking about what is in our hearts, what we understand with our heads, and what we are going to do as a body.
>
> As I said a moment ago, military strength is made up of various things, of which the fighting forces are merely the cutting edge. One of the greatest factors in this whole thing is morale, and, ladies and gentlemen, almost the rest of my talk will be made up, directly or indirectly, in discussions of this question of morale; because morale involves understanding, it involves heart, it involves courage, fortitude, basic purpose.

MUST ACCEPT DISADVANTAGE

> We must accept, as we must always accept, the disadvantage, militarily, internationally, that goes with peaceful intent and defensive purpose only. Any aggressor picks a day on which he intends to strike, and he builds everything to that point. We have to devise a scheme that we can support if necessary over the next 20 years, 30 years, whatever may be the time necessary, as long as the threat, the announced threat of aggression remains in the world, and that means since we must be ready at any time, one of the important times is today, and from there on.

FINANCING BIG CONSIDERATION

> I believe that properly adjusted to this purpose of ours, the purpose of peace and security, is our ability to carry it forward without insolvency for year after year. I believe that within those limits we must now go to the production of equipment exactly as if we were preparing for an emergency and war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed with the general's repeated reference to the question of solvency and insolvency. Undoubtedly, the general has some big question in his mind as to how this undertaking is to be financed and whether or not we can do the job of financing and still retain an economy based upon free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, when we entered World War I we faced a Federal debt of less than $1,500,000,000. When we entered World War II this debt was about $49,000,000,000 and now as we begin the operations under what might be termed World War III we have a Federal debt of about $257,000,000,000. These are very fundamental facts in the light of what the general has reported to us.

INSURED BANK HOLDINGS OF FEDERAL SECURITY

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation report No. 33, page 9, shows that insured banks on June 30, 1950, held $72,553,872,000 of the United States Government obligations, direct and guaranteed. That is a fundamental fact, at this particular hour, we cannot ignore.

TREASURY NONMARKETABLE OBLIGATION

January 2, 1951, the Treasury had outstanding nonmarketable obligations in the form of Treasury savings notes, United States savings bonds series D, E, F, and G, and depositary bonds, and Armed Forces leave bonds and Treasury bonds, investment series, totaling some $68,124,937,281.74. The amount of series E bonds alone outstanding January 2 amounted to $34,546,168,368.23. During the period January to December 20, 1950, the sales of series E bonds by the Treasury amounted to about $3,500,000,000 plus, with cash redemptions of those bonds by the people of $3,800,000,000. In the face of all the selling camapign pressure the people redeemed small savings bonds issues during the year 1950 of about $1,250,000,000 in excess of sales. In the years 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 the Treasury will face a super task in refunding maturing series E bonds alone. Here are the figures taken from the January 2, 1951, Treasury statement:

1952	$3,873,457,573.12
1953	5,361,717,550.00
1954	5,923,756,771.66
1955	4,704,723,804.41

And with the years 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 running from $2,400,000,000 up to $2,800,000,000 annually. Of course there will be many other maturities in the marketable issues which will not be met through payment because the tax dollars will not be there to meet the maturities. This simply means more and more refunding operations faced by the Treasury.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the general referred to "talking about what is in our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hearts, what we understand with our heads, and what we are going to do as a body," he must have somewhat had in mind this financing problem and the solvency of our financial system.

On or about the 18th of January last, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder appeared before a group in New York City and made some observations pertaining to the interest rate to govern on refunding operations and such new issues as may be necessary due to the deficit financing of the Treasury. Secretary Snyder certainly left the country to understand the financing would be made within the pattern of a 2½-percent rate, and of course his statements carried the implication there would be no increase (within the near future) in the short-term rates. He likewise announced that the holders of the near maturing series E bonds would be given the opportunity to automatically extend the time of the maturing bond for another 2 years, and this would be equivalent to a 20-year bond at an interest rate of about, say, 2.9 percent per annum.

I understand that the Committee on Ways and Means will have a bill on the floor of the House this week authorizing that transaction.

This is a ridiculously low rate for such a transaction, especially with the buying power of the dollar continually declining. But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Snyder, among other things, said:

> In the firm belief, after long consideration, that the 2½-percent long-term rate is fair and equitable to the investor, and that market stability is essential, the Treasury Department has concluded, after a joint conference with President Truman and Chairman McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, that the refunding and new money issues will be financed with the pattern of that rate.

At the time I wondered about the absolute accuracy of the Secretary's statement insofar as it involved Chairman McCabe of the so-called independent Federal Reserve Board. For too many years, Mr. Speaker, the good people of this country have been subjected to the suicidal economic or financial war or feud running between Secretary Snyder, and backed by President Truman, and the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System.

The fight now is in the open. President Truman has really put the silk hat on this contest between the two agencies in sending his now famous letter on this subject to Chairman McCabe of the Board. By reason of what Secretary Snyder said at the New York meeting which misled many to believe the entire Board was in agreement with the Treasury on interest rates on refunding and new issues, plus what the President said in his letter to Chairman McCabe, and in the light of the actual facts, I am forced to the conclusion a deal was made between the President and the Secretary to accomplish what? Simply to so compromise the Board that the interest rates and the supply of credit and money can be dominated by the political office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, on the front page of yesterday's Sunday Star appears this article:

ECCLES ASTONISHED BY TRUMAN STAND ON INTEREST RATE POLICY—DISPUTES ASSUMPTION THAT BOARD SUPPORTS TREASURY POSITION

An apparent attempt by President Truman to smooth over Treasury and Federal Reserve Board differences in the Federal interest rate policy backfired yesterday and at least one Board member threatened to resign.

The dispute became deeper and more bitter when Marriner S. Eccles, a member and former chairman, declared he was astonished by a Presidential letter indicating that the Board sided completely with the Treasury's stand for low interest rates on Government obligations.

He disclosed a record of a White House meeting at which President Truman last Wednesday talked with the Board's Open Market Committee. The President, in a letter to Board Chairman Thomas B. McCabe, said he had assurance that the agency would fully support the Treasury defense financing program, both as to refunding and new issues.

The record stated that the President made no mention of recent differences of opinion with the Treasury. It also contained no direct references to Treasury defense financing programs both as to refunding and new issues.

At the root of the controversy between the Treasury and Board officials are two major questions:

Is the Federal Reserve System, created by Congress in 1913 as an independent agency to control the credit structure being dominated by the administration and the Treasury?

Does the Treasury's so-called easy money policy of low interest rates add to inflation?

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has defended that policy. He warned recently that an increase of as much as one-half of 1 percent in the average rate of interest on outstanding Treasury obligations would boost debt carrying charges by $1,500,000,000 a year.

DOUGLAS IS FOE OF POLICY

That policy is disputed not only by some Board members but also by some influential Members of Congress, notably Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of a joint economic committee group that last year looked into the problem. Senator DOUGLAS reportedly will lead a congressional drive against what he has called the Treasury's devotion to low-interest rates that will ultimately cost the Government and taxpayers far more in higher prices for goods and services.

Mr. Eccles, in disclosing a record of what took place at the White House meeting, explained that the committee, made up of the seven Board members and presidents of Federal Reserve banks in five metropolitan centers, agreed on the record. He added, however, that:

"Any other comment would be superfluous. I am giving you this solely on my own responsibility and without the knowledge of other members of the committee. It is most unfortunate that this vitally important matter of monetary and credit control which Congress has placed in the Federal Reserve System has been raised in a manner which only needlessly adds to the confusion."

M'CABE CONFERS WITH TRUMAN

Following a notation that Chairman McCabe had met with Mr. Truman in the President's office shortly before the meeting with the committee in the Cabinet room, the record continued:

"The President stated that during the past few weeks he had met with many groups in Government because he wanted them to know the seriousness of the present emergency and to ask for their full assistance and cooperation. He stated that the present emergency is the greatest this country has ever faced, including the two World Wars and all the preceding wars.

"The President emphasized that we must combat Communist influence on many fronts. He said one way to do this is to maintain confidence in the Government's credit and in Government securities. He felt that if people lose confidence in Government securities all we hope to gain from our military mobilization, and war if need be, might be jeopardized. He recalled his wartime experience when he bought Liberty bonds out of his soldier's pay. When he returned from France and had to sell his bonds to buy clothes and other civilian things, he got only $80 or a little more for his hundred-dollar bonds and later they were run up to $125. He said he did not want the people who hold our bonds now to have done to them what was done to him.

"He stated that most politicians would not ask for higher taxes prior to election but that he had vetoed a reduction in taxes before election and won anyway. If it had not been for that irresponsible reduction in taxes, he said, the Federal budget would have been in balance all these years. He stated that he wanted to levy all the taxes necessary to pay the cost of the defense effort, which, he felt, would be between one hundred and one hundred and twenty billion dollars over the next few years. He stated that he had just met with the congressional leaders and asked for $16,500,000,000 in taxes and that he expected to get this in two bites—a quick tax bill yielding about ten billion and the other six and a half billion to come after more careful study. He wanted us to understand that he is doing all he can on the tax front to combat inflation.

"The President gave each member of the committee a copy of The Federal Budget in Brief. He expressed the opinion that the budget had been pared to an irreducible minimum. He said that he had participated in the preparation of 16 budgets and felt he was competent to judge and understand them. Maybe something could be cut out, but it would make a hole in the defense effort and that he would not do.

"The President said he felt we had done a good job and wanted us to continue to do a good job in maintaining the financial structure of the country. He further stated that he had had a number of conferences with our chairman but this was his first opportunity to meet and talk with the entire committee. He made no mention of recent differences of opinion with the Treasury."

COMMITTEE WORK PRAISED

"Chairman McCabe thanked the President for receiving us and indicated that we all share his concern for the maintenance of the Government credit. He stated that although the support of the Government bond market was something in the nature of an extra-curricular activity for the Federal Open Market Committee, it had performed this service for the past 9 years or more and had done a very good job. He stated that the committee had always carefully weighed its responsibilities to the Government and to the general economy as well and that these are statutory responsibilities which it could not assign, if it would.

"The President interjected that he was familiar with that, but wanted the committee to continue its good work during the defense period. He emphasized that he was speaking of the defense period only.

"Chairman McCabe referred to the fact that in the last few days the Government bond market had gone up a few thirty-seconds and then had come down a few thirty-seconds, which he considered to be proper market operational technique. The President said he would not undertake to discuss

details of that kind, that he was principally concerned with maintaining the confidence of the public in Government securities as one way of presenting a unified front against communism. He did not indicate exactly the details of what he had in mind, but he reiterated that we should do everything possible to maintain confidence in the Government securities market. The Chairman outlined concisely some of the responsibilities with which we were charged, principally to promote stability in the economy by regulating the volume, cost, and availability of money, keeping in mind at all times the best interests of the whole economy. The Chairman turned to the members of the Federal Open Market Committee and said the President could depend on everyone in the group to do what they could to protect the Government credit."

DIFFERENCES EXPECTED

"Chairman McCabe stated that with a group of men such as those composing the Federal Open Market Committee there would, of course, be differences of opinion as to just how the best results could be obtained. The President nodded, indicating that he understood this. The Chairman suggested the following procedure—that we consult frequently with the Secretary of the Treasury, giving him our views at all times and presenting our point of view strongly, and that by every means possible we try to reach an agreement. If this could not be accomplished, he (the Chairman) would like to discuss the matter with the President. The President said this was entirely satisfactory and closed the meeting on the same note as it was opened, namely, that he wanted us to do everything possible to maintain confidence in the credit of the Government and in the Government securities market and to support the President of the United States in achieving this end.

"The Chairman stated at the end of the meeting that he presumed that any statement concerning this meeting would be made by the President. The President said he would have no objection to our making a statement and thought that it might be a good thing. The Chairman then asked him what would be the general nature of the statement, and he said it can be said that we discussed the general emergency situation, the defense effort, budget and taxes, and that he had stressed the need for public confidence in the Government's credit. He said further that he would be talking to the press the next morning and that he would be prepared to answer questions that might be raised. Since the President indicated that he would be discussing it with the press, the Chairman said he felt it would be best for us not to issue any statement to the press at this time. The President did not seem particularly concerned about whether or not a statement was issued. The press conference scheduled for the following morning was canceled because of General Eisenhower's appearance at the Capitol."

TRUMAN LETTER RELEASED

The record concluded with press association accounts of an announcement Thursday by Presidential Press Secretary Joseph H. Short that the Board had pledged its support to the President to maintain the stability of Government securities as long as the emergency lasts. Mr. Short was quoted as saying the announcement was "to quiet those rumors" of differences of opinion between the Treasury and the Board.

The White House late Friday gave out the text of President Truman's letter to Chairman McCabe.

Expressing thanks to the Board and committee for "their expression of full cooperation," the letter stated:

"Your assurance that you would fully support the Treasury defense financing program, both as to refunding and new issues, is of vital importance to me. As I understand it, I have your full assurance that the market on Government securities will be stabilized and maintained at present levels in order to assure the successful financing requirements and to establish in the minds of the people confidence concerning Government credit."

Based on the facts and on what has now appeared in the paper, and on Mr. Eccles' testimony before the Senate committee, I repeat that I think a deal was made between the Secretary of the Treasury and the President. When Mr. Eccles appeared before the Senate committee, among other things, he said this:

People hold an unparalleled amount of liquid assets in the form of bank deposits, Government bonds, equity in insurance policies, building and loan shares, and other forms. Potentialities for inflation are now tremendous. It would be impossible to prevent inflation under these conditions without at least balancing the Federal budget. As inflation proceeds, the desire increases to convert liquid assets into money and then into goods and services.

That is the reason people are running away from the ownership of dollars to the ownership of things, because they do not have confidence in the constant buying power of the dollar, simply because the administration continues to proceed with policies which generate the inflationary forces instead of taking steps which will destroy those forces.

This is what is known as the flight from the dollar. Thus you can have an inflation even if all Federal deficit financing is done outside the banks.

He further said:

The only way to stop access to Federal Reserve funds is by withdrawing Federal Reserve support from the Government securities market and penalizing borrowing by the member banks from the Federal Reserve banks. As long as the Federal Reserve is required to buy Government securities at the will of the market for the purpose of defending a fixed pattern of interest rates established by the Treasury, it must stand ready to create new bank reserves in unlimited amount. This policy makes the entire banking system, through the action of the Federal Reserve System, an engine of inflation.

Nobody knows that any better than Secretary Snyder. I will not say the same of Mr. Truman, because I do not think he knows much more about technical banking, generally speaking, than a lot of high-school boys who have studied the subject some in our high-school system. This whole question is technical and difficult and on it he has not specialized. He leaves the matters largely to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Going a step further, Mr. Allan Sproul, who is one of the top men in the Federal Reserve banking picture, had this to say, and all in reference to the anouncement of the Secretary:

I am afraid that the announced debt management policy would lead us directly or indirectly into too much financing by the banks, if we had to do any substantial amount of deficit financing.

Going further, Mr. Sproul said:

And even in terms of possible refunding of bank-held debt, by sale of long-term obligations to nonbank investors who temporarily find other outlets for funds lacking, it would have shortcomings. It runs the risk of falling short of attracting willing nonbank investors in the first instance, and of creating reluctant holders of Government securities for the longer run. We must have learned from our experience during and following the last war, with respect to market bonds, and more recently since the Korean fighting started, with respect to savings bonds, that these are real risks. If these risks were realized, they would mean that too much of our financing would sooner or later be done with bank credit based on the ready availability of Federal Reserve credit. And when that credit began to express itself in inflationary price advances, we would again find our powers to control the inflationary brew greatly impeded by the needs of a Government security market requiring extended periods of extraordinary support.

Remember I gave you the figures of the bonds held by the banks in excess of $72,000,000,000 last June 30. The job is to keep this new financing out of the bank portfolios. How can you do that? If you want the people to buy them, how can you have the people buy them other than by an interest rate which will cause the people to put their money into Government bonds on a long-term basis, and then protect the buying power of the dollar so that if you buy a 20-year bond today, when it matures and you cash it in you will have the same buying power that you put into the bond at the time you bought it. The gentleman from Texas, as he probably will state later on today, and as he stated before—and this is no criticism of him because these are his views—he is entitled to his views the same as I am entitled to my views—as I say the gentleman from Texas will probably state that his position is that a rate high enough to induce you to buy long-term Government bonds and keep the bonds out of the banks will run up the cost of carrying the debt. Of course it would. But the great Creator of the universe certainly knows that that type of operation would save our people literally billions of dollars which they are now losing by reason of the inflationary forces. As the Government goes out to buy 150 or 200 or 500 billion dollars' worth of goods for defense purposes, it would save the Government of the United States, namely, the taxpayers of this country, additional billions of dollars by preventing the inflationary forces from running against those purchase orders to be placed by the Government. So he who advocates a low interest rate on a great Federal debt simply so that you can stand up and say that the faith and credit of the Government was never so high as it is today as a result of the rigged low-interest rate which the Treasury is now advocating and thus forcing the issues into the bank portfolios instead of into the hands of the people—I say that he who advocates such a philosophy is advocating a fallacy and that time that has passed and time yet to come will prove it to be a fallacy, because it is literally unsound to go upon such a theory, when you are in a country such as ours with a private enterprise system, to which General Eisenhower referred. Upon what basis can you advocate soundly a philosophy which says to the citizen, "Here, you buy Government bonds. You put in $1,000 today that will buy us $1,000 worth of goods and 15 or 20 years from now I will hand you back $1,000 that will only buy $400

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

worth of goods." That citizen has lost the interest on his money. He has lost $600, as you and I have lost on these bonds that we bought in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941; some of which bonds have matured, and others are about to mature. We have lost on that investment. The President made a statement to the 10 members of the open market committee at the White House the other day. He called them in and discussed this very subject, at which time he said nothing to those 10 men about approving this 2½-percent rate; but in a letter which he sent out, it leaves the inference before the people of the country to the effect that they okayed that rate, and he sends this letter over there to Chairman McCabe in such a manner as to tie him into the agreement when the Board of Governors and the open market committee made no such agreement insofar as I can ascertain from those who deal with this subject from day to day and who generally are well informed on what transpires in such close dealing.

Personally I think that is sheer intellectual dishonesty which should not be practiced at a time when we are expecting our people to carry a $269,000,000,000 debt and put $60,000,000,000 into the tax box on the theory that that is going to prevent inflation by balancing the budget, when you know as well as we all know anything that the inflationary forces can continue to run after the budget is balanced, and through the sales of these refunding issues to the portfolios of the commercial banks instead of to our people. Too much of the debt structure of $256,000,000,000 is in short term paper, and too much held by banks. It should be shifted from banks to the people themselves and the way to do this is increase the interest rate and stabilize the dollar.

For 5 or 6 years I sat on the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and argued with Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau against this very type of debt structure which he built under the previous administration on the ground that was the easy way to do it and of course he and his chief, Mr. Roosevelt, was all the time inflating prices and running down the buying power of the savings of the people and making the citizens feel they were growing rich by reason of the increased supply of money and cheap credit.

Mr. Speaker, the President took occasion to point out to the Open Market Committee his experience upon his return from World War I and how he sold bonds at $80 which cost him $100 and went on to say in substance that he did not want people who hold bonds now have done to them what was done to him. Well. Is President Truman so uninformed on what his inflationary policy has done to our people? If you hold any savings bonds which you purchased in 1937 or 1938 or 1939 or 1940 and all of which have matured, just how much could you buy with your returned investment plus the interest thereon—yes, I say plus the interest—as compared to what you could buy with just your investment at the time you bought those bonds? This is the hard cold fact Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder face. This attitude and knowledge of the people of what has happened, what they have felt, what they have experienced, is real. They know that as they collect on a savings bond today which has matured and which they purchased about 10 years ago that what they have lost due to inflation is about 150 percent of what Mr. Truman is griping about and what he lost on his transaction. I repeat that Mr. Truman's philosophy on this inflation and interest rate question is fallacious and destructive to our people.

There are those who would have profits cut and taxable income reduced and at a time the President calls for more than $60,000,000,000 for the tax box on an annual basis. If we are to pay these bills there must be income—big income—that can be taxed: Make no mistake about that. But unless Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder can stabilize the buying power of the dollar and stop their inflationary forces they will have more trouble than at present. Let the full light of truth on this matter of high finance come to our people if you want them to purchase tens of billions of dollars of Federal securities annually and carry a debt aggregating from two hundred and fifty-six to three hundred billion dollars or more. If the 20- to 30-year program of General Eisenhower is to be consummated, let me say, Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary for someone to do things other than make sales talks to the people. Some bad policies will have to be changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before delivering the address I have prepared on another subject, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] one question in respect to the speech he just delivered, which I admit is extremely important and informative.

As I understand it, the gentleman believes the interest rates on these bond issues should be in sufficient amount so that the people of the country will want to buy them as an investment; in other words, make them sufficiently attractive so that the people will invest in Government bonds as they would any other securities and reduce spending to that extent, rather than have the banks to invest so much of their funds in them. Is that right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I make myself perfectly clear. A low interest rate, short-term policy, has been followed by previous Secretaries of the Treasury, and both Presidents in the White House, which substantially drove the Federal debt into the portfolios of the banks. That was almost equivalent to sheer printing-press money. About the only difference was the psychological influence on the people, because as those bonds went into the bank they expanded the supply of money and provided the inflationary force.

Now, here we are coming around to the maturing of nonmarketable securities. The buying power of the dollar, through inflation, has substantially decreased, and citizen after citizen who holds a bond that matures gets his money, and instead of going back into the bond market, as evidenced by what happened last year, says, "Well, I am going to take this money and go and buy some goods and services, because if I buy another bond, it will drop another 20 or 30 percent in value."

Now, why does the bank take it? The bank is willing to take it on the low interest rate, and thus you engineer more inflation. My position is to pay a rate of interest sufficiently high to the citizen so that he will buy these long-term bonds—not short-term bonds—hold them to maturity, and thus keep them out of the banks and thus destroy the inflationary force, and put the dollar on a stabilized buying basis. I am willing to pay my share of the taxes incident to that increased burden of carrying the public debt by reason of the higher rate of interest, and I will wager dollars to doughnuts you can get 75,000,000 other people in the United States to do the same thing if they understand what is really going on right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his views.

REPORT OF HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have recently received a letter from the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, who outlined the savings which have been accomplished by the General Accounting Office in its internal operations since April 1946.

It is a rare thing, indeed, for Members of Congress to receive letters from the heads of Government departments which demonstrate actual achievements in the field of Government economy and reducing nonessential Federal expenditures.

I wish to take this opportunity to call attention to Comptroller General Warren's excellent record and compliment him on his activities, not only as head of the important General Accounting Office, but also as an able and conscientious administrator.

We need in our Government more officials of the high caliber and conscientious devotion to duty such as the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren.

I have reason to believe that Mr. Warren's letter was too conservative in taking credit for savings and reductions of nonessential Federal spending. I know personally of many instances in which the General Accounting Office has brought about great reductions in Government spending and has saved our Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee called upon the General Accounting Office to assist in an investigation of

mismanagement and maladministration of the Army Finance Center, St. Louis, Mo. In addition to uncovering a multitude of discrepancies and examples of maladministration, the General Accounting Office is recovering Federal funds improperly spent by the Army Finance Center at the rate of over $100,000 a month. The way of a Government administrator who seeks to save Federal funds is not easy. The Department of the Army fought vigorously the activities of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee as well as the General Accounting Office in our mutual endeavor to improve the operations of the Army Finance Center.

Upon other occasions the General Accounting Office, under authority of section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, has cooperated with the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Appropriations Committees and the Committees on Expenditures in Executive Agencies, to secure a more efficient and more economically conducted Government operation.

During the Eightieth Congress when I had the honor of being Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee I discussed with Comptroller General Warren the possibility of conducting studies of various operations in the postal service to determine whether such services could be conducted more efficiently with a reduction in the large postal deficit. The General Accounting Office cooperated with our Committee and made an excellent study of the post offices at Philadelphia and Los Angeles. Upon the basis of these studies, the Hoover Commission formulated many of its recommendations which have been carried out by the Congress and the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, if I had more time I would cite hundreds of examples wherein the General Accounting Office, under the able leadership of Hon. Lindsay Warren, has produced a substantial savings in Federal funds in almost every department and agency in the Government. The only criticism I have heard of the Comptroller General has been by uninformed and ill-advised persons who are motivated by a selfish or personal desire for the continuation of some nonessential Federal expenditures. The Comptroller General is assisted by a most capable staff who are loyal to the Comptroller General and to the policies and principles for which he stands.

In reducing the staff of the General Accounting Office from 14,904 in April, 1946, to 7,063 employees in January, 1951, I trust the Comptroller General has not been handicapped in the performance of his important duties and responsibilities. I sincerely hope that the General Accounting Office will be able to carry on its excellent and constructive work which is so important during this period when Government expenditures have reached a new peacetime high.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Comptroller General has a function which is of great importance today. He is authorized to conduct investigations into the manner in which Government expenditures are being made and to report to the Congress with respect to these matters. I earnestly hope that the Comptroller General will continue to exercise his responsibility in this field as he has in the past and that the Congress will appropriate him sufficient funds to carry out this important activity.

In his letter to the Members of Congress, Comptroller General Warren made the following observation:

> It is essential to our economic survival not only that the national defense be strengthened, but that it be done as effectively and economically as possible. On this score, the GAO bids fair to make a real contribution. We will not only audit defense spending, but will also concentrate to seek out excesses, waste, and extravagances in the defense program. At the same time, we will continue to keep a watchful eye on civilian spending to ferret out those extravagances and frills which our country should not and cannot now endure.

I am certain the great majority of the American people will support Mr. Warren in his efforts to bring about savings and reductions of nonessential Federal spending. The heads of all agencies in our Government ought to scrutinize the situation with respect to their particular activities and make sure that expenditures be made on the basis of absolute need and that manpower be utilized in such manner as to bring about the highest efficiency and the most productivity possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TRYING TO FORCE AN INCREASE OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], for whom I have a very high regard. I have known the gentleman from Michigan for a long time. I have always had a high regard for him. He is one of the most studious Members of this body. I do not know of any Member of this House, since I have been here 22 years, who has worked harder than FRED CRAWFORD has worked. I will be a witness for him any time if he were ever to need one, and I am sure he never will, as to his honesty, sincerity of purpose, and his desire at all times to do something in the interest of our country.

I am not going to take direct issue with him on all of the things he said, because in his talk he did not make his views sufficiently clear to me and on one or more I agree with him.

One thing in particular that I have in mind is about interest rates to individuals. He makes a very fine argument in favor of an interest rate that will cause the individual to invest his money in Government bonds, although the interest rate is higher than our going rate at this time. Unfortunately for that argument, though, we do not need to increase our rates to get individuals to buy our bonds; they are buying all that we issue; so that is not needed. The question as I see it is between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury through interest rates that will be paid to banks.

The interest rates that have been compelled the last year or two by the Federal Reserve Board which, of course, dominates the Open Markets Committee because the Board constitutes 7 members of the 12 on the Open Markets Committee—the interest rates have increased from three-eighths percent for short-term securities to 1.375 percent; these interest rates have increased over 300 percent. To individuals? No; to banks. So the policy of the Federal Reserve Board has been to make it more profitable to those institutions that do not need and are not entitled to that extra profit at this time on Government securities. Of all the times in history, the banks of our country today are enjoying the greatest prosperity they have ever enjoyed. It has not been long since I have been a Member of this House when the banks were paying four and five hundred million dollars a year interest on demand deposits. We passed in this body what was known as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act and required a small assessment from the banks for that guaranty up to $5,000 for each depositor or customer.

The banks said: "We need a saving somewhere in order to pay that money," which would cost them about $100,000,000 a year, although it finally reached about $130,000,000 a year. In conference a little phrase was written into the law which made it illegal, if you please, unlawful—the kind of regimentation the people like if it benefits them—for the banks to pay interest on demand deposits. That saved them hundreds of millions a year and they would be paying out today, were it not for that law, a billion dollars a year. We put it in the law. I believe the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me on that. All right; we permit them to withhold that interest from the demand depositors to pay for the guaranty of their deposits up to $5,000. Now they have paid about $125,000,000 a year that way to the FDIC, but the banks have been saved a billion dollars a year; and last session we made it easier for them to put up that money. They have in the past been given a back log of Government credit of $3,000,000,000 upon which they could always rely, and reduced their assessments. So we have been pretty good to the banks; they do not need this now, not at all. But during the last year we have arbitrarily—that is the Federal Reserve Board—has arbitrarily forced up interest rates from three-eighths of 1 percent to 1.375 percent on short-term paper, or more than 300 percent. An attempt is now being made to increase the 2½ percent rate. Does the demand come from the people? No. Who does it come from? It comes from the banks including the Federal Reserve banks.

The Government is good to the banks in another way. Let us assume a groceryman who has 7 cans of peas up there on his shelf. If he had to buy only 1 of the 7 cans and when he made a nickel profit on that can, that nickel would be on the investment he made. Take the other 7 cans that Uncle Sam had bought for him, and in which he had no investment at all; he makes a nickel apiece on all those, the groceryman would be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in a pretty good condition. That is exactly what the banks do. They make a loan of $1 that they actually own; then they extend the credit of the Nation on $6 more. That is Uncle Sam's credit. That is your credit and mine that they are using. That is a mortgage upon the homes of the people of this country, on business and our incomes. The Federal Reserve System uses that absolutely free.

During the last few years the Federal Reserve Board has maneuvered itself into a position of what the members consider, I am sure, to be a position of great security. When the Federal Reserve Act was passed and became law on December 23, 1913, it provided that somebody had to be on there to represent the people—the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury—but when our national debt was low, when nobody was looking, so to speak, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency were taken off. We now have seven members left, none of whom are responsible to the people directly. They are certainly not elected by the people and they are certainly not responsible to anyone who is elected by the people. They are separate and distinct from any other agency of the Government. They consider themselves independent and their arrogance in this particular case demonstrates to me they are ready to assert their independence which they have gotten in amendments to the law that came through a phrase here and a sentence there when nobody was looking. So I think it is about time to bring the whole thing out into the open. I think we ought to have a fair and a complete investigation of the Federal Reserve System. Let us go behind that iron curtain.

A great deal has been said about the General Accounting Office, but the General Accounting Office has never audited their books. What will their books contain? They will show the use and possibly the abuse of Government credit.

The money that we have today, the only money upon which we rely for business, that keeps us from resorting to barter, is in the form of Federal Reserve notes. That is your money. What does a Federal Reserve note say? A Federal Reserve note does not say that the Federal Reserve bank that issues it will pay to the bearer upon demand so much money. It does not say that the Federal Reserve System will pay it or that the Federal Reserve Board will guarantee the money. The Federal Reserve money, and the only actual expanding money we have today, says that the United States Government will pay to bearer upon demand $20 or whatever the amount happens to be. The Government promises to pay it.

Who issues it? Why, the privately owned Federal Reserve banking system. Did you think we would come to that in this country? Who else can issue money? Can the Treasury issue money? Not a penny—not a dime. Can the Comptroller of the Currency issue money? Not a penny—not a dime. The issuance of money is confined strictly and solely to the Federal Reserve System. It is a blank mortgage upon all of the property of all of the people and upon their income and everything they make. And they issue them at the Federal Reserve banks free of charge. They pay the cost of printing, it is claimed, and possibly they do, which, of course, is too insignificant to mention, about 30 cents per $1,000.

All right. Now, these Federal Reserve banks in using that Government credit free make a lot of money. It goes into the funds of the banks. We used to have a law that 90 percent of those profits would go into the United States Treasury for the use of the Government's credit free. While Members of the Congress were not looking and without much, if any debate in either chamber, the House or the Senate, that also was repealed. There is no law now upon the statute books compelling them to pay their excess profits into the Treasury. Wise men, as they are, and knowing how vulnerable they must be, they have discreetly decided that they should pay approximately 90 percent into the Treasury anyway, which they have done the last 2 years. But, there is no law compelling them to do it. And, before they do it, what do they deduct? You know, the deducts always come in for their share. Sometimes the deducts get more than anybody else gets. So, before they make this calculation as to the net profit they have certain expenses they can charge. No one supervises or audits these expenses. That is before you get down to the net profits. So, here we have what a critic could call a politburo, in our financial system, or a Kremlin, in charge of our financial system, that is using our Government credit as they want to use it. They are not audited by the General Accounting Office; no report on them. Of course a report to Congress usually is made, but you know how they are made rather general.

INVESTIGATIONS NEEDED

So, I think it is time for a congressional committee to go into this great Federal reserve system and see what makes it tick in the way and manner it is ticking today, which I think is against the public interest.

President Truman, yes, as Commander in Chief, asked the members of the Federal Reserve Board and the open markets committee, including, of course these five presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, to come to see him. Why? To help win the war, in the interest of national defense. What did he ask them to do? "During this defense period, gentlemen, I hope you help me keep the Government credit stabilized." Here is what he said, "The President would like to depend on everyone as a group to do what you can to protect the Government's credit." Is that asking too much of them? That is all the President asked. And, they promised it as they should. Then the President's secretary authorized this statement: "Washington, AP. The Federal Reserve Board has pledged the support to President Truman to maintain the stability of Government securities as long as the emergency lasts." They did. Do they dispute that they did? I am sure not one of them will refuse to go along in a case like that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the purpose of that was to stabilize the price of Government bonds in the market which has been going on since December 31, 1941, and Mr. Eccles himself, as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, assured a stable market in Government bonds in a public statement he made at that time, to prevent bonds going down to 82, like they did after World War I, and the holder forced to sell them. We know what happened then. They were purchased by certain interests, and they sold them as high as $115 to $125 some time later.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Truman had personal experience with that. He was in World War I. He bought bonds, just as we did, and deductions were made from our pay each month to pay for those bonds. When the boys came back in 1918 and 1919 after the war, some of them were compelled to sell the bonds for as low as $80, and Mr. Truman did himself. They were Government bonds, bonds of the United States, that were worth 100 cents on the dollar. The people who bought them used the Government's credit to hold them until they could get $125 for them.

I knew of isolated cases back in remote sections of the country where these swindlers would go out and buy the bonds for as low as 74 cents on the dollar, using the Government's credit to buy those bonds and swindling the veterans out of them.

Mr. Truman wants to stop that. I want to stop it. When the financing bill was before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1941, I appeared before that committee and pleaded with them, "Whatever you do, gentlemen, as members of this great Committee on Ways and Means, do not let a situation like that occur in this country again. It is scandalous, it is disgraceful."

I have not looked it up, but I think you will find in the reports that we were promised that the American people would never again be forced to go through such swindles as that and through such scandalous situations. This is an attempt by the Federal Reserve Board, whether intended or not, to restore the power to swindlers to do more racketeering like that on the American people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not hold any brief for the banks, but suppose the Government asks for the floating of a loan of say a billion dollars within the rather near future, at a low-interest rate, as the gentleman advocates, even lower than the last interest rate; how does the gentleman propose to float that loan?

Mr. PATMAN. We will not have any trouble floating it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How would you do it?

Mr. PATMAN. Just as we have always done it. We are doing it every day. The people in the country today have

confidence in their Government. They have more reason to have confidence in their Government than they ever had before. More people own their homes, own their farms, have good jobs, have automobiles, and are enjoying more of the comforts and even the luxuries of life than ever before in history. They have reason to have confidence in their Government that gave them these things.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But who would buy the bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. The individuals and the banks and the insurance companies. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that we should not sell the bonds to the banks. That is just like creating money on the books of the banks. They are not out 1 penny for those bonds. It is creating money, it is inflationary. The gentleman from Michigan is exactly correct. It should not be permitted. But this increased interest rate deal is not restricted to individuals. The banks will be the principal beneficiaries, and they are not entitled to it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We read in the newspapers that the individuals are selling bonds presently and that they have been reinvesting their money in other securities and other investments.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. The Federal Reserve Board's action will shake the confidence of the people, and anything is likely to happen. If the Federal Reserve Board does not get in line and obligate itself to help win this war, just like the President and Congress and everybody else, you are likely to shake the people's confidence more, and more people are liable to sell bonds. This thing is confidence-shaking. The Federal Reserve Board should certainly be ashamed of itself to take issue with the President of the United States in a national emergency like this, and at a time when we are trying to stabilize prices, to fix prices on everything, commodities, products, salaries, and wages. They want to be exempt and they want to increase the interest rate another 50 percent or more.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for four additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it was in the President's statement to the open-market committee when they met there at the White House the other day where he said something about his war experience and the fact that after returning from the service he sold bonds as low as 80 cents on the dollar as if that was a considerable burden to him. I think the gentleman from Texas will agree with me that the facts are that the good people of this country who purchased savings bonds in the late thirties, which bonds have matured in the last 2 or 3 years, and especially during the last year lost in the buying power of the dollars invested in those bonds anywhere from 150 percent to 200 percent as compared to the losses which the President refers to having suffered through having to sell bonds at $80 instead of at par. There are two sides to this question and the President might as well admit it because the inflationary forces are destroying the buying power of all the savings of all the people of the United States, whether he likes it or not.

Mr. PATMAN. I join the gentleman in expressing apprehension that any increase in prices, wages, interest rates, and so forth is heading towards inflation. I invited attention to the fact that we are paying half a billion dollars more this year in interest because the Federal Reserve Board compelled the increase in interest rates on short-term securities. Where are we going to get that money from? It would be obtained through deficit financing. Is that helping to fight inflation? No. That is pouring oil on the fire of inflation—that is what it is doing. If you were to permit the Federal Reserve to win this fight, and increase the interest obligation of the Nation by at least $2,000,000,000 more by next year, will that be fighting inflation? Of course not. That is all inflationary. We do not have the money to pay it. It will result in deficit financing again, which will be doubly inflationary.

In conclusion, let me say I read a statement the other day which was very interesting to me. It was made at Beaumont, Tex., on January 10, by Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors. He said the Federal Government did not have the political guts to tax the people enough to pay for the present emergency. Who did he mean when he said, "the Federal Government"? He meant us. He meant the Congress. That is who he meant. I hope we prove Mr. Wilson to be wrong. I am going to vote for the tax bills that are necessary to balance this budget, if they are presented to us. I will vote for taxes that I would never vote for before—taxes that I have always opposed. But I will vote for them if it is necessary to do so. I am not going to hide behind some little insignificant something in the budget and say, "You ought to cut that out, and I am not going to vote for taxes because you will not cut that item out." We have a challenge here today. Now is the time when we should compel the Federal Reserve System, if they do not do it so that we can help win this war and quit giving out these statements against the President who is trying to protect the people. It is time for them to stop it. It is time to balance the budget, and not have any more deficit financing if it can be helped.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

MANAGEMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the very few occasions during my 23 years as a Member of this body that I have ever asked for the privilege of addressing the House under a special order.

In view of the importance of the matter discussed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] with respect to the superindependent body that is accountable to nobody, I am trying to find out what they are independent of; playing such an important part in the life of the people of our country that they claim complete independence from everybody—this creature of something, but responsible to nobody—in view of the importance of this subject, I feel constrained to make some remarks today.

I would like to talk today about a subject which is of direct personal interest to every citizen of our country. It has to do with the management of the Federal debt of this country. There are a great many people who feel that this subject is one which can only be understood by financiers or by specialists in monetary management. A decision relating to the management of the public debt, they feel, can have little bearing on their own personal lives or on their own personal finances.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The public debt is owned by every one of us, whether we actually have in our possession a savings bond, or whether we own Government bonds indirectly—such as the depositors in commercial banks or in mutual savings banks, or as the policyholders in insurance companies. Moreover, the payment of the interest on the public debt affects every one of us. Interest on the public debt this fiscal year will represent more than 10 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government. It will be more than twice as large as the entire projected deficit of the Federal Government for this fiscal year.

It is clear that every person in this room, every taxpayer, and every American citizen is affected by decisions which have to do with interest payments on the public debt. That is why I should like to take a few minutes today to bring to the attention of the people of our country an extremely important announcement recently made with respect to such payments.

The announcement to which I am referring relates to the rate of interest on the long-term securities of the Federal Government. The present return on such securities is 2½ percent per year. The Secretary of the Treasury, as chief fiscal officer of the Government, has recently announced that 2½ percent will continue to be the maximum rate paid on Federal securities throughout the period of national crisis in which we now find ourselves.

As the Members of the Congress are well aware, the Secretary of the Treasury since this Nation was founded has been charged by law with full responsibility for the management of the Nation's finances. The Congress has further provided that every issue of Fed-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

eral securities with a maturity of more than 1 year must be approved by the President of the United States. But no part of the Secretary's responsibilities can be delegated. That is why it is both important and necessary that only the Secretary of the Treasury formulate and announce financial policies which are appropriate for the Federal Government.

The 2½ percent rate now paid on long-term Government securities is not a new rate. It has been in effect for more than 10 years. It was an integral part of our financial system during a period when we financed the most costly war in our history and then made a most rapid and successful return to peacetime business at a high level of activity. During this momentous decade in our history, the 2½ percent rate paid on long-term securities has been the most important single factor in the financial policies adopted by private business throughout the entire country. It is the most important factor in the financial markets where the obligations of private business are bought and sold. It is a key factor in the rates charged by public utilities. It is a key factor in insurance operations. It is a major consideration in the operation of practically all of the Nation's financial institutions. Most of these institutions, it may be noted, have shaped their policies and built their business around that rate. And their business has been better in the past 10 years than ever before.

Most life-insurance companies, for example, have brought the guaranteed interest provisions of their policies into alinement with the 2½ percent rate which they receive for the investment funds which they put into a long-term Federal securities. Today, a very large proportion of the new life insurance premiums received by insurance companies are on policies written at interest rates of 2½ percent or less. It is clear that this rate has been satisfactory both to the insurance companies and to their customers, since there is $100,000,000,000 more life insurance in force now than there was 10 years ago.

Mutual savings banks have had the same satisfactory experience. The interest which they pay on funds of their depositors is closely related to the interest they receive on their large investments in Federal securities. But the mutual savings banks have not suffered—their deposits are twice as large as before World War II.

It is evident that the 2½-percent rate has not interfered with a tremendous expansion in these financial institutions. And it has been sufficient to make their operations highly profitable. After investing very substantially in Government securities based on the 2½-percent rate, earnings of banks and life-insurance companies are double those of 10 years ago. In addition, financial institutions of all types are enjoying the best earning position in their entire history.

Our country has never been more prosperous than during the recent postwar period. Our individual citizens, who saved during the war years in order to build up financial backlogs and in order to buy houses, automobiles, household equipment, and so on when war restrictions were over, have never been in a better financial position than they are right now. Yet the funds available for investment in our economy during the past decade, whether of private individuals, financial institutions, or business concerns, have received a rate of return closely tied to the 2½-percent rate paid on long-term Federal securities.

The securities of the United States Government make up one-half of all the debt obligations of the country, public and private. As long as they constitute such a significant portion of the debt of the country, the rate paid on long-term Federal securities will be the controlling factor in the rate of return on investment funds in this country. For that reason, any change in this rate is of overwhelming importance not only to our financial institutions and to individuals who hold large portions of their assets in Federal securities, but to every citizen in the country. That is why the announcement on the part of the Treasury that the 2½-percent rate will be continued and will not be raised is of such extreme significance. That is why the demand for a higher rate—which has been particularly insistent in some sectors of the financial community—must be examined and analyzed for what it is worth.

The first fact which should be made crystal clear in the minds of every taxpayer is that the present interest charge on the public debt amounts to almost $6,000,000,000. A rise of ½ of 1 percent in the average rate of interest would add $1,250,000,000 to the budget expenditures of the Federal Government. Let me repeat that figure—$1,250,000,000.

Right now, interest on the public debt has to be paid at the rate of $16,000,000 every day of the year. It has to be paid at the rate of over $600,000 every hour of the day. To pay the added cost brought about by a one-half of 1 percent rise in the average rate of interest, there would have to be an increase in the Federal income taxes paid by individual taxpayers, or, instead, the burden would be shifted to business corporations. If, on the other hand, we did not increase taxes to pay for the added interest charge on the debt, this cost under present budget conditions would have to be paid for by deficit financing, thereby increasing inflationary pressures.

Yet the very people who are clamoring for higher interest rates also want to balance the budget by forcing cuts in nondefense expenditures. Higher interest costs on the public debt would turn the budget in just the opposite direction. They would increase nondefense expenditures. They would increase the deficit. They would increase the need for higher taxes at a time when every dollar of added tax money is needed to pay for the defense requirements of this Nation.

Since this is true, we need to ask what the real driving force is behind this demand that the Government pay more for the money it borrows from its citizens.

Those who want a greater interest return on Federal securities say that slightly higher rates will cause more individuals and more institutions with available funds to invest in the securities of their Government. I simply do not believe that this argument can hold water. The people of this country, whether individual citizens, presidents of financial institutions, members of boards of directors, investment managers, or those who in some other way are concerned with investment funds—do not, I am certain, need the inducement of an added levy on the taxpayers of the Nation to invest their funds in the securities of their Government. Investment in Federal securities is already well recompensed. It has already proven highly profitable.

Federal Reserve officials have stated that the purpose of raising interest rates is to combat inflationary pressures by restraining credit expansion. Credit expansion must be restrained, but this cannot be done by small increases in interest rates—either short-term or long-term. Such increases are not effective in combating inflationary pressures. Moreover, in my view, the use of such ineffective measures is extremely dangerous, because they give the country a false sense of security. People believe that the fight against inflation is being won in a painless way. This cannot be done.

The fight against inflation is a hard fight. It is a fight which cannot be won by a theoretical approach that has no practical basis of successful operation behind it. It is a fight which cannot be won by talk and propaganda—by saying that small increases in interest rates will keep prices down. Those who advocate this course of action do not prove their case.

Those persons who are answerable for running the fiscal affairs of the Government of the United States have tremendous responsibilities. The stakes are so large and the risk so great that we cannot try experiments. We must let the cold light of careful analysis shine on the problem and use tools in the fight against inflation that we know have a real opportunity of winning the battle.

The rapid credit expansion that this country is experiencing can be controlled. We have effective measures for this purpose. But events have shown that small increases in interest rates do not cut down the urge of businessmen to borrow. They do not stop credit expansion. The situation in recent months is a case in point. Starting in August, the Federal Reserve, through open-market operations, caused yields on Government securities to rise. It carried on an extensive propaganda campaign to lead people to believe that these small increases in interest rates would, by themselves, deter businessmen from borrowing. The record makes clear what happened. In nearly every week since August 18, for example, loans of weekly reporting member banks have risen. The total loan increase of these banks in the past 5 months has amounted to over $4,000,000,000. This, it seems to me, should have been no surprise. Businessmen know that a fraction of 1 percent is too little to matter when it comes to borrowing money for carrying inventories, plant construction, and the like.

Years ago, we had more extreme examples. In 1919 and 1920, rates on short-term Treasury issues were run up sharply. They reached nearly 6 percent, and the rate on call money went as high as 30 percent. In 1929, the rates on short-term Treasury issues were run up to above 5 percent, and the call money rate went to 20 percent. All of you are familiar with the market crashes which followed.

It seems to be clear that increases in interest rates large enough to result in effective discouragement of loans would represent a crude application of economic laws that is out of harmony with proper economic policy. It would be on a par with driving civilian users of essential defense materials—such as steel, aluminum, copper, zinc—out of the market by means of excessive price rises. This is a course of action which in any area of our economic life is not only unjust in its effects, but is extremely dangerous to the healthy functioning of the economy.

In my view, the demand that the Government pay the investors more money for their funds at the expense of taxpayers is in reality a cloak for an effort on the part of certain sectors of the financial community to use the national emergency for selfish advantage. I believe that such is the real force and the real motivation of the pressure being exerted on the Government for higher rates now. It is no more and no less than an attempt on the part of a few to profit at the expense of many. That is why I have used this occasion to throw some additional light on a current issue of such great import to every one of us—an issue which needs only to be clearly viewed to be appreciated in its true proportions.

The Treasury has stated that its policy is to maintain stability in the Government-bond market. I agree with that policy. The great number of financial people agree with that policy. The announcement has been made that the 2½-percent rate will be maintained, and that such financing as is required will be done within the framework of that rate.

This program is essential in order to keep a high level of confidence in Government securities—confidence that has been built up over a long period of years. It is essential in order to keep the millions of investors who have been brought into the Government-security market so laboriously during the past decade.

We have an army of bondholders. We need them now. We do not want to make the mistake of chasing them away as we did after World War I, when Liberty bonds were allowed to drop to 82. As you well know, it has taken years of financial planning plus tremendous quantities of promotion and aggressive selling to bring nonbank buyers of Government securities—particularly individuals and small corporations—back into the Government-security market. We cannot waste this effort.

The fiscal policy of the Treasury recognizes these facts. That is why it calls for stability in the Government-bond market built around the 2½-percent rate on long-term bonds. I agree with such a program. I feel that it is tremendously important. The credit of the United States Government is the foundation on which the financial strength of our Nation is built.

We must keep this foundation strong. We have the ability and the resources to do so. And I am certain that we have the will to do so. A debt-management policy which succeeds in maintaining stability and confidence in the credit of the United States Government is essential to our national survival.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say why the President refused to impose price and wage controls until so many months elapsed, after the Congress gave him authority to do so?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will discuss that on some other occasion. Why did Congress refuse? Did the gentleman vote to permit the gamblers to continue gambling on the commodity market? Did the gentleman vote to permit them to do that?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman in favor of exempting farmers on the question of the 100-percent parity? Those were avenues, wide-open avenues. Did the gentleman vote to permit gambling in food in the commodity futures market? Did he vote for that?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well now, my question is just as irrelevant, I will admit, to the subject we are discussing today, as the gentleman's question to me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I voted to stop profiteering in the market, and if the gentleman will go back to the RECORD he will find that I am one of the few when I made the statement in the RECORD on that subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman voted to permit the Government to control speculation on the commodity market.

Mr. GROSS. He certainly did. How did the gentleman vote?

Mr. McCORMACK. But a great majority of the Members of the House did not. I voted the same way the gentleman did.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement on economics, and I am always interested in hearing him on any subject. But, I would like to know if the gentleman is making an explanation or apology for the situation that now exists, for the reason that what he has recited up to now has been in the control of the party that he is the majority leader of in this House, and all of the situation that we are under concerning the Treasury Department and the bond situation is the responsibility of his party. Now, what is this, an explanation or an apology that he is giving to the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. How wise a question my very sweet friend from California asked. It is neither an explanation nor an apology.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What is it?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a statement. Of course, the gentleman may not be able to distinguish between a statement, an explanation, and an apology. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] took issue with the position of the President and the Treasury on this particular matter. Then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] stated his views. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is now stating his views. The gentleman is talking about an apology. Does the gentleman desire to have American bonds go down to 82?

Mr. McDONOUGH. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman and I are in agreement. The gentleman is very frank, as he always is when he is asked a direct question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The gentleman has made out my case from his angle, so I will yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not by the answer to that question. It is not so simple as that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all this whole thing was for—to stabilize the price of bonds during the emergency.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman will admit that this whole debate that has come onto the floor of the House today originated in a dispute between Mr. Marriner Eccles and the President just within the last 36 hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It came from that source.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not say Mr. Eccles.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The problem we are facing now and the debate we are having now is the result of a misunderstanding on the fiscal policy of the United States in the administration itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is no party question here. I am not speaking as a Republican to a Democrat, except to say that this responsibility is on the Democratic Party.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman occasionally reaches an honest but rash conclusion. The gentleman knows that the Federal Reserve Board is not subject, under the law, to the slightest direction from the President of the United States. If anything, it is more responsible to Congress. Any report it makes is supposed to be made to Congress, as I recall. Is that correct?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. The members of this Board are appointed, and, once they are appointed, they are for all practical purposes accountable to nobody, yet they have the financial destiny of the people of this country under their control. They exercise their judgment honestly. I am not going to make the slightest

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

intimation conveyed that they are not sincere. They are fine men. But it is a tremendous power to vest in anyone. I would not want it. I do not know why they want it.

Some years ago the Secretary of the Treasury was a member and had a voice on that Board, and the Congress took it away. That was the voice of the public. We have a voice in the stock exchanges, not the commodity exchanges but the stock exchanges. We do not have a public voice on the Federal Reserve Board. The gentleman knows that. Within the realm of the Federal Reserve System a question may arise and within the realm of the Treasury a question may arise, and these questions may be related to one another. The Federal Reserve Board says it is in favor of higher interest rates on long-term securities. The Secretary of the Treasury says "No," in substance. There is an impasse. The most logical thing in the world is that they should then sit in with the President of the United States, the one who should consider it, no matter who that President might be. That would be true if a matter arose 20 years from now and there was a President there who was elected as a Republican. He would be the President, though.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I think our majority leader is to be commended for taking the floor which, as he indicated, is seldom, to speak under a special order to call to the attention of the House this matter with which so few of us are thoroughly familiar. I feel a careful analysis of what the gentleman has said will show that what he has said is completely free of any political implication. I think as Democrats we have the courage to stand on our feet and criticize any organization within this Democratic administration. Personally I feel that the majority leader and the gentleman from Texas who spoke a moment ago are to be commended for taking the floor today and opening up this subject in order that the Members of the Congress may be more acutely aware of the problems involved.

Mr. McCORMACK. And may I state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], also is to be commended for calling these problems to our attention in the same way.

Mr. DEANE. I hope the majority leader and other Members of the House will follow it up to the end that this matter is thoroughly understood by all Members of the Congress and to serve notice to the Federal Reserve System and any other agency of the Government that the Congress is studying this very carefully and that decisions which are made should be made in the interest of the American people.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope that the members of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury and all others interested will dispassionately consider not only this question but any other questions that arise. It seems as if we are going to have a sharp legislative fight on it. I hope we do not. They can control the situation by sitting around the table as men respecting each other's views, no matter how much they may differ with each other, and not impugning each other's motives. I make that suggestion and I hope that they will approach this problem in that way rather than having the question brought up here during this emergency, in a legislative battle, so that the questions involved will be obscured and involved in intense debate on the floor of the House which we know will envelop it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I said in my remarks that the Federal Reserve Board originally had as members of that board the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency. Eventually they were taken off the board. I desire to read the original Federal Reserve Act on that very point:

SEC. 10. A Federal Reserve Board is hereby created which shall consist of seven members, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall be members ex officio, and five members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

So you see at that time out of the seven members two were selected by someone responsible directly to the people—by the President of the United States. Those two members were the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency. By changing that over a period of years just a little now and then, now we have a board of seven men. The Secretary of the Treasury is not on the Board, and the Comptroller of the Currency is not on the Board. There are seven independent members selected for 14 years. They are under no obligation to the Executive or to the executive branch. They are an independent body and they are asserting their independence in a way which is costly to the people of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to that point, I believe they are unwise in creating the question, or so-called question of independence. We have gone along now for 10 years with market operations on the part of the Government so that the price has been established. Certainly it seems to me during the emergency the policy which was in operation during World War II and in the postwar years to date might well be followed. One of the worst things which I think could happen and which would have the effect of impairing the morale of our people would be to have Government bonds dropping again to as low as 90, or 85 or 82, as a result of open-market operations. And then to have people—again I do not mean to say they did it deliberately, but again to have people who are financially able to buy them up and hold them over a long period of time, as they did after World War I, in some cases disposing of them at $125. I think this question should not be aggravated. The members of the Federal Reserve Board ought to realize the significance of world conditions and they ought to sit around the table with the Secretary of the Treasury and thrash these questions out instead of having the question brought in to the legislative body with an intensity of feeling which will appeal to the emotions of our people and the effect of which would be to divide our people on this false issue of independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of February 3.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RABAUT, for an indefinite period, due to a death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

162. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 47 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I., pursuant to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter dealing with certain resolutions pertaining to the administration of the government of American Samoa, which were submitted by members of the Fono of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

165. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to there appearing to be a technical violation of section 1211 (h) of Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to the provision of section 1211 (1) (2) of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

166. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 15, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chassahowitzka

River, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

167. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Creque Gut and tributaries, island of St. Croix, V. I., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

168. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Julington Creek, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

169. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 18, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Coldwater Creek, Calhoun County, Ala., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

170. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 15, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of waterway from packing house and railroad terminal at Belle Glade, Fla., to Lake Okeechobee and to the intracoastal waterway through the Hillsboro and West Palm Beach Canals, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

171. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 28, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Westfield River, Mass., with a view to modifying the existing Knightville Reservoir to provide low-flow regulation, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

172. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chapel Creek, Dorchester County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

173. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Choctawhatchee River, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; Choctawhatchee River and tributaries, Alabama and Florida, and Choctawhatchee River, Fla., and Ala., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; and Choctawhatchee River, Ala. and Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

174. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Little Pottsburg Creek, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

175. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel to Pahokee, on Lake Okeechobee, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

176. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake certain additional developments in connection with the Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

177. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 95. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2268. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2141. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; with amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2192. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2374. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2375. A bill to exempt amounts paid for admissions to operas from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2376. A bill granting to persons in the Armed Forces who receive or are eligible to receive the Korean Campaign Medal, and to their dependents, all the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of World War II and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2377. A bill to clarify the requirement in title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with respect to the period within which a course must be initiated; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2378. A bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2379. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 2380. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide that certain individuals who engage in strikes while occupationally deferred shall be made immediately available for military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2381. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2382. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2383. A bill to amend section 3.4, subsections (a) and (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2384. A bill to provide that attendance during designated dates at service academies of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I shall be considered active military or naval service on the same basis provided for veterans of World War II for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 2385. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide for the regulation and control by farmers of their surplus agricultural commodities, to provide for the establishment of farmer-elected control boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2387. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2388. A bill to authorize grants to Ferry and Okanogan Counties, Wash., in lieu of taxes on certain lands restored to tribal ownership; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2389. A bill to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2390. A bill to rescind certain details required by law to be included in the annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE (by request):

H. R. 2391. A bill to liberalize the eligibility requirements for payment of pension to children of deceased World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):

H. R. 2392. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during a period of war a further presump-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tion of service connection for active pulmonary tuberculosis and certain other chronic diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2393. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to sit upon the Supreme Court in place of any justice who is unable to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2394. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2395. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2396. A bill to amend chapter 213 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2397. A bill authorizing an appropriation for emergency repairs to and protection of the Canadian River siphon, Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2398. A bill to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2399. A bill to provide that the hours of work (exclusive of overtime) in any one calendar day of officers and employees subject to section 604 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 shall be limited to a period of not more than 10 consecutive hours; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2400. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of charwoman working part time in the appropriate grades of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2401. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2402. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 116. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint, or affecting certain other matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. Res. 117. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the United States educational system in the light of world conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Res. 118. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 28; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 119. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 120. Resolution to increase compensation to certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to ratifying proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to opposing the drafting of 18-year-old youths; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 2403. A bill for the relief of Leda Taft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2404. A bill for the relief of Mark Yoke Lun and Mark Seep Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2405. A bill for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2406. A bill for the relief of B. H. Manley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2407. A bill for the relief of the Wilson County Fair, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 2408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2409. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshi Ishibashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2410. A bill for the relief of John DelGatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2411. A bill for the relief of Pierino Francesco Berta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2412. A bill to grant increased retired pay to Maj. Gen. Wilson B. Burtt, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2413. A bill for the relief of the Kloman Instrument Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 2414. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Maurice Mumford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

37. The SPEAKER presented a petition of W. Dudley Gunn, secretary-treasurer, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, New Orleans, La., favoring quotas being placed on shrimp importations from all foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the guiding wisdom in the life of men and of nations, we pray that we may be endowed daily with understanding and insight to discern and interpret rightly the eternal will of God.

May the assurance of Thy continuing grace and favor inspire us to search diligently and faithfully for the right solution to all our national and international problems.

Give us a more vivid sense of our social responsibility. May we be loyal partners with men everywhere in the difficult task of establishing the kingdom of brotherhood upon the earth.

Encourage us to carry on heroically and hopefully in the glorious adventure of bringing in the day of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 82. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941;

S. 101. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949; and

S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the tenth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid to China and the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended September 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1951.*

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTOMATIC EXTENSION OF SERIES E SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2268) to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker; I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2268, with Mr. ENGLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 2268, would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to allow owners of series E savings bonds the option of retaining such bonds after the maturity date and earning interest upon the maturity values for not more than 10 years. As explained by the Secretary of the Treasury, any bond which is not turned in for cash or for reinvestment at its original maturity date will automatically be extended until such time as the owner presents it for redemption. The extended bond would bear interest on the original maturity value at the rate of 2½ percent for the first 7½ years and interest thereafter at a rate sufficient to amount to an overall return for the 10-year extension period of 2.9 percent, compounded semiannually.

There are now nearly $35,000,000,000 of E bonds outstanding. Starting in May of this year the series E bonds bought during the war years will begin to mature, and $1,100,000,000 worth will mature in 1951 alone.

Since many people now holding series E bonds doubtless will want to continue their investment in United States savings bonds of some kind, the enactment of the pending bill would enable them to do this without the inconvenience to them and the expense to the Government of exchanging their present bonds for new bonds.

It must be emphasized that nothing in the pending bill would interfere with the right of the bondholder to present his series E savings bond for cash either at maturity or at any time after the date of original maturity.

In his statement before the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday on the tax program of the administration, Secretary Snyder emphasized the following:

> Taxes and savings must go hand in hand. Although much depends upon a strong tax program, taxes cannot do the job alone. Every effort must be made to preserve confidence in the future purchasing power of savings in order to discourage the spending of accumulated savings and to stimulate new savings.

The enactment of legislation to make it possible and convenient for bondholders to retain their present investment in series E savings bonds would be in accord with this announced policy.

An essential feature of the bill prescribes the rule for tax treatment of interest on series E savings bonds held after maturity. Under the provisions of section 2 of the bill such bondholders may elect to treat such interest as income as it accrues rather than report it as income in the year of redemption or final maturity. This option is similar in terms with that now accorded under existing law with respect to interest accrued on such bonds prior to the date of maturity.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and should be promptly enacted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means this question? These series E bonds mature, as I understand, carrying an interest rate of about 2.9 percent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. When held to maturity, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, suppose I take a series E bond that is now matured and proceed under the provisions of this bill to carry it, say, another 10 years, but I wish to cash that series E bond in, say, a year from now. At the time I cash it in, do I draw 2.9 percent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. As I understand, the rate would be 2.5 percent for the first 7½ years, then the rate for the next 2½ years would be sufficient to amount to 2.9 percent compounded semiannually for the entire 10-year extension.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I hold the bond from date of issue, we will say 10 years ago, up to date, to where it brings me 2.9 percent, how can the Treasury justify in asking me to continue at a less rate than 2.9 percent?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They do not ask you to. It is your own option. You can cash the bond any time you desire. That is your choice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. From a sheer standpoint of equity and ordinary common sense, there is a question in my mind, Why does not the Treasury, in order to induce me to continue with the obligation, allow me 2.9 percent from here on? I have carried it during the 10-year period up to this point. I am not criticizing; I am just analyzing it. I think it is just good business to do it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know what reason the Treasury had for that. But as I understand, if you purchase a series E bond, you get a much lower rate of interest than that if you cash it during the first few years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is good, common sense at the beginning, but here I have carried a bond for 10 years. I have gone through the low-interest period and up to which I am now earning 2.9, and I voluntarily say to the Government, "Now, I would like to carry it another 10 years. Will you give me 2.9 from now on?" I think at that point it is good ordinary horse sense for the Government to say, "Sure, we will give you 2.9 from now on, because you have gone along with us through the years."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, probably it is to the interest of the Government. I do not know the reason the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that; but he lives with that question the year around. I am confident that, if he believes they should pay a higher rate of interest for the later years of the extension period, that is the proper procedure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I agree with that, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, it is the same principle, that is applied to new series E bonds. On the series E bonds you do not get any interest at all for the first year. You pay $75 for a $100 maturity-value bond. If you cash it before the end of the year, why you just get $75, but after that you receive a progressively higher rate of interest.

Under this bill, if a series E bond is returned after maturity, and you cash it at the end of 7½ years, the rate of interest on the original maturity value is 2.5

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

percent, but if you hold it for the full 10 years then you get 2.9 percent compounded semiannually. So it is the policy of the Government that the longer you hold the bond under the terms of the contract, the more interest you are paid.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Treasury is letting the commercial banks outsmart them in this way. I can go to a commercial bank and say, "Here, I will let you have my money on a deposit certificate for 5 years," and I get 2½ percent. I have some of those papers.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I compliment the gentleman. He has the advantage of most of us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I can step forward and extend that another 5 years, but if I do not hold it 5 years I do not get my 2½ percent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The principle of this bill is to pay 2½ percent for the first 7½ years of the extension and an over-all 10-year rate of 2.9 percent compounded semiannually.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I extend it from 5 years onward, I get my 2.5 percent from the date of the extension. I think the Treasury is making a mistake in not allowing 2.9 percent from the maturity date on.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman can offer such an amendment if he thinks it proper.

We had hearings. The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before our committee and explained the bill in full. Our committee was impressed with the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury, and we reported the bill unanimously. It was hoped that it would receive the same consideration by the House that it received by our committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Can the gentleman tell us what the difference in cost to the Treasury will be as between the method of the committee and the method proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], the 2.9 percent interest annually, just extended?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There would be a slight difference in the interest paid, since not all bondholders would retain these bonds for the full 10 years. There would be a slight disadvantage to the Treasury. The bondholders would get a little more in the early years of the extension period and the Treasury would pay somewhat more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield, the Treasury faces this situation. If I cash my bond and go buy a new bond, the Treasury has to pay the expense of engraving, and then some bank out here in the country that issues thousands of these bonds in the service of the Treasury to payrollees and others will get a fee, for there is a fee paid to the banks for writing those bonds. We turn them out by the thousands because so many are cashed every day. Fourtenths of 1 percent is involved, the difference between 2.5 and 2.9. Fourtenths of 1 percent is so small when it comes to the actual cost of financing that I think it is just chicken feed so far as the cost of financing is concerned. But if it induces 30,000,000 holders of savings bonds E, for instance, to continue with the Treasury, you have a free flow of finance running, you have no issuance of new bonds, you have no writing of new bonds, no fee paid on the issuance of new bonds, and so on down the line.

I would love very much to see the chairman of the committee take the position that you will be paid 2.9 percent if you will continue with the Treasury. I think you will save us money in the long run.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the gentleman's method is cheaper, but is there any estimate as to the difference in the cost?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The holder of the bond can at any time cash his bond. If it is to his interest to cash it before the end of 7½ years, or to hold it for 10 years, he can do either. The Government has to do whichever he says. The Government does not have any option about that. If he presents it the next day after maturity, the Government must pay.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the distingushed gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. COMBS. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony yesterday stated that any increase in bond interest made with respect to one issue would extend in the natural course and operation of things to the entire bonded debt of the United States, and that an increase of even one-half of 1 percent, to go to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in interest rates will increase the burden to the American taxpayers $1,250,000,000 a year. The pending bill does create a premium, in answer to what the gentleman from Michigan says, of about $33 per thousand over a period of 10 years as an inducement to the present E-bond holders to continue holding their bonds. Now, if you made it 2.9 percent for the full 10-year period, as has been suggested, you would enormously increase the total cost to the American taxpayer—I do not have the time to figure it out now. The $33 premium is believed by the Secretary of the Treasury, as I understood him yesterday, to be a sufficient inducement to cause present holders of these bonds to hold them in preference to selling them and buying new issues. I think that is the whole question which we have to watch as we finance the enormous debt of this Nation against increased interest rates because the debt is so large, a slight increase means an enormous increase in taxes which we will be called upon to vote for in order to pay that increased debt.

Mr. DOUGHTON. These bonds will begin to mature in May of this year. In 1951 I understand they will mature to the amount of $1,100,000,000, and this bill gives the bondholders an opportunity, at their election, to keep their investment with the Government. It just automatically takes care of the situation without the necessity of cashing his bond and going to the trouble of purchasing a new bond. This saves the Treasury and the Government the expense of issuing bonds. It seems to me that it is a practical proposition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would agree with my friend the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, and the Treasury—if he has quoted the Treasury correctly—if those remarks were related only to marketable issues. The series E bonds, the savings bonds, are not marketable issues. I cannot put them in the market and sell them; I must take them to the Treasury. I cannot sell the series E bonds in market. It is not a marketable issue. Therefore the Treasury can raise the interest on that without disturbing the market in marketable issues. There is no question about that in the field of finance. If they raise the interest rate on one marketable issue, it does disturb the market price on other marketable issues. I think the gentleman from Texas has probably overlooked that particular point.

In yesterday's RECORD in my presentation I showed the maturities for the years 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 on page 1004 of the RECORD. These maturities run from $3,800,000,000, $5,300,000,000, $5,900,000,000, $4,700,000,000; then in 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959, they run from $2,400,000,000 to $2,800,000,000 per annum. This is no little job the Treasury has in financing in replacing these series E bonds and other savings bonds. I think they ought to put the 2.9 rate on those bonds and facilitate their financing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill H. R. 2268 has been very thoroughly explained on the floor already. There are a few points that I wish to make.

There are approximately $35,000,000,000 of E bonds outstanding, as the chairman has stated, and $1,100,000,000 will mature in 1951. There is one point that interests me very much. If they were to go to the banks to take up those bonds that are maturing, you will probably multiply the money in circulation by about 10 to 1. I cannot imagine anything that would be more inflationary than that, to multiply this $1,100,000,000 by 10. You would have about $11,000,000,000 added to your circulation. So, I think it is well for us to seriously consider the merits of this bill.

Beginning in May of this year the series E bonds bought during the war years will start to mature. During 1951 maturities will mount to $1,100,000,000. The purpose of H. R. 2268 is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to give the holders of E bonds an opportunity to retain their bonds after the date of maturity with an automatic interest-bearing extension. It is believed that a substantial number of persons holding E bonds will desire to continue their investment in these E bonds and the enactment of this legislation will make it

possible for them to do so after the date of maturity of their bonds.

I want to point out that there is no obligation imposed by this bill on the holder of an E bond to retain his E bond after it matures. This legislation simply gives the holder an election to continue to hold the bond. The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in executive session and outlined the Treasury proposal for handling these maturing series E bonds. Under the Treasury plan the bondholder would be given three choices, as follows:

First. Accepting cash, according to the original terms of the contract;

Second. Continuing to hold the present bond and earn interest on the maturity value without any action on his part; or

Third. Exchanging his bond for a current income savings bond of series G in authorized denominations.

Under option 1 the owner of any series E bond may receive, if he wishes, full cash payment for his bond at maturity. This is, as stated, in accordance with the original terms of his contract. The Treasury proposals with respect to maturing bonds would not abrogate in any way this right of the investor. Nor would the bondholder's choice of options 2 or 3 preclude the subsequent cashing of his bond.

There is no question that the savings bond program has played an important part in encouraging savings and to a considerable degree helped in curtailing inflation. The same basic reasons for the initiation of the savings bond program exists today and the money saved in today's emergency period will help to achieve a stable economy when the present emergency is over.

There is one point which I think should be brought to the attention of holders of E bonds, particularly those who elect to hold their bonds after maturity. This has to do with the payment of income taxes on the interest. Under existing law holders of E bonds have the choice of either including the accrued interest of the bonds annually or of including the full amount when the bond matures. The bill H. R. 2268 provides that if a taxpayer elects to hold his investment in savings bonds, interest on the bond will not be taxable in the year of original maturity, but the entire amount of interest on the investment will be taxable at redemption or final maturity, whichever is earlier. In other words, if a taxpayer does not elect to pay a tax each year on the accrued interest, waits until the date of maturity and then elects to hold the bond, the amount of interest subject to tax at the end of the additional 10-year extension period will be considerable. I hope that in its program of encouraging E-bond holders to retain their E bonds the Treasury Department will encourage people to report the accrued interest for tax purposes annually. If people are encouraged to do this, the amount paid upon redemption or maturity of the bond will not be reduced by taxes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the option still remains in the taxpayer on this extended time, just exactly the same as it exists today?

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. He can either pay his tax annually during the extended time, or pay it all at the end?

Mr. REED of New York. That is right. One of the dangers is that people of small holdings of E bonds will not take advantage of paying their interest each year. They will come to a year when these E bonds finally mature and the interest on them has accumulated, then of course it will throw many of the bondholders into a higher bracket. They will have lost perhaps much of the increment they thought they had gained.

Mr. KEATING. Also from the point of view of the Treasury it is desirable to have the taxpayers paying in full.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I quite agree that the Secretary of the Treasury should include that as part of his publicity.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is important that the taxpayer should be notified.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I, too, want to commend the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, for his stand with the Federal Reserve Board. A number of Members of the House are in favor of the Brannan plan for farmers because it will help the farmers, and the farmers need it. It will also help the country, and they believe the country needs it. The Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee are trying to force the Brannan plan for the banks.

I am against the Brannan plan for the banks because the banks do not need it. There is no reason why we should continue to subsidize the banks. The question of interest rates on Government securities that this bill is really intended to do something about is a major problem. Back at the beginning of the First World War, when our national debt was very low, probably one or two billion dollars, it did not mean very much in our fiscal policy. At the beginning of the Second World War, when it was about $46,000,000,000, it still did not mean too much as a major policy in our fiscal affairs. But here in—I will not say the third world war, but in a third national war emergency—when our national debt is in excess of $250,000,000,000, interest rates on Government bonds becomes a major problem. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] suggested a while ago, every time the interest rate on Government bonds is raised one-half of 1 percent it means that the taxpayers of this country will have to dig down and fork over $1,250,000,000 a year in order to pay that excess interest of one-half of 1 percent.

The Federal Reserve banking system through the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee are trying to force higher interest rates in this country. It will mean a lot to the legislation this Congress has in mind and to the taxpayers in particular. I think we should commend the Secretary of the Treasury for the stand that he has taken. Certainly, one who is opposed to the Brannan plan for the farmers, cannot consistently support the Brannan plan for the banks, and I hope that the Treasury wins in its contest with the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very practical matter in which practically everybody is interested. If you will bear with me I should like to explain it if I can by illustration.

In this proposed legislation we are dealing with the refunding of the E bonds, the maturity of which starts on the 1st of May. Let us take the E bond and let us see how these bonds were put out when they were first issued. Those of you who own them will understand what I shall try to say. Here is the situation: if you bought a $100 E bond 10 years ago you paid $75 for it when you purchased it. You naturally expected to get interest on that bond and the interest is stipulated in the bond just how much it would be. If the bond were cashed in a short time after its issue, say 6 months or so, you would get no interest, but if you would carry the bond along for the full 10 years, the interest rate is graduated upward until you eventually receive 2.9 percent interest on the amount that you had paid in. You will have $100. In other words, the bond will mature into $100.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the Government is confronted with. On the 1st of May next a lot of people, who in the aggregate own millions of dollars worth of these E bonds, are going to do something with those bonds. Will they demand cash for them or will they be willing to permit this money to stay with the Government? If you want your money on your bond you can get $100 for it. The Government will live up to its contract, and will cash the bond when you present it for redemption. If you wish to leave the bond with the Government, the Government will continue to pay interest on the bond. You do not have to communicate with the Government if you want to leave the situation as it is, but it would be far better if you did contact the Government, letting the Government know that you expect to carry the bond on through for an additional period. If you decide to keep your money with the Government you will start with a principal of $100. You can get that $100 at any time you want it and they will pay you 2½ percent interest on this $100, up to 7½ years. Then at that time if you want to continue on to 10 years they will increase the rate until the interest will be on an average 2.9 on the $100 clear through to the 10-year maturity.

It is a very sensible program, in my opinion. The Government is anxious to have you leave the money with the Government, for if most of the holders of these bonds decide not to cash the bonds the Treasury will be relieved of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

trouble and expense of selling an additional issue of bonds. In this way the Government does not throw itself open to any wild speculation of any kind. The Government does not compel you to take the money. The Government simply says: "You can have it if you want it." What is more fair than that?

Should my constituents inquire of me about this matter, here is the way I expect to answer them. I shall say to them: Here, you have paid $75. You now have $100. Your $100 will increase at the rate of 2½ percent for 10 years if you want to keep the bond clear through that time. Any time you want to cash it in you can do so, and get a fair return.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman states that these bonds are due on May 1. At that time, if they have been held for 10 years, they have appreciated in value 25 percent because of the interest rate, as a practical proposition.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If a man does not cash his bond in at that time, is he required to report as income for tax purposes the 25-percent appreciation for the year 1951?

Mr. JENKINS. I understand not until he cashes the bonds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman stated that these bonds have appreciated in value. Have they actually appreciated in value? That is, in terms of net purchasing power.

Mr. JENKINS. No; I am sorry to say that these bonds are like any other kind of an investment; they are affected by the difference in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The question just asked by the gentleman from Iowa was along the line of a question I was going to ask. The gentleman said that he would tell his constituents if they had a bond they paid $75 for 10 years ago, it is worth $100 now, and they can hold it another 10 years and it will be worth $133. If they should ask the gentleman what they could buy 10 years from now for that amount of money what would the gentleman tell them?

Mr. JENKINS. Oh, my answer would probably be, Who knows? You have $75 that you paid for that bond. You could probably have bought a finer suit of clothes with the $75 at the time you bought the bond than you can get now with the $100 that the bond will be redeemed for. Of course, we are not solving the problem of the high cost of living in this discussion about cashing or continuing to hold these E bonds.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. And the debtor on this bond has it within its power to determine the value of money?

Mr. JENKINS. I am afraid that we are getting into something foreign to the issue here.

Mr. GROSS. When the Secretary of the Treasury was before the committee did the committee get any assurance from the Secretary of the Treasury that they would not further debase and debauch the currency of this country?

Mr. JENKINS. No. The Secretary discussed only the matter of cashing or carrying these E bonds. Anybody who has a $100 E bond now, and it matures, can get $100 for it. That was his contract with the Government. He can get that $100. That is the contract he made 10 years ago. If he wants to take it, let him take it up now, or he can permit it to run along for another 10 years and get interest for it at the rate of 2.9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I think this proposal is fair and reasonable, for it gives the bondholder the right to cash his bond or to permit the Government to have the use of his money at the fair rate of 2.9 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I have risen at this time not to oppose the bill before us but to express sorrow that this bill should come before us before the vitally important relationship between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board has been settled. I think perhaps the most important matter that the Committee on Banking and Currency could take up this year is a clarification of the respective positions of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in connection with monetary rates and the very inflationary activity now being carried on by the Secretary of the Treasury. I think it is little realized that in supporting Government bonds, with their cheap interest rates, the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve has bought literally billions of these bonds and has placed the cash with which it purchased those bonds into general circulation. That cash then became a part of our general demand deposits in the banks and the basis for further credit.

If you take a look at the story from the pre-Korean week to the present, you will find that it is not Government spending that has been responsible for the inflationary crisis in this country. More than any other single thing it has been the cheap money policy of the Government which has allowed an expansion of bank loans to the extent of about $10,000,000,000. And the curious thing about that study is that it will show that the price inflation has followed in percentage points almost exactly the same amount as the inflation in our currency and credit.

One of the great dangers in connection with the extension of the life of series E bonds is that if the holders of that series hang onto them there will be a continuing depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar. Those who bought those bonds 10 years ago will find that the dollars that they get back in May, when the first bonds mature, will be worth approximately 60 cents in purchasing power of what they were worth at that time. What they may be worth in purchasing power 10 years from now depends entirely on what is done to stop the ruinous inflation now encouraged by the Treasury's cheap money policy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is why I think it is so very important that the Treasury go just as far as it can to induce me and you and the other bondholders to hold the series E bonds, or any other bond, instead of cashing it and taking that cash and going into the market place and bidding against each other for these disappearing goods, and I do not believe the Treasurer has used sound judgment. I think he is entirely off the beam, in the parlance of the street, because of this inflationary force that is running. I concur in what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a statement by a group of the leading economists of this country entitled "The Failure of the Present Monetary Policy."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. The article reads as follows:

THE FAILURE OF THE PRESENT MONETARY POLICY

Our purpose in preparing this statement is to show that the present monetary policy of the Federal Reserve is highly inflationary, that the monetary actions of the Federal Reserve since Korea have permitted the marked price rise which has already occurred, and that the Federal Reserve, presumably under the influence of the Treasury, is pursuing an ill-conceived policy that will interfere with effective mobilization of our economic strength even though taxes are increased enough to keep the Federal budget in balance.

Prices are rising at an alarming rate. This rise is widely attributed to the armament effort, to the efforts of business firms as they get ready for military contracts, and to speculative purchases by businessmen and consumers in anticipation of further price rises. This explanation neglects the critical role being played by a misconceived monetary policy in permitting these armament and private efforts to produce a price rise. As a result of the monetary failure, the Government is now committed to drastic measures in its attempt to control prices and wages which do not strike at the root causes of inflation and which impair the general efficiency of the economy and, also, affect adversely the armament effort.

Actually the production of armament is as yet a mere trickle. The recent price rises cannot, therefore, be attributed to expenditures on these. Neither can they be attributed to other expenditures by the Federal Government. During the second 6 months of 1950, the Federal Government took in substantially more than it paid out. The Federal budget was, therefore, if anything, a deflationary rather than an inflationary force during this period. True, as

armament expenditures rise, this situation will change unless new taxes are levied to meet the increased expenditures. Such additional taxes should be levied. But the recent price rises cannot be attributed to failure by Congress to enact adequate taxes. On the contrary, the willingness of Congress to impose new taxes has been the brightest spot in our economic policy during the last 6 months.

The expectation has been that there would be substantial armament expenditures in the future, that a wide variety of goods would be unavailable, and that there would occur future rises in prices. The expectation has given a strong incentive to businesses and individuals to buy now. The repeated threats by Government of wage and price ceilings have further promoted price rises by serving notice on any groups that can exercise control over prices or wages to increase them before it is too late. But neither force could have produced a price rise together with full employment and a high level of output unless businesses and individuals had been able to get funds with which to finance additional purchases. Anticipations of future price rises could have been prevented from producing a price rise by a vigorous monetary policy designed to make credit tight, to prevent an increase in the quantity of money, or, if necessary, to decrease the quantity of money in order to offset a rise in the rate of use of money.

Instead of following such a policy, our monetary authorities have done nearly the reverse. They have provided additional reserves to the banking system, thereby making it possible for banks to extend both their loans and their deposits at an extraordinarily rapid rate. The loans have provided the financial means for speculative purchases; the deposits have provided the circulating medium for the larger money volume of transactions. The consequences are written clearly and dramatically in the statistical record since Korea. From May 31 to the end of 1950, bank loans rose by nearly $10,000,000,000, or nearly 20 percent. Adjusted demand deposits, the most active component of the money supply, rose by over $7,000,000,000, or over 8 percent. Currency outside banks rose only slightly, by about $500,000,000, so that the total circulating medium rose by 7 percent. This increase in the money supply was made possible primarily by Federal Reserve purchases of Government securities. Federal Reserve holding of Government securities rose by almost $3,500,000,000, or 20 percent. Almost half of this increase was offset by a gold outflow, but nearly $2,000,000,000 was added to member bank reserve balances by the security purchases and other Federal Reserve operations. The resultant 12-percent increase in reserves was more than eough to support the 8-percent increase in demand deposits so that excess reserves were actually more than twice as large at the end of 1950 as they had been 7 months earlier.

With a rise of over 8 percent in demand deposits, it is little wonder that personal income rose about 10 percent, wholesale prices about 11 percent, cost of living by nearly 6 percent. It is no accident that these figures are so nearly of the same magnitude. This is about as clear a case of purely monetary inflation as one can find.

These are admittedly highly technical matters, which is one of the main reasons why, as professional economists, we feel it incumbent on us to call them to the attention of the public. They clearly are technical matters of the gravest importance. The price rise of the last 6 months could almost certainly have been largely or wholly avoided by effective monetary action. Indeed, prices would probably today be little above their level in May if the Federal Reserve System had kept its holdings of Government securities unchanged instead of adding to them by $3,500,000,000.

The Federal Reserve System has had ample legal power to prevent the recent inflation. Its Board of Governors are an able and public-spirited body of men. Their failure to stop the inflation can be charged neither to impotence nor to ignorance nor to malice. Why then have they failed to use the means at their disposal?

The failure to tighten bank reserves since Korea is a consistent part of the financial history of the last decade. One cost of effective use of monetary measures to stem inflation is a rise in the interest rate on the Government debt. The major weapon available to the Federal Reserve System is control over its holdings of Government securities. Sales of securities produce a flow of money into the Federal Reserve System and out of currency in circulation and out of bank reserves. This action reduces the availability of credit to the public. This weapon has not been used effectively throughout the last 10 years because the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System between them have been unwilling to let one particular price, the interest yield on Government bonds, rise more than fractionally. They have preferred to hold this one price down even at the cost of facilitating a rise in all other prices. It is long past time that this short-sighted policy was abandoned.

These remarks are clearly of more than historical interest. The problems we have been facing during the last 6 months are unfortunately likely to plague us for a long time. A sound economic policy for this period should rest on two pillars: Monetary policy and fiscal policy. It should use monetary policy to prevent the civilian sphere from adding fuel to inflation; it should use fiscal policy to offset the inflationary pressure of Government spending. The need for fiscal policy, specifically, heavier taxation to match heavier expenditures, is fortunately by now widely recognized. The need for, or even the possibility of, using monetary policy is hardly recognized at all. Nor can we accept the dictum of the Council of Economic Advisers that "because of the needs of debt management, * * * general credit policy cannot be expected to be a major anti-inflationary instrument during the coming period of intensive mobilization." The prices at which the citizens of this country can buy goods and services are much more important than the price at which the Government can borrow money.

The so-called needs of debt management have been magnified out of all proportion to their actual importance in economic policy. A determined policy to stop inflation will have numerous consequences, one of the least important of which would be a rise in the interest rate on Government debt, a rise that would probably be moderate. But even from the narrow point of view of debt management, the policy being followed by the Treasury is, to say the least, short-sighted. The nearly $35,000,000,000 of series E bonds outstanding can be redeemed at the will of their holders. Further price rises that continue to reduce the real value of these bonds are almost certain to produce sooner or later a flood of redemptions of outstanding bonds, to say nothing about the effect of further price rises on the willingness of the public to purchase additional savings bonds. This outcome would raise far greater difficulties for debt management than a rise in interest rates.

Monetary measures to keep down the supply of money have the great advantage that they operate impersonally and generally, affecting all alike. They do not interfere with the details of day-to-day operation, require no great administrative staff to enforce them, do not interfere with, but rather add to, the incentives to produce efficiently and economically. By preventing an expansion of credit, they assure that credit obtained to finance armament production is at the expense of credit for other purposes instead of in addition to such credit. In this way, they make the financial operations consistent with the physical operations. The physical resources for armament production must largely be obtained by diversion from other uses; they can more easily be so obtained if the financial resources are diverted as well.

Monetary policy cannot serve two masters at once. It cannot at one and the same time buttress a strong fiscal policy in preventing inflation and be dominated by the present misconceived cheap money policy of the Treasury. The necessity of making a clean-cut choice between these two objectives has been obscured by brave talk and rear-guard actions by the Federal Reserve—the raising of reserve requirements, moral suasion of the banking fraternity, selective controls on installment and stock-market credit, and the like. These are all doomed to failure so long as the Federal Reserve System stands ready to buy unlimited amounts of Government bonds at essentially fixed prices.

Our national security demands a major armament effort. This armament effort is bound to create inflationary pressure. We cannot afford to add to this inflationary pressure by an inflationary monetary policy. The Federal Reserve System should at once announce that it will conduct its operations with an eye single to their effects on the supply of money and credit and on the level of prices. It should at once begin to sell Government securities to whatever amount is necessary to bring about a contraction in the currently swollen credit base. And it should preserve in this policy to the point that the inflation is checked even though one of its incidental effects is a rise in the interest rate on Government securities.

MILTON FRIEDMAN,
LLOYD A. METZLER,
FREDERICK H. HARBISON,
LLOYD W. MINTS,
D. GALE JOHNSON,
THEODORE W. SCHULTZ,
H. G. LEWIS,
Department of Economics, University of Chicago.

Statistics and sources

1. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CASH BUDGET

	1950, second half (in billions of dollars)
Cash receipts	21.9
Cash payments	19.95
Total	1.95

Source: One-half the annual rates given in table 9, Annual Economic Review by the Council of Economic Advisers in the Economic Report of the President, January 1951, page 160 (hereinafter referred to as Annual Economic Review).

2. MONEY AND CREDIT DATA, BANKS OTHER THAN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

[In billions of dollars]

	End of—	
	May 1950	December 1950
Demand deposits adjusted	85.0	92.1
Currency outside banks	24.7	25.2
Total circulating medium	109.7	117.3
Time deposits	59.5	58.9
Total privately held money supply	169.2	176.2
Loans (all banks)	51.2	60.8

Source: Annual Economic Review, table A-28, p. 198, for all items except loans. May loans, Federal Reserve Bulletin, December 1950, p. 1641; December loans, increase to Nov. 29, from Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1951, p. 55; increase from Nov. 29 to Dec. 31 estimated on basis of increase for commercial banks shown in Annual Economic Review, p. 197.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

3. OPERATIONS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

[In millions of dollars]

	May 31, 1950	Dec. 31, 1950
U. S. Government securities	17,389	20,778
Total credit outstanding	17,935	22,216
Gold stock	24,231	22,706
Member bank-reserve balances, total	15,814	17,681
Excess reserves	526	1,174

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1951, pp. 43–44.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I agree with the observation of the gentleman from Massachusetts regarding the wisdom of the Committee on Banking and Currency's taking a look at this controversy, if it is that. I think there is a tendency sometimes to oversimplify, to look at it as a war between the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury, and to feel that it is an irreconcilable conflict. There are conflicts, of course, but just as the gentleman has said, the Treasury is naturally interested in saving as much money as possible on our interest charges. That is a laudable thing.

Mr. HERTER. I should like to make this observation. Many people have said that it is our Government spending which has been responsible for the inflation and the rise in the cost of Government.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. HERTER. Last year on balance the Government of the United States took in $3,500,000,000 more than it paid out. In other words, its own actions were deflationary rather than inflationary. At the same time, due to the monetary policy of the Treasury, the bank loans increased over $10,000,000,000. The percentage almost exactly corresponded with the increase in the cost of living during that period.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Many of us are concerned about the effect on the Federal budget ultimately of the higher charges, resulting from inflation, for the goods we buy as a Government. When steel goes up, and there are extreme charges for other materials, we more than wipe out any savings in interest charges. So I think the gentleman is doing well to focus interest on it.

Mr. HERTER. I completely disagree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who said that the Treasury is saving $1,200,000,000 by keeping interest rates low, for the resulting inflation in the country as a whole has brought about an increase in the cost of the things the Government has to buy that is many times that amount.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is an economic, not a political, issue.

I should like to add, Mr. Chairman, that we first need more information regarding the influence of the Treasury Department debt-service policy on the Nation's fiscal structure. Some time ago the Joint Committee on the Economic Report explored the apparent divergence of views of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department and prepared a useful document on the subject. A sincere effort was made apparently to reconcile the conflicting views, but the conflicts were viewed finally as a natural result of the different mandates of these agencies.

The Treasury Department quite naturally thinks in terms of a low interest rate on the national debt. If the Department were indifferent to increased costs resulting from a higher interest rate we would doubtless hear criticism of it. There are many factors involved that have to be weighed, and it may be a decision for the Congress to make in the light of inflation threats. I recall, for example, that the Secretary of the Treasury stated once to the Banking Committee that the Treasury Department would be prepared to respond at once to any directives from Congress as to interest rates but that the Department would ask that any such decisions be made in the light of the effect on the budget and other relationships.

This involves highly technical considerations which I am not able to appraise, but I am convinced that much weight must be given to warnings issued by the Federal Reserve Board as to the inflationary effects of maintaining a low interest rate on Government bonds. The gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that the Banking Committee make an effort at clarification. The committee, being charged with legislation dealing with inflation, would, of course, have jurisdiction over many aspects of the question. Likewise, the Ways and Means Committee, dealing with debt-service problems, would also be concerned with over-all policies. The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a continuing problem requiring the alert interest of the Congress. It should never be determined on the basis of personal or political preferences. It is a cold, scientific question involving the highest kind of professional service.

The fight against inflation must continue on all fronts. At some stages in this struggle to prevent ruinous inflation greater insight and courage than we have yet displayed may be required. We must not permit the illusion of a balanced budget based on depreciated dollars to trick us into an easy attitude on this subject. At times the temptation to surrender to the allurements of inflation is very great. It is so easy for everyone to yield when the pressures are applied for higher prices, higher wages, and even higher taxes. There are pitfalls ahead, however, even for those who momentarily profit by the readjustments. And for millions of people who do not participate in the increase, severe injustices will result if there is a soft attitude in the face of this threat.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know the answer to the questions raised this afternoon. What I say is inspired by a fear that we will be less than rigidly moral in our fiscal arrangements, for we must be fair to those who have placed their faith in the soundness of the dollar. The problem cannot be solved by an aye and no vote of approval upon any specific policy of any specific agency of the Government. It is entirely too complicated for that, but we would do the people of the United States a disservice if we permit the impression to be gained that price control and higher taxes alone will solve the problem of inflation. Both are needed, but we could have maximum efficiency in controls and an ideal tax program and still fail if we do not take into account the relationship of bank credit to this over-all effort to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the President of the United States has authority to send thousands of our boys to their death on the hills of Korea without an act of Congress, does he have authority to keep open the supply lines in this country? This railroad strike should have been ended a long time ago. Is the grievance of these men greater than the need of supplies for our troops? Is their complaint of more importance than the welfare of our economy? It has gone on day after day and day after day. The President of the United States has played politics with it, afraid to come out and do what he should do. He has ample power. He has authority over the administration of the selective-service law. He has other laws.

As a matter of fact, technically the Government of the United States is running the railroads. Who is the greater, these offenders or the Government itself? Why does he not end this strike? Everyone knows that the reason he has not ended it is that he is playing politics with the strikers.

The tactics resorted to are not new. They were used in the coal strike a year or so ago. In a matter of hours, men who claimed to be ill, when in reality they were striking, could have been brought into court and dealt with for contempt of the order of the court. If this strike does not end, there are going to be more people than the strikers in the contempt of the American people.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the American people are entitled to a statement by the administration that there is one policy which has been decided upon as the money-rate policy of this Government. The trouble with the present situation is that one executive agency is pulling one way—that is, the Treasury is pulling one way—and the Federal Reserve is pulling the other. Regardless of which is right, whether it is the viewpoint stated by the gentleman from Texas or that of the gentleman from Massachusetts, we the American people are entitled to one policy being set by the Executive.

Coming to the present E-bond-extension bill, I am glad to see that the Congress of the United States is handling the extension of these E bonds by a voluntary method where the E-bond holders have their choice. We in

the Congress should look to it to see that by action on the interest rates of specific Government bond issues we are not disrupting the money rates in this country and generally increasing the interest rates on Government bonds. Such action would put an undue burden on many working people, including the white-collar workers of this country, in paying increased debt-service costs in the form of added taxes to meet current interest on the Government bonds.

For the record, I am opposed to drafting into the Army or putting in jail the railroad workers of our country, who are a vital part of the economy of this country. I publicly opposed that policy when the President first proposed it a few years ago, and again I oppose it at this time. I also spoke on this floor against the use of blanket injunctions as the President proposed. We should do everything we can to assist the railroad workers and honest management to get their just grievances settled, and to arrive at collective-bargaining agreements by voluntary methods. Congress cannot put one large segment of this population in our economic life in chains and expect this voluntary democracy of ours to work. I am sorry that yesterday on the floor of the House we should have had the administration's chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor urging that railroad workers should be put in bondage who want certain contract-agreement provisions, some of which are granted without question to most of the other labor groups in the country. One thing that they are asking for, for example, is the 40-hour week. I am sure responsible railroad management does not want its employees coerced by threats of Government force. If there has been delay in coming to an agreement, and if there has been delay in assisting these people to arrive at voluntary agreements for the benefit of the country, then the Executive should step in immediately and try to help them reach voluntary agreements, rather than playing politics with the situation. On the other hand, the Executive should not again try to use the Army as a catch-all. I believe it is unfair to fine men in the Army to have it proposed as a threat or a proposed punishment, and I think it is equally unfair to good railroad workers of this country, who are just as patriotic as the rest of us. We cannot operate our country on the basis of coercion and on the basis of forcing people in industry to do things that they will not do by collective bargaining. Agreement and voluntary action is the basis of our system, and not coercion and force against large groups of the working people in our economy. Might I ask the question: If Congress starts on coercion in one great industry, where do you stop?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe substantially to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

In my opinion, President Truman has added the railroad workers to his collection of political footballs. But that should occasion no surprise for he has made a political football of labor legislation since the early summer of 1949.

Truman has had control of the railroads for many months. When the general chairmen of the brotherhoods refused to ratify the proposal of the National Mediation Board it was then incumbent on Truman to compel both sides, and that certainly included the operators, to sit down immediately at the bargaining table and try again.

It is logical and timely to ask what would have been the Truman attitude and action if the situation were reversed—if the unions had accepted the Mediation Board's proposal and the rail operators had rejected it?

Unquestionably the operators would have come right back to further bargaining. Does anyone think Truman would have initiated contempt proceedings against the operators if they procrastinated?

The public, a vitally interested party to every labor-management dispute which results in a strike, has been injured by this rail tie-up which need never have occurred if Truman, already the directing head through Government seizure, had moved long ago with intelligence, courage, and decision.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, in the year 1950 the holders of savings bonds in this country suffered a loss in purchasing power amounting to $3,600,000,000 from their holdings of savings bonds. Here are the figures:

1950 loss in purchasing power of United States savings bonds outstanding Dec. 31, 1950, based on U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index

Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index:[1]	
1949, Dec. 31	167.5
1950, Dec. 31	178.4
(10.9 increase during 1950, or 6.5 percent.)	
United States savings bonds outstanding[2] (in billions)	$56.7
1950 loss in purchasing power of principal (in billions)	$3.6

[1] Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics.

[2] Economic Report of President, January 1951.

In the face of that loss we are trying to find a way to encourage those bondholders to extend their bonds as they come due in 1951 and thereafter.

Specifically, this bill proposes that maturing E-bondholders voluntarily extend their bonds for a second 10-year period. I am going to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to encourage those bondholders to extend their bonds by giving them protection from additional inflation.

The amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk provides that the principal amount of the bonds when matured shall be adjusted upwards in accordance with the BLS cost-of-living-index change upwards during the next 10-year period.

In other words, the amendment would give the bondholders, the investors who make a contract with the Government of the United States, the same protection during the next 10 years from inflation that the CIO auto workers have been getting for 2½ years or more from the General Motors Corp. on a short-term contract. Certainly, if that kind of a clause is important on a short-term contract, and when a short-term contract of that type has the blessing of the Government, the bondholder who makes a 10-year contract with this Government is entitled to similar protection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Will the gentleman's amendment include a provision tying the bond-interest rate to the cost of living, so that if it goes down you would reduce the interest?

Mr. BUFFETT. This amendment does not attempt to change in any way the interest rates on the bond. It does provide that at the end of 10 years, if there has been no increase in the cost of living, the bond principal would be the original amount specified.

Mr. COMBS. What would be the result if there is a lowering of the cost of living during that period?

Mr. BUFFETT. The result would be that the investor would have made a sound contract.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The net result would be that the bondholder would get the benefit.

Mr. BUFFETT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no way you could beat the game. If it drops he gets the benefit of the drop in the cost of living. If the cost of living goes up, by reason of the Government paying higher dollar price for the bond, he is protected against the inflationary price.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In the past 10 years the E bond holder has lost 44 percent of his purchasing power. We want these bonds to be extended. A most important factor to the future of this country on the home front is the public credit of the United States. Now what is happening?

The month of January bears sober testimony on E bond sales. I want to give you the figures from the Treasury statement of January 31.

In January the new savings bonds issued decreased $231,000,000 from the sales in January 1950. The sales of new bonds went down 32 percent. That is a serious decline.

During the same month the redemptions of war bonds went up 20 percent. So that we have this fact: Bond sales going down and redemptions going up. The reason for that is obvious—the people are losing faith in the financial integrity of the Government.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. If we were on a sound currency, with the gold standard, you would not be here presenting this proposition, would you?

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly not.

The point is that we are asking people to make a contract with the Government

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for another 10 years to replace a contract which in the last 10 years has lost 44 percent of its value.

The question becomes: Are we going to give those thrifty, humble, trusting citizens, who are the backbone of this country, a deal that has fairness and justice in it, the same protection as the CIO auto workers get, and unions all over this country are insisting on in short-term contracts. Only an escalator clause on these bonds will give the investor that protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I might say in the beginning it is not my purpose to use 9 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is the gentleman's understanding with reference to the E bonds coming due now in May, that, if they are continued without a reissue, no report has to be made for the purpose of income tax for the year 1951, for the 25 percent that has accrued in value?

Mr. MILLS. Let me see if I understand the gentleman's question. The gentleman means, if this legislation is passed and these bonds are extended for another 10 years, then the interest which has accrued for the first 10 years need not be reported as received in 1951, but may be reported at the end of the additional 10 years provided for in this legislation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, the gentleman is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. By that time we hope the tax will be lower.

Mr. MILLS. And some of us may not be making as much money either.

The bill before us is quite simple. It has two sections. The first section has been explained by several Members. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to continue to pay interest on series E savings bonds now outstanding for an additional 10 years at rates consistent with the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. Without that authority, people still might not cash their bonds upon maturity, but they would not receive any additional interest for any time after maturity.

Section 2 of the bill continues to give to the owner and possessor of those series E bonds the option of reporting interest every year as it accrues, or to report the entire amount of the interest when the bond itself is redeemed or upon the date of final maturity.

That is all the bill does.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield

Mr. FORD. May a bondholder pick any particular year and report the accrued income for, we will say, 13 years, and then let it go for the next 7 years?

Mr. MILLS. The bondholder in any taxable year before maturity may elect to report the interest accruing in that year and in all prior years, but once this election has been made, he then must report the interest as it accrues each year. If no election is made, the interest is reported in the taxable year of redemption or maturity.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. A person has a certain option to make, and after he has made the option it continues for the rest of the life of the bond.

Mr. MILLS. In other words, the answer I gave the gentleman from Michigan is correct.

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. If the tax is not paid on the interest each year then you must accrue the total until the bond is cashed or redeemed; you cannot mix the two systems.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it at all necessary for the bondholder who desires to continue with the program to so report to the Treasury?

Mr. MILLS. If he desires to retain his series E bonds after maturity?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. It is not necessary for him to make any report of his election to retain the bond.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is important, because a lot of people will not report. They will be protected, however?

Mr. MILLS. They will be protected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Whether they carry it another 1 year, 3 years, or 10 years?

Mr. MILLS. That is right; the gentleman is correct; they need not report their election to retain the bond after maturity, and they may wait to report the interest for tax purposes until the bond is redeemed, or until the year of final maturity.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. But if this accrued interest goes over a period of years until maturity it may throw the taxpayer into a bracket where he will really suffer quite a substantial loss. Is not that true?

Mr. MILLS. That is entirely true; he could. He, of course, has that election, as the gentleman from New York knows.

A question has been raised about the amount of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury suggested to the Committee on Ways and Means should be paid on these bonds for the additional 10 years. The Ways and Means Committee is relying upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to this interest. He has a group of some 500 people on the payroll, and several thousands or maybe a million volunteer workers throughout the United States who handle these series E bonds for the Treasury. I know it is their thought, after considerable study, that the interest rate over the next 10 years of 2.9 percent, compounded semiannually, is sufficient inducement to cause most of the holders of the some $35,000,000,000 in series E bonds outstanding, to continue to draw interest on them for the next 10 years rather than to cash those bonds in with the Treasury.

The Treasury, of course, may be wrong; it may be necessary before all of these series E bonds are disposed of by continuation or redemption for us further to amend the legislation to provide an additional interest rate over the 2.9 percent contemplated. I do think, though, that we should be impressed with the likelihood that the Secretary may be right; and if he is right and these bonds can be continued at the 2.9 interest rate, we should permit the Secretary to have that opportunity, because if we do raise the interest rate on these bonds materially over that which we contemplate here, then when the F and G bonds begin to mature we will probably be back asking for similar legislation with respect to them; we will have to treat the holders of those bonds as we treat the holders of the E bonds. This is quite an important question, for the $58,000,000,000 of savings bonds outstanding constitute a rather considerable portion of the Federal debt.

Those of us who are interested in economy would desire the interest rate to be not higher than is necessary to induce the holders of these bonds to continue to hold them for the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, we realize, I think, full well that if these $35,000,000,000 worth of series E bonds are redeemed in the next few years as they become due, in all probability there will not be a sufficient amount of revenue in the Treasury derived from taxation to redeem these bonds. Additional bonds, in all probability, will have to be issued and sold to somebody in order to get the money to redeem these bonds, if they are not extended for another 10 years.

It appears to me that the redemption of these E bonds now, in a period when we do have a lot of inflation, and the issuance of additional bonds to the Federal Reserve which they will perhaps buy, or other banks will buy, will not help our inflationary situation but will make it worse. There are many compelling reasons, therefore, why the Congress should permit the Secretary of the Treasury this opportunity to endeavor to induce the holders of these series E bonds to continue to draw interest on those bonds for another 10 years. I think we should offer him this opportunity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It occurs to me that if we delay the cashing of these E bonds for 10 years it will then just give the Treasury an opportunity to sell some new issues of bonds and the situation in the future will be worse than it is now.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will agree with me that the Treasury will not sell a lot of additional bonds to accumulate cash in the Treasury when there is no purpose for which that cash must be used; in other words, just to build up a big surplus. I doubt that the Treasury would do that and I think that the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might agree with the gentleman, but from the budget which has been presented here and the threat of a request for additional large sums for the future it occurs to me there may be new issues.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman ought to be over with our committee where we are trying to raise a large amount by taxation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope you do not raise all of the money asked for.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman would rather have the Treasury issue bonds?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I do not want that, either. I want to cut down on nonessential expenditures.

Mr. MILLS. I join with the gentleman in that hope. I trust we can do it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will be adopted by the Committee of the Whole without amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U. S. C. 757c (b)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and adding the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to provide by regulation that owners of series E savings bonds thereafter maturing may, at their option, retain the matured bonds and earn interest upon the maturity values thereof for not more than 10 years at rates consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1)."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

INVESTMENT IN E BONDS

Mr. Chairman, the point has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts a short time ago that a $100 bond purchased 10 years ago for $75 will only buy about $60 worth of goods, commodities, and services at this time according to his statement. It should be pointed out, however, that if the $75 had been retained by the individual instead of investing it in E bonds his $75, according to the same standard, would be worth only $45. So he is certainly much better off in investing his money in the E bonds if the gentleman is correct about the 60-percent figure.

SHOULD NOT INCREASE INTEREST RATES

Mr. Chairman, the question has also arisen as to why we should pay more interest on the Government debt. It has been brought out here that every time we increase the interest rate 1 percent it means an increase of $2,500,000,000 a year in interest charges.

Certainly we should not increase the interest rate unless it is absolutely necessary. Who is demanding an increase?

The people are not demanding an increase; the individual investors are not demanding an increase. They can get investments that will yield 5 percent, 10 percent, or even 20 percent. But, it is a risk and they do not want to run that risk. They would rather let the Government have their money at 2.5 percent and know they can get it any time they want to. They run a risk investing their money in these other enterprises. So, there is no reason why we should pay more than 2.5 percent on long-term paper, and if the Federal Reserve Banking System cooperates, we will not have to pay more. If they do not cooperate and they try to adopt a Brannan plan for the bankers, like they have proposed, by subsidizing the bankers, why then the interest rate will be increased. But, it should not be increased. The main reason for the inflation today, or the principal reason, or a major factor in the increase in inflation, is because of the condition of our budget—engaging in deficit financing. If we are going to have increased interest rates and increase the burden on servicing our national debt, why that increase is inflation, because it will be borrowed money to be added to our deficit. It is sort of a double-barreled inflation we would be engaging in.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

The way to stop inflation is to balance the budget, and I think the budget should be balanced. I would be one humble Member out of 435 who would not adjourn this Congress until we did balance the budget, pass the appropriation bills, pass them quickly, find out where we are, and eliminate every dollar that is not needed. Certainly every dollar of waste or every dollar that is not needed should be eliminated, and then when we find out what we have in the form of a budget, whether we like it or not, say, "We are going to balance the budget and we will vote for taxes to balance the budget." I think we should do that. We have a good opportunity now to render a great public service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke of the Brannan plan. The worst enemy the cotton farmers ever had in this country was this man Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, from Pikes Peak. He would not know a cotton stalk from a cocklebur or a boll weevil from a bumblebee.

Mr. PATMAN. I was discussing only the financial part.

Mr. RANKIN. I represent cotton farmers, and I want to say this to the gentleman——

Mr. PATMAN. I think Secretary Brannan is one of the best friends the farmers ever had.

Mr. RANKIN. The present price of cotton in this country is about 43 cents a pound while in Brazil it is 70 cents a pound. This Brannan plan is destroying the cotton farmers of America. You can see that cotton is at least $125 a bale higher in Brazil than it is in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not discussing that part.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman ought to.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the Secretary of Agriculture is about the best friend the farmers ever had. Certainly the Brannan plan for the farmers would be justified, because they need it, although it is not in operation now. But a Brannan plan for the bankers is not needed because they do not need it, and should not be invoked.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. While the gentleman is talking about balancing the budget, will he tell us how to do it? I am interested in that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, Mr. Truman made a proposal yesterday. It is pretty rough, but it seems to me when we vote for these appropriations we should expect to vote for the taxes to pay them. I think the Members of this great body should keep that in mind when we vote for the appropriation bills and should have the courage to turn right around and vote for taxes. They were very hard taxes and we do not like them, but we voted for the appropriations and we should vote for the taxes to cover the appropriations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then if I understand the gentleman correctly his proposition is that as we vote appropriations we should vote for taxes which will raise a like sum.

Mr. PATMAN. I say that when we vote to appropriate money out of the Treasury we should vote for tax measures that will bring that money back into the Treasury and balance the budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what I believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas, while he is bragging on Mr. Brannan as being a friend of the farmer, that the farmers cannot agree to that, since he is robbing us of from $100 to $140 a bale on the cotton we sell now, and has been doing so since last fall.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. PATMAN. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, has been a very fine Secretary. He is a good, honest, courageous man, and I think very sincere. Although I do not agree with him on everything—and I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi does not agree with him on everything—he is bound to agree with him on some things.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I agree that he ought to be back on Pike's Peak, and the cotton farmers agree with me from one side of the country to the other. You will hear from them.

Mr. PATMAN. The cotton farmers are getting along pretty well.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what the gentleman thinks.

Mr. PATMAN. They are getting 45 cents a pound for their cotton and $100 a ton for seed. I have never known a time in the history of this country when they got along better. Does the gentleman know such a time?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. PATMAN. When?

Mr. RANKIN. When they were not mistreated as they are being mistreated by Mr. Brannan today.

Mr. PATMAN. When was that?

Mr. RANKIN. Any time before.

Mr. PATMAN. Do not say "any time," say when.

Mr. RANKIN. The farmer gets less for what he sells than he ever got in history.

Mr. PATMAN. Say when.

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about all the time.

Mr. PATMAN. Name the time.

Mr. RANKIN. Any time any man robs you that way you will be the sufferer.

Mr. PATMAN. When the gentleman makes charges like that, I think he ought to name the time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman thinks it is a good thing for the farmers to rob them of from $100 to $140 a bale on their cotton?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the farmers should be helped as they are helped today. They are getting along better than they ever did before.

Mr. RANKIN. It helps a man to take money out of his pocket and give it to somebody else?

Mr. PATMAN. There are more farm owners today than ever before. Why? Because of a good farm program. There are more people who own their homes today than ever before in history. That is your answer to communism and socialism. As long as you have home ownership in this country, as long as people own their automobiles or their cattle or even their pigs, they are not going to join some organization where they will have to divide what they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am utterly surprised at the argument of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Telegrams are pouring in protesting against this man Brannan's fixing the price of cotton in the United States when he cannot fix it abroad. Last year he did the same thing. He put an embargo on cotton because it was rising toward its normal value. It cost the cotton farmers of my section and Texas and every other State about $100 a bale at a time when we had the worst boll weevil condition we have had in years. I am not guessing at this. I know what I am talking about. Telegrams are pouring in protesting against his fixing the price of cotton.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I say this neither in defense or justification of Mr. Brannan, but Mr. Brannan did not fix the price of cotton.

Mr. RANKIN. Brannan put on the embargo. If the gentleman from Louisiana does not know that, he had better go back and find it out.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Mississippi knows Mr. Wilson is the price stabilizer.

Mr. RANKIN. He was not in the picture last year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the embargo had not been placed on, you would not have cotton to make uniforms for our soldiers today.

Mr. RANKIN. Why not ask the farmers to commit suicide and be done with it? If the farmers followed that kind of policy, they would commit suicide. They are making more cotton in Brazil than they made 20 years ago. I called up and got the prices, and I found that cotton was 43 cents a pound in the United States, and that means New Orleans and New York, and 71 cents a pound in Brazil. What is the difference? It is $128 a bale. That is what farmers of Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, the Carolinas, and every other Southern State are being robbed of today. Yet they propose to carry that program on to literally grind the cotton farmers into the dust.

I will tell the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] what has helped the farmers of this country. It has been rural electrification, for which I am largely responsible. We have electrified the farm homes. We have made it possible for the farmer and his wife and children to live in comfort and to enjoy everything you have in the city except the noise of the city and taxes, traffic jams, and parking meters.

But that does not justify this program of grinding the farmer into the dust by driving the price of cotton down below the cost of production. The farmer is paying for his own electricity.

If cotton had risen to its normal value last year it would have gone to 60 cents or probably 85 cents a pound. Yet today you are going on with an inflation of the currency. It was inflated to the extent of $731,000,000 since the first day of September, up through the month of December. Yet while the currency is being inflated the farmers' prices on cotton are being held down, which keeps them from enjoying that measure of prosperity to which they are entitled, while their boys are being drafted to fight every war throughout the world, and others are being exempted, and some of them going out on strikes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman believe that the embargo put on by the Secretary last summer was put through to keep the price down and not in order to protect the domestic supply of cotton?

Mr. RANKIN. Of course it was not to protect the price of cotton. That situation raised the price of cotton to probably $100 a bale more in Mexico than it was in Texas right across the line. It raised the price of cotton to $100 a bale higher in Brazil, in Chile, in Argentina, and in every other country in South America than it was in the United States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. What was the price of cotton when this embargo was put on?

Mr. RANKIN. The price of cotton was around 40 cents a pound, and it was justified at from 60 to 85 cents a pound, according to the volume of currency and the prices of everything else at that time.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question, yes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Did that stop the price of cotton from going up?

Mr. RANKIN. No, but it boomed the price of cotton to $100 a bale higher in Mexico than it was in Louisiana or Mississippi. Cotton went to $100 a bale higher in Brazil than it was in Louisiana, and today it is $125 a bale higher in Brazil than it is in Louisiana.

Does the gentleman understand that?

It is robbing the farmers of Louisiana, Mississippi, and every other cotton State of more than $100 a bale.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Cotton was selling higher on the New Orleans Cotton Exchange last week than in the entire history of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; and it was $128 a bale cheaper than it was in Brazil. I have the record. No. The gentleman does not understand the financial situation or the cotton market.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman admits that he is not an authority on Brazil, as the gentleman from Mississippi seems to be.

Mr. RANKIN. I am no authority on money, but I know the price of cotton. I can tell you now that if Brannan carries on this program it will mean grinding the cotton farmers of America into the dust. Today, as I said, I called up and found out that cotton was 70 cents a pound in Brazil and 44 cents a pound in New Orleans. In other words, it is $125 a bale higher in Brazil than it is in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee has under consideration a bill which is designed to protect the solvency of the United States of America and to protect the

people who have been patriotic enough to invest their savings and their money in the securities of the United States of America. This bill, I believe, was reported out unanimously by the committee of which I have the privilege to be a member, the Committee on Ways and Means. Until this moment it had not occurred to me that there could possibly be any connection between this bill which serves to protect the people—all the people, the farmers, the housewives, the businessmen, workers, cotton planters, sugar planters, people who work with their hands, people who work as clerks, and everybody—I could not dream that there could possibly be any connection between this bill and the price of cotton in Brazil. But there seems to be such a connection in the mind of the gentleman from Mississippi.

I ask the Members of this body to consider this bill on its merits, without respect to the price of cotton in Brazil. I may say to you that I am not an authority on cotton in Brazil. I do not know anything about it except what I read in the newspapers, and frequently I find that that information is not too accurate. I can say that despite the fact that I have represented a district which is largely urban, I do not know of a single measure which has come here designed to be of benefit to the cotton growers of our great area which I have not supported, and supported wholeheartedly and enthusiastically. Rather than grinding the cotton farmer into the mire and the dirt, the cotton farmers in my area received a higher price this year for their cotton than at any time in the history of the United States of America, and I believe the same thing applied to cottonseed. So if that is grinding them into the mire and the dirt, I say "more grinding."

I hope the Members of this body will not be diverted by a discussion about Mr. Brannan, who had nothing to do with the imposition of this price order which was imposed by Mr. Wilson and not Mr. Brannan, and will not let that red herring influence their judgment on a bill which is designed to help the holders of E bonds.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Since the gentleman has brought forth the "Red herring," which I am used to, I wish to say that I am not opposed to this bill; but I got into this argument with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] about the way our cotton farmers are being mistreated. I am not opposing this bill, but last year our farmers were robbed of $100 a bale on their cotton and they are being robbed today of about $125 a bale.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Of course, the gentleman may be right. I do not know. But the gentleman assumes by his statement that the price of cotton would have come to 85 cents and he assumes that no measures would have been taken before it reached 85 cents. If it had reached 85 cents, it would have been 200 percent higher than at any time in the history of the United States. With all due deference to the gentleman from Mississippi, who I know is a genuine friend of the farmer—he always has been and I am sure always will be—I am not sure that if you put a completely inflated situation on the farmers that you would help our farm economy, because if you inflate farm prices you certainly will have to inflate everything else.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says cotton would not have gone up. It went up in Brazil, it went up in Mexico, it went up in Argentina $100 a bale higher than it was in the United States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I admitted to the gentleman I was not an authority on Mexico or Argentina or Brazil, or any of these other nations that he knows all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It is not my intention to get into this cotton fight, but I would like to repeat a little of the history.

Two years ago, before the Ways and Means Committee, we were holding a hearing and I had been studying a report by a professor at McGill University, who had been down to Brazil and made a study of the country, as a prospective producer of cotton. He found there were about a million acres of land that were ideally suited for the raising of cotton. During the New Deal administration king cotton in the United States was on its deathbed. There was great alarm about it. After I made this statement in the committee that probably we would have competition from Brazil, a leading cotton man of the South took me to task out in the hall, and said, "You are not familiar with cotton. Brazil will never furnish any competition to the southern cotton."

Here is what happened: If you will remember, Secretary Clayton, interested in cotton in a large way, when king cotton was on its deathbed, went down to Brazil and opened a school to teach the Brazilian people how to cultivate cotton. He was responsible for the development of cotton in Brazil. You are not only having competition now but you will have devastating competition from Brazil in the future, because they have more new land available for raising cotton than you have in all of the South.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Right at this point let me say to the gentleman from New York that I agree with what he said about Mr. Clayton. Mr. Clayton and I came from the same town, but in 1928 Anderson, Clayton & Co. rigged the cotton market. I forced an investigation, finally got the Senate to put on an investigation. They invited me over to cross-examine Mr. Clayton, and we showed that his company had bought several hundred thousand bales of cotton that did not meet the requirements, and had got it approved by the Government classers, and used it to whip the cotton market down from 22 cents to 14 cents a pound. We sent men up there who investigated it, and cleaned it all out of the Bay Way Terminal, and taken off the market. Cotton went back up to 22 cents a pound; went up $40 a bale before those classers got back to Washington.

Mr. REED of New York. He was responsible for taking vast amounts of cotton machinery from the United States and other North American areas and putting it in Brazil.

Mr. RANKIN. And greatly increased the production of cotton in Brazil.

Mr. GROSS. Is that the same Clayton who was Assistant Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; he is the same one.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I have a question on that.

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Is that the same Mr. Clayton who was championing the trade-agreements program and who helped administer it? And is it the same Mr. Clayton who went to the Geneva Trade Agreements Convention and took 10 Communists with him?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; he is the same man.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat bewildered by the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] who sometimes is considered a financial expert, I would say, to those on the left of the aisle. What he told us today we might well keep in mind. He gave us a formula for balancing the budget. In answer to my question he said in substance that when we voted for appropriations we should then or soon thereafter vote taxes to get a like amount. Well, that is all right; that sounds sensible, does it not? But the gentleman's record since 1935 nowhere tells me that he ever voted against any appropriation bill. I doubt if he ever has. If he had tried to balance the appropriations for which he has voted by new taxes there would not be in the Congress a man who was in the Congress which levied taxes in that sum.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] just ignores the fact, in spite of all his expert knowledge, that the way to balance the budget is to quit spending so much money. I wonder if the gentleman ever heard of that method? The gentleman has voted for practically all the New Deal spending and wasting.

Now he comes along and he tells us why we would have been foolish to have kept $75 in cash instead of buying a $100 bond. He said that if we had kept the $75 in cash instead of buying a bond that $75 would now be worth in purchasing power only $40. What an indictment of the New Deal, the man or woman who worked and saved 75 hard-earned dollars for his old age, now for those $75 can buy but $40 worth of food or merchandise. If you had bought an old cow or a fairly young cow she would have had eight calves in that same length of time and they would have brought you more in purchasing power than you would ever have gotten out of the bonds. Never did I expect to hear a dyed-in-the-wool New Deal sup-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

porter like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] confess that this administration had followed a program which had cut the worth of the workingman's $75 to $40. The gentleman's argument is absurd for few there be who bury their dollars as the one servant hid his talent when the master went on a journey.

Then there is one other thing, the gentleman by his statement seems to have created an apparent disunity, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] being in opposition on the cotton situation. I do not think that is a good thing. I am all in favor of unity.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Mississippi, pardon me—the TVA gentleman; the gentleman who talks about rural electrification; but let me finish this—I am all for unity. I do not like the idea of those Republicans in the other body who do not want to go along with that gentleman from Connecticut who thinks that Republicans should select their committee members over there in compliance with some Democratic suggestion—that is not the way to get unity, according to their book; you just cannot get along that way. Their idea of unity is for Republicans to accept their every thought, even before they have it. The Democrats have Mr. Dulles, they have Mr. Austin, they have Mr. Dewey and others of these great internationalists and one-worlders; so we cannot criticize our Democratic friends. They even tried within the week did they not to get Mr. Hoover to help solve the problem now existing in India? I do not know—am just asking.

Mr. Chairman, I am going back a little bit to show you how the New Dealers tried to get unity when the WPA was on. If you wanted a job on the WPA the work paid for out of tax money, you had to have the endorsement of your local committee, if you were successful. Here is one:

No. 100. Application for endorsement by Kalamazoo County Democratic Committee.

This was to get a job. The usual questions were asked, then the following:

Did you vote in the primary of September 1932? Democrat? Republican?

Did you vote in the primary of September 1934? Democrat? Republican?

I do not know what that had to do with obtaining a WPA job, but there must have been something to it.

Are you a member of any Democratic organization or club? Where?

Are you a registered voter of what township or ward?

Did you vote in the election of November 1934?

Have you contributed to any Democratic organization in Kalamazoo County? To whom? How much since August 1, 1932?

Are you now occupying the position for which you seek endorsement of the Kalamazoo County Democratic Committee?

Here is the application for rehabilitation funds put out in the 1930's.

Now, listen to this paragraph. You asked for money for rehabilitation, money that the Congress voted, money that some Republicans voted for. Certainly Republican taxpayers helped to contribute to the fund. Here is what they put in:

I agree that at any time prior to the final liquidation of my loan from the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to do nothing that is in opposition to the AAA program.

What do you think about that?

Today the jobs are given to the New Dealers, preferably someone born abroad—old-line Democrats, Republicans not wanted—except where no one else can do the job.

The papers from which I read, read as follows:

No. 100

APPLICATION FOR ENDORSEMENT BY KALAMAZOO COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE

Name ---------- Residence----------
Age ----------
For what position are you now applying?

How long have you lived in Kalamazoo County? ------- previous residence -------
Did you vote in the primary of September 1932? ---------- Democrats? ----------
Republican? ----------
Did you vote in the primary of September 1934? ---------- Democrats? ----------
Republican? ----------
Have you ever run for an elective office? ---------- On what ticket? ----------
When -------- Were you elected? --------
Have you ever held a political appointive position? ------ By whom appointed?------
What are your qualifications for position you seek? ---

Are you a grammar-school graduate?----
Where? ---------- When? ----------
Are you a high-school graduate? ---------
Where? ---------- When? ----------
Have you attended college? ----------
Where? ---------- When? ----------
What course did you study? ----------
Did you graduate from college? ----------
Where? ---------- When? ----------
Where were you last employed? ----------
What position? -------- How long? --------
Were you discharged? -------- For what reason? -------- Number of employees under your supervision? --------
Are you a member of any Democratic organization or club? -------- Where? --------
Are you a registered voter of what township or ward? ----------
Did you vote in the election of November 1934? ----------
Have you contributed to any Democratic organization in Kalamazoo County? --------
To whom? -------- How much since August 1, 1932? ----------
Are you now occupying the position for which you seek endorsement of the Kalamazoo County Democratic Committee? -----
Have you ever had any military service? ----------
Have you any relative employed by village, city, county, State, or Federal Government? ---------- Relationship? ----------
Department? ----------
Were you ever convicted of a felony? ------
Are you in good health? ---------- Have you any physical infirmity or deformity? ----------
What special knowledge or training do you possess which in your opinion would aid in performing the duties of the position for which you apply? ---
---

I, the undersigned, do solemnly swear that the statements made by me, in answer to the foregoing questions, are full and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.
Date ---------- Signed ----------
This application must be returned within 5 days.

IX. APPLICATION FOR REHABILITATION GOODS

The following paragraphs must be read to or by the applicant:

I agree that I will not waive my rights, assign, mortgage, or in any other manner give title to any livestock, tool, or any other properties furnished, rented, sold or leased to me by the Michigan Rural Rehabilitation Corporation. In consideration of the approval of this application, I agree to use such feed, seed, livestock, and exercise such methods of care in cultivation, harvest, preservation and in utilization of crops, livestock, livestock products, poultry, poultry products, etc., as may come into my possession and/or under my control by reason of the Michigan Rural Rehabilitation Program, in the manner prescribed by the Michigan Emergency Relief Administration or by such authority as they may designate for that purpose. I agree to keep such reports and accounts as may be required and make them available for the examination of Rehabilitation officials. I agree that at any time prior to the final liquidation of my loan from the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to do nothing that is in opposition to the AAA program.

I hereby certify that the above agreement has been read by or to me and that I understand and agree to the terms of it.

Therefore, I ---------- of ---------- address ---------- respectfully request that I be furnished and charged for the following rehabilitation goods:

Item	Number	Value
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
----------	----------	$---------
		$---------

Signed ----------
Client

The applicant is an accepted rural rehabilitation client. His application has been received, and a rehabilitation plan has been approved. The list of rehabilitation goods applied for and listed above is within the range of the approved budget for this client.

Date: ---------- 193-
Approved by:

Agent for Michigan
Rehabilitation Corporation.
Recommended by: ----------

County Rural Rehabilitation Supervisor

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, referring to H. R. 2263 now before the Committee, I would like to see this language put in the bill, but in view of the fact it has been unanimously reported by the committee I see no practical way on earth I can get the language in the bill.

Line 11, page 1, after the word "at" insert the language: "a rate of not less than 2.9 per centum per annum" and strike out the language "consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1)."

That, in my opinion, would be one of the greatest sales arguments that you could possibly design to get the people of this country, who hold approximately $34,000,000,000 worth of these series E bonds, to go along with the Treasury

and continue to hold those bonds instead of cashing them in, taking that money and going into the market place and bidding against each other, thus raising the prices of things that are for sale.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has referred to the confidence the people have in the Treasury issues because there is no market risk. During the period from January to December 1950 the sale of series E bonds by the Treasury amounted to in round figures $3,500,000,000. The cash redemptions of that same type of bond were $3,800,000,000. So the people of this country have just $300,000,000 less confidence. That is minus the confidence the gentleman from Texas refers to.

The gentleman since yesterday morning has made something like four or five speeches condemning the Federal Reserve bank machinery and operations of this country. Marriner S. Eccles, the ex-Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, is, in my opinion, one of the best authorities the world has ever produced on finance, credit, and banking.

He said just the other day:

> As long as the Federal Reserve is required to buy Government securities at the will of the market for the purpose of defending a fixed pattern of interest rates established by the Treasury, it must stand ready to create new bank reserves in unlimited amount. This policy makes the entire banking system, through the action of the Federal Reserve System, an engine of inflation.

Here is a member of the Board of Governors, ex-Chairman of that Board, pleading with the people of this country to fix it so that the Federal Reserve does not have to do these destructive things that it has been condemned for so vociferously by our friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in some four or five speeches yesterday afternoon and today. Yet the Treasury of the United States in this bill, and otherwise, fixes an interest-rate pattern that forces the banking machinery of this country to act as an engine of inflation in order to support the ruling made by the Secretary of the Treasury and backed up by Mr. Truman.

In 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 the series E bonds will mature in these amounts:

The first year I mentioned, $3,800,000,000.

The next year, $5,300,000,000.

The next year, $5,900,000,000.

The next year, $4,700,000,000.

And for the years 1946, 1957, 1958, and 1959 the maturities will run from $2,400,000,000 to $2,800,000,000 annually.

General Eisenhower, in speaking the other day, said:

> The fighting forces are but the cutting edge of a very great machine. The inspiration and the power for which we find in the heart of citizens and all of the various mechanisms that are necessary are represented in our investment capacity, our economic processes, and so on, so that when we talk about defending the free world, we are not merely talking about the divisions and groups and battleships and planes. We are talking about what is in the hearts, what we understand with our heads, and what we are going to do as a body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. General Eisenhower stood before the Members of this body, and he emphasized time and again that this job had to be done within solvency. He spoke about the free enterprise system, the investment capacity, and the confidence our people have in these Treasury issues.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yet the general had no reluctance in telling us that we had to ship vast quantities of materials to Europe and more troops to Europe.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is true, and he knew that before you did that, you would have to have people at home who were willing to carry these securities issued by the Treasury in their own individual portfolios instead of in the bank portfolios.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. He also said in substance that this Nation should not be the Atlas supporting the world.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct, and we need to give very serious consideration to this problem.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Is inflation contrary to the policy of this administration?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not. It is in conformity with the policies of the administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the disturbing thing about this legislation is the breach of faith on the part of the administration in not providing for the same purchasing power of the dollar that you receive today when you cash in these bonds as it was at the time they were purchased. I remember very well how the late President Roosevelt took to the radio, and his then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, and told the people if they would buy these bonds, that they wanted to make them sound, return a sound dollar that would have the same purchasing power that it had at the time the purchase was made.

Our Government has broken faith with the investors in these bonds. Most of them are small people who have relied upon the integrity of the Government that their money would have the same purchasing power when the bonds were cashed in as when they were bought.

I am not opposing this legislation; I will support it. The gentleman from Louisiana a few minutes ago said this was to protect the solvency of the Treasury. We must be in pretty bad shape, if we have to pass legislation to protect the solvency of the Treasury. Maybe we need it, but if we have come to that point, where there is a lack of confidence in the money in this country and in the policies of the Treasury and the Administration, we have reached a new low in American history.

I was rather interested in what the gentleman from Texas had to say about balancing the budget. I have been listening to him ever since he came to Congress. He has been one of the chief advocates of cheap money and printing-press money and deficit financing in the United States. This is the first time I ever heard him mention balancing the budget of this country. I think it is a remarkable achievement on the part of someone to convert him to the philosophy that we need a balanced budget. I hope they will continue their effort, and maybe he will come out for sound money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I join the gentleman in tribute to the gentleman from Texas for his changed viewpoint. However, the gentleman from Minnesota must remember that the main method of balancing the budget suggested by the gentleman from Texas is by increasing taxes rather than cutting down expenses. In that respect the gentleman now speaking and the gentleman from Minnesota, I feel sure, would be found on the other side of the fence.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have to collect taxes, but I notice the President's proposal, the first dose that came up here this week, provides for a tremendous increase in the taxes on the middle- and lower-income groups. Most of these people are not getting any benefits from war expenditures. Most of them are living on fixed incomes. Many of them are living on pensions and annuities. Many of them are old people. I do not know how they get along. But the time is rapidly coming, if they pursue this policy, that a large portion of our middle class and lower-income groups will be working at least 6 months out of the year to pay the tax bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman join with other Members in the House in voting against adjournment of Congress until he has voted for sufficient tax measures to balance the budget, after saving every dollar that can be saved in the appropriations?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly will, and I hope the gentleman, who has never heretofore voted for any reduction in Federal expenditures, will join this side of the aisle and vote to cut six or seven billion dollars from the budget on non-essential expenditures. I am glad to join with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield further, I simply want to point out to the gentleman that the same lower income and middle-income people who have been hit hardest and are now being asked to take another wallop with this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tax bill are the very people that are hit the hardest by the Government's inflationary policy, which has reduced to about $60 the value of the $100 E bonds in which they have invested, thinking they were making an investment in our Government and thinking that they were going to get more money when they turned in their bonds than when they bought them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman. There appears to be a determined effort on the part of the present administration to liquidate a large mass of our population that is living on fixed incomes in this country, people who have no means of hedging the little income they get.

Mr. KEATING. Like the gentleman from Minnesota, I shall support this legislation. Prudent management requires that a sound orderly plan be devised to make it possible and reasonably attractive for holders of series E bonds to continue their investment beyond the maturity date.

But we should be careful not to be lulled into a false sense of security, feeling that, having passed this legislation, our financial problems are solved. A campaign will have to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Treasury to convince the people that they should hang on to the E bonds instead of cashing them in, as is their privilege. Confidence in Government securities is even more important in this type of investment, than is the yield, which is relatively modest in any event.

Those who bought a $75 bond 10 years ago upon the representation that they would receive $100 at maturity now realize, to their sorrow, how it was possible for the Government to deprive them of their promised return. They now find that the $75 which they put in 10 years ago, instead of being worth $100 today, as anticipated, is only worth $60.

This is a direct and inevitable result of the profligate spending and "cheap money" fiscal policies of the Administration. Those who now hold these bonds and others who might be induced to purchase them must be convinced that these demonstrably unsound policies will not be continued, if they leave their old money or put their new money into this type of investment. They must be assured that their Government to which they have a right to look for protection will not turn around, after it has their money in its coffers, and deliberately cheapen the value of that money in terms of what it will purchase, thereby depriving them of the rightful increase in value of their investment which it has been represented to them they may expect.

No one of us, of course, wishes to take any step or voice any utterance which will militate against the necessary efforts of the Treasury to sell Government securities. The point is that the success of these efforts rests almost exclusively in the hands of the Administration officials who direct our fiscal and financial policies and also must handle these bond sales. It is entirely up to them and their predecessors in office to determine whether the $100 which a series E bondholder now elects to leave with the Government as an investment will be worth $133 at maturity 10 years hence, as represented to him, or whether he will meet the same fate which befell the investor of 10 years ago and find in 1961 that he can only buy less than $100 worth of goods with the bond which he cashes, rather than having $133 to spend which was promised him.

This is a particularly serious problem because it hits hardest those in the lower and middle income brackets who are accustomed to investing their modest savings in this type of security. Like so many of these fatal Administration policies, the retired workers or those enjoying a small fixed income suffer the worst. They deserve and have a right to expect better treatment from their Government. They should no longer be deceived. Many have already awakened to the injustice perpetrated on them. We in Congress should continue to exert constant and unyielding pressure upon the administration forces to insure a square deal for those who entrust their hard-earned savings to the Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act, section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended—

(1) by inserting after "stated intervals" in the first sentence of subsection (b) the following: "or owning an obligation described in paragraph (2) of subsection (d)";

(2) by inserting after "acquisition" in the last sentence of subsection (b) the following: "(or, in the case of an obligation described in paragraph (2) of subsection (d), the date of acquisition of the series E bond involved)"; and

(3) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(d) Matured United States saving bonds: In the case of a taxpayer who—

"(1) holds a series E United States savings bond at the date of maturity, and

"(2) pursuant to regulations prescribed under the Second Liberty Bond Act retains his investment in the maturity value of such series E bond in an obligation, other than a current income obligation, which matures not more than 10 years from the date of maturity of such series E bond,

the increase in redemption value (to the extent not previously includible in gross income) in excess of the amount paid for such series E bond shall be includible in gross income in the taxable year in which the obligation is finally redeemed or in the taxable year of final maturity, whichever is earlier. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to a corporation, and shall not apply in the case of any taxable year for which the taxpayer's net income is computed upon the basis of the accrual method of accounting or for which an election made by the taxpayer under subsection (b) is applicable."

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUFFETT: Page 3, after line 14, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) The amount payable upon redemption of any series E United States savings bond retained for 10 years or more after maturity pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 22 (b) (2) of the Second Liberty Bond Act shall be—

"(1) the amount which would be payable if this section did not apply, or

"(2) the amount referred to in paragraph (1) multiplied by the ratio of (A) the Consumers' Price Index as of January 15 of the tenth calendar year following the calendar year in which the bond matured to (B) the Consumers' Price Index as of January 15 of the calendar year in which the bond matured.

whichever amount is higher.

"(b) The amount payable upon redemption of any series E United States savings bond purchased after December 31, 1950, and held until maturity shall be—

"(1) the amount which would be payable if this section did not apply, or

"(2) the amount referred to in paragraph (1) multiplied by the ratio of (A) the Consumers' Price Index as of January 15 of the calendar year in which the bond matured to (B) the Consumers' Price Index as of January 15 of the calendar year in which the bond was purchased,

whichever amount is higher.

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'Consumers' Price Index' means the Consumers' Price Index for Moderate Income Families in Large Cities, All Items, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"(2) If a ratio must be determined between a Consumers' Price Index in computing which a given base period is used, and another Consumers' Price Index in computing which a different base period is used, one index shall be converted to the same base period as the other."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The bill before us has to do with the retention after maturity of certain bonds, and the payment of interest upon those bonds for a period not to exceed 10 years after the present maturity date. The amendment offered by the gentleman proposes a payment to bondholders which is beyond the concept of interest. As I understood, the gentleman earlier in explaining his amendment referred to it as not taking the place of interest, but providing a payment in addition to interest proposed in section 1. Therefore, the amendment goes beyond the scope of the bill and is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] on the point of order.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to encourage the retention of bonds for a second 10-year period. That is the purpose of the bill. The terms of the bill authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity and for other purposes. It is to be assumed those other purposes would embrace terms for the extension which would encourage bondholders to extend his bond for that period of years and protect him against inflation which might occur during that period. It seems to me that this is the appropriate bill for such an amendment to be considered, if these bondholders are going to have that protection, and it has to be done at this place or it will not be done.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further on the point of order, the bill in the two sections amends two different statutes. The first section amends the Second Liberty Bond Act and the second section amends section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code. There is nothing in either the Second Liberty Bond Act or in the Internal Revenue Code which is in keeping with the gentleman's amendment, and there is nothing

in the bill to which the amendment itself is germane.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the Committee deals not only with payment of future interest due but also with the payment of the principal on these bonds. It provides for the payment of the principal at future times. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] likewise deals with the repayment of the principal on the bonds.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], it is true that the bill does provide for the payment of principal and interest at a future date, but it does not provide for an additional premium of some sort based upon the cost of living.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ENGLE). The gentleman from Arkansas has well stated the point, in the opinion of the Chair. The fundamental purpose of the amendment must be germane to the fundamental purpose of the bill. In this instance the bill deals with interest on Government bonds, but the proposed amendment is so broad that it would change the basic obligation of the Federal Government on the principal of the bonds. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that a point of order has been raised against this amendment. This legislation gives to the Congress of the United States its first opportunity to give the holders of savings bonds a square deal, to prevent in the future the raw deal that they have received in the last 10 years from their ownership of savings bonds.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] told you how important it was that the people of the country retain confidence in the credit of the United States. He told you how important it was that sales of these bonds be continued at a high rate. But now we find in the consideration of this bill that an amendment is ruled out of order that would give these bondholders some protection against inflation during the next 10 years, an inflation that has robbed them of 44 percent of their principal during the last 10 years.

The amendment, Mr. Chairman, would have operated to restore the faith of the people in United States obligations.

It would have operated to accelerate the sale of war bonds and to discourage the redemption of war bonds.

It would have operated to make plain to the people and to the Congress the imperative importance of sound Federal financing.

The amendment would have given this Congress a chance to show the same fidelity to trusting citizens that the heads of labor unions demonstrate when they insist on an escalator clause in union contracts.

As a practical matter, this Government can go on fooling uninformed people and selling them a deteriorating investment but—day by day—and I testify from 25 years' experience in the investment business—day by day more of these folks are finding out the inherent unsoundness of holding a deteriorating obligation, a fixed-income obligation in a period of inflation.

Unless this Congress comes to grips with this problem that knowledge will grow and expand, until most of those who own Government bonds, and who become familiar with inflation, will have turned them in and put their money in some other form of investment.

The humble, trusting citizens of this country, by and large, are the holders of these war bonds. They are being sold down the river financially, so long as inflation continues and their bonds remain payable in a fixed amount. Every man sitting in this Chamber knows that. Every man sitting in this Chamber knows that in the last 10 years there has been a substantial deterioration in the purchasing power of that dollar. I say this Congress should do something about this situation, and this is the place and time to do it.

We should play square with the bondholders who have placed their future financial independence in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I agree with everything the gentleman has said about the depreciation of bonds and, in general, the awakening of the American people to some of the difficulties they are going to be concerned with in the purchase of bonds. But is it not true that what the gentleman charges as far as Government bonds are concerned applies equally to any other bonds which the purchaser might buy?

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct insofar as any fixed interest obligation is concerned. However, these obligations are our specific responsibility.

This deterioration is a financial debacle without parallel in this country since the Revolutionary War and the repudiation of the continental currency.

This deliberate inflation is so shocking that an able economist, Dr. Paul Poirot, characterized it in this strong language:

> No government anywhere in the world at any time ever perpetrated upon its citizenry a greater fraud than is practiced in the United States of America today. (The Pension Idea, by Dr. Paul Poirot.)

Has he overdrawn the picture? The 44 percent depreciation in savings bonds, life insurance, and war bonds in 10 years is a loss that comes to more than $26,000,000,000.

Here is the picture of the enormity of the loss suffered the last 10 years by those who have been saving dollars.

At the end of 1940, United States savings bonds, savings bank deposits, and life insurance assets amounted to $61,200,000,000. At that same 1940 date the cost of living, measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was at 100.2.

Now let us look at those savings at the end of 1950. The Bureau of Labor Statistics cost of living index was at 178.4, against 100.2 in 1940.

The buying power of those 1940 savings had been reduced 44 percent. The real loss to the holders of those 1940 savings was over $26,800,000,000.

Even more strikingly I can express the deterioration in one sentence: The deterioration in savings bonds last year of three and one-half billions was a billion and a half more than the total of all losses from bank failures from 1921 through 1933.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if American taxpayers generally understood the real meaning of the administration's tax proposals, as conveyed to the committees of Congress, I believe there would be an immediate uproar in behalf of drastic cuts in nonessential Government spending which neither Congress nor the President could ignore.

Even more so would this be the case if taxpayers should compare Federal taxes nowadays with those of only 10 years ago. The comparison shows the alarming extent to which Federal administrations over the past 18 years have gobbled up the substance of the people.

A statistical analysis, which came to my attention through my esteemed colleague, NOAH MASON, of Illinois, shows that in 1940 only about 4,000,000 individuals were paying personal income taxes, which were limited to comparatively high incomes. Today we have 52,000,000 people making personal income-tax returns.

In 1940, a married couple with no children enjoyed an income-tax exemption of $2,500, while today the same couple have exemption of only $1,200.

In 1940 the tax rate in the lowest income bracket on which taxes were imposed was only 4 percent, while today it is 20 percent. In 1940, the highest corporate income-tax rate was 19 percent, and today it is 47 percent.

In 1940, Uncle Sam collected a total of about $4,000,000,000 in all personal income, corporation, and excise taxes. Today he collects $55,000,000,000 from these three sources.

Thus there are 13 times as many people on the Federal income-tax rolls as there were in 1940. Uncle Sam is taking away five times as much of their personal incomes as he did in 1940. He has nearly tripled corporate tax rates, until now he takes away nearly a half of all corporation incomes.

A few weeks ago the expiring Eighty-first Congress added a corporate excess-profits tax, amounting to 75 percent of corporate earnings, above certain predetermined earnings totals.

Since corporations cannot survive unless they pass taxes along to consumers in the form of higher prices, those high corporate taxes, and the additional excess-profits taxes, in the end are paid by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the same people who pay personal income taxes.

Needless to say, corporation officials and stockholders are also consumers, and pay their full share of the corporate taxes, because they pay the same prices as everyone else for the things they buy.

The President now has advised Congress that in his opinion personal income-tax payers must bear the heaviest part of the burden imposed by his proposal to raise an additional $16,500,000,000 in Government income. Lower- and middle-income earners would pay nearly all of the increase, because those in the high-income brackets receive only about 8 percent of total incomes received in the Nation each year.

It has been estimated that it will be necessary to boost the tax rate on lower and middle incomes from 20 to 24 percent, in order to raise only $10,000,000,000, proposed by the President as a first installment of the $16,500,000,000 increase he says eventually will be required.

The Congress should bear it in mind that Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has proposed specific measures for cutting nonessential Government spending next year by something more than $9,000,000,000 from the $72,500,000,000 budget submitted by the President.

If the present Congress fails to take the advice of Senator BYRD, to insist that nonessential spending be cut by at least $9,000,000,000, and if the 4 percent is added to personal income-tax rates, the result may tend to destroy our free-enterprise system, and in the end our individual liberties, under a socialistic form of government.

A Federal income-tax rate of 24 percent would take nearly a quarter of everyone's annual income. A quarter of a year is 3 months. So it would figure out that the 24-percent income-tax rate would have everyone working at least 2½ months a year, just to pay Federal income taxes alone, to say nothing of State and local taxes, and indirect payment of corporate taxes.

If these latter direct- and indirect-tax payments should be added, it appears that the total tax burden for each individual would approach 50 percent of earned income, and everyone would work a full half of each year, just to pay taxes, before lending a hand toward the support of himself and his family.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, it looks to me as though the Republicans ate nothing but rooster yesterday the way they are crowing today.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ENGLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2268) to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WILDCAT RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday several Members announced they had introduced legislation designed to put an end to the paralyzing wildcat strike of some railroad employees.

Information that we have today indicates that many of these strikers are returning to work, probably in response to the very fine plea made to them by Mobilization Director Charles Wilson.

The tendency in the past in instances such as we are going through has been to forget all about the proposed legislation when these people go back to work, then when another emergency comes along and there is another wildcat strike, we are right back where we started.

I think that we should be careful in the type of legislation we enact, making sure that no basic rights of individuals are eliminated. However, always in an emergency, all of us have had to submit to the suspension of certain privileges for the good of the country as a whole. We must be in a position to protect and implement in every way possible our boys in Korea. If they retarded our defense effort as much as has been done by these strikes, they would be court-martialed. We here at home are certainly no better than they are. Even if all these people go back to work today, irreparable damage has already been done our defense effort. But for future reference, remember, it is too late to lock the barn after the horse has been stolen. I therefore cannot urge too strongly that the Members who have introduced this corrective legislation push it through regardless of the outcome of the present strike. I offer my assistance to them in every way possible.

AMENDING SECTION 313 (b) OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2192) to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 be amended to read as follows:

"(b) Substitution for draw-back purposes: If imported duty-paid sugar; nonferrous metal; or containing nonferrous metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and linseed oil, and duty-free or domestic merchandise of the same kind and quality are used in the manufacture or production of articles within a period not to exceed 1 year from the receipt of such imported merchandise by the manufacturer or producer of such articles, there shall be allowed upon the exportation of any such articles, notwithstanding the fact that none of the imported merchandise may actually have been used in the manufacture or production of the exported articles, an amount of draw-back equal to that which would have been allowable had the sugar; nonferrous metal; ore containing nonferrous metal; flaxseed and linseed, and flaxseed and linseed oil, used therein been imported; but the total amount of draw-back allowed upon the exportation of such articles, together with the total amount of draw-back allowed in respect of such imported merchandise, under any other provision of law, shall not exceed 99 per centum of the duty paid on such imported merchandise."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS: Page 1, line 6, strike out "or" and insert "ore."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2141) to make permanent the existing temporary privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, Supp. III, title 50 App., sec. 847), is hereby amended by striking out "and before July 1, 1951."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "and before July 1, 1951" and insert in lieu thereof: "July 1, 1951, and inserting in lieu thereof July 1, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the text of President Truman's speech made a few days ago at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each to include editorials.

Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a speech.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article written by Lt. Robert T. Follin entitled "It's Happening on Your Own Front Lawn."

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from an article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he previously made and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson on Sunday, January 28, 1951.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include letters.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an article from the Jersey Observer of January 19, 1951.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today some small charts.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from a radio broadcast by Paul Harvey.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter in two.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include quotations.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by John F. Nave, national commander, Italian-American World War Veterans.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Raleigh News and Observer entitled "RAYBURN'S Record."

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the death of Admiral Berrien.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hugh Baillie, president, United Press Associations.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

RENT INCREASES IN OAK RIDGE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Oak Ridger of January 25, 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission, on January 23, 1951, announced rental increases for all Oak Ridge family housing and dormitories effective August 1 which average approximately 28 percent, based upon the theory that this increase is justified in order to put rents in Oak Ridge on a level with those in surrounding areas, presumably referring to the nearby municipalities of Clinton and Knoxville, Tenn., 6 and 25 miles distant, respectively. It seems to me that this doctrine of comparability has no more application to Oak Ridge than would Professor Einstein's theory of relativity; perhaps, less.

This doctrine of comparability is ably discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Oak Ridger on January 25, 1951:

THAT TERM "COMPARABILITY"

You've heard of places being described as incomparable. We think that term describes Oak Ridge, too.

Recent announcements seem to indicate that Congress and the AEC want more rents for Oak Ridge houses after August 1. We view the changes with mixed feelings. We'll devote future editorials to the inflationary and home ownership aspects of the rent boost.

Today we'd like to concentrate our fire on the word comparable, or comparability as it is used by Government officials in describing why rents here will be raised to the same level as the surrounding area.

On the surface the rent raises are supposed to have been done in the interests of comparability. That's a word we're tired of hearing. Comparability be hanged. You can't compare this community with any other, anywhere.

And to compare Oak Ridge housing with that in Knoxville or Clinton is absurd for several reasons. First, we'd like to see the yardstick Tredwell and Goldstein used. Did it allow for drafts? Was there a notch for mildew? Did the lack of cellar count for anything? There's a lot of clarification needed about the T and G yardstick.

We think Messrs. Tredwell and Goldstein would not have recommended such a sizable boost had they been living in one of our cemestos or flattops during a recent cold spell.

Secondly, the rents paid in other cities of this size might have some bearing, but Knoxville is a metropolitan area of 250,000 and Clinton has about a tenth of Oak Ridge's population. And the size of a town has a definite effect on its rent structure.

Nevertheless, AEC officials say comparability is the term congressional committees use when they state what they want Oak Ridge rents to be. O. K. if comparability is the byword, let's inform Congress and the AEC that it can apply to a lot of other things beside rents. And should apply to a lot of others before it is applied to the rent picture.

We feel it entirely just for residents to insist that as local officials make rents comparable with this section other city policies should become comparable, too.

When we pay normal city rents we should have the privilege of choosing our own home. We should not be confined to a certain type of housing because of our job classification or the number of children in the family. We should be able to buy our own fuel—and not have to be satisfied with coal of inferior quality.

Most of all, when we are paying rents the same as those persons with free enterprise landlords, we should have the privilege of saying "nuts" to renting a house and buying one of our own.

When these and other conditions are made comparable then it would be high time for the AEC to talk about comparable rents.

In our minds, the time for such a rent increase has not arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that 32,000 persons live in Government housing in Oak Ridge. In the summer of 1949 a joint 18 percent increase in rents and utility charges was made. I visited many homes in Oak Ridge during the summer and fall of 1950. These people then felt that their rent was too high.

In my opinion, this rent increase is not justified.

I have discussed the matter with members of the Banking and Currency Committee of this House and when hearings are resumed on rent control I shall appear before that committee and ask that appropriate measures be taken to prevent the currently announced rent increases in Oak Ridge. And at the proper time I shall seek full investigation of this entire subject.

It is anomalous to say that a Federal agency can do a thing which is prohibited to be done by private business and industry without respect to cost factors or return on investment, but upon the so-called basis of comparability.

The residents of Oak Ridge have no voice in their local government, although they vote in Federal, State, and county

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

elections. The entire governmental set-up at Oak Ridge should be studied and revamped by the Congress. This will not hinder or impede the great atomic energy program. On the contrary, in my judgment, it will greatly improve and facilitate this highly important work.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISCUSSION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it seems that in our foreign relations today there is so much that is passing as coin of the realm which is just miserable counterfeit. We have been told in season and out that we are in deadly menace; that some bogeyman of the night is going to get us if we do not watch out. The powers that be have even gone a few steps further; they have identified the goblin as Stalin. Well, they ought to know. They were the first to take his blood-stained hand, red with the blood of his own tortured and murdered countrymen, and claim him as the friend of America, another great Democrat—good old Joe. After his adoption by the past administration, the bogeyman was fed and made strong by the gift of 14 billions of our dollars which Communists claim to despise, thousands of tons of food and materials which we shall shortly need, and hundreds of war planes and other war matériel of all sorts, which we are now afraid he will use against us and which we could have used so effectively ourselves in the recent disturbance in Korea.

They donated the continent of Asia to him; and the rape of South Korea and the downright murder of our innocent and ill-trained GI's in Korea were all implicit in the sordid sell-outs of this country at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

There may have been some excuses for the late Chief Executive being taken in by Stalin and Hiss at these meetings. Outside of being a foxy local politician, it was never my idea that he was a particularly astute man; and during the last meeting with Stalin, in spite of the statements of crooked and time-serving doctors to the contrary, he was actually a dying man. Only a very young doctor or a fool could have been mistaken in the death mask he wore for a face.

With the present Chief Executive, the case should have been different. Being from Missouri, he should have been a good mule trader, and I understand he is actually a good poker player. As such, he should have known that good old Uncle Joe held a royal flush against his pair of deuces. But he has presented other evidences of being a poor Missourian. A good poker player loses gracefully.

Knowing that the gift of Manchuria and North Korea to good old Uncle Joe would be an irresistible invitation for Stalin to take South Korea into his sphere of influence; and particularly so after the Chief Executive's duly authorized spokesman, Dean Acheson, had so plainly stated to the world that we should not defend South Korea, in case of aggression.

Just what would you expect Stalin to do? Under those conditions, could he have been expected to leave South Korea to develop into a hated capitalist state or that it should be taken in and educated into the better way of communism?

A good poker player would have stood pat and let Stalin take South Korea at least until we were prepared to take care of such a campaign properly if that is what we decided to do after mature deliberation, being in a position to fully count the cost of our interference.

And so here we now have America more or less betrayed by the men who were sworn to protect it. Even if we should give them the benefit of the doubt, though I know of no particular reason why we should, inasmuch as they had taken their oath to protect the flag and integrity of the United States. Let us assume they were glamored, mistaken, or just plain dumb, when they signed and sealed the future security of the United States over to Stalin. Even if that were the case, when the fatal consequences of that mistake are now so evident to us, it is still no reason why they should persist in their obduracy, nor why they should still follow a course which may yet wreck America, the land they have so solemnly sworn to defend and protect.

We hear a good deal of a mandate to be world saviors; in fact practically every speaker and every newspaper article refers to the existence of such a mandate. We constantly hear that we are the divinely appointed people to lead all other nations into freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, where do we find anywhere in history or tradition that we have at any time received such a mandate? There is nothing in the whole scope of American history which even suggests the existence of such a thing. No one has ever had such a revelation. It just seems to be one of those peculiar things which, when the time seems ripe for its emergence from limbo, seems to spring fully armed into action for good or evil, depending upon the nature of the mandate. There was one other nation in history which claimed to have such a mandate to be fruitful and to replenish the earth and become the eventual owners thereof. History does not as yet record any more startling fulfillment of that mandate than will probably be attained by that which we have claimed.

This whole country, and particularly my constituents, are asking when and from whence did this mandate come to the United States to become the new Messiah and lawgiver to lead the world.

Mr. Speaker, in my youth, I used to read Martin Chuzzlewit, by Charles Dickens. In that work is portrayed what was supposed to be a typical American of those days—a cheap braggart, and all in all a most objectionable individual. At that, I am not too sure he was more ignorant and reprehensible than the insufferable coots who claim to be the prophets of the brave new world.

Mr. Speaker, can it be that our President, our Secretary of State, our Secretary of Defense, and General Eisenhower, and others, are so ignorant of the great big heart of America that they do not realize that what America is hoping for, praying for, and striving for is just one little word of five letters as applied to our relations with other countries. What is that word? Just "truth."

America wants no more secret meetings at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, Brussels, or Washington. Eisenhower's message meant little or nothing to us. We care little about his secret report to the Chief Executive for, after all, he is merely just one man. Congress is composed of the duly elected representatives of the sovereign people of the United States. We are the people. We are the country. We are the United States. Congress is the last hope of America.

Just when and where did the Congress of this United States become less reliable than Alger Hiss or Judith Coplon? Just when and by whom was this Congress committed to salvage the results of following the mistaken advice of Owen Lattimore, the trusted servant of this present Government, when he recommended that we should let Nationalist China and South Korea fall to the Communists without giving the appearance that we had pushed them?

We live in the midst of rumors of war, turmoil, drafting of 18-year-olds, transplantation of Government facilities out of bombing distance from Washington, price controls, a ruinous increase of taxes of every known variety, and some which were never heard of before; increase of expensive armament, rumors of bigger and better bombs, and so on ad libitum—and for why?

Mr. Speaker, I pause to ask the question in all truth and fairness. Where is the war with which we are threatened? True, we have the miserable fiasco in Korea into which we were pushed by our unnatural stepchild, the United Nations. I know all about that. But outside of that, who is threatening us? Who ever said they are going to attack us? Perhaps the Chief Executive has some inside information from "good old Joe" that he is going to attack us at some set time or at least sometime. If he has, it is just another of those secret things to which my constituents object most strenuously.

The truth is, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that no one has said they had any designs on our territorial integrity or our free American institutions. I am not a pacifist. I hate Russia and communism. If I loathe this sort of thing outside the United States, how should you think I would regard the vast spurious jingoism which is at present passing for the coin of the realm in America? America is not at war. There is no immediate present reason why she should be. Our stepchild, the United Nations, is at war. It has created for us precisely the peril which it was supposed to prevent. But we are doing 100 percent of the paying and 90 percent of the fighting and dying.

Then why are we having this cheap hysteria of immediate deadly peril, this urgency of securing for the party in power fantastic, and to the taxpayers of

America, ruinous taxation to collect suicidal levies for the party in power to squander as it has done for the past 18 years?

Mr. Speaker, does one not read? Does one not think? The whole history of this administration has been that of one crisis after another and each has fed into the administration's coffers the billions of dollars necessary to continue the illusion of good times, prosperity, and whoopla, entirely resting upon the insecure foundation of borrowed money. Where is this thing to stop? What are we doing about it? It has been stressed so long by the administration, the public has become like the victim of a recent nightmare, conditioned to accept illusion as reality. And this evil is compounded when we consider the United Nations. It was a dark day for America when we accepted the domination of this brain child of Alger Hiss.

We are approaching the anniversaries of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. May I ask you to stop dead in your tracks for a moment and contemplate just what those two stalwarts would have thought of our membership in the United Nations? What do you think the reactions of either or both would have been if they were serving as American delegates to that body? Without spending any more time in speculation, you know exactly what George Washington would do about it. But what about Lincoln? He committed his Nation to a most grievous internecine war to preserve the integrity of the Union. He would not recognize the flag of the Confederacy. But after all the Confederate flag was American. The people who fought and died for it were Americans, separated from us mainly by the problem of slavery which would have been settled in 20 years without the war due to the advent of modern machinery.

The United Nations flag is not American. It has no heredity back of it except that of crime, treason, lies, hate, suspicion, and double dealing. It has nothing in it which is American except our money, and it holds little promise of ever being anything but a wilted and blood-stained rag against the glorious history and tradition of our flag of America, our beloved Stars and Stripes.

Who is that body to command General MacArthur to lead our betrayed young men to death in Korea? Who is that body which advises us to arm Western Europe and sends Eisenhower with our billions to further a project in which my constituents have not the slightest interest; nay, indeed, the whole venture enjoys their most active opposition.

Mr. Speaker, one must have truth. America is too great, too grand, too sublime to sacrifice on any altar erected to illusion. To what shall we then cling in these troubled times? We are naturally a happy people here in the United States. The newcomers from elsewhere have been fed, clothed, and sheltered and trained to be good citizens of our beloved country. We have met our "lions by the way" in the spirit of Americanism, fair play, and candor and have solved most of our disturbing problems. I am fully satisfied that we shall once again attain a reasonable stability as we build up the safety of our country here at home, create as powerful an army for our own defense as we can afford, equip it as fully with modern facilities for war making as will suffice to make us as strong as any other nation of our size. After these objectives are attained, if it be determined upon taking the people of the United States into our confidence and being completely truthful that we can afford to do some other things which would advance our security abroad, such as the creation of air bases in Europe, Great Britain, Japan, or the Philippines, we might then equip such bases. We should not use our land forces to any extent against a foreign power.

Mr. Speaker, I shall close upon the same theme as I began.

First. The United States is not at war.

Second. We are no nearer war than we have been for the past 5 years, except for the jingoistic talk too prevalent in the United Nations.

Third. There is no excuse for the levying of such huge taxes as the Chief Executive has proposed. I should recommend however that a good deal better job be done with the funds spent for the rearmament of the United States than was apparent in the past 5 years.

Fourth. That the Chief Executive immediately and forever cease the strident cries of "wolf, wolf" unless a real crisis exists.

Fifth. And that finally as we settle back peacefully into our American way of life once again and proceed to do that which we should never have stopped doing: "Mind our own business."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DISABLED VETS BARRED FROM WORK ON DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is more than a crime against fair employment practices when men who fought for their country are politely informed that they are not wanted when they apply for work in plants that will make sizable profits from Government orders.

I am not referring to the unfortunate few who do not have the training or experience to qualify for any job.

I am speaking for the many who possess skills that are needed, and are on the point of being hired, until the interviewer learns that they have been disabled, even to a minor degree, while in the service of the United States.

For this "weasel" reason alone they are being frozen out of employment at the very moment that the Government, worrying about a forthcoming manpower shortage, is drafting plans to enlist women, cripples, and the aged to meet the stepped-up demand for workers in defense production.

Discrimination against disabled veterans on the basis of disability alone does not make sense.

And it does not square with elemental justice.

Our repeated tributes to them have a hollow ring, if they are not followed up, not by charity or special privilege, but by down-to-earth protection of their employment rights.

These men can produce, and they want to produce.

Having sacrificed so much on the combat line, they know better than others the importance of diligent effort on the assembly line.

In this emergency some employers insist on doing business as usual, without realizing that there is a public need that requires some sacrifices from all. When we draft men to suffer and to die in our defense, the rest of us at home should be prepared to make some adjustments to the new and critical situation that confronts this Nation.

Such employers will contend that they must be careful about the people they hire. Those who are not physically fit may become involved in accidents or aggravate their disabilities, thereby paving the way for claims against the employers. These, in turn, would increase the cost of the employers' insurance.

Suppose for the moment that we accommodate ourselves to this viewpoint.

In order to understand the manufacturers' position, we will forget all about the veteran of 1941 and 1945 and what they gave, without counting the price, to save us and our comfortable lives. We will even close our eyes to the disabled vets from Korea who are trying to start all over again back home, but at a competitive disadvantage.

We will look at the issue I bring to your attention, coldly and calmly, measuring it by the strict rule of dollars and cents.

Employers avoid taking on qualified men, even those who are but 10 percent disabled because of the insurance risk.

And yet many of those same employers will owe their survival to the Government orders now flowing to them. Before the present emergency supply was catching up with demand in many fields of economic activity. Some industries were approaching a leveling off, leading to a decline. There is no reason to believe that Stalin wanted to save them. But as a result of his activity, this Nation is committed to an all-out preparedness program that is giving a shot-in-the-arm to business as a whole, including some lines that were beginning to falter.

This is also a matter of dollars and cents.

Now none of us will regret the fact that profits and employment will hold up well in 1951.

But I, for one, do not wish to see our disabled vets excluded from participation in this constructive effort.

I believe that we should assist industry to overcome its fears, and encourage it to hire such veterans who are otherwise qualified.

In the award of defense contracts, the Government has an opportunity to remove this discrimination by insisting that disabled vets who apply for employment shall not be turned down by reason of their disability alone.

But how to get around the insurance factor?

In part, some of the insurance risks covering, in my opinion, the Government should assume—in part—some of the insurance risks covering physically im-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

paired ex-GI's who are hired by private employers to help on defense orders, and that this obligation should be written into law.

With the liability eased, employers would be only too glad to use the skills of handicapped ex-servicemen and women who can still put in a good day's work for the benefit of themselves, their employers, and their Nation, and for the most effective mobilization of our human resources.

I intend to introduce a bill to incorporate this provision in legislative form.

It is my hope that the administration will lend its support to this measure before the industrial manpower shortage becomes acute.

The Federal Government should lead the way, through the medium of its contracts, to set fair employment standards that will guarantee equal job opportunities for our disabled vets.

Surely their rights to employment on Government work should be second to none.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 82. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in conection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 101. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 653. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

178. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes," together with an analysis of the various provisions of that proposed bill; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 335. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 512. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River; with amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 596. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 599. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 613. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 638. A bill for the relief of Warren Thomas and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 647. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas; with amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 680. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 706. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma; without amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 712. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Carlo de Luca; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 727. A bill for the relief of Julia Busch; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolan J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Harris A. Bakken; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 774. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; with amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 990. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of William J. Drinkwine; with amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1239. A bill for the relief of Bruce M. Stern; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1249. A bill for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1461. A bill for the

relief of Josephine Lisitano; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1566. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1580. A bill for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Gunn; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; with amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Earl L. Doss; with amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1596. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Sam Patterson; with amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2416. A bill relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2417. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and Local Governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2418. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of emergency hospital care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2419. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2420. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2421. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of certain employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 2422. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide, for certain individuals who have completed 30 years of service and attained the age of 60, minimum annuities equal to one-half of the average compensation received by them during their five highest years of earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2423. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity at age 60 after 30 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 2424. A bill to require that cases in which the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction be decided by the affirmative vote of at least five members of the Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2425. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2426. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of charwoman working part time in the appropriate grades of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2427. A bill to provide that the hours of work (exclusive of overtime) in any one calendar day of officers and employees subject to section 604 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 shall be limited to a period of not more than 10 consecutive hours; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2428. A bill to protect the public health and economic welfare of the States and the subdivisions thereof and of the people thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2429. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2430. A bill to abate the income-tax liability of members of the Armed Forces dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2431. A bill to designate a certain grave at Valley Forge, Pa., as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2432. A bill to provide refunds of certain deposits made for the purpose of obtaining credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2433. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2434. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, with respect to its application to employees of the Panama Railroad Company or its successor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2435. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2436. A bill to stop damage to certain industries and prevent lowering the standard of living of American workmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2437. A bill to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2438. A bill to repeal the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow deduction of certain premiums paid for life and fire insurance in computing income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2440. A bill to strengthen the national defense by making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) as well as all other personnel to choose the type of units in which they serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2441. A bill relating to the deportation of certain aliens who refuse to perform training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2442. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the filling of vacancies in the Senate and House of Representatives in the event of a major disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the legislative branch concurs with the executive leadership in the implementation of armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2443. A bill for the relief of the City of Harriman School District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2444. A bill for the relief of James A. Vines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2445. A bill for the relief of Nella Norma Giorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2446. A bill for the relief of Vitus Johannes De Vries and his wife, Antonie Paula Else De Vries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 2447. A bill for the relief of George M. Sanger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2448. A bill for the relief of Jan Sroduiski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Pulaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of A. G. Crunkleton, trading as A. G. Crunkleton Electric Co., of Greencastle, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of George W. Purdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of John R. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2454. A bill for the relief of Margaret Vrabel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Adolpho Pinedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Akbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Miss Claudia Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. E. W. Sauer, Fisher Methodist Church, Fisher, Ill., offered the following prayer:

At the very beginning, our Father, of this Lenten season, commemorative of the last days in the life of the One who was redemptive love, we pray for divine wisdom that we may so exercise the privileges of American citizenship that we shall do that which is acceptable unto Thee, remembering always that he best serves his country who best serves his God. This we ask in the name of the One who said, "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. HART, PATMAN, BUCHANAN, BOLLING, WOLCOTT, HERTER, and BOGGS of Delaware.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abbitt	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Addonizio	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Leonard W.	O'Konski
Aspinall	Harris	Passman
Baker	Hart	Patterson
Barden	Havenner	Pickett
Bennett, Mich.	Heffernan	Powell
Blatnik	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Bonner	Holifield	Redden
Bosone	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Bray	Johnson	Ribicoff
Breen	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Brehm,	Jones,	Sabath
Buckley	Hamilton C.	Scott, Hardie
Case	Judd	Scudder
Celler	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Cooper	Kee	Smith, Va.
Corbett	Kennedy	Spence
Coudert	Kilday	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Steed
Dawson	Larcade	Taylor
Dempsey	McGregor	Trimble
Dingell	Mack, Wash.	Velde
Dondero	Magee	Vurtell
Donovan	Mahon	Werdel
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Fine	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Fugate	Morgan	Wood, Idaho
Gathings	Moulder	
Gillette	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 95 be recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1612.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1612, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on the bill has been concluded. The Clerk will now read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: After line 9, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. As soon as practicable, but not more than 90 days after enactment of this act, the President shall take such action as is necessary to withdraw or prevent the application of reduced tariffs or other concessions (including the binding of an article on the free list) contained in any trade agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into under authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, to imports from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to imports from any nation or area thereof which the President deems to be dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. As I understood the reading of the amendment, it is not germane to the bill presently before us, H. R. 1612. The purpose of the bill before us, and the sole purpose, is to extend the authority of the President to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements. The gentleman's amendment goes far beyond that purpose, and therefore is not germane to the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us deals with the Trade Agreements Act. One of the purposes of the bill before us certainly, and its major purpose is to extend the authority of the President under the Trade Agreements Act. However, in keeping with that purpose and objective, the Congress has the authority and right to either limit or extend the trade agreements authority of the President. This amendment is directed to that objective. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the principle of germaneness would restrict us in this proceeding today to the single consideration of whether or not the authority of the President is to be extended in the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. I think it is certainly germane to either restrict or extend the authority of the President under the act. This amendment goes to the scope of the authority granted to the President.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Wisconsin has well stated. The question here today is the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress in extending that authority is well within its own rights to adopt restrictions in its grants. As I understand, the gentleman from Wisconsin has offered an amendment inserting a new paragraph in the bill which would restrict trade concessions and free privileges to the U. S. S. R. and other Communist countries, known as the satellite countries. Is that not the fact, may I inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of the amendment. It would restrict the application of concessions granted under the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment is in order. If Congress wants to bar Communist countries from special privileges given to our friendly neighbors it should have that right. We must not forget that to Congress was given the authority to regulate tariffs and it should of course be able to restrict that grant if it so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to add language to the bill providing, among other things, "that as soon as practicable, but not more than 90 days after the enactment of this act, the President shall take such action as is necessary to withdraw or prevent the application of reduced tariffs, or other concessions contained in any trade agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into under the authority," and so on.

The bill before the committee at this time provides merely that the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years, from June 12, 1951.

The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is not germane to the bill under consideration and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further, the Chair then, I understand, takes the position that Congress has no right to restrict any agreement hereafter to be entered into? Is that the fact?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is not germane to this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why is it not germane?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated the reasons.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am asking the Chairman the question if his ruling is based on the fact that it should not interfere with a treaty that has already been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling is based on the retroactive aspect of the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It would be within the jurisdiction if the gentleman's amendment provided that any treaties hereafter made shall not apply to Soviet Russia or its satellites?

The CHAIRMAN. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] would not withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled.

Are there further amendments?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: After line 9 insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign-trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the Commission) with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles, the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign-trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period.

"(b) In the course of any investigation pursuant to this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"((c) Section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930,' approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and before concluding such agreement the President shall request the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and report provided for by section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and shall seek information and advice with respect to such agreement from the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.'

"SEC. 4. The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign-trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings, as provided in section 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign-trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement.

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 30 days after any trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has been entered into which, when effective, will (1) require or make appropriate any modification of duties or other import restrictions, the imposition of additional import restrictions, or the continuance of existing customs or excise treatment, which modification, imposition, or continuance will exceed the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles as found and reported by the Tariff Commission under section 3, or (2) fail to require or make appropriate the minimum increase in duty or additional import restrictions required to avoid such injury, the President shall transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

"(b) Promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign-trade agreement to Congress the Commission shall deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a copy of the portions of its report to the President dealing with the articles with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is the peril-point amendment. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MILLS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if this is not the so-called peril-point amendment, that has the same purpose as the amendment which the gentleman offered in the Ways and Means Committee earlier?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct. It is the same, with some changes as to dates.

Mr. MILLS. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] may have five additional minutes in order to explain his amendment, in view of the fact that it has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for requesting the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is of far greater impor-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tance now than it would have been a few moments ago had the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] been found germane.

This is the so-called peril-point amendment; the danger point. Those words are understood by industry everywhere. Those are words understood by working men everywhere, by those 4,000,000 and more men who lost their jobs about a year ago because of the competition of imports from abroad.

To establish the peril-point principle is the one thing this body can do today to give some assurance to the American workingman that his job will not be traded down the river. This amendment provides a very simple proposition: It is that when the President determines that there shall be further negotiations under the trade agreements, the Tariff Commission, which is an independent body, a fact-finding body created by this Congress, shall make an examination and determine a tariff rate below which serious damage will be done to an American industry if the tariff is cut. That is all it does.

After the Tariff Commission makes that finding it hands it over to the President; it is secret in the hands of the President except as he sees fit to pass the word on to men to whom he delegates authority. They proceed with their negotiations. In the event, and only in the event, that this peril point is disregarded and the tariff is cut below the peril point, then and then only is anything further done. Under that circumstance, when the rate is cut below the warning rate as set by the Tariff Commission, the President of the United States simply writes to the Congress, to us, and says: "I have for the following reasons thought it wise to cut the tariff below the danger point." That is all he does. There is nothing secret about it, no further information regarding the proposed peril points with respect to other items. Certainly that is no burden of any unjust character to place upon the President. Certainly it is the least we can do to assure jobs to our workmen back home.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand from the gentleman's amendment that in the final analysis it is a matter entirely within the discretion of the President as to whether he shall ask that the peril point be invoked?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The President has no choice. If the tariff rate is cut below the level set by the Tariff Commission as the safe level, and the President approves a tariff cut below that rate, then the President, with respect to that single item, says to the Congress: "I have for the following reasons decided that we should cut the tariff below this safe rate as set by the Tariff Commission."

Mr. COLMER. Then, in order that we may clarify it, there is a finding of fact made by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Correct.

Mr. COLMER. And then it is mandatory upon the President to make the request.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is mandatory upon the President to make a report to the Congress if he approves a cut of the tariff below that point. But in no way whatever is Mr. Truman or Mr. Acheson or anyone of the negotiators limited; they may cut below that level as found by the Tariff Commission if they see fit to, but if they do, I repeat, they must tell the Congress that they have done so and why they have done so.

Mr. COLMER. Then what does the Congress do?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The Congress then will do just what I am going to tell you now.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Was the peril-point provision written into trade-agreement bills in the past?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No; it would never be written in a trade agreement; it was merely written in the law some time ago.

Mr. FISHER. It was written into one of the extension acts?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Correct.

Mr. FISHER. And it worked very well?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. We say it worked very well within the limits of the time opportunity. The report was made to the President, but it was not included in the bill.

If I may, I wish now to proceed and suggest a couple of things to do. We are in the war effort, we are very seriously at a disadvantage because we do not have certain items, one of which is timepieces, another of which is wool, another of which is chemicals for the manufacture of ammunition and so on, another of which is synthetic rubber, another of which is certain products made in the glassware industry in wartime, and there are a number of others. Minerals are the most important ones in which we are short.

In every one of those industries what any reasonable person will now say is that the peril point has been exceeded and in every one of those strategic industries we are today short at a very time when we need them. Had this peril-point provision been the law, had the President come to us and, speaking about watches, said: "Gentlemen, I have cut the tariff below the peril point," do you think that you, as Members of Congress, would have sat here and allowed the great watch industry to deteriorate by one-third in the past year? What if the companies remaining have made a few dollars profit, where are we today for timepieces, for the very essential bomb detonation fuses and so forth? We need the skilled labor that was available in that industry. Then there is the optical glass industry, which makes range finders we are importing from Japan, Germany, and other countries today. Remember that the one company which makes those in this land was, within the past 3 months, requested by our Government to increase its capacity by 40 times. They cannot do it. There is not the skilled labor here with which to do it. That industry has been almost ruined because we are today permitting shipment into the United States from Germany, from Japan, and from other countries abroad of the instruments that we should be making here.

We are dependent upon ocean transportation in those very critical fields. Those critical fields I have enumerated only include a few hundred thousand employees. They are within the area where the Hisses that may have been in Government, or the Remingtons, if you please, or any one of the dozen others who have at one time or other been in the State Department, and who have been instrumental in the preparation of these trade agreement policies could, if so inclined, have confined their efforts to those strategic areas with the result that today we are in real danger. We are dependent for our national defense upon the importation of those items manufactured in areas abroad, we are dependent upon ocean transportation at the very time we should be safe. We should be making them here. We should be getting our own minerals here.

Put this peril point provision in the bill and in the future that condition will not come to pass because you and you, as Members of Congress, will not sit here and allow that peril point to be exceeded. I ask you to support my amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What the gentleman says about industries important to our defense is very true. It is significant to note that the Women's Patriotic Congress, held in Washington on January 25 to 27, comprising some 40 patriotic associations, passed a resolution to the effect that the Trade Agreements Act should expire and be not extended.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; that great patriotic organization realized that the entire program should not be passed, but certainly would approve this kind of an amendment. You owe it to the people within your district, you owe it to the people of the country to support my amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that when the President cuts a tariff to a level that is injurious to American industry, the Tariff Commission is notified and in turn the Congress is notified. When the Congress receives this information, what is it going to do about it?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. When the Congress has the information, as I have stated, you would not stand for cuts below the danger point.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What happens? What action can we take?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. After the President notifies Congress he has cut the tariff below the danger point,

any Congressman with an affected industry in his district will know what to do.

He will put up a yell on behalf of his constituents, the employees, and owners of the industry. The Congress will take notice; the blame can be pinned on the President and State Department where it belongs, and believe me, the industry will be saved by congressional action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to examining this amendment in some detail and what it seeks to accomplish, I think it pertinent to go back a few years in the history of this legislation and to the historic friends and enemies of this program.

The reciprocal trade program first went into effect in 1934 under the direction of one of the great leaders for peace in this world, the great Judge Hull, former Secretary of State, and former Member of this body from the State of Tennessee. That program came about after we had seen enacted in the late twenties the Smoot-Hawley tariff which drove off of the seas American commerce and American shipping and reduced our foreign trade to zero, and rather than a program of protection and employment for industry in this Nation, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania now pleads for so eloquently, we experienced the greatest period of depression and unemployment that the Nation had ever known up to that time.

I, of course, do not propose to claim that the reciprocal trade program, operating by itself alone, accomplished these objectives.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Of course, I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts is opposed to this program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the gentleman, since I referred to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman from Louisiana that I am not opposed to the program. I voted for it the last time, but I am in favor of giving American industry and the workers of America an opportunity to flourish, and if the gentleman will accept this amendment, I will be very happy to join with him.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman knows that there are two ways to be for a program. You can be for it so that the program can operate or you can emasculate it by amendments which will kill it, and then on the final roll call be for it. But historically the Republican Party has opposed this program. Historically it has been a high-tariff party, and the gentleman who comes here today, who says that he is a friend of this program, for all practical purposes, regardless of how he may dress up his amendment, is presenting to this body the historic high-tariff policy of the Republican Party.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Not at this point.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wanted to tell the gentleman that McKinley was the one who inspired this program.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Now, despite the plea of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the facts are that employment in this Nation at this time is greater than ever and industrial output has reached a level that no one dreamed it might reach in 1934. American industry is stronger, more virile than it has ever been, so that the charge that this program has affected the security of American industry is palpably false on the face of the record.

Let us examine just exactly what this amendment seeks to do, and let me point out to you how it destroys this program if it is adopted. This amendment sets aside, puts over in a compartment by itself, and isolated from the other agencies of the Government, the Tariff Commission of the United States. It says to the other agencies of the Government, "You are deprived of the facilities of the Tariff Commission of the United States."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago in support of his amendment made a plea based upon the defense requirements of the United States of America, yet, I say to you that the effect of his amendment is to deprive the executive agencies of the United States of the consultation of the Tariff Commission in the establishment of these agreements. Under existing legislation, not only do we employ the facilities of the Tariff Commission, the experts of the Tariff Commission, the trained personnel of the Tariff Commission, but we employ the facilities of the Department of Defense, the Department of Commmerce, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and other agencies of the Government which are capable through the joint committee of formulating policies which affect the over-all welfare of the United States.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman must know that the Tariff Commission is a fact-finding body. That is why it was created. It is the one that presumably today tells the President where the danger point is. The only difference is that the President cuts the tariff, if he sees fit, below that danger point and then does not tell the public. All this says is, "Mr. President, you must tell Congress that you have seen fit to cut the tariff below this level," and the American people are entitled to know that.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In reply to the gentleman I will read a statement, just a paragraph or two, made by Mr. Kline, president of the Farm Bureau Federation of the United States, where he in behalf of the farmers vigorously opposed this amendment. He opposed it then and he opposes it now. This is what he said 2 years ago when the Republicans did put through these crippling amendments:

> These amendments remove the United States Tariff Commission from the list of agencies from which the President must seek information and advice with respect to the negotiation of proposed trade agreements, and the Commission or its representative are specifically prohibited from participating in the negotiations of trade agreements.
>
> These amendments also require that before trade-agreement negotiations can be conducted, the Commission must conduct separate, independent investigations and reports, and hold separate hearings which duplicate the hearings held by the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Not only did Mr. Kline say that but the United States Chamber of Commerce said the same thing. The Junior Chamber of Commerce said the same thing. Every friend of this program, to my knowledge, without exception, took the identical position. Mr. Charles Taft, the distinguished brother of a Member of the other body, testified before our committee and made a very strong statement against the so-called peril-point amendment. The amendment is opposed by the civic, by the business, by the commercial organizations of the United States. It is opposed almost unanimously by the press, whether that press be Democratic or Republican in its predilections. It comes here not under the sponsorship of the traditional friends of this program but under the sponsorship of the people who gave this country the highest tariff in its history, and who now seek by indirection, by a procedural device, if you will, again to destroy the program.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend who has just spoken said that those who favor this amendment are enemies of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Such is not the case at all. I have always supported the reciprocal trade-agreements program. I am for it. I am going to vote for it today, whether or not this amendment is adopted. But I do say that this is a reasonable, a fair, a democratic amendment, and that we ought to adopt it.

I recall when the President last addressed this Congress he said we should put the welfare of the country above partisan politics. We all agree to such a principle. The peril-point and the escape-clause amendments being offered to this bill are very much in the public interest.

The peril-point amendment after all simply gives to industry and labor in this country a wailing wall, so to speak.

It does not in any wise tie the hands of the administration, as alleged. I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

have sat in this chamber during numerous debates on the various extensions of the reciprocal trade agreements program. I am getting tired of having the personality of our great former Secretary, Mr. Cordell Hull, made an issue in this discussion. We revere his services to the country and he was the father of this program, but that is no reason why there should not be from time to time a reasonably practical amendment to the program. The Congress is being asked here to grant almost plenary power of life and death over American industry and American labor to the Secretary of State. I am not willing to entrust such power to any agency or department of Government. The American people are getting tired of this Congress frittering away its legislative duties and responsibilities. If you Members have been reading your mail lately, you know that we are being castigated because we do not do our duty and because we turn over to the sprawling executive branches of the Government vast responsibility and power over the lives and property of the people.

There are two amendments to this bill which are going to be offered. I want to go on record as being in favor of both of them. One is the peril point amendment and that is an amendment before the fact, if you please, to give industry and labor the right to go down to the Tariff Commission and say, "Here is a level below which we are going to be hurt." In the course of American jurisprudence and American justice has anybody ever been denied such a right—the right of petition, if you please?

The other is the escape clause amendment which is going to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and I understand another by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. That amendment gives the industries and labor organizations of the country the right to go in after the fact, when these agreements have been working for a while, and say, "Conditions have changed. Business has fallen off. The economic situation has changed, and we are entitled to some relief."

Who is there here who has the temerity to stand in the well of the House and say that American industry, American labor, and the American people are not entitled to both those rights? Have we come to a point in this country where we are willing to deliver to anybody, good, bad, or indifferent, plenary power of life and death over American industry and American labor? I still say we should take care of this country first. I do not think we can do it by high tariffs. Neither do I think we can do it by eliminating all protection and all restrictions which have been set up for the protection of the American standard of living. We all know, and we are proud of the fact that American labor has the highest standard of living of any labor in the entire world. We also know that American labor cannot compete with coolie labor in China and with the labor of many other parts of the world. So we simply say here through the peril-point provision that these people, our people who have contributed to the strength and security of this country, have the right to be heard. Opponents of these amendments say, "Oh, you are taking the Federal Tariff Commission out—you are depriving the committee that negotiates these treaties of the expert advice of the Federal Tariff Commission." There are plenty of other people who can give expert advice. For that matter they can take the assistance even of the commissioners themselves outside of their official role as commissioners, if necessary, and consult with them. That is simply a smoke screen in an effort to defeat amendments which ought to be written into this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the House exercise good judgment and write into this program American amendments for the benefit of American labor and American industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to be realistic, and first of all to be Americans. How does it happen that we have one of the greatest governments in the world? How does it happen that we have the highest standard of living?

Going back to the beginning of this Government, every government, including Great Britain, was trying to make us just a producer of raw materials. She was going to have the payrolls. She was going to manufacture the goods. This country has always protected its market. It has had to protect its market against the cheap labor abroad. Today, the disparity between wages in this country in industry and those competing industries abroad is so great that it is utterly impossible for us to continue to have the high standard of living which we enjoy.

Already foreign goods are coming into this country in quantities that are disastrous. When I say "disastrous" let me bring you down to earth, if I may, just a moment. There are simply thousands of villages and communities throughout this country that live upon the payroll of an industry. Our communities are built on payrolls. When we export those payrolls abroad we destroy not only the payrolls of that community but we destroy the community itself.

Can you imagine anything that those countries behind the iron curtain and Russia herself would enjoy more than to be able to strike terror into this country by destroying its payrolls?

Who helped frame these low tariffs? Well, Alger Hiss was one of the moving spirits in that, as he was, of course, in relation to the United Nations. Strange thing that they should have the veto power in the United Nations. Strange thing that they would want to lower the tariffs down below a danger point.

When we think of our boys fighting in Korea, probably under worse conditions than an American army ever faced, losing their feet, their hands, their eyes, and many of them losing their lives, fighting 7,000 miles away from home, I wonder what they are going to think when an amendment like this is under consideration and the House opposes it on a technical parliamentary point. I wonder what they are going to think about turning down by a parliamentary move the Byrnes amendment that was offered earlier. All we are trying to do is to stop our enemies from getting the benefit of all the reductions made to 45 free countries. Russia dominates over 800,000,000 people, with all of those countries behind the iron curtain, yet we turn down a proposition of protecting our boys who are fighting over in Korea. Russia and her satellite countries can pour their imports in here and get all the benefits of a low tariff, get dollars with which to buy the tanks and guns and facilities to murder our boys. Think of it. Yet they raise a point of order against our boys—not against us, but they raise a point of order against our boys in Korea being able to defend themselves against Red China and the Russian satellite countries.

I say the time has come to be realistic. Certainly there is no industry in this country that should not be protected against the tariff being lowered below a danger point, the destruction point of that industry. I say, if there is anybody on this floor who wants to fight for the boys, they should at least strive to save this peril point; save our industries. We are going to need production if we do not have inflation.

You may believe that foreign goods are not impinging on our payrolls. What I am reading is local, but it applies to every community in this country.

> Only yesterday, a Washington clothier and haberdasher in an advertisement calling attention to an inventory clearance offered such items as men's fine shirts of imported fabrics, imported hand-blocked wool neckwear, imported sweaters, imported English wool hose, imported men's toilet soap, silk mufflers hand-blocked in England, men's English gabardine topcoats, imported English felt hats, imported Scratch felt hats, made in Italy, imported Shetland sport jackets, tailored sport jackets of imported fabrics, handwoven Shetland tweed sport jackets, imported material cheviot topcoats, Burberry topcoats, made in England, tweed topcoats, hand woven in Scotland, Chester Barrie tweed topcoats, hand-woven in Scotland, imported shoes made by Alan McAfee of London, Saxony woolen coats made by Rodex of London, Rodex Scotch tweed topcoat, and a group of imported single-breasted English raincoats for women.

These advertisements are being carried all over this country. Now, are you going to stop it or are you going to do away with the peril point and let these industries be destroyed?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to point out to the gentleman that these industries to which he refers have been producing the money that makes the profits, that pays the taxes into the Federal Government, that makes this whole program in Europe

possible. In other words we pumped $40,000,000,000 into Europe in the last 4 years to rehabilitate the industrial life of the European countries. Now they lower the tariff barriers and they flood this country with cheap merchandise that is crucifying the industries that make the whole program possible.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that over in Germany today they are making chemicals just as good as we can here in this country. The gentleman knows also that right now at Torquay they are negotiating away the protection of the American chemical industry. This industry today cannot expand because private capital will not go into it knowing that the same chemicals will come from plants in Germany which have been built under ERP funds.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. I want to call attention to another thing: The gentleman from Louisiana referred to our export business. Yes; I went into the export business in my first speech. That was the export business that brought about the war in the Pacific and murdered our boys in Pearl Harbor and Japan. We poured $40,000,000,000 since the war in Europe through the ECA and what has happened? Of course we can ship over exports when the money that pays for the exports comes out of this country; and, of course, there is a certain group of our people, the taxpayers, who will pay for the exports, and, of course, the foreign nations will believe in a system of government that gave them gratis the exports. I say again, the time has come to be realistic.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this peril-point amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, there is nothing that could be done that would so jeopardize the trade-agreements program or so cripple its administration as to adopt this amendment.

It has been said here by speakers before me, and especially by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], that this amendment will create a forum or a wailing wall for American industry. He evidently is not familiar with this program and does not know the method of negotiating a trade agreement at the present time. The very Tariff Commission in whose hands they seek to put the whole proposition sits on the Committee for Reciprocity Information. It is a superb fact-finding commission, and it dominates the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Let me briefly describe what takes place when a trade treaty is in process of negotiation. In the first place they publish a list of those articles that may be negotiated. The public is put on notice that these articles may come up for negotiation with a certain country and if any manufacturer or producer of those articles desires, he may appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and give testimony. Now, Mr. GOSSETT, there is your wailing wall, there is your committee. They hold hearings and at these hearings there will be, and always is, a member from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of National Defense, and lately they have added all of these new agencies like the ECA.

Let me explain to you what recently happened in my own district. We are producing down there an agricultural product that is not produced anywhere else in the United States to any extent. My district produces 95 percent of the American supply of it. They advertised they were going to hold these renegotiation hearings at Torquay, England, and that this article might be brought up and might be negotiated. We immediately appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the member on that committee from the Tariff Commission particularly questioned me about this product, why it happened to be grown down there, and so forth. I am glad to tell you that they made a report that the tariff rate must not be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, the Tariff Commission not only hears this testimony just as it would under the peril-point proposition, but they sit in at the negotiations, they will have their man to talk in England, and you are now getting the benefit of all the knowledge that the Tariff Commission has on any item.

Let me say further that in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which has not been repealed, there are more than 5,000 articles or items and each one of these items has many forms and shapes; so you might say there are 20,000 items. How long do you think it will take the Tariff Commission to set up peril points on all of the goods manufactured in this country?

Let me tell you something else. Instead of helping this program, instead of helping to protect the interest of manufacturers in this program, it will so retard the work of the Commission they will never get around to all of them. This program has been in effect since 1934. It has been so successful that every big trade body in this country, including the United States Chamber of Commerce, is in favor of it. Since its inception in 1934 there have been only 20 appeals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer an argument advanced by the gentleman from Louisiana with reference to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act passed many years ago. You know, that is almost ancient history, but this is a very vital fact; at no time since that bill was passed has the Democratic majority ever tried to repeal any of it. They have been challenged on this floor dozens and dozens of times to do something about it and quit talking, but they have never done a thing about it. They must really like it.

Let me speak for a few minutes about this peril-point proposition.

On this proposition the words "peril point" are very catchy, and they mean a whole lot. But, there has been a great deal developed in the last 2 or 3 years that makes this peril point still more important.

My good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] spoke about what the Tariff Commission does. The Tariff Commission is a high-class commission, appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. It is a continuing commission; it is a nonpartisan commission. I think it has four Democrats on it and three Republicans. It has made a great reputation, but it has not been allowed hardly at all to function since these Hull agreement laws have been passed. What has taken its place? This thing they call the Committee on Reciprocity Information has in effect taken its place. That is a political committee. Now, does anybody want to dispute that with me? I repeat, that committee is purely a political committee. You may say, "Well, one man sits on it from the Tariff Commission." Yes, only one man. He goes there, but listen to me, the practice and the story that we get before our committee is that people have gone down there by the dozens to present their views and they get the brush-off; they do not get anything. It is purely a political committee, and speaking a few days ago I said something about it and I struck what I said out of the record—I said their conduct has been almost disgraceful. Maybe I ought to strike that out of the record because I do not like to say it. It is not a popular committee; it is not functioning properly. It has been an overriding committee. On the other hand, who is there here who wants to say that the Tariff Commission has not done a high-class job? It has.

Now, all we want to do with this peril-point business is this: The law provides that the President can increase or decrease tariff duties within certain limits. Do you know he never has increased the rates but once? I believe that is all; I may be wrong about that, but not more than two or three times has he ever increased any duty for anybody under any circumstances. All of his actions have been reductions. He reduces, he reduces, and continues to reduce. Why? Because the Committee on Reciprocity Information tells him to do that. The President can hardly have time to know these details. That is one of the reasons this Congress set up the Tariff Commission.

Now, all we do have now is two things. We try to take from this Committee on Reciprocity Information some of this power that it has arrogated to itself, and the only way to do that is by publicity, and that is the reason we want this publicity. The President should be compelled to make a report to the Congress. I want to tell you that in this democracy there is a wonderful potency in publicity. Likewise, there is potency in being truthful and honest and aboveboard, and that is all we ask in this amendment for the President to tell the Congress and the world why it is he wants to reduce the tariffs down below the point which will be perilous to some industry and below a rate fixed by the Congress and by the Tariff Commission itself. At present he can do as he

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

pleases without any accountability to anybody, and I tell you that this President or any other President should have that power taken away from him. We went a long way when we gave the President power to fix duties within a limit in the first reciprocal agreement tariff law. The Constitution gives that power to the Congress and not only does it give Congress the power, but it puts upon Congress the duty. We have that responsibility, and we have in the interest of expediency, in times gone by, clear from the days of McKinley, given to the President some rights and some privileges. But these privileges were only to be exercised as an assistance to carrying out the law and were to be exercised only within certain definite limitations. In that way Congress kept the legislative function to itself and gave to the President only a well-limited executive function. But now we come to the place and say, "You have abused that privilege; your committee has exceeded the limits." How do we know? Take the testimony of the watch people, the pottery people, and the glass people, and the fisheries on both oceans, and they will tell you what kind of treatment they get down there before this Committee for Reciprocity Information.

My friends, I say that is in the interest of everybody, that the people be protected by the passage of this amendment, fix certain points below which the duties should not be lowered.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual role for me to occupy. Ordinarily I have not been opposed to the reciprocal trade agreement program, but I have had some complaint about the administration of it. However, it seems to me this amendment is impotent, unnecessary, ineffective, and would bring no benefits at all to those who are supporting it.

Let me read you the testimony of a man whom you all know, who I think knows as much about tariffs as any man, and who is as much opposed to the reciprocal trade agreements program as any man could be, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. MALONE. As I read his testimony from page 374 of the hearings, may I say that his position is my position on this amendment:

Mr. MILLS. Senator, were you one of the advocates in the Senate of the so-called peril-point provision? I think I recall that you introduced, with other Senators, a bill along that line back in the Eighieth Congress. Am I not right on that?

Senator MALONE. No. I want to correct you on that. I am not in favor of the peril point. Of course, it would be better than what we have now, but I am not in favor of it because all it would do would be to make the President write us a letter to let us know why he is exceeding the peril-point tariffs.

Mr. MILLS. If you will permit me to interrupt you, actually it has been my opinion all the time that the peril-point provision did not really accomplish the safeguards that its advocates have claimed it would accomplish because it does not prevent anything from occurring. Is not that right?

Senator MALONE. In my opinion, it would be useless, and probably worse, because if we accept the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act with that principle, then we are lost.

I take the same position as the Senator from Nevada. This is an amendment offered only for the purpose of amending something. It has no force and effect and would be of no value to the people who might be led to believe they were getting some benefit under this amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has quoted Senator MALONE. He has not covered the fact, though, that Senator MALONE stated he was 100 percent opposed to the program.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right; he is opposed to it, but he is opposed to it outright, and he is not ready to accept an amendment of this kind by the back door. It would have the effect of destroying the very thing he is for.

There are other reasons why I have changed my mind somewhat on this program. The situation is different than it was a year ago. We are in a world struggle today. Peace is more important now than any other thing to be desired. These trade agreements are interlaced with every country with which we have relations. These relations are already strained to the breaking point with many of them, not only with Russia and the satellite countries but with others. It seems to me that this amendment, instead of encouraging the boys in Korea, would have the opposite effect by giving them the impression that we are doing something to rock the boat and disturb our now serious relations with other countries of the world. I think it is unfortunate that we should do this at this time. Even if I were for amending this trade-agreements program, I would hesitate to do it at this particular time. But this amendment is impossible, as it would hold out only a false hope to one who considered himself to be injured.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subject before us today known as the Trade Agreements Act, H. R. 1612, vitally affects all Americans—the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer. It will determine whether we go forward to a high standard of living with a higher standard of wages, or blunder into another depression or recession. In my opinion, American trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man no matter how sincere he may be. This authority should be retained by Congress or, at least, Congress should establish certain standards for the guidance of the President so the people, business, labor, and agriculture will know what to expect.

I believe this bill should be amended so we will have a peril point provision which is nothing more than a report made by the Tariff Commission specifying a point which would be perilous to this country to go below in tariff reduction. In other words, the peril point is a stop or, at least, a slow clause which will certainly help protect the American worker, farmer, and industrialist from low wage rate goods imported into the United States from foreign countries. It would prevent glassware, tableware, pottery, Russian furs, Red Chinese dried eggs, and other farm and industrial products from being sold in America much cheaper than they could be produced here simply because they are produced by slave labor. No thinking and patriotic American should object to the inclusion of this amendment which is essential to the preservation of our Nation's economy and our Nation's security.

I also urge that an amendment be included in H. R. 1612 to provide an escape clause. The reason for this is that at the present time many industries whose tariff protection has been seriously reduced are unfairly discriminated against because they are denied the privilege that other industries have of appealing under the escape clause. I contend that all industries should have equal treatment and a chance to have their day in court.

If these two amendments are not incorporated in this bill, certainly the working people and all those who have a stake in the continued prosperity of our Nation should hold the New Deal party strictly responsible for the economic evils and disastrous consequences which will beset our national economy, and be the result of any ill-advised tariff reduction. When the time arrives when factories are closed and millions are out of work, those directly affected should remember who is to blame.

May I reiterate my former statements, Mr. Chairman: When you reduce the tariff on products from other countries, you are allowing products to be brought into this country made by low-income labor, which makes it impossible for the American worker to match. We all believe in reciprocal trade, but let us make sure it is reciprocal, taking into consideration the welfare and living standard of our own people. The Trade Agreements Act is a sell-out by the New Deal party to the free traders of the South. The farmer, the workingman, and the small-business man are pushed aside and their interests are forgotten. We must remember we are furnishing cash to foreign countries to pay the labor for their products so as to be a part in world markets. This bill as written would force us to compete against our own tax money and grant favoritism to our competitors.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am shocked at the position of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], a member of the committee. For 12 years the gentleman and I and many others have fought together here to rehabilitate the mining industry of America. I have no mines in my district, but I have fought for the sake of our national defense. We have had our quarrels with the Munitions Board. He knows full well what President Truman's position was in signing Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Stock Pile Act, when he opposed very outwardly, but did not veto, the "Buy American" clause in that law. I have on my desk the last annual report of the Munitions Board dated January 23, 1951. We have reached the miserable percentage of 30 percent of the Government's stockpiles, and so far as the mines are concerned,

we lost 8,000 of 11,000 gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc mines between 1935 and 1951. Eight thousand have been closed. We have crossed the peril point so often and so violently I am surprised that any Member from a mining State can stand up in the House of Representatives and defend an action which seeks to eliminate any provision which would inform the American people that we are going below the peril point. I do not know why the mining industry would want us to blindfold ourselves so that we will not know when we are again crossing the peril point. As a matter of fact we have crossed it many, many times and this bill makes us ever more impotent in our national defense efforts.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman will admit that there was not a single mining man or livestock man or wool grower who appeared before the committee or who even wrote a letter to the committee in opposition to the passage of this bill; is that not true? Not a man appeared before our committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Not this year, but we incorporated by reference the proceedings of the preceding hearings 2 years ago and the gentleman will find plenty of evidence and plenty of testimony in opposition. Those hearings were incorporated by reference, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings you will find the statement of President Truman opposing the "Buy American" principle on page 295. If you are interested in it I suggest that you read it. You will find there his ideas about "Buy American." You will also find the situation of the wool industry in America very graphically portrayed in this year's hearings on page 164, and you will find the contrasting situation in wool in South Africa on page 165 of the hearings. If you are interested you should read it. If you want to go back a little more in history, go back to the hearings of 1948 and read there Mr. Clayton's testimony and picture the background there of his dash back here from Geneva to induce us to do something about wool. What did we do with wool? We granted Britain a 25 percent reduction in the wool tariff to get Britain lined up with our trade agreement program. What happened? Well, you can find out from the hearings. I will tell you that the population of sheep in America today is at its lowest ebb since the Civil War, and we are more dependent on imports than ever before. You will also find, if you want to look for it, that Australia and New Zealand are selling wool and shipping it into Russia today.

Now let us consider the question of rubber. If you want to find a sickening surrender of our State Department in trading over the safety of our men in Korea, then look at pages 836 and 837 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31 where I quoted the State Department's excuse for condoning the sale and shipment of rubber from Malaya and Hong Kong to the U. S. S. R. and Red China. Rubber is going there in ever greater quantities. Is it any wonder that raw rubber jumped from 17 cents up to 75 cents? Is it any wonder that wool jumped from $1.99 last June to $4.30? We are bidding frantically against the world while our allies help our enemies. We are bidding against our enemies with our own allies who are the principal sources of supply because we have long since passed peril points so far as our own production of domestically produced strategic and critical materials and our own self-sufficiency is concerned.

Now, let us take this Munitions Board report. I have just received this report today. It is dated January 23. Our Government stockpile stands at 30 percent. Oh, they say they revised the objective. What have they been doing? Taking a nap for 5 years? I wanted to get this objective up 5 years ago. They have been nursing us along with statements of their own self-praise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I say the Munitions Board today have finally jumped out of their rocking chairs with their pants on fire. They tell you now that they have an objective of $8,000,000,000 of strategic and critical materials. They were satisfied less than a year ago with an objective of $4,000,000,000 of Government stockpile.

What is the situation in private industry? We could take the hide off of them too, because they not only gobbled up all the available supply of strategic and critical materials after World War II, and RFC handed over to industry about $12,000,000,000 worth of them; they not only gobbled all that up but they have lowered their reserves to the danger point. There is no adequate private industrial stockpile of strategic and critical materials in this country today.

Now, the Democrats tell us that we are so impotent that we must continue the most-favored-nation clause to our enemies. How can I expect you to join with me in standing up and fighting Great Britain and some of her colonies and telling them what we think of them for insisting on sending rubber and wool and other critical and strategic materials directly into China and directly to the iron-curtain nations? What am I going to write to my boy, who is an infantryman in the fox holes of Korea? Am I going to tell him that Congress is totally impotent; that Congress has to take this lying down? Is that the message you want me to write to my son?

For 12 years I have been trying to build up, rehabilitate, and activate the mining industry of America. I do not have a mine in my district, but I do have a son in Korea. I have tried to build up the wool supply of America, and the result of my effort is that the wool supply is at the danger point. Our sheep population is at the lowest point since the Civil War. Think that over. And then, if you picture an all-out sudden war with Russia, will you tell me how you are going to get those supplies of the 71 strategic and critical materials in here from Australia, New Zealand, and the other countries over those long dangerous sea lanes. Read the record of how many snorkel submarines there are available to stop those shipments. Then, where will you go from there? Get out and shake your bare fist at the enemy and see how far you get.

This is a serious business. I hate to surrender, I hate to place trade over our national defense. That is exactly what you are doing, and that is why I am against this bill as it is now written. I am for reciprocal trade, but unless this amendment and others to be offered here today are adopted there is not an ounce of reciprocity in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am against extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at all. The misapplication and abuse to which this principle has been subjected during the past few years by the State Department has rendered even the principle repugnant to me.

I am seriously concerned with the manner in which this law throws all precautions overboard and places the whole American economy at the mercy of the State Department.

As the elected Representatives of the people, we Members of Congress are bound by oath and solemn duty to watch over the welfare of our constituents.

Congress has a grave responsibility to the people of this country to make certain that any delegation of its powers over tariff matters is properly administered, and we cannot, without completely disregarding this responsibility, lightly issue such blanket delegation of power without a check on it. To do so is a surrender by Congress of its watchdog functions to an agency of the Government which is not primarily interested in domestic problems and is not prepared to cope with them.

However, there is one way that Congress can prevent abuse of tariff rates by officials who are too preoccupied with our international problems to be the best judges of problems on the home front. And that is to restore the so-called peril-point amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which the Eighty-first Congress struck out 2 years ago.

Previous legislation concerning the peril-point amendment provides the following procedure with which I am in full accord:

The President shall notify the United States Tariff Commission the commodities for which negotiation for reciprocal reduction of tariff and other trade barriers was intended. Following such notification, the Tariff Commission shall conduct hearings and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

make an investigation to determine the point to which duties could be reduced without seriously injuring the domestic industry. The Commission shall inform the President of its findings no more than 120 days after the original notification.

The peril point is solely intended to inform the President. It does not restrict him in any way in the granting of concessions. The President is specifically permitted to disregard the peril point and to grant concessions below such a point if he felt that the concessions to be gained from foreign countries, and other circumstances, makes it advisable to do so.

If the President disregards the peril-point recommendations of the Tariff Commission, he must explain to Congress his reasons for doing so.

The peril-point amendment was removed from the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the Eighty-first Congress at the express request of the President. I think it is highly proper at this time when the President has asked Congress to extend the act another 3 years to examine his reasons for wishing the legislative check-rein removed.

In negotiating trade agreements, the President acts through the State Department. Thus, it may be assumed that the President's request either emanated from, or had the unqualified approval of the State Department. Let us look into State Department's official explanation of the reasons for the President's desire to eliminate the peril-point procedure.

The following explanation was made by Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee of the House 2 years ago.

Mr. Thorp declared that such peril points would be set without regard for any national or international considerations, and would disregard benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, the necessity of obtaining the best possible use of domestic resources, possible strategic considerations, or the possible repercussions of our action upon the policies of other countries toward us.

He further stated that the peril-point procedure returns to the old protective theory that only the prosperity of an individual industry is affected by a tariff or a quota, and practically makes such narrow protectionism the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

Let us analyze Mr. Thorp's statement so that the basic explanation may become more apparent.

Mr. Thorp says in effect that the peril points established by the Tariff Commission do not take into consideration all of the factors which must be considered in making trade concessions. He then concludes that the establishment of these peril points practically makes the prosperity of individual industries the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

I grant that in establishing peril points the Tariff Commission primarily is interested in the protection of domestic industries. But Mr. Thorp's conclusion does not necessarily follow. Should the President, and through him the State Department, be bound by the peril points, and were unable to grant concessions below such points when other considerations warranted such action, then Mr. Thorp's conclusion would be correct.

However, that is not the situation. The State Department is not bound by such peril points, and would specifically be permitted to disregard them when other considerations indicate a need for action.

To fully comprehend the dangers inherent in the presently unprotected act as amended of 1948, we must keep in mind the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among the various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce.

It must be admitted that times have changed somewhat since 1934.

There is no national economic depression, and, on the surface, at least, there is no evidence that agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce are fighting with one another.

I will go along with Mr. Thorp in his premise that benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, are factors which must be taken into consideration in determining what concessions should be granted. However, I feel very strongly that protection of domestic industries is at least one other factor which should be considered.

By elimination of the peril-point procedure, the State Department has virtually said, "We do not want to know the needs of individual industries. We do not want to be told that if we grant a certain concession the effect will be to injure an individual domestic industry. We want to make our decisions without being influenced by any such considerations."

By removing the peril-point amendment, the Eighty-first Congress gave the State Department too much authority to grant trade concessions without any regard to the effect which such trade concessions will have on domestic industry.

I feel that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make certain that adequate consideration is given to all factors; one of the most important of those factors is the effect on domestic industry.

While I am completely sympathetic to the importance of encouraging the importation of foreign merchandise in order that living standards abroad may be improved, as well as to enhance the purchasing power of foreign countries, I do not feel that we should entirely disregard the effect which such importations will have on domestic industries.

Our first responsibility is to the people of this country, and my first responsibility is to the working men and women of my district, and that responsibility cannot be ignored.

In my district are located a number of plants engaged in the manufacture of pottery, chinaware, and glassware. They employ thousands of workers who depend upon this employment for a livelihood. Today, half of them are unemployed. Why?

The answer is that American industry, with all its financial strength, its managerial, technical, and labor skills, cannot compete with foreign goods which are manufactured at slave wages without some tariff protection.

Whenever we ask the State Department for a remedy to correct this condition they stick their heads in the sand of empty words and point vaguely to the escape clause as a palliative. This is a wholly unsatisfactory recourse.

A much sounder procedure would be to gain a better idea beforehand than to await damage that will be difficult to repair. The way to meet this situation is to have a competent agency make adequate investigation before action is taken.

Suppose the Army or Navy proceeded on the theory that it is better to wait until we are defeated in battle before obtaining as full intelligence reports as possible? Certainly, if information is a proper guide to action in all other fields of human endeavor, this also applies to cutting the tariff, unless we assume that the welfare of industry and its employees is of no importance.

Two years ago I proposed an amendment that would deny to Russia, Red China, and the satellite countries the benefits of reduced tariffs in agreements the United States makes with free nations. Many of the Republicans at that time refused to support it. Now I understand my orphan child is being adopted by the Republican Party and will be introduced as their own baby. I will support any amendment that will prevent economic aid being given to the countries behind the iron curtain, regardless who proposes it.

If reciprocal trade is to work effectively, it must be as a two-way street. There is no point in helping others unless they will respond by making some effort to help themselves. Great as our resources are, they are not limitless. If we go on giving and giving and giving we can exhaust ourselves and become absorbed by a world whose general level of economic activity is insufficient.

We cannot raise the world level of prosperity by pulling our own level down.

The only way we can prevent this is to keep our standards high and to make tariff concessions only to those nations which raise their living conditions and only to the degree in which they do so.

The Congress should maintain continuing interest in the manner in which supervision of tariff rates is used or abused. The most effective way of assuring this lies in lodging with the Tariff Commission the power to give authoritative guidance to the State Department on the basis of studies and investigations. With proper liaison between these two agencies, while maintaining

the independence of the Commission, we could face with greater confidence the future course of the trade-agreement program.

We should require the Tariff Commission to submit hearings and reports to the Congress. And we should further require that the President report to us directly when he acts contrary to these tariff recommendations. This is our right and our duty.

We are entitled to know the facts. If an American industry is to be jeopardized in order to provide a market for foreign goods, or to provide a foreign market for the goods of other domestic industries, we are entitled to know the considerations which prompted the concessions which bring about such a result. We were elected for the purpose of representing the people who will be affected, and we are the ones who are going to have to explain the reasons why it was necessary to destroy the industries which have provided their livelihood.

It is for these reasons that I am 100 percent for restoring the peril-point amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this amendment there are two things which must be considered: First the source of the amendment; and, second, the purpose of the amendment.

As to the source of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, we all know the amendment is offered by one who is an admitted opponent of the reciprocal foreign-trade policy, a devout follower of the Dingley, Fordney - McCumber, Smoot - Hawley, Grundy tariff policy; that is the source of this amendment. I think in my colloquy with my friend from Pennsylvania the other day he admitted that he was opposed to the entire reciprocal trade policy. So much for the source of the amendment.

You have heard something about being wary of Greeks bearing gifts. We might be wary of the purpose of this amendment when we consider its source, namely, one who perhaps loses more hours of sleep studying plans, methods, and ways of crippling and weakening the foreign trade policy than any other man in this chamber today.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, but I want it understood that I do not question my friend's sincerity.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I want to make sure of that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Now I do not yield for a speech, but if I have misrepresented the position of my good friend, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, with respect to his position regarding the reciprocal trade policy, then I yield; otherwise I do not. I do not yield for a speech, because I do not have enough time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know whether I understand the terms under which the gentleman is willing to yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield only if I have misrepresented the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not unless the gentleman says I have misrepresented him; if I have, yes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman used my name; the gentleman referred to me; does he yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not yield for a speech. I do not want the gentleman to take up half of my time justifying his position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair assumes that the gentleman from North Carolina does not yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In my opinion the purpose of this amendment, the sole purpose is not to strengthen and make more effective and workable the foreign trade policy as embodied in the trade agreements law now on the statute books, but to so cripple and weaken it as to destroy its effectiveness. That is my opinion of the purpose of it. Therefore, I think that Members who are in this House who do believe in the reciprocal trade policy worked out, wrought out, and thought out by that eminent statesman, Cordell Hull, had better beware of the amendment offered by an avowed opponent, and supported by those, who if they cannot kill this policy, by frontal attack will try to destroy it by flank movement, by crippling amendments.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of our committee, has said something about transfer of payrolls abroad. None of us is in favor of that unless we extend payrolls at home to a greater extent than we transfer them abroad. I call my good friend's attention to the fact that our exports of agricultural products are large when compared to our production—these are 1949 figures—we exported 616,000,000 pounds of lard, 23 percent of our production; wheat, 502,000,000 bushels, 38.2 percent of our domestic production; soybean oil, 311,000,000 pounds, 17 percent of our domestic production; milk, 623,000,000 pounds, or 12.7 percent; leaf tobacco, 510,000,000 pounds, or 25.6 percent; raw cotton, 4,748,000 bales, or 32 percent of our domestic production.

Now, what about the interest of those engaged in agriculture—those who produce the domestic surplus of agricultural products? Suppose we lose those markets? You cannot buy unless you sell. This foreign-trade proposition is not a one-way street or a one-way business. We all know that we cannot sell unless we buy.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Of course, we exported those items to which the gentleman referred, but we sent dollars over there first. We gave them dollars first, with which they bought. That is not profitable to our country. They got the dollars and they got the goods.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Secretary of Agriculture ought to know more about that than the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am not sure Mr. Brannan does.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This foreign-trade policy favorably affects agriculture as well as industry. The American Farm Bureau Federation and a host of other farm, business, labor, and consumer organizations endorsed this policy as sound, as effective, and as beneficial to them, including the following: The National Farmers Unions, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, the United States-Cuban Sugar Council, the American Chamber of Commerce of France, the Detroit Board of Commerce, the Tobacco Associates, Inc., the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, the National Cotton Council, the National Council of American Importers, the American Watch Assemblers Association, the National Foreign Trade Council, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, the United Textile Workers of America, the International Association of Machinists, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Division of Christian service of the Methodist Church, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Council of Catholic Women, the Catholic Association for International Peace, the Board of Social Missions of the Lutheran Church, the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, and the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman referred to Mr. Hull who brought up this idea. Who is the Secretary of State today?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Who is what?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has referred to Mr. Hull as being the great Secretary of State who designed this program.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, I have; I am proud of it and the gentleman ought to be, too.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Who is Secretary of State today?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows. What is the use of taking up my time by asking that question?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Acheson is the Secretary of State.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We have not only the Secretary of State, but the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and others engaged in administering this program.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that the Secretary of State runs it.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman seems to be greatly disturbed about the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has no greater voice than the head of any other Department or the Trade Agreements Committee.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I am concerned about him.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What has that got to do with this question? Not one thing.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes. The whole Nation is concerned about the Secretary of State. He is not a businessman, yet he has complete control over the industry in my district and in the gentleman's district.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He knows that Department does not have complete control. No one department has complete control. Many departments have a part in this program, including the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Interior, the Tariff Commission, and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to what my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] had to say about the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, the law under which we had the greatest depression, the greatest unemployment, under which labor was pauperized, under which agriculture was paralyzed, under which industry was in bankruptcy, under which there were 15,000,000 laboring people walking to and fro, up and down the highways seeking work and finding none. He says the Smoot-Hawley law has been on the books a long time and we have not repealed it. That does not do justice to my good friend from Ohio because he knows very well that the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates have been substantially reduced under trade agreements now in effect.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman will admit that the Democrats never have seen fit to repeal one line of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. That has never been done. Why did you not do it? That is what I asked the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows surely that complete repeal of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act would have placed responsibility right back in the Congress for setting tariff rates on thousands of commodities, a virtually impossible task to perform wisely and effectively by legislation. Moreover, it would have been fatal to reduce our tariffs without mutual and reciprocal reductions in the tariff barriers which other countries had erected in retaliation against the high rates of the Smoot-Hawley tariff law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is either a wise or a practical measure for the Congress to attempt to legislate trade agreements in detail. It is far better, in my opinion, for a scientific, nonpolitical commission who have the time and the knowledge to devote themselves to such a task and to perform this function for us. However, when Congress abdicates such power, it should assure itself that the industries of this country are not lost in the midst of international political shufflings. Surely, the Congress should insist that any time the administration decides that it is willing to sacrifice an industry and does this even though the Tariff Commission brings to its attention the implicit peril it will create, the Congress of the United States should be informed of such a drastic and dangerous decision. We have been very generous, Mr. Chairman, in distributing our golden eggs throughout the world but when we destroy the goose—our system of free enterprise which has made our country what it is today—we invite our own collapse and, therefore, those who depend on us throughout the world.

And what is happening today?

In the fine city of Gloucester, Mass., which is within my congressional district and at the present time the largest port in the United States for the landing of edible fresh fish, the industry is moving to Canada. Why?

In 1939, we produced in this country about 98,000,000 pounds of fresh and frozen ground-fish fillets. Imports that year amounted to about 9,000,000 pounds or 9½ percent of the domestic production.

In 1948 imports had increased to over 53,000,000 pounds or 40 percent of the entire domestic production of 138,000,000 pounds. In 1950 it was estimated that imports would represent almost 50 percent of the United States production.

There is at present approximately an 11-cent-per-pound spread between local costs of fish and those imported. Do the American housewives get the benefit? They do not. They pay exactly the same for imported fish as they do for local fish. Certainly in this case, one of the most cogent arguments for free trade—lower cost to the consumer—falls to the ground.

It takes no deep thinking, then, to understand why our fishing industry is moving to Canada. The tariff established in 1939 was set at 1⅞ cents per pound for the first 15 percent of domestic catch and 2½ cents per pound thereafter on an unlimited basis. In view of the increase in prices and the procedure of filleting fish, which gives two and one-half times as much edible fish per pound, there is no barrier whatsoever against imports.

There is only one factor that prevents importers from driving us out of business at the moment, and that is the limited fishing facilities which are being rapidly expanded in these other countries.

The time will come when the State Department must realize these dangers and the problem in Gloucester will have to be corrected. We are giving false assurances to these countries that no administration can guarantee over a period of time. When the time comes that we are forced to take action, the injury that must be done to these countries will be much more damaging in international relations than is gained by concessions at this time.

The Merrimac Hat Corp., of Amesbury, Mass., which until recently has had to face the low-price competition of Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia, now finds that the relief it gained is only temporary because of imports which are now arriving from Japan. The landed cost of wool hat bodies in the United States from that country is $2.76 per dozen. The total manufacturing cost of this item at the Merrimac Hat Corp., not including selling, shipping, and administrative cost on this particular body, is $6.96. The actual amount of wool for this body costs $4.75. How can this American firm possibly compete under these circumstances?

The leather industry in and about my district, including Salem, Lynn, and Peabody, have found it almost impossible to compete against the subsidies of foreign countries. I shall ask unanimous consent when the Committee rises that a letter from Mr. Stephen Palmer, vice president, A. C. Lawrence Co., be included at this point.

A. C. LAWRENCE LEATHER CO.,
Peabody, Mass., February 2, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BATES: I have your telegram of February 1 in which you say that the reciprocal trade extension bill comes up in the House of Representatives next week and that you would like to hear from me as to what effect the bill has had or may have on the leather situation.

To start off with, I might say that in the light of what has happened during the past few years, the reaction on the part of any tanner probably is that of complete frustration. The leather industry is one which believes in international trade and we live by it. In recent years, on many occasions when the leather industry has been asked questions in connection with international trade, tariff agreements, etc., industry spokesmen have repeatedly said that it is not the tariff agreements which are the crucial problem in international trade; it is reciprocity. United States tariffs on leather have been cut again and again until they are now the lowest of any important leather-producing nation in the world. To our knowledge there has been no reciprocity from others.

So-called reciprocal trade agreements have only resulted in other countries' setting up against us discriminatory measures, embargoes, preclusive trading, bilateral and unilateral trade contracts, barter, and, of paramount importance, subsidies. These artificial barriers and outright discrimination against the United States have completely vitiated the purpose of reciprocal trade agreements.

We have a very recent case which is a glaring example of what seems to be happening when it comes to our Government's interpretation of reciprocal trade agreements. This type of situation is the reason for our saying that we think our opinion, or perhaps anyone's opinion, as to reciprocal trade agreements is rather useless. Last spring and summer chamois leather from the United Kingdom was dumped into the United States at prices below the cost of United States tanners' raw material. Obviously, this could not be done in any other way excepting through subsidy. The trade in this country knew that the English tanner was subsidized and it was common knowledge

in the United Kingdom. This subsidy was only a part of the official plan of the English Government as demonstrated by official publications. When we, as United States tanners, asked for protection against such outrageous dumping, we were told by Government officials, after months of insistent questioning, that there was no subsidy within the precise language of the law.

From our viewpoint, so-called reciprocal trade agreements are nothing more than mockery and hardly worth the paper they are written on. In actual practice, under these agreements our leather tariffs have been cut to the bone. Other nations apparently have openly violated such agreements and we are no longer protected against foreign internal subsidies, Government monopolies, embargoes, cartels, and all sorts of discriminatory measures practiced against United States trade which our Government has tolerated abroad and which have not been practiced in the United States.

May we say, therefore, that if any reciprocal trade agreement is allowed to continue to function as it has in the past few years, then it is rather useless. Any reciprocity, from our standpoint, has been from the United States only, and in the long run the result most surely will be detrimental to American industry and American labor.

Sincerely,

A. C. LAWRENCE LEATHER CO.,
STEPHEN PALMER,
Vice President.

Down through the years our shoe industry has been seriously affected by foreign trade. Those in my area will never forget how 19 major shoe factories were closed by a flood of Czech imports. We must make certain this will never happen again.

In a letter addressed to me on February 5, 1951, Mr. Norman J. Randell, executive secretary of the Lynn Chamber of Commerce, informed me:

The Italian, Swiss, French, and Austrian countries present serious competition to the American shoe industry. They purchase styles and designs and leather in this country and the work is mainly done in people's homes, therefore, they are able to market fine shoes at a lower price than the American market. If trade barriers are let down, we will be unable to compete at all.

Our trade agreements must be mutually beneficial in order to be reciprocal.

The peril point should be unanimously adopted by this body.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a time for concluding debate on this amendment. How many Members want to be heard on the amendment? I observe 17 Members are standing.

There is no thought on the part of anyone on this side to close off debate. However, I think it is understood that we would like to dispose of the bill today, and there are other amendments to be offered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close at 2 o'clock.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I suggest we let the debate run on for a little while.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago it was stated on the floor in the debate that the control of this program was in the hands of the Secretary of State. I disagree with that, and that is the reason I take the floor. The act requires that the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Economic Cooperation Administration take part in the program; so the statement that the Secretary of State has control of the program, I think, is in error.

Mr. Chairman, the press of the country is overwhelmingly in favor of the continuation of the present program for a period of 3 years. In addition, some Members may be surprised to know the various organizations that support the present program. So that they may become aware of what responsible organizations support this program as is, I read into the RECORD the following list of organizations that have gone on record as supporting this program:

The American Farm Bureau Federation.
The National Farmers Union.
The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
The United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.
The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.
The American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba.
The United States-Cuban Sugar Council.
The American Chamber of Commerce of France.
The Detroit Board of Commerce.
The Tobacco Associates, Inc.
The Commerce and Industry Association of New York.
The National Cotton Council.
The National Council of American Importers.
The American Watch Assemblers' Association.
The National Foreign Trade Council.
The American Federation of Labor.
The Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The United Textile Workers of America.
The International Association of Machinists.
The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
The League of Women Voters.
The General Federation of Women's Clubs.
The Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church.
The National Council of Jewish Women.
The National Council of Catholic Women.
The Catholic Association for International Peace.
The Board of Social Missions of the Lutheran Church.
The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church.
The Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mr. Chairman, these associations have seen this program in operation since 1934. These associations know the effect this program has on the general economic welfare of the country. The labor groups, both organized and unorganized, know what effect it would have on the high wages of the people of this country if we throw up a Chinese wall around our industry and are not able to export goods. It will shut down factories in every State and every community of the Nation if other countries refuse to buy from us. You can say what you want about a few individual industries being hurt, but you are going back to the old Smoot-Hawley system if you adopt this peril-point amendment. You will be going back on your friends throughout the world with whom we have established good will. You will be going back to the isolationist policy. You will be branded as isolationists. You do not think that the newspapers and the editors of the newspapers of this country and the subscribers of those newspapers are so wholeheartedly in favor of this program if it is hurting American industry in general, do you?

Should we pick out one industry and say that industry has suffered, and therefore we must destroy much of the export business of the country? That is what you will be doing if you adopt crippling amendments such as this one undoubtedly is.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee, if it adopts this peril-point amendment and the escape-clause amendment as proposed, will be taking a stand today which will definitely brand the country as going back on its friends. America today is established as a leader of the world, as a country that wants to promote trade among the nations of the world, as a country that wants to promote good will. If we cripple this program of reciprocal trade agreements, those who vote to do so will be branded as isolationists insofar as trade is concerned, insofar as our friends are concerned, and insofar as the good will of the balance of the world is concerned.

We should be careful what we may do because of a few instances wherein a minor domestic industry has complained of competition from imports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just concluded addressing the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is quite concerned about us turning our backs on our so-called friends overseas. Well, I am more concerned, Mr. Chairman, about not turning my back on the workingman of this country. I also would like to point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in my district I have over 3,000 men who are employed in the tannery industry. Last spring I received a petition signed by every member of the three labor organizations requesting me to intercede for them with the Reciprocity Committee and the Secretary of State in an effort to protect their industry and protect their jobs against further tariff reduction on leather and leather products. There is no doubt in their minds and there is no doubt in my mind that if the war in Korea had not developed, those men would be out of their jobs. They would be out of jobs where they have skills which require long training and experience. I have in my hand a pair of gloves which my secretary purchased this summer for 59 cents. These gloves were made in Czechoslovakia, a Communist-dominated country, a country where they utilize slave labor. These gloves, so I am told, cannot be manufactured in the United States, by an American company hiring American labor, for less than $2.50. How do we expect American industry and how do we expect American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

labor to maintain their high standards of living and high wage scales which we want them to have, when they have to compete against foreign cheap labor and slave labor.

I say to you that if we continue our present policy of reciprocal trade, which is not reciprocal, we will lose many vital industries and force many men into unemployment if we ever reach a period when we are not at war.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just wanted to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are people who say, "Well, what about the consumers? They should be able to buy in the cheapest market." Here is what happens: When they have driven our industry out of business and our labor out of work, then they put the prices up away beyond what they were before.

Mr. POTTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. And what good does it do to have cheap commodities if our workingmen are out of jobs? Industries, such as the pottery industry, wood products, fishing, and the leather industry, will either be abandoned or wage cuts will have to be made if we are going to compete with foreign labor.

They talk about reciprocity. We do not have reciprocal trade with these other countries that are producing leather. As a matter of fact, our foreign trade had declined prior to the Korean War, while imported goods had flooded our markets.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that today, 17 years after the program started, there are more restrictions and more limitations on free trade than there were when Mr. Hull had his idea?

Mr. POTTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This letter was written May 22, 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I thank both the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Arkansas.

I would like to read this letter which was written on May 22, 1950:

Mr. EDWARD YARDLEY,
Executive Secretary, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YARDLEY: It is my understanding that open hearings will commence before the Committee on Reciprocity Information Wednesday, May 24. It is my privilege to represent the Eleventh Congressional District of Michigan in which are located several tanneries. These tanneries employ many hundreds of men.

The tariff on leather has been reduced time and time again making it ever more difficult for our leather industries to compete with foreign competitors. This competition is grossly unfair. The foreign competitors utilize cheap labor, some of it being slave labor. We in the United States on the other hand believe that labor should receive the highest possible wage, in order to maintain a decent standard of living.

I have received several hundred letters from employees of the various tanneries in my district protesting a further tariff reduction on leather and leather products, which will be an item for negotiation at the coming tariff conference this September. It is becoming increasingly difficult for our tanning and leather products industries to operate successfully due to this foreign competition. A further reduction in rate would force many of our companies out of business with the resultant effect of loss of employment to hundreds of skilled workers in my district alone.

The theory of reciprocal trade is not working as was the intent of Congress. The countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements have violated the principle of reciprocal trade by imposing embargoes and other obstacles upon American manufactured goods in order to protect their own industries. In other words, reciprocal trade—as presently applied in world trade—is a one-way street. We lower our tariffs to a point where foreign competition forces industry after industry to close and at the same time our exports are decreasing. If further reductions are made in tariffs, it will mean increasing unemployment in the United States; it will mean a gradual lowering of our standard of living and it will force the working men and women of the United States to either accept lower wages or be forced out of employment.

You will have before your Committee on Reciprocity Information protesting the action by the United States, representatives of the leather industry—The Tanners' Council of America, The Luggage and Leather Goods Manufacturers of America; the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, and others. I request your committee to heed the protests that will be made by the organizations representing both the manufacturers and labor.

Very sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. POTTER,
Member of Congress.

This protest has been made on behalf of the laboring men in the leather industry. Leather products was one of the items which were to be considered for further tariff reduction. If the Korean War had not come along, these industries would have been out of business. It is a sorry situation that recipient trade agreements does the American people great harm unless we are at war. I hope the administration does not plan on war as a permanent policy.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to clear up some questions that have been raised in this extended debate on the so-called peril-point provision. Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do. I shall support his peril-point amendment. But I would like for the members of the committee to realize that the peril-point proposition has its limitations. You must not get the idea that the peril-point provision will solve the basic problems that need to be solved to bring relief to your vast industries. I will give two or three examples to illustrate the point I am making.

All the peril-point proposition can do if followed to its fullest conclusion is to restore the basic rates in the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930. Let me give an example to the gentleman from Texas who made such an excellent speech. He has a lot of independent oil in his State. The Smoot-Hawley bill assessed an import duty of 21 cents a barrel on crude oil. That has been reduced under the reciprocal trade agreements policy to 10½ cents. Considerable testimony was taken by both the Senate and House committees last year on the danger to the independent oil industry and the coal industry, and it showed that it would take $1.05 import duty per barrel of crude oil to preclude and prevent injury to the coal industry and the independent oil industry of this country. I point that out, and I propose to support the amendment because it is a step in the right direction. However, we must find an avenue of escape for harassed industry through a properly worded and properly delegated escape clause, which I understand the gentleman from Nebraska will offer before debate has closed on the proposition to extend this act.

I want to call attention to another instance to show that this peril-point proposition will not solve all of the difficulty. We have a freeze order here on highly tempered steel that is used in the manufacture of clothespins. I have the largest clothespin factory in the world in my district. What is happening? That industry will not be able to get this highly tempered steel. It happened back in World War II. Sweden, our chief competitor in the clothespin industry, takes over the American market because she did produce prior to World War II and sell clothespins for 49 cents a gross in New York City, while it cost 81.3 cents a gross to manufacture them in my plant in West Virginia. The minute the war ended, Sweden brought her price down to 42 cents. But while the war was on she raised that price up just as high as the American market would stand.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Has that not always been true in the history of our country, away back to the dye plants which were driven out of existence in this country? When they once capture the American market and crush our local industry, then they immediately impose higher rates.

Mr. BAILEY. They take their pound of flesh.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the need for a real sensible approach that will allow the industry to be given consideration. I am not speaking for the five industries that are vitally affected in the State of West Virginia. I tried that in 1945 and in 1949 and I got run over with a steamroller.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will offer an approach to this problem, which I will support, although I shall probably offer a substitute amendment. This would provide an escape for every industry in this country if it is harmed by foreign importations. It will be a simple procedure that will allow the President to initiate it, the Tariff Commission to initiate it or an industry that thinks it is harmed can initiate it by asking the Tariff Commission for a hearing. It is up to the industry to show they are injured. But we must have an escape clause because of the fact that we are going to have more than 200 critical articles frozen in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also support the escape-clause amendment that will be offered a little later. I shall endeavor at this time to show how the reciprocal trade program has injured the wool industry.

Mr. Chairman, the recent repeated reductions in tariff duties have been a major factor contributing to the present low estate of the wool and sheep industry in this country. We find ourselves today with the fewest sheep since records have been kept, at a time when we need wool for the war effort. A brief review of the policies that produced this dangerous state of affairs will help in an understanding of reciprocal tariffs. Under the threat of war this country is producing less wool, an absolutely essential war material, than in any year of record. Why is this?

The total domestic production of shorn and pulled wool from 1933 to 1944 averaged 434,800,000 pounds. In 1945 it was 397,000,000 pounds; in 1948 it dropped to 280,000,000 pounds—and for 1950 it was estimated at 212,000,000. The United States had 53,000,000 sheep in 1933. This number has declined to 46,000,000 in 1945, 34,000,000 in 1948, and an estimated 27,000,000 at the present time.

During this period our domestic consumption of wool has been on the increase. But instead of expanding to supply this demand, the domestic wool industry has declined and imports of foreign wool have increased tremendously.

Stocks of wool on hand have diminished from about 1,000,000,000 pounds in 1946 to an estimated 200,000,000 pounds at the present time. There is no stockpile of wool with which to clothe our armed services, to say nothing of the civilian population, yet we have known throughout history that wool is essential to clothe troops warmly and that great armies—Napoleon and Hitler learned this lesson in Russia—must have warm woolen clothing.

The average annual import of wool in the prewar years, 1930–40, was 64,000,000 pounds. In 1941 the first tariff concessions were negotiated on wool, with Argentina, and immediately imports began to increase. In 1946 imports of South American wool were more than twice the prewar level, and from Argentina they were three times the prewar quantity. The total was near 1,000,000,000 pounds. This was the high point of wool imports, which have since leveled off at about 600,000,000 pounds per year. The total for 1950 is estimated at 500,000,000 pounds.

Imports of woolen fabrics—excludes piles: 1947, 4,612,000 yards worth $8,368,000; 1949, 8,217,000 yards worth $18,416,000; 1950—first 10 months—14,891,000 yards worth $25,822,000; when November and December figures are in, it will be twice the previous year.

The chief source of wool and wool textiles are Australia and England. In 1947 textile labor costs were three times higher in the United States than in England, and ranching costs, including herding, were 4 or 5 times higher than in Australia. This was after we had reduced the tariff on English textiles as much as 40 percent, and on raw wools, 25 percent.

As I have said, our consumption is running in the neighborhood of 1,000,000,000 pounds per year in normal times, far more than that in wartime. Our production has decreased from 435,000,000 pounds in 1933–44 to half that amount in 1950.

The tariff reductions and trade concessions negotiated from time to time have been perhaps the principal factor in the decline of the wool industry here in the United States. These concessions have been made in the face of repeated warnings from those who recognized the need for a sound sheep industry in the United States. We could not expect, perhaps, to supply all of our domestic requirements, but a healthy industry, capable of supplying at least one-third to one-half of our requirements, is the bare minimum for safety. The lack of foresight which prompted the destruction through tariff policy of the domestic sheep industry is going to cost the taxpayers of this country untold sums to provide the wool necessary for the uniforms our soldiers need. At the present time there are American agents in Australia and England making every effort to buy this vital material and they will have great difficulty in acquiring any sizable supply of wool. Is it not incongruous that at the same time other Americans are sitting at Torquey, England, in a trade concession conference with 38 other countries at which one of the items on the bargaining list, for further tariff reductions, is wool?

Mr. Chairman, the production of wool is an exceedingly important industry in the 11 Western States, covering an area from Texas on the south, the largest producer, to Montana in the north where it is one of our largest industries. It makes use of a natural resource—grass grown on some 800,000,000 acres—that would not otherwise be used. The United States should have the maximum number of sheep, gathering this resource and processing it into a commodity vital to our economy and to our national defense.

We should not overlook the coproduct, lamb and mutton, which is in short supply because of this same discouragement of the sheep industry. A proper supply of lamb and mutton would make a tremendous contribution to a better diet for our people.

Someone will remind me that today wool is quoted at the highest price in its history. This is true, and it is true because of the policy followed by our administration in dealing with wool under the reciprocal-trade program and the related policies of the OPA which fixed the price of wool at an unrealistically low figure during the wartime wool purchase program. The price of domestic wool is still lower than prices anywhere else in the world.

The January 1947, issue of Fortune magazine carried an obviously inspired article entitled "The Trouble With United States Wool Is That It Is Uneconomic." In a subtitle were these comments: "The industry subsists on excessive tariffs, wartime subsidies, and political shenanigans." Well, the tariffs were lowered, the Government bought all the wool during the war at a price so low that the wool industry in this country withered and nearly died. There were no wartime subsidies, tariff favors or political shenanigans in this, unless the obtuse attitude of the administration could be called political shenanigans. The result is, as I have shown, that sheep numbers in this country have decreased to the lowest on record and we have agents in Australia and England today trying, we hope not in vain, to buy wool supplies necessary to our war effort. As many of us predicted, when we protested tariff reductions, the decline of our sheep industry has left us at the mercy of foreign producers. We cannot do without wool and we must buy it on their terms. We must bid for it in competition with Russia and her satellites.

Mr. Chairman, today we have before us a proposal to extend the reciprocal-trade program. One of the factors that has contributed so greatly to our unfortunate wool situation, at a time when we must have wool for our soldiers, is this same program.

It is proposed that the legislation before us be amended in two instances so that industries vital to our national defense and our economy can be protected.

Amendments will be offered that would include in the legislation a peril-point clause and a workable escape clause. I am firmly convinced that the adoption of these two amendments is the minimum necessary if we are to have a domestic wool industry.

The National Wool Growers Association adopted the following resolution at its annual convention in December 1950:

The National Wool Growers Association desires to reaffirm its position, stated many times in past conventions, that the maintenance of a sheep industry in the United States of sufficient size to prevent wastage of forage growth as well as to assure our Nation a continuous supply of meat and wool depends primarily on the assurance of a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

domestic price which will equalize the cost of the production here with that in those countries which are permitted to sell in our market.

We believe that, from the standpoint of all parties concerned, the cheapest as well as the most effective method of accomplishing this end is the use of an adequate tariff.

We again emphatically reaffirm our position in believing that an adequate tariff on wool, lambs, and sheep is the bulwark of strength for our American sheep industry.

We view with grave alarm the report that the Australian Minister of Commerce, Mr. John McEwen, has told the House of Representatives that Australia is seeking a substantial reduction in American duties on the imports of wool; also that Mr. McEwen said the request had been submitted to the tariff conference now in session at Torquay, England.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with this resolution.

The answer to our wool problem is to rebuild the sheep industry. Lowering the tariff does not result in lower costs to the user in this country. Witness the present highest price on record after repeated lowering of the tariff. Let us protect this great industry so necessary to our war effort, an industry that gives employment to over 100,000 people in the West, makes use of a great natural resource that would otherwise be wasted, and that adds to the health and enjoyment of all.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on January 16 of this year—in company with several of my colleagues—I journeyed down to our State capital city of South Carolina to witness the inaugural ceremonies of one of our former colleagues as he was inducted into the office of Governor of our State. In Governor Byrnes' inaugural address, he warned that we cannot successfully prosecute or defend this threatened global war strictly as Democrats or Republicans. Said he:

In times like these, we must rise above party politics and stand and fight as Americans.

Mr. Chairman, from what I understand, the pending amendment is not in accord with the views of my party. We have heard the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. BOB DOUGHTON, chairman, Ways and Means Committee, speak against the amendment. When I find myself in disagreement with such Members as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], I reexamine my views because of my high regard for him. Reference has been made here to one of our greatest Secretaries of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, who served during World War II. I have implicit faith in his judgment but even he could be in error. Soon after coming to Congress—which was long before Pearl Harbor—in company with some of my then colleagues, I went down for a conference with Secretary Hull calling his attention to the ever increasing export of scrap iron to Japan. The Secretary contended that we must keep up a trade balance with Japan, but we advised him to be cautious for fear trouble would ensue. The Secretary would not interfere with the export of scrap iron to Japan,, and ultimately, much of the self-same metal came back home in the bodies of our gallant sons. Thus it is, Mr. Chairman, that none of us are invincible.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of tariffs is an exceedingly technical one. I do not pretend that I am capable of understanding all or even many of its implications. I do have more than a half-century's practical experience, and I now draw upon my own experience and observations.

It is my privilege to represent a district in which I am told there are more spindles and looms than any other congressional district in the world. I sprang from the loins of those who spin and weave the products of our fields into the beautiful and useful fabrics so sorely needed to clothe the nakedness of the world. I was advised during the last war that textiles were among the most essential items in the war program. In June of last year, I appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission, in opposition to any further cut in tariffs on imported cotton textiles. Under date of June 7, 1950, I pointed out from the well of this House the grave threat to our high standard of living among textile workers by the increasing importation of Japanese textiles. I was amazed to find the facts to be as they were then. Since that time, I have given further study to the problem and have found that India, the second largest cotton producing country in the world, likewise presents a grave threat to our textile way of living. The record reveals that although approximately half of India's textiles are produced by hand, she is able to export her textiles to our country in opposition to the products from our modern looms at far less cost to the public. This, of course, is understandable when we know that while textile employement in India is considered of the highest type, the average annual wage of a textile worker in India is $67. This annual wage is little more than the weekly wage of the textile workers in my district. Manifestly, our textile industry here at home cannot cope with or survive against such slave labor wages. As you know, a conference is going on now at Torquay, England, studying suggestions for further lowering tariffs. I sincerely hope that due caution will be taken before any other reductions are authorized.

As in the past, I intend to vote for this reciprocal trade agreement. I believe that the adoption of this amendment will be a proper safeguard. I call upon you as Americans, without regard as to which side of the aisle you sit on, to rally around the support of this proper amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to go on record here and now as being very much concerned about this whole program. In the early thirties Jan Bata, foreign shoe manufacturer, sold shoes in the United States and flooded the market in competition with the Endicott-Johnson products and many other American shoe concerns. He established a Bata Shoe Co. here, but for some reason was unable to maintain labor standards, so he folded up and went back to Europe. When Hitler took over Central Europe Bata kept on producing, only he produced shoes for the Hitler war machine. Since then he or his successors have been relegated to a position behind the iron curtain, but it is my understanding that the Bata Shoe Co. is still making shoes. There is a strong possibility that they may be in direct competition, if the State Department gets its way, with Endicott-Johnson shoes. I am talking today not from the management standpoint of this great corporation because the management did not consult me on this matter.

I am talking for the 20,000 patriotic men and women who make shoes and the finest kind of shoes for the American people in the Endicott-Johnson workers' democracy in the Triple Cities area. They are now fulfilling or attempting to fulfill orders for millions of pairs of shoes for the Armed Forces of the United States. About 6 months ago I had a flood of postcards from Endicott-Johnson workers, 20,000 of them, demanding that I contact the State Department to protest and protest loudly the possibility that they were proposing to scrap the American selling price for rubber footwear and rubber-soled footwear. This would have thrown thousands of these workers out of their jobs. When I consulted the State Department the answer I got was, "It is all in this reciprocal trade program. We cannot help it. If we throw out a few hundred workers in a certain industry here, or a few hundred or a few thousand in a certain industry there, we cannot help it. It's just too bad, but it is in the program."

Those are the words in answer to the request that I made for consideration of these shoe workers. It is serious because those shoe workers in my district have a time-honored profession. They have worked at their trade in some cases for 20 or 30 years. It is a disgrace and an insult for the State Department to say to them, "It is just too bad, but you will have to find work elsewhere. Our program must go on whether or not thousands of Endicott-Johnson workers are going to be dropped from the payrolls." That means those men will have to find jobs elsewhere. Either that, or it is a problem of the WPA, or wanting that, it will be a problem for local relief.

Can any of us afford to get into a position of that kind where we, representing patriotic American workers, can say to them back home, "I voted for a program which is going to jeopardize your jobs. I voted to continue the direct competition of Japanese-made shoes which will flood the country in the event the American selling price is scrapped or in the event that the peril-point amendment is not adopted?" Is it going to be your position to say, "I voted for a program which will allow shoes to flood this country which are manufactured behind the iron curtain, which supplied the footwear for Hitler's armies." Is it going to be your policy to say, "I voted for a program which will favor workers behind the iron curtain and in Japan, and will let down the bars so that 20,000

Endicott-Johnson workers are going to be jeopardized in their jobs"? Are you going to say that the shoe workers and others in many of the key industries, and in other hundreds of industries throughout the United States are going to be penalized because we approve this policy? I am against the whole program unless this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, since I came to Congress in 1939, I have supported the reciprocal trade agreements with an understanding that they were enacted in June 1934 under emergency conditions and were designed to assist in the restoration of the American standard of living, overcome domestic unemployment, expand foreign markets, and promote world trade. In later years they have been continued on the basis that they were a vehicle to be employed in achieving universal world peace.

In 1948 when extension of the Trade Agreements Act was before Congress, I supported it with one reservation, and that was my approval of the peril-point amendment to safeguard American industry.

At that time we were told by advocates of the reciprocal trade agreements that their impact on the wage earners of America was negligible. We were informed that the peril-point provision of the act was unnecessary and that the Committee for Reciprocity Information would take testimony from the industries concerned and that complaints would be investigated and adjustments would be made.

During the succeeding years of 1949 and 1950, the effects of imports on the jobs of the American wage earner became a matter of grave concern. The situation developed to the point that key industries in my congressional district, as well as throughout the United States, began to lodge vigorous complaints with Congress against the importation of cheaply manufactured and in some cases slave-labor products from behind the iron curtain. These American business concerns were joined in their protests by representatives of the trade-union movement as well as by individual workmen and their families.

Like many of you I complained to the Department of State and was referred to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The Committee replied with the stock argument that conferences were being held at home and abroad and when concluded, recommendations would be made to correct any abuses. At this moment I want to be brutally frank by stating that, in my opinion, the Committee for Reciprocity Information is nothing but a window-dressing agency through which complaints are pigeonholed.

You will recall that a year ago we were in a comparative state of normalcy in the field of American business and that the threat of war was not so clearly pronounced. Therefore, we should consider the effects of imports on employment of the American workingman from the standpoint of conditions in 1950, and not during periods of emergency when American production is at its height.

Since 1948 it has been almost a daily occurrence for Members of Congress in both parties to arise and deliver a statement showing the ill effect of cheaply made foreign products on industries in various congressional districts. Surely, you recall the Waltham Watch Co.'s experience, and the many speeches protesting the importation of Russian crab meat, foreign oil, hides, pottery, glassware, cotton and woolen textiles, and numerous other commodities.

At that time, as a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, I joined with my colleagues from nearby West Virginia and Maryland in protesting the importation of bunker oil from the Middle East that was rapidly displacing the use of coal in our respective States.

The complaints against foreign imports became so numerous and bitter that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor conducted public hearings for several weeks last May and June on the subject.

Spokesmen for management and labor representing some 28 industries testified that the effects of foreign imports were devastating and immediate relief was urged. Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, appeared before these congressional committees and supported the views of their constituents.

In my opinion, the testimony given at these hearings and which has been printed as a public document, a copy of which I hold in my hand, without doubt represents the most bitter and factual indictment of the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Let us see what Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, and executive secretary, America's Wage Earners Protective Conference, said in testifying on May 2, 1950, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. His testimony appears on page 12 and includes the following statement:

> The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as has been administered and as it is proposed at this time to continue to administer it, is a threat to employment in this country.

Mr. Strackbein represents a good cross section of labor-management groups affected by foreign imports and is recognized as an authority on the subject.

To further support this indictment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it is well to consider the testimony given by the following spokesmen for industry and labor.

Mr. J. M. Wells, representing the United States Potters Association said:

> Total sales of the members of our association for 1949 dropped to $64,000,000 from $77,500,000 in 1948, or a loss of 17 percent. During that same period imports of competitive dinnerware increased more than 24 percent.

Mr. Patrick McHugh, secretary, Atlantic Fishermen's Union, Boston, Mass., testified that—

> When fish from foreign countries are landed at lower prices than in our own, the competition is felt quickly. Today the wholesale prices are about 10 percent lower than 1948. Imports reached a peak in 1948, with the exception of the first quarter of 1950, and amounted to nearly 54,000,000 pounds, which is nearly 30 percent of our total consumption.

Mr. C. W. Gustkey, president, Imperial Glass Corp., said that—

> Our industry in 1948 produced and sold approximately $35,000,000 worth of handmade glassware. In 1949 our industry produced and sold about $27,700,000 worth of merchandise, which reflects a decline of nearly $8,000,000.

He continues by saying:

> Imported glassware sold in the United States in 1949 had a market value at American factory price level of approximately $6,000,000. In 1948 the similar total volume was $1,000,000 smaller than in 1949.

Mr. Gustkey stated:

> The imported glassware sold in the United States in 1949 represents about 20 percent of our domestic production.

Mr. Marx Lewis, general secretary, United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union, testified that—

> In a declining industry such as ours, imports run close to 20 percent, and this year it is expected it will go above that—we do not know the exact amount—but it becomes a serious problem, one which affects the employees and the earnings of the workers.

Mr. Matthew W. Davis, vice president of the International Council of the Aluminum Workers Union, said in his testimony that—

> Until 1947, imports on aluminum were no problem in this country but effective January 1, 1948, the tariff was substantially reduced. As a result, Canadian aluminum has invaded the United States market in such large quantities as to become a very serious threat to employment in the domestic aluminum industry.

Mr. W. L. Carver, managing director, the Wall Paper Institute, testified that—

> Imports amount to 15 percent of the domestic manufacturers' delivery of papers of comparable price class. Not only is the volume of these imports on a sharply rising trend, but there is evidence that with currency devaluation, the field of the raiding of our market and employment opportunities will broaden rapidly.

Mr. H. B. Fell, executive vice president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, said:

> The value of crude-oil production in the United States was $5,245,000,000. In 1949 it was only $4,690,000,000, or a decrease of over $500,000,000. This was due primarily to the excessive imports of foreign oil, and resulted in considerable unemployment in the oil and gas industry in the United States.

Mr. Joseph T. Berta, president, Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corp., said in his testimony that—

> Imports of foreign oil—now flowing freely into the United States at a rate approaching a million barrels daily—threaten to disrupt seriously our employment situation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, told the subcommittee that—

But we also realize the writers of the Trade Agreements Act did not intend the tariff reducing agreements to injure the American economy as they are now doing. The present flow of import oil has gravely disturbed our American economy. If it continues, and increases as the prospect seems to indicate, we shall witness a complete disrupting and revamping of our American fuel pattern.

Mr. Chairman, representing as I do, a congressional district where bituminous coal is the backbone of our economy, I wrote to President Truman asking him to exercise the authority he has under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by increasing the tariff on foreign oil to save the jobs of American workingmen.

The President replied on June 12, 1950, as follows:

Naturally, I am very much interested in the welfare of all segments of the economy of the United States but I have yet to be convinced that anybody is being hurt by the present situation in oil.

I disagreed with the statement of the President and still disagree with it because this time last year foreign imports were destroying the jobs of American workingmen. This is evidenced by the testimony I have quoted and I could supplement it with numerous statements from representatives of the fur, hides, textile, gas meter, steel, leather, and paper industry.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am not going to change any votes on this legislation by my remarks. I want to assure you that the people I represent are suffering from the evil effects of foreign imports and I cannot in good conscience continue to support the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act because of the manner in which it has been administered.

In a few words, the trade agreements are revealed to be an international log-rolling program conducted at the expense of American industry and American wage earners, and for that reason I cannot conscientiously vote for their extension.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to strike out the enacting clause of H. R. 1612.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in proper order and, therefore, cannot be entertained.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a test of the reciprocal trade agreements for many years and I think after the debates we have had session after session we have finally begun to see through this thing and the great majority of the American people are beginning to understand it. It has proven a failure. Certainly the least we can do in this session of Congress in my judgment is to establish the peril-point policy and then write a real escape clause that will protect, I might say, almost the God-given right of industry, management, and the laboring people of this country to protect their jobs and thereby help to protect the economy of our country.

We are facing serious times ahead; we need to increase the power and strengthen the economy of this country. I think that the economy of this country and the best interests of this Nation demand that we take such corrective action with reference to reciprocal trade agreements here as representatives of the people, that will protect the just interests of the laboring men and of all of the people of the country.

They talk about 60,000,000 people employed, the trade agreements has never had a chance to operate because we have either been in war or working under the rumors of war most of the time. But they came near having an opportunity, may I say, to operate in 1948 and 1949. Then we had 3,500,000 people out of work and they were being laid off daily. Why? Because of the influx of foreign-made goods into the American market selling for prices lower than they could be produced here at the high standard of wages paid the American wage earner. Being a member of the Committee on Public Works I remember how representatives of the Administration came before our committee offering bills of authorization to be laid on the shelf, authorization to start public works here, public works there.

They knew that the policy of these reciprocal trade agreements and low tariffs were so destroying the economy of our country that they were going to have to be faced and they began to make ready to add to the budget expense of this country and to provide made work for the American people. That was the result of only a few months of our experience with these trade treaties.

Talk about labor supporting reciprocal trade agreements, the CIO met here in the city of Washington in 1949 with the oil industry and said "We want to help you in any way we can to raise the import duties and to prevent foreign oil from flooding this country with the duties having been cut over 50 percent." They testified before a subcommittee down in the southwestern part of the country, the head men of the CIO of that great region down there where the oil industry operates so intensively, urging that the import duties be raised because hundreds and thousands of their workmen drawing high salaries were being thrown out of jobs. Where did they go? They went onto the pitiful relief rolls. Yes at the expense for doles from the Federal Treasury.

I happen to represent a county in my district that mines 60 percent of all the fluorspar mined in this country. Hundreds and hundreds of those men were thrown out of work because of the importation of the low-wage fluorspar products of Mexico and some other countries that flooded the market. The representatives of the fluorspar industry of the Nation, when they were getting ready to cut the tariff again at Torquay, England, protested the lowering of the tariff on the importation of lead, lead derivatives, and fluorspar.

I went before representatives of the State Department in opposition to further tariff reductions. I was courteously received but, of course, without effect.

The State Department has never given relief in such instances, and the time has come for the Congress to assert itself and write peril points into this legislation, and to write into it an emphatic escape clause that will protect industries in this country from being ruthlessly destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this vital subject of foreign trade, I call the Members' attention to part 2 of the latest census report No. FT 410.

This might be called a routine, cold statistical report because it is published every month and is confined entirely to a listing of the kinds and amounts of products exported from the United States, and to which countries.

But with a deadly war going on in Korea, this report is no longer routine. Instead, it documents one of the most sordid chapters in the commercial history of the world, such a monstrous thing as to make the nefarious gun runners of old look like deacons by comparison, and enough to turn inside out the stomach of every moral and patriotic citizen.

This routine report discloses that the internationalists for a profit, including so-called Americans, are conducting a land office business, with British Hong Kong apparently emerging as the number one international robbers' roost.

Here is the situation. While Chinese Communists are killing our men in Korea, small manufacturers throughout the United States either must crawl on bended knees to the black markets for all too many metals or practically do without, resulting in lay-offs and, in some cases, bankruptcy.

In the face of all this, the Truman administration, to its everlasting shame, is allowing precious metals and other strategic materials to be exported all over the earth, including Communist China and to nearby Hong Kong for shipment anywhere, most of it to China.

Does this profitable open door, in juxtaposition for dealing with the various and sundry governments and bandits of Asia, explain why the Chinese Reds did not long ago walk in and occupy Hong Kong; why Britain was one of the first to accord formal recognition to the Chinese Communist regime; and why both Britain and France, on paper, supported the United Nations resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor, but then halted abruptly and exuded a tortured cry against following up the resolution with a blockade of the Chinese mainland?

From the standpoint of the London Government, and the leeches on Fleet Street, the few British troops fighting in Korea are probably considered entirely

expendable, and, indeed, good investments in Britain's historic cause of international profiteering and exploitation, whether or not they are killed by ammunition made from material lucratively transferred from Hong Kong to Red China.

But the British are not alone.

Before proceeding further, permit me to point out that American internationalists, with the full knowledge of the Truman administration, and in a vicious circle, are not only providing Red China with strategic materials. By importing into the United States a wide range of Chinese products, these international parasites are providing American dollars which are used in turn to build up the Chinese war machine. Imports from Red China, in October alone, ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and included such items as drug flowers, tableware, bow hair for violins, fish products, electric lamps, film material, azimuth mirrors, jewelry, medical preparations, antiques, dolls, and dice. I wonder if the dice were loaded, in true Communist fashion?

But perhaps most interesting of all is the importation from Communist China of almost a million pounds of dried eggs, during October, in addition to shell eggs and frozen eggs, for which American internationalists paid China about a half million dollars. This, mind you, on top of an American domestic surplus of some 100,000,000 pounds of dried eggs in the caves of Kansas. And it has been going on for months and months, as I have revealed to the Members on more than one occasion, with the Truman administration doing nothing about it until, finally, last fall, the President announced that the tariff on dried eggs from China would be increased, effective December 11, 1950. In other words, he gave the Reds advance notice, providing them with plenty of time to do their worst—to flood the American market before the tariff increase went into effect. And they did exactly that.

Now back to the exports of our critical materials.

In November alone, tons and tons of American iron, steel, aluminum, copper, brass, bronze, lead, nickel, tin, zinc, and so forth, went to the four corners of the globe; heaven only knows how much of it was or will be transshipped to China for use against our troops in one form or another.

Large quantities, perhaps suspiciously large, were exported to Canada and certain of the small countries of South America, all of whom, incidentally, have been conspicuous by their absence in the front lines in Korea. I am not qualified to say how much of this material is used in the various countries to which it is shipped. Perhaps we will never know who is shipping what to Russia, China, and the rest of the Communist satellites.

But the report does list shipments of various goods direct to China from the United States, including, for example, black ungalvanized carbon steel to the tune of more than 7,000,000 pounds, making China, next to Canada, the largest single recipient of this item during November. Hong Kong was in third place with almost 5,000,000 pounds.

The United States exported to no less than 29 countries, during November, more than 11,000,000 pounds of galvanized steel sheets, the same kind for which small manufacturers in Iowa and elsewhere are crying, to keep their businesses alive and their employees on the job.

But these are just a few examples of the scarce metals pouring out of the United States. For further details, I refer you to the report.

Mr. Chairman, the Members will also be interested to know that both China and Hong Kong are high up on the list of more than 75 countries receiving millions of dollars' worth of American drugs, including huge quantities of penicillin and streptomycin, for the benefit of Communist Chinese soldiers.

I would venture to say that if the inhabitants of Hong Kong existed solely on drugs, they would undoubtedly founder before they could possibly consume even a fraction of the amount shipped in.

I urge my colleagues to obtain a copy of this report. It reveals in mathematical fashion internationalism for a profit at its worst and growing ever fatter on the blood of American troops in Korea—condoned if not aided and abetted by the Truman administration.

How much lower can the human race descend?

Do we need any further evidence that the Truman administration is unworthy of a continuation of vast and sweeping powers to manipulate our foreign trade?

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should approach this question in the light as set forth by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and think back a year or more in our consideration here today. Last year I introduced a bill to restore the peril point and the escape clause, and again this year introduced a like measure.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment now before the House will receive favorable action, because there was never a time to my way of thinking when industry and the American workingman should be more considered as against the cheap imported labor from without. I do not feel that this measure in any way disturbs the diplomatic relations with other countries throughout the world, and while the peril point feature as it is introduced is not entirely to my liking, I would like to have a peril point established by the Tariff Commission and after they had established such point below which the tariff could not be reduced without discrimination against the American working man, and before the tariff could be reduced below that point, that the President would be compelled to report back to the Congress and secure from the Congress permission to make such reduction. The peril point as proposed today would only require a confession of the President to the Congress that he has taken action and reduced a tariff which is going to be detrimental to the best interests of the workingman of this country. It only puts the Congress and the American people on notice that the President has taken action and reduced the tariff on a particular article, and that that action is going to be the ruination of that industry in this country.

If we think back a year and a half ago, when 16 labor organizations met here in Washington and protested the reduction of tariffs on many of the products being brought into this country, that meeting started the subcommittee action by the Committee on Education and Labor which caused them to hold hearings last year for a period of several months. I appeared before that committee on two separate occasions, and I know that labor, industry, and agriculture were vitally interested in the subject matter they were considering at that time.

I know that the hop industry in the State of California was being greatly hampered from the importation of Czechoslovakian hops, to a point that it caused a slump in the price of hops and the solvency of this substantial industry. I received a letter just a few days ago regarding the increased importation of almonds into this country now. If we would bring into the United States each year 5,000,000 pounds of almonds, that together with the production in this country would supply all the almonds the American market consumes. So far this year over 7,200,000 pounds of almonds have been imported and it is estimated that before the season is over 18 to 20 million pounds of almonds will be brought into the United States. This affects not only the almond industry in my district, it affects the walnut industry, it affects the pecan industry, and it affects many other like industries throughout the United States.

Are we going to sit idly by and permit American industries one after another to fall by the wayside because of an unrealistic approach to the whole program affecting the trade agreements between nations. I want it thoroughly understood that I believe in the principle of the reciprocal trade agreements program, but it must be reciprocal. It cannot be the one-way street, the downhill, crooked trail they are taking us on today through the operation of the trade agreements.

I am going to support the escape clause because I believe we have gotten ourselves into a great number of agreements with foreign nations that are going to ruin many industries which if properly administered we could have avoided.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I belong to that group of many who formerly supported the reciprocal trade agreements program, because I believed it would do much for the American people. In the face of what has happened, in the face of the removal of the peril-point provision 2 years ago, I no longer share that faith; and I think something will happen to the American people unless today we adopt this amendment and ensure once more the safety of our productive agencies.

I had not meant to speak today, but while I was sitting on the floor of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House there came to me a letter from my district. It is a great district, of which I am very proud, because it contains, in addition to large numbers, representatives of every kind of activity that makes this country great—industry, agriculture, universities, small-business men, and small-shop keepers. I read you this letter not because I am foolish enough to think that you can generalize from one instance, but because I think that the letter expresses a condition existing in one industry which exists in many. I think also that the evidence is important because it comes not from the heads of that industry but, as it says, from 1,500 workers organized into an employees committee in the plant of Arnold, Schwinn & Co. This is a letter that I would have you listen to with care:

We, the Schwinn Employees' Committee, represent 1,500 workers in the plant of Arnold, Schwinn & Co., at 1718 North Kildare Avenue in Chicago.

We understand that a renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act will be considered in the Congress in the near future. We know that bicycles are produced in Europe in large quantities and that foreign manufacturers are in a good position to compete in the American bicycle market because of their large volume and modern production facilities. This condition is peculiar to the bicycle industry, as the foreign producers of most other consumer durable goods are not in large-volume production.

Recently a large national merchandiser purchased 40,000 bicycles in Germany at a figure which is considerably under the bare cost of production in America. This is entirely possible because Department of Commerce figures indicate that workers in German bicycle factories are paid less than one-fifth of the scale in similar American plants. These bicycles are not the European type—they were designed to fit the American market and are exact prototypes of American bicycles in design, finish, thread fittings; in fact, exact duplicates in every detail.

Other national merchandisers who handle bicycles, noting this action on the part of their competitor, are now active in attempting to purchase quantities of bicycles in Europe so that they will be in a position to compete.

We understand that there is very little hope of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act being discontinued, but there is a possibility that an amendment may be considered which will afford an industry in our difficult position some possibility of relief through establishment of quotas.

We are convinced that our industry is in a precarious position and that there is a possibility of practically complete destruction of the industry, as in the case of watchmakers, ceramics, felt hats, and others.

We are informing you of the above outlined vulnerable position of our industry in the hope that you will support any amendment to the act which might be of help to industries which face ruinous foreign competition.

Yours very truly,

Arnold, Schwinn & Co.: Frank Peters, Frame Shop; Emmett Schellhorn, Welding; Walter Macierowski, Wheel; Edward Flintz, Shipping; Willard Beeskow, Tube Mill; Adam Jasinski, Inspection; Marshall Larsen, Tool Room; John Posinski, Assembly; Irving Tiedt, Special Parts; Arno Stimple, Maintenance; Walter Staff, Receiving; August Janov, Plating; Edward Wriedt, Lock; Henry Carlson, Paint.

Mr. Chairman, today we face a crisis. We are being told that on every side. One thing we know: Our strength is based on our essential freedom; but underlying any defense we can make in behalf of our country is our strong productive capacity. In the name of the employers of the great Thirteenth District of Illinois; in the name of the thousands of employees who share their employer's conviction that something must be done to protect American industry; in the name of the thousands of humble Americans like myself who believe that American principles are worth fighting for—and who are willing to make any sacrifice—but who expect us in the Congress of the United States to do our duty in protecting their means of living, I shall support this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, we have a large manufacturer who for years has been turning out bicycles and bicycle parts. I am informed, as the gentlewoman from Illinois has been informed, that one of our big mail order houses with these great branches throughout the United States has purchased these bicycles in lots of something like 40,000 from the Ruhr Valley in Germany and that they are being sold on a retail basis for about $19.75 as against our American price of about $36.50 to $40 per vehicle; and that there is no way on earth that our people can meet that price. I assume that is the type of competition to which your friends have directed your attention. It is somewhat of a double-barreled proposition in that I assume material will not be allocated to our industries to continue the manufacture of bicycles because of the material being diverted. And further with these parts coming in in competition in the form of a finished product and as you say produced in almost the exact color scheme with the chrome decoration and all that, there is just no way that we can hold the American market for these workers.

Mrs. CHURCH. I agree thoroughly that that is the current danger.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], known as the peril-point amendment. I also support an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], or the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], which provides for what is known as the escape clause.

I wonder if the members of this committee have received much correspondence from their constituents with respect to granting too much power and authority to administrative agencies, including the State Department. It has been said on the floor of this House that the approval of these agreements is made by several agencies of the Government, but I call your attention to the fact that the policies with regard to the making of reciprocal trade agreements are laid down and promulgated by the State Department. In other words, it is the State Department that after all has the determination and makes decisions with regard to the making of the hundreds of reciprocal trade agreements that are made on behalf of this country. If we could realize that the Secretary of State is the one who finally determines these matters, it is possible that we might give this proposed amendment a little more serious consideration.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] called attention to certain groups that are favorable to the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements, but he did not say that these groups and organizations are opposed to this proposed amendment. Do you think, for example, the United States Chamber of Commerce whom he mentioned is opposed to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]? Do you think the farm organizations oppose a proposal that protects them in some degree when their prices go below what is known as the peril point? Do you think that any of the organizations named by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], would object to such proposal if they knew about it and understood it?

All in the world the amendment does is to require the President of the United States to let the Congress know when the price of goods and materials in trade with foreign nations goes below what is known as the peril point or danger point. In such event, the President simply notifies the Congress that such action has been taken and gives reasons therefor. Then it is for the Congress to take such action as it sees fit under the circumstances. It is a very mild sort of thing. I do not see how any member of this committee or anyone else interested in this legislation can object to it. The amendment should be approved by an overwhelming majority. You will observe that those who have risen against the amendment have given no substantial reasons why it should not be approved. They have directed their arguments against allowing any changes in the bill as proposed by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that the State Department has such an enviable or outstanding record that its policies are above reexamination in any field. I am inclined to think that it might be well to at least reexamine its actions with respect to its policies in reciprocal trade.

There are many on the floor of this House who have criticized and condemned the State Department in recent months with regard to its policies in other fields. I hardly see, therefore, why you would be unwilling to permit Congress to be notified when agreements are made with other countries with respect to exports and imports that may result in injury to the industries of America.

I think I should also call attention to the fact that the agreements presently

in effect are considerably different from what they were when Secretary Hull entered into agreements 16 years ago. I am not unmindful either of some of those agreements.

I recall quite vividly in May of 1941 when I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State demanding that the tremendous increased amounts in shipments of scrap steel to Japan and Germany be withheld or greatly reduced. I also directed attention to the danger of sending huge quantities of high octane gas to Japan. The reply I received was in substance that because of agreements our country had made with Japan, we were not in position to make any changes under reciprocal trade.

The proposal before you today is a mild but important one. Again, let me repeat, I hardly see how those of you who have been critical with regard to the power and authority given the Secretary of State can oppose this proposal. In fact, I just do not see how anyone can oppose it. It is in the interests of American industry, American agriculture, American business, and American labor. In fact, it is in the interests of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

When a matter like this comes up, I want to be sure that I am clear myself about it. I appear here for the purpose of finding out some information that may set me right. Where does the authority come from that the President has to negotiate these agreements in the first place? It comes from Congress. But when the President has made a mistake and he has executed contracts below the danger point what do we do about it? Nothing.

The only thing that is important about this amendment is that the President must come in here and tell us that he made a mistake, but there is no provision by which we can correct it after he has made that statement.

Are you afraid to exercise the authority of Congress that the Constitution gives you? If you have the power to give him the authority to make these contracts, by the same token you have the power to take that authority away from him if he makes a mistake.

As to your escape clause, I should like to find out how you are going to escape. It tells you it is an escape clause, it holds out a hope that you can get out, but I do not think it is an escape. You ought to do something about this; you ought to do something about this in the law now by providing that whenever the President makes a contract that is going to destroy industry in America that contract is null and void.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think we better put something in the bill right here to have Congress retain control over the agency?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; right here. But, of course, you are afraid. You conferred this authority, but you are afraid to take it back.

While these amendments are weak and do not provide a positive course to pursue in regard to peril-point report by the President, the escape clause amendment is also merely a statement and does not show anyone how to escape.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I believe its adoption will add some protection to what in my opinion is bad legislation. I shall vote against the extension of the act itself.

I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that some of us who occupy seats on this side of the aisle, which have been empty for some years, do so because the people of this Nation have registered a protest against legislation of this kind.

If I may use a rather threadbare but appropriate phrase, we have a mandate to recapture and protect some of the functions of the Congress that have been delegated to other authorities in recent years. I believe this to be one of them.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall regulate foreign trade and shall levy duties and imposts. I believe it is time to reestablish the constitutional prerogative of this great legislative body.

Early in my service in this House I should like to be on record as being opposed to undermining the economy of this Nation in an attempt to foster ideologies that are not based on the protection of the jobs of American workers and the investments of the life savings of millions of our people.

I will perhaps be branded a reactionary. Well, I do react against exporting the jobs of American workers into cheap labor areas and destroying our standard of living.

I will no doubt be branded a conservative. If that means because I believe in the conservation of America's resources in order that we may have a stable economy, then I am a conservative.

The so-called liberals will want no part of me. If being a liberal means being liberal with the industrial strength of this Nation and giving it away in such a way that even the fair trade of competition is destroyed, then I do not want to be a liberal. But if being a liberal means believing in the liberty of the American workingman so that he may produce, earn, and save, if it is liberty and freedom for all our people under the Constitution, then I am a liberal.

Mr. Chairman, I want the record clear early in this session on my position—I shall in any way I can, however humble that may be, vote to restore to the Congress its rights, duties, and responsibilities.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it might be helpful, as we consider this amendment and consider the bill, to take a brief look at some things that are a matter of record.

Let us look at the record. Of the thousands of concessions that have been made under the trade-agreements program, only 20 applications for relief under the escape clause have been filed with the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission has recommended that one concession be withdrawn, which has been done. There are five applications pending. The rest have been dismissed because injury could not be proved.

I should like to indicate how really small these imports have been in comparison with the value of production of these same products in the United States.

In 1949, the most recent year for which statistics are available and the period during which it is claimed that many industries were being hurt, imports of walnuts represented less than 4 percent of the value of domestic production, imports of woolen textiles less than 1½ percent of the value of domestic production, imports of rubber footwear less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of domestic production, imports of coal-tar dyes less than one-half of 1 percent of domestic production, imports of cotton cloth only two-tenths of 1 percent of domestic production, and imports of cheese only 2.7 percent of domestic production.

Let us take another industry, the pottery industry. Imports of table and kitchen ware were lower in 1949 and are estimated to be lower in 1950 than they were in either 1937 or 1939. Imports of artware have increased since the end of the war but domestic production in 1949 was over three times what it was before the war.

Imports of potatoes, about which we have read so much in the newspapers, were only 2.4 percent of domestic production. Imports of women's and children's leather gloves less than a sixth of 1939 imports and about one-twelfth of imports in 1937. Imports of fresh tomatoes were less in relation to production than in 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1937.

Then there are a group of industries who have complained about imports whose exports actually exceed imports coming into the United States. Exports of bicycles exceeded imports in 1949 by a million dollars. Exports of leather shoes were more than double imports. Exports of saws were 15 times imports. Exports of rayon fabrics over 10 percent of production, imports less than five-tenths of 1 percent. Exports of softened plywood running at the rate of over eight times the imports.

Imports of fish fillets have increased but so has domestic production, which is very close to the highest peak ever reached. With the single exception of Waltham, the profits of the domestic jeweled-watch companies have been higher in the last couple of years than ever before in their history.

And now there are two industries exporting over $100,000,000 each—metalworking machinery and textile machinery. Total imports of these products into the United States were only $6,000,000—$6,000,000 against $236,000,000 exports—but there have been complaints about these imports as well.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on citing facts like these for hours, but perhaps by now it is as clear as it ever can be, that all this talk of a dangerous flood of imports is only significant because of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the dangerous exaggerations which have been expressed in connection with it.

Total imports into the United States are smaller in relation to national income than they were before the war. They have risen slowly since 1947 and it is to our national interest for them to rise gradually over a period of years to the point where large appropriations of the taxpayers' money will no longer be necessary to balance our international accounts. We will then all be better off and richer to boot. Nobody has been injured yet in this very gradual process and it is my contention that nobody will be injured if we keep clear and alert about the facts and are not warped by fears which are hardly compatible with the pioneer spirit that has made this country great.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask the gentleman if the figures he has given are not figures that were obtained from the Tariff Commission itself?

Mr. PRIEST. Those figures were obtained from the Tariff Commission, and I believe those figures are in every sense reliable and accurate.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman spoke about the fact that the imports were only 1 percent of our products. I call his attention to the fact that there are some very big floods in some of the cities of this country when probably the amount of rainfall is not over one-half of 1 percent of the general rainfall of the country, but it causes a great deal of trouble to those communities. The same thing is true of the shipment of butter into New York, or of eggs from China. It breaks the market of the whole country on those particular commodities.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe these figures are rather convincing and that they will stand the test of careful examination.

Mr. REED of New York. We have poured about $38,000,000,000 into foreign countries. Why should they not have exports? Our taxpayers have paid for it. That is one of the reasons why you are here with a $16,000,000,000 tax bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old maxim of equity that one should not do indirectly what one cannot do directly. This obviously is an indirect attack upon the theory of the reciprocal trade-treaties program. It is not only indirect but it is, in my opinion, insidious, for the reason that this amendment, indulging as it obviously does in the clichelike term that is used only to substitute for thinking, seeks to arouse the fears of the membership of this Committee.

How does it propose to carry out its purpose? On the one hand it creates the Tariff Commission as a most dependable, objective, studious, nay, sacrosanct body, that is the only agency of Government that knows anything about tariffs or the point at which American industry is affected, and on the other hand, specifically, permanently, and irrevocably removes the Tariff Commission from the consideration of any given treaty.

The language of the amendment is quite clear. That is what it does. No member of the Commission will be able to participate in any of the hearings leading up to a trade treaty. My position simply is that that is only one phase of this great program upon which the American people have voted and passed upon in four separate national elections. It is well for our friends on the other side of the aisle to point to one or two or more accidents among them and define their presence as a mandate from the people of the country. You and I know that the factors which lead up to the conclusion and execution of a trade treaty are far more important and broader than the very patriotic and capable shoe workers at Endicott, N. Y., or even the equally patriotic and undoubtedly efficient pottery workers of West Virginia. This, Mr. Chairman, is 1951. It is not 1890 or 1900 or 1920. It is not even 1937. This program has taken its rightful part in our obviously sincere and conscientious efforts to establish a world of peace and order. I say to you members of the Committee the courageous thing for us to do today would be to vote that program up or down, but not try to mislead the public into thinking that we are for it, yes, but we are killing it while we are for it. It is my firm opinion the adoption of this obviously attractive amendment would not be perilous to the program, it would not be perilous to the country; it would be fatal to both, and it would be most disruptive of the attempts on the part of these great agencies of government.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one who would dismiss lightly the very sincere and serious efforts that are made by men chosen to head the great departments of our Government in their efforts to bring about a peaceful economy throughout the world, including the United States of America. When the RECORD is written, when you who today pose as friends of American labor and we who for years by our votes and by our deeds have proven ourselves truly to be their friends, the people will not be misled by your arguments today.

We should reject this amendment as a fatal blow which would kill the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman believe that the so-called peril-point amendment places in jeopardy the success of the ECA program? We have seen the economy, the productive potential of the nations of Europe, built up with our aid to the point where they are once again on their feet and off our backs. Now with this peril-point amendment we will be telling the nations of Europe, "You have built up your economy. We do not want you to deal with the Russian countries or with their satellites, but we still do not want you to deal with the United States if it imperils our industries in any respect. We ask you to remove your trade and tariff barriers between yourselves; we ask you to integrate yourselves economically." Yet does not the gentleman feel that the peril-point amendment proposes that we pursue a policy directly contrary to what we are asking the European nations to follow?

Mr. KEOGH. I am fortunate that the gentleman put his question in the form of a statement, for he has stated it far better than I could have. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that statement. This program is certainly far more important than any one phase, however important that phase is. The gentleman, coming from Chicago as he does, and I, coming from New York, know very well that the worst way to go into any negotiation or any trade is to go in with your hands tied and your feet tied and your powers limited.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has said, in effect, that after taxing the American people to build up these great industries in Europe we now must cut our tariff and provide a market for those people at the expense of the taxpayer-workingman here.

Mr. KEOGH. Of course, I am not bound by any effect the gentleman may put on what were my attempts to use a kind of simple language that the people of this country will understand, if the gentleman does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall not object if I may have 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will I be allowed the 3 minutes? Otherwise I should be forced to object.

The CHAIRMAN. It depends on how many Members care to speak. The time will be allotted between all Members who desire to speak.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I modify the request and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for an opportunity to stand up here and say a few words for New England, and especially Massachusetts, where we have probably been the greatest producers of materials of any State in the Union.

I was particularly interested when the gentleman from North Carolina talked about exports. We are interested in imports, not exports. If I had my way on this entire proposition, in addition to sending all of the exports out, I would like to send the State Department as one of the exports, too. I think it might help us a little bit.

Now, politics has been brought in here. I do not think there is any politics in the United States when it affects every single State in the Union, as this does. It may be because we are a State that produces things and have had to suffer from these tariff regulations as we have, but many businesses have gone out of business in Massachusetts because they could not compete with the starvation wages that the foreign countries pay. The people who ought to be interested in this proposition are the Members on my right who believe in America and want to make America strong and not European. Somebody has found fault because some of us are isolationists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERIL-POINT AMENDMENT

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, judging by the contents of my mail, many thoughtful and patriotic Americans are deeply concerned over the way in which Congress has surrendered and continues to surrender its powers and authorities to the executive departments of the Government.

We, who are elected to make the laws, should not surrender our power either lightly or quickly to the nonelective officials of the Government bureaucracy.

The present reciprocal trade bill gives great authorities to the nonelective officials in the State Department. The Congress and the country has little, if any, confidence in our State Department because of the way in which it has dismally bungled the foreign policy of this country.

I, for one, do not want to give any more power than it is absolutely necessary over the domestic affairs of our people to this State Department which has so utterly failed in the field of foreign affairs.

As an indication of what the people think of this State Department, to which this bill, unless amended, will give great powers without any curbs or restrictions, I cite you the results of a recent newspaper public-opinion poll on our foreign policy taken by newspapers in my district.

The Aberdeen Daily World, a newspaper of 15,000 circulation, published in Aberdeen, Wash., a city of 25,000, recently asked its people if they approved or disapproved of the administration's foreign policy. Out of 999 ballots received in the first 3 days of that poll, only 65 said that they approved the present foreign policy of the State Department and 934 said they disapproved that policy.

On the question, "Do you think our foreign policy should be reexamined," only 45 said they did not think it should be reexamined, and 944 said they believed our foreign policy should be reexamined.

The Daily Washingtonian, of Hoquiam, Wash., conducted a similar poll among its readers, and the answers revealed that more than 92 percent of those replying to the poll to be against the present foreign policy and less than 5 percent for it.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] tells me that a similar poll, conducted by a daily newspaper at Grants Pass, Oreg., produced similar results.

My own mail, in which I receive 99 letters against the State Department's foreign policy, to every letter I receive endorsing that policy, confirms me in the belief that these newspaper polls offer a correct evaluation of public opinion.

The people are not for the State Department. They do not and I do not want to see that Department have any more powers than it now has. I would rather see its powers curbed and lessened rather than increased and expanded.

I shall vote for the peril-point amendment to this bill, because that amendment will, in some small way, curb and restrict the activities of the State Department over the domestic life of the Nation.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY

In 1949 the State Department permitted 499,000,000 pounds of foreign fish to flow into the United States. As a result of these foreign imports of fish our American fishermen suffered a decrease in markets and had their employment curtailed and their incomes decreased.

Fishermen engaged in catching fish for livers were practically put out of business by Japanese fish-liver imports. Our American fishermen and cannery workers could not compete with the low wages paid Japanese fishermen and cannery workers.

Huge quantities of bottom fish and tuna also were imported to the great detriment of our fishermen.

The crab industry was hurt by canned crab imports from Russia and Japan.

I tried for 11 months to get the State Department to take some action to stop the imports of canned crab from Russia. The State Department would do nothing to stop these Russian canned crab imports. It consistently took the position that our American fishermen were not producing enough crab for domestic consumption and refused to take any action to bar Russian canned crab imports, despite the fact that the American dollars which were paid for the Russian canned crab were used by the Russians to buy and pay for war supplies from Western European nations. Russia bought more than $200,000,000 of such war supplies as rubber, tin, iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, automobile trucks, ball bearings, and barbwire from Britain, France, and Belgium in the 1 year of 1949. This unholy trade financed in part by the money we pay Russia for crab, furs, and other luxury items still continues.

FILBERT NUTS

We have had a prosperous filbert nut industry in the States of Oregon and Washington. The State Department has permitted large quantities of competing nuts to flow into the United States from China and other low-wage countries. Our filbert nut raisers have been greatly disturbed by these low-wage nut imports.

Many of our Washington-Oregon nut growers, at times, have even considered cutting down their filbert orchards because they knew they could not compete with China and other low-wage countries. Their very livelihood has been in constant jeopardy by this senseless policy of stimulating imports from low-wage countries without thoroughly considering the great risks to our own economy involved in these imports.

If we get a peril clause in this bill, we will be assured that before any tariff is reduced our nut raisers will have an adequate investigation made by the competent and nonpartisan Tariff Commission.

The nut growers want that kind of an investigation to be made. They are entitled to have it made.

PLYWOOD

State Department officials, without ever assuring an adequate investigation by such a nonpartisan group as the Tariff Commission, have threatened to reduce the existing tariff on plywood. If this is done, increased quantities of plywood will flow into the United States from Canada and Mexico, to jeopardize the employment and income of the 18,500 workers who are employed in the 56 plywood mills of Oregon, Washington, and California.

These plywood workers want the nonpartisan, scientific Tariff Commission to pass judgment on whether or not existing tariffs on plywood shall be reduced. They are entitled to this assurance and this protection.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the peril-point amendment which has been offered to this bill. Its adoption will lift a great fear from the hearts of many of our fishermen, nut growers, and plywood workers as well as from the workers in many other industries of this country.

Last year I attended a meeting here in Washington of the officials of 16 AFL unions and every one of these AFL officials favored adoption of this peril clause as a means of protecting the interest of the union workers they represent.

I am against giving more powers to the State Department. I will therefore vote for the peril-clause amendment.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am going back into past history. I remember a certain gentleman in the State Department, a distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, who told me when I was complaining that Japanese products were closing the corduroy and velveteen mills in the city of Lowell where I live, that we must not hurt the feelings of the dear Japanese. That State Department representative, Mr. Chairman, was caught in Corregidor after the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor, and over the radio came the plea that we go and help him. I tell you that because it is important that we think. We not only ruined our industries, but we hurt the boys, the youth of the country.

You will remember the Czechoslovak competition with our boots and shoes and the closing of our boot and shoe industry, the coming to the United States of Jan Bata, who ran a slave-labor camp at Belcamp, Md. That was exposed, and I had the help of the Department of Justice in exposing it.

You should stop, look, listen, and investigate, Mr. Chairman, before these agreements are made. You do not want to ruin not only the industries of our country but weaken our country itself. Remember, it is not always the volume of imports that matters, but the value. We all know that. Low price is the market price and we cannot compete with low-priced foreign goods. Remember the plight of the Waltham Watch Co.

Why, Mr. Chairman, were not representatives of the House and the Senate asked, as I requested, to sit in at the meetings in Torquay, England, when these reciprocal trade agreements were being discussed? Every nation affected by those trade agreements had their representatives there, their members of Parliament listening to those discussions. It gives you a lot of food for thought, Mr. Chairman. We must not weaken irreparably the industries of our country. We should accept this amendment or a comparable one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] is recognized.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to state I am not, and have not been, opposed to the worthwhile over-all objectives of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program. It undoubtedly embodies one of the most constructive efforts ever made to promote world trade on a scientific basis.

Realizing this fact I am, however, very deeply concerned that we retain its proved benefits to the maximum degree while, at the same time we carry out our conscientious obligation of including provisions to insure the least possible degree of injury to any American industry and to any product produced by the American taxpayer. This is, in my opinion, a moral duty we have to protect our domestic industries and our own people here at home.

That certain our own industries and people have suffered because of unintended and unseen reactions from the operation of the present reciprocal trade agreements policy, I know from my personal experience. On this score I have, during the last 4 years, made repeated appearances before the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, to acquaint them with the injustices being visited upon the American woolen, shoe, and watch manufacturing industries and their employees in my own congressional district, to whom no relief has been afforded from unfair foreign competition. In these particular industries, and many others, employment opportunities have been taken from our own people through no fault of theirs. In these fields we have also unwittingly, I am sure, hindered our war preparations by preventing an adequate production of woolen clothing for our fighting forces and by discouraging skilled craftsmen in our domestic watch manufacturing industry, whose products are so vitally necessary to atomic war instruments.

Mr. Chairman, there have been too many instances, heretofore, under the agreements entered into, where industries in this country have had to meet the competition of products manufactured by underpaid labor in foreign countries, some of whom might well be questioned as to their assistance to the Communist powers. This has resulted in hardship to the affected industries and workingmen of America. We cannot maintain our standard of living and successfully compete with foreign products made under the low-scale wages prevalent in foreign countries. In our charitable attempts to help these foreign countries we cannot afford to be unmindful of the possible adverse effect upon our own wage earners. To do otherwise is to improve conditions abroad at the unjust expense of the American people at a time when they are facing tremendous tax burdens. I do not blame the officials of foreign governments for favoring their own nationals but, on the other hand, it is only right and reasonable the agents of this Government be equally concerned about the welfare of the American people. Right and justice should be exercised in this country's administration of the law at least equal to that which is observed by foreign competitive governments.

In summary those are the reasons why I favor the inclusion of the peril-point provision in this bill.

In brief, all that the peril-point procedure will do is that—

First. The President will be required to submit the list of articles to be negotiated to the Tariff Commission.

Second. The Tariff Commission must make a factual study of each item and make a report within 120 days to the President. The report will contain the Tariff Commission's findings as to the limit the President might lower or raise duties without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles.

Third. The Tariff Commission is required to hold hearings.

Fourth. The Tariff Commission is to continue to furnish factual information to the negotiating committees but members of the Tariff Commission may not sit as members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information or the Trade Agreements Committee.

Fifth. If tariff cuts and other concessions are made below the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission, the President must identify the articles and state the reasons to the Congress for the action taken with respect to such items.

Sixth. The Tariff Commission is to furnish the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee a copy of its report on only those items which have been cut below the peril point.

The inclusion of this amendment is, in essence, merely implementing and clarifying the present intent of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It can do no harm and may well result in much good to our labor and industries.

The provisions of this peril-point proposal do not take away any of the existing authority of the President and they will serve to provide the Congress with an alarm system to act, when necessary, to protect the fundamental interests of the American people and American industry. That, in my conviction, is why Congress is in existence. The adoption of the peril-point amendment, with the escape clause, is a reasonable step in the right direction toward the preservation of a healthy economic life in these United States. It will be also, in this emergency time, concrete evidence to the American people that we are, as we should be, primarily concerned with their welfare.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RIGIDITIES IN THE PERIL-POINT SYSTEM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the peril-point amendment would introduce a number of rigidities into the method of formulating recommendations to the President about tariff concessions.

The first rigidity is that, in practical effect, the extent of the recommendation would be controlled by one agency of the Government.

The second rigidity is that this agency is required to fix accurately and with precision the exact point below which a tariff rate may not be reduced, or the exact point to which a tariff rate would have to be increased in order to prevent the causing or threatening of injury to a domestic industry. It is not possible to fix such a point with precision.

The third rigidity is that the Tariff Commission's decision on peril points must be made without the benefit of discussion or consultation with other agencies, some of which, like Agriculture and Defense, are particularly qualified to have judgments on the probable effects of a tariff concession on particular products within their field of interest.

The fourth rigidity is that this peril-point determination must be made by the Tariff Commission in advance of the actual negotiation and without the benefit of any facts that may be developed in the course of the negotiation. One of the important things that happens in

the course of a tariff negotiation is discussion of the situation in the two countries with respect to the products being considered. These facts cannot be considered by the Tariff Commission in fixing peril points.

The fifth rigidity is that under this system the peril points will inevitably be fixed higher than is necessary for most products. In a situation in which the Tariff Commission is required to do something which is inherently impossible, to wit, to fix a precise peril point, the point will inevitably be fixed at the very top of any scale of doubt.

The sixth rigidity lies in the fact that if the President should go beyond a peril-point recommendation and, consequently, under the amendment that was in effect 2 years ago, the President would be compelled to publish all peril points involved in that particular negotiation, those peril points will limit action in the future, either (a) because even if circumstances change, and he makes a concession below that peril point in some future negotiation, the fact that the higher point was once fixed will always be cited against him, or (b) because if he does not go so far down as the peril point would permit, the fact that the peril point was lower than what he did do will always be cited against him by the other country in future tariff negotiations.

The seventh rigidity also arises out of the requirement that if one peril point is disregarded, the entire list of peril points involved in the negotiation must be published. This rigidity is that if the President should decide that the advice of the Tariff Commission on a particular peril point was wrong and that he could safely go further than the point fixed, he would be restrained from doing so by the knowledge that he would have to give away his whole hand to the other countries through the publication of the total peril-point list.

The eighth rigidity arises out of the fact that the members and staff of the Tariff Commission are not permitted to participate in any decisions or in the making of any judgments by the Trade Agreements Committee, but are limited to giving information. The line between information and judgment in the field of tariff making is a very thin one and an express statutory prohibition against either the members of the Tariff Commission or the members of its staff venturing at all into the field of judgment, recommendation or decision could only have a highly limiting effect upon their usefulness to the Trade Agreements Committee, even in the field of supplying actual information.

Finally, the amendment is unnecessary. Certainly the record of the past 17 years has been impressive as to the care with which this program has been administered. The record shows that the collective judgments made by the members of the Trade Agreements Committee have been wise and that the exercise of the authority conferred by the act has been judicious. Against such a background, the introduction of an amendment with so many disadvantages as the peril-point amendment could only be a serious backward step.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I have been amazed during the debate to hear repeated statements made by Members—and I do not question their sincerity at all—expressing fear of what will happen to labor, the people who will be left out in the cold with no jobs, and what will happen to business if their crippling amendents are not adopted. Yet it cannot be disputed that in the days of the high tariff of the twenties and thirties millions were unemployed and business was prostrated. Under the reciprocal trade policies—not due solely to them but under them—from the late thirties until now our production has increased, employment has increased and we have reached a level of production and of prosperity for our business unexcelled in all the history of our Nation. Such statements therefore have no basis in fact; they are denied by the record.

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the Junior Chamber of Commerce are on record in support of this bill, the farm organizations are for it, most of the major labor organizations of the Nation are on record for it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. No, I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. No, because the gentleman does not want me to dispute his statement.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman will have a chance to speak. The record is here in the printed hearings and speaks for itself. I have only a short time and therefore cannot yield. I want to refer to what one labor union says in support of the program, and I refer to the testimony of the United Textile Workers of America. I do this because a question has been raised about the attitude of labor unions. The resolution is in part as follows:

During the 1920's protective tariffs, which were at their biggest point in the history of this Nation, failed to provide regular employment or high wages for American textile workers. Similarly, these high barriers did not make jobs or maintain wages for our textile workers back in the depression days of the 1930's. It has been American efficiency and know-how which have enabled American producers to compete in the world market against goods from foreign countries, when people in the world market can get the dollars to pay for American goods. On the other hand, high tariffs have raised the living costs of American consumers. This tends to reduce the ability of American workers to buy American goods, including American textiles.

Tariff reductions under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program are made with care and moderation and only after exhaustive study by trade experts, and after opportunity for interested persons to state their views. In the 16 years during which this program has been carried on it has not brought about any flood of imports of any commodities. In 1949, notwithstanding the various tariff reductions in different types of textiles, under trade agreements since 1934, total United States imports of textiles were ridiculously insignificant by comparison with the vast size of our domestic production. In fact, since the development of the program, the American textile industry has grown very prosperous, jobs have been more steady, and wages for textile workers have reached their highest levels in our history.

Mr. Chairman, that is an expression from a group that is supposed to have been injured by the reciprocal trade program.

Under date of January 17, 1951, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, transmitted to the chairman of our committee a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor convention held in Houston, Tex., September 18–23, 1950. That resolution, in strong terms, sets forth the arguments in support of the program in language similar to that I have already quoted from the resolution of the textile workers and proceeds:

Resolved, That the Sixty-ninth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor gives its support to our Government's reciprocal trade-agreements program and urges that it be pushed with vigor, unimpeded by partisan political obstacles and the sordid pressure of special interests.

This is on pages 616 and 617 of the printed proceedings. I would read from the testimony of the representatives of other major unions, except it would unduly prolong the discussion at this point. They are all in the printed proceedings and to the same general effect as those I have quoted with the exception of a few unions mostly in local areas where, beyond question, there has been some falling off in production of local industries such as glassware, pottery, and some others due to foreign imports. However, I feel confident this situation can and will be remedied under the law without any amendment. As a matter of fact, only 20 claims or protests have been filed with the Tariff Commission alleging injury from imports under the Reciprocal Trade Act escape clause, which was first inserted in 1943. It is a remarkable record. Truly our country has prospered under the reciprocal trade program which got us away from the depression conditions brought about by the high tariffs of the late 1920's which dried up our foreign trade.

But it is not alone of dollars and increased production and the increased prosperity of our factories, farms, and workers that I want to speak. The reciprocal-trade program is a vital part of our foreign policy which is aimed to increase peaceful commerce and trade and understanding among the nations of the world and to lay the basis of a permanent peace.

All of us know that world communism is not in sympathy with our aims in that direction.

It has been suggested that the trade-agreements program is being used to coddle and help Communist countries. Let me call the attention of the House to what the Soviets are saying right now about the United States trade policy.

In the December 1950 issue of Vneshnaya Torgovlya—Foreign Trade—there appears an article in which United States trade policy and practice are blasted in the most violent terms as anti-Soviet and undermining Soviet trade. The United States theory of freer and multilateral trade is called a "mad concept of United States hegemony for the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

enslavement, plunder and monstrous exploitation of other countries." Our polices of trying to liberate trade are dismissed as "a demagogic slogan for the penetration and inundation of foreign markets by stale American products."

This is what the Soviets themselves are saying about the trade program, of which the act the House is now considering is a central part. Surely this shows more clearly than any other argument how baseless is the charge that the trade-agreements program is being used to help the Soviets.

In the May 16, 1947, issue of Trud, the official publication of the Soviet trade unions, there is a long article blasting the Geneva trade talks as an attempt by America to force upon other capitalistic countries the trading principles of the nineteenth century. This article analyzes United States trade policy, with particular reference to the most-favored-nation principle. On this point it says in part:

In the light of this trend of American policy, the purpose of the London conference of the autumn of 1946, the present conference in Geneva and the United Nations world trade conference it is intended to hold this year is perfectly clear. It is an attempt on the part of the United States to force all countries of the world to accept the most-favored-nation principle for American goods. Why is America so persistently pursuing this aim? * * * The aim of America's economic policy is, by forcing the most-favored-nation principle upon other countries, to insure greater opportunities for the sale of her goods in the world market and thus to solve, or at least mitigate, the problem of disposing of her products.

On December 28, 1947, the same publication painted a picture of the Habana Conference as being an effort to open world markets and sources of raw materials to the further penetration of American monopolies. The article is entitled "Blackmail at Habana." It labels the Marshall plan and the proposed International Trade Organization as concealment for the imperialist plans of the United States, and ends up by calling the Habana Conference a typical American racket.

In an article in Foreign Trade, the official monthly magazine of the Ministry of Foreign Trade in Moscow, the writer said in part:

One of the means of establishing world domination is the foreign-trade program of American imperialism. * * * The basis of the American foreign-trade program is the demand to remove exchange and quantitative restrictions in foreign trade, to remove the preferential system of trade, and to introduce the principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment and equal opportunities. * * * The establishment of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, the reduction of tariffs, and the elimination of preferences mean the removal of any barriers in the way of American expansion.

These expressions from leading trade publications of the Soviet Union leave no doubt about the attitude of that country. Of course, their charges that we are using the trade program to advance the cause of American imperialism is ridiculous. Its purpose is to promote trade and commerce among the nations of the world that they may live together in peace and have the means in each nation to promote the general welfare and raise the living standards of their own people.

But in increasing our markets for foreign goods, reciprocal trade has increased enormously the foreign markets for American goods, mostly manufactured products of many kinds from automobiles and farm machinery to farm products; because, as we purchase the products of other countries, many of them basic raw materials that we seriously need, our purchases put American dollars in the pockets of their peoples so they can buy our products. This is the real reason that Russia opposes the program. The Soviets would like nothing better than for us to so injure or destroy the reciprocal-trade program so that our purchases of foreign goods would cease, thereby bringing about a situation in which she could make special arrangements with other countries, and thus put rubles in their pockets instead of American dollars and force them to trade with her because they would not have the means of trading with us. That is the crux of the whole matter. Let us not betray the free world by crippling with amendments our foreign-trade program which has brought us so far along the road toward the restoration of normal trade and commerce between our country and so many countries of the world. This program is vital to the future prosperity of our own country. It is vital also to the peace of the world. And the kind of bill the Congress shall eventually pass may well determine what kind of world our children will live in for a long time to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman fram Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have made my views known in this body several times before concerning the reciprocal-trade program. I desire, however, briefly to state some of the reasons which motivate my present action in opposing any reciprocal-trade measure which shall not adequately and expressly safeguard the welfare and prosperity of American industry, and thus guarantee, to a maximum degree possible, American working men and women to full-time, well-paid employment.

Let me state that I favor the encouragement of trade and commerce with foreign nations provided that the flow of that trade and commerce does not impair, harm, and destroy our own industrial strength. I have always opposed log-rolling tariffs which bestowed bounties on some classes and imposed oppressive prices and exactions on others. Such tariffs worked great injustice, promoted special privilege, and in effect levied indirect imposts upon the people. I believe, therefore, that the tariff question should be removed from politics as far as possible. I believe that qualified experts, businessmen, farmers, labor representatives, and other interested groups should all take part in the formulation of tariff rates and trade agreements.

If such principles were followed by our officials in making agreements and fixing rates, there would be no basis for criticism. But the whole process of making these trade agreements has been marked all too frequently by compromises and concessions to foreign nations that have not only imperiled American industries but have visited them with stagnation and depression, stalemate and unemployment which, were it not for the existing emergency in the world, would rapidly bring about economic collapse for many industries. I will not burden the House with detailed examples because they are well known and range from mining to textiles and from wool to boots and shoes and scientific instruments.

In my opinion, there is no justification for any law which permits the present flow of competitive goods from Russia and its satellites behind the iron curtain. This policy is strengthening potential enemies by giving them not only valuable dollars but also strategic materials.

Nor is there justification for failing to incorporate in this law provisions requiring certain and speedy adjustments of tariffs whenever imports reach the peril point and threaten the security and well-being of industries upon which we must depend to provide jobs, opportunities, and sustenance for American workers.

It is also incontrovertible that any worth-while reciprocal trade program should contain provisions by which our Nation would be able to escape from or avoid adverse and unfavorable and harmful consequences as the result of inequitable and unfair competition by cheaply made foreign goods.

Unless this bill is amended to meet these objections, I will vote against it because in that event it would work a great injustice to the workers and industries of my district and State.

I think that the American people are very much dissatisfied with—and some have strongly protested against—the ultraliberal and ultrainternationalistic concepts and ideological aims that have crept into the negotiation and administration of the trade-treaty law. The devaluation of the pound sterling has evidenced the gap between foreign and domestic cost of production with regard to several nations. That is surely most harmful in its effects. But it is hard to understand, much less estimate, the arrangements which allow the so-called iron-curtain countries to dump their slave-labor goods on the American market.

These particular agreements are defended on the ground that they promote peace and good will and raise standards of living in certain backward nations. But it is a peculiar and ill-advised altruism indeed which effectuates these concessions bringing loss of employment and loss of prosperity to American industries and at the same time strengthening the economy and the military potential of nations lined up against us in the conflict between freedom and slavery.

I hope the House will vote in this instance to secure and protect our industries, our workers, our farmers, and our businessmen. That is the path to the national strength we must have in this grave hour of world history.

American productive capacity is our greatest weapon in this crisis. Let us zealously and fearlessly protect it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, many years ago there came from the great State of Tennessee to the Halls of Congress a young man whose name was Cordell Hull. He served in this body with distinction for a great many years, fighting high tariffs put into effect by the Republican Party of his day. He recognized the future danger to our country of such policy. He saw the position that our over-all economy might be put into, the disadvantage to agriculture, the disadvantage to many elements of our industry. He saw the repercussions abroad in the ultimate building up of higher and higher tariff walls in other countries against our goods from the farm and from the factory. He saw the vicious circle developing, and he knew that that was one of the causes that led to unrest, suspicion, distress—yes, hatred, which brought about imperialism and resulted in war. For many years he fought in this Chamber to have the Congress enact into law a scientific method applicable to our country and reasonably just and fair to other countries for international intercourse in business, and at the same time bringing protection to our own people, both in industry and on the farms. He later was sent by the people of his great State to the United States Senate and he continued his great fight. He not only fought in this direction but he fought for income-tax legislation. He made many other great fights, but one of his great contributions was in the field of sound, intelligent tariff legislation.

After leaving the other Chamber he was appointed Secretary of State, and for all time the name of Cordell Hull will go down in American history as one of the greatest Secretaries of State that our country has ever had or will have. As a cornerstone of his great career, if he were asked to pick out the one greatest thing, the greatest contribution that he felt he had made to the progress of our country, it would be the Hull reciprocal trade agreements legislation. We are now asked by the pending bill to extend for a period of 3 years that which Cordell Hull fought for for so many years and that which Cordell Hull finally was instrumental in enacting into law. If Cordell Hull were not confined to his home during the past several years due to illness, we would hear his voice ringing today urging the Members of Congress to extend unrestricted for another 3 years the Hull reciprocal trade agreements law. He saw the dangers and the harmful results of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. He saw it make a powerful contribution in bringing about an economic conflagration. He saw its great contribution to this misunderstanding throughout the world, and it certainly did bring great misunderstanding throughout the world. You and I saw this great country go into a great economic conflagration due in part to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. In 1932 the national income was $39,000,000,000; last year it was $260,000,000,000. We have seen what the high protective tariff acts of the Republican Party have brought about. And we have seen the beneficial contributions made to the healthy building up of our country domestically and bringing about satisfactory conditions throughout the world under the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In 1936 the Republican Party in its platform came out for the repeal of the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. He is opposed to this type of legislation. I respect those who are opposed to it, absolutely and definitely. They want us to go back to the Smoot-Hawley Act with all of its vicious results. And they are honest. But there are those who by indirection are trying to impair and destroy the effectiveness of that which the great Cordell Hull, after many years of effort, had put on the statute books of our country and which today we are attempting by the pending bill to extend for 3 years.

The pending amendment, if adopted, will seriously impair the Hull reciprocal trade agreements law. You and I who have followed the leadership of Cordell Hull, you and I who believe in the leadership of Cordell Hull, should keep in mind that this is an indirect attack on the stability and the strength of the Hull reciprocal trade agreements law.

In 1949 we exported $12,000,000,000 of goods and farm commodities and imported $7,000,000,000. In 1939 we exported $3,000,000,000 and imported $2,000,000,000. The reciprocal trade agreements law has removed artificial barriers, has brought about better understanding, and has inured to the benefit of our country. Today it is an important part also of our relationship with other countries.

The pending amendment, as I say, will be an attack upon that which Cordell Hull has given to us. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the trade agreements program has been in effect since 1934. The proponents of that program said that it would relieve the depression and would bring peace to the world. When we entered the war economy of World War II there were still about 10,000,000 unemployed in the country. It is ridiculous to suggest that the trade agreements program has produced either prosperity or peace.

It is important that Congress take a look at the trade agreements program to see how it is being administered. The State Department, in administering the trade agreements program, has not kept faith with agriculture. The State Department officials not only lacked information about the problems of the American farmer, but they rejected the information that has been available from the Department of Agriculture and the Tariff Commisison. In the early years of the program greater reductions of tariff were made with reference to agriculture than any other industry. The fact that the tariff had been cut the full 50 percent as authorized in the original act on many agricultural products was the primary reason for the administration asking for authority to make an additional cut of 50 percent a few years ago.

When Mr. John C. Lynn, associate director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before our committee I asked him about the potato situation in reference to our tariffs and the trade agreements program. I want to quote to you just a little from that testimony:

Mr. LYNN. Well, the potato situation is not a good one to talk about.

Mr. CURTIS. But you have to hear about it.

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir. You have to face those rotten eggs once in a while. The potato situation that has given us so much trouble, or given us so much publicity, I think, is the Canadian potatoes coming into the United States. I think we could make a point there as covered in our statement.

Now, potatoes from the United States going into Canada pay a 75-cent duty per 100 pounds; potatoes coming from Canada to the United States on a quota of 3,500,000 bushels pay a 37½-cent duty. There is a case where we believe that reciprocity should be considered in these trade agreements. We are not saying that the duty should be raised to this level in Canada. But take Maine, for example. There is just an imaginary line between Maine and Canada, and potatoes are split right down the middle of the area; therefore, the duty from one place to another should be the same.

Another example to illustrate that is apples. In the case of apples from Canada to the United States, the duty is one-quarter of a cent a pound; in the case of apples from the United States to Canada, it is three-quarters of a cent a pound. Now, again, the same thing would apply.

Mr. CURTIS. And you had situations like that in mind when you stated it should be reciprocal?

Mr. LYNN. That is right.

Mr. Lynn pointed up the highly competitive nature of American farm products and their susceptibility to foreign imports. The testimony continues, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. Now, take the Western Hemisphere. There are a great many competitors of the American farmer, are there not?

Mr. LYNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. But not so many very great competitors of America's heavy industries?

Mr. LYNN. I think, generally speaking, we are just about as efficient producers of agricultural products as industry is of industrial products. However, if I might use this as an example, an American GE refrigerator is just so much different from any other kind you see in the world that it is superior; whereas a bushel of wheat produced in America of the hard type and a bushel of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the hard type from another country are about alike.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, agricultural products are more sensitive to world prices than many industrial products?

Mr. LYNN. I think that is right. I think that is generally true.

Mr. Marion R. Garstang, of the Milk Producers' Federation, gave some very pertinent testimony on this same point. The testimony continues:

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Garstang, you represent dairy farmers or the manufacturers of dairy products, or both?

Mr. GARSTANG. The farmers, the producers.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the duty on butter has been reduced by trade agreement negotiations from 14 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound on the annual quota of 60,000,000 pounds?

Mr. GARSTANG. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. That means that if they import more than 60,000,000 pounds, the tariff goes to 14 cents on that amount that is over?

Mr. GARSTANG. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. And is not 60,000,000 pounds almost three times as much as past imports in any one year except 1920?

Mr. GARSTANG. That is true. It is also a sufficient amount on a delicate market to just tear it to pieces.

Mr. CURTIS. Do not the chief imports of butter usually arrive at New York City; that is one of the principal ports of entry?

Mr. GARSTANG. I think that would be true; I am not sure.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe it is. And is it not also true that the price received by dairy farmers for their products is geared to the wholesale price of butter in New York City?

Mr. GARSTANG. In a great many markets——

Mr. CURTIS. I am talking about dairy farmers that are not in an organized milkshed where they have a local area for selling their product.

Mr. GARSTANG. Even in a great many of the milksheds which are subject to Federal orders, the price is set up on a formula which uses the price of butter as one of the elements of the formula and in a great many of the other markets that are not under Federal orders, a formula is used in which the butter price plays an important part.

Mr. CURTIS. Would the arrival of a boatload of butter, or the knowledge that it is expected to arrive, depress the price of butter in that market which would, in turn, depress the price to the dairy farmers throughout the country?

Mr. GARSTANG. I have heard the managers of some of our cooperatives say that one boatload of butter would upset the market particularly if the market happened to be well supplied with domestic production at the time.

Mr. CURTIS. Because the seller who offers his product at the lowest price really sets the market?

Mr. GARSTANG. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time butter imports are controlled through this section of the War Powers Act which you have read?

Mr. GARSTANG. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. But if those controls are removed the situation that you have described would exist, would it not?

Mr. GARSTANG. We were told at the Department of Agriculture about 2 or 3 weeks ago that there was considerable pressure on them to grant import licenses for butter. They are holding them down rather closely, but there are demands being made on them to grant import licenses for butter.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the duty on Cheddar cheese was reduced to 3½ cents per pound, but not less than 17½ percent ad valorem by the trade agreements negotiations at Geneva in 1948?

Mr. GARSTANG. I do not have that information here, but that sounds about right.

Mr. CURTIS. And that is about one-half of the 1930 rate. I think you will find that is true. Do you know approximately what the imports of Cheddar cheese were in 1950? Were they not in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 pounds?

Mr. GARSTANG. It was 12,000,000 pounds for the first 10 months, so it would run close to 15,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you think that this duty reduction contributed to these large importations?

Mr. GARSTANG. Yes; I am sure that it did to some extent.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all.

Not only have the farmers of Nebraska been injured under the trade agreements program, but it has been a detriment to industry. One of Nebraska's leading industries is the production of motor scooters. These motor scooters are made at the Cushman Motor Works in Lincoln, Nebr. It is one of our largest home-owned industries. The principal competitor of a motor scooter is a motorcycle. There has been a heavy importation of motorcycles into the United States. Many of these came from behind the iron curtain. In other words, tariff concessions were granted by our Government to the makers of motorcycles in Czechoslovakia. Now I want to tell you just a little bit about the tariff on motorcycles.

The Tariff Act of 1930 fixed a 10-percent ad valorem duty on motorcycles, with a provision that if another country had a higher duty on motorcycles that our tariff could be raised to meet the foreign competition. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 repealed this contingent provision. The present tariff duty for our importation of a motorcycle into Great Britain is 22½ percent ad valorem. The States Department has frozen our tariff on English motorcycles coming into this country at 10 percent. Is that reciprocity? Is that fair play? The motorcycle imports from England into the United States the first 10 months of 1950 were valued at $2,759,000.

The domestic jeweled-watch industry, consisting of Elgin National Watch Co., Hamilton Watch Co., and Waltham Watch Co., has been seriously affected by the reduced duties on imported Swiss watch movements. Their employment, earnings, and unit production have been severely curtailed by the competition from the Swiss industry whose average wages are almost one-third of the domestic average.

Elgin has been forced to begin importing low-priced watches through a subsidiary, Wadsworth Watch Case Co. Other companies will be forced to take the same measures.

The serious aspect of this situation is the injury to our national defense. There is no question that the jeweled-watch industry is vitally essential to our preparedness and ability to wage war. It is indispensable not only for timepieces but for many precise mechanisms to be used in a war of gadgets. Yet it is being whittled away, stifled, and ignored.

There are many ways to confuse the picture, but in the end the facts remain that our watch industry is well below our needs, not only in these fields but also in jeweled bearings, all of which are now imported from Switzerland. Aside from what may be done with the trade-agreements program as a whole, our jeweled-watch industry must be protected. It is already too small and should be supported and given an opportunity to expand as rapidly as possible. There is no excuse for our country being too little and too late in this part of its industrial capacity.

In a letter addressed to me and read to the committee, Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., said:

In 1935, the year before the trade agreement with Switzerland, the domestic industry supplied about 53 percent of the watches sold to the American public. By 1941 this had fallen to 39 percent and today it is 28 percent. Though imports have increased from about 4,000,000 movements in 1941 to almost 9,000,000 in 1946 and 7,000,000 in 1949, the domestic industry in 1949 was able to sell only slightly less than the number of watches it sold in 1941. It would be difficult to convince our salesmen that the Swiss trade agreement helped the industry.

As we have stated before, our position respecting tariff has not been taken solely out of consideration for the welfare of the industry, or even its employees, but also because of the industry's extreme importance to national security. As you know, it has been our contention that the industry is too small for the vital purposes of national defense. This, now, has been borne out by statements made by the Chairman of the Munitions Board in answer to an inquiry from a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee, specially appointed last year to study the situation of the domestic industry. Pertinent excerpts from two letters by the Munitions Board Chairman are quoted below so that you may have before you the proof of our contention in this connection:

"Assuming that we will have to rely exclusively on our domestic capacity to produce timepieces and related items in a future emergency, and based on an analysis of our experiences in the last war, I believe that the preservation of a minimum level of domestic productive capacity is absolutely essential.

"I regret that I am not in a position to state now what that minimum level should be, but if it would be helpful to you, I would venture the opinion that in no event should it be lower than the 1941 level of operations." (Letter of March 17, 1950.)

"As I pointed out in my prior letter, the maintenance of a heathy watch industry is essential to the national security. In addition to the items which it alone can produce the industry undoubtedly would again be called upon for the production of other items for which it is not the sole producer.

"In view of this, it is our feeling that, as a matter of precaution against probable future needs, every effort should be made to prevent the dissipation of the productive capacity of the industry and to maintain it in a healthy condition." (Letter of May 9, 1950.)

The total conversion of the industry to war production during the years from 1942 through most of 1945 gave the importers of foreign-made watches and movements a virtual monopoly of the American market. It has taken the whole American industry, not just this company, the 3 years since the end of the war to fight its way back in unit sales to the 1941 level. Even now, with a new and more serious threat to our national security than ever before, the industry is still at that minimum level to which the Chairman of the Munitions Board referred. In these times minimum levels are not enough. This country should have an industry fully capable, beyond doubts, of taking care of all

needs. Great Britain has been subsidizing and supporting its horological industry for 10 years, because of its military importance.

I think it is fair to say that the State Department has been openly hostile to the American jeweled-watch industry, notwithstanding that industry's absolute necessity to our defense program. A thorough investigation ought to be made of the people in the State Department who have been running our trade-agreements program. It is well known that Alger Hiss had something to do with the trade agreements. When the general trade-agreement convention was held in Switzerland, Mr. Clayton took 100 or so associates over there with him. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] caused an investigation of these individuals to be made and found that there were 10 Communists in Mr. Clayton's party. I would like to ask the question, Were the Communists sabotaging America through the trade-agreements program?

One of the very fine witnesses that appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in reference to trade agreements was Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of American Watch Workers Union. Among other things, he said:

A perusal of these rates will show that a watch finisher receives from 54.1 cents per hour to 57.2 cents per hour, American money, and in the United States the comparative rate for a piece worker, watch finisher, is $1.85 per hour with earnings averaging better than $2 per hour. A pinion maker ranges from 26.9 cents per hour, class 7, to class 1 at 56.5 cents per hour in Switzerland and the comparable rate in the United States is $1.60 to $1.90 per hour.

This pinion maker is an interesting comparison, because the American pinion maker works on the same machine as his counterpart in Switzerland.

These machines they work on are manufactured in Switzerland in Moutier by the firms of Beckler, Peterman, and Tornos, and are sold to us here in the United States, one of the few pieces of machines not blocked for sale by Switzerland to American firms. The productivity from these machines must be the same, but how different the wage rates are.

Our average wages in the United States are in excess of $1.40 per hour and in addition there is a vacation with pay, the paid holidays, the group insurance, the pension plans, social security, unemployment compensation, which is part of the direct wage costs, among other things. These are all based on the employee's average wage in their payment and the total average wage is about $1.60 per hour. In Switzerland these figures will show the wages are from one-third to one-fourth of our wages.

The records are clear as to what a 17-jewel watch movement can be brought into the United States for. The Commissioner of Customs can readily make those figures available to your committee as can the Statistical Division of the Department of Commerce. Profit and all, 17-jewel watch movements come in for an average of $6.10 apiece, transportation costs with insurance not more than 10 cents per movement and the tariff ranges from $2.10 for a 17-jewel man's watch movement to $2.70 for a woman's watch movement, a total of $8.90. The cost of producing a 17-jewel watch movement in this country is considerably in excess of that with American wage costs and other costs. How can a domestic manufacturer compete on equal terms with such competition?

Mr. Chairman, I too would ask the question as did Mr. Cenerazzo—how can the men and women employed in the Elgin National Watch Co.'s factory at Lincoln, Nebr., compete with this Swiss system without some further measure of tariff protection? It is apparent that the importers are the ones who have the ear of the State Department.

Another witness who made a very fine contribution to our hearings was Mr. O. R. Strackbein. It is very significant that more and more of the working people of the country are finding out that our trade agreements program is not reciprocal; that it favors Soviet Russia; and that it discriminates against American labor and industry. It has not relieved unemployment. And certainly it has not prevented war. Mr. Strackbein spoke in opposition to the trade agreements program. In his dual capacity as chairman of the Labor-Management Counsel of Foreign Trade Policy and as secretary of America's Wage Earners Protective Conference, Mr. Strackbein spoke for the following labor groups: American Flint Glass Workers' Union; Atlantic Fishermen's Union; Seafarers' International Union; Fish Cannery Workers' Union of the Pacific; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America; United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers' International Union; International Council of Aluminum Workers' Unions; National Brotherhood of Operative Potters; United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers' Union; International Chemical Workers' Union; National Match Workers' Council; Greenhouse Vegetable Workers' Union 20557; United Wallpaper Craftsmen and Workers' Union of North America; International Union of Operating Engineers; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association; Window Glass Cutters' League of America; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America; American Wire Weavers' Protective Association.

The trade-agreements program has lowered the tariff on most imports coming into the United States. The tariff is a tax on imports. If any tax is taken off or removed, it has to be made up in some other way. This means that this program, which has failed so terribly, has caused a great loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury. If the imports that came into the United States last year had paid the regular rate of duty as established by the Tariff Act of 1930, our Federal Treasury would have been about $3,000,000,000 ahead. Now Mr. Truman is insisting that we raise the taxes on the American people. Three billion dollars is a lot of money.

The fact that our trade-agreements program has played definitely into the hands of Russian Communists cannot be denied. On that point, I want to quote from the minority report on this bill:

As the result of the most-favored-nation principle, reductions in duty and other concessions made by the United States with all countries under the trade-agreement program are automatically extended to Russia, Communist China, and all other Communist-dominated countries. We now have trade agreements with approximately 45 free countries covering literally thousands of imported items, and the benefits of all these concessions contained in these agreements are now benefiting Russia, Communist China, and their satellite iron-curtain countries.

In the case of Russia, for example, approximately 88 percent of its dutiable imports into the United States benefit from reduced rates provided in trade agreements by us with free countries, and 92 percent of the tax-free imports from Russia consists of products bound on the free list in trade agreements by us with free countries.

In the case of Communist China, 72 percent of the dutiable imports into the United States from that country benefit from trade-agreement concessions granted by us to free countries, and 75 percent of the duty-free imports of that country benefit from our concessions to the free nations.

Briefly summarized, similar figures for other iron-curtain countries are as follows:

Poland, 80 percent of the dutiable imports and 79 percent of the free imports.

Hungary, 73 percent of the dutiable imports and 69 percent of the free imports.

Bulgaria, 97 percent of the dutiable imports and 30 percent of the free imports.

Manchuria, 99.8 percent of the dutiable imports and 98 percent of the free imports.

Rumania, 96 percent of the dutiable imports and 84 percent of the free imports.

Detailed statistics on these import figures are contained in appendix A.

It is outrageous that our American soldiers should be fighting the Communists in Korea while at the same time all the Communist countries are enjoying the benefits of concessions made by the United States to the free world without (except in the case of Czechoslovakia) having given the United States a single concession in return. We recommend that this rank and preposterous inconsistency in our foreign policy be removed at once by the denying to Russia and Communist China, and to any Communist satellite country (including North Korea) which the President finds is part of a conspiracy against the free world, the benefit of the reduced rates which we have granted to the free world.

The administration of our foreign trade by the State Department in addition to helping Russia's war potential has hurt the United States defense program. It is not any wonder that the twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense meeting at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on January 25–27, 1951, condemned the trade agreements program and recommended that the act be not extended. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas a healthy national economy is necessary to a strong national defense; and

Whereas good wages and full employment form the foundation of a healthy economy; and

Whereas the free trade importation of products of countries where workers are paid much less than workers producing comparable goods in the United States can only result in increasing unemployment here and a weakening of our economy and our potential for national defense; and

Whereas the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program has removed protection from our workers and investors against the unfair competition of the low-paid workers of other countries, thereby threatening jobs of workers in industries important to our national defense; and

Whereas as a result of the reduction of tariffs and import fees incident to the passage of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended, grave injury already has been in-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

flicted upon various industries in this country important to our national defense program; and

Whereas imports into our country should be controlled by the imposition of import fees which would reflect the difference in our workers' wage standard and standard of living to those standards in other countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended which expires in June of this year, be not extended further and that in its place there be established the principle of flexible import fees, to be decided upon by the Congress in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

The Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense consists of 40 participating organizations as follows: American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.; American Gold Star Sisters, Inc.; American Gold Star Wives, Inc.; American Legion Auxiliary; American War Dads Auxiliary; American War Mothers; American Women's Legion of World Wars; Auxiliary to Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; Blue Star Mothers of America; Catholic War Veterans of the U. S. A. Ladies Auxiliary; Dames of the Loyal Legion of the U. S. A.; Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861–65, Inc.; Daughters of the United States Army; Ladies Auxiliary of the Military Order of the Purple Heart; Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; Marine Corps League Auxiliary; National Amvets Auxiliary; National Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; National Patriotic Council; National Society for Constitutional Security; National Society, Daughters of the Revolution; National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861–65, Inc.; National Society of New England Women; National Society, Patriotic Women of America, Inc.; National Society of Service Star Legion, Inc.; National Society, Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; National Woman's Relief Corps Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; National Yeomen F; Navy Club, United States of America Auxiliary; Navy Mothers Club of America; New York City Colony, National Society, New England Women; Society of Sponsors of the United States Navy; The Wheel of Progress; United States Army Mothers; Women of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America; Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia; Reserve Officers Association, Ladies Clubs of the United States; The National Gold Star Mothers, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, right now people are worried about the war. That does not relieve this Congress from taking a look at this legislation. I am convinced that an investigation of the operations of the trade agreements law would lead a majority of the Congress to feeling that the program should be discontinued.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLS) there were—ayes 198, noes 107.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: After line 9 add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. As soon as practicable, but not more than 90 days after enactment of this act, the President shall take such action as is necessary to withdraw or prevent the application of reduced tariffs or other concessions (including the binding of an article on the free list) contained in any trade-agreement hereafter entered into under authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, to imports from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to imports from any nation or area thereof which the President deems to be dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve the point of order so that I may have an opportunity to examine the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the word "reciprocal" bandied about this afternoon. Anybody listening to the speech delivered on the floor just a few moments ago by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, heard it used in practically every sentence. Webster defines "reciprocal" as "mutual, shared, felt, shown, or the like, by both sides." Webster also says "reciprocal has the implication of an interchange of the same feeling or act."

Mr. Chairman, under the administration of the Trade Agreements Act there has not been reciprocity. There are today more trade barriers imposed against American goods than when the program was instituted. Other countries have imposed import quotas, blocked currency operations, currency manipulations, state trading, and all the other vast number of new devices that are used today to restrict imports.

Mr. Chairman, I am not criticizing those countries, for doing so, because I think we can all appreciate the difficulties they had and the problems they had so far as their trade balances were concerned. But I certainly do not think it befitting a majority leader or a Member of the Congress or a department of the Government of the United States to sell a program to the people of the country on the basis that it is reciprocal when it is no such thing.

There is compelling evidence that this program is not reciprocal. It can be found in at least one instance by an examination of the operation of the program with respect to the Communist countries of the world. Let us understand at the beginning that we have no trade agreement with any country behind the iron curtain, with the exception of Czechoslovakia. We have today no trade agreements, for instance, with Russia, none with Bulgaria, none with Poland, none with Hungary, none with Rumania, and none with China. Yet all of the concessions that we have granted to any country with whom we do have an agreement by virtue of the Trade Agreements Act is extended to those countries. What does that mean today in the trade between these countries and the United States of America, particularly as it relates to their exports to this country?

Using the figures for 1949, which is the year for which we have complete figures, of the dutiable goods imported into this country from Russia, 88 percent came in with the benefits of concessions granted under the trade-agreements program. Of the items imported from Russia which were on the free list, 92 percent were items which have been bound on the free list by reason of trade agreements entered into under the authority of this act.

In the case of Poland, 80 percent of the dutiable imports that came into this country in 1949 came in with benefits granted under the Trade Agreements Act.

In the case of Bulgaria, 96 percent of the items coming into this country have benefited by reason of concessions made.

From Hungary 73 percent of the dutiable imports were benefited as a result of concessions. Rumania, 96 percent; China, 76 percent.

Is that what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] would call a reciprocal program, when they gave us nothing for all the concessions that we have given? They have no agreements with us whatever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inform the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that I have in my office three linen towels stamped in the weave "Made in Soviet Russia," bought in a department store in Miami, that came into this country under the provisions of the Czechoslovakia reciprocal trade agreement. I just wonder how much of that is finding its way into the American markets through the favored-nation clause. I hope the gentleman explains to the Committee a little more the devastating effect of the favored-nation clause.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that evidence of a lack of reciprocity and what is actually happening as a result of the extension of the concessions that we have made to the iron-curtain countries.

Where, may I ask, is the reciprocity in a program that extends benefit to a country that gives you nothing in return? I am amazed that the majority party, that the majority on the committee, should seize upon a technicality to continue those benefits to the Communist countries of the world.

The amendment which I proposed in the first instance recommended only one thing and asked only one thing, that is, that any concessions granted by reason of these trade agreements should not be extended to the Communist countries. That is all it did. Yet they seize upon a technicality and say, "Oh, no. We want to continue to extend these benefits to Communist areas."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain that his amendment will in no wise hinder the importation from Russia of any war materials that we may want?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It certainly does not. Items coming from iron-curtain countries are not restricted by reason of the amendment. All it provides is that any imports that do come in shall come in under the tariff rate imposed by the Congress under the Tariff Act of 1930 and not come in under reduced rates which have been given as the result of so-called reciprocal concessions, in which they played no part whatever.

Another thing the amendment would do, however, it would free our hands, as a Congress and as a Government, to deal as we see fit, with the problem presented by the importation of specific items from those countries. Let me explain briefly what I mean by using this example. Fur imports from Russia and the iron-curtain countries since the war have been used as a device by Russia and the satellite countries to get dollars—dollars with which to purchase strategic items elsewhere, which they may need for their economy or their military efforts. In the last 4 years the iron-curtain countries have imported into this country $148,000,000 worth of furs. Granted they were on the free list, but the industry, in attempting to get some action to protect itself against this inflow of imports, was faced with this statement from all of the agencies of Government to which they appealed: "We cannot impose any restrictions on the importation of Russian or Communist furs because they are bound on the free list, as a result of trade agreements that we have with other countries."

Do we have to be bound in our conduct and treatment of goods from Russia and Communist countries by reason of some concession we have granted some other country and for which Russia or the other Communist countries have given up nothing of worth? I say "No," and I say that we as a Congress should say "No," and write it into the act. Unfortunately we cannot do much in view of the insistence of the majority to stand on a technicality in order to permit Russian goods to come with the benefits of the concessions granted in trade agreements already entered into. However, we should do all we can to prevent such things happening in the future and see to it that no concession granted in future trade agreements shall be extended to the importation of products from countries under Communist domination.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. When we buy fur coats from Russia we pay her in gold which they use to buy war equipment which they use to fight our men in Korea.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Absolutely, and it makes it that much easier for them to get dollar credits if they can do so on some nonessential item rather than to have to part with such essential things as manganese, tungsten, and some other things that we need and which can be imported without damage to domestic industry.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many false claims made for the trade agreements program. The most unfounded claim is that it is reciprocal. It is no such thing. The adoption of this amendment will not make it so. The adoption of the amendment will, however, remove the most glaring evidence that it is not reciprocal.

The adoption of this amendment will also show that in at least one area we are not going to further appease communism.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to discuss the gentleman's amendment as it has been altered and corrected with some of the members of the committee on this side. As I understand the gentleman's amendment now, what he is proposing to do is to direct the President to remove the most-favored-nation policy in connection with any future agreements that may be entered into as far as imports from Russia, Red China, or the satellites of those countries are concerned. Is that right?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is substantially correct.

Mr. MILLS. I think perhaps the purpose the gentleman has in mind can better be served by other language, but as far as I personally am concerned I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment with the understanding now that during the course of the consideration of the bill in conference, we may perhaps want to perfect the gentleman's amendment if it is possible for us to perfect it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would be very pleased to have the gentleman perfect it and particularly perfect it relating to some of the agreements that are now in existence. But I do want to say to the gentleman that I appreciate his action at this time with respect to the present state of the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman understands that those of us who bring legislation in on the floor of the House sometimes feel honor bound to the committee and to ourselves to protect the legislation from amendments which are not in keeping with the rules of the House. I objected to the gentleman's amendment earlier because it was not germane to the bill before us. The gentleman's amendment now is germane to the bill before us and I am suggesting that, as far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment. Some others on this side agree with me.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I appreciate that. If the gentleman would permit I should like to make it clear, however, that we on this side of the House have waived points of order on amendments coming up from the floor dealing with specific subjects.

Mr. MILLS. With regard to other legislation, but not legislation from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, a great forward step will be taken with the passage of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. It has my fullest endorsement because its purpose and aim to a limited degree will accomplish the expression of my Concurrent Resolution 11 introduced on January 3. It is the sense of the Congress in that resolution that the President should take such action as may be necessary to rescind any foreign-trade agreement negotiated with any foreign country, or any instrumentality thereof, under the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, if the Secretary of State is of the opinion that the government of such country is Communist controlled.

Addition of the Byrnes amendment will be heartening to those of us who desire additional action beyond the curtailment of the benefits now inuring to Communist satellite countries from the favored nation clause. The Byrnes proviso added to the peril point amendment and the addition of the escape clause will make the bill before us, H. R. 1612, a composite measure for which I can vote on final passage.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, throughout this debate, the proponents as well as the opponents of the extension of these agreements, have stressed the fact that the escape clause had been invoked in only one instance. I also point to that single instance with some pride because the Presidential proclamation just before the last elections withdrawing as of December 1, 1950, certain United States tariff concessions on women's fur felt hats and hat bodies made in the general agreement on tariffs and trade concluded at Geneva in 1947, was issued in accordance with recommendations of the Tariff Commission made after an investigation. I made a personal appearance and testified at length before the Tariff Commission on May 9, 1950, for the revocation of the concession which was causing serious injury to the hat industry and the workers in Norwalk and Danbury in Connecticut and the other affected areas in Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for the excellent amendment he has offered and state that I wish that the Democratic leadership had not made a point of order against the amendment as originally offered so as to make it apply to existing trade agreements.

I am in favor of sound reciprocal trade agreements with peace-loving nations. But I am not in favor of giving any trade concession, directly or indirectly, to a nation that is seeking to destroy us. Russia is in reality conducting a war against us. She is doing it of course, by means of indirection, primarily through her satellites. Trade advantages indirectly given to Russia or its satellites is a grave injustice to American boys who are called upon to fight Russian satellites in Korea.

I wonder if the technical gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who will not disturb present agreements benefiting Russia know how much Russia has benefited thereby so as to enable her to be in a position described in the following AP dispatch under today's dateline out of New York:

SOVIET JETS OUTPUT SEEN AT 400 MONTHLY SOON

NEW YORK, February 7.—Russia is expanding production of her MIG–15 jet fighter planes and, according to Swedish sources, expects to be producing 400 a month in the next few months, the magazine Aviation Age said today.

It said American production of planes of all types does not exceed 250 a month.

The magazine said MIG–15, which has been in action over Korea, has speeds up to 660 miles an hour.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I have supported the principles and the theory of the Reciprocal Trade legislation, and I shall today vote for the pending measure because I believe in the principles involved. As I have stated before, however, I do find considerable fault with the manner in which the legislation has heretofore been administered. For that reason I have supported the so-called peril-point and escape clause amendments. I shall also support the so-called iron-curtain amendment. I take this time to call to the attention of the Members some factual information with respect to the fur farming industry and to the effects upon it by imports of foreign furs. In the year 1939 there were approximately 3,000 silver fox farms scattered throughout the United States. Some 200 of them were located in the State of Washington. I regret to say that there are less than 400 of these farms left in business in the United States today. Whereas, these fur farms have produced 350,000 silver fox pelts, the estimated production for 1951 is less than 25,000 pelts.

Mink farming did not reach a point of importance until the late thirties and showed a steady growth until 1948 when there were 6,061 mink farms. Today there are a little over 5,000 mink farms, a decrease in 2 years' time of approximately 1,000 farms.

During the year 1950 imports of silver-fox furs totaled 44 percent of the domestic production. During the same year imports of mink furs totaled 69 percent of the domestic mink-pelt production. How much longer the remaining mink farms can stay in business against this foreign competition is a matter of your personal conjecture. The foreign pelts are, of course, produced at a much lower cost with cheaper labor. In many instances, and I refer to Russian imports particularly, the fur pelts are produced by slave labor or forced labor. Obviously, they can and do undersell our domestic product. As a matter of fact, Russian furs today dominate our domestic fur market. In that connection may I say that during the last 5 years we have imported over a quarter billion dollars' worth of furs from communistic-dominated countries, over $190,000,000 of which came directly from Russia.

I am not certain just what effect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will have upon these imports of Russian furs. Be that as it may, I want the Members to know that imports of certain foreign products can and do injure domestic industries. It is my belief that the Secretary of Commerce should forbid the importation of Russian-produced furs just as he has now prohibited the importation of Russian canned crab, on the grounds that the fur pelts, like the crab, are produced by slave or forced labor. I hope the House will approve the so-called iron-curtain amendment. If, as it is presently worded, it does not relieve the existing situation, then, perhaps the amendment may be reworded in the other body where the rule of germaneness is not as strictly applied as it is in the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it would be much easier and more pleasant for me to sit still and be quiet. But, who can remain silent when a measure of such vital importance to every family and individual in America is before us?

Always I have thought that anything that is fundamentally wrong and basically unsound cannot be justified by all the camouflage and sophistry which clever and ingenious men might employ.

Never have I voted for these reciprocal trade treaties and never shall I vote for them because Congress supinely and abjectly surrendered its prerogatives and delegated its powers to one branch of the executive department.

Instead of our foreign trade being controlled by an independent, unbiased, bipartisan agency, whose sole function is to study it and whose decisions are based upon factual evidence, it has been maneuvered, manipulated, and concocted by long-haired men and short-haired women in the State Department who are largely, if not wholly incompetent and unfitted to pass upon such matters.

These treaties are surrounded by an aura of mystery, conducted in secrecy without the duly elected representatives of the people, the Members of Congress, or the representatives of American business, labor, or agriculture, being given an opportunity to be heard. Such star-chamber proceedings are repugnant to free men and violate every tradition of the American people and the lovers of liberty everywhere.

Representatives of foreign governments and of foreign industry are granted admission to the hearings on these negotiated treaties, but all Americans are barred. There is nothing reciprocal about them because it is all give and no take so far as we in this country are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there are other countries much larger than the United States in both area and in population. There are civilizations older, with vaster natural resources. Yet the incontestable fact is, that we have grown in the past 160 years to be the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth. Perhaps the chief reason for our industrial might and productive capacity is that we had a high protective tariff to protect our infant industries, which have made us the marvel of our age. I know that we are now grown up; that our industries are not any longer infant, and that we must have an active flow of commerce between the different nations. It is both interesting and significant to note that the father of reciprocity was the former outstanding chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, a good Governor of Ohio, and the great and beloved Republican President of the United States of America—martyred William McKinley.

Naturally, other countries must sell to us if they can buy from us, but we have an American standard of living to preserve and I still prefer to help my next door neighbor in Missouri or in any one of our 48 great States than to help anybody in a foreign land—whether he be prince or pauper—from English aristocracy, French royalist, German junker, to the coolie in China, the peon in Mexico or the hottentot from Zanzibar to Zamboanga.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and other Members on the Democratic side have pointed out the undeniable fact that today we have high employment with the highest wages ever before in our history. This cannot be disputed but what kind of prosperity is it that we are enjoying? Is it natural, normal, sound, and permanent? Or is it artificial, unnatural, unsound, temporary, and synthetic? Sir, I declare that it is a false prosperity, built upon war and the spilling of American blood. This blood money I do not want.

Every intelligent and well-informed person knows that the New Deal from its inception in 1933 to Pearl Harbor in

1941 doubled our national debt, increasing it from $32,000,000,000 to $66,000,000,000 on boondoggling, pump-priming, leaf-raking, silly, asinine projects. In spite of the vast expenditures during the 1930's, in spite of the increased taxes and the mounting debt, we still had 8,000,000 people in this country unemployed at the time of Pearl Harbor. It took World War II to put our people in the Army and in our munition factories, to reduce unemployment, and lull our people to sleep in a blissful state of a false and damnable prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, every State in our Union and every section of our population is vitally affected by this legislation. Potatoes grown in Canada are brought into this country with a tariff of 25 cents on the hundred pounds. Potatoes grown in the United States, in Aroostook County, Maine, across an imaginary border, in Long Island, in Idaho, and even in Missouri, as well as many other States, when shipped to Canada, have a tariff of 75 cents on the hundred pounds. Of course, the Canadians have a three-to-one advantage over us on this one item.

Sir, we grow many apples down in my district, and the greatest and best apple grower is Stark Bros. Nurseries in Louisiana, Mo. It just happens that Lloyd Stark, a great and patriotic American, is a former Democrat Governor of Missouri, and he sells not only his apples but his apple trees all over the Nation. When we ship apples to Canada we pay a great duty, but when people in Canada ship us apples they pay about one-third the duty. Of course, that must help Lloyd Stark and all the other apple growers in our country. It does not help those in my district; and I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that even though we are "apple knockers," we still insist upon our rights and do not want to be pushed out of business. We are at the lowest ebb now.

Hats and gloves from Italy, all kinds of leatherware from Austria, and Czechoslovakia enter the American market in competition with our own workers in those industries. This is the reason that our industries in Gloversville and Amsterdam in New York have suffered and it is the reason that St. Louis, the shoe capital of the world, not excepting Brockton, Mass., and the many little shoe factories in my own district at West Plains, Marionville, Aurora, Sarcoxie, Monett, and other towns have felt the pinch because of cheaply made shoes in Czechoslovakia, and these countries behind the iron curtain where labor is employed at exceedingly low wages. Much of the labor is slave labor performed by conquered peoples and by political prisoners. Sir, we cannot compete with this cheap foreign slave labor in any of our industries without lowering our American standard of living. Even a moron should be able to see this. Evidently, some Members of Congress cannot.

There are millions of acres of forest lands in Siberia that have not yet heard the sound of a woodsman's ax. Does any Member on this floor from the great Northwest, whether from Washington, Oregon, or from the deep South in Alabama, dare tell us that we can compete in this country with the slave labor of Soviet Russia? Of course not.

Mr. Chairman, the glassware, pottery, and ceramics business in West Virginia, Ohio, and other spots in our Nation have felt the terrific impact of the imports of these cheap products from abroad. Before the present chaos in Asia, millions of pounds of dried eggs from Red China were imported into this country in direct competition with the poultry farmers of my own congressional district. Oh yes, we not only grow chickens and produce eggs in the Ozarks but in the tri-State area—Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma—we produce lead and zinc; in Arizona, Utah, and Montana, they produce copper, and our mining industry in every section of this country has suffered terribly in competition with the importation of ores and minerals produced by cheap and slave labor abroad.

Sir, I could continue the list, but time will not permit. However, I do want to refer to one other industry—the watch and jewel movement industry in this country that has not only suffered but has been almost annihilated. Everyone here knows that Waltham Watch Co., in Massachusetts, has been closed; that Hamilton and Elgin have suffered because of the importation of these items from abroad, particularly from Switzerland. Many people have lost their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican member on the Armed Services Committee, I am particularly concerned with our national defense. I do not want to have to depend upon any foreign source for these highly developed technical precision instruments in time of war. If Russia could overrun all of Europe—as practically everyone agrees, how could we depend upon Switzerland or any other country to furnish us the materials needed? Do not forget, sir, that in World War II, 54 of our 59 tankers carrying oil from Venezuela, Aruba, and Curacao were sunk by Nazi submarines off the Atlantic coast.

Since I have mentioned oil, it may be pertinent and not completely out of order, to mention that we have increased by exploration in this country, our oil productive capacity. We cannot rest assured that we can depend upon the vast, rich oil fields in the Near East, in South America, and Mexico, or anywhere else in the world should we become engaged in a global conflict. Oil, like rubber and steel, is the lifeblood of our Nation in both peace and war because America is a nation on wheels.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of the Committee, and I shall not trespass further upon its patience and strength, but I do hope that today, and I fervently expect this House of Representatives of the American people to stand up and be counted. We shall not abdicate our powers, turn over our prerogatives, but shall return and hold fast to the trust that has been placed in us.

I shall vote for all the amendments that have been offered here. I shall vote to recommit the bill and in my opinion it is a measure that needs—not a doctor, but an undertaker. It was enacted to bring about world peace. It gave us the greatest war in our history and threatens in a clever and subtle manner to wreck the foundations upon which this Republic rests. I hope, sir, that my position on this particular measure is clear to everyone who can read—but unfortunately and tragically many men who can read do not understand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us seeks to extend the authority of the President for 3 years to enter into foreign trade agreements. It is popularly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. For 5 years, I have been attempting to find the reciprocity features in the act. So far, I have been able to find that it is chiefly a one-way street with most of the reciprocity on the part of good old Uncle Sam. Actually under its operation we trade a horse and get a hare in return.

The Democratic administration, which has sponsored the program since 1933, under Cordell Hull, as Secretary of State, has been compounding a felony against the American workingman and his standard of living. The fancy language that is used to describe the benefits of the program is political trickery and the American people are not being fooled. The union factory worker, who has lost his job because of unfair competition from abroad is now aware of the great danger to him and his family if this bill is finally approved. I am for a true program of reciprocity but on an equal basis and after full public hearings. I am absolutely against the measure before us because there are no public hearings and because it gives to the State Department, through the President the right to bargain away the rights and protection of the American workingman in those industries affected in the agreements. The present bill is anti-American and I repeat I am against it in its present form.

Mr. Chairman, extended hearings before the House Committee on Education and Labor were held last year on the question of the effect of foreign imports on employment. Some 14 A. F. of L. and CIO union representatives appeared and testified and all to the same effect that foreign imports are seriously affecting employment in their respective industries.

As a fair example of the testimony given before the House committee, one Rudolph Heinl, Chicago, Ill., representing the United Wall Paper Craftsmen and Workers of North America, A. F. of L. said and I quote:

A survey of imports of wallpaper into the United States between 1937 and 1948 shows that such imports from Canada have increased 24.2 times and 2.5 times from England in that period. A survey conducted in 1923 by the United States Tariff Commission revealed that print rollers produced in foreign countries were entering this country at a declared value of $9.68 per roller while the over-all cost of the same American-made unit was $34.73; as a result, employment in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the industry suffered seriously and finally reached a point where skilled workmen—who had spent 3 to 5 years learning their trade—were forced to try to earn a living by making rollers in their homes because the United States mills were forced to close because they could not compete with the imported product.

Thus it is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that this reciprocal trade program is one that is today threatening the standard of living of the American workers. It is time that we take protective action to make sure that American workers and their families are protected against unemployment and that the investments made by American business people are not undermined and destroyed by unfair competition from abroad as now exists under the Democratic reciprocal trade program.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in reaching a decision on the question of extending the authority to enter into reciprocal-trade treaties with foreign countries, the House today is faced with a decision on a more fundamental problem of the kind which has troubled legislators from time immemorial. The basic question is whether we as legislators should support a bill the letter, purpose, and spirit of which are entirely proper and purposeful, knowing, at the same time, that the administration of that act will be faulty and irresponsible. Such is the predicament in which I find myself in reaching a decision on this question, which is of such vital importance to American industry and the American workingmen.

It must be remembered that this is not the first occasion when an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Treaty authority has been sought and granted by the Congress. The original authority to make these trade treaties was enacted by the Congress some 16 years ago for 3 years' time. At the termination of that period the Congress has granted additional extensions for periods of varying lengths of time. The proposal before us today is to extend the authority for another 3 years. Therefore, we have had the law in operation for approximately 15 years, and something of the nature of its administration is known to us.

The principle of trade reciprocity is thoroughly sound. It was first put into operation by the Republicans over 50 years ago. The trouble with trade reciprocity as it has been experienced under the Democratic administration is that these agreements have not been truly reciprocal. They have been of greater benefit to the foreign countries than they have to the United States. To express it differently, they have been more harmful to the United States and many of its specialized industries and workers than they have been helpful to the country generally. To be truly reciprocal, these agreements must be mutually advantageous, mutually helpful to each of the parties to the agreement. Trade reciprocity is a two-way street, advantages flowing out to a foreign country and into this country. The trouble has been that in administering these agreements in the past they have not been reciprocal; they have not been mutually helpful to this country as well as foreign countries.

I have come to the conclusion that I shall support the proposal to extend the Reciprocal Trade Authority for another 3 years, in spite of the fact that experience has shown to us a lack of proper administration of the law, for the reason that I am hopeful that through some change in personnel in the State Department, and of individuals who have the responsibility of carrying out the purposes of this law, or that there will be a change in heart and attitude of those people. In other words, I have concluded it is better to have a good law, even though poorly administered, than to have no law at all. If we have no law, the best of available competent administrators would be helpless in the absence of statutory authority; with a good law on the statute books, even though temporarily administered by incompetent or irresponsible people, there is always the hope and the opportunity and the outside chance that a change in the personnel will occur and an improvement made in the individuals who are to administer the law.

I realize that in the administration of this act substantial harm has been done to some of the industries in my own congressional district, notably the glass and salt industries. These instances represent some of the evils in the administration of the law to which I made reference a moment ago. Undoubtedly there have been some advantages gained to American industry and workingmen through the administration of these treaties; it is not all bad.

I have reached this conclusion with no great amount of enthusiasm. It has been with reluctance that I have come to this decision. However, I do feel that in the national interest in the long run it is the proper course for us to take. In making this decision. I have elected to take the lesser of two evils.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, authorizes the President to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments whenever he finds the fact that existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or of any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and to make such changes in duty rates and other import restrictions contained in the general tariff laws as are required to carry out such agreements.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was originally made effective for a period of 3 years but has been extended by the Congress in 1937, 1940, 1943, 1945, by the Republican Eightieth Congress in 1948, and in 1949.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 extended the program until June 30, 1949, and instituted the following procedural changes:

(a) The President was required to submit the list of articles to be negotiated to the Tariff Commission.

(b) The Tariff Commission was directed to make the so-called peril-point report within 120 days to the President. This report was supposed to contain the findings of the Commission as to the limit the President might lower or raise duties without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles.

(c) The Tariff Commission was to continue to furnish factual information to the negotiating committees, but members of the Tariff Commission could not sit as members of the CRI—Committee for Reciprocity Information—or the Trade Agreements Committee.

(d) If the President exceeded the factual findings of the Commission contained in the peril-point report, he had to advise the Congress within 30 days after any trade agreement had been entered into and had to identify the article to which the limits or minimum requirements had not been complied with, stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such items.

(e) The Tariff Commission was directed to furnish the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate with a copy of its peril-point report to the President if the President exceeded the peril points.

The Eighty-first Congress repealed the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 and extended for 3 years from June 12, 1948 the period during which the President was authorized to enter into new foreign-trade agreements. The net effect, therefore, of the enactment of the extension made by the Eighty-first Congress was to extend the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, until June 12, 1951, in the form in which it was effective immediately prior to the Republican Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

The only limitation under the President's authority is that he may not increase or decrease by more than 50 percent any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, and he may not transfer articles between the free list and the dutiable list. When the President changes the duty rates for particular articles under the trade agreements program, the new rates become applicable to such articles imported from any country and regardless of whether such country is a party to the agreement.

In considering whether the Congress should again delegate to the President for another 3-year period the responsibility of making new trade agreements, it should be recognized that this program is now being administered by the State Department and for the State Department. In my opinion, the original intent of the Congress in delegating this authority to the President, has been completely misinterpreted by the State Department, and, pending an opportunity by the Congress to reexamine the entire

program, no further extension should be made.

If, on the other hand, this legislation is passed by the House then most certainly Congress should enact certain safeguards for its administration. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee showed that, unless some safeguards were imposed by the Congress, many more segments of our economy would be seriously injured as the result of improvident tariff cuts and concessions made by the State Department. Undoubtedly, had not the present emergency intervened, the influx of imports resulting from this program would have caused widespread unemployment throughout the country and at the very moment when world conditions become stabilized again we will see a recurrence of the unfortunate effect of the hit-or-miss basis on which the State Department has administered this program.

In general, there are at least two steps which should be taken by the Congress in restricting the unbridled authority of the State Department in cutting tariffs and making other concessions. The first step is the reenactment of the peril-point report. The facts now show that the arguments spread in this connection by the State Department were without any foundation and that the procedural machinery involved in the preparation of the peril-point report worked entirely satisfactorily for the negotiations in Annecy, France, in the summer of 1949. As has been pointed out during the debate on H. R. 1612, the Republican amendment for the reenactment of the peril-point report makes a significant change in the procedure adopted in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1948. This change is the elimination of the requirement that the Tariff Commission must furnish its full report to the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. To accommodate those who objected to this part of the peril-point procedure, we have limited the information to be supplied by the Tariff Commission to the Congress to only that portion of its report which deals with the items on which the President has reduced tariffs and made other concessions below the point which the report indicated would seriously injure domestic producers.

Thus modified, the only basic issue arising from the peril-point procedure is whether the State Department should have the benefit for its guidance of a peril-point report of the bipartisan expert Tariff Commission which we recommend or whether the State Department should conduct this program on only a calculated-risk basis without adequate safeguards.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that Secretary Acheson stated in public hearings that no new trade agreements were contemplated during the next 3-year period, it is manifest that the adoption of the peril-point procedure will not undo the damage already done. In fact, even if the State Department contemplated making new agreements, the peril-point report will not protect the country from rash tariff cuts, because in the final analysis the only penalty imposed by the peril-point report is that the President must notify the Congress of the action he has taken.

It seems to me, therefore, that the most important step to be taken at this time is to improve the escape-clause procedure. The authority of the President to enter trade agreements was delegated to him by the Congress in the 1934 amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930. The 1934 amendment did not, however, itself provide any avenue for escape from serious injury, but almost all trade agreements now contain a so-called escape clause designed to prevent serious injury, or the threat of it, to domestic producers and their workers. The language of the escape clause is as follows:

> If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under this agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that contracting party in such relatively increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting party shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession.

The President has directed that all trade agreements negotiated in the future contain an escape clause, and it will be recalled that, following the Republican recommendation, the State Department finally has undertaken to have the clause inserted in the Swiss agreement.

The great difficulty with the escape clause is that, due to the ambiguity of the language and lack of any standards established by the Congress for the President's guidance in determining when relief should be granted, the escape clause is a wholly inadequate relief provision. This is illustrated by the fact that in all the applications for relief only one has been granted. Moreover, of the 15 cases under the escape clauses which have been disposed of, 13 were dismissed without even a formal investigation or a public hearing. The domestic industries, which believe they had been seriously injured, were given virtually no explanation as to why their applications were dismissed. It is clear, in my opinion, that the Congress should, therefore, do everything in its power to remedy this situation. Good wages and full employment are the foundation of a strong economy, and every producer should have a fair opportunity to show that serious injury is being done as the result of imports from countries where workers are paid much less than our own workers producing comparable goods in this country.

The Republican minority will offer an amendment designed to make the escape clause an effective relief provision where it can be shown that serious injury or the threat of it to a domestic industry has occurred. Rather than attempt to have a new escape clause inserted in the agreements, the Republican amendment will establish a few simple principles or guideposts to assist the President—or the agency to which he delegates the responsibility for administering the escape clause—in interpreting the term "serious injury to a domestic industry." The amendment will also provide a clarification of the terms "domestic industry" and "like or directly competitive"—two ambiguous and troublesome terms.

If the Republican amendment for improving the effectiveness of the escape clause is adopted, I believe that a vast improvement in this whole program will be made. At the first opportunity, however, consideration should be given to the problem of rewriting the escape clause itself and inserting this new escape clause into all agreements.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that, in my opinion, the 3-year extension provided for in H. R. 1612, is too long a period before the State Department should be required by the Congress to give an accounting of its stewardship of this program. The effect of this legislation is to delegate to the executive branch of the Government one of the most fundamental responsibilities of the Congress under the Constitution and the Congress should be required to examine the administration of this program at least every 2 years.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Page 1, after line 9, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 3. The act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930,' approved June 12, 1934, is hereby amended by adding after section 4 the following new subsection:
>
> "'SEC. 5. (a) If as the result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of any obligation (including any tariff concession) incurred by the United States under a foreign trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 any article is imported into the United States in such relatively increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry in the United States of like or directly competitive products, the President shall suspend the obligation in whole or in part or withdraw or modify the concession to the extent and for such time as he deems necessary to prevent or remedy such injury: *Provided*, That such action shall be taken only with respect to an article or articles provided for in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade or in any other trade agreement which contains a provision similar to article XIX of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade.
>
> "'(b) Serious injury to a domestic industry shall be presumed to have been caused or to be threatened as the result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of any obligation (including tariff concessions) incurred under a foreign trade agreement if—
>
> "'(1) The ratio of imports of the imported article or articles to the production of the like or directly competitive domestic article or articles has increased within a period during the past 12 months over a corresponding period in the preceding 12-month period; and
>
> "'(2) The President finds that either employment, wages, sales, prices, or profits have declined with respect to an important segment of the domestic industry.
>
> "'(c) For purposes of this act—
>
> "'(1) The term "domestic industry" means that the like or directly competitive article or articles constitute the principal product of one or more domestic producers of a relatively important product of two or more domestic producers.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"'(2) The term "like or directly competitive" means an imported article which is used for substantially the same purpose as the domestic article or tends to displace the domestic article in United States markets.

"'(d) When directed to do so by resolution of either House of Congress or upon application of a party or parties having a substantial interest, the President shall immediately institute an investigation to determine whether action should be taken under subsection (a) of this section. If after such investigation the President determines no action should be taken under subsection (a), he shall, within 90 days from the date the investigation was instituted, issue a report setting forth the reason for such finding.'"

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is what is commonly known as the escape clause and it is not in conflict in any way with the amendment previously adopted known as the peril-point amendment. As the gentleman from Texas so well pointed out, the peril-point amendment involves a procedure to be followed before a trade agreement is entered into. The escape clause amendment is an attempt to bring remedy for injury that might occur after a trade agreement has been entered into.

The trade agreements originally negotiated with foreign countries were binding for 3 years certain and continuing until one nation or the other brought it to an end. Then this problem arose: Suppose after a trade agreement is entered into a situation arises where an industry or a segment of our economy or a group of our workers are injured, what then? The State Department has put into the trade agreements an escape clause. They have opened up some of the early trade agreements and inserted an escape clause in those agreements. The first section of this amendment incorporates the langauge of the escape clause in the existing trade agreements, including the general agreement on tariffs and trade. We were confronted with this further problem, however, of certain definitions and standards in order that that escape clause might have real meaning. It uses the term "serious injury to domestic industry." That creates a possibility for disagreement, so we in this amendment provide that serious injury to a domestic industry shall be presumed to have been caused or threatened as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of any obligation incurred under a foreign trade agreement; if the ratio of imports of the imported article or articles to the production of like or directly competitive articles has increased within a period of 12 months, and that the President finds that either employment, wages, sales, prices, or profits have declined with respect to an important segment of our domestic economy. Now, certainly there can be no objection to putting into the act the identical escape clause the State Department has already inserted in all of our major agreements, and certainly this Congress has a right and the duty to define what we mean by "serious injury to domestic industry." We do that here. We also define what we mean by a domestic industry. If one town has one plant that is injured or may be put clear out of business, is that an industry? We provide the answer. The term "domestic industry" means that like or directly competitive article or articles constitute the principal product of one or more producers or a relatively important product of two or more producers. The purpose of this amendment is to vitalize the escape clause that is already in the trade agreements.

Now this escape clause in the trade agreements also uses the term "like or directly competitive." This is subject to various interpretations. So this Congress, the group that is charged with fixing duties and tariffs, lays down a rule as to what we mean by "like or directly competitive." It means an imported article which is used for substantially the same purpose as the domestic article.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. A like or directly competitive article is one that is used for substantially the same purpose as the domestic article or tends to displace the domestic article in the United States markets. Now that makes it clear. It means that if a product does displace an American product, it is directly competitive.

Some 20 or so cases have been heard in reference to granting relief through the escape clause. Relief has been granted in only one case. A number of these cases were presented and argued, and briefs were filed, and then nothing happened; no answer was given. It should not be that way. The people of this country, if they feel that they are injured should have a place where they can present their case and they should get an answer. So the last section of this amendment provides:

When directed to do so by resolution of either House of Congress or upon application of a party or parties having a substantial interest, the President shall immediately institute an investigation to determine whether action should be taken under subsection (a) of this section.

In other words, either House by resolution pertaining, could require the President to investigate an article and see whether or not the concessions made in reference to the article involved should be withdrawn. Keep in mind the foreign country has already agreed that we have the right to withdraw.

This last section further provides that after an investigation is held to determine whether or not there is an injury, the President, if he takes no action, shall within 90 days from the date the investigation was instituted issue a report setting forth the reason for such finding. That is all.

Someone has said, "How can you compel escape?" An interested party cannot. But the fact that the clause is in the agreement means that so far as the foreign nation is concerned we as a Nation have the right to escape from the consequences of a particular concession if we can prove that we are injured. This amendment incorporates that language into the statute. It sets up four definitions, and it provides that the President, when the Congress or an interested party demands it, shall immediately investigate, and that he shall give an answer.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Does not the gentleman's amendment go beyond his description of it? Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment, whether there is an injury or not, just a mere decline of some sort, a mere increase in imports of some sort, is sufficient to justify the invocation of this escape clause?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think not.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman says it is presumed.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The intention here is that that shall be a presumption of injury. It is not a presumption that cannot be overcome by the evidence. We have this very real problem. The people go before these existing committees and point out that they have been injured, that their production is falling off, their inventories are piling up, that they are hurt, that the market is slipping away. At the present time those who hear them can say, "Yes, that is true. You are injured, but there are a lot of other factors that may be involved here and it may not be the result of the agreement." So they grant no relief.

This amendment says that if the ratio of imports and imported articles to the production of like domestic articles has increased and employment, wages, sales, prices or profits have fallen off, that there is presumption that they have been injured by the trade agreement. It is not a direction that they must give relief, it merely shifts the burden of proof and gives the citizen a fair chance.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very clear illustration of the very grave danger which is inherent in the adoption of amendments on the floor of the House without due consideration and discussion, and consultation, and without sufficient debate.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this amendment was offered in committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot yield to the gentleman. I made the statement on which I stand. I hope the gentleman will permit me to continue. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if I have the time. I would like to express some of my thoughts before the committee.

The gentleman calls his amendment an extension of the principle of the escape clause. The escape clause is very

popular both among the Republicans and among a great proportion of the Democrats. The membership knows that the escape clause has been put in every trade agreement which has been entered into since 1943 and under it we have operated fairly successfully. The gentleman's amendment goes very much further than the present escape clause. It is one of the most restrictive amendments that could possibly be drawn. It is one of those amendments, if you actually study it, you will see is ridiculous and its very absurdity makes it impracticable in application. In fact, if this amendment were enacted into law, I am certain the law would be absolutely nullified. I mean that in all sincerity and ask both sides of the aisle to consider it well. The gentleman's amendment applies to wages; it applies to sales; it applies to prices and to profits; the four basic fundamentals of industry. If any industry suffers a decline in wages or if there has been a small increase, even to the extent of one-fifth of 1 percent in imports, then this amendment is effective and that trade agreement cannot continue in operation. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is not stating the situation correctly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies to sales. If the sales of any particular major company in the country manufacturing a large proportion of a particular item decrease in any given period of a year, and the proportion of imports is increased, then the trade agreement previously entered into practically becomes null and void. The same thing is true of prices. Suppose for some reason or other, through the adoption of better production methods, the price of a certain item is reduced to some extent. At the same time, by some coincidence, there is a greater import into this country of that particular item. Then the agreement heretofore entered into would be subject to being called null and void.

The same thing applies as to profits. So that I am certain if the members of the committee on the Republican side have an opportunity to study this amendment they would not support it themselves.

Let me give you an instance. Here is a concrete example of what would have happened. In 1946 and 1947 the imports of electric ranges increased from $1,416 in 1946 to $31,098 in 1947. At the same time, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment declined by almost 2,700 workers. That brings into effect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. However, domestic production increased from $51,000,000 in 1946 to $131,235,000 in 1947. That is an increase of three times the production of electric ranges in this country. Despite that increase, the ratio of imports to production did increase in a greater ratio, and therefore the President would have been required to withdraw the concession. I am sure that the Members on the majority side do not approve of any such provision in this act.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No. I do not yield at this time.

Here is another example as far as the automobile industry is concerned: The imports of automobiles increased from 1947 to 1948 from 2,000 to 29,000. That seems like a very large percentage of increase. At the same time there was a decline of 40,000 in employment in the automobile industry. This decline was due to a strike at the Chrysler plant. Domestic production increased from 3,500,000 to 3,900,000 automobiles, but because of the formula which the gentleman's amendment sets forth, the President would have been required to withdraw the small tariff concession on automobiles and parts.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain this Committee does not want to adopt any such drastic proposal. If these examples are not sufficiently convincing, I submit we might as well not have any reciprocal trade-agreement program whatsoever. We might as well recommit the bill if this amendment is adopted. It is unworkable. It would apply to any company that manufactures the larger proportion—not a majority proportion—of a particular article. Suppose one company had almost a monopoly, suppose it manufactured 40 percent of a certain item. Suddenly there became a great deal of competition in this country from other domestic companies, and they would be compelled to reduce their prices, and then there would be a slight increase, two-tenths of 1 percent, in imports, the President would be required to abrogate the trade treaties with respect to that particular industry, affecting all competition, affecting agreements in every respect whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment was not really discussed and considered in the committee—I will say that it was not discussed, according to my recollection—I doubt if other members on the committee knew what this amendment provided. I submit if they knew it, they would not have supported it, and I hope the gentleman from Nebraska will see fit to withdraw the amendment. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to give him an opportunity to withdraw the amendment and study it a little further.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. There is not anything the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said about the amendment that is supported by the facts or the language of the amendment, and I have no intention of withdrawing it. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman that my facts and figures were obtained, as I now so state to the committee membership here and to the chairman, from the Tariff Commission. I am willing to submit my contention to the Tariff Commission that under the language as drawn by the amendment submitted by the gentleman the result will be as I have stated.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania making the point that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska does not do what the gentleman from Nebraska intends it to do, but goes far beyond what he says now he wants to do?

Mr. EBERHARTER. There is no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this question of an escape clause is vitally important for the protection of American industry. We have an escape clause in the agreements today, but unfortunately the agreement does not provide the escape which industry needs. There have been, I believe, about 20 applications for relief under the escape clause, but of the 20 only 1 has been acted on favorably; 8 or 9 have been summarily dismissed. There was no opportunity whatever for the complainant to appear and register his objection nor was any reason given on the part of the administration as to why the summary dismissal was ordered, yet that is the fact. There are several still under advisement, and we know that something must be done to protect those industries that have been damaged.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has a most inaccurate understanding of what this amendment does. If an industry makes its showing, it is still entirely discretionary with the President of the United States to do what he pleases.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. If he chooses to act, he does not nullify the entire agreement as alleged by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]; he does not junk the trade agreement; he merely withdraws the concession as to a particular article in question.

There is nothing in this amendment that would force the hand of the President or force the President to nullify any trade agreement; it is still discretionary with the President. The only mandatory thing is that he must hold the investigation, and then we provide that within 90 days he must give us an answer, but it is his answer.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is right. He is under no compulsion whatever. He simply listens to the people. He is bound by certain limitations and if he finds that a company makes a proper case then he would give relief which he does not do now.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Nebraska mentioned my name. I wish to read this portion of the amendment:

The President shall suspend the application in whole or in part or shall withdraw or shall modify the concession to the extent and for such time as he deems necessary.

The word "shall," I submit, is a requirement, and I object to the word "shall."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I wish the word "shall" were in the law today; I want it in now.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to these 20 appeals for relief under the escape clause, stating that relief had been granted in only one case. To what agency of Government were those appeals directed?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They are directed to the Tariff Commission, are they not?

Mr. MILLS. They are directed to the Tariff Commission, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Let me make myself clear on that, they are directed to the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff Commission is represented on the Reciprocal Trade Policy Committee which is completely dominated by the Department of State. There is in my opinion no fair place to where a group of businessmen may go for relief, and that claim has been substantiated repeatedly by the fact that each of these cases is summarily dismissed.

Mr. MILLS. Before whom were these appeals heard? They were heard, were they not by the Tariff Commission, not by the Reciprocal Trade Committee or the Committee on Reciprocity Information and report is made by the Tariff Commission to the President if injury is exposed.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. My point is that no report was ever made. None is required and the industry was never told why the adverse action was taken and it will not be told.

Mr. MILLS. I understand 14 or 15 of them have been disposed of and one has been recommended to the President as being an injury.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They were disposed of, but the industry was not told why it was not given relief.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Referring to the language that was read a moment ago, that language was read from the first section of my amendment which copies in the language of the escape clause that was put in there by the State Department. It has nothing to do with the procedural part coming thereafter. The President is still the judge, or such agency as he designates is the judge of whether or not there is injury and what, if any, remedy or escape there may be if there is injury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Does the gentleman not think it is revolutionary for us to require the President when he acts on something that is vital to the concern of the Nation to give his reasons for action or an explanation for his actions? Is that not revolutionary?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I think the revolutionary part of this is that the Congress is perhaps going to give some relief to the businessmen.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say that the examples I gave of the automobile industry and the other industries referred specifically to those words "shall suspend."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Add a new section to be known as section 3, as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement entered into by the United States under the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, any product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that serious injury is being caused or threatened through the importation of the article in question, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury.

"(c) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for such a recommendation to the President it shall, after due investigation and hearings, make a finding in support of its denial of the application, setting forth the facts which have led to such conclusion. This finding shall set forth the level of duty below which, in the Commission's judgment, serious injury would occur or threaten.

"In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission shall deem a downward trend of production, employment, and wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales and a higher or growing inventory attributable in part to import competition, to be evidence of serious injury or a threat thereof."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill before the House, H. R. 1612. The amendment is retroactive in its effect as well as prospective. The bill before the House has to do with an extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreement negotiations for a period in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAILEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have been advised from information developed in the course of the debate here today that a similar amendment to this was discussed in the Committee on Ways and Means. I assume that the outgrowth of that discussion was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. CURTIS, There was no question raised in the Committee on Ways and Means about its not being germane. I can see no reason why the amendment is not germane at this time because it has to do directly with the administration of the reciprocal trade agreements. Let me say to the Chairman that the present so-called escape clause is not a basic part of the reciprocal trade agreements. It was manufactured at the Geneva Conference and is not a part of the law. My amendment would attempt to write it into the basic law, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and not leave it as a plaything for the State Department. I make the point that it is germane; that it is the business of this Congress to set out the procedure, delegating such authority as it desires to the President and to the Tariff Commission, telling the industries of this country what they may do and what methods of relief and what procedures they will have to take to get relief under this clause.

I insist, Mr. Chairman, that my substitute, since it deals directly with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, is germane, and we should have a discussion on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Of course, the distinction between the substitute amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska is to section 350 of the Tariff Act. The substitute offered by the gentleman from West Virgina is in effect an amendment to the bill before us now, H. R. 1612. The Chair would like to point out to the gentleman that casual examination of his amendment discloses that the effect is, among other things, retroactive, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Chair bear with me further?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I have here an amendment to amend section 350 of the act. I suspected that the other substitute might be subject to a point of order, but I do not think the point of order will rest against this amendment to the basic Tariff Act.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. BAILEY. I am offering this as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Amend section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended, by adding thereto the following subsections:

"SEC. 5. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement any product on which a concession has been granted is imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession, or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parti s interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment which I propose will attain the objectives of the gentleman from Nebraska fully It will answer the major part of the objections raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who opposed the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment merely sets out a simple procedure whereby harassed industries of this country can get relief directly through the Tariff Commission. I would much prefer that the wording of this procedure be decided here on the floor of the House of Representatives and in the Congress of the United States than be written, as the terms of the present so-called escape clause were written, subsequent to the Geneva agreements.

This simple procedure is provided, that when some domestic industry feels that it is being injured under the reciprocal trade agreements program, all that has to be done is this. The President is first given authority to ask the Tariff Commission for action. The Tariff Commission itself has the right to initiate action. However, in case neither the President nor the Tariff Commission takes that action, then any aggrieved individual may apply to the Tariff Commission for a hearing.

The amendment sets up the procedure by which the Tariff Commission will hold hearings and take testimony and make a decision, and make public their decision. It also provides the procedure that if the Tariff Commission finds that the case presented by this industry is a legitimate one and that the industry is being injured, the Tariff Commission then directs the President to suspend the concession, modify the concession, or set up import quotas to control the amount of foreign goods coming into this country.

If the testimony offered by the complaining industry is not sufficient to convince the Tariff Commission that the industry is being unduly injured, then the Tariff Commission shall make a report and shall make public their findings.

The gentleman from Nebraska proposes to get relief. He proposes to enact into the basic reciprocal trade agreements law the so-called escape clause, that was written, as I said before, subsequent to the Geneva Conference. It is not a part of the basic law.

I think this is the place for this Congress to say to the President, "This is the authority you shall have," to say to the Tariff Commission, "This is the authority you shall have," and to say to the harassed industry of this country, "Here is your avenue of escape. You can come to the Tariff Commission and get relief if you are actually being injured and can prove it."

It is so simple a procedure it will not hurt the basic structure of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at all.

Why is it necessary that we have some escape clause like this? Because we have already frozen and we will continue to freeze during this war effort hundreds of essential commodities in this country that our domestic manufacturers have to have to produce their products. If we do not have an escape clause like this, what happens? Why, the foreign importer moves in while our American producer cannot get the material to manufacture the product. They move in and take over the American market. We have to have an escape clause like this to assure the domestic producer that when he is handicapped by a freeze order on essential material, there must be something to offset the foreign producer who is not living under a freeze order on essential material. The foreign producer moves in and takes our market. We must have this escape clause so that we can regulate the amount of foreign imports which come in while we have these freeze orders during this emergency. We simply must have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, some partial relief will be achieved, should the peril point proposition be carried through to the complete amendment stage. But it does not offer the type of relief which is needed by so many of our industries which are being handicapped due to our efforts to prepare this country for an adequate defense. Let me say to my friends that the escape clause will settle the proposition raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] with reference to the independent oil situation. That is very serious because indirectly it affects the coal industry of this country. I explained a minute ago in discussing the peril point that the peril point would only restore the original 21-cent import duty imposed by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930 on a barrel of crude oil. There are over a million barrels of crude oil coming into this country daily. It was testified by both industry and the unions concerned at hearings of both the Senate and House that we could only stand 460,000 barrels of foreign oil daily being imported into this country without injuring domestic oil and the independent oil industry and without harming the coal industry of this country. Here is a method whereby the independent oil people can come in and show that they are being harmed by the excessive imports of cheap oil from Mexico, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq and Iran.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield briefly, for a direct question.

Mr. GOLDEN. You are familiar with the obvious effect upon the oil industry and the coal industry resulting from the reciprocal trade agreements as we now have them. Is it not true that your amendment will give relief to both of these basic American industries?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true, I will advise the gentleman. It will offer a method of relief for every other industry in the country. It will take care of the lumber situation and the fishery situation in the Northwest. It will take care of the fruit situation in California. It will take care of the independent oil situation in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Kansas. It will take care of the pottery industry in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, West Virginia, and Ohio. It will

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

take care of the glass industry in West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. It will take care of the fishery industry in New England. It will take care of the hat industry in New England. It will take care of the watch industry in New England. It will take care of the textile industry in Rhode Island, Connecticut, as well as Massachusetts, and in other sections of the country. It will take care of the aluminum situation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. May I inquire of the gentleman if there is any substantial difference between the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska and the substitute which the gentleman from West Virginia has offered. In other words, as I understand it, the gentleman has the same objective. The only difference between the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the substitute amendment is one of language; and if the point of order made against the gentleman's substitute is withdrawn and is not to be insisted upon, then I wonder if the author of the regional amendment, in view of the fact that the only difference between the amendment and the gentleman's substitute is one of language, might not accept the substitute amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. That is an end to be desired. I would like to have an expression of the attitude of the gentleman from Nebraska. It accomplishes all that the gentleman hopes to accomplish.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The objectives are similar. The approaches are different. The amendment I offered is based upon proceeding with the escape clause as already in the agreements.

Mr. BAILEY. That is exactly why I am offering this substitute, because the present so-called escape clause is not workable, and you propose to give it a basis of legality by writing it into this act, and I am opposed to it. We want a sensible escape clause in there.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I did not write the escape clause. I am simply trying to protect the industry.

Mr. BAILEY. Then you should not be protecting the escape clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bailey substitute. Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have always supported the reciprocal trade-agreements program and have supported the committee up until this point in all their efforts to put across a satisfactory reciprocal trade program. I am for the bill and intend to support the committee today excepting this substitute amendment. I realize that in times like these it is more important that we have workable reciprocal trade agreements than ever before. From a diplomatic standpoint, it is altogether important that we maintain the good will of all countries who believe in democratic forms of government. We cannot deny the fact that our reciprocal trade program has made a great contribution to our increased standard of living in America, and the renewal of these trade agreements have had the same effect in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that certain basic industries have not received the consideration they should have received from the State Department. I come from a coal-producing district. I have some figures here that I would like to give the committee:

During the year 1948 the bituminous-coal industry produced 599,518,229 tons of coal; for the calendar year 1949, 437,868,036 tons—a drop in coal production of approximately 162,000,000 tons in a period of 1 year. During the first half of 1950 the same coal industry produced 232,746,000 tons. After the Korean situation and the demands for some 15,000,000 tons of coking coal in Western Europe came about, besides the increased demands in the United States, we produced approximately 273,000,000 tons.

During the year of 1949 and the first half of 1950, more than one-third of the miners in my district were out of employment and many of the other miners, outside of the captive mines, were working only 1 to 3 days a week. Coal production for the corresponding period in my district was off approximately one-third. During the year 1948 the Big Sandy coal fields produced 15,287,180 tons in comparison with 10,661,740 tons for the year 1949. Coal production in the Hazard coal fields for the year 1948 amounted to 8,971,050 tons as compared to 5,557,700 tons for 1949. Coal production in the Pond Creek section of Pike County, which is a part of the Williamson coal fields, was off approximately one-third. The coal production in the Harlan coal fields in southeastern Kentucky was off approximately one-third during the year of 1949 and the first 6 months of 1950. Many of the mines in eastern Kentucky have been completely closed down and it will take more than a year to open some of those mines back up and get them in suitable condition to produce the amount of coal that this great Nation may need in times of emergency. The importation of residual oil today is almost two and one-half times greater than in 1948. Coal cannot compete with such unfair competition, especially since this imported residual oil costs very little in comparison with production of coal.

I am supporting this Bailey substitute because I firmly believe the State Department has not given appropriate consideration to our coal industry. Imports of residual oil have been permitted by the State Department to come into this country to such an extent that such imports have curtailed the normal functioning of America's great coal industry, and will continue to cripple it in normal times unless something can be done with a few oil concerns who have brought oil into this country and dumped it on the eastern seaboard at the rate of a million barrels per day, and many times, mostly residual. I mean, after these companies had extracted their first profits from gasoline.

I feel confident that no one in times of emergency would want to raise any question about any oil imported into this country, whether it be residual or sweet, because we need crude oil. I do think, however, that a party in interest should have a right to have a hearing before the Tariff Commission in the event this emergency should soon be over and another year similar to 1949 and the first half of 1950 should recur.

The imports of crude petroleum and residual oil into the United States are under the Internal Revenue Act of 1932, and under the trade agreements. Such imports, under the Revenue Act, are subject to an excise tax or a tariff of 21 cents per barrel of 42 gallons. In the trade agreements with Venezuela, which I think were entered into about the year 1939, the United States agreed to admit a certain quantity of crude petroleum at a reduced rate of 10½ cents per barrel. The amount that could be shipped in under the reduced rate was to be equal to 5 percent of the total crude oil processed in the United States refineries during the preceding calendar year. That trade agreement is still in effect.

A desperate effort was made by the coal people and the United Mine Workers, and the independent oil producers, to get some relief from this situation last spring. A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee conducted hearings and Senator NEELY conducted extensive hearings.

I am sure that no one would object in times like these to our Government importing all residual oil or fuel oil needed for Government use, or for use as ship fuel, or for reexport purposes. Oil of that type comes in free under the Trade Agreements Act today. If, in normal times, these oil concerns, who are altogether operating on a money-making basis, insist in bringing this oil into this country at the rate of a million barrels per day, and I think the record shows that approximately 315,000,000 barrels were shipped in during the calendar year of 1950—but, of course, a lot of that was crude oil—and continue to buy up the residual oil in countries like Venezuela at the rate of a few cents a barrel, and can bring an unlimited amount into this country by paying the regular tariff rate of 21 cents per barrel even though it exceeds the trade-agreements quota, under such circumstances the interested parties should have a right to protect the coal industry.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the Bailey substitute, it is quite different from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. The Curtis amendment will not be of any

avail to the coal industry and the independent oil producers. On the other hand, the Bailey substitute will permit the party in interest to go before the Tariff Commission, and if he can show that a substantial injury is resulting to a basic industry, the Tariff Commission is required to make a finding of fact and make a recommendation to the President, modifying the agreement in whole or in part, and can recommend the establishing of import quotas.

I am sure many Members of Congress, who have been concerned with the present escape clause brought about by Executive order, feel that the conditions set forth are extremely difficult, if not impossible, to prove. We could not contend that the conditions that have resulted in the coal industry from the importation of residual oil were unforeseen at the time the agreements were entered into.

Besides, the escape clause created by Executive order does not require a finding of fact or a statement of reasons underlying the dismissal of an application by the Tariff Commission. The important question under the Bailey substitute is injury of a domestic industry as a result of imports. The Tariff Commission is required to hold hearings and make findings of fact and give their reasons therefor. No reasons were required under the Executive order escape clause.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the membership of this body would not want to see a few oil concerns crucify the important coal industry in this country. There seems to be no program now before the American people that would make our industrial pattern harmonize with our basic resources. But we are, on the other hand, by our own acts, accelerating the drift from abundant coal to scarce oil and gas fuels. The State Department certainly has permitted this unsound trend to be further accelerated by the large-scale importation of residual fuel oil, which tempts still more industries away from coal. While this is basically unsound, it is becoming doubly so in times of an emergency when the burden must again be shifted back to a coal industry that has been injured by this very process.

Mr. Chairman, I am against the Curtis amendment and hope the Bailey substitute will be adopted.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. To state that I accept the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This comes as a surprise to me. Is it not necessary that unanimous consent be obtained before the gentleman can accept the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be put to a vote; the substitute has not been agreed to and it has not been withdrawn.

The parliamentary situation is that the gentleman from New York is recognized under an agreement for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, we are witnessing another attempt legislatively to do indirectly what the Congress has refused to do for many years. It is suggested that there be written into the basic law under which these agreements are executed the mandatory provision for the insertion of an escape clause. This suggestion follows, I am sure, without a full realization that it has been and is now the policy to obtain the insertion in all these agreements of the so-called escape clause.

In 1942, none of the reciprocal trade agreements had such a clause; in 1947, only 23 of them were without the clause, and, in 1949, only 14 were without the provision. Upon the successful conclusion of the conferences at Torquay there will be only nine such agreements that do not have this provision. I am informed that most of these are agreements with Central and South American republics in which the insertion of the provision now would yield no benefit to the United States.

It is, therefore, the intention of the administration and it has been evidenced, to proceed as rapidly as possible to obtain these provisions in all outstanding agreements. Why then should we do this by law? It violates, in my opinion, a basic tactic of any negotiation; for when we charge our representatives with the duty of obtaining the mandatory provision in any agreement, a provision of any kind but especially this kind, it puts the other parties to the negotiation on notice of the limitations of our representatives' powers.

In many instances where it will avail the United States no direct benefit, the necessity to include this provision in the agreement will result in impediments and will result further in our having to make concessions on the far more important subject of rates in connection with other commodities. A congressional mandate such as this does not belong in basic law when we have the relief provided for in the outstanding agreements, and when we have the bona fide evidence of those charged with the administration of the program that they will continue to negotiate such provisions into the agreement.

Referring now to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia I should like to call your attention to the fact that he makes his provision applicable where conditions cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry but makes no effort to define what a segment is. A segment of an industry is any part of the industry. You and I well know, much as we perhaps hate to admit it, that in all industries there are managements that are less efficient, there are locations that are less attractive, there is plant equipment that is obsolete, which would cause that segment of the industry to reflect a changed condition. It might very well be charged that this has been caused by the execution of a reciprocal trade agreement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know whether I fully understand the substitute for the Curtis amendment but if I do, may I ask a question. If the substitute is adopted, and then the amendment as amended is adopted, will that not seriously affect the reciprocal trade agreements program?

Mr. KEOGH. In my opinion it would.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The other side has won its case if we adopt that substitute for the original amendment.

Mr. KEOGH. It is trying to do indirectly what should not and cannot be done directly.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD at this point some of the views of our mine workers and our coal operators.

It is my purpose to direct the attention of the Congress to the dangers inherent in the policy of permitting the unrestricted importation of oil from foreign sources. I urge that, first, such legislation include a quota restriction on the importation of residual fuel oil; and, second, such extension of the Trade Agreements Act be limited to a period of 1 year from June 12, 1951.

In this time of grave international crisis one does not lightly question the propriety of unrestricted trade with friendly nations. However, when the policy of unlimited importation threatens to deprive a basic resource industry of its ability to serve the Nation and the Military Establishment in time of emergency, justification exists for an examination of the program as a whole to determine whether some basis for modification exists.

On March 2, 1934, the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress requesting authority to enter into executive commercial agreements with foreign countries for the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other barriers to the flow of international trade. The President, in asking for the authority, indicated that it was part of an emergency program necessitated by the economic crisis and that the request was an essential step in the program of national economic recovery. In commenting upon the prospective exercise of this authority, the President had this significant statement to make:

> The authority must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed * * * the adjustment of our foreign-trade relations must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests.

It can be shown beyond question that the coal industry has been injured by the operation of the reciprocal trade policy and that this great industry is entitled to protection. Our great industry—both operators and workers—does not believe that the entire recipro-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cal trade policy must inferentially be abandoned because of selective modifications in the interests of protecting a basic domestic industry from unfair foreign competition. On the contrary, protective modifications fall within the framework of the administrative policy enunciated by the President. Such action is also implicit in the acceptance of the escape clause principle in reciprocal trade agreements. The escape clause was first included in the agreement between the United States and Mexico—1943—and subsequently appeared in the agreement with Paraguay and in the multilateral general agreements on tariffs and trade—1948. The escape clause provides that under specified conditions either party to the agreement may withdraw or modify any concession made. The Tariff Commission is directed, under Executive Order 10,082, to conduct investigations to determine the facts and to recommend remedial action for the President's consideration in cases where facts justifying invocation of the escape clause are found to exist.

The difficulty here, however, is that the Tariff Commission has not exhibited any inclination to grant requested relief pursuant to the escape clause procedure, but what is more important, even if such relief were accorded the coal industry, no useful purpose would be served since the existing import excise tax on oil is only 21 cents per barrel—an amount wholly inadequate to keep coal competitive with cheap foreign oil.

In 1949 the importation of foreign oil supplanted about 150,000,000 barrels of American petroleum production and resulted in surplus residual oil of 100,000,000 barrels which, in turn, displaced 25,000,000 tons of coal. This meant that 25,000 miners and 25,000 transport workers lost their jobs. The coal industry lost $125,000,000 in gross income; and the railroads, $75,000,000 in freight revenues. The Nation, States, and cities lost tremendous sums in purchasing power and taxes. Resultant unemployment in the coal and railroad industries brought about by foreign oil added materially to heavy relief burdens of States and cities. The report from the National Coal Association indicates that there was a daily average of 836,000 barrels imported during this period and that the totals for the year amounted to 304,882,000 barrels. It is obvious that coal tonnage displacements and the impact upon labor, railroad, and related industries was even more severe in 1950 than was the case in 1949.

In response to the public demand for action, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare initiated hearings on May 22, 1950, pursuant to Senate Resolution 274 to determine the causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, and railroad industries. The subcommittee was headed by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, West Virginia.

I had the pleasure of appearing before this able subcommittee of the other body and urging action to remedy the deplorable condition.

On July 14, 1950, the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare issued a unanimous report on the hearings held pursuant to Senate Resolution 274. In appraising the materiality of the report for the purposes of this hearing, it is well to bear in mind that it was issued after the Korean crisis which developed June 25, 1950. Pertinent excerpts are as follows:

Many distinguished witnesses, including United States Senators, governors of States, Members of the House of Representatives, and prominent spokesmen for the coal, oil, and railroad industries testified that if oil imports continue at present levels, these industries will suffer lasting injury.

The indispensability of the coal, oil, and railroad industries to our national economy and security requires that measures be promptly taken to prevent their deterioration.

The committee fully recognizes this Nation's heavy responsibility to expand commerce, to the limit of its capacity, between the United States and friendly foreign countries. But when policies designed to increase trade result in continuing injury to the economic well-being of the American people, it becomes necessary to reexamine those policies and to weigh the evident harm against the assumed benefit.

It is perhaps inevitable and certainly understandable that those preoccupied with urgent problems of global concern should be somewhat insensitive to protests of domestic economic dislocation. Fortunately, such lack of vision is not characteristic of legislative representatives entrusted by the Constitution with responsibility for the welfare of the people of the United States.

Of equal importance, but of special interest to the Members of this House are the hearings which were initiated by a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on June 1, 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 75. The subcommittee was headed by Hon. TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and other distinguished Members.

Approximately 40 witnesses appeared in these hearings, including responsible representatives from the bituminous coal industry and various affected railroad, labor, small-business, and independent oil groups.

The chairman of this subcommittee made the following statement:

Since the Congress will be called upon this session to consider again the reciprocal trade program, I commend these hearings to the Members who desire more factual information on just what far-reaching authority is granted and how the careless use of this authority can and does frequently undermine whole industries in this country.

These hearings contain considerable information about how we have permitted reciprocal trade agreements to benefit nations behind the iron curtain and to harm American factories and workers. I hope the Congress will provide the safeguards in the new reciprocal trade legislation that we need to avoid these abuses in the future.

In conclusion, I believe that the future national security of our country depends upon the enduring strength and vigor of the coal industry. I have made every effort in this statement to address myself exclusively to the facts. The record will show that the policy of unrestricted importations of foreign oil has resulted in severe damage to our industry, and we are confident that justification exists for seeking remedial legislation. With the stakes to the Nation so high, there is no room for retreat behind the once comfortable words, "trade barriers" and "economic nationalism." It is obvious to an important segment of the American people that there must be congressional action—it is hoped that the Eighty-second Congress will perceive that the time is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLS) there were—ayes 191, noes 89.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: Page 1, after line 9, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) No reduced tariff or other concession resulting from a trade agreement entered into under this section shall apply with respect to any agricultural commodity for which price support is available to producers in the United States unless the sales prices (as determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture) for the imported agricultural commodity within the United States after the application of such reduced tariff or other concession exceeds the level of such price support.'"

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that you have just heard read by the Clerk is simple and provides for just one thing, that when we are maintaining price supports for any agricultural products, no foreign country can ship in the same product at the same time for less than the support price.

We have been criticized throughout this Nation because of the potato situation and similar situations. We have a shortage of farm labor, but notwithstanding that, we are producing huge surpluses in this Nation, which are purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Then we pay to have them destroyed. At the same time, because of cheap labor in some of the nations throughout the world, they are shipping in the same produce, and whatever amount they ship in, we are required to buy because it increases the surplus. That just does not make sense to me. I think if you want to have these foreign countries ship this produce in, it is all right. But they should not come in at less than the floor price at which the products are being supported.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I can well understand the gentleman's interest in the reduction of importations of any product when the

Government is supporting the production of that product. Those who have negotiated at the Geneva Conference on tariffs and trade took into consideration this very concern that the gentleman has, and that agreement contains a provision permitting the imposition of quotas at any time. It is not necessary for us to do so in order to protect our control program and support price program. I do not think the gentleman's amendment is necessary as a part of this bill. In addition, we have section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which also applies, as members of the Committee on Agriculture know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You probably have various provisions, but the fact is that they are not being applied, and you are not doing it. A few minutes ago here on the floor of the House, I heard our very able majority whip give percentages, half of 1 percent or 2 percent. Those seem to be small percentages, but if they are on $800,000,000 or $900,000,000, it is a lot of money to me or to the people I represent.

I have received letters from all over this Nation telling me of the potatoes leaving Canada going to Florida, New Orleans, and various parts of this country. Letters such as this one:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *January 26, 1951.*
Representative DEMPSEY,
Democrat, New Mexico, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was interested in your timely remarks on the potato situation in the United States, in the Florida-Times Union (Jacksonville paper) of January 24.

As a housemother at the Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority at Florida State University, I read market and shipping reports. I serve meals to around 60 people twice a day. It shocks me to read of potato shipments into Jacksonville while the United States Government is foolishly, and I do mean foolishly, destroying potatoes. I am no economist but I know waste when I see it. Once this winter, I was even unable to buy potatoes from the wholesale houses for several days.

I enclose a shipping notice, steamship *Adriatica* (GK) unloading potatoes at the port of Jacksonville. If you look back through port files, you will also find potatoes from Canada have been unloaded here, too. How many potatoes are shipped in general-cargo listings would be interesting to know.

If a garage man overbuys gasoline, nobody pays him for unsold stock on hand; if farmers overplant potatoes you toss away millions. With hungry spots on the world's surface, and our Army to feed, why doesn't someone do something?

More power to you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. STANLEY WATSON.

P. S.—I realize farmers must live—maybe it is our whole farm program that needs overhauling? "Waste makes want" in any language.

At the same time, it is being publicized in the papers of the United States that we have just destroyed $22,000,000 or $23,000,000 worth of the same commodity we are bringing in from some other nation.

If we are going to create a situation where we subsidize the agriculture of other nations, I think we are putting such a burden on our workers that I do not believe we can carry the load.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How about the 805,000 pounds of dried eggs that came in from China in October, in 1 month?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The percentage concerning potatoes that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee said was only 2.4 could mean about 10,000,000 bushels of that commodity. Maybe in dollars it is not so much the way figures are today, but the quicker we stop throwing away that much money and apply it where it should be applied the better off this Nation is going to be. The people are confused about it. I think the time has come when we ought to do something about this situation. I thought the committee would adopt this amendment, because I offered it in a spirit of cooperation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is actually not a new amendment to this program. As I understand, the amendment has been offered from time to time in the past, at least in another body.

Let us see what the gentleman is proposing to do. He is proposing by his amendment to take care of one industry in the United States by special and unusual treatment which is not accorded to any other industry in the United States under this program.

I have heard members of the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation speak on occasion when they have said they did not want, so far as this program is concerned, any treatment different from that extended to any other industry in the United States.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am speaking now of the people that are paying taxes in the United States. They are the ones I am talking about. They resent what we are doing.

Mr. MILLS. I, too, am interested in the people who are paying taxes in the United States, and I will come to that in a minute.

The gentleman from New Mexico, my good friend, does not have a monopoly of interest in the welfare of the American farmer, either, because I do not represent anybody but farmers; I do not have any industry in my district to amount to anything. I am interested in the farmers, too.

Let us see what we have here. We have as a part of our existing trade agreements now in effect this Geneva agreement on tariffs and trade entered into in 1948.

In that agreement we undertook to refrain from doing certain things, such as imposing further restrictions in quotas and so forth, except under certain circumstances. In that agreement we reserved the right, in keeping with the terms of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to impose quotas on agricultural commodities when the Federal Government was supporting the price of those commodities and acreage or marketing were being controlled, and where the imports of those commodities threatened to jeopardize those particular domestic controls here in the United States. The gentleman's amendment would extend that kind of protection to agricultural commodities whether there is a support-price program, and whether there is a control program or not. It is my humble opinion, and I think I am right, that the imposition of such a provision would absolutely force the Geneva agreements on tariffs and duties to be abandoned by all countries because we would have violated what we have said we would do.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. My amendment states "where price controls prevail."

Mr. MILLS. I understood the gentleman's amendment to provide quotas on agricultural commodities where they are below a certain price, but not if there is price control. Did I misunderstand the reading of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The amendment says price supports.

Mr. MILLS. Price supports? The gentleman understands that not to conflict with what was done at the Geneva conference?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It means if we are supporting the price at $2.50 a bushel, they could not bring it into this country under $2.

Mr. MILLS. Is that an additional restriction, beyond that which we permitted to be placed into effect under the Geneva agreement on tariff and trade?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It does provide that where we have these surpluses and where we have a price support on those surpluses, then they cannot bring those commodities in at a lower price.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is concerned about Irish potatoes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I love Irish potatoes.

Mr. MILLS. I love Irish potatoes, too. But the gentleman did mention Irish potatoes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This applies to all these agricultural commodities.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman told us that we were bringing in Irish potatoes when we were supporting the price of Irish potatoes. The gentleman knows the program of supporting the price of Irish potatoes terminates with this crop. Some of you members of the Committee on Agriculture who are acquainted with that provision, I think, will back me up when I state that that program for the support of Irish potatoes is about over. We do not want to do something here just to keep a few potatoes from coming into the United States which nullifies and vitiates the agreements already entered into and which is contrary to the pledges we have made in that agreement. Do we want to do that?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Surely the gentleman knows that when the negotiators got together in Geneva

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

they wrote into that general agreement many provisions for which they had no legislative authority. They greatly exceeded their authority.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman may be right, but we gave them authority to reduce the tariffs.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. But not to make agreements tying the hands of Congress on domestic matters.

Mr. MILLS. In addition to doing that, they took into account the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. They retained the right on the part of the United States to impose quotas at any time quotas are needed to protect the price of agricultural commodities that are being supported, and with respect to which control programs are in effect. I do not think the amendment is necessary. And I think we can do a tremendous amount of harm to our standing with these democracies of Western Europe with which we are allied in the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I come from a territory that raises potatoes and Republicans, and I am supporting this amendment. It is true that the support goes off of this crop. It is also true that they have in the law a provision which permits this country to prevent importations, as the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has stated, but the trouble with that is that they do not impose it. We had one in Maine, and they abrogated it. So, under the circumstances, we thought we had been a little bit mistreated. When you consider that 10,000 carloads were imported in 1 year, when we raised 70,000,000 bushels, and they dumped some 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 bushels because they had a surplus, I think perhaps the imposition of a quota would have been a good thing. They abrogated it, for some unknown reason, and we complained very bitterly about it. Ten thousand carloads means 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. As I now understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], it would not help the potato situation in Maine. That support price is withdrawn with this crop.

Mr. FELLOWS. That is very true, but I am interested in other States of the Union, including Arkansas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would surely help the egg situation. The gentleman might not be in favor of helping hens, but I am telling you we have to rely on them sometimes.

Mr. FELLOWS. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan is a source of wisdom, and I listen to him occasionally.

I like our Canadian neighbors. They are splendid neighbors, and I believe in the good-neighbor policy to a certain extent, but I do feel that we should protect our own, and I am at a loss to understand, during all this debate, why it is if anybody stands up here and says that we have a country and that it needs our help, somebody gets up to tell us that we should be more interested in Poland or Czechoslovakia, or what not. We celebrate this week the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "I have not thought much on the subject recently, but my general impression is that the necessity for a protective tariff will ere long force its old opponents to take it up, and then its old friends can join in and establish it on a more firm and durable basis."

This thought has entered my head today: It might be of more profit to us, and it would save us money, if we dug up the *Mayflower* and refitted it and all went back. We could thus save much transportation expense.

I am going to support this amendment in the interest of Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am not going to take any more time. I was allowed 3 minutes on the last amendment, and I did not finish.

I was very much interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], as was everybody else. I am glad that we have a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will print what he said, because he talks the same language as we do in Massachusetts. As a matter of fact, Maine was a part of Massachusetts at one time and we got rid of it.

Somebody here—I do not know who it was—was finding fault with those people who were voting the American way, accusing them of being isolationists. Well, I want the 435 Members here to know, and the country at large to know, that there is another one here that is going to be an isolationist if they do not change their tactics.

What have these internationalists brought us? Two wars and the possibility of a third, and letting France, England, and some other foreign countries who neither talk our language nor understand it tell us what to do.

I was interested to hear about the exports, but what about the flood of imports? When are we going to stop them?

We have got to start right now, I think, to tell the whole world that at least we are going to look out for our own country. The sooner we do it the better off we shall be. If this be isolationism, then I am an isolationist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLS) there were—ayes 124, noes 110. So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 103, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Simpson amendment and also on the Curtis amendment as amended by the Bailey amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: After line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign-trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the Commission) with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles, the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign-trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period.

"(b) In the course of any investigation pursuant to this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"(c) Section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930,' approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and before concluding such agreement, the President shall request the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and report provided for by section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and shall seek information

and advice with respect to such agreement from the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.'

"SEC. 4. The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign-trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings, as provided in section 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement.

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 30 days after any trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has been entered into which, when effective, will (1) require or make appropriate any modification of duties or other import restrictions, the imposition of additional import restrictions, or the continuance of existing customs or excise treatment, which modification, imposition, or continuance will exceed the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles as found and reported by the Tariff Commission under section 3, or (2) fail to require or make appropriate the minimum increase in duty or additional import restrictions required to avoid such injury, the President shall transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

"(b) Promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign-trade agreement to Congress the Commission shall deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a copy of the portions of its report to the President dealing with the articles with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 168, answered "present" 2, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—225

Aandahl	Beamer	Burleson
Abernethy	Belcher	Burnside
Adair	Bender	Busbey
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Bush
Allen, Ill.	Bentsen	Butler
Andersen, H. Carl	Berry	Byrnes, Wis.
	Betts	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Chenoweth
Andresen, August H.	Blackney	Chiperfield
	Boggs, Del.	Church
Angell	Bolton	Clevenger
Arends	Bow	Cole, Kans.
Armstrong	Bramblett	Cole, N. Y.
Aspinall	Bray	Cotton
Auchincloss	Brehm	Coudert
Ayres	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Bailey	Brownson	Crawford
Baker	Bryson	Crumpacker
Baring	Budge	Cunningham
Bates, Mass.	Buffett	Curtis, Mo.
Beall	Burdick	Curtis, Nebr.
Dague	Jenison	Robeson
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins	Rogers, Colo.
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Dempsey	Johnson	Sadlak
Denny	Jonas	St. George
Devereux	Kean	Saylor
D'Ewart	Kearney	Schwabe
Dolliver	Kearns	Scott, Hardie
Dondero	Keating	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Donohue	Kersten, Wis.	
Donovan	Kilburn	Scrivner
Dorn	Lane	Scudder
Eaton	Lantaff	Secrest
Ellsworth	Latham	Seely-Brown
Elston	LeCompte	Shafer
Fallon	Lind	Sheehan
Fellows	Lovre	Short
Fenton	McConnell	Sikes
Fisher	McCulloch	Simpson, Ill.
Fogarty	McDonough	Simpson, Pa.
Ford	McGregor	Sittler
Forrester	McKinnon	Smith, Kans.
Gamble	McMullen	Smith, Wis.
Gathings	McVey	Springer
Gavin	Mack, Wash.	Staggers
George	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Golden	Martin, Mass.	Stockman
Goodwin	Mason	Taber
Gossett	Meader	Talle
Graham	Merrow	Thompson, Mich.
Gross	Miller, Md.	
Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Hagen	Miller, N. Y.	Towe
Hale	Morano	Vail
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morton	Van Pelt
	Mumma	Van Zandt
Hand	Nelson	Vaughn
Harden	Nicholson	Vorys
Harrison, Wyo.	Norblad	Vursell
Harvey	O'Hara	Weichel
Hays, Ohio	Ostertag	Wharton
Herlong	Patten	Wheeler
Herter	Patterson	Whitten
Hess	Philbin	Widnall
Hill	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Hillings	Polk	Williams, Miss.
Hoeven	Potter	Williams, N. Y.
Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson	Willis
Hoffman, Mich.	Prouty	Wilson, Ind.
Holmes	Radwan	Wilson, Tex.
Hope	Reece, Tenn.	Winstead
Horan	Reed, Ill.	Wolcott
Hull	Reed, N. Y.	Wolverton
Hunter	Rees, Kans.	Wood, Idaho
Jackson, Calif.	Regan	Woodruff
James	Riehlman	

NAYS—168

Abbitt	Fernandez	Lesinski
Addonizio	Fine	Lucas
Albert	Flood	Lyle
Allen, La.	Forand	McCarthy
Andrews	Frazier	McCormack
Anfuso	Fugate	McGrath
Barrett	Fulton	McGuire
Bates, Ky.	Furcolo	McMillan
Battle	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Beckworth	Gary	Mack, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Gordon	Madden
Blatnik	Gore	Magee
Boggs, La.	Granahan	Mansfield
Bolling	Granger	Marshall
Bonner	Grant	Mills
Bosone	Green	Mitchell
Brooks	Greenwood	Morgan
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Morris
Buchanan	Hardy	Morrison
Buckley	Harrison, Va.	Moulder
Burton	Hart	Multer
Byrne, N. Y.	Havenner	Murdock
Camp	Hays, Ark.	Murphy
Cannon	Hébert	Murray, Tenn.
Carlyle	Hedrick	Norrell
Carnahan	Heller	O'Brien, Ill.
Case	Heselton	O'Brien, Mich.
Chatham	Holifield	O'Neill
Chelf	Howell	O'Toole
Chudoff	Irving	Perkins
Clemente	Jackson, Wash.	Pickett
Colmer	Jarman	Poage
Combs	Javits	Preston
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Price
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Priest
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Hamilton C.	Quinn
Deane		Rains
DeGraffenried	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ramsay
Delaney		Rankin
Denton	Karsten, Mo.	Reams
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes
Doughton	Kelly, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Doyle	Keogh	Richards
Durham	King	Riley
Eberharter	Kirwan	Roberts
Engle	Klein	Rodino
Evins	Kluczynski	Rogers, Fla.
Feighan	Lanham	Rogers, Tex.
Rooney	Steed	Walter
Sasscer	Stigler	Welch
Shelley	Tackett	Whitaker
Sheppard	Thomas	Wickersham
Sieminski	Thompson, Tex.	Wier
Smith, Miss.	Thornberry	Yates
Smith, Va.	Trimble	Yorty
Spence	Underwood	Zablocki
Stanley	Vinson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Patman Sutton

NOT VOTING—38

Barden	Harris	Passman
Boykin	Heffernan	Powell
Breen	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Celler	Judd	Redden
Cooper	Kee	Rivers
Corbett	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kerr	Sabath
Dingell	Kilday	Taylor
Elliott	Larcade	Teague
Gillette	Mahon	Velde
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Calif.	Werdel
	Murray, Wis.	Withrow
Halleck	O'Konski	Wood, Ga.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Sutton for, with Mr. Cooper against.

Mr. Wood, Ga., for with Mr. Kerr against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Mahon against.

Mr. Henshaw for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Heffernan gainst.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK. I voted "nay." I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present" since he would vote "yea" if he were here.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. COOPER. I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present" since he would vote "nay" if he were here.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is requested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Amend section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"SEC. 5. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement any product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively-increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill H. R. 1612 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the committee may be permitted to correct section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND THE FLORIDA FRUIT AND VEGETABLE INDUSTRY

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, while the fruit and vegetable industry in my district has been adversely affected in some respect by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, nevertheless, the record of accomplishment under the act, and the best interests of the country as a whole, dictate that I vote for H. R. 1612. Today our greatest concern is the maintenance of our national security in cooperation with other nations.

The fruit and vegetable industry, of which I speak, has suffered because of the large quantities of fruits and vegetables imported from Cuba and Mexico, where labor is cheaper than in south Florida, and to afford that industry an opportunity to be fully heard I have voted for certain amendments.

Originally this industry did not support the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As the years have passed, they have changed their opinion, however, and now believe that the trade treaty principle is sound, considering the national good, but in the overall application there are inequities which need correcting.

Recently this industry made a study covering nearly 2 years' time, and worked out an economic program adjusted to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, its entire principle and purpose.

This proposal was so sound and fair that the major vegetable association in Nogales, Ariz., which owns or controls 70 percent of the vegetable production in Mexico, endorsed the program submitted by the Florida growers.

At the same time, the producers and exporters of Cuba agreed to the program and endorsed it. Representatives of these foreign and domestic groups made an appearance before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and submitted that agreed-upon program last September.

Nothing, however, has been accomplished to date. These producers are constantly told that certain policies will not permit the Department of State to include their program in the trade treaty now being negotiated with Cuba. They have not been formally turned down, but little, if any, consideration has been given to adoption of this sound program agreed to by both foreign and domestic interests. Such an unreasonable attitude is not in best interests of our citizens, and will eventually harm the whole reciprocal trade program.

BROOKLYN REGIONAL OFFICE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent the Veterans' Administration now maintains a regional office for the Borough of Brooklyn. There seems to be some talk or report in Washington of this office being taken away from the borough.

To forestall such action, I have this day introduced a bill and I shall urge that favorable action be taken providing that a regional office of the Veterans' Administration be maintained in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more generous, wise, or farseeing than the provisions Congress has made for the protection and assistance of veterans of the Second World War. There has never been anything to equal it in our history or in that of any other country. There is always the danger, however, that the actual beneficent intent of Congress will be nullified to a greater or less degree by the ineptness of those who are called upon to administer the provisions of the law.

An instance of this has come to light in the report that the Veterans' Administration is about to close its regional office in the Borough of Brooklyn. The ground alleged is that the building in which the present regional office is housed must be vacated to make way for a war industry in connection with the present mobilization.

I venture to hope that this report is without solid foundation in fact. If the situation is otherwise, and the Veterans' Administration is really seriously considering the closing down of this office, a great disservice will be done to one of the largest groups of veterans in the whole country. There are some 400,000 veterans served by this office. Every one who has any connection with veterans' affairs knows something about the complexity of the questions that are constantly arising in connection with the many-sided activities carried on. Innumerable questions and uncertainties arise; there are innumerable occasions when nothing will clear up the case except a personal interview between those concerned.

To assign all this work to some center at a distance from the borough where 400,000 of the beneficiaries live will contribute neither to expedition nor to efficiency. There will be unnecessary delays and avoidable misunderstanding, and a considerable degree of inconvenience to 400,000 veterans.

If defense needs really require the evacuation of the present building, there are many other sites which can be found. It is not necessary to give up the regional office altogether, thus adding further confusion to an always confused operation.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the following members of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives were at the White House at the time roll call No. 11 took place: Messrs. BUCKLEY, FALLON, DAVIS of Tennessee, TRIMBLE, BLATNIK, PICKETT, JONES of Alabama, LANHAM, MOULDER, DEMPSEY, SMITH of Mississippi, DONDERO, ANGELL, MCGREGOR, MACK of Washington, VURSELL, SCUDDER, BRAY, BAKER, and WOOD of Idaho.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may have an indefinite leave of absence due to illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRAIN WRECK AT WOODBRIDGE, N. J.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have sent to the Secretary of Commerce and the Attorney General a request that they furnish the House of Representatives at the earliest practical date full and complete information with respect to the railroad accident which occurred near Woodbridge, N. J., on February 6, 1951, an accident in which the lives of 81 persons were taken and 500 others injured, specifically advising the House whether the accident was directly or indirecity caused by sabotage.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House realize that we have had far too many railroad accidents in the past months, many of them killing our soldiers going to camp and to the front. This matter should be thoroughly investigated.

I have introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce of the United States is requested to furnish to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date full and complete information with respect to the railroad accident which occurred near Woodbridge, N. J., on February 6, 1951, and took the lives of 81 persons and injured 500 persons, and specifically advising the House whether the accident was directly or indirectly caused by sabotage.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as part of my remarks an article by Mr. David Lawrence on Yalta and a resolution adopted by the Polish Peoples University Forum of Chicago; further that my colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN], be permitted to extend their remarks at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

YALTA HAUNTS U. S. A.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the sixth anniversary of the Yalta agreement. At Yalta, three men with their advisers met and determined the fate of Europe and Asia—Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt. The events that have flowed from that meeting have left the world in utter confusion and on the brink of another global war.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget the first day of March 1945 when the then President Roosevelt came into the well of this House and reported to a joint session of the Congress on his trip to Yalta and return. He was a very sick man and it was evident that he had undergone considerable strain notwithstanding his attempt to take matters lightly. I have just read his speech in the RECORD of that day and I now realize that he gave us a detailed report. I was particularly interested in one statement that he made. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 1622.

Quite naturally this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe—and not with the Pacific war.

As we look back, Mr. Speaker, we realize that certain Asiatic problems were discussed and agreed upon contrary to that statement. Russia was given concessions in Manchuria and certain islands in the Pacific at the expense of China who was not represented at the conference in direct contradiction to the agreement made at Cairo in 1943. This was the occasion when we put the skids under China. The record has been made. It cannot be denied. This deal was engineered by the Democratic administration.

Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the very day after the President had made his report to Congress it was my privilege to have addressed this body on the subject of Yalta and the title of my remarks was: "Yalta—A Moral Retreat—Poland and Small Nations Crucified." On that occasion I stated that the purpose of my remarks would be confined to that phase of the Yalta conference which dealt with the so-called Polish question and specifically the determination by the conferees at Yalta to settle the boundary lines of Poland before that question was even submitted to the free people of Poland. I charged then, Mr. Speaker, that such agreement was a retreat from the high moral ground that we had steadily maintained throughout the war, namely, the right of all people to the principle of self-determination.

I recognized, Mr. Speaker, at that time that I might be charged with fostering disunity among our then allies but, notwithstanding, I considered it my duty to speak out against what I believed was a great injustice to the people of Poland. I said then that a great mistake was made at Yalta and further, and I quote:

It is a mistake, which if not rectified, will lead to world war III.

I did not realize, of course, that these words would in effect be a prophecy but as we view events today we are apprehensive that another war—world war III—is about to begin, largely as a result of the Yalta episode.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the results of Yalta. Violent discussions pro and con still go on. The very prestige of the late President appears to hang on the good or bad that will eventually flow from that meeting. I submit that the results of the conference must be tested by their effect upon the inalienable rights of millions of people in Europe and in Asia who apparently had no spokesman at Yalta.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been close to events since 1939 remember the broad and sound principles upon which the Atlantic Charter was expressly written. May I remind you at this time as to just what they were as they are related to the right of self-determination and territorial expansion:

1. No country shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

2. They desire to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

3. They shall respect the rights of people to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Today we know that those principles were completely ignored at Yalta. We all realize that our good friend and ally, China, was sold down the river to communism on this date in 1945. We are paying the penalty for the violation of those principles. In Europe, and especially in Poland, we acquiesced in the demand by Stalin to partition that country and to set up a puppet Polish Government at the expense of the exiled government in London. Here we see the first working of the "principle of coalition government" which Marshall insisted upon in China. Here we see the hand of Alger Hiss, Lattimore, Service, and others. Here it was that we sold the liberty-loving Polish people into slavery—a nation which had been recreated with the help of Woodrow Wilson after World War I. Here it was that the satellite countries—Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia—were made the easy victims of Red infiltration. Mr. Speaker, I read again a portion of my remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 1702, and I quote:

Madame Speaker, my plea today is for the recognition of the rights of small nations; we cannot bypass them now by ignoring their rights and expect to have established the privileges of permanent peace. Russia is our friend and we have given unstintingly of our resources to her and surely she is amenable to reason. So with our British friends; we are all in this world situation together. I am satisfied, Madame Speaker, that unless we adopt the policy now of no territorial aggrandizement, we are headed for trouble in the future which can only result in another letting of blood when the next generation has reached military age.

Mr. Speaker, I take no pride in calling attention to the fact that my remarks then seem to be proving true today. At that time I referred to Russia as our friend. Today we know that she is our only enemy, but if she is strong and if she has sufficient strength to oppose us, then we must admit that it is so because of the help we gave her when the Germans were pounding at the gates of Stalingrad and Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have watched with admiration the fight being waged by Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence and for democratic forms of government. That interest will be continued. Our people are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any interference on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak. These principles constitute the very foundation upon which our existing international relationships are formed with other free people. We shall continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles is inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law cannot be preserved. These are the principles of modern civilization as we understand them.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia will rise and throw off the yoke of the invader and will, in the not too distant future, resume their places in the family of nations as free and independent. God speed that day.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial that appeared in the United States News and World Report on March 2, 1945, entitled "The Tragedy of Yalta," by Mr. David Lawrence, that outstanding journalist. He said that the defeat which America suffered at Yalta was more than a surrender to political expediency by the President; it was a defeat for American leadership at home, in Congress, on the radio, and in the press. I include the article in question:

THE TRAGEDY OF YALTA

(By David Lawrence)

NATION HAS RATIONALIZED ITS SURRENDER OF PRINCIPLES BY ATTITUDE TOWARD POLISH BOUNDARY PROBLEM AT YALTA—CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENTS SHOWS POWER POLITICS IN OPERATION

The defeat which America suffered at Yalta was more than a surrender to expediency by the President.

It was a defeat for American leadership at home, too—in Congress and in the press and on the radio.

Last week Americans were beginning to rationalize the Polish boundary dispute. After all, some writers asked, wasn't this one-third of Poland taken by force originally from Russia many years ago, and wasn't the Curzon line the boundary that some of our own experts worked out more than a quarter of a century ago at the last peace conference, and didn't Russia lose out because she was weak in 1919 and had made a separate peace with Germany?

Also, even if the matter had been left to the decision of a tribunal at the end of this war, wouldn't Russia's claims have been recognized and the result the same?

Let's apply that method of rationalization to a simple proposition of justice as it relates to that occasional outburst of ours called lynching. Have we not heard it argued that the Negro was guilty and that, if he had been tried by a court, he would have been convicted and hanged anyhow? And aren't courts of justice too slow?

We had been told—and the young men who are fighting this war have been told—that this is a war to bring about a new reign of international law, a new order in the world, a system of justice.

But, instead, Poland has been lynched and most of the comments would indicate that American opinion in large part agrees the lynching was all right, and that the affair would have ended the same way anyway if it had been left to the peace conference. And besides, it is remarked with comfortable cynicism, what difference do a few square miles of Polish territory make to us if it makes Stalin happy? Little thought apparently is given to the fact that Poland is supposed to annex some German territory and create a new Alsace-Lorraine for world war III.

It is our first major test. If we continue to appease and appease and play the game of expediency, we will find in the end that the price gets higher all the time. Didn't we rationalize as to Munich in 1938 that after all Hitler should have the Sudeten because there was a big German population in Czechoslovakia?

Let us examine the record before Yalta and see how the game of power politics works. The story goes back to Tehran. Here is the realistic chronology as it can be deduced from the files of the New York Times:

December 1943: Mr. Churchill, at the Tehran Conference of the Big Three, raises the question of the future of Poland. Stalin demands the Curzon Line. Mr. Roosevelt is so informed. The world is told afterward no agreements, secret pledges, or partition of territory were consummated.

October 1944: Churchill and Eden go to Moscow and Stalin demands that the Polish question be settled before the peace conference is held. The American Ambassador is present at nearly all the talks.

December 15, 1944: Churchill tells the House of Commons he has decided to make an exception and not wait till the peace conference to settle the Polish question, and he reveals publicly that he has agreed with Stalin. He warns the Polish Government in exile to accept now or the price will be higher later on. Mr. Stalin must be appeased, he says, in effect, and he betrays irritation that Mr. Roosevelt has not come through with his end of the appeasement.

December 16, 1944: President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, says he hopes America will say "No" to Churchill's plan to redraw Poland.

December 17, 1944: A New York Times dispatch from London says that Churchill made a secret deal at Tehran and Roosevelt was "neutral," and adds:

"It is quite clear now that in Tehran (December 1943) Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin divided Europe into spheres of British and Russian influence. * * * Stalin would not agree to coordinate the Red Army's operations with those of his western allies until he had definite assurance that Britain would support Russia's claim to Polish territory as far west as the Curzon Line."

December 17, 1944: The Army and Navy Journal in Washington calls for an offensive through Poland by Russia, and Pravda denounces this publication as "a source for pro-Hitlerite propaganda," but many military men in Washington agree that Russia is stalling in order to force the hand of Churchill and Roosevelt.

December 18, 1944: The State Department issues a statement paving the way for the surrender to Stalin at Yalta. The statement says America has felt the Polish boundaries should be left to the peace conference at the end of the war, but that if "a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned this Government would have no objection to such an agreement." This is a tip-off that if Stalin can put across his puppet government through the Lublin committee the United States can be counted on to approve the ultimate recognition of some sort of Lublin government, modified, of course, to make it appear national.

December 19, 1944: The Nazi offensive is costing tens of thousands of American casualties on the western front as Germany, knowing that Stalin has been stalling, takes advantage of the lull on the eastern front.

December 19, 1944: A wave of criticism of Churchill sweeps the United States. The New York Times refers to the Churchill proposal on Poland editorially:

"It must be admitted frankly that this is not the way border problems were to be settled, under the terms of the Atlantic Charter. This is not an idealistic settlement made 'in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.' * * * We invite the attention of the Russian Government to the hazards of making decisions in a coalition war on the basis of unilateral action. This is isolationism. It engenders isolationism in others."

The Times says bluntly also that "agreement on the Curzon Line is apparently to be the 'go ahead' signal for a resumption of the battle in the east."

December 19, 1944: Teamwork by President Roosevelt, who backs up Churchill's "lapse of memory" statement. Churchill in his December 15 speech had said that "it must not be forgotten that words are inserted in the Atlantic Charter, 'No changes before the peace table, except changes mutually agreed'." Mr. Churchill next day said he was mistaken and that the words he quoted were somewhere in one of Mr. Hull's speeches. Anyway, Mr. Roosevelt now helps out by saying to a press conference that the Atlantic Charter was just a bunch of scribbled notes anyway and not a formal, signed document.

December 21, 1944: Stalin sees his way out. Dispatches announce from London that Stalin is to install the Lublin committee as the Government of Poland.

January 12, 1945: Stalin apparently decides he is tired of waiting for the concurrence of Mr. Roosevelt and that, since he has Mr. Churchill's backing, the Russians can resume their offensive and take the matter of a provisional government in their own hands.

February 1945: Mr. Roosevelt agrees at Yalta to the dismemberment of the territory of an ally—Poland.

That's the main sketch of the tragedy, but in that December 15, 1944, speech of Mr. Churchill to the House of Commons, he said:

"The President is aware of everything that has passed and of what is in the minds of the Russians and British."

It looks as if Mr. Roosevelt must have known all the time that the Atlantic Charter pledge was being torn to pieces. He was maneuvering for a way out. The Yalta communique, in effect, said that what had been wrong as a unilateral action was now all right. It was a confirmation of lynch law in international affairs. High-sounding phrases about military coordination plus the summoning of the United Nations meeting at San Francisco were all counted as a smokescreen to becloud the fiasco at Yalta.

But some people have asked, "What would you have done about it—gone to war with Russia?" Alas, that's the familiar cry of those who lose courage and falter where principle is at stake.

No, we need not have gone to war with Russia, but sooner or later appeasement must end, and Yalta was the place to end it. Russia would have respected us for it and a mere deferment of the Polish question to the peace conference—or its adjudication even before that time by a special international commission at which all interests, including those of Poland, could be heard, and the United Nations could sit in judgment—would never have caused a break in

the present alliance between Russia, Britain, and the United States. If this partnership is founded on any such frail basis, then, indeed, we are in for trouble ahead and we must appease and appease and appease.

After all, America's military might has not been such an insignificant contribution to Russia. Our tanks, our planes, our ammunition, and our resources have been at the disposal of Stalin. He needs them, and he cannot conquer Germany without us.

We simply have been outmaneuvered and outbluffed and we on this side of the Atlantic already have begun to sacrifice our ideals and principles down the long painful road of rationalized surrender.

There's a way to save our souls, and that's at San Francisco, where machinery must be inserted definitely pledging to give American guaranties only if there is review of interim agreements. The people of the United States should be asked to back up only those settlements which are in accord with the principles and the formula set forth by the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. Speaker, I am also submitting at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Polish Peoples University Extension Forum, of Chicago, on Sunday, February 18 and on Sunday, February 25, 1945, apropos the conference at Yalta:

THE YALTA DECISIONS REGARDING POLAND

The Polish Peoples University Extension Forum, of Chicago, an educational and cultural organization, which has functioned for the last 37 years, voted on Sunday, February 18, and on Sunday, February 25, 1945, approved the following resolution regarding the Yalta decisions concerning Poland:

The Yalta decisions regarding Poland constrain us to record not only a keen disappointment in them, but also a serious apprehension as to any hopes of a durable peace. We are unquestionably winning the war, but by all appearances of things we are definitely losing the peace, as we did at the close of the First World War.

The Yalta decisions regarding Poland are, in our judgment, first of all, most unfair and wholly unjust to Poland. Not only do they surrender to Russia more than 40 percent of Polish 1939 territory—a territory to which Russia, strictly speaking, has absolutely no legitimate claim on any grounds whatsoever, either historical or ethnic, and which she does not need for any reasons that she may advance, least of all any security reasons. The territorial compensations proposed north and west are, in a strict sense, no compensations, for historically they, too, constitute Poland's rightful possessions taken away from her by force by the first three partitions. These so-called compensations, then, would, in any event, be only a rectification of the northern and western frontiers drawn by the Paris conference of 1919.

Also, these decisions are a repudiation of the London Polish Government, legitimate and so recognized not only by Great Britain and the United States, but also by Russia until the time when Russia violated her own agreements with Poland, and began to lay claims to Polish territory, to which the London Polish Government naturally could not yield, and an acceptance and recognition of Russia's puppet government set up by her for Poland. If Hitler's puppet governments set up in Norway, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and the Vichy collaborationist government in France were discountenanced by the United Nations, Russia included, why and how can the Russian puppet government set up for Poland be more acceptable to Great Britain and to the United States? And why can it or should it be more acceptable to the Poles, at home or abroad? Can such a government possibly express the will of the Polish nation, and can it really represent and defend Poland's interests?

Moreover, the Yalta decisions practically surrender the whole of Poland under the domination of Russia—much as they may talk of independence, democracy, and free elections. People and nations are known by their deeds. Russia's centuries-old absolutism together with her centuries-old policy of aggressions against the Eastern European nations speak more eloquently and more convincingly than any professions of democracy or promises of freedom, independence, and free elections in any country over which she is allowed to dominate.

In the second place, the Yalta decisions regarding Poland are a clear repudiation of at least some of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, signed by the President of the United States and the Premier of Great Britain, and accepted by Russia after Hitler's attack upon her and her consequent alliance with us. Points one and two of this charter state clearly and explicitly: "Their countries"—and this includes Russia—"seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other"; and "they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

In the third place, these decisions are a violation of and a departure from the principles, policy, and the traditions of the United States. The United States, the historic symbol of freedom, the exponent of democracy, the champion of justice and fair play, the hope and refuge of the world's enslaved and oppressed, has by the Yalta stand regarding Poland become a partner to Russian aggression, a partner to a fifth partition of Poland, and to her impending enslavement by Russia.

These decisions betray, in the fourth place, clear and distinct appeasement, which is a mark of weakness on the part of the appeaser or appeasers, and which has no end, as experience has already clearly and sufficiently demonstrated. The sacrifice of Manchuria and all our shipments of oil and scrap-iron did not appease Japan; the sacrifice of Ethiopia did not appease Fascist Italy; the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia did not appease Nazi Germany. Will the sacrifice of Poland and Eastern Europe appease the Russian bear. Doubtfully, very doubtfully. Sooner or later he will turn against his appeasers, who by their very appeasements have built up his strength and power, demonstrating at the same time their moral, if not material, weakness.

Consequently, in the fifth place, these Yalta decisions and agreements are, we fear, no foundation on which a durable postwar peace structure can be erected. Rather do they already contain sufficient elements for new postwar tensions, frictions, and a third world war. The only foundation of real peace and of real durable peace, whether in the home, a community, a nation, or among nations in the world, is justice and fair play. The Yalta decisions and agreements, however, are rooted and grounded in injustice, to begin with, and consequently constitute no safe foundation on which any hope of a durable postwar peace may be based.

Because of these considerations and for the reasons here advanced, we, therefore, record our disapproval of the Yalta Agreement. As citizens of the United States we recoil from seeing our country made a partner to any such agreement as the one in question, an agreement so manifestly unfair and unjust, which bows and submits to an unscrupulous aggressor, which threatens the peace we fight and long and hope for, and which, as a matter of fact, is in reality a clear betrayal of a friend and ally; and not only that, but also of ourselves, of the United States of America, the country of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, of her best and real self, of the very principles and ideals of freedom, of justice, of unselfishness, and fair play for which she has ever stood and which have been both her strength and her glory.

POLISH PEOPLES UNIVERSITY EXTENSION FORUM.
PAUL FOX, *President.*
V. M. SPUNAR, *Vice President.*
PAUL MICZKO, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

ABROGATE THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has just documented for the House the conspiracy between Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt that took place at Yalta 6 years ago. At Yalta in February of 1945 capitulations to Russian demands resulted in the betrayal of Poland into Russian hands. It was at Yalta, where an ailing President, surrounded by advisers of the caliber of Alger Hiss and others, whose loyalty to this country has been questioned, allowed Russia to annex our heroic ally, Poland.

After the Yalta agreement, Poland became enslaved. We in the United States will never be able to forget our disgraceful actions, our failure to live up to principle. We today are paying a terrible price for this cynical resort to expediency, for this gross miscalculation as to Soviet intentions.

The Polish people were the first to fight the Nazi tyrants; they were the first to be conquered by the Communist barbarians. By means of the iniquitous Yalta agreement and through bribery, corruption, intimidation, and coercion, they have been deprived of the freedom which they had so richly earned by their persistent and heroic efforts during the years of titanic struggle.

In every war since the eighteenth century, Polish patriots have fought in the cause of freedom. In fact, Poland's record as a fighting nation—as an unswervingly faithful ally, as the only nation which, regardless of Hitler's unprecedented barbarisms, never produced a quisling—stands out unexcelled.

Such a stand of Poles earned them the name of "inspiration of the nations" and "conscience of the world." They fought not only in the defense of their own freedom but also in the defense of the threatened freedom of the whole world. The western democracies assured the Polish Nation repeatedly that its great sacrifices will not be in vain and it will regain independence and freedom. The Polish Nation believed fully in these assurances.

Unfortunately, the victorious end of the war against Germany did not bring the well-deserved and longed-for freedom and independence to the Polish Nation, which suffered under brown tyranny and under the Red tyranny. Surely freedom and independence was earned by the Poles for fulfilling its duty beyond glory.

The western democracies bear the responsibility; we Americans, who have not kept our promises given to Poland, are responsible for it. Our administration is guilty because in Tehran and Yalta it agreed to turn Poland over to the Soviet sphere of interest; turned over to Soviet bondage and completely

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

abandoned by the western democracies after the war.

Poland has suffered not only at the hands of her enemies but also by her association with those who posed as friends.

We must realize that much of the threat to our own American national security and to world peace, for the protection of which we are now engaged in a semiwar action in Korea, comes from that nefarious agreement at Yalta—an agreement which has never been approved by the people of this country officially. The present critical events in the Far East justify the conclusion that the wrong toward Poland at Yalta set the pattern for an attitude which has brought us to the present dangerous foreign entanglements.

The time is long past due when this Nation should recognize as invalid the agreement concluded at Yalta. The Soviets have given ample proof that the pledges made at Yalta were disregarded. The decisions of Yalta no longer bind us. We must, without further delay, repudiate this ill-conceived document that is steering us headlong into another declared world war.

Our stand at this crucial point in our history should be expressed by a firm and convincing action aimed at restoring to Poland and other nations, swallowed up by the Communists, the freedom that has virtually disappeared from their midst.

Since the United States Senate has failed thus far to ratify the Yalta agreement, I once again wish to express my conviction that we should no longer continue to honor this shameful document of appeasement.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, we are now marking the sixth anniversary of the conference of the Big Three at Yalta, where they conferred from February 4 through February 11, 1945.

Neither this anniversary nor any other anniversary of the Yalta Conference is anything which the American people care to celebrate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the fervent and unfulfillable thought of most Americans at this time is that the world would have been infinitely better off had such a conference never taken place. When the Yalta Conference took place in February 1945 we were on the brink of winning World War II. And it was also at Yalta at the same time that we unnecessarily bartered away the peace.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that since 1945 we have not been nearly so much engaged in the making and maintaining of peace as we have been in trying to undo the secret agreements entered into at that small Crimean seaport. One of the results of the Yalta Conference came very near fulfillment at the end of 1949, with the loss of China to a Communist government.

Another result of the Yalta agreement was the dismemberment of Poland and the subjugation of her freedom-loving people to a foreign totalitarian state. It should be recalled, too, that it was to protect the territorial integrity of this same Poland that Great Britain and France went to war in 1939. Thousands upon thousands of the sons and daughters of Poland fought and died for the principles of freedom and a democratic form of government. Such principles might reasonably have been achieved except for the agreements reached at Yalta.

It is for these and many other reasons that I state today that most Americans, and certainly all of those who are of Polish descent, wish without hope that this conference had never taken place. Consequently, we must continue to strive to overcome and to rectify the grave injustices which resulted from the Yalta Conference and which deprived millions of people of the freedom which they cherished and for which they fought so valiantly.

YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth anniversary of one of the most shameless international political transactions that this Nation has ever been party to.

During the last 6 years much has been said and printed of the evil that has stemmed from the Yalta agreement. During all this time we have failed to hear but a whisper, or to see but a line in print to tell us of the resulting good of that expedient but principle sacrificing arrangement, which to this date has never been submitted for ratification to the Senate of the United States. I defy any American to defend the Yalta agreement. I defy, for that matter, any freedom-loving person to justify its very creation and existence. It was ill conceived without justification, no good has come from it and no earthly good can be expected of it.

In spite of the fact that the Yalta agreement was counseled by one since discredited and convicted, it is nevertheless regarded by our State Department as a binding commitment. If at any time, under international law or under moral law, it could be considered legal or binding, certainly now we know that because of its breach it cannot be considered legal and would never be ratified by the upper House of this Congress.

I, therefore, challenge the Department of State to take this infamous document off the list of commitments to which this country intends to adhere, and then, and only then, will the peoples of Europe, whose partnership and cooperation we seek, believe in the sincerity of our intentions.

Prior to June 25, 1950, Yalta was the symbol of slavery for the Polish Nation. It also paved the way for the enslavement of other European nations and it was the vehicle of expansion for the Soviet Empire permitting the Communists to extend its borders to the very heart of Europe. To many Americans from all walks of life and various ethnical groups it was also the symbol of a sell-out of principle, a sell-out of principle which made this country great; all for the sake of political expediency. Since the invasion of South Korea we see further evil results brought closer to home. The stench not only lingers, but grows more foul. To date it has already cost us well over 50,000 casualties in Korea and has forced this Nation to prepare and mobilize for a general war. That is the price we are paying for resorting to political expediency.

With the passing of another year, another black page has been added to the history of the world. Yalta marks the cornerstone for Soviet expansion. It marks the decline of freedom in the world. A return to the adherence of principle will reverse this trend.

I repeat my challenge to the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETS BETRAYED BY WASTEFUL ECONOMIES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, taxes are going up, but the services we promised to the veterans of all wars are being slashed.

New economy is a fine thing when it works.

Penny-pinching savings that cause far more damage than good have a way of being far more expensive in the end. When the hatchet strikes at one essential service of the Government without thought as to the consequences, the inevitable bill for surgical repairs doubles the cost.

Why the Government should pick on the veterans first is beyond understanding or sufferance.

Especially when a two- to three-million-dollar cut in contact office service to the veterans will eliminate local aid to the disabled and throw the burden on the VA staffs in the few and scattered big cities.

One would expect the Government to go after the billion or more in legitimate taxes from the vice lords and others, which these elements are "withholding" from the Treasury, instead of crippling the functions of the VA with small but disastrous economies.

First let us look at the savings themselves on the basis of figures alone.

Percentagewise the reduction for the VA contact offices amounts to about one fourteen-thousandth of the budget for the fiscal year 1951.

Or one one-hundred-and-fortieth of 1 percent. Maybe less.

It would take a microscope to see the tiny gain in this economy "blood count."

On the other side of the ledger there is our solemn promise to help the veterans, their widows and dependents, which can be seen in the laws and can be felt in our conscience.

The credit of the United States Government is not measured simply by the soundness of the dollar, or its record in meeting financial obligations. There is also the yardstick of character—determining its success or failure in living up to the obligations it has undertaken in behalf of its own people.

If we default on the veterans, who have always carried the heaviest burden of citizenship in sacrifices not limited to a

budget, then we shall forfeit all claims to respect and trust.

I cannot conceive of a more callous inconsistency than to meat-ax the Veterans' Administration at a time when thousands of veterans are returning, broken in health, from the fighting in Korea. The new casualty list of widows and orphans is increasing daily. And the young of the land are being summoned to military service, some to take the places of the fallen in Korea, others to stand strong for us in strange places and under conditions so difficult that time alone will reveal.

The Veterans' Administration cannot ignore its continuing and increasing responsibilities. True, there is a tapering-off in educational and on-the-job training benefits with consequent savings to the Government for promises fulfilled. But the disabled will be with us for so many years to come that a grateful Nation will insist that all pledges made to them will be adequately and honorably maintained. The VA will do its job well for them, as long as it is not hampered by impulsive and ill-considered economies that cause a breakdown in servicing the needs of our veterans and their dependents.

The contact offices not only give advice and help in filling out forms for benefits due under legislation concerning veterans, but give additional assistance to the disabled, particularly the amputees. These range all the way from securing license, registration, and plates for the automobiles of amputees, to special tax counsel and information on civil-service opportunities for the millions of others who are physically impaired.

I want to quote from the Unit Contact Record for the Year 1950 of the one-man contact office in my home city of Lawrence, Mass., because it is representative of Lynn, Mass., and Chelsea, Mass., and the other 321 such offices that are scheduled to be closed by April 1.

Bear in mind that the contact officers and clerks will be assigned to central offices in the few large cities, cutting off personal calls at the homes of sick veterans, the infirm, and widows tied down by youngsters. Under the proposed consolidation, there will be heartbreaking delays. We cannot expect disabled vets to travel long distances and then wait in long lines for attention to their problems. And we cannot see the value of getting a monthly disability check to a sick veteran months after he has passed away. Overburdened VA staffs in the larger cities will be overwhelmed and unable to keep up with the concentrated workload.

In giving you the figures for Lawrence, as a typical field office, I want to compare the activity for January 1950 with December 1950. The spread will indicate that there has not been a falling-off in work accomplished to justify the elimination of 351 contact offices.

Here is the January–December comparison:

Personal contacts the office, 1,127 as contrasted with 927.

Counter contacts, 201 as against 263.

Telephone contacts, 782 and 628.

Correspondence items prepared, 252, 286.

Forms prepared, 456, 329.

Benefit applications prepared, 378 and 172.

Totals for January of last year 3,196, compared with 2,605 for December.

As the editorial from the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune of February 5, 1951, states in part, and I quote:

If it is the intention of the Government to serve the interests of economy in the matter, it's our feeling that the interest of economy would be better served by leaving the situation undisturbed. Maintenance of the local VA office certainly involves no such great sum of money that its expenditure reflects painfully upon the tax rate. Nor does it add a fraction of an inch to our mountainous national debt. Zeal for economy is laudable, but it misses the mark when it attacks so basic a function as the Veterans' Administration. Men who have served their country to the best of their ability—and may soon be called upon to do it again—have a right to expect that their country will serve them to the best of its ability.

The Quincy (Mass.) Patriot-Ledger of February 1, comments in part, that—

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has ordered the closing of 317 offices having only 1 contact representative and a clerk.

The reason—lack of funds.

Perhaps nationally, a fairly sizable sum would be saved at the expense of veterans of all ages * * * the younger men of the Korean war and World War II, the middle-aged of World War I, and the elderly of the Spanish-American War.

It would also be at the expense of the widows of heroes of all wars.

* * * If the Federal Government wants to show it intends to keep expenses down, it would be well to look with an economical eye at some other branches of service that are burdening the taxpayers.

It should not cast its economical eye at a service that offers so much to the men who did so much.

The Veterans' Administration itself cannot do anything to reopen the offices ordered closed for lack of funds.

It will be up to the veterans themselves, their families, and their organizations.

Pressure from them in the form of protest letters to their Congressmen might do a lot of good.

We, in Massachusetts, are up in arms over this squeeze play, because we are veteran-minded. There are many hundreds of thousands of veterans in the Commonwealth, and the concentration of schools and colleges and hospitals in this area is a service to veterans from New England and beyond.

We recall, with a mingling of "I told you so" and "It can happen again," the economy wave of 1943–44 that hit the VA and how it backfired.

To cure the resulting paralysis, the employees who were let go had to be called back in a hurry. But this was not enough to untangle the pile-up of claims. More employees had to be hired and trained in VA operations before they could be of help.

We cannot afford to repeat that foolish experience in the name of economy that turns out to be extravagance in disguise.

The veterans of this Nation know what it is to be the target of enemy action, and many of them will endure the painful effects of that experience for life. The least we can do for them now, and for the rest of their days, is to protect them from the snipers who would cut down the benefits and services that we owe to all men and women who have given to their country in a manner that can never be repaid in full.

The VA needs a small deficiency appropriation to head off the proposed curtailment of service not of its own making.

This can be compensated for many times over in other agencies of Government where economy will not directly affect human beings.

April 1 is the dead line.

Before that time, it is necessary for us to authorize an appropriation to maintain contact offices at the local level.

And by so doing to keep faith with all veterans, past and future.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], who is a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and who has been such a dear friend to the veterans of all wars.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has always done so much for the veterans. I hope that his plea will not fall on deaf ears. I am very glad he is making this fight. I believe he will be successful. Of course, if the men do not have the proper medical care, they will lose their lives and also it would be very expensive if they did not have that medical care furnished to them near their homes, because then they would have to go to Boston for treatment.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POLAND AND THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 7, marks the sixth anniversary of the so-called Yalta agreement which was brought about through a conference of leaders of allied nations during the dark days of World War II. Unfortunate agreements and concessions made at this conference, as the years unfold, reveal that the Soviet leaders before the Yalta Conference, during the Yalta Conference, and since the Yalta Conference had no respect or sincerity for not only their allies in World War II but for the future freedom and independence of any nation on the globe, large or small, who desires freedom and self-government.

Poland has been the major victim among independent and free nations who has felt the sting of intrigue and the Communist lust for power, control, and domination. After the World War II shooting stopped the Soviet duplicity was revealed and the tyrannical aggressions and infiltrations have continued to spread as the years passed.

When Poland reemerged as a nation after World War I Russia had undergone humiliating defeat at the hands of Germany. Also the powerful Austria-Hungary monarchy had been deposed and banished, as Poland rose once again.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It was a happy moment when Poland again took up her birthright as a nation and proved to the world that what seemed to have died had only been sleeping. With remarkable energy, under the direction of the brilliant Paderewski and the formidable Pilsudski, she rapidly became a power in the councils of Europe. In this period of her reviving strength, had she so desired, she could have crushed the puny tyranny which had seized the reins of power in Russia. Poland chose to remain at peace with her former enemies when they lay in defeat, anarchy, and chaos.

I need not review the nonaggression pacts which Poland made with its neighbors back in the 1930's. In 1939 Nazi Germany, without a shadow of provocation or a scintilla of justification, violated its solemn treaty obligations and invaded Poland. In a short time, after Poland fought gallantly, brilliantly, and desperately against the Nazi onslaught from the west, the bandit leaders of Soviet Russia struck them from the rear and inflicted a temporary deathblow to the Polish Nation. A peaceful nation and an honorable people had stood up against overwhelming odds and fought the violation of Poland's territory and sovereignty. True to form, thieves and bandits eventually fall out. The Hitler Nazis and the Stalin Communists locked horns and the panzer divisions invaded Russia. Time does not permit the review of the duplicity and maltreatment Poland received at the hands of these two great military powers.

The Red army betrayal, as they allowed the Nazi overlords to slaughter the Polish people, will be recorded as history's most barbarous duplicity and treachery. The desire for liberty, ever emblazoned in the breasts of patriotic Poles, knew that the fight must continue. The defeat against overwhelming odds within the borders of Poland sent thousands upon thousands of Polish warriors to fight beyond its borders. Through a clever underground assistance, many escaped and joined the Allies in France and England. Polish aviators played a stirring part in the air battle over Great Britain and the Continent. Polish soldiers of the Carpathian brigade covered themselves with glory on the battle fronts of Africa. In Italy they did their share at the Battle of Monte Cassino. Future history will record the daring feats of Polish patriots for their allied comrades against Hitler and Stalin tyranny.

The discovery of the graves of over 5,000 Polish officers near Katyn on April 12, 1943, reveals a new low in international banditry, the like of which has never been surpassed in world history.

I am recalling these facts because it is our duty to keep alive in the minds of free nations everywhere the type of criminal intellect which predominates the brain of the present rulers of the communistic Soviet regime. It is evident now that the Democratic and free nations of the world must marshal all their forces to stamp out the spread of dictatorial aggression and not repeat the mistakes that were made after World War I when the isolationists got control of our Government and repudiated Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. Had America, the greatest nation of the world, accepted its responsibilities 30 years ago, aggression by dictators could have been stopped and World War II would have been avoided. Loyal Americans and friends of Poland must now not be stampeded by politicians to repeat the mistakes of 30 years ago.

We must now rally behind the United Nations, and it is my earnest hope and belief that the steps that we have taken in Korea to stop aggression will be the beginning of the age-old effort to successfully outlaw war. No international organization similar to the strength and power of the United Nations has ever been tried in world history before. Let us hope that we have found a solution.

We must follow through even if the road at present looks rough and rocky. If we do, Stalin will either be crushed from without or overthrown by his own subjects from within. The gallant Polish Nation, which has fought so many defensive wars in times past, will again achieve the independence, the liberty and the peace to which she is entitled. Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United Nations must be ready and on guard for any surprise attack.

Democratic nations in the past have conceded too much for peace and thereby encouraged the dictators to aggress, infiltrate, and conquer. Thank God America and the United Nations have discarded the policy of paying too big a price for peace. This was demonstrated when we turned the tables on tyrannical aggression in Korea.

The time has now come when every nation in the world who intends to survive, must know that it cannot make agreements with other nations and discard them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone, is to require that Russia withdraw all her military and civilian forces from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again. The same yardstick applies to other nations under the whiplash of tyranny. The democratic nations wanted peace too much when the war was raging with Japan. That was before the atom bomb appeared on the scene. Unfortunate concessions were made to Russia for her help in the Japanese war theater.

The mistakes made at Yalta, 6 years ago today, in yielding to the Russians must be corrected and rectified. At that time our military leaders underestimated our military strength or the atom bomb. We did not know then that the atom bomb was soon to knock Japan into surrender. Yalta and Tehran and the results of the mistakes incident to those conclaves, will be a threat to world peace until the day comes when the Soviet aggressor retreats behind its own border. Russia has broken its promises—agreements made at Yalta and Tehran should be thrown in the wastebasket. Appeasement did not work at Munich, Yalta, or China because Hitler and Stalin are vultures of the same kind, as we learned in 1939 and again since the shooting war terminated in 1945.

Our bipartisan foreign policy must continue as long as the shadow of war hangs over the globe. I do not doubt that ultimately, this shadow will be lifted, the iron curtain dissolved and mankind permitted again to march in peace and security toward a goal now hidden from us. Then there will be justice and freedom for all. Then justice will be done for the benefit of the peoples now shackled under the clouds of tyranny and shut off from the sunlight of liberty.

Poland has shaken off tyranny before and Poland will do it again.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LARCADE (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two speeches.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Messrs. HORAN, POULSON, and BENDER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to include a letter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement he made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SCHWABE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include a letter from a constituent and in the other an address by Mr. BUFFETT on March 18, 1947.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech on reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include in one an interchange of correspondence, and in the other an article.

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks, notwithstanding the extension exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. WOODROW W. JONES), for the remainder of the week, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

180. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

181. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

182. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

183. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

184. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting concrete statements and tabulations of the reclamation program as reflected in the President's budget; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 400. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 403. A bill providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 94. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 95. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina; with amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 624. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chisako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl; with amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 667. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 676. A bill to amend Private Law 814 of the Eighty-first Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale; with amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Aenny Blank; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 859. A bill for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis; with amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis; with amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann; with amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe; with amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson; with amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann; with amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe, Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa; with amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Lum Ying; with amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta); with amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders; with amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1840. A bill for the relief of Bernard Spielmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; with amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian; with amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 49. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2460. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 2461. A bill to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2462. A bill to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters were killed while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 2463. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 2464. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to provide additional financial assistance to municipalities and other political subdivisions for their airport development projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2467. A bill to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2468. A bill regulating hours of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 2469. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2470. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2471. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2472. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2473. A bill to provide for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 2474. A bill to grant pensions to the widows of certain persons who served less than 90 days in the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2475. A bill to remove the limitation on the commencement of prosecutions for offenses arising from espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2476. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2477. A bill to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2478. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2479. A bill to provide an increase in compensation for certain officers and employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2480. A bill to provide that a regional office of the Veterans' Administration shall be maintained in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2481. A bill to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2482. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2483. A bill creating a commission on Federal reimbursement to States and local governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2484. A bill to provide for the allocation of cellophane so as to insure an adequate supply thereof during the present emergency for use in wrapping food and food products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2485. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2486. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2487. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2488. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 2489. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which prevent effective control of food prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2490. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2491. A bill to grant certain former officers of the Army who enlisted for aviation cadet training certain lump-sum payments of which they were deprived by the enactment of the Flight Officer Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2492. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2493. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2494. A bill to restrict the application of section 1154 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the dispensing of intoxicants to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2495. A bill to restrict the application of section 1154 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the dispensing of intoxicants to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 121. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 122. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it with particular reference to reprieves of German war criminals; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations conducted pursuant to House Resolution 51; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 124. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 125. Resolution for investigation of possible sabotage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Res. 126. Resolution requesting the Attorney General to furnish information with respect to the railroad accident near Woodbridge, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Mario Gomez Coelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Orlando Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2498. A bill for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Gamel Mohfooz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Alexander George John McKerrow and George Edgar McKerrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Sarah Kabacznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Burkwitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Carl Weitlanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Jacobowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Henry S. Watcke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Paul Dacut or Pawlo Dacsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

38. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Montgomery, Pa., urging that the State and Federal Governments take immediate action in the construction of flood-control devices in the valley of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

39. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted on January 25, 1951, by the board of directors of the Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, requesting the Members of Congress and all Federal agencies governing the control of such supplies, equipment, and transportation that they give full consideration to the necessary requirements of the industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

40. Also, telegram from the executive committee of the Greater Paterson Council of Churches, urging the prompt sending of needed grain to India as the most dynamic thing democratic America can do both morally and diplomatically; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

41. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dr. A. Albers, president, Ostasiatischer Verein Hamburg-Bremen E. V., relative to the fate and welfare of those German nationals who have been driven from their homes and have been deprived of their property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us. Grant us this day the grace to live on the altitudes of our aspirations. As servants of Thine and of the Nation and of the peoples of this shattered earth, stricken, bleeding, starving, save us from false choices and guide our hands and minds to heal and bind and build and bless. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 2192. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and offer other routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NEW JERSEY RAILROAD TRAGEDY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address myself for 2 minutes to New Jersey's tragedy of Tuesday evening, the railroad wreck in which 83 people gave their lives, and countless others were seriously injured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the outset I desire to express my deepest sympathy to those who have suffered in any manner therefrom, and particularly to those who have lost forever the loved ones whose lives were taken in this needless tragic catastrophe.

I might say, Mr. President, that among those whose lives were snuffed out in this horrible accident was Mr. George McCarter, one of New Jersey's leading lawyers and the son of one of New Jersey's greatest of all time attorneys general.

Throughout the history of mankind, there have been similar tragedies. Some have been the result of unknown causes. I dare say that God in his wisdom has purposely visited some of them upon defiant violators of his laws. But for the most part, I am sure that they have been the result directly or indirectly of the hapless errors of judgment on the part of responsible authorities in every given instance.

That New Jersey's tragedy on Tuesday was one of the worst in railroad history, no one can gainsay or deny.

Mr. President, I shall withhold judgment upon the major factors which contributed to this awful miscarriage of safety principles, those principles to which our Nation has in more recent years dedicated so much of its resources at all levels of government for proper solutions. I am sure that the pending hearings in New York City before the Interstate Commerce Commission will bring to light those errors of human judgment and whatever there may be of mechanical fault involved. I am sure that justice, as we practice it, will properly adjudge any who may be guilty of wanton negligence.

But, sir, there is one factor which the people of America should not overlook or forget in the immediate catastrophe. We know that selfish labor interests are conducting a railroad strike in what has come to be a most crucial period of the Nation's history. We know that precious lives of American mothers' sons are being sacrificed in Korea for our free way of life; we know that the current strike runs directly counter to all of the things in which we believe and for which we happily contribute in these most critical times, and as to the tragic call upon innocent lives in New Jersey's costly disaster, we know that without the strike, the death toll would have been materially reduced. The facts in this connection speak for themselves without regard to the mechanical and human failures involved.

No one can deny that an overcrowded train is a hazard. No one can deny that, but for the strike, there would have been fewer passengers on the fateful train which was to bring so much sorrow to so many.

Mr. President, were I a party to the current strike, I would always wonder to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the end of my time whether or not I had contributed to the sorrow and misery which must necessarily follow in the wake of New Jersey's tragedy of Tuesday evening.

Perhaps it takes such things to awaken us to a full consciousness of our responsibilities to each other and to the Nation.

I fervently hope that at least this shocking incident will cause every selfish interest in the country to pause and give thought to the indirect contributions which it is so easily possible for them to make to tragedy when they disregard the Nation's basic needs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what my distinguished colleague has said with regard to the tragic disaster in New Jersey. I appreciate what he has said, and I join with him in the sympathy he has expressed and in the tenor of his remarks.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Some of our good friends on the other side of the aisle feel that they need a week to try to convince the people that their party should have a little more consideration than it has had in the past. I agree that it will take that long, and longer, for them to do so. Inasmuch as there is important committee work to be done, which can be done next week, I thought we should accommodate them, and give them that opportunity. I am sorry we cannot give them longer, because I am sure they need longer. However, I wish to announce that there will be no votes on any controversial matters next week. Therefore they can feel free and at ease to go out and do what they can for a lost cause.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the majority leader for his very forthright statement. I appreciate that type of leadership. In the past it has been a leadership of indecision. We never knew whether there would be an important vote or not. I thank the distinguished majority leader and compliment him on his fairness in stating that next week there will be no vote on a controversial matter.

If I may be permitted to say a word further, we did pretty well in 1950, with the time allotted to us. Perhaps in 1952, as a result of the Senator's fairness, the American people will do a wonderful job, and produce the result which we anticipate. So I thank the Senator for the extra days he is giving us during the Lincoln's Birthday season.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I find that the more time our friends on the other side of the aisle have, the worse they do. That is one reason why I am willing to be liberal. I desire to be fair with the Senator and let him know my reasons.

Mr. WHERRY. We thank the Senator for his kindness. If the best he can do is to give us a week, we appreciate that, and we will let the people decide. They will be the judges of who does well and who does not do well. I am satisfied that we made a great start in 1950, and I think we are going to do a wonderful job in 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was stipulated that there be no debate during the morning hour proceedings.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did wish to state that some bills may be taken up during the latter part of the week, but if there is any controversy over them, and any Senator wishes to have them go over, they will go over.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the annual report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1951.*

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the tenth report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid to China and the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign-aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended September 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1951.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

INCREASE IN CERTAIN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO VIOLATIONS OF PASSPORT LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change from 3 years to 10 years the statute of limitations, applicable to violations of the passport laws and the laws relating to the falsification of evidence of citizenship (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ACT PROVIDING CODIFICATION OF NAVIGATION LAWS RELATING TO ADMEASUREMENT, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending legislation to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENTS, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake certain additional developments in connection with the Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTIVITIES OF TEMPORARY AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LETTER FROM SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF SAMOA TO GOVERNOR OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a letter from the speaker of the house, Legislature of American Samoa, to the Governor of American Samoa, dated December 11, 1950, relating to the administration of the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

VIOLATION OF LAW AGAINST INCURRING OBLIGATIONS ABOVE EXPENDITURES

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, relating to a technical violation of law against incurring obligations above expenditures authorized by section 1211 (1) (2) of Public Law 759, approved September 6, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report on the improvement of Federal-aid highways, for the fiscal year ended June 30,

1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DETAIL OF OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IN CONNECTION WITH CIVIL AVIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the detail of officers of the Armed Forces in any duty or position with the Department of Commerce in connection with the work of promoting civil aviation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first part of the annual report of the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Enrolled Joint Resolution 1

"Whereas both Houses of the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session of such Congress, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the Office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the Office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the Office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the Office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the Office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the Office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress" '; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

"SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D. C., to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"JOHN A. WATKINS,
"President of Senate.
"W. O. HUGHE.,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"Approved January 31, 1951.
"HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
"Governor of the State of Indiana."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate concurring, ratifying proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein):

"Whereas by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America the following article was proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two (2) years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths (¾) of the several States within seven (7) years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress"; and

"Whereas it is provided by the above articles that it shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislature of three-fourths (¾) of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein), That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State, to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"ORY J. ARMSTRONG,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., relating to the burning of the Hawkins Point Ammunition Pier in Baltimore; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, urging an all-out effort for complete mobilization, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Business and Professional Women's Club, Ashland, Ky., relating to the use by the enemy in Korea of arms manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorializing the President of the United State to immediately go on record as favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Administration intermediary hospital and rehabilitation center at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., with a strong department of physical medicine

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the late President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, knowing from his own experience the value of physical medicine and after a survey of the possibilities of Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., gave his moral support for the establishment of a hospital with a strong department of physical medicine; and

"Whereas Mr. Roosevelt, then President of the United States, when informed that there were a large number of veterans from various sections of the United States here "on their own" to regain their health though there were no Veterans' Administration facilities available, the President of the United States brought the matter to the attention of General Hines and asked him to survey the possibilities at Truth or Consequences (Hot Spring), N. Mex., for a Veterans' Administration hospital, with a strong department of physical medicine; and

"Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, each in their respective department and national conventions, endorsed the establishment of a Veterans' Administration Hospital at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., for the benefit of their disabled comrades: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States be and he is hereby memorialized to take immediate and proper action as has been resolved by the national conventions of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars by going on record as favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Administration intermediary hospital and rehabilitation center at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., with a strong department of physical medicine, and to request

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Veterans' Administration to take immediate action to establish this much needed facility.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"Approved by me this 30th day of January 1951.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorial by the Twentieth Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico Representatives therein, to oppose the drafting of 18-year-old youths

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas it is contemplated that a bill be presented to the Congress of the United States changing the age of drafting men from 19 to 18 years of age; and

"Whereas the drafting of 18-year-olds will interrupt the Nation's youth and the completion of their high-school education; and

"Whereas the United States has a great source of youth to meet the demands of a sufficient Army for the prosecution of the defense of the United States and of any offensive in other parts of the world; and

"Whereas the drafting of 18-year-olds at this time would have a serious effect on the morale of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the Members thereof from New Mexico, are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to defeat any proposed bill which would require the drafting of 18-year-old youths; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a few days ago a group of combat-wounded veterans met in convention at Indianapolis, Ind. The convention was officially for the third zone conference of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The third zone consists of the States of Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio. However, members of the organization from almost every State of the Union were represented.

The convention considered and unanimously adopted a resolution which I consider to be of the utmost importance, especially in view of the fact that it comes from young men who have been tested in battle and not found wanting. While I highly admire a number of other veterans' organizations, this one stands out specially. Each of these young men has been wounded in combat and knows whereof he speaks. I should like to have the resolution appropriately referred and inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point. It deals with the theft of secrets from the Pentagon. It covers the recommendation of these combat-wounded veterans as to what action should be taken by the Justice Department and by the Pentagon, having to do with the theft and publication by an alleged columnist.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Whereas Drew Pearson has lead a smear attack against so many national and international figures who have attempted to fight communism, some of the subjects of his smear attacks being Gen. Douglas MacArthur, James V. Forrestal, Chiang Kai-shek, the various heads of the Un-American Activities Committee, and Senator Joe McCarthy; and

Whereas Pearson has recently been conducting a campaign in his column to discredit the generals in charge of our troops in Korea, as well as the GI's doing the fighting; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Army has stated in a letter that Pearson has been publishing in his column secret military information which indicates that there is a spy in the Pentagon stealing these secrets and passing them to Pearson; and

Whereas it appears that if Pearson has access to the secret information as stated by the Secretary of the Army, he undoubtedly has access to unlimited numbers of like secret documents; and

Whereas this organization feels that this constitutes the gravest threat to our national security and endangers the lives of every member of our Armed Forces, as well as those being drafted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Military Order of the Purple Heart in convention assembled for the third zone conference at Indianapolis, Ind., this 4th day of February 1951, go on record as demanding that every facility of our Intelligence Service be put to work to immediately find the spy who is stealing military secrets and that then criminal prosecution be immediately commenced against him and against everyone else who has violated our espionage laws by working with this spy.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from B. R. Dugdale, secretary of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, a resolution adopted by the seventy-ninth convention of that group on an issue affecting every American farmer; namely, selective service. I know that this resolution expresses the views of countless farmers throughout America, as well as their organizations. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Agriculture, particularly the production of dairy, livestock, and poultry products is a basic industry essential to national defense and the preservation of the moral and physical strength of America and her free world democratic allies. Consideration must be given to the fact that reserve supplies of dairy and livestock products are diminishing. A decided shift away from milk and dairy production toward grain and other types of mechanized farming that can utilize import labor, is already in evidence.

Dairy, livestock, and poultry operations require workers of special experience, skill, and aptitude. Selective-service boards should recognize these facts and in the interest of national welfare and defense, retain such essential farm workers on the basis of volume of production and giving consideration to each individual case on the basis of history of farm work and critical family situation.

We believe there should be greater uniformity among the various draft boards in considering these principles. We insist that bona fide farmers be included in the membership of selective-service boards.

In view of the importance of the dairy, livestock, and poultry industry and the threat to sustained production, we recommend that selective-service legislation be enacted as soon as possible to remedy the present threat to our Nation's food emergency.

PRIORITY FOR SCHOOL BUILDING MATERIALS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, SHOREWOOD, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the educators of Wisconsin, like those of the other States of the Union, are deeply concerned lest in the situation of tightening supplies of building materials the schools of this Nation be forgotten and not be provided with adequate wherewithal to meet increasing enrollments. I have this morning received from one of the school boards of my State in Shorewood, Wis., a resolution urging that there be allocated sufficiently high priorities so that schools can obtain necessary building materials, equipment, and so forth, to handle their problems. I thoroughly agree with the sentiment expressed in this resolution and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 4, VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.

Whereas ODM and NPA are apparently ignoring the schools in planning the Nation's defense; and

Whereas to house schools and keep them running we must have priorities for necessary materials and equipment; and

Whereas schools face greater loads than ever before and are being called upon for use and services in the civil-defense program of the Nation; and

Whereas an educated soldier is vital to national security; and

Whereas an educated and resourceful people are necessary for national survival: Be it

Resolved by this board, That the White House, Congress, and defense officials be advised to place a vigorous emphasis on the importance of a high standard of education for both military achievement and industrial production, and that recognition be given to the basic needs of schools over the Nation in meeting the greater enrollments and demands on school plants and facilities for civil-defense and related mobilization programs, and that competent educational consultants and administrators be

used by NPA in planning school priorities, and that speedy implementation of these suggestions be initiated by those entrusted with the grave responsibilities for planning for defense and mobilization; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to (1) the President of the United States; (2) all Members of the Senate and House from Wisconsin; (3) Charles E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; (4) William Henry Harrison, Administrator, National Production Authority; (5) Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education.

Passed and adopted this 26th day of January 1951.

HERMAN W. PFEIL,
District Clerk, Board of Education, Shorewood School District No. 4, Shorewood, Wis.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. AIKEN), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 271. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 53. Resolution to investigate personnel needs and practices of the various governmental departments and agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 81), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report an original resolution (S. Res. 71), and I submit a report (No. 89) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings and making investigations as authorized by subsection (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending on January 1, 1952, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such professional, administrative, and clerical personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,870, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN EAST COAST OIL TANKER INDUSTRY—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 82)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pursuant to Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, I submit a report on labor-management relations in the east coast oil tanker industry, including the individual views of the senior Senator from Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed with the individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Montana.

INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—APPREHENSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS WITNESSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution providing for apprehension of certain persons as witnesses, and I submit a report (No. 83) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar for the information of the Senate. I hope that before the resolution is called up that some of the persons named may come out of hiding and make themselves available to the committee. I expect to call the resolution up at an early date. This committee has followed the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary and has asked the Sergeant at Arms to subpena the witnesses in addition to other extensive efforts to subpena them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 65) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Whereas the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce has reported to the Senate that subpenas have been issued for Rocco Fischetti, Charles Fischetti, Murray L. Humphreys, Jacob Guzik, William G. O'Brien, John Angersola alias King, Moe Dalitz alias Davis, Samuel T. Haas, Morris Kleinman, Louis Rothkapf alias Rhody, Samuel "Gameboy" Miller, Morris "Mushy" Wexler, Samuel Tucker, George Angersola alias King, John Croft, James Brink, and Louis Levinson, and that these persons are important witnesses, necessary to the successful conclusion of inquiries being conducted by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, and that the said persons have not been located for service despite diligent search on the part of persons employed by the committee, and peace officers assisting the committee and that thereafter new subpenas calling for the appearance of these persons were handed to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, pursuant to the policy recommendation of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, with the request that he endeavor to make service of these subpenas through all the facilities at his command, and that the Sergeant at Arms, after using great diligence in endeavoring to locate the said witnesses and to serve them, has reported to the chairman of the committee that he had been unable to effectuate service; and that the committee has reasonable cause to believe and does believe that the named persons will not appear in response to subpenas but are in hiding or have left the United States in order to evade the service of subpenas upon them and will continue to be unavailable for service of subpenas upon them in order to avoid testifying before the committee; and

Whereas the appearance and testimony of the witnesses named before is material and necessary in order that the committee may properly execute the functions assigned to it and may obtain information necessary as a basis for proposed legislation: It is therefore

Resolved, That the President of the Senate issue warrants commanding the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, or such persons as may be deputized by him, to take into custody the bodies of Rocco Fischetti; Charles Fischetti; Murray L. Humphreys; Jacob Guzik; William G. O'Brien; John Angersola, alias King; Moe Dalitz, alias Davis; Samuel T. Haas; Morris Kleinman; Louis Rothkapf, alias Rhody; Samuel "Gameboy" Miller; Morris "Mushy" Wexler; Samuel Tucker; George Angersola, alias King; John Croft; James Brink; Louis Levinson; and to bring the said persons before the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce at Washington, D. C., or if the said committee be no longer in existence when the arrest is made, before the bar of the Senate or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, then and there to answer such questions pertinent to the matter under inquiry as the said special committee, the Senate itself or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate;

That, for the purpose of executing warrants issued in accordance with this resolution the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate may by all-inclusive order or orders deputize all law-enforcement officers of the Federal Government; and

That the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, the Senate itself or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may discharge any of the persons taken into custody under the authorization of this resolution upon proper assurance by recognition, or otherwise, that he will appear to give testimony when required to do so. The committee, the Senate, or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may require such assurances as it deems necessary, not to exceed $25,000 for any one witness.

For the purpose of discharging any person from custody and ordering assurances, one member of the said committee, or of an appropriately designated standing committee of the Senate, shall be a quorum.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks short statements prepared by the staff of the committee as to the background of the persons involved, and why they have been sought, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

CHARLES AND ROCCO FISCHETTI

Both Charles and Rocco Fischetti have been leading members of the Capone syndicate in Chicago for the better part of 30 years.

Charles Fischetti particularly is today unquestionably one of the most important underworld characters in the Nation. He has been arrested numerous times. In 1933 he and Murray Humphreys were taken into custody and questioned with reference to the murder of the secretary of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Union, Local 569. He has maintained close contact with such syndicate members in Chicago as Jacob Guzik, Rocco de Stefano, Paul Ricca, and Tony Accardo. He and Tony Accardo joined together in their flight to Mexico to avoid the committee's subpenas.

Charles Fischetti has also been associated with John and Fred Angersola, of Cleveland. He was active in the gambling games conducted in the Wofford Hotel in Miami, Fla., along with Joe DiCarle of the Cleveland syndicate, Joe Massei of Detroit, and Joe Adonis. Charles Fischetti has also been associated with Jack Dragna, prominent west-coast

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hoodlum. He was picked up in a car with Dragna upon returning from a gambling ship off the coast of California.

There was strong indication that he and his brother, Rocco, loaned $300,000 to the Flamingo Hotel venture in Nevada. They are linked to the venture by Barney Ruditsky, who handled bad checks for the Flamingo during "Bugsy" Siegel's regime. Ruditsky claimed that the Fischettis, "Longy" Zwillman of the New York-New Jersey gang, "Nig" Rosen of Philadelphia, and Louis Shomberg have money in this hotel. Charles Fischetti was also reported to have been associated with Virginia Hill, "Bugsy" Siegel's ex-girl friend.

It is alleged that Charles and Rocco Fischetti were involved in two notorious gambling spots near Chicago—the Vernon Country Club and Ralph's Place. Charles Fischetti also has an interest in the 229 Club and the Black Hawk Club in Chicago. The committee has been unable to find out the nature of these clubs because of Fischetti's flight from the committee's subpena.

Rocco Fischetti is closely identified with the activities of his brother, Charles, in gambling ventures in Cook and Lake Counties in Illinois. He was once the bodyguard of John Capone.

MURRAY (THE CAMEL) HUMPHREYS

Humphreys has been a long-time leading member of the Capone syndicate. He was considered the strong-armed man of Al Capone. He was arrested on numerous occasions in connection with labor racketeering, gambling, and vice activities.

He was named in an injunction with other syndicate members as having attempted to take over the Bartenders and Beverage Dispensers Union, Local 278, in Chicago; he was questioned along with Charles Fischetti regarding the murder of the secretary of the Hoisting and Portable Engineers' Union, Local 569; he was described in 1933 by the chief investigator for the State's attorney's office as public enemy No. 1 and the czar of business rackets in Chicago. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury in July 1933, along with Al Capone and 22 others on charges of conspiracy to dominate the cleaning and dyeing industry and carbonated beverages and linen-supply industries through kidnaping, strikes, bombings, and acids; he was sentenced to 18 months in the penitentiary and fined $5,000 for tax evasion. He has a close association with top Capone syndicate members, Paul Ricca, Louis Campagna, the Fischettis, and Jacob Guzik. He and Guzik were reported to be the brains behind the wire-service deal, which sought to push Continental Press out of business.

His name (or rather one of his aliases—J. Harris) was found in "Mo Mo" Adomo's confidential address book, which was seized by Los Angeles police, and which contained the names of leading hoodlums throughout the country. Adomo is Dragna's first lieutenant on the west coast. In 1947 Humphreys was reported to have been in Los Angeles, along with Jacob Guzik, to see Dragna about continuing to take the Capone syndicate wire service—Trans-American.

JACOB GUZIK

Guzik was referred to as the business manager of the Capone syndicate in Capone's heyday. He was accused by James Ragen, Sr., of having tried to muscle into Continental Press, along with other Capone syndicate members—Tony Accardo and Murray Humphreys. Ragen made this statement to the State's attorney's office because he was afraid of his life. Shortly after he made his statement, he was shot and later died. The Capone syndicate then formed its own news service—Trans-American Publishing and News Service, Inc. Guzik was reported to be the brains in back of this deal.

Guzik was sentenced to 5 years in the penitentiary and fined $7,500 for income-tax evasion in 1930. In 1940, he was indicted for violation of the Federal Communications Commission Act with other syndicate members—Frank "Chew Tobacco" Ryan and Hymie "Loud Mouth" Levin.

Guzik and Murray Humphreys were reported to have gone to Los Angeles in 1947 to see Jack Dragna about retaining the Capone syndicate racing news service.

Guzik has been closely affiliated with all the leading members of the Capone syndicate, including John Patton, Frank Nitti (both of whom are now dead), the Fischettis, Paul Ricca, Louis Campagna and, especially Tony Accardo. Guzik today is Accardo's partner in the policy racket in Chicago.

WILLIAM G. (BUTSY) O'BRIEN

Butsy O'Brien (alias William Keough) was formerly the southeastern representative of Moe Annenberg's Nation-wide news service with headquarters in Miami. In 1940, O'Brien was named in a Federal indictment for being involved in schemes to take over this news service, which was abandoned by Moe Annenberg. Named with him in this indictment were such individuals as Arthur V. (Mickey) McBride, Thomas F. Kelly and Mushy Wexler of Cleveland, William Molasky of St. Louis, James Ragen, Sr., of Chicago, and others.

O'Brien is the Florida chief of Continental Press' outlet in Florida—Intrastate News. Through his service, the S. & G. Gambling Syndicate received their racing information. It was this service that was involved in the cut-off in 1949 when the Capone mob muscled into S. & G. It will be recalled that S. & G didn't receive renewed service until after Harry Russell, the Capone mob's representative, was made a partner in the syndicate. O'Brien is the individual who actually ordered the cut-off.

JOHN ANGERSOLA AND GEORGE ANGERSOLA

John Angersola (alias John King) has been closely associated with criminal syndicate members in the Cleveland area and in Florida. More recently he has moved his operations principally to Florida, but before that he and Alfred Polizzi—notorious Cleveland hoodlum—were actively engaged in the slot machine and gambling rackets in Ohio and Kentucky.

Angersola is also closely tied in with Alfred Polizzi in the ownership of valuable real estate in the Miami, Fla., area, and he is intimately connected with prominent hoodlums throughout the country by virtue of his interest in such various hoodlum hotel hangouts as the Wofford, Grand, and Raleigh Hotels in Miami, Fla.

The Wofford Hotel, the well-known meeting place for hoodlums from all over the country, has included among its owners John Angersola, two relatives of his—Otto Lorentzen and John Cardone—Max Marmorstein, a hotel manager and real estate operator from Cleveland, and Frank Erickson and Anthony Carfano, from New York.

Angersola was also associated in gambling games at the Wofford with Little Augie Pisano and Mike Coppola of New York, Joe Massei and Joe Burnstein of Detroit, Charles Fischetti of Chicago, Angelo DiCarlo of New York, and Willie Weisberg of Philadelphia.

John Angersola is one of the creditors in the Grand Hotel in Miami which his brother Fred is connected with and which is another hoodlum haunt, and he also loaned $25,000 to Thomas Cassara toward the building of the Raleigh Hotel in Miami.

George Angersola has been closely tied in with his brother John's gambling activities, both in Cleveland and in Florida. While he is not reflected in the ownership of the Wofford Hotel, he has been one of its frequent patrons along with well-known hoodlums from all over the country.

MOE DALITZ (ALIAS DAVIS)

Dalitz is a leading member of the Cleveland syndicate, although he was one of the few who have managed to avoid a police record. However, his association with syndicate members dates back 20 years or more.

Dalitz, along with another leading syndicate member, Lou Rothkapf, was implicated in the famous murder of a Cleveland City councilman, William Potter, in 1931. It was alleged that Potter was killed because he was about to expose a tie-in between city officials and an advertising company operated by Dalitz.

Dalitz and other syndicate members have been connected with such notorious gambling clubs in Ohio and northern Kentucky as the Mounds Club, the Pettibone Club, the Jungle Inn, the Beverly Hills Club, the Lookout House and the Richmond Country Club, among others.

The syndicate has been able to control the actions of law-enforcement officials to such a degree that their illegal operation is continuing almost unmolested.

Dalitz and his associates also own the fabulous Desert Inn in Las Vegas, Nev. Dalitz is treasurer of the inn. Dalitz has been and still is in a number of legitimate businesses in the Cleveland area.

SAM HAAS

Known as the lawyer for the Cleveland syndicate, Haas has managed to avoid a police record. However, he is closely tied in with the syndicate in its gambling and business ventures.

His name has come up in connection with the Desert Inn, the Cleveland syndicate's famous gambling joint in Nevada, and with certain juke box distribution companies, later found also to be handling slot machines.

Haas also owns valuable property in the Palm Beach, Fla., area—the same area in which Arthur McBride of Cleveland owns a large amount of property. Haas owns the property on which the Palm Beach Ambassador is located. This hotel was built by Burnstein Bros., of Cleveland. One of the officers of Burnstein Bros. is Allard Roen. Roen was the recipient of telephone calls from a west coast gambler, believed to be Mickey Cohen.

MORRIS KLEINMAN

Kleinman, another leading member of the Cleveland gambling syndicate, is an ex-pugilist and ex-bootlegger with a prison record which includes a 3-year stint in jail for income tax evasion.

He has been associated with other syndicate members in all their important gambling operations and in their ties with leading hoodlums throughout the country.

Kleinman is vice president of the Desert Inn in Las Vegas, the inn is controlled by the Cleveland syndicate.

LOUIS ROTHKAPF (ALIAS RHODY)

Rothkapf, an important member of the Cleveland syndicate, has been identified with all the syndicate's principal gambling operations in Ohio and Nevada.

He has been in close touch with Abner Zwillman, big east-coast gambler, and with Mickey Cohen and Jack Dragna on the west coast.

SAMUEL "GAMEBOY" MILLER

Another member of the Cleveland Syndicate, Miller is closely identified with the syndicate in its widespread profitable gambling operations.

He has appeared to be the syndicate's representative in an important Florida gambling operation—the Island Club—which is located at Sunny Islands Casino in Dade County. He is associated in this venture

with Samuel P. Cohen, of the S. & G. Syndicate, Herbert Manheim, of the Detroit gambling fraternity, and Jack Friedlander, a New Jersey lieutenant of Longie Zwillman.

MORRIS "MUSHY" WEXLER

Wexler, a friend and long associate of Arthur McBride's, today owns the Empire News Service, Continental Press' outlet in Ohio. The Empire News Service is the lifeblood of the illegal bookmaking business in Ohio. Wexler also owns a racing stable and has a famous restaurant in Cleveland.

Wexler, in 1939, was indicted with McBride, James Ragen, Sr., William Molasky, of St. Louis, and others for conspiracy to carry from one State to another a list of prizes drawn or awarded by a lottery in violation of the criminal code.

SAMUEL TUCKER

Tucker has long been identified with all the principal gambling operations of the Cleveland Syndicate. In 1930, he was indicted along with Dalitz and Kleinman for operating a huge rum running ring. He is a stockholder in the Desert Inn at Las Vegas.

JOHN CROFT, JAMES BRINK, AND LOUIS LEVINSON

These individuals are local northern Kentucky gamblers, who were taken in as minor partners by the Cleveland Syndicate when it moved into the Newport-Covington, Ky., gambling clubs. The fact that the Cleveland syndicate took in these minor gamblers indicates a new trend in the methods used by the large gambling syndicates. In the old days these small-time gamblers would probably have been shot.

CITATION OF JOSEPH AIUPPA, ALIAS ANTON PALUNAS, ALIAS JOEY O'BRIEN, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 84) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio to the end that the said Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JOSEPH DECARLO, ALIAS "THE WOLF," ALIAS DICARLO, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 85) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said Joseph DeCarlo, alias "The Wolf," alias DiCarlo, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JAMES LICAVOLI, ALIAS JACK WHITE, FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing James Licavoli, alias Jack White, for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 86) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of James Licavoli, alias Jack White, to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said James Licavoli, alias Jack White, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF PETER TREMONT FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing Peter Tremont for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 87) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Peter Tremont to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Peter Tremont may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF DAVID N. KESSEL FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report an original resolution citing David N. Kessel for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 88) thereon. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of David N. Kessel to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of California, to the end that the said David N. Kessel may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1950, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 21,415 during the month of December, bringing the total to 2,184,693.

The December civilian employment by the Military Establishment totaled 988,441, and in the civilian agencies the total was 1,196,252.

There was a net decrease in the civilian agencies during the month, resulting primarily from a seasonal decrease of 1,535 in the Department of Agriculture.

Civilian employment by the Military Establishment increased by 21,520, including an increase of 880 detailed to the mutual defense assistance program.

Among the new emergency agencies in December the National Production Authority was employing 789; the Defense Transportation Administration was employing 31;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Economic Stabilization Agency was employing 925; the Federal Civilian Defense Administration was employing 99; and the Office of Defense Mobilization was employing 8.

These figures were published today in a compilation of personnel reports submitted by the various agencies of the Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The same reports showed the civilian payroll in the executive branch during November totaled $611,027,000, an increase of $8,000,000 over the payroll costs in October.

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1950 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,184,693	2,163,278	+21,415	$611,027	$602,968	+$8,059
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,196,252	1,196,357	−105	344,062	341,555	+2,507
2. National Military Establishment	988,441	966,921	+21,520	266,965	261,113	+5,852
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,958	1,942	+16	844	787	+57
Department of the Army	433,968	425,100	+8,868	108,711	106,646	+2,065
Department of the Air Force	186,359	183,505	+2,854	51,379	50,695	+684
Department of the Navy	366,126	356,374	+9,752	106,031	102,985	+3,046

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table V on page 10 shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the mutual defense assistance program by the Commerce and State Departments, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950; and pay for November 1950, and comparison with October 1950*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	$21,459	$21,082		$377	74,285	72,750		1,535
Commerce [1 2 3]	17,730	17,893	$163		56,574	56,819	245	
Interior	18,211	17,997		214	59,840	59,429		411
Justice	10,203	10,687	484		27,264	27,609	345	
Labor	2,308	2,216		92	6,473	6,430		43
Post Office	129,665	129,869	204		494,937	495,278	341	
State	7,675	7,997	322		25,053	25,474	421	
Treasury	28,605	29,331	726		87,596	87,877	281	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	149	149			329	324		5
Bureau of the Budget	555	557	2		505	510	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	17	18	1		78	73		5
National Security Council [4]	9	9			17	17		
National Security Resources Board	240	[5] 241	1		490	409		81
Council of Economic Advisers	22	22			36	38	2	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	3	1		5	7	2	
Emergency agencies (1950–51):								
Defense Transport Administration		4	4		17	31	14	
Economic Stabilization Agency	3	19	16		96	225	129	
Federal Civil Defense Administration [6]						99	99	
Office of Defense Mobilization [7]						8	8	
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	112	114	2		294	312	18	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,675	1,729	54		4,918	5,016	98	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	9	9			15	15		
Office of the Housing Expediter	900	911	11		2,621	2,530		91
Philippine Alien Property Administration	9	8		1	58	58		
Philippine War Damage Commission	115	103		12	304	72		232
War Claims Commission	34	33		1	111	113	2	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	67	69	2		639	639		
Atomic Energy Commission	1,976	1,997	21		5,090	5,107	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	261	248		13	567	567		
Civil Service Commission	1,179	1,216	37		3,669	3,719	50	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	62	67	5		124	128	4	
Federal Communications Commission	508	512	4		1,239	1,232		7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	414	416	2		1,089	1,076		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	177	185	8		328	333	5	
Federal Power Commission	303	309	6		722	735	13	
Federal Security Agency [8]	10,003	10,187	184		34,865	34,891	26	
Federal Trade Commission	287	287			623	623		
General Accounting Office	2,678	2,653		25	7,093	7,041		52
General Services Administration	6,919	7,145	226		26,478	26,878	400	
Government Printing Office	2,613	2,506		107	7,174	7,173		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,111	5,027		84	14,266	14,187		79
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			10	11	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	830	836	6		2,050	2,077	27	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,446	2,527	81		7,346	7,360	14	
National Capital Housing Authority	87	88	1		319	352	3	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	3	1		19	19		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	24	14		10	24	8		16
National Gallery of Art	84	83		1	300	319	19	
National Labor Relations Board	550	576	26		1,487	1,557	70	
National Mediation Board	62	69	7		114	113		1

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: November, 408; December, 347; a decrease of 60.

[2] December figure is exclusive of 285 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] Includes 780 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 137 over the November total of 632.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] Includes $48,042 obligated for Civil Defense Office before Federal Civil Defense Administration was established.

[6] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10186, dated Dec. 1, 1950, activated Dec. 1, 1950.

[7] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10193, dated Dec. 16, 1950, activated Dec. 21, 1950.

[8] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950, and pay for November 1950, and comparison with October 1950*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	October	November	Increase	Decrease	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
National Science Foundation [9]						24	24	
Panama Canal	$3,053	$3,202	$149		20,223	20,137		86
Railroad Retirement Board	677	666		$11	2,126	2,117		9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,509	1,525	16		3,517	3,454		63
Securities and Exchange Commission	453	460	7		1,054	1,054		
Selective Service System	1,360	1,396	36		7,212	7,466	254	
Smithsonian Institution	172	180	8		564	571	7	
Soldiers' Home	109	109			735	735		
Tariff Commission	99	98		1	214	212		2
Tax Court of the United States	55	57	2		132	133	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	4,699	4,428		271	14,850	15,161	311	
Veterans' Administration	53,312	54,213	901		188,178	187,550		628
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	341,555	344,062	3,727	1,220	1,196,357	1,196,252	3,255	3,360
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment			2,507				105	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [10]	787	844	57		1,942	1,953	16	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	96,195	98,288	2,093		380,693	389,134	8,441	
Outside continental United States	10,451	10,423		28	44,407	44,864	457	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	45,653	46,022	369		158,016	160,808	2,792	
Outside continental United States	5,042	5,357	315		25,489	25,551	62	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	96,502	99,306	2,804		330,138	338,254	8,116	
Outside continental United States	6,483	6,725	242		26,236	27,872	1,636	
Total, National Military Establishment	261,113	266,965	5,880	28	966,921	988,441	21,520	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			5,852				21,520	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	602,668	611,027	9,607	1,248	2,163,278	2,184,693	24,775	3,360
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			8,359				21,415	

[9] New agency established under authority of Public Law 507, 81st Cong., dated May 10, 1950, activated Dec. 12, 1950.

[10] Includes 18 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and 223 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	71,808	70,333		1,475
Commerce [1 2 3]	52,860	53,141	281	
Interior	53,257	52,976		281
Justice	26,774	27,112	338	
Labor	6,338	6,298		40
Post Office	493,098	493,440	342	
State	9,039	9,213	174	
Treasury	86,844	87,123	279	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	329	324		5
Bureau of the Budget	506	510	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	73		5
National Security Council [4]	17	17		
National Security Resources Board	490	409		81
Council of Economic Advisers	36	38	2	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	5	7	2	
Emergency agencies (1950-51):				
Defense Transport Administration	17	31	14	
Economic Stabilization Agency	96	225	129	
Federal Civil Defense Administration [5]		99	99	
Office of Defense Mobilization [6]		8	8	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	102	103	1	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,189	1,203	14	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	15	15		
Office of the Housing Expediter	2,595	2,503		92
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	35	29	
War Claims Commission	102	104	2	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	17		
Atomic Energy Commission	5,085	5,102	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	553	553		
Civil Service Commission	3,665	3,716	51	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	127	4	
Federal Communications Commission	1,214	1,207		7
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,089	1,076		13
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	328	333	5	
Federal Power Commission	722	735	13	
Federal Security Agency [7]	34,567	34,588	21	
Federal Trade Commission	623	623		
General Accounting Office	7,093	7,041		52
Independent agencies—Continued				
General Services Administration	26,415	26,819	404	
Government Printing Office	7,174	7,173		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,169	14,088		81
Indian Claims Commission	10	11	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,050	2,077	27	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,346	7,360	14	
National Capital Housing Authority	319	322	3	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	19		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	24	8		16
National Gallery of Art	300	319	19	
National Labor Relations Board	1,473	1,543	70	
National Mediation Board	114	113		1
National Science Foundation [8]		24	24	
Panama Canal	621	619		2
Railroad Retirement Board	2,126	2,117		9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3,507	3,444		63
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,054	1,054		
Selective Service System	6,976	7,227	251	
Smithsonian Institution	556	563	7	
Soldiers' Home	735	735		
Tariff Commission	214	212		2
Tax Court of the United States	132	133	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,850	15,161	311	
Veterans' Administration	186,653	186,045		608
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,137,519	1,137,646	2,961	2,834
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			127	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,940	1,957	17	
Department of the Army	380,693	389,134	8,441	
Department of the Air Force	158,016	160,808	2,792	
Department of the Navy	330,138	338,254	8,116	
Total, National Military Establishment	870,787	890,153	19,366	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			19,366	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,008,306	2,027,799	22,327	2,834
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			19,493	

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: November, 408; December, 347; a decrease of 60.

[2] December figure is exclusive of 285 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[3] Includes 789 employees for the National Production Authority, an increase of 137 over November total of 652.

[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[5] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10186, dated Dec. 1, 1950, activated Dec. 1, 1950.

[6] New agency established under authority of Executive Order No. 10193, dated Dec. 16, 1950, activated Dec. 21, 1950.

[7] Includes personnel for Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

[8] New agency established under authority of Public Law 507, 81st Cong., dated May 10, 1950, activated Dec. 12, 1950.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,477	2,417	----------	60
Commerce	3,714	3,678	----------	36
Interior	6,583	6,453	----------	130
Justice	490	497	7	----------
Labor	135	132	----------	3
Post Office	1,839	1,838	----------	1
State	16,014	16,261	247	----------
Treasury	752	754	2	----------
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	192	209	17	----------
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,729	3,813	84	----------
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	27	1	----------
Philippine Alien Property Administration	56	56	----------	----------
Philippine War Damage Commisaion	298	37	----------	261
War Claims Commission	9	9	----------	----------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	622	622	----------	----------
Atomic Energy Commission	5	5	----------	----------
Civil Aeronautics Board	14	14	----------	----------
Civil Service Commission	4	3	----------	1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	1	----------	----------
Federal Communications Commission	25	25	----------	----------
Federal Security Agency	298	303	5	----------
General Services Administration	63	59	----------	4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	97	99	2	----------
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	14	14	----------	----------
Panama Canal	19,602	19,518	----------	84
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10	10	----------	----------
Selective Service System	236	239	3	----------
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	----------	----------
Veterans' Administration	1,525	1,505	----------	20
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	58,838	58,606	368	600
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment	----------	----------	232	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2	1	----------	1
Department of the Army	44,407	44,864	457	----------
Department of the Air Force	25,489	25,551	62	----------
Department of the Navy	26,236	27,872	1,636	----------
Total, National Military Establishment	96,134	98,288	2,155	1
Net increase, National Military Establishment	----------	----------	2,154	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	154,972	156,894	2,523	601
Net increase, including National Military Establishment	----------	----------	1,922	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1950, and comparison with November 1950*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,364	1,287	----------	77
Interior	4,902	4,700	----------	202
State	560	495	----------	65
Treasury	8,321	8,385	64	----------
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	116	119	3	----------
General Services Administration	97	120	23	----------
Panama Canal	1,536	1,516	----------	20
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	----------	----------
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,317	8,518	201	----------
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	25,221	25,148	291	364
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment	----------	----------	73	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	206,722	212,409	5,687	----------
Outside continental United States	24,378	24,849	471	----------
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	89,294	90,738	1,444	----------
Outside continental United States	18,829	18,746	----------	83
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	221,607	227,924	6,317	----------
Outside continental United States	19,666	21,240	1,574	----------
Total, National Military Establishment	580,496	595,906	15,493	83
Net increase, National Military Establishment	----------	----------	15,410	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	605,717	621,054	15,784	447
Net increase, including National Military Establishment	----------	----------	15,337	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program*

Department or agency	Civilian personnel			Payroll (in thousands)		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	28,259	27,379	+880	$7,990	$7,947	+$43
Commerce Department	1	1	----------	1	1	----------
State Department	251	243	+8	102	83	+19
Economic Cooperation Administration	17	11	+6	8	6	+2
Office of the Secretary of Defense	41	41	----------	17	17	----------
Department of the Army	23,930	23,404	+526	6,871	6,791	+80
Department of the Air Force	1,003	1,116	−113	258	285	−27
Department of the Navy	3,016	2,563	+453	733	764	−31

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 809. A bill to waive certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 810. A bill for the relief of Howard I. Smith;

S. 811. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord; and

S. 812. A bill for the relief of Ramakant Pandurang Patil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 813. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees; and

S. 814. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees under jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian Agency in Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 815. A bill to erect a suitable shrine on the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor in memory of the crew killed in the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 816. A bill for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 817. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact

for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; and

S. 818. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ellsworth Schroeder; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dolores Hogan; and

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Echevarria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis;

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg;

S. 823. A bill for the relief of Arthur Lilienfeld; and

S. 824. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 825. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 826. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 828. A bill for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 829. A bill to amend section 207, title II, part I, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 830. A bill to recognize nonprofit, nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 831. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. CASE introduced Senate bill 832, to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 833. A bill to coordinate the small-business activities of the Government and achieve full utilization of independent small-business enterprises in the national defense program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 834. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 835. A bill for the relief of Sook Kat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY also introduced Senate bill 836, to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 837. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 838, to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CAIN also introduced Senate bill 839, for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. CAIN also introduced Senate bill 840, for the relief of Harue Sato, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 842. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General; and

S. 843. A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. CASE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the full statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 832) to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That from and after July 1, 1951, and during the continuance of the present national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, annual leave with pay shall be granted and allowed to civilian officers and employees of the Government of the United States whose appointments are on an annual or monthly basis at the rate of not to exceed 15 working days per annum. No such annual leave shall be accrued and carried forward from one fiscal year to another fiscal year, but shall be taken and used during the fiscal year in which the same shall be earned from and after July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting any annual leave that has heretofore been or shall be accrued to and including June 30, 1951.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby suspended during the continuance of the existing national emergency proclaimed by the President by Proclamation No. 2914 of December 16, 1950.

The statement presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Today, I am introducing in the Senate a companion bill to that introduced by the Honorable CHARLES VURSELL in the House of Representatives to make the annual leave privileges of regular Federal employees the same as that of postal employees during the declared national emergency.

This bill will save from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 per year during the national emergency.

The terms of the bill cut back the present 26-day annual leave for nonpostal employees to the 15-day leave rights of the postal employees. It does not affect the 500,000 postal workers who have never had more than 15 days annual leave with pay. It does not affect sick leave.

When one remembers that the 15 days leave means the working days of three 5-day weeks, this does not seem an unfair request to make during a national emergency. This bill does not affect existing law which provides increased pay for overtime above 40 hours.

The accumulation of accrued leave from year to year has created a liability against the Government of $581,000,000 today. That is a real national debt not shown in Treasury figures. It is a bill the Government must pay under the law. The proposal which Mr. VURSELL and I have made would prevent that amount from growing by requiring that annual leave must be taken in the year for which it accrues. The purpose of establishing leave was to increase efficiency. The Government does not get that increased efficiency when leave is permitted to pile up and become simply a new debt.

I feel sure that the great rank and file of the citizens of the country, if they could speak, would say that they see no reason why nonpostal employees should receive 26 days of leave, not counting sick leave, when postal employees receive only 15. This proposal should be adopted for the national emergency.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the purposes of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 836) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am again introducing a bill to create a temporary bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This bill is identical with one introduced by me last year with the cosponsorship of 41 Senators.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The volume and complexity of relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments will be substantially increased as a result of the defense mobilization program. I, therefore, feel it is extremely essential that the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not be delayed, and that the Commission be instructed to submit its report as well as its recommendations as soon as possible. Federal activity in the fields of defense housing, supply and distribution of farm labor, emergency maternity and infant care, maintenance of community facilities, payments in lieu of taxes, employment administration, and civilian defense will account for this increase in conflicts between levels of government.

It was the Hoover Commission's specific recommendation that such a Commission be established not only because Federal-State relations is a question of our federal system of government, but also to accomplish its other recommendations in an adequate and orderly manner. Although the Hoover Commission recommended that such a Commission be of a continuing nature, I feel it is only fair that the Congress have an opportunity to review such a Commission's work before establishing it on a permanent basis; and, therefore, the bill which I have introduced provides for a temporary Commission. I do not, however, wish this to be interpreted as precluding the temporary Commission's becoming a continuing one if that should prove desirable.

I anticipate that this bipartisan Commission would divide its recommendations into two categories: those affecting the present emergency and those of a permanent or nonemergency character. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in the Eighty-first Congress, at which time extensive hearings were held, I can say that the testimony was both unanimously and enthusiastically in favor of the establishment of such a Commission.

DISTRIBUTION OF TRIBUNAL FUNDS OF COLVILLE INDIANS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statment by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Washington. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 838) to provide for per capita distribution of tribal funds of the Colville Indians, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute per capita to the enrolled members of the Colville Indian Tribe who are living at the date of such payment all funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of such tribe on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Amounts paid to members of the Colville Tribe under this act shall not be subject to any lien or other claim arising prior to the date of such payment.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Under the terms of an act of the Congress dated February 12, 1929, there was established in the United States Treasury a fund to be held in trust for the Colville Indian Tribe of Washington State. This fund has increased through timber sales, grazing fees, and accrued interest to the sum of $1,498,905.25 as of February 8, 1951. This money, on deposit with the United States Treasury, to the credit of the enrolled members of the Colville Tribe, is drawing interest as provided in the statute at the rate of 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually.

On November 21, 1950, a Senate subcommittee held a public hearing in Spokane, Wash., on legislation then pending pertinent to the Colville Tribe. As part of the official record of that hearing, there was introduced a petition, signed by 599 members of the Colville Tribe. I quote in part from that petition, which, Mr. President, may be found in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1951, on page 491:

"Whereas $1,600,000 of Colville Indian funds is now in the hands of the United States Government from the sale of timber and the leasing of grazing lands;

* * * * * *

"It is therefore necessary for the undersigned to take action by this petition for the purpose of distributing the above funds for the general benefit and welfare of the whole tribe; and therefore, the undersigned hereby petition Congress to authorize the distribution of said fund by a per capita payment to the Colville Indian Tribe.

"CHRISTINE WILLIAMS
(And 598 others)."

I am informed that the 599 petitioners, who ask that the money now held for their account in the United States Treasury be distributed to them, comprise a majority of the adult members of the tribe presently living on the reservation.

Therefore, first because these tribal members have petitioned the Congress for this per capita payment, and secondly, in behalf of the American taxpayer, who has and presently pays annual interest on this trust fund in the amount of $60,000, the junior Senator from Washington believes the bill just sent to the desk for appropriate reference to be in the public interest, and commends its serious consideration to his colleagues.

ALICE IBRAHIM HANNAN IBRAHIM, ET AL.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, six children who are refugees from the Palestine war. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill, and an article from the Yakima Republic by Ray Ruppert, which gives a good summary of this case be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement presented by the Senator from Washington, together with the article from the Yakima Republic will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 839) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Mater, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Mater, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

The bill provides for the relief of six children who are refugees from the Palestine war. They were brought to this country in 1948 by Mrs. Dorothy J. Schut and her husband, now deceased, from an Arab village where all six were wandering half starved as homeless waifs. The Schuts brought the children to Yakima, in my State of Washington, after untold and unbelievable hardships, and together with their own three children have raised them as their own. In the 3 years that these children have lived for the first time in their lives in peace, security, and with enough to eat, they have developed from frightened, hopeless little wanderers into bright-eyed, happy, well-adjusted children. Mrs. Schut wants them to stay with her in America until they are grown and educated to be able to take care of themselves and to be able to share their knowledge and training with those in their homeland, where she plans eventually to return them, and to go herself to reestablish the orphanage she and her late husband founded in 1945 near Bethlehem and ran against superhuman odds for 3 years.

The children are in the United States on refugee permits and paroled to Mrs. Schut. Since 1948 she has been working to change the children's status. Time and again she has appealed the decisions of the Immigration Service and several times the Government has extended the children's paroles. The Government has now refused further extension, and unless this bill is passed, Mrs. Schut will travel 9,000 miles to return these children to a war-ridden country to face a tragic future.

The Immigration Service is not, from my study of the case, to be criticized for denying an extension of the children's paroles. The Immigration Service is doing only what the law requires.

My hope is that the Congress will recognize the extraordinary character of the case which involves these six children, and that an exception to the law will be granted.

These children are as close to her heart as her own. "These are my children," she said. "Jackie came to me when he was 2 days old; Ruthie, a few months. I have no wish to keep them in America, to rear them in luxury. I want to return them to their own people to share what they learn. And I want to go with them. But not yet. Not when there is war and poverty and misery in their own land and before they are ready to help their own. Give me 10 years. Give me time to raise these children whom I found as waifs. Let me send them to American schools, train them to be nurses, cooks, and

mechanics. Then let me take them back to their homeland, living testimony to the greatness of America. Don't send these children now back to a land where Jew and Arab still fight and where these children will face death."

What more convincing testimony could we have than Mrs. Schut's appeal for permission to keep and raise these children in America than this? Testimony of her willingness to make happy, well-adjusted adults out of six tragic little souls whom she has saved and whom she plans in the future to return to their homeland, prepared to take their places in life and in their country which so sorely needs the kind of persons she is raising them to be.

The article from the Yakima Republic by Ray Ruppert is as follows:

BRAVE WOMAN BATTLES FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

(By Ray Ruppert)

Uncle Sam wrote a short, although not unkind, letter to Mrs. Dorothy J. Schut, of Yakima, last week. He told her that the six refugee children she rescued 3 years ago from war and misery in Palestine must be returned to that unhappy land immediately.

The letter was neither unexpected nor welcome. If Mrs. Schut does what the letter says she must do, she will trek again 9,000 miles from Yakima to a village near Jerusalem. The worst she can expect there for her six waifs is death and the best is hunger and sickness and poverty.

THE SHADOW OF DEATH

Mrs. Schut is a brave woman. Many times she has passed through the valley of the shadow of death. She has not yet abandoned her 3-year tug-of-war with immigration authorities over the future of "her" children.

The situation is this: The six Palestinian children, ages 3 to 21, live with Mrs. Schut and her own children, Donna Mae, 12, and Alfred, 20, at 203 South Hillcrest Avenue.

Mrs. Schut's husband died a year and a half ago of tropical dysentery, contracted in Palestine.

The household is supported by Alfred, who works in a fruit warehouse, and by the help of friends who give Mrs. Schut fruit and vegetables and old clothing for the children.

Mrs. Schut brought the children into the United States from Palestine in 1948 as refugees from the bitter Arab-Israeli war then raging. They were to have visitor's permits, but in the confusion of war the children were admitted as refugees and paroled to Mrs. Schut. This meant the waifs could stay only until their h meland stabilized enough for them to return.

Since 1948 Mrs. Schut has been battling to change the children's status. Time and again she has appealed decisions of the Immigration Service and several times the Government has extended the refugee children's paroles.

Confronted now with a letter which appears to be Uncle Sam's last word, Mrs. Schut today is debating the wisdom of going to the Nation's Capital for a personal appeal from the apparently final unhappy decision of the Immigration Service.

What she can tell the authorities is this: "Give me 10 years. Give me time to raise these children whom I found as waifs. Let me send them to American schools, train them to be nurses and cooks and mechanics. Then let me take them back to Palestine, living testimony to the greatness of America. Don't send these children now back to a land where the Jew and Arab still fight and where these children will face death.

THESE, MY CHILDREN

"These are my children. Jackie came to me when he was two days old; he couldn't be closer to me if he were my own. Ruthie was with us since the time she was only a few months old. Roseileen and Nadiah and Alice and Helaniah are as close to me.

"I have no wish to keep them in America, to rear them in luxury. I want to return them to their own people, to share what they learn. And I want to go with them. But not yet. Not when there is war and poverty and misery in their land and before they are ready to help their own."

Probably she will tell the story as it began and as it happened.

The village of Beit Jala (bay jella) sits across the highway from Bethlehem, 6 miles from Jerusalem. The land is bare of trees and brings to mind the barren Yakima hills. In the summer, the sun burns, and in winter cold rain soaks the hills. There is no heat in the flat-topped, whitestone houses clustered on the hillside. The children grow up hungry, stomachs distended by malnutrition, lungs weakened by the wet cold of winter.

To this place came Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Schut in 1945 to found the Palestine Orphanage and Refugee Society. It was for them the beginning of a dream long delayed by World War II. When they came to Beit Jala, "it was like coming home," Mrs. Schut said. But they soon found in the people and the streets and the smells that they were in a far off land.

Life in Beit Jala was not easy. There were many children without homes or families. In time, the orphanage had 30 children of all ages, colors and sizes to care for. "We were new, we didn't know and we just went ahead," Mrs. Schut said. The orphanage took in infants, something other orphanages would not do.

Food was a problem. Mrs. Schut, reluctant to talk about those days for fear she will be misunderstood and thought a sympathy-seeker, can be drawn out. She said the rice they got wouldn't be pig food in this country. Before it was cooked, she picked out the match sticks, crumpled cigaret packs and things I won't mention." The flour, "when we had flour," was sifted through a fine screen. "That took out the big worms. The little ones just went through and we baked our bread."

Despite the handicaps, the orphanage did well. Mr. and Mrs. Schut were missionaries without a tie to any denomination. Donations from home kept them going and they were sustained by strong faith. They were sure they were under divine protection, that tomorrow's bread would come. Who can deny this faith, after hearing Mrs. Schut's story?

The orphans, the waifs, the unwanted lost the bow in their legs caused by malnutrition. Their limbs straightened and strengthened.

In the fall of 1947, the United Nations partitioned the Holy Land in hope of bringing peace between the Israelis and the Arabs. The partition deepened the hatred between the people.

"You could feel the tension grow day after day. You couldn't step out on your balcony without becoming a target for a bullet."

A curtain of fear and hate wrapped around the orphanage. The children could not travel the 6 miles to Jerusalem to school because a sudden curfew might leave them stranded away from home. Mr. Schut could not go abroad because his blond hair and blue eyes might lead the Arabs to think him a European Jew.

TRAPPED IN JERUSALEM

The fierce fighting between the Jews and Arabs, heated by the partition, boiled over when the British planned to withdraw their troops from the Holy Land. England had been holding Palestine under a League of Nations mandate for 30 years; the mandate ended on May 14. Months before that time, guerrilla war flared. There was no peace. No one knew his enemies or his friends.

Mrs. Schut and 18-year-old Helaniah, the eldest among the orphans, journeyed to Jerusalem on Easter of 1948 to complete papers at the American Consulate. An outburst of fighting cut the two women off in the Holy City for 4 days. They lived in a small, dark room in a Russian orthodox convent, next door to the headquarters of the Arab Legion.

Three artillery pieces mounted atop the legion headquarters barked and boomed through the night. Return fire from Jewish forces plunked into the convent walls. Mrs. Schut heard that the orphanage had been raided—that her husband and her son and all the children had been slain.

The Arabs overran Jewish settlements and the Israelis irregulars raided Arab towns. The people of the villages came to the orphanage and asked the Schuts if they could not take this boy or that girl, who belonged to their village, home for a holiday. In time, Mrs. Schut learned that the people of the village simply wanted to be together when they died. The village would be raided and the orphan, home for a holiday, would be among the victims.

So many things happened then that it is difficult to say which happened first. Mr. Schut became gravely ill with tropical dysentery. He became a burden on Mrs. Schut, already heavily laden with the care of nearly 30 orphans. It was decided that her husband and her daughter should return to the United States. Until she saw them again in Yakima half a year later, Mrs. Schut was not certain that they had not been killed before they left Palestine.

ARABS SPARE LIFE

They had a close call. Riding in a TWA station wagon to catch an airplane, Mr. Schut, Donna Mae, and an American newspaperman were engulfed suddenly by a band of roaming Arabs. The Arabs talked excitedly. Donna Mae, who speaks Arabic, began to cry.

"What are they saying, Donna Mae?" asked the newspaperman.

The girl sobbed, "They are going to kill us and take the car."

"Donna Mae," instructed her father, a calm person, "tell them that we will take them wherever they want to go, that we are going home to mama and that your daddy is very ill."

This appealed to the Arabs. They piled into the station wagon and asked to be taken to a battlefield; they were in a hurry to join the fighting.

Suspicion and fear and hate seeped through the land. Life was cheap and quickly taken. Mrs. Schut passed through an Arabian guard post without question. On her return, the guard had changed and strangers were at the gate. The Arabs were, in her words, "on me right now, with their knives ready to take me right there."

Mrs. Schut believed she was going to die. She said a prayer, a bit for herself but mostly for the orphan children at Beit Jala. Her murmured words were picked up by an Arab who took pride in the smattering of English he knew. He misunderstood her. He told his companions, "Let her go. Her skin's too tough."

The Arab States invaded Palestine on May 1, 2 weeks before the British were to pull out. The sniping, guerrilla fighting became open war. The American consulate at Jerusalem told Mrs. Schut that she should leave but she wouldn't abandon her orphans. Finally, she was ordered out for her own safety and to avoid any incidents involving an American citizen.

In the meantime, she had obtained (she thought) visitors permits for six children. Had she begun sooner she might have gotten permits for more children. As it was, she handed out the other orphans to families to care for and arranged to flee from Beit Jala.

They hired a Diesel truck, used for motor freight through the mountains. Providence was with them. The British delayed their departure by a day, just enough time for Mrs. Schut to take her party out first. After

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Tommies pulled out, roads were mined, bridges blown up and escape impossible.

BULLETS HIT TRUCK

The truck rumbled out of Beit Jala on May 14 to begin an 8-hour trip that took 3½ days. The heavy vehicle lumbered along a hillside road to Jerusalem between battling Arabs and Israelis. A tarpaulin across the back of the truck was bullet-riddled. Mrs. Schut cradled Ruthie, age 9 months in her arms in the cab. In the back, Alfred flung his body across the waifs to protect them from the gunfire.

Running this gantlet of fire, the truck reached Jerusalem. The holy city was caught in the agony of battle. The Jewish militia, Haganah, fought the Transjordan legion in a house-to-house street fight. Mrs. Schut counted 300 bodies in the streets of Jerusalem as they passed through. They were not beyond the range of bullets until passing Jericho, they crossed the border into Transjordan.

At every village, they were stopped, searched, questioned, and their papers scrutinized. On the evening of the first day, they reached Amman and camped for the night. With them on the highway leading away from the fighting were 20,000 other refugees. The following night they reached Damascus and on the following day they came to the port city of Beirut, their goal.

In Beirut, Mrs. Schut found disappointment. The visitors' permits she had expected for her six orphans were not there. Something had happened to the papers, apparently, when the American consulate pulled out of Jerusalem for the sea coast. Nevertheless, times being hectic and dangerous, American officials at Beirut allowed her to proceed as if she had the permits.

There was a month in which to get a boat from Beirut to the United States. Providence being with them again, they obtained passage on a Greek freighter on the last day of their allotted month.

In the meantime, the eight people huddled in a one-room storehouse in Beirut while the early summer sun baked the city. Alfred suffered a slight sun stroke and a touch of dysentery.

Feeling ran high in Beirut between Jews and Arabs although the Lebanon city was outside the fighting area. Murders were not uncommon. A man was slain just outside the window of the room where the Schuts lived. "We heard it all."

Food was a nearly unsolvable problem. A sack of potatoes cost $37. The black market offered 100 pounds of rice for $120.

Mrs. Schut crossed her fingers when they boarded the Greek freighter. The children had been bitten and eaten by sand fleas so badly that she was afraid authorities might think the orphans had smallpox and forbid them to leave.

The freighter plowed through the Mediterranean to stand 3 miles offshore from a Greek port. It took on a cargo of high octane gasoline and set off on a 6 weeks' crossing of the Atlantic.

At New York, there were no visitor permits for the children. The Immigration Service paroled the six refugees to Mrs. Schut for 6 months under $500 bond apiece. A friend put up the $3,000 required.

And so they came to Yakima. They came here because, Mrs. Schut explained, the summer weather, the hills are so much like their home in Palestine and because she knew the valley.

Three of the children are in school. All have grown sturdy and strong. Jackie, a rotund, chubby little boy who will be 5 this month can remember so little about his homeland that the only boat he knows is not the one he crossed the ocean on but the one he rode on at the fair.

Will they stay in Yakima? Mrs. Schut hopes they will until the children are raised. She wants to return someday to Palestine with her "staff" to re-establish the orphanage at Beit Jala.

"I've been kicked and spit upon in the streets," she says of Palestine, "but still I love them. They are people. They need help."

"HE WILL CARE FOR ME"

She realizes that she cannot help them now, not while fear and war ride about the Holy City. But it is not for herself that she entreats Uncle Sam to stay his hand. She is thinking of the children who would go back to a land where a Jew is killed because he is a Jew, where an Arab is slain because he is an Arab, where food is beyond price and where there is no hope until peace finally comes.

Nor would she abandon the children, sending them back alone while she stays here. "They are mine," she says simply. Instead she will leave her daughter, Donna Mae, here and return with the war waifs.

In the last few days, Uncle Sam has given his final word: The children must go. But Mrs. Schut steadfastly hopes that the Immigration Service will delay its ruling and let the children remain until they can go home as examples of American training and education.

Perhaps the children think of this when they sing the "theme song" of the Schut home—"If the Father's eye is on the sparrow, surely He will care for me.

HARUE SATO

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Harue Sato, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 840) for the relief of Harue Sato, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

The bill is for the relief of Sgt. Franklyn Roff, a wounded veteran of the Korean War. Sergeant Roff had requested permission to marry his fiancée in Japan but was transferred to a hospital in the United States before the proper papers could be processed. This bill, if enacted, will make it possible for Sergeant Roff to have his fiancée brought to the United States so that he may marry her.

I believe that this is little enough to do for a man who has fought our war and has been wounded in our cause. I wish Sergeant Roff the best of luck, a speedy recovery, and a very happy married life with the woman of his choice.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION PROVIDING REPRESENTATION IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND CERTAIN TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution and a statement by me explaining the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia and certain Territories of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purpose as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"In choosing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the District of Columbia, and each Territory of the United States entitled by law to select a delegate in the House of Representatives, shall be entitled to appoint, in such manner as the Congress may provide by law, one elector who shall possess the qualifications required by article II of the Constitution and whose ballot shall be cast and counted as provided by the twelfth article of amendment of the Constitution."

The statement presented by Mr. Case is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Today I am introducing a proposal for an amendment to the Constitution that would give upwards of 2,000,000 disfranchised citizens of the United States a chance to vote in Presidential elections.

The amendment would give to the District of Columbia and to Territories with a Delegate in the House of Representatives a vote in the electoral college.

There were approximately 800,000 people in the District of Columbia by the last census, the number retaining voting rights in their States being unknown. There were 499,794 in the Territory of Hawaii and 128,643 in the Territory of Alaska.

Hawaii and Alaska have the status of Territories and elect a Delegate to the House of Representatives. There are current proposals to provide the District of Columbia with a Delegate in the House of Representatives, but without amendment to the Constitution, they still would not vote on President.

There are pending, of course, proposals to give both Alaska and Hawaii full statehood. I happen to have voted for such a measure in the House of Representatives but I recognize that there is considerable doubt that either Territory will win statehood in the immediate future.

It has occurred to me that granting the Territories and the District of Columbia an opportunity to vote for President with representation in the electoral college might command the support of many Members of the Congress who oppose statehood. I believe these citizens of the United States should have a right to representation in the Congress and in the election of the President and Vice President. We draft their sons and we tax their incomes.

The proposed amendment is simple, and with the permission of the Senate, I place it in my remarks.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 2192. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; and

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION TO VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 780, to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have conferred with the author of the bill, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and with his approval I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL OTHER PEOPLES

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address myself for 2 minutes to a concurrent resolution which I propose to submit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is a great tragedy that the Communists have stolen the word peace from the free nations of the world. That happens to be a fact, hard as it is for the average American to understand why it should be so.

Despite recent Soviet aggressions, the Communists have been very successful in selling the idea that the United States is a warmongering Nation while the Soviet Union wants peace. A recent Soviet outburst called us atomic barbarians.

The Communists have planted distrust of the United States and its allies over most of Asia and the Far East. A great many Europeans are in doubt about our peaceful intentions because of clever Communist propaganda.

Perhaps most dangerous of all is the fact that the Soviet Government is constantly telling the Russian people that the United States is a Nation of warmongers intent on their destruction. It is within our power to correct the record, and I believe we should.

I am now submitting a concurrent resolution, which I am proud to announce is being sponsored by 20 other Members of the Senate. The sponsors include Republicans and Democrats; this is in no sense a partisan issue. The sponsors joining with me are the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The title of the concurrent resolution explains its purpose in simple language. It is called "A declaration of friendship from the American people to all other peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union." A similar resolution is being submitted in the House of Representatives today, so that we may have an expression of the Congress.

The concurrent resolution sets forth in simple language what I sincerely and deeply believe to be a fact, namely, that the overriding desire of the American people is to bring about permanent peace. It declares that the United States Government stands ready at all times to compose its differences with the Soviet Government by honorable negotiation.

The resolution also calls upon the President of the United States to transmit the resolution to the Soviet Government with the request that its contents be made known to the Russian people.

The prestige of the Congress of the United States is very great throughout the world, because it represents the American people. I believe adoption of this resolution will set forth the true position of the United States in clear and unmistakable terms.

I submit the concurrent resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), submitted by Mr. MCMAHON (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Members of this Congress reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, by declaring—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the U. S. S. R., and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, an article entitled, "McMAHON's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951; an article entitled, "A Bold Challenge to Joe Stalin," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951; and an editorial entitled, "Nothing Against the Russian People," published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951]

McMAHON'S PLAN TO EXPRESS AMITY TOWARD RUSSIANS HAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S proposal of a resolution to be adopted by the Senate expressing friendship for the Russian people is the first sign of common sense that has come in a long while from officialdom here on the subject of moral force as a preventive of war.

The assumption that, because armament has to be increased substantially to meet outbreaks of aggression, all other forms of peaceful effort to prevent war need not be pressed is erroneous. Yet whenever military measures take the limelight these other methods of avoiding war seem to be sidetracked.

With two world wars to remind mankind that military conquest does not really bring peace, there have been equally erroneous assumptions current that military strength has become futile or unnecessary. The truth is that defense armament is indispensable,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and so is an armament of reason and genuine friendship expressed by one set of peoples to the other.

THE CAUSES OF WAR

The Russian people are not bellicose by nature. They do not want war any more than do the people of the allied countries. Inasmuch as all peoples would prefer the ways of peace to armed hostilities, the real question always is why there should be any wars. Generally they result from the acts of a dictator or of a small group of men—oligarchies, they used to call them in ancient days—who exploit whole nations and force the young to go to war by inflaming public opinion against other countries.

There is no reason to believe that, if the minds of the 200,000,000 people of Soviet Russia could be reached with genuine evidences of friendship, the rulers of the Communist regime would have the power to take the steps of aggression which have now brought the world to the brink of war.

Like all other moves of this kind—and they are by no means novel—the question of methods and means arises. The United States has brought forth what is known as the Voice of America program. This project was for a long time in need of funds, but now has the money from Congress. What is lacking is the ideas that must go into such an undertaking to make it successful. Those ideas cannot begin and end on the bureaucratic level. They must come from the very top level of our policy makers. They must be part of national and international policy.

Today the Voice of America is just one of a number of bureaus in the State Department. It ought to be an important agency independent of any department and reporting directly to the President. It should have enough prestige to command the sympathetic support of Members of both Houses of Congress. It should be the public relations instrument of the government itself in international relations. Few men who have been at the head of the State Department have ever been qualified to do this type of planning even if they had the time to devote to it.

But to occupy so important a role, the project must have Cabinet-level ranking and must be composed of advisers who are able to suggest major policies that will appeal to other nations, especially those behind the iron curtain. Strange, indeed, that nobody has put any official momentum behind the idea of a formal expression of friendship by the Congress addressed to the people of Soviet Russia or that other moves which can appeal to peoples behind the iron curtain should not have come before now from authoritative quarters.

MUST CAPTURE IMAGINATION

The Voice of America can relay messages and broadcast interesting scripts and carry a polemic technique to counteract Communist propaganda, but that's not enough. There must be ways to capture the imagination of the Russian people. That's why the suggestion by Senator McMAHON is likely to prove more penetrating than all the high-sounding speeches of diplomatic phraseology that come forth so regularly as the only expression of American idealism.

But will such policies of friendship and other proposals get through to the people behind the iron curtain? The answer is that any event of sensational importance percolates through any man-made barrier. The persons who go and come across the border from the satellite states to the free world are constantly discussing these same issues. Word-of-mouth distribution of ideas still remains the most effective single instrument of communication the world has ever known.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1951]

A BOLD CHALLENGE TO JOE STALIN—SENATOR MCMAHON WOULD CENTER ATTACK ON THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—It is good that in the gathering storm one man is willing to stand up boldly and appeal for another attempt to break through the iron curtain so that our people, as people, might speak to the Russian people, as people, for understanding and peace.

For this Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, Connecticut, would use both our Senate and the United Nations as instrumentalities.

No man is more entitled to speak—and be heard. The Connecticut Senator knows whereof he speaks, and is conscious of his tremendous responsibility. He is a man with a burden on his soul. As chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee he lives daily, so to speak, with the awful weapon that could wipe out civilization. He realizes also another bitter truth that history teaches—that arms races such as that in which the United States and Russia are engaged can end only in wars.

UN OUTLET IN RUSSIA

To challenge Joe Stalin and the rulers of the Kremlin on the iron curtain he proposes:

1. That the United Nations assert its rights to have its deliberations known behind the iron curtain—as a minimum by operating its own radio station in Russia.

2. That the Senate pass a resolution expressing friendship for the people of Russia by the people of the United States and otherwise declaring the intentions of our own people for peace and for honorable negotiations for peace, and that the Soviet Government be asked to circulate this among its own people. To reinforce its effect he would have the resolution circulated all over this country and signed by our people.

The Senator was impelled to speak out because of developing circumstances. He has become alarmed by the headway Russia has made with her continuous propaganda that the United States wants war and that our people are warmongers. He knows, as we all know, that this is not so—that, as he said, no Member of the United States Senate wants war, nor do any of our people. Nor, he adds, do the people of Russia.

OUR STORY HIDDEN

But we have not got our story across. As regards Russia, we are stopped by the iron curtain so that we cannot reach the people. As for other people, particularly in Asia, we have failed to get our story to them and to let them know of our interest, from our national experience, in their aspirations to shake off colonialism and run their own affairs as independent nations. Yet we know what they want better than any other people.

The Senator simply would challenge Joe Stalin by asking him "that the free peoples' views be circulated among the Russians as the Soviet's views are circulated among us." As the Senator was speaking, our press wires, for example, were carrying the latest diatribe against the United States as "warmongers"—in this instance, by Peter Pospelov at the Lenin anniversary celebration.

STRONGEST WEAPON

The Senator is not sanguine that Stalin would accept either the UN or Senate proposal; but he is convinced, he said, "that if we focus world opinion on the iron curtain and expose it as a fraud and a menace to world peace, we may convert this barrier against truth into a Soviet liability.

The barrier against truth, the Senator explained, "may be the Soviet's strongest weapon.

"Perhaps we cannot convince the Kremlin rulers to open up the curtain, but I am absolutely certain that we can cripple and perhaps silence the Soviet propaganda guns in the western world. People can see through a fraud very easily when it is exposed to them."

Except for the iron curtain, he declared, "I am sure that ordinary Russians would invoke their wrath on rulers who deny them life's barest necessities and who saddle them with crushing armament expenditures."

As an inducement to peace to people everywhere, the Senator reintroduced his resolution of last February calling for a reduction of armaments, including atomic weapons, by an iron-clad international agreement providing for inspection. The money thus saved would be pooled and applied to build up backward nations.

His threefold program is simple, direct, bold, and possible—that is, if we really want to save ourselves and the world.

[From the Washington Post of January 25, 1951]

NOTHING AGAINST THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

There ought to be more attention paid to the suggestion of Connecticut's Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, that the people of Russia should be assured of the continued friendship of the people of the United States.

No, that is not appeasement. In a way it is just the opposite of appeasement, because it draws a sharp line between the people of Russia and the present Government of Russia.

The people of Russia are continually bombarded with Soviet lies to the effect that the people of the United States hate them and seek to do them ill. If some semblance of the truth can penetrate behind the iron curtain—and there are leaks in that curtain despite all vigilance—it would produce a very different attitude in the mind of the average Russian.

What Senator MCMAHON is really proposing is that we should approach this international problem with some of the skill that the Russians themselves have shown in using propaganda as a means of bolstering their side. The ordinary American must be thinking somewhat sadly that since the close of World War II Soviet Russia has made enormous advances by just such methods and without the loss—so far as we know—of a single Russian life. Meantime our boys are dying on the battlefields of Korea while in the matter of world public opinion we seem to be losing ground instead of gaining it.

It is time that we made some effort to cause the real truth to penetrate behind the iron curtain and thus to beat Russia at her own game. For what Senator MCMAHON proposes is the simple truth. Nobody in this country hates the Russians as such, nobody has ill will against them as Russians and all of the furore in this country against communism is based solely on the evil deeds of a Russian Communist dictatorship.

We should not be misled into believing that the crooks and terrorists now in power in Moscow are any more typical of the Russian people as a whole, than the dope peddlers now being rounded up in New York City are typical of the American people.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address myself to the concurrent resolution for 2 or 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is

recognized for 2 or 3 minutes—the Chair will make it 3.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to join in cosponsorship of the resolution offered today by the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] expressing the deep longing of the American people for peace and expressing their friendship with the rank and file people of the Soviet Union.

I congratulate my colleague on the very sound reasoning of his approach. I trust that the text of this eloquent resolution will be relayed effectively to the peoples of the world.

There is an old hymn which reads as follows:

Make channels for the streams of love,
Where they may broadly run;
And love has overflowing streams,
To fill them every one.

But if at any time we cease
Such channels to provide,
The very founts of love for us
Will then seem parched and dried.

For we must share, if we would keep
That blessing from above;
They cease to have who cease to give;
Such is the law of love.

Mr. President, we have tried nearly everything in the world for peace except the thing which is embodied in the concurrent resolution. The United States Senate is expressing the hope of the people of this country when it agrees to this resolution.

There is absolutely no reason why the man on the street or on the farm in America should have the slightest desire in the world to inflict harm on the man on the street or on the farm in Russia or its satellite states. On the contrary, all human beings, whether they live unfortunately behind the iron curtain or whether they enjoy the blessings of western freedom, have the same wants and desires, the same fundamental longing to live in peace with their neighbors and to enjoy freedom and security for themselves and their loved ones.

It is only the power-hungry leaders of the Soviet Union who have brought about the recent tragic chain of circumstances which finds United Nation boys killing Chinese and Northern Korean boys on the frozen battlefields of that distant peninsula. Moreover, the responsibility for any future aggravating the present situation rests solely on the leaders of the Soviet Union.

We of the west desire peace; we will strive for peace, and move heaven and earth to try to maintain peace. We despise war. We know that war would settle nothing. It would not end communism; it would only bring on more hunger, more disease, more chaos, more confusion, and more suffering to the humble people of the world.

There is no good reason for war. War is not inevitable. On the contrary, peace is very definitely attainable if the leaders of the Soviet will simply recognize the facts that—

First. We of the west will be prepared for every possible contingency, but

Second. We of the west will join in seeking any reasonable and lasting settlement founded on deeds of justice, rather than mere words.

We will not appease, but neither will we provoke. We will not place our faith in armament alone, but neither will we strip ourselves of the arms necessary for defense. We will not change our attitude of love and friendship toward the humble people of the earth, even though they live in aggressor countries. But neither will we change our attitude toward defense of the heritage of which we are the trustee.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will promptly adopt this splendid resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Connecticut and his associates.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed to make a full and complete study of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act with respect to the assets of foreign countries and nationals thereof and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF STUDIES OF ISSUANCE OF INJUNCTION IN LABOR DISPUTES BY STATE COURTS (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, and the approval of the Senate Rules Committee, the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, in 1950, commissioned four universities to make studies of the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes by State courts. Our agreements with the universities provided that the subcommittee would not in any way attempt to influence the findings of the universities. The studies have now been completed, have been received and approved by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, and by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. By direction of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that these studies on State injunctions be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may, during the recess of the Senate, be permitted to file reports on two bills, one being H. R. 1, to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, and the other (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif. (Reappointment.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of 59 postmasters, which were unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

WELCOME OF ISRAELI AMBASSADOR ABBA EBAN—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

[Mr. BUTLER of Maryland asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, in welcoming the Ambassador of Israeli, Mr. Abba Eban, on his visit to Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESENT DANGER—ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CONANT

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Present Danger," delivered by James B. Conant, for the Committee on the Present Danger, on February 7, 1951, over a national radio network, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE UNITED STATES—LETTER FROM DR. SWAN ERICSON

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Swan Ericson, of Le Sueur, Minn., under date of January 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

LIVES AT STAKE IN THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lives, Not Profits, at Stake," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POINT 4 PROGRAM—BROADCAST BY RAYMOND SWING

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast by Raymond Swing on January 15, 1951, in regard to the point 4 program, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR TRAGEDY IN CHINA—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY TIMES

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Tragedy in China," published in the Kansas City Times of January 31, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RISE IN COFFEE PRICES—ARTICLE FROM COSMOPOLITAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Who Made the Money on Coffee?" published in Cosmopolitan magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ASSISTANCE TO INDIA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LEHMAN (for Senator BENTON) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "India's Need," published in the Washington Post of February 6, 1951, an article entitled "Famine and Diplomacy," by Walter Lippmann, and an article written by Robert Trumbull and published in the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

TELEVISION CHANNELS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES—TELEGRAM FROM THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y.

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed by the Medical Society of the County of Queens to Commissioner Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, dated January 17, 1951, regarding the assignment of television channels for educational purposes, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREAMBLE OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION CONVENTION—STATEMENT BY CARROLL BINDER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Carroll Binder, United States representative in the Committee on Freedom of Information, regarding the preamble of the Freedom of Information Convention submitted by the U. S. S. R., which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENTION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION—STATEMENT BY CARROLL BINDER

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Carroll Binder regarding the drafting of the Convention on Freedom of Information in the United Nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMIT, PLEASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Remit, Please," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIGHT IN DARKNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Light in Darkness," published recently in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIVIDUALIZED WAR AGAINST RED LEADERS—ARTICLE BY ARNOLD PERRETON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Eventful Present: Individualized War Against Red Leaders," written by Arnold Perreton, and published in the Manchester Union-Leader of January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide," published in Life magazine of January 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORWAY IS READY TO FIGHT—ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Is Ready To Fight," published in the United States News and World Report, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREAT OF RUSSIAN AGGRESSION—ARTICLE FROM THE MANCHESTER UNION-LEADER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "You Can't Play Games With Gangsters," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union-Leader of January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN DEFENSE ACTIVITY IN MANCHESTER, N. H.

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an account of a recent civilian defense activity in New Hampshire, which appears in the Appendix.]

A 44-HOUR WORKWEEK—ARTICLE FROM THE CONCORD (N. H.) DAILY MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Wrong Medicine," published in the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor of January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN HEART WEEK AND NEGRO HISTORY WEEK—VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM—PROCLAMATIONS OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two proclamations by the Governor of New York State, the first proclaiming the week of February 11 to 18 as American Heart Week and Negro History Week, and the second proclamation is to be included in the Voice of America program to the oppressed peoples of the world.

There being no objection, the proclamations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

The toll of death in our State and our country from diseases of the heart and blood vessels continues to rise in tragic fashion. This constitutes a major menace to the public health at any time and in any year. Right now, when we are in the throes of drastic mobilization for self-defense, the problem becomes more serious than ever.

We have to realize that more people die of heart diseases than of the next five leading causes of death combined. We are faced with the ominous fact that cardiovascular diseases threaten to impair our national manpower reserve.

The State of New York and its people have embarked upon an intensive program for coping with heart disease both by dint of the research being carried on in nine medical schools and by the research projects of the State Health Department for applying new knowledge to the treatment of heart disease. Last year New York State took the leadership by providing State funds for the establishment of a Chronic Disease Research Institute at Buffalo, in cooperation with the Medical School of the University of Buffalo. Heart disease is one of the principal elements being studied at this Institute.

We are also carrying on demonstrations in attempts to control rheumatic fever in children by the use of some of the new drugs and antibiotics. Rheumatic fever in children leads to serious heart disease among adults. We are making serious efforts to curb this ailment by controlling it at an early age.

The efforts of the State in this direction have the invaluable help of private organizations, outstanding among which are the American Heart Association and its affiliates. In order to call the attention of the public as dramatically as possible to the urgent needs of the 1951 Heart Fund, the Heart Associations will celebrate February 11 to 18 as American Heart Week. This campaign deserves the utmost possible support.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of February 11 to 18, 1951, as American Heart Week in the State of New York and I call upon the schools, churches, scientific bodies, civic associations and other organizations, as well as the generous people of New York, to cooperate to the limit of their abilities.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 31st day of January in the year of our Lord 1951.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Attest:

JAMES C. HAGGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

PROCLAMATION

I am happy to be able to say that today there is so much concrete evidence of outstanding progress in the position of American Negroes in our State and our economy. I am particularly proud that much of this progress can be directly traced to the passage of our law against discrimination in employment, in which the State of New York took the lead.

We are now in the sixth year of the administration of that law which has ceased to be an experiment in social legislation and has become a real instrument for social progress as well as a model for seven other States. During the past 12 months we passed the second anniversary of the effective date of the New York State Fair Educational Practices Act, also a pioneer law in the United States. We passed another milestone last year when the Austin-Wicks bill, prohibiting segregation and discrimination in both public and publicly subsidized private housing, went into effect.

On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States outlawed the segregation of passengers on the basis of color in railroad cars. This legal decision on a national level followed the success of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination in persuading the Pennsylvania Railroad to abandon the practice of segregating Negro

passengers on trains from New York City to points south. Furthermore, the principal railroads of the State of New York have announced that their employment policy no longer confines Negroes to menial occupations. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination also announces that opportunities for Negroes have been considerably expanded in the white collar and clerical fields.

We obtained another notable victory for freedom, equality and decency when the American Bowling Congress voted to rescind that section of its constitution which restricted membership to members of the Caucasian race. This followed the action of Attorney General Goldstein when he filed legal proceedings against the American Bowling Congress in the State of New York. Many private agencies—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—added their voices to this effort. Legal and educational steps were also taken in Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

All this does not mean that prejudice and injustice towards Negro fellow citizens have come to an end. We still face the need of vast improvement. But the facts I have recited clearly indicate that we are on our way in this vital domain of human relations and the progress we have attained is worth recording.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 11 through February 18 as Negro History Week in New York State and I call upon the people of the entire State, regardless of their color, to cooperate with Negro organizations and individuals in the observance of the spirit of this proclamation.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 1st day of February in the year of our Lord 1951.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Attest:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday marked the sixth anniversary of the Yalta agreement. In this connection I have prepared a statement, the text of which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. IVES was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Yesterday, February 7, marked the sixth anniversary of a black and disgraceful page in the history of American foreign policy. On that day in 1945 was concluded at the Yalta Conference an agreement, to which our Nation was a party, and by which our national honor was betrayed and our Government sold out our friends and allies over many years for a mess of Soviet pottage.

This agreement did not represent the will of the American people or the will of their representatives in Congress. It was never submitted to the Congress for approval. The Congress was not even consulted about it. It serves as an appalling example of what can occur when the Chief Executive usurps too much authority.

As victims of this betrayal, the people of Poland have suffered untold hardship and anguish. And yet, their freedom gone, persecuted and tormented by the merciless hordes of Soviet Russia, they still carry on undaunted, determined to be free. Their heroic attitude provides a mighty inspiration to the remaining free nations of the world in this dark hour when freedom everywhere is in peril.

The terrible plight of the Polish people also provides a constant tragic reminder of our Government's duplicity and irresponsibility. If our Nation ever had an obligation, it is our obligation to right the wrongs committed by our representatives at Yalta. We meet this obligation at the earliest possible moment.

In the meantime, with the knowledge that they have the deep sympathy of the American people and that the American people strongly desire to rectify the wrongs thus perpetrated, the people of Poland should take renewed courage and acquire renewed faith that the day will come again when they will be independent and free.

ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a condensed version of a talk delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, Wilshire Boulevard Temple, before the congregation on Rosh Hashana—the Jewish New Year. This discussion, forwarded to me by Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. pictures of New York, was given on September 12, 1950, and is a frank portrayal of the dangers of communism here and abroad. It should serve as a warning in our future relations with Soviet Russia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA—THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the New Year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomin Neroim, the awesome days; the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomin Neroim atmosphere, an awesome days' atmosphere for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling, and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now, this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made, was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order, that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia, and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth, but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no. We were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the western world. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration.

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Hashana morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war; and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman, and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing; and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a twofold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America, and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our coreligionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from 3 months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very trite words, but nonetheless true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here, and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave; he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything—Russia, and not America. Therefore, Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends: That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige. And even in Moscow the Yiddish daily, Heint, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today. And those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and all the rest of the Balkan countries—they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this, should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched its being inflicted in the synagogue, were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the charem, excommunication. So we today must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today, the punishment of excommunication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact, a fact that faces you, and you, and you, and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us, and inscribe our dear ones, and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you, and you, and you, and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted, that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us, then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in, may be for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

TAXATION AND REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS-LEADER AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond News-Leader of February 6, 1951, the title of which is "$10,000,000,000 cart, $71,000,000,000 horse."

I believe this editorial very graphically presents the situation with respect to increasing taxes before reducing nondefense expenditures.

To follow this editorial, I ask that a statement made by me on February 4 likewise be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News-Leader of February 6, 1951]

TEN BILLION DOLLAR CART, $71,000,000,000 HORSE

Mr. Truman's $10,000,000,000 tax program, as it was outlined yesterday to the House Ways and Means Committee, leaves a great deal to be desired. Clearly, the President has in mind a plan to tax first and spend later; Congress would do better, in our view, to wait awhile before putting so monstrous a cart before so intangible a horse. Not until the recommended budget has been stripped of at least $7,000,000,000 in nonessential spending should the Congress give its approval to new tax legislation. The world will not come to an end if we wait to look at the menu before paying our check.

Once the budget has been boiled down by committee action to a more realistic figure, the question of a tax increase can be considered. When that time comes, the first aim should be to close loopholes in existing tax law—in short, to abolish the outrageous privileges of oil and mining interests, to bring tax-exempt cooperatives into the fold, to tighten up rigorously on others who are getting a relatively free ride. Secondly, the necessary tax increases should be designed to obtain some direct revenue from millions of persons in low and moderate income brackets who now escape direct Federal taxation almost altogether. A $100 reduction in the individual exemptions under income tax law would enroll 5,000,000 new taxpayers who would contribute an estimated $240,000,000 without overwhelming personal hardship. Finally, other necessary tax increases should be spread as equitably as possible over the entire economy. A Federal sales tax seems to us the best answer to the problem.

This newspaper has insisted steadfastly, since the Korean War began, that the Nation's taxes must be increased so that we can pay as we go, to the very limit of our endurance, for the preparedness effort. The sacrifices demanded by high taxes are infinitely preferable to the prospect of currency collapse and national bankruptcy. But personal taxes already have been hiked by 17 percent; corporation taxes have been increased sharply, and an excess profits tax law has been reestablished. There are some indications that these amendments in tax law will produce substantially higher revenue than the Treasury had predicted. At any rate, the Government's need for immediate cash is not as urgent as it was 4 months ago.

It follows that this is a time for taking stock. One mistake was made in December in the enactment of an excess profits tax which will cause endless difficulty in administration; if further mistakes can be avoided, let us avoid them now. For our own part, we raise no special objections to the proposed across-the-board increase of four percentage points in individual income taxation, but the recommended boosts in excise taxes seem excessive. A tax of 20 percent on automobiles and 25 percent on household appliances should be considered carefully. The requested increases in whiskey, beer and cigarette taxes may prove more than these golden geese can survive, but the point is one for tax experts to decide; as luxury commodities, these items assuredly should be taxed right to the point of diminishing returns. Again, it seems to us that a sweeping Federal sales tax would prove fairer and more desirable than heavy increases in selected fields.

But we do not wish to leave any impression of opposition to higher taxes in general. With the best will in the world, Congress cannot cut the swollen Federal budget to a point where present revenue laws will cover the inflated costs of national defense. Mr. Truman has requested Congress to levy taxes "'til it hurts." Added taxes will hurt, and we can only pray that the confiscation of more than a quarter of national income for the expenses of government will not cause irreparable damage to the economy. Sooner or later, as a new tax bill is drawn up, the time will come for separating the men from the boys. And if that day brings an additional tax of 15 cents on every 10 gallons of gasoline, or 30 cents more on a carton of cigarettes, or 60 cents more on a fifth of whisky, let us grouch and grumble and howl to our heart's content—but let us pay it in the grim realization that far worse sacrifices could be demanded of us all.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD RELEASED ON FEBRUARY 4, 1951

To pass a quickie tax bill of $10,000,000,000 to be followed by another, as requested by the President, would be a most unwise procedure.

Two so-called quickie tax bills have already been enacted in the past several months. The Treasury estimates that the tax take will be increased from $37,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1950 to $55,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1952, even if no further tax increases are enacted.

We have taken off the fat. Further huge tax increases will dig deeply into the lean meat and possibly into the very bone structure of our economy unless they are eased by elimination of nonessential expenditures.

General Eisenhower has warned that our war-alert status may last 20 or 30 years. We

must husband our financial strength and tighten our belts for the long struggle ahead.

The country is entitled to a firm financial program from the administration instead of piece-meal quickies. Our financial preparedness cannot be attained by piece-meal implementation such as the President proposes.

It is essential to pay as we go, but the people of the United States will not accept huge tax increases in good spirit unless they are accompanied by:

1. The closing of all loop holes in existing tax laws;

2. Improved tax assessment and collection system to prevent tax evasion; and

3. Elimination of every dollar of nonessential spending.

ECONOMIES UNDER THE HOOVER RECOMMENDATIONS—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR LODGE AND HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as Senate author of the Lodge-Brown Act which created the Hoover Commission, I recently wrote to former President Hoover asking him to state the economies which could be effected by carrying out the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Report. Mr. Hoover estimates that total savings of over $5,000,000,000 could be achieved. I believe this estimate is, if anything, conservative, and I hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee in particular will read this correspondence and put into effect all of the true economies which it recommends. I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Mr. Hoover's response be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
The Waldorf Towers, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This inquiry is addressed to you as the former Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

We shall soon be asked to raise additional taxes to finance the expanse of our defense efforts. This will focus, more than ever before, public attention on the need for economic and effective Government. I therefore ask you:

1. How much of your Commission's recommended changes, innovations, and reorganizations remain yet to be accomplished?

2. What is your estimate of the dollar savings to be expected if these remaining recommendations are carried out?

As Senate author of the act establishing the Commission, I have a continuing interest in this whole subject and wish to do all I can to promote its reports. May I have your permission to use your reply in connection with my efforts on behalf of this objective?

With kind personal regards,

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senator.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 26, 1951.*

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I have your letter of January 8. Your continued interest in the Commission, created under the Lodge-Brown Act, is most gratifying.

The opening sessions of the Eighty-second Congress offer an opportune time to consider again the proposals of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. International circumstances now require that this program to achieve efficiency and economies in the Federal Government be brought to fulfillment.

Much has already been achieved in the field of Government reform. The Eighty-first Congress approved 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans, embodying recommendations of the Commission. These, together with administrative actions taken within the executive branch, mean that nearly 50 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been authorized. The attached Report to the American People, prepared by the Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, details these reforms.

Savings from those reforms already authorized should eventually approach $2,000,000,000 annually, according to estimates of the Commission's task forces. Those recommendations not yet adopted should provide additional savings of similar proportions. These savings estimates were based upon a $40,000,000,000 budget. A budget of $70,000,000,000 could well increase certain items in these estimated savings pro rata. Although it is difficult to estimate such increases without complete research, it would not be unreasonable to hope that full enactment and faithful execution of the recommendations could bring total savings of over $5,000,000,000 to the Nation's taxpayers. It must be realized, however, that such vast changes take time.

The full savings and efficiencies from the work of the Commission can be accomplished. However, there must be acceptance of three fundamental responsibilities:

First, the responsibility of Congress: The report of the Commission on Organization was a complete plan for the orderly organization of Government. Even those portions of the plan now in effect will not yield the maximum benefits as long as some other integral parts are missing. Remaining recommendations, applying to both specific and general aspects of the Government, require enactment by the Congress.

Second. The responsibility of the executive branch. Savings do not automatically follow passage of a law. Savings follow only upon skillful and vigorous application of reforms. Federal officials and employees must (a) demonstrate a desire to install the reforms and save the money, and (b) demonstrate skill and talent in applying those reforms. In the final instance, of course, the degree of Federal efficiency and economy is dependent upon the officials and employees of the executive branch.

Third. The responsibility of the citizens. Active citizen interest and demand for better Government must continue. Public momentum behind Federal reform is the key to action. Constant citizen attention must be focused on the problems of Federal management. It must be expressed through an ever-vigilant Congress. Otherwise, the value of the reforms will atrophy.

Administrative economies may seem small by contrast with necessary huge increases in Federal expenditures for defense. Actually, the potential economies suggested by the Commission reside only partly in the realm of measurable dollars and cents. Over the long run, better administrators, working with up-to-date methods within a sound organizational structure, are found to do a more efficient, and hence a more economical, job.

This points up the necessity for prompt action on the Commission's remaining recommendations. Among these first priority must be given to proposals for better personnel management. The need for attracting and holding capable administrative, scientific, and specialized personnel has been greatly accentuated by the emergency. As the Commission said: "High caliber executives can eliminate cumbersome and wasteful forms of management." No matter how good a watch is, someone must wind it.

Among the other vital reforms ahead are these: (1) Consolidation of present overlapping, duplicative, and wasteful Federal activities in water resources development and other public works, and the provision of adequate review and supervision for all projects; (2) reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in order to provide more effective and economical service to our increasing numbers of veterans, particularly with respect to life insurance; (3) centralization of policy determinations and of supervision for the expanding Federal medical programs in order to permit full utilization of our limited facilities, both private and public, and, at the same time, to conserve our precious and limited supply of medical manpower; (4) a top-to-bottom overhauling of the United States Department of Agriculture and the transfer to it of control over the public domain; (5) completion of the streamlining of the Post Office Department and ripping out all vestiges of politics; (6) a complete review and reform of the abuses and malorganization which the Commission found in many Federal business enterprises.

Item 6 above offers a particularly fruitful field for congressional activity, as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation review of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency so clearly demonstrates.

Adoption of these remaining Commision recommendations will alleviate, to considerable extent, the increasing burden falling on the taxpayers. Your appreciation of this fact and your foresight in establishing the Commission is commendable.

You are at liberty to make such use of this letter as you choose.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to make a statement concerning the critical situation which has arisen over the management of th public debt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during my 6 years of service in the Virginia State Senate I was a member of the finance committee which handled both taxes and appropriations. Having through that service become familiar with the financing of the State government, I was happy to be privileged to serve for 10 years on the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives and to participate in the framing of 12 tax bills, including the financing of World War II. For the past 3 years I have served on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Federal Reserve System with jurisdiction over the problems of banking and credit. My 24 years' study of fiscal matters have at least given me a keen appreciation of what is involved in our present unprecedented inflation, although I confess that a lifetime of study of either taxes or banking and currency would be insufficient to give any man expert knowledge of all the intricate details of either.

Knowing how deeply concerned I was over the present disagreement between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board over the plan announced in New York on January 10 by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury for the management of the public debt, the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], requested me last Monday to make an investigation of the matter and report to him whether or not I thought a public hearing on the issue involved by my subcommittee or by the full committee would serve a useful purpose.

On the following day, after conferring with officials of both agencies, I announced to the press that, while the problems confronting both the Treasury in the management of the public debt and of the Federal Reserve Board in the management of currency and credit as a brake upon inflation were bigger and more difficult than ever in our history, I felt that full and frank conferences between the officials of the two agencies, with the public welfare as the north star of any agreement being discussed, could result in an area of agreement and, if so, such a means of settlement was much to be preferred to a public hearing. I have never stated, as reported in at least one newspaper, that the issue is a dead one and that I had washed my hands of it.

On yesterday the Senator from South Carolina and I interviewed at length the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Open Market Committee of the Board and found them willing to enter into negotiations with the Secretary of the Treasury along the lines we suggested. The Senator from South Carolina and I urged immediate action since the issue was so vital to the Nation, and since all members of the Open Market Committee were in the city. The result of that conference was communicated to the Secretary of the Treasury, who this morning invited the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to confer with him as a preliminary, I assume, to the type of conference suggested by the Senator from South Carolina and myself. Since the confidence of the public in the value of Government securities, without which there can be no successful management of the public debt, is involved, I hope that partisans of a high-interest rate and partisans of a low-interest rate, concerning which at the moment there is no categorical answer, will be restrained in their comments until we know whether or not a policy geared to the general welfare can be agreed upon by the two agencies in question.

During my service in the Congress I have found Mr. Richard L. Strout, of the Christian Science Monitor, to be one of the clearest and most accurate reporters on fiscal affairs. His article, published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 6, entitled "Reserve Board-Treasury Row Breaks Out Into Open," is a clear and accurate description of the issue involved, expressed in terms that a layman can understand, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE BOARD-TREASURY ROW BREAKS OUT INTO OPEN

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—A first-rate row has broken out between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

It involves the conflicting personalities of stubborn Missourian Harry S. Truman and crusty multimillionaire Marriner S. Eccles, Mormon banker.

It involves the pocketbook of nearly every American.

The majority faction on the Reserve Board charges, in effect, that the administration is doing a job of controlling inflation at the grocery store but at the same time is pumping out inflation for all it is worth at the corner bank.

To which quiet-voiced ex-small-town banker John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, retorts in effect: "t aint so!"

Mr. Truman is listening to his old friend and close intimate, Mr. Snyder.

MAJORITY SEE SNYDER WRONG

As contrasted to Mr. Snyder, most Federal Reserve officials, the great majority of the bankers, and pretty nearly all economists say the Treasury Department and Mr. Truman are wrong.

This is no mere academic squabble.

It is true that it is extremely complicated. There is not a man in a thousand who can understand the ramifications of the credit-finance system and how bank loans and interest rates are turned into credit.

But there are two things to say: first, complex or not, the issue could hardly be more important because in the final analysis it involves the success or failure of Government efforts to lick inflation.

Second, although the windings of the banking credit system are intricate as a city's gas mains, the important thing to the average citizen is not the winding but whether when he strikes a match he gets gas.

In the same way it is the pragmatic effect of the complex system that is important rather than expert understanding of details.

Inflation is caused by a scarcity of goods in comparison to a plentiful supply of money and credit which bid up prices.

The Eccles school in the Reserve System charge that under presidential and Treasury Department pressure they are forced to support an "easy money" credit policy with low interest rates.

THE SNYDER ARGUMENT

Secretary Snyder likes low interest rates. The reason is natural. The United States is enormously in debt. If interest rates are low he does not have to pay so much on the debt. Interest payments are now $5,800,000,000 every year. Long term interest rates are about 2½ percent. Raise that interest rate as much as one-half of 1 percent, says Mr. Snyder, and presto, the Government's interest payment jumps $1,500,000,000.

This has to be added to the taxpayers' tax bill, Mr. Snyder points out.

On the face of it, it is an open and shut case. Low interest rates seem good for the taxpayer.

But now comes the other side of the argument.

Low interest rates for Government borrowing mean low interest rates for everybody else. Stripped of details the argument goes that low interest rates encourage speculation, business activity, inflation, just when the accent should be on belt-tightening and austerity.

Says the Eccles school the taxpayer stands to lose infinitely more by an easy-money policy that sees the basic value of the dollar depreciated by inflation, than by the hard-credit policy (higher interest rates) even though the latter boosts the cost of carrying the Federal debt.

PERSONAL FEUD INVOLVED

A bitter personal feud has got entangled in one of the great financial controversies of the day.

Until a few years ago Mr. Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. His caustic independent comment and differences with Mr. Snyder got under President Truman's skin. When Mr. Eccles' term expired Mr. Truman politely reappointed him as a member of the Board but replaced him with good-natured friendly Thomas B. McCabe as the new Chairman. Mr. Eccles was demoted. Many thought the wealthy Mormon bachelor would resign from the Board. He stayed on, quietly seething. He is a tough fighter.

The interesting thing is that Philadelphia Banker McCabe seems to have come over to the Eccles viewpoint on the basic opposition to the Treasury's easy-money policy.

The big row burst into the open this week when the showdown came.

Mr. Truman called to the White House for a peace meeting the entire Board membership and heads of the five Federal Reserve big city banks.

Following the meeting, quick statements by Mr. Truman and the Treasury announced the Board had pledged itself to the Treasury program.

This looked like a complete capitulation.

Then came the bombshell.

TRUMAN VIEW CHALLENGED

On his own authority, and specifically stating that he was acting without consultation with other Board members, Mr. Eccles released the official minutes of the meeting prepared by Gov. R. M. Evans and approved by the Board.

These showed that the Truman-Snyder interpretation was incorrect or at any rate overstated the case. On the basic dispute the Reserve Board members had hardly expressed any opinion at all to Mr. Truman. The critical issue of interest rates had hardly been raised.

Internal evidence indicates that Mr. Truman took silence for consent at the meeting. His statement appears to have been issued in good faith. A bitter schism has appeared in the Reserve Board. Members ask why Chairman McCabe didn't act as their spokesman and present the issue. When Mr. Truman left the conference he apparently thought he had full agreement.

The seven board members and five bankers took a vote afterward on a motion to suspend independent action and go along with Mr. Snyder and the Treasury on interest rates. It was defeated 8 to 4. Here was the vote.

For the motion: Board Governors Vardaman, Powell, Norton & Evans. Against: Board Chairman McCabe, governors Eccles, Szymczak, bankers Sproul, Young, Peyton, Gilbert & Erickson.

In such bitter division the crucial inflation issue now stands.

THE MEAT SITUATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, it has been my intention to obtain the floor today, if possible, to make a statement in regard to the meat situation. However, in view of the fact that I understand that the program for today is to be a very busy one, and in view of the fact that I have to attend a committee meeting at 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement

which I intended to make printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. BUTLER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T HAMPER THE MEAT PRODUCER

(Statement by Senator H. BUTLER)

During the last few weeks, the livestock producer and the meat industry generally seem to have been selected and singled out as the principal object of the efforts of the Office of Price Stabilization in its program of controlling the cost of living. Almost every edition of any daily newspaper carries stories about new orders or rumors of orders to control the production of meat. Meat prices were, supposedly at least, frozen along with the general freeze of all prices issued a few days ago. In addition, we are told that slaughterers are to be placed under a special licensing system, and are to be required to make special reports. There is talk of meat rationing, and there are rumors of subsidies as an instrument of price control. In fact, there are rumors of almost every conceivable price-control technique on meat and livestock.

Evidently, there is a sort of crusade underway against the farmer and the livestock producer. Apparently, he is to be the object of all the experiments that may come to the minds of those administering price control. Furthermore, it is apparent that he has been selected as the goat of the whole inflation problem. The story has been presented to the public that meat prices must be controlled first and most thoroughly, if other items in the cost of living are to be controlled.

This general campaign against the farmer has gone to such lengths that I believe it is time for some of us from farming areas to speak out. If there has been any inflation to date, the farmer is not the cause of it. Industrial prices and wages have reached new record heights. Farm prices have not yet even recovered from the price collapse of the last few years. Farm prices are still well below the level of 3 years ago. In fact, prices of many farm products are still well below parity.

I realize, of course, that there are those in the administration who would like to place ceilings on farm products at levels below parity. Parity prices for farmers are a favorite target for some big-city newspapers. During the last few months, the volume of criticism of some of the daily newspapers has increased steadily in volume against Congress—for refusing to permit ceilings below parity.

It is certainly true that Congress insisted that no ceilings be placed on farm products below parity. Congress put that provision in the law, and I hope and believe that Congress will keep it in. I, for one, would never vote to take it out. If we are to have a system of price controls, the farmer is certainly entitled to a fair price under such controls—and that's what parity is.

Returning now to these various proposals to control livestock and meat, just why are any controls necessary on livestock or livestock products?

I can understand the absolute necessity for placing price controls on those products of which there is an actual physical shortage because they are being used directly for rearmament. The shortage of these items would create such a scramble among consumers that their prices would certainly go sky high if there were no controls. There is no shortage of meat, however, and the men of the armed services do not eat any more meat than they did at home, or at least not enough to make any difference.

I can also understand why it may be necessary to control the prices of many manufactured items during an extreme sellers' market, such as we have now. Industrial prices are generally set by the industrial firms selling the goods. The purchaser has no choice except to pay whatever price is asked or do without. That is not the situation that the farmer faces in the sale of his products. He has no way of setting his own price on the products he sells. The price for his produce is set by the buyer, or at an auction, or perhaps by the fluctations of an open market. It is, so to speak, always a buyers' market for farm products.

There is no way that the farmer can exploit his customers, even if he wanted to. He has virtually no control over the price of what he sells.

In short, we are now speaking of putting a ceiling on an item which is in plentiful supply and which is sold in an open, uncontrolled market where buyers freely purchase whatever quantities they want at prices they agree upon. If prices have gone up, it is because buyers have bid them up.

I suggest that if meat and cattle prices have gone up too much, it is not the fault of the livestock producer. It is because of inflationary governmental policies, and particularly because of wrong Federal financial policies. Prices are being pushed up because the Federal Government is spending more than it takes in, and that is the only reason. We can correct it and prevent it if we choose by balancing the budget.

Mr. President, I do not believe that it is in the interests of either producer or consumer to attempt to control the price of either meat or cattle at this time, and under present conditions. I believe that the attempt at control will defeat its own purpose. Furthermore, I believe our experience should teach us that it is virtually impossible to exercise effective control over meat.

As I mentioned before, there is no shortage of meat in this country—yet. There may be if the livestock industry must submit to price controls, but today our supplies of meat are practically at an all-time high. That supply can be increased still further if the meat industry is not hampered and discouraged by unrealistic control. Let me cite a few of the basic facts about the meat supply.

Last year, after making allowances for the quantity of meat required by the armed services, there was still available 145 pounds of meat per capita for our entire population. That is not quite a record supply per capita, but it is very close to it. This year, there will be even more—146 pounds per capita.

That is more meat per person than was consumed in any year since 1947. It is substantially more than in any prewar year. This supply of meat can be even further increased by a considerable amount. Production of meat has been rising for the last 3 years. During that same period, feed supplies have been increasing ever faster. Production of feed over the past 3 years (including an allowance for normal quantities of wheat and rye for feed) has averaged nearly 155,000,000 tons. That is more feed than we have ever used in any year—even in our peak production year of 1944.

We are starting into this defense production effort with an all-time record carryover of feeds. The corn carry-over this year is 860,000,000 bushels (25 percent of the normal crop). In addition, we are fortunate in that we are now on a rising trend of cattle numbers. During and following the OPA days, there was extensive slaughter of herds. Cattle numbers on farms dropped from a peak of 85,573,000 head down to a low point of 78,126,000. During the past few years, that figure has climbed up rapidly again. On the first of January 1950, there were 80,277,000 head, and it is expected that the figure for January 1, 1951, will be at least 82,000,000. If there is no interference with this process, we may hope that cattle numbers will continue to rise rapidly, at least to 85,000,000, and perhaps even to 90,000,000 head. That will mean more breeding stock, and also more meat on the hoof within a comparatively short time. As I have already pointed out, we will undoubtedly have the feed to carry this increased number of cattle, and produce the additional meat we want.

Under these circumstances, it is highly probable that meat production can be pushed well past the production level of 1944, which allowed 153 pounds of meat per person, aside from those in the armed services. I can understand that consumers would like to have their meat at a low price, but I believe they also want to secure the maximum quantity of meat. Unwise controls will cut down this production and cut into the meat supply that consumers want.

There is another problem which is peculiar to the meat industry. That is the virtual impossibility of really effective controls. Meat is produced on thousands of farms all over this country. Much of it is processed in a few packing plants, but it does not have to be. It does not take very elaborate equipment to slaughter livestock and prepare the meat for consumption. Furthermore, livestock can be and is sold not only at the large stockyards, but also at country markets, by private sales, and virtually at every crossroads. The marketing channels are extremely fluid and can be readily changed.

There are no precise grades or quality classifications that can be placed on live cattle. Each shipment of beef cattle commands its own price on its own merits. Therefore, it is not possible to establish effective ceilings by grade.

Altogether the livestock industry is the one industry that is just impossible to control effectively. There are too many different possible markets, too many individual differences in cattle, too many ways to get around the control machinery.

We have learned from our experience during World War II that a simple price ceiling is not enough to do the job. Price ceilings create shortages and the apparent need for rationing. If any real attempt is made to enforce price ceilings, I predict that we will have meat rationing within 3 months. If we do, that is when the black marketeers will really come into their own. I have heard rumors that there are packing houses now closed down, which are getting ready to reopen as soon as rationing is restored and black market opportunities arise. During World War II, the black marketeers were amateurs at the game, but now they have learned all the tricks. I am afraid they will do a professional job of diverting the meat from the legitimate channels and into the black market.

Altogether the job of administering such a complex system of controls would tax the ingenuity of the most competent, honest, and nonpartisan administrative organization. Unfortunately, it does not seem likely that we shall have such an organization to administer this system. The administration has already given clear evidence that price-control machinery is to be handled on a strictly political basis. The Office of Price Stabilization is being loaded up with political appointees and "lame ducks" of every description. In State after State, the better positions are being parceled out to those acceptable to the Democratic organization. Thus these high-salaried positions are being reserved to a select clique, but more important, those holding the top enforcement jobs will be in position to use their authority for the benefit of the party. It is safe to assume that if any black marketeers who are not on friendly terms with this administration are caught, they will be prosecuted. Whether party stalwarts who break the regulations will receive the same treatment, remains to be seen.

Mr. President, altogether the difficulties in a program of this sort are tremendous, while the advantages are questionable. To

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

my mind, the whole attempt is virtually a confession that we have failed to develop sound policies to finance this rearmament effort. Why should price controls and rationing be necessary if there is no shortage? Why, at the very time when we want and need more meat, should we take an action which will necessarily hinder the production of meat? The livestock men of this country can produce all the meat we can possibly require, and at a fair price. If given a chance, they will do so in response to the normal play of the forces of supply and demand. They can and will expand livestock numbers and increase meat production very sharply within a year or two, now that they know there is a market for it. We are foolish if we do not let them do so.

Instead, the Office of Price Stabilization appears intent on holding down meat production, thereby creating an artificial shortage, and then rationing the shortage.

In this emergency, Mr. President, I suggest that much of our thinking is in the wrong direction. Instead of restriction, we need expansion. Instead of cutting down on necessities, we need more production to produce those necessities and to meet the demands of rearmament.

To take the other course is to take the path that Socialist England has taken. England put price controls and rationing on early in World War II and has never reached the point where she can take them off. The price of meat is controlled, but there is no meat. The individual ration for meat has been cut—again and again. It is now less than one-half what was allowed during World War II. Today in England, the individual ration for meat is so small that it provides each consumer about one square meal per week. That is the course, I am afraid, down which we are being led. I do not worry so much about temporary hardships and temporary controls. I am more afraid that these temporary emergencies will be used to fasten a control system on us permanently. That is my real fear, and that is why I am protesting today.

Mr. President, price ceilings and rationing will never solve the problem of supplying meat to our people, but production will. I urge most strongly that the Office of Price Stabilization, in its consideration of any proposed regulations and controls, will adhere to that fundamental principle.

PRICES RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR EGGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a list which appeared in the Renville County Farmer, a very fine newspaper published in Renville County, N. Dak., showing that the price of eggs on February 1 to the farmer was 25 cents a dozen.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tuesday's market

Butterfat No. 1 (sour)	$0.69
Butterfat No. 1 (sweet)	.71
Wholesale butter	.71
Wheat	2.16
Flax	4.35
Oats	.75
Rye	1.46
Choice A durum	2.00
Red durum	1.91
Eggs, dozen	.25

COMPLAINT BY DEFIANCE SPARK PLUG CORP. CHARGING MONOPOLY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to address the Senate for 2 minutes in connection with a letter which I wish to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the letter is dated January 25, 1951. It relates to Federal Trade Commission Docket No. 3977.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Democratic leader, to this letter. I do not know the writer of the letter, although I have had some correspondence with him since I received the letter, but what he states in his letter is in direct contrast to everything the Democratic Party promised the people at the last election.

I now read the letter:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: May 4, 1937, we filed complaint with the Federal Trade Commission against Champion Spark Plug Co. charging monopoly.

Final hearing was held December 4, 1950, in Washington.

Thirteen years is a long waiting period. The Big Three—Champion Spark Plug Co., AC Spark Plug Co., and Electric Auto-Lite Co.—have 90 percent of the spark-plug business in the country, while some 40 small manufacturers are bleeding to death; more than 20 have "passed on."

Can anything be done to hasten action by the Commission?

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

DEFIANCE SPARK PLUG CORP.,
RAYMOND P. LIPE, *President.*

I may say that three of the present members of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Mead, Mr. Carson, and Mr. Spingarn, are not to blame for the condition complained of in the letter; but if any member of the Commission has served on it for as long as 10 years, I suggest that he should resign his office and should let a competent person take his place.

Mr. President, in that connection I hold in my hand a list of the licensed attorneys in North Dakota. This list gives the name of every licensed lawyer in that State. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed along with the letter. I suggest that any lawyer practicing in North Dakota, no matter how young or how old he may be, can do a better job than has been done in this case, in which 13 years have passed without the taking of action.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948 LIST OF LICENSED ATTORNEYS

ADAMS COUNTY

James A. Clement, Charles M. Dunn, E. C. Thomas, Hettinger.

BARNES COUNTY

Romen H. Fitzner, Fred J. Fredrickson, A. F. Greffenius, Valley City; A. P. Hanson, Litchville; Tilford Owen Kroshus, E. G. Larson, Bernard C. Lyons, Marian Maloney, William L. Paulson, C. E. Peterson, Roy A. Ployhar, D. S. Ritchie, John Sad, L. T. Sproul, L. A. W. Stephan, Valley City.

BENSON COUNTY

L. L. Butterwick, Minnewaukan; Adrian E. Buttz, Leeds; M. C. Hiasen, Charles A. Lent, Albert Louis Lindstrom, W. G. McDonald, Steve Ward, Minnewaukan.

BILLINGS COUNTY

William W. Eichhorst, W. J. Ray, Medora.

BOTTINEAU COUNTY

W. H. Adams, Asmunder Benson, O. B. Benson, Bottineau; E. O. Haraldson, Lansford; Maurice Weeks, Bottineau.

BOWMAN COUNTY

Mark H. Amundson, M. S. Byrne, Theodore B. Torkelson, Bowman.

BURKE COUNTY

Earl Walter, B. L. Wilson, Bowbells.

BURLEIGH COUNTY

W. J. Austin, Robert A. Birdzell, Scott Cameron, Joseph Coghlan, Ed. B. Cox, Gordon V. Cox, I. C. Davies, E. Forsyth Engerbretson, P. J. Engeseth, C. L. Foster, P. B. Garberg, Arnold O. Gopien, Bismarck; A. H. Helgeson, Wilton; Harold Hopton, E. A. Houck, J. A. Hyland, Clifford Jansonius, William Langer, Charles Liessman, Thomas Daniel McCarty, F. E. McCurdy, Archie H. McGray, Walter Mohn, Catherine E. Morris, R. C. Morton, J. K. Murray, William S. Murray, Gunnar Olgeirson, I. M. Oseth, Owen Tudor Owen, William R. Pearce, George M. Register, George S. Register, P. O. Sathre, Geo. F. Shafer, Charles Simon, Alvin C. Strutz, C. L. Young, Alfred Zuger, John A. Zuger, Bismarck.

CASS COUNTY

Gordon S. Aamoth, Alvin Aas, Oscar H. Ahlberg, Aaron Aronson, Harold W. Bangert, Albert R. Bergesen, Pershing Boe, Clair F. Brickner, Myron H. Bright, Lee F. Brooks, Gordon F. Burnett, W. F. Burnett, Neil Cameron, Fred W. Colby, E. T. Conmy, E. T. Conmy, Jr., J. F. X. Conmy, Ralph F. Croal, A. W. Cupler, Alfred S. Dale, Vernon W. Edenstrom, H. S. Finch, Morgan D. Ford, Martin C. Fredricks, Jr., A. S. Grady, Wayne A. Grimm, Otto Haakenstad, S. W. Hagan, William E. Heller, J. E. Hendrickson, Lyle Eugene Huseby, John S. Johanneson, A. I. Johnson, Francis X. Kirsch, Fargo; G. W. LaBree, Casselton; P. W. Lanier, P. W. Lanier, Jr., Harry Lashkowitz, B. H. Lee, Marion Jane Leslie, G. Eldon Longstreth, Fargo; Arthur Whitten McCauley, West Fargo; D. E. McCullagh, William P. McGrath, Adrian McLellan, Dale R. McMichael, Harry O. Mowery, John J. Mudready, Francis Murphy, Herbert G. Nilles, John Joseph Nilles, L. H. Oehlert, Fargo; Manfred R. Ohnstad, West Fargo; Bessie Spangler Olson, John Gordon Ottis, John G. Pfeffer, Roger Pitsenbarger, Charles M. Pollock, Joseph M. Powers, Roy K. Redetzke, Scott T. Rex, Robert W. Rovelstad, C. J. Rund, Chester J. Serkland, Emanuel Sgutt, Albert W. Shupienis, Charles H. Shure, W. H. Shure, Chauncey B. Simons, Leland J. Smith, George A. Soule, Lynn U. Stambaugh, Emanuel M. Stern, Marie K. E. Stiening, Odlin J. Strandness, Norman G. Tenneson, Paul G. Thonn, Franklin J. Van Osdel, Mart R. Vogel, Phil B. Vogel, Fargo; Alfred O. Wallen, Erie; C. C. Wattam, Goodwin T. Westlund, Neal E. Williams, Fargo; Frank J. Woell, Joseph H. Woell, Casselton.

CAVALIER COUNTY

Thomas Devaney, E. L. Donovan, Robert Q. Price, Ellis G. Snowfield, J. M. Snowfield, Langdon.

DICKEY COUNTY

T. L. Brouillard, Donald R. Crabtree, F. J. Graham, Ellendale; A. P. Guy, George Margulies, Oakes.

DIVIDE COUNTY

Olaf Braatelien, George P. Homnes, R. H. Points, T. S. Stuart, E. A. Tannas, Crosby.

DUNN COUNTY

J. Kenneth Eckes, Karl Gruenwald, Killdeer; H. L. Malloy, A. J. Palmer, Halliday.

EDDY COUNTY

Dorwin Z. Aas, R. G. Manly, Edgar P. Mattson, Lynn W. Schwoebel, New Rockford.

EMMONS COUNTY

Robert Chesrown, Charles Coventry, H. C. Lynn, Linton.

FOSTER COUNTY

C. W. Burnham, William A. Kunkel, Thomas A. Roney, Carrington.

GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY

W. L. Eckes, John Keohane, Beach; Guy Lee, Sentinel Butte; Howard A. Moum, Beach.

GRAND FORKS COUNTY

Grace Alphson, John A. Alphson, Robert A. Alphson, Philip R. Bangs, O. B. Burtness, Ronald N. Davies, Carroll E. Day, Thomas L. Degnan, Theodore B. Elton, Robert A. Feidler, Edward C. Gillig, Harold M. Hager, Helen N. Hamilton, Fred E. Harris, Donald C. Holand, Carther Jackson, E. Clifton Lebacken, Grand Forks; J. A. Lemery, Inkster; James Edward Leo, Daniel S. Letnes, W. H. Linwell, Martin U. Lohn, George Longmire, Charles A. Lyche, Cyrus N. Lyche, H. H. Matt, Milton E. Moskau, Kenneth J. Mullen, C. J. Murphy, Carlton G. Nelson, Lowell A. O'Grady, Henry O'Keefe, Jr., Grand Forks; Ralph S. Oliver, Larimore; Henry Grattan Owen, Samuel E. Paletz, C. F. Peterson, Samuel Rubin, Henry G. Ruemmele, Harry L. Schwam, Harold D. Shaft, Sam S. Silverman, George D. Smith, Arthur W. Stokes, T. H. Thoresen, Olaf M. Thorsen, T. A. Toner, Grand Forks; Horace G. Webster, Northwood.

GRANT COUNTY

R. G. Beede, Elgin; Edmund Dubbs, New Leipzig; Emil A. Griese, Carson.

GRIGGS COUNTY

Maurice William Duffy, Oscar J. Thompson, Cooperstown.

HETTINGER COUNTY

Reuben J. Bloedau, Charles E. Crane, V. H. Crane, H. P. Jacobson, Mott.

KIDDER COUNTY

Jasper N. McCarter, Ralph N. Molbert, Rees L. Phelps, Linn Sherman, Anne Vinje, Steele.

LA MOURE COUNTY

Mark A. Buechler, Roy A. Holand, Theodore F. Kessel, T. W. Lynch, LaMoure.

LOGAN COUNTY

D. L. Anderson, Burnstad; August Doerr, C. Francis Swanke, Napoleon.

M'HENRY COUNTY

Thomas D. Morrow, Walter R. Spaulding, Victor V. Stiehm, D. G. Topp, Towner.

M'INTOSH COUNTY

B. E. Kretschmar, I. A. Mackoff, Edwin J. P. Myers, Jr., Max A. Wishek, Ashley.

M'KENZIE COUNTY

P. C. Arildson, A. O. Haugerud, J. S. Taylor, Watford City.

M'LEAN COUNTY

R. A. H. Brandt, Big Bend; Robert L. Fraser, Milton K. Higgins, Washburn; D. W. B. Kurtz, Jr., Garrison; Lewis J. Mann, Washburn; Alex W. Skoropat, Wilton; Robert L. Vogel, Garrison; John E. Williams, Washburn.

MERCER COUNTY

Wesley Henry Esterly, Beulah; F. Leslie Forsgren, Hazen; W. R. Mills, Stanton; Raymond R. Rund, Golden Valley; Theodore A. Sailer, Hazen; Floyd B. Sperry, Golden Valley.

MORTON COUNTY

C. D. Cooley, Mandan; August E. Draeb, Hebron; J. P. Fleck, R. F. Gallagher, Richard P. Gallagher, Mandan; S. E. Halpern, Glen Ullin; Thorstein Hyland, Mandan; P. S. Jungers, Hebron; C. F. Kelsch, Mandan; Kurth H. Krauth, Hebron; John F. Lord, Mandan; J. V. McCormick, New Salem; William H. McCormick, Walton S. Russell, Clarence James Schauss, W. H. Stutsman, John F. Sullivan, Mandan.

MOUNTRAIL COUNTY

K. E. Edwardson, White Earth; Quentin R. Schulte, R. E. Swendseid, F. P. Wyckoff, Stanley.

NELSON COUNTY

E. C. Boostrom, Lysle C. Boostrom, Einar Johnson, Ingman Swinland, Lakota; Peter C. Tangen, Aneta.

OLIVER COUNTY

Burton S. Wilcox, Clara W. Wilcox, Center.

PEMBINA COUNTY

Eugene E. Coyne, Leonard J. Eid, Walhalla; Ross H. McEnroe, Drayton; Ross McIntosh, F. S. Snowfield, H. B. Spiller, Cavalier; I. Steenson, Drayton.

PIERCE COUNTY

Roland A. Heringer, A. R. Jongewaard, Harold B. Nelson, L. R. Nostdal, H. B. Senn, Lawrence E. Watson, Rugby.

RAMSEY COUNTY

F. T. Cuthbert, Clyde Duffy, Douglas B. Heen, Henry E. Lemke, D. B. McDonald, Howard Maher, Devils Lake; T. W. Morrissey, Edmore; Myer R. Shark, Torger Sinness, H. W. Swenson, Obert C. Teigen, S. W. Thompson, Fred J. Traynor, Mack V. Traynor, Devils Lake.

RANSOM COUNTY

S. D. Adams, Lisbon; Charles G. Bangert, Enderlin; Charles S. Ego, Lisbon; Tim A. Francis, Enderlin; Clarence G. Mead, H. P. Remington, Lisbon; Frank E. Shaw, Sheldon.

RENVILLE COUNTY

P. M. Clark, Theo. P. Clifford, S. A. Sorenson, Mohall.

RICHLAND COUNTY

M. S. Aker, Hankinson; Wayne T. Childs, Wahpeton; Everett R. Dawson, Lidgerwood; Jos. G. Forbes, Vernon D. Forbes, Harry M. Griffith, Wahpeton; O. S. Gunderson, Christine; Mildred Burns Johnson, Vernon M. Johnson, Patrick T. Milloy, Clifford Schneller, Wahpeton.

ROLETTE COUNTY

John B. Hart, Rolla; Ralph B. Maxwell, Belcourt; J. Howard Stormon, John A. Stormon, J. Arthur Vandal, Rolla.

SARGENT COUNTY

Walter C. King, A. Leslie, Forman; O. S. Sem, Milnor.

SHERIDAN COUNTY

Victor L. Thom, Goodrich; John Oliver Thorson, Warren A. Tripp, McClusky.

SIOUX COUNTY

Nelson Mason, Fort Yates.

SLOPE COUNTY

R. L. Striebel, Marmarth; Theodore Swendseid, Amidon.

STARK COUNTY

L. R. Baird, Richard V. Boulger, W. C. Crawford, Theodore Kellogg, M. L. McBride, H. A. Mackoff, Norbert J. Muggli, T. F. Murtha, W. F. Reichert, Gilbert Saxowsky, C. H. Starke, J. W. Sturgeon, Otto Thress, Dickinson.

STEELE COUNTY

A. E. Dolezal, Hope; E. T. Meldahl, Finley.

STUTSMAN COUNTY

A. W. Aylmer, Quentin N. Burdick, Leslie R. Burgum, Russell D. Chase, J. A. Coffey, Robert D. Dames, M. C. Fredricks, Robert Emmett Fredricks, T. E. George, Arnold O. Ginnow, John Hjellum, Arthur I. Knauf, John Knauf, Cytella Dahn Rittgers, Harry E. Rittgers, Arnold M. Snortland, Samuel A. Wilder, Jamestown.

TOWNER COUNTY

Paul L. Agneberg, C. E. Joseph, J. J. Kehoe, J. S. Moothart, Lloyd B. Stevens, Cando.

TRAILL COUNTY

G. J. Clauson, Hatton; Thomas G. Johnson, Chauncey T. Kaldor, Hillsboro; Harvey N. Kaldor, Harvey B. Knudson, Carl J. Larson, Mayville; John I. Lerom, Buxton; Charles H. Shafer, Hillsboro; George F. Sorlie, Buxton.

WALSH COUNTY

Mark J. Clayburgh, Jr., Grafton; George V. Coffey, Minto; T. I. Dahl, H. C. DePuy, W. T. DePuy, Ben Greenberg, Lynn G. Grimson, Albert Lundberg, Joel Myers, Grafton; Roy A. Neste, Park River; Robert Vaaler, Wallace E. Warner, Grafton; F. Lorene Whitesides, Park River.

WARD COUNTY

C. D. Aaker, Robert H. Bosard, B. H. Bradford, G. O. Brekke, Robert A. Buttz, Paul Campbell, Thomas F. Clifford, Carlton B. Davis, B. A. Dickinson, Joseph J. Funke, Halvor L. Halvorson, H. L. Halvorson, Jr., O. B. Herigstad, Clara J. Johnson, H. E. Johnson, Robert M. Johnson, Leo C. Lindemann, Grant J. Lindlauf, John C. Lowe, E. B. McCutcheon, E. Hugh McCutcheon, George A. McGee, Richard H. McGee, E. J. McIlraith, Jim Miller, Thomas B. Murphy, Magner J. Muus, Mrs. F. Margaret Pfeffer Muus, P. D. Norton, Alice E. Olander, Robert W. Palda, Minot; A. J. Pederson, Kenmare; Joseph P. Stevens, C. A. Thompson, Ella J. Van Berkom, Bruce M. Van Sickle, Corbin A. Waldron, G. S. Wooledge, Minot.

WELLS COUNTY

Samuel H. Dolve, John A. Layne, F. W. McGuiness, Arthur L. Netcher, Fessenden; J. W. Schmidt, John J. Tebelius, Aloys Wartner, Aloys Wartner, Jr., Harvey; Adam V. Zuber, Fessenden.

WILLIAMS COUNTY

Arley R. Bjella, Williston; H. Morris Borstad, Tioga; Eugene A. Burdick, U. L. Burdick, Walter O. Burk, F. W. Medberry, Joseph N. Mendro, Robert Norheim, Everett E. Palmer, Telmar E. Rolfstad, Williston; E. C. Rudolph, Ray; Dean Winkjer, Williston.

TAX LAWS MUST BE BASED ON EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed approximately 4 minutes in which to make a statement on the President's tax message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American people last week read with great interest the tax message submitted by the President. I heartily endorse the President's determination to pay as we go for our expanding defense effort. It is wise to tailor the tax program to the unfolding defense program, pushing through about $10,000,000,000 of higher taxes now, and holding the rest of the tax increase until the military picture unfolds.

A pay-as-we-go tax policy is the least we can do in the face of the sacrifices being made by the men and women in our Armed Forces. Besides, it is just common sense to match expenditures on guns, planes, ships, and tanks with tax receipts. Otherwise, the Government will incur large deficits, and the inevitable result will be more inflation.

I am sure that the American people see the need for additional taxes. I am also sure that they are willing to make their contribution, even if it hurts. But we cannot in good faith ask the rank and file to pay their share when a chosen few can take advantage of glaring loopholes in the tax laws. It would violate every test of equal sacrifice to ask the man in the street to pay higher excise and income taxes when the rich become richer through our failure to close loopholes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I, for one, will insist that the $10,000,000,000 tax bill be accompanied by a firm commitment that loopholes will be closed. The American people demanded an excess-profits tax last year, long before the Congress acted. This year the American people will insist on a tough loophole-closing program to catch the tax dodgers. They want to have a right to equality of sacrifices; they oppose special tax privileges for anybody. I intend to make it my business, and I hope that other Senators and Representatives will join me in the effort to tell the people the unvarnished truth about these loopholes.

Those who want to keep on protecting the privileged few will argue that loophole closing will not raise much revenue. It is a familiar line: "Why worry about the few dollars that slip through the net? The real money lies in raising rates." This is false counsel. Let there be no mistake about the fact that billions of dollars can be raised by plugging loopholes. Here are a few samples:

First. The excess-profits tax which was enacted by the last Congress is full of holes. Railroads, utilities, natural-gas companies, and other regulated companies are virtually exempt from tax. Congress has also guaranteed other corporations fabulous levels of profits free of excess-profits tax by a number of technical provisions, such as the growth formula and the special allowances for borrowed capital. By tightening up the excess-profits tax we could raise at least $1,000,000,000.

Second. Our unbelievably generous depletion provisions hand the oil and mining interests half a billion dollars each year. Last year, the President called this loophole the most glaring in the tax laws. Congress did nothing about it. This year, with tax rates going still higher, this loophole is even more unconscionable and more expensive.

Third. The estate and gift taxes are in a pitiable state. It is unbelievable that, in a country so wealthy as ours, these taxes raise little more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. The Secretary of the Treasury presented a plan to the Congress last year for tightening up these taxes. Again nothing was done. Yet there are at least another three-quarters of a billion dollars to be had for the asking from the estate and gift taxes, by plugging loopholes, raising rates, and reducing the big exemptions. Let us make these taxes do the job they ought to in the richest country in the world.

Fourth. At the same time that wage earners are paying every last cent of their taxes because the money is withheld from their pay envelopes, billions of dollars of interest and dividends are evading taxes. This criminal evasion must be stopped. One of the best ways to do this is to withhold the tax from interest and dividends, just as we do on wages and salaries. By this elementary improvement in enforcement, we can add at least $300,000,000 a year to our revenues.

Fifth. The income-splitting provisions enacted by the Eightieth Congress confer unwarranted tax benefits on the well-to-do. People in the lowest tax bracket gained nothing from this provision. At the $25,000 level, it reduced the taxes of a married person by more than a quarter. We cannot afford to give such hand-outs in times like these. If the benefits of income splitting were eliminated, we could increase tax collections by no less than $2,500,000,000.

These five items alone add up to an even $5,000,000,000. I have not mentioned others, such as the loopholes in the capital-gains provisions, the tax exemption for interest on State and local bonds, and the weak tax provisions for life-insurance companies. I have no doubt that a determined effort to close all the loopholes could be made to yield practically all of the $6,500,000,000 needed over and above the $10,000,000,000 program itemized by the President.

Last year, when the Senate was considering the Revenue Act of 1950, I joined with my able colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in bringing to the attention of the Senate defects in the bill. We presented at that time 12 amendments designed to close various loopholes in tax legislation. I am pleased to say that we will again, with the assistance of other distinguished and able Members of this body, make an effort to improve the tax laws by eliminating loopholes. It is our hope that, with the assistance of the American people, this will be done. Already, as a result of the energetic activities of radio commentators such as Mr. Frank Edwards and Mr. Drew Pearson, many thousands of Americans have written to me expressing interest in our activities, and requesting information.

I therefore ask unanimous consent at this point that there be included, following my remarks, a summary of our tax presentation on the floor of the Senate of last year outlining certain of the tax loopholes which were at issue in the 81st Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY BY SENATOR HUMPHREY OF TAX BILL AMENDMENTS TO CLOSE LOOPHOLES

It is essential for the American people and all their representatives in Congress to know more about Federal taxation. It is not enough merely to know that a graduated individual income tax is desirable, because it is based on ability to pay, and that a sales tax is bad because it hits hardest those with lowest incomes and largest families. In order to insure that everyone pays his fair share of income taxes we have several considerations that must be taken into account:

1. We have to weed out those who misrepresent the amount of their income when they fill out their tax return. This is primarily the job of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but the rest of us can help out by frowning upon sharp tax practices and assuming our responsibilities as citizens.

2. We have to keep a sharp lookout that our graduated income tax system is not defeated by efforts of individuals or corporations to divide or "split" income with other persons in such a way as to avoid payment of taxes, while at the same time retaining effective economic control of the income.

3. Another source of trouble has been the availability of a much lower rate of tax on so-called "long-term" capital gains, with the resultant temptation to taxpayers to try to claim that ordinary, recurrent income is really a capital gain.

4. There is constant pressure upon taxpayers (and those who do not want to pay taxes) to reduce their taxable income by charging off greater deductions than would normally be allowable under proper rules of accounting.

Finally, there are the pleas, usually upon some claim of injustice, discrimination or unconstitutionality, that all or part of the income of an individual or corporation should not be subject to any tax at all.

This summation of the principal current problems of Federal income taxation may wreak havoc with the erudite concepts of the tax lawyers, accountants and economists. But I have taken this approach in an earnest effort to understand how the income tax part of the Federal tax system really operates. Perhaps a little unorthodoxy can help us dispel some of the fog which enshrouds the twists and turns of Federal taxation as tightly as do all the security regulations in the field of atomic energy.

If we analyze the provisions of the pending bill, and the decisions of the Committee on Finance, there are a number which seem to fall within the broad confines of the five areas I have outlined.

An analysis of the 12 amendments introduced by me is as follows:

1. Dividend withholding: Out of about eight million paid out in corporation dividends annually, one billion is not reported on stockholder tax returns. Wage earners must pay taxes as earned, why continue to tolerate evasion by coupon clippers? The provision in the House bill for withholding taxes on dividends should be restored. The Government is now losing between one hundred and sixty and one hundred and seventy million dollars a year under present law.

2. Percentage depletion: Neither the Senate nor House bill does anything to limit the excessive depletion allowances for oil and gas and other minerals which the President described as the worst loophole in our tax laws. This windfall costs the Government $400,000,000 a year. If an ordinary businessman invests $100,000 in plant and equipment, he gets a tax deduction of this amount prorated over the useful life of the property. Another man who invests in an oil well can, through "percentage depletion" allowances obtain a tax deduction not only for the $100,000 initial investment, but several times this amount.

3. Oil royalties: Instead of receiving royalties from oil wells, which are subject to ordinary income and surtax rates, oilmen would be able to "sell" their right to such income for a 1-year period or longer, and be subject only to capital-gain rates. Many oilmen are now taxed at normal and surtax rates totaling 50 percent or more. Yet these operators would pay, under the committee bill, at only the capital-gain rate of 25 percent on such "in-oil" payments.

4. Family partnerships: This is a retroactive reversal of Supreme Court decisions which refused to allow businessmen to make fictitious "partners" of their wives, children, and other relatives, solely to split up their income for tax purposes. For example, the tax on an unmarried man with an income of $40,000 a year amounts to almost $17,000, or nearly double the total taxes of $8,500 payable on four incomes of $10,000 each.

5. Stock options: Corporate executives would be allowed to pay at capital-gains rates in lieu of normal and surtax rates, on that part of their salary received in the form of options to buy company stock at less than market price. An unmarried executive earning $30,000 a year would pay $12,000 more in taxes if given a $20,000 a year cash bonus. If the bonus is paid in stock options, under the Finance Committee bill he would pay only $5,000 more in taxes.

6. Tax-free redemption of stocks to pay estate taxes: Estates of owners of corporations would be allowed to draw down accumulated earnings and profits free of income tax to the extent used to pay estate and inheritance taxes. This amendment has practical application under present gift and estate tax exemptions only to single persons with estates of $250,000 and over, or to married persons with estates of $500,000 or more.

7. Corporate spin-offs: This provision would exempt from taxation the value of new stocks distributed to stockholders by a corporation which decided to "spin off" part of its business into a separate firm. These stocks are now considered as "dividends" for tax purposes and, thus, are subject to individual income taxes. Under the committee bill, therefore, accumulated corporate profits could be distributed to stockholders at capital gains tax rates instead of the usual normal and surtax rates applicable to dividends. This amendment is of real benefit only to single persons with income of $18,000 a year and married couples of $33,000 a year.

8. Amortization of emergency facilities: While omitting an excess-profits tax on corporations, the committee bill would permit accelerated amortization of plants and equipment certified to be necessary for the current emergency. Instead of the usual 15- to 40-year period of depreciation for tax purposes, the entire cost could be recovered tax-free within a period of 5 years. The report of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program states that many persons responsible for the renegotiation of war contracts in World War II considered accelerated depreciation as the greatest source of excessive profits during the last war.

9. Section 117 (j): Since 1942 the tax law has contained a "heads I win, tails you lose" provision in favor of a taxpayer who sells property used in his trade or business. If the sale results in a profit, it is taxed as a capital gain. If it results in a loss, the loss is treated as a fully deductible ordinary loss. The Treasury has estimated this loophole as costing about $70,000,000. Accelerated amortization greatly expands the importance of this loophole.

10. Life-insurance companies: At a time when other individual and corporate taxpayers are overburdened, life-insurance companies paid no taxes on income for 1947, 1948, and 1949. This results from a technical error in the Revenue Act of 1942. The committee bill would in effect grant a $50,000,000 tax melon to the life-insurance industry by striking out the provisions in the House bill for collection of the 1947 and 1948 tax liabilities.

11. Foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations: The House bill would have closed a loophole in the existing law under which domestic corporations can liquidate subsidiaries operating abroad (such as oil companies), and bring back tax-free profits that have never passed through the Federal income tax stream. The committee bill would retain this glaring loophole.

12. Reduction in holding period for long-term capital gains: Under existing law a capital gain is taxable at a maximum rate of 25 percent if the asset was held for over 6 months. Under the Senate bill this period is reduced to 3 months. This amendment, which was included in the House bill and approved by the Finance Committee, fits best the tax needs of the stock market and commodity speculators, who are thus permitted to convert ordinary profits into capital gains. This loophole will benefit principally single persons above $18,000 and married couples above $36,000.

DEEDS PROVE THEIR VALOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deeds Prove Their Valor," published in the Indianapolis Star of February 2, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEEDS PROVE THEIR VALOR

When Drew Pearson gave credence to an alleged Red Chinese "combat bulletin" in yesterday's column, in which the American Army in Korea was pictured as a gang of cowards, we expected a storm of protest, which the Star has received, and in which we wish to join.

According to the bulletin from which the Washington columnist quoted American troops are not aggressive, tend to panic and "quail and flinch at the sound of heavy firing." Mr. Pearson then added on his own part that this "Chinese intelligence estimate" was true, although we are not aware that he has visited the Korean front or that he has access to official military information which is not available to other reporters.

The record of America's fighting forces in Korea speaks for itself. Against tremendous odds our troops have held on in that miserable land and have inflicted terrible punishment on the enemy.

Dispatches of front-line reporters in Korea have drawn a far more reliable picture of the performance of American troops than any "intelligence estimate" which the enemy is likely to distribute or any of Drew Pearson's "pipeline" information. These dispatches, uncensored until recently, have consistently disclosed a high quality of aggressiveness and a wealth of individual and unit gallantry on the part of United States forces of which every American can be fiercely proud.

The very best we can say for Mr. Pearson in this instance is that he is innocently or overzealously promoting a dangerous generality which gives aid and comfort to the enemy. Throughout history a favorite propaganda trick has been to impugn the foe's courage. Hitler called Americans decadent cowards and, to his misfortune, came to believe his own lie. Stalin and his Chinese stooges know better but they are busily advancing the same lie. But the deeds of our men in Korea shout down both this lie and the unfortunate opinion which Mr. Pearson chose to express.

FARM POLICY COUNCIL

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for less than 2 minutes regarding the Farm Policy Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as a result of the hearings conducted by the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, it becomes quite apparent that drastic shortages of material and manpower are appearing. Thousands upon thousands of small businesses are confronted with the possibility of having to give up unless raw materials and supplies upon which they must depend for their very existence are available even in restricted quantities.

No one objects to the shortages of such materials as steel, lead, zinc, nickel, aluminum, electrical supplies which are actually needed in furtherance of the war effort. Thousands of small businesses are interested in the manufacturing, processing, and distribution of much-needed farm supplies and those used in connection with specialized farming activities in dairying, poultry raising, and many other types of small industries in supplying farm trade. The farm groups who are interested in seeing that they receive just consideration for supplies have done a very good job in organizing to make their demands and requests known and to see that businesses directly connected with farm-producing activities are not overlooked.

There appears in the February 1951 issue of the Country Gentleman an editorial entitled "Let's Strengthen Agriculture's Position." This editorial stresses the need of the farming interests for better safeguards as to their position both in the producing program and the farm-labor situation, which, from reports, can become critical before next summer. This editorial further points out that this is not a matter that affects the farming interests alone. Everyone has a stake in what is likely to happen. Everyone wants plenty of food. The defense program needs the necessary supplies. This editorial stresses the need and the necessity for a Farm Policy Council to be set up by the leading farm organizations with the responsibility of watching over the needs of farming, including farm labor, and to present these matters before the proper groups charged with the administration of the various defense production boards and groups.

Mr. President, I think this editorial is so timely and is so important to the agricultural interests of this Nation that I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STRENGTHEN AGRICULTURE'S POSITION

Farming needs to be better safeguarded under the defense production program. The farm labor situation, which could become critical by next summer, is an example of what can happen unless the interests of agriculture are properly looked after.

It isn't a matter that affects farmers alone. The public, which will have to do without some other things, will want plenty of food and the defense program requires ample supplies of food and fiber. But neither fact assures prompt attention to farm needs for all-out production. Somebody will have to take the responsibility for getting that kind of attention.

The Defense Production Act, passed by Congress, did fairly well in protecting farm prices. But it left the Department of Agriculture with little authority over the workings of the defense program. The Department can advise and can present claims for materials necessary for farm production. But this does not mean they will be granted. It will be only one of a number of interests pressing claims for materials, some of them with a stronger backing than agriculture now has in Washington.

Not only vigor in pressing farm requirements but an alertness in anticipating them is needed. The farm labor situation, reported in the Roundup columns on pages 4

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and 10 of this issue, shows how important this can be. Such a loss of experienced farm workers, as now seems certain, may seriously handicap the heavy production program that has been called for. Farming is in a much different position than at the outbreak of World War II. At that time a surplus of farm workers had been backed up on the farms by the depression. Even then a farm manpower shortage soon developed. There is scant surplus of farm manpower now and farming is mechanized to twice the extent it was in 1941. Just any kind of worker won't do now.

This makes it imperative also that a shortage of spare parts be averted in the future. Many farmers keenly recall the time they spent and the distances they traveled trying to find needed parts during the last war. A far more highly mechanized agriculture couldn't stand that sort of experience again. Somebody will have to see to it that it doesn't happen.

Agriculture isn't in a position to do much about such things now. Outside the Department's services it has been represented only by a consulting committee on the National Resources Security Board, now superseded by the Office of Defense Mobilization. This committee was not fully representative of farming and has been of little effect.

Something is needed to strengthen the position of agriculture. For that purpose Country Gentleman suggests a farm policy council, set up by the leading farm organizations. Its job would be to keep watch over the needs of farming and to press them vigorously when they arise. Labor has such a council and there has been no lack of vigor in presenting labor's case in Washington. A council, fully representative of agriculture, could be an effective voice in its behalf. It could cooperate with the Secretary if he were willing, as he should be, and reinforce his claims for needed farm help and materials. And it could work along the same lines with the two agricultural committees of Congress.

But, before any such council can be set up, two things will be necessary. The various farm organizations will have to submerge their differences and work together for the common good of the farmers they represent. And there will have to be less thinking in terms of commodity groups and more in terms of agriculture as a whole.

This lack of unity and the struggle for special commodity gains together make up one of the reasons why agriculture isn't in as strong a position as it should be. The effects are felt both in Washington and in the attitude of the public, which isn't any too friendly toward farming and is inclined to take its food supply for granted.

These disadvantages should be removed. In this emergency farming requires a single effective medium through which its needs can get attention. It ought to have a responsible channel through which it can reach the public with the facts about agriculture. A farm policy council could render both these services. The farm organizations should see the opportunity and act upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further routine matters, the Senator from Ohio is recognized.

THE EUROPEAN ARMY PROJECT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the most serious and fundamental question before Congress today is whether we shall establish, and furnish troops for, an integrated European army under centralized command. Even today people hardly realize the tremendous implications of this proposal. On the decision we make may hang the issue of peace or war. On that decision depends the size of the Armed Forces, perhaps for the next 10 years. On the size of those forces hangs the tax burden which must be paid by the American people during that period. It will determine also the question whether we must draft boys of 18 or 18½ or 19 with all of its effect on education and industry. Finally, the extent of credit and price and wage controls so difficult to enforce and so burdensome on freedom and progress, will also be measured by the size of our Armed Forces and the economic effort in arming other countries.

General Eisenhower has made a report to us regarding the interest of the European nations in protecting themselves against Russian aggression. He has done a fine job of raising their morale and tells us of his hope that they will do their share. He has expressed his general approval of the project before us. But in my mind, at least, his report only makes this whole plan more hazy and indefinite and uncertain in outline than it was before his return.

At this time, therefore, I wish to discuss certain questions relating to this project:

First. What is the project, and to what share in it do we obligate ourselves?

Second. Is the President to have unlimited power to act without approval of Congress, or are the people themselves to have a voice in deciding the extent and nature of this revolutionary program?

Third. To what extent do we all agree on certain fundamental principles relating to the resistance to Communist aggression in the world, and in particular in Europe?

Fourth. Is the program a wise program and, if so, should its limitations be clearly stated?

1. WHAT IS THE PROJECT, AND TO WHAT SHARE IN IT DO WE OBLIGATE OURSELVES?

Before General Eisenhower's return, I had supposed there was a definite plan agreed upon at Brussels. Article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty reads as follows:

> The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. * * * The council * * * shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5.

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee says that the powers of the council "are purely advisory with respect to governmental action. Its purpose is to make recommendations to the governments and to assist them in reaching coordinated decisions. It should be emphasized, however, that the responsibility for making decisions lies in the respective governments rather than in the councils. * * * The defense committee will concern itself primarily with making plans and recommendations for the implementation of articles 3 and 5, i. e., preparation for the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense. Being subordinate to the council, it too shall have only advisory powers."

In December 1950, the council established under article 9 met in Brussels and issued the following communiqué on December 19th:

> The North Atlantic Council, acting on the recommendations of its defense committee, today completed arrangements initiated in September last for the establishment in Europe of an integrated force under a centralized control and command. This force is to be composed of contingents contributed by the participating governments.

The North Atlantic Council speaks as if it had authority to do so, although its recommendations are simply advisory, under the treaty.

On December 22 Secretary Acheson made the following statement about the Brussels agreement:

> At Brussels we did several things. We took recommendations which had come from the meetings immediately preceding in London and acted on those recommendations. They had to do with the creation of the united, unified, integrated army which is to provide for the defense of Europe.
>
> The papers which came to us laid out the structure of that army, how it should be composed, of what troops, where should the troops come from, how should it be organized, what was its command structure which would give that army its direction, and how should the supreme commander be selected and appointed. All of these matters were dealt with in the papers that came to us and all of those matters were acted upon. The structure was agreed upon and the force was created.

Mr. President, I cannot understand what authority Secretary Acheson had in that connection, because I do not think there was anything but advisory power in the Council; but that is the statement which he issued.

Today no one knows whether an agreement was entered into or not. General Eisenhower tells the committees that he does not know whether or not there is any commitment on our part. Congress is unable to obtain any reliable information as to the size of the "united, unified, integrated army which is to provide for the defense of Europe." We are unable to find out how many American divisions are to be contributed to it. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] seems to feel that the army is to be one of 55 divisions of which we should contribute 10. I have heard from high sources that it is to be approximately 60 divisions of which we ultimately will contribute 15. The newspapers report some talk in the committees of a total army of 40 divisions by the end of 1952 after 2 years of preparation. There has also been some suggestion that there will be five or six American divisions in Europe by the end of 1951. General Eisenhower has said that we would only contribute a minor fraction, but not a major fraction, but this might mean 30 percent or 40 percent and might amount to a million men before our obligations are finally completed.

The number of foreign divisions at that time or any time is clouded in doubt. General Eisenhower stated that there would be 25 French divisions at the end of 1952, but this was immediately contradicted by Mr. Pleven, and the figure perhaps is 15 divisions on that date, and 20 divisions by the end of 1953. I get the general impression from General Eisenhower's broadcast and testimony

that we will contribute five or six divisions in 1951, including the two already in Germany, and then wait to see what the others do. At Brussels it seems to have been contemplated that there would be German divisions, but General Eisenhower says that the Germans are out for the present.

Mr. President, there is just as much uncertainty regarding the nature of the proposed army as there is concerning the status of General Eisenhower himself. He did not tell the committee whether he was only the President's representative in Europe, or whether he was a commander of the new army deriving his power from the action of nine governments. It seems clear to me from the communiqué issued in Brussels that he is the appointee of the Atlantic Pact nations if they had any authority to set up an army, which I doubt. Perhaps the Council's action is only a recommendation. Is this in fact an international army, or is it only a loose grouping of various national armies? To whom are the American divisions responsible after they are asisgned to this army? Do they take orders only from General Eisenhower, or do they take orders from General Marshall or General Collins? Can General Eisenhower overrule the Joint Chiefs of Staff on questions of military strategy, or are they to be superior to him?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield for a question. I do not wish to break up my remarks unduly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator leaves the question of the number of divisions, let me inquire if he heard the testimony of General Eisenhower, or read his testimony, before the Armed Services Committee in which he said, in answer to a question by the Senator from Nebraska, that he believed the Europeans would furnish the bulk of the land forces in Europe.

Mr. TAFT. The only quotation I saw, and that was in the newspapers, was that the United States would provide a minor fraction and not a major fraction. Perhaps he used those words before the House committee. But he says "the bulk," whatever that may mean. Possibly it means 60 or 70 or 75 percent. I do not know what "bulk" means. But there is no question that General Eisenhower stated that we are at least not to put up a majority, but how much less than a majority I think remains in doubt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it is a very substantial part of the Army.

Mr. TAFT. However, the Senator is not able to tell me what branches are involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; that was not specifically stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in all my experience in Washington I have never seen an important program so confused and uncertain. Yet we are to be asked to pass upon it within the next few weeks.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to read a quotation from The Economist of January 13, 1951, as follows:

> The machinery of the Atlantic Pact, now nearly 2 years old, remains for the layman as mysterious, incoherent, and confusing as ever. "There was a time when no one outside the organization could understand what went on inside," so a distinguished adviser at the Brussels meeting of the Atlantic Council was heard to mutter. "But," he continued sadly, "now no one inside can understand either."

Mr. President, this is secret diplomacy with a vengeance. It seems to me that there was a definite plan, but that the administration is deliberately concealing its nature, or delaying its completion, because it is afraid Congress will not consider the detailed proposal as practical, fair, or desirable.

So far as I can see at the moment, Congress is going to be asked to set up a great Armed Force of 3,500,000 American boys and give the President carte blanche to do anything with them which he wishes to do. If he claims that he had the power to send troops to Korea, he must be claiming the right without approval of Congress to send them to any other country in the world if that country is attacked by another country. He apparently claims authority to assign them to any foreign commander, or to any international force which he approves. This is a straight demand for simple dictatorship and a claim of power which no President has ever had in time of peace.

Let the administration submit this project in definite form. We cannot intelligently pass on it otherwise. Without this we cannot intelligently pass on the size of our Armed Forces, our draft laws, or our tax laws. I can hear cries now that a definite plan would reveal top secrets to the enemy. I can only say that within 1 week from the time the size of the Army, and the proportion and size of the American contribution is fixed, every columnist in the United States will know what it is and discuss it in his columns.

2. IS THE PRESIDENT TO HAVE UNLIMITED POWER TO ACT WITHOUT APPROVAL OF CONGRESS, OR ARE THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES TO HAVE A VOICE IN DECIDING THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF THIS REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAM?

I do not think that the American people have ever faced a more serious constitutional issue, or one which in the end may present a greater threat to its freedom. The framers of the Constitution provided expressly that only Congress can do certain things, and we find these powers in section 8 of article 1:

> To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water;
>
> To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

That reflects a certain and definite suspicion of setting up a great permanent military force.

> To provide and maintain a navy;
>
> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

There are other powers relating to calling out, organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

The Constitution also provides that the President shall have power to make treaties, but only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The President's relation to the Army is stated only in section 2 of article II:

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

What possible basis is there for the claim that the President can enter into an agreement with foreign nations to set up an integrated international army under a centralized command, and to commit a certain number of American troops to that army without the approval of Congress?

It may be said he has acquired more power from the Atlantic Pact. But I think it is fully agreed now that the Atlantic Treaty did not commit us to the providing of any troops whatsoever and that under article 11 of the Pact the carrying out of the provisions of the Treaty must be in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the country concerned. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate stated expressly that the Treaty did not increase, decrease, or change the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, or impair the full authority of Congress to declare war. It is clear, therefore, that the President must look to his constitutional powers for the agreements that he has made or is proposing to make and there are no such constitutional powers.

Certainly an obligation to furnish armed forces to an integrated force for the defense of other countries has all the dignity of a treaty, and certainly it is not within the President's power as Commander in Chief.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Ohio certainly could help my thinking, if he would. On January 8, 1951, the President of the United States addressed a joint session of Congress. On that occasion the President was very positive in what he said. I would deeply appreciate the reaction of the Senator from Ohio to the observation made in very positive form by the President of the United States, in which he indicated to us and the American people that he had reason to believe that NATO military plans were in existence. He said:

> Together we have worked out defense plans. The military leaders of our own country took part in working out these plans, and are agreed that they are sound and within our capabilities.
>
> To put these plans into action, we sent to Europe last week one of our greatest military commanders, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.
>
> General Eisenhower went to Europe to assume command of the united forces of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, including our own forces in Germany.

Against what the President said so clearly and in such concrete fashion on January 8, I hope the Senator from Ohio will give us his reaction as to where and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in what form he thinks such plans actually are.

Mr. TAFT. Frankly, I do not know. General Eisenhower testified before committees of both Houses of Congress, and either he did not know or he did not say. I understand he was asked what his own status was. He said he did not know. I think the Senator is correct. At least an official statement was issued in Brussels announcing that General Eisenhower had been appointed by the council. Whether the council had the right to make the appointment may be open to question. At least, that is the position he occupies. In any event, he did not seem to be certain of it himself.

Mr. CAIN. If I may, I should like to make one observation. I think the great contradiction in the minds of Members of Congress and the American people today is simply that the President of the United States on the 8th of January said that American military minds, in concert with their friends across the sea, had actually drafted a concerted plan of action for the future, and that General Eisenhower had gone to Europe to activate it. When General Eisenhower returned he said, as a very honest and frank individual, that he would not be able for some time to discuss in any detail any comprehensive, integrated plan for action in Europe, because at the moment one does not exist. He went so far as to say, "Please encourage me in what I want to do. I want to come back in about 6 months, and perhaps then I can begin to answer your very legitimate questions." If there is an integrated, comprehensive military plan for NATO and Western Europe, as the President has said exists and General Eisenhower has said is only in vague and preliminary form, no one has yet produced it for study by the Congress or the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to following such a course, provided the Senate is not asked next week to give the President unlimited power to send troops or to make any agreement regarding an international army. That seems to me to be the problem which we shall have to face in another week, without a single idea of what the plan is. I thought that perhaps the President was referring to a detailed military plan. Of course, we in Congress cannot determine where we are going to defend Europe, or anything of that kind.

However, it seems to me that we have before us the constitutional question of what it is that we are going to be asked to do. In other words, what is the nature of it? Are we going to commit troops to an international army, to serve under an international command? It so happens that the present commander in chief is an American. He could very well be a foreign general. The council would have the right to appoint someone else in General Eisenhower's place, if it wished to do so. My own feeling is that the whole subject is shrouded in uncertainty. If we are to pass on the subject it should be reduced to certain general and definite principles so that we can consider it on its merits.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Bearing on the status of General Eisenhower, he was quoted in London—and I presume he was quoted accurately—as portraying himself, I trust somewhat facetiously, as only one-twelfth an American. I took it to apply to his status under the Council, to the effect that he recognized a responsibility, by implication, to 11 other countries. Is the Senator from Ohio familiar with that statement?

Mr. TAFT. No; I am not certain of it. However, the Brussels Council issued a communiqué saying that it had appointed General Eisenhower to head the army. That was what the communiqué said. I assume that is the authority under which the general is acting.

Certainly it seems also clear that as Commander in Chief he cannot delegate his command to a foreign government, or to 10 foreign governments, without the approval of Congress which has full power to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

With regard to the sending of troops to Europe without any commitment no doubt the President has power to send divisions to occupy Germany, which it is our obligation to police and defend. But it can hardly be claimed that this power would justify sending more than two or three additional divisions. I have heretofore stated my opinion that the President cannot send an army to defend one country against another country which is attacked in the absence of any treaty, because it clearly involves us in war. Many cases have been cited against that view, because the President has actually landed troops in many countries in the past. In every case, however, the action was taken to protect American citizens or American property, and in no case has it been maintained that the President can even involve this country in war unless it is attacked.

There may be an argument that under the Atlantic Treaty if one of the Atlantic Pact nations is attacked, the President could send troops to defend it, but under article 11 of the treaty, it seems clear to me that the President's power to carry out the treaty is dependent upon a declaration of war by the Congress because clearly such action of the President would involve us in war. That roughly speaking, is the test as to the sending of troops abroad.

I do not say that the Congress by resolution or the Senate by the adoption of a treaty may not authorize the President to involve us in war without a congressional declaration of war. That certainly is a debatable question, but I do say without qualification that neither the Congress nor the Senate has given any such authority to the President. A somewhat similar authority was contemplated under the United Nations Charter, which was approved as a treaty, but the actual authority to send soldiers to an international army was limited by article 43 to the terms of a special agreement, and Congress provided that that agreement must be subject to approval by Congress.

Any other view means that the President today would have power to involve the United States in war in any section of the world in his unlimited and arbitrary discretion, and that Congress in creating a great American Armed Force of 3,500,000 men and drafting every boy of 18 for that purpose is completely without power to limit the President's arbitrary discretion. Merely to state this proposition should arouse the undying opposition of every man who believes in the maintenance in this country of government by the people.

It is rather interesting to note in Winston Churchill's second volume, Their Finest Hour, the reference to the opinion of Franklin D. Roosevelt on his own powers in this field. Mr. Roosevelt had written a letter to Monsieur Reynaud, the Premier of France, which Mr. Churchill thought could be construed as an agreement for America to join the French and British Governments in their defense against German aggression. Mr. Roosevelt hastened to disavow this conclusion, and Mr. Churchill in his book says that Roosevelt "then said he had told Ambassador Kennedy to inform me that his message of the fourteenth was in no sense intended to commit, and it did not commit the Government of the United States to military participation. There was no authority under the American Constitution except Congress which could make any commitment of that nature."

On February 15, 1848, Abraham Lincoln wrote his law partner, William H. Herndon, with reference to Polk's use of the Army against Mexico.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Ohio realizes, of course, that there was a different situation at that time. The President was assuring the Prime Minister and Mr. Reynaud that he could not commit troops to the war which was actually going on. The Senator realizes that the situation to which we are now referring is the business of putting troops there for the purpose of keeping the peace, and not to engage in conflict.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read what Abraham Lincoln said:

> Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect. If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us"; but he will say to you, "Be silent: I see it, if you don't." * * *
>
> The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that

no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood.

It is argued that no one can stop the Commander in Chief from sending the Army anywhere he wants to send it. This argument only goes to his power, not to his right. If he has not the right, Congress can properly restrain him by law or resolution.

It is suggested the Congress should grant general authority to act in Europe because any such authority will be wisely used. Our experience in Korea does not support any such conclusion.

The confusion which surrounds the Brussels agreement raises the question whether the administration is trying to avoid congressional action by denying the existence of any agreement. I have pointed out that I do not think the President can send troops to Europe for the defense of Europe without congressional approval, even in the absence of a binding agreement. Apart from his right to contribute troops to an international army, however, it would certainly be most unwise to do so without a binding agreement. Surely, if we are going to participate in an international army for the defense of Western Europe, we want to be sure that the other nations will provide most of the soldiers. Before we send any troops, we should certainly have a binding contract to that effect from these other nations. General Eisenhower's speeches were both directed to the proposition that these nations are willing to undertake the principal burden of their own defense. In his broadcast, he said: "The European nations must, of course, produce and maintain the great bulk of the land forces necessary to their defense." He said: "By no means do I believe that we Americans can support the world militarily or economically. In our own interest we must insist upon a working partnership with every nation making the common security its task of first priority." In other words, if there is not an agreement, there ought to be an agreement. Whether there is or not, the project and any such agreement, are only lawful if approved by congressional action—not by any mere Senate resolution expressing the sense of the Senate, but by legislation in the form of a bill or joint resolution.

There is one final reason why this should be done. It is stated clearly in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Atlantic Treaty where provision is made for the ratification or the carrying out of the treaty by the constitutional processes of the country involved:

> It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional principles of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Am I correct in my recollection that the Senator from Ohio was quoted in the press as saying that he would be in favor of a limited number of American divisions?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I am coming to that. I believe very strongly in the necessity of this Government carrying out its promises lawfully made. Whatever project may be approved by Congress, whether I agree with it or not, will have my support in future years. But if the President undertakes to make promises which he has no right to make, I feel no obligation to support those promises. There will never be unity behind the proposal unless it is constitutionally approved. The only path to unity is to obtain the approval of Congress to a definite program or agreement relating to the use of American armies in Europe in time of peace.

I therefore intend, if any general resolution is brought in, to support the Wherry resolution, and also to offer a further amendment providing that no agreement relating to the furnishing of American troops to an integrated European army formed under the Atlantic Pact shall be valid until it is approved by Congress. I do not mean to propose that every military detail be contained in such an agreement, but certainly the size of the army and the basis of national contributions should be clearly specified. These facts will under no circumstances remain military secrets, and they form the very basis of the character of the entire project, and of every other major proposal before Congress.

2. TO WHAT EXTENT DO WE ALL AGREE ON CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN THE WORLD, AND IN PARTICULAR TO EUROPE?

There have been a good many misunderstandings with regard to the issues which we here face, and as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has pointed out, there are many areas of agreement.

A. No one is proposing that we abandon Europe or run out on Europe or invite the Communists to take over Europe. We have assisted Western Europe continuously for many years. We helped many of the countries by lend-lease during the war. Many loans and grants were made after the war. Under ECA, billions have been freely given in unprecedented generosity to build up the economic life and the industrial potentiality of Western Europe so that today production is approximately 40 percent over prewar. We have appropriated billions to provide armament with which these nations may defend themselves, and no one has questioned that principle since it was adopted by Congress in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

B. We have entered into the Atlantic Treaty under which we have agreed to go to war if any nation attacks a member of the pact. No one is even considering a withdrawal from that obligation. I certainly believe in carrying out the promises we have made; I did so even when I voted against making them. This means also that, if Russia or any of its satellites in Eastern Germany, Poland, or Czechoslovakia attacks Germany we will go to war with the aggressor. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its report on the North Atlantic Treaty says:

> It should be noted that Germany receives some protection since the treaty covers armed attack upon occupation forces.

One question does arise which perhaps should be determined by the members of the Atlantic Pact. If East Germany or Poland attacks the occupied zones in Germany or any of the pact nations, do we go to war with the satellite which makes the attack, or do we regard such an attack as an attack by Russia itself involving a war with Russia? Should we give a definite notification to Russia that an attack by certain countries will be regarded as an attack by Russia itself? Such a notification might be a deterrent to the beginning of a limited war in Germany which in the end would almost certainly lead to general war anyway. The Atlantic Pact nations should adopt some policy also regarding an attack on Yugoslavia so that snap judgment is not taken at some midnight conference.

C. There is no doubt that the freedom of Europe is of vital interest to the United States. There would be a much greater threat to our own liberty if Western Europe were conquered by Soviet Russia. No one questions that conclusion and, of course, it is the only justification for spending billions on ECA, and on armament for Europe, and for the agreement to go to war if Europe is attacked. It does not follow, however, that because we desire the freedom of every country in the world we must send an American land army to that country to defend it. Western Europe, after all, has more people in it than we have in the United States and is completely able to defend itself if we furnish the armament and if it desires to do so.

There is a good deal of confusion as to exactly what would happen to Europe in case Russia should attack, and arguments have been made on behalf of this program on the theory that in some way Europe would be entirely taken over by the Communists, and that that would involve the rest of the world. If Russia should attack, obviously there would at once be a general war. We would be engaged in bombing the Russian bases. Any army, whether we contributed troops to it or not, would probably have to retreat to the Rhine and make a stand there against Russian aggression. England and France and Germany west of the Rhine presumably would be bombed by the Russians, and Russia and Eastern Germany by the Allies. If France were overrun as they were by the Germans, this time presumably a Free French Government would retreat to Africa and continue to perform its obligations under the Atlantic Pact. It is inconceivable to me that the Russians could conquer Great Britain. I see no reason to suppose that the industrial potentiality or the skilled labor of all Western Europe—which have been stressed so much—would be at any time available to Soviet Russia. In case of war, much of the industrial power might be destroyed in Russia, Germany, and France. We know that after the last war only the tremendous assistance of the United States

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and the ECA brought about the restoration of industrial power.

Nor does it follow because of a Russian success on the Continent that we would be cut off from any raw materials, either in the Belgian Congo or in Indonesia. In short, General Eisenhower and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and John Gunther somewhat exaggerate the danger of an unsuccessful war in Europe. But I fully agree that we are vitally concerned with the continued freedom of England, France, Italy, and the other Atlantic Pact countries, as well as Germany.

It is certainly vitally important that we do not exhaust our resources on a vast land army in Europe and neglect to any extent the sea and air power and the supporting armed troops necessary to protect these sources of raw material upon which General Eisenhower lays so much stress. But it can be said that the serious difference regarding the importance of the defense of Western Europe is the extent to which the establishment of a great international army with many American divisions is effective for that purpose during the intermediate period, and whether it commits the American people to something beyond their power of fulfillment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the opinions he has expressed in regard to the military situation are based upon advice given to him by military men; or are they his own personal opinions?

Mr. TAFT. What particular opinion does the general—I mean the Senator from Arizona—wish to ask me about?

Mr. McFARLAND. I disclaim being a general. I know we have many "generals" on the floor, "experts" in regard to military matters, but I disclaim anything like that. I give the Senator from Ohio credit for being one.

Mr. TAFT. I have talked to a good many generals, some of very high rank. We have received advice from military critics. I certainly have not ventured to go into anything but the most general principles in asserting any military opinion in this connection. I do not know what the Senator from Arizona has in mind.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator just stated that if Europe was involved in a war with Russia we would also be involved in it.

Mr. TAFT. We would be at war with them. We would be fighting.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be true regardless of whether we had troops there or whether we did not have troops there. The Senator concedes that; does he not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, the Senator from Ohio proceeds to outline what the military situation would be, and what would be the result of such a war if it should break out. I was wondering if the Senator was giving his own personal opinion as to those matters or whether it was based upon the advice of military experts.

Mr. TAFT. The only opinion I remember off hand expressing was that if there were such a war, it would involve bombing on both sides, and to a large extent the destruction of the industrial potential of Europe, the use of which by Russia was one of the things held up to us as being completely fatal in a war between Russia and the United States. I simply suggest that if war should start that industrial potential would probably never be available to the Russians.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is that the opinion of the military men, or is that the Senator's personal opinion?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think that is particularly a military question. We saw what happened in the last war. We know that when the war ended the industries of France and of England were unable to go ahead without many billions of dollars from the United States—amounts which Russia probably could never furnish. That is a mere conclusion. That particular conclusion I formed for myself. As to where and when fighting might take place, I have talked to some generals.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to know what the source of the Senator's opinion was.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Arizona question my conclusion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not questioning it, nor am I conceding it. I am not setting myself up as a general—a term the Senator has just applied to me. Yes; I might question the Senator's conclusion. I might question some of the things the Senator has to say. But I would not want to set myself up as a military expert or a "general," by which term the Senator has just addressed me. I believe it takes a military expert to pass upon many of the questions the Senator is speaking about in his address today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know, I have not tried to establish any great military principles which are not accepted generally by everybody writing on military or cognate subjects. I do not know that I have laid down any general principles that will not command respect, so far as the military aspects of the situation are concerned. Like the Senator from Arizona, I do not venture into detailed prediction of what military operations are to be undertaken.

D. Of course, there is now general agreement that control of the sea and air is our primary field in war with Russia; and that we cannot also assume the major burden of any great land army. That is clearly stated by General Eisenhower. Control of air, sea, and the Eurasian Continent is probably beyond our power. If we commit ourselves to more than we can carry out, we weaken the whole Nation and we weaken the effectiveness of every branch of the armed services including our sea and air forces.

If we provide sea and air support plus all of the equipment required for land forces, plus five divisions of land troops, we will certainly be doing 50 percent of the entire job. Unless these nations together are willing to defend themselves by providing the other 50 percent, I do not believe that any integrated army could be successful. If we provided half of that land army, our total share in the entire operation would probably run up to 80 percent. We do not want to find ourselves again as in Korea, doing substantially the entire job, because we cannot possibly do it.

E. There is general agreement that the whole project is dependent upon substantial action by European nations and by high morale. May I say that I have never questioned that morale. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] based most of his criticism of my speech on the theory that I said that the European nations would not fight. Others have indicated their doubt on this subject, and even General Eisenhower does not seem to be certain; but I said nothing to indicate any belief on my part that England and France were not vitally interested in their own defense. I am glad to have General Eisenhower's assurance that their morale is steadily increasing. I notice, however, that he is not completely certain. He said, "We must make sure that the heart and soul of Europe is ripe. That is one of the obligations certainly that is imposed upon me and my staff." In other words, there is still something to be done in the future in this field. His whole report is an expression of hope, and a hope that I feel confident will be justified; but he spends part of his time explaining why France is completely occupied in Indochina, and why any further sacrifices impose a reduction in their standard of living, already low. In any event, I am quite willing to accept the principle that Europe is ready to go ahead; but I do insist upon definite promises from them as to the part which they will play in the project.

F. There is general agreement that this country can overcommit itself and thereby weaken its whole economic structure and interfere not only with our morale, but with the important function of providing equipment for Europe. General Eisenhower repeatedly says that we cannot carry the world on our shoulders like Atlas. The General Staff, I think, clearly recognizes that there is a practical limit to our Armed Forces. They have rejected the idea of 6,000,000 men, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and have fixed a goal of 3,500,000 men. I have said myself that I believe 3,000,000 is about the limit that we can wisely provide for a permanent standing army, navy, and air force over a long period of years. The present estimate is that this force of 3,500,000 men will cost us $40,000,000,000 in cash in fiscal 1952, but that the cost will increase. I think we can assume that it will increase to at least $55,000,000,000 a year for several years, which means a total expenditure on the President's budget, including nondefense expenditures, of $85,000,000,000. Even with great economy in nondefense expenditures, the budget would be $80,000,000,000 and would require $25,000,000,000 more in taxes. Even now the President does not dare to recommend taxes to meet the $71,000,000,000 expenditure which he proposes. I do not see how we can today raise taxes beyond,

say, about $65,000,000,000 a year without hardship and injustice and danger to the economy of the country. Whatever the amount, there is a general agreement that some limit on our commitments must be imposed either by the President or Congress. I believe it should be by Congress, that it is our constitutional duty to decide that question.

4. IS THE PROGRAM A WISE PROGRAM AND, IF SO, SHOULD ITS LIMITATIONS BE CLEARLY STATED?

For these reasons and for other reasons stated in my speech of January 5, I am opposed in principle to undertaking a land force on the continent of Europe. As I stated then, however, we do have two divisions already in Europe; and I would not object to a few more divisions, simply to show the Europeans that we are interested and will participate in the more difficult job of land warfare while we carry out also our larger obligations. This is particularly true because the President has gone so far in his unauthorized promises that a withdrawal now will affect badly the morale of the European's interest in his own defense.

I can restate briefly my objections to any large American participation in an integrated European army.

A. I believe that the formation of such an army and its location in Germany along the iron curtain line, particularly one headed by an American general and dependent primarily on American strength, is bound to have an aggressive aspect to the Russians. We would be going a long way from home, and very close to the Russian border. If we merely help France arm in France and England arm in England, it is hard to see how Russia could object; but a great army in Germany is undoubtedly a threat to their present dominion. Of course our purposes are purely defensive, but a first-class defensive army must also be an offensive army. Today, armies do not stand still—either one advances or the other advances. Russia cannot reasonably fear from this proposed army an attack on Moscow; but if the army can hold the Russian Army at all, it could make advances into the eastern zones of Germany or Austria, or Czechoslovakia or Poland. It has therefore seemed to me that the formation of this army is more an incitement to Russia to go to war, rather than a deterrent. They have not been deterred by land soldiers up to this time because there have been no land soldiers; and if they have been deterred at all it has been through our Air Force and the power to drop atom bombs on Russia. If Russia is contemplating a military attack in Western Europe, why does not the present plan give them an incentive to attack at once, or in 1952? Apparently it will take at least 2 years to provide 40 divisions, and no one thinks that is enough. On the other hand, if Russia is not contemplating a military attack, this proposal might incite it to do so, when otherwise a gradual increase in strength could be achieved among Western European nations without danger of war. I have repeatedly asked the question with reference to this temporary period of 2 or 3 years during which we are building up an army on the borders of Russia, before it is sufficient in the opinion of military experts to withstand a Russian attack: If Russia is planning a military attack at any time in the future, why will they wait during this period?

B. The whole defense program seems a very hazy one to a layman, and I know it is considered by many military experts to be impracticable as far as the defense of Germany east of the Rhine is concerned. It is useless to talk about defending the line of the Elbe, because the Russian zone, with strong military positions, extends halfway from the Elbe to the Rhine already. Today it is within approximately 80 miles, I think, of Dusseldorf. A defense of Europe to the Rhine means that Russia will control the Ruhr and much of Germany's industry. To defend completely the British and American zones and Denmark would apparently require at least 75 divisions, and no one is proposing to develop that number. Therefore, it seems useless to talk about the defense of large sections of Western Germany for a good many years to come, or to expect the Germans to participate until a much larger number of divisions are available than now seem to be in sight. That appears to be the position of the Adenauer government. The defense of Germany at the Rhine would endanger Holland and place France, Belgium, and England themselves in easy reach of Russian short-distance bombs, and perhaps of the atom bomb itself. I am not at all a defeatist as to the ultimate ability of Europe to defend itself, but I would prefer to wait until each of these countries has built up a very considerable force of its own, and until Germany is independent and arming itself, before we attempt to establish a military position with an integrated army.

C. When it is possible to do that, however, there is still a question in my mind whether we should even then commit any considerable number of American forces to that European army. The effect of it is to commit us to a major war on the continent of Europe against Russia, and that will inevitably be the major project to which most of our limited resources will have to be devoted. The larger the force we station there, the more we are committed to fighting such a war to the bitter end in Europe and putting more of our energy into that part of the contest, postponing or neglecting the job that ought to be done elsewhere to assure our raw materials and lines of communication. We would be fighting Russia on a battlefield most favorable to them, and one where we would always be outnumbered in manpower. It is said repeatedly that wars can only be won by land soldiers. That may be true, but it is no longer absolutely certain. It was complete control of sea and air which enabled us to take over the smaller islands of the Pacific, and it was the same control which enabled us to take over Japan without landing a soldier. Possibly a third world war could be won from the air. It is also doubtful whether a victorious nation gains much from physical occupation after destroying the industries of the vanquished. Possibly in the end, Mr. President, we might decide that the only way to win a war is to build again an army of 10,000,000 men and march to Moscow; but certainly we cannot have any such army in being at the beginning of the war, and it may never be necessary. Our military authorities are too apt to think that a third world war will be just like the Second World War; but a new war is never like the one that preceded it.

D. Finally, I believe that the undertaking of a project in Europe which is not strictly limited would lead to a constant demand for a larger and larger land army. Senator Douglas evidently realizes that to carry out the project would require 6,000,000 men under arms, as he proposes, instead of the 3,500,000, which the administration is now asking for. The Army plan is for 1,400,000 men, or 27 divisions, in the United States—the total land army of the United States. It seems to me it would be unsafe to station a large proportion of that army in Europe. We require troops in this country to protect us against attack from the air, and we require troops in Alaska and in the Far East. There should certainly be mobile forces to protect air bases in Africa and elsewhere in the world and to go to the assistance of other nations which request assistance if the project is important and practical. If we are going to have to station 15 divisions in Europe, we probably need closer to 45 divisions overall in our Army, instead of 27. That would add another 1,000,000 men and perhaps $13,000,000,000 for maintenance and equipment.

At present the administration is trying to play down the requirements of this program and, of course, is not even telling us what the program is, at least beyond the year 1951. We have seen this process constantly repeated. We were told that Bretton Woods would solve the financial problems of Europe. Within a few months it became apparent that the British loan was necessary. That was followed by other aid, and then by the Marshall plan. In every case the next step was said to be essential in order to maintain the morale of Europe against communism. Then came the Atlantic Pact, our obligation to go to war, and the commitment of small sums to the arming of European countries. Then the appropriations for arms had to be quadrupled. Now we are told that the morale of Europe will collapse unless we send at least three or four more divisions in 1951. So long as we encourage the idea of constantly increasing aid to Europe, and do not pin down the size of the European army and the extent of the contributions of the European nations, there will be every year a new demand again urged as essential to save the value of all that has been done before. It seems to me that we should definitely notify the European nations the limit of what we can do so that they may make their plans on that basis. There is this tremendous difference today over the past. What we are proposing to do stretches the capacity

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the people of the United States to the very limit in 1951 and many years thereafter. The program, even on its present scale, proposes to take all 18-year-old boys for 27 months service in the Army, while General Eisenhower is praising France highly for instituting universal service for 18 months. We have the lion's share of the job of producing munitions, and we are short of manpower for that purpose. We cannot upset our system by taxes so heavy as to interfere with that job. We hear much of the need of bolstering up the morale of Europe. The tremendous taxes and long universal service may have a substantial effect on the morale of the people of the United States. Even now the President is soft-pedalling his tax request, because he is afraid the people will not take an increase sufficient to balance the budget which he has submitted.

If, therefore, Congress decides to proceed with this project of contributing American troops to an integrated army in Europe under a centralized command, then I believe certain limitations should clearly be imposed. I would suggest that the American contribution be not more than 1 American division to 9 foreign divisions—that is 5 American divisions to an army of 50, or 6 American divisions to an army of 60, and that it be undertaken only as and when foreign nations bind themselves to provide the divisions determined to be necessary for an adequate defense. I also suggest tentatively a provision that not more than 20 percent of the land army of the United States and not more than 10 percent of the Air Force be stationed on the continent of Europe in time of peace. These limitations, I believe, should be attached to any authority given the President to set up an integrated army in Europe and commit American troops to that army.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me say that no one is more determined to resist Communist aggression in the world than I am. I think the Russians present a menace to the liberty of the entire world and to our way of life, a menace greater than we have faced before in our history. That menace is not entirely military. It is a battle of liberty against communism in the minds of men. We cannot afford to destroy at home the very liberty which we must sell to the rest of the world as the basis for progress and happiness.

There is no reason whatever for panic or defeatism. I feel less concern about the ultimate success of Russian military power than do many others. But if they choose to start a war, it will be a long and bitter conflict, and this country must remain strong in every aspect of production and morale. Our limited resources must be directed to the field where they can be most effective. I do not believe that Western Europe can be defended unless the Western Europeans are determined to defend themselves and take the intiative in rearming which is essential for that purpose. To encourage that action, we are furnishing them with economic assistance and military equipment in practically any amount which they request. We will support them by sea and by air, and I would agree to send some troops to prove to them that we do intend to fight at their side if Russia attacks. But even the program which I outline will require tremendous sacrifices from the American people, from every taxpayer, from every family, from every boy. We should not further endanger the position of America as the arsenal of democracy and the bastion of liberty.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I commence my address, I desire to express my appreciation of the splendid presentation we have just heard by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on this very important and difficult subject. The Senator's remarks indicate to me that it is vitally important that any decisions arrived at with regard to this important question of foreign policy be considered fully and completely by the Congress of the United States.

I have contended from the beginning that, irrespective of the constitutional aspects of the question as to whether the President had the power to send troops without consulting the Congress, he would be making a critical mistake if the Congress were not fully consulted and if appropriate action were not taken to support such a policy. What we need today is the confidence and support of public opinion in America. We need the support of the American people. The only way we can have that support is for the representatives of the people in the Congress to have an opportunity to participate in the development of such an important piece of foreign policy as is involved in this debate.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have felt it incumbent upon me to try to follow in detail and to study carefully the contributions which have been made to this subject. I have studied the original speech made by Mr. Herbert Hoover last December, and the speeches which followed, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], by Mr. John Foster Dulles, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the contributions made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and other Senators, including the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], my colleague. It was my purpose originally to cover in my remarks today not only the European question, but also to cover some of the problems presented by the situation in Asia, and especially in Korea. But I realize that that is a very large field, and therefore I have decided to limit myself today to the so-called Eisenhower report, and to what I believe to be his purposes, from my talks with him and from my reading of his address and his broadcast, and also to discuss certain aspects of the so-called cold war.

I hope that next week, or probably sometime later, I can discuss certain aspects of the Asian problem, especially the crisis in Korea. I think it is too large an order to cover both those problems in one address. So, Mr. President, I shall turn, first, to the situation in Europe, primarily to the matter which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has been discussing.

I think, generally speaking, I could agree with the approach of the Senator from Ohio if it had been put in a positive form as a warning to us in considering the issues involved in the whole question of our European participation. As I heard him, I rather felt, I am frank to say, that his remarks were on the negative side. He emphasized the difficulties rather than, in the first instance, realizing that the problem facing us from the standpoint of world security is one of finding positive ways of meeting those difficulties.

I want to stress first certain conclusions which, it seems to me, we have to accept after hearing General Eisenhower, and after studying the critical problems facing us. I am convinced that the North Atlantic Treaty countries—and this is the reason why the treaty was established—must stand together and mobilize together. I cannot see any possible alternative to that. I believe the Senator from Ohio would probably agree with that statement, although I would probably go further in the development of that mobilization than he would.

My next thought, Mr. President, is that probably the spirit and determination of the European countries are dependent to a large degree upon our leadership. I am sorry for that, but I feel that it is true. We emerged from World War II unscathed, in a way, because we did not feel the brunt of the destruction caused by the war. We are looked to, because of the stronger position we are in, at least to give the sense of leadership which the other free nations need.

General Eisenhower brought out the fact that the spirit and determination of European nations were dependent to a large degree on our willingness to provide—what? In the first place, arms and ammunition. Those nations do not have arms and ammunition, nor do they yet have adequate facilities to produce them. Whatever emphasis General Eisenhower may have placed on manpower, his first and strongest emphasis was on arms and ammunition. Then he referred to a reasonable ratio of troops in order to give assurance to those nations that we would participate and not merely contribute material aid.

In studying his statement, and in talking with him, I received a further impression. I thoroughly believe he was right in the way in which he presented the case to us. His investigation indicated that it is too soon now to define the numbers of troops, either the overall number or the ratios that can be furnished by the contributing countries, including the United States. He was in Europe for about 3 weeks, and he said to us, frankly, that he could not in that short period of time get all the information on which he could form a considered judgment. He was still engaged in the planning stage and had not yet reached the point where he could present an intelligent and concrete program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. As I heard the remarks of General Eisenhower, and I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will concur with me, he stated that the European Continent had the men, but that what we want to do is to place rifles in their hands.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true, but he did not preclude our participation with men to a reasonable extent. He did, however, emphasize the fact that to a large extent they have the men and we have the rifles and ammunition.

Mr. President, let me state another thing that impressed me. I have not seen it reported by any commentator or given any publicity, but it was very clear to me from what he said and from what I gathered from my conversation with him before he went abroad—and this is not violating any confidence—that General Eisenhower felt we could deal with the subject using the same approach which we used with the Marshall plan. We would probably have to have a larger participation at the beginning, until the European nations were built up. As by degrees their defenses were perfected, we could ease off in our participation. He said it would probably be possible to have a flexible and decreasing program so that we would not be facing a permanent program of 15 or 20 years in which we would have substantial numbers of troops continuously stationed in Europe and dedicated to European service.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is not pleasant to be seemingly the devil's advocate, but in the words which were quoted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and agreed to by the Senator from New Jersey, the American people have indelibly impressed upon their recollection the words of Winston Churchill, which were:

> Give us the tools and we will do the job.

We have also the recollection of Korea in connection with which the United Nations overwhelmingly voted for our embarking upon the enterprise, in which their participation has been almost negligible. Does the Senator from New Jersey feel that in the minds of the American people there must be very tangible evidence that neither of those episodes is going to be repeated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the point raised by the Senator from Maine is entirely correct. We have to make as clear as we can what our commitments will be. I agreed with what the Senator from Ohio said, to the extent that when the program is developed it should be brought up for consideration and approval before it is arbitrarily put into effect by the President of the United States. I do not know what the Senator from Maine means with reference to convincing the people. Of course, we must have public opinion behind us, and we are trying to prevent either arbitrary or unwise action.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator from New Jersey said as to the necessity of satisfying the people of America that we are going to go forward in a cooperative mood. The formula which I would follow in connection with it, in the light of the two episodes to which I have referred, which have caused very serious concern, is as follows:

> What you do speaks so loudly, I cannot hear what you say.

Those are the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Moreover, I would remind the Senator of the old adage that actions speak louder than words.

The American people, if I may add a metaphor, like a "singed cat"——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator's comment is relevant, but I was wondering whether the Senator implies that we should do nothing until we have complete agreement on what should be undertaken.

Mr. BREWSTER. Not at all. We have had two recent experiences in which words have far outrun deeds. We have great confidence in General Eisenhower and in his capacity to survey the situation, but I think it would be a grave disservice to the cause of world peace if our European friends should understand that in America there are not serious misgivings with reference to embarking upon this enterprise. General Eisenhower was unable to give us specific information relative to the contribution of the other countries and of our country. He said it was impossible to do so either from the standpoint of their economy or their military laws. That adds to the difficulty of understanding. So that the more the nations of Europe can do to show us that they mean business, the easier it will be for us who recognize the great importance of Europe and the very great desire to defend freedom everywhere in the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. In answer to his statement, I have here a quotation from General Eisenhower's speech, which I read:

> What we are trying to do is * * * to start a sort of reciprocal action across the Atlantic. * * * We establish an upward-going spiral between this problem of strength and morale. * * * The only thing that can defeat us is to establish a descending spiral, born of suspicion, unreadiness on the part of each of us to do his job, the job that he knows in his heart he must do. * * *
>
> We must make sure that the heart and the soul of Europe is ripe. That is one of the obligations certainly that is imposed upon me and my staff. * * * But we must not watch that so closely that we fail to get out in front to provide the leadership that will make this thing a complete success.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned, the general also said that it is developing into a situation in which we must not look over our shoulders to see whether the others are doing their part.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not recall that statement, but I do recall that he very distinctly hoped to come back within a period of a few months and report to us whether or not in his judgment the Europeans were doing the things which they had undertaken to do. I think that was very important.

Mr. BREWSTER. There can be no question about that. Apropos of the question of looking over our shoulders, I am sure that the boys in Korea are looking over their shoulders to see whether or not they are getting the assistance which they were apparently pledged they would get by the action of the United Nations, which assistance has been conspicuously lacking in the past 7 months. I think we would be doing a very serious disservice to the entire cause if we did not realize that such considerations are being weighed in the minds and hearts of the American people. We cannot say that we should not be suspicious or doubtful, when boys are dying in Korea because we will not let the Chinese Nationalists go to their aid.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Maine has said in that respect, and I shall go into the subject further a little later on in my address.

Mr. President, continuing my analysis of what I understand to be General Eisenhower's position, as I said, I interpret what he said to me and what he said in his speech to mean that what is needed now is to get under way the mobilization of the North Atlantic countries that is needed for the collective defense of Europe. As European nations develop military strength and as such strength grows from the inside, there will be less and less call on us for help, as in the case of the Marshall plan. Under the Marshall plan we established a 4-year program. It will be wound up in 1952. In other words, our program now is to join with these European countries and start the ball rolling, to get the program under way. It is not expected of us to keep a permanent army in Europe. I am sure that is the feeling General Eisenhower had.

Mr. President, as I announced a few moments ago, and as has been brought out by questioning by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], General Eisenhower said the greatest need today is for arms and equipment. He also said—and I think this is very important—that our contribution must be within the limit of our resources, and our system must remain solvent. That is what the general said:

> Our system must remain solvent.

The general will be governed by that fundamental principle, which was also referred to by the Senator from Ohio in his address this morning.

Mr. President, I said before that the American people must be behind the program. Without congressional approval I do not believe any program can succeed. So I continue to restate my position, that irrespective of the constitutional question of whether or not the President has the power to send troops, in my judgment it would be fatal if he

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

did not consult Congress and get congressional approval before any troops were sent. That is the spirit of the Wherry resolution. I believe it is the spirit of the American people today. If the letters and telegrams which have come to me are any indication of what the American people are thinking, that is their spirit today. The spirit of the American people is that we should work together in developing a policy for setting up a European army to help defend the bastion of liberty throughout the world.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the very able Senator from New Jersey that my mail indicates the same thing. It shall be my determination to make certain that Congress will know what our Nation is committed to do, and that there shall not be the secret agreements entered into which we have witnessed in the past. I am determined to see to it that it will not happen in the future, if I can do something about it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with the Senator. I think his position is perfectly sound. I may say that in my judgment, while under article 9 of the North Atlantic Pact the United States and the Western European countries have been considering what kind of set-up we should have, I am satisfied that General Eisenhower does not feel bound by any commitments. He told me that, so far as he knew, there were no commitments which in any way bound him, and that he would have a free hand to determine what the whole picture should be, what planning should be undertaken, and what the participation of each nation should be. When that has been determined, and when we know what General Eisenhower thinks each nation should and can do in the common effort—and all that must be done before we are called upon to contribute anything—it will be time for us to consider how many troops we should provide, in what ratio, and similar questions.

I am frank to say that I was very much impressed by General Eisenhower's approach. It seemed to me to be the correct one. He indicated that he would come back for approval of any program that should be carried out. In the meantime, of course, there is no reason why our production should not be stepped up. We will need war materials whether we send them abroad or keep them here. Our whole military program must be accelerated. It is perfectly proper for an expanded selective service draft to go into effect, so that we can be ready, when the time comes, to make the best disposition of our strength.

Mr. President, I should like to point out one danger which I see. General Eisenhower emphasized it, among others. It is that we must be careful not to try to dominate the whole program. We must look to the other people who are working with us to take part in the program and to accept their share of the responsibility of setting it up. It must not be looked upon as though we were dominating the entire program. The Senator from Ohio pointed that out. I have no doubt that General Eisenhower is the ablest man to head the program. That does not mean that we must run the whole show. That does not mean that it must all be done under our dictation and with complete disregard of other countries. We must not do so, or they may very well take the position, "the United States is going to do it all. We can just sit back." That is the danger, as I see it. I shall speak further on this subject of domination, as distinguished from leadership, before I conclude my remarks today.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word about Germany. On my trip to Europe last fall, to attend the Interparliamentary Conference in Dublin, and then during my visits to London and Paris, my discussions with the leaders of the various countries which I visited indicated there was a strong feeling, which I shared, that Western Germany was an important part of this whole European army set-up. Understandable difficulties confronted some countries, especially France, which had been invaded so frequently, in approving any sort of German Army. There has been widespread discussion of divisions being organized in Germany which might be made a part of a larger army.

General Eisenhower has convinced me that any discussion of Germany's contribution to a European army is probably a mistake until a political solution is worked out. There is no use precipitating differences of opinion. For the moment, at least, we do not need to move into that particular problem. It can wait until the political questions are solved and until such time as the German people definitely feel they want to be a part of a western European set-up, until they wish to come in voluntarily, and not under any pressures or any feeling of compulsion because they were the conquered nation in the last war.

As General Eisenhower pointed out, they should be looked upon as equals when they do come in. He specifically spoke of "equality." He said that they should have some divisions of their own, with their own leadership, but, of course, with adequate safeguards provided against their ever developing again a militant spirit for aggressive nationalistic purposes.

Therefore, Mr. President, after reviewing, as I have, what I take to be General Eisenhower's approach, I am glad to state that I find myself in accord with the point of view he presents. He is not suggesting a program in the sense that it is worked out in detail. He is investigating what may be needed and developing a program that he is going to bring back to us for approval. We have not yet reached the final stage of making military commitments, nor are we going to give blank checks. I would not do that.

I think the Senator from Ohio was right in calling attention to that. I have found nothing in his words of caution with which I would not agree. But I think the time will come when General Eisenhower will come back to us with a program for a certain-sized European army, if there is to be one—and I think there should be one. He will tell us the contributions to be made by the various contributing countries. He will tell us how much they can aid, based upon his own studies; and he will have suggestions as to what part we can play in that particular program when the plan comes to us for approval.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like, at the appropriate point in the Senator's discussion, to refer to the situation in the Mediterranean. I do not know whether it would come more appropriately now or later.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I would prefer to finish my discussion of Europe, because my points are arranged in sequence, and I am afraid that if I interrupt my presentation, what I am trying to develop will not be clear in the RECORD.

I wish now to move from my interpretation of General Eisenhower's over-all approach to a discussion of strategy. I do this with great humility, because I am only a layman. However, because of my interest in the subject, I have been discussing the matter with various persons. I have been discussing the question of the possible strategy so far as all of Europe is concerned, and, in fact, so far as the world is concerned.

The Senator from Ohio referred to the difficulties involved in trying to meet force with force, and the danger, if we arm now, of our stimulating an attack by Russia. I should like to explore that subject for a moment.

I suggest that the basis of our strategy is to deter the Russians from aggression by building our own strength to the point where aggression would be too costly for the Russians. As I see it, this is the key of our policy position. I am not talking about establishing a ground army that can, by itself, resist an attack by the Russians. I want an over-all strength sufficiently great to deter them from risking the attack. So I am going to call our policy the building up of deterrent power. I underline the words "deterrent power."

This deterrent power should have three elements. As a layman I am not competent to judge military strategy, but I have discussed the subject very fully with military authorities and others who have studied it. What I am submitting is, to a considerable extent, the result of the conversations which I have had. I believe that it is well worthy of careful exploration. I think it is the spirit of the Atlantic Pact idea of collective defense against aggression.

This deterrent power, as I have said, must have three elements:

First, the power of strategic retaliation. This includes not only our atomic-bombing force, but all other weapons and techniques whereby, if Russia should start a global war, we could carry that war—where? To her own homeland. The power of strategic retaliation is very important, so that Russia will

know perfectly well that if she starts world war III, a global war, we can carry our defense, through retaliation, to her own homeland. That, to my mind, is the most potent deterrent to war today. I remember Mr. Churchill saying to me when I was in London, "The one thing that has prevented world war III has been the control of the atomic bomb by the United States." The point I am making relates to the power of strategic retaliation in case Russia should start a war.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. One question occurs to me. In the event Russia should attack the United States, and should choose to attack us by air, she would be attempting to lay waste our strength by destroying our industrial plants and communications. Let us assume that such an approach were from the north, across Canada, from Alaska, or in the Pacific area. If such an approach were made, and a sufficient number of planes, loaded with atomic bombs, were sent to our shores Russia would naturally hope that she could get a few planes through—one to New York City, one to Chicago, one to the Twin Cities area, one to San Francisco, and one to Los Angeles, for example. If only a few planes, with atomic bombs, got through, they could lay waste our strength immediately.

If such an attack occurred upon this continent, in the United States, would it not then be to our advantage to have bases on the European continent so that we could immediately make an attack upon Russia, without the necessity of a long flight from the United States across the Atlantic to the mainland or the real heart of Russia? That is the picture as I see it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. It is a part of the strategy of retaliation, to be in a position where we can do that from available bases. We require such bases if our plans are to be carried out.

Mr. THYE. That is why western Europe is so important in the entire world defense against communistic aggression. The peace of civilization and the freedom of religion are involved in whether we stop the Russian communistic aggression or whether that aggression is permitted to overpower one nation after another. It seems to me that our strength will lie in how strong the countries of western Europe are made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Doubtless the Senator would agree with my suggestion that one of the elements in deterrent power is the power of strategic retaliation from properly located bases, so that we could attack at once with our atomic strength.

Mr. THYE. I have followed very closely the comments of the able Senator from New Jersey. I am very much in agreement with his views and ideas. That is why I was prompted to make the comments which I made about what it seems to me we must accomplish. We must strengthen the countries of western Europe militarily to such an extent that they can stand as bases from which we start, if the intent of Russia is ultimately to strike at this great, strong nation in order that the Russians may have a better opportunity of spreading communism to all corners of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. The United States stands today as one nation which in the past has demonstrated its ability to produce the implements of war. Russia recognizes that. She also recognizes our ability to encourage men to fight when the time calls for a fight. For that reason, if Russia attacks at all, she will attack our industrial heart, and not attack in any other manner. She will dissipate our strength, as she is doing in Korea and elsewhere, but when the final hour comes, if Russia wants to attack, she will not attack anywhere but at the very heart of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. We must be able to retaliate decisively or Russia will succeed in her endeavors.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator wait until I finish the discussion of deterrent power? I have two or three more points to bring together. Then I shall be glad to yield.

As I have stated, the first element is the power of strategic retaliation. The second is the power of mobility. This, to my mind, is vitally important. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio is not present in the Chamber, because I think this would help to answer one of the difficulties which he had in mind concerning the great Russian force.

The free world cannot hope to build a static defense line all around the iron curtain, but it can and must deploy powerful mobile forces at strategic bases so that, in the event of attack, they can go into action at the weakest points in the attacker's armor, wherever those points may be.

So we have the power of strategic retaliation and we have the power of mobility. We cannot possibly put a circle around the land mass of Russia plus the land mass of China, which are now together. I cannot conceive of a static army strong enough to meet an attack from any of those areas. We must have mobility. We must have the strategic points which the Senator from Minnesota has so well emphasized, in order to be able to retaliate promptly with our air and atomic weapons.

Finally—and this, I think, is very important—there is the power of ground defense in Europe. Western Europe is now the most vital area endangered by Communist aggression. By building the Western European army under General Eisenhower, we make it clear to the Russians that they cannot swallow this immense strategic prize without paying an ever-increasing price, not only in retaliation against their own homeland, but also in heavy losses on the ground. It has been suggested that there is no use in having any army in Europe, because we cannot possibly meet an over-all attack by Russia. Mr. President, I submit that we must have forces organized to defend those homelands that are so vital to the free world and to make the Russians pay a maximum price if they are going to take that risk.

I have been exploring the possibility of thinking in terms of a measuring stick for the European army, and I submit only this one tentative suggestion, namely, that the measuring stick might conceivably be a strong enough force to meet any possible attack by one satellite or a group of satellites; a force that could meet anything except the actual impact of the whole Russian strength. This would force the Russians themselves to join in the attack, in effect, to start world war III, and we would be prepared to retaliate immediately by striking at Russia's weakest points with all the force of our atomic bombs, our air and naval strength, and our mobile units.

The suggestion has been made that we could set up an army adequate to take care of a satellite or a group of satellites, which would not require the enormous army the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has referred to in his remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am prepared to yield to the Senator from Indiana if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to ask the Senator from New Jersey, as well as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a question at this point. During the colloquy which took place between the two Senators mention was made of the fact that if Russia were to attack the United States we would want bases from which to attack Russia. My question is: Is the Senator confident that the European nations will fight Russia if Russia attacks the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, that is the whole spirit and purpose of the Atlantic Pact. The Atlantic Pact contemplates that an attack on one is an attack on all, and the third world war would then be on.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the spirit of the United Nations is that they will likewise declare an aggressor to be an aggressor, and that they will join with the United States or any other members of the United Nations to fight an aggressor. England particularly has failed to do that with respect to Korea. They say they want no part of a war.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I said earlier that I agreed with the implication of the Senator's remarks, because the danger he speaks of is a real one in the light of the most unfortunate shilly-shallying in the United Nations. The intent of the UN Charter is to follow aggression with sanctions. In the case of the North Atlantic Pact, in my opinion, it is the duty of General Eisenhower to satisfy himself that in case of such an attack on the United States the other countries would stand fast and join us in defense against Russia.

Mr. CAPEHART. At the moment my opinion is that they would not.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sympathetic with the Senator's feeling, but I do not think that we should choose the alternative of accepting that position and saying that therefore we will do nothing to assure the building up of collective security. I feel that it is necessary for us to stand together in a program of collective defense and see if we cannot work this problem out by the deterrent, united power of the North Atlantic nations, which should cause Russia to fear starting anything and make her realize that we are strong enough to meet attack, in other words, to show Russia that the cost of an attack is more than she can pay.

As I have said, I plan, in an address to be made next week, to deal with the Middle East, the Asian and the Japanese questions, and the present troubles in the UN, but at this moment I desire to pass to another aspect of this subject, because I feel it is vitally important to the whole picture. I shall move from the position of discussing defense, which is the Atlantic Pact problem, to a discussion of the problem of our offense in Europe. What should our offense be? We are not going to be aggressors, but, as I survey the situation, there is something going on in the world to which I am convinced we have not given sufficient attention.

I refer to the battle for the minds and spirits of men and women, otherwise known as the ideological struggle. In my considered judgment, having studied this matter ever since I have been in the Senate, and especially since the postwar period has come, the ideological struggle is the most important aspect of our foreign policy. Military strength and economic strength are important, but they are not enough. We might win in a third world war and still lose because we did not undertake wholeheartedly this important ideological struggle. We must face the issues in that struggle and the question whether or not Russia is defeating us in the battle for the minds and spirits of men.

I submit that if we are to win out in this struggle, it is not sufficient merely to be anti-Communist. Along with political, economic, and military programs the Communists have been smart enough to use the power of ideas in what may be called a four-dimensional offensive against us. The Communist ideology has been the central factor in the Russian attack. They have placed their ideology in the middle of the picture, and then built their military, political, and economic program around it.

Our defense, on the other hand, has tended to rely primarily on a three-dimensional strategy. That is, we have thought in terms of economic, political, and military programs, and have given too little attention to the power of ideas. We have given too little attention to what I call the spiritual and moral offensive to catch the imagination of the people of the world, and enable them to see that the issue is something very fundamental.

So I suggest that the free world must develop the superior force of an idea greater than communism, an idea more revolutionary than communism: The universal idea of human freedom. It seems to me that that is the thing which is being lost sight of in this whole contest.

There is a picture in the world, to which I shall refer again later, of America as a capitalistic, materialist, dollar-sign nation competing against Russian communism, with the Russians claiming that they are the champions of the downtrodden, and that they are trying to release the downtrodden classes from the domination of other powers. In trying to counteract this devastatingly erroneous interpretation, we have failed to put across the conception of freedom which is the foundation stone of all our American traditions. We must emphasize that the keynote of our traditions is not merely freedom as license, but freedom under the high spiritual power of Almighty God, and that we have built this country on a deeply spiritual foundation which has made possible our greatness. If once properly set forth and explained to the world, it can defeat the claims of communism, which are atheistic and materialistic, and which embody the Marxist philosophy of class hatred.

I think it is appropriate to refer to an illustration which I am taking from the Constitutional Convention of 1787——

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to the Constitutional Convention, may I ask him a question on the subject of freedom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont, although I am going to continue on the subject of freedom.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have been wondering to what extent freedom, as an abstract question, is of primary interest to people who are living in a substandard manner of life, as we understand it. Are there not, in the case of the people behind the iron curtain, questions of freedom which apply more directly to their own situations? Is it not reasonable to believe that the freedom of their sons or their brothers or their fathers who have been taken away in the darkness of the night, perhaps, and sent to labor camps, they know not where, is of more immediate concern to them? Is there not a very lively personal sense of freedom viewed from that standpoint which perhaps would be stronger with these people than freedom as a more or less abstract subject?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont has raised that point. As I recall, when he was speaking in the Senate a week or so ago, he stated that the "gemier" parts of his speech would come later. I may suggest to him that the points he has raised in the questions he has asked me will be developed later in my speech.

My point here is that we must interpret freedom in a way that the people with whom we deal can understand, for otherwise we shall not be understood. After all, when we discuss freedom when we are dealing with Americans we translate it into terms which apply to the lives of our own people. So we should proceed in similar fashion in attempting to have our interpretation of freedom understood by the people in the Far East, for example, by the people in the other parts of the world, where the people have never enjoyed the freedoms we take for granted, and where they may be suffering from hunger and poverty. I think we must consider and emphasize that.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, although I had agreed to be in attendance at a certain committee hearing to listen to a person of very high rank, I am inclined to remain here now, to wait for the gems of which the Senator from New Jersey speaks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will not be disappointed.

First, Mr. President, I wish to point out that in the early days of the history of the United States, our people floundered around with their conceptions of freedom. They were not entirely clear as to what freedom meant. Those who came to this land knew in a general way that they had come here in order to achieve certain freedoms. However, there was confusion regarding them at the time of the writing of the Constitution, in Philadelphia, in 1787; and our people were prone to be divided by bickering and jealousies which were reflected in the discussions at Philadelphia. Then arose one of our elder statesmen, Benjamin Franklin, who was over 80 years of age at the time, and he called attention to the fact that one trouble was that the people there thought they could rely upon their own wisdom and did not need to rely upon a Higher Wisdom.

I refer now to the spiritual guidance we need in connection with our attempts to deal with these complex world problems and to solve them. I think the words of Benjamin Franklin will be most helpful to us. He said then:

> I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? I * * * believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded; and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

Mr. President, at this time I quote that statement merely because it seems to me that in connection with the present battle for the minds of men, it is most important to have all men realize, as we have learned during the course of our history, that man by himself cannot solve these problems.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we continue to think of what we mean by human freedom, it seems to me we should redefine to the other nations of the world our moral position in concrete and positive terms, so as to stress the common aims and aspirations of the free world for freedom and peace with justice. Such a redefinition should take the

form of a ringing and positive declaration of peace objectives. I suggest the following as examples of matters which should be included in a redefinition of peace objectives. These have been suggested by many other Members of this body, so they are not new, but all of these suggestions should be refined, clarified, and assembled in one declaration, which would include:

First, the broad outlines of a disarmament program. Let us keep stressing our desire for peace, Mr. President.

Second, consistent adherence to the principle of freedom of communication and freedom of information, not only as applied to ourselves, but also as applied to the peoples of other countries. In that connection, I refer to the resolution submitted today by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] in which I was happy to join, and which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has endorsed. As evidence of our adherence to the principle of freedom of communication and information, we should send a message of friendship to the people of Russia, and we should insist that that friendship message be gotten through the iron curtain, in order to reach the Russian people.

Third—and this is very important, as I found as I traveled through the Far East last year—we must present to these people our unquestioned belief in the self-determination of peoples, through self-expression and self-development; and we must present to them our unquestioned opposition to any future imperialism, colonialism, or any attempt to impose by force a system of government upon a peaceful nation. We must be prepared to do all we can, just as we have done in Korea, and as we ought to be prepared to do in other parts of the world, to help people who aspire to achieve freedom.

Fourth, we should continue to demonstrate our willingness to achieve our objectives through the United Nations. Of course, I have been disappointed in the recent developments in the United Nations, but I believe that the United Nations organization still contains the promise of peace with justice; and while it is going through the ordeal of developing a new means of dealing with international problems, we must continue to demonstrate our willingness to work through the United Nations.

Fifth, we must affirm our rededication to democratic principles in our own countries. There must be a frank recognition that our systems of government are not perfect, but that we are seeking to give people freedom of self-expression and self-development. Certainly we must insist that the people of the free world must practice the democratic principles we profess and in that way give to the other nations examples of freedom in action.

Mr. President, in addition to the declaration of peace objectives I have outlined, we must lose no opportunity to strengthen our information programs, and to relate them to the traditions, the problems, and the attitudes of other peoples, so that they will have an impact upon the everyday life of the peoples concerned. This is a part of our foreign-policy program that has not been adequately emphasized.

We must translate our conception of freedom—and this is the approach to the problem about which the Senator from Vermont has asked—into words which have tangible meaning to peoples all over the world.

Mr. President, I have often suggested that we should not try to dominate this field by necessarily applying to our broadcasts the title "The Voice of America." I have suggested that we call it, the Voice of Freedom or the Voice of the Free World.

In order not to get into a position of appearing to dominate in that connection, we should encourage other countries to join us in stating what freedom means. There might well be a Voice of the Western European Nations, a Voice of the Benelux Countries, a Voice of Free China, or a Voice of Free Asia.

In any event, the important point is that in the dissemination of information from the free nations of the world to those that are groping for freedom, we must use words and terms which have tangible meaning to the peoples of countries all over the world; and we should state very definitely, in terms they will understand, just what freedom means to them.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should state that General Eisenhower, in his recent speech at the Library of Congress, before the joint meeting of the House and the Senate, emphasized the importance of our information program. He said:

> I will close on one note * * * (that) does not lie completely within my province, but it is important. * * * That is our own efforts to let the world understand what we are about, about what we are, and sometimes our own efforts to have our own people understand what we are trying to do. In any event, I believe that the United States needs a very, very much stronger information service. In our case I will not call it propaganda, because the truth is all we need. We don't have to falsify the record, nor our intentions.

Mr. President, I think we have relegated the entire program of information—our Voice of America program and all the aspects of the communication of ideas and information which is a central part of this cold war for the minds of men—to a relatively insignificant place in our entire military and diplomatic scheme of things. I am very sympathetic with the suggestion made recently by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] that we should take the information service, the Voice of America, entirely out of the State Department, and should set it up by itself, because of its importance, so that we can be sure that it constitutes one of the chief means upon which we rely in our continuous contact with the rest of the world and in our struggle against Communist infiltration.

Recently I was engaged in conversations with some of my colleagues, and the question arose, "Have not we lost our prestige in Europe, recently?" There was general agreement that whereas in years past we were respected and admired as one of the leading champions of freedom in the world, since then we have become unpopular for one reason or another. Those who participated in these group discussions attempted to explore the reasons for this situation. I shall not go into detail in that connection, except to say that it is always true that if one member of a group is more prosperous than the others, there is always an element of envy which results in making the prosperous person somewhat unpopular. I am afraid, however, that we have not used our prestige and our strength to the best effect. Rightly or wrongly, we have been looked upon as the "dollar country." We have been rather aggressively dominant in dealing with many of these people. We should face these facts, and should realize that we have to practice an attitude of humility in dealing with other people of the world, who are very proud, and who resent any attempt on our part to be the dominant factor in discussions or in working out these programs.

That is why I said earlier that, even though I feel that General Eisenhower is the most capable military man to deal with the present situation in Europe, he is wise when he says he does not think he should be in the position of dominating the decisions, but should rather share in determining the decisions of those who have the problems to meet.

So we cannot overlook the importance of humility. We have to face the problems of the world as one of many nations, not permitting to operate against us the feeling which apparently has started in some areas of the world. I shall deal with that subject more fully next week, because my experience in the Far East has brought it forcefully to my attention. The people of the Far East understand us less than do our European cousins, and they feel that we are a people far removed from them, with completely different ideologies from their own.

There are obvious examples of our own derelictions, which I feel we must correct. I am calling attention to them to indicate that we cannot merely pride ourselves as having attained a position of eminence in this matter. We cannot solve these problems without recognizing the difficulties in our own country, which indicate that we have fallen down within our own borders. For example, the Kefauver subcommittee has been doing excellent work in bringing out many evidences of crime in America. The situation depicted is very distressing, and it is something to which we should certainly be giving a great deal of attention, in an effort to determine why such things can happen.

I was very much disturbed by the draft rejections which we experienced during World War II, and have been concerned about the rejections in the recent draft, which indicate that a large percentage of young people are suffering from mental illnesses. They are disturbed because they do not know quite where they are going. They are drifting. They need leadership.

I am distressed by the evidences of family distintegrations in this country. I am distressed by the evidences of discrimination, of one kind and another,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

among our people. We do not adequately face up to these moral issues which mean so much to the future of any nation, and which meant so much to us when this great country was originally founded.

It is my conviction, as I stated earlier, that we must return to the principles of our basic Christian tradition, on which were laid the moral and spiritual foundations of this great Republic. In times past, when we drifted away from these principles, we felt the evil effects of our derelictions.

I need only refer to the crisis during the war between the States, which arose when Lincoln was suffering his greatest difficulties. One statement he made at that time, which is not quoted so frequently as are some of the other things he said, seems to me to be particularly applicable today in considering the problems we are facing. Lincoln said:

> We have been recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in number, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God who made us.

I merely quote that and place it in the RECORD because it seems to me that there we have the thinking of one of the greatest leaders of all time, a man who certainly understood his people, who certainly loved them and was not overly critical of them. He was merely saying that we became "intoxicated with success" without recognizing that the force behind what happened was a power outside ourselves.

But, in addition to what I have said about humility, and about the necessity of examining our own record before we try to preach too much to others, I desire to submit a word of caution. The fact that we need humility does not mean that we do not have great responsibility for leadership. I wish to distinguish between leadership in the right sense and an attitude of domination, which I fear, and against which General Eisenhower warned us. The great province of leadership is to inspire others by example. That is what I have been hoping I could bring out in the course of my remarks—that the course America follows will be the means by which we can sell our idea of freedom to other countries.

We have an example today in the food problem of India. I have been very eager to relieve the Indian people who may soon be suffering from famine, and I hope helpful legislation will be enacted. I trust the assistance may be extended without relation to any possible political implications, without reference to the fact that we may not agree with India's position today. The questions of suffering, of famine, of human beings being in danger of losing their lives, are entirely apart from any differences between us as nations. America has always met such a challenge, and I trust and hope and pray that she will meet this challenge.

The great province of leadership is to inspire others by example, to persuade them to do what needs to be done in their own interest. General Eisenhower referred in his speech to a rising spiral of strength and morale, and we must have that rising spiral. This does not mean paternalism. It does not mean a constant goading. We want to get away from any feeling of resentment which may come from any of our activities. We must try to dispel any feeling on the part of other nations that we look upon them as inferiors. As the strongest free nation, we must exert true leadership of the kind to which I have referred, and the leadership which through its actions, speaks louder than words, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has said. We profess to believe in humility, but if our actions do not coincide with our professions, it is of no avail. These problems are matters involving character—our national character and individual character.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. President, I desire to call attention especially to what seems to me to be a very significant aspect of the present world crisis. Russia, by very clever propaganda, has painted a picture of what is going on in the world which to my mind is absolutely misleading. Yet it has pervaded the minds and hearts of many peoples of many nations. Russian propaganda presents the struggle as a fight between the two major powers, the United States and Russia, with the United States representing imperialism, colonialism, and a decadent capitalism that exploits the common man, while Russian communism is the virtuous and benevolent champion of the poor and downtrodden.

There is no doubt that in large areas of the world this erroneous contrast has been dramatized until today there are nations wondering whether for their own best interests they should get into the tent behind the iron curtain with Russia, or whether they should get behind the western countries, and especially the United States. Millions of people are confused as to the real issue, and as to the true aspirations and objectives of the United States and the Western World.

This is evidenced by the strong sentiment for neutrality. I encountered when I was in Europe the question whether some of the countries should remain neutral, the suggestion that the struggle need not affect all nations and all peoples and the idea of waiting to see. It has shocked me beyond measure, because it seems to me that if the free world has not been able to show that what is at stake is something far more than simply a contest for power between two great nations, it has missed its greatest opportunity. The future of the civilized world is definitely at stake. Our most important challenge, then, is to convince the peoples of the world that this is a struggle between human freedom under God and slavery to a totalitarian state.

This means that we must acquaint people everywhere with our belief in the sacredness of the individual man, of his right to self-expression, to self-development, and to protection against exploitation by any stronger power. That is what we mean by freedom. It also means informing people everywhere of the true nature of the Russian Communist system, with its complete denial of the value of the individual, and its complete exploitation of the individual by the state. The contrast is evident, but, as I see it, we have failed to make it clear. The fundamental issue is between real freedom, freedom under God, as we have experienced it in this world, and human slavery.

Lincoln quoting Scripture, it will be recalled, said that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and so a nation half slave and half free cannot endure. I think we are facing the issue of a world divided against itself unless this great problem is solved. Nothing less than our dedication to a new birth of freedom of the world is adequate to meet the crisis. As Lincoln Day approaches I believe we cannot too often restate his great vision of what this eternal struggle is about. I need only to quote the closing words of his Gettysburg address:

> That this Nation, under God—

We can change the words, now, to "This world, under God"—

> may have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

The America of our forefathers is the hope of the world today. It is my hope and prayer that America shall not fail the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wanted to address myself to the subject the Senator was discussing, as I indicated, but I waited until the conclusion of the Senator's very worthwhile address, which I wish might be esteemed the "Voice of America" to be heard by our friends around the world. If they would listen to it and follow its teachings, our problem would be much less difficult.

Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senator's attention briefly to a portion of geography which it seems to me has been very much ignored. I refer to the Mediterranean. It was not mentioned by General Eisenhower in his discussion, but it is my understanding that in his statement before the committees he did recognize its strategic importance, as well as that of the nations which border the Mediterranean. It has been the center of civilization in the past, and is a place in which wars in the very recent past have been waged.

Turkey, in proportion to its resources, has been the greatest contributor to the battling in Korea. I think that would be a fair statement, would it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Maine is absolutely correct. I

am glad to join with him in paying tribute to the wonderful aid which the Turkish forces have been contributing in the war in Korea. They realized their own danger in connection with the Dardanelles and the Bosporus, and they knew that they might be the next victim. They realized what Korea meant in the whole picture of the world struggle.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is profoundly correct. Would the Senator from New Jersey, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which we must look for guidance, think that European countries would be recognized in connection with any appeasement program, so far as the Bosporus may be concerned?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as I am concerned, I can see nothing in appeasement. I should be opposed to any such appeasement program as the Senator suggests.

Mr. BREWSTER. Especially with reference to a nation which is standing so resolutely by our side at this time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. There are the usual rumblings of diplomatic intrigue in the discussions proceeding among the four great powers.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will agree with me that that was one of the things that was so disastrous in the conferences in which some of us felt that China was betrayed.

Mr. BREWSTER. So much for one end of the Mediterranean. I shall now invite the attention of the Senator to the other end of the Mediterranean, Gibraltar, and to its strategic importance in connection with the world-wide picture which has always prevailed. I wish to refer to the amendment which was adopted under the sponsorship of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. It has been a matter of concern to many Senators, and it was the subject of an overwhelming vote of both House and Senate when the amendment was offered. Is the Senator aware of the fact that under the provision which was adopted 6 months ago, not one dollar of assistance—and I quote the exact language—"has been extended to Spain"?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not aware of that.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the fact. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the language of the Senator from Wyoming in discussing the amendment, indicating what he had in mind, and what I am sure was the intent of both the Senate and the House in their vote. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, page 11465, the Senator from Wyoming speaking:

> That is precisely what the Senator from Nevada wishes to do—provide export-import credit aid to Spain. It can be done, it seems to me, more successfully by adopting the technique in the bill which was passed last year rather than by cutting anything out of the appropriation for the rest of Western Europe.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] asked him how this would affect or change the situation, and the Senator from Wyoming replied:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will show the Senator precisely how it changes it. I think that as a matter of realism we have to come to the conclusion now we should no longer be dependent upon vague promises which are not fulfilled and her is a directive of the Congress to perform an act the failure to perform which in the past has been defended on the ground, "Well, we have the legal power and we need no more." Yes, the Export-Import Bank had the power, but for reasons which are difficult to explain on any theory that does not conflict with our announced policy to contain communism the loans have not been made.

The Senator from Wyoming went on to say:

> I think that with respect to the policy toward Spain, if the State Department has opposed Export-Import Bank loans, this is precisely the place to reverse it, because if the Spanish peninsula is not held in the affairs which are now rapidly developing in Western Europe, much if not all of our economic aid to ECA countries will have been lost. If the arguments which are being made today at Lake Success, in the Security Council, under the Presidency of the representative of the Soviet Union and on behalf of the Kremlin policy—if those arguments and those tactics should prevail, it seems to me that there could be no possible question that refusal to deal realistically in Spain will only help to handicap our program. We should match realism with realism, and meet the issue as it is.

The Senator from Wyoming went on as follows:

> The Senator from New York has already answered himself, when a moment ago he rose and interrupted me to ask me a question. His question was: Does not the Export-Import Bank now have the authority to do this? The inference from the Senator's question was, of course, "We are ready to lend this money now. The Export-Import Bank can do it." But the sad fact is that the authority of the Export-Import Bank is not being used and we were told this afternoon the State Department is responsible.

Is the Senator from New Jersey surprised and concerned to find that six months' time has elapsed since that overwhelming vote, and that not one dollar has been advanced, so far as Spain is concerned?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not aware of that development.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator consider that there is any doubt that Spain has adequately presented its case before the Export-Import Bank in order to get the relief which Congress apparently considered was essential?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not aware of what protestations Spain made.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has referred to the need in India. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the need in Spain is equally great? Is he aware that in Yugoslavia, to which we gave aid some time ago, the wheat crop was 80 percent of the normal crop, and that the wheat crop in Spain for the past 5 years has been 65 percent of the pre-war normal. Would it not seem, under the mandate of Congress and because of human need, that the Export-Import Bank and other agencies of Government might well give consideration to the question either on the ground of expediency, on which the Yugoslav proposal was presented by the Senator from Arkansas, or on the ground of human need, which the Senator from New Jersey so eloquently and properly feels is present in the case of India?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was under the impression when we passed the legislation that it would go through the regular routine, and relief would be given. I am glad the Senator has brought up the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust that the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in their vision, which extends around Europe and through the Orient, will give consideration to conditions in the Mediterranean, in the interest of carrying out the plain mandate adopted by Congress six months ago.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I was not able to listen to his entire address. Unfortunately I had an engagement outside the Chamber and was therefore unable to hear all of it. I did hear the last portion of his address. The Senator knows how thoroughly I agree with him in the thesis which he has expounded, to the effect that the greatest strength that America can bring to the struggle is moral strength. I wish to thank the Senator for what he has said concerning the resolution which was submitted today. He was generous in joining with me and the other Senators in its proposals. I hope that we can now go forward and at least give positive evidence that the Congress of the United States, contrary to the propaganda pouring out of Moscow every day to the effect that we intend and desire the imperialistic enslavement of humanity everywhere, is determined that the world and its people shall be free. I think the Senator has delivered a statesmanlike address and exposition of the truth of our real intentions.

I may say to the Senator that I have taken an excerpt from the news ticker in the cloakroom, dealing with the Kremlin's attitude on our position. It seems to me that the pitch of their campaign is rising in its intensity. I view such development with a good deal of apprehension. It smacks too much on the same kind of techniques which Hitler and Goebbels used as they prepared for their aggressions. I do not know whether it has escaped the attention of Senators. If so, I recommend that they investigate the rising intensity of the bitterness of the releases which are coming out of Moscow, in which we are being accused of plotting all kinds of foul deeds in the world. I assure the Senator it is a study which is well worth while.

I close my remarks by saying to the Senator from New Jersey that I congratulate him on his excellent address.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE WAR IN KOREA AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before I take up my prepared address I wish to comment very briefly on the colloquy between the able Senator from New Jersey and the equally able Senator from Minnesota a short time ago, in which they referred to the huge volume of mail which has come to them from their constituents. Every Member of the Senate, and every Member of Congress, has been astounded by the huge volume of mail which has come to him. Thousands and thousands of letters have come to our offices from the folks back home whom we have the honor to represent. Our offices and our staff have been figuratively, if not literally, buried under the avalanche of communications. I believe there has been nothing like it in legislative history, at least not to my knowledge. The communications are not the ordinary run of the mill letters with reference to pending legislation, such as, "Please vote for this," or "Please vote against that." They reflect a degree of bewilderment and confusion which, as I have said, is without counterpart in legislative history. All through them, like a thread through a string of beads, runs one word: "Why?"

They say:

Our boys are fighting in Korea. Why?

There is no declared war. Yet we have upward of 50,000 casualties in Korea. Why?

We are told that the major portion of the so-called United Nations Army in Korea is composed of American troops. Why?

We are told that our intelligence was faulty. We are told that there was some failure, possibly, to evaluate such intelligence as was available. Why?

We are told that there is a possibility, at least, that we will be called upon to send our boys to Formosa, Indochina, the Philippines, and Japan. Why?

We are told that it is necessary to build up an army for the defense of Western Europe. Why?

We are told that it is essential to build up an army of perhaps 3½ million or 4 million men within the coming few months. Why?

We are told it is necessary to impose universal military training on the Nation. Why?

We are told it is necessary to lower the draft age to 18 years. Why?

We are told that the military program may take 10 years. Why?

We are told that it is necessary to have absolute economic control and rationing. Why?

We are told that we are going to have to increase the tax load on our people to an almost unbelievable weight. Why?

Why? Why? Why?

Mr. President, our people are entitled to know. It is because such questions have not been answered that there have resulted confusion, misunderstanding, and some measure of hostility. I have been somewhat critical of the leadership of the Nation, because I felt that it was lax, within the limits imposed by the security needs of the country, not to make the policies and the reason for the thinking behind the policies available to the American people.

Mr. President, ours is a democracy. The people of the United States, under our form of government, are not limited by the famous lines of Tennyson:

> Theirs not to reason why,
> Theirs but to do and die.

Mr. President, I have received and answered since Christmas more than 6,000 letters of the character to which I have referred. I said that I have criticized the leadership, because it has not made available to our people such information as could be made available to them. The people of my State, as of every other State, are ready to contribute their boys, and they are ready to assume any burden of sacrifice or responsibility if they have an idea of what it is for and what the goals are.

Mr. President, in attempting to answer the letters, I have found it impossible to cover the ground within the confines and limits of a dictated reply. In preparing for delivery in the Senate a speech which might be in a measure a foundation stone for future discussions, I felt that I was lax, because it was so difficult, and the ramifications were so complex, that it was almost impossible for me, within the limits of an address to be delivered on the floor of the Senate, to give any clear explanation.

I am also tremendously concerned because my friends who write to me from Iowa say, "Senator, we have sent you to Washington as our representative. We cannot be on the ground to know what is going on. Will you please give us a simple, clear, concise answer as to what the objectives of our Nation are in the policies which we are undertaking and carrying out?"

The inability to do that is something which has kept me awake at night. We are undertaking here what we call the great debate. Unfortunately, too often that debate has been concerned either with military strategy—whether we think it is militarily possible to defend this area or that area—or with a discussion of general principles.

I was pleased when the able leader of the majority [Mr. MCFARLAND] interrogated the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] when the latter was making his very eloquent speech this afternoon. He asked the Senator from Ohio, "Is the Senator stating his own conclusions, or opinions which he has received from the generals?" It occurred to me that there were two generals to whom we ought to listen, that is, General Principles and General Experience. The sooner we do that, the better it will be for the Nation and for the world.

I was also much interested a few moments ago when the eloquent Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] spoke of the fact that we should engage not only in defense but in offense. He defined the offense to which he alluded as the offense to bring to bear on all the world the basic principles of brotherhood, and spiritual and heart development.

In an attempt to correct in a small measure my own laxity, I beg the indulgence of the Senate to deliver a prepared address, which, unfortunately, is somewhat abstruse, but I believe that it ought to be in the RECORD as a cornerstone to the discussion which will be carried on later this week, and will certainly be carried on after the appropriate committees have considered such resolutions as the pending Wherry resolution.

Mr. President, it is becoming a commonplace to say that the United States is confronted with a permanent world crisis. It is a crisis unlike any we have known before, and we have been slow to learn how to live with it. One of the first things to learn, as the record of the past 7 months seems to show, is that no foreign policy and no grand strategy which the Government's experts and specialists may devise to meet this sort of crisis can hope to succeed without the full understanding and the fundamental agreement of the vast majority of the American people. It therefore becomes the business of all our people, and of all their representatives, to join in every major step of the long-range planning for foreign policy. If the people and their representatives do not make this their business, if they leave it to the experts to do the job, if they do not therefore understand and agree at least with the broad outlines and the ultimate purpose of our country's foreign policy, the whole structure may collapse or be torn apart from within at the moment of greatest danger.

Today, Mr. President, I am inviting my fellow Senators to join me in a voyage of discovery, or a tour of inspection, to explore the geography of our foreign policy, in the hope that we may return from the trip with a clearer picture of the broad outlines and the ultimate purpose of that policy than some of us may now possess.

THE THREE ESSENTIALS

The foreign policy of the United States is a constant process of seeking to create and maintain an effective balance among three basic elements: First, America's vital interests in the world; second, the commitments made to protect or advance these vital interests; and, third, the power America must have to fulfill these commitments.

I would judge that a country has a solvent foreign policy if it has assumed commitments great enough and broad enough to protect its vital interests but not too great and not too broad to fulfill with the power at its disposal. A country that has made commitments beyond its capacity to fulfill will one day be obliged either to reduce its commitments or to increase its power, if it can, or incur national bankruptcy and defeat.

Whenever in our history we have failed to achieve or maintain an effective balance among these three essentials, we have paid dearly in lives and in treasure for that failure. From 1900 onward, for example, the United States was committed to the defense of the Philippines; yet for 40 years few Americans, except the experts, believed that the Philippine Islands were an area of vital interest to our country. Then in 1941, we learned the tragic facts: we did not have the power to fulfill the commitments made 40 years before to defend those islands. It took us nearly four terrible years of

war to liberate them from the Japanese conqueror.

In the present day, failure to balance the essential factors of our foreign policy might not mean merely the temporary loss of distant island outposts, but the destruction of our Republic itself. If the Senate is to have a debate on foreign policy, it is to these great questions that we should first address ourselves, long before considering the ways and means of implementing the policy or passing judgment on the conduct of one or another of its subordinate aspects.

First, it seems to me, we must seek to define the interests of the United States in the world, reach an agreement among ourselves and our people as to what they are, distinguished accurately among vital and secondary interests, and determine in what order of importance we should rank them. Until this is done, we will continue to walk in the fog of doubt and confusion.

Second, we must survey the major commitments which the United States has made for the protection of its vital interests, in order to ascertain whether we have made adequate commitments, whether we are overcommitted in terms of what our interests require, and whether we may have committed ourselves to protect areas of interest which are not really vital but instead only secondary or apparent.

Third, we must estimate as closely as we can, with the advice and counsel of military and other experts, how great a power we must develop, and of what kind, in order to fulfill the major commitments covering our vital interests.

Then, based on our estimate of what is required, we must assess the power, the resources, and the capacity presently or potentially available, to determine whether we have enough to carry out the commitments made, whether we have a deficit in necessary power, or whether we have a surplus of power and potential, either to hold in reserve or to exercise in the fulfillment of new obligations we may be compelled to make to meet new threats to our vital interests.

If we do these things, Mr. President, I feel confident that we can approach an effective balance among our interests, our commitments, and our power, and I also feel confident that the American people, understanding this, will give our Government unhesitating support in the great tasks ahead.

Wherever our formal commitments and our vital interests in the world do not coincide, or at least do not seem to, there we find the source of the most embittered disagreements within the Congress and among our people. This is most obviously the case with regard to the Far East, especially in Korea, China, Formosa, and Indochina. It is less obviously the case with regard to Western Germany, Central Europe, and the Mediterranean, especially Spain and Yugoslavia.

If we are ever to reach a decision on our Far East policy which our people can wholeheartedly support, we must first agree on whether or not Korea, China, Formosa, and Indochina lie within an area of vital interest to the United States. We must agree on the nature, the extent, and the relative importance of that interest. We must agree on the character of the commitment we will make to protect that vital interest, if we decide such an interest exists.

Until we do this, Mr. President, all the speeches and propaganda and emotional appeals and hysterical accusations by which we are being assailed from all sides will serve merely to deepen and widen the chasm of confusion into which we have been plunging. We shall continue to be torn between the Europe firsters, the Asia firsters, the Formosa firsters, the America firsters, the globalists, and the retreatists, and all the other 999 varieties of parlor strategists and back-door statesmen.

OUR UNITED NATIONS COMMITMENT

First of all, however, I should like to preface a survey of our interests, commitments, and power with a brief discussion of our commitment under the United Nations Charter.

It will be valuable to draw a distinction between two kinds of commitments. One is the kind we make for the purpose of protecting an area of vital interest to the United States, in which we say, in effect, that the protection of that area is so essential to the defense of our own country that we will go to war, if necessary, to protect it. This is a commitment through vital interest.

The second type of commitment obligates us to abide by the principles of an international organization of states. We have made this kind of commitment under the United Nations Charter, which we participated in formulating. We are committed to abide by the principles of the Charter and by the decisions of the constituted agencies of the United Nations, which we also participate in formulating. This is a legal commitment covering our relations with a world organization.

Viewed negatively, the difference between these two types of commitment is that, whereas we might withdraw from our commitment to the United Nations without necessarily imperiling any of the areas of vital interest to us, we cannot withdraw from commitments we make for the protection of areas of vital interest without sooner or later imperiling our very national security. I do not wish to be interpreted as advocating withdrawal from the United Nations; I am merely illustrating the distinction between two kinds of obligations.

A farmer who owns property in a region plagued by prairie fires has a vital interest in protecting his property; he commits himself to insurance policies, buys fire-fighting equipment, and joins his neighbors in a volunteer fire department for their common protection. The farmer also assumes another commitment of a different sort as a citizen; he obeys the laws of his government, pays taxes, and, to the degree he can or will, participates in governing his country. He can withdraw from this latter commitment by changing his nationality and leaving the country. He cannot withdraw from his commitment to defend his vital property interest against prairie fires without risking the loss of both his property and his life.

This analogy leads us directly to the issue in Korea.

When the North Korean armies breached the peace and invaded South Korea, the members of the United Nations were obligated by their legal commitments to that organization to do certain things. The United States took the lead in proposing ways to fulfill these commitments. On June 25 and June 27, 1950, our delegation proposed resolutions which, the Soviet Union being absent, the Security Council adopted with alacrity. Among other things, the Council recommended that members furnish such assistance as might be necessary to repel the armed attack and restore peace.

Thereafter, and throughout the Korean War, the United States and the other countries which have sent men and matériel to Korea under the United Nations banner have been acting on the principle that they are fulfilling a legal obligation or commitment under the United Nations Charter. Yet, from the beginning, it has been the United States that has taken the lead. Why? Was it simply because we are the strongest and richest member? Was it merely because we had troops in Japan close to the scene? Was it because we believed more firmly in the principles of the Charter than anyone else, or that we believed our commitment under the Charter was greater and more binding than that of other countries, and that, hence, we had to do more to fulfill it? There is no doubt that these considerations played an important role.

But is it not strange that so little mention has been made of another consideration? Is it not likely that reasons of vital American interest may also have been a potent factor in inducing the United States to take the lead and to invest nine times more troops and matériel in fighting the Korean war than all the other countries together? Is it not likely that the United States Government, after a period of protracted indecision, finally decided, when the chips were down, that Korea was an area of vital interest to this country and had to be protected, if humanly possible, against conquest by the advance guard of an expanding military empire aiming at the islands of Japan—another vital American interest?

Were not our legal commitments under the Charter, therefore, paralleled and reinforced by the decision that we did have a vital interest in Korea and by the realization that our membership in the United Nations not only obliged us to fulfill a legal commitment but also permitted us, belatedly, to act in defense of our vital interest?

In so reasoning, Mr. President, I do not wish to be regarded as a mind-reader who knows what went on in the high councils of our Government at that time. Events, nevertheless, have a way of speaking for themselves. Standing in a strategic position between Japanese, Chinese, and Soviet territories, the Korean peninsula has long been an area of vital interest to these three governments. As we know, Japan controlled it in this country until 1945.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In that year Korea also became an area of vital interest to the United States. American troops occupied South Korea up to the thirty-eighth parallel. We assumed a commitment to defend those troops, and, by inference, the territory which they occupied. We also occupied nearby Japan.

Many top American military commanders are said to have believed all along that Korea was indefensible against a determined assault from the mainland. Thus, after 1945, although we had a vital interest and a commitment to defend South Korea, we did not have, or believed we did not have, the power to back it up. Our Korean policy was not in balance.

Then, in 1949 after long negotiations we withdrew our troops from Korea. We made no formal commitment to the new Republic of Korea to go to its defense, but limited ourselves to sending economic and military assistance. In these circumstances, we still had a vital interest in Korea, because of Japan, but we had neither a commitment nor the power to fulfill one.

In June 1950 the Soviet Union sent its North Korean puppets to occupy all Korea. The attempt failed. In November Communist China in its turn set out to take over all Korea. The United Nations, America in the lead, has been trying to prevent both the Soviet Union and China from accomplishing their objectives. I should think that this brief recital of events demonstrates that the United States has a vital interest in Korea but has had an indecisive and wholly unbalanced policy for dealing with it.

Finally, Mr. President, would not the innumerable expressions of dissatisfaction, anger, and scorn that we have heard among our people over the failure of other members to respond with proportionate vigor and sacrifice have been somewhat less vociferous if the people had been told, and had believed, that we went into Korea not only for a principle, not only to fulfill an obligation, not only to counter an act of aggression, but also to defend our country in an area of vital interest to our long-range national security?

In June the course we took was almost universally acclaimed as the only honorable and possible one to follow. In January it has become fashionable to denounce and decry that course because it has not led to success. Yet, I ask my fellow Senators, would it not have been wiser and more responsible to have decided long before June 1950, through debate and agreement in the Congress, that the Korean peninsula was an area of vital interest to the United States, or that it was not, and that we were committed to its protection with sufficient power, or that we were not? Must we not now reach that sort of decision with regard not only to Korea but also to Formosa, China itself, Indochina, Japan, and perhaps other countries in the Far East? If we decide these areas are vital to our national security, and if this decision reflects the opinion of our people, must not we then commit ourselves to the protection of our interests there? Or, if we decide they are not vital, must we not prepare a wholly different series of measures for the defense of our Pacific frontier?

Furthermore, I believe that the American people would understand better why other countries have not poured men and materials into Korea proportionate to what we have sent if they realized that, while Korea may be an area of vital interest for America, it may well not be for many other countries. Let us ask why other countries hold back and do not follow our lead against Communist China. Could it be that for many of them China is not an area of vital national interest at all, and that for others their interest in China is altogether different than ours? Had this series of aggressions occurred somewhere else, might not a quite different alinement of forces have arisen to meet it, under quite other leadership?

All I am saying, Mr. President, is that, United Nations or no United Nations, sovereign states have their own paramount interests, and must, if they are to survive, commit themselves in their own way to protect those interests as best they can. We may not approve the way they choose or believe it has the slighest chance to succeed, but we will not be able to alter their course so long as China is not regarded by them as an area of paramount interest or is regarded as an interest quite different for them than it is for us. The task of our diplomacy, it seems to me, is to persuade the other non-Communist members of the United Nations that we and they have one supreme interest in common to us all. But I doubt that we can define that one supreme common interest until the United States has made up its own mind as to what and where its own vital interests are.

Without making any pretense of professional expertness in these matters, and with the hope and expectation that my colleagues will fill the gaps with their own valuable contributions, I should like now to make a rough sketch of what I believe to be the most important among our country's vital interests and the commitments that have been made, or not made, to cover these interests; and, finally, with even less pretense to expert knowledge, I would raise the question of the power and resources we have and those that we need in order to fulfill these commitments.

AMERICA'S VITAL INTERESTS

We have listened to a number of definitions of the purpose of American foreign policy. Some have been specific, some general, some broad, and some narrow. All, however, seem agreed that its purpose is primarily to defend something. I know of no one who defines its purpose as the conquest of the world or the establishment of an empire or any other aggressive aim, except—as referred to by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]—the type of offensive to which he referred as "the spiritual offensive." If there exists here in America a school of thought which holds that the purpose of our foreign policy should be conquest, imperialism, expansion, or aggression, it is a secret school of thought without publicly avowed exponents either in Congress or in the public at large.

Some say the purpose of American foreign policy is to defend peace, to prevent war, and, if these fail, to be able to fight and win a war. Others say its purpose is, first, to defend liberty, and, second to defend peace, but not peace at the price of liberty. Others have said that it is to defend our way of life and our institutions from conquest by the armies and agents of totalitarian dictatorship. Others again hold that its purpose is to contain communism or to deter aggression. Still others define it as the defense of democracy, or of free society, or of capitalism, or of Christian civilization, or of western culture, or of some other ideal or set of principles.

This sort of verbal definition, of course, is susceptible of infinite variation, with every man exercising his inalienable right to interpret the words in his own way, and to read into the words peace, liberty, way of life, civilization, and so forth, as much, or as little meaning, or as different meanings as he can or will. I wonder, Mr. President, whether we are not likely to lose ourselves completely in a forest of words and slogans if we continue to seek to define in purely verbal terms the purpose and objectives of American foreign policy.

Perhaps it will make for greater clarity and mutual understanding if we define the purposes of our foreign policy more in physical than in metaphysical terms. By physical terms, I mean chiefly geographic terms.

If we can establish with some degree of certainly the geographic areas which are of vital interest to the United States—that is, the areas which we must defend if the United States is to survive—we may reach a clearer conception of what our foreign policy is and what it must be. I realize that this effort will call for a longer view than our daily tasks usually permit us to take, but few will deny that the short view we have consistently taken these last years has led us to the brink of bottomless disaster.

What the American people need more than anything else in the present confusion is a picture of where they stand in the world. I have been hoping that the President of the United States would draw such a picture; and I believe it would be of incalculable value if he were to undertake a series of intimate radio talks with the people, in which he would draw the lines of this picture for all of us to see. While waiting for him to do so, it may be worth while to attempt to sketch some of the broad outlines of the picture, as they appear to one Senator.

What, and where, are America's vital interests? Remembering that its vital interests are those which are so essential to its own national security that it must protect them, by war if necessary, it goes without saying that the Nation's paramount interest is the defense of its own territorial integrity, its own physical security, and its own political independence.

The primary purpose of American foreign policy, therefore, must be to protect that paramount interest—in other words, to protect the territory which we inhabit and the Government under which we live. All the other countless interests of the

United States would obviously be indefensible if we should fail in the defense of our own territory and independence. Of course, I include within this territory all the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal, and our other outlying possessions.

Beyond the borders of American territory, however, there lie areas of almost equal importance for the defense of our country. They are as follows:

First. The first area of vital interest to the United States is the North American Continent as a whole. This has been a fact for almost as long as we have been a nation. The defense of the territory, security, and independence of the North American Continent, and of the countries within it, is indisputably essential to the security and independence of the United States.

Second. The second area of vital interest to us is the Western Hemisphere and the countries within it. This has been recognized ever since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed. For the United States to remain secure and independent, the territorial integrity and security of the Western Hemisphere and the political independence of the countries within it are basic requirements, and have been for a century or more.

Third. The third vital interest of the United States is the protection of the sea and air approaches to the Western Hemisphere, particularly North America, across the Arctic, Atlantic, and Pacific Oceans. With every new technological advance in communications and transportation, the extent of this area has widened until it now includes all the islands lying on the sea and air approaches to our hemisphere, embracing even those close to the far shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, especially the British Isles to the east and the Japanese and Philippine Islands to the west, as well as Greenland and the islands to the north of Canada.

Regarding these three immense areas spreading outward from the United States, I doubt that there is any fundamental disagreement among our people. Whatever their attitudes may be toward the peoples or the governments of countries located in these three vast regions, most of the American people would agree, I believe, that the defense of these areas is essential to the protection of the United States itself. But if there is fundamental disagreement among us regarding these areas or any segment of them, we should know about it immediately and should settle the question among ourselves once and for all.

It is when we begin to consider the next two areas of greatest importance to us, however, that deep divisions appear and crack the surface of our Nation's unity. Let me, nevertheless, present them in the same form as that in which I have presented the areas of North America, the Western Hemisphere, and the sea and air approaches across the oceans that surround us.

Fourth. The fourth vital interest of the United States lies in the area comprising the countries of Western Europe and North Africa which border on the far shores of the Atlantic Ocean, an area which, if dominated by a conquering military power bent on our destruction, could become an enormous base for launching attacks on our sea and air approaches and for mounting an invasion of areas even more essential to our national security.

Two terrible wars in this century have demonstrated that the United States considers its national security endangered whenever the Atlantic coasts of Western Europe are conquered by a hostile, aggressive military power dominating that continent. When this happens, we prepare for the worst.

If the Nazi power, which in 1940 extended eastward only to the heart of Poland, made us leap to rearm ourselves the moment the western Allied barrier was breached, to what would we be driven today if the Communist power, stretching eastward across all Europe and Asia to the Sea of Japan, should stand at the Channel ports, on the coasts of Norway, and in Morocco?

By virtue of the fact that in the past 34 years the United States has twice gone to war to prevent the permanent conquest of Western Europe by a German military empire, by virtue of the action of Congress in establishing and appropriating funds for the European recovery program, and by virtue of the action of the Senate in ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty, I believe it is beyond question that a heavy majority of the people and the Congress of the United States have for a long time been convinced that the countries along the Atlantic coast of Europe form an area of vital interest to the security of the United States. This conviction is by no means unanimous, but the actions taken by the Congress and by the Government in the face of a threat to Western Europe bespeak a preponderant opinion among our people that that area is vital to American security. How deeply into Europe and into the Mediterranean that interest extends, and how far down the coast of Africa, has yet to be decided and agreed on. Does it reach to the frontiers of the Russian orbit in central and southeastern Europe? Do Greece, Turkey, and North Africa lie within it? These are things we must decide. Only this afternoon, the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] interrogated the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] along the line of that question.

Fifth. The fifth vital interest of the United States lies in the area comprising the countries of eastern Asia which border on the far shores of the Pacific Ocean, from which an assault by a hostile conquering military power controlling those countries could be launched on the sea approaches and territory of North America.

By virtue of a great number of American actions in the far Pacific, including our long occupation of the Philippine Islands; the enunciation of the open-door policy for China; the intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt in the settlement of the Russo-Japanese War; the American mission in Siberia during Russia's post-revolutionary civil war; the long, if futile, efforts from 1931 to 1941 to prevent by peaceful means the Japanese conquest of China; the war against Japan from 1941 to 1945 to prevent the permanent conquest of Eastern Asia by the Japanese military empire; and the subsequent efforts to preserve Chinese independence, and, latterly, Korean independence—by virtue of all these actions it seems clear that the Government of the United States and a large proportion of the American people have been for a long time convinced that the countries of the Far East, including both the seaward islands and the mainland coasts of Siberia, Korea, China, and Indochina, do form an area of vital interest to the security of the United States. In the past, distance and unfamiliarity have combined to render difficult the formation of opinion in this country regarding the nature and extent of our vital interests in the Far East, though I imagine this is less true today than ever before. Yet, do we know how deeply into the Asiatic mainland this interest extends? How far south toward Malaya and Indonesia does this interest reach? Are Australia and New Zealand included within it? These are also things we must decide.

It is obvious that there is much less agreement about these last two great areas of vital interest—Western Europe and Eastern Asia—than about the first three I have cited. Therein lies the confusion, the bewilderment, the uncertainty which our people are daily voicing. Some are certain that both areas on the far shores of the oceans surrounding us are vital interests of the United States. Some are certain that neither is.

Others believe that the Atlantic coast of Europe is an essential area for our defense, while the Pacific coast of Asia is not. Still others believe the opposite is true. In addition, there are innumerable gradations of opinion giving various weights to the relative significance of these regions, and other shades of opinion that consider these areas as too narrowly or too broadly defined. At the root of such oversimplified and single-minded proposals as those advanced by the Europe-firsters, or the Asia-firsters, or the America-firsters, lie these fundamental differences over what are and what are not America's vital interests.

I do not see how we dare assume that there is basic unity behind our Nation's foreign policy, when there is no underlying agreement even on what our vital interests are, and where they are to be found. I see no point in pretending that these divisions of opinion do not exist. Every delivery of mail which comes to our desks shows that they exist. I do see great advantages in exposing these differences for all to see, so that we may debate them openly, honestly, and completely. To those who cry, "Beware, the Kremlin is listening," I would reply that these disagreements are a secret from no one, and as long as they persist, their effect will be to embitter American opinion itself and to poison relations with our strongest allies.

Beyond these vital interests to the security of the United States, and the geographical areas in which they lie, I shall not go in my enumeration, because they are of such extraordinary importance as to outclass any other interest, however real, to which we may point. There is no question that the United

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States has real, perhaps vital interests elsewhere in the world; they also merit our full attention.

We have troops in Germany, Austria, and Trieste. A Mediterranean country, Italy, is joined with us in the Atlantic Pact. We are furnishing military or economic assistance to Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Iran, and, in the general area of China, to Indochina, Thailand, Indonesia, and Formosa. We have air bases in Lybia, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere. Most of the oil for Western Europe comes from the fields of the Middle East. Under the concept of containment, which is frequently translated as meaning that the United States should oppose the expansion of Russian power anywhere beyond its 1945 perimeter, the vast regions to the south of the Soviet border would seem to form an area of very great importance.

Yet the interest of the United States in all these places, real and growing as it may be, is not generally considered as of the same order of importance as those in the five areas which I have described.

I hope I have made clear, Mr. President, that we have much to discuss before we have delineated the extent and the character and the order of importance of the areas that are, or may become, of vital interest to America's own defense.

AMERICA'S COMMITMENTS

When we come to the commitments which the United States has undertaken to protect and advance its vital interests, we find that, with several significant exceptions, the areas covered by our commitments coincide almost exactly with the great region within which America has her most vital interests. This is a reassuring discovery, since it suggests that, so far as interests and commitments go, ours are more or less in balance. The exceptions require a separate, most serious study.

I will say at once, Mr. President, that by a "commitment" I mean a solemn pledge, usually embodied in a treaty or agreement with one or more other governments, that the United States Government will go to war, if necessary, to protect the interest covered by the commitment. Again I am stressing the geographic character of commitments and the areas they are designed to cover.

I should remark at this point that I do not regard the so-called Truman Doctrine as a commitment, in the proper sense of the term, that has been undertaken by the Government of the United States. I realize that the word "commitment" is rather loosely employed, but I am defining it, for purposes of this discussion, as a solemn, binding pledge by our Government to engage in war, if need be, for the defense of a specified area of the world which we deem essential for the protection of our own national security. The Truman Doctrine is not a formal commitment of the character of the Rio Pact or the Atlantic Pact or the agreements such as have been made with the Philippine Government. It is not a pledge to defend a specified area of vital interest to American security. There are no treaties or executive agreements, so far as I know, which define this doctrine. It is not a legal commitment such as we have made under the United Nations Charter. To my knowledge, no congressional enactment has placed it on our statute books. The Truman doctrine is a declaration of principle or a pronouncement of intentions by the President of the United States, and is consequently and properly regarded as a proclamation of incontestable importance and vast implications. But it is not a commitment in the sense I have been employing this term.

Mr. President, in starting this survey I see no need for discussing our obligation to defend the territory and independence of the United States and its outlying possessions. We will fight for them no matter what it costs or how long it takes.

First. North America: We are committed to the defense of North America, and the obligation is formally recognized in a number of treaties and agreements with our neighbors. Our commitment to join Canada in her defense is partly set forth in the Ogdensburg agreement reached in August 1940 by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada, which provided for establishment of a Permanent Joint Board of Defense "to consider in the broad sense the defenses of the north half of the hemisphere." On February 12, 1947, the postwar extension of this agreement and of the Defense Board was recognized in a joint statement by the two Governments. In view of our traditional friendship as well as of the realities of our position as mutually dependent on one another for the protection of the national security of both countries, no treaty, executive agreement, or contractual obligation was entered into. The agreement is none the less real.

Moreover, Canada and the United States are formally allied as signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty.

With regard to our other nearest neighbor there has been in existence since January 1942 a Joint Mexican-United States Defense Commission through which the Governments of this country and Mexico have been working together on common defense problems. As a signatory of the Rio Pact, of course, Mexico is formally allied with the United States and the other Latin-American countries.

It is inconceivable that we would not defend our closest neighbors as if they were ourselves.

Second. The Western Hemisphere: We are committed to the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—the Rio Pact—which was ratified by the Senate in 1947. The essential article of this treaty, article 5, declares that "an armed attack by any state against any American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states."

The security zone defined under article 4 includes all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and embraces Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Canada, and the Arctic islands lying to her north, Greenland, the Caribbean islands, and a segment of Antarctica.

Mr. President, exhibit A, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks, contains articles 3 and 4 of the Rio Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, while the treaty does not make the use of armed force obligatory by any party to it, it is a recognition of a fact that has been true, insofar as the United States is concerned, since the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine and that is now formally affirmed by treaty—the United States will go to war, if necessary, to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of the Western Hemisphere.

Third. The North Atlantic: When the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, the United States became formally committed to the defense of the Atlantic Ocean north of the Tropic of Cancer, the sea approaches across the Atlantic, and all the countries lying on the European shores of the Atlantic except Spain and Germany, as well as of the western Mediterranean and the North Sea.

By article 5 of this treaty, "the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." The same article also provides that if such armed attack occurs, each party will assist the party or parties attacked by taking forthwith "such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

The security zone defined by the Atlantic Pact in article 6 includes the territory of any of the parties in Europe, or North America, the Algerian departments of France, the occupation forces of any party in Europe, the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic north of the Tropic of Cancer, and also, the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the signatory powers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibit B be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. It contains articles 5 and 6 of the Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, Senate Executive Report No. 8, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee accompanying the North Atlantic Treaty, makes clear that our commitment under article 5 does not apply to any of the overseas territories outside the North Atlantic area. "The only outlying territories covered," it states, "are the islands of the North Atlantic area, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, and the islands of the Canadian Arctic." Thus, our Atlantic commitment does not extend into Asia or Africa, except for the Algerian departments that are constitutionally part of metropolitan France.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would it not be easier for the Senator to tell us what spots we are not going to defend than to tell us the spots we are going to defend? Have we not already taken in most of the earth?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to say, in reply to the Senator's question, that on the next page of my address I shall cover the territory which is not covered by the commitments to which I have been referring.

Our commitment cannot be extended, even on the continent of Europe, without our permission. The treaty requires unanimous agreement to invite other states to join, and the report states that the committee was fully satisfied by the pledge of the President, delivered by the Secretary of State, "that he would consider the admission of a new member of the pact as the conclusion of a new treaty with that member, and would seek the advice and consent of the Senate to each such admission."

The following paragraph in the committee report seems of particular significance in the present connection, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate to read it:

> We have learned that the security of the North Atlantic area is vital to our own peace and security. In accepting the obligations of the treaty, therefore, we merely make clear that we are following a course of action which we would follow without the treaty. If we were to accept the same commitments on a world-wide basis or in areas less vital to our national security, we might well run the danger of spreading ourselves too thin.

In the light of what I have been saying about balancing commitments and vital interests, Mr. President, I think this paragraph from the committee report also merits repetition at this moment:

> Suggestions have been made that the United States enter into similar pacts with countries in the Middle East and Pacific areas. During the hearings members of the committee questioned administration witnesses specifically on this point. It was established that the United States Government is not currently considering participation in any regional or collective defense arrangements.

To the best of my knowledge, this last statement still holds true. Therefore, the only two commitments of a collective, regional character that we have made, covering two areas of vital interest to the United States, are the Rio Pact and the Atlantic Pact—both of which, I need scarcely remark, have been duly ratified by the United States Senate.

Fourth. Occupation areas: We now come to another type of commitment, which, although not defined by treaty or agreement between governments, is nonetheless real. The existence of these obligations is known to everyone. They have been repeatedly considered and approved by the action of Congress. They are part of the heritage of World War II.

As aftermath of that war, the United States has found itself obliged to maintain occupation forces in Berlin and Western Germany, in Vienna and part of Austria, and on the islands of Japan. The presence of these occupation forces raises question as to the nature and extent of the American commitment in these countries, while at the same time confirming the existence of our obligation.

Our legal position in Western Germany is currently defined by a statute of occupation, yet with the establishment of a federal republic in that part of Germany and its rapid resumption of full sovereignty, the terms of the statute will certainly be modified soon if not abolished altogether. Then the role of United States troops in Germany will have to be settled by some new agreement, contract, or treaty. Meanwhile, since the North Atlantic Treaty provides that an attack on occupation troops of the signatory powers shall be considered in the same light as an attack on their territories, some measure of protection is already afforded West Germany under our Atlantic commitment. As in Austria, where, for lack of a treaty, the nature and extent of our commitments are in the realm of the undetermined, but where we have American forces stationed, so in Germany it would seem almost certain that an armed aggression against our occupation troops would be a cause of war—if indeed it were not the signal for an all-out invasion of the rest of Western Europe.

Similarly in Japan, where our legal position as chief occupying power is defined by international agreement, we must await negotiation of a treaty or contract with the Japanese Government before the American commitment in Japan is fully and clearly determined. For the present, it is virtually certain that an armed aggression against United States troops in Japan would be regarded by us as cause for war.

The Prime Minister of Japan, Shigeru Yoshida, writes in the current issue of Foreign Affairs that:

> American statesmen and military leaders have declared again and again the determination of the United States to hold on to its defense perimenter in the Pacific, a chain of islands running from the Aleutians to the Philippines, of which Japanese Islands form the central and vital link.

Mr. Yoshida also quotes Secretary Acheson's remarks of a year ago at the National Press Club in Washington, when the Secretary said:

> The defeat and disarmament of Japan have placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in the interest of the security of the entire Pacific area and in the interest of Japan's security. I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defense of Japan.

I believe, Mr. President, that it can safely be assumed, by us and by all others concerned, that, although we have not yet made formal treaties with Germany, Austria, and Japan, the United States is at present committed to fight for the protection of Western Germany, of that part of Austria not under Soviet occupation, and of the whole of Japan. While the legal right of American troops to be stationed in these occupied areas may not ever have been passed on as such by the Congress, we have repeatedly authorized and appropriated the necessary funds for maintaining the occupation forces. I am not aware that any question has ever been raised as to the moral obligation of the United States (and of the other occupying powers) to defend the defenseless peoples whose countries we are now occupying as a consequence of our military victory over the Axis powers.

It is a serious question, however, whether we have the power at present to fulfill these obligations, and this raises the further question as to whether we should augment our forces in those areas as rapidly as we can, so as to meet the unwritten but nevertheless real commitment we have assumed by our occupation of them since 1945. It will be for Congress to decide, moreover, if—when the occupations officially terminate—we are prepared to consider Western Germany, Austria, and Japan as falling within areas of vital interest to our country's defense.

Fifth. The Philippines: We turn to still another type of commitment. This one is based on the mutuality of interest which the United States and the Philippines continue to share even though the latter country has attained its full independence. On June 29, 1944, the Congress adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to acquire bases in the Philippines for the mutual protection of the United States and that country. This agreement was signed at Manila on March 17, 1947. Its terms provide that the Governments of the two countries take the necessary measures to promote their mutual security and to defend their territories and areas. We are therefore committed formally to the defense of our bases in the Philippine Islands, and it is impossible to ignore the implication that the agreement also commits us to defend the whole of the Philippine Islands. As a result of an executive agreement authorized in advance by congressional action, the vital interest we have had since the opening of the century is now matched with a commitment to defend it.

Sixth. The Pacific islands: Along the sea and air approaches to the United States across the Pacific Ocean we have commitments to defend a large number of islands. Some, like the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the Carolines, we administer under United Nations trusteeship. Others are smaller Japanese islands taken by right of conquest and held pending negotiation of a peace treaty with Japan. As occupying power and as possessor of important bases, we are committed to defend Okinawa and the other Ryukyu Islands, Iwo Jima, and the Bonin Islands.

This completes my list of commitments undertaken by our Government for the protection of areas of vital interest to American security. Other than the defense of its own island possessions, such as Hawaii, Midway, or Guam, the United States has no commitments to defend areas of the world outside the Western Hemisphere, the North Atlantic, Western Europe, including occupation zones and adjacent waters—but not including Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, Spain, Yugoslavia, or Greece—the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

islands of Japan, the Philippines, and certain South Pacific islands. All of these commitments, which imply where they do not specifically state it, constitute pledges by the United States to go to war, if necessary, for the defense of the area covered by the commitment, whether made by treaty, by executive agreement, or by virtue of the presence of American military forces.

Thus, unless my information is faulty—and I welcome corrections where I am wrong—it is not true, as has been rather recklessly charged from time to time, that the administration has made commitments of this life-and-death character without congressional approval or knowledge, except in the sense that negotiations with foreign governments sometimes have created a moral obligation on Congress to ratify or legislate in order to back up diplomatic arrangements on which we are not consulted in advance.

Mr. President, in making that statement, I do not want to be understood by implication to mean that I have approved of all such commitments. In my short address today I am trying—and perhaps I am taking too long—to outline the situation so that our people may know what commitments have been made when they ask, "Why here?" or "Why there?" They should know the answer when they ask, "What responsibility do we have? Why are we going to send our troops here, or there? Under what authority are we doing it? Under whose authority is the action being taken? Who has exceeded his authority?" I have tried to present a survey of the whole field of commitments which have actually been made. In every instance which I have mentioned the commitment was made with the consent of Congress. Although I have criticized the leadership, and still expect to criticize it, it is not fair to say that authority was assumed or usurped in any instance I have mentioned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that every Republican who is now criticizing the President on the question of sending troops voted a great number of times for the other commitments?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from North Dakota is correct, as he almost always is.

There is one commitment made in this past year by the President which did not take the form of a treaty or an agreement and which was not assumed as a legal commitment under the United Nations Charter. This was the President's order to the Seventh Fleet to neutralize the island of Formosa. In effect, this amounted to a commitment to protect Formosa from invasion by the Chinese Communists. Yet it has never been established by any congressional decision that Formosa is to be regarded as an area of vital interest to the United States. On January 21 of this year, however, Ambassador Gross, our deputy delegate to the United Nations, indicated that there has been such a decision reached on the highest level of our Government.

I shall now read what Ambassador Gross stated.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Was Congress aware and did Congress give its consent to the Russian order with respect to the city of Berlin which caused the United States and its allies, especially the United States, to undertake the airlift in order to supply Berlin?

Mr. GILLETTE. I presume the Senator is referring to the agreements reached at Tehran and Yalta.

Mr. THYE. That is correct. Was Congress aware of the fact that such a situation was to be established, which was to cause our Nation the expense, both in dollars and in physical equipment, and the loss of our men, in order to supply the United States sector of Berlin with food when the Russians imposed their embargo?

Mr. GILLETTE. To the best of my recollection, there was no such information given to the Congress of the United States. I was a Member of the Senate at the time. However, I ask the Senator from Minnesota to keep in mind that when the agreements were negotiated in Tehran and Yalta we were engaged in the Second World War. It was during the war that we entered into the agreements. Again I may say, having some inside information at the time of the character of the agreements, I was not one who approved. The fact remains that they were in the nature of military agreements which were made to meet an exigency of war which was very real at the time. I do not know whether, had I been representing the United States at one of the conferences, I would have agreed to what was agreed to by the then President of the United States, and in the conclusions which were reached. I have sometimes questioned whether I would or would not. However, if my recollection serves me correctly—and I hope it does—at that time there was serious doubt with respect to overtures which we were told had been made by the Central Powers to Russia to make a separate peace, to take Russia out of the war so that the Central Powers would not be compelled to fight on two fronts, but could concentrate their forces to meet our attack across the Channel on the Normandy coast.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me finish this point.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me finish, please.

The fact that it was militarily impossible, in the opinion of our best military minds, for us to meet the German might on one front. It was necessary that Russia should stay in the war so that the Central Powers could be divided and compelled to meet an attack from two fronts. That necessity was so vital and so real that, much as I deplore some of the agreements which were made at the places mentioned by the Senator and mentioned by me, if I had been there, knowing what the result might have been if we had refused to accede to demands of that kind, I am not sure what I would have done. I have asked myself over and over again, if the question had been placed before me for decision, what my answer would have been. Perhaps if I had been there I would not be so critical as I have been of those who entered into such agreements.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There has always been a question in my mind as to what the United States leaders were thinking of when they made such grave concessions to a country such as Soviet Russia. Whether they were military men who sat in the conferences, or whether they were diplomatic representatives of our Government, with the then President, what were men thinking of when they made such grave concessions, when the cordon about Berlin was acceded to? The same thing was true of Vienna, and all of eastern Austria. The productivity of Austria was yielded to Russian control. Those two examples on the European continent would lead us to question the wisdom of those decisions.

The next question, of course, is with respect to Manchuria. An agreement was entered into that Russia should have control over that vast area of China. Then there was the decision as to the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. Some very serious commitments were made, of which Congress was not aware. That leads us today to be more critical and more demanding in our desire to know what the commitments are. The Senator and I are today attempting to avoid mistakes such as those which have proved to be so terrifically costly to this Nation. They have caused us a great deal of expense in the South Pacific, and have resulted in the loss of many of our youths in the very flower of life.

All this was the result of mistakes in years past. For that reason some of us are asking today that no more secret commitments be made. We say to our leaders, "Let us know what you are thinking. Let us know what plans and agreements you are entering into before you commit this Nation." I can only say to the very able Senator from Iowa that although those commitments may have seemed wise under the pressure of war, yet they were far-reaching and very heavily weighted.

Men should not make such commitments unbeknown to those who are elected by the people of the Republic. The Members of the House are elected every 2 years, and one-third of the membership of this body is elected every 2 years. We are the ones who must answer to the people in our respective districts or States as to what is being committed and what is being done by the Government. Unless we are informed, and unless we can know today, tomorrow, and in years to come, to what this Government commits itself and what agreements it enters into, we are not going to be able to defend our action, nor can we in any sense exercise the

responsibilities with which those who elected us entrusted us.

Personally I hope that there will be sufficient respect for the legislative branch on the part of the Executive and the State Department to be frank and honest and give us information as to what they are confronted with, and what the plans and commitments of the United States are to be.

I thank the Senator for yielding so much time to me.

Mr. GILLETTE. It was a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Let me say that I am in accord with his statesmanlike remarks. In addition to some of the commitments to which he referred, other commitments were made at that time which seemed necessary to meet the exingencies of the situation. I have mentioned them over the years. I question now, and will question so long as I am a Member of the United States Senate, the commitment of this Nation under usurped authority, authority which no agency of the Government possesses, without going through the constitutional processes under which recognition is given to the responsibility of the legislative branch.

The question which the Senator just asked was in accord with his responsibility as a Senator from the State of Minnesota. He is discharging his duty. He does not need to apologize for it.

What I have tried to do in the outline which I have given here today is to answer the questions which the people are asking the Senator from Minnesota and me and every other Senator—such questions as, "Why are we doing this?" or "Under what authority is that being done?" I have tried, by a survey, to show the commitments which have been made. I have quoted from them, and have read them, telling when they were were made, and when the Congress, by action, gave its approval. I am not by implication or suggestion—heaven forbid—giving my endorsement to commitments which have not been reached through constitutional processes. I assure the able Senator that I very much appreciate his contribution.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for yielding so much time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not in the Senate during the years referred to by the Senator from Iowa. I assume, of course, that the agreements reached at Yalta and Tehran were neither reported to nor approved by the United States Senate. But is it not a fact that agreements which were made under other circumstances and in different areas also were not reported to or agreed to or approved by the United States Senate?

I have in mind, for example, the great conference which was held at Casablanca. As a result of that conference, which was not reported to or approved by the Senate, we were able, in conjunction with our allies, to drive the German forces out of Africa and to make safe the entire Middle East. We were enabled to develop an easy and rapid route to India, and to provide for the invasion of Sicily, and finally of Italy.

Is it not also true that the historic agreement which was entered into in 1943 or 1944 to open up a second front in the war by an invasion of Normandy on the north and of Italy on the south, was not reported to or approved by the Senate? Yet I cannot believe that anyone would question the wisdom or necessity of those great and historic movements. Had those agreements not been made by those who were fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, on our side, the entire history of the world, in my opinion, might readily have been changed.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from New York.

I may add to what I have already said that at the time I was critical when information came to me of the purported agreements which had been made. I questioned very much whether they should have been made. But I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I have asked myself hundreds of times whether, had I been in the same position of those then in authority, had I been President of the United States or authorized to speak for the United States, I would not have entered into the same agreements.

If, for instance, word came to me—and it did come to me indirectly at that time—that Germany had made overtures to the Soviet Union for a separate peace, what would I have done had I been in authority? Let us assume that Germany had said, in effect, to Russia, "What are you fighting for? What do you want? You have been bled white? You have killed millions of our boys and we have killed millions of your boys. What do you want? Do you want the Dardanelles? All right, you may have them. Do you want a warm seaport in the Adriatic? All right, you may have it. Do you want the Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? All right, you may have them. What do you want? Do you want these things? Then why do you continue to be a cat's-paw for Great Britain and the United States, if you can obtain the things you want? We will give you everything you want if you will make peace with us now."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It would be difficult for any nation to feel it was a cat's-paw after an invading army had driven into it and had destroyed many of its cities, as the Hitler arm had destroyed many of the cities of Russia, had devastated the countryside, had bled white great districts of the country by killing or taking captive many of its children, women, and men—all who were not in the military forces. It would be quite difficult for Russia, facing an enemy such as Hitler's army, which had so invaded it and had so destroyed many of its cities, to think of giving up and not seeking revenge.

I believe that Russia was seeking revenge, and that our Nation, the United States of America, did not have to plead with or beg very strongly that Russia continue in the war. It was not necessary for the United States to give an assurance to Russia that she could have Poland, that she could have Eastern Germany, that she could have the city of Berlin, with the land immediately surrounding it, and with no corridor for us to enter Berlin. It was not necessary to give to Russia eastern Austria, with all its industrial potentialities, leaving only the mountainous summer resort area of Austria under the control of the countries that were allies of the United States.

So I say that we must have to draw on our imagination to quite an extent to reach the conclusion that we had to make overtures to Russia in order to keep Russia with us in the war, after Hitler's army had invaded Russia, destroyed so many of its cities, mutilated its manpower, annihilated the resources of the section of Russia the Hitler army entered, and committed unspeakable acts of cruelty against the women, the children, and the aged of Russia. We will have to draw quite strongly on our imagination to be able to say that we had to make overtures to Russia to induce her to remain in the war.

Mr. GILLETTE. In view of what the able Senator from Minnesota has just said, I withdraw the complete endorsement I gave to his remarks made a little while ago. I cannot follow him into the realm of conjecture. I cannot follow him into the realm of what might have been. The fact of the matter is that we were faced with a military situation, as I recall conditions at that time, preparing for an attack across the Channel, an invasion of the Normandy coast, which at best was a terrible and a dangerous venture. It was an impossible venture if the Central Powers could bring their whole force to bear. We could not at that time enter into the conjectural field and say, "Well, maybe Russia will not make peace with Germany. Maybe she will recall the German attack on Stalingrad. Maybe she will recall the devastation of the Ukraine. Maybe she will not make peace. But maybe she will."

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will yield as soon as I complete my statement. If she had made peace with Germany would we not have been in a dangerous position? We would have been in an impossible position militarily. Again I say that perhaps no man has been more critical than I have of the concessions which have been made to Russia; but I recognize the realities, and I repeat, I have asked myself over and over again: What would I have done had I been in the position of authority and a military decision had to be made? Yes, a military decision in connection with implementing a policy that was laid down by allied nations.

Will the able Senator from Minnesota excuse me while I yield to the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I had just one thought in that connection. I may

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

say, if the Senator will be kind enough to yield one more moment, that if my memory serves me a right, Russia was insisting and criticizing the United States and countries allied with us because we did not establish a second front in order to give Russia a little relief from the full impact of Hitler's army.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. So, I think Russia was pleading with and begging us, and we were not at that particular time the one that was begging and pleading with Russia to remain in the struggle. Russia was the country that was begging of us to establish a second front. Yet we made the concession with regard to the city of Berlin, with no corridor for us to get into it, and the concession with respect to Vienna, and the concession dividing Germany and dividing Austria. For that reason I feel that in the event Congress had had an opportunity to look at the chapters which were being written then, we might have been a little bit more realistic and not been quite so generous in the concessions which were made at that particular time.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is undoubtedly true, but it was information which could not have been given out at that time when we were at war with the Central Powers, and confronting the greatest military force that had ever been assembled. The measures were those which were taken to meet the problems which arose as to whether we would establish two fronts or whether we must concentrate on one. The fear that we could not cope with the enemy on more than one front was information which could not have been made available at that time. The enemy had enough information as it was respecting our military potential, so we could not make that information available to them.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to compliment the Senator from Iowa on his intellectual integrity. The Senator from Iowa is trying to place himself in the position of the men who were at the conference and who were connected with the events which took place at the time, rather than trying to be a grandstand quarterback. I suppose the greatest example of the reiteration of errors being accepted as true is the constant outpouring we have heard in this Chamber about the conferences held at Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam. I desire to say now that Winston S. Churchill was the signatory for Great Britain to every one of the documents. I do not believe there are many who will rise to challenge the statement that he has been one of the great leaders of history. He is a man known for his perspicacity in matters pertaining to military strategy.

The Senator is correct in saying that these were military agreements made in the face of information the men in authority had at the time. At Yalta they were told that we would lose a million more men upon the shores of Japan if an invasion were made of that country. Perhaps that invasion would not have taken place, and it did not take place, but that is one of the factors which Mr. Churchill, as well as Mr. Roosevelt, had to weigh.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Minnesota that so far as the Potsdam Agreement is concerned, Mr. Churchill was at Potsdam for two-thirds of that conference; and he, too, approved the agreement. I, for one, am looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to Mr. Churchill's forthcoming book, in which he will discuss his participation in those conferences, because I think it will do much to correct some of the misapprehensions about them.

Mr. President, the present difficulties in the world have been caused, not by the agreements which were made at those conferences, but by the breaking of those agreements. At those conferences, free elections in Poland were promised. However, we know that free elections in Poland did not occur. When that promise was broken, we had the choice of doing one of two things: Either do what we did, and swallow the fact of the breaking of the promise; or else make war to enforce the promise. At that time I did not hear from any Member of this body, any Member either on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, a suggestion that we go to war.

At the time when the Yalta conference was held, there was no assurance that the atomic bomb would be used, and would be used effectively. There was no assurance that we would not soon find our forces fighting the enemy on the mainland of Japan. I, for one, think it was necessary at that time to do all that possibly could be done to insure that Russia would agree to join us in the war in the Far East; for if at that time things had not turned out as they subsequently did, and if it had not been found, subsequently, that we did not need to have the Russians come into the struggle in the Far East, we would have had to make—alone—that invasion, an invasion in which hundreds of thousands of American boys would have died on the shores of Japan.

So, Mr. President, it is easy enough to answer after the event has occurred. However, that does not alter the situation and the problems confronting our leaders at the time when those conferences were held.

So I am delighted that the Senator from Iowa has raised this question. It is something upon which the American people need education. I wish to say that when all the ills of which we are now the victim are paraded as being the result of the conferences at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, I, for one, will rise to challenge that thesis, because I think such a conclusion is demonstrably in error and can be refuted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Iowa distinguish between agreements of the kind referred to by the Senator from New York, in connection with the landing of troops at Normandy, and the agreements which were made in regard to the way we would fight the war in North Africa—agreements purely and simply as to military, strategic acts—as compared with the agreement made at Yalta, in which a division of the world was agreed upon? Does not the Senator distinguish between those two kinds of agreements, one of which was of immediate military importance and the other of long-range political significance?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly, Mr. President, I see a difference. However, all the agreements which have been referred to in the debate were made in the light of a military need and the necessity for military implementation. There were differences. One could be a strategic decision; one could be made on the field of battle; or one could involve other areas of land or an over-all picture of the area or of the cementing factors in connection with which the Allied Powers had formed a coalition. Of course there are differences. However, there is the one common denominator, namely, that all those agreements were made in time of war, and to carry out a military mission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Potsdam agreement was made after the end of the war in Europe?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh yes. The colloquy I had with the Senator from Minnesota was with reference to Tehran and Yalta.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Tehran agreement was made in December 1943; the Yalta agreement was made in February 1945; and the Potsdam agreement was made in August 1945.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. In our colloquy, no reference was made to the Potsdam agreement. It was mentioned by the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has now said those agreements have been breached by the Soviet Union. Does not the Senator agree that because of the breach of those agreements, they are no longer binding upon the United States of America, even if they ever had any binding effect? Is not that a fact?

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator from Connecticut said that, at least I did not draw that conclusion from what he said.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did he not say those agreements had been breached by the other side?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield, let me say that I did say that; but I drew no conclusion that the breaching of them by the Soviet Union released us from the obligations we had assumed. I do not pass on that point at all. I am interested about the conclusion the Senator from Michigan wishes to draw from the fact that they have been breached, and I am interested in knowing what he

thinks the breaching of them gives us a right to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to draw this conclusion, and I now state it on the floor of the Senate——

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is nowhere else.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to draw the conclusion that the United States of America should repudiate those agreements, first, on the ground that there was no authority, under the Constitution of the United States, to make them; and, second, that even if they were made with authority—and they were not—they have been repudiated by the other party, and, therefore, have no more binding effect upon the United States of America, and the time has arrived when they should be repudiated.

Mr. McMAHON. Very well; so now they are repudiated. So what? What does the Senator want us to do now?

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the majority leader; and then I shall yield to the Senator from New York—assuming that the Senator from Michigan has concluded.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have other questions to ask, but I am willing to wait.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa whether I correctly summarize the statement he has made: We followed a certain course during the war, and we won the war. Now no one, even if he is critical of that course, can truthfully say that he knows we would have won the war if we had followed a different course.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Arizona for that contribution.

Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has tried to differentiate between the kind of agreement made at Casablanca, and in connection with the invasion of Normandy, and the Tehran and Yalta agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield, let me say I did not try to differentiate or distinguish between them; I did distinguish between them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan, if I may, that there is no distinction, for the agreements reached at Yalta and the agreements reached at Tehran were just as definitely military in character as were the other agreements to which reference has been made.

I am quite certain that the distinguished Senator from Michigan will realize that the agreement which was made at Tehran was the one under which the Soviet Government promised its aid in liberating China and in saving the United States the rigors and agony of acting alone in the invasion of Japan.

This afternoon I have heard statements made which are so typical, in my opinion, of many pieces of wisdom which come after the act, instead of before it. The impression has been given here that at the end of 1944 the war was over, and that we did not have to make any concessions to the Soviet Government or use such influence and power as we had to get Russia to join us in the war in the Far East.

Mr. President, I happened to be in France in December 1944. Prior to that time, everything from a military standpoint had been going along splendidly. However, as the Members of the Senate will recall, on or about December 1, 1944, and for a month thereafter, the Battle of the Bulge occurred. Having been fairly near the scene of that battle, I can say to the Senate—of course, I realize that some of our colleagues may have forgotten about this, because it occurred 6 years ago—that the people of France, who had been liberated only several months before then, and the people of Great Britain, and, I am very confident, the people of the United States, were very much frightened at the developments which had occurred because of the progress made by the Nazis in the Battle of the Bulge.

It is all very fine to say now that we should have done this or should have done that; but I admire the Senator from Iowa very greatly for having had the courage to say here what many of us have felt, and what some of us have publicly expressed, that it is much easier to criticize after the fact, and to be wise after the fact, than before.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. THYE. It will take me only a moment.

Mr. GILLETTE. I hope Senators will be a little more considerate. I have been on my feet for almost 2 hours, and I am an old man.

Mr. THYE. The Senator looks very young, I may say.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to conclude. In view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan engaged in colloquy with the Senator from New York, I should yield to him briefly, and then to the Senator from Nevada; and then, if my good neighbor, the Senator from Minnesota, insists, I shall yield very briefly to him.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in order that the RECORD may be correct, I merely want to call attention to the fact that the landing in Normandy occurred on June 6, 1944.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is the date I gave in my brief remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Senator from Iowa has sought in his remarks today to leave the impression that the United States of America was threatened with a representation that, unless we made the agreements at Tehran and Yalta, which have been described here, our ally, the Soviet Union, was going to desert the ship and go back to the Germans, where it had been previously? We, of course, know that the Russians originally had a treaty of friendship with the Germans, which they repudiated. The effect of their deserting the Germans ultimately brought them side by side with America, Great Britain, and the other allies, but is not the Senator trying to indicate that they were about to go back to the Germans unless we made these agreements? If that is true, then were the agreements not made under such threats, such blackmail, that they should no longer be considered binding upon the United States?

Mr. GILLETTE. I should not want to draw any such conclusion. I may say in reply to the distinguished Senator that I not only wanted to leave the impression to which he just referred, but those of us who were accorded information at the time were told definitely that that was a factor, and that it was a fact that that possibility was considered—not a probability, not a possibility, but a fact—and in connection with a military decision, every factor must be taken into consideration. Whether they would have done it or not, I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has indicated that he was "in the know."

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan certainly was not.

Mr. GILLETTE. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator from Iowa has been here a number of years, and it is surprising how infrequently he has been let in "on the know." In fact, the Senator from Iowa has often felt that the door was definitely closed against him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator say that he and the Senator from Michigan fared about equally in that respect? But is it not true that the President of the United States, returning to this country, stated to a joint session of the Congress that no agreements had been made that affected the Pacific War or the Far East, whereas we now know that very extensive and very serious agreements of a political nature affecting the Far East were made with the Russians?

Mr. GILLETTE. Is the Senator referring to the Potsdam agreement?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am referring to the Yalta agreement.

Mr. GILLETTE. My memory does not serve me on that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the record will show that; and I was wondering how, with that statement in the RECORD, it would be possible for the Senator from Iowa to know that there was a threat sufficient to cause the yielding to these agreements.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa at that time was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The information to which I have alluded — perhaps unfortunately, at this time—was information which I gained at that time. It was certainly a factor in the conclusions which were reached.

I yield now to the Senator from Nevada.

WE GAVE MANCHURIA, BERLIN, AND NORTH KOREA AWAY WITHOUT SAFEGUARD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are endeavoring to keep the record straight, I should like to ask the Senator a question in line with the discussion between the Senator from Iowa

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and the Senator from Connecticut. I should like to ask him whether it is not a fact that the Yalta agreement virtually gave, or had the effect of giving Manchuria to the Russians; in other words, through turning over the transportation systems and the harbors to the Russians we gave them control of Manchuria—the bread basket of China. Is not that true?

In addition, it was without the knowledge of the Chinese themselves, or of the Nationalist Government which was in power at the time; and later pressure was brought to bear on Chiang Kai-shek to accept the agreement.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I may say in reply that, trusting entirely to memory, I have been forced far afield in this discussion. I was discussing an entirely different matter. I was attempting, in my poor way, to cover the field of commitments which we have undoubtedly made, and obligations under which we are now functioning; so that I, along with other Senators, could give something by way of answer to our people when they ask, "Why are we doing this? Why are we doing that? Under what authority are we doing it?" We should have something definite to present in reply.

I wish to add—and then I hope the Senator will excuse me—that no Member of the Senate will fight any more strenuously than will the junior Senator from Iowa any attempt on the part of the executive department or of the judicial department to infringe upon the responsibilities and duties of the legislative department. On this floor I have, in times past, made a very lengthy talk on the question of the execution of agreements by the executive department without submission to the Congress.

If the Senator will bear with me, I shall repeat what I said on that occasion. I submitted to the State Department at the time a query as to what it considered a treaty which must be submitted to the Senate for ratification, and what it considered an executive agreement. The reply of the State Department, which I have in my file, stated the difference in this way: A treaty is a contract which must be submitted to the Senate for ratification; an executive agreement is one which does not have to be submitted to the Senate. I cited at that time something I had heard as a boy. I was told the way to distinguish a male pigeon from a female. The method was, to put corn in front of the bird; if he picked it up, it was a he; and if she picked it up, it was a she.

Mr. President, so long as I can speak, and so long as I am a Member of the Senate, speaking on this floor, I shall jealously fight to the extent of my ability in defense of the responsibility and authority of this legislative body under the Constitution of the United States.

Let me repeat that I merely wanted today to outline the kinds of obligations which had been ratified, commitments which had been made and either expressly or by implication had been ratified by the Senate of the United States. I had no desire, and I certainly did not expect, to discuss the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, under the personal guidance of the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief moment?

Mr. GILLETTE. I had not quite finished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to get on the record one more date, namely, of the Cairo Conference of November 22 to November 26, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom did the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GILLETTE. I had been yielding to the Senator from Michigan. I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I hope I have not diverted the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa from his theme. I had no intention of doing that. On the contrary, I want to compliment him on the job he is doing in documenting this evidence, because it is very important. We gave Berlin to the Russians without any means of egress or ingress. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to enumerate the many other instances when similar serious mistake were made. I have in times past stated them to the Senate in some detail.

Russia actually entered the war 2 days after the first atom bomb was exploded in Japan. I suppose she waited to see whether the bomb would actually explode. The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut indicated that the reason we wanted to assure ourselves of Russia's support was that maybe we were not sure the atom bomb would explode.

Mr. President, of course, it was, and is well known that Japan had been trying for a considerable time to surrender before we used the bomb and before Russia came in.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason for making the comments I made when the very able Senator from Iowa was speaking was to endeavor to get all the facts in the RECORD. I like the Senator from Iowa too well to disagree with him.

I am reminded of the old Chinese proverb, which is as follows:

> Look back that you have the wisdom to intelligently look forward.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, since the Senator has been kind enough to refer to my courtesy, I hope he will continue to be kind enough to permit me to conclude my remarks.

I was about to read what Ambassador Gross said, as follows:

> We have reserved and continue to reserve the right to make certain that the question of Formosa will be handled in a way completely consistent with our national interest and security.

It might be wise, Mr. President, if this is the official American position with regard to one of the most controversial areas on earth, for a resolution to be considered by the Congress supporting, or rejecting, that position, so that there will be no doubt anywhere of our intention. Certainly, before we are committed to go to war, if necessary, in the defense of Formosa, Congress must agree, and express its agreement, that Formosa is a vital interest to American security. Once this has been determined, we can then determine the relative importance of Formosa in our scale of vital interests in the Far East, as lesser or greater or equal to American interests in Japan or the Philippines; and with these factors in mind we can more readily determine the nature and the extent of the commitment we shall make for its defense. Should it be the judgment of Congress that America has no vital interest in Formosa, we would of course take a quite different course. All I am asking is that the determination be made, one way or the other.

THE AREA OF THE GAP

The United States, as we have seen, has commitments in one form or another from the Adriatic coast of Italy westward across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to the western shores of the Japanese and Philippine Islands. Nowhere east of the boot of Italy, all the way eastward through the Mediterranean, the Middle East and into Southeast Asia up to the Pacific shores of Indochina, is the United States committed by treaty, agreement, occupation force or otherwise, to go to war for the defense of any country lying along that huge stretch of territory.

Our military assistance goes to many of the countries in this area but this in no sense obligates us to go to their defense. As things now stand, the only way we could become involved in any outbreak along this line would be in case the United Nations took action recommending or deciding that the United States and other members send forces for the defense of a country attacked in that area.

Yet this immense territory, extending from the middle of the Mediterranean to the Pacific shores of Indochina, lies along the longest land frontier of the Soviet orbit. At no point thereon is the United States, except by United Nations action, pledged to the defense of a victim of aggression.

There are sound historical reasons for this. In our time, this whole stretch has been largely a zone of British, and to a lesser extent, French influence, vying, of course, with Russian influence, both czarist and Communist. America's interests there have certainly grown greater since the war. The first application of the doctrine of containment, if you wish to interpret it as such, came in Greece and Turkey. Even prior to that, in the late winter of 1946, we countered the Soviet pressure on Iran and were able to keep the Russian power from pouring into that country. The great oil fields of the Middle East, which we have both an economic and a strategic stake in keeping out of Soviet hands, are an area of real importance to the United States.

If these areas should be lost to Soviet control, there is no knowing how far the disaster might spread: Europe deprived at a stroke of its source of oil, the

Suez Canal overrun, Africa laid open to penetration and conquest, 400,000,000 Hindus and Pakistanis swallowed up into the manpower machine of the Soviet Union.

Here is the great gap in application of the doctrine of containment. Here the United States has defined no truly vital interests; at least it is most doubtful if the American people are now persuaded that such interests exist. Here we have no firm commitments to go to war for our own defense by defending these distant regions. Here we have no sufficient power to fulfill commitments even if we had them.

The primary responsibility for guarding this area is not America's. That responsibility lies chiefly with the British Commonwealth of Nations, and is shared at the Far East terminal by France in Indochina. The Commonwealth countries having vital interests in this region would seem to include the United Kingdom, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, in the front rank, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the other British African states in the second rank.

American interests may be great in this area, especially in checking expansion of Soviet power, but they do not appear to be vital interests to the same degree as the areas surrounding the oceans between which we live. Our role there is necessarily secondary, subsidiary, and auxiliary.

If the day should come when a commitment to go to the defense of this vast region, or any part of it, is proposed to the American people, I hope and pray that we will have long since reached an agreement among ourselves whether or not, in the light of our long-range security, of the techniques of modern warfare and of the global situation vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, the United States does have vital interests in that area, interests so vital to our Nation's security that we must engage in war if need be to protect them.

CONCLUSION

Before closing, Mr. President, I want to touch only for a moment on the question of the power we shall need to fulfill the commitments we have made or may be compelled to make to protect our vital interests.

The chief domestic issues which we will debate in this Congress are meaningless except in terms of our foreign policy. Foreign policy today is the determinant of domestic policy. Taxes, production, manpower, prices, wages, profits, housing—all these basic issues of national policy cannot even be discussed except in relation to what our foreign policy is and is going to be. The decisions we make this year and next will shadow all we think and feel and do for decades to come, indefinitely. Military expenditures this coming fiscal year will take 73 cents of each budget dollar. How many men, tanks, trucks, planes, ships, bombs; how much wheat, cotton, and meat; what rate of taxes and how much debt; all these depend on the power we intend to mobilize. But how much power must we have? What areas will our forces protect? Where shall they be sent if total war is deferred but the permanent crisis goes on? Answers can be found only in what our foreign policy requires, and what that policy requires can most easily be seen by studying the geography of our position.

Mr. President, because of my strong conviction that we must reach agreement on the essentials before we can agree on ways and means, I have not proposed answers of my own to the questions I have raised. Let us by all means debate frankly and freely, but let us debate with a view ultimately of forging an ironclad base of fundamental agreement. On this base, and only on this base, can we construct an enduring and effective foreign policy suited to the age in which we live.

EXHIBIT A

ARTICLES 3 AND 4

INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE

Article 3

1. The high contracting parties agree that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. On the request of the state or states directly attacked and until the decision of the organ of consultation of the inter-American system, each one of the contracting parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually take in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity. The organ of consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be taken.

3. The provisions of this article shall be applied in case of any armed attack which takes place within the region described in article 4 or within the territory of an American state. When the attack takes place outside of the said areas the provisions of article 6 shall be applied.

4. Measures of self-defense provided for under this article may be taken until the Security Council of the United Nations has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

Article 4

The region to which this treaty refers is bounded as follows: Beginning at the North Pole; thence due south to a point 74 degrees north latitude, 10 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 47 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 50 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 35 degrees north latitude, 60 degrees west longitude; thence due south to a point in 20 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 5 degrees north latitude, 24 degrees west longitude; thence due south to the South Pole; thence due north to a point 30 degrees south latitude, 90 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point on the Equator at 97 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 15 degrees north latitude, 120 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 50 degrees north latitude, 170 degrees east longitude; thence due north to a point in 54 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 168 degrees 58 minutes 5 seconds west longitude; thence due north to the North Pole.

EXHIBIT B

ARTICLES 5 AND 6

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Article 5

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article 6

For the purpose of article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senate has had the opportunity of listening this afternoon to some very able speeches, particularly one by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and one by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. President, the Nation has suffered a paralyzing railroad strike, and it is not over yet. The stoppage of rail transportation as a result of "sickness" among employees of operating brotherhoods is so ridiculous that mention of it is nauseating.

No officer or member of the brotherhoods has offered to condone this type of curtailment of railroad transportation.

After studying the chronological record of the conductors' and trainmen's wage dispute, one must admit that it has been poorly handled; in fact, it has been mismanaged and mishandled.

In checking this case history, one must conclude that the administration did not have the courage to act and act properly. When the President of the United States provided for Government seizure of the railroads on August 25, 1950, he became directly responsible for the continued operation of the railroads.

It is not my intention to discuss the merits or the demerits of the agreement signed at the White House on December 21, 1950, or the rejection of the settlement by the general chairmen of the trainmen's organization on January 5, 1951, and the rejection by the general chairmen of the conductors' organization on January 7, 1951.

There are always two sides to a question involving wages and working conditions. As Governor of the State of Kansas, I had an opportunity to sit, with

other governors of States traversed by the Missouri Pacific lines, in arriving at a settlement of the strike and wage dispute last year. This gave me an opportunity to study the problems that are presented to both the employer and the employees. At that meeting the governors and the representatives of the governors of the States were able to work out an agreement that brought about immediate operation of the railroads.

It is my contention that the administration should have acted similarly in the present situation. The fact that they did not take advantage of this opportunity and use the full influence of their offices has cost the Nation and will continue to cost the Nation a continuing serious loss in the movement of commodities. It is to that subject that I want to devote a few minutes of my time. It is my intention to discuss frankly the effect of this rail tie-up on the movement of grain and commodities in the Midwest.

At my request, Ralph Clark of the Association of American Railroads, has supplied me with figures on the receipts of empty boxcars by western roads from eastern and southern connections. These daily reports show the effect of the first strike, which began December 13, 1950, and ended 3 days later. On December 13, 652 cars were delivered to midwestern roads through Chicago, St. Louis, Peoria, and Memphis.

On the 14th, the second day of the strike, 374 cars were delivered, and on that 8-day week end an average of 253 cars were delivered. On the second week end following the strike, December 22 to 25, an average of 362 cars were delivered. On the third week end, December 29 to 31, an average of 557 cars were delivered. I am using these figures to prove the point that even though the strike is over, it takes weeks before the movement of cars gets back to normal.

The daily average movement of cars to the midwestern railroads through regular points for November 1950, was 929. For December, 550, and for January, 838. These average daily movements show that even after 50 days following the end of the first strike, railroad movement of cars to that area had not reached the average of the month preceding the strike.

The present strike, which has not yet ended, has lasted 10 days instead of 3 days, which was the length of the December strike. It is reasonable to assume that it will be late spring before the movement of these badly needed cars will be back to normal operation.

Another factor entering into the movement of cars is, of course, the extreme cold winter through which we are going. This again affects the movement of rail transportation.

My office has received literally hundreds of requests from Kansas grain dealers and shippers for cars during the past few weeks. Typical of these telegrams is the following from the Dean Grain Co., of Agra, Kans.:

AGRA, KANS., *January 23.*

Senator CARLSON: Reference item Topeka Daily Capital issue January 20 advising you from Wichita grain box car supply showing improvement. Missouri Pacific branch railways serving south of here have been receiving more cars possible reason for this favorable report from that receiving station. However, certainly does not apply this and surrounding Rock Island railway stations as grain car situation has been getting worse past 30 days. We have 160,000 bushels grain here in store. Sixty thousand bushels of it bought and sold waiting cars for shipment the past 30 days and have had standing order since first of the year for 30 box cars to move it. We only been furnished four grain cars since first of the year. Our elevators here have been blocked for 2 weeks and grain piled on ground. Elevators at Kirwin 6 miles south of here on Missouri Pacific received eight cars one day last week and elevator manager advised us did not have sufficient grain to load all of them as both Missouri Pacific branch railways south of here have been receiving sufficient box cars to keep open and operating for the past 30 days. Please investitgate and advise why this so poorly managed and unequal distribution of the box cars that are available for grain loading.

DEAN GRAIN CO.
C. H. DEAN.

My office has had the finest of cooperation from the Association of American Railroads and the officials of the railroads operating in this area, yet the situation was very serious and now it is critical.

On February 1, 1951, there were 1,298 elevators blocked in the grain area, and of this number 170 were in Kansas. It is very unusual to have elevators blocked in January. Normally this situation prevails in June during the harvest month.

The stocks of grain in the grain area on January 1, 1951, were greatly in excess of the same period in 1950. On January 1 this year in Kansas we had 174,461,000 bushels of wheat in all positions, and on that same date in 1950 we had 158,904,000 bushels.

Holdings of all grains in Kansas on January 1, 1951, were 207,554,000 bushels, compared with 178,701,000 bushels in 1950.

I hesitate to think of the serious delay and the actual loss in the movement of this grain, not only in Kansas, but in the entire Midwest.

This loss and difficulty must be charged to those who are responsible for the operation of the railroad transportation system.

I had intended to discuss only the loss to grain producers and grain dealers, but this morning I received a telegram which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate. It is from the Berrys Hatchery, of Atchison, Kans., and Newton, Kans., is dated February 7, 1951, and reads:

One hundred thousand baby chicks hatched today are homeless and must be destroyed because cannot ship to customers account rail strike. Have destroyed thousands baby chicks in past week. We have half a million chicks hatching within week, all sold for delivery to broiler plants and egg farmers throughout United States that cannot be delivered and must be destroyed unless rail strike is settled. Over 200,000 chicks in brooders on orders to hundreds of farmers that must be shipped at once or will lose them. Situation very critical and will mean bankruptcy to thousands of hatcheries throughout country and loss of millions of pounds of food next summer and winter unless positive action is taken at once. Domination of entire business economy by a few men is disastrous to American principles and way of life. Urge immediate action to prevent further losses to industry and to future food production

BERRYS HATCHERY,
GEORGE BERRY,
ERNEST BERRY.

NEWTON, KANS.

No doubt this same situation prevailed in many sections of the Nation, and the loss referred to is a loss which cannot be justified at a time when the Nation needs full production to prevent inflation, and for badly needed food.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. I was very much impressed by the able remarks of the Senator from Kansas relative to baby chicks. A baby chick does not have much value from the standpoint of food. However, if an individual hatcher must destroy thousands of baby chicks, it may well amount to his ruin. Give a baby chick a few weeks, and it is a broiler or a fryer. Give it a few months, and it is a productive bird. Therefore it is very important to have movement of baby chicks from the hatchery, because if the baby chicks are not moved within a few days after they are hatched, they must be disposed of. I was impressed by the reference to baby chicks and the problems that have resulted from the railroad tie-up.

We in the Northern States have endured one of the most severe winters we have experienced in many a year. Excessive snow has blocked transportation by truck. The excessive cold weather during the past 2 months has depleted our coal reserves. Without boxcars and without adequate railroad transportation, the entire northern area, not only the State of Minnesota, is faced with an emergency. Unless we get coal there will be a great deal of suffering, to say nothing about the loss to our industrial and food-processing plants.

On behalf of the people of the Northwest I thank the Senator from Kansas for his very able speech. By his able presentation the country can see how we are being affected by the present railway tie-up.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. Next spring, even before the harvest, when the Commodity Credit Corporation grain is needed, as we begin to move, in April and May, we shall really feel the effects of the strike which is taking place in January of this year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield gladly.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend from Kansas that this is an old question. Five years ago, under the Democratic administration, a member of the Republican Party submitted Senate Resolution 185. The distinguished former Senator from Kansas, Clyde Reed, who perhaps knew as much about railroads, railroad freight rates, and boxcar shortages as any man who has sat in the Senate, conducted an investigation. I want to ask my distinguished friend if it is not true that we find incompetency on the part of officeholders in many departments of the Government? For illustration, this morning

I showed that a small manufacturer of spark plugs filed a complaint in 1937, 13 years ago, and up to now no decision has been rendered in the case. When I heard about it on the fourth day of December, 20 small firms had gone into bankruptcy. Three great big outfits control the field. Eventually a decision will be rendered, I presume.

With respect to the antitrust statutes, there is not a Senator, including my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who does not know of the laxity in the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LANGER. During all these years not one person has been put in jail for violation of those laws. Our officials are sworn to uphold the law. A farm organization in my State brought an action before a Government Commission, and it took 6 years to get a decision.

Mr. President, justice delayed is no justice at all.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas is speaking on this very important subject today. Where is the fault? A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] mentioned the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation did not get its wheat out, but left it in the elevators, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said, until about the time the new crop comes in. The elevators are blocked all over the Northwest, and it is necessary to pile up the wheat and the flax.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it was the able Senator from Kansas who referred to the blockade of grain in the elevators. I want to give credit to the able Senator from Kansas, because he was the one who brought out that thought and made it known to us.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. What happened? It was brought out at the last hearing, 3 months ago, that the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. had only 6 or 7 percent of its cars there. It was shown that we manufactured 34,000 cars for England, 4,000 cars for Mexico, and 4,000 cars for the Argentine. No cars were manufactured for us at all. Today, when inquiry is made, as I am sure my friend from Kansas has made inquiry, it will be said, "Oh, we are manufacturing 100,000 cars now, or 120,000 cars, or 150,000 cars." I submit that under the present administration the farmer has been completely neglected so far as concerns the transportation of products which he raises. He is suffering a loss, as my distinguished friend from Kansas knows only too well. We know that instead of being able to store his grain, the farmer has had to haul it to the elevator and take the best cash price he could get. That is the situation all over North Dakota.

I compliment my distinguished colleague and friend, the former Governor of Kansas. He is intimately acquainted with the situation. I compliment him for presenting the facts. I hope that, following the lead of the distinguished former Senator from Kansas, Clyde Reed, he will keep right on, with a few others of us from the Northwest, until we get justice for the farmers. I finish my question by asking whether or not he is not going to do it.

Mr. CARLSON. I am indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his comment on this important subject. I appreciate what he has said in behalf of the distinguished late senior Senator from Kansas, Clyde M. Reed, whom I have the honor to succeed. He was an outstanding authority on freight rates, and was recognized as such not only in Kansas but in the Nation. If I could only approach in a small way his knowledge on this subject, I should be very happy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing some of the figures on the movement of cars, together with a statement showing the chronology of the conductors' and trainmen's wage dispute.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Receipts of empty boxcars by western roads from eastern-southern connections (via Chicago, St. Louis, Peoria, Memphis)

	No. cars
First strike:	
December 13	652
December 14	374
December 15–17 (average 250 daily)	761
December 18	823
December 19	461
December 20	605
December 21	591
December 22–25 (average 362 daily)	1,447
December 26	710
December 27	573
December 28	330
December 29–31 (average 557 daily)	1,671
January 1	400
January 2	507
January 3	677
January 4	801
January 5–7 (average 577 daily)	1,731
January 8	616
January 9	874
January 10	737
January 11	903
January 12–14 (average 837 daily)	2,511
January 15	1,273
January 16	1,287
January 17	1,029
January 18	1,213
January 19–21 (average 756)	2,270
January 22	985
January 23	1,013
January 24	1,903
January 25	966
January 26–28 (average 703)	2,110
Second strike:	
January 29	779
January 30	888
January 31	288
February 1	297
February 2, 3, 4, 5	419
Daily averages:	
November 1950	929
December 1950	550
January 1951	838

Average boxcar loadings and boxcar deliveries—Kansas roads (Union Pacific; Rock Island; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; Missouri Pacific; Chicago-Burlington-Illinois)

Grain and grain products:	1950	1949
4 weeks January	+32.7	+28.2
National	+31.7	+19.5

TOTAL BOX LOADINGS

National, 3 weeks, January	+7.0
Box deliveries to western roads, Jan. 1–30 (average 838 daily)	25,149

CHRONOLOGY OF CONDUCTORS' AND TRAINMEN'S WAGE DISPUTE

March 15, 1949: Submitted proposals to amend existing agreements to provide 5-day 40-hour workweek for yard employees without reduction in pay, time and one-half for Sundays and holidays. Graduating rate of pay for conductors and trainmen according to weight on drivers of locomotives being used. Modification of other operating and pay rules.

April 1949: Conclusion of initial conferences on individual railroads, under procedural machinery of Railway Labor Act. Railroads authorized three regional committees to participate in concerted handling with union's committees.

September 22, 1949: National conferences began.

December 14, 1949: National conferences terminated.

December 15, 1949: Railroad invoke services of National Mediation Board.

January 16, 1950: Mediation commenced.

February 14, 1950: Arbitration proffered. Railroads agreed to submit dispute to arbitration, but conductors and trainmen rejected arbitration.

February 17, 1950: Announcement by unions that strike date had been set for 6 a. m., February 27, 1950.

February 24, 1950: President of United States created Emergency Board to investigate dispute; comprising members were Justice Roger I. McDonough, chairman; Judge Mart J. O'Malley; Prof. Gordon S. Watkins.

March 2–May 9, 1950: Hearings of Emergency Board.

June 15, 1950: Emergency Board recommended: (1) A 5-day 40-hour workweek for yard employees with increase in basic rates of 18 cents per hour, to become effective October 1, 1950. (2) That in lieu of daily earnings minimum guaranty, rates of pay of yard employees be increased 2½ cents per hour. (3) That carriers be given right to lift restrictions on interdivisional runs; pooling of cabooses should be permitted; and certain other rules changed.

June 20, 1950: Parties met in Chicago to discuss recommendations of Board.

June 22, 1950: Carriers wired acceptance of Board's recommendations, but unions assailed report.

June 27, 1950: Mediation Board again met with parties, conference continuing through July 8, then recessed to convene at Washington on July 17.

July 11, 1950: Unions wired President of United States that Board's recommendations were rejected and that they would use every power at our command to bring about a just and satisfactory settlement.

July 17–August 15, 1950: Mediation between parties continued in Washington with Dr. Steelman participating from August 7.

August 4, 1950: Unions requested President to seize railroads.

August 16, 1950: Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen called 5-day strike of yardmen at three terminals, strike to be effective from August 21.

August 17, 1950: Unions called 5-day strike of trainmen and yardmen on two railroads from August 22.

August 19, 1950: Dr. Steelman suggested a settlement. (1) The Board's recommendations. (2) A 3-year peace settlement, including, for yardmen, an additional 5 cents an hour and an automatic quarterly wage adjustment of 1 cent an hour for each 1-point increase in cost of living. (3) An increase of 5 cents an hour for road men instead of no increase as recommended by the Board, with cost-of-living adjustment. The railroads agreed to Dr. Steelman's proposals, but the unions rejected them.

August 23, 1950: Unions called Nationwide strike for August 28.

August 25, 1950: President of the United States provided for Government seizure of railroads, and their operation by the Secretary of the Army from August 27.

September 6, 1950: At suggestion of Dr. Steelman, Mediation Board again conferred with parties.

October 1950: Trainmen's convention at Miami, Fla.; no negotiations between parties under auspices of Mediation Board held.

November 20, 1950: Negotiations renewed at White House with Dr. Steelman.

December 11, 1950: Wildcat strikes in certain large yards; temporary restraining orders were secured by the Government in three locations.

December 15, 1950: President of the United States termed strikes unlawful and said yardmen should return to work. Employees did return to work on or about December 16. Joint conferences between the parties continued at the White House.

December 21, 1950: Memorandum of agreement was signed at the White House which provided: (1) A 40-hour week for yardmen, the actual effecting of which was postponed until January 1, 1952. (2) A 23-cents-per-hour wage increase to yardmen, retroactive to October 1, 1950. (3) A 2-cent wage increase to yardmen, effective from January 1, 1951. (4) A 4-cent wage increase to yardmen, if and when the 4-hour week becomes effective. (5) A 5-cent wage increase to road men from October 1, 1950. (6) A 5-cent wage increase to road men from January 1, 1951. (7) A quarterly adjustment of wages, 1 cent for each 1-point rise in cost of living for both yard and road men. First adjustment to be made April 1, 1951. (8) Establish rules recommended by Board. (9) In consideration of above, agreement to be effective until October 1, 1953.

January 5, 1951: General Chairman of Trainmen's Organization reject settlement of December 21, 1950.

January 7, 1951: General Chairman of Conductors' Organization reject settlement of December 21, 1950.

January 18, 1951: Unions again conferred with Dr. Steelman, who in turn referred them to the National Mediation Board.

January 30, 1951: Wild-cat strikes began at various large centers.

February 8, 1951: Most operating men back at work.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was called out of the chamber while the Senator was speaking, so he may have referred to it, but has not the difficulty in the rail situation arisen from the refusal in recent years to abide by the findings of the Railway Labor Board, and from political appeals to the White House, which enabled politicians to accord what they believed to be political consideration for political advantage? Now the men feel that they can go a step further. It was the practice of both the present and preceding President to attempt to settle these matters by political means rather than by arbitration.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement of the Senator from Maine. Before he entered the Chamber I stated that the President was directly responsible for the mishandling of this strike. It should have been taken care of immediately. I mentioned the fact that the governors of nine Midwestern States took hold of the Missouri Pacific strike, and that an agreement was reached. The same thing could have been done in Washington.

UNITED STATES VERSUS WILLIAM REMINGTON

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last evening a jury in a Federal court in the city of New York decided a very important case. It was the case of the People of the United States against William Remington. The jury in that case decided that Remington had lied when he had denied ever having been a member of the Communist Party. That case and its decision were significant for a number of reasons.

In the first place it established as a legal principle that to be a member of the Communist Party in the United States, and a part of its apparatus, one does not have to be a card-carrying member of the party. In other words, the decision recognizes the underground nature of Communist operations. This is highly important as evidence of a realistic view of the nature of the Communist conspiracy.

The case was also highly important for its very nature. It again focuses attention on the fact that in recent months we have found the only method which has been effectively pursued by the executive branch of the Government in relation to disloyalty has been trials for perjury. I cite the case of Alger Hiss, and now the case of Remington, as well as the case of Carl Marzani. The reason is this: The Congress of the United States has been very active against disloyal persons. Believing that the security of the United States was involved, the Congress has made certain investigations on the question of loyalty and subversion. It has brought to light certain facts which would otherwise have been buried. Once brought to light public opinion dictated that there should be prosecutions, and perjury charges have been the means of bringing to justice these people in Government whose disloyal activities were exposed by the Congress.

When the jury in the Alger Hiss case came in it convicted Mr. Hiss and acquitted the Un-American Activities Committee of the House. When the jury came in last night and the jury foreman said, "We find the defendant guilty as charged," that jury convicted Mr. Remington of perjury and acquitted the United States Senate. It will be recalled that in 1948 Mr. Remington was the subject of an investigation by a Senate subcommittee of which the Senator from Michigan was then chairman.

At the time the Senator from Michigan was seeking to bring out the facts in relation to Mr. Remington the Senate was subjected to severe criticism. The President of the United States said, in connection with those same hearings, "That is nothing but a 'red herring'." But, Mr. President, a jury in Federal court last night found that it was not just a "red herring," but that it was a serious matter of vast implications and deep meaning.

The fact that these cases have been successfully prosecuted as perjury cases leads one to ask why the job cannot be done as well behind the cloak of secrecy—and I am talking about the Government's loyalty program—with which the executive department surrounds itself in such matters. Why cannot the same job be done by the Government within its own household as can be done out in the open, in a trial before the Federal court.

I ask this question: Is perjury more damaging to the public interest than disloyalty? I repeat the question for emphasis: Is perjury more damaging to the public interest than disloyalty?

Loyalty hearings are star-chamber proceedings. But unlike the original star chamber the secrecy operates for the benefit of the accused, and they do not bring out all the evidence. But when it comes to a court case, after a grand jury has indicted an individual for perjury, the FBI is called upon to dig up the evidence, and it produces it as demonstrated by the Hiss and Remington trials. Why cannot the same FBI be asked by the Loyalty Board to obtain evidence? The reason is that one proceeding is held in secret, and the other is in public. Exposed to the light of public scrutiny in open court, the Government has no alternative but to employ its best prosecutive talents.

Mr. President, it is an amazing thing that there were placed in evidence in the New York trial of Remington statements from the files of the Civil Service Commission, which has charge of the Loyalty Board, which were never even used before the Loyalty Board when it had the Remington case before it.

The Loyalty Board, as you know, cleared Remington after the Senate subcommittee had first brought his case to light. I say that decision of the Loyalty Board in the Remington case rendered a great disservice to the public interest and the United States. It retained in Government employment a person who, under the findings of the New York jury, could not possibly be considered as anything but a grave security risk. We had adduced concrete evidence that he was delivering classified Government data to an admitted courier for a Communist spy ring. It is more than irony, because it was a travesty of justice, that the Loyalty Board decision permitted William Remington to sue that courier for libel in the civil courts, and by reason of its decision to obtain damages, although I must say that the settlement was not made willingly by the courier who had known she was telling the truth. The Board's decision allowed William Remington to obtain back pay from the Government of the United States for the period of his suspension while under investigation, and to go back on the payroll and work for the Government. I say all that is a clear consequence of trying to do things by executive decree, instead of trying to do them under the law.

The decision of the jury has cleared the Senate of all discredit heaped upon it following the Remington hearings in 1948. I recall not only the President's cry of "red herring" while the Remington hearings were in progress, but a bitterly clever piece of abuse heaped on the Senate subcommittee in the magazine New Yorker. That magazine painted a picture of injured innocence in a "profile" of William Remington. I wonder if now the magazine New Yorker will want to supplement its account of that case with a more up-to-date "profile" on Mr. Remington, its picture of injured innocence.

The Senate was halted in its investigation of the Remington case by the refusal of the President to produce pertinent documents. In effect the matter

was left to the Loyalty Board, however unwillingly. The full circumstances under which the Senate committee was forced to abandon its pursuit of the Remington case were set forth in a report which the Senator from Michigan filed June 19, 1948.

I wish to read what we said in the report, which is Senate Report No. 1775 of the Eightieth Congress. I read from page 20:

> The request of the Executive Departments for information in the Remington case is a reasonable request. If the executive branch persists in its present policy of refusing to grant that request, the true facts cannot be learned by the subcommittee or the public. Both are entitled to the facts.

Mr. President, it was impossible for us to secure all the facts for the public's benefit. For instance, an admiral in the United States Navy came before us and gave us highly incriminating facts about Remington, off the record. But when he was formally summoned to testify as a witness under oath, he said that he had orders, direct from the President of the United States, that he could not give the committee or the public the facts concerning Mr. Remington.

The folly of the Loyalty Board's clearance of Remington, after Congress had pointed the finger at him and carried its charges as far as possible, is now shown by the decision of a jury of the United States court. This points directly to the weaknesses of the present loyalty program.

The startling fact is that under existing interpretations of the Loyalty Board's functions, Remington could return to the Federal employment tomorrow, so far as the Board is concerned. A jury has found that he committed perjury when he said to the grand jury that he had never been a Communist. Yet under the interpretation by the Loyalty Board of the Executive order under which it functions, William Remington could tomorrow return to the employ of the United States, if he were otherwise free to do so. I understand the judge last night sent him to a detaining point where he would not be able to offer his services in voluntary Federal employment.

Mr. President, I ask this question: What then is wrong with the loyalty program? Basically its very name is deceptive, and its present existence does no more than deceive the public.

Its only justification is as a security program. Why be concerned with disloyalty except for security reasons? Yet in practice it is only remotely a security program when it ties itself to the vague meanings of loyalty. Consequently it has dangerously lulled the public into a false sense of security. This so-called loyalty program has been palmed off on the public and has been accepted as a security program, but it simply is not that. Right now, as in the past years, we need a security program. We need one desperately. And we need a new one, as is clearly shown by the Remington case.

The Loyalty Board which is the final authority in the loyalty program claims it has been tied down by the terms of the Executive order under which it is constituted. If so, it has been tied down by a strained interpretation of its own directive, which interpretation requires (a) that disloyalty—as against the question of security risk—must be proved; and (b) that the proof must be of the instant, that is the individual now, at the time of the hearing, must be proved disloyal. Evidence of past disloyalty, in other words, is not to be permitted to color the decision as to present loyalty. This is to say that if yesterday I was known and proved to be a card-carrying Communist, but today that same evidence of disloyalty could not be produced, I would be cleared of any charges of disloyalty as affecting my fitness for Government service. I submit that simply offends common sense and good judgment. But it is the present basis of operations for the Loyalty Board.

Let me read from the Executive order which constitutes the Loyalty Board, the part which gives rise to that construction. It is Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947, and I read from part V, on "Standards":

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to disloyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for a belief that the person involved is disloyal—

And I want to underscore the words "is disloyal"—

> to the Government of the United States.

Prior to that particular Executive order there was in effect another War Service Regulation, dated February 28, 1942. From part 2, section 3, I read as follows:

> An applicant may be denied examination and an eligible may be denied appointment for * * * (g) "a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States".

This is one of the reasons which were "sufficient cause for removal from the service" prior to the operations of the present Loyalty Board, but the standards stated therein have since been changed.

Mr. President, an order was issued in February, 1942. In March, 1947, a new order was issued upon creation of the new loyalty program. The Loyalty Board says that under its interpretation of the changed directive, it cannot do the same things under the new order that were possible under the old wartime order.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the Loyalty Board has surrounded itself or been surrounded with restrictions and limitations so that it cannot function in the public interest. The consequence has been that the Board has recognized all the Commie lines of imaginary rights, such as the "right" not to be accused and the "right" of freedom from guilt by association.

Mr. President, before these Commie line "rights" were brought out the basic rights in the Constitution and under the law of the United States were sufficient. The Commie rights are just phony baloney rights, and there is nothing in our system which says they should ever have been recognized by the Loyalty Board when it was charged with trying to preserve the security of the United States of America.

While the two Executive orders are apparently similar in purpose, the effect of their interpretations are miles apart. It follows from the interpretation of the present Executive order that the conviction of Remington would not bar him from present employment in the Government. That conviction, despite the volumes it tells about the man does not prove that he is now disloyal, I emphasize the words "is now disloyal" because they are the key words in the interpretation of the Loyalty Board's directive.

Mr. President, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the President, in issuing the new Executive order in 1947, deliberately and intentionally changed the wording of the 1942 order so that the present interpretation might be had. By doing so he has sought to close forever the book that contains the records of the Communists and the fellow travelers in the Government of the United States of America.

If that interpretation by the Loyalty Board is allowed to stand, it will freeze in the Government service, and will conceal them there, all persons who in the past have been disloyal to the Government. It will protect them from the discipline and the policing of public opinion.

In such case, all that disloyal Government employees will have to do will be to conceal their present disloyal activities, because their past, by this interpretation, is said to be of no concern to the Government and the public. Of course, Mr. President, such persons have had sufficient warning, and have gone underground. Why would not they conceal their present activities? I say that unless we can open the books of the past activities of Communists and fellow travelers in the employ of the Government of the United States, we shall never be able to get at them.

Are we going to be so naive as to believe that the Soviet Union, with its spies all over the world, in all other countries, has not attempted to have them penetrate the departments of the Government of the United States of America? Do we not know, from the Hiss case and the Remington case, that the Soviet has had its spy rings in this country and in our Government? Mr. President, the job for the United States to do is to ferret out those spies, and get them out of our Government.

The United States must recognize that the first and the greatest weapon used by the Soviet Union in its conspiracy to take over all the world is the penetration by its spies of the other nations and their governments. If the Soviet Union is unable to succeed in doing that, it will use its satellite armies, as it has done in Korea. There is every reason to believe that if the Soviet Union is unable to succeed by means of either its first method or its second method, it will use the Red Army. That is a pattern of strategy against which we must defend ourselves.

So, Mr. President, I again say that we should anticipate Communists and fellow travelers are in the departments and agencies of the Government of the United States. Our job is to ferret them out, not to permit them to be protected

by means of an Executive order which will freeze them in the Government of the United States and will conceal them there.

Mr. President, if this interpretation of the present Board's function is correct, then the past activities of a person in the Government service will be permitted to throw no light at all on his present intentions or his present integrity for public trust. Under present circumstances, the Board will only ask, in regard to such a person, "Is it proved that he is now disloyal?" The Board will not ask, "Was he once disloyal, and if so, does that have a bearing on his present loyalty and fitness for public trust."

Mr. President, I have reasons for believing that the present Loyalty Board understands that difficulty and that weakness, is not satisfied with the present condition, and realizes that the present situation is a farce and a phony. I hope something will be done about that matter very soon. However, the time is growing late. I hope the Board will be able to examine the past activities of Government employees. We have been reminded that a Chinese philosopher once said that it is well to study the past, in order to be able to anticipate what will occur in the future.

Mr. President, one result of the limitation now imposed as a result of the order and its interpretation, namely, that it is necessary to prove that such a person is now disloyal, has been that 60 percent of the regional Loyalty Board cases, in regard to findings of disloyalty, have been overturned. Apparently the regional boards have not strained at the interpretation which governs the parent board.

Mr. President, the Board also is weak because in practice it does not seek all available evidence. It is not even empowered to do so by means of subpoena. Just think of that, Mr. President. The Board is created to ferret out those insidious persons who have been placed by the Communist Party in our Government service, but the Board cannot make use of the power of subpoena in order to obtain evidence against such persons.

Recently a new executive commission to inquire into all phases of subversion was appointed. But it, too, is without the power of subpoena. How far will that Board be able to go? How far will it be able to do a proper job? Do we wish to have a proper job done? If we do, why do not we take all possible steps to make sure that a proper job will be done, instead of reposing trust in executive decrees, not laws? It is the idea that decrees will solve the problem that makes it impossible for a proper job to be done, because the decrees must emanate from those who have vested interest in the errors of the past. In order to insure that a proper job will be done, we must see to it, among other things, that any agency handling such matters will have the power of subpoena, so that it may obtain the evidence it needs, and so that the persons who testify before it will be required to tell the truth, under threat of punishment for committing perjury.

Mr. President, the net effect of the loyalty program's operations has been to cloak all the security weaknesses of the executive branch of our Government. That cloak or cover has been maintained by means of the absolute refusal of the executive branch to disclose the details of its internal operations to the inquiries of Congress, so that security procedures may be strengthened.

The standards of disclosure are those which have been formulated and adopted by the executive branch of our Government itself. The executive branch claims that the standards which have been adopted are based on the national interest. However, that claim boils down to an apparent belief that the national interest would suffer from revelations of internal weakness and administrative error in the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. President, that conclusion on the attitude of the executive branch is borne out by a spectacle enacted just last week. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when dealing with export controls, wished to examine the minutes of the export control and advisory committees which acted as advisers to the Secretary of Commerce. The Senate committee wished to make inquiry regarding the shipment of cotton to China after the beginning of the Korean War. However, the executive branch of the Government would not permit the committee to obtain those minutes; it was claimed that to do so would adversely affect the security of the Government and of the Nation. When the matter was pressed, a statement was made that to permit the committee to examine the minutes would have an adverse affect on the best interests of the United States. Why, Mr. President? Because the minutes of the advisory committee were in terrible shape, and it was thus claimed by the executive branch that exposure of the inefficiency of the advisory committee would be harmful to the security of the United States. Mr. President, I ask the American people if that is good reason for keeping such minutes secret. That case is the most recent in a long series of similar refusals by the executive branch to cooperate in the inquiries of Congress.

Incidentally, that case is also very interesting because of its relationship to the Remington case. At the time Remington was before the committee—and at that time the committee inquiry was pronounced "a red herring"—he was secretary of the ad hoc committee of the Office of International Trade, the identical agency that is responsible for permitting the shipment of cotton to China after the beginning of the Korean War. Just as we were blocked in 1948 from gathering further evidence on Remington, the executive branch of the Government today does not wish any evidence on why such shipments were made to come to the knowledge of the public.

Mr. President, what we need is a security program. The present so-called loyalty program does not provide that.

A high Government agency, I understand, has been working for the past year to set up some kind of a genuine security program. Late as is that effort, it is commendable. But the fact is that not a thing has been done about it. Why? When we see the interpretation of this order freezing the past activities of Government employees, and not allowing such activities to be inquired into as a means of determining the wise course for us to pursue in the future, we can see why nothing has been accomplished by that agency, even though it has been working for a year in its endeavor to obtain a security program.

Next, Mr. President, this matter involves the necessity for a set of sound, practical security standards. As a working basis, I suggest a study and consideration of the report on the Remington case which I have cited. I wish to read one paragraph from that report, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the remaining portions which I have marked, on pages 2 and 3 of the report, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

Let me read this part at this time:

> No person has a right to work for the Government. Working for the Government of the United States is a privilege which should be extended only to those in whom the greatest trust may be imposed. This distinction between a right and a privilege is a most important one in the consideration of a program to guarantee the loyalty of Government employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the portions of the report referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In our zeal to rid the Government of subversives we must constantly be alert to protect individual rights. While fighting to preserve our democracy we must not forget to practice democracy. The subcommittee desires to stress how important it is that all of our constitutional safeguards remain inviolate. We must be mindful, however, that Communists clamor loudest about constitutional guaranties in their efforts to undermine our democracy. For this reason we must think clearly to avoid the confusion which the Communists hope to create. Arguments about constitutional guaranties should be analyzed to see if they apply to the facts at hand.
>
> No person has a right to work for the Government. Working for the Government of the United States is a privilege which should be extended only to those in whom the greatest trust may be imposed. This distinction between a right and a privilege is a most important one in the consideration of a program to guarantee the loyalty of Government employees.
>
> Freedom of speech, freedom of political belief, freedom of assembly, and the right not to be forced to testify against oneself, are basic rights guaranteed to all our people by the Constitution. However, we must not be confused as to the extent of these rights. Let us consider three cases by way of illustration: (1) Today a person in our country has a right to be a Communist and to speak out in behalf of communism if he violates no law such as espionage or conspiracy. By so doing, however, he forfeits any privilege he may have had to work for the United States Government. Surely no one can seriously claim that a person dedicated to overthrowing our form of government is entitled to the privilege of working for that government; (2) in a criminal case a man has a right to a trial by jury and can force the Government to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt based on testimony other than his own. He cannot be convicted on suspicion. However, a man may forfeit his

privilege to work for the Government by constant association with known subversive elements. All Communists are potential espionage agents, and a Federal employee who constantly associates with persons of that ilk forfeits his privilege to work for the Government just as a man may forfeit his privilege to work as cashier of a bank if he constantly associates with known thieves; (3) under our Constitution a person has a right at any time to refuse to answer any question as to his conduct if by answering he would incriminate himself. If he is a Federal employee and he refuses to answer questions as to his loyalty, obviously he forfeits any privilege he has to continue working for the Government. It is analogous to the case of a cashier who, when questioned as to a shortage in his books, refuses to answer on the ground that his answers would tend to show that he is guilty of a crime. In refusing he has exercised a right guaranteed by the Constitution. But when the president of the company revokes the privilege of the cashier to work for the company by firing him he, too, has exercised his right under a free government. Certainly our Government must exercise at least as much care as the operator of a private business in employing persons it can trust.

Our Government, then, should guarantee the rights of all its citizens and should be zealous to prevent any diminution of these rights. On the other hand, it should be equally as vigilant to see that the privileges of citizenship are not abused by the very persons who seek to destroy all rights and privileges.

Stated in terms of loyalty, the program of our Government should have this aim. Communists and other subversives, their sympathizers, and their intimates should be forced out of Government and kept out of Government. Considering the insidious cunning and deceit of a Communist, any reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of a person should be resolved in favor of the Government. There are a sufficient number of persons whose loyalty is above question that self-interest alone should demand that the Government not employ persons of doubtful loyalty. To date this aim has not been accomplished.

Mr. FERGUSON. Third, we need a real determination to put into effect a genuine security program. No program will be successful without that determination. But to assist such a program I suggest the adoption of genuine security tests as the standard of Government employment; instead of vague loyalty standards hampered by requirements of current positive proof. This can be accomplished by adopting the principle that Government employment is a privilege and not a right.

I also submit that any loyalty board must operate on the basis of the right of subpoena, and it should exercise it. Further, it should require that the FBI and the other agencies that can look up evidence for them shall get all the evidence, instead of the Board's taking what is handed them on a platter by an interested board of the particular department, more often than not composed of the personnel employing these particular people.

Fourth, we need a policy of disclosure in the executive branch, so that the public may have the facts, and, on the basis of the facts, may be assured that security risks and subversives are not operating within the walls of the Government and within the Government agencies.

Mr. President, this is a matter which touches the roots of our existence. America is not only in a hot war, but is very much in a cold war. Our men are dying, and we prepare, through the appropriation of billions of dollars—and we are asking $70,000,000,000—to save our material wealth and our lives. But what are we doing to save the internal structure and the ideals which are America? If, through internal penetration and subversion, we lose this structure and the ideals that we have, the walls of this Chamber will be but stones. It is a matter of what the principles stand for inside—of what we stand for on principle, inside. It is a matter of ideals. It is the recognition of the inalienable rights of the people, of government by consent of the governed. Those are the things concerned in the prevention of a conspiracy to overthrow that which is sacred to all of us.

Are we, or are we not, going to do the necessary job of internal defense? That is the question. The jury in the case of the people versus Remington has told us how little we have done in that first line of defense in the recent past.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished Senator from Michigan aware of the fact that a Thomas Blaisdell, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce, defended Remington, Michael Lee, and several other characters of that ilk, who have later been either convicted or fired from their jobs?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am familiar with that.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator know where Mr. Blaisdell is at this time, after having resigned from the Department of Commerce? The Senator probably suspects that we are gathering evidence from him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I saw in the press that he was employed as a professor; I think, as a professor of political science, in a university; which I think was in the State of California.

Mr. MALONE. The University of California. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, Mr. Blaisdell is, I am advised, adviser on international relations; which, of course, enables him to continue his work in the great State of California.

If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask whether he is familiar with the work of Mr. Gladieux who, I believe, was assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and whether he knows where Mr. Gladieux is now?

Mr. FERGUSON. The name does not strike a responsive chord. I am afraid I am not familiar with it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Gladieux resigned, because there was a direct connection with Communists, apparently; at least we thought there was, and we are still working on it—and he is now with the Ford Foundation, I am informed. These men continue their work, even after they become disconnected with the Government.

I should like to ask the Senator, again, whether he is familiar with the resolution, S. Res. 230, introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada, following disclosures by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and whether he is familiar with the discharge of Mr. Remington and Mr. Michael Lee, following an investigation conducted by the Commerce Committee. The junior Senator from Nevada had offered a resolution on the floor of the Senate and asked that a committee be appointed to investigate the loyalty and general work of employees of the Department of Commerce.

Following all those disclosures, and the firing of these two characters, one—Remington—quit immediately, but Mr. Lee hung on. He, at first, had been held to be not actually disloyal. This was prior to the time of the hearing conducted by the Commerce Committee. But he was held to be a dangerous security risk. The junior Senator from Nevada was aware of that when he was questioning him. But Lee refused to resign. Remington resigned, after Mr. Sawyer fired him. He was almost immediately indicted, and now, as the distinguished Senator has outlined so ably, he has been convicted.

Is the distinguished Senator from Michigan aware that before Secretary Sawyer finally fired Mr. Lee he cleared him of any charges of disloyalty, despite the fact that he had been found actually disloyal by the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce, and therefore, as the distinguished Senator has explained, Mr. Lee could go back to work at his old job, if any Department of Commerce head saw fit to hire him? There is nothing on his record; he has been cleared of all such charges. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am only familiar with it from reading the press. Naturally, I did not follow it as closely as did the Senator from Nevada, because he was greatly interested in the Lee case and has followed it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it may be well to complete the RECORD regarding Remington. I hold in my hand the latest dispatches which show that Judge Gregory F. Noonan, before whom the case was tried, this afternoon sentenced Mr. William W. Remington to the maximum sentence possible for his crime, namely, 5 years imprisonment and a $2,000 fine. I think it is gratifying that the judge at least has recognized the enormity of this situation.

What interested me was the point made by the Senator from Michigan as to the position Remington had occupied as chairman of the Export Control Board. I should like to call the Senator's attention, in that connection, to the testimony of General Marshall before our committee, that there was an embargo for 10 months on the shipment of the matériel to the Chinese Nationalists; that thereafter the embargo was lifted; but General Marshall said that for 10 months thereafter it proved impractical to resume ship-

ments. Apparently Mr. Remington was a key to the situation. In other words, the downfall of the Nationalists apparently was contributed to in no small measure by the manipulations of this man which were made possible, and our boys are paying the price and the penalty for it today. That is the long reach of the activities of a man who finally, after this long time, stands convicted.

I hold in my hand the record of hearings on the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, when some of us, on February 23 and March 22, 1949, seriously questioned Mr. Blaisdell about Mr. Remington, and when Mr. Blaisdell defended Mr. Remington. I have here the statement by Mr. Blaisdell when he was defending Mr. Remington. He said he was a nice fellow, he had known him, and he was all right. I asked Blaisdell whether Remington had not misled him in getting a job. He said he did not think he had; he thought he was all right. So I read now the very question of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] quizzing Mr. Remington in this other hearing, which is found on page 22 of the hearing:

Mr. FERGUSON. Now do I understand today that you want to leave this with the committee, that you in effect misled Blaisdell on not having knowledge of certain facts, that you stated it in such a way as to conceal certain facts?

Mr. Remington—and I think this does him some credit—admitted to me as follows:

I now believe that I misled him.

The thing that intrigues me is that, although Remington admitted to the Senator from Michigan that he had testified that his superior, Mr. Blaisdell, when he was getting his job, was defending him saying he was just an innocent young boy, yet Remington was considered a suitable man to carry out a tremendous responsibility.

I notice that the Senator from Nevada in his statement of March 1950, when we were still trying to get consideration in the matter, stated that it was not a "red herring." The Senator from Nevada pointed out that when an investigation is made, the investigators will run into some curious phenomena. For instance, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Thomas Blaisdell, a protégé of Henry Wallace, has been defending Michael Lee; he also defended William Remington. Remington, it will be recalled, admitted cooperating with Elizabeth T. Bentley, a confessed Soviet spy.

Blaisdell seems to have had Remington with him in the National Resources Planning Board, the War Production Board, the Naval Intelligence in London, and the Department of Commerce. I now understand that Remington is back in the Commerce Department, but supposedly carefully kept away from the "sensitive" jobs.

I admit, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, that we receive a little more cooperation from the executive departments than we get from the top. The Secretary of Commerce was before us, and he testified that he had not been informed about it. He said, "I did not know of this." He was asked, "Who is responsible for not knowing about it? Now that you know about it, what are you going to do?"

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I pointed out that it is absolutely true that after Congress gets the grand jury to recognize the facts and to indict a man for perjury in connection with his relation and his activities in the Government, the Department of Justice is able to obtain evidence and get a conviction beyond a reasonable doubt. But think of it: It was possible to convict this man Remington in a court of justice beyond a reasonable doubt—not an imaginary doubt, but a reasonable doubt. Yet he was cleared of disloyalty charges before a mere executive board.

Mr. BREWSTER. And the department for which he worked could find no reason to dismiss him.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Blaisdell resigned from the Department of Commerce a few days before Remington went on trial, knowing, I assume, that he was going to defend him. He probably decided that it was time to get out. We know Lee's record: we know Remington's record. He is a convicted felon. We know the record of Gladieux, who was connected with the Ford Foundation. How much more there is in that case Senators can check——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada pointed out that Mr. Gladieux was Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and presumably, though there is no valid proof, because the evidence had not reached the Secretary, according to his statement, it was assumed by everyone that Mr. Gladieux was involved. He claimed to be innocent of the whole thing. Mr. Whitney, if he were so inclined, could blow the lid off a great many of these things.

Mr. BREWSTER. In his resignation I think he made it quite clear that the reasons for quitting were good and sufficient. I refer to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. MALONE. At the time the junior Senator from Nevada made his statement on the floor and asked for a committee to investigate the subject, there must have been someone in the gallery who attended to it—it could not have been done in any other way—for an evening newspaper carried the usual denial and stated that he had been cleared of the charges.

Mr. Macy's testimony in the hearings on Senate Resolution 230 on March 28 to April 4, 1950, admitted that he was in error in saying that notwithstanding the junior Senator from Nevada, although he did not disclose it at that moment, had definite information that while Mr. Lee had not been convicted of absolute disloyalty, the recommendation was made that he was a poor security risk. So the junior Senator from Nevada asked that he be sworn as all other witnesses were sworn. If he had stated under oath that he was cleared, we would have had Mr. Macy, and if he had admitted it, we would have had Mr. Lee. It was one or the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the whole question is one of security.

Mr. BREWSTER. And they know it.

Mr. FERGUSON. But they will not apply any rules or regulations to oust persons as being bad security risks. They fix it so that it must be found at the time of the trial that he is a disloyal person.

In other words, he must be actually an espionage agent and disloyal at the moment he is being tried. Under their interpretation, before a person can be ousted it must be shown that at the time of the trial he is disloyal. That is not a security test. Just think of a program being sold to the people as protecting their security under an Executive order reading as this Executive order is now interpreted to read.

If the President of the United States thinks the proper interpretation of his order is not being made, why has he not corrected it? He could do so simply by changing his order, or by removing his Board if he thought its interpretation of his order was not correct.

While the Remington trial was in progress, Arthur Krock wrote an article which I placed in the RECORD showing clearly the basis on which the Loyalty Board interprets its functions and the scope of its authority. Not one thing has been done about it by the President, who has the final responsibility for the loyalty program he initiated.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator expect that the investigations by committees would be characterized as asinine by those persons in high authority in the executive department?

Mr. FERGUSON. The committees were trying to render a service to the people of the United States. I take it that the words "red herring" and "asinine" are really one and the same. I understand the President did describe a committee report today as being asinine.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was kind enough to ask the junior Senator from Nevada to sit with the committee. We asked for the minutes of an executive session of the Loyalty Board in reference to the hearings on Mr. Lee. Mr. Blaisdell said that by order of the President, he had to refuse. All they needed to do, in order to save the time of the Senate and of other agencies which were working on the case, was simply to lay the minutes of the Board before the committee. But, by order of the President, they were withheld.

I should like to read into the RECORD a short paragraph to show the distinguished Senator from Michigan further supporting evidence that he is exactly correct.

Senator BRICKER. That is right—personal characteristics as well as his ability

In other words, had he been examined before he had been hired.

Mr. BLAISDELL. Correct, sir. And a review of this man by the Department, as I say, the Secretary of Commerce himself has found that Mr. Lee, to the best of our knowledge and on the basis of all the information we have been able to secure, is competent, able, and loyal and has done his job properly.

Mr. President, I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that at that moment the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce had held this man to be a poor security risk.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his comment. I yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it seems that it is almost necessary for a person to have been investigated at least once for treason to his Government, or at least suspected of disloyalty, to be recommended for appointment to high position in the Government.

THE CASE OF HARRY RUSSELL, CITED FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the past few days several of my distinguished colleagues have expressed their views concerning the opinion of Judge Letts in the contempt case against Harry Russell, which was decided on Monday, February 5. Harry Russell was a very reluctant witness before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. Russell refused to answer a great many questions pertaining very directly to the work of the committee. The Senate had cited Harry Russell for contempt because of his failure to cooperate with the committee, and the office of the United States attorney of the District of Columbia quickly prosecuted the case with vigor. Mr. Fay, the United States district attorney for the District of Columbia, presented the case immediately to the grand jury, and Russell was indicted on some sixty-odd counts. The case before Judge Letts was handled on behalf of the Government by William Hitz, assistant district attorney for the District of Columbia, and it was handled very well indeed. The case was fully presented and well argued by Mr. Hitz on behalf of the Government. Mr. Fay has stated that similar cases which are pending before him will go forward. We are very glad to note that he does not feel the decision of Judge Letts is any more than the opinion of one district court judge, and that it is not binding as to the action that should be taken in the other cases.

Judge Letts granted Harry Russell's motion for a judgment of acquittal, and this result is not appealable. If it were appealable, I am satisfied that the Supreme Court would reverse Judge Letts, because in my opinion he extended the rule of the Blau case beyond logical reason. The opinion in the Russell case by Judge Letts, in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, merely stands as the opinion of one district court judge. I think the opinion of Judge Letts is clearly in error under all the decisions of the Supreme Court, including the Blau case.

As I have publicly stated, I do not believe that the decision in the Russell case should be considered a precedent which would result in the acquittal of other persons cited for contempt of the Senate or the House of Representatives. Each case, in my opinion, must be judged on its own merits and on the basis of the particular facts involved.

My view is, in part, based upon a reading of certain portions of the court's decision which appear to relate to matters of opinion and observation, as distinguished from an application of principles of law. In this respect, I have in mind the portion of the opinion wherein the court, after referring to the background of the committee, the resolution of the Senate authorizing the committee, and an interim report of the committee, stated that all these matters were pertinent to Harry Russell's state of mind at the time when he refused to testify.

The judge said:

> In all probability, he had in mind the purpose of the investigation and the trend it had taken. He must have had in mind that the committee regarded him as a big shot in interstate gambling activities. He may well have concluded from the initial questions propounded to him that the committee was unfriendly to him and hostile to him. He may have become alarmed at the manner of the committee's approach. Surely that approach was not patterned to put him at ease.
>
> The court thinks he had reasonable grounds for his apprehension. Certainly this is true if the suspicions entertained by the committee were justified, and the court thinks in all likelihood this defendant knew of the suspicions so entertained by the committee.

In all fairness I do not believe that every judge hearing other contempt cases would find that a resolution of the Senate and an attitude of a Senate committee must be so kind and conciliatory as to put all witnesses at ease.

In investigative hearings a majority of the witnesses appearing before a Senate committee are unfriendly. Is Congress to be deprived of its necessary investigative function because it is unable to put a witness at ease when he appears before a Senate committee? The investigative function is a very vital part of the work of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. I may say that if this opinion were the law, which I do not think it is, the carrying out of such investigative work by Senate and House committees would be greatly, unfairly, and improperly impeded, because if we must meet the requirement of putting a witness at ease and not show a hostile attitude, then of course we would be prevented from eliciting information from many witnesses. As a matter of fact we know that some of the most valuable information is secured from unfriendly witnesses. If a witness can merely refuse to answer, among other reasons, because the committee does not feel kindly to him, or does not put him at his ease, of course Senate and House committees are at a great disadvantage.

I cannot conceive of the result which the court apparently envisions, namely, that the Senate must divorce itself in the course of the conduct of hearings from any unfriendly thoughts concerning witnesses that might appear before it. Each one of us knows of some witness or other who has appeared before a Senate committee toward whom he could not feel friendly.

As a matter of fact, our committee had every reason to believe on the basis of testimony and of investigation that Harry Russell was intimately connected with the Capone outfit. Furthermore, it appeared that Russell had in some fashion muscled his way into the S. & G. syndicate which controlled bookmaking in the Miami area. With all this knowledge, we tried to give Russell the fairest of hearings. Actually, when Russell first appeared and stated that he had not consulted an attorney as to his rights, we put his hearing over to another day in order to give him the fullest opportunity to consult a lawyer. Nevertheless, when Russell appeared the second time, he appeared without counsel and made no effort to reciprocate the cooperative attitude of our committee.

I wish to point out—and Judge Letts would have done well in my opinion to have at least taken notice of it—that after the hearing was postponed for several days in order to enable Mr. Russell to engage counsel, he stated, on his return that he did not want counsel although he had consulted an attorney, and that the attorney had stated the law and his privileges to him exactly as the chairman of the special committee had done during the previous hearing.

Certainly these facts would show that in Russell's case, as in all other cases, the committee has made every effort to be fair to the witnesses. Of course, the persons whom we ask to testify are very often those whom we suspect of being intimately connected with organized crime in interstate commerce. We do not approach the hearings without some knowledge of the facts and, therefore, we must have suspicions and feelings toward those persons who are the big shots in the criminal world.

Another reason for my view that the Russell decision will not be binding on other cases of contempt and that such cases will have to stand on their own facts and merits is the fact that our courts have created a line of decisions which may be read as permitting many questions of the type that we asked Harry Russell.

I have in mind a line of cases beginning with Mason against United States which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1917. That was a case in which a witness before a Federal grand jury was compelled to state whether he saw a game of cards being played at his own table in Alaska where, under Federal laws, the playing of cards for money was a crime.

Since the Mason case, we have had Camarota against United States decided by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in 1940. In that case, a witness was required to answer questions relating to the sale of wire service to bookies, even though subsequent answers might incriminate him as to Federal income-tax statutes. Harry Russell was asked many

easier questions than those involved in the two cases I have discussed, but in some instances he declined to answer questions relating to whether he knew people or whether he had ever met people, whether during a certain time he had ever been in Miami Beach, whether he had ever consulted a lawyer, and many other questions of that kind. Certainly, such questions would not, nor the answers thereto, incriminate a person under the Federal statutes, for I know of no Federal law which makes it a crime to know a person with a criminal record. Some of the persons about whom we asked him did not have criminal records. I do not know of any crime of which he could have been guilty by reason of having been in a certain place or in a certain section, because certainly a citizen of this country has a right to go anywhere he wishes.

I could go on at this point to cite a great many more cases which have held that questions such as those asked of Harry Russell must be answered. I believe it is unnecessary to do so at this time. However, I did want to take this opportunity to point out that legal precedents exist which might very well be observed in other jurisdictions and by other judges before whom contempt cases are brought.

I might add that the recent Blau case—the Communist case—decided by the Supreme Court does not appear to apply to Harry Russell's case and might not apply in other cases because Harry Russell himself indicated that he did not really fear a Federal prosecution as is shown in his own words when he said to the committee: "I don't think, Senator, that I have committed any crime."

In all these cases the refusal to testify was on the ground that it might incriminate the witness. The refusal must relate to some definite fear, something which is real. It cannot be a mere fantasy or a possibility. Furthermore, under other decisions of the Supreme Court, it cannot be the fear of prosecution under a State law. With respect to many of the questions asked Harry Russell, refusal to answer could be based only upon a fantasy or a fear very far removed from any possibility of the answer incriminating him.

Mr. President, I say that if congressional committees are to have any power at all to obtain information from witnesses, the rule laid down by Judge Letts cannot be a sound rule of law. Certainly if a person has a real fear, and if his answer might really incriminate him in connection with some Federal offense, under the fifth amendment he has the right to decline to answer; and that is as it should be. But to allow a person to refuse to answer merely because he has some faint and fantastic idea that a question might incriminate him or might be a link in a chain which might incriminate him, when he will not even specify the Federal statute or law which he has in mind, would be taking away from congressional committees a very necessary power to compel witnesses to testify in order to obtain information which investigating committees must have.

I wish it understood that I have full respect for our judicial authorities. I never like to make any criticism of any judge's opinion. We all have our own opinions. Various judges have different opinions. However, I felt that I must take this occasion to point out that certain factors which Judge Letts found to be so important in the Russell case would not necessarily appear so important to another judge hearing a case of alleged contempt against the Senate.

I wish also to point out that in my opinion Judge Letts' decision does not follow the decision of the Supreme Court in the Blau case and other decisions of the Supreme Court. In order for a witness to refuse to testify on the basis of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, there must be a real fear that his testimony would incriminate him, and it must be in connection with some Federal statute which he has in mind. He may not refuse to testify merely because the committee is unfriendly to him, or because he has some unreal, remote, fantastic idea that his answer might lead to some chain of events which would incriminate him.

The matter has been fully discussed with members of the special committee. We feel that it is our responsibility to bring to the attention of the Senate recommendations for contempt proceedings against witnesses who refuse to answer questions which we feel are pertinent, when no showing is made that the answers to the questions might incriminate them. We feel that there will be different results before other district judges in the cases which will be presented to them.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

F. Joseph Donohue, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Guy Mason.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George G. Jeck, of Atlantic, Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Iowa, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Charles J. McNamee, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Hon. Robert N. Wilkin, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, vice Charles H. Cashin, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Edgar W. Scarborough, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida, vice Jordan B. Royall, deceased.

William Quillen Treseder, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice Gilbert Mecham, retired.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Wallace A. Burgess	Thomas D. Lewis
Eugene B. Conrad	Ralph A. McCroskey
Valleau E. Curtis	John DaC. Meyer
Gresham G. Downs	Donald A. Miller
Walter A. Ellinghaus-en, Jr.	John M. Neel
	Charles P. Pressly III
Clarence Erkelens	Gilbert D. Saul
John R. Gunderson	Thomas B. Smiley, Jr.
Arthur D. Jessen	Stephen D. Stevning
John M. Key	Jerry "D" Wolfe
Edward D. Kuball	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Charles L. Cotter	Robert E. Hodgson, Jr.
Roland S. Dick, Jr.	Joseph A. Juhlin, Jr.
Paul C. Gaertner, Jr.	Arthur G. O. Roe
Frank U. Garrard III	Robert L. Sheppard, Jr.
Jack T. Hamilton	James L. Thwing

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officers):

Joseph R. Geraud	Robert H. Nicholson
Harold Hoag	Franklin E. Porter
Paul R. Kramer	Edwin P. Preston
Charles E. McDowell	James M. Wallace, Jr.
David W. Miller	James D. Wilder

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

James K. Cunningham.
Halvdan G. K. Faaland.
Charles P. Root.

LIEUTENANT

James A. McLaughlin.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luther W. Brady, Jr.	James B. Lynch
William R. Daniel	Thomas G. Lyons
Robert L. Davis	Kenneth W. Meinert
Seldon C. Dunn	George W. St. C. Moore
John E. Gill	Robert G. Reaves, Jr.
David Gillette	George W. Thoma, Jr.
Theodore C. Hooker	Edgar E. Thomas, Jr.
Gilbert M. Kinzer.	Earl A. Thompson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John P. Byrnes	John L. Moran, Jr.
Samuel R. Hardman	Harlin E. Tillberg
Lucian C. Mattiello	James H. Veary
Don M. Michael	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Thomas H. Mayo.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Earl R. William.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Addie E. Baker	Thedia A. Michael
Elizabeth A. Bispham	Henrietta A. Mulhollan
Helen J. Black	Rose A. Pachiano
Betty A. Gibson	Jane M. Parrick
Lola M. Green	Edla M. Plosila
Doris E. Marsch	Angelina T. Pommier
Lucille A. Matchus	Anna C. Read
Millicent E. Merrick	Ellen G. Warren

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Doris F. Bentley	Josephine E. McCarthy
Arline W. Harding	Clara T. Szczypin
Edythe A. Head	

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frances J. Jacobson.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Line of the Navy, for Limited Duty Only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Albert L. Ballard
Edward H. Bayers
Louis E. Blechlin
Joe M. Danielski
Edward M. Doran
Harold C. Gabriel
Carll T. Gleason
Eldon L. Guhl
Harry A. Guthrie
Clarence C. Hawk
Marion H. Hawkins
Stanley J. Lewandowski
LeRoy Loewer
James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Robert E. Mansard
Kenneth A. Mundy
Rollin M. Reed
Victor A. Schmalfeldt
Horace D. Schultz
William E. Taylor
George S. Watson
Ephraim R. Weaver
Juston W. West

LIEUTENANTS

Thomas E. Acton
William F. Adams
John C. Arthur
Dwight F. Asmus
Thomas E. Bager
John W. Barden
George R. Becker
Henry F. Berck
Alvin C. Bergquist
Joseph Buehlman
Silas M. Blakely
Harold B. Boaz
Alfred V. Boutin
Jim W. Bryson
Donald F. Byers
Don M. Cameron
Allan R. Carlson
Evan M. Chanik
Homer W. Chellew
Jack G. Churchill
William T. Coulson
James D'A. Dodge
Gordon B. Dosskey
Ivan H. Douglas
Harold M. Dubree
Jesse W. Dunwoody
Robert J. Erickson
Leon S. Ertle
Marion S. Evans
Eudore A. Forcier
Laron S. Franklin
William E. Fuller
Ned A. Gardner
John G. Gillissie
John Greksouk
Lyle T. Griffis
Truman P. Grubl
Harry D. Hall
Russel L. Hendrickson
Frederick J. Hicken
Glenn W. Holmes
Leo T. Howard
Paul E. Huffman
Clayton F. Johnson
Harvey B. Jones
Caddis G. McKee
Richard R. Matthews
Johnnie E. Mattis
Bernard A. Middleton
Edward C. Miller
Joseph F. Miller
LaVern C. Moore
LeRoy Perkins
George W. Perrin
James E. Plowden
Aquilino L. Ponciroli
Robert R. Ragsdale
Elsworth C. Reynolds
Chesley W. Richey
Meredith C. Riddle
William H. Robb
Donald E. Runyon
Walter Schauer
Ray W. Seiwert
John R. Shannon
Paul A. Smith
Russel D. Smith
Will L. Stalnaker
Robert B. Stickles
Ralph C. Thomas
James L. Thompson
Joseph B. Tiara
John S. Walden
Frank W. Warrick
Walter R. Watkins
Boyce St. C. Webb
Robert E. Wheeler
Paul H. Williams

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

George A. Ales
William G. Bigony
Rudolph M. Buselmeier
Howard W. Carr
Albert F. Christener
Craig McD. Coley
Fred W. Davenport
Claude L. Dickerson
Telofil Dmoch
Donald D. Dunton
Eugene R. Forsht
Herbert A. Franck
Donald Gaither
Claude E. Hale
William F. Harris
Claude J. Hinds, Jr.
Paul A. Hunt
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Gordon W. Jones
Charles E. Landahl
Allan E. McArthur
Charles H. McMakin, Jr.
William R. Morgan
Lawrence O. Nasset
Eugene A. O'Brien
Ross Peters
Lewis J. Polansky
Charles W. Postlethwaite
Wilbur E. Reed
Linus H. Schuh
Harold J. Shapard
Robert A. Stahl

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANTS

Andrew F. Bevill
Kenneth P. Dehart
Eddie M. Johnson
Edmund J. Prosch
William R. Whitney
Clarence R. Wright
Robert L. Jones
Don C. Mandeville
Raymond H. Stutheit
Joseph H. Tetrault

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Harlan L. Bowman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Justin D. Denman

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Line

Paul F. Abel
Carolyn E. Abrams
William Abromitis, Jr.
Richard C. Adams
William K. Adams
Francis J. Alberto
Thomas E. Alexander
Frank J. Alfonso
Richard L. Alford
Benjamin G. Allen
Hoyt E. Allen
Richard P. Allen
Robert C. Allen
Walter L. Alt
Gordon A. Anderson
Ralph L. Anderson
Roy C. Anderson
Jack F. Andrus
Robert P. Armstrong
William S. M. Arnold
James J. Ashford
Carl B. Austin
John D. Austin
Edward M. Axtell, Jr.
William R. Ayers
Joseph F. Bachman
Homer D. Bailey
Donald R. Baird
Daniel Balish
William R. Ball, Jr.
David P. Barker
Warren W. Barker
William H. Barnes 3d
Max D. Barr
Russell Bartmes, Jr.
William H. Barton, Jr.
William R. Bartow
George M. Bates
Richard W. Bates
Joseph R. Bavie
John A. Bayers
David A. Beadling
Francis T. Bean
Richard L. Beatty
Jerry T. Becker
Donald R. Behrens
Harry E. Beiflower, Jr.
Gregory M. Bell, Jr.
James R. Bell
Richard M. Bellinger
Manuel A. Benero, Jr.
Syd "A" Bennett
Archie E. Benton
Herbert P. Benton III
Robert E. Berggren
Rex R. Berglund
Kenneth L. Bernstein
Harry E. Betts
Benjamin W. Bevis
Oral J. Bilderback
Patrick P. Billingsley
John H. Bilkey
Louis Bilyk
Stanley W. Birch, Jr.
Carl Birdwell, Jr.
Arthur C. Black
Carl E. Blaes
Douglas I. Blancheri
Walter T. Blakney
Edith M. Blauvelt
Floyd H. Blizard
Robert P. Blount, Jr.
Richard V. Bodmer
Tudor M. Bogart
Charles D. Bolan
Louis J. Boland
Philip H. Bolger
Herbert L. Bondurant, Jr.
Raymond J. Borntraeger
Eugene H. Bouslog
Eugene S. Bowers
Franklin L. Bowersox
Richard C. Boyd
Keith D. Boyer
Claiborne S. Bradley
Richmond D. Brannen
William J. Brantley
Joseph J. Braun
Cullen D. Bray
Martin F. Bremus
Ernest M. Brides
Kenneth B. Brisco
Francis E. Brooks
William N. Brock, Jr.
Charles H. Brown
Charles O. Brown
Eldon W. Brown, Jr.
George Brown
Oliver F. Brown
Ralph W. Brown, Jr.
Woolson S. Brown
Stuart M. Brownell
John M. Brozena
James S. Brunson
James D. Bryan, Jr.
Paul G. Bryant
Douglas P. Buchanan
Beaumont M. Buck
Robert G. Buechler
Stanley H. Bueg
Norwood W. Bullington, Jr.
Clarence V. Burch, Jr.
Ernest Burks, Jr.
Kenneth A. Burrows
Roger T. Burson
Ronald S. Burton
James E. Callahan, Jr.
David W. Carey, Jr.
Earl C. Carpenter Jr.
Ramon L. Carpenter
Charles C. Carter, Jr.
Rodney B. Carter
Ernest C. Castle
Nicholas A. Castruccio
Samuel F. Catterlin
John D. Caylor
Horace B. Chambers, Jr.
William D. Chandler III
Edwin M. Chapline
Roger A. Chapman
Adrian E. Chavannes
Thomas P. Cheesman
Robert S. Chew, Jr.
Michael L. Childress
William T. Chipman, Jr.
Eugene R. Christie
Robert G. Claitor
James V. Clampet
Graham S. Clark
Wyndham S. Clark, Jr.
Richard J. Clas
John G. Clifford
John D. Clithero
Richard A. Cochran
Joseph E. Codemo
James N. Comerford
Jack H. Conable
William E. Conniff, Jr.
Robert C. Conolly 2d
Albert E. Conord
Joseph E. Coogan
Murray C. Cook
Patricia Cook
Charles P. Coulter
Jack Cowden
Richard S. Coy
Virginia Craig
Richard H. Crangle
John M. Cravens, Jr.
Catherine M. Crombie
Edward J. Cronin
Howard S. Crosby
James S. Crosby, Jr.
Vernon L. Crow
Samuel R. Crowell
Stewart P. Crowell, Jr.
John R. Crumpton, Jr.
Thomas W. Cuddy
Daniel W. Cullivan
Robert J. Cutler
Bradley L. Daley
Bennie V. Damberg
Donald H. Dansby
James E. Davenport, Jr.
John M. Davis
Charles Dearmond
John DeGoede
Daniel T. Deibler
Leonard V. Delling
Walter M. DeLoach
Richard N. DeMun
Dean D. DeWitt
James B. Dick, Jr.
Kenneth S. Dick
Joseph C. Diedrich
Henry C. Dinger, Jr.
Edward S. Disbrow, Jr.
George W. Dittmann
William D. Dittmar
Lewis L. Dobbs
Henry H. Dodd
Genevieve E. Doherty
Anthony Dombroski
William K. Donnell
Mary E. Donnelly
Claude E. Dorris
Laurens Dorsey
Benjamin S. Dowd, Jr.
William E. Dozier
Richard W. Duerner
Norman L. Dunbar
Norman L. Duncan
Richard T. Duncan, Jr.
Robert D. Duncan
Alex R. Dunn, Jr.
John C. Dunn
James W. Dupree, Jr.
Frederick L. Eareckson, Jr.
Walter M. Earley, Jr.
William F. Easterlin, Jr.
Rex C. Eaton, Jr.
Gerald C. Edwards
Donald L. Egger
Frank N. Eklund, Jr.
Dewey A. Ellis, Jr.
Robert T. Ellsworth, Jr.
Lowell E. Elmore
Gordon R. Engel
Joseph T. Erk
Leland F. Estes
Delmar H. Evans, Jr.
William A. Evans
John Evasovich
John L. Everngam, Jr.
Dorothy J. Eyler
Emil M. Eyler
Alvin K. Fentress
Andrew C. Ferguson
Reginald G. Ferrel
Robert L. Field
Ernest D. Fife
William R. Fisher, Jr.
Donald T. Fitzgerald
Michael J. J. Fleming
Edward B. Fleming
John A. Fletcher 2d
Francis C. Fogarty
James A. Forsyth
Kenneth D. Fosnaught
Fredrick L. Foster
Donald D. Foulds
Benjamin B. Fowke
Alfred N. Fowler
James H. Foxgrover
Andrew L. Frahler
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr.
Ian N. Fraser
William F. Fraser
Jack M. Fretwell
Max G. Freudenberg
Edward Frothingham, Jr.
Wallace S. Gabriel
John P. Gaffigan
Stanton B. Garner
Herbert K. Gates, Jr.
Sidney W. Gaylord, Jr.
Alvin E. Geist
William E. Gildow
Claude F. Giles
William V. Gillen
Donald A. Gillham
Frank C. Gilmore
John G. Gilyard
Gordon B. Gish
Philip C. Gliem
William F. Goodman
George E. Goodwin
Ralph T. Goodwin, Jr.
Raymond I. Gornik
Jack L. Gracey
Morris R. Grady
Richard L. Graham
Warren C. Graham, Jr.
Frederick H. Gralow
John A. Grauer
Ernest J. Gray
Richard Green
James C. Greer
Waldo D. Groom
Louis M. Guerrieri
Richard C. Guess
Roy V. Gunther
Harold Gurman
Edwin K. Hacker
Thomas F. Hahn
Charles R. Hall
Donald B. Hall
Joseph F. Hall
Preston D. Hall
Robert Hall
Robert W. Hall
Norman L. Halladay
Albert B. Hallman
David R. Hamlin
Robert W. Hanby, Jr.
Russell L. Handy, Jr.
Kevin Hanlon
Charles R. Hannum
Arthur W. Hanton
Charles Z. Hanus
Chester J. Hardenburg, Jr.
Joe W. Hargrove
Edgar W. Harlan
Robert J. Harlow
Jean F. Harrington
Elwin R. Harris

Harley S. Harris, Jr.
Wade H. Harris
David L. Hartshorn
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr.
Charles E. Hathaway
Douglas B. Hatmaker
Stanley R. Hawe
Edward A. Hawks, Jr.
Edward B. Hebden
Leonard M. Hendrix
Robert F. Henning
Albert G. Henry, Jr.
James E. Henry
William J. Hepburn
William M. Hepburn, Jr.
John D. Herlihy, Jr.
John G. Herndon
Walter J. Hester
Harry C. Hiatt, Jr.
Alvin S. Hibbs
Lester N. Hill
Rowland P. Hill
Robert P. Hilton
Charles W. Hines
Katherine J. Hinman
William R. Hintz
Richard B. Hodson
Roy L. Hoffmann
Leslie C. Hofto
Hugh S. Holder
Leland A. Holdren
Frederick W. Holler, Jr.
Dorothy V. Holliday
William W. Holm
Dudley Holstein
Matthew V. Hoover
Thomas M. Hopkins
John E. Horan, Jr.
Kenneth A. Horn
John L. Hotes
Lee S. Houchins
Roy A. Howard, Jr.
Claude C. Howell
Floyd E. Hower, Jr.
Donald Hubbard
Harry E. Hunt
Robert D. Hunting-ton, Jr.
Robert E. Huntzinger
David A. Hurt, Jr.
Karl H. Huss, Jr.
William G. Ikard 2d
Richard W. Iligen
James M. Ivey, Jr.
Edward D. Jackson, Jr.
Elmer E. Jackson
Frederick D. Jackson, Jr.
John G. W. Jackson
Eldon A. Jacobs
John W. James
Alan L. Jansen
Robert L. Jasmin
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr.
James F. Jenista
John L. Jensen, Jr.
Ronald H. Jermstad
Francis C. Johnson
Henry B. Johnson
Jack K. Johnson
Constance L. Jones
Edward G. Jones
Harry L. Jones
Howard W. Jones
Henry F. Kaiser
Robert C. Kaiser
William A. Kanakanui, Jr.
Howard N. Kay
Jack C. Kays
John R. Kearney
Robert G. Keller
Bruce E. Kelley
Roger W. Kelly
Kenneth Kelty
James H. Kendall 2d
Robert E. Kenyon
William H. Kernan
Harry N. Key, Jr.
Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.
Neal Kincannon
Robert E. King
James W. Kissick, Jr.
Joseph E. Klause
Herbert S. Kline
John W. Klinefelter
Ralph C. Knight
Harold F. Knudsen
Robert A. Komoroff
Edward L. Korb
Francis P. Koval
Albert J. Kralik
Earl R. Krieger
Louis Kriser
John Kriss
Hugh C. Kuhlman
Roderick J. Kulus
Frederick R. Lafferty, Jr.
Arthur Landis, Jr.
Charles M. Lane
William N. Langone
Charles H. Langton
William J. Laubendorfer
Jason P. Law
Paul D. Lawler
William A. Lebert
Robert L. Lee, Jr.
William W. Lee, Jr.
John F. Leicester III
Edwin M. Leidholdt
Alexander Lennox, Jr.
Albert P. Lesperance
Edgar S. Levy, Jr.
Richard E. Lewis
William W. Lewis, Jr.
James E. Liles
Mary J. Linderman
Sara J. Lloyd
Aubrey L. Loeffler
Hubert B. Loheed
Richard L. Lombard
James H. Longworth
Thomas A. Loomis
Warren W. Lord
Albert F. Lovata
John R. Lowdenslager
Charles A. Luff, Jr.
Robert B. Luzader
Robert B. Lyle
Albert C. MacDonald
Stuart C. MacIntire
William E. Madden
William D. Mallinger
Thomas E. Maloney
Richard E. Mankus
Charles W. Mann
Earl Mann
John C. Mape
Arthur L. Markel
Walter G. Markham
Thomas P. Marks
Marvin D. Marsh
George W. Marshall
Lee R. Marshall
Raymond A. Marston
Robert J. Martin
Travis A. Mathis
Thomas E. Matia
Frank E. Matthews
Harley D. Mayfield
Eugene B. W. Meeker
Olive A. Meining
Robert E. Melhorn
James I. Mellencamp
Charles W. Melville, Jr.
Murray Menkes
Clayton W. Merrill
Charles Mertz 3d
Edward W. Meyers
Edward L. Miles
Lee C. Miles
Colvin E. Milham
William T. Mitchell, Jr.
George B. Moore
Howard B. Moore
James R. Moore, Jr.
Randolph Moore
Roderick B. Moore
Sumner K. Moore
William V. Moore
Charles T. Morden
Gloria E. Morenz
Daniel M. Morris
David H. Morris
Donald R. Morris
LeRoy O. Mosher
Eugene C. Moss
Peter R. Moureau
Leonard W. Mulbry
John E. Mulcahy
Justus A. Muller
William L. Mumma
James F. Murphy
William L. Murphy
Eugene R. Murray
James E. Myrick
Robert D. McBain
James A. McCaig
Elmer A. McCallum, Jr.
John K. McConeghy, Jr.
John W. McCord
Richard K. McCorkle
William W. McCue
Jack H. McDonald
Milton C. McFarland
Ralph I. McFarland
Robert S. McGihon
Ted R. McGinnis
Iris C. McGlothlin
Andrew McIntyre
Robert L. McIntyre
Donald A. McIver
Robert B. McKay
Russell R. McKechnie
Marvin "M" McKinley, Jr.
Edward F. McLaughlin, Jr.
Vivian J. McLaughlin
William E. McLuckie
John R. McMahon, Jr.
Thomas D. Nabors, Jr.
Arthur E. Nash
John N. Neal
Robert R. Neely, Jr.
Carl C. Neidlinger
Frederick L. Nelson
Leland E. Nelson
John D. Ness
Leonard H. Nettnin
William L. Neubauer
William L. Newell
Paul W. Nicholson
Richard E. Nicholson
Richard H. Nickerson
Richard D. Nielsen
Frederick M. Nizich
Eugene J. Noblet
Harry M. Noland, Jr.
Dan R. Nolen
Raymond P. Notson
Robert P. Nottingham
Thomas H. Nugent, Jr.
Wedo Nutaitis
John H. Nyhuis
Ronald R. Oberle
Mark J. O'Friel
Robert C. Olsen
Lyle R. Olson
John D. Omvig
Robert W. O'Reilly
Frank W. Orr, Jr.
Edward J. Ortlieb
Burdett A. Otis, Jr.
William B. Otto
Jerry A. Pacillo
Gerald L. Palmer, Jr.
Clarence E. Parker, Jr.
James M. Parnell
Franklin C. Paschal, Jr.
John S. Patton, Jr.
Joseph J. Paulis, Jr.
Jacob L. Pawer, Jr.
Paul A. Peck
Donald W. Perry
Benjamin H. Pester
Edward Phillips
Edward G. Phillips
Ralph T. Phillips
John H. Pickering
William C. Pierson
John A. Pino
Ray C. Pittman
Judith S. Plaster
Ira G. Plouff
Bernard Poppert
Charles S. Porter
Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
Louis C. Potter
William H. Potts, Jr.
William Poulakis
Ross S. Power
Louis J. Previati, Jr.
Byron Price
John P. Prisley
Delton B. Pruner
Theodore W. Pstrak
Harlan R. Purdy
Robert O. Pyle, Jr.
Paul L. Quinn
Wesley L. Ralston
Thomas E. Rand
Charles E. Ransom, Jr.
Hugh B. Rardin
Charles C. Ratcliff
Earl L. Reardon
Jackson B. Reavis
William L. Redmon
Walter L. Rees
Alfred J. Reichel, Jr.
Thomas E. Reilly, Jr.
Henry Remsen
Harvey E. Rennacker
Earl F. Resch
Edwin C. Rice
Elmer A. Rice
William L. Richards, Jr.
Ward P. Riggins, Jr.
Guy W. Riggs
Ernest E. Rivers
Knight M. Robbins
Lonnie J. Robbins
Liona R. Roberts, Jr.
Keith H. Robertson
Clarence O. Robins
Beverly M. Robinson
Rufo W. Robinson
Edward B. Rogers, Jr.
Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
Robert A. Rohr
Allan W. Romans
Brent C. Rosa
Edmund I. Rosendahl
Donald S. Ross
Ernest H. Ross, Jr.
Henry M. Ross
Terry A. Ross
George B. Rothrock, Jr.
Andrew T. Roulston
Clyde A. Reaves, Jr.
Herbert E. Reichert
John Ruggiero
John F. Rule
George E. Russell
John A. Russell
Maclyn K. Russell
Aimo M. Saari
William F. Sallada
Raymond O. Sanders
Kenneth M. Sandon
Charles R. Satterfield
William G. Sawyer
James A. Schader
Arthur S. Schlofman, Jr.
Francis L. Schlude
John F. Schneider, Jr.
Albert R. Schofield, Jr.
Ernest H. Schorz
George M. Schrauth
Lawrence W. Schultheis
Robert A. Schultz
Harold C. Schwan
Richard D. Schwartz
Robert E. Schwoeffermann
Richard U. Scott
Ami W. Sear
Ruell A. Searson
Henry T. Settle, Jr.
William S. Shaffran
William C. Sharpe
Anna M. Shaub
John D. Shaw
Wayne G. Shear
Charles A. Sheehan
Frank H. Sheffield
Peter N. Sherrill
Jack N. Sherwood
Albert F. Shimmel
Richard E. Shimshak
Alfred L. Shiner
Dorothea H. Shinn
Frank J. Shoemaker
Lewis B. Shultz
Edward S. Siergiej
Donald R. Simon
Louis H. Simmons
Paul A. Sims
Walter H. Singleton
William N. Small
Charles A. Smith
George E. Smith
George F. Smith
Harold F. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Robert H. Smith
Nicholas W. Smusyn
Robert K. Smyth
Harland C. Snyder
Charles M. Sodersten
Robert W. Somers
Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr.
Thomas C. Spalding
Raymond W. Spangrud
Ralph R. Speicher, Jr.
Richard H. Sprince
Richard J. Springe
Edward F. Stacy
William A. Staff
Donald E. Stanley
Thomas E. Stanley
Reynold F. Stelloh, Jr.
Bailey D. Sterrett, Jr.
Charles W. Stevens
Robert L. Steward
Arthur J. Storeide
Charles G. Strahley
James B. Stricker, Jr.
Richard Struyk
Max W. Stults
William R. Stuyvesant
Robert T. Styer
George H. Sullivan, Jr.
John P. Sundberg
Joseph L. Sunderlin
Edward P. Supancic
Francis J. Suttill, Jr.
Douglas D. Swift
Dillan W. Taff
Joseph P. Tagliente
Stewart E. Tangeman
Duane A. Tarpenning
Robert M. Tatum
Boone C. Taylor
Robert L. Taylor
Karl R. Thiele
Albert J. Thompson
James J. Thompson
James L. Thompson
Malcolm E. Thompson
Keith E. Thomson
David R. Thornhill
Frank S. Tiernan
Robert E. Tigner
Robert E. Tisdale
Ernest E. Tissot, Jr.
Dennis W. Tomlin
Herbert N. Townsend
Thomas C. Trafzer
Kenneth M. Treadwell
Paul R. Tripp
James R. Trommlitz
John C. Tsiknas
Neely E. Turner
James F. Turney
Nicholas J. Vagianos
Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
Robert F. Valentine
Eldon P. Varner
Savino Vesco
Carlos C. Villarreal
John E. Vinsel
John C. Vogel
Robert H. Wade
William F. Wade
Quentin W. Wagenfield
William G. Wagner
Daniel P. Walchko
James W. Walker, Jr.
Robert N. Wallis
William G. Walston
Glenn W. Ward
James F. Ward, II
Charles E. Waring, Jr.
Lawrence C. Warren
Richard K. Watson
Dean E. Webster
William Wegner
Elbert N. Wells
James K. Welsh, Jr.
Howard W. Westervelt, Jr.
Otis V. Wheeler, Jr.
Richard O. Wheeler
Charles J. White
John F. White, Jr.
Joseph P. White
James R. Whitehead
Charles A. Whitmore, Jr.
Eugene H. Whittlesey
Lloyd C. Wholey
Alan S. Wilhite
Gilbert Wilkes, 3d
Peter A. Williams
Stanley Williams
Stanwix M. Williams
William E. Willingham, Jr.
George M. A. Willows
Joseph A. Wilson
Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
John G. Wissler
William K. Witthaus
John C. Wold
Arthur O. Wolf
Dwight E. Wood, Jr.
Robert C. Wood
William H. Wood III
Kyle H. Woodbury
Thomas Woods II
Guy G. Wooten
David L. Wright
George S. Wright
Walter J. Wright, Jr.
Robert E. Wurlitzer
Robert T. Wurzbacher
Louis J. Yakich
Billy G. Yarbrough
Karel E. Yedlicka
Richard E. Young
Robert M. Young
David E. Zacharias
Ellis M. Zacharias, Jr.
Robert A. Zajichek
Walter P. Ziarnik
Austin L. Zicht
Jack P. Zimmerman

SUPPLY CORPS

Augustine A. Albanese
Edmund S. Armstrong
Robert P. Barber
William H. Bason

James D. Bennett
Floyd E. Bergeaux
James C. Billings, Jr.
Mack B. Bingham
Roger C. Bliss
William E. Borchert
Charles R. Braley, Jr.
William G. Brendle
James H. Breunlin
John M. Bristow
Leonard E. Brock
Robert T. Broili
John W. Bruner
Ramon L. Burke
Elwood A. Carmer
Dan M. Carpenter
James H. H. Carrington
LeRoy T. Carter
William F. Cecil
George I. Chegin
Francis J. Chester
Norman D. Chetlin
Henry A. L. Church
Donald H. Corson, Jr.
James A. Cox
Cassel O. Crain
Wayne R. Crozier
William J. Crutchfield
Michael Dasovich
Martin J. Deutch
William F. Doddy
Harry C. Dolbeck
Howard H. Dolch, Jr.
Robert F. Dunbar
Kenneth W. Dunwody, Jr.
Vaughn H. Earley
Glendale M. Eaton
George P. Edgerton
Leonard D. Ellingwood
Melvin I. Freedman
Homer Fults
Gerald K. Gamber
Robert L. Ghormley, Jr.
William F. Glase
Lewis E. Gleason
John C. Green
William M. Hamilton
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr.
Paul C. Herndon, Jr.
Harvey R. Humphrey
Dale E. Jackson
William H. Jeffery
William E. Johnston
Harold Kearsley
Andrew Khourie
Milton E. Kreyenhagen
Robert S. Leventhal
Charles L. Lewis
Walter E. Linthicum
Harold B. Lipschutz
John J. Mahaffey
James R. Martin
Richard C. May
Raymond A. Medlin
Donald C. Mehaffey
Roy D. Monnie
Karol M. Morphew
Edwards M. Morris
David F. Morrow
Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr.
George A. Murphy
Walter M. McCandless
William J. McMordie
Carl H. Newman
Wilson M. Obendorfer
Dean O. Powell
John B. Pringle
John W. Randall
Raymond B. Renne
Harold L. Robiner
Charles E. P. Schappacher
Ben R. Schmidt
Robert V. Schmidt
Homer D. Simons, Jr.
John G. Slattery
James H. Smeds
Morris M. Smith
Ralph A. Smith
Roy F. Smith
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
Warren E. Steele
Philip A. P. Stine
Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.
Charles L. Suit III
Charles C. Swanke
Darrell E. Swenson
Clarence G. Tatum
Kay K. Thurman
George D. Tracy
Howard A. True
Kiehl E. Underhill
Richard E. Utman
Wesley W. Van Malsen
Wayne S. Vroman
John W. Walsh
Stephen J. Walsh
Robert L. Weaver
Kenneth B. Webster
James E. Weibel
Harry K. Welge
Paul B. White
Warren P. White
Robert G. Whitman
Emmett J. Wild
Leslie W. Williams
Fred I. Woodworth, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Domenico N. Bibbo
Charles W. Calhoun
Robert G. Carroll
Francis W. Day
James C. Day, Jr.
Robert E. Dickman
Sydney W. Dunn, Jr.
Arnold W. Ebert
Richard M. Fluss
Ray W. Foreaker, Jr.
Herbert R. Foster
Howard D. Graessle II
Charles W. Gulick, Jr.
Arthur E. Hackett
Wayne C. Hall, Jr.
Robert F. Harsch
Jerry D. Harshman
George L. Hoffmann
Charles B. Hogan
Steven K. Kauffman
William Kieck, Jr.
Edward F. Krueger
Robert S. Lee, Jr.
George A. Leighton, Jr.
Edward L. MacCordy
Nestor P. Michaleczko
John W. Murdock
Philip J. McEleney
Edward A. McManus
Raymond D. Phillips
Robert R. Raber
Harry L. Rimmer, Jr.
Charles D. Rohay
Colonel J. Shook, Jr.
David M. Smith
Jack M. Thornburgh
Richard L. Tinklepaugh
Nicholas F. Truog
Robert C. Vance
John D. Watson, Jr.
Marvin A. Weir
Dexter M. Welton
Frank D. Wilson
Robert L. Winkler
Robert P. Woodworth
Robert F. Jostberg
Anson C. Perkins

NURSE CORPS

Arlene B. Albany
Betty J. Alexander
Edna L. Archibald
Jane F. Arseneault
Marguerite Asci
Geneva W. Babitsky
Margaret T. Barrow
Anna M. Belaire
Ann A. Bergen
Marie M. Boatman
Wanda C. Bowman
Reba M. Bradford
Eileen A. Butler
Joan E. Burch
Janice M. Burcham
Marion A. Burger
Jean D. Cairns
Virginia M. Cardillo
Mary E. Carmickle
Emma L. Carroll
Cristina H. Chacon
Margaret E. Chapman
Kathleen J. Christensen
Nell M. Chumley
Patricia M. Clark
Virginia M. Cleary
Josephine L. Croftchik
Nancy J. Crosby
Dorothy K. Cummings
Helen Daroska
Betty M. Davis
Mary M. Deak
Daisy L. Deem
Mary I. Deksnys
Nettie A. DeLisa
Florence J. Delynko
Winifrede Devan
Helen M. DeWitt
Vivian M. M. Dicke
Geraldine K. Dignen
Janet F. Dixon
Patricia L. Dowell
Catherine R. Dupuis
Barbara Ellis
Alyeene L. Emfinger
Dorothy K. Erickson
Joan T. Ernst
Marilyn Ewing
Lorraine V. Feifer
Jean M. Fitzpatrick
Dessie J. Flood
Elizabeth A. Folan
Lillie M. Frank
Dorothy M. Frison
Dorothy H. Fuller
Dorothy J. Garber
Norma H. Gardill
Norma J. Geho
Rita A. Gervais
Mary E. Glavin
Bessie Gochis
Rebecca Gomez
Dorothy J. Goodell
Marcia O. Graham
Ruth L. Grass
Betty L. Gregorio
Sara J. Grieve
Alice T. Griffin
Frances T. Griffin
Rosemary L. Gunn
Dorothy G. Haiduven
Shirley A. Harbaum
Laura C. Haring
Anna G. Hart
Rhoda C. Hilke
Beverly A. Hoellworth
Joan L. Huber
Leslie E. Hylton
Barbara E. Hull
Louise M. Jablonske
Louise F. Jakshe
Virginia M. Jennings
Marie A. Johncola
Marion G. Johnson
Betty J. Jones
Catherine B. Jones
Eva D. Jones
Lenora M. Judy
Esther T. Kaczmarek
Phyllis N. Keene
Helen A. Kenyon
Margaret E. Kissinger
Frances S. Klein
Vila L. Knuth
Aldona Krushinski
Patricia R. Laisure
Clara J. Leoni
Veronica A. Lesho
Jean M. Little
Cornelia F. Long
Elsie M. Lovely
Kathleen M. Malloy
Ann Manley
Dorothy L. Martin
Lois C. Merritt
Dolores Michalski
Marcel A. Mickiewicz
Jeanne M. Milles
Betty M. Millsop
Dorothy E. Moore
Doris M. Mortimer
Arline L. Murphy
Mary P. McCarthy
Esther G. D. Nielsen
Shirley E. Norman
Cecile R. Normandin
Elizabeth J. O'Brien
Mary E. H. O'Brien
Kathleen J. O'Kane
Regina M. Olko
Celia Olshefski
Maribelle Page
Angie L. Pettit
Jean B. Pieczarka
Charlotte R. Pierce
Luisa A. Power
Martha J. Preuss
Evelyn F. Przybylek
Muriel E. Ramage
Gloria V. Rapp
Velva D. Ray
Muriel H. Riley
Nathalie A. Roark
Agnes M. Roberts
Ruth C. Robinson
Phyllis A. Rodenbaugh
Patricia A. Roe
Helen Roller
Katherine E. Roth
Dorothy L. Rowe
Edna J. Rundell
Madeleine J. Ruppert
Margaret Russell
Owedia M. Searcy
Florence J. Settlemyer
Katherine G. Shea
Carolyn J. Shearer
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short
"E." Marie Smith
Leona Soback
Angeline J. Spotto
Melva Stankovich
Anna M. Stary
Ruth M. Stephens
Gloria J. Sterling
Mary J. Stevenson
Margaret J. Stewart
Lillis L. Stoops
Betty J. Streeb
Ellen E. Stricklin
Mae B. Stumm
Dorothy N. Sweetman
Bernice Szostak
Alfreda Szkodna
Lucy I. Tarvin
Elizabeth Taylor
Mary R. Thames
June R. Thurnau
Dolores Troskoski
Virginia C. Trujillo
Katherine Vagenas
Barbara Warner
Mary M. Wein
Marjory H. Werme
Frances C. Whitlock
Ann E. Wiggins
Lillian R. Wojnarowski
Joan A. Wunder
Loree Young
Kathryn E. Zabel
Dorothy Zulick

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter B. Pruett, Methodist Church, Carrollton, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art on earth as well as in heaven, we thank Thee for the privilege that is ours of bearing various responsibilities these days. Realizing that we cannot do well enough the deeds that must be done unless we turn to Thee, we pause now to commune with Thee. Grant unto us, we pray, the insight to see clearly the problems that face us and are our responsibility, the wisdom to find the best possible solution for each problem, and the strength and courage we need to do the things we thereby feel to be according to Thy will.

These things we pray as Thy most humble children. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday and Wednesday next for 30 minutes each day, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TAXES ON LIQUOR

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Mirror.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the Secretary of the Treasury has suggested that additional taxes be levied upon spiritous liquors. We are all cognizant of the necessity of raising revenues in these trying times. However, those who are suggesting that taxes be placed upon items that are already highly taxed seem to forget the law of diminishing returns. The high tax that is now in existence on liquors has been the cause of increased bootlegging. Reports from Secretary Snyder's own Department admit that there is more bootlegging today than at any time since the repeal of prohibition. Wherever a gallon of illicit untaxed liquor is sold, a gallon of licensed legitimate liquor is not sold and the Government loses at least $9.

Some people who should know allege that 20 percent of the liquor that is being consumed in this country today does not pay any Government tax since it is illicitly manufactured. There is no doubt that the illegal liquor is inferior in taste, contents and body, but because of its cheapness can more than compete in certain circles with a licensed product. If we are going to place an additional tax on liquor, you may rest assured that the flood of bootlegging liquor throughout the country will cause a serious loss of income to our Government.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of February 1, 1951]

THAT MAN IS HERE AGAIN

G-men and Suffolk County cops made a call Monday on a dilapidated house in a remote section of North Babylon, Long Island, where the United States Government lost $1,795,500.

Uncle Sam took that rap in uncollected taxes. The State of New York was also a loser, to the amount of $157,500.

Not to keep you in suspense, the raided house contained a 500-gallon-a-day still, which had been happily cooking up 190-proof whisky for a period of 7 months.

Well, naive as we are, we had believed the bootlegger went out of business with the death of prohibition. So we investigated.

Here are some of the results:

Bootlegging is a bigger business today than at any time since the eighteenth amendment went off the books in 1933.

In 1949, for which complete statistics are available, Federal, State, and local police officers throughout the United States confiscated 18,884 stills which had a combined capacity of 529,456 gallons daily. These stills are estimated to have operated an average of 90 days each before they were knocked off.

For each day they functioned, there was a Federal and State tax loss of $5,543,920, or a total tax loss of $498,952,800 for the 90-day average period.

The basic Federal excise tax on whisky is $9 per 100-proof gallon, and the average State tax is $1.48 per 100-proof gallon. (New York State tax is $1.50.) It should be noted that there are many other taxes on legal liquor, but the above are the principal and basic ones.

Only in the last peak years of prohibition was the bootlegger more active than he is today.

In those dry years, enforcement officers were confiscating stills at the rate of 25,000 a year—a figure which compares with the 18,884 stills put out of business in 1949.

The incentives for the distiller and distributor of "rot gut" illegal whisky are the same as they were during prohibition and in about the same degree—big, quick, easy money.

He starts right off with a $10.48 (per 100-proof gallon) tax advantage over his legal competitor. He can sell a gallon of his poisonous product, usually 190-proof, for as low as $4 or $5.

One gallon of bootleg whisky of 190-proof can be cut into 2 gallons of salable liquor.

The bootlegger, of course, has few of the other expenses of the legal manufacturer.

He does not have to pay for insurance, analysis, warehousing, or financing. True, his product may be injurious to health, even fatal, but what does he care? He is not liable.

We have always believed that the American people, when they junked the eighteenth amendment, were not so much voting liquor back in as they were voting bootlegging, gangsterism, and vast empires of corruption out.

We don't know what the full solution is to the present, and rather alarming, rebirth of the illegal hootch business.

Obviously, more enforcement is necessary to protect the Government's own legal sources of taxation. The Federal Government today does not have enough "revenooers" to more than whittle away at the edges of the bootlegging industry.

Obviously, also, liquor is something which should be taxed, and taxed heavily, but there is a point beyond which taxation cannot go.

In other words, Government—Federal and State—should not recreate, by taxes, a corrupt and abominable situation which the people killed by ballot.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] for proposing, and the Committee on Ways and Means for accepting, the amendment prohibiting future trade concessions to Soviet Russia and those nations she dominates. I am also sympathetic with the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which was ruled not in order, and which would have applied to existing agreements.

I am hopeful that the action of the committee in agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin indicates that favorable consideration will be given to a resolution, introduced by me and a number of my colleagues during the Eighty-first Congress, and reintroduced in this Congress. My resolution provides "that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such action as may be necessary to rescind any foreign-trade agreement negotiated with any foreign country, or any instrumentality thereof, under the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, if the Secretary of State is of the opinion that the government of such foreign country is Communist controlled."

When this resolution had been pending before the committee last Congress for many months, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] filed a discharge petition, which, unfortunately failed.

I had intended to offer this resolution as an amendment to H. R. 1612 yesterday, but because of the tradition to recognize only members of the committee, was not able to offer it. The point of order raised against the first proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin precluded my offering it as a substitute, and the rapidity with which the committee accepted his second proposal, prevented its being offered a second time. To secure any relief to American industry, the principles announced in the amendment, must apply to existing treaties.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can obtain action on the resolution itself. I believe if we do, it will pass, and grant to our industry the relief sought to prevent unfair competition.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 55)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Annual Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1951.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 37) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "202", strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 4, 1951, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there an amendment to the resolution?

Mr. STANLEY. There is no amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire as to how the amount carried this year compares with the amount carried last year?

Mr. STANLEY. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress there was appropriated $200,000; in the second session an additional $150,000 was appropriated of which $25,000 was unexpended as of January 1, 1951.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This carries the amount, then, that was appropriated during the first session of the last Congress.

Mr. STANLEY. Yes, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am, of course, in favor of the continuance of this committee. I think it has done a splendid job, but I have been considerably worried, to tell the frank truth, by the fact that the committee has not met since January 1. Many people believe that there was a little slow-down in the committee last year. I hope those beliefs are not well-founded. But I think when the committee is asking for money at this time that we ought to have an understanding as to whether the committee is going to do what it was set up to do, whether it is going to carry on this great work of exposing communism in the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I may state that the clerks of the committee have not been paid since December, and the committee has not met for the reason that we have had no appropriation. The only staff we have are the people who are willing to serve in the belief that ultimately they will be compensated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Might I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the members of the committee are all Members of Congress? They are paid to be here and they ought to have had a meeting before now.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to remind the minority leader that the ranking Member on the Republican side has been ill, and out of deference to him we have been waiting for some information concerning his attitude on certain things we intend to do.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania it is true that the ranking member on the Republican side is ill, but the other three minority members are here and ready to go to work.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this committee was never more important than it is today. Our danger from communism is at home. This country is permeated with them and they are going underground, many of them getting on the Federal payroll. I would like to see this committee get all the money it needs and at the same time I would like to see them speed up some of these investigations and expose the enemies within our gates. While our boys are being killed, or freezing to death in Korea, these Reds ought not to be permitted to undermine their country. For God's sake, let us protect the country at home.

Mr. STANLEY. In reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to state that under Executive order dated March 1947 the President designated the Committee on Un-American Activities as a source of information to check in connection with loyalty investigations in the executive departments and also in other departments, and further to report on the activities of this committee. During 1950 representatives of the executive departments and other agencies, including Central Intelligence, the FBI, the Metropolitan Police, and the United States Secret Service, made over 3,600 visits to the office to investigate and see the files of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What did that committee do after they made all of these visits? I do not mean the Un-American Activities Committee. I mean the President's committee.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been making a great point of the fact that the President's committee visited the office of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. STANLEY. That was in reply to the gentleman's statement that there had been no activity. I was informing him there had been considerable activity since 1950.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not say that the committee was not active.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman said there was a slow-down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There has been a slow-down of the work of the committee which we all regret, because we take great pride in what the committee has accomplished in the past. We want it to go ahead and do a similar work in the future. I am not protesting this amount, I think it is very small, but I do hope that the committee will be stimulated a little to proceed with its work.

Mr. STANLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to make a comment and also propound a query. First of all, I think it is quite a tribute to the House Committee on Un-American Activities that the President has seen fit to issue an Executive order permitting the various intelligence agencies and other agencies of the Government to turn to the files of the Un-America Activities Committee for information. This would indicate that the committee has in past years obtained a lot of important information on matters of loyalty; but it seems to me to be rather a sad commentary that while the President of the United States has seen fit to turn to a congressional committee to obtain information on questions of loyalty somehow or other the Congress of the United States has been unable to obtain from the various agencies of the Government under the control of the Executive the information that it desires as to the question of loyalty of many employees.

I rose to ask the gentleman whether or not any of this amount of $200,000 carried in the resolution can be used for the printing of testimony or reports?

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to the gentleman that it cannot be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It cannot be used for the printing of hearings?

Mr. STANLEY. In the breakdown of the proposal on expenditures there is nothing to that effect. It cannot be used for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am interested, because there was considerable testimony given last year before this committee as to communistic activities in Ohio, and it was seemingly impossible to get any printed or even typed copies of that testimony during the latter part of 1950. I am wondering if there is any way that that testimony can be made available to the Members of Congress as well as to the people of Ohio who, being rather patriotic Americans, are very much interested in the communistic activities that have been going on in the State of Ohio, and the persons who are responsible therefor.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I am quite certain that the gentleman from Ohio, zealous as he always is in safeguarding the interests and right sof the American people, will agree that it would be a very dangerous thing to publish the testimony of a man who was committed on several occasions to mental institutions, who was convicted of crimes and whose statements before the committee, statements under oath, were not true as checks made by the investigators of our committee will disclose. There is no reason why any Member of Congress cannot see that testimony, but when they do examine it, I know that they will reach the conclusion that was reached by the members of the committee, that it was very dangerous, to say the least.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Might I reply to the gentleman by saying that, of course, each Member of Congress should have the opportunity to see the testimony and to judge for himself the correctness of the statements that have been made. I certainly have the highest respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, I am not unmindful of the fact that the gentleman to whom he refers as being a witness before the committee was, for a great many years, a representative of and an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation who somehow or other found him sufficiently capable and sufficiently honest to use him and to predicate upon his investigations many of the actions taken by the FBI, and whether he be completely pure as the wind-driven snow or not, I believe that the great State of Ohio and the great newspapers of that State

that helped to reveal these activities have the right to know just what is what, and when is when, and who is who, and to judge for themselves. I am rather of the opinion, with all due respect, that perhaps the people of the State of Ohio are as capable of passing on the veracity and the honesty and the mental capacity of this gentleman as the Members of the committee or the Members of Congress, and I hope that the records may be made available.

Mr. WALTER. Just to keep the record straight, the man to whom the gentleman refers was never an agent of the FBI. He was, to use the technical term that was applied to him by a representative of that organization, an unpaid stool pigeon. I hope that the gentleman will distinguish that status from that of an agent of the FBI.

The distinguished minority leader has talked about the lack of activity on the part of this committee during the last Congress, and in that regard at this point I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the report on the work done during the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses. I am sure that after the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Massachusetts have examined that record, they will reach the conclusion that the committee did lots more work during the Eighty-first Congress than at any time in the history of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HEARINGS AND REPORTS RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES FROM 1945 TO DATE (79TH, 80TH, 81ST CONGS.)

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Titles and dates

Hearings regarding Office of Price Administration, June 20, 21, 27, 1945.

Hearings regarding Communist Party, September 26, 27, October 17–19, 1945.

Testimony of Gerald L. K. Smith, January 30, 1946.

Hearings regarding Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, April 4, 1946.

Testimony of Louis F. Budenz, November 22, 1946.

Reports

No. 1829: Proceeding against Dr. Edward K. Barsky and others, March 28, 1946.

No. 1936: Proceeding against the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, April 16, 1946.

No. 1996: Sources of Financial Aid for Subversive and Un-American Propaganda, May 10, 1946.

No. —: Citations by official Federal Government or State or municipal agencies regarding the character of organization named, May 29, 1946.

No. 2233: Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, June 7, 1946.

No. 2354: Proceedings against Corliss G. Lamont, June 12, 1946.

No. 2707: Proceeding against George Marshall, July 31, 1946.

No. 2708: Proceeding against Richard Morford, July 31, 1946.

No. 2742: Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, January 2, 1947.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Hearings on Gerhart Eisler, February 6, 1947.

Hearings regarding Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen, March 5, 21, 1947.

Hearings regarding H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States, March 24–28, 1947.

Testimony of Walter S. Steele, July 21, 1947.

Testimony of Victor A. Kravchenko, July 22, 1947.

Hearings regarding Hanns Eisler, September 24–26, 1947.

Hearings regarding the Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry, October 20–24, 27–30, 1947.

Reports

No. 209: The Communist Party as an agent of a foreign power, April 1, 1947.

No. 271: American Youth for Democracy, April 17, 1947.

No. 592: Southern Conference for Human Welfare, June 12, 1947.

No. 1115: Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization, September 2, 1947.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Hearings on proposed legislation to curb or control the Communist Party of the United States, February 5, 6, 9–11, 19, 20, 1948.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government, July 31, August 3–5, 7, 9–13, 16–18, 20, 24–27, 30, September 8, 9, 1948.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government, part II, December 7–10, 14, 1948.

Reports

Report to the full committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Un-American Activities, March 18, 1948.

Decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in re *Edward Barsky et al*, Appellants, v. *United States of America*, Appellee (majority and dissenting opinions), March 24, 1948.

Report of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Proposed Legislation to Control Subversive Communist Activities in the United States, April 10, 1948.

Report No. 1844, to accompany H. R. 5852, April 30, 1948.

No. 1920: Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of the Government by force and violence, May 11, 1948.

Constitutionality of H. R. 5852, Eightieth Congress, second session, June 3, 1948.

Interim report on hearings regarding Soviet espionage within the United States Government, August 28, 1948.

Excerpts from hearings regarding investigation of Communist activities in connection with the atom bomb, September 9, 14, 16, 1948.

Report on Soviet espionage activities in connection with the atom bomb, September 28, 1948.

Index II to publications of Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies committee), and the Committee on Un-American Activities 1942–47, inclusive, October 21, 1948.

Citations by official Government agencies or organizations and publications found to be Communist or Communist fronts, December 18, 1948.

Decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in re the *United States* v. *Leon Josephson*, December 19, 1947.

Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the United States House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, December 31, 1948.

Soviet Espionage Within the United States Government, second report, December 31, 1948.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the U. S. A.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Government (see revised edition December 1, 1950).

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Documentary testimony of Gen. Izyador Modelski, former military attaché of the Polish Embassy, Washington, D. C., March 31, April 1, 1949.

Soviet Espionage Activities in Connection With Jet Propulsion and Aircraft, June 6, 1949.

Hearings regarding Steve Nelson, June 8, 1949.

Hearings regarding Tomo Babin, May 27, July 6, 1949.

Testimony of Paul Crouch, May 6, 1949.

Testimony of Philip O. Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney and statement regarding their background, May 24, 25, June 9, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume I, April 22, 26, May 25, June 10, 14, 1949.

Hearings regarding Clarence Hiskey, including testimony of Paul Crouch, May 24, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 1, July 13, 14, 18, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 2, July 14, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 1 (local 601, UERMWA, CIO, Pittsburgh, Pa.), August 9–11, 1949.

Hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia, part 1, June 28, 29, July 6, 12, 28, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume II (identification of scientist X), August 26, 1949; July 1, September 10, 1948; August 14, September 14, 27, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 2 (security measures relating to officials of the UERMWA, CIO), December 5, 6, 1949.

Testimony of James Sterling Murray and Edward Tiers Manning (regarding Clarence Hiskey and Arthur Adams), August 14, October 5, 1949.

Hearings regarding shipment of atomic material to the Soviet Union during World War II, December 5, 7, 1949; January 23–25, 26, March 2, 3, 7, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic (undercover agent), February 21–23, March 13, 14, 24, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 1, April 10–12, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 2, April 13–15, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, April 20, 21, 25, 29, May 4–6, 1950; July 30, August 7, 1948; June 8, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Territory of Hawaii, part 3 and appendix and index, April 17–19, 1950.

Hearings on legislation to outlaw certain un-American and subversive activities, March 21–23, 28, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, part 2, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic (including appendix and index), March 24, 25, 1950.

Testimony of Philip A. Bart (general manager of Freedom of the Press, publishers of

the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party) and Marcel Scherer (coordinator, New York Labor Conference for Peace and formerly district representative of district 4, UERMWA, CIO), June 21, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist activities in the Cincinnati, Ohio, area, part 1, July 12–15, August 8, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, part 3 (testimony of Josh White), September 1, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, August 28, 31, September 1, 15, 1950.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, part 3, based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic and documents of Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, June 22, September 28, October 13, 21, 1950.

Hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia, part 2, December 6, 11–13, 1950.

Testimony of Edward G. Robinson, October 27, December 21, 1950.

American aspects of assassination of Leon Trotsky, July 26, August 30, October 18, 19, December 4, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic-bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume 3, December 20–22, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions, part 3, August 29, 30, 1950.

Hearings regarding Communist espionage, November 8, December 2, 1949, February 27, March 1, 1950.

Testimony of Hazel Scott Powell, September 22, 1950.

Reports

Spotlight on Spies, released March 23, 1949.

No. 1954: Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City, March 25–27, 1949; April 19, 1949.

No. 1951: Report on the American Slav Congress and Associated Organizations, June 26, 1949.

No. 1952: Report on Atomic Espionage (Nelson-Weinberg and Hiskey-Adams cases), September 29, 1949.

No. 1953: Report on the Congress of American Women, October 23, 1949.

No. 1950: Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1949, March 15, 1950.

Index III to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, June 28, 1950.

No. 2986: Report on Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee, a Communist Front, August 24, 1950.

No. 3123: Report on the National Lawyers Guild, Legal Bulwark of the Communist Party, September 21, 1950.

Report on the Honolulu Record, October 1, 1950.

No. 3248: Report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, a Communist Lobby, December 7, 1950.

No. 3249: Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1950, January 2, 1951.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism (revised) series; in the United States of America, and Religion, and Education, and Labor, and Government, and Spotlight on Spies, December 1, 1950.

Public Law 831: Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 9490, Internal Security Act of 1950, September 22, 1950.

No. 2980: Report to accompany H. R. 9490, August 22, 1950.

No. 3112: Conference report to accompany H. R. 9490, September 19, 1950.

No. 2847: Proceedings against Julius Emspak, August 10, 1950.

No. 2848: Proceedings against Steve Nelson, August 10, 1950.

No. 2849: Proceedings against Philip Bart, August 10, 1950.

No. 2855: Proceedings against James J. Matles, August 11, 1950.

No. 2856: Proceedings against Thomas J. Fitzpatrick, August 11, 1950.

No. 2857: Proceedings against Thomas Quinn, August 11, 1950.

No. 2858: Proceedings against Frank Panzino, August 11, 1950.

No. 2859: Proceedings against Ralph Tokunaga, August 11, 1950.

No. 2860: Proceedings against Charles Fujimoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2861: Proceedings against Dwight James Freeman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2862: Proceedings against Esther Bristow, August 11, 1950.

No. 2863: Proceedings against Rachel Saiki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2864: Proceedings against John Reinecke, August 11, 1950.

No. 2865: Proceedings against Ernest Arena, August 11, 1950.

No. 2866: Proceedings against Koichi Imori, August 11, 1950.

No. 2867: Proceedings against Denichi Kimoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2868: Proceedings against Pearl Freeman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2869: Proceedings against Marshall McEuen, August 11, 1950.

No. 2870: Proceedings against Ruth Ozaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2871: Proceedings against Stephen Murin, August 11, 1950.

No. 2872: Proceedings against Jack Hall, August 11, 1950.

No. 2873: Proceedings against Frank Silva, August 11, 1950.

No. 2874: Proceedings against Jack Kawano, August 11, 1950.

No. 2875: Proceedings against John Akana, August 11, 1950.

No. 2876: Proceedings against Yukio Abe, August 11, 1950.

No. 2877: Proceedings against Yasuki Arakaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2878: Proceedings against Edward Hong, August 11, 1950.

No. 2879: Proceedings against Kameo Ichimuri, August 11, 1950.

No. 2880: Proceedings against Douglas Inouye, August 11, 1950.

No. 2881: Proceedings against Levi Kealoha, August 11, 1950.

No. 2882: Proceedings against Adele Kensinger, August 11, 1950.

No. 2883: Proceedings against Benjamin Kaahawinui, August 11, 1950.

No. 2884: Proceedings against Frank Kalua, August 11, 1950.

No. 2885: Proceedings against Yoshita Marumo, August 11, 1950.

No. 2886: Proceedings against Robert Murasaki, August 11, 1950.

No. 2887: Proceedings against Robert McElrath, August 11, 1950.

No. 2888: Proceedings against Julian Napuunoa, August 11, 1950.

No. 2889: Proceedings against Tadashi (Castner) Ogawa, August 11, 1950.

No. 2890: Proceedings against Hideo Okada, August 11, 1950.

No. 2891: Proceedings against Wilfred Oka, August 11, 1950.

No. 2892: Proceedings against Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, August 11, 1950.

No. 2893: Proceedings against Mitsuo Shimizu, August 11, 1950.

No. 2894: Proceedings against Frank Takahashi, August 11, 1950.

No. 2895: Proceedings against Shigeo Takemoto, August 11, 1950.

No. 2896: Proceedings against Ralph Vossbrink, August 11, 1950.

No. 2897: Proceedings against Thomas Yagi, August 11, 1950.

No. 2898: Proceedings against Giovanni Rossi Lomanitz, August 11, 1950.

No. 2899: Proceedings against David Joseph Bohm, August 11, 1950.

No. 2900: Proceedings against Irving David Fox, August 11, 1950.

No. 2901: Proceedings against Clarence Hiskey, August 11, 1950.

No. 2902: Proceedings against Frank Hashmall, August 11, 1950.

No. 2903: Proceedings against Talmadge Raley, August 11, 1950.

No. 2904: Proceedings against Esther Tice, August 11, 1950.

No. 2905: Proceedings against Marcel Scherer, August 11, 1950.

No. 2906: Proceedings against Mrs. Louise Berman, August 11, 1950.

No. 2907: Proceedings against Pasquale Leonard James Branca, August 11, 1950.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman in conclusion, for I do not want to prolong this discussion, that, having been unable to see the record to which the gentleman referred, I am unable to judge whether his statement is correct or whether the statements made by the Cincinnati Enquirer, the greatest Democratic paper in the Middle West, in which it exposed all of these activities, or attempted to, and made statements and wrote the complete story of the undercover agents, and quoted FBI agents, by the way, have been correct. If I could read all the testimony I might know.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, the witness about whom the gentleman is talking first testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us look at the record; then we can judge by that.

Mr. WALTER. The then Republican-controlled Committee on Un-American Activities reached the same conclusion that the Committee on Un-American Activities reached in the Eighty-first Congress, and did not release the testimony of the witness that they felt was irresponsible. The then Republican-controlled Committee on Education and Labor also heard this witness during the Eightieth Congress and they also did not release his testimony.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let us see the testimony.

Mr. WALTER. I extend to the gentleman from Ohio an invitation to go to the Committee on Un-American Activities at his leisure and examine the record.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's cordial invitation. I hope the other members of the committee will join in that. I should like to see that record. I have been trying to see it for a good many months, and so have the people of Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I say to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that I assume we are talking about one Matthew Cvetic, who testified. Is that correct? The gentleman was talking about the testimony of Mr. Cvetic?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; the gentleman has one of the eastern Ohio men in mind. I do not believe the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I was not inquiring about Mr. Cvetic, or whatever his name is.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to point out to the gentleman that I tried to get some information from the Committee on Un-

American Activities, as apparently the gentleman did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He is from eastern Ohio, I think.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No, he is from Pittsburgh. He is alleged to have named some people in eastern Ohio who were Communists. I was interested in finding out about it. Some of the members of that staff over there, who seemed to be perhaps in their own opinion more important than Members of Congress, first decided that I could not see it. Later, perhaps after they screened me, they decided it would be safe to let me look at it, and I did get access to it.

Mr. WALTER. The testimony of Matthew Cvetic, whose name was just mentioned, has been printed and is a matter of public record, so all the gentleman from Ohio has to do is get a copy of his testimony. It is printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I realize it is printed now, but at the time I wanted it it was not printed and it was not easy to get from some of the employees of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

May I say further that it is no fault of the House Administration Committee that the Un-American Activities Committee has not had their money before this, because, the minute a meeting was called of the subcommittee on Accounts, we went in there and heard the chairman and the ranking majority member. They asked for $200,000, and the subcommittee unanimously voted to give it to them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman will agree we are both very much interested, as are all the people in Ohio, in seeing any Communist activities in our State exposed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All we are trying to do is get the information, so that we may proceed accordingly. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman tell me if this resolution, House Resolution 42, brought up today is any different in its language than the resolution that was brought up a year ago?

Mr. STANLEY. There is no difference.

Mr. KEARNEY. If that is so, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia why it is that this resolution then does not cover the expense of printing the testimony of the various witnesses.

Mr. STANLEY. The resolution will be offered when the Committee on Un-American Activities desires to have its hearings published, or it can have certain publications made under its own appropriations, that is already made.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I am delighted that there seems to be a revival of righteousness at the other end of the Avenue, so far as the Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned. I certainly hope they will now release the Condon letter which the FBI wrote a few years ago.

I call your attention to the fact that on the front page of the paper this morning there is carried the story of the conviction of Remington. I tried to cross-examine Miss Bentley about Remington in the Eightieth Congress and I was denied that opportunity by the then chairman of the committee. Miss Bentley had been a Communist and she knew them and had been associated with them. Every time one of these Communists has repented and turned state's evidence, they have been able to produce documents. But we have never been able to get that letter which the FBI wrote about Condon.

And then they put Anna Rosenberg at the head of the Department of National Defense, you might say. This man DeSola was a Communist. He had turned state's evidence and he pointed to her and said, "She is the individual." They said she was the wrong Anna Rosenberg.

But if you ever saw her or her picture, you would know that nobody could mistake her for someone else. Besides, in the Dies Committee report she is mentioned four times in appendix IX and she is called "Anna M. Rosenberg," in the reference appendix thereto. Yet she has been placed in the most responsible position over the manpower of the Nation. This man Condon is still down there at the head of the Bureau of Standards, after all that information which the FBI dug up. Then that report was concealed and the Committee on Un-American Activities was denied access to it when the Committee on Un-American Activities was trying to expose the Communists within our gates.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the charge against Anna Rosenberg, I would like to the say to the gentleman that a committee of another body has come out with a unanimous report on Mrs. Rosenberg and confirmed her appointment unanimously.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am wondering if the members of the committee of the minority have been informed, if the funds become available today, which I assume they will be, when we will have a meeting to organize the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. It is the understanding that the committee is already organized and has been organized from the beginning of this Congress.

Mr. POTTER. If that is true, then they failed to notify the minority members.

Mr. STANLEY. Of course the gentleman would have to get that information from the committee itself. The Committee on House Administration, of course, does not go into the question of the operation of the committee.

Mr. POTTER. Would the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, so that the Members will know and have some idea as to when the committee will meet to organize?

Mr. STANLEY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of having the gentleman from Michigan propound a question.

Mr. POTTER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have any idea now that the money, as I assume, will be made available, when the committee will have its first meeting to organize?

Mr. WALTER. According to my information, a meeting was scheduled yesterday on the theory that by that time this money would have been appropriated and we would know where we were. But the brother of Mr. WOOD, chairman of the committee, died and was buried on yesterday, and for that reason the meeting was called off.

Mr. POTTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I hope the committee will not wait until the ranking minority member gets back from the hospital, as was inferred from your statement, because other members of the committee have been anxious to have the committee organized. It is most embarrassing to pick up the paper day after day and find statements as to what the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing, and not be informed. So I hope the gentleman will convey that information to the chairman of the committee when he returns.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How did the committee agree to ask for this $200,000 appropriation if it never met?

Mr. WALTER. The chairman of the committee was called to a meeting, I believe last week——

Mr. STANLEY. A meeting of the Subcommittee on Accounts.

Mr. WALTER. The Subcommittee on Accounts. On the morning of the meeting the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] called me and asked me if I would accompany him. He suggested that it would be proper to apply for the same amount that the committee had last year. This, despite the fact that added burdens have made it apparent that the money is not going to reach.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The only question I am bringing up is that the Armed Services Committee, for instance, met and voted that they wanted $50,000, and they went to the Committee on House Administration and asked for it. But apparently your committee has not asked for it.

Mr. WALTER. I do not have any other information as to how the amount was arrived at.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Were any of the minority members of the committee consulted about the amount at all?

Mr. WALTER. They are whenever they are available.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What do you mean by "available"? They are here all the time.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, during the last session of the Congress, with the exception of one or two members on the minority, the other members did not attend.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know what the discussion is all about, but from past experience I realize the committee is going to get all the money it asks for, and when it asks for it. There is a great deal to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said. Let me illustrate it this way. A week or two ago I received a wire and also a letter from an individual who offered to come down here and shoot a high official in the executive department and to pay his own expenses. I turned it over to the FBI. Yesterday I received a registered letter, four pages all pasted together, and it indicated to me very clearly, if I am any judge at all, that that individual should be in some asylum. That is the way a great many of these things turn out. I can understand why the testimony of some witnesses should not be broadcast, blackening the name of some individual, as has happened in the past. But I am not asking for the printing of any testimony. Time and again we do receive requests for reports of the committee. As an illustration, I have been asked for copies of that pamphlet put out by the committee, One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism. Then, I have asked for these other pamphlets where the names of individuals are listed and their connections with subversive organizations. I understand the gentleman to say that this request for funds does not include authority to print those reports—or does it?

Mr. STANLEY. It does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, I hope that sometime the committee will come in and ask for the money to do that. I will have to vote for that appropriation, to provide money sufficient to print these pamphlets that you have already put out at other times but the supply of which has been exhausted.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman understands the committee has authority to print its reports.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Regardless of what may be said, it is a fact that the resolution now before the House was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and it appears it was filed on January 3. As soon as the Subcommittee on Accounts had a chance to act on this resolution, the committee did act and approved the amount, $200,000. It is true also that the House Committee on Administration immediately reported this out. The amount is $200,000. It is considerably less than the committee has had in previous years. So far as the Committee on House Administration knows, the Committee on Un-American Activities plans to proceed with investigations forthwith.

Mr. STANLEY. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution asking for money for the Armed Services Committee is authorized in a resolution adopted by this House.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. KEARNEY. I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that his statement is a little erroneous, because the three minority members of that committee were present every day but we were not consulted in the slightest.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 114) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 127) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if one of the resolutions we just passed would allow two new investigators as to contracts by the Army?

Mr. STANLEY. It would allow the employment of two additional members of the clerical force.

Mr. NICHOLSON. For the purpose of looking into contracts?

Mr. STANLEY. No; they are to be members of the clerical force whose duties are to be assigned by the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WHITTEN RIDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks as a result of having been the author of the so-called Whitten rider, which makes an effort to hold down the total number of permanent personnel in the Federal service to the level existing in September 1950, and which further makes an effort to make available to the defense agencies trained personnel from other civilian agencies which it is believed will have less to do and therefore have surplus personnel, I have received numerous calls and visits from permanent employees in the Federal Government who for patriotic reasons have supplied me with information with regard to how many places in Government there are whole sections of employees with little to do.

From these reports which come from within the departments themselves, instead of the department making it easy for such employees to move to places where they will have fulltime work, which they want, these departments are busy trying to get themselves designated as defense agencies and are trying to find something to do or some new program in which they can enlist the department so as to keep these employees.

In hearings before our subcommittee last year, the head of one of our larger agencies denied to me that he had folks who were not busy because, as he said, "I find them something to do."

Unfortunately, too frequently that is the attitude—made work—to keep them busy, instead of releasing them to do work badly needed in the defense agencies. We must see to it that the Civil Service Commission acts now and we must see to it that the old-line departments cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, there are literally thousands of patriotic workers who due to the change in the national situation realize that they are not fully needed nor busy within their own department, who are trained and experienced and would be glad to help the national defense agencies during the period of emergency if the department and the civil service would simply make it possible for them to secure a leave of absence during the emergency with full right of reemployment to their present job.

Mr. Speaker, today every department in Government should be required to send out to each employee that it has in Washington and in many other offices, asking each employee whether he would be willing to take a leave of absence and serve in a national defense agency, if he were assured the right to return to his job at the end of the emergency. From the calls and visits I have had I am led to believe that thousands and thousands would gladly accept such a proposition.

The civil service then should be required to work out a full right to return to the job upon the department's giving such leave of absence. These names would be certified to the national defense agencies.

Legislation should not be necessary to carry out these needed actions. All we need is for the Civil Service Commission and the departments to use the authority they now have. The so-called Whitten rider would have been unnecessary if the Commission had been willing to take this action. The action recommended here is within the intent of that rider and if the Commission and the departments will cooperate additional experienced personnel will be made available to the defense agencies, and additional millions of dollars will be saved.

Such expert personnel could then help the Congress in its effort to hold in check the defense agencies, many of which would mushroom far too fast at great expense. Already reports are coming in that one of the recently established agencies has brought in at $65 per day a large group of advisers, renting of expensive hotel suites for conference rooms when there are hundreds of caucus rooms to be had in Government buildings here in Washington, which could be used without expense, and thousands of just as capable people who would assist in an advisory capacity at far less cost, including perhaps those same people who are here at $65 per day. The same reports come in concerning the setting up of other agencies. Perhaps they do not realize the total amount involved if all did that, or perhaps they are looking at the figures of the national debt as an asset. In setting up new agencies the best personnel people in the regular departments should be borrowed for such purposes.

I have introduced H. R. 110, which would provide a special committee to investigate the use of facilities and manpower. Such a committee with an adequate staff could save millions. I offer as proof the facts set forth in my speech in the House of Representatives on January 29, 1951.

The position I take is not altogether popular with the Civil Service Commission, but it heartens me to know there are thousands and thousands of Federal employees who are on our side in this effort. We must hold down at the beginning, at the setting up. We on the Appropriations Committee, with the approval of the Congress, will do our best to hold down and to cut appropriations where it can be done without injury, but after the money is spent or the commitment made, it is too late for the Appropriations Committee to do much about it. It avails us nothing to close the stable door after the horse is gone.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Daily News of February 2, 1951, by Mr. John Cramer, which clearly shows the fallacies of the so-called recent answer of the Civil Service Commission to a speech, mentioned a moment ago, which I made on January 29, 1951, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

9 TO 4:30

WHITTEN GETS "REPLY"

(By John Cramer)

Your United States Civil Service Commission has come out with what purports to be a reply to Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, Mississippi.

Representative WHITTEN is the author of the so-called Whitten rider of last late summer, which put most Government personnel actions on a temporary basis.

In a House speech this week, he roundly lambasted the Commission for dragging its feet and generally messing up the handling of Government manpower problems since the start of the Korean crisis.

If Mr. WHITTEN has any slightest doubt about the accuracy of his charges, the Commission's "reply" should set his doubt at rest.

The Commission statement makes certain valid points against the Whitten rider. For example: The fact that the rider discourages former United States employees from reentering Federal service, because it permits only temporary appointments for them—and sharply restricts their grades and pay.

Facts and syntax

Having done this, the Commission then proceeds to some remarkable twisting of facts and, also, syntax.

First. It complains that the "Whitten rider has impeded the movement of Government workers to defense agencies. * * * Specifically, by requiring that all transfers be temporary, many permanent employees have hesitated to give up their permanent positions in nondefense agencies to accept temporary jobs in defense agencies, even with reemployment rights.

That's what the Commission says. The facts are:

That Federal employee transfers during World War II were exclusively on a temporary basis—and this most definitely did not impede the free movement of workers to defense agencies.

Not the rider

That the thing which is impeding such transfers now is not the Whitten rider, but, instead, the Commission's own severe restrictions on reemployment rights for employees who do transfer. Under its rules, the employee transferring to a defense agency can be given reemployment rights only if he goes to a job which the Commission has listed as critical.

This list is a very narrow one—and here is proof: The Army, Navy, and Air Force have several thousand job vacancies here and are finding increasing difficulty in filling them. But most of the vacancies can't be filled by transfers from other agencies, for the simple reason that the Civil Service hasn't yet seen fit to put the particular job involved on its critical list.

That the Commission's transfer program not only impedes free transfers to defense agencies but in fact was designed mainly to make it easier for nondefense agencies to convert back to normal operations after the war. The Commission itself let this particular cat out of the bag when it announced its transfer program in November. It spoke then of the desirability of avoiding chaos in the nondefense agencies after the emergency.

Second twisting

Now here is the second way in which the Commission twisted the facts in its reply to Representative WHITTEN. The Commission's statement said:

"The Commission, long before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, studied the possible needs of the service in the eventuality of a greater emergency developing. It had worked out detailed plans to be put into effect when the situation required it."

No authority

The Commission further said that it had noted Mr. WHITTEN's comment that the Commission waited months to announce a policy on reemployment rights. The fact is that until Executive Order 10180 was signed the Commission had no authority to require an agency head to grant such rights. The Executive order was published in the Federal Register on November 15. The Commission's new regulation establishing a system of reemployment rights was published in the Register on the same day.

From this you might gather that the Commission had its plans all ready for the pressing of the push button. You might be led to believe that the Commission had no responsibility whatever for its long delay in setting up a reemployment system. You might, quite reasonably, get the idea that the Commission was trying to put the blame on the White House.

Neglected facts

The Commission, however, neglected to mention these facts:

That the Commission is expected, in the ordinary course of things, to initiate Executive orders such as the one on reemployment rights.

That the Commission is expected to carry the big share of the load in preparing such orders.

That its failure to do these things promptly and vigorously was, as this reporter has confirmed, a major reason for the delay in issuing the reemployment rights Executive order.

All this presumably is known to the officials responsible for the Commission's reply to Mr. WHITTEN. It is mentioned here for the benefit of Mr. WHITTEN and others who possibly might be misled by the Commission's fact twisting.

And you are welcome to the conclusion that the Commission was not completely—well, let's say—forthright in its statement.

ROLL-BACK OF PRICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include various articles, statements, editorials, and newspaper material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 2515, a bill to roll prices and wages back to June 25, 1950, and to impose a 100 percent tax on excess profits above the normal peacetime profit of the year 1949.

I have watched with dismay and anger the unwarranted increase in the cost of living. I have taken the floor of this House on a number of occasions to request and to demand that something be done to curb the dangers which the number one domestic problem of inflation presents.

I have attacked the January 26, 1951, order freezing prices and wages at the highest levels and ignoring profits because it is an order which will not control inflation.

Just yesterday, according to the Washington Post of February 8, 1951, Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston told a press conference that a further rise in

the cost of living for a few months is inevitable. He further stated that by midsummer price levels could be held relatively stable on a plateau for a considerable period, perhaps until the end of the year. The implication is that even into 1952 price rises will continue and that we can look forward to increasing inflation and all its accompanying evils.

Since June 25, 1950, prices in general have advanced in excess of 6 percent to an all-time high, corporation profits after taxes have increased by 21.8 percent, and food prices have advanced on the average of 2 percent a month. Some organized workers have received increases in wages but take-home pay has not been increased, but rather decreased, due to high costs and increased taxation. The unorganized workers, the pensioners, those living on annuities, people working for State, municipal, and county governments—the so-called white-collar class—have received no relief whatsoever and are slowly being ground down.

If a roll-back is not soon ordered we cannot escape more inflation which in turn will be accompanied by more strikes.

We should be ashamed of the so-called stabilization policy we have foisted on the people of this country. We should be ashamed of the way we are deliberately allowing the dollar to lose its value.

We should be aware of the fact, now, that if this mad economic situation continues, we are all going to lose. If that happens, it will be good news to the men in the Politburo.

We have wasted 7½ months in futile talk and useless orders. The cost of living is now 81 percent above prewar levels. We have taken half-way, timid steps when direct and courageous action is needed. The only place where that action can and should be taken is in the Congress of the United States and the people are looking to us for action and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that action will be taken on my bill as soon as possible so that the No. 1 domestic problems of inflation can be met and defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a speech I made on price control on January 19, 1951, a copy of a statement I made on January 27, 1951, after the price-wage freeze was announced by the ESA, two articles by John Suchy carried in the Missoula Mirror, a laboratory newspaper of the senior seminar class of the School of Journalism at Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., and dated January 24 and 31, 1951, and an article in the Washington Post of February 8, 1951:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1951]

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present inflationary picture is a sorry one indeed. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Administration to handle and to cope with inflation and price gouging have been very weak and ineffectual. It has been in operation 3 months—3 months marked by timidity, confusion, muddled words, and frenzied inaction.

Run-away prices have been a national scandal since June 25, 1950. At that time, I advocated a wage and price freeze across the board, but was unable to get any action. The Congress, the administration, and the officials selected to supervise the Defense Production Act of 1950 have all fallen down on the job to control inflation.

Mr. Di Salle, Price Director, was reported last week to have been ready to impose a 30-day price-wage freeze, but Mr. Alan Valentine, Director of Economic Stabilization Administration, said, "We have come to the conclusion that we do not plan any present across-the-board freeze of prices." What does he mean and who is he trying to help—or to shield? Certainly not the people of this country who are being harassed by the constant increases in everything they have to buy.

Mr. Speaker, the ineptitude of the ESA is such that it should either be abandoned or a new and strong group of officials named to administer the program. How are you going to collect taxes if this inflationary spiral keeps up, and how are you going to impose new taxes if inflation continues?

This is no time for voluntary price controls or vague talk. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that an over-all price-profit-wage control be imposed before another week of profiteering passes by. The people are demanding action and have been since June 25, 1950. The price scandal means cruel and inhuman punishment for thousands of our citizens and imperils our defense effort. The period of inaction in the price-control field has created confusion, bitterness, and frustration.

Big business can—and has—increased prices; organized labor can—and will—demand wage increases; the farmer is protected by support prices, but the great middle group—people living on servicemen's allowances, unorganized white-collar workers, school teachers, State, county, and municipal employees, older persons living on pensions and annuities—all are having trouble making their savings stretch and warding off inflation. Furthermore, redemption of E bonds for the past 9 months have exceeded sales, which indicates that people are being forced to spend beyond their incomes and that inflation is our No. 1 and most serious domestic problem.

The times call for equality of sacrifice in the payment of taxes, the granting by Congress to the Department of Agriculture the right to sell stored commodities to force down prices, and the imposition of direct controls and price ceilings to keep down prices to stop inflation.

We need:

First. A real excess-profits tax of 100 percent above normal peacetime profits—average profits run 51 percent over last year, and some corporations' profits as high as 286 percent.

Second. Elimination of existing tax loopholes so that our economy can be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Third. A roll-back on prices to halt inflation.

Fourth. Legislation to end commodity-market speculative profiteering.

Fifth. A halt to nonessential Government expenditures.

The picture of inflation is a very dangerous one. The need for drastic action is now, and I urge that we enact legislation to roll back prices to October 1, 1950, although I would personally prefer to have the date set at June 25, 1950. The people want action, and they are looking to this Congress for leadership and results in the fight against inflation.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, JANUARY 27, 1951

I am disturbed, disheartened, and angry over the price-wage freeze just announced by the Economic Stabilization Agency.

It is an act of timidity when the times call for decisions of courage and strength. It means in effect that high prices will remain at their highest level and beyond that will go still higher in the weeks and months ahead due to the loopholes in the order. I have consistently maintained that there should have been an "across-the-board freeze since June 27, 1950" and have on several occasions taken the floor to make my position known. The people of the country have taken a deep slash in their take-home pay which this price-wage freeze order helps to accentuate.

This phony freeze is of no benefit to many portions of our people because, while a few will make tremendous profits as a result of high prices, the great majority will continue to suffer increased losses. I do not see how it will be possible to ask the people to pay more in the way of taxes if we allow this order to stand and allow inflation to continue unchecked.

The real solution to the problem would have been for a roll-back to June 25, 1950, of a wage-price profit freeze across the board. However, in view of the difficulty and the immediate danger, the next best step would be to issue an order to put into operation a roll-back of prices-wages to October 1, 1950. The people want action and I am quite certain that they are disgusted with the leadership and administration of the ESA on the across-the-board freeze of yesterday."

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Mirror of January 24, 1951]

FOOD COSTS DOUBLE IN 12 YEARS

(By John Suchy)

Price ceilings are expected sometime this week.

Why they are expected is no mystery to most Missoulians. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, foods cost more than twice as much now in the United States as they did in 1939; the entire cost of living is almost double that of prewar years.

Figures for September 1950, place retail national food prices 2.08 times those of a 1935–1939 base period. The entire cost of living is 1.74 times the living cost of that period. These figures show only part of the facts. More recent wholesale price information shows even greater price increases for late 1950 and early 1951.

To confirm this data, a survey of Missoula merchants indicates that local prices are conforming to the national trend. Usual prices quoted in newspaper advertisments of January 1939, January 1945, September 1950, and January 1951, served as a basis for this survey.

Accurate price comparisons for each item could be best compiled for certain food products which enter into the Government's retail food index. Only these are quoted in this first report.

This survey revealed that Missoula food prices are apparently slightly lower than the national average. However, these prices have increased a somewhat greater relative amount since 1939 than have national food price averages. In other words, food prices in Missoula seem to be catching up with those elsewhere.

In 1939 Missoulians could buy round steak for 18 cents a pound. Now it costs 98 cents, 5.44 times as much as before. This means that it has a price index of 544 against an index of 100 for a 1939 base period. The national retail price index for round steak is only about 300. However, Missoula's meat

prices are probably no higher than meat prices elsewhere.

Local prices and indexes for several essential food products are tabulated here:

	January price		Current local price index
	1939	1951	
Wheat flour (5 pounds)	$0.15	$0.50	333.3
Corn flakes (13 ounces)	.095	.21	221.5
Corn meal (pound)	.028	.10	357.1
White bread (pound)	.10	.22	220.0
Plain boxed cookies (pound)	.125	.35	280.0
Beef rib roast (pound)	.18	.69	327.8
Pork chops (pound)	.19	.64	336.8
Sliced bacon (pound)	.25	.54	216.0
Whole ham (pound)	.25	.65	260.0
Salt pork (pound)	.15	.39	260.0
Pink salmon (pound can)	.131	.62	336.7
Butter (pound quarters)	.32	.88	275.0
Mild cheese (pound)	.25	.49	196.0
Evaporated milk (tall can)	.065	.148	227.7
Eggs (large, dozen)	.27	.63	233.3
Fresh carrots (bunch)	.04	.115	287.5
Dry onions (pound)	.025	.044	176.0
Fresh cabbage (pound)	.07	.08	114.3
U. S. No. 1 potatoes (15 pounds)	.18	.495	275.0
Sweet potatoes (pound)	.06	.125	208.3
Canned peaches (No. 2½)	.21	.29	138.1
Canned pineapple (No. 2½)	.22	.37	168.2
Canned corn (No. 2)	.125	.17	135.5
Canned tomatoes (No. 2)	.09	.19	211.1
Canned peas (No. 303)	.113	.145	128.3
Dried prunes (pound)	.069	.315	456.5
Dried navy beans (pound)	.06	.125	208.3
Coffee (pound tin)	.22	.89	404.5
Lard	.125	.245	195.2
Processed vegetable shortening (pound)	.183	.36	196.7
Oleomargarine (pound)	.22	.38	172.7
Sugar (5 pounds)	.29	.525	181.0

In this limited survey fluctuations in quality could not be accurately gaged. An attempt is made to find average large-retailer prices for each item. Following is a comparison of local and national price indexes as of September 1950, for selected food items:

Food item	Local index	National index
Wheat flour	306.7	192.8
Corn meal	271.4	203.3
Pork chops	310.5	262.1
Sliced bacon	212.0	184.5
Whole ham	212.0	233.9
Salt pork	233.3	181.7
Mild cheese	168.0	227.7
Dried onions	152.0	148.7
Potatoes (No. 1)	[1] 316.7	170.9
Canned peaches	138.1	158.4
Canned corn	[1] 152.0	141.6
Dried prunes	333.0	242.6
Coffee (tin)	368.2	336.1
Processed vegetable shortening	169.4	167.7
Oleomargarine	159.1	173.8
Sugar	170.0	188.4

[1] Indicates new crop not in by September 1950.

A partial picture of local price increases may be obtained by comparing the local price indexes for September 1950 with those of January 1951. A more complete picture may be gained by comparing the prices themselves over several periods of observation. The following table does just that for selected food items:

	January 1939	January 1945	September 1950	January 1951
Wheat flour (5 pounds)	$0.15	$0.24	$0.46	$0.50
Corn meal (pound)	.28	.70	.76	.10
Pork chops (pound)	.19	.33	.59	.64
Evaporated milk (tall can)	.065	.10	.148	.143
Eggs (large, dozen)	.27	.40	.67	.63
No. 1 potatoes (15 pounds)	.18	.69	.57	.495
Canned corn (No. 2)	.125	.14	.19	.17
Dried prunes (pound)	.069	.122	.23	.315
Coffee (pound tin)	.22	.31	.81	.89
Oleomargarine (pound)	.23	.27	.35	.38
Sugar (5 pounds)	.29	.33	.493	.525

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Mirror of January 31, 1951]

MISSOULA PRICE INDEX CLIMBS

(By John Suchy)

What does it cost to live?

Since the Korean war started, the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumers' national price index has been going up about 1 percent a month. On October 15, it stood at 174.8. Last Thursday, when the Government started price controls, it was probably much higher.

Over the divide from Missoula, in Butte, food prices were 214.5 percent higher in October than they were over a 1935–39 base period. An item-by-item survey of Missoula food prices was reported in last week's Mirror.

This is a comparison between late January 1939 and now of prices of some items other than foods that enter into Missoula's cost-of-living pattern. The Bureau of Labor Statistics compiles no national itemized survey for each of these items, so no comparison is listed between Missoula and the Nation as a whole. Differences in quality make it impossible to compare some items.

In January 1939 Missoula and the Nation were worrying about the war in Spain, "Hap" Arnold was calling for a $300,000,000 Air Force expansion program, and the Milwaukee railroad was charging $2.60 for a ski-train round trip to Ronald, Idaho.

A de luxe model Hudson coupe cost $745, delivered at Detroit. Three-year-old 90-proof whisky was advertised at 90 cents a pint. Low-grade hamburger sold at 10 cents a pound.

In 1939 Missoula's one first-run movie theater charged a 40-cent top price, 30 cents in the afternoons. Now the two first-run theaters charge 70-cent top prices. Maximum admission price for the three other theaters was 25 cents. Now it's 65 cents and 60 cents. Children's admissions are now 20 cents, twice what they were in 1939.

Dry goods prices provide a good standard for comparison, since these products of the same brand name differ little in quality over the years. Here are some of them from the same large independent retail department stores—prices of the same brands are compared in all cases:

	January prices			
	1939 [1]		1951	
	Brand A	Brand B	Brand A	Brand B
Sheets, percale:				
81 by 99 inches	$1.39	$1.29	(2)	(2)
81 by 108 inches	1.49	1.35	$4.00	$3.75
72 by 108 inches	1.39	1.29	3.75	3.75
Towels, terry cloth:				
24 by 48 inches	$0.49		$1.50	
20 by 40 inches	.23		.85	
16 by 28 inches	.19		.50	
Heavy wash cloths	.075		.25	

[1] These prices were taken from a January white sale advertisement and are from 10 to 25 percent below normal prices for the time. This store had no January white sale on these items in 1951.

[2] Not available.

In January 1939 another independent department store in Missoula advertised nationally known towels for 5, 9, 13, 18, and 21 cents. These were not manufacturers' seconds. A retail chain store advertised 81 by 99-inch muslin sheets wash 234 times, by test, at 69 cents each.

The same chain store advertised women's cotton print dresses at 44 cents each. Another chain store listed them at 49 cents. They were common in all stores which sold women's clothes at prices starting no higher than 98 cents. Today's lowest mail-order price for cotton print dresses is $2.29.

Listed below are some more January 1939 and January 1951 Missoula prices for comparable items:

In the following, the January 1939 price is given first, January 1951 price, second:

Nationally advertised tires (6:00 x 16): best quality, $15.70, $20.10 (plus $1.12 tax); good quality, $11.80, $14.60 (plus $1.12 tax). Steel cabinet sinks (no fittings), $32, $70. Chain store men's work shoes (cheapest), $1.74, $4.98. Chain store women's shoes (cheapest), $1.77, $4.79. Chain store men's suits (cheapest), $17.77, $36. Chain store sanforized shirts (cheapest), 98 cents, $2.17. Chain store percale print fabrics, 9 cents yard (32 inches), 35 cents yard (35 inches). Furniture (good quality, sale prices): four-piece bedroom suite, $109, $185; mohair living-room suite, $122.50, $229.50; walnut dining-room suite, $69.50, $130; studio couch, $29, $65; 9- by 12-foot rugs, $29 to $90, $69.50 to $175.

About the lowest increase in prices between 1939 and 1951 was in the per line rate for classified advertising in the local daily newspaper. In 1939 it was 14 cents; now it's 15 cents. The same paper used to cost 20 cents a week, delivered by carrier in Missoula. Now it's 35 cents per week.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 8, 1951]

JOHNSTON SEES NEW PRICE RISES, LEVELING OFF BY MIDSUMMER

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston told an impromptu press conference yesterday that a further rise in the cost of living for a few months is inevitable.

He added, however, that by midsummer the price levels could be held relatively steady on a plateau for a considerable period, perhaps until the end of the year.

Johnston's forecast of a steady upward movement in prices accords with a view previously expressed by Price Stabilizer Michael V. Di Salle. He has pointed out that the powerful momentum of past increases, like a car going at 60 miles an hour, cannot be braked down instantly.

Furthermore, under the present price-control law, ceilings cannot be placed on most farm products, because their prices are below the parity levels. Yesterday, a spokesman for Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson confirmed reports that Wilson is also seriously concerned over this aspect of the problem.

Wilson had been reported as favoring some vigorous action to plug this enormous escape hole in the price freeze. Yesterday he conferred with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and discussed the subject, but in general terms.

Associates of Di Salle have represented the price chief as being loath to get bogged down in a political battle to obtain a change in the law. He was said to be virtually resigned to an attempt to hold prices at parity, when they get there, rather than tackling the farm bloc which opposes amendments that would let farm prices be frozen at lower levels.

Obviously, however, Di Salle would be delighted if Wilson wants to participate in a joint fight for a change in the law.

In his news conference, Johnston said that how long the summer level of prices can be held will depend on whether the budget is balanced, production is increased, and credit controls are tightened.

Johnston said prices can and will be rolled back on some major products, but that he doubted whether those reductions would offset increases in other parts of the economy.

The Economic Stabilizer's mention of credit controls was taken by some observers as a reference to the problem of stopping the enormous expansion of lending by commercial banks since the outbreak of the Korean

War. How this is to be done is presently the subject of vigorous dispute between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury.

The FRB proposes somewhat higher interest rates on Federal securities. It feels the concurrent drop in the prices of those issues would deter many banks from selling them whenever they need reserves in order to make loans.

From testimony 2 weeks ago before a congressional committee, it would appear that Johnston sides with the FRB. There are other indications that the FRB position is supported also in other high places in Wilson's Office of Defense Mobilization.

WHY RENT CONTROL SHOULD BE EXTENDED

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraenous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign I pointed out to the electorate that if the Republicans were continued in control of the New York State Legislature there would be no opportunity for genuine opposition to the previous rent-control law—a Republican measure sponsored and passed by a Republican controlled legislature, and signed by the Republican governor.

The worst fears of those of us in the State legislature who opposed the Republican rent-control law have now been fully realized. In a joint statement issued on February 5, 1951, Senator Elmer F. Quinn, minority leader of the New York State Senate, and Assemblyman Irwin Steingut, minority leader of the assembly, brought to light the full evils of this alleged rent-control law.

Far from giving the citizens of New York the protection that they had reasonably expected from the State legislature, they now find themselves the helpless victims of rent increases which may well spell the ruination of countless families in the middle and related groups of income.

The new regulations promulgated pursuant to the rent law contain a series of jokers which will automatically become law if not disapproved by a joint resolution of the New York State Senate and Assembly on or before February 15, 1951. On Monday night, last, a Democratic attempt to have such a resolution of disapproval adopted, failed in the assembly. The Republican Party has once again demonstrated that they only give lip service to the needs of the people.

By reason of these disclosures there is but one alternative, if we are sincere in our objectives to give the greatest amount of aid to the people in this present national emergency. Federal rent control should be extended to apply to New York as well as to the rest of the country.

Shelter constitutes one of the primary and basic necessities of life and during the period of this new emergency rents for housing accommodations should continue to be stabilized, regulated, and strictly controlled in order to prevent unreasonable and unwarranted evictions which would inevitably adversely affect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the people.

As the President declared recently, we are in a state of national emergency. The actions of Soviet Russia and its satellites throughout the world leave us no alternative but to take all necessary steps to insure our national defense. One of the vital ramparts of that defense is taking proper care of the basic needs of our citizens here at home so they can produce the needed goods and services so essential for our fighting men abroad.

One of their essential needs is shelter—decent housing at a fair price that they can afford to pay. With construction shortly limited by the large down payments required—around 50 percent if you build a good house—most of the common people have to look to their Government for protection against rent gouging. Like the rest of the Nation New York faces a similar rent crisis and the people need help.

In order that the Members of Congress have a clear picture of the rent crisis in New York, under unanimous consent, I ask that the following release be made a part of the record of my remarks at this point:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELMER F. QUINN, MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE, AND ASSEMBLYMAN IRWIN STEINGUT, MINORITY LEADER OF THE ASSEMBLY

In 1950, when Governor Dewey succeeded in having his own rent control law passed by the legislature, we announced our vigorous opposition, pointing out that its many weaknesses, its inadequately defined sections, and its obvious inequities would result in sever hardship for untold numbers of families.

We introduced a bill of our own that would have provided strong rent control. We predicted that the passage of the Republican bill would lead to the breakdown of effective rent control. Our fears were more than justified. The new set of regulations proposed by the rent control commissioner will take the lid off rent ceilings—will mean increases for almost one-half the tenants of New York State.

One of the provisions of that law to which we particularly objected was that giving the rent commissioner authority to set up his own plan of controlling rents to take effect on March 1, 1951. We denounced this grant of power to one man as a dangerous precedent and a flagrant surrender of legislative authority to a commissioner who could do anything he wanted with rent control.

The commissioner has now submitted his regulations for future rent control. As we predicted, they will open the way for many new rent increases, many new hardships for tenants.

Of the regulations laid down by the rent commissioner, the following we regard as particularly treacherous.

1. The fair-value formula: This inflationary device provides that a landlord may raise his rent on the basis of his property's assessed valuation, so that he is guaranteed an income of 4 percent of the property's worth. This means that a landlord can raise rents indefinitely—first, he can increase his rental on the basis of his assessed valuation, then he can raise the value of his property on the basis of new rent increases, thereby qualifying for still another rent increase because of the higher assessed valuation of his property.

2. Subdivisions: The 1950 law gave landlords the power to remove apartments from rent control by subdivision or conversion. Under this section of the law, a landlord can inform the tenant at any time that he plans to convert his apartment from one apartment into two or more apartments. He can evict the tenant and the tenant has no redress. And, once the apartment is converted, it is no longer under rent control.

The rent administrator's regulations provide that subdivisions can only occur when an apartment is undertenanted. A six-room dwelling inhabited by two parents to two teen-age children is defined as undertenanted—and such a family is powerless against an eviction for the purpose of subdividing. Once that subdivision occurs, of course, the landlord may charge what he pleases for the two or more new apartments he has made for himself. Meanwhile, there are thousands of such apartments of six or more rooms, lived in by typical middle-income families throughout the State.

3. The 15-percent voluntary rent increases: Under this regulation, it would be perfectly possible for landlords who have already received a 15-percent rent increase by virtue of Federal laws to obtain an additional 15-percent increase now, either by "voluntary" agreement with a tenant under the "fair net" operating formula.

That such increases would be voluntary on the tenants' part is little more than a farce. By threatening to subdivide the apartment, the landlord virtually forces the tenant to consent to an increase. Or, by asserting that he is not getting a fair return on his property's assessed valuation, the landlord can again put the tenant on the spot when he asks for a 15-percent voluntary increase.

4. Evictions permitted without proof of compelling necessity: The owner of a one- or two-family house of a cooperative apartment may have a tenant evicted if he wishes to occupy the premises himself, even though there is no evidence that he, the landlord, needs to change his accommodations.

5. Exemptions from controls: The rent administrator's regulations fail to correct the discriminatory provision in the law which exempts from control all new housing completed since February 1, 1947, and new housing created through remodeling after May 1, 1950. Again the sky is the limit for rentals charged for such accommodations.

An equitable rent-control law would provide that newly built apartments be controlled on the basis of the first rental charged—such a rental having been fixed in a free market.

In our opinion the provisions of the law passed in the 1950 session, combined with the regulations concerning the granting of rent increases laid down last month by the rent commissioner, all but destroy effective rent control in New York State. That we should be pursuing such a disastrous course at a time when total mobilization points to an even greater housing shortage, is truly unthinkable.

It is only fair to the citizens of New York State that they know how their legislators stand on the vital question of effective rent control. This week we will move to discharge from committees of the senate and assembly our resolution disapproving the rent commissioner's regulations. This will give an opportunity to every member of the legislature to state his stand on rent controls—whether he wants to hold the line and hold it firmly, or whether he wants the lid taken off so that skyrocketing rents will add to the peril of national inflation.

Within the next week, we shall submit our own rent-control bill—a bill remedying those inequities of the present regulations which we have already pointed out. Our bill will hold the line on rent control—allowing increases only in those cases where the landlord can prove undue hardship and loss. In that way, we shall provide a second opportunity for every member of the legislature to put himself on record where rent control is concerned.

A DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL OTHER PEOPLE OF THE WORLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House concurrent resolution entitled "A Declaration of Friendship From the American People to All Other People of the World." A similar resolution is being introduced today in the other body by Senator McMAHON, under the joint sponsorship of 21 Senators.

The purpose of the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution is to reaffirm the American peoples' desire to live in peace with all peoples, including the people of the Soviet Union. The resolution will specifically request President Truman to call upon the Soviet Government to make known the contents of this resolution to the Russian people.

Spiritual power and not material power is the key to the world's ills. As a Nation, we must set peace as our goal. The heart of the world must be touched. While we rearm, we must not sidetrack other methods to avoid war. We must never fail to tell the peoples of the world that our goal is peace. This resolution will put the American people and Congress squarely on record as standing for peace instead of war, for life instead of death.

With the best moral case in the world, we are still on the defensive. We must have the vision and imagination to contribute ideas. We cannot lead if we are not guided by a moral and spiritual force of our own.

This resolution is the start of a positive program for peace. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world.

A copy of this resolution is set out below:

A DECLARATION OF FRIENDSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING THE PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Members of this Congress reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, by declaring—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the U. S. S. R., and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

BLACK MARKET IN MEAT

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I have unquestionable evidence that the black market in meat is back again with us in New York. As of yesterday it would cost $1,800 under the table to get a chance to bid on a car of dressed beef in the New York market.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a telegram from a gentleman in New York who knows the meat industry from hogs and beef on the hoof to the finest product as it finds its way on the tables in the best hotels and restaurants in the greatest city in the world. He says:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 8, 1951.*
Congressman JAMES G. DONOVAN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D .C.:

Meat conditions under present Government regulations are chaotic in New York area. Black market conditions rampant. A few weeks of such conditions can make a ruthless wholesaler richer by far than any violator during OPA era. Cash is being exacted and passed. Straight carcass being sold at prices ceilinged for cuts. Low-grade meats being sold for prime quality prices. Most meats lack Federal grading and practically no top quality meats available. General feeling in trade is that there is no patriotic reason for imposition of controls which stifle business when meat prices are not regulated at farm level. Trade does not feel we are at war and it is public knowledge that meat supplies are adequate if all levels of meat industry are given fair profit margins to work with. Resentment high that top qualified men in meat industry are bypassed and advice is accepted from poorer qualified consultants. Impossible to obtain cooperation to convict violators of present regulation because of fear supplies would be shut off to anyone turning in concrete evidence makes it presently impossible to expect or demand such cooperation under existing conditions the following proposed suggestions would gain widespread support for a controlled program from the meat industry at large. Freeze price of feeds and grains. This is only commodity not frozen on farmers list of requirements. On basis of frozen grain prices ratio on beef, veal, lamb, pork, and poultry can be satisfactorily ceilinged at farm level. This permits impositions of fair ceilings on milk, butter, cheese, eggs, flour, and all other byproducts this also permits proper ceilings at slaughter-house level which also readily permits proper ceiling margins to be calculated for wholesale distributor, jobber, hotel supply house, and retail levels. Belief if grain prices must advance is to move up percentagewise at all levels. Obligatory Government grading for all meat of utmost importance. Finally let meat industry do its own policing pledging Government its support in this program.

Very sincerely,

PAUL A. SPITLER.

SEVEN SILVER STARS GIVEN REAR ECHELON BIG SHOTS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am going to insert in my remarks an article about seven Silver Stars which were presented to six generals and a colonel in Korea, none of whom had been under fire, and none of whom had been up on the battlefront. Apparently that Silver Star has become quite a coveted award, and these fellows felt that they would look better with it on their chests. I hope the Members will read this newspaper story. I might say that 16 or 17 months ago, when the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was in Greece, we were up on the Albanian frontier, and some of us heard some gun fire in the distance. I do not know whether that puts us in line for a Silver Star or not, but if it does, I would be embarrassed to accept it, and I do not think I would want to wear it under those circumstances.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of February 7, 1951]

SEVEN SILVER STARS GIVEN REAR ECHELON BIG SHOTS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The Air Force has awarded 17 Silver Stars so far. Seven have gone to generals and a colonel based in Tokyo. They usually get to Korea about once a month.

Congress created the Silver Star in 1918 as a reward for "gallantry in action when the Medal of Honor is not warranted."

It specified, however, that such gallantry must be of "marked distinction." The Silver Star has become one of our most coveted decorations. You don't win one hanging around the rear echelon. At least, that's the way it used to be.

Nevertheless Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer, commander of the Far East Air Force, has presented it to:

HERE'S LIST

Maj. Gen. Laurence Craigie, vice commander for administration and plans.

Maj. Gen. Otto P. Weyland, vice commander for operations.

Brig. Gen. Jarred V. Crabb, deputy commander for operations.

Brig. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, Far East inspector general.

Brig. Gen. Charles Y. Banfill, deputy for intelligence.

Brig. Gen. Derr H. Alkire, deputy for matériel.

Col. Leo J. Erler, director of installations.

NO. 1 MAN

Each man, the citations say, "distinguished himself by gallantry in action in Korea during the period July through November 1950." Each, General Stratemeyer said, acted "in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service."

General Cragie—General Stratemeyer's "No. 1 man"—"made frequent visits to combat elements in Korea to coordinate operations * * * participated in reconnaissance, tactical control, and bombing missions over enemy territory to observe and improve effectiveness of his plans * * * was subject to attack by enemy aircraft and ground fire."

General Weyland also was decorated for flying to Korea occasionally to visit Air Force elements (and) coordinate operations. He participated in bombing missions over enemy territory to obtain first-hand knowledge. Like General Craigie, he was subject to attack by enemy aircraft and ground fire.

General Crabb "at great personal risk and in constant danger * * * made frequent visits to combat Air Force elements in Korea." His participation in combat missions enabled him to improve the effectiveness of his direction of operations.

General Picher—the inspector general in charge of paper work—also is credited with making frequent trips to advanced air bases in Korea to obtain information. General Banfill—in constant danger from enemy ground and aerial attacks—flew to Korea and obtained vital information concerning the enemy.

General Alkire visited the most forward airfields and made ground and aerial surveys to insure an uninterrupted flow of matériel. Ditto Colonel Erler.

NO OPPOSITION

The citations don't say they were fired upon. They were subject to attack. So was everyone else in Korea. The chance of ground attack on even the most forward Air Force base in Korea is remote.

And you can count on one hand the number of enemy planes over Korea after the first week of July. The frequent trips from Japan to Korea simply involved getting in a C-54 transport in Tokyo and getting out in Korea. As a rule it's about as risky as flying from New York to Cleveland. And they went on combat missions merely as passengers and spectators.

CAME HARDER

Other men apparently worked harder for their Silver Stars. Take Hospital Corpsman Vernon Ault, of Greeley, Colo., for instance. His citation said he was "painfully wounded in the arm and leg while serving with a Marine infantry company. Despite pain and extreme loss of blood, he courageously continued to administer to the wounded while under intense enemy machine-gun fire. He refused to be evacuated * * * until he collapsed from his wounds and loss of blood and had to be carried."

William G. Araza, of San Antonio, fearlessly and courageously ran forward under intense machine-gun and antitank fire and, although receiving a painful wound, proceeded to pull a wounded man 30 yards to a covered position and administer aid.

Many Air Force men are bitter. They feel promiscuous awards of the Silver Star to staff officers has cheapened it. One combat pilot who won the Silver Star in World War II for torpedoing a Jap cruiser, told me he had put the medal away and would never wear it again.

DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as acting chairman of the Democratic steering committee, I am calling a meeting in the Rules Committee room at 2 o'clock today, if the House has adjourned at that time; otherwise immediately after the adjournment of the House. The notice went out that the meeting would be held immediately after the adjournment. I am changing that now to make it 2 o'clock today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman makes his announcement as acting chairman. I hope that after the meeting he will again be chairman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Judge Call of the municipal bench of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States was formulated by the Constitutional Convention to retain all rights of the States and inherent rights of the people in statu quo, except such powers as were therein expressly given and delegated to the Federal Government. The rights and duties of man under the natural law were recognized, and the personal liberty of the individual was to be protected.

Since the adoption of our Constitution, a trend has developed toward liberal and enlarged construction of implied powers of Congress. A drift from the Constitution has become apparent, and its ultimate effects upon our form of government and the extent to which it may encroach upon the liberty of our citizens should receive serious consideration.

An excellent article on this subject appeared in the January issue of the Los Angeles Bar Bulletin. It was written by the Honorable Joseph L. Call, judge of the municipal court of the city of Los Angeles. This article should receive thoughtful consideration from the Members of Congress.

[From the Los Angeles Bar Bulletin of January 1951]

THE DRIFT FROM THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. Joseph L. Call,* judge of the municipal court of the city of Los Angeles)

"Government, through its rulers, may be the implement of tyranny."[1]

This was the political condition that confronted the colonists and precipitated the Declaration of Independence and the War of the Revolution.

The fundamental objection of the colonies was that the colonies and Great Britain were coordinate members of the great English Empire under the dominion of a common sovereign but not united by common legislative sovereignty or legislative rights. The colonists declared that their legislative power to govern themselves was as complete and distinct as that of the English Parliament to govern England. Great Britain maintained that the colonies were subject to English parliamentary laws and royal executive decrees emanating from the homeland. The assertion of the right of self-government by the colonists, a denial of this principle by England and the arbitrary assumption of the right of Great Britain to make laws for all constituents of the English Empire without their right of participation or self-government, in each and every instance, led to the discovery by England that she had no right to make laws for the colonists in any respect whatsoever.[2]

This led to the Declaration of Independence by the Thirteen Colonies in which the basic and ever-underlying premise of American Government was emphasized, and that was that "* * * all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."[3]

These principles of (a) the inherent sovereignty of the people; and (b) the consequential creation of government to maintain these rights, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed, therefore gave rise to the Bill of Rights of the Thirteen Original States and thereafter the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution.

It is seen that the doctrine of inherent sovereignty of the people is the major premise upon which this government was founded, and that very obviously all public officials are agents and agents only of the sovereign power, to wit, the people; and that consequently, the inherent right of self-government is always the primary right of the people:

The assertion of these rights by the American people gave rise to 7 years of merciless and bloody revolutionary war and incredible hardships, but was finally culminated by the independence of the American colonies climaxed by the surrender of General Cornwallis at Yorktown, October 19, 1781; and thereafter emerged the thirteen original colonies as free and independent states.

It is well to note that these states came into existence as separate governments and entities; and each retained all of the right of self-government, self-regulation, and all rights incident to complete sovereignty. They were independent of any other state or nation. Any problems, situations, improvements or social adjustments, all found adequate protection and comprehension within and by reason of the sovereign power of the individual state. None of these states was inadequate to determine fully on all matters of internal concern.

There were, however, certain limited problems that the people felt they were unable adequately to contend with. These inadequacies of the states acting as political units are stated by the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in its letter recommending to Congress the adoption of the new Federal Con-

*Judge Call received his bachelor of laws degree from the University of Southern California School of Law in 1925. He has served on the bench of the Los Angeles municipal court since 1931.

[1] Excessive Law Making—A Threat to Liberty, by Robert M. Jones, Tennessee Law Journal, vol. 16.

[2] Madison's Report on the Virginia Resolution (1800), Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution, vol. IV, p. 562.

[3] Declaration of Independence, adopted in Congress, July 4, 1776.

stitution. This letter is signed by George Washington and presents this limited state inadequacy as follows: "The friends of our country have long seen and desired, that the power of making war, peace and treaties; that of levying money and regulating commerce; and the corresponding executive and judicial authorities should be fully and effectively vested in the general government of the union."[4]

Throughout the debates in the Constitutional Convention was the constant insistence that in the dual system of Government about to be formulated, the rights and the sovereignty of the people and the States were to remain supreme in all matters of local and self government, but subject to certain powers to be expressly granted or delegated under the terms of the proposed Constitution to the proposed Federal Government.

And, the insistence of these principles in Convention debate was certainly not without precedents garnered from the rise and fall of government throughout history. Under the postulates of European monarchies and under the prerogatives of the Roman civil law, the state or government is exemplified as all-powerful, all-knowing, all-wise and even of divine origin. A corollary of this premise was it therefore became the duty of the government, that in order to achieve supreme success and happiness for the people, the state or government must obviously regulate and prescribe for all human endeavors, and that the deity of the state naturally denied the right of the individual to work out his own problems, and to prescribe his own methods of procedure. This theory of government postulated from the time of the disintegration of the Roman republic at the time of the formation of the first triumvirate, approximately 50 years before Christ, found expression and was fully bearing fruit at the time of the American Constitutional Convention. The European theory advocated that the government of monarchy and dictatorship was all-knowing and all-powerful, and was predicated on the premise that the people whom it sought to govern were utterly incapable of governing themselves and prescribing their own rules and regulations. Its purpose was that of dictating to and for the lives of its peoples.

Consequently, at the Constitutional Convention, it was the considered opinion of the members of the Convention that the state was not divine nor omnipotent nor omniscient, but that, on the contrary, sovereignty, law and regulation were rights of the people, and that the official was but an agent of the people placed in office for the purpose of administering laws enacted by the people, and that every individual had the right without the interference or intermeddling of government to formulate his own happiness and his own laws.

Accordingly, with the ever-retained sovereign rights of the people as the major premise, there was formulated the United States Constitution (September 17, 1787) retaining all rights of the States and inherent rights of the people in statu quo, except such powers as were therein expressly given and delegated to the Federal Government. Under the Federal Constitution there are created three separate and distinct departments of government. Article I creates and delegates power to the legislative or congressional department; under article II there is created and delegated power to the executive department; and under article III there is created and delegated power to the judicial department. Each department of government, under this novel system, is supreme within its own field, but, nevertheless, acts as a check-balance upon the other departments.

[4] The Growth of Federal Bureaucratic Tyranny, by Sterling E. Edmunds, The Lawyer and Banker, vol. 36 (1933).

Although the sovereignty of the people and the States, under the Constitution, as submitted and adopted in 1787, was clearly supreme, nevertheless the people were so zealous of these unalienable rights and fearful of the usurpation of power by the Federal Government and that tyranny under the pretense of constitutional authorization might become enthroned, that the Thirteen States thereafter adopted, in 1791, the ninth and tenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. These amendments again reaffirmed the limitations of the Federal Government and the sovereign rights of the States and the people as independent political units. These amendments at the time seemed to satisfy the minds of the most skeptic, and were thought to definitely and finally put to an end the respective rights and any possible contentions that might arise under the relative rights of the dual government.

Article I, section 8, of the Federal Constitution enumerates 18 specific grants of power by the people to the United States Congress. Among these grants there may be listed the following fundamental rights affecting the life and liberty of the people of the country:

1. The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;
2. To pay the debts of the United States;
3. To provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;
4. To borrow money on the credit of the United States;
5. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes;
6. To coin money and regulate the value thereof and fix the standards of weights and measures;
7. To declare war;
8. To raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy;
9. The power to make treaties under the authority of the United States (art. VI, sec. 2).

At this time it should be noted that the American system of government was entirely the creation of the American people and American way of life, and that under the Federal Constitution one of the purposes was to eliminate the doctrine of an all-powerful legislature as well as an equally powerful administrative or executive division. Under the English law neither division of government was subject to any judicial control. Hence both operated independently, exclusively, and to a great extent, without restraint and without restraint upon each other.

To obviate any such situation in this country there was incorporated in our Constitution and created the United States Supreme Court with power to determine all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Supreme Court was set up as a bastion against the encroachment by the legislative or executive branches of the Government against each other or by them against the sovereign rights retained by the people, and consequently to prevent any arbitrary, unlawful, or self-assumed power by either the executive or legislative branches of the Government.

It was the intention of the framers of the Constitution that the Supreme Court be established nonpartisan, free and independent, and beyond the pressure of any whim and caprice of public factionalism, fanaticism, public clamor, or the platitudes of the masses. The Court was established to be an all-time bulwark against such pressures and against infractions of the Constitution, however minor or serious, that might occur, and for the purpose also of declaring null and void any usurpations of power or encroachments that might occur by either the legislative or administrative branches of the Federal Government. For this reason the Supreme Court was placed beyond all approach and appointed for life.

The constitutional principle of complete sovereignty of the people, and that the States operated as independent political units, and that the Federal Government existed by reason of a grant of powers by the people was thereafter respected for at least 100 years. Under the protection of these principles and the establishment of this dual system of government, the United States became the freest and the most stable Government in the world. The liberty enjoyed by the citizens of this country was unequaled and unparalleled from the earliest records of organized society, dating back at least 4,000 years B. C., up to and including the present time.

It would be well to note at this time, however, that in the year 1819, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, speaking through Chief Justice Marshall enunciated a principle obviously necessary to a proper construction of that case, but which later served as a yardstick for the unwarranted assumption by Congress of vast powers never intended by the framers of the Constitution nor by the States subscribing thereto. This doctrine, simple at the time of its creation, was as follows:

"There were to be implied to the Federal Government all powers necessary to the exercise of the enumerated powers to the Federal Government."[5]

However, with some deviations, this principle *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* was strictly adhered to and powers that could not be truly and honestly considered as powers necessarily implied from the specific grants of power to Congress was not enlarged (*License Cases, 5 Howard*, 46 U. S. 504 (1847), and the American Government flourished and progressed under the dual system of government, as contemplated by the Federal Constitution.

Indeed, even after the war of the rebellion in 1866, during times of the greatest internal and national stress ever faced by the United States, in affirming the elementary principles of the Federal Constitution and the sovereignty of the people of the States, the Supreme Court states in ex parte Milligan[6] as follows:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory on which it is based is false; for government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority."

However, from approximately 1887, the Supreme Court, slowly at first but thereafter during the years gaining momentum, enlarged by judicial construction the authority of the Congress of the United States and decreed as valid acts of Congress on the premise and ground that such legislation was a proper and necessary implied power to an express grant of power to Congress under the Constitution. The decision of the Supreme Court in *Bowman* v. *The Chicago Railway Company* (125 U. S. 465 (1887)), indicates the beginning of this trend of construction enhancing the implied powers of Congress. In this case the legislature of the State of Iowa, acting under the police powers and the sovereign rights of the people, had decreed that common carriers bringing intoxicating liquors into the State must first obtain a certificate from State authorities.

[5] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheaton, p. 316).

[6] U. S. 2 (1866).

The enactment by the legislature of this law was necessary to adequately enforce the policy of State prohibition against the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquor.

The desires of the people of the State of Iowa in this regard were swept aside by the Supreme Court in this decision, and the State legislation nullified insofar as this case was concerned, the Supreme Court, in construing the implied powers of Congress and the powers of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, held that the Iowa Legislature violated implied powers granted to Congress under the commerce clause, and states in part as follows: "The statute of Iowa * * * (requiring a certificate) is essentially a regulation of commerce among the States within any differentiation given to that term or which can be given; and although its motive and purpose are to perfect the policy of the State of Iowa in protecting its citizens against the evils of intemperance, it is nonetheless on that act a regulation of commerce." And so this State legislation and desires of the people of the State of Iowa were nullified and terminated.

This trend, however, toward liberal and enlarged construction of (implied) powers of Congress saw through the ensuing years, however, sporadic but continuous enlargement. As vacancies occurred, obviously personnel on the Court changed. There were also, however, placed upon the Supreme Court conservative lawyers and students of the Constitution and men studied in the fundamental principles of American government.

One of the greatest exponents of American constitutional Government, as contemplated by the American Constitution and the American way of life, was Justice David J. Brewer, who was a member of this distinguished bench from 1890 to 1910. One of his decisions standing out as a milestone in United States jurisprudence and coming at a time in which the trend of the court was and had been for some time toward liberal construction of legislative powers was the decision rendered in *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46 (1906)), in which he states, on behalf of the court, that the United States Government is one of enumerated powers and has no inherent powers of sovereignty; that this enumeration is to be found only in the United States Constitution, and that if Congress seeks new powers, it should be obtained as provided in the Constitution, and that the reservation and the reaffirmance of the rights of the people and the States, as set forth in the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution, are to be construed in simple English and are to mean what they say, and that "the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in the grant of powers, is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a government of enumerated powers. That this is such a government clearly appears from the Constitution independently of the amendments. * * * This natural construction of the * * * Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment. This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted." [7]

This decision again reaffirmed and reestablished principles of constitutional government, but not for long. The doctrine of implied powers was again to be reaffirmed by the Supreme Court soon thereafter and in no uncertain fashion. Numerous decisions thereafter followed over a period of years and down to the present time which have opened the gates with increasing acceleration to Federal legislation and to administrative acts of the executive department in a manner never contemplated or comprehended by the States ratifying the Constitution, by the framers of the Constitution, or by the Constitution itself.

[7] *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 546, p. 89).

WARTIME PROHIBITION ACT

In 1919 this drift from the Constitution again became apparent. On November 21, 1918, there was enacted the Wartime Prohibition Act (40 Stat. 1046). This was approved 10 days after the armistice with Germany was signed. It provided that until the conclusion of the present war and thereafter until the termination of demobilization it was unlawful to sell alcoholic beverages. The act stated that this was for the purpose of conserving manpower. It is to be noted that under the grants of power to Congress there is no right given to legislate on the question of prohibition, and that if this legislation is a valid exercise of legislative power it would have to be affirmed as an "implied power" incidental to a direct grant of power to Congress. It is to be noted that this legislation was enacted after the capitulation of Germany and the signing of the armistice. However, the Supreme Court affirmed this legislation of Congress and held this legislation a "war power"—a power of Congress arising under its right to declare war and "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" [8] the powers expressly granted. This appears to be the first time that reference is had to "war powers" of the United States, powers that arise by implication from express grants of power to the Federal Legislature.

This decision opened the door to limitless legislation by Congress on the theory that legislation was justifiable as a war power. A right or power of Congress to enact legislation derived from the direct power to declare war and to enact such legislation as may be necessary to enforce the same.

The vicious part of this unbridled power is that these war powers are not confined to a period of time at which the country is actually engaged in a state of war. Let us examine further.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT, 1947

There was passed by Congress, effective July 1, 1947, and practically 2 years after the complete capitulation of Japan, what was known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, effective July 1, 1947, regulating the maximum price of rents to be charged under the authority of the Housing Administrator. The constitutionality of this litigation was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court [9] as valid legislation of Congress under their "war powers." And it is to be noted that in affirming the Housing Act of 1947, the Court cites with approval and authority the decision rendered in 1919 in Hamilton against the Kentucky Distilleries Co., supra, as its precedent, and concludes that "the war power includes the power 'to remedy the evils which have arisen from its rise and progress' and continues for the duration of that emergency. Whatever may be the consequences when war is officially terminated, the war power does not necessarily end with the cessation of hostilities." And most significant is this statement of the Court: "But we canot assume that Congress is not alert to its constitutional responsibilities." [10] In connection with this statement, it is well to remember that the Supreme Court is and was to act as a bastion and bulwark against the encroachment by Congress upon any other departments of the Government or the Constitution itself. The history of congressional legislation indicates to the contrary, and that Congress has time and again directed legislative mandates contrary to its power, and that on such occasions it has not been alerted to its constitutional responsibilities, and that the Supreme Court has had to vitiate and set aside such acts of Congress.

In this holding (Woods against Miller Co., supra), there is a concurring opinion, written by Justice Jackson who, while affirming the legality of the legislation, nevertheless views the same with great concern and skepticism, declaring that "the Government asserts no constitutional basis for this legislation other than this vague, undefined and undefinable 'war power.' No one will question that this power is the most dangerous one to free government in the whole catalog of powers." At the time of the present writing, it is 5 years and 4 months since Japan completely capitulated and under the guise of war powers, the Federal Government has and is enacting legislation not authorized under the Federal Constitution nor possible of conscientious construction as a "war power" of Congress.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

One of the greatest detours from the Constitution is to be found in the construction of implied powers to Congress resulting from the grant of power to Congress to regulate commerce among the States. This big step was made in the sanctioning of Federal legislation by the Supreme Court in a divided opinion rendered in 1935 in the case of *Ashwander* v. *The Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288). This decision literally and actually put the Federal Government into the business of distributing and selling electric power over large districts and to expel companies which had long serviced them and the control of the markets therein. This with all the protective rights of the sovereign and subject to no limitations whatsoever. A brief résumé of the history of this litigation and the ultimate finding of the Supreme Court is illuminating and the full import of its decision startling and amazing.

The Tennessee River is approximately 900 miles in length. The drainage basin approximately 40,000 square miles; the volume of water is extremely variable; commercial navigation is of moderate importance. However, during and immediately after World War I, there was constructed at Muscle Shoals, near Florence, Ala., the Wilson Dam. With its auxiliary plants, including the hydroelectric power plant, they were intended to be adapted to the purpose of national defense. Also, the act authorizing the creation of the same, the Defense Act of June 3, 1916, had in view improvements to navigation. As a result of this, the Federal production of electricity soon commenced. Some was devoted to Government purposes; much was sold but delivery made at or near the dam.

On May 18, 1933, Congress created a corporation, known as the Tennessee Valley Authority, and operations were begun for improving the Tennessee River navigation, and especially for developing the water power along the whole river at public expense. This plan involved conversion of water power into electricity for wide distribution throughout the valley and adjacent territory.

The United States Government immediately thereafter acting through its creation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, promptly took over the Wilson Dam; construction work began on the Wheeler Dam, 20 miles up the river; and the Pickwick Dam, some 40 miles lower down. It commenced construction on the Norris Dam, across the Clinch River, a branch of the Tennessee River 200 miles above the Wilson Dam. All of these additions

[8] *Hamilton* v. *The Kentucky Distilleries Co.* (251 U. S. 146, p. 156 (1919)).

[9] *Woods* v. *Miller Co.*, 333 U. S. 138 (1947).

[10] *Woods* v. *Miller Co.*, 333 U. S. 144 (1947).

were to be connected by transmission wires, and electric energy distributed from them to millions of people in many States.[11]

At this time it is to be noted that during the last 30 years (prior to 1935), several corporations had been engaged in the business of developing electrical energy. It finally resulted in an extensive business having been built up; all private corporations, of course, and operated under State supervision. Among them were the Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and the Tennessee Electric Power Co. They were ultimately banded together under the mother company of the Commonwealth and Southern Corp. During this time and during the creation of these big private enterprises, huge sums of money were invested by thousands of persons in many States of the Union, and the companies were at all times diligently developing their several systems in response to the demands of the people in the territories that they served.

The creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority was to put the United States Government into the business of distributing and selling electric power through the same districts serviced by the aforementioned private power companies, and to expel the power companies which had long serviced them and to control the market therein.[12]

The question before the Supreme Court was that the Tennessee Valley Authority was not properly created nor authorized by any express grant of power or right to Congress, nor were the rights assuming to be exercised by Congress in the creation of the Authority proper incidental powers to be derived from any express power granted Congress.

The majority opinion in affirming this Federal legislation held "the act of 1916 had in view improvements to navigation. Commerce includes navigation. The power to regulate interstate commerce embodies the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. The Government acquired full title to the dam site, with all riparian rights. The power of falling water was an inevitable incident to the construction of the dam. That water came into exclusive control of the Federal Government. The mechanical energy was convertible into electric energy, and the electric energy thus produced constitutes property belonging to the United States."

By this construction the Government was put into active competition, with all the exemptions of sovereignty, with private enterprise, which was subject to all of the burdens of government and of sovereignty.

A very capable dissenting opinion is written by Justice McReynolds in which it is pointed out that the public service corporations which were and had been servicing the millions of people in many States were to be brought to such terms as the Valley Authority saw fit to dictate, or to be put out of business, and that an early expenditure for this purpose of public funds of at least $75,000,000 was appropriated by the directors for this purpose. The purpose of the Valley Authority was definitely to control the market of selling and distributing electric power heretofore serviced by private companies. And the dissenting opinion clearly points out that "a Government instrumentality had entered upon a pretentious scheme to provide a yardstick to the fairness of rates charged by private owners and to attain no less a goal than the electrification of America."

Under the competition of Federal enterprise tax free and subject to no limitation other than the sovereign may desire to prescribe for itself, and free from any State limitation whatsoever, it is clear that the power companies, operating under the name of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., were either to be forced into bankruptcy, or to comply with the pleasures of the Valley Authority. They chose the latter.

The Alabama Power Co. agreed to sell for $1,000,000 all of its low-tension transmission lines, substations, and all rural lines in five Alabama counties and parts of two others.

The Mississippi Power Co., for $350,000, agreed to transfer all of its transmission and distribution lines, substations and generating plants in nine counties in the State of Mississippi to the Authority.

For $900,000, the Tennessee Power Co. agreed to convey its transmission and distribution lines, substations, and distribution system in four counties in Tennessee and all of the 66 kilovolt transmission lines from Cove Creek to Knoxville, Tenn., to the Valley Authority.

Justice McReynolds in his conclusion states that "Congress has no constitutional authority to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority or any other Federal agency to undertake the operation essentially permanent in character of a utility system for profit, involving the generation, transmission, and commercial distribution of electricity within State domain, having no reasonable relation to a lawful Government use." He further states, "if under the thin mask of disposing of property the United States can enter the business of generating * * * and selling power * * * with the definite design to accompany industry wholly beyond the sphere marked out from time to time by the Constitution, an easy way has been found for breaking down the limitations * * * to guarantee protection against aggression."

Clearly, the holding of the majority of the Supreme Court constitutes constitutional amendment by judicial legislation. Now for a step further and as a natural consequence of the breakdown of constitutional barriers, let us analyze the holdings of the Court in its construction of the commerce clause to be found in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111) decided some 7 years later (1942).

At this time there had been adopted by Congress the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It was amended in 1941, and this case has to do with the amendment of 1941. In this case the defendant, Filburn, had for many years owned and operated a small farm in Ohio. From this farm he obtained his living by selling cattle, milk, and raising poultry. To keep the farm operating properly, he raised a small acreage of winter wheat, which when sown in the fall was ready for harvest in July. Of this small amount of wheat, he would sell a portion of the crop to feed part of the poultry and livestock; another portion of the crop he used for home consumption; the rest of the crop he kept for seeding for the ensuing year. Under the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, an order was issued limiting Filburn to 11.1 acres for the raising of wheat and each acre not to yield more than 20.1 bushels of wheat. Apparently, finding that he could not adequately operate his small farm on this arbitrary allotment, he planted and sowed 23 acres of his land with wheat and harvested from the excess acreage sown (11.9 acres), excess bushels in the number of 239. Under the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, he was now subject to a penalty of 49 cents a bushel, or $117.11, and because of his refusal or inability to pay the penalty, he was refused a marketing card. Obviously the effect of this was to put him out of business.

The question of the constitutionality of this act was presented to the Supreme Court and the Court affirmed the validity of the act on the ground that the act constituted a regulation of interstate commerce and as such was the exercise of a power authorized to Congress.

The validity of this act is justified by the Court in part in the following words: "The general scheme of the act is to control the volume moving in interstate and foreign commerce in order to avoid surpluses and shortages, and the consequent abnormal low or high wheat prices and obstructions to commerce."

The opinion also asserts the following conclusion of the Court: "The question (constitutionality of the act) would merit little consideration since our decisions in *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100) sustaining the Federal power to regulate production of goods for commerce, except for the fact that this act extends Federal regulation to production not intended in any part for commerce but wholly for consumption on the farm." [13]

Can this be said to be anything other than judicial enlargement of constitutional powers? And what has happened to the dual system of government contemplated by the Constitution in the face of this holding and the rights of the States and the sovereign rights of the people clearly defined in the fundamental law?

Does it not bear out the admonition and the warning emanating from the dissenting opinion of Justice McKenna, in the case of *Block* v. *Hirsch* (254 U. S. 458), in which the majority opinion of the Supreme Court affirmed rent control of private property in the District of Columbia in 1921, in which Justice McKenna states "'withstand beginnings' (*Boyd* v. *United States* (116 U. S. 616)). Who can know to what end they will conduct? The facts of this litigation point the warning."

The decisions, of course, are replete with similar holdings on "implied" powers of Congress relative to the commerce clause. However, this trend of construction does not stop with the commerce clause. The same "liberal" attitude or drift is to be found in the construction by the Court of the power granted to Congress "the power to make treaties under the authority of the United States" (art. VI, sec. 2).

Under the guise of a treaty with Canada protecting migratory birds, an act of Congress which standing alone was manifestly unconstitutional [14] now became the law of the land (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), opinion by Justice Holmes. But the consequence of this holding and subsequent holdings is so very far-reaching and so transcends constitutional grants that they can only be adequately treated in a separate discussion.

NINTH AND TENTH AMENDMENTS BEING NULLIFIED

And so it is clearly apparent that the inherent and sovereign rights of the people and the States, recognized and guaranteed in the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution have been inched away by congressional usurpation of power and authority, and that legislative exercise of power in this respect has been affirmed by the supreme tribunal.

The great danger to be found in the wake of such expansion and centralization of power is totalitarianism and dictatorship. History is replete with the rise of false prophets motivated only by political success and desire for personal grandeur and personal enthronement, who through the usurpation of powers, will play to the platitudes of the masses and under the postulates of

[11] Dissenting opinion of Justice McReynolds, *Ashwander* v. *The Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288).

[12] See, Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for 1934-35.

[13] *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111, p. 123).

[14] *United States* v. *Shauver* (214 Fed. 154 (1914)); *United States* v. *McCullagh* (221 Fed. 288 (1915)); *State* v. *Sawyer* (113 Maine 458 (1915)); *State* v. *McCullagh* (96 Kans. 786 1915)).

democracy will not hesitate to seize power and ultimately annihilate the sovereign rights of the people. A most casual analysis of the Hitler regime, the Mussolini dictatorship, the present Stalin bureaucracy advocating the alleged supremacy of the proletariat, illustrates nicely and comprehensively the complete assassination of sovereign rights and free enterprise, and the consequential results of the doctrine of unlimited powers of Federal Government.

Such a situation and such contingencies and uncertainties were most comprehendingly discussed by President William Harrison in 1841, in succeeding to the Presidency and after the expiration of the office of Andrew Jackson. In his only message to Congress, after pointed comments in regard to the powers assumed by Andrew Jackson, he follows with this observation:

"This is the old trick of those who usurp the government of their country. In the name of democracy they speak, warning the people against the influence of wealth and the danger of aristocracy. History, ancient and modern, is full of such examples. Caesar became the master of the Roman people and the senate under the pretense of supporting the democratic claims of the former against the aristocracy of the latter; Cromwell, in the character of the protector of the liberties of the people, became the dictator of England, and Bolivar possessed himself of unlimited power with the title of his country's liberator. * * * The tendencies of all such governments in their decline is to monarchy, and the antagonistic principle to liberty there is spirit of faction—a spirit which assumes the character and in times of great excitement imposes itself upon the people as the genuine spirit of freedom, and, like the false christs whose coming was foretold by the Saviour, seeks to, and were it possible, would impose upon the true and most faithful disciples of liberty. It is in periods like this that it behooves the people to be most watchful of those to whom they have entrusted power."

POLAND SOLD OUT AT YALTA

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the month of February brings to mind many dates of which the American people are justly proud, such as Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays.

However, this week marks the anniversary of a date on which America can lower her head in shame. We are not proud to remember that 6 years ago the now infamous Yalta agreement was drawn up by the architects of our present foreign policy, one of the chief advisers being Alger Hiss.

Yesterday marked the day that the Democratic Party, the Hisses, the New Deal, the Fair Deal—yes, even the "queer deal"—sold Poland into slavery and paved the way for the enslavement of eight more European nations and permitted the Soviet Empire to become a great world force. They turned the Polish people over to communism; they covered up the facts of the Katyn massacre for many years where many thousands of Polish officers were wantonly massacred: they put religion on the chopping block to such an extent that the feature news story in last Sunday's Catholic News reported:

"The curtailments suffered by the church in Poland during 1950 were among the worst in its 1,000-year history."

In my own city of Chicago the great majority of Polish people in the past have supported the Democratic Party. Why does not the Democratic Party demand just treatment and renounce the sell-out of Poland? Why does not this Democratic Party right the wrongs of Yalta? Why? Because they will not admit their own blunders, and it will have to remain for the Republican Party to restore decency and confidence in our foreign relations, and to restore Poland to its rightful place among the great nations of the world.

THE BOXCAR SITUATION IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar situation throughout the Midwest is again becoming very bad and especially has it been aggravated by the switchmen's strike. I have today introduced H. R. 2517, which would give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate the rental charges on boxcars which, for example, leave our area in the Midwest with a load of grain or lumber for an eastern destination. Eastern lines then used these cars day after day instead of returning them immediately to their home railroads in the West and Midwest. Consequently, at times, some of our railroads in the Midwest have 30 percent of their boxcars doing shuttle service at $1.75 a day on the eastern lines, instead of being returned for another long haul. By raising the rental to a reasonable figure, the Interstate Commerce Commission can regulate the use of these cars and prevent chaotic conditions occurring periodically in the great grain-producing areas of our Nation. I hope the membership will help in getting this legislation adopted. It will save from spoilage and wastage millions of bushels of high-moisture-content grain annually.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

TWO RELATED INCIDENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, two events took place yesterday which should have a definite relation with each other in the minds of the American public.

One was the successful effort of the Republican minority to achieve a greater degree of realism in the reciprocal trade agreements program; and the other, the conviction in New York City of William W. Remington for perjury involving denial of his Communist affiliations.

While I do not charge that the negotiation of trade agreements with other countries, handled or at least dominated by the State Department, has been dictated by unpatriotic motives, the evidence is conclusive that disloyal elements have wormed their way into this crucial governmental activity. Certainly, case after case can be cited where the United States negotiators displayed far deeper concern over the welfare of foreign industries and those employed in them than they did over American businesses and American working men and women.

International trade is vitally important to the prosperity and well being of the people of this country. If trade agreements are conscientiously arrived at and scrupulously administered in accordance with the protective provisions now incorporated in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and all parties concerned sincerely bend their efforts toward making it work, many of the evils and injustices which have resulted from the present program can be eliminated without impairment, indeed with an increase in the volume of international trade flowing in both directions.

It is regrettable that the attitude of the administration leaders who sponsored the bill before us yesterday made it necessary to water down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to withdraw the application of reduced tariffs and other concessions which have been granted to imports from Russia, Red China and other Communist dominated countries. At least the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means did succeed in convincing the Majority that they should not throw a road block in the way of the effort to stop the State Department from championing the grant of such concessions to Communist countries in the future.

Probably no one in Congress knows what goes on behind the scenes in preparation for these international trade conferences or what takes place at the conferences themselves. Contrary to the practice of other countries, Members of the United States Congress are excluded from participation in these conclaves.

We do know that in many instances damaging, sometimes fatal, concessions have been made by our representatives. We also know that the personnel of some of our negotiators was, in many instances, not such as to commend them to the confidence of the American people.

The insidious influence of Alger Hiss in international conferences has been repeatedly emphasized. Now we have the case of William W. Remington, who stands convicted of having lied when he said he was not a member of the Communist Party.

It is important for us to remember, and for the American public constantly to bear in mind, the high official positions which Remington held and the influence upon international trade matters which

he necessarily exerted. Let me refresh your recollection as to the high posts in Government which he held.

When he testified in July of 1948 before the Senate Committee on Expenditures, he had previously been a staff member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers with offices in the White House and the assistant executive secretary of a committee headed by Mr. Harriman, with offices in the White House, and was at that time the director of the export program staff of the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce. In this last capacity he was directly under Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for foreign and domestic commerce.

It should not be necessary for the Congress of the United States to be required by legislation to direct, as they did yesterday, that the executive agencies shall endeavor to protect American interests when they negotiate trade treaties and that they shall not grant reduced tariffs and other concessions to Communist-controlled countries. But unfortunately, bitter experience has dictated the necessity for such protective amendments.

On the very day Congress steps in to protect American interests, a dramatic illustration of one of the reasons for this action is furnished by this conviction in a court of law of one of our highest placed experts in international trade.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman stated something about an amendment being adopted yesterday by the Republican minority. Did not that amendment receive support from the majority side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. The RECORD speaks for itself, as to what took place on the floor of the House.

THE TREASURY AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board it is the people who are getting burned. One of the things we said about this emergency was that there was not to be business as usual or politics as usual. I think it is time to end politics in this situation and have the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board get together to answer these questions: Shall the interest on the national debt be a billion or so dollars less, which makes the budget look better; or shall inflation be dealt a real blow by dealing with the inflationary expansion of bank credit at its source? Let us remember that such inflation can cost our people many times in billions of dollars of purchasing power what additional expenditure would be involved in somewhat higher interest rates on some Government bond issues.

Normally the people are entitled to low-interest rates and that is in the long-range interest of the United States. We are in grave danger from inflation now and reasonable people will not object to measures to halt it so that we may indeed again be able to take up the forward march to normal economic conditions and low interest rates. But if one of these parties wins an absolute victory—and that is the Treasury—they are going to go off in one direction without the Federal Reserve Board with what may well prove a disservice to the people. The time has come for compromise, we need the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board unified on policy. It would be a service to the people if the President "called off the dogs" and both parties got together and inflation attributable to vast additions to the money supply and public credit was dealt a body blow now. The people will understand that saving somewhat on interest payments on national debt in such circumstances would be penny wise and pound foolish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, for several decades it has been evident that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will make a substantial addition to the economic strength of Canada and the United States. By removing the narrow bottleneck—created by rapids in the St. Lawrence River—between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal—a distance of 114 miles—a 2,347-mile deepwater channel between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean will be opened. Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Toledo, Duluth, and other Great Lakes cities will become ocean ports. Great transportation savings will result throughout the area when the midwest finally receives its Panama Canal.

As part of the dual-purpose development of the St. Lawrence River, a power project, the equivalent of a Grand Coulee, will be made available. The site of this power development is at Massena, N. Y. Shared equally by Canada and the United States, the 13,000,000,000-kilowatt-hours of electric energy generated annually will go far to alleviate the critical power situation facing Eastern Canada and the New York-New England region.

The present legislation calls for the project to be self-liquidating. Tolls are to be charged on the waterway. The State of New York is to pay for the power facilities, which will be turned over to that State. Thus, the taxpayers do not bear the ultimate burden of the costs of the St. Lawrence development.

The present world crisis serves to emphasize the urgency of getting started on the St. Lawrence project. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Board for Defense, Canada and the United States, and the Defense Department, have all taken the view that the St. Lawrence development is needed for the security of Canada and the United States.

But most important of all to our national security is the need for the St. Lawrence seaway to provide a protected waterway to transport Labrador iron ore to Great Lakes steel mills.

Over a 50-year period, and through two world wars, the mines around Lake Superior have supplied most of the Nation's iron ore. But now, the huge reserves of high-grade ore in the area are seriously depleted. The demands of the present mobilization period will make new inroads on our declining domestic reserves of ore. By 1960 we shall be forced to import a very substantial portion of the iron ore required by our steel mills. Labrador ore provides the only major continental source of high-grade ore to supplement our dwindling domestic supplies.

The St. Lawrence seaway is urgently needed to make it possible to bring Labrador iron ore in over a protected inland route rather than over exposed ocean routes, subject to enemy submarine attack.

Moreover, the inexpensive waterway transportation will have a stabilizing effect on industry in the Middle West. If the seaway is not constructed, the steel industry and associated industries will tend to migrate to coastal areas to take advantage of cheap tidewater transportation of foreign iron ores. The resulting economic decline of the Midwest, and the further concentration of industry on our exposed East and Gulf coasts, will adversely affect the security of the Nation.

Both the power and navigation facilities of the St. Lawrence project are urgently needed for the national security of Canada and the United States. Further delay in undertaking the St. Lawrence project must not be tolerated.

CONVICTION OF WILLIAM W. REMINGTON

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, another red herring has finally been laid to rest. This time it is the case of William W. Remington, the $10,000-a-year Commerce Department economist who was found guilty last night of perjury. What the verdict amounts to, of course, is a finding that Remington has been a member of the gang of Communist spies, saboteurs, and traitors in high Government positions

who have been serving the cause of Russia for many years.

We should draw two lessons from the Remington verdict. First, it is a sad commentary on the President's so-called loyalty program. In February 1949, many months after espionage charges had been made against Remington, the President's Loyalty Review Board cleared him and awarded him $5,000 in back pay to cover the period of his suspension. One of the many astounding aspects of the Board's action was the later admission by its chairman, Seth Richardson, that it had never bothered to study the testimony about Remington that had been developed by a Senate investigating committee during the Eightieth Congress, even after that testimony had been transmitted to the Board for its especial consideration. This Mr. Richardson is, of course, the same man whom Mr. Truman has recently nominated to be chairman of the new Subversive Activities Control Board. By this action in the Remington case alone, Mr. Richardson has disqualified himself for any such important position.

The second lesson from the Remington verdict is that it proves the importance of the work of congressional investigating committees in ferreting out disloyalty. The Remington case was developed in its early stages by the House Un-American Activities Committee, as was the Alger Hiss case. Luckily, these committees did not believe that the stench from the Remington and other cases were just the odor of "red herring," as President Truman wise-cracked repeatedly.

EFFICIENT USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, General Marshall and his advisers are advocating that Congress approve legislation for the drafting of 18-year-olds. This legislation might not be necessary and veterans of World War II would not be recalled to active duty if the Department of Defense would only use the available manpower efficiently and economically.

A recent communication from a GI on duty clearly indicates the Army is not doing the job effectively. A corporal was recalled to active duty in November. He spent 2 weeks at Fort Sheridan in Illinois. From there he was shipped to Tacoma, Wash., where he remained 2 weeks. Then a shift back east to Percy Jones Hospital in Battle Creek, Mich., for duty. Approximately a month later he received orders to report to his new duty, back again at Tacoma, Wash.

This GI will have traveled approximately 10,000 miles in 3 months. From Fort Sheridan, Ill., to Battle Creek, Mich., is about 140 miles but under Army orders he traveled to the west coast and back again.

The American people need to have confidence in the Department of Defense, but they are properly disturbed by such unsound personnel policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 90 minutes on Wednesday next, following the disposition of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NEWS REPORTS AND COMMENTARIES FREE OF LABOR INFLUENCE

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that has for its purpose the preservation to the American public of its right to news reports and commentaries, free from the influence that can be exerted by national labor organizations upon their membership.

Under this measure I propose to exclude from the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended, all employees of newspapers or periodicals, and all others, directly involved in gathering and presentation of marketed public information.

Freedom of the press is one of our constitutional guaranties, recognized as vital to our national security. However, it cannot be contradicted that no real freedom of the press can exist, no complete honesty of presentation can be assured, and no genuine, well-founded public confidence can be reposed in reportorial accuracy if individuals who develop and phrase news that shapes public opinion are subject to economic pressure from sources having vital and widely varied interest in news content.

It would seem obvious that the news reporter under the impression his working conditions have been or could be improved by membership in a union through its affiliation with a national labor organization or who can, under certain circumstances, be deprived of his means of livelihood under the rules of such organization cannot fail to be influenced in some degree by reason of the relationship.

Sound public policy demands forthright presentation of news. The American press must function freely, safe from even the suspicion of undercover utilization of power over reportorial staffs by labor organizations for the purpose of directing public thought through news coloration nor should even the suspicion exist that such organizations could, through friendly relations established by mutual interests restrict or prevent publication of unfavorable information.

Public policy has decreed that Federal, State and municipal employees be excluded from the provisions of the act. Surely to no less a degree can exclusion be justified of that group that is charged with the great responsibility of reporting the news for public consumption on which the opinions formed by our American citizenry are predicated.

The fourth estate has its proud traditions. It constitutes a field of service that affords great opportunity and attracts men and women of exceptional talent. Its very nature and its exacting requirements insures for them adequate compensation and fair working conditions. Clearly, an alliance of newsmen with any organization having a vital selfish interest in news content is contrary to public interest and a departure from traditional reportorial independence.

It should be made clear that this bill is not to be interpreted as accusatory in the sense that it is prompted by the back record. The intent is purely to safeguard to the greatest possible degree vital public interest in open-minded news presented.

My bill reads as follows:

H. R. 2516

A bill to deny the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act to any labor organization whose membership includes certain employees of newspapers and periodicals

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, no petition filed by a labor organization under section 9 (e) (1) shall be entertained, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, if such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit of any national or international labor organization and includes among its officers or members any individual employed by a newspaper or other periodical as a writer, reporter, correspondent, or commentator, or in any other capacity which is directly involved in the gathering or presentation of news."

PACKED APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee met yesterday and organized 1 month after the organization of the House. I want to call the attention of the House to one of the most shocking examples of packing committees that I have ever witnessed in my 28 years in Congress.

Although the historic ratio between majority and minority members has been 3 to 2, the Democrats yesterday packed two subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee at a 5-to-2 ratio, and three other subcommittees at 4-to-2 ratio.

I want to call attention to the fact that the five committees which have been stacked are committees where any substantial savings in the budget this year must be made. With Republicans hav-

ing 46 percent of the membership of the House, it is impossible for me to reconcile the fact that we received only 29 percent representation on two committees and only 33⅓ percent representation on three others.

I can only conclude that it is the intention of the committee chairman, Mr. CANNON, and the Democratic leadership of this House to ignore public demand for economy and to protect the bureaucrats in their spend-as-usual programs. If Mr. CANNON wants to be the pallbearer for the Democratic Party, who am I to stop him? I can only tell this House that the Republican members will work with all the energy they possess to hold every non-defense-appropriation item to only essentials. But I must tell the House that Republicans cannot be held responsible for appropriations voted by stacked committees.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, as members of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriations, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and myself find that subcommittee has been stacked against us 5 to 2. For the life of me, I cannot understand what the chairman and the Democratic members of the committee hope to gain by such tactics. I know that the people of my district, and I am confident that the entire population of this country, want a maximum of economy, particularly in nondefense items, during this crisis when they are asked to submit to taxes until it hurts.

There is simply no justification for this arbitrary action unless it be that the Democratic Party wants to commit suicide. If the Democratic Party wishes to extinguish itself, it has picked a certain way to do it because the responsibility for any extravagance during this critical year will lie squarely on that party.

As a member of the committee, I will, of course, spend every hour that I can in efforts to effect the economies that we must have if this Nation is to remain secure, and I know that I express the sentiment of all 20 Republican members of the Appropriations Committee. But I cannot accept responsibility when I am not permitted to share in it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of one of the committees that has in effect been stacked 5 to 2 in favor of reckless spending, I rise to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in this protest. We on the subcommittee for the Interior have worked long hours in the past to do the best job possible. What justification there can be for this procedure, short of protecting the bureaucrats and spenders, I do not know. I will promise the House this much: My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and myself will do the best we can, even though we may be outvoted 5 to 2, and I further promise that if substantial reductions are not made—and I have very little hope that they will be made—we will bring amendments to the floor that will give this House—with its 54–46-percent ratio representation—a chance to do the job.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I think the comments made by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER] and other Republican members of that committee today are of interest to everybody in the entire United States. They show an organization plan in the committee which can be directed to only one thing; that is, to the protection of spending as against saving.

I am also interested in the fact that the Subcommittee on Agriculture, a basic commodity of the United States, a great industry of the United States, is to be placed by the committee chairman and the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations in the same category as the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I protested to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] against treating the Subcommittee on Agriculture in that fashion yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SUBVERSIVES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago reference was made to the Remington and Hiss cases. Both Remington and Hiss were cleared by loyalty boards. These cases bring to my mind another case.

I refer to the case of George Shaw Wheeler, a man whose record I exposed on this floor several years ago. I was severely criticized and smeared at the time because it was stated that the man had been cleared by three loyalty boards. A little over a year ago this same man repudiated the United States and sought asylum behind the iron curtain under Russian protection. A man who was educated in this country and given every opportunity the same as any other citizen repudiated the country of his birth and the land that gave him opportunity and education.

This brings me to another point. This Nation does not yet know the debt of gratitude we owe the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, for the part he played in establishing the Committee on Un-American Activities. That committee examined the records of Alger Hiss and Remington and their questionable connections. The function of this committee is to examine the records of people of this type for security reasons, and it has done excellent and valuable work.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of William Remington for perjury in connection with his membership in the Communist Party has another lesson which I think ought to be pointed out. It has to do with the reliability of Miss Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, and Louis Budenz. These three individuals, against whom every possible smear has been directed in an effort to discredit them and destroy confidence in them, have been demonstrated to be accurate in every case that could be confirmed or disproved by additional evidence. In every case thus far where it has been possible to establish the truth about persons whom any one of the three has said he knew as a member of the Communist apparatus, their testimony has been proved true. I think the country owes a debt of gratitude to them for their willingness, when subpenaed, to go back into their own past and bring out some thing which they naturally would rather have kept secret in order to do their duty to their country now and try to atone for the harm they did their country in the past.

What about the other persons—besides Hiss, Remington, Wadleigh, Pressman, and so forth—whom Bentley, Budenz, and Chambers have said they knew as members of the Communist Party, and whom loyalty boards or Senate committees have cleared? It seems to me that all of us who are sworn to defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, must assume that such accused persons are suspect until proved otherwise and must govern ourselves accordingly. When deciding whom we are to believe, the record clearly indicates we can and should believe the three abovenamed witnesses who have consistently been proved right rather than the loyalty boards who have so often been wrong, to the detriment of our national interests.

FREEDOM FOR POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite appropriate that we should today recall the unconscionable agreements made at Yalta, from which emanated such unspeakable grief, injustice, turmoil, and current threats of war. Much of the strife and discord that exist in the world today can be traced to Yalta. Certainly the predominance, which the Soviets have achieved in world polity, is lastingly attributable to Yalta and similar concessions and appeasements.

One of the most shameful of all chapters in the Yalta handbook was the betrayal of Poland. Many times I have characterized that action as one of the great crimes of history and that is just what it is.

The idea of casually consigning into slavery the great and noble Polish people, with centuries of historic love for liberty and sacrifice from freedom, is monstrous. For my part, I have never acknowledged the validity of the agreements reached at Yalta, affecting the Polish and other free nations with similarly fine traditions, who were entitled to the same benefit of the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, as other nations in the world.

I again make another emphatic and vigorous protest against the enslavement of the Polish people and ask this Government and this Congress to take a stand in favor of their deliverance from the tyranny of the Soviets. I ask that relief in the name, not only of Poland alone, but of Lithuania and other nations suffering under serfdom, and in the name of the millions who sacrificed so bitterly in order that freedom might be made a reality but whose sacrifices have been nullified up to this point by diplomatic blunders.

SUBVERSIVES

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when, in 1946 as chairman of the Republican National Committee, I made speeches on the platform and on the radio pointing out that Communists, fellow travelers, and subversives had insinuated themselves into positions of importance in the Government service and I named Alger Hiss and William Remington as examples, I was castigated, cartooned, and reviled extensively in the press. While no one takes satisfaction in seeing harm come to any individual, there is consolation that the records of some of these subversives are finally being established in the courts of our land. I am satisfied there are many others still in positions of influence.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what some of the honorable gentlemen have said regarding the Remington conviction, particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] regarding the attack made on people like Whittaker Chambers and Louis Budenz, I recall about 7 or 8 months ago when Louis Budenz appeared before a Senate committee and gave very strong testimony against one of the State Department policy advisers, Owen Lattimore. And, I recall that within a very few days thereafter a vicious attack was made against Louis Budenz on the Senate floor in an administration effort to protect Mr. Lattimore. It was a disgraceful thing. It was the type of thing that has brought us to the bad situation we are in today, not listening to the truth, trying to cover up some of the mistakes and some of the traitorous acts of people like Alger Hiss in the Government service and the pro-Communist advice of professors like Owen Lattimore called in to shape the thinking of Secretary Acheson in the disastrous far eastern policy that led to Korea.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my real purpose in remaining here is to listen later on to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. But, while waiting for that, permit me to suggest to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the Republicans, that you should not be too greatly grieved about the fact that they have stacked those subcommittees against you. In the last session the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had 18 New Dealers—no, I guess it was 5 Democrats, 13 New Dealers, and but 7 Republicans. Being on that committee I considered that ratio something of a compliment. Seven Republicans equal to 5 Democrats plus 15 Truman Democrats, made me feel fairly good. So, my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee do not grieve too much about it. Moreover, the Democrats were only trying to establish unity, and to do it by excluding the greatest possible number of Republicans from the committee and the subcommittees.

There is however a matter of principle involved in this situation and unless we are willing to ignore our duty to the Republican Party, abandon our faith in the two-party system we should take immediate aggressive action to right the wrong, to protect our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

In my judgment a resolution should be offered to the House instructing the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the committee itself to appoint new subcommittees, the membership of which should be divided between Democrats and Republicans in as near as possible to the same ratio that exists in the House.

That has been the custom in the years gone by, it is fair and just. There is no reason why the chairman of that committee should be permitted to punish members who voted against his pet idea of the way appropriation bills should be handled.

If the Republican leadership does not offer such a bill I shall do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to talk about another subject.

Today, the Army, which has been in nominal charge of certain railroads since last August, issued an order which calls upon the striking employees to go back to work when called, unless they can show that they are really ill. If the strikers do not comply with this order, which was signed by Assistant Army Secretary Karl R. Bendetsen, they will be discharged—lose their jobs as railway employees.

The order states that, twice since last August, "a relatively small group of over one million employees have violated the law of the land."

I do not know whether this relatively small group of railway employees has violated the law of the land, but I do know that some of them have disobeyed court orders and that the effect of the transportation tie-up which they have brought about has prevented the shipment of needed munitions of war to the men who are fighting abroad; it has interfered with the movement of conscripted men to their training camps. It has prevented some men, who have served abroad, making visits to their families.

Twice, impartial mediation boards, appointed by the President under the law, have found that the demands of the railroad men were not justified, should not be granted.

On the last occasion, a mediation board, if my understanding is correct, recommended a raise of 18 cents an hour for the yardman, and 5 cents an hour for the roadmen. This recommendation was accepted by the railroads and by the officers of the union. Notwithstanding this agreement, some of the crews went on strikes and transportation was, for the second time, tied up.

The Army order anounces an interim wage increase of 12½ cents an hour for the yardmen, or 5½ cents less than was recommended by the Mediation Board; and 5 cents an hour, or the same increase that was recommended, for the roadmen.

One thing is certain—all too long, small groups in various unions which to a large extent are employed in activities supplying transportation, light, fuel and water to the public have been permitted to enforce their demands through strikes.

It has long been my contention that no group, either of workers or industrialists, should be permitted to follow a course which interfered with the health, welfare or safety of the public.

The soundness of this contention is apparent when we remember that the rates charged by public utilities, by companies furnishing the services above referred to, are often fixed by either State or Federal authorities.

It may be, as has sometimes been charged, that in the past these strikes have been brought about by Communists working from within the unions. We do know that the CIO, in recent months, has, as a matter of self-protection, been forced to expel a number of its affiliates because Communists had acquired control of those unions.

It would be absurd, it would be foolish, to charge that strikes as a whole are instigated or carried on by Communists, for there are few—but the few very powerful—Communists in unions.

There is strong reason to suspect that some, desiring the socialism of public utilities, have instigated, do lend support to, these strikes, in the hope that the Government will be forced to take over the companies operating these public utilities.

No doubt, some who wish the Government to take over are of the opinion that, when the Government secures control, then the unions, through political pressure and political alliance with those in authority, will find it easy to make good their demands for either shorter hours or increased compensation.

Few there are who believe that any man should be forced to work at a job other than one of his own choosing. It is equally true that no man should be permitted to be a dog in the manger, that is, to refuse to work at a job which did not suit him, where the compensation was not to his liking, and, in addition, prevent anyone else from working at that job. That sort of a position cannot be maintained in a free America.

A remedy? The remedy is simple if the facts are given consideration.

Unions have obtained a position of power because, and only because, the Congress has given unions and union members certain special privileges and benefits denied to nonunion members.

When the unions or the members of such unions refuse to exercise those powers wisely and judiciously, when they use those powers oppressively and, through the exercise of those powers, endanger the public health, safety or welfare, then the obvious remedy is not to throw the union men in jail, not to attempt to force them to work, but to deny them the special benefits and privileges which have been granted them by so-called labor legislation.

A bill has been introduced which would apply that remedy; which would take from union men the special benefits and privileges which they enjoy as union men, when they refuse to work at their jobs and when such refusal is injurious to the public as a whole.

There is evidence that the few who, in unions, attempt to use the special privileges granted them, capriciously, arbitrarily, injuriously, to the detriment of the public, have come to the end of the road; that the people, and the Congress, although lagging behind the people, will ultimately enact and insist upon the enforcement of legislation which will protect the public against the demands of the few.

THE REMINGTON CASE

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the conviction of William Remington, I think it only fair to point out, in view of the severe criticism of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has been appearing recently in Westbrook Pegler's newspaper column, that whatever sins of omission or commission the committee has been guilty of, it was responsible, nevertheless, for the reopening of the Remington case. Through the efforts of the committee, additional evidence was certified. This evidence led to Remington's conviction yesterday in Federal court on a charge of perjury.

I had the honor to serve on the Committee on Un-American Activities during the Eighty-first Congress. I found, very quickly, that the work of that committee is extremely difficult. It is under constant attack, both from the right and from the left. The extreme right complains because it does not hang somebody before sunrise every morning. The extreme left denies that the committee has any business investigating anybody or anything.

It is my sincere belief, however, that the committee conducted its proceedings in the Eighty-first Congress with dignity, with fairness, and in keeping with its assigned mission. A careful reading of the published reports and transcripts of hearings bears this out, and my regret is that these publications have not received more general attention. It heard more witnesses, took more pages of testimony, and published more reports than at any time in the history of the committee.

The committee has uncovered a startling series of subversive Communist operations in the United States—operations undertaken methodically and accomplished with chilling success. The investigations of the committee gave clear proof of the extent to which the Communists have attempted a systematic undermining of our atomic research projects, establishment of sabotage cells in communications and in other key industries and infiltration of the Federal Government and such important defense bastions as the Territory of Hawaii.

The committee certainly is not immune to criticism. I believe Mr. Pegler should consider the whole record of the committee, however, in the interest of fair reporting.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of finding out the program to be announced by the majority leader for next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is Lincoln's birthday and there will be no legislative business on that day. On Tuesday there will be no legislative business. There is no business scheduled for next week at all, as a matter of fact. The House has been acting so efficiently that we have disposed very promptly of the matters that have come before us.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts is being very courteous to the Republicans who will be speaking next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the observation of my friend, and I want him to know that it brings pleasure to me to arrange the program with that in mind. It is what I want to do and what any decent-minded person in my position should do.

There will be no legislation on Wednesday. If there is any legislation to be considered next week it will not be before Thursday, and I know of none at the present time. If any legislation does come out of committee to come up next week, and that is to be considered under the regular rules of the House, that is, with general debate and consideration under the 5-minute rule, I shall give the House as much advance notice as possible so that Members will not be left in an unguarded position. However, I know of nothing important for next week, and insofar as I am able I shall try to have nothing important come up if it should be reported out of committee. I do not want to bind myself to that, but even if anything is reported out it will not come up before Thursday of next week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I assume, then, that the majority leader has not in mind any anticipated emergencies that might call for action on a resolution or anything of that nature, and that those who stay here will have opportunity to express their views from the well of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman knows, I am a great believer in the principle of freedom of speech. As far as I am concerned, I enjoy every speech I hear, whether or not I agree with it in whole or in part. If the gentleman has any desire to make speeches on any day next week, or every day, it is perfectly all right with me. We will meet every day except, of course, that I would not want to have the House meet on Friday of next week if we had no business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not have any in mind now, but occasionally impulses to speak cause me to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is quite a natural impulse, that we all thoroughly appreciate, and respect, I might say.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this request or to a similar request next week, but, having a great desire to finish our work and get home sometime early next fall, after next week I intend to do what I can to see if we can expedite business so that when the 1st of September comes along the House may adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman in all seriousness——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am serious about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman is very serious about it, and not facetious. May I say that when the committees get rolling out legislation, if I set a week's program and the House disposes of it by Thursday, a good week's program, I am sure the gentleman from Michigan, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, would feel completely satisfied and glad to adjourn over from Thursday to Monday, even in the weeks after next week. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have seen so much in the papers about the T. T., but I am not a member of the T. T. Club.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not much of a paper man, is he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know what you mean by that. I read the paper occasionally, the Washington Post, which advises me what I should do to serve the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. But do you do it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; no; I do not. I find in my experience that I can best serve my district if I just go the opposite, usually, to what they say. Of course, once in a while the Post does have a sound, constructive idea, but usually I can serve my people pretty well by going along the opposite way from what the Post suggests. The Post is just a little too internationalist for me. What I was thinking about was, not belonging to this—what do you call it?—T. to T. Club, that is, to come Tuesday and adjourn Thursday Club, I do not know any reason why some of us who come from so far away should be required to be here all the time and the others just go home for a large part of each week. I do not know what they do—maybe play golf or ride on their yachts when the sea permits; but anyway they just are not here. I am not finding fault with them nor with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I know he works hard. He is always working. He tries—but are we to loaf along and then stay here until September or October or November?

Mr. McCORMACK. All of which comes under the principle of freedom of speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; no freedom to get away and earn a dollar on another job when it might be well to give first attention to this job to which we are elected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THANKS FOR THE COMPLIMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, being one of the members of one of those subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations which have been packed 5 to 2, my reaction is just a little different from some of the other members. I am a little bit like old Uncle Mose, when the stranger at the gas station asked if he had the change of a $20 bill. Uncle Mose said, "No, sir; but thanks for the compliment."

If they have that much regard for the strength of my ranking member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], my reaction is, "Thanks for the compliment."

THE PRICE OF MILK

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, thus far through this session, in spite of all the talk and promises to do something about prices and rollbacks, we are still just where we started, with nothing as yet done.

The consumers of this country are paying too high a retail price for milk. The farmer is never guaranteed enough to cover his cost of producing this vital commodity.

People cannot continue paying 22 cents and up for a quart of milk. Even if they buy some at that figure, their children will not be privileged to get enough milk.

A family consisting of five children should be able to consume more than five and even seven quarts of milk per day. That means a regular charge on the family budget for milk alone of over $1.50 daily and well over $10 a week.

Those amounts will not include other dairy products such as butter, cream, or cheese which children need in addition to milk.

Therefore, 22 cents for a quart of milk makes this necessary food prohibitive for the American family table.

For several years, I have been pleading in vain for some action to remedy all these high food prices. Certainly milk is an outstanding example of how inflation has run wild with the average family food budget.

I am not among those, Mr. Speaker, who wants to blame this bad state of affairs on the dairy farmer. I own and operate a farm myself, not a large dairy, but a family size one. Therefore, I am able to testify that the average dairyman is in serious straits financially and that unless he is assured a fair and stable price for his milk, he is lost.

The dairymen in upstate New York cannot make his cost of production with an income of less than $5 per hundred pounds of milk. He cannot make a reasonable profit on an income of less than $6 for the same amount.

The farmer who receives an income of $5 per hundredweight actually realizes about 10 cents a quart for his milk. That looks big, but it is not, at least for the man who milks a herd of from 10 to 20 cows.

In order to give such a herd the proper care to obtain a decent yield, he must employ another man besides himself, especially if his son has been drafted. That requires an outlay of well over $100 a month to pay this hand and oftentimes $150.

This, added to the dairyman's taxes, his terrific feed bills, his supplies and machinery, makes it well-nigh impossible for him to stay in business.

Last spring, I was roundly criticized by selfish interests because I came out for a $6 minimum price per hundred pounds for the dairymen of the Northeast. Big city operators sent stooges to every creamery to smear me with the average farmer several months prior to my primary election.

A lot of money was spent to send thugs from farm to farm to try to force the farmers who had always supported me to vote for some other candidate.

Speakers were induced to go into the granges unbeknown to the rank and file members to do a job on me. They were vicious and loud in their denunciations of my record because I tried to get the dairy people of my section more money for their milk.

I do not expect to let these birds get started again because I am wise to what went on last time. I will have a few friends of my own planted in these meetings to stop these agitators in their tracks.

But let us return to the price the dairy farmer now receives for his product. It is unstable and inadequate. He lacks the guaranty he should have to produce enough of this vital food.

My bill proposes to give him a floor price of 10 cents a quart for milk, below which the market cannot go. Then he will be sure of some protection against a sheriff's sale of his property.

In the same bill, I provide for a ceiling price over the counter of 18 cents a quart.

This means the consumer gets fair treatment, the dairy farmer gets fair treatment. There is still a wide margin of profit between the 10 cents surety the farmer receives and the 18-cent quart of milk the consumer pays for

Unless something similar to these proposals is put into effect, the American public will soon be unable to buy any milk, the Armed Forces will be lacking sufficient diet, dairy producers all over the United States will have to give up.

Therefore, I urge this Congress to get busy, take the bull by the horns, and see that our price stabilizers put such a plan into immediate effect for the very survival of our Nation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SKILLED MANPOWER IS VITAL TO FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, policies of the Truman administration have set in motion a vicious inflationary price spiral that has increased the cost of living for every American. Persons living on fixed incomes, who do not profit from war expenditures, are hard hit as a result of the present inflationary trend. Food is the vital item for every consumer. I have taken this time to discuss food production in all of its phases.

According to the 1950 census about 18 percent of the population of the United States resides on the 6,000,000 farms of this country. More than two-thirds of these farms are known as the family-size farms that produce up to 85 percent of the average consumer diet. The family-size farms are generally operated by members of the farm family and on these are produced the dairy products, poultry, eggs, meat, fruits and vegetables so necessary for a healthy diet. It is not possible for the average farmer to employ competent labor, in competition with the short hours and high pay in industry, and therefore, the farmer and his family must do the work. Today, I am dealing in particular with the manpower problem confronting the farmers who operate family-size farms.

There is only one sound method to retard or stop the present inflationary spiral of food prices, and that is to secure more production of food by American farmers. Abundant production of food can only be assured for 1951 and the war years to come if Government manpower policies provide for the retention of essential farm workers on the farms and an adequate supply of farm machinery and equipment. Prompt action must be taken to initiate such policies or we will experience serious food shortages, black markets, higher food prices, and stricter Government control.

Because of the confusion and buck-passing that is found in top levels today over the need for skilled essential manpower in food production, I will discuss some of the common practices generally found throughout the Selective Service System in dealing with agricultural manpower problems.

It has been my observation, Mr. Speaker, that many consumers in this country and those who make the policies for the Government take it for granted that we will have ample food supplies to take care of the people without providing necessary manpower. Most of the consumers of the country do not realize that you must have skilled men to produce food in this country if it is to be produced and in abundance.

It also appears that the Defense Establishment does not appreciate the vital part that food production and supplies play in a wartime economy. This is evidenced by the following correspondence that I have recently had with the Secretary of Defense:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 18, 1950.

Gen. GEORGE MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Since I represent a district in the Midwest where a large portion of the Nation's food is produced, I am writing you to get your opinion on the need for abundant food production in connection with the present war effort.

During the last two wars the following slogan was publicized: "It will take food to win the war and write the peace." If this slogan deals with realities in connection with winning the war, I would very much like to have an expression from you which I can publicize to encourage additional production of vital food for the men in the Armed Forces, our allies, and for the domestic economy.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 26, 1950.

The Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: In answer to your letter of December 18 asking for my opinion on the need for abundant food production in connection with the present war effort, I can state that the ability of a country to supply its armed forces with adequate food is one of the most important considerations in the conduct of war.

I believe, however, that any specific recommendations with reference to the production of food should properly come from the Department of Agriculture. I would, therefore, suggest that you address your inquiry with reference to your district to Secretary Brannan.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT LOVETT,
Acting Secretary.

It will be noted that Acting Secretary Lovett does not concern himself with food production for the civilian economy or the inflationary price spiral when food shortages occur. He simply refers me to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan for information on food production. Secretary Brannan is urging all-out food and cotton production, but has done nothing to secure the retention of essential and skilled manpower on the food producing farms of this country. I want to be fair with the Secretary of Agriculture, because his Department is working with the Departments of State and Labor to have 500,000 Mexicans brought to this country to do seasonal work on cotton, sugar beet, vegetable, and fruit farms. But this type of labor can under no circumstances replace the skilled domestic workers vital to food production on dairy, livestock, poultry, and grain producing farms of this country.

It is estimated that more than 750,000 skilled farm workers will leave the farms in 1951. Of this number 500,000 will be drafted into the Army and 250,000 will go into more highly paid defense work. This exodus of skilled manpower away from our food-producing farms, with no replacement available, is bound to curtail food production and add more fire to the inflationary spiral of food prices.

THERE SHOULD BE NO GENERAL DEFERMENT FOR ANY TYPE OF LABOR

Food is the vital item for every civilian and soldier. Without food the people cannot live, work, or fight. The high price of food is the main complaint from consumers. To produce necessary food, we must have adequate manpower, machinery, and equipment.

I do not recommend that all farm workers be deferred from the draft, but I do insist that the Selective Service System adopt a uniform Nation-wide manpower policy that will properly classify essential, and I emphasize, essential farm workers, so that such essential workers may continue in food production. Such a policy should be mandatory and a requirement for every local draft board is considering the merits of each request for deferment. At least one able-bodied man should be allowed to remain on each farm.

I am not criticizing local draft boards. These boards are made up of patriotic Americans who are giving much of their time, without compensation, in the present war emergency. They are assigned a quota on every call for men and they do their best to fill it. They work under terrific local pressure and are subject to much abuse. However, this pressure and abuse would not occur if local boards would evaluate each draft case under specific instructions from General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service.

The Selective Service System should be Nation-wide in its scope, operating under specific regulations applicable to all parts of the country. The following letter from General Hershey would indicate that the governor of each State heads the Selective Service System for his State. If such be the case, does the governor have the power to issue specific regulations for the guidance of local draft boards?

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

The Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: As requested by you, I am confirming the information which Colonel Franck, of my staff, furnished you when he was recently in your office concerning the status of a State director of selective service for a State.

The Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, provides in section 10 (b) (2) authority for the President "to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State Director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for

the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System: * * *".

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

General Hershey indicates that he has no control over the State selective service system. He states that the State selective service organization is appointed upon the recommendation of the Governor. In view of this fact, it seems to me that one way to handle the agricultural manpower problem would be for the Governor of each respective State to formulate mandatory regulations to govern local draft boards in the consideration of agricultural and other essential manpower problems.

In my own State of Minnesota at least 50 percent of the food which is produced is used throughout the entire Nation and much of it finds its way into the Military Establishment. Therefore, a loss of a substantial number of essential farm workers now engaged in food production in our State, will be a loss to the Nation. The end result will be drastic cut-backs in production to the detriment of the Nation and our war effort. I feel that the Governors of our respective States should exercise their authority with reference to the manpower problem.

It is obvious that we must have men for the military forces. It should be equally obvious that we must also have skilled men to produce the food for the country and men to produce war materials. The President possesses sufficient authority under the Selective Service Act of 1948 to issue specific regulations to deal with essential agricultural manpower. He has not used this authority, which is found in paragraphs 622.13 and 622.14 of the draft law and quoted as follows:

622.13. Class II–C.—Registrant deferred because of agricultural occupation: (a) In class II–C shall be placed any registrant who is employed in the production for market of a substantial quantity of those agricultural commodities which are necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, but only when all of the conditions described in section 622.10 are found to exist.

(b) The production for market of a substantial quantity of agricultural commodities should be measured in terms of the average annual production per farm worker which is marketed from a local average farm of the type under consideration. The production of agricultural commodities for consumption by the worker and his family, or traded for subsistence purposes, should not be considered as production for market. Production which is in excess of that required for the subsistence of the farm families on the farm under consideration should be considered as production for market.

622.14. Length of deferments in class II–C: (a) Class II–C deferments shall be for a period of 1 year or less. If there is a change in the registrant's status during the period of deferment in class II–C, his classification shall be reopened and considered anew.

(b) At the expiration of the period of a registrant's deferment in class II–C, his classification shall be reopened and he shall be classified anew in the manner provided in part 625 of this chapter. The registrant may be continued in class II–C for a further period of 1 year or less if such classification is warranted. The same rule shall apply when classifying a registrant at the end of each successive period for which he has been classified in class II–C.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the local board to retain in class II–C any registrant when the reason for his occupational classification has ceased to exist.

During the past 3 months I have had many conferences with policy-making members of the National Selective Service Office on the subject of proper classification of essential farm workers. I regret to state that up to the present time there has been no change in the policy of that office with reference to the proper classification of essential farm workers.

GENERAL HERSHEY STATES LOCAL BOARDS HAVE FULL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROPERLY CLASSIFY ESSENTIAL WORKERS

In a recent letter to local draft boards discussing the responsibility of local boards in properly classifying registrants in essential occupations, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey has set forth the following facts:

First. The local draft board has the responsibility for determining, initially, every classification of a registrant.

Second. A registrant seeking a deferred classification for occupational hardship or other reasons should furnish the local board with a complete written statement, supplemented by substantiating evidence, giving all facts for the local boards to consider in properly classifying the registrant.

Third. A registrant has the right to appeal his classification to the State appeal board if he is dissatisfied with the decision of the local board. The attorney for the local board will assist the registrant in perfecting the appeal.

If the decision of the State appeal board is not unanimous, a further appeal may be taken to the President's appeal board in Washington.

Fourth. Under Selective Service Regulation 1625, a registrant may have his classification reconsidered by the local board upon the presentation of new evidence at any time before the induction notice is issued to the registrant by the board. Such request for reconsideration should be made in writing to the local board.

If the local board does not change the classification of the registrant after considering the new evidence, the registrant is entitled to again appeal his classification to the State appeal board.

Fifth. A registrant is entitled to a hearing before the entire local board, as a matter of right.

General Hershey also states in the letter to the local draft boards:

It has been unfortunate that this strict application has found utterance attributed to local board members by registrants that local boards could defer no one in the absence of specific instructions to do so or that they would defer no one of certain occupational classifications, such as farmers or members of the maritime service. In the first instance, the power to defer does rest with the local board. In the second instance, it is unwise for an administrative agency responsible for individual decisions, such as the classification of a registrant, to indicate that decisions are made to defer or not to defer in any other manner than after a careful consideration of the particular merits of the individual case.

The danger inherent in this situation is that the pressure for legislation or for regulations, or for both, increase. There is a demand that local boards be authorized to do that which they already can do, but with the authorization will inevitably come directives as to what they can and what they must do. The autonomy of local self-government disappears more often by abdication from within than usurpation from above.

The selective service operation is a decentralized one. All of the actions which lead to the induction of men into the Armed Forces are performed in the community. This fact requires that the power to act be delegated to the local board. This has been done in large measure by the Congress by giving to the local board the responsibility for determining, initially, every classification of a registrant. This classification is final unless there is an appeal exercised under regulations provided by the President.

The question to be decided is whether the task being performed by the registrant is essential to the national interest; and finally, can he be replaced. These are judgments that in the last analysis local board members have rendered in the past and must render in the future. The making of these judgments is their responsibility. It is the local board's job.

Since many of the local boards have taken the position that they do not have the authority to properly classify essential farm workers, General Hershey's instructions definitely give the local boards full authority and responsibility to pass upon the qualifications and occupation of each registrant. This may be buck passing but, nevertheless, it is now definite that the local boards have full responsibility to pass upon the essentiality of each registrant in food production or any other line of occupation. Each case must be decided upon its merits by the local board.

A few days ago Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Defense Secretary for Manpower, appeared before a committee and stated it was necessary to have 4,000,000 workers in industry, engaged in the manufacture of implements of war. But she said nothing about the need for manpower in food production.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very glad to have the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a congressional authority on agriculture, bring this thing up, because it looks to me as if this is where we come in, as they say in the motion-picture industry; as if we are going through the same things which we went through during World War II. The gentleman will remember that we did not have any allocations of steel or essential materials especially for agriculture, and if it was necessary to get repairs or baling wire, or whatever it might be, he would have to get permission to purchase it, and it was a sort of hunting license, to see if he could go out and see if he could find it.

I am particularly glad to have him bring up the matter of labor because there has been a movement—I have seen it in a labor journal laid on my desk in the last few days; I have seen it in a magazine which I have read called

The New Leader, a complete misrepresentation, a complete misstatement of the facts; and I am very glad the gentleman is bringing up the question so we may have a thorough airing of it and a determination of whether or not we shall be able to retain the labor on our farms that we need, that is, retain the essential trained labor, and whether we shall be able to get the vegetables and the foodstuffs out of the fields.

The gentleman will remember that in World War II, even though we had an amendment known by the name of a former Member of the other body, the Tydings amendment, which had for its purpose the protecting of skilled labor, the protecting of experienced labor on the farms for producing the foodstuffs that were needed, yet Selective Service paid no attention to it. The gentleman will remember that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I remember that very well, and I may say that in the Draft Act that was passed last year the President of the United States was given the same authority virtually that was contained in the Tydings amendment; he now possesses the power to issue regulations to permit local draft boards to defer essential farm workers that they may continue in the production of food.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the Congress should pass some sort of legislation prescribing that Selective Service must leave at least one able-bodied man on each family-sized farm during the emergency? In my district I have cases today where the only able-bodied man working on a particular farm, the man who has been actually operating that farm has been given instructions that he has got to have a sale and get ready to go into the service—an established farm family that has been in existence for several years. I do not think that is good business for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are thousands of similar cases throughout the United States, because it is quite apparent it is now the policy of Selective Service down to the local draft boards to draft men who are essential to produce the food the Nation needs.

I do not urge that farm workers be deferred as a class; I think that the case of every selectee who comes up and presents his facts should be determined on the merits, whether or not he is essential. It would be a big mistake were we to ask for the deferment of all farm boys as a class, and I do not want to do that; I would be against that. But out home, out in the areas where we really produce the bulk of the Nation's food and in parts of the country where they have small production the local boards are so close to the production that they sometimes do not comprehend the important part that people in the producing areas play toward furnishing the over-all supply of food for the Nation. So, I hope that when we have our hearings before the Committee on Agriculture we can prevail upon General Hershey and upon the President—he will not be there, but through General Hershey—so that we can have a definite policy whereby each case may be determined upon its own merits by the local boards instead of just drafting them into the service wholesale.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was very much interested in the description of the type of farm mentioned by Mr. ANDERSEN, where the only able-bodied man of a farm family was about to be taken; for instance, it may be a farm where the father is an elderly man and has an only son who really operates the farm, yet he is being considered for the draft. I think that practically destroys that farm unit and it is an important unit yet in this country. To what extent can the gentleman state whether or not this foreign labor we are bringing into the country will help that kind of farm?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, that I have scores of cases in my congressional district where the only son has been classified in I–A for induction into the Army. That is one reason I am calling this vital matter to the attention of the House and the country, with the hope that corrective measures will be promptly taken by General Hershey. The foreign labor to which I referred cannot do the work on our dairy, poultry, livestock, and grain farms. They are not suited for this type of farming, and they can in no manner replace the young men from our farms, who have been trained through life to do the work.

While I have many draft cases in my district, I know that a similar situation prevails throughout the entire country—particularly in food-producing areas. Food production and the essential manpower to produce it, must be dealt with on a Nation-wide scale if farmers are to produce food in abundance as demanded by the Secretary of Agriculture. To close down or curtail farming operation because of a shortage of essential farm workers in the present inflationary war emergency, does not make sense, even in the United States and the President and his administrative officials should do something about it. We can pass more legislation on the subject, but that will not afford relief unless the executive branch of the Government administers the law in accordance to the intent of Congress. I say again, that the President possesses ample authority under existing law to issue regulations that will correct the mistake now being made in agricultural manpower policies.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman means foreign labor from any area from which we obtain it could not be utilized?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. It is not there. The labor that can be used in vegetable, sugar beet areas, and the cotton areas, a good deal of it at least, is stoop labor. The Mexicans and other foreign labor that come in here can do that kind of work. But we who represent diversified areas, producing at least 85 percent of the perishable crops of the country, must have skilled, competent labor to produce it. The farmers who operate these family sized farms are not able to go into the labor market and employ experienced farm labor to replace their own boys who are taken into the Army because they cannot compete with the short hours and high wages of the industrial centers of the country.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, is the gentleman in position to state whether or not a small, family sized cotton farm, we will say, would likely qualify for that labor that is brought in?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I know what kind of labor you need. You need a certain amount of skilled labor, of course, and you can probably get along, at least for a time, with some of the imported labor, much more so than we can up in our section of the country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Foreign labor should be divided into two classes, the class which is brought in specifically to pick a crop in a large area, to which the gentleman from Minnesota refers, and those that come in little by little under the immigration laws and have stayed here and acquired the facility to operate. Those can be used on the small farms. The imported labor can be used on cotton ranches.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is the machinery to be so worked out that we will say the average small farmer in a given area can participate in the program?

Mr. PHILLIPS. This morning I read a release of the Department of State and I am very doubtful that we will be able to participate in the program satisfactorily unless some material changes are made in it. That is why the gentleman's committee is doing a great service in holding public hearings on this matter. I know what the gentleman has in mind and it is a very important point.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to go into that picture at this time because we have had extensive hearings on it. I know what the gentleman from Texas is referring to. However, our committee will hold a hearing on February 26, according to what the chairman of that committee told me this morning, so that we can go into the whole manpower situation. What I want to direct attention to at this time is the policy of the drafting of essential farm labor from the family-sized farms where experienced men are required to produce food.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota on his analysis of this problem and to refer to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said with respect to leaving one able-bodied man on each family-sized farm. Actually that system was tried during World War II in Iowa through a directive, I believe

from State headquarters of the Iowa Selective Service System. I served as chairman of one Selective Service Board during the early part of that war. I know the problem to which the gentleman has alluded was very acute at that time. My observation has been that the plan of leaving one able-bodied man at least on every family-sized farm under this directive to which I have referred worked quite well, and, as a rule of thumb, I am not so sure but what it might not be applicable to every part of the United States and might well be written into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As the gentleman knows, my district is largely agricultural, with the exception of perhaps two or three industrial centers. We have this problem facing us right now. But, is not this labor that the gentleman proposes to bring in coming from a United Nations neighbor?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I think that is correct.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Can the gentleman see any good reason why we should furnish an asylum for another nation to send their sons to America while we send ours to fight and die in a war over on the other side of the Pacific?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is one reason for this discussion.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have to have the right kind of labor to get the job done.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have to get it done if we are to provide food. As far as our committee is concerned and I am personally concerned, I am only interested in getting food produced in abundance for the American people in order to stop inflation, in order to stop black markets, in order to have less Government control. You know, one of the principal demands for price control is on account of high food prices at the consumer level. Let us try to solve the proposition by securing abundant production. But to do so we must have the manpower and the machinery and the farm equipment to do it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman contend that there is necessity for some action that will tell the immediate draft boards not to take farmers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; immediate action is vital and urgent for essential farm workers.

Mr. SADLAK. May I clear up that point?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. SADLAK. It is my understanding that from areas which include agricultural districts the members of those immediate draft boards are constituted, or have membership on them, of farmers who know the problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is not entirely correct.

Mr. SADLAK. If I understand what the gentleman desires to bring about, it is that they have no alternative other than to take a person, whether he be a farmer or not, in answer to the demands of the quota needed, but that action is necessary on top of that to restrain the taking of a farmer from that area, even though there was a call for men from that area who are farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me make it clear, because I do not want to be misunderstood. In the first place, I do not favor a general exemption for farm workers; but I insist that if it comes down to the production of food we must have experienced and essential manpower to produce it. Now, the only way we can get the manpower on most of the farms in our country is from the farmer's own family, and in each case where a boy or young man is being called for induction his case should be considered by the local draft board as to whether or not he is essential to the production of food. Now, to give that consideration they must, of course, have the facts before the board. Heretofore in many sections of the country facts have been ignored. But what I think we should have emanating from Washington is a definite policy that every board should consider a man's essentiality in the line that he is in, especially if it is in food production, so that the board can determine whether he is essential or he is not essential, without just automatically putting him into the service without considering the merits of each case.

Mr. SADLAK. If the gentleman will yield further, over the past week I had a like case in Connecticut, and I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will concede that among the many industries we have in the great State of Connecticut we also have a great deal of farming. We had the case of two boys of farm families. One had been on the farm throughout his 23 years; the other, a lad of 25, brought up on the farm, but who left the farm and had gone out into another industry, another business. As of the first week of January they have taken the lad who had been on the farm all of his life. Now they are preparing to take the other lad, who had left the farm. The father says that he is ill and should have one of the boys back on the farm, the one who had left the farm. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, I am not a draft board and cannot pass on that question, but if the gentleman has had one case like that, I know of hundreds of them that are somewhat similar, where the boys have left the farm and gone into business or are farming for themselves. In fact, I have one case that I got yesterday where there are three boys in the family. They have a 340-acre farm. Two boys have already enlisted in the Air Corps and the third is now in class I–A, ready for induction next week. This leaves a father, who is 63 years old, to operate that 340-acre farm, with a lot of livestock. He just cannot do it. He is 63.

Down here in Washington they retire admirals and generals at 62 because they say they are no longer any good, yet expect men who are that age or older, with disabilities, heart trouble, arthritis, rheumatism, and a good many other things to go ahead and operate large farms.

Mr. SADLAK. I desire, of course, to cooperate with the gentleman wholeheartedly in this tremendous and vital problem, but they have told me, as no doubt they have told the gentleman, that on the draft board as constituted covering that area, agriculture has a member.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a rule there is no farm member on a local board.

Mr. SADLAK. They have told me that. If the gentleman has found that they have not, then I am ready to cooperate with him in order that they may have a properly constituted, fully informed draft board, so they would know all the problems, particularly those concerning agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. According to the present set-up, the draft boards are appointed by the governor through the State selective-service director, who is appointed by the governor. What I am trying to get at is that we should have a coordinated policy in the country, from the President down through the Selective Service, that will issue specific instruction to the local draft boards and the State selective-service director that each case in agriculture or some other line shall be considered on its merits as to the essentiality of the man who is being drafted.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. First I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making. It is the first attempt to probe into this subject that I have heard on the floor in recent weeks. May I say that I am of the same opinion as the gentleman, that I think there should be some kind of policy stated, and stated soon, otherwise farm labor is going to be drafted off every dairy farm in up-State New York and in Minnesota and other dairy States.

I do not know whether I want to go any further than the gentleman does in saying that we should defer or give special attention to the deferment of farmers, but I do know that the dairy farmer has a particular problem. He has a specialized work which the migrant labor cannot attend to. Such a worker cannot help on a dairy farm. It would take at least a year to get accustomed to running a dairy. Therefore, at least in my section, every single farm off which these boys are being drafted is going to be forced to close up its dairy. The farmer will just have to sell off his stock and go out of business. The flow of milk will become considerably lighter if that keeps on. That is not in the interest of producing food for our Armed Forces.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. That is the point I have

tried to make, that food production is vital to the economy of the country and to the war effort in which we are engaged in the present emergency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not here when the gentleman began his speech, so I do not know whether he has covered this point or not, but I understand however you are arguing we must have some migrant labor at least?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, I am not talking about migrant labor, I am talking about the family labor on a family sized farm, such as you have in your area and we have all through the Middle West where we cannot employ good outside labor to come in and do the work on the farm because of the competition with the cities with the short hours and the high wages that is offered, which the farmer cannot pay. I am talking about that kind of labor which is necessary to produce the food and if essential farm workers are taken into the service we will not be able to produce the food for the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of the work on our farms is not done by local people, that is, what you call the stoop labor and some of the fruit picking, but this other situation which I think you have in mind, from what I heard, existed in the last war. The gentleman recalls, I know, that then we had the Tydings amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. That has been discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then we had the proposed Lemke amendment. I am sure you recall that the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] put the facts in the RECORD here one time as did some others from Michigan, but General Hershey, notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, insisted that the local boards, acting through the State board, were instructed to draft the farm labor which was in violation of the Tydings amendment. Have you any remedy which will prevent that situation from happening again?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I am trying to do it to get a coordinated policy, starting from the President down, who has the authority under the Selective Service Act, which was passed in 1948, to issue orders so that local boards and the Selective Service organization will consider each case for each industry on its own merits and write regulations that the local boards should follow in considering a man's occupation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They did that before and then along came General Hershey who said, "No, never mind all that stuff. You take the men." In fact he came to my office with some more brass and he said, "It does not make any difference what the Tydings amendment says, we need the men and we are going to take them." That is the situation that worries me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I am worried about is that we will not have the essential manpower to produce the food and farm prices will pierce the ceilings and then we will have strict Government control—rationing and black markets in vital items, like beef, veal, pork, poultry, and eggs—throughout the country on a Nation-wide scale and people who want to live according to the law of the land and regulations, will not be able to get meat through legitimate channels.

From a political angle that might be a good thing, but here we are dealing with realities and that is the production of food for the people. Those of us who are working to bring about a situation where the consumer will have plenty of food at reasonable prices should be given assistance by the administration to solve this critical manpower problem before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, on the occasion of the annual Democratic dinner in New York.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Dr. Hugh Bennett.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio broadcast over Station WBT, Charlotte, N. C., also questions and answers in which the public is interested.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SUTTON (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report of the Wayne County Soil Conservation District.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter; and further to extend his remarks and include the bylaws of the Italian-American World War Veterans, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $492.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN and Mr. SHORT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two addresses.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a portion of an article in the VFW magazine by Homer B. Ketcham, the national legislative director.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the attorney general of Idaho.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain quotations.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

185. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

186. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a law enacted by the Tenth Guam Congress, Public Law 36; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 37. Resolution authorizing additional clerical assistants; with amendment (Rept. No. 96). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 42. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 114. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of

the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 38; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2515. A bill to roll prices and wages back to the June 25, 1950, level and to impose a 100-percent tax on excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 2516. A bill to deny the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act to any labor organization whose membership includes certain employees of newspapers and periodicals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2517. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to car service, with particular reference to charges as between carriers or between carriers and other owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2518. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school-construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2519. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2520. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2521. A bill to place a ceiling price on milk of 18 cents per quart to the consumer and a floor price of 10 cents a quart to the dairy farmer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 2522. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2524. A bill to exempt amounts paid for admissions to concerts and operas from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2525. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2526. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2527. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2528. A bill to amend title 39, chapter 8, the franking privilege, section 321, to include the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2529. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 2530. A bill to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2531. A bill to protect persons who retain their investment in series E United States savings bonds for 10 years after original maturity, or purchase such bonds after December 31, 1950, and hold them until maturity, against decline in purchasing power of the dollars so invested; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2532. A bill reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2533. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase annuities and pensions under such act, to permit retirement regardless of age, and to permit payment of widow's insurance annuities regardless of age; to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2534. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2535. A bill to provide hospitalization and flag burial for merchant marine veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 2536. A bill approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National and International Movements, and regulations for the conduct of hearings and activities of congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide funds for the investigation and study continued by House Resolution 74; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rocha Batiste and Frederick P. Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2539. A bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Irvin M. Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2540. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Sumner County, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Kambe Salts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Tennessee Fresh Frozen Foods, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Roy Mirt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grant Frederick Duerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Wong Thew Hor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2548. A bill to provide for the issuance of commissions in the United States Coast Guard Reserve as temporary members to members of the St. Andrews Bay Pilots Association and the Port St. Joe Pilot's Association; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2549. A bill for the relief of Talmage Wilcher, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Digges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of the Mount Vernon Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Leon Gregory Britanisky, his wife and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

42. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of citizens of Bradford, Pa., urging the Congress to roll back prices where they were before the freeze and to plan for the workers to draw an in-

come sufficient to raise their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

43. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Edward B. Morris, secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., requesting that legislation be enacted which would create a transportation commission for the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, whose power is unsearchable and whose judgments are a great deep, at the beginning of the day we would quiet our hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind, and fire of this violent world we wait for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive hearts to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey. Let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us from our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need.

We acknowledge our oneness with all humanity. Humbling ourselves in penitence for our boasted pride, confessing our share in the evil that has brought confusion and ruin on the earth and praying for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood, we ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(At the request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. HENDRICKSON and editorials submitted by him in connection therewith were ordered to be printed at this point in today's RECORD:)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are met here today on the anniversary of the birth of the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. There may be some who will disagree when I say that Abraham Lincoln was the greatest of all our Presidents, but I make that statement, believing firmly that it is so. Some historians, some students, and some political writers may disagree, but I say that it is so because Mr. Lincoln lived in the most crucial hour of the Nation's history, an hour even as crucial as that in which we are living today, and he led us to safety and security once more. As we of the Senate, when we pay tribute to the first President of the United States, George Washington, on his birthday, recognize that none of us possess sufficient eloquence to pay just and fitting tribute to him, and therefore substitute for our lack of eloquence the reading of his own eloquent Farewell Address, therefore, Mr. President, in recognizing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, I think we must also recognize that in his case, as in the case of Washington, we who serve in this body lack the eloquence to pay to the martyred President the full tribute which is properly due him. Perhaps the greatest epitaph ever written of Mr. Lincoln was written by his great Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, when at the time of Mr. Lincoln's death, Mr. Stanton said—despite the many bitter differences of opinion which existed between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Stanton—"Now he belongs to the ages."

Mr. President, as we pay Washington a tribute by reading the words of his Farewell Address, so now I endeavor to pay appropriate tribute to Mr. Lincoln by reading a few words from his second inaugural address, delivered on March 4, 1865, which are as appropriate today as they were when they were uttered at the end of the War Between the States. In that address Abraham Lincoln said:

> Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

And then he said, as we remember his famous words:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. President, I think those words in themselves pay Mr. Lincoln all the tribute which any mortal could hope to pay to him. They are his own immortal words—almost as eloquent, indeed, as the words of his Gettysburg address.

Mr. President, some of the great newspapers today have paid tribute to Mr. Lincoln more eloquently than I could ever hope to do. Therefore I shall ask unanimous consent to speak through them and to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three stirring, thought-provoking editorials in honor of Lincoln. They should be read by every Member of the Senate. One is from the Philadelphia Inquirer, and is entitled "Lincoln's Way Can Still Save America and Freedom."

Another, entitled "The 'Lincoln Idea'," is published in the New York Times for today. I hope every Member of the Senate will take the time to read this editorial in the light of the situation existing in the world today.

The third editorial, entitled "The Universal Lincoln," appears in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune. It constitutes another thought-provoking discussion of a great man.

Mr. President, I cannot say any more that would raise the name of Lincoln higher than he himself raised it throughout his entire life, and up to the time of his death. We should be grateful that our people show an ever-growing recognition of his greatness, and are reflecting that recognition in their everyday lives.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that these remarks and these editorials may appear in the RECORD at the beginning of the proceedings for today, rather than at the end of them, as a further tribute to Mr. Lincoln.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 12, 1951]

LINCOLN'S WAY CAN STILL SAVE AMERICA AND FREEDOM

On this birthday of Abraham Lincoln the great question is whether this is the glorious Nation he fought so hard and so well to save.

Are its people as determined in 1951, as they were in 1861, to preserve its freedom? Are they as eager to struggle against terrible odds to continue America on the path to still greater destinies?

We believe that to all such questions an affirmative answer can instantly be given and that Lincoln himself, who once fervently spoke of the promise of "man's vast future" in our country, would without hesitation render the same verdict.

The Rail Splitter, as he was about to become President, saw the enormous perils that were rushing upon the Nation and remarked: "The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am, none who would d more to preserve it, but it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."

Look at his subsequent course: he sought peace, but with never a thought of appeasement. Up till the first shot at Sumter and throughout the war which followed he repelled every attempt to bring about its end on terms that would weaken the Union.

Lincoln, who knew how to deal with Copperheads and traitors, faintheart's and appeasers, has virtually given us a chart for national conduct in dealing with the Reds and fellow travelers of 1951 and the dangers they represent now.

There were timorous Americans in 1861 who wanted to "let the erring sisters go." They wanted to give up the Union—they wanted peace at any price. Throughout the war there were disloyal people who secretly or openly tried to aid the enemy.

Abraham Lincoln's steadfast wisdom overcame them all. With similar but greater perils from the Red menace confronting us today we need to cling to the Great Emancipator's way as the only way to discharge our duty of world leadership; to save America and with it human liberty on this earth.

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1951]

THE "LINCOLN IDEA"

It might even be true, as some scoffers say, that Lincoln has become "the great American myth." It could be true that the cult of "Lincolnolatry" has obscured the man and most of the facts about him. Nevertheless, the man and his meaning have an indisputable and an unshakable place in

American life and in the hearts and minds of almost all Americans. There is definitely such a thing as the "Lincoln idea." The name is a symbol, and its connotation is much the same wherever it is spoken.

To invoke the name of Lincoln is to place first emphasis on complete integrity. This feeling has now gone far beyond the "Honest Abe" of his contemporaries. The man symbolizes for us the positive conception of personal goodness and social righteousness. The image of Lincoln is recalled when we, as persons or as members of a social group, are asked to choose between right and wrong, good and evil. That image strengthens our resolution. It may, indeed, dictate our choice.

To most Americans, also, the name Lincoln connotes the true dignity of a great simplicity. It is the foe of artifice, the destroyer of vanity. If Americans are, as they should be, humble in his presence, it is in the realization that he, too, was humble in the presence of the great tasks with which he was confronted.

That sense of integrity and simplicity is carried over into the application of the "Lincoln idea" to matters of Government and the affairs of the state. It is partly because Lincoln himself was so much of the people that he could speak persuasively of government by and for them. He gave us our most eloquent and, at the same time, our simplest real definition of government by the consent of the governed. He made us feel that we were our masters so long as we kept faith with the ideals that had been set up for us.

Surely, this Lincoln's birthday is a time when we can once more call upon his image and what it represents for the strength and encouragement that we need. We are still engaged in a great struggle to see if our society, founded on the concepts of freedom, can survive and endure. From Abraham Lincoln we can once more hear a call for a new dedication to that struggle and once more determine that we shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 12, 1951]

THE UNIVERSAL LINCOLN

One can imagine that Abraham Lincoln would chuckle a little wryly if he were to witness all the causes that in later days were to seek the support of his name and the shelter of his tradition. It is the fate of every national hero to have his words and deeds cited by future generations in new contexts, but few have been so variously honored in this way as Lincoln. Doubtless he would have some earthy frontier narrative to fit the case, as he did for the episodes of his years of trial. Yet it is part of the quality of the man, his universality, that so many should turn to him, so long after his death, for wisdom and inspiration. Perhaps they misread the message of his life, perhaps some distort it. Nevertheless, that grand figure, looming through the mists of time, seems to absorb the misconceptions and the distortions of praise as he once withstood those of blame, and is not lessened thereby.

Even in his stormy lifetime, when the unperceptive looked upon him as a strange and comic creature from a rude environment, facing responsibilities beyond his grasp, the magic of Lincoln's personality was at work. Those who cheered the pompous oration of Edward Everett at Gettysburg and jeered at the concise power of the President's address were nevertheless uneasily conscious that the latter was the product of no mean mind. Those who were shocked at tales of Lincoln's crudity or fastidiously repelled by his tall, gaunt form, heard him, at his second inauguration, speak words of enduring majesty. And when his assassination tore away the veils of hatred, misunderstanding, and partisanship that had shrouded him, the upsurge of respect and affection swept over the bounds of section, faction, and Nation. There was no more felicitous epitaph than that of Stanton, as Lincoln died: "Now he belongs to the ages." If, sometimes, posterity tends to squander this rich legacy unworthily, it does not matter. Lincoln's heart, as Emerson said, was as great as the world; there is enough for mankind to share.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I think we all appreciate the splendid tribute paid by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey to the great American, Abraham Lincoln. I know that we should all be happy to be identified with that fine expression, both of patriotism and of important national history, especially in times like the present, when the spirit of Lincoln, above all things, is so needed in our own national life and in the life of the world.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT BILLS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance may have the privilege of filing reports during the recess of the Senate between today and Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit other routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FEDERAL REGISTER—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to article 36, section 1, Public law 506, Eighty-first Congress, I am transmitting herewith a copy of part II of the Federal Register, February 10, 1951, in which there are set forth the rules and regulations which I have promulgated to implement the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1951.*

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to law, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. Harry Lee Brittingham, of East Orange, N. J., relating to the budget and defense spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, favoring the creation of a transportation commission for the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., etc., to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The petition of Domingo S. Romau, of San Juan, P. R., relating to relief for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mrs. Constance Darling, of Dolgeville, N. Y., relating to the withdrawal of all United Nations armed forces from Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., relating to the donation of certain funds in the form of currency by the public to assist quadruple amputees; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., protesting against the shipment of all materials having any value to Communist China; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing the President and Congress of the United States to promptly take all measures necessary to complete the St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of ocean-going ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American Continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

"Whereas the Presidents of the United States for the past 31 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence River and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

"Whereas world developments of the past few months and the existence of the present national emergency require in the national defense the development of this inland waterway as an additional means of transportation for the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the northwest States; and

"Whereas, the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 31 years, has affirmed its continued support of this project; and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the

Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the senate, the house of representatives concurring, commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to take all measures necessary to bring about the speedy completion of this great project as a vital defense and economic necessity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"*President of the Senate.*
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"Approved February 8, 1951.
"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"*Governor of the State of Minnesota.*"

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY LEADERSHIP—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received an important resolution from the Wisconsin Council of Churches pointing out America's heavy responsibilities to continue to provide international leadership through the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the armament races by separate sovereign states have been and are now an unsatisfactory means for the settlement of international disputes and as now developed threaten the destruction of society, and whereas, we believe that our Nation has no alternative but to build up its armed strength so long as the United Nations does not have the power to give all nations security, and whereas, the strengthening of the United Nations so that it may unite the peoples of the earth in peace and justice while preserving the freedom of different peoples to pursue their separate ways of life would represent the implementation of our Christian faith in the brotherhood of man: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Council of Churches call on the Congress and the President of the United States to declare that it is a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, incorporation, and enforcement of world law. Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to our United States Senators.

ACTIVITIES OF SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received an important resolution from the Secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Herbert Myer, of Baraboo, Wis. This resolution was adopted at the February 1 meeting in Madison of this association and it pertains to the vital subject of the continued activities of the Soil Conservation Service in the United States Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION
OF SOIL CONSERVATION
DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,
Baraboo, Wis., February 2, 1951.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, representing 61 county-wide districts in the State, I have been instructed to transmit to you the following resolution:

"Whereas conservation of our soil and water resources is essential to the vigorous health and high morale of our people, a strong national defense, and our democratic system of government, is an established and accepted truth; and

"Whereas soil conservation districts, democratically organized and locally controlled local units of State government, have proved to be an effective group through which this vitally important national assignment can be accomplished; and

"Whereas soil conservation district supervisors have secured excellent cooperation from State and Federal agencies and organizations, particularly the Soil Conservation Service, in working toward a well-rounded program of proper land use and soil and water conservation, and since continuation of this essential work is dependent on keeping a strong and adequately financed Soil Conservation Service; and

"Whereas rumors in the press indicate that various reorganization ideas are under consideration which would weaken or destroy the direct technical assistance the Soil Conservation Service is giving districts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Members of Congress and the United States Secretary of Agriculture be informed that soil conservation district supervisors in assembly at a State meeting in Madison, Wis., on February 1, 1951, hereby enthusiastically endorse the work of the Soil Conservation Service and do further petition that this agency be administratively strengthened, kept a separate bureau in the United States Department of Agriculture, given full responsibility for Federal help on soil and water conservation, and given adequate appropriations to take care of technical needs of farmers of the Nation through the medium of our soil conservation districts."

Your consideration and support of our resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
HERBERT R. MEYER,
Secretary.

SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS OF ARLINGTON, TEX.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a document entitled "The Arlington Resolution." This is a resolution adopted by a group of prominent citizens of Arlington, Tex., urging the revitalization and strengthening of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the citizens of Arlington, Tex., recognize the grave situation that threatens our American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we will support with our every effort every member of our national administration and of the Congress who will put aside all party politics and remember that his first duty in this crisis is to America and the American people. To this end, we stand ready to do our full share, pay our part, and give our lives, if need be; and be it further

Resolved, That we expect our Congress to take immediate steps toward revitalizing and strengthening the United Nations into an effective force to halt aggression and establish and preserve world peace, with each member nation contributing its fair and proportionate share; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our neighbors throughout our Nation to support the principles embodied in this resolution so that, through our united efforts and our prayers to Almighty God, our way of life will be preserved for our children and our children's children.

Authorized this, the 16th day of January 1951.

A. E. Betzel, Chairman, Owner-Manager, A. E. Betzel Engineering Co.; B. C. Barnes, Mayor, City of Arlington, Tex.; E. H. Hereford, President, Arlington State College; Bob Cooke, President, Bob Cooke Motor Co.; Duncan Robinson, Head, Publicity Department, Arlington State College; J. E. Vernon, President, Southern Industrial Steel Corp.; George W. Hawkes, Editor, Arlington Citizen, President, Arlington Rotary Club; D. J. Hood, Owner-Manager, Hood Auto Supply Co.; C. Albert Altoegg, Jr., Editor, Arlington Journal; F. J. Vandergreff, President, Chamber of Commerce; W. H. Winslink, Superintendent, Arlington Public Schools; Frank A. Raines, Manager, Midway Inn; Joseph H. Elder, Jr., Police and Fire Commissioner, City of Arlington, Tex.; J. E. Ferguson, Owner-Manager, Ferguson Lumber Co.; O. B. O'Dell, City Manager, City of Arlington, Tex.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 90)

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted, pursuant to law, its fifth report with respect to studies of the relationships between the United States and international organizations in which the United States participates, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Cashin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 845 (by request). A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Harold Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 847. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Adam Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 849. A bill to provide for an unemployment reinsurance fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Igo Sobel;

S. 851. A bill for the relief of Reiko Tanaka;

S. 852. A bill for the relief of Jorma Haakon Romppanen;

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ying Tak Chan; and

S. 854. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Winternitz and Jenta Winternitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 855. A bill to provide for free transmission of official mail of members of certain United Nations commands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 856. A bill for the relief of Sana Treger;

S. 857. A bill for the relief of Fausto Leonardo Marcal; and

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 859. A bill for the relief of the Rubbercraft Corp. of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 860. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (by request):

S. 861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 862. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 863. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edna M. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 864. A bill to provide that the widows and children of persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities shall be entitled to pensions for non-service-connected death on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 865. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 866. A bill to extend the requirements for fixing the minimum number of deck officers and licensed engineers on steam vessels to certain additional vessels of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

UNCLAIMED MONEY IN THE TREASURY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and I ask that I may have 5 minutes in which to explain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 73) submitted by Mr. LANGER was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to unclaimed moneys, bonds, and other securities in the Treasury of the United States with a view to ascertaining the extent to which the inability of the Treasury Department to determine and locate the persons entitled to payment of such moneys, bonds, or other securities is due to a lack of a sufficient number of civil-service employees qualified to perform such duties.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the United States Treasury today has nearly $2,000,000,000 of unclaimed moneys belonging to individuals from every State in the Union, to which the Treasury has no title, and under the law cannot use as a result of a Supreme Court decision because it is the escheatable property of the State in which these funds originated.

Under this decision, *United States* v. *Klein* (303 U. S. 276) it is plainly stated that the Federal Government has no power of escheat of unclaimed moneys, but that unclaimed moneys in the Federal Treasury belong to the State in which these unclaimed funds originated.

Some of these moneys have accumulated and been lying in the United States Treasury since 1790. Some are unclaimed Civil War bonds. Some are unclaimed Liberty bonds and Victory notes from World War I. Some are Armed Forces leave bonds, United States savings bonds, Treasury tax and savings notes, Treasury savings certificates, Treasury bills, certificates of indebtedness at various interest rates, which are carried in the daily statement of the United States Treasury, in the first statement of each month under the heading "Matured debt on which interest has ceased" and "Debt bearing no interest."

The total of these unclaimed securities as of January 2, 1951, was $561,734,147.76. In addition to these unclaimed securities of the Federal Government, there are many millions of dollars of unclaimed tax rebates which, under the Supreme Court decision, belong to the State in which the unclaimed funds originated. There are unclaimed Federal court funds in every State in the Union which have been remitted to the Treasury yearly by the clerks of each district court since these courts were organized and which, under the Supreme Court decision referred to above, have been adjudicated as belonging to the State in which the funds originated.

There are approximately 22 categories of these unclaimed amounts, with a possible total of $2,000,000,000, which would enrich the school funds of every State in the Union in an entirely legal manner at a time when the States are struggling so hard to maintain their high standard of education in this period of tremendously rising costs.

At least two States in the Union, Florida and California, have already passed laws on the subject and are claiming these unclaimed Federal funds but are being opposed at every step, in spite of the Supreme Court decision referred to, by which Pennsylvania secured title to unclaimed Federal court funds in that State.

Of the $561,734,147.76 in bonds referred to, the unclaimed amounts are increasing at the present time by roughly $100,000,000 a year. This rapid increase is due to approximately $55,000,000,000 of E-bonds outstanding, a small portion of which, for various reasons, never appear for redemption. The unclaimed securities category is expected to reach at least $1,000,000,000 by the time these 10-year bonds mature.

It is likely that after the States get their share of approvable claims, a large proportion of this $2,000,000,000 will be left, and provision should be made whereby that sum could be prorated among the States.

It is my further belief that this entire matter ought to be investigated, and I have, therefore, submitted today a resolution to ascertain how much of this money belongs to civil-service employees, whether there are sufficient employees in the civil service properly to untangle this matter so that from this involved bookkeeping it may be ascertained how much each State is entitled to receive, and whether it is necessary to have more civil-service employees work on this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement rendered by the Federal Treasury as of January 2, 1951, may be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Matured debt on which interest has ceased

Old debt matured—issued prior to Apr. 1, 1917 (excluding Postal Savings bonds)	$1,381,220.26
2½ percent Postal Savings bonds	169,340.00
Liberty bonds and Victory notes, at various interest rates	8,908,000.00
Treasury bonds, at various interest rates	189,160,600.00
Adjusted service bonds of 1945	6,514,900.00
Treasury notes, at various interest rates	14,098,400.00
Certificates of indebtedness, at various interest rates	27,849,150.00
Treasury bills	15,494,000.00
Treasury savings certificates	107,050.00
Treasury tax and savings notes	40,399,700.00
United States savings bonds	228,873,562.50
Armed Forces leave bonds	28,778,225.00
Total matured debt on which interest has ceased	561,734,147.76

DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST

Special notes of the United States: International Monetary Fund series	1,270,000,000.00
Other:	
United States savings stamps	47,631,965.73
Excess profits tax refund bonds	2,854,656.16
United States notes	346,681,016.00
Less: Gold reserve	156,039,430.93
Total	190,641,585.07
National and Federal Reserve bank notes assumed by the United States on deposit of lawful money for their retirement	346,356,563.50
Old demand notes and fractional currency	2,020,270.51
Thrift and Treasury savings stamps	3,719,918.25
Total	593,224,959.22
Total debt bearing no interest	1,863,224,959.22
Total gross public debt (including $8,469,696,080.52 debt incurred to finance expenditures of Government corporations and other agencies for which obligations of such corporations and agencies are held by the Treasury)	256,707,571,188.72

COMBAT PAY FOR INFANTRYMEN IN KOREA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate a bill (S. 579) which would provide combat pay of $50 a month additional for enlisted men and $100 a month for officers on duty in Korea. This bill is designed to correct an injustice of the current Army pay system under which the infantryman, who endures the greatest hardships, receives no additional compensation, while members of other services, such as the Air Force and the submarine service, draw extra pay for hazardous duty. Needless to say, I hope this matter will receive the early and favorable attention of the Armed Services Committee.

In connection with the subject matter of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excerpts from the newspaper column of Mr. Drew Pearson.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON.—Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean war are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and pencil pushers behind the lines.

It used to be that infantrymen could collect $10 extra each month for combat work. If they wore the combat infantryman's badge, it was good for a $10 monthly bonus. However, even this has been taken away from them in Korea, despite the fact that combat airmen and submarine men still draw $20 to $75 per month extra for hazardous duty.

Meanwhile, it's the infantrymen who feel the bite of enemy bullets, who slog through mud, sleep in foxholes, and live on cold K rations, who have little chance to take a bath, see a movie, attend church, write letters, or sleep with their shoes off.

Nevertheless, in Korea, the average monthly pay of a man in an infantry rifle company is $135, compared with $226 for an Air Force combat crew man and $172 for a submarine crew.

Highest-paid troops in the Army are ordnance men, followed by signal corps, armored force, quartermaster, antiaircraft, field artillery, engineers, medical, and, last on the list, the infantry.

It's the same story with other awards. During World War II, infantrymen suffered 70 percent of the casualties but got only 11.6 percent of the medals. The Air Force was decorated with 76.2 percent of the medals, while other branches got the remaining 12.2 percent.

Now that the Korean war is nearly won, the Army should give fair pay and recognition to the foot soldiers who did the slugging and the slogging.

Senator LONG TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, in addition to helping steer United States foreign policy, is never too busy to fight for the little fellow. He is now about to win an important financial victory for American doughboys in Korea.

On October 21, Senator CONNALLY spotted an item in the Washington Merry-Go-Round which read:

"Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean war are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

"These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and pencil pushers behind the lines.

'It used to be that infantrymen could collect $10 extra each month for combat work. If they wore the combat infantryman's badge, it was good for a $10 monthly bonus. However, even this has been taken away from them in Korea."

Senator CONNALLY clipped the column and sent it to the Army, together with a letter wanting to know why combat men were being discriminated against. He has now received a letter from the Army indicating that it would urge a $50 bonus monthly for combat enlisted men, with $100 a month for officers.

What the Army told Senator CONNALLY in summary follows:

"The Department of the Army recognizes the plight of the infantrymen who in past wars and in the Korean operation have borne the brunt of the fighting. We intend to do everything possible to give the deserved recognition and compensation to those combat fighters upon whom the success of all our military efforts ultimately depends.

"From the standpoint of extra compensation for the combat fighter, the Army has prepared and submitted to the Department of Defense a proposal to ask Congress for extra pay for each month of combat duty in Korea. The Department of Defense has indicated considerable interest and we anticipate early submission of the proposal to Congress."

PROPOSAL TO DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLD YOUTHS—LETTER FROM SHEBOYGAN (WIS.) COUNCIL OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in Wisconsin, as throughout the rest of the country, there is a tremendous interest and controversy on the subject of the drafting of 18-year-old youngsters. Naturally, this issue touches the heart of every parent, in addition to affecting veterans and other large groups.

I believe that a letter which I received a few days ago from the Sheboygan, Wis., Council of Parent-Teachers Association well expresses views on at least one side of this picture which have come to me from other P.-T. A.'s and from numerous educators throughout Wisconsin.

I would not, of course, attempt at this time to offer a final evaluation of this subject, because, like my colleagues, I am naturally awaiting the expert report of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I feel, however, that this Sheboygan communication is very indicative of widespread sentiment. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEBOYGAN COUNCIL OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
SHEBOYGAN, WIS., *January 26, 1951.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In view of the fact that at present there is a bill before the Congress of the United States to draft 18-year-old young men for military service, and realizing we are not in a position to know whether or not our country really needs the 18-year-olds for our country's service, we, the Sheboygan Council of Parents and Teachers, wish to urge that a provision be made to insure that each young 18- or 19-year-old student have a chance to finish his high-school course before entering military service.

Very few young men in our community, and in many others, finish high school before becoming 18 and many are 19 years old because of regulations relative to entering school or for various other reasons during their primary and secondary education. We cannot overlook the many advantages of a high-school education, not only to the young man himself, but also to our country as a whole. To insure the young men a high-school education is to strengthen our country's defense. He may then look forward to higher education or work in the field of his choice upon discharge from the military service.

Our group represents a true cross-section of parents and teachers in our community of more than 40,000 population and we feel a definite need for such a provision which will be a constructive step forward toward ultimate peace, which is the thought uppermost in the minds of all of us today.

We wish to commend the action of Congress in regard to college students being able to finish their terms at present and would like to count on a provision being included in the present bill before Congress to insure the opportunity which would enable the 18- or 19-year-olds to finish high school in the event a bill to draft 18-year-old young men is passed.

As a chosen representative of the people, your leadership and action relative to this matter is desired.

Yours truly.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY, EDITORIAL COMMENT, AND RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE COMMON COUNCIL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on February 10, an editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, a resolution of the Milwaukee Common Council, and an editorial from the Minneapolis Star, all relating to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TREASURY-FEDERAL RESERVE DISPUTE—ADDRESS BY AUBREY G. LANSTON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Aubrey G. Lanston, president of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., before the fifty-fifth annual meeting of group II of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, held at Philadelphia on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM A. CALVIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on social security delivered by William A. Calvin on January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE WORLD SITUATION—ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CAREY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, on January 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROLS—STATEMENT BY THE MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association on the subject of price controls, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN DECIDED IN FAVOR OF INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation," published in the Minneapolis Star of February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED ARMS FIRST—ARTICLE BY MARCEL WALLENSTEIN

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Need Arms First," written by Marcel Wallenstein, and published in the Kansas City Star of February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL BASIS BEHIND ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS—ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Jackson Grows Candid," published in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 24, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Candor," published in the New York Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR UNIONS HELP WIN FREEDOM FIGHT—AN EDITORIAL FROM LOS ANGELES DAILY NEWS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Unions Help Win Freedom Fight," written by its editor and publisher, Mr. Manchester Boddy, and published in the Los Angeles Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Friday evening ex-President Hoover made a very important contribution to the so-called great debate on American foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I have been urged by many thousands of you to again discuss with you our foreign policy.

A responsibility rests upon me to speak out from 50 years of personal experience with most of the peoples of the free world and with Russia and China. I have been entrusted during 35 years with high responsibilities by my countrymen.

I should like to address you through the rose-colored spectacles of idealism and the need of free nations to defend freemen.

But I would be doing my country a disservice if I did not take into account the realities in this endangered world.

There is nothing sacrosanct about foreign policies, as witness the tombstones which have been erected over many of them in the last 10 years. They bear the inscriptions "Undeclared war, the alliance with Stalin, Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, dismantling of German peacetime industry, the promoting of Mao Tse-tung."

Many men, including myself, have demanded the revison of these policies at each wrong turning.

The rightness of our many proposals has been proved by time. I shall recall only two of them for your test.

Seventeen years ago, as President, I refused recognition of the Soviet government. I knew from ample experience, and their own documents, that this bloody conspiracy against mankind would flood our country through this open door with fifth columns and spies; that they would sabotage our national life and Government. Every American knows they have done just that.

ADVICE ON STALIN AND HITLER

About 10 years ago, on June 29, 1941, in a great crisis I urged the revision of our policies to meet the greatest danger that had come to the American people.

Mr. Roosevelt had proposed a tacit alliance of the United States with Stalin and his Communist Russia. Britain was then safe because of the diversion of Hitler's armies to an attack on Russia: A few sentences from that address were:

"Now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. * * *

"It makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the "four freedoms" to mankind a gargantuan jest. * * *

"If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in this world."

I said these two dictators—Stalin and Hitler—were locked in deadly combat, that statesmanship required the United States to stand aside in watchful waiting, armed to the teeth; that the day would come when these nations "will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic, and moral powers of the United States and at that moment and that moment only can the United States promote a just and lasting peace."

Remember this was in June 1941, almost 10 years ago. Need I remind you that the grip of communism in this decade has spread slavery from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 people? And we have no peace.

I could recall a dozen more instances, some within the past 12 months.

SIX FACTORS TO BE APPRAISED

In order to reach any conclusions as to the wise course for America to pursue in the critical issues which confront us we must again and again appraise the constantly shifting forces moving in the world.

The problems which we face are of far larger dimensions than the current discussion on sending contingents of American boys to Europe.

Their appraisal must also include:

1. Land war strengths.
2. The defense of the American people and the Western Hemisphere.
3. Our economic capacity over a long period.
4. The United Nations.
5. Our policies in the Far East.
6. The North Atlantic military alliance.

Policies in these six categories cannot be separated from each other—they are all interlocked.

We must appraise the somber facts around these points before we can map a national direction. We must not shrink from clear-minded appraisal of our strengths, our weaknesses, and the attainment of the purposes to which the Congress has committed us.

GROUND FORCES COMPARED

We may again appraise as best we can the present military strengths for land war in the world.

I am fully aware of the shortcomings of the term "divisions" as a measuring device for comparative military strength, but it is the nearest to a common descriptive unit that we have.

The Kremlin-directed horde has under arms and in reserves probably 300 combat divisions, with 30,000 tanks. I am now told they have over 20,000 mostly tactical planes and they have with their satellites 50,000,000 men available for cannon fodder.

In World War II, when Russia was without the satellites, the Germans failed with 240 well-equipped divisions to overcome her. With her allies of General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth, she had stopped the Germans even before lend-lease had reached her.

The nations of Europe in the Atlantic Pact have at the present moment less than 20 equipped and trained combat divisions available for European action.

There is here a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any seeable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion. But that does not mean that there are no other methods of stopping the Kremlin's ambitions.

The second stark realism upon which our foreign policies must be based is the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Its defense is not only in our interests but in the interests of free men eveywhere.

Much criticism is offered, even to a discussion of this question. An atmosphere of hurry, rush, anxiety is being developed the effect of which is to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the American people to judge their own situation.

I may say at once that with proper economic action this hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials. From a long professional career and from years as Secretary of Commerce dealing with such questions, I might qualify in this field.

Further, unless we so dissipate our strength as to become a beaten and crushed people, we will be able to keep sea lanes open.

Moreover, this hemisphere can be defended from Communist armies, come what will. It is still surrounded with a great moat. To transport such invading armies either 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or 6,000 miles across the Pacific would require transport ships and naval protection which the Russians do not possess and could not build or seize, no matter what further countries they occupy.

If we have a proper naval and air strength, we could sink them in midocean. With somewhat more attention paid to our defense, this would apply to invasion via the Bering Straits. Hitler could not even cross the English Channel. Atomic bombs do not transport troops over the ocean.

Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any allied armies can get to Moscow.

No responsible military man denies these two conclusions.

The American people should not be frightened into rash action by fear that we cannot survive. I am not advocating isolationism. But if other nations should fail, we may be isolated by force of circumstance and against our will.

We might go into a period hard to endure, but this Nation can stick it out.

STRAIN ON ECONOMIC CAPACITY

The third stark realism upon which our policies must be built is our economic capacity. The bleak outlook of the world may well last more than a decade—possibly two of them.

The new budget calls for Federal spending of over $71,000,000,000. This $71,000,000,000 alone, plus state and local expenditures, is about 37 percent of our national income.

That is beyond the long endurance of any nation and fatal to the preservation of a system of free men.

The President has asked for a large increase of taxes. We will need also to increase State and local government taxes.

This burden is going to fall on people with smaller incomes. The proof of this is easy.

If all personal incomes above the level of a United States Senator were confiscated it

would yield only about $2,500,000,000 of additional revenues. But confiscation would stop most people earning the $2,000,000,000. We must also remember that excise and corporation taxes in most part are ultimately passed on to the consumer or these milch cows would die.

Grim austerity must enter the door of every American home.

Even before these burdens are actually imposed there are stark signs of economic strain. The purchasing power of the dollar has fallen 20 percent in 6 months. The stock boom indicates that many people are seeking flight from inflation.

Our already gigantic Government debts permit little expansion without inflation of credit. Two wars prove economic controls cannot wholly stop inflation. The surest road away from inflation is to accept the President's wise proposals to "pay as you go."

But we simply cannot carry this expenditure or such tax load for long.

Spending, taxing, and inflation of ourselves into exhaustion is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome the United States.

The economic destruction of the United States is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome us.

UNITED NATIONS COMMITMENTS

The fourth focal point of our thinking must be the United Nations.

Our stark reality here is the lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations. Even some of our European allies are anxious to appease the Chinese branch of the Kremlin on policies of the United Nations.

Despite this, we must not forget that the aspiration of mankind for over a century has been to find peace by collective action against aggressors. The United Nations was built on this same central idea as the concert of Europe and the League of Nations. Halting and faulty as it may be, we cannot abandon this idea and this hope.

But it must be clear that the UN for the present will not be a substantial protection from Communist aggression.

Our men are holding heroically to the mission assigned us by the United Nations in Korea. We are suffering great losses. General Marshall says we must send 15,000 men a month. We cannot yet see the end. But if we were to drive all the enemy out of Korea, how much of our armies must remain there to protect it?

Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines are vital links in our national security. This must not be minimized by nations anxious to direct our energies to Europe. We will need to retain much military strength in the Pacific to protect those areas.

Certainly there is little stark reality in talking about American ground divisions in Europe in view of our involvement in Asia.

ATTACK AS SIGNAL FOR TROOPS

The sixth consideration in our decisions revolves around the North Atlantic Pact and the proposals to start another American expeditionary land army to Europe.

Current statements stretch this pact far beyond its text. The pact provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. There has been no attack.

Moreover, at the time of ratification of that alliance the administration, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, gave positive assurances that under the pact no expeditions of American ground troops would be sent to Europe.

That certainly meant no forces to Europe prior to attack. Our participation, prior to an attack, was to be limited to munitions. The pact being the will of the American people through the Congress, and in the faith of the text and those assurances, I supported the alliance.

But last fall it became evident that the Administration was contemplating sending ground troops to Europe.

It was also evident that after years of gigantic American subsidies, the European Atlantic Pact nations had done nothing of consequence toward their own defense. Former Prime Minister Churchill had repeatedly and forthrightly stated this fact—the last occasion being only a few weeks ago.

I made two addresses in protest. Judging by the scolding of the European press, I may have helped to start them thinking.

Then General Eisenhower was appointed to organize their military strength. And the general has become the potent symbol of the policy of at once sending American ground troops to Europe.

The American people are indebted to General Eisenhower for many great services. He has magnificent fitness both for the command and the stimulation of spirit and action among the allies in Europe.

But his appointment does not commit the American people as to policy.

EUROPE AS RUSSIA'S CHOICE

The stark realities in western continental Europe are their large Communist parties and the disunities which gnaw at their vitals. Their prejudices prevent taking Spain into the alliance with 20 divisions and the most defensible area in Europe. For some reason Turkey and Greece are excluded from the alliance.

Equally vital is the fact that there is little hope of adequate land defense of Europe without West German participation. Two months ago detailed plans and great progress were announced. Now it is decided that West German military participation is out or can wait.

From press reports based on information from European officials and from General Eisenhower's statements, it would appear that his army, including the two American divisions now in Germany, would start with 9 or possibly 10 divisions; by the end of 2 years, including American divisions, it would seem to be 35 or 40 divisions.

The stark reality is that such an army is small compared to the strength of the enemy.

America is at present the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest. There is nothing that Stalin would like more than to get the United States into his clutches by fighting us on the ground in Europe. There lies his overwhelming strength.

Disaster could thus come to the American Hemisphere with no salvation to Europe.

The American people should have more information before they risk trying a third expedition of ground troops to Europe.

Any defense line in Europe must be over 400 miles long. Will our responsible leaders make a public statement that the forces so far proposed can defend this line against odds of 3 or 4 to 1? We have tried this in Korea.

Will our responsible leaders tell us whether they contemplate the proposed American contingent as only an installment? Does not this contribution and our huge increase in the Army budget imply many more American divisions? Do the American people know all the facts?

AIR-SEA POWER AS DECISIVE

Despite all these stark realities and these problems, I have believed there is a way to at least an uneasy peace for the world.

In my address of 6 weeks ago, I stated that we should not land men or send money to Europe until large European forces were in sight. I was well aware of the obligation assumed by Congress to give aid in case of attack. It was my view that we should hold to that provision of the pact and I urged "arming our Air and Navy to the teeth."

I suggest that air power and the Navy is the alternative to sending American land divisions to Europe. With our gigantic productive capacity and within our economic strength we can build and sustain overwhelming air and sea forces held on our home ground ready in case of attack.

Stalin well knows we could carry on that kind of war for his destruction for indefinite years.

The air threat has been during 4 years the most powerful deterrent to any attack on Western Europe. It is far more powerful than pouring American divisions into the reach of this Asiatic horde.

I am suggesting no attack. I am suggesting the very protection for Western Europe and our own defense which the Senate contemplated when it ratified the Atlantic Pact.

There are other reasons for such a policy—both military and economic.

LESSON OF STRATEGY IN KOREA

Manifestly if attack on Europe came, the free world would be inferior in ground forces. Such a ground war would at best be a war of defense. In the air we would have the offensive. An air force has range, speed, flexibility and striking power which can come nearer gaining a decision than allied ground armies.

Especially is this true, for in an air war the Communist horde would be without a large part of its ground allies—General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth.

The whole Korean tragedy is developing proof that the way to punish aggressors is from the air and sea and not by land armies. It would be indefinitely less costly in dead and disaster.

The unbearable strain on our economic system will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an air force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves; and to sent land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long.

I can give you an indication of the lesser economic strain to attain the same or more power by air than ground forces.

To train, equip, place in Europe, and maintain for 1 year 10 of the usual combinations of American divisions would cost about $4,500,000,000. This same sum would for example, purchase and man 390 B-26 long-range bombers compared to 60 of them at present. If neither went into battle, the annual cost of the 10 divisions would be about $3,000,000,000, and that of such a segment of the air force less than $1,000,000,000.

POLICY REVISIONS PROPOSED

I can most clearly state the points of foreign policies in which many of us believe at this time by summarizing a program. No program can be perfect—none without risk. For the present I suggest:

1. We should devote our overwhelming productive power to air and naval strength and supply of munitions.

2. If the Europeans are attacked, we should be prepared and use such overwhelming air and naval power to the limit and keep it up until they have had enough. The Kremlin knows that we are committed by the Congress to do so. I believe that reserve, if large enough, is Europe's real protection.

3. We should supply munitions to nations doing their utmost to defend themselves.

4. From the starkly realistic, economic, political and military reasons which I have given you, my personal conviction is that we should not create land armies for expeditions into the quicksands of either Europe or China. I do not want to even start on the road to another Korea.

5. There are those who think we should send more divisions to Europe for their encouragement even before there is an attack. To them, I urge watchful waiting until much more military strength has been developed

by Europe itself and there is more evidence they have resolved their disunities.

6. We must reduce our national expenditures to a level we can carry over a long term of years, and at the same time avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America.

Senator BYRD estimates that $8,600,000,000 of proposed nondefense expenditures in the budget could be reduced or postponed. We should spend all we can afford on air, navy, and munitions rather than large armies.

FOR BACKING CHIANG KAI-SHEK

7. We can and must defend Formosa, the Philippines, and Japan. We can do it by naval and air forces.

As to Korea, we should demand of the United Nations that they call for a stop of supplies to Communist China by the non-Communist nations.

Since Red China is making war on our American armies, we should free Chiang Kai-shek to do what he wishes in China and furnish him munitions.

8. I proposed 3 years ago that we should give full independence to Japan and Western Germany under representative governments. During 100 years these nations were the great dams against these Russian-controlled hordes.

In the last war we may have been engaged in a great crusade for freedom of mankind, but we certainly destroyed these two dams. The sooner they are given their independence the sooner, for their own security, they will resume their ancient role.

9. Recently I proposed that if the nations of Europe failed we should, as a prudent nation, have in mind a second line of air and naval defense based upon the foreign shores of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans both north and south, and I may add the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean.

10. Congress should recover its constitutional authority over starting wars. It could certainly do so through its powers over the purse.

PROGRAM FOR RESTRAINING FOES

I have proposed no retreat, no withdrawal. I have proposed no repudiation of treaties or obligations. Rather I have proposed that the pledges to the Congress and the American people be kept. I have proposed that we stop, look, and listen before we start on a road of land war that risks the loss of all civilization.

I propose no good to Stalin. His greatest hope is to get us into a land war.

Before we go off the deep end of steps toward another land war in Europe, let us remember that we fought two such wars hoping to bring peace and we have no peace.

We should be prepared to make heavy sacrifices to help. But we should do it with common sense, within our strength, with the long view of history in mind.

The essence of the program I have proposed is to effectively restrain our enemies from attack upon our allies or ourselves. It is the best chance of peace—even if it is an uneasy peace.

If we pursue the lines of our own genius and resources, we can meet this—the greatest menace of a century.

And being in the right the Almighty is on our side.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a 3-minute statement preliminary to the introduction of some matters into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the most important questions affecting the stability of the economy of the Nation today is that which has arisen as a result of the differences between the views of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury. While these differences do not command the attention which has been given to the more dramatic debate on foreign policy, there are those of us who believe that their impact may be almost as telling on our ability to remain free.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] received last week a copy of a statement prepared by Hon. James K. Vardaman, Jr., a member of the Federal Reserve Board, intended to set forth Governor Vardaman's position in the dispute. With his statement, Governor Vardaman enclosed a covering note, asking for the comment of the Senator receiving it. At the request of the Senator from Ohio I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Vardaman, together with the note accompanying it, the reply to Mr. Vardaman by the Senator from Ohio and five articles by respected columnists commenting on the matter. These articles are: Politics in Finance, by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of February 7; McCabe Holds Power in Fight With Snyder; Dare He Use It?, by J. A. Livingston, from the Washington Post of February 8; Mr. Walter Lippmann's columns entitled "Today and Tomorrow," from the Washington Post of February 8 and February 12; and a column entitled "Fighting Fire With Gasoline," by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, from the February 5 edition of Newsweek magazine.

There being no objection the letters and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
February 5, 1951.

Memorandum to Senator BRICKER:

There is enclosed a statement which I issued to the press today giving my impressions of what happened at the meeting between the President of the United States and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System at the White House at 4 p. m. on January 31; and also stating what I believe the Federal Reserve Board should say and do in connection with the financing program of the Government as officially promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I would sincerely appreciate it if you would read this statement in its entirety and give me the benefit of any comment you may care to make.

J. K. V.

STATEMENT BY GOV. JAMES K. VARDAMAN, JR., MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, FEBRUARY 5, 1951

Never having regarded membership on the Federal Reserve Board as a speaking part, I have made only three short public talks and given about the same number of interviews in nearly 5 years' service on the Board. However, in the present situation where an apparent attempt is being made to question the veracity of the Presidency in its dealings with this Board I feel that it is only fair to give my impressions of what has happened and what the conduct of this Board should be.

After the meeting between the Federal Open Market Committee and the President at the White House at 4 p. m. January 31, the Committee, consisting of all seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks, returned to the Board's quarters and went into executive session. The suggestion was made that a written memorandum of what took place in the White House should be prepared, and Chairman McCabe requested Governor Evans to undertake that task. The preliminary draft of Governor Evans' memorandum which was released to the press by Governor Eccles without authorization of the Board or the Committee had not been approved by the Federal Reserve Board members nor all of the members of the Federal Open Market Committee. It was thought to be correct in all essential details but certain minor changes had been suggested. Governor Evans had prepared the memorandum from memory without notes. There were no notes taken at the meeting with the President so far as I know.

Governor Evans' memorandum was correct in essential details as to the words which were spoken during the meeting with the President, but the memorandum did not attempt to set forth the impressions and general atmosphere prevailing during the meeting. My own impression of the meeting was that the President of the United States had been allowed to leave the conference room with the definite impression in his heart and mind that the Federal Open Market Committee would support the Government financing and bond program as officially promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury on January 18. I said to the Committee that I thought it was tragic that the President had been allowed to leave the conference with such an impression when the majority of the Committee apparently knew at the time they were not going to carry out the President's wishes.

On January 29, 2 days before the meeting with the President, I submitted a written memorandum to the members of the Federal Reserve Board and on the 31st to the Open Market Committee suggesting that the Board make the following public statement:

"The Federal Reserve Board has made its recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with the interest rate on short-term Government obligations and also with reference to the interest rate and maturities on funding and refunding bonds. In the exercise of his statutory authority and obligation, the Secretary has not thought it wise to follow all of the suggestions made by this Board in connection with these matters. Acting in his official capacity, as the spokesman for the Government, the Secretary has announced a financing program, and this Board has nothing further to say on the questions involved other than to state quite firmly and clearly that the Board will support to the fullest extent of its authority the program as officialy promulgated by the United States Treasury.

"Whenever it is in line with its statutory authority to do so, the Board will advise with the Secretary on all matters relating to the management of the public debt or any other questions which he may desire to discuss. But it should be clearly understood that under our constitutional framework and present statutory laws, the management of the public debt is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury and this Board will support him to the utmost of its ability in his officially declared programs and actions.

"We believe the duty of this Board to be to make its ideas available and known in council, but not to make such ideas prevail and the Board will act in accordance with this belief in the present situation."

The Board and the committee refused to consider the issuance of any such statement in spite of the fact that it was generally thought that Chairman McCabe had given

President Truman every reason to believe that the Committee and Board would support the Government financing program.

As long as the questions involved were in the negotiation stage I felt it to be the duty of the Board to present and argue its ideas with the Secretary of the Treasury, and if necessary with the President. But once the Secretary of the Treasury, as the official spokesman for the Government on debt management, had promulgated the Government program I felt strongly that this Board should give such program its wholehearted support personally and officially. The question of statutory prerogatives and personal feelings should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this time of national emergency. For myself I unhesitatingly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time; and if there is any question in my mind as to the propriety of such a waiver I will try to appear before the proper congressional committee to ask for clarification of my statutory responsibilities as a member of the Board.

February 7, 1951.

The Honorable JAMES K. VARDAMAN, Jr.,
Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VARDAMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your statement of February 5, 1951, and the attached memorandum requesting any comment that I might care to make.

The first part of your statement relates to your version of what took place at the January 31 conference between the President and the Federal Open Market Committee. Naturally, I cannot determine whether your report of that conference or the report of Governor Evans is correct. However, the aftermath of confusion which has followed a conference intended to clarify matters convinces me that the President has failed to grasp the basic issues of fiscal policy which are at the bottom of the dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

Your statement makes it clear that you feel that the Board should support the financing and bond program advocated by Secretary Snyder. If this opinion is based on economic rather than legal considerations, I do not question your right to advance it. My own view is that the Treasury's fiscal policies will result in disastrous inflation. Since May 1950 the Board's holdings of Government securities have increased by $3,500,000,000, which in turn has led to a *sixfold* expansion of credit. The proposal that the Board should continue to support the Treasury's cheap-money policies has been accurately described by Mr. Henry Hazlitt as "fighting fire with gasoline."

The concluding paragraph of your statement is one of the most amazing ever uttered by a public official in recent years. You say: "The question of statutory prerogatives * * * should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this national emergency." The meaning of this euphemism is that the laws passed by Congress should be disregarded whenever the President *feels* that the national emergency so requires. I am unalterably opposed to that sort of totalitarian philosophy either in war or in peace.

You also say in the final paragraph of your statement that you "unhesitantly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time." First, I would like to point out that the laws of the United States are not "theoretical" for 150,000,000 American people. They must obey them or go to jail. By what right do you presume to waive statutory authority in violation of your oath of office?

Finally, I invite your attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve System is accountable to the Congress, and not to the Presidency as you suggest. Congress has not charged the Board with the duty of supporting the price of Government securities, but, rather, with the duty of supporting the value of the dollar.

Until such time as the duties of the Board may be changed by act of Congress, I trust that you will see the impropriety of your suggested waiver of statutory authority and prerogatives.

Sincerely yours.

[From the Washington Post of February 7, 1951]

POLITICS IN FINANCE

(By Marquis Childs)

HOW NOT TO STOP INFLATION

As the roulette wheel of inflation continues to spin, checked somewhat but not stopped by the wage-price freeze, there are events in the news which have an ominous meaning. The following developments have a bearing on whether the wheel is to be stopped or whether the reckless gamble is to go on.

1. The response of Congress to the President's tax recommendations is confirmation of the fear that existed before the program came up for final action. Almost certainly final action will be delayed for several months. There is a widespread determination to cut deeply into the President's $71,000,000,000 budget—which can be healthy if it is not indiscriminate on the defense side.

2. The report of a Senate subcommittee shows how political influence has operated to get loans out of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Professional fixers, in one or two instances former RFC employees, have taken large sums to get loan applications approved.

3. The controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board over Government credit and the interest rate on Government bonds has created doubts as to fiscal policy. Congress, which granted the original powers to the Federal Reserve Board, will have to step in.

For several years reports have circulated about politics determining, in some instances, the loaning policy of the RFC. Details were first supplied in this column on how Merl Young, with his White House connections, stepped from a comparatively minor position in the RFC to a highly paid job as Washington representative of the Lustron Corp., which got a $37,000,000 loan. That loan is in default and the RFC has a doubtful chance to get something back from the assets of the company.

What has happened in the RFC shows the deterioration in standards of administration that has taken place during the past 3 or 4 years. There has been too much indifference toward ordinary integrity, or even the appearance of integrity, in the conduct of Government and the handling of the large sums of money entrusted to Government.

This points up sharply the contest between the Treasury and the White House on one hand and the Federal Reserve Board on the other. For most of us the argument over fiscal policy is in terms that are nearly impossible to understand since they are so far beyond our daily problems of grocery bills and the installment due on the car.

But one thing is perfectly easy to understand. That is President Truman's action in calling the members of the Board to the White House to discuss their policy on Government bonds. What makes this such an unusual act is that Congress specifically gave the Board powers independent of the Treasury to act as an instrument for maintaining the Government's credit relationship with the Nation's banks. Never before has a President taken up directly with the Board the issue of the Board's policy.

After the meeting the White House issued a statement saying that the Board had pledged to maintain the Government's security market at existing levels both as to refunding and new issues. Board Member Marriner Eccles says that no such agreement was reached since, he adds, the President did not raise this point during the discussion.

Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder insists that to raise interest rates on Government securities by half of a percent would cost a billion and a half additional in interest charges. This, Snyder says, would be the next effect of Federal Reserve policy.

Eccles and others on the Board say that the extra interest cost would be nearer $200,000,000 since the rate would be raised only on new issues and not on all Government securities. But even if the cost was considerably greater they argue that it is essential in order to check the flow of credit that is being released through the banks under the present policy.

The Federal Reserve Board has bought $3,500,000,000 in Government bonds since May chiefly from insurance companies and savings banks. This figure should be multiplied by six, it is contended, to get the amount of credit inflation which such action means.

In April of 1948 the President replaced Eccles as Chairman of the Board and named in his place Thomas B. McCabe, a Philadelphia industrialist. Two years before he had made what was generally interpreted as a political appointment in naming his old friend from St. Louis, James K. Vardaman, Jr., to fill a vacancy on the Board. Vardaman had had only limited experience in the banking field.

To permit politics in this field is to invite an explosion that could do almost as much damage as an atomic bomb. With each day that passes it becomes increasingly obvious that the wage-price freeze cannot hold the line against inflation unless it is buttressed by other measures. There should be at this moment a willingness to consider the remedies that, however unpalatable they may be temporarily, have the backing of so many knowledgeable men.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1951]

MCCABE HOLDS POWER IN FIGHT WITH SNYDER; DARE HE USE IT?

(By J. A. Livingston)

In the fight between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, the initiative rests with the Reserve Board if it cares to exercise it. This is true even though President Truman has publicly sided with Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder.

The Reserve Board's Open Market Committee has congressional authority to lower the prices it pays for Government securities. But to do so would run directly counter to Snyder's program of financing rearmament. Will Chairman Thomas B. McCabe risk that? Or will he feel he must resign?

Snyder has laid the groundwork for a knock-down, drag-out fight in Congress—if necessary. In a New York Times interview he berated those "who would have the Government make it possible for the banks to make even bigger profits at a time when industry, business, and labor are asked to forego part of the profits they would realize from defense mobilization." Shades of Andrew Jackson in his fight against the Bank of the United States.

In the row to date, members of the Reserve Board have been dominated by the thought that the country's great internal danger is inflation and that Snyder's policy aggravates it. Commercial banks own $80,000,000,000 of Government securities. If the

Board is required, as Snyder demands, to buy these bonds at fixed prices, the banks can—at will—increase their reserves sufficient to expand credit by $360,000,000,000, or seven times the outstanding volume of loans. All the banks have to do is sell their bonds. Thus the volume of credit would be determined by individual banks, and not as Congress intended, by the Reserve Board.

The Reserve Board is quite prepared to maintain a stable market for Government securities. But it wants to be free to let prices drop, so that if banks want to sell, they'll be penalized. Or, to put it the other way, it wants to create an incentive for holding.

As it is now, a bank or insurance company that has purchased a marketable 2½-percent long-term bond can get its money back at any time—from the Federal Reserve—without loss. No holder of American Telephone & Telegraph bonds can expect that. He always runs the risk of loss if he wants to sell. Presumably he buys to hold to maturity.

The Treasury's underlying fear is that once the Reserve Board started to lower the price of Government securities, holders would anticipate the decline and try to beat it. Panic might result. So Snyder would rather keep prices and interest rates fixed and the market settled. In that way, he always knows beforehand what future financing will cost him.

Thus, the real issue is this: Who's boss over the money supply, the Treasury or the Reserve System?

If Snyder prevails in the fight, then the Reserve Board would become an administrative arm of the Treasury. It would clear checks, supervise regulations W and X, examine banks. Some people say that it has already surrendered its independence, that whenever a central bank bucks the Government, it writes its own finish.

The Treasury, then, would be in the anomalous position of being the central bank and the country's biggest borrower at the same time. It would make its own terms on what it borrows and then use its central banking powers to make the loans good.

A face-saving device is conceivable. From time to time, the board has sought additional power to curb bank credit. One recent proposal would "sterilize" all reserves created by Reserve System purchases of Government securities. But Snyder had adhered to the institutional line of former Secretaries of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Fred Vinson. They haven't liked to cramp the banks because that might depress the market for Government securities.

Perhaps now Snyder will back a Reserve Board legislative proposal for additional powers to curb bank reserves. The Board could then save face by agreeing to support Snyder's bond market in the manner to which Secretaries of the Treasury, ever since Morgenthau have become accustomed. And a knock-down, drag-out fight in Congress—to determine who's boss—would be avoided. But the conclusion would be plain: Snyder. He'd have the Reserve in Truman's hip pocket.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

FOR MR. SNYDER TO EXPLAIN

The dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board is not a tempest in a teapot. It is certainly not a personal feud. Nor are there any questions of veracity or honor involved. It is about a question of policy which is fundamental in our mobilization—what to do about the fact that a gigantic military program has been superimposed on the greatest civilian boom in our history.

The Federal Reserve System is appointed by law to see to it that the volume, the cost, and the availability of the total money supply of this country is such as to avoid either a deflation or an inflation. The view of the Federal Reserve Board is that the armament program can be carried out even allowing for an increase of productivity, only by a considerable deflation of the civilian boom. But it is impossible to reduce the civilian boom, indeed it is impossible not to pour oil on the fires of inflation in that boom, if the Federal Reserve System is going to be compelled, as it is now, by the President and the Treasury to buy unlimited amounts of Government bonds at essentially fixed prices—at a 2½-percent rate for long-term marketable bonds.

The view of the Treasury, as stated by Secretary Snyder in his carefully prepared speech of January 18, is that the public credit of the United States depends on keeping the price of Government securities at the 2½-percent level, and that this is of such enormous importance that the Federal Reserve System must manufacture the money to keep on buying the bonds in order to maintain them at that price.

I may say, however, that though the Secretary has stated his views, he has merely stated them dogmatically, without proof and without any serious attempt to reply to the great array of expert opinion which supports the Federal Reserve Board. There is not available at the Treasury as this is written any document which shows how the Treasury thinks the inflation of money, which its policy demands, is to be dealt with.

Perhaps Secretary Snyder can prove his case. But he will have to prove it, not merely to declare it. He will have to prove that policy of manufacturing money to keep the price of Government bonds at a 2½-percent rate does not, as Mr. Eccles says it does, set up "an engine of inflation" which raises all other prices and, therefore, because it devalues the dollar, makes even the apparent stability of Government securities a fiction.

In arguing the Treasury case Mr. Snyder will have to face up to the fact that the dispute is no longer theoretical. The record of the last 6 months of 1950 proves with a conclusiveness that is rare in matters of this sort how inflationary is the Treasury's policy. The record shows that the inflation we have suffered since the Korean war is due to this policy, that as a memorandum from the economists of Chicago University puts it, "the price rise of the last 6 months could almost certainly have been largely or wholly avoided * * * prices would probably be a little above their level in May if the Federal Reserve System had kept its holdings of Government securities unchanged, instead of adding to them by $3,500,000,000." That is a serious and a definite charge made by responsible experts who speak with great authority, and their argument has the support of an overwhelming majority of bankers and theoretical economists.

The inflation since the Korean war began last June has been marked by a rise in personal incomes of about 10 percent, by a rise in wholesale prices of about 11 percent, by a rise in the cost of living of nearly 6 percent.

What caused this inflation? Was it the Government's expenditures for war and rearmament? It was not. During the last 6 months of 1950 the Government actually took in more money than it spent. It had in fact a surplus of nearly two billions in the cash budget. This surplus was due to the fact that the taxes Congress so wisely imposed had begun to yield revenues from the enormous prosperity of the boom before there was time to spend very much of the big appropriations for armaments.

Thus the inflation since Korea has not been caused by the military budget. The budget in fact has been deflationary. What is more, during this same period the Federal Reserve System has lost $1,500,000,000 in gold that went abroad. That also was a deflationary influence.

Nevertheless, despite the deflationary budget and despite the deflationary loss of gold abroad, we have had a lively and extremely disconcerting inflation. What caused it? It was caused by the compulsory manufacture of money in the Federal Reserve System in order to buy those Government securities which the Treasury insisted must be bought at a fixed price. That is what caused the inflation. From May 31 to the end of 1950 the demand deposits of the country—the money in which business is largely transacted—rose by over 8 percent. This increase in the volume of money corresponds very closely indeed to the increase in prices. "It is no accident," says the Chicago memorandum, "that these figures are so nearly of the same magnitude. This is about as clear a case of purely monetary inflation as one can find."

Mr. Snyder should tell the country how he proposes to finance effectively the military program if, in competition with it, he continues to insist on having inflationary manufactured money pumped into the civilian economy through private channels, through local governments, and through the agencies of the Federal Government, of which, according to Mr. Russell Leffingwell, there are now about 100 engaged in lending and giving and spending money.

And while Mr. Snyder is explaining all that it would be a good idea if the Director of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, considered the problem, and perhaps took a hand in the solution. He is vitally interested in the solution. For it is hard to see how he can fail to run into tremendous trouble if underneath the artificial price and wage structure he is trying to establish there is the destructive force of a repressed but swelling monetary inflation.

[From the Washington Post of February 12, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

OFF THE CUFF

Much is at stake in the argument between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System, and the complicated problem can only be confused and bedeviled if President Truman lets it become distorted into a political quarrel between his friends and his opponents. The controversy is not like an election or like a football game which can be settled and disposed of when one side has won and the other has lost. For the management of our huge Federal debt by the Treasury and the regulation of the supply of money and credit by the Federal Reserve will have to be carried on continuously and cooperatively.

The two agencies of Government are going to have to agree on a common policy. Neither can afford to win in the sense that it knocks out the other and then drags it along triumphantly behind it.

The crux of the present controversy is whether they are to work together with some flexibility, or whether the Treasury is to dominate the Federal Reserve System in order to maintain a rigid pattern of interest rates. My own inquiries have convinced me that if the issue of flexibility were left to those who best understand it in the two agencies, it would not be a fighting issue at all, and that the problem could be settled by practical operations in the money market, and without resounding declarations.

The rigid dogmatism which now appears to be the Treasury policy certainly does an injustice to its good sense and competence. And the impression which has got abroad is,

of course, absurd that the Federal Reserve System is not concerned about the Federal debt and is advocating a policy of let her rip. "We are suffering," says a very highly qualified observer who wrote to me the other day, "the consequences of having had three exceptionally stubborn Secretaries of the Treasury in succession during the past 10 years." Now that it is essential to put an end to the inflation of Federal Reserve credit, we have to deal not only with the problem itself, which is a delicate one, but with politicians who have become so addicted to inflation that they tremble at the idea of being deprived of it.

Before long Mr. Truman will find that the question is not so simple as he thought it was when he summoned the Federal Reserve Board and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks to the White House. He will find that even if he were able to force the Federal Reserve to manufacture as much inflationary money as the Treasury's rigid interest rate required the controversy would break out again elsewhere.

It would break out because to control prices and wages and to obtain production uninterrupted by strikes will prove to be impossible if the pressure of inflationary credit is not reduced. It is a reasonable certainty that if the Federal Reserve Board were to knuckle under today, within a short time Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston would have to revive the argument.

When the order for a general price freeze was issued on January 26 Mr. DiSalle issued a statement which had been approved by Mr. Eric Johnston, the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency. It is the statement of men who find themselves forced to do something which they don't at all like to do. The statement says that though the general price control has become necessary as an emergency measure, Mr. Johnston and the men responsible with him have no illusions: "The effect of price control is not to eliminate inflation but to suppress it * * * major reliance must be placed upon vigorous taxation and a strong credit policy. To the extent that we succeed in reducing the inflationary pressure by these means we make the task of price control that much easier."

As a matter of fact, this is almost certainly an understatement. Price control will not work at all if the inflationary pressure continues to accumulate. It will produce an orgy of corruption and black markets, of injustice and discontent. In order to make price control work well, that is to say with reasonable honesty and fairness, it would be necessary not only to stop adding to the inflation but to find ways of accomplishing a measure of disinflation.

We shall have to come to that. At least for the emergency period of the mobilization we shall have to resort to emergency methods to disinflate, measures beyond any contemplated by the Federal Reserve Board or really within the proper use of its powers. In one way or another the disinflation will have to be brought about by a considerable reduction in Federal, State, and local public expenditure of civilian uses, by greater private and corporate savings, and almost certainly also by scrutinizing more critically than it is now the fashion to do the content of some of the military programs. We should not naively assume that the survival of western civilization depends upon treating every order from the quartermaster, and every order for four-door sedans, as sacrosanct.

Perhaps the most important thing to be noted about the President's intervention in this business is that he thought he could settle it personally in a few minutes' talk. That is one of Mr. Truman's weaknesses. In this case he didn't settle the controversy but he aggravated it. Thus, though he was lining up the Federal Reserve System behind the Treasury, he did not even take the precaution of having the Treasury represented at the meeting. This prevented him from hearing the issue argued by men competent to discuss it. It left him supposing that he himself could argue the Treasury's case. In fact he didn't argue it and he couldn't argue it. The Federal Reserve men listened to him and did not argue with him because they were too polite to argue with the President of the United States on a subject about which the President obviously was not understanding the question.

It would be ever so much better if Mr. Truman would recognize the difficulties and the complexities of a problem like this, and would realize that no one would think it a reflection on the President of the United States if he himself does not know the answers off the cuff. Then he would do what most Presidents before him would have done. He would bring together those most responsible and best informed—in this case the representatives of the Treasury, of the Federal Reserve System, and the civilian mobilizers, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. DiSalle—and he would press them to work out agreements. He would reserve his own influence for use against anyone who in the discussion showed himself to be at once badly informed and highly opinionated.

[From Newsweek magazine of February 5, 1951]

FIGHTING FIRE WITH GASOLINE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

How preposterous can the situation get? The administration starts the inflationary fire, fights it by pouring on more gasoline, and then talks as if it were completely mysterious in origin. Or it hints that the fire was started by business, by the speculators, the hoarders, the profiteers, or by the buying public. And it acts on this assumption when it insists on the completely false remedy of price control, which puts the economy in a straitjacket of prohibitions, allocations, rationing, licenses, and subsidies, unbalances and disrupts production, creating artificial shortages. All this is called total mobilization.

Take the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder. He is personally a mild-mannered, quiet, unassuming, amiable, loyal, and honorable man who thinks of himself as a conservative. He would be shocked beyond measure to learn that he is more responsible than any other single man for the existing inflation in this country and the almost universal fear of further inflation. And he has earned this No. 1 position not only by his past record but by his extraordinary announcement on January 18 that the long-term rate for marketable Federal securities must be held at 2½ percent. He might just as well have announced outright that he is determined to have more inflation.

Mr. Snyder's attitude stems, of course, not from any desire for inflation, but from a tragic lack of understanding of economic cause and effect. Inflation, always and everywhere, has one basic cause—an increase in the supply of money and bank credit. At the end of 1939, demand deposits and currency outside of banks totaled $36,000,000,000. At the end of May of 1950 this total had reached $109,000,000,000. At the end of December of 1950 it had reached $117,000,000,000. This is not merely the cause of inflation; this is the inflation. The increase in commodity prices is merely a consequence.

And the principal cause in turn of this increase in money and bank credit has been the artificially low interest rates maintained by the Treasury. This cheap money policy has not merely swollen the volume of private borrowing; it could be maintained—in connection with the policy of pegging Government bonds above par—only by encouraging the member banks to load up with Government bonds and by forcing the Federal Reserve banks to buy as many of those bonds as is necessary to maintain the predetermined rate. They bought these bonds by creating deposits or printing money.

All this is now an old story among monetary economists and bankers. But Mr. Snyder has never understood it. He can see the problem only from the immediate short-run interest of the Treasury—to pay as low an interest rate as possible. "Any increase in the 2½-percent rate," he says "would seriously upset the existing security markets."

Any increase in prevailing interest rates would of course mean a lower price for present outstanding bonds. But Mr. Snyder refuses to see that the only alternative to accepting this comparatively mild consequence is an uncontrollable inflation. In the face of overwhelming economic opinion and evidence to the contrary, Mr. Snyder persists in declaring that a cheap money policy and inflation have nothing to do with each other.

If Mr. Snyder stood alone in this appalling blindness the situation would not be so grave. But he is supported in administration circles by a conspiracy of silence. Within the Federal Reserve System there is some real understanding of the situation; but—with a few honorable exceptions like Allan Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—there is precious little courage. Mr. Snyder's statement clearly implies that Chairman McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board acquiesces in the policy of maintaining the inflationary 2½ percent interest rate. In lieu of any genuinely effective over-all action, the Board on January 16 announced the token gesture of increasing required stock margins from 50 to 75 percent. Meanwhile, an ominously growing bureau prepares to cure inflation with the colossal hoax of price control.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD from the letter by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in order to stress the particular point involved, as well as some other points. The letter was addressed by the junior Senator from Ohio to Governor Vardaman. I read:

The concluding paragraph of your statement is one of the most amazing ever uttered by a public official in recent years. You say, "The question of statutory prerogatives * * * should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this national emergency." The meaning of this euphemism is that the laws passed by Congress should be disregarded whenever the President feels that the national emergency so requires. I am unalterably opposed to that sort of totalitarian philosophy either in war in in peace.

You also say in the final paragraph of your statement that you "unhesitantly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time." First, I would like to point out that the laws of the United States are not theoretical for 150,000,000 American people. They must obey them or go to jail. By what right do you presume to waive statutory authority in violation of your oath of office?

Finally, I invite your attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve System is accountable to the Congress and not to the Presidency as you suggest. Congress has not charged the Board with the duty of supporting the price of Government securities, but rather the duty of supporting the value of the dollar.

Until such time as the duties of the Board may be changed by act of Congress, I trust that you will see the impropriety of your suggested waiver of statutory authority and prerogatives.

REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE TO CUT THE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last Thursday the President of the United States held a press conference during the course of which a reporter noted that some Members of the Congress had expressed their determination to squeeze the water out of the budget. Newspaper reports quote Mr. Truman's reply to the effect that, "they said they were going to do that last year, and ended by adding a billion or so, and then asked the President to do the cutting." The President is further reported as saying he is not going to do it for them this year, that it is a good budget and a tight budget, and he dares the Congress to do anything about it.

Mr. President, I am not sure that it is my sole responsibility, as a minority Member of the Senate, to attempt to set the RECORD straight so far as Congress is concerned. The President's statement certainly is a challenge to the majority of this body, as well as to the minority, because in the handling of the budget last year we did function properly. I wish to state that the kindest thing the Senator from New Hampshire can say about the President's remarks—and the Senator from New Hampshire has a kindly and warm feeling for the President, personally—is that either Mr. Truman was misinformed, or he was attempting to be facetious. He has repeatedly advised the press and other groups that he is an expert on the budget—that he has been preparing budgets for years and knows all about them.

We can only hope, Mr. President, that President Truman knows more about the budget which he submitted on January 15 of this year than he knew about the budget he submitted last year.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear where I stand on this matter. I wish to take exception to the President's statement that the Congress added a billion or so and then asked the President to do the cutting. I have in my hand a copy of the appropriations estimates for 1950–51, with all the actual budget estimates which were requested by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget for consideration by the Congress.

I have the record here, in its official form. If it is available to me, certainly it is available to the President and to every other Senator, so what I am saying I am taking from the official record. Senators can examine it. There can be no question about it.

Let us discuss, first, the general appropriations bill for 1951. The estimates considered by the House were $30,300,000,000. The House cut this figure to $29,100,000,000. By the time the budget estimates reached the Senate, the figure had grown to $35,500,000,000. As finally enacted, the appropriations bill had been reduced to $33,900,000,000, a reduction of more than $2,000,000,000.

I wish next to call attention, Mr. President, to some facts concerning the second supplemental appropriations bill. The estimates considered by the House totaled $18,000,000,000. The House reduced this figure to $17,800,000,000. By the time the estimates had reached the Senate the figure had grown, as a result of increased estimates from the President, to $19,900,000,000, and the supplemental bill as finally passed by the Congress remained at that figure—$19,900,000,000.

It can readily be seen from these facts that the statement which President Truman made the other day to the effect that Congress had added a billion or so simply does not make sense.

Taken together there are some interesting figures regarding the total appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. The estimates considered by the House were $66,700,000,000. The House reduced this figure to $65,000,000,000. By the time the estimates had reached the Senate, the President and the Bureau of the Budget had submitted additional estimates to bring the figure up to $74,200,000,000. When passed by the Congress this figure had been reduced to $72,300,000,000.

The Senate will recall that the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which had the support of the overwheling majority of this body, was adopted by a vote of 55 to 31. The over-all effect of that amendment was to reduce the appropriations bill by nearly a billion dollars and as amended by the Senate it provided for an additional cut of $550,000, a very substantial amount. The Congress was perfectly clear at this point. It stated where the cuts were to be made and by whom they were to be made. However, when the appropriations bill was sent to conference, the administration leaders brought sufficient pressure to bear to change the intent of the Bridges-Byrd amendment and directed that the President and the Bureau of the Budget make these reductions, in the sum of $550,000,000, wherever they see fit.

It is very interesting in view of these facts, Mr. President, that President Truman claims the Congress added a billion dollars or more, and he did the cutting. The fact of the matter is that he did the adding on and the Congress did the cutting. The facts are here. They speak for themselves. It was the Congress and not the President which reduced the final estimates submitted by the President and the Bureau of the Budget from $74,000,000,000 to $72,000,000,000.

The President, Members of Congress, and everyone else should examine the official record in this regard, which speaks for itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the President sent to Congress supplementary estimates and budgets, so that he increased the budget, rather than the Congress increasing the budget over and beyond his estimate?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, the Congress did not appropriate unbudgeted items over and above the amount of the budget estimates both as contained in the original and in supplemental budgets.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Michigan is absolutely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that it is up to the whole Congress, representing the people as it does, to accept the challenge issued by the President, by looking into his budget and examining it and actually cutting down some of the unnecessary expenditures provided in it? Does not the Senator agree that it becomes the duty not only of the minority in the Senate, for whom I can speak in the Senate, but of the majority in the Senate, in fact of the whole Senate, to scrutinize every item and accept the challenge issued by the President in relation to the cutting of the budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that when I speak here today I am speaking not only as a minority Member of this body, but I feel I am speaking for this body. Someone should speak for the great numbers on the majority side who contributed to the writing of the record to which I have referred. It is a good record. It is not so good a record as I wish had been made, but it is a good record that was written. The duty certainly falls on the shoulders of someone to stand on the floor of the Senate and correct the President's statement issued to the country in which he said that the Congress had added a billion dollars to the appropriations, whereas the Congress had actually cut $2,000,000,000 from the budget, plus the amount represented by the Bridges-Byrd amendment which, as proposed, would have cut nearly $1,000,000,000 more, but which, when it finally went to conference, resulted in cutting $550,000,000 more.

So the Congress, instead of adding a billion dollars, as the President said, cut directly $2,000,000,000, plus the $550,000,000 which was cut in conference. The Congress saved $2,500,000,000, which, in the opinion of some individuals may not amount to much, but certainly it means a considerable amount to the heavily taxed people of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not fair to say that the President, by his statement, has endeavored to lead the public to believe that the Congress is responsible for the appropriations and the size of the budget and, over and above the President's request, increased the budget by approximately $1,000,000,000? The Senator from New Hampshire has now pointed out that that is not a fact. He has pointed out that the President actually demanded a certain amount of funds, and that the Congress gave him even less than he demanded, instead of more than he demanded.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the Congress appropriated $2,000,000,000 less than the

President demanded, and, in addition, as a result of the action taken in the final conference Congress wrote in a cut of $550,000,000, in lieu of the amount of cut proposed by the Bridges-Byrd amendment, which resulted in a total reduction of more than $2,500,000,000 which the Congress either made directly or provided for by law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that, in spite of the reduction provided in the Bridges-Byrd amendment, an amendment which the Senator from Michigan joined in supporting, in spite of the specific provision of law passed by the Congress as a result of that amendment, as it was changed in the final conference, there have come back into the present budget items which were cut out by the provision of the law passed last year?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The last supplemental bill contained a very large number of such items. There is practically a continual story in that connection, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to add that I shall join other Members of the Senate, in accepting the challenge of the President to cut the present budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a great many taxpayers may raise the question as to why these estimates considered by the Senate are so much higher than those considered and passed by the House. That question has a very simple answer. Anyone who has worked on the Appropriations Committee as I have over a period of a decade and a half knows that there is an almost constant influx of additional requests for appropriations from the time the budget is submitted until it is finally passed. A classic example of this is to be found in last year's budget. The general appropriations estimates submitted to the House did not include any requests for a foreign-aid bill. Between the time the House was given the estimates and the time the Senate considered them, the President had submitted a foreign-aid bill calling for $4,900,000,000.

Mr. President, using the same kind of logic the President used in his press conference on Thursday of last week he should, in order to have been consistent, have accused the Congress of adding the $4,800,000,000 to the budget for foreign aid.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that these budget estimates are recommendations of the President and the Bureau of the Budget, which is under his direction, and a creature of the Executive.

The same thing is happening again this year. On January 15, the President submitted his budget to the Congress. Only last week the President sent to the Congress a request for a small item, for $3,125,000 to be added to one item alone. It should be clearly understood that it is the President and not the Congress who is asking for the increase in this item.

Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member on the Senate Appropriations Committee, I ask that the American people be given the facts. If the President insists upon constantly increasing his request after the original budget estimates are made, let him tell the American people that he is the one who is adding to their tax load and not the Congress.

Many of us want to accept the President's challenge to cut the budget this year. Most of the Republican Members of this body, with whom I have talked, feel as I do, and I know that some members of the President's own party, will join in an effort to reduce the cost of government.

It would be extremely helpful if the Congress could count on the President's cooperation in this effort. Of course, if we cannot have that cooperation then we will have to do it without his cooperation.

I want to serve notice of our intention to scrutinize very closely every request in this budget. We must reduce to a minimum every nondefense expenditure. We must likewise examine carefully every request for money for the Defense Establishment, to see that a dollar's worth of defense is received for every dollar spent. I think that is a very logical thing for us to do.

Mr. President, I believe that in these days of sacrifices by the American people, we will have the character, the determination, and the courage to accept the President's challenge. The people elected us to watch out for their interests, and it is up to us to meet our responsibilities.

The Senator from New Hampshire, for one, is convinced that if we are to draft American boys, if American boys are to die on the foreign battlefields, if we are to tax American families more than they have ever been taxed before, if we are to call for sacrifices and for the acceptance of a lower standard of living, then we have the right and the duty to demand that the administration likewise make some sacrifices.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator tell the Senate what proportion of the budget is not related to military expenses? By "military expenses" I mean, of course, expenses for preparation for the national defense now and the cost of the veterans' care and the interest on the national debt. What percentage of the total budget is involved in military expenditures?

Mr. BRIDGES. Something over two-thirds.

Mr. McMAHON. As a matter of fact, it is approximately 74 percent, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us bear in mind that the Senator from Connecticut may not be aware of the fact that when the President submitted his budget estimates the other day, and when they came to the Congress in January, for the first time the President failed to accompany them with justifications, except for a small part of the total amount he requested. So, thus far, the Congress—as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], could tell the Senator as well as I could—is not able to state the details; we have only the broad figures.

However, as the Senator is aware, roughly speaking, we are talking about an expenditures budget, on the one hand, and an appropriations budget, on the other. The expenditures budget will approximate the size I have stated, and percentagewise may be less than the appropriations budget to which the Senator from Connecticut is referring. The difference is a small percentage figure, which I would not attempt to give from memory. However, the figure stated by the Senator from Connecticut is in the general field of being correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to know that, because when we approach the budget question, I think all of us realize that the opportunity to achieve economy in Government is somewhat limited to us by the nature of the expenditures we have had to make and those we shall have to make for the national defense and security. I think that point cannot be emphasized too strongly.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that during the last session I voted consistently for what I thought were reasonable cuts in the appropriations for the executive departments. I refused to vote to apply for a conservator and to ask the President to do something the Senate refused to do. I voted against that, and I shall continue to vote against it, because if I cannot discharge my own responsibility, I am not going to ask the President to discharge it for me. So I intend to pursue the policy which I followed during the last session.

On the other hand, let us not deceive the American people about the scope within which we can operate in connection with the budget. When some talk about cutting $6,000,000,000 from the civilian expenditures budget, it simply cannot be done, and it is merely a piece of fakery to say that it can be done.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I have said that this budget could be cut by from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000. I think it is an absurdity to assert that the budget cannot be cut by 10 percent straight through, without doing any serious harm or injury to the national defense program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I would not have the Senator from Georgia misunderstand me at all. As I understand, the Senator contemplates a cut right straight through the budget on the military expenditures.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say that. I said that the budget could be cut by 10 percent, and even then we would not get

the waste out of the military side of the budget.

However, I rose to point out that I am not guilty of any fakery, nor am I guilty of any attempt to deceive the American people, when I say that the budget can be cut by between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000, without injury to the national defense.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me, so that I may answer the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I did not mean to imply that the Senator from Georgia was guilty of fakery. What I said was that we could not take $6,000,000,000 from the civilian expenditures, as opposed to the military expenditures, of our Government; and an attempt to say that that could be done in my opinion is fakery.

Now the Senator from Georgia says that the $6,000,000,000 cut can be achieved over the entire range of the budget. That is a subject upon which I would not comment at this time because I have not made a study of the military expenditures and I am not prepared to say that that cannot be done. My impression is that before the end of this year we shall end up by appropriating more money for military defense than is requested in the budget.

I would not want the Senator from Georgia to think I applied the statement of "fakery" to him, because he is talking about an over-all cut, a cut out of the entire budget, which he thinks is possible, whereas I am talking about a cut of $6,000,000,000, which I have seen advertised, although not by the Senator from Georgia, as being possible to be taken from the civilian side of the budget, as opposed to the military side.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut, because he has talked about a division of the budget as between the expenditures for military purposes and those for civilian purposes, that, of course, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and all other Members of Congress wish to appropriate sufficient money so that the security of the United States may be assured. However, when anyone says or attempts to say that the military budget is untouchable, that simply is not so.

Let me give an example, in order to illustrate why I make that statement: When we were sent the last supplemental appropriation bill, requesting additional appropriations for military purposes, naturally the Appropriations Committee wished to move, and move rapidly, in handling that bill. In that connection we did some things which I did not approve of doing. We actually included in that bill some items which were not authorized by law, for the over-all construction program had not then been authorized. Nevertheless, in the interest of the national defense and the national security, the committee deemed it wise to do those things, and the Senate concurred in that action. I am not quarreling as to that.

On the other hand, in connection with the brief examination we made of the military items, one item alone which stood out was for $100,000,000 for relief in Korea. For whom was that relief to be provided? It was in substantial part for the relief of the North Koreans, whom we were fighting, and who were killing American boys day by day; and included in that amount were items for such things as rebuilding municipal electric-light systems or rebuilding various building projects in North Korea. We even found included in that total an item for the purchase of diapers for North Korean Communist children. Those were actual items in that budget request.

So, Mr. President, when we find such items as that included in a military budget, I say it is not an untouchable budget; and therefore we can well survey the entire situation. I have cited that case only as an example. I believe, therefore, that the budget this year should have the personal attention of every Senator.

Recently I noted an item in the press showing that executive departments which, by the greatest stretch of the imagination, have nothing to do with national defense, were asking for increased personnel, in commission after commission, department after department. That certainly is not moving in the right direction, but in the wrong direction. I note also that many agencies of Government are coming forward saying, "We must do certain things because of the war effort," when as a matter of fact their proposals were not for the war effort at all. Those are matters which must be scrutinized.

No one is perfect; I realize that; but the Senate this year is faced with the likelihood that taxes will go to their highest level, at a time when American boys are being killed, and when other American boys are being drafted. With the situation throughout the world what it is, and when we are trying to help our friends in other countries build up and provide for collective security, I think it is up to us to perform a real job in keeping down appropriations.

I realize what the President has said about this being a tight budget. I have not studied it as fully as I should like to do, though I feel confident that I have given it as much study as anyone else in the Congress, and perhaps as much as anyone in the country, aside from the Bureau of the Budget. I contend that the budget is demonstrably as full of water as a field of melting snow. I think we can squeeze a great deal out of the budget. But, Mr. President, there must be a will to do it. The facts must be known to the American people, and there must be a will on the part of this body to do it. We cannot merely stand by and scoff at every attempt and at every serious-minded effort to cut the budget.

To cut some of the nondefense items of the budget is not going to harm anyone. Certainly anyone who gives more than a casual glance at the defense items knows we can cut some of the fat from the unnecessary things, such as Korean relief, and from certain of the military items which have been submitted. I hope that when the record of this Congress is written, it will demonstrate that we have done our work well—that several billions should be cut from the budget—and at least that we equal or better our last year's record, when we cut something over $2,000,000,000 from the budget by direct action on the part of the Congress, and at the same time included a directive to the extent of an additional reduction of $550,000,000.

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Newark News of yesterday, Sunday, February 11, 1951, there appeared an article written by William R. Clark, one of the leading news writers in the State of New Jersey. The article is captioned Political Foreground and in it Mr. Clark emphasizes the fact that Governor Driscoll, fresh from the State budget triumph we have just had in New Jersey, now is ready, along with the Governors of the other States, to take on another great fight, namely, to try to find a solution of the excessive Federal budget. This article is most apropos, in view of the remarks made earlier today by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL FOREGROUND—FRESH FROM STATE BUDGET TRIUMPH, DRISCOLL WOULD TRY HAND AT FEDERAL FIGURES

(By William R. Clark)

Having won his bout with a middleweight budget, Governor Driscoll is tempted to accept a challenge for a go with a real heavyweight. He has been reading about the Federal budget, which weighed in at $71,000,000,000, and of President Truman's open invitation to cut it down to size, if possible.

While Mr. Truman's defi was addressed specifically to the Congress, Mr. Driscoll thinks maybe this shouldn't be a private fight. He is confident that if the Congress couldn't bring the President's budget down his brother Governors could. For one thing, he thinks they've had more training and, of necessity, stiffer budget work-outs than either Congress or the administration. Even though they operate on a limited scale relatively, Governors have faced no such fiscal set-ups as Washington. Their revenues come harder and all have been victims of inflation and Federal tax encroachments.

From a wealth of experience, Mr. Driscoll is ready to concede that a Governor's recommendations don't mean any more in Washington, say, than a price freeze that isn't. He knows about the impact of rearmament on Federal costs, and on State costs, too, for that matter; and that everything, especially taxes, is on a bigger scale nationally. But he also knows that budgets and champions grow fat on soft living, and he's convinced that financially the country could do much worse than give a Governors' committee a crack at trimming Federal overhead.

INFLATIONARY DRIFT

Since most Governors have completed or are in process of completing State budgets, they are acutely aware at this time of the fiscal soft spots of the Federal Government and what the inflationary drift has done to State resources. Mr. Driscoll's prize exhibit

in this direction is the State turnpike. By the time this project completes its 118-mile journey next November from the George Washington Bridge to Deepwater it will have picked up en route $30,000,000 in increased costs. Original estimates, it seems, did not take into account the spectacular flight of materials and allied construction costs.

In the 1949 election, the voters ratified a bond issue of $25,000,000 for a State hospital construction program. At the then market, the Governor and department of institutions and agencies expected the $25,000,000 to provide buildings and facilities sufficient to care adequately for the State's 25,000 patients and to meet reasonable increases in institutional population. Today's prices will sheer off one whole wing of the new South Jersey Hospital.

Within a few months, and due to unchecked and nonscheduled price flights, Mr. Driscoll finds $500,000 added to the fuel and grocery bills of these same 21 mental, correctional and specialized institutions. The Governor is getting figures from the State government council on what fuel and food increases, for one thing, have done to budgets in other States.

Mr. Driscoll hopes Eric Johnston, the ESA optimist, knows what he is talking about when he estimates that, under the thawing price freeze, costs will level off by midsummer. That, he thinks, will be fine, provided State budgets don't melt first.

UNWILLING TO WAIT

But the Governor notes that pressure is already being exerted at vulnerable spots for a cost-of-living increase for State employees. For some strange reason, they seem unwilling to wait, with Mr. Johnston's easy equableness, for the promised price altitude to be reached.

The State's payroll already runs to $49,550,000 a year. That's an increase of $2,130,000 over 1950, and provides only for normal salary increments due employees under civil service ratings. This upgrading, for which Mr. Driscoll already has set aside sufficient funds, is not to be confused with cost-of-living raises. When you get into that department you're in the heavy money zone—somewhere between $10,000,000 and $16,000,000, depending upon which of several estimates are consulted.

Not all of Mr. Driscoll's inflationary exhibits are as aggravated as the turnpike and institutions items, or as the salary problem could be. They are the largest, and the ones over which he has no control.

In other controllable categories, the Governor's recommendations are in the bare bones class. He believes that, in spite of Mr. Truman's confidence, some of the same hard economics could be introduced into the Federal budget. Anyhow, Mr. Driscoll thinks it would be fun to try.

THE FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 1243–1244.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and also on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I desire to express our gratification that the President has supported our proposal for emergency aid to India and has sent a message to Congress urging prompt consideration of a bill to implement it. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on next Thursday we plan to introduce a bill providing for emergency aid to alleviate the famine situation in India and we hope that there will be many Senators on both sides of the aisle who will join us on this bill. A similar bill will be introduced in the House at the same time by a bipartisan group of Representatives.

We have attempted to get the best information obtainable on the exact situation in India, to ascertain what foods are available, and how much India must have in order to avert the very critical famine. We hope to have our measure ready to circulate among interested Senators tomorrow and to introduce in the Senate next Thursday.

I may say that the proposal for aid to India originated in the Congress as a bipartisan movement. We have been in touch with the State Department, which has given us valuable assistance in providing us with information on the situation in India, but we feel it is best for this proposal to come from the Congress as an indication of the wishes of the people of the United States who, from the information we are getting by way of letters, telegrams, and so forth, are eager that something be done to provide relief. We have therefore tried to apply ourselves to all the problems involved, and to obtain the assistance of the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, ECA, and other interested departments and agencies, to ascertain exactly what can be done. A very careful study has been made, and of course, in the hearings, testimony will be forthcoming to show what has been discovered.

For the information of the Senate, I might add that on January 30, a bipartisan group in both the Senate and the House addressed a communication to the President on this subject. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, the communication to the President, together with the names of the signers from both the Senate and the House, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1951.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Over 3 years ago the people of India entered a new era as a free and independent member of the family of nations. We, as Members of Congress, have been aware of the common devotion of the American people and the people of India to the ideals of human liberty.

This year India is faced with an emergency food shortage and has asked the United States for help. We have been discussing this situation among ourselves and with interested citizen groups, and have come to the conclusion that a favorable response by the United States to this Indian request would be in harmony with the interests and traditional policy of the United States and would furnish a concrete demonstration of the friendship and good will existing between our people and theirs.

A series of misfortunes including earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locusts has cut India's grain production this year 6,000,000 tons below her minimum requirements. It is our understanding that, in an effort to make up this shortage, the Indian Government has arranged to purchase some 4,000,000 tons from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States. These emergency purchases have drastically reduced India's foreign exchange reserves, so that she is reported to be unable to purchase the remaining 2,000,000 tons needed to prevent widespread famine. For this remaining deficit India has appealed to the United States for emergency aid, and we understand the United States is in a position to meet that request.

To that end we are considering the introduction of legislation under which Congress would authorize the necessary emergency assistance. Unless we act promptly, many hundreds of thousands of people in India face starvation.

It is our hope that we may have an early opportunity to discuss this question with you in detail. In our view, the need to prevent starvation is entirely separate from all political considerations. It is our further view that a response to that need should not imply any commitment on the part of the United States beyond the present emergency food situation. We do not want our desire to help the suffering people of India within the reasonable limits of our capacities to be regarded as in any sense lessening our opposition to the apparent views of the Government of India with respect to the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, our firm opposition to this apparent position of the Government of India on that issue does not lessen in the least our desire to help relieve the acute food shortage in India.

As a bipartisan group, therefore, we hope we may have your support for our proposal and that we may coordinate our efforts with those of the executive branch. We look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, RALPH E. FLANDERS, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, IRVING M. IVES, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, WAYNE L. MORSE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, JAMES E. MURRAY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, CHARLES W. TOBEY, United States Senators; FRANCES P. BOLTON, THURMOND CHATHAM, JAMES G. FULTON, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, JACOB K. JAVITS, WALTER H. JUDD, EDNA F. KELLY, MIKE MANSFIELD, THOMAS E. MORGAN, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Subsequent to the sending of that letter, the President of the United States invited representatives of the signers to confer with him. We had a very extended conference with the President and certain of his advisers as to the practicability of our proposal. The President subsequently took the matter up, as we know from the press, with former President Hoover, who came to Washington specifically for the purpose of discussing the question with the President. Mr. Hoover, on leaving, expressed his approval of an emergency assistance program and called attention to certain problems concerning it which will be covered by our hearings. The President subsequently met with ranking leaders of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to discuss the proposal.

It is my purpose, as I said in my opening remarks, on behalf of myself and of the Senators whom I have named, and on behalf also of any other Senators who

may wish to joint with us in this effort to introduce an appropriate bill on Thursday next. We are inviting all who desire to cooperate to join with us in sponsoring that bill, which will be promptly referred to the respective committees of the House and Senate for hearings. I believe that the program can be developed in a prompt and orderly manner, in accordance with this procedure.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Hoover Intervenes," published in the New York Times of February 9, and an editorial entitled "Wheat for India," published in the New York Herald Tribune of the same date. These editorials indicate the popular support that has been developed on this important subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 9, 1951]

MR. HOOVER INTERVENES

Former President Herbert Hoover's timely intervention seems to have quieted some Members of Congress who held that starving people whose governments differ with our Government should be permitted to go on starving. As a result some 120,000,000 persons in India who have been living on a grain allowance of 9 ounces a day, perhaps 40 percent of what they need, can hope to benefit by 2,000,000 tons of American wheat. We don't believe anybody on Capitol Hill wanted those people to starve or to die of the diseases malnutrition brings. But some did seem to hold that it was up to Mr. Nehru to prevent this catastrophe by chiming in on the United States policy toward Communist China. There is no connection between the two facts: Mr. Nehru is, we believe, wrong; his people need the grain we can easily send and should have it.

Mr. Hoover is, as everybody knows, a humanitarian with a practical bent. He has had long and honorable experience in relief work; he is well aware that grain moves by rail and by water and that no amount of good will can offset a shortage of planning. He did not mention bushels or dollars after seeing the President on Wednesday. He did not, however, seem to see insurmountable difficulties in finding 1,800,000 to 2,000,000 bushels of wheat India must have or the ships to carry something like 220 shiploads that the amount asked will make.

India asked for this food on December 16, offering to assume a long-term debt to pay for it. At best 2 months from that date will have gone by before the shipment is authorized, and this is too bad. Perhaps it will help a little if we give this grain free—and give it in the spirit of a remark made by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota: "This is people to people, not government to government."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1951]

WHEAT FOR INDIA

President Truman has done well in securing Mr. Hoover's help in planning aid for the starving peoples of India; Mr. Hoover, in turn, has responded with the alacrity and magnanimity that was to be expected of him. "This is not in the category of politics but in the category of Christianity," he said; and the view will be echoed, we believe, by the overwhelming majority of Americans. It is an impressive thing that this wise and experienced public servant, having contributed to his country and to the world more than is asked of many men in a generation, should take up this fresh assignment with an unrelaxing sense of duty and with something close to youthful enthusiasm. A democracy is rich in proportion as it contains proven men ready to respond to any call; and Mr. Hoover, throughout his long career, has been one of those who have never failed where service was asked of them.

The case for sending grain to India is clear. A series of natural catastrophes has struck at the food supplies of the new-born nation. Floods, droughts, earthquakes, and visitations of locusts have conspired to render life uncertain for millions. Some 6,000,000 tons of grains will have to be imported this year if a minimum standard of diet is to be maintained; of these two-thirds have already been provided for, and a request to the United States has been solemnly made for the additional 2,000,000. Our Government possesses the grain; transportation can be arranged; the terms on which it will be sent—whether as a grant or as a long-term loan—can be worked out. The important thing is that the human cause not be lost sight of, and that action be taken before it is too late.

There has, unfortunately, been a disposition to delay, partly as a result of the divergences on international policy between India and ourselves. It is inconceivable, however, that such considerations should weigh significantly in America's decision. The humane tradition of our country is one of its glories; and it is not now, when we step forth to take our full role on the world stage, that narrow motives or unworthy second thoughts should control us. Mr. Hoover has in the past been credited with saving millions of lives through the administration of relief regardless of political affiliation; will he find that some petty calculations or pressures stand even temporarily in the way of saving life in a nation that, despite superficial differences, is one with us in its love of freedom? In the Congress a bipartisan movement to assure relief for India is on foot; and this, combined with effective Executive leadership, will certainly carry the day. Let us only hope that this good victory will be assured while the day is yet young.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for not more than 1 minute?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have listened to the message of the President with great interest and sympathy. I wish to say that I fully approve and shall strongly support the program which is outlined in the message. I shall deem it a great pleasure and a source of pride to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I hope, with many other Senators, in introducing the necessary bill to implement the recommendations of the President. I very sincerely hope that such proposed legislation will receive early and favorable consideration by the Members of the Senate.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that I fully associate myself with the statements which were made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a very brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation, my gratitude, and congratulations to the President of the United States for his message to the Congress urging legislative action in support of the request of the Government of India for 2,000,000 tons of grain. The Members of the Congress know this has been a concern of mine ever since I became a Member of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. It was my belief then and remains my belief today that the future of Asia will depend to a large extent on the destiny of India and its people.

The people of India are a freedom-loving people who achieved independence in a manner similar to the way the United States achieved independence 175 years ago. They are imbued with the concept of human dignity. Their leaders and their scholars have been weaned on the inspiration of Thomas Payne, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. There is a common bond which unites the people of India and the people of the United States. The future of world peace and the future of our democratic civilization depends on the strengthening of that bond and of that feeling of unity.

The people of India are today in need; they face famine, starvation, and disease. The people of the United States, in the spirit of generosity, humanitarianism, and the Judaic-Christian teachings, are eager and willing to respond to that need.

Mr. President, I am proud and happy to be able to join the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New York in urging the enactment of legislation on this important subject. I am proud of the fact that the issue of food for India unites the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, as it has united the distinguished former President and leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Hoover, and the leader of the Democratic Party President Truman.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the enactment of such legislation as that proposed would be another demonstration of the warm heart, the warm hand, and the kindly spirit of the American people. If there ever was a time when the people of the world needed to know that our minds are filled with something else besides rearmament and the terrible threat of war, it is at this hour. I am convinced that such a demonstration of the simple, basic, and fundamental goodness, love, and affection would do more to win us friends in the world, and to gladden our own hearts than any other one thing that has been accomplished in a long time by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial en-

titled "Starvation in India and American Grain," published in the Minneapolis Star of January 29, 1951, and an article entitled "Have You a Dollar To Help India?" written by Paul W. Ward, and published in the Minneapolis Star of the same date.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STARVATION IN INDIA AND AMERICAN GRAIN

Reports from Washington and New Delhi are that India is going to ask America for an extra 2,000,000 tons of food grain as an outright gift, and that if the gift isn't forthcoming 20,000,000 Indians are going to starve during 1951.

The 2,000,000 tons that will be asked are in addition to between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 tons that India is buying with all the exchange it can get its hands on from its own resources or from loans.

About half of the 2,000,000 tons would be wheat, and the balance kafir corn and milo—grains that aren't regarded as foodstuff here, but as feed. That's roughly 33,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 50,000,000 bushels of coarse grain.

The United States will have about 450,000,000 bushels of wheat still on hand when the new crop starts coming in, and the wheat crop prospects look fairly good. So, from a supply standpoint, the country could easily stand shipping 33,000,000 bushels to India.

Last year's crop of grain sorghums was the largest on record, and the country is generally in good shape on stock feed. It can ship the kafir and milo without much interference with the need for increased livestock production.

Giving India this extra 2,000,000 tons won't solve India's long-run problem. There shouldn't be any illusions about that either here or in India. Neither should India be misled into thinking that America could stand repeating such a gift year after year.

But the gift undoubtedly would extend millions of lives another year, and that is not a small thing. The gloomy rule that while there is life there is hope applies.

With all this in view, the Star thinks the gift should be offered. And we hope that current political differences with India won't cause Congress to balk at the necessary appropriations.

HAVE YOU A DOLLAR TO HELP INDIA?—2,000,000 TONS OF UNITED STATES GRAIN SOUGHT AS GIFT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How much is 2,000,000 tons of food grain? Roughly, it is 1¾ percent of America's annual grain crop. It would fill about three-quarters of Minneapolis' elevators, which have a greater capacity than those of any city in the world.)

(By Paul W. Ward)

American altruism is about to be put to an even stiffer test in India's behalf than the one it passed successfully last month in Yugoslavia's case.

The test will come when officials get up sufficient courage to pass on to Congress India's request to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of food grains.

It is equivalent to asking each of this country's 150,000,000 residents to put up $1 in aid to India at a time when—largely to pay for an anti-Communist defense program that India shuns—they are being prepared to fork up nearly $500 apiece in Federal taxes.

Executive-branch officials already have satisfied themselves that the grain is available; that India cannot possibly pay cash for it or even acquire it on a loan or credit basis; and that, if anything, it will have to be an outright gift from American taxpayers to the Indian people.

They have not yet satisfied themselves, however, that Congress is in any mood to consider such an outlay, and their doubts on that score have mounted as—

1. Some of the key Democratic as well as Republican Members of Congress continue to lambaste as "complete appeasement" and "abject surrender" the Truman administration's recent apparent acquiescence in an Indian-led move by the UN toward a peace-at-any-price deal with Communist China.

2. Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Prime Minister, reasserted his "new China" thesis at the London Commonwealth conference while continuing to balk at applying to settlement of India's 3-year-old dispute with Pakistan over his homeland of Kashmir the simultaneous-troop-withdrawal formula he prescribes for Korea.

Despite the resulting uncertainties within primarily the State Department, it is virtually certain that inside a month the administration will submit India's request to Congress with an urgent recommendation for its approval on wholly humanitarian grounds.

Considerations pressing them to urge favorable action on Congress are chiefly these:

1. If the aid sought from America is not promptly granted, between 10,000,000 and 20,000,000 Indians will be condemned to death by starvation in the months immediately ahead.

2. If the United States balks at extending aid to a non-Communist government because of its different attitude toward Communist China and related issues, America's foes in Europe as well as Asia will use the fact as proof the Kremlin is right in contending that American humanitarianism is hypocritical and that all aid from this country is given with political strings attached.

3. If Nehru's government should topple under the strains of a starvation economy, its successor would certainly be one reflecting in larger degree the antiforeignism and anti-Americanism of the Indian masses than Nehru's does and thus even more helpful to the Kremlin's Asiatic designs than Nehru's presently may seem to be.

THE TERMS OF AN HONEST PEACE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on January 17 last I offered suggestions to the Senate as to how the world conflict in which we are engaged could be more economically and effectively prosecuted, so that it might be brought to an end at a date short of the time of complete prostration for our allies and ourselves. Toward the end of that talk I made brief reference to the possibility of peace by disarmament. I wish now to discuss in more detail a concrete proposal to that end.

Mr. President, we have found ourselves in a very serious position as a result of our foreign problems and the military preparations we are making to meet them. In domestic matters we are facing severe economic strains. Dependence on the military arm to solve our problems requires that we arm to the limit and train soldiers, sailors, and airmen to the limit. While our military budget has been set by the President at nearly $50,000,000,000, no one with mature judgment and experience believes that even that enormous sum is the limit. There is no limit to military demands. By its very nature Armed Force demands of us everything we have. Its desires are as insatiable as in the case of the two daughters of the horse leech to whom Solomon refers in Proverbs. They cry, "Give, give"—and we are giving.

To strain our economy to the utmost is the set purpose of the Politburo. This purpose was foreshadowed by Lenin and is being ably carried out by Stalin. We are dancing to their tune.

It is not only that we are sacrificing to defend our standard of living and the free independence of our economic life. We are sacrificing our freedom itself. We are being forced to shift the American way of life into the pattern of the garrison state. Not only are we shifting we are there now. Yet it is only as the months go by that we will begin to realize all that has happened to us.

It is clear enough that the future of the young men and of many of the young women of this country no longer lies in their own hands. That future is at the command of the military. Schooling will be interrupted, opportunities for beginning employment in life work will be denied. The whole future of the youth of America is clouded with uncertainty as to everything except that the Armed Forces hold their lives and prospects in their hands.

But this power of the garrison state extends beyond persons to institutions. The Armed Forces can determine which ones of the colleges in our country shall survive and which shall perish. With this tremendous drain on the youth of our land only that college which is granted an ROTC contract can continue to perform its functions. Our wealth, our standard of living, the lives of our young people, and our institutions are under the control of the military. We are no longer a free people.

We are doing no better on the foreign than on the domestic front. Our position with relation to Korea is clearly understood by us. It has been clearly expressed in resolutions passed by the House and Senate and has the overwhelming support of the American people. But it is folly for us to ignore the weakening of our position with relation to those who should be our allies.

In very large part the weakening of our allies is due to an unwillingness to face facts. It is due to a strongly ingrained attraction toward appeasement in spite of the fatal results of appeasement hitherto.

But there is more to it than this. To the outsider our position, our policies, and our actions are difficult to distinguish from an old-style contest for power as between ourselves and the Soviet Government. The surface appearances all point this way to those who do not have access to the inner thoughts, desires, and aspirations of the citizens of America. We really are sheep in wolves' clothing. Our neighbors see the wolf's skin but cannot believe there is a sheep in it. Our most plaintive bleating seems to them the sound of a snarling growl. These are the facts of life, and we must face them.

That we are not doing too well in the United Nations goes without saying. Our first impulse is to write that organization off as a failure if its members do not understand our position or sympathize in our attempts to maintain its integrity. Aside from this insistence in maintaining the integrity of purpose of

the United Nations which is vital and on which we cannot compromise, the foreign observer must conclude that our attitude and activity are largely summed up in the endeavor to outshout the Soviet delegates. To give our respected Ambassador to the United Nations that thankless task is to weaken our cause and nullify our representation.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that we can move from the negative to the positive in the United Nations. It is my conviction that we can present proposals for peace which will be so simple, so practical, and lead so evidently toward the desired result, that we can appear before the United Nations and before the world as honest, honorable, and practical peace seekers instead of being considered as one of two parties to a contest for world domination. Let us not write off the United Nations. Let us use it.

The proposal is a simple one. It is based on the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy which was rejected by the Soviet government. It differs fundamentally from the Stockholm Peace Proposals which were aimed at the destruction of the armament in which we are strongest while reserving a full strength to the Soviet government the elements of military power in which that nation is strongest. In essence, the proposal would be to disarm completely in every weapon and to any degree above the few small arms required for maintenance of civil order. The essential, of course, is that the carrying out of this disarmament must be progressive and must be done under the direction and under the inspection of the United Nations itself.

The Baruch plan provided for international control and inspection of a particular form of armament—the atomic bomb. We would propose to extend this to all armament. It requires a treaty signed by all members of the United Nations. This would have to be extended to cover all nations of any importance, whether at present members or not.

As in the Baruch proposals, the treaty would set up a control agency, would provide for complete access by that agency to every nation, would prohibit the manufacture of prohibited arms, would provide for the disposal of those now existing, and would provide sanctions for violations. The peace proposal we would offer would contain these provisions. Most importantly, as will be stated later, the right of access would be the first step in the progressive application of a peace agreement.

In the words of the Baruch report, "In consideration of the problem of violation of the terms of the treaty or convention it should also be borne in mind that a violation might be of so grave a character as to give rise to the inherent right of self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

This total disarmament plan should likewise provide a schedule for the completion of the transitional process over a period of time step by step in an orderly and agreed sequence leading to the full and effective establishment of international control of armament.

This is the American plan extended to cover all major armament instead of one single element of it.

The first of the series of steps by which disarmament and peace are to be reached will be that of freedom of communication. We must set as the goal the same freedom of communication behind, through, and in front of the iron curtain as existed in Western Europe and the Americas prior to the Second World War. This is not complete freedom, for now, as then, we would require visas the duration of which would be determined so that travelers would not be allowed to become residents. But the whole freedom of travel and likewise the whole freedom of uncensored communication—by air, by wire, by cable, by the post—would be reestablished.

It would be well for us to start even with the Soviet government in this matter of communication. While we have placed restraints on the freedom of satellite representatives, we have consistently maintained the decencies of international relationships with the Soviet government, while its satellites have cut themselves off from friendly relations with the rest of the world. This situation has extended over years through both war and peace. The example of the nations of the Western World persistently maintained against great provocation has had no effect whatever on the Soviet powers. They still persist in shutting us off from friendly and normal relationships and communications. In making the comprehensive peace proposals such as have been outlined, we should start by announcing that we will apply exactly the same restrictions on the travel of citizens and on the movements of accredited representatives that they apply against us. The power of example has failed. We will start even on this question of decency in international relationships.

Mr. President, while this proposal for peace and disarmament can be stated comprehensively in these very few paragraphs, it is necessary that we realize the serious implication of the proposal for us. It means throwing America open to travelers whom we suspect of having subversive purposes. We will let in Communists. Let us not blink that fact. But let us also remember that Russia will let in capitalists, as they will call any visitor from a capitalist country. This is going to be at least as unpalatable for them as for us. It is, in fact, going to be more dangerous for them than it is for us, for the institutions they have set up cannot be so easily maintained in the light of knowledge and free intercourse. The Politburo knows this, and this is the reason for the iron curtain.

We are not endangering our institutions to the same degree. While we have scared ourselves stiff, it is because we have faced subversive activities in a society which is already weakened by the necessities of military preparation, and which, in consequence, cannot devote itself wholeheartedly to the well-being of its citizens. When we can reverse our direction and purpose, nothing that Communists can say or do will divert the American people from the attainment of the economically high and the spiritually satisfying way of life which we are able to work for and attain.

Mr. President, our principal need in this respect is a revival of our faith in our institutions. Polluted rivers are purged of infection as they flow for miles under the bright sunshine. Communist infiltration will wither and die under the bright sunlight of knowledge and the fresh winds of freedom. Let us not lose our faith.

Can the Soviet government refuse such a proposal as this? It will indeed be hard for it to swallow, but will it not be harder yet to be put on record before the eyes of the world as refusing peace when it is offered completely and unequivocally? How can that government sell to the world the idea that the western nations, and particularly our own country, are warmongers seeking world domination? In the face of such an offer the proposition is absurd. No really peaceloving nation will entertain it for an instant. World sentiment will again turn our way. It cannot fail to do so. The Soviet government, branded as seeking conquest rather than peace, will either have to retire within its boundaries defeated and bare to internal dissension, or will have to join the ranks of the really peaceloving nations.

Mr. President, in making this proposal we cannot lose. If it is accepted we and the whole world win a disarmed peace. If it is rejected, the Soviet government stands convicted before the eyes of the world without a single excuse for its rejection of peace.

If it chooses to rejoin the peace-loving nations, the way to its aspirations held for generations and centuries, will be open. In a United Nations having united support of the nations and which has been successful in establishing a disarmed peace, many things are possible that are now impossible. For instance, the rulers of Russia have long fretted at their confinement. They have not had free and easy access to the great oceans of the world. From access to these oceans it has felt itself barred by more advantageously placed nations, by narrow seas subject to hostile military control, and by the icy barrier of the Arctic. This can be changed with such a peace agreement as has been described. It would be possible—nay advisable—to put the narrow seas in charge of the United Nations with a suitable police force for patrolling and safeguarding in a peaceful world. The narrow passages of Scandinavia, the Dardenelles, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal—yes, and the Panama Canal—can and should be under international control under those conditions. The age-old complaint of Russia would lose its justification.

Another complaint of the Soviet is that it has inadequate supplies of oil. So long as that government seeks to set the world in turmoil to add to its enormous conquests and to its millions of enslaved peoples, we must see to it that its supplies remain inadequate, that there be no doubt that this is our purpose; but in a disarmed and peace-seeking world we can change all that. Plans can be arrived at whereby Russian commercial

access to the oil supplies of the world are enjoyed by that nation on the same terms as the rest of the world enjoys.

Aside from these two complaints, access to the oceans and to adequate oil supplies, the Soviet Government can make no just demands that the rest of the world is not ready and willing to meet.

There are many powerful and judicious voices which have been raised in support of some of the ideas which I have been setting forth. Among them I would call attention especially to Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union of the CIO, to our own fellow Senator, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and to ex-Senator Tydings who, in spite of the fact that he was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, made a bold and outright plea for disarmament. Both the Senator from Connecticut and Mr. Reuther have proposed that any plea for peace and disarmament should offer proposals on our part for a wide expansion in amount and application of the point 4 program to nations now groaning under the burden of armament. Mr. President, I agree with the desirability of this but I do not like to see the proposals used as a means of buying peace. The value of peace is without price. It must be sought as a precious jewel—not purchased in the open market.

However, the possibility of expanding point 4 has a great and necessary interest to us. Our rearming has painfully modified our economy and our way of life. It will affect them harmfully to a still greater degree as we get deeper and deeper into the policies and practices of the garrison state. But we must not dodge the fact that a sudden return to peacetime activities would likewise be disturbing. It might, in fact, have almost the effect of an atomic bomb on an economy and a way of life which have been geared to war. We have to face not merely the moral equivalent of war but the economic equivalent as well, which we must develop and build up rapidly for the period of transition if the necessity for war preparation disappears.

Point 4 is one of the transition policies to which we may have recourse. As rapidly as may be we can redirect productive, managerial, and engineering ability now concentrated on war to the development of the undeveloped parts of the world. Even should we do this as a free gift, it would still be better than the free and destructive expenditure of our blood and treasure in preparation for and carrying out of warfare. We will need this moral and economic equivalent of war if we are to shift our purposes and our direction.

But it is not only in the foreign field that we must find these equivalents. We have to redirect our energies to similar undertakings on the domestic front. We are, for instance, far behind in school building. We must see to it that our equipment of educational facilities are renewed, rebuilt, enlarged, and improved. There are innumerable other things we can do as the moral and economic equivalent of discarded warfare. All the streams of America should run fresh and pure to the sea. No sewage should taint their waters. No industrial refuse should pollute them. Billions upon billions upon billions we devote purposefully toward destruction. A part of these funds for an extended period must be directed toward the health, education, and higher satisfactions of the American citizen. The period of liquidation of the garrison state may become a period of constructive rebuilding of American life.

During this period of diminishing expenditures, we can expect diminishing taxation. This means increasing freedom. One of the means by which the garrison state destroys our freedom, is by that excess of taxation which destroys our ability to do for ourselves and makes us dependent on the Federal Government. The garrison state is the consort and breeder of the Socialist state.

Now, Mr. President, just a few words of recapitulation. We must look closely enough at our present position and course to recognize that we have lost the battle for the American way of life. Instead we are beginning our experience with the garrison state. On the domestic front the Soviet has already won. Military victory will be barren in the face of this grim fact.

We must also face the fact that we are losing the sympathy and support of other nations in the world, large and small, and that through the clever propaganda of the Soviet Government we are being made to appear as one of two contenders for supreme power in the affairs of the globe. We know this is not so. But it is not so clear to the outsider. We are losing on this field of battle as well.

If, as is true, we are seeking peace, we must make that so evident that no one can misunderstand it. We can make it evident by such a peace proposal as I have described. In the face of the clear evidence of such a proposal the Soviet Government will either have to accept or be branded before the world as seeking power over the world, as it has already sought and obtained power over so many hundreds of thousands of square miles and so many hundreds of millions of helpless captives.

This opportunity for peace must not be presented as an ultimatum to be accepted in a given number of days and then withdrawn. Our willingness to join in a disarmed peace must be set before the nations of the world as a permanent exhibit. We must proclaim it monthly, weekly, daily, hourly. It is always valid. The world's warmongers must never be allowed to forget it.

Our position before the world is that of holding a sword in one hand and a Bible in the other. The sword means that there can be no truce with violence, injustice, and tyrannical conquests. The Bible means that we hold to the doctrine of the brotherhood of all men with Christ under the Fatherhood of God and that we are prepared to incorporate that belief in a practical proposal for peace for the nations of the earth.

Our road is clear and the chance is here.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have asked the distinguished Senator to yield for a moment, in order that I may express my warm commendation of the splendid presentation he has made and the addition he has made to the so-called great debate with regard to where we go from here, in the great peace offensive which I agree with him we must undertake at once. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I, too, should like to make a comment on the splendid presentation the Senator from Vermont has just made. I wish to say that I think his speech is a very fine follow-up of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont when, a few months ago he made a speech entitled "Let Us Try God."

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in regard to the very eloquent address just made in the Senate by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, yesterday was the birthday of one of our Nation's greatest men, Thomas Alva Edison. Nowhere in the world was he more widely respected and more greatly honored than in New Jersey, where he lived and worked for the greater part of his lifetime. The people of New Jersey revere his memory, as do the people of the entire country. At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a tribute to Thomas Alva Edison, as presented by Ted Mack on the Ted

Mack Family Hour on Sunday, February 11, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—let me say that when I was a student at Columbia University, from 1906 to 1910, several times I had the great privilege and opportunity of meeting Thomas Edison at his home, and there I met his family. Not only was he a great engineering genius, but he was a great American, and particularly a great family man. Therefore, I join with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, in saying that among all the outstanding Americans of his time and of his age, and particularly in association with John Burroughs, Harvey Firestone, and Henry Ford, Thomas A. Edison set one of the greatest examples of true progressivism of any American of his time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS ALVA EDISON AS PRESENTED BY TED MACK ON THE TED MACK FAMILY HOUR ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1951

Once more we hear the strains of America, the Beautiful, and turn to our album of great Americans. Today is February 11, and more important, it is the birthday of one of the greatest minds that ever was produced in America—Thomas Alva Edison.

You know it's more than possible that I wouldn't be talking to you—there'd be no brilliant signs on Broadway, you'd have no radio, television or phonograph, and not even movies—oh, we'd be missing a great many things we take for granted today—if a boy hadn't been born in a simple little home at Milan, Ohio, in 1847.

Young Edison, from the stories we have at hand, seems to have been a typical American boy who tried to hatch chickens by sitting on them, set fire to his father's barn, ran a chemical laboratory in the cellar, and had a job of sorts as a candy butcher on the Grand Trunk Railroad. If any of you at home are wondering what's going to happen to your young hopefuls—after reading the midyear report cards—you may take comfort in knowing that Edison's school teachers expelled him as not worth teaching at all.

Tom Edison was taught from that time on by his mother, by a railroad telegrapher and by the "university of hard knocks." When he was 30 years old, he invented a tin-foil phonograph—and if you're interested, the very first words to come out of this wonderful machine were "Mary had a little lamb."

Of course, he hadn't been idle before that, you know. He had invented a stock ticker, helped make the first successful typewriter and automatic telegraph machine, and electric rheostat, the electric pen which made possible the mimeograph machine and the carbon transmitters for telephones. I'm sure the recording stars of today would get a real kick out of visiting Edison's first recording studio in West Orange, N. J. Singers and musicians sang or played into megaphones instead of out of them in those days.

There were other scientific discoveries, but the most important one to come up next was the invention of the electric light in 1879, when Tom Edison was only 37 years old.

What happened in the years since the first light bulb glowed in his laboratory is apparent in your own home every time you push a button, and it's certainly evident on the main street of every town in America.

In 1891 he applied for patents on the motion-picture camera—actually it was developed 2 years before that, 1889, but Edison was a little ambitious. He was trying to tie up his phonograph with the camera to make talking movies. That, friends, was 60 years ago.

Then he went on to develop electric semaphore signals for railroads; he invented the fluoroscope; and at one phase of his life, he worked on metal ore refining. Out of this work came iron, copper, and zinc miracles, and even a new cement.

You must realize that we're just skipping across the top of his many contributions to mankind. In among the familiar inventions, the name of Tom Edison touches safety lamps for miners, dictating machines, coal tar derivatives that provide many flavors and perfumes today.

For all his contributions to mankind, they've struck off medals in his honor, they've issued stamps in commemoration of his great works, but every time we turn on a light, ride in an automobile, a train, or a plane, every time we take part in the pleasures of radio, television, the movies, the theater—in fact, whenever we enjoy life in America today, we are walking around among the monuments a great man erected to the eternal American ideal that a country boy from Ohio has the opportunity of asserting his genius.

It can be done again because it's been done before. For that we thank Tom Edison and for that we're glad we're Americans.

ADVISABILITY AND EXTENT OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the all-important discussion regarding the advisability and extent of our participation in the defense of Western Europe, it is gratifying to note the wholehearted determination of outstanding citizens of both parties to present their well-considered views on this vital matter.

The people of the United States have already had the opportunity to weigh the various arguments and recommendations voiced both in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere. But too much cannot be said in relation to a decision which must be made in the near future. The lives and possessions of many Americans are involved; the future course of our Nation's history is at stake. Under these circumstances each one of us has a duty to submit his best judgment, whatever it may be worth.

I believe the President of the United States should consult Congress regarding the important phases of our troop assignments to Western Europe. I have in mind the definition of "consult," as given in a leading dictionary, as follows: "to ask the advice of, to take counsel with, etc." Such a proceeding negatives the idea of simply allowing the Congress to express itself, after which the President would do as he pleased.

Nor do I think any great difficulty will be encountered if the President takes Congress into consultation, in the true sense of that word. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are possessed of the same high degree of patriotism as is to be found in the executive branch—no greater, but no less. There will be found in the Senate and House of Representatives earnest and devoted public servants who are as zealous in safeguarding our Nation's interest as any other representatives of this democracy.

When these true Americans in the Congress are consulted by the President as to the components of any United States expeditionary force they will respond patriotically. Any proposed plan must, of course, be based upon practical considerations, and be definitely required for the security of our country and for the containment of communism, which is a menacing threat to liberty and freedom.

Congress should be consulted as to troops for Europe, not only because it is in keeping with the understanding at the time of approval of the North Atlantic Pact, but because such joint action of the Congress and executive branch will be the surest guarantee of national unity. The Members of the Congress are truly representative of the will of the American people. They reflect the attitude and determination of the citizenry. This is an all-important consideration in the creation and perpetuation of support for the vital decisions upon which the lives and possessions of our people will depend.

I say this as one who has consistently supported foreign-aid programs. Since that epoch-making message of March 1947, antedating the anti-Communist program for Greece and Turkey, and continuing through the successive steps which were designed to rehabilitate the democracies of Western Europe, I have voted for the different outlays. Furthermore, I am convinced that without these programs, to which we gave unstinted support, the iron curtain would long ago have enveloped other nations, just as Poland and Czechoslovakia and other peoples are now subjected to Communist domination.

But in casting those various votes for European aid in huge amounts, I did so with the understanding that Congress would have voice in the determination of policy involving the sending of men, just as we were implored to give support to plans for the sending of dollars to Europe.

The instinct of self-preservation impels us to maintain our position of world leadership. It is not that America has any aggressive intentions. Rather, it is that our Communist foe represents a global menace, and that, the further his ideology is spread, the more imminent is the danger to our security.

It is incumbent upon this Nation to reaffirm allegiance to the doctrine of collective security. We must not abandon Europe. Not only would such a course mean the repudiation of our pledges and the loss of the great military and economic investment already made but it would represent an open invitation to Moscow to strike whenever the time appears propitious.

Furthermore it is not sufficient to conclude that we can fulfill our objectives alone by air and sea power. History and

experience, not only of past decades but contemporaneously have demonstrated that in addition to these two mighty forces there is a third essential, namely, ground troops of infantry and artillery.

Reinforcements must be available to our fellow members of the Atlantic Pact. To hold that we will not give assistance in this matter until and unless the foe has already inflicted his damage would be to defeat the very purpose of the program long since adopted.

Not to be ignored also is the fact that we already have troops in Germany who must not be abandoned. Obviously we cannot allow these Americans to be the victims of a ruthless enemy.

But a policy to commit ground troops to Europe should have qualifications attached. There is a limit to what the United States can do, as Korea has shown. Our European allies should understand in advance that they cannot expect too sizable a portion of our limited infantry and artillery. Possibly, if they had been warned when hostilities opened in Korea of this fact, they would not have thrust so great a burden upon the United States as was done. We must not repeat our all-out assumption of defense, as has occurred in the Korean crisis, where the United States has suffered tremendously and disproportionately.

An inflexible mathematical formula cannot be decided in advance of an emergency. It is no more possible in advance to say that 16⅔ percent is all that we will commit any more than it would be reassuring to know that while 10 planes might be needed to cover a given target, only 9 can be allowed under the technical blueprint. Britain could never have determined in advance that after Dunkerque so many troops and supplies would go to Egypt, to France, to Africa, to Malta—and when. The determination of "adequacy" must take into account the needs of the hour and the availability of other forces. We must leave such tactical and strategic decisions to the military strategists who are the better informed as to what is required, lest perhaps, through shortsighted policy, we jeopardize the lives of American boys already dispatched to foreign lands.

But all this is not to say that limitations should not be placed. I do not believe in giving a blank check to anybody, whether it be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States or to anyone else. We would never countenance the giving of a blank check for the expenditure of United States Treasury moneys for domestic purposes. Much more serious would it be to consider giving such unlimited authority over lives of American boys upon whom the future of our Nation and of the world will depend. How best to accomplish the objective of commitment without jeopardizing the entire program is obviously the difficult question. Consideration should be given to imposing a requirement that the President must receive the approval of Congress at stated intervals as to the commitments made in the intervening time. If such approval could not be secured from the people's representatives, then no additional troops could be sent.

In addition, consideration should be given to the establishment of a joint bipartisan emergency policy committee of possibly 12 Members of the Congress, who would be consulted regularly as to developing needs in the European defense area and who would be called upon continuously for consultation by the President of the United States. Such a committee should include representatives of the Foreign Relations, the Armed Services, and the Policy Committees of both parties of the Senate and of the House. If additional appointments to the group are necessary, the presiding officers should take this action. Members of this emergency committee should meet at stated intervals, throughout the critical period, with the President, the Secretary of State, and military officials, so that they would continue to be informed of the latest reports as to changing conditions. More important, they should be consulted in the formulation of policy and in connection with further decisions.

More and more it would seem necessary that Russia, and all the nations of the world, be kept informed of basic United States reactions and intentions with regard to the matter of preserving the peace and security of the world. Had Russia, Communist China, and North Korea been fully convinced of the determination of the United States not to permit violation of the independence of Southern Korea, I am sure that they would have been less ready to face the opposition which the free nations have offered in that area.

Undoubtedly, if the United States forces and armaments are to be poured into any and every area where Communist Russia directs one of her satellites to strike; if they are to be dissipated in attacks upon those subservient forces, we can well wear ourselves out fighting a windmill, like Don Quixote of fiction, while Russia sits by and awaits the day when she can send her own forces into action against a United States which has been so weakened by successive incidents that our ability to defend our freedom may be sorely impaired.

It must be clearly made known to the Kremlin that further Communist aggression anywhere in the world is tantamount to an attack upon the United States. Let it be made clearly evident that efforts to counteract such incidents will be directed at the oppression center from which they stem, namely, Moscow and Russia's points of military production, as well as against the satellites who are actually prodded into the attack.

With every new area gained through aggression, Russia strengthens herself by manpower and natural resources, and by so much weakens the power of the free nations of the world for final resistance.

To permit absorption by the Communists of the resources of Western Europe, for instance, or of Southeastern Asia, could well be to produce the final increment to Communist strength and productive facilities which would make the difference between victory and possible defeat for the United States and the nations allied with her. Every hour we delay in making such a position known, every additional square mile of territory yielded by such delay, adds by so much to the task that ultimately and surely will confront us.

Mr. President, there is one point about which I agree entirely with former President Herbert Hoover. Our allies in Western Europe must not undermine our efforts by continuing to supply our Communist—and common—enemies the products and raw materials of a strategic nature or that serve to bolster the behind-the-line economy of those enemy countries, to which Mr. Hoover referred in his speech of last Friday.

Certainly nothing could be more open to condemnation than is a policy on the part of any of these nations whom we propose to help, of continuing to benefit financially and otherwise by trade with nations who are seeking to destroy both them and us and who will make use of all supplies thus sent them, in one way or another, toward our defeat and destruction.

This particular point needs stressing at this time because of the information possessed by the subcommittee investigating shipments to Communist areas regarding the vast amounts of highly strategic items—copper, steel, and their products; electric machinery, machine tools, transportation items, and so forth, which have been flowing to the satellite countries and to China, and to bordering nations which have been transshipping those items to the very areas which now are in open or at least actual hostilities against us.

To summarize, it is earnestly suggested that—

First. To refuse any troops to Western Europe would let that whole area go by default should Russia attack; much of that area has been overrun twice or more since 1914. The people's "will to fight" depends understandably to a large extent on the belief in the possibility of successful defense.

Second. Our planning should not make it possible for Russia to walk in almost unopposed, and then have opportunity to attack this country from Atlantic bases when she has consolidated her hold upon Europe. Rather we must assist our European allies with troops and armament to defend their countries, to hold and delay the foe, to fight our battle and theirs, while we carry out our major task of destroying the enemy's home, military, and productive centers by air attack to prevent reinforcements.

Third. If Korea has shown anything at all, it is that air and sea power alone cannot repulse and destroy masses of foot soldiers.

Fourth. Troops furnished Europe must be according to an all-over program that allows for adequate home defense; but any rigid proportional allotment of such troops to troops of other nations obviously must depend upon conditions as they develop.

Fifth. Congress much be consulted—not on the basis of a fait accompli, a decision already made, but as to whether

troops should be sent, when, and how many.

Sixth. Realizing the unwieldiness of a policy of Presidential consultation with large congressional committees, I suggest a bipartisan consultation group, from both Houses of Congress, consisting of Members of each party from the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Policy Committees, who would be delegated by the Congress to represent them and to consult on necessary decisions with the President in matter of troops dispatched in an emergency.

Seventh. United States must demand that all anti-Communist nations be included in the defense set-up. To exclude Spain, Turkey, or Greece would be to weaken a system of defense which, at its strongest, will be subjected to all-out strain in case of Russian aggression against Western Europe.

Eighth. Insistence that United Nations allied with us stop supplying enemies with needed supplies and material.

Ninth. Concentration upon defense to exclusion of all nonvital spending for construction or for expansion or initiation of Government social services.

It is heartening, when one considers the vast differences of opinion which naturally follow the free thought of the American people and their leaders on vital aspects of foreign policy in the past, to realize how much basic unity of thought now prevails with respect to United States European commitments, despite all the apparent sound and fury.

All the vehement arguments for ceilings on the amounts of troops to be sent, or for proportionate allocations of American troops to those of other countries involved, serve but to emphasize the very important general agreement on the necessity of aid from this country to the nations of Western Europe, particularly in the form of armaments.

Happily there is a resurgence of determination that the cause of liberty and freedom shall not be defeated. Further, there is general realization among our people that, within the Atlantic coalition, there lies the best hope for resistance to the enemy.

To the undying credit of the American people let it be said that they approve of the outlay from our Treasury of whatever is necessary for the fulfillment of the extensive rearmament program which will supply not only our own troops but will assist Western Europe in building its defenses against possible Communist aggression.

Also, as a dire warning to Moscow is the determination of our country to meet force with force and to carry the fight to the homeland of the enemy, if the Soviets launch an attack upon Western Europe.

In the light of recent developments and fortified by the definite state of unity among the American people which has been noted, particularly since General Eisenhower's survey and report, the United States can be depended upon to do its part to prevent the overthrow of democratic institutions and to frustrate the onrush of Communist aggression.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very much delighted to find a Democrat among my friends on the other side of the aisle hitting the sawdust trail. Not only do we find a Democrat who agrees on at least two points with former President Herbert Hoover's program but, if I may do so, I most respectfully suggest to my distinguished friend from Maryland that within the next few months I think he will probably agree with Mr. Hoover's program in its entirety.

Do not let us forget, Mr. President, that it was a Democratic President who first recognized Russia, after Herbert Hoover had declined to do so. Let us not forget that it was during a Democratic administration that this Nation engaged in World War I and World War II.

Well do I remember early in World War II Winston Churchill saying over the radio:

> We don't want American boys over here. We don't need them. Just give us the tools. Give us the guns.

Mr. President, the Connally resolution which was adopted by the Senate provided for a second front. What did we find within a few days after we adopted the resolution? Only a few weeks after Mr. Churchill had said over the radio that the British had all the manpower they needed out of 116,000 casualties in the Normandy invasion 86,000 were American boys.

A few days ago President Truman appointed a new commission. He said the purpose of appointing the Commission was to find out why American people did not go to the polls and vote. It is particularly appropriate today, since it is the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, to call the attention of the Senate to the great fact that Abraham Lincoln found that the political parties of his day were not doing a good job. Therefore he organized the Republican Party. We tried very hard a short time ago to have a new constitutional amendment adopted. Did we get the support of the Democrats? We did not. In the elections of 1940, 1944, and 1948 we could as well have had one party. People who were opposed, as some of us were, to sending American boys all over the world, sending our treasure to every country on the globe, spending $200,000,000 for tobacco for citizens of foreign lands, buying $200,000 worth of Coca-Cola for foreigners, purchasing and sending to them didies, and all of that sort of thing, had no place to go. The Republican bipartisan policy, for which my friend made his plea only a moment ago, stopped us. We heard Mr. Dewey, the Republican candidate, asking for more help for Western Europe than had been asked for even by President Truman. He asked for more men and larger contingents of boys to be sent to foreign countries than had been asked for even by Mr. Truman. A few nights ago Mr. Dewey again renewed his plea over the radio.

Mr. President, why does Mr. Truman want to appoint a commission now to find out why the American people do not go to the polls? Why is it that nearly 50,000,000 Americans stayed home at the last election? They stayed home because there was no candidate and there could be no candidate under the Constitution after the Republican and Democratic national conventions had met and made nominations, to represent the rank and file of the American people, who were opposed to sending American troops abroad, and who were opposed to continuing to send billions and billions of dollars abroad. Mr. President, I suggest to my distinguished friend that some day, when he is at liberty and he has nothing else to do, he look up some of the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and read some of the speeches which were made by Members of the Senate after World War I. My distinguished friend could find no more instructive reading. Senator after Senator, some of whom are still Members of this body, rose on the floor and said that we had made a mistake, that we had no business getting into World War I. I refer him to the RECORD.

Mr. President, in Europe, before World War I, there existed the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It was over a thousand years old. It was made up of 19 different nations. The house of Hapsburg was older than the royal house of England. After World War I a Democratic President took a trip to Europe. Woodrow Wilson said, "We are going to have self-determination of nations over here." The nations of Europe had been working together. They almost had a common currency. It was possible to travel from one country to another without any difficulty. They almost had a real United States of Europe. All that was torn to pieces. Let us take the case of poor Poland. England guaranteed the sovereignty of Poland. England said, "We are going to war to preserve Poland." The record shows how England preserved Poland. It does not take the senior Senator from North Dakota to show the lamentable job which England did on that project.

Mr. President, everyone knows how national conventions are rigged. President Truman does not need to appoint a new commission to find out why nearly 50,000,000 American people did not vote at the last election. Let him pick up a newspaper and read the accounts that were written at the time the national conventions were held. Well do I remember that the Republican convention at Kansas City was delayed 25 hours until Andrew Mellon from Pennsylvania could appear before it to tell whom to nominate for President. Well do I remember that twice the lawyer for the House of Morgan had them nominate the candidate for President of the United States.

Every one of us is familiar with what took place at the Democratic convention at Chicago when a loud-speaker microphone was installed in the basement of the convention hall, through which a fellow yelled in a loud voice, "We want Roosevelt. We want Roosevelt." A few weeks later, in Philadelphia, we find the Republicans nominating a man who in the primary had not carried even one State. They nominated Wendell Willkie. He had not carried one primary election. A few

days before the convention we found the London Times saying, "There is a great demand for the nomination of Wendell Willkie." They said that only a few days before the nomination took place. Then we find the House of Morgan sending its representative to Philadelphia. Fake tickets were issued to men and women, who, after being paid a certain amount, went into the balcony and shouted, "We want Willkie. We want Willkie." They shouted "We want Willkie" from morning until night.

Mr. President, we tried to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment. My distinguished friend the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] tried to help us the last time it was brought before the Senate. It was an amendment under which all the people could go into a primary election and cast their vote for their candidate for President, in the same way that they can now nominate a candidate for governor, Representative, and Senator.

Mr. President, I well recall the great fight put up by the late George Norris for the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of President of the United States. Senator Norris was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and he worked, not weeks, not months, but years, in an endeavor to get that constitutional amendment adopted. But in spite of his great prestige, in spite of the fact that he was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, in spite of the fact that he finally got the joint resolution reported from the committee and upon the floor of the Senate, it was emasculated until he himself could not recognize his own proposal. Then, finally, it was defeated by an overwhelming majority.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for his assistance some months ago when we finally got one-third of the membership of this body to vote for the submission of an amendment providing for the direct election of President of the United States, and providing in the same amendment for a primary election.

Ah, Mr. President, I well remember when in my own State a citizen could not vote directly for a United States Senator, and no citizen had that right until a constitutional amendment making provision for it was ratified. Today no one can vote directly for a President of the United States, and I submit that one reason why 50,000,000 remained at home at the last election was because they were so disgusted at what took place at the Republican convention and the Democratic convention that they did not care to vote at all.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not blame the people. So far as the foreign policy was concerned, what difference was there between the parties? There was not any difference. Yet only a short time before that Burton K. Wheeler, then a Member of this body, a distinguished Senator from the State of Montana, speaking in Los Angeles just before we entered into World War II had an audience of 108,000 people. Did those 108,000 people have a chance to express themselves?

So today, on Abraham Lincoln's Birthday, I call attention to the fact that Mr. Lincoln, not liking the parties which were then in existence, organized the Republican Party. I only wish that today the Republican Party was still enunciating the principles of Abraham Lincoln as he announced them at the time the party was established.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], earlier this afternoon mentioned George Washington and George Washington's Farewell Address. He referred particularly to the part in which Washington said that we should avoid entangling alliances with other countries. It would have been a pretty good thing if we had followed the advice of Gen. George Washington.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which was published by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association which says that North Dakota's share of the Federal debt is greater than the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the State of North Dakota.

Time and time again upon this floor I stated the amount of the debt which would be borne by every county in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, in North and South Dakota, and the same information was available as to every other State. I showed, for example, that the total debt of a small county such as Cass County, N. Dak., just for the Marshall plan, would amount to more than $16,000,000.

To show how little the rank and file of the people know about it, I may state that one day I went into the gallery of the Senate, where three of the leading bankers of Fargo, N. Dak., were sitting, when the Marshall plan was being discussed. All three of these bankers were for the Marshall plan, and I said to the first of them, "How much will the share of Cass County be?" He said, "About $250,000." I asked the next one and he said, "about $350,000." The next thought it might be half a million dollars. These bankers are supposed to know all about fiscal matters, but not one of them knew that the share of Cass County, N. Dak., would be $16,000,000.

Mr. President, I agree with nearly every word of what Herbert Hoover has said in his last two speeches. He is a man who has spent the major portion of his adult life in foreign countries. He has taken trips all over the world since he was President. I say frankly that I was shocked when I picked up the New York Post yesterday and saw on the front page a statement to the effect that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was not even going to call Mr. Hoover before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Who are the men who know so much, the men who do not want to hear a former President of this country even testify? I was delighted to find in the same article a statement to the effect that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], although he said he did not agree entirely with what former President Hoover had said, nevertheless was going to ask that Mr. Hoover be requested to appear and testify.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he read the report of the former President about the reorganization of the Post Office Department, and how many hundreds of thousands of dollars he thought he could save. Does the Senator believe he could save that money in the Post Office?

Mr. LANGER. Let me preface my answer to the question by saying that when I received that report, I wrote a letter to Mr. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Among those who served on the Hoover Commission there were prominent labor leaders, and such men as our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and men high in business and in industry. I wrote to Mr. Johnson and said, "I want to know who wrote this report. Did Mr. Hoover write it? How many meetings have you had of all the directors of the Hoover Commission?"

Would not my distinguished colleague be anxious to get the answer which I received from Mr. Johnson? They meet once a year, and many of them are not present when the committee meets. So we find that this report is not a report of President Hoover at all. It is a report of Mr. Johnson and his staff.

But answering the Senator's question directly, I say that I believe a great deal of money can be saved in the Post Office Department. I believe the suggestions made were good.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator speak of "Johnson" or "Johnston"? I should like to have him clear that up. I was not the one to whom he wrote.

Mr. LANGER. "Johnson" is not the Senator. I gladly clear that up. The name of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina is "JOHNSTON." The chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is a man by the name of "Johnson." The names are very much alike, but there is a "t" in one and not in the other.

As I said, I was very much delighted when I found that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] announced he intended to invite Mr. Herbert Hoover before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed again in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the table prepared by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association, showing that North Dakota's share of the national debt is much greater than the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

North Dakota's share of Federal debt is much greater than total taxable value of all real and personal property in State

[Each individual's share of the $256,598,297,426 Federal debt amounts to $1,708]

County	Population, 1950	County's share Federal debt	Net taxable valuation, 1950
Adams	4,801	$8,253,828	$4,659,425
Barnes	16,822	28,731,976	16,134,965
Benson	10,618	18,021,544	10,685,428
Billings	1,769	3,651,452	2,552,297
Bottineau	12,091	20,828,428	12,296,154
Bowman	3,998	6,267,584	4,260,661
Burke	6,597	11,130,676	7,319,443
Burleigh	25,252	43,898,416	17,826,697
Cass	57,903	98,971,324	52,551,326
Cavalier	11,693	19,484,644	12,794,204
Dickey	9,066	15,484,728	10,428,079
Divide	5,977	10,318,716	6,450,961
Dunn	7,212	12,318,096	6,611,827
Eddy	5,361	9,557,568	6,244,652
Emmons	9,694	16,005,352	7,879,929
Foster	5,301	9,954,108	6,835,722
Golden Valley	3,487	5,935,796	4,153,306
Grand Forks	39,190	66,936,520	30,777,683
Grant	7,109	12,022,172	6,003,366
Griggs	5,414	9,147,112	6,936,639
Hettinger	7,086	12,502,888	5,611,526
Kidder	6,154	10,011,032	6,661,298
LaMoure	9,471	16,176,468	10,224,453
Logan	6,345	10,837,260	5,387,407
McHenry	12,556	21,445,648	11,970,079
McIntosh	7,391	12,965,428	5,724,150
McKenzie	6,840	11,682,720	6,401,900
McLean	18,770	32,059,160	11,641,182
Mercer	8,676	14,818,608	6,814,786
Morton	19,242	32,865,336	13,739,567
Mountrail	9,399	16,053,492	9,001,100
Nelson	8,055	13,757,940	9,538,100
Oliver	3,077	5,255,516	3,252,447
Pembina	13,944	23,816,352	13,080,697
Pierce	8,259	14,106,372	8,888,549
Ramsey	14,334	24,482,472	15,830,950
Ransom	8,838	15,095,304	8,052,989
Renville	5,388	9,202,704	5,616,626
Richland	19,738	33,712,504	19,017,396
Rolette	11,094	18,948,552	5,346,531
Sargent	7,568	12,926,144	8,080,145
Sheridan	5,226	8,926,008	4,870,378
Sioux	3,709	6,334,972	1,616,010
Slope	2,308	3,942,664	2,647,915
Stark	16,121	27,534,668	11,677,794
Steele	5,131	8,763,748	6,837,939
Stutsman	24,039	41,058,612	20,241,619
Towner	6,329	10,809,932	8,844,535
Traill	11,330	19,351,640	12,388,027
Walsh	20,485	34,988,380	15,545,378
Ward	34,631	59,149,748	25,014,286
Wells	10,384	17,735,872	10,902,828
Williams	16,402	28,014,616	15,555,793
Total	617,965	1,055,484,220	559,647,225

Sources: Valuation, State tax commissioner; Federal debt, U. S. Treasurer's Report, November 1950; population, Bureau of Census.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that the record shows that the share of each individual in North Dakota—and I am not now talking about a family, Mr. President, for if a man has a wife and eight children the total family share would be ten times as much—the share of each individual in North Dakota of the $256,598,297,426 of Federal debt amounts to $1,708. That is what every North Dakotan, not every family, but every individual in North Dakota, owes.

I have here the list which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of every county in the State, showing the population of each county and each county's share of the Federal debt, as well as the net taxable valuation of each county in 1950. If my distinguished friend from South Carolina is interested in the details, I shall be glad to secure them for him. The total population of North Dakota in 1950 was 617,965. The share of the Federal debt of the counties of North Dakota is $1,055,484,220. The taxable valuation in 1950 was $559,647,225.

That, Mr. President, shows where the Democratic Party has led us. That is the result of permitting the party to remain in power since 1932.

In all honesty and humility, Mr. President, I wish to say that the Republican Party, under the bipartisan program, is partly to blame. I notice that my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is smiling at what I am now saying. When he was running for the Senate in the State of Minnesota I heard him say over the radio that he blamed the Republicans just as much as he did the Democrats because of the so-called bipartisan policy. Well do I remember how the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota rolled those words under his tongue. I also remember the great impression his statement made upon the rank and file of the people of the State of North Dakota. I can understand why my distinguished friend from Minnesota defeated by nearly 300,000 votes his opponent, who had voted for the giving of all the vast sums of foreign aid money, who had voted that the United States should take care of a great portion of Europe. Since that time Asia has been added. As one Senator stated today, we are now going to take care of Asia also.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only want to help the Senator from North Dakota make the RECORD accurate. I must remind my good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, that my charges made in the last campaign were not that we were doing too much internationally. My charges were that we were not doing enough or doing it well enough. I believe possibly it is well at this point to say, in view of the fine eulogy by the Senator from North Dakota, that the people who heard me applauded my remarks, and liked what I said. They liked what I said because they believed it to be the responsibility of the United States to do this job internationally. It so happens that the junior Senator from Minnesota was taking issue with his opponent on the basis that we were not following through on the bipartisan foreign policy.

I merely wanted to clarify the RECORD, because I know the Senator from North Dakota and the junior Senator from Minnesota do not see eye to eye on our foreign policy. In fact we see, let me put it in this way, rather back to back instead of eye to eye.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he flatters himself. He did not receive those votes because the people of Minnesota thought he was going to do more for the people of Europe and Asia than the man against whom he was running. They voted against Mr. Ball because they did not like his record. They said "We do not know what he, the man running against him, will do, but he cannot do any worse so far as aid to foreign countries is concerned and we are going to take a chance on him."

I call to the attention of my distinguished friend that his distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], speaking over the radio when he was running against former Senator Shipstead, said, "I would not have voted for the loan to England." Both former Senator Ball and former Senator Shipstead are from his own State of Minnesota. When my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] ran for Senator the last time he stressed the fact that he also would not have voted for the loan to England.

In closing I want to make a prophecy, Mr. President. I prophesy that in a few years, it may not be long, some of the very Senators who are now upon the floor of the Senate will do what Senators did after World War I, rise on the floor and apologize to the American people for having participated in the present foreign policy, for having sent billions and billions and billions of dollars to foreign countries, when at this very moment there are 10,000,000 families in America trying to live on $2,000 a year.

My distinguished friend from Minnesota is a member of the board of directors of an organization known as the Institute of National Affairs. That organization has in its employ as executive secretary a man named Dewey Anderson. A short time ago I placed in the RECORD a report made by Dewey Anderson, who, I assume, was chosen to the position he now holds, by my distinguished colleague from the State of Minnesota. In that report Mr. Dewey Anderson gave figures to show that there are some families in the United States trying to live on a thousand dollars a year. Those are not my figures. They are the figures of Mr. Dewey Anderson, a leading economist, selected by my distinguished colleague from the State of Minnesota himself.

So, Mr. President, I today venture the assertion that if hard times come, if, for example, we should have a drought such as we experienced some years ago in the Northwest, if conditions become bad, some of the Senators who are so anxious to vote billions upon billions of dollars to almost every other country on the face of the globe and some of them who are now saying, "We are going to send our boys all over the world," will change their position.

I remember that the former Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Gurney, during the Eightieth Congress introduced the selective-service draft bill. I then asked him, "To what countries on the globe are you going to send American boys?" Former Senator Gurney said, "To every single country in the world to which the President of the United States may care to send them."

Mr. President, although I may be in a hopeless minority, I wish to say that I do not propose to send American boys all over the earth. I voted against the appropriation of every dollar of money which is going to any foreign country, with the exception of the appropriations for UNRRA, representing $2,000,000,000 to feed the naked and the hungry. What a mess was made with the UNRRA program before it was finished. Russia handed out our money, or the food purchased with our money to other countries of Europe. Under that program England handed out our money in South

America. The United States received no credit.

Today what do we find? We find the bipartisan crowd made up of Democrats and Republicans alike again saying they are going to vote to send more and more American boys across to Europe. On the other hand, we find the President of the United States saying we are not at war. Mr. President, if we are not at war, I suggest that some Senators who are so anxious to send American boys across the sea, go to Walter Reed Hospital and talk to some of the boys there who have no arms, who have no legs, and some of those who are unable to feed themselves, and have to have nurses to take care of them morning, noon, and night. Let Senators talk with those boys and find out whether or not we are at war. They can tell us, Mr. President.

KOREA AND THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD and to make a few comments thereon, with the understanding that I shall not take more than 2 minutes to do so?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a dispatch from London concerning a statement by His Majesty's Government, made by Prime Minister Attlee, to the effect that the British Government opposes another crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON.—Prime Minister Attlee announced that the British Government opposes another crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea until after full consultation in the United Nations.

Attlee said in Commons it was especially important to get the views of the nations fighting in Korea.

Attlee said that while Britain loyally supports the United Nations and considers China the aggressor, "the question of sanctions is not one which we can support until there is no hope of settlement."

He said the thirty-eighth parallel is not a military line but just an imaginary line on the map, and that therefore there might be unintentional crossings here and there at times.

But, referring to any planned intention to cross the parallel, Attlee said:

"In our view the thirty-eighth parallel ought not to be crossed again until there has been full consultation with the United Nations and, in particular, with those member states who are contributing forces to Korea."

Attlee criticized those who insist that the issue in the Far East is solely between the United States and China.

"The issue is between the United Nations and Korea," he said. "It is just stupid to suggest that China has done nothing in this. It is equally stupid to suggest that His Majesty's Government have no policy of their own."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to comment briefly on the dispatch, within the time allowed me.

On February 1, by a vote of 44 to 7, and with 8 absent, the General Assembly of the United Nations determined that the Chinese Communists were aggressors in Korea. Twelve days have passed since that action was taken by the United Nations. I think the Senate of the United States and the American people are entitled to know what sanctions, if any, have been proposed by the United Nations, whether they be economic or military.

I also believe that both General MacArthur and General Ridgway are entitled to have a clear understanding as to just what the policy on the part of the United Nations is in regard to the Korean situation. Those generals have had their hands tied behind them up to this time by the limitation which prohibits the United Nations forces from attacking military targets north of the Yalu River, whether they be supply depots, air bases, arsenals, or troop concentration points from which reinforcements are being sent to attempt to destroy the United Nations forces in Korea.

Mr. President, it is bad enough to ask men to fight and to risk their lives when they are placed under those very severe handicaps which are recognized as such by every responsible American commander in Korea and by every soldier, sailor, and airman fighting in Korea. If His Majesty's Government is going to propose that the United Nations forces not go north of the thirty-eighth parallel, it is time that information was very clearly outlined in specific detail. What, in effect, this will mean, Mr. President, is that the Communists of North Korea will be assured that they will have the opportunity to build up a Korean government north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and it will make military operations very difficult if this limitation is placed upon General MacArthur and General Ridgway.

However, more important than that, Mr. President it is time that we have a clear understanding as to what the Prime Minister of Great Britain proposes to do in the event the forces of the Republic of Korea are going to go north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I was in Korea last November. I am convinced that the Republic of Korea will never be satisfied with having that country divided at the thirty-eighth parallel. The fact of the matter is that Korea cannot exist economically or politically if divided at the thirty-eighth parallel.

I predict that Mr. Attlee will have some difficulties with the government of the Republic of Korea and with the 38,000,000 free people of South Korea if he attempts once again to establish a Communist regime north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

CONFIRMATION OF ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE NOMINATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that I may report, from the Committee on Armed Services, various and sundry routine nominations and promotions in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. These nominations have been before the committee for some 2 or 3 weeks, and they are reported unanimously by the committee. In the interest of economy, and to avoid the expense of having to print the nominations in the RECORD on a subsequent occasion, I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations may be confirmed en bloc forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that, as in executive session, he be permitted to report the nominations from the Committee on Armed Services? The Chair hears none, and the report of the nominations is received.

Is there now objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the nominations be considered at this time?

Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES MILITARY AND CIVILIAN POLICY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that there is a fear among the people of the United States that we are facing another war. It is my belief that that is exactly what Russia wants us to believe. I am convinced that at the present time Russia wishes our people to become so frightened and so stirred up that the United States will rush headlong into full armament and at the same time cripple the domestic economy. Russia wishes the United States to do that, not only to make our country spend money, but also in order to keep the Russian people in fear that America will attack Russia.

Today the Russian leaders are telling their people that the United States intends to attack them. Mr. President, the people of America know that is not true. On the other hand, the American people are saying that Russia is going to attack us. I do not believe that is true as of now. On the other hand, I do not want anyone to think that in time of peace we should not prepare for war. We must do so. At the same time we must keep our feet on the ground, so to speak; we must keep our economy sound, in order to pay off the enormous debt we owe and keep our people employed, in order that the Russians will not have a fertile field in which the Communists can stir up strife and discontent and form their own fifth columns in America.

For that reason I have prepared some remarks on this subject, to let the people of the United States know that we do not fear Russia, that we can take

care of Russia, and that we want Russia to know that we can take care of her if a war is forced upon us. We want Russia to know, also, that we have allies, who will assist us in case of a war. We should let Russia know those things.

Mr. President, in the events of the past month, I sense a heartening development in the return to the national scene of the fine perspective and moral judgments that have always served America so well in periods of trial and conflict.

I feel and see, as you must, Mr. President, a growing measure of real unity that comes from a true understanding of the issues in world affairs and from their full and honest discussion to which we here and all our citizens have been treated by the Members of this Congress.

We may well take comfort from the fact that in this hour of great challenge, we have proved again that we have leaders who, by their scholarship, patriotism, and statesmanship, have demonstrated their ability to deal with the complex and numerous problems whose constructive solutions are so tied in with our national well-being and the future security and prosperity of the democratic world.

As this debate has gone forward, all of us have been made increasingly aware of the fact that we are engaged in a struggle for the continuance of our American way of life. The values we hold dear are daily under contest in many parts of the world. We cannot take anything for granted; but, rather, we must make a positive and constant effort to secure and expand the rights which we as Americans consider priceless.

In the recent past I believe we have been prone to bring an emotional rather than a factual and objective appraisal to the global situation. Once we enthrone fear as the basis of our plans and programs and are confronted with its extensions at every turn, then we are subject to gross and costly error. That is why I am particularly glad to note at the present hour a return to sanity and realism. Once we fully consult our own resources and project them into global strategy in relation to the assets of our allies of the free world, we find that our position is promising, not dismaying; we have the task of making the most of what we have, speedily and with intelligence.

As to the current differences on use of American military manpower abroad, I am glad to note that they appear to be receding to the point of what would be reasonable under the circumstances for the protection of world peace.

The Russians are generally credited with having available for action in Western Europe a striking force of about 175 divisions. To this force it may be expected naturally that they could muster up substantial additional reserves. This standing army, augmented by the vast armament which the Soviet Union possesses and by the standing troops in the satellite countries, we know is far beyond what Stalin and his Kremlin masters require in order to protect the national interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The physical powers and the foreign policy of the Soviets clearly constitute a threat to world peace. Of this we must never lose sight, no matter how greatly we may be tempted to shy away from this distasteful situation.

In the face of this threat, we have the job of rallying the resources of the democratic world to meet the situation, and of developing such strength that our would-be enemies will realize the futility of contesting our strength.

Before we get on with the development of the factors of strength in America, I believe we should proceed cautiously and not write off Europe at one stroke, as so many of our self-styled experts are inclined to do. There are substantial anti-Russian forces in Europe, and they constitute elements which need to be reckoned with. At the moment I am making particular reference to nations which are not technically associated with the Atlantic Treaty powers. Thought needs to be given to advancing their availability and increasing their effectiveness. I feel that we may be certain General Eisenhower is giving due attention to these forces in his calculations and over-all plans.

Yugoslavia, for instance, has an army of 32 divisions, or 400,000 men; Greece, 8 divisions, or 130,000 men; Turkey, 30 divisions, or 550,000 men, and Spain, 30 divisions, or 450,000 men.

Let us examine all this aspect for a moment. We know that Tito's men would have their work cut out for them, since Stalin has approximately three-quarters of a million satellite soldiers in arms around the borders of Yugoslavia. Nevertheless Tito stands as a serious obstacle to any Soviet walk-over of Europe. While the Grecian Army probably would be occupied mainly at home, it is well trained, and even though small, it would act as a road block to a Soviet blitz.

Any way we look at it Turkey and Spain have forces that could play an important part in the western defense. Judged by professional standards, Spain is said to have one of the best armies in Europe, and we all know the battle strength of the Turks. If the military forces of the nations I have just enumerated were to be added to the military strength now being developed for General Eisenhower's command, there would be a solid basis for hope that the Soviets could be withstood until the full powers of the free nations could make themselves totally felt.

What are the prospects of such an all-Europe front against Soviet expansionism? Turkey has clearly lined up with the west against Russia, and the Turkish force would appear to be clearly available. American money and equipment have been made available to the Turks to bolster their military strength. Turkish soldiers are in the thick of the fight in Korea. Staff liaison would appear to be the principal need, and this could be arranged. In my opinion, too, the quicker we arm Western Germany the better it will be for the allies; for if war should start now, it would start at the Rhine, but if we had Western Germany, then it would not begin at the Rhine, but would begin on the other side of Western Germany, which would be to our advantage. I think the military leaders of the allies should train a German Army. I am not now speaking of Germany's coming back and being built up immediately, but we need them, and we had just as well be sensible about it and handle them to our advantage.

When we come to the western fringe of Europe the situation is different. Only within recent weeks has the United States restored full diplomatic recognition to the Franco government. With the appointment of an Ambassador to Spain, America gave signal recognition to the realities of the day. The world picture made our new policy advisable. Too long did we harken to the promptings of voices which contended that the rightist leanings of the Franco government could be modified by the application of political and economic pressures. Our military authorities have long urged the resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. Although General Eisenhower did not find it convenient to confer with Franco on his recent tour, it would be well to hear what he has to say about linking up the assets of Spain with those of other European nations banding in defense against Communist aggression.

While we are on this aspect of the general question of husbanding our global strengths, it will not be amiss to say a few words regarding Japan. The Chinese Communist invasion of Korea clearly points up the need for a peace treaty with Japan, concluded at the earliest possible reasonable date. Japan, alone among the states of the Far East, presently holds the potential of offsetting and frustrating the Communist drive to dominate Asia. Japan's industrial capacity and her military potentials loom large as assets to withstand the aggressive onslaughts of Communist China.

As in the case of an Austrian peace treaty, Russia with her legalistic bickerings is playing the part of an obstructionist. Russia does not want any Japanese treaty; she does not want any revival of an economically and militarily potent Japanese Nation fostered by democratic principles.

There are many who perhaps have emotional blocs against the United States pushing for the revival and restoration of a recent enemy belligerent. But it would be foolhardy for us to work against our own best interests and the best interests of a stabilized world condition for such a reason.

Because of the predominant role we played in the Pacific War, we have the right to call the turn on the Japanese Peace Treaty; and if Russia wants to play dog in the manger, that is her privilege. Everything we can do should be done to hasten the day when Japan is a sovereign democratic nation so that her strength may be joined in the fight of the free world to turn back communism.

If these things were accomplished in Europe and in Asia the complexion of the world picture would be altered materially. We would come to look differently at our own manpower requirements and needs if all our efforts were exerted to get everybody on our team that wants to be there, and should be there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am wondering whether the Senator from South Carolina has given any consideration to the possibility of a few allies behind the iron curtain. It seems to me that we are locking horns with a very unorthodox type of attack. The Communist imperialism has used with great success fear propaganda warfare, economic warfare, political warfare, and actual military warfare. It has used with some success in some parts of the world saboteurs and agents within our country and in many of the other countries of the world. The people of Poland have a great passion for national independence. The history of Poland is that of a great people desiring with fervor and emotion their independence. There are also the people of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I would also include that former great democracy, Czechoslovakia. It appears to me that we should be practicing at this stage of world history what we practiced during World War II when we had the OSS and when we had our agents going behind enemy lines. They were in Yugoslavia and in Czechoslovakia, stirring up the people against the Nazi oppressor.

Is there any reason in the world why we should not be able to bring into our fold untold millions of people who would be anxious to work for the cause of human freedom if we but had contact with them? Possibly we do have such contact with them; I do not know. There are some things which we are not privileged to know. But it appears sensible not only to think in terms of Western Europe and of the friends we have in the Philippine Islands, but let us think of the peoples who over the centuries have fought for freedom—the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, the Bulgarians—who are ruled by a handful of Communist political leaders.

I think it is safe to say that in Czechoslovakia 90 percent of the people are anti-Communist. We should not lose touch with them.

I wanted to bring this thought to the Senator's attention because I pretty much agree with what he is saying, but I want us not only to have our own strength for combating Soviet imperialism, but I should like to remind the Senator, in all friendliness, that there are forces within the Communist Empire who are ready to fight for freedom.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I sincerely thank the Senator for Minnesota for his contribution. There are, it is true, millions of persons back of the iron curtain and in the satellite nations who are only waiting to be given an opportunity to shake off their shackles. There is no question in my mind about that. I think America could spend more in the field of propaganda, as we may call it for want of a better term, to sell the truth as to what is taking place in America and letting those people know what a democratic nation stands for and what privileges we have here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Today, February 12, marks the birthday of a great American who has gone down in history for many brilliant accomplishments, one of which was his emancipation proclamation. Does it not appear to be a wise and prudent policy on the part of our Government that we make to the world not only an expression of friendship, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] recently in a resolution, in which I joined, expressing friendship for the Russian people, a friendship which I am sure we have for them, but would it not seem a wise and prudent policy to announce through the Congress of the United States, the people's representatives in this country, a sort of emancipation proclamation for all enslaved peoples?

I think the people of Poland are a little bit worried about our containing policy. They think we are going to let them go by the board. I am against the containment idea, and I want the Senator to know that that is my position. I think containment is essentially a negative program. I believe we should be thinking about ways in which we may liberate people.

I can think of no better day than February 12, 1951, to say to people who have been enslaved by Communist hypocrisy and defeat that they are not forgotten souls; that, actually, they are very precious on the agenda of human liberty, and that we are interested in their salvation and in helping them in the process of liberation. Just as we need the armies of France—and the Senator has mentioned the armies of Spain and Greece, and I concede we need those armies in our military program—so do we need to breathe the continuous hope into the hearts and minds of all peoples behind the iron curtain to let them know that we are just as much concerned about their liberty and freedom as we are concerned about the liberty and freedom of France, England, and Western Germany. The only difference is that Poland has already been assaulted; she has been partially consumed by the Communist fire. We should remind those good souls—and they are our friends—that they are not forgotten, that they may temporarily be enslaved, but they are going to have their hour of emancipation, and that this Nation, dedicated to emancipation, is going to try to help them in every possible way.

I wish the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the great leaders of the Senate and of the House would say again and again, every day in the week, to the peoples of the world that we are not only interested in saving what we have but we are interested in the welfare of all peoples and desire to help them liberate themselves from the masters who would grind them into the dirt and into deprivation and misery.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senator from Minnesota that I shall touch on that point as I proceed with my speech. I believe we should let the countries which are satellites of Russia know that we are interested in them and that the reason we are not helping them at this time is because we cannot reach them in our efforts to help them. That is our problem in spreading the gospel to them and letting them know about our American way of life.

Although much of the world is tired, disillusioned, and cynical, yet freedom still remains the greatest attraction to man, and with our leadership and support much can be made of situations which, as I said before, all too many people are too ready to write off as liabilities.

We have good reason to believe, for instance, that despite the apparent ironclad Soviet rule of the satellite states there are strong underground movements which await only the day when the signal is given for them to throw off their wraps and enter the fight for freedom. And the same thing applies inside Russia where a small Communist elite impose their regime of organized inequality on the millions of exploited Russians.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina on his observations. I did not know that he would bring out that point. He has surely thought far beyond what I have thought on this issue. I wish only to add one idea. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina will have something further to say about it.

According to newspaper reports, some of the Communist leaders in European countries were trained in Moscow in the principles of communism. Years ago they attended special training courses in Moscow. That is particularly true of such leaders as Togliatti, in Italy, and Gottwald, in Czechoslovakia, as well as of many other Communist leaders. They were trained at Moscow in the techniques of communism. It appears to me, Mr. President, that it would make good sense and that it would border on reasonableness, for the Government of the United States to try to smuggle from behind the iron curtain some of the key democratic leaders and to train them in all the lines they need training for reestablishing free rule in countries behind the iron curtain as well as to feed to them supplies, money, and every conceivable instrument that would be useful to their liberation.

Instead of our always worrying about what the Communists are trying to do to us, I should like to have the Communists behind the iron curtain, in Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, worrying about what we are trying to do to them. I should like to have them wonder whether we could launch counterespionage and counterattacks which would be successful. I think we have been a little weak in that respect. I do not know why. I do not think we have put sufficient emphasis on the philosophy of a counterattack, of trying to get behind the iron curtain and engaging in guerrilla warfare, whether it be political, economic, or diplomatic. We have not done enough along that line. I hope the Senator will touch on the point further along in his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Probably not the least deterrent to the Politburo's go-ahead for an all-out war is the grim prospect of policing Europe to the English Channel, in the event Soviet arms were initially successful. This they know might well be the wheel on which the Soviet rule would be broken as their far-flung occupation faced the terrors of not one, but many underground armies.

Let us not fall into the error that Western Europe's potentialities are spent. There on the continent which nurtured western civilization and gave to the world its brightest periods in man's history are vast physical resources, great reservoirs of human skill, fires of human spirit. All can be made to serve the cause of liberty once again.

We can and must understand, however, that Europe's people have been through one agony after another. Communities have been pounded into rubble, economies wrecked, human weariness grown to the point of despondency. There is dullness and despair to be found in some places, cynicism and wretchedness, but beneath all this is the spring of hope and aspiration that can never be choked off while life remains.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator spoke of despair and rubble. Has the Senator been in Europe recently?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have been there, but not recently.

Mr. LANGER. How long ago was the Senator in Europe?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not since immediately after the First World War.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator speaks of rubble and despair. There is not much of it today. Some of the countries of Western Europe are in better shape than the United States. I was there only a few months ago. Denmark and other countries are in better shape than the United States. We have 10,000,000 families who are living on $2,000 a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator will remember that Germany has been laid low.

Mr. LANGER. Germany has been laid low. I visited Germany. Did the Senator from South Carolina read the report which was made recently by the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are building back fast. There is no question about it.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wondered how much of the despair which the Senator has mentioned he knows to exist from his own experience.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the outset I referred to the number of divisions the Russians have. It would be well, I believe, before we lead ourselves into miscalculations to understand that a Soviet division is not so large as an American division. The Russian division has approximately 10,000 men, whereas ours run from about 17,000 to 18,000. It can be seen at once that speaking purely in terms of divisions, comparatively, we may ascribe to the Soviets more armed and trained manpower than they actually possess.

Again for sake of guidance, and not in any way to minimize the threat that confronts the West from the Soviets, we may be generally safe in asserting that the Soviet soldiery may be counted upon to be more effective in defending the homeland than in purely offensive action. All of this should figure in our reckonings.

By the same token we cannot ignore the comparative strength of Communist and democratic forces in the air and on the sea. In strategic air power we have the decided edge, and this, of course, would be the instrumentality through which either side would deliver the A-bomb. On the other hand, in numbers, if not in quality of aircraft, the Soviets have the advantage in tactical air power, although we can do much to whittle down the disparity if we push along quickly in our plane-procurement program. On the seas, we are very much out front, especially in surface craft; our advantage is encouragingly marked when we consider the total naval strength of the free world powers. We are adding to this, too, and emphasis is being put upon improved undersea craft.

What I am saying is that there is no need or sense for us to be intimidated into adopting any course which runs contrary to our national conscience or our national interest.

We have what it takes to prevent any power from winning a modern war, and if we proceed with our mobilization program without any undue delays we should shortly be at a point of actualized power where it would be foolhardy for any nation or combine of nations to launch a war.

I feel that one of the chief dangers we must avoid is that of falling into rigid and unimaginative planning on the international scene. Some of our people, with the very best of intentions, have brought themselves around to a mental attitude of "It's all this way, or else." I am of the coviction that no one has a corner on just what is best for the world. Frequently when I am about to cast my vote in the Senate I honestly do not know whether I am voting correctly. In such cases I only ask God to guide and direct me in my vote. As a matter of fact, the whole international situation is in a condition of fluidity and change. We have the task, through our intelligence, of keeping alert to every possible alteration of fact and attitude in the world, and playing it accordingly. No arm is more important than accurate intelligence. We must insist on adequate, competent intelligence service. Only through such media can we steer the right, safe course.

It is of vital and primary importance that we know at the earliest possible date of any weak spots that may be developing within the Soviet orbit of power. How about conditions inside the iron curtain? What about the reports that the Ukraine may be a source of internal trouble for Stalin? We must find out.

In the same way, we must take every step to insure putting our story across to the Soviet world. We know that in the open, the Communist way, with its phony doctrines of equalization, with its special privileges for the elite, with its organized techniques to prevent a free press and free assembly, with its terror apparatus and secret police, cannot stand the competition of a free society. The more we can let the captive peoples of the world know about the real America the faster we can crack the barriers which are maliciously maintained to keep the whole world divided.

Words are weapons, and propaganda with us must be a major instrument of national policy, just as it is with the Soviets.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in what the Senator had to say about Saigon and Burma and some of the other countries. Does not the Senator think it is more important to clean up the slums in the city of Washington within two or three or four blocks of the Capitol than to send money over to Saigon or Burma?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not believe the Senator heard me say anything about Burma or Saigon.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator mentioned Saigon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sure the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LANGER. What country was it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was speaking of other countries. The Senator knows my position as to spending American money abroad. I have never been in favor of spending too much money under the Marshall plan.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator agrees with me that it is more important to remedy slum conditions in Washington, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am in favor of dealing with the slums at home. I am in favor of taking care of the home front. I think we should take care of that at the same time when we are looking after the world situation.

In recent months we have been showing considerable improvement in our informational effort, and there are present signs that in the days ahead even more fruitful results will be forthcoming from this source. For too long a time we have been too modest, backward, and subjective about telling the American story to the world. We have a moral arsenal in the saga of this great Republic, and it behooves us to make the most of it.

Certainly we come before the world with clean hands. Our performance during the Berlin airlift was a lesson in humaneness and heroic endeavor that ranks high in the history of the world. True to our promise, we gave the Philippines their independence. The MacArthur stewardship of Japan is something without precedent in history. I wonder how many of us have paused to ponder that Japan, only recently our bitter enemy has been so won to our side that when the Korean invasion by Communist aggressors was launched last June, General MacArthur could virtually strip Japan of all our military forces, dispatch them to the Korean front, and be

secure in the knowledge that the Japanese would make no overt move to profit by the situation. Yes, we have a moving story to tell through the Voice of America.

My approach to this whole question of what is best for America and the democratic world in this troublesome period is one of critical constructiveness. I believe I have thrown some light on several areas in which we may have greater sources of strength.

Now one of the things which have caused me a great deal of concern is manpower policy. I know there are many horns to this dilemma. As we proceed in this mobilization it behooves us to keep before us the fact that there are limits to our manpower, just as we should not forget that the battlefield is only the extension of the home front. While providing for adequate armed forces, we also must not disrupt the national work force to the point where production goals will not be met; again it is important to our Nation's future that we take steps to assure our educational institutions that they will not be depleted, and the country thus denuded of that leadership so essential to our national progress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator mind repeating what he said about Berlin? I did not quite catch his statement. Did he say we did a good job in Berlin?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I said we did a good job with the airlift in Berlin.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator certainly would not say we did a good job when we gave all the territory around Berlin to the Russians, and have to ask the Russians, "Won't you please let us bring some foodstuff into the city?"

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator was out of the Chamber when I was speaking a few moments ago. I think there should be some peace terms arranged for Western Germany as soon as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator see the poll taken by John McCloy, as published in the Wall Street Journal, which indicated that only 5 percent of the Germans would volunteer and only 10 percent would fight if they were drafted. That appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 19.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Such a condition will exist until they are giving more privileges at home. I think we should give the people in Western Germany greater privileges.

Mr. LANGER. What privileges would the Senator give the people of Western Germany?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would not have done what was done to the people of Western Germany or Eastern Germany. I would not have taken the machinery from their factories and used it somewhere else.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know who is to blame? Is it not a fact that Russia so completely controls Berlin and Vienna that the Americans who helped capture those places cannot enter them?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the Senator knows that is a long story. He knows it would take me several hours to go into the details, and explain what took place and what did not take place in regard to why the Russians are where they are today.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield that I may ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from North Dakota studied the history of the fighting around Berlin; has he counted the American losses which would have been sustained had we gone ahead ourselves and attempted to capture Berlin; and has he studied the situation as it developed afterward, when we permitted the Russians to capture Berlin in order to save the lives and prevent the suffering of American boys?

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator addressing the question to me?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I made a complete study of it. Not only that, but I went to Germany to investigate. I found there that the German population took off their white shirts, got on the roofs, and waved their shirts, and wanted the Americans to come in because America was a much better friend of the German people than were the Russians. What did we find the condition finally to be? We found an agreement under which the Russians completely surrounded the area of Berlin and the area of Vienna. My understanding is that the Ambassador, the man who committed suicide, John Winant, was not blamed, that it was a matter of carelessness that a corridor was not left so that the Americans could go into the city of Vienna and into the city of Berlin.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota was in that area as soon as was the present speaker, and realized that the Russians would overrun Berlin before VE-day. I agree with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the Germans would have welcomed the Americans, and would have welcomed an American occupation of East Germany. I talked with East Germans, with Lithuanians, with Letts, and with others about it. But, unfortunately, a situation had arisen in which armies had advanced to definite lines. It would have meant an immediate joining of hostilities between Russia and the United States at that time.

I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I hesitate to blame anything on John Winant. To my mind he was one of the best ambassadors I met in all the European theater. At this time I want to pay tribute to him because, when I talked to him in London in 1945, he appeared to be the only one who fully realized the Russian menace. I now think his unfortunate suicide was based upon his realization of the menace we faced from Russia. I say that because, as it seemed to me, he was the only American diplomat in the European area who knew what was going on inside Russia. He knew the Russian system as operated by the Politburo. I believe his realization of that menace was the reason why he took his own life. He was in England at the time, and I do not think he could have resolved the situation. I think the matter was probably settled—and I hate to blame anybody for it—in the United States. I want to protect the memory of John Winant because I had the highest respect for him, I regarded him as a great American, a great diplomat, and a great patriot, and I still do. I wished to make that statement for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota. Incidentally, Mr. Winant was not a constituent of mine and never had been.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished Senator from West Virginia tell us who was to blame for the fact that Russia completely surrounded Berlin and Vienna so that Americans could not see and visit the countries they helped to liberate? I may say that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was one of the men who fought over in Europe in World War II. The Russians took for themselves all the country around Vienna, including Salzburg and Linz. The Senator from New Jersey was High Commissioner there. One day he received an order that, in spite of the fact that many of our boys had been killed in conquering that territory, the American Army must march back some 200 miles, and it did so. Does the Senator know who is to blame for that?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from North Dakota is now jumping from the Berlin area to the Austrian area. I was talking about the Berlin area. I think the Senator from North Dakota will find that the Russian troops had completely overrun and surrounded the Berlin area, and that we had to accept what we could in the Berlin area.

As to the Austrian area, let me say this: A man by the name of Eli Perkins, a very fine Baptist preacher of the city of New York, once said—and I think the people of the United States of America would do well to heed the statement Eli Perkins made—"If our foresight was even one-fourth as good as our hindsight we would all be rich." A certain situation existed. In the face of that situation the men on the ground had to decide what to do. Whether that decision had to be made by our State Department or generals in our Army, I do not know. I do not want to place the blame on a man who, through, let us say, a complete lack of foresight, failed to understand what the result of the decision would be. We, with our much better hindsight, can understand what should have been done. I hesitate to place the blame.

The Senator from North Dakota sometimes defends lost causes, and I know that predecessors in the Senate of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] defended lost causes. I know that our foresight sometimes is not so good as the hindsight of our grandchildren or even of our children. So let us not make general condemnation because of something which was done based on lack of foresight. That, I should say, it water over the dam. Let us see what can be done to get around the situation which has come about, and let us, with our good hindsight, correct the mistakes which may have been due to lack of foresight. Let us not, however, jump on a man of the greatness of John Winant and blame him for all that took place.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York for an observation.

Mr. LEHMAN. A few days ago I made substantially the same statement the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has made today, that our hindsight is likely to be much clearer than our foresight. But there are two things aside from that which seem very plain to me. In the first place John Winant was an intimate friend of mine. I saw him constantly during the war, because, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, during the period I was head of UNRRA I visited England and other areas of Europe frequently. He never made a statement to me such as has been ascribed to him. As a matter of fact I saw and spoke to him in New York the day before he killed himself. There was no indication of the correctness of the statement which has been ascribed to him.

Furthermore, let me say that we hear a great deal about the wisdom of what was done at Yalta; about a sick President being fooled. I maintain that the decisions made at Yalta were as sound, in view of the circumstances existing at that time, as they could possibly have been made. We were at that time preparing to invade Japan. We had great numbers of men in the Philippines poised to invade Japan. We knew that without Russian help the loss of lives of our fighting men would be staggering. We were not sure of Russia at that time. We were not sure that they were not going to make a separate peace with Germany. We felt it necessary to keep them as our allies ready to join us and fight our battles with us side by side as comrades.

As the Senator from West Virginia says, it is very easy now to be critical, 6 years afterward, in the light of developments which nobody could have foreseen. I am tired of that sort of talk, and I say that not in derogation of my esteemed friend from North Dakota, for he is not the only one who is indulging in it. Some persons less sincere than he, are making statements of that kind, I believe for political purposes, to tear down the memory and the record of the greatest American in my time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I say that the judgments made at that time were sound in the light of what was known and what was believed at that time. It ill behooves any one now to seek to destroy the memory and the deeds and the acts of a great man.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a brief statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may suggest to my distinguished friend from New York that sometime when he has the opportunity—I know he is a busy man—he read a book entitled "The Mistakes of the War," written by Hanson Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, a man who is not in politics. No one who reads in that book the record of the mistakes of the war, as set forth by this distinguished military expert, can possibly believe as does my friend the Senator from New York.

Returning to the question of Berlin and Vienna, not even the most uneducated farmer, whether he lives in Missouri, New York, West Virginia, or North Dakota, would buy a piece of land, 40 acres completely surrounded and inside of a section of land, and fail to reserve the right of the use of a road to get to his piece of surrounded land. Yet we did that with respect to Berlin. We did it again with respect to Vienna. When an American wants to go to Berlin or to Vienna he must ask of the Russians, "Will you please let me go to Berlin or to Vienna."

Perhaps hindsight is better than foresight. But when one mistake after another is made, I submit that criticism is justified. I think the only way one can learn is from studying mistakes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, but this is the last time I shall yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I hope I do not misquote Ambassador Winant. I know, however, that Amabassador Winant was troubled and worried about the future. I know that he knew the inside of Russia.

Let me say, further, that when reference is made to a case in which allies suddenly declare war upon allies—which is exactly what the Senator from North Dakota said—we should recall that at that time we were in the middle of a war in Europe, and we had a war going on in Asia, and VJ-day had not then occurred. I happen to know something about the conditions which existed at that time, for I was in Europe before VJ-day, and spent some time there when some of these things were occurring. Possibly we did allow the Russians to overrun a part of Germany, but they did so at the cost of a tremendous loss of life to themselves, and that meant a tremendous saving of life to our forces.

So, Mr. President, although I believe in criticism, if it is constructive, particularly when it occurs after the act, yet, of course, it does no good to advise a man that he made a mistake in getting married, for example, although it is really worth while to give him advice on that subject before he is married. Possibly the same is true, as applied to women, in more cases than as applied to men.

However, in this case the United States was "married" to an alliance, without which the war could not have been won. All of us must realize that.

Mr. President, all too often we forget that fact when we indulge in criticism. At that time we had an alliance. At that time we had to work as allies. At that time representations were being made even by the great Eric Johnston and by many others who had returned to this country from visits abroad, in offering all sorts of trading propositions with Russia. I am familiar with some of them, because I attended a number of meetings, and heard those propositions stated. Many of those gentlemen had far more trading experience, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota than had the present speaker, and I think they had a little better trading experience than has the senior Senator from North Dakota. Many of those gentlemen were somewhat inclined to recommend that we accept those trading propositions, as the Senator will recall if he happens to remember the speeches made by Eric Johnston. Of course, I think he is a very honorable gentleman. In this connection let me also refer to the head of the War Production Board, another very honorable gentleman. I think all of them were "taken in."

Mr. President, those are some of the things we must consider in contemplating this entire matter. We must not condemn a man like John Winant, and certainly we must not condemn the man who carried us from the abyss of despair, where we were at that time, to the brink of victory. They should not be condemned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend from West Virginia will remain in the Chamber until the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has concluded his remarks, I shall answer him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senators began their colloquy a few moments ago, and referred to the mistakes which were made and why they were made, I had been discussing the manpower problem now facing us. I intend to point out some of the mistakes which probably were made.

I hope that our foresight this time will be a little better than our foresight was before, and I hope we shall profit by our mistakes. Our highest officials make mistakes, of course; but sometimes they make mistakes under circumstances and conditions which are just a little different from those existing at the present time. For that reason we cannot always criticize those officials for making such mistakes, for probably they did what they thought best under the circumstances then existing. If my memory serves me correctly, I did not hear many Senators criticize what was occurring when the United States Army stopped its fighting and let the Russians continue

fighting. I did not receive many letters from my constituents at home expressing opposition to what America was doing at that time. Neither did I hear any Senator speak in this Chamber or any Member of the House speak in the House of Representatives in condemnation of what was occurring then.

However, now, after many years have passed, and when conditions have changed, our hindsight is better than our foresight was on those occasions. Then it is that I hear the prophets of today begin to criticize and tell what we should have done many years ago. That is what is occurring in America today.

Mr. President, we should study our history, realize the mistakes we made in the past, and try to learn how to meet the situations which will arise in the days to come.

A few minutes ago I was speaking of the manpower situation now existing, and of its seriousness. One of the things I would like to see would be an efficient integration, at the very top level, of all the various policies relating to manpower for the Armed Forces, for the needs of the civilian population, and for the industrial-production program. I have in mind the lessons of the last war when only too often bickering and contradictory courses marked the home front, as the various agencies concerned with advancing the war effort created conflicts which were wasteful and costly in the end.

All of us know that in the last war, due to placement of war-production facilities, many communities were literally choked because they did not have sufficient houses, transportation, or community facilities to handle the load which was placed upon them. At the same time there were many other communities which fought in vain for war plants. As a result, in one place after another official bottlenecks of congestion were created, producing adverse economic, social, and moral results. What did it avail a father to make a high wage if he had to live in a distant city, pay wartime living scales, be separated from his family, and in the end have scant send-home pay? Homes divided and homes broken were too often the result. Anyone versed in industrial production will tell us that labor is vastly more efficient when employed at home than when it is compelled to become migratory.

One of the first ways in which we can meet the increasing demands upon our national manpower resources is to insist upon the adoption and execution of production policies which will make the utmost use of the available manpower pools of the country. This factor should be a guiding principle in the designation of new industrial facilities, and should be a prime consideration in the placement of war contracts. When all such surplus-manpower regions have been utilized to their capacity, it will be time to get on with the job of consulting the possibilities of using male and female workers in the upper age brackets.

On the educational front we have a serious situation. All of us have been disturbed, I know, by the pictures and news stories of the long lines of college students who in recent days have been visiting recruiting centers, endeavoring to sign up in the armed services. Our patriotic youth has been rather hard put to know what to do. It is mightily encouraging to find them ready in such large numbers to volunteer. On the other hand, what of the future of our Nation if we are not to have educated leaders for the professions and the sciences and in other walks of life?

All of us, I know, welcomed the announcement, as I did, by Defense Secretary Marshall, the other day, of a basic new policy for enlistment in the Armed Forces by college students. According to Secretary Marshall, the policy is intended to prevent the waste to the Nation and the damage to the educational system that is involved in having young men leave school in mid-term because they desire to enlist in the service of their choice before they are called for preinduction physical examination by their local draft boards. As we know, under the old rule, no branch of the armed services would accept a voluntary enlistment after a man had received notice to report for his preinduction physical examination.

Under provisions of the new policy, it is provided that students enrolled in colleges or universities, and thus automatically entitled to deferment for the school year in which they receive their induction notice, shall, to the extent of available openings in each service, be allowed to enlist in the service of their choice at any time in the 2 months immediately preceding the final month of their school year. As in the past, each service would accept enlistments only to the extent that places were open for those who desired to enlist. The new policy provides that a young man called by selective service during the academic year would continue his studies and still retain the right to designate his choice of service. Services accepting enlistments during this 2-month period would not call the students to duty until they had finished their school year.

In the opinion of General Marshall, the new rules will prove of benefit to the students, the colleges, and the national defense effort. In making the announcement, he put emphasis on the importance of the Nation's maintaining a vigorous educational system and on eliminating the unsettled conditions which have developed throughout the country in college circles as a result of enlistments by men who wanted to enlist before they received their selective-service calls.

I was very much pleased, too, to see General Marshall at the same time urging college students enrolled in the Army, Navy, or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps to make every effort to complete their courses as a patriotic duty. As General Marshall stated, ROTC is a fundamental element in all Departments of Defense planning for expansion and maintenance of the Armed Forces. Because of this, the Selective Service Act defers from induction under its provisions during all their college years selected ROTC students who sign agreements to accept commissions and to serve a minimum of 2 years on active duty in the military service for which they are being trained. All ROTC students who successfully fulfill the training and physical requirements are assured of commissions in the Regular or Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

All this is very important to America's security. Our whole policy is one for the maintenance of peace. If, however, we are forced into a global war, it probably wil be one of long duration, and will place a continuing emphasis on the need of trained military leadership. On the other hand, if we are to go on through a long period of tension, in a twilight zone, it becomes doubly important that we get on with the education of our young people, and at the same time give as large a number of them as possible military training. To this end, the ROTC programs rank high on our list of national requirements. I should like to see every educational institution in the country which is capable of maintaining an ROTC program in any or several of the armed services be assigned such programs to their capacity. Money spent in this way, I believe, would be a very sound national investment.

Sound over-all strategy—that is the need of the hour; strategy in all aspects and elements of our democratic life. We know that the enemies of democracy are strong, but they are not invincible. In a contest between a materialistic Godless atheism, which seeks to enslave the world, and a democratic order, founded on man's belief in God, democratic man will emerge the victor. The United States has never flinched in the face of a threat or a challenge, and we have no intention of abdicating before our responsibilities and opportunities now.

So I say, let us bring a calm and resolute frame of mind to the problems which need our attention, ever cognizant of the fact that each of us, as a Member of the Congress, has the right to his own views; being mindful of the fact that, although we may differ, none has a monopoly on patriotism, virtue, or wisdom. What needs to be done, we can do with good spirit, through constructive compromise, and in ways that will unite all our people, as America, a strong champion of freedom and justice, goes forward in confidence to achieve its destiny.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in the concluding remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, stressing the right of every individual to his own views, and so forth. Will the Senator not say that the Republican Party has kept this country out of war whenever it was in power, and that every time we have become involved in a war a Democratic administration has been in power.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In reply, I should like to ask the Senator

from North Dakota how any administration could have kept us out of World War II, after the attack upon Pearl Harbor? Would the Republican Party, which is the Senator's party, have kept us out of war, following that attack? Will the Senator from North Dakota answer that question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I will answer it. Let me tell my good friend that, if there had been a Republican administration, there would never have been a Pearl Harbor attack. Let me tell the Senator further——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has asked me a question, and I want to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Go ahead. I tell the Senator further that if——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, he yielded to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yielded for a question.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator asked me a question, and I should like to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. I may say further that we would never have had World War I, if we had followed the advice of that great Democratic Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, who resigned rather than become a party to it. He was a great Democrat who came from the Middle Northwest.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Can the Senator from North Dakota tell us how many Members of Congress voted against World War I?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend that former Senator Gronna, of North Dakota, was one of the so-called "willful 12", who stood here and fought with former Senator La Follette to keep us out of war. He fought until he almost dropped. Let me say further——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. May I inquire of the Senator whether former Senator La Follette was at that time a Republican, a Democrat, or a Progressive? What was he?

Mr. LANGER. He was a Republican, I am happy to say. I may say further that Woodrow Wilson, as a candidate, carried the United States on the slogan, "I will keep you out of war." He carried my State on that slogan, although it was a Republican State. Woodrow Wilson carried it because he promised absolutely to keep us out of war. That was during the campaign in the fall of 1916, and within a few months, and on April 6, 1917, we were in the war.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota recalls the slogan "Remember the Maine," which occurred during the administration of William McKinley, as I well remember it, and also the slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FARM PRICES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE PRICE-CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, made a statement concerning farm prices and their relationship to the price-control program. It appears to me that the Secretary of Agriculture has brought to the attention of the people some very significant facts concerning farm income, farm prices, and their relationship to the price, wage, and profit picture. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Brannan be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I wish to invite particular attention to his concluding remarks, as follows:

Parity is the fairest available measure of equitable prices for agricultural products.

Parity never increases until after prices of goods bought by farmers have increased, and then only by enough to balance the increases in prices and cost rates paid by farmers. When prices paid by farmers go down, parity goes down.

So, Mr. President, I might say that if there is a desire for lower prices, that desire can be met by adjusting what is called parity; in other words, the relationship of things sold to the relationship of things purchased.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PRICES IN THE PRICE-CONTROL PICTURE

A number of recent public statements have created the impression that agricultural commodity prices are unreasonably or disproportionately high in relation to prices of other consumer goods or to wages or to the farmer's costs. This impression is not warranted by the facts.

Other statements indicate that food prices are exempted from price control. This also is not true. On the contrary, food products now included in the freeze order represent about 40 percent of the total food cost in the BLS consumers' price index.

Still other statements seek to show that farmers have been given special or privileged treatment in the laws and regulations providing for inflation control. Again, this is not true.

The purpose of this statement is not to deny that prices of some foods and farm commodities have substantially increased but rather to show where they really stand in our economy of general prosperity and full employment.

1. HOW HIGH ARE FARM PRICES?

It is true, of course, that prices received by farmers for many commodities have risen in recent months and are now high in relation to their own history. But the same is true of most other raw and finished goods. For example, since the Korean outbreak, tin has gone up more than 138 percent, aluminum over 78 percent, lead nearly 50 percent, chemicals about 27 percent, and textiles 32 percent. In the same period prices received by farmers have advanced 21 percent.

Prices received by farmers have still not reached their previous record level, while farmers' costs have gone on up to new record heights. On the other hand, corporate profits, wages, and average personal incomes are setting new records.

Here are major facts about farm commodity prices and farm income which should be considered in the present situation:

(A) Most prices of farm commodities to the producer are below parity—the statutory measure of fair relationship between prices received by farmers and prices paid by farmers. Some are above parity—meats in particular—but these are now under the same type of control that applies to all other prices.

Much has been made of the fact that the farm commodities selling below parity are free to rise and thus increase the cost of living before becoming subject to control. But if all farm commodities now below parity should reach the parity level, consumer food costs would rise less than 5 percent, and this would mean less than a 2-percent rise in the over-all cost of living.

Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that such a rise will occur. Prices of potatoes and oranges represent about a third of that 5-percent difference; those prices have been about 50 percent of parity and there are no current indications of substantial rises; also, canned fruits and vegetables now in the warehouses and grocery stores are from last year's crop, already sold by the farmer; thus, there is no farm price of those commodities to be increased.

(B) Food prices have risen less than prices of some other commodity groups in the BLS consumer price index. From June to December food went up 5.3 percent, while clothing rose 6.2 percent and house furnishings rose 10.6 percent.

Consumers' price index: Cost of goods purchased by wage earners and low-salaried workers in large cities, United States (1935–39=100)[1]

	June 1950	December 1950	Percentage change from June 1950 to December 1950
All items	170.2	178.4	+4.8
Food	204.6	215.4	+5.3
Apparel	185.0	196.4	+6.2
Rent	123.9	125.8	+1.5
Fuel, etc	138.9	144.1	+3.7
House furnishings	185.2	204.8	+10.6
Miscellaneous	155.3	162.0	+4.3

[1] Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from Retail Price, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As shown by the table above, rents were relatively stable. Exclude rents from the computation and it will be seen that the other items of the index rose approximately the same as food.

(C) The average of all farm commodity prices is just now overcoming the drop it took in 1948 and 1949. The drop in farm prices averaged 24 percent, while nonfarm prices and wages were either dropping very little or continuing upward.

As of January 15, prices received by farmers were still 2 percent below the January 1948 peak. While receiving lower prices, farmers had to continue paying high prices, with the result that their net realized income went down 3 years in a row.

Net income realized by farm operators dropped from almost $18,000,000,000 in 1947 to about $16,500,000,000 in 1948, about $14,000,000,000 in 1949, and about $13,000,000,000 in 1950. If prices had not risen substantially in the latter part of 1950, farmers' net income for that year would have been further appreciably reduced.

(D) No other major segment of our economy went through such a severe economic setback. In fact, corporate profits after taxes, following a small decline, have gone on up to new records and are now running about 32 percent above the 1947 rate. For 1950 as a whole they were 18 percent above 1947. Wages have gradually risen, and hourly earn-

ings of factory workers in 1950 were 18 percent above the 1947 level.

Corporate profits after taxes amounted to $18,500,000,000 in 1947, went up to $20,900,000,000 in 1948, were at $17,000,000,000 in 1949, and reached a new record peak of $21,900,000,000 in 1950. In the last quarter of 1950, they were running at an annual rate of about $24,500,000,000. Factory wages were $1.24 per hour in 1947, $1.46 in 1950, and for December were $1.54.

(See chart for these and other comparisons.)

It is sometimes said that it is unfair to compare recent trends with levels reached in 1947, the all-time high year for agricultural income. Other comparisons can be made. For example, for the last quarter of 1950 as compared with the prewar period 1935–39, food prices had slightly more than doubled, but consumers' disposable income per capita was more than 2½ times the prewar level. Also, in 1950 income from agriculture was running 2½ times the 1935–39 average, while nonagricultural income was almost 3½ times and corporate profits more than six times 1935–39.

It should also be remembered that until the early part of the recent war, agriculture had not fully recovered from its long depression of the 1920's and early 1930's. Comparisons based upon depression conditions are completely unfair. Comparisons with postwar benchmarks at least measure how the various segments of the economy have been doing recently.

(E) Food is a better bargain for the average person today than in the prewar period. Those people whose incomes have kept up with the average can buy with 19 percent of their disposable income the same diet that required 23 percent of their disposable income in 1935–39. It is true, of course, that persons whose incomes have substantially lagged behind the general rise are at a disadvantage—some seriously. They have a real problem which requires the sympathetic attention of the whole public. However, agricultural commodity prices in general cannot be geared to the needs of the disadvantaged group as long as other prices are left at high levels. The result would be to drive farmers out of business and disrupt production at the time we most need a strong, highly productive agriculture.

(F) Prices of many farm commodities have very little relationship to consumer prices. Several examples give this picture clearly:

The cotton in a shirt now selling for $3.50 to $4 probably did not bring the farmer more than 30 cents.

A 16-cent can of tomatoes represents about 3 cents of gross income to the farmer.

The corn in a can retailing at 19 cents brought less than 2¾ cents to the producer.

Onions which were selling in stores in November for 5.7 cents a pound had been sold by the farmers for a little over 1 cent.

When milk leaves the farm, it immediately goes into a distribution and processing system that almost doubles its price in a few hours.

The wheat in a loaf of bread that sells for 15 to 16 cents brings the farmer only about 2⅔ cents. It is interesting to note that the retail price of bread has gone up 1.7 cents a loaf since June. If this were due entirely to a rise in the price of wheat, it would mean that wheat had gone up $1.12 a bushel. Actually, the farm price of wheat in January was only 16 cents a bushel higher than it was before the Korean outbreak.

Although the farmer is getting a larger share of the consumer's food dollar than a year ago (now about 51 percent) this is still considerably smaller than the share received by the farmer in several recent years. In 1945 and 1946 the farmer's share averaged 54 and 53 percent, respectively. From January of 1943 through September 1948, the farmer's share did not go below 50 percent in any month.

(G) Causes of price rises in agricultural commodities are somewhat different from the causes of price rises in nonfarm commodities generally. Prices of many manufactured items tend to rise because market supplies are being lowered in order to permit increased production of military goods. Most agricultural commodities, on the other hand, are available in record and near-record amounts, but demand is increasing as consumer incomes increase.

These considerations emphasize the importance of abundant production in the job of keeping prices of agricultural commodities at reasonable levels. On the other hand, it should not be taken for granted that agricultural production can be increased enough to meet all of the rising demands.

(H) The public does not ask manufacturers to produce military goods at less than fair returns. On new defense plants, rapid depreciation is permitted in order to reduce tax liability. Under the Defense Production Act, Government agencies encourage financial institutions to lend money to defense producers by guaranteeing the lenders against loss. The Government itself may lend money for the expansion of productive capacity, the development of technological processes, explorations and mining. The Government often makes advance commitments to buy what is produced.

Many agricultural commodities are of such importance that, if necessary for expansion of production, the public (through Government) would undoubtedly make to farmers some of the same concessions and guaranties that it makes to manufacturers and other producers of defense goods. Some such devices might become necessary if agricultural prices were depressed in relation to other prices.

2. ARE FARM PRODUCTS EXEMPTED BY LAW FROM PRICE CONTROL?

No. Prices of all farm commodities are subject to control as soon as they reach a legally specified level.

Important farm commodities were put under price control in the price-wage freeze order issued by the Economic Stabilization Agency, January 26. Among them were the meat animals, wool, cotton, cottonseed, rice, and flue-cured tobacco.

3. HOW DOES THE LAW DEFINE THE LEVEL AT WHICH A CEILING MAY BE PLACED ON AN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY?

No ceiling may be established below the parity price or the highest price received by producers during the period from May 24 to June 24, 1950. Both levels are subject to adjustment for grade, location, and seasonal differentials. Except in a few unusual situations, those provisions apply generally.

4. UNDER THE LAW, MUST CEILINGS BE HIGH ENOUGH TO PERMIT FAIR MARGINS FOR PROCESSORS?

Yes. The law says, "That in establishing and maintaining ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

5. DOES THE LAW SPECIFY THE LOWEST LEVEL AT WHICH CEILINGS MAY BE APPLIED TO WAGES AND TO PRICES OTHER THAN FARM COMMODITY PRICES?

Yes. The standard for both is the May 24–June 24 level, but exceptions are permitted. Prices found to be abnormal in that period can be adjusted to a representative level. Provision is also made for adjustment of hardships and inequities. Controls on wages, salaries, and other compensation must not be "inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, or any other law of the United States, or of any State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States."

6. IS THE PROHIBITION AGAINST BELOW-PARITY CEILINGS FOR FARM PRODUCTS INCONSISTENT WITH OTHER PRICE AND WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE LAW OR WITH ACCEPTED GOVERNMENTAL PRINCIPLES?

No. The law seeks to achieve certain purposes, including the control of inflation, by means which are fair and equitable. In consequence, its provisions are based upon certain standards contained in previous legislation—minimum standards for wages and working conditions in the field of labor and the parity or fair price measurement for farm products—as well as a general provision for normal or representative prices.

If the old standards of equity were to be abandoned, new legal standards would have to take their place or be improvised by administrators from day to day.

Neither agriculture nor business nor labor nor any other segment can properly be asked to bear controls first, alone, or inequitably. Such action would be neither effective nor fair. All must bear the responsibility together.

Parity is the fairest available measure of equitable prices for agricultural products.

Parity never increases until after prices of goods bought by farmers have increased, and then only by enough to balance the increases in prices and cost rates paid by farmers. When prices paid by farmers go down, parity goes down.

OPA officials, reviewing price-control experience during World War II, concluded in a publication issued in 1947 that "it does not seem possible that anything other than parity could have been adopted by OPA as an administrative method of measuring generally fair and equitable prices for agricultural commodities."

REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF KEOKUK LOCKS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, KEOKUK, IOWA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President's budget for the coming fiscal year makes no provision for repair or replacement of Keokuk Locks on the Mississippi River, at Keokuk, Iowa. The dam at Keokuk and the locks are in a bad state of repair. A break-down in these facilities would impair or wreck river transportation on the upper Mississippi River. I have urged the Bureau of the Budget to reconsider its decision to delete funds for adequate repair or replacement. I have written to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations pointing out the importance to the national economy and defense of these vital river facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of my letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and an editorial from the Minneapolis Star of January 26, 1951, entitled "River Transport Faces Bright Future, Unless—"

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1951.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have on a number of occasions directed the attention of your committee to the matter of the rehabilitation of the Keokuk Dam, at Keokuk, Iowa.

I have recently been informed that although the Army Corps of Engineers included a one-million-dollar item in their

report to the Bureau of the Budget for the Keokuk Dam, the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to delete that item.

At this time, I would like to bring to your attention some data which I think is pertinent and should certainly receive the fullest consideration of your committee.

Nine-foot depth for navigation on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., a distance of 660 miles, has been available since 1939, but a serious bottleneck still exists at Keokuk, Iowa, about 170 miles above St. Louis, Mo., where the existing lock, built in 1913, is entirely inadequate for needs of present-day traffic. The existing lock is 358 feet by 110 feet, compared to 600-foot by 110-foot locks at other sites, and the 1,200- by 100-foot lock being provided at Chain of Rocks and proposed for new lock No. 19.

After 35 years of service, the old lock shows the effect of age and wear, and many of its mechanical features are nearing or have reached the end of their economic life. Major overhaul of the structure is urgently needed and should be undertaken at once if the new lock is not constructed in the immediate future. Unless such action is taken, the old lock, to a much greater extent than at present, will cause prolonged delays and interruptions to upper Mississippi River traffic. Even with complete overhaul, which could be accomplished only with intolerable interference with traffic for several years, the structure would remain an outmoded lock of short length with slow-operating characteristics, in a system of larger and faster operating locks.

Failure to rebuild the Keokuk lock would very seriously affect the security and economy of the territory adjacent to the Mississippi River, north of St. Louis. In substantiation of this statement, I quote Lt. Col. G. A. Finley, Corps of Engineers, of Rock Island:

"In answer to your request of October 26, 1950, for lock No. 19 traffic data for the 1949 navigation season, the following figures, for commercial tows only, are furnished:

	1948 [1]	1949	1950 [2]
Total tonnage	1,573,410	3,514,072	3,030,920
Average tons per tow	3,140	3,085	3,349
Total number of tows	501	1,139	905
Total number of lockages	1,007	2,195	1,810
Time spent in lockages hours	1,004	1,872	1,582
Time of delays to tows hours	537	1,000	1,000
Average lockage time, per tow hours	2.00	1.64	1.75
Average delay per tow hours	1.07	.88	1.10
Average time to transit lock 19 hours	3.07	2.52	2.85
Average time per lockage hours	1.00	.85	.87

[1] 1948 figures are for June, July, October, and November only, as those were the only months when delays records were maintained. Total tonnage for 1948 season was 3,125,156 tons.

[2] 1950 records for March through September only are included.

The tonnage figures are preliminary, but it is considered that they would be in substantial agreement with the final official figure.

"In explanation of the apparently excessive average lockage time for 1948 season, it is pointed out that work on the discharge valves was carried out during the navigation season, and that the emptying time of the lock is increased about 25 percent when one of the valves is out of operation, as was the case for a considerable part of the 1948 season.

"On the basis of the 1948 season figures, had the proposed new lock been in operation, the 1,139 tows could have been passed in 1,139 lockages, and delays would have been practically eliminated. Since the filling and emptying time for the new lock, including gate operation time, will be about 10 minutes, and if 5 minutes each is allowed for entering and leaving the lock, which will have much better approaches than the existing lock, the lockage time should be approximately 20 minutes if upstream and downstream tows alternate, and 30 minutes if all are from the same direction. For use in estimating time savings, 25 minutes is considered a fair average lockage time. Lockage of 1,139 tows would require 475 hours, a saving of 1,397 hours; these hours, taken with the 1,000 hours of delay time eliminated, make an estimated possible saving of 2,397 towboat hours. Similar figures for the 7 months of the 1950 season extended to a full season indicate possible savings of 1,549 hours in lockage time, plus 1,283 hours of delay, or a total possible saving of 2,832 hours.

"The value of savings in time, estimated (perhaps too conservatively) to be $37.50 per hour for 1948 statistics, must be considerably greater by now, considering the steady increase in horsepower in new towboats and the increased construction, maintenance, and operating costs. We have no detailed information with which to revise our annual charge figures for the boat and barge fleets, but on the basis of a few figures on lay time charges and construction costs of tows now in the petroleum trade, we consider that $60 per hour is not unreasonable. Using $60 per hour for delays in 1949 and 1950, the annual value of delays and cost per ton moved through the Keokuk Lock are shown in the following tabulation:

	1948	1949	[1] 1950
Tons	3,125,156	3,514,072	3,680,398
Possible savings hours	2,760	2,397	2,832
Savings value	[2] $103,500	$143,820	$169,920
Value per ton	$0.033	$0.041	$0.046

[1] 7 months' figures extended to 9 months.

[2] 4 months' savings figures extended to 9 months at $37.50 an hour.

"Repair maintenance and improvement costs for the Keokuk lock for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 were $94,993.25 and $38,796.26, respectively. Figures for 1949 include $45,560 spent on gate repairs and $15,800 spent on discharge-valve repairs."

When you realize the amount of fuel which comes up the Mississippi River north of Keokuk, Iowa, should it be cut off, we would have difficulty in supplying an area that is further removed from the source of either solid or liquid fuel, and might cause extreme hardships to industries, communities, and the farming area.

I most sincerely urge the Committee on Appropriations to give adequate reconsideration to this vitally important matter.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 26, 1951]

RIVER TRANSPORT FACES BRIGHT FUTURE, UNLESS—

Nearly 3,000,000 tons of freight moved on the Mississippi River above Guttenberg, Iowa, in 1950. Most of it was shipped into or out of the Twin Cities. The tonnage is a gain of almost 20 percent over 1949, a gain of 2,000 percent since 1937.

These figures are cited in the annual report of the Upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission, an unpaid official agency of the State of Minnesota, manned by five public-spirited citizens.

River transportation of coal and petroleum products has become much more important to this State than most Minnesotans probably realize. The commission's report says:

"Except for the river, the State would be experiencing fuel and power costs which would definitely injure our economy. Electric rates here are competitive with those near coal mines and power sites largely through low-cost barge transportation. When a serious fuel-oil shortage prevailed three winters ago, it was due to an early closing of water transportation and was relieved when navigation again opened."

Water traffic was particularly valuable to this part of the country during the war, when railroads were overloaded and freight cars wore out faster than new ones were built. With another defense emergency, the same threat of a fuel shortage must be faced.

Based on increases in river traffic in recent years, the time is not far off when 5,000,000 tons will be carried. But Army engineers warn that the river system is only as strong as its weakest link, and the weak link is the Keokuk, Iowa, lock.

When the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi was authorized in 1930, locks of 110 feet by 600 feet were agreed upon. A dam at Keokuk, built in 1913, already had a lock 110 feet wide and 365 feet long. Congress said that would have to do.

Keokuk has a lift of 38 feet, much higher than the usual lock on the river. This lift, plus the fact that barge tows must be broken up to get through the lock, slows up traffic at Keokuk. Delays of 6 to 10 hours are frequent.

Plans have been prepared for a 1,200-foot lock. The cost would be about $8,000,000. That's a lot of money and in these times no unnecessary civilian expenditures should be undertaken. But the big role played by upper river traffic indicates that it is necessary to replace an antiquated lock that is near the limit of its capacity.

The Government now has an investment of $170,000,000 in the 9-foot channel. Private industry has invested a quarter of a billion dollars to use the river. More industries are in prospect, unless the Keokuk bottleneck holds traffic near present tonnages.

Even an economy-minded Congress should consider how much a new lock would mean to improving the whole transportation system for a vital part of the Nation.

HISTORY AND SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 6 the Fraternal Order of Eagles observed its fifty-third anniversary. It is a pleasure for me to bring this fact to the attention of the Senate and to commend that organization and its 1,200,000 American members for its splendid community services. I am proud to be a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It is a humanitarian organization; it is a patriotic organization. Dedicated to the four cardinal virtues of liberty, truth, justice, and equality, it has directed its energies in behalf of workmen's compensation, old-age pensions, social security, assistance to the Armed Forces, among many other great services. Its emblem is the national emblem of the United States, the white-crested American eagle, symbol of courage, strength, and hardihood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement setting forth the history of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and a summary of its accomplishments.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES AND ITS SOCIAL VISION

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a life member of Buffalo (N. Y.) Aerie, signed the Social Security Act on August 14,

1935, he expressed his appreciation for what the Eagles had done.

"I have long observed with satisfaction the sponsorship by the FOE of social justice legislation both in the States and in the Nation. The records for more than a quarter of a century bear witness to the campaigns of education conducted, the literature distributed, and the addresses delivered by your socially minded order. These efforts have borne, and are bearing gratifying results. Our countrymen owe the Eagles much good will for their unselfish services.

"The pen I am presenting the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your 600,000 members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people."

A summary of the social legislation sponsored by the Fraternal Order of Eagles follows:

Eagles sponsored and led the fight for the enactment of the first mothers' pension law in the history of America, the Missouri law.

An Eagle drafted and Eagles supported the first workmen's compensation act passed in any State in the Union, the Wisconsin law.

Eagles led the crusade for State old-age pension laws and the first State pension system, that of Montana, was introduced by an Eagle member legislator and signed by an Eagle governor.

Eagles spent 14 years campaigning for a national social security law and the President who signed the Social Security Act, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, gave the pen with which he signed the measure to the FOE in recognition of its pioneering leadership.

An Eagle made the first known public plea for the observance of a national Mother's Day and the order adopted the idea as a fraternal observance, long before Mother's Day became a national holiday.

Eagles played an important role in starting America's first Citizenship or I Am an American Day, with Manitowoc, Wis., as the locale of the first Citizenship Day program.

Eagles endorsed the principle of the guaranteed annual wage back in 1930 and are campaigning for a wider acceptance of the "52 pay checks a year" employment guaranty.

Eagles originated the observance of June 20 as Emblem Day, making the adoption of the American bald eagle as the official emblem of our country.

Eagles, at the request of the sponsors of the measures, joined in the fight to secure enactment of the GI bill of rights, as a framework for future veterans' service legislation.

HISTORY OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

The Fraternal Order of Eagles today is America's greatest benefit paying fraternity. More than a million members are affiliated with the fraternity that bears the banner of liberty, truth, justice, and equality in almost 1,800 communities in the United States, Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Guam. Dedicated to brotherhood, friendship, and helpfulness to their fellow men and their communities, the Eagles have been a potent force for happiness and the enrichment of the lives of its members and all fellow citizens.

Who are Eagles? Eagles are people, your neighbor, the butcher, the grocer, the judge, the lawyer, the businessman, the civic leader. An Eagle may be the President of the United States, for four Eagles have served in the White House. An Eagle may be a celebrated sports figure like Jack Dempsey, or another famous American, like the late Father Flanagan of Boys Town. He may be a member of the Cabinet, or a Congressman. But whether he is known to millions, or only to his family and circle of friends in his home town, an Eagle is drawn into his fraternity by his yearning for sociability, friendliness, and the opportunity to participate in worthy endeavors. In service to others through the Fraternal Order of Eagles, he finds a medium for enhancing the welfare of others, and contributing to his own inner satisfaction and joy.

Founded more than 50 years ago, the Eagles have achieved a noteworthy record in its programs and movements for economic and human betterment. It is a record that is still being written. It includes pioneering for the great social legislation of our time—the National Social Security Act, State old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, and workmen's compensation. The order has paid out millions to its members in sickness and death benefits. Its humanitarian service to all, regardless of race or creed, runs into inestimable totals. And with its benefactions, the Eagles have built up an organization with financial stability and integrity, with net assets exceeding more than a hundred million dollars. Today there are 1,778 aeries in the United States and Canada.

The growth of the Eagles achieved tremendous proportions under Administrative Director Matty Brown, who served as managing organizer from 1944 to 1950. During that period the membership reached more than a million. A total of 595 new aeries were instituted. The organization of ladies auxiliaries attained impetus, with the institution of 360 such units, and doubling of the membership to 92,000. Formation of the Junior Order of Eagles was launched, youth groups, sponsored by subordinate aeries, to provide sports, civic and recreational programs for boys and girls in a movement to build better citizens. Other significant developments included the establishment of an Eagle employee's pension system, the Eagles National Life Insurance Co., the architectural service department, the reserve membership department, and the benefit fund security plan.

THE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

But undoubtedly most significant of all, the most humanitarian undertaking of many in the history of the order, was the establishment and operation of the Fraternal Order of Eagles Memorial Foundation. The foundation was born out of World War II, the brain child of the then managing organizer Matty Brown, who conceived it as a living memorial to benefit the lives of children whose Eagle fathers had given their lives for their country. The foundation was established through the generous donations of aeries and individual Eagles for philanthropic purposes associated with the order's programs and ideals. The initial work of the foundation is the providing of medical, dental, and other physical welfare services and college educations for the children of Eagle fathers whose lives were lost in World War II. Hundreds of these children are now being aided. As a perpetual fund, with the principal remaining intact, and only investment proceeds used, the foundation will in later years contribute to other worthy causes advancing Eagle ideals.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles was founded on February 6, 1898, by six theatrical men who sauntered over to the tideflats at Seattle and sat on a lumberpile to discuss the formation of a "Seattle order of good things." Little did they realize that their idea of a friendship society would be seized upon with such enthusiasm. The six founders, none of whom are now living—John W. Considine, John Cort, Tom J. Considine, Harry Leavitt, Mose Goldsmith, and Arthur Williams—invited a few more friends the following Sunday to join the new organization. At a meeting the following Sunday at the Bella Union Theater, with the stage of the theater as the lodge room, a constitution was adopted. A short time later the name of the organization was changed to the Fraternal Order of Eagles. New aeries were formed in the region, and the purpose of the order broadened to include serious and significant programs for the general welfare.

THE EARLY DAYS

It is interesting to learn about the early development of the Eagles from the man who was in the best position to tell it, John Cort, one of the founders and the first grand worthy president. Speaking at the first grand aerie convention held at Seattle, May 6-9, Cort said:

"We called our lodges aeries because an eagle's nest is called an aerie," he said. "Shortly after the founding of the order, I went to Spokane, my old home. I talked to some of the boys about our organization, and out of that came Spokane Aerie No. 2. Then a little later, one of us happened to be in Tacoma and talked to some of our friends there. Out of that came Tacoma Aerie No. 3. Someone went to Portland, and we had Portland Aerie No. 4. Someone else went to San Francisco, and so we had San Francisco Aerie No. 5."

"You see, we theatrical people traveled extensively, and wherever we went, we usually found men who were interested in having an aerie. That's one of the reasons why you find aeries with low numbers even in the East; No. 40 in New York City, No. 42 in Philadelphia and No. 46 in Buffalo."

Aeries mushroomed rapidly. Soon the Fraternal Order of Eagles became nationally known, and the influence and prestige of the fraternity began to make itself felt in significant movements.

EAGLE MOVEMENTS

The first public plea for a national Mothers' Day was made by an Eagle, Frank E. Hering, on February 7, 1904, on the stage of English's Opera House in Indianapolis during a memorial program by Indianapolis Aerie. Under the leadership of Mr. Hering, who became grand worthy president and editor of the Eagle magazine, the idea spread. Subordinate aeries began observing a Mothers' Day, and in 1912 the grand aerie placed Mothers' Day upon the Eagle calendar, 2 years before the event was officially designated for national observance by Congress. In 1929, the American War Mothers officially honored Mr. Hering and the Eagles for their Mothers' Day role by dedicating a plaque at the site of the first Mothers' Day address.

The movement for State old-age pensions, which finally was to spread to practically every State in the Union, began through the initiative of the Eagles in Montana where the first old-age pension act was drafted by Representative Lester H. Loble, who later became grand worthy president. Supported by the Eagles, the measure was signed by the then governor, Joseph M. Dixon, a life member of the order, who said at the time: "You Eagles have planted this seed and you can no more stop the progress of old-age pensions than you can stem the tide of the Pacific Ocean." His words were prophetic. Led by the Eagles, other States began the enactment of similar old-age pension legislation.

Simultaneously, the order launched its pioneering campaign for the National Social Security Act. More than $1,000,000 was spent to publicize the need for such a measure through pamphlets and other literature. When President Roosevelt, a life member of Buffalo, N. Y., Aerie, signed the act in 1935, in presenting the pen to the Eagle delegation which he had invited, he said:

"The pen I am presenting to the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people. * * * Our countrymen owe the Eagles good will for their unselfish service."

Shortly before Mothers' Day was recognized by the Eagles, the order launched two campaigns for social legislation which were to bring a measure of economic security to millions in America.

A mother's pension act, the first in the Nation, was enacted by the State of Missouri in 1911, after Eagles initiated the measure and propelled it into law. The legislation was fathered by the late Judge Edward Everett Porterfield of Kansas City, an Eagle, who had observed the distress of needy widowed mothers in his courtroom. Other States began to follow the lead of Missouri.

A workmen's compensation act, also the first in the Nation, became law in Wisconsin about the same time as the Missouri legislation for mothers, again through the support of the Eagles. Daniel W. Hoan, an Eagle who became mayor of Milwaukee, drafted the measure, and although his proposal was bitterly fought in those early days, it passed, due to the efforts of the Eagles and organized labor.

PATRIOTIC LEADERSHIP

The FOE has taken the leadership in advancing patriotic observances. Emblem Day, commemorating the adoption of the eagle as the national emblem, by the Continental Congress on June 20, 1782, was first observed by aeries, and placed upon the Eagle calendar in 1943. Today, this event is annually observed by aeries and a movement has been started in Congress to proclaim the day as one for national observance. Eagles played an important role in launching America's first Citizenship or I Am an American Day with Manitowoc, Wis., the scene of the first observance.

In peace, stanch champion of the American ideals of freedom and democracy, the FOE in two World Wars rallied with all its resources and energies in the struggle to preserve this heritage.

In World War I, more than 47,000 Eagles served in the Armed Forces. On the home front, aeries bought millions in Liberty bonds, provided entertainment for veterans, boosted morale with letters and gifts to servicemen, and sparked blood donations and salvage drives in many Eagle communities. In World War II, 56,000 Eagles served on all battle fronts of the world, and 3,123 made the supreme sacrifice. On the home front, aeries purchased more than 25 millions in war bonds and the activities to aid the war paralleled those in World War I, only on a more expansive scale as the war continued in intensity.

THE FUTURE

More than a half century of noteworthy achievement and unselfish service behind it, the Fraternal Order of Eagles marches toward new and glorious goals, inspired by the slogan of its golden anniversary year in 1948—"Hats off to the past, coats off to the future." In the offing lies the objectives of Administrative Director Matty Brown: 2,000,000 members and 2,000 aeries. A vital and moving force for brotherhood among all men, America's greatest fraternity, remains steadfast to its oft-proclaimed ideals—liberty, truth, justice, and equality—and to the aims voiced with its founding—"to make human life more desirable by lessening its ills and promoting peace, prosperity, gladness, and hope."

SENATOR McCARTHY'S CHARGES AGAINST THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, today is the birthday of a great American. I well remember that last year I was severely criticized—incidentally, not by Democrats—for making a speech on Lincoln's birthday before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which I lauded Abraham Lincoln as a great, outstanding, and wonderful President.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once made a remark which is doubly appropriate on this day. That wise and honest man said:

If you forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never again regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

It is peculiarly fitting that we recall this quotation by Abraham Lincoln, for this is not only the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday, but also the anniversary of the bringing of the charges against the State Department by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The junior Senator from Wisconsin made his first charge against the State Department and the Secretary of State in a Lincoln Day speech last year in my State. He spoke before the Republican Women's League at Wheeling, W. Va., and his speech was broadcast twice over radio station WWVA. I have before me his words which are still preserved on recordings of his speech.

The Senator from Wisconsin said:

I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department.

Mr. President, many words have been uttered and spread upon the printed page since last year, and from this river of words a fog of confusion has risen and spread across the land. It is, therefore, in keeping with this anniversary that we penetrate to the source of this fog and see what we can do about clearing it up.

In the first place, the junior Senator from Wisconsin soon retreated from his Wheeling, W. Va., speech a few days afterward—on February 20, 1950—the junior Senator from Wisconsin told the Senate:

I told him there were 57 Communists in the State Department—205 who, according to the President's own Security Board, are security risks.

He retreated still further and on May 3, 1950, he explained to me on the floor of the Senate:

I will tell the Senator exactly what I gave the radio station, as far as I know. They were given a rough draft of the speech. It is entirely possible—I have not seen the draft since I gave it—that there was an error and that 205 was used in place of 57 instead of in connection with the Byrnes letter, but there is no doubt in anybody's mind—or in the mind of the Senator—

Referring to me—

that in that speech that night I used the figure of 57 as I stated. I said: "I have the names of 57 people in my hand who are either members of or loyal to the Communist Party."

The Wheeling, W. Va., speech was recorded. Affidavits have also been signed by Paul Myers, program director of Station WWVA, and by James K. Whitaker, news editor of radio station WWVA, that the Senator from Wisconsin indeed used the figure of 205.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has ceased calling them card-carrying Communists and has called them "Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers."

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has attacked what he called the "silly numbers game" in connection with these charges.

Mr. President, let us assume that it is not important whether the junior Senator from Wisconsin accused 205 or 57 State Department employees of being Communists. It is important that he said they were employees of the State Department at the time the charges were made and that that fact was known to the Secretary of State. It is important that he stated at the time he made that speech that a definite number were card-carrying Communists and that the fact was known to the Secretary of State, thus casting a reflection upon that official.

Mr. President, 1 year has passed. The time has come for the junior Senator from Wisconsin to name the alleged Communists in the State Department. Who are they? While the controversy was raging on the floor of the Senate, when the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was being presented, the question was asked by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. As I recall the question—and I think I can quote it verbatim—the Senator from Washington said:

I am going back to my home State of Washington, and the first question I am going to be asked there is, "Are there Communists in the State Department?" Now I ask you, Did your committee find at the time of your investigation that there were Communists in the State Department?

To which the Senator from Massachusetts replied, in effect, that the committee did not so find.

Mr. President, for 1 year we have listened to a blue whirl of charges and accusations, but where is the proof? Where it is, Mr. President? Why can it not be introduced? Why can we not have the names of the men who have been charged with being members of the Communist Party and employed in the State Department, even though there be 57 of them? That was the last figure stated. If there are but 57 of them, why have their names not been presented to the Senate of the United States? If there are not that many, why have their names not been presented to the Senate of the United States by the real author of the accusation, whether there be 205 or 57?

Mr. President, I cannot make such a presentation. I would be worried if there were one Communist in a policy-making position in the State Department, as would be every other Member of this body. Yet when I go home to my State, where that speech was originally delivered, I am constantly faced by questions. The Presiding Officer well knows the kind of questions that can be asked by people in Greenbriar County, Mercer County, Monroe County, or Pocahontas County, W. Va. The people in those counties are of pioneer stock. They want to be sure that everything is right. How can I answer their questions unless

the names of the alleged Communists are disclosed? If their names cannot be disclosed, we should know who the author is. Who set the number? We should know, Mr. President, so that the people of my State, for whom I speak, can be told the facts.

I represent people of pioneer stock. However, such people are not found only in my State. Thank God, the places where they are found are limited only by the shores of the Atlantic, the shores of the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, the Mexican border, and the Canadian border. Thank God, they are found even beyond those borders. Mr. President, we want real government, not phony government. How can we answer the questions unless we know the names of the persons against whom charges were made a year ago? A year's time should be sufficient for anyone to be able to disclose the names of the persons who were so charged. If the names cannot be furnished, we should know who the author is.

The Senator from Wisconsin said he had a list of them. If he had such a list, why was it not put into the RECORD? If a list were put into the RECORD, our people would be satisfied. In that way we could get to the bottom of the charge. Let us not chase around and hunt down some college professor in Baltimore or somewhere else. Let us find out what is wrong. Let us restore the confidence of the American people. We are not concerned so much with newspapers. We are concerned with the foundation of our country, which lies in the men who live in the hollows, along the creeks, on the mountain tops, and on the plains, the harvesters of America's crops and the men in America's factories. They produce the material wealth of this country. Let us satisfy them. If we do so, it will be easy to get rid of persons who are justly accused. If they are erroneously charged, it is easy to clear up the charge. Mr. President, is it not time that the Member of this body who made the charge should come to bat with his proof and not merely with allegations?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand that the first statement which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin was to the effect that there were 205 persons in the State Department or closely associated with the State Department against whom charges would lie. I think he made that statement in West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. It was made in Wheeling, W. Va. The Senator from Wisconsin said that there were card-carrying Communists in the State Department who were known by the Secretary of State to be such.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator how many of the 205 persons in the State Department, or any other number which was mentioned, who were charged with being such card-carrying Communists, have been proved to be card-carrying members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KILGORE. To the best information of the present speaker, not one such person has been proved on the floor of this Chamber, in any report filed in this Chamber, or in any report filed anywhere to be a card-carrying Communist. For the benefit of the Senator from New York, I may say that I was charged with attempting to whitewash the State Department. All I am asking is what I have been asking for the past 10 months, and I have not had an answer yet. Nevertheless, the author of the charge said I was trying to whitewash the State Department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that not only did the Senator from West Virginia ask that question but that his colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] asked the same question, and neither Senator has received any satisfaction or information?

Mr. KILGORE. That is absolutely correct. The State of West Virginia was in a turmoil on that point. Everybody was worried. I may say to the Senator from New York that we are a conservative-liberal State. In other words, we are liberal in government, but very conservative in the methods of its operation. Our people are of the pioneer class. They believe in loyalty to their Government. They cannot see anything else. They were terribly upset to hear that a department of their Government might have policy-making officials who were in the Communist category.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from West Virginia is raising the point because the charge was made in his State. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Partly so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is making the statement because he feels that the people of the United States ought to know the facts. Is that another reason?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator feel that if the facts were made known with respect to what has taken place during the last year since the statement was made the people might have a little different opinion concerning their State Department. Is that another reason?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Not only that, but I may say to the Senator from North Carolina——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. South Carolina.

Mr. KILGORE. South Carolina. I beg the Senator's pardon. It is like calling a West Virginian a Virginian, or vice versa. It starts them fighting. The distinguished Senators from Virginia were born in West Virginia within 3 months of each other, in the same block of the same city, but they are still Virginians, and I am still a West Virginian. I understand the feeling of the Senator from South Carolina. However, that is the situation.

I think that we must have confidence in the policy-making top of the State Department. If we do not have such confidence our entire effort toward winning international peace will fail. If the head of the State Department is in such a position that he should be ousted, I say to the Senator from South Carolina, I want to help oust him. If he should not be ousted, I want the people's confidence restored to the extent that they will back his policies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator feels, does he not, that when a man holding a position as high as that of United States Senator makes a statement to the effect that there are 205 Communists in the State Department and that he can name them, he should have named them during the last year?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly, I do. There can be no question about it. We have heard nothing but blanket charges. The Senator from South Carolina knows that there could not be maintained in court a blanket charge that there were 50 murderers loose in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is anyone who says that he can name 205 Communists in the State Department, but keeps those names unto himself for a year, doing justice to America?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I do not have my notes before me. The Official Reporter has taken them. I think my notes show that the statement which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin was, "I have in my hand a list of 205 known Communists who are known to the Secretary of State to be Communists, and who are in a policy-making position in the State Department." I cannot quote the statement verbatim because I do not have my notes before me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but is there any record anywhere that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at any time before making the statement to which reference has been made went to the State Department and told the officials there that he knew of any Communists in the State Department?

Mr. KILGORE. It was later developed here that he had notified them. It came out in connection with the number of 57, or something else.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did he give the Department the names of any of them?

Mr. KILGORE. No; the names of the 205 or the 57 have never been procured, or of the 7. How many wise and how many foolish virgins were there? I am not playing the numbers racket; I am discussing traitors—let us call them plain, common, garden variety of traitors—and I want to know their names.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In addition to the statements to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred, covering a list of 205 alleged traitors, none of whom have been shown to be in any way disloyal, and the names of none of whom have been disclosed, does the Senator not recall, as I do, that on the floor of the Senate there has been an attempt to blacken the names of great Americans, patriotic and loyal Americans, who have served their country with distinction and devotion? I can mention

the names of only a few to show the type of men who have been attacked on the floor of the Senate without one shred of evidence, purely on the basis of irresponsible and vicious statements, men like Secretary Acheson, Ambassador at Large Philip P. Jessup, Minister Vincent, Secretary Marshall, and Secretary Hull.

Mr. KILGORE. What the Senator says is true, but not one scintilla of evidence has been offered to prove the statements. It is easy to call men names. Let me say that people called Abraham Lincoln, with all his Americanism, a Socialist, which in his day was equivalent to calling a man a Communist or even worse. People called Thomas Jefferson a Red Communist. Various others have been called all sorts of names. But the question always has been as to producing some evidence to prove the charge. It is possible to call a man almost anything, provided he does not take it out on his traducer personally, or is in a position where he can sue him. In New York State there is a ruling of the supreme court to the effect that calling a man a Communist is libelous per se. Unfortunately, such rule does not prevail in many other States. Had it prevailed, there would have been many "busted" people in this country due to libel suits. It is possible to charge anyone with anything.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator not agree with me that to seek to blacken the names and reputations of men of the character of those I have just mentioned is below the dignity and responsibility of a Member of the United States Senate?

Mr. KILGORE. I would say yes, because, let me say to the distinguished Senator from New York, relatively a Member of the United States Senate ranks next to the President and the Vice President, even higher than a Cabinet officer, or the head of any department or agency, even higher than the Chief of Staff of the Army, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. For a man so elevated by his people to take an unfair advantage, and to so use his position is—I do not believe I need to say just what I think it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I fully agree with him.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make an observation with reference to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and also to commend him upon his forthright statement today. I had hoped at an earlier time, when the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] was making his remarks, likewise to commend him for his courage and for his insight into what I consider to be a most difficult and perplexing problem before the American people.

Mr. President, I have this observation to offer in my own behalf. Without looking into the merits or demerits of what has transpired during the past year, I wish to say that the greatest tragedy that can befall the cause of human freedom in this critical hour of world history is to undermine faith in representative government, to undermine faith in the elected representative of the people, and the apparatus of government which serves our Nation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the elected representatives of government are the difference between totalitarianism and democracy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, indeed.

Mr. KILGORE. If we eliminate the elected representatives of the people as a curb upon the executive branch of the government, we wipe out any idea of either a republican or democratic form of government. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore an effort to undermine the confidence of the people in their Government is a direct blow at the American way of life. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely appears that way to the Senator from Minnesota. Now I should like to continue my observation, and then I shall yield to any other Senator who desires to make any inquiry.

It appears to me that fear and suspicion is growing throughout the country. American freedom cannot live in an environment filled with suspicion, and American political institutions cannot live in an environment filled with fear. It is true of those of my colleagues with whom I have talked about the matter that, unfortunately, much of the mail received from home during the past year has indicated that there is doubt and great suspicion in the hearts and minds of thousands and thousands of people.

It is true that the attack of the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been very effective politically, but it has been very unfortunate morally, and in terms of the preservation of free institutions. I have no doubt that politically, speaking in terms of elections, it has been a powerful and perhaps successful attack, but I think what is more important to keep in mind is not whether this kind of attack is successful politically, but what it means in the long run, for the solvency, the security, and the stability of free political, economic, and cultural institutions.

Unfortunately, it seems to me, there is today a psychosis of fear in our Nation, at a time when our people should be imaginative and creative, at a time when we should have people in Government who are trying to think out new answers to meet new problems. I would say that it is a tragedy that members of the Senate permitted this to happen.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to get the idea of partisanship on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle out of the picture. We frequently denominate ourselves as being the greatest deliberative body in the world. The Senator has heard that statement made, has he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. We frequently hear speakers make that statement. We are prideful of the fact that we are the greatest deliberative body in the world. Deliberation means thoughtful consideration. We are a deliberative body. That means that we should have a basis of fact upon which deliberation may be based. I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he does not think it is incumbent upon this body, as the greatest deliberative body in the world, to insist that the proofs be shown to this body, that it be shown that the charges are factually correct, and if not, that the charges be retracted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senate should defend itself in the eyes of the people of the United States as being the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me almost axiomatic that a man sitting on a committee which has the responsibility of appropriating money for a bureau or a department should approach his task in a purely objective manner, without either favor or bias. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, very courageously pointed out the fact that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] had been appointed a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the State Department, and that there could be no question with regard to his bias against the State Department. Hundreds of utterances by the Senator from Wisconsin have given clear evidence of this. He should not have been appointed to the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with funds for the State Department.

Yet, even after that clear and courageous statement by the Senator from Connecticut, very few newspapers in this country made any substantial mention of the speech, or of the issue involved. In my opinion it was a very great moral issue, a very great issue of good government. The newspapers simply permitted the issue to die without any substantial reference to it. It seems to me that this circumstance bears out just what the Senator from Minnesota said a few minutes ago, that there is hysteria, that there is panic, that there is fear on the part of people that if they raise their voices in any way in defense of those who may be accused irresponsibly, they will be accused of being "soft" toward communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York for his statement. The reason the Senator from Minnesota referred to the fear, hysteria, and suspicion is that it is a disease which can consume our strength. This is a time when we need to put away fear, this is the time when we need a sense of calm, this is the time when we need a sense of trust in our Government.

Many letters have come to my office on this subject. Last evening I took home with me between two and three thousand letters which have come to my office in the last few weeks on the issue of foreign policy. In many of the letters I read of

the lack of trust and lack of faith in our Secretary of State, in our President, in our Government, arising from charges made on the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to make this comment in reference to our Secretary of State, because the charges center around him and around our State Department. Without having too much intimate knowledge about the State Department, but just about as, I would say, the average Representative or the average United States Senator has, I say that the present Secretary of State is an able, conscientious, patriotic, devoted public servant, who has dedicated a lifetime of service in the struggle for freedom, and has dedicated his physical energy, his emotional and mental capacities in the struggle against communism. I think that is a matter of record. There is not one scintilla of evidence that could lead anyone to believe any time, any place, anywhere, that the present Secretary of State or any of his predecessors have ever been even remotely sympathetic to communism as a philosophy, an ideology, or as a practicing form of political organization. I submit that many of the men who have been under attack are great Americans. The distinguished Senator from New York mentioned Phillip Jessup, who is not only a great American, but who is a great world citizen.

I likewise submit that there are as many capable, honest, devoted servants in the State Department as there are in any branch of our Government or in any branch of any government in the United States—State or local. There may be some incompetents, but I would venture to say one could find some incompetents in the largest corporations or in the best trade-unions, or even within the Congress or the judiciary.

I submit that if there are Communists in the State Department, we have the machinery to find out. I shall always believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its agents are more qualified to find Communists than any United States Senator. If there is a United States Senator who is better qualified than Mr. Hoover, I submit he should seek Mr. Hoover's job, because we need the best at the top of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am likewise convinced that our Attorney General, the man at the head of the Department of Justice, a man of deep religious faith, a man of conviction and honor, a former United States Senator, who served in this body with honor, as well as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, would not be going around coddling Communists or covering up for them to please any political party or any member of the Government.

If the Department of Justice does not have the manpower it needs in order to do the things which need to be done, I submit that we should vote for the necessary appropriations, instead of trying to get ourselves junior G-man badges and trying to act as supersleuths, when we are not equipped, by either experience or background, to do so.

The question before us is a simple one, as was the question a year ago—namely, are there 205 Communists, known to the Secretary of State, in the State Department? If 205 is the wrong number, the next question is, are there 57, or are there 7, or are there any?

If the charges are not true, then I suggest that someone should refrain from further comment about the alleged subversion in this Government, because the best way in the world to break down the spirit of the American people and their morale, the best way to destroy the faith of the American people in the entire mobilization program, the best way to sell out this country to the Communists, is to make false charges—any kind of false charges, whether false charges of corruption or subversion or whatever else it may be.

Mr. President, this is a time when we need to believe in democracy. Our procedures should conform to the democratic spirit.

No one in the world has a greater responsibility to live and breathe for democracy and to do his utmost to make it work than the Members of the United States Senate or of the House of Representatives of the United States Government. We are the ones who at this hour should lead in asserting a steadfast belief in democracy, and we should do so by exercising leadership, both political and moral.

So let me suggest to the Senators on both sides of the aisle that charges be documented so that they will be able to stand up in a court of law. If there is not such evidence and such documentation, the charges never should be made, because to destroy faith in our Government is to strike a blow deep in the heart of freedom; and to destroy the name of a man is to perform the most immoral, un-Christian, indecent act which possibly could be done, for, Mr. President, after all, the name, the reputation, and the character of a man are his most precious heritage.

I submit to you, Mr. President, that the Secretary of State of our country has been maligned and abused, and he has been the victim of unfair and unjustified criticism, to a point where the poor man's heart must be breaking. Bad enough it is that he should be maligned by false charges, but it is worse that one who is in such a responsible position should be maligned. Have you noticed, Mr. President, that every time our Secretary of State is about to enter into negotiations or is about to attend a conference of foreign ministers, or every time he is about to go to a meeting of the United Nations, on a great mission of hope and of peace, every time our Secretary of State is about to enter into such important transactions, the daggers come out and the epithets are hurled against him. To me, Mr. President, such action is not very patriotic, particularly at times like the present ones.

As long as Mr. Acheson is our Secretary of State and as long as he is to be our negotiator in the councils of the nations, he has to be the strongest man he possibly can be; and we should not undercut him every time he is about to enter into consultations and negotiations. We would do well to remember that wars are not won by military power alone. They are also won by the spirit of the people, the high moral sense of the people, the idealism of the people, and the forthrightness of the people and their leaders.

We are spending billions of dollars now to equip ourselves with atomic weapons, B–36's, and bazookas. I think it would be well for us to spend a little time each day in equipping ourselves with honesty of purpose and a carefully planned and carefully considered program, and to work for confidence in and respect for our own leaders, as they try to protect the best interests of this Republic.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, with considerable surprise I have listened to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and my distinguished colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and just now the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It seems to me, Mr. President, that if they are good Democrats, the less they say about this matter the better, because it stinks to high heaven.

Mr. President, we appropriated $2,000,000,000 for the development of the atom bomb, and we turned that money over entirely to the Democratic Party, to Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt. We said, "Go ahead. Hire whomever you wish. You do not have to account for a dollar of the $2,000,000,000; but we are depending on you, sir, as President of the United States, to protect even the most humble citizen of this country."

Mr. President, how did the Democratic Party perform that assignment? They spent the $2,000,000,000, all right; but although the FBI had millions of dollars, although the Secretary of State had million of dollars more, all the time—for 14 months—down in New Mexico sat Dr. Fuchs, the spy, the known Communist, the man who, day after day after day after day, as our Government was developing the atom bomb, was giving the secrets to Russia.

I say shame on a party, shame on the Democratic Party, which would defend that kind of thing. They had warnings. The President had warnings from Canada. In Canada the spies were convicted; and the Canadian Government said to our Government, "In your Government there are spies working in conjunction with the spies who have been at work here in Canada."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield; I did not interrupt any of the three Senators whom I have mentioned. I sat here in disgust, listening to their speeches, in which they attacked a Member of the Senate who is not present today. They attacked a fellow Senator at a time when he was not present.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been on this floor day after day, week after week, month after month, but those Senators waited until he was away, when they knew they would be safe, when they knew he was absent from Washington, giving a Lincoln Day speech; and then they rose here on the floor of the United States Senate and attacked him.

To whom did the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] go? Did he go to a subordinate? Did he go to a Cabinet officer? No, he went to the President of the United States. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 2, page 1953, I find a telegram sent to the President by the Senator from Wisconsin, reading as follows:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling Thursday night I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department. You can convince yourself of the falsity of the State Department claim very easily. You will recall that you personally appointed a board to screen State Department employees for the purpose of weeding out fellow travelers—men whom the board considered dangerous to the security of this Nation.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is a telegram which was sent to Harry S. Truman, as President of the United States, by a United States Senator. I continue:

Your Board did a painstaking job, and named hundreds which had been listed as dangerous to the security of the Nation, because of communistic connections.

While the records are not available to me, I know absolutely of one group of approximately 300 certified to the Secretary for discharge because of communism. He actually only discharged approximately 80.

That is, 80 out of 300. I continue:

I understand that this was done after lengthy consultation with the now-convicted traitor, Alger Hiss. I would suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that you simply pick up your phone and ask Mr. Acheson how many of those whom your Board—

"Your Board," Mr. President—the Board appointed by the President, himself. Continuing—

how many of those whom your Board had labeled as dangerous Communists he failed to discharge. The day the House Un-American Activities Committee exposed Alger Hiss as an important link in an international Communist spy ring you signed an order forbidding the State Department's giving any information in regard to the disloyalty or the communistic connections of anyone in that Department to the Congress.

The President would not give any information to this very body. The telegram continues:

Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you but you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own Board listed as being disloyal and who are still working in the State Department. I believe the following is the minimum which can be expected of you in this case.

1. That you demand that Acheson give you and the proper congressional committee the names and a complete report on all of those who were placed in the Department by Alger Hiss, and all of those still working in the State Department who were listed by your Board as bad security risks because of their communistic connections.

2. That you promptly revoke the order in which you provided under no circumstances could a congressional committee obtain any information or help in exposing Communists.

Failure on your part will label the Democratic Party of being the bedfellow of international communism. Certainly this label is not deserved by the hundreds of thousands of loyal American Democrats throughout the Nation, and by the sizable number of able loyal Democrats in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, what more could any United States Senator do than that?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from North Dakota has propounded a question.

Mr. LANGER. I propounded no question to the distinguished Senator, and I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER What more could any United States Senator do than to advise the President of the United States? I do not know why Harry Truman did not promptly pick up his telephone and call the Senator from Wisconsin. That is what the average President certainly would have done. He would have said, "Senator McCARTHY, come to see me. You are only five or six blocks away. Come here, and lay down your list. You say there are 57 Communists in the Department. I want to know who they are. If my Secretary of State has not been doing a good job, I want to know about it. I appointed him, and the Senate voted to confirm him. Together, the Congress and I, we put him in the State Department. Let us talk it over. If there is anything wrong in the Department, I, Harry Truman, want to know it." Was not that due any United States Senator? Whether he belonged to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party or was a nonpartisan, was it not a simple courtesy due him? But Harry S. Truman did not even reply to the telegram.

Mind you, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin and President Truman had not had any trouble, they were friends. Several Senators have been Governors of their States, as I have been the Governor of my State. When a complaint came in against the head of any department, what would any governor do but call in the man who made the complaint and say, "Present your proof today, away from any newspapers."

President Truman could have said to the Senator from Wisconsin, "I want your proof." There is all the more reason for the President to call upon him, because Mr. Acheson had said, after Alger Hiss was convicted, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss." That should have put the President on notice.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin, when he offered to present all his proof to the President of the United States, did as much as any Senator could be expected to do. No sane man will contend that a United States Senator, with a salary of $12,000 a year and an expense account of $2,500, is going to be able to make an investigation entailing the spending of thousands upon thousands of dollars.

Let us look at it in reverse, Mr. President. Supposing the Senator from Wisconsin had not telegraphed the President and it could be shown afterwards that he had knowledge of these men being in the State Department: then the very Senators who today are condemning the Senator from Wisconsin would be condemning him for not telling the President of the United States about it. They would say, "You had notice that there were 57 Communists in the State Department and you kept silent. Because of your silence you are guilty."

I say, Mr. President, that when a United States Senator gets in touch with the Chief Executive he does all that my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], or my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] could do had they been in a situation in which the Senator from Wisconsin found himself.

I myself as a Senator from North Dakota, when, on two occasions, there was something wrong, promptly called the White House and told all about it. I think that is a duty which every Senator owes to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, a charge is made with reference to the Senator from Wisconsin being on a certain committee. I do not know the facts about it, but I have here the statement made by the minority leader of February 1. He said:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are certain rules by which we operate. Those rules have absolutely been maintained in connection with the appointment of Senators to committees, legislative committees and otherwise. I am quite satisfied that the members of the Republican committee on committees did not interrogate anyone with reference to his feelings about the State Department or how he felt regarding the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority. Of course there were some disappointments in connection with membership on some committees. For example, last year the Republicans attempted to place on the Small Business Committee certain Senators who had had long service in that connection, and we very humbly made suggestions to the majority party. But what happened? They were all ignored; their service did not count for anything. Oh, no; they had been somewhat hard on the administration, and, therefore, there would be new faces on that committee.

The minority leader said there was nothing unusual about the way in which the members of the committee were chosen. He said:

They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority.

If that is not true, certainly some Senator on the other side of the aisle should

have told the minority leader about it. I do not hold any brief——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator says someone should have told the Senator from Nebraska about it. The Senator from Nebraska made a half-hour speech on the subject.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] had spoken ahead of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and it is the reply of the Senator from Nebraska that I have been reading. He said:

> They wer ' ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority.

If that was not true, the fact should be established.

Mr. LEHMAN Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. With all respect to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], it was my feeling when I heard that reply, and it is still my feeling, that it was not responsive to the statement made in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. LANGER. Let us see. That can be very easily determined. I have before me the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. Shall I read it all?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be glad if the Senator would read his speech.

Mr. LANGER. I have read it, and I think the answer of the Senator from Nebraska was a perfect reply.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to ask me whether I suggested that he read the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. I might say that I think it is such a good speech, and so important, because it raised an issue of government, that I should be delighted to have the Senator read it again on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a most important speech. But I do not want to advise the Senator to read it and take up the time of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I do not mind. We have plenty of time—at least, I have. But I think the Senator from Nebraska answered the speech of the Senator from Connecticut perfectly. Here is what the Senator from Connecticut said, and it appears at page 865 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to utter a brief but very solemn warning. This week I called on former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Secretary Hull honors me by permitting me to visit him every few months, and it has been my custom to do so since even before my service as Assistant Secretary of State.
>
> As I entered the room Secretary and Mrs. Hull were watching on the television the proceedings at Lake Success. I wish every Member of the Senate could have been with me and could have heard Secretary Hull's wise and penetrating discussion of the vast problems with which we are faced today. I am sure Secretary Hull will not mind my reporting to his old colleagues in the Senate that he is deeply concerned because we here are devoting so much of our time to matters of relative insignificance, while the world is trembling on the edge of catastrophe. I am sure he will not——

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think most of us heard the speech made by the Senator from Connecticut or have since read it. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut has been available to have a conference with me since he made his speech. As chairman of the Republican committee on committees, I intend to do him the courtesy of a personal interview. I personally do not think it is necessary to read his speech at this time, unless the Senator from New York insists.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York did not suggest the reading of it. He simply replied to an inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota. The discretion with regard to the reading of the speech rests entirely on the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the only reason I suggested reading it was that my distinguished friend from New York said that the Senator from Nebraska was not responsive in his answer to the Senator from Connecticut. I think his answer was responsive. I think the speech of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] fully answered the Senator from Connecticut. I happen to be a member of the committee on committees, and, so help me, I do not know of one solitary thing that was done for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] that was not done for every other Member of the United States Senate. We took them in order of seniority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that the difficulty which exists between my good friend the Senator from Connecticut and the members of the Republican committee on committees be resolved in a private conference, as our fine friend from Nebraska suggests. I think all of us have read the RECORD. I heard the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. I also heard the distinguished minority leader's reply and my colleague's reply. I believe it is merely a matter of difference of opinion as to whether or not the appropriate policy was carried out. Since a quorum is not present—and perhaps we should have present if we are to go into a discussion of this subject—I suggest that we rely on the integrity of everyone's rereading the address of the Senator from Connecticut, and coming to his own conclusions with respect to what was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. I know that my good friend from North Dakota would give a most interpretative reading of the speech delivered by the Senator from Connecticut. However, I heard the speech when it was delivered. It was a very good speech. I thought so the first time I heard it. I still carry with me in my heart and soul the impression that it was a good speech, and I should like to leave it that way.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps I could do a better job than the Senator from Connecticut did the first time, though his is a very interesting and fine speech.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I had in mind making a short address on a subject entirely foreign to the matter which has been under discussion for some time. However, it is entirely proper for me to have at least a few words to say with respect to the subject which was initiated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

As one Member on this side of the aisle I am delighted to know that my friends on the other side of the aisle take recognition of the great day of February 12, and help us celebrate it. I think a February 12 appearance in West Virginia last year must have made quite an impression. It is being repeated here today. To the best of my recollection it has been repeated perhaps thousands of times over the Nation. I was impressed with the patriotic speech made by the acting majority leader. If my recollection serves me correctly, in describing the Secretary of State he referred to him as "an able, patriotic, and devoted servant."

Mr. President, I know of no more able, patriotic, or devoted servant of the American people than the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. Certainly we can have differences of opinion without losing all sense of reason. I trust that the Members of the Senate on the majority side are not too discouraged because they think that 1 member of a committee of 21 members is not in complete accord with the views of the State Department. I do not know why they should think it to be such a terrible thing. Surely 1 man on a committee of 21 members is not going to control the committee. He is only one member. I do not know how many members sit on the subcommittees. I think it is five. Surely one member out of five is not going to have any undue influence. Therefore I hope that my good friends on the other side of the aisle will not become too much exercised over the appointment that was made by my committee of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to get to my other statement.

Mr. KILGORE. I have only two short questions to ask.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nebraska, of course, recognizes the fact that I was not on the floor when the controversy arose with respect to the membership of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he agrees with me—and I am making no reflection on the junior Senator from Wisconsin—that the Senator from Wisconsin should furnish to the Senate the names of the persons to whom he referred. That is all I ask.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he agrees with me that this

body should be furnished with the names of the persons who were employed by the State Department in policy-making capacities on February 12, 1950, who were known by the Secretary of State to be card-carrying Communists. I do not think that is an unreasonable request to be made by a member of the majority party, a member of the minority party, or by any Member of this body in any capacity. It should not be considered unreasonable to make such a request 1 years after the charge was made in numbers only, particularly when the charge caused so much disruption in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will answer the distinguished Senator's question in this way. I believe the Senator said not once, but several times, as did the junior Senator from Minnesota, that he did not care whether the charges involved 201 persons or 1 person.

Mr. KILGORE. The junior Senator from West Virginia, not Minnesota.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If my memory serves me correctly, in the last year there has been more than one conviction in court of men who certainly were indirectly, if not directly, connected with the State Department.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I do not care to yield again at this time. There are thousands of people in every one of the 48 States in the Union who have confidence in the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I am sure there are millions of people all over the Nation who have confidence in the McCarthy charges.

Mr. President, a subcommittee was appointed following the adoption of a resolution by the Senate. We thought the resolution was a good resolution. We thought it was watertight. Nevertheless, the subcommittee did an excellent job of whitewashing. I am inclined to think that if the subcommittee had done a thorough job we would have been spared much of the worry that has arisen since that time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I decline to yield at this time. If President Truman will take the padlocks off the files of the State Department, the McCarthy inquiry can be completed. It will not be completed until the padlocks are taken off the files. I should like what I have said to be the final word, if the Senator from West Virginia is agreeable.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has not answered my question. Does he think it fair to this body not to be told the names of the persons to whom the Senator from Wisconsin has referred, and of whom he said he had a list?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will refer the Senator from West Virginia to the records of the Tydings subcommittee. I think they contain all the answers he wants.

Mr. LANGER. And the election.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes. Mr. President, I should now like to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

GERMAN COOPERATION IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in the course of General Eisenhower's report to the Congress a little over a week ago, he said:

> I am not even going to mention my several conversations in Germany and for a very specific reason. I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved and an understanding reached that will contemplate an eventual and earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of an army. I, certainly, for one commander, want no unwilling contingent, no soldiers serving in the pattern of the Hessians who served in our Revolutionary War, serving in any army I command. Therefore until the political leaders, the diplomats, and the statesmen find the proper answer, it is not for a soldier to delve in too deeply.

Mr. President, what General Eisenhower obviously meant, without putting it into so many words, is that we cannot expect the Germans to be loyal to western ideals and to the western alliance so long as we continue to persecute them. Nothing can be more obvious than that fact. Many of us over the years have taken the floor of the Senate to emphasize that fact and to point out how our policies toward Germany have been destructive of any possibility of cooperation with the German people. The tragedy is that we had to wait so long for any slight recognition of that problem by anyone in the councils of this administration.

If we really want the cooperation of the Germans, we shall have to right some of the wrongs of the last few years, and it may be good for our souls to recall some of those wrongs.

First was the Morgenthau plan, that foolish and unworkable notion that German industry could be destroyed and the Germans forced to resume the life of a peasant nation with most of her people living off the land. That idea was completely unworkable, simply because there is not enough land in Western Germany to support all of her population. Yet that program was seriously tried. Until very recently, we were still tearing down German factories, while with the other hand we dispensed relief to the starving German unemployed.

Next was the displacement of millions of German people and those of German extraction from the border lands of Czechoslovakia and Poland and from settlements in Eastern Europe. Thirteen million of them were displaced altogether—forced into Western Germany and simply turned loose without food, clothing, or shelter. No adequate provision or program for these poor people has ever been made by this administration, even when we had displaced persons legislation up for action. It was almost impossible to secure real consideration for these unfortunate people.

Next is the problem of the property of Germans seized by the Alien Property Custodian in this country. Time after time proposals have been made for some slight relaxation of the rigid rules of the Office of Alien Property so as to recognize at least a few of the meritorious claims of Germans to their own property. During the last 2 years, I have sponsored two different bills designed to do justice to the Germans on this question. One of them would simply have extended the date within which time claims could have been filed for the return of property to which the claimants were already legally entitled. The second one, in which I joined with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and several others, would have permitted Germans to acquire property bequeathed or given to them by American citizens.

On both those bills, we had the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. Both measures passed the Senate, but they were pigeonholed in the House because of the hostility of the Alien Property Custodian.

The treatment of those two bills is a sample of the attitude of this administration toward the German nation. Some spokesmen of this administration occasionally speak a kind word for Germany, but their actions do not support their words.

Now we are in trouble and we ask for the help of the Germans. They are not inclined to join our armies. Is there anything surprising in that?

Mr. President, we must have German cooperation if Western Europe is to be saved. We cannot expect to secure it so long as we treat Germany as a second-class nation. Most of us now realize that we must grant the Germans full equality and recognize their rights and legitimate aspirations. Since that is the case, why do we not accept them into full partnership willingly and promptly? Why must we appear to make each concession grudgingly, only after it has been forced from us? How can we expect to secure a willing partner that way?

Mr. President, we have played into Communist hands throughout in our treatment of Germany. The Communists wanted us to be severe and unreasonable toward the Germans, while at the same time Communist Russia pretended to be friendly and generous. By that means, the Communists hoped to turn the Germans against democracy and toward communism. If they have not succeeded, it is not our fault. Our policies since VE-day and before have been tailored to suit the wishes of communism.

Mr. President, it is time we make a drastic change in our whole outlook toward the German nation and the German people.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for what he has just said relative to the friendly and unfriendly relations between the people of Germany and the people of America. What he says about the actions of the American people being influenced by Communists is, in my opinion, the absolute truth.

The Morgenthau plan of starvation was not drawn up by Mr. Morgenthau at all; it was drawn up by Harry Dexter White, a man who was in the Department of State, and who committed suicide, I believe, 5 days after he was subpenaed by the Committee on un-American Activities.

In regard to the dismantling proposal, time and time again the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], both the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], both the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. WHERRY], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and others, rose and pleaded that the dismantling be stopped.

For example, take the case of the fertilizer plants. At the very time the fertilizer plants in Germany were being torn down, New York firms got contracts to ship fertilizer to Germany, the contracts running into the millions of dollars. The sad thing is that this fertilizer arrived in Germany too late, long after the time had gone by for the German people to use it in the spring of the year. So that fertilizer was wasted. Plant after plant after plant in Germany was dismantled and bodily moved to Russia.

Mr. President, that is not the worst of it. There were men on the payroll of the United States Government who had worked here on the Daily Worker, and had taken part in communistic activities, who changed their names. They were on the payroll of the United States Government, and were sent to Germany to assist American courts, where there were American judges and American prosecutors. They assisted there in the denazification program.

The result was that every school teacher, every scientist, every engineer, was automatically banned from work. Russia did not have a denazification program, and very promptly hired all these people, 50,000 of them, as nearly as we can estimate the number, including engineers who had been operating under Hitler preparing engines of destruction, and working on submarines. All of them were put on the payroll of the Kremlin. There they finished up the different jobs they had commenced under Hitler, and today, according to the Navy, Russia is almost supreme in the matter of submarines, having many more than we have, and having some which can remain under water longer than ours can.

Mr. President, that is not all. In addition to all I have mentioned, there are in Germany the 13,000,000 expellees, men from the Sudeten lands, so well described by the senior Senator from Nebraska. Under the German law these people automatically became German citizens. They did not have to be naturalized in Germany. They were citizens the moment they entered, although their ancestors may have left 100 or 200 or 500 or 800 years before. What happened? The International Refugee Organization was established. Its purpose was to take care of every child in the world except German children. The Senate approved that organization. The German children could starve to death so far as the International Refugee Organization was concerned.

That was not all. We now send over there General Eisenhower, the man whose forces had previously bombed the Germans and who held off his troops while the Russians moved in and raped, according to the statistics, 85 percent of the women in Austria and Germany. The very man, Mr. President, who had charge of the American troops, and held them off, and did not let them go in, we send now to Germany to plead with the Germans to join up with the Americans and the other Atlantic Pact forces and to fight shoulder to shoulder with us.

What do the German people think about that, Mr. President? They held an election there about 8 weeks ago Sunday, and in Württemberg-Baden, which it is stated had never before voted Social Democratic, the people voted for the Social Democrat ticket. The chief plank of the Social Democratic Party was a plank in opposition to rearmament. That is the first time such a thing had occurred in Württemberg-Baden.

In the state of Hesse a similar election was held, and by an overwhelming vote similar action was taken.

Bavaria is a solid Catholic state, a state overwhelmingly opposed to communism; yet, by an overwhelming vote, the Social Democrats carried Bavaria.

So is it any wonder that on the 19th day of January the Wall Street Journal said that the high commissioner, Mr. McCloy, had taken a secret poll and found that only 5 percent of the Germans would volunteer to fight with us? He also found that if a draft law were passed, only 10 percent would obey the draft. Is it any wonder that when General Eisenhower returned to the United States and talked to us he very skillfully omitted any reference to Germany at all? He counted them off as far as we were concerned, and as far as defense is concerned.

Mr. President, I want to pay public tribute to the work done by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who time and time again has risen on the Senate floor and pleaded with Senators on this subject. He prophesied what would take place unless we stopped the dismantling of German industrial plants, unless we treated the German people on more of a basis of equality than we were doing at that particular time.

Mr. President, an American soldier could marry a German girl if he obtained the consent of the military. Congress passed the Anti-Communist Act some time ago in spite of what many of us tried to do to stop it. That act bars from coming to America and joining her husband the bride of an American soldier, if she is of German origin and went to school in Germany, even though she went to school only until she was 10 or 11 or 12 years old, and even though she may have a baby. Even though the man who married this German girl is a veteran, he cannot bring his wife to this country. The night that act was passed 200,000 Germans had applied for visas to come to America. One thousand two hundred of them were on a ship. They had sold their property in Germany. They had quit their jobs. They had said good-by to their relatives. They had sold their furniture. They were coming here to the land of the free and the home of the brave. When they got to Ellis Island the 1,200 of them were taken off the ship and sent back to Germany.

Mr. President, I do not have time to go into all the details of the matter, but I could not refrain from complimenting my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska. I want the people of Germany, and I want the people of Nebraska to know that the German people have a friend in the Senate who time and time without number has risen to the defense of what was right in trying to secure justice for the relatives of the 33,000,000 citizens of German ancestry who live in this country. We have them in Nebraska, we have them in Missouri, we have them in Montana, in North Dakota, in South Dakota, in Minnesota—we have them all over in America, and they are good citizens. They are loyal, true Americans. But they cannot bring in their sister or brothers or other relatives because of the so-called Anti-Communist Act which was passed a short time ago. That is simply a travesty on justice.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska at this particular time in bringing to the attention of the Senate the situation of the people of Western Germany.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is fitting and proper to end this legislative session with a little quotation from Abraham Lincoln, who said:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right.

We have had a heated discussion this afternoon. I am always very much moved by the eloquence, the oratory, and persuasiveness of the arguments of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I should like, however, to correct the RECORD in one respect, because I know the Senator from North Dakota is accurate in his presentations. He has a great legal mind. I should like to have the RECORD read as it should read.

No. 1: The telegram on the part of the junior Senator from Wisconsin to the President, to which the Senator from North Dakota referred, was sent after the speech in West Virginia. It was after the charge was made.

Mr. LANGER. The 20th of February.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After the date. I am very happy the date is properly recorded.

Secondly, that the number of 57 alleged Communists in the State Department was a number that was resurrected, recreated, rehabilitated out of the rather moth-eaten and weather-beaten records of the Eightieth Congress in the House of Representatives when the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, after having held exhaustive hearings, came to the conclusion unanimously that the 57 were not Communists; and after a full and exhaustive examination, recommended that all charges be dismissed. There were speeches galore made on the floor of the House of Representatives to the effect that it would be better if we just forget the whole thing. I thought maybe it would be good to bring that point up right now, and

I do bring it up in the spirit of the profound remarks made by the immortal emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing sundry nominations in the Coast Guard, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination which has just been stated?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a pamphlet entitled "Civilian Nominations," which I obtained a few days ago, which gives a list of all civilian nominations submitted by the President to the Senate during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, from January 27, 1950, to the sine die adjournment on January 2, 1951. I know everyone will be interested to know what appointments were made, and from what State the appointees came. The first one with respect to whom his State is given, is Holmes Baldridge, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General. Then others follow: Robert T. Creasey, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor; Henry G. Bennett, of Oklahoma, Technical Cooperation Administrator; Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board.

Rockefeller's job is Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board.

Next is Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, Director for International Security Affairs.

Then we come to the nominations to boards, bureaus, commissions, and so forth. I call the attention of the Senators now present to the fact that we look at this list in vain to find one appointment from the great State of North Dakota.

First in the list of appointments to boards, bureaus, and commissions, we find a Californian, Lt. Col. William R. Shuler, of California, a member of the California Debris Commission.

Next we find Charles E. Wilson, of New York, Director of Defense Mobilization.

Next is John W. Gibson, of Michigan, a member of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Next is William C. Foster, of New York, Administrator of Economic Cooperation.

Next is Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Next is Allen Valentine, of New York—that is the fourth appointment from New York in this list—Economic Stabilization Administrator.

Next is Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York—this is the fifth nominee from New York in this list, Mr. President—a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Next is Hugh W. Cross, of Illinois, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Next is John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Next is John D. Small, of New York—the sixth from New York—Chairman of the Munitions Board.

Next is George J. Bott, of Maryland, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Next is John Thad Scott, Jr., a member of the National Mediation Board.

Next is Sophie Bledsoe Aberle, of New Mexico, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Chester I. Barnard, of New York—this is the seventh from New York—member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Robert Percy Barnes, of the District of Columbia, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Detlev W. Bronk, of Maryland, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Gerty T. Cori, of Missouri, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Charles Dollard, of New York—that makes eight from New York—a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Robert F. Loeb, of New York—that makes nine from New York—a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Andrey A. Potter, of Indiana, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Lee A. Dubridge, of California, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Donald H. McLaughlin, of California, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Edward L. Moreland, of Massachusetts, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Joseph C. Morris, of Louisiana, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Harold M. Morse, of New Jersey.

James A. Reyniers, of Indiana.

Elvin C. Stakman, of Minnesota. As I understand, he is quite a good friend of my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota, and was appointed, I believe, on his recommendation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from North Dakota state again the name of that distinguished citizen of Minnesota? I did not understand the name as he read it.

Mr. LANGER. It is Elvin C. Stakman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Excellent.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, an excellent appointment.

Next is P. H. Yancey, of Alabama.

James B. Conant, of Massachusetts.

John W. Davis, of West Virginia.

Mr. President, John W. Davis left West Virginia 30 years ago. He has lived in New York for more than 30 years, and has practiced law there during that period. Yet, to keep the people from knowing that he comes from the State of New York, he is listed, because he was born in West Virginia some 60 or 70 years ago, as coming from that State. As a matter of fact, he is a New Yorker, has his office at 23 Broad Street, has been there all these years, and is labeled the No. 11 New Yorker.

Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin.

Paul M. Gross, of North Carolina.

George D. Humphrey, of Wyoming.

O. W. Hyman, of Tennessee.

Frederick A. Middlebush, of Missouri.

Charles E. Wilson, of New York. That is the twelfth appointment from New York.

Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio.

Walter E. Cosgriff, of Utah.

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan.

W. Elmer Harber, of Oklahoma.

G. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts.

William E. Willett, of Maryland.

Seth W. Richardson, of the District of Columbia.

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York—the thirteenth appointment from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Seth W. Richardson is a native of the great State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say to my distinguished friend that he is entirely mistaken. Seth W. Richardson is a native of the great State of Wisconsin. He came to North Dakota and played baseball there for a while, and at one time was admitted to the bar there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. For over 30 years he has resided in the District of Columbia, and it will be noted that he is listed as being, not from North Dakota, but from the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Seth W. Richardson did practice law for a period of time in the State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; and he also practiced law in the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Minnesota is across the river from North Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that, as was done in the case of John W. Davis, we change the listing of the residence of Seth W. Richardson, as it appears in the statement from which the Senator is reading, and have Mr. Richardson listed as coming from North Dakota. Then there would be an appointment from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we have no authority to change the listing. If I could, I would do so, because Seth W. Richardson was one of the outstanding men of North Dakota, when he resided there. President Hoover appointed him Assistant Attorney General of the United States. But he came to the city of Washington, and he has been here now for more than 30 years. I want to treat him as I treated John W. Davis, who left West Virginia, and now lives in New York, and has lived there for more than 30 years, and now is from New York. Mr. Richardson left North Dakota 30 or 35 years ago, and has not been back there since then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not Seth W. Richardson, in the mind of the Senator from North Dakota, a very competent and able man?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; he is very able and very competent; he is one of the best officials in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. His loyalty is beyond question, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. Absolutely; and his appointment is one of the best appointments ever made by a President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is aware of the fact, is he not, that this is the same Seth W. Richardson who screened the employees of the State Department for their loyalty?

Mr. LANGER. I am very much aware of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota believes that Mr. Richardson was honest and patriotic and conscientious in performing that task, does he not?

Mr. LANGER. There is no question in the world about the patriotism, honesty, and loyalty of Seth W. Richardson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with me that Seth W. Richardson when appointed the head of a loyalty board for either the State Department or any other department, or when appointed the head of any antisubversives board—regardless of the department for which such a board might be appointed—would, if he found any Communists in that agency, be the first to expose them?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my friend that there is not a shadow of doubt about that. There is no one in the entire Government more able or more loyal or a finer citizen than Seth W. Richardson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to have the Senator's observation in that connection, because I agree with him that there is no one more able than Seth W. Richardson. It gives me real assurance to know that he was head of the Loyalty Board in that case; and I feel deep in my heart that he did an honest, conscientious job. Therefore, I can look with some ease of conscience at the personnel of that department.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Minnesota that, if Seth W. Richardson is appointed to any important position, I expect to vote for the confirmation of his nomination, and I expect to fight for it, because, as I have said before, Mr. Richardson is not only honest and capable, but he is patriotic and loyal and absolutely one of the finest public servants this country has ever had.

Mr. President, a moment ago I read the name of Peter Campbell Brown, of New York, the thirteenth appointee from New York appearing in this list.

Now I come to Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, a representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Her appointment is the fourteenth from New York in this list.

Then I come to the nomination of Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia—the fifteenth appointment in this list from New York.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador. That is No. 16.

Walter S. Gifford, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain. That is No. 17.

In other words, of the four ambassadors appointed during all this time, three came from New York State. The other one, the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, Howard H. Tewksbury, came from New Hampshire.

We come now to the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the scores of nominations on this list, but shall merely say that not one of them comes from the great State of North Dakota, although, as I recently said, and proved, on the floor of the Senate, there are thousands of men and women in North Dakota who are capable of filling any one of these positions.

I again call attention to the fact that under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, six New Yorkers were in the Cabinet at one time, while the State of North Dakota has never, in its entire history, since it became a State in 1890, a period of 62 years, had an ambassador. We have had only one consul during all that time. He was appointed consul at Quebec.

A perusal of the names will disclose that the only appointments the State of North Dakota has, as shown by the Executive Calendar which is before the Senate today, and the nominations on which the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, who is acting ably as majority leader, has asked me to permit to be confirmed, are of two little postmasters; and, under the law, those postmasters had to live in the State of North Dakota. Those two postmasters are Elmer L. Schielke, of McClusky, and Edward J. Sondag, of Sykeston. Both are very small towns.

I do not see on the Executive Calendar today anyone who is appointed to a policy-making department. I want to thank the distinguished acting majority leader for at least not taking postmasters from outside the State of North Dakota, for instance, from the State of Minnesota, and bringing them into the State of North Dakota. I remember that but a short time ago a man by the name of Tom Moody was brought in from Minnesota and ran for Governor of North Dakota. It was necessary to take the case to the Supreme Court in order to have him thrown out. Not satisfied with running the State of Minnesota alone, but an effort was actually made to put a man from Minnesota into office as Governor of North Dakota.

I might add, Mr. President, that the citizens of North Dakota are much more able than the citizens of Minnesota, if I may say so without disparagement to the great State of Minnesota, a State which I very much like. I think the distinguished Senator will agree with me that we in the State of North Dakota, time and time again, have furnished very able citizens to take jobs in the State of Minnesota. The people of Minnesota are intimately acquainted with the high caliber of men to be found in the State of North Dakota. I remember that, when the distinguished Floyd Olsen was elected Governor of Minnesota, he looked all over the State of Minnesota, trying as best he could to find a man whom he could trust to be his private secretary. Do you know, Mr. President, out of the great population of Minnesota, of, I think, a million and a half, as I now remember, Governor Olsen could not find one. So he came to North Dakota. There he hired his private secretary. A little later he looked around, and he called me. I was Governor at the time. He said, "I need a tax commissioner." Out of all the people in the State of Minnesota he could not find one who would make a good tax commissioner, and he appointed George E. Wallace, of Wahpeton, N. Dak. A few days later the Governor again telephoned me and said, "Governor, there are in northern Minnesota a million and a half acres of pine brush, State-owned land, and I must get someone who is smart enough and capable enough to take care of it. I do not have anyone in the State of Minnesota who is competent and whom I can appoint." So I said to him, "We have a man in McLean County by the name of Harry Dunbar." So Governor Olsen got Harry Dunbar from North Dakota to take care of the land.

A little later he again called me and said, "I am in terrible trouble. There is bootlegging of gasoline all over the State of Minnesota. I must find someone who will stop it." I said, "That is simple. We have a dozen men who will do it for you." He got George W. Griffith, of

Burke County, N. Dak., who went to Minnesota and did a remarkable job of stopping the bootlegging of gasoline.

Governor Olsen realized the high character, ability, efficiency, and honesty of the men of North Dakota, and he again called me a few days later, and said, "We need a bank examiner in Minnesota." Out of all the thousands of accountants and bankers in the State of Minnesota he could not find one who was capable of being bank examiner of that great State. In North Dakota, in Grant County, there is a little town by the name of Carson, and in that town there was a banker by the name of Robert D. Berry. I recommended Mr. Berry to Governor Olsen, who appointed him to be bank examiner for the great State of Minnesota. A little further along, again he called me and said, "I need a man who can drive an automobile so that, when I go out for a ride, I know I am going to get there—a man who will not drive me into the ditch. I need a private chauffeur." Out of the million and a half people in the State of Minnesota he could not find one to drive his automobile safely and carefully, so he hired Morris Rose, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., to be his personal chauffeur.

Mr. President, without saying anything disparagingly of any other State, I may say that while I was Governor, a man by the name of Dave Nolan escaped from our penitentiary. He was serving a life sentence for murder. It took us 3 years to find him. And do you know, Mr. President, when we located him, in Arkansas, we found that he had been elected public printer of the State of Arkansas. [Laughter.] In other words, in Arkansas they recognize true merit. When Mr. Nolan was returned to the penitentiary of North Dakota to serve the remainder of his life sentence, it was necessary for the people of Arkansas to call a special election to fill the office of public printer of the State of Arkansas.

So I want to say to my distinguished friend and colleague here today, I am not going to object to the nominations on the calendar. I am delighted to know that Minnesota is not trying to put Minnesota men into office as postmasters in the State of North Dakota; and I am grateful for the little crumbs we get from the Democratic administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota it appears that the process of elevation of prominent North Dakota citizens is by way of Minnesota. After hearing the very informative address of the Senator from North Dakota and learning that the distinguished former Governor of my State recruited all this splendid talent in North Dakota, I want to say, in the tradition of Floyd B. Olsen, an honorable man and a great governor, how grateful we are to the people of North Dakota for the talent they have shared with us. That was the original, I may say, of the Marshall plan; in a sense, the Marshall plan of the time. They were sharing the resources of the abundant and prosperous State of North Dakota with the good and, I may say, conscientious and sincere people of Minnesota. We are extremely grateful, and the Senator may be sure that if Minnesota can be helpful in securing any recognition for North Dakota in the upper eschelons of government, we shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LANGER. I thank my distinguished colleague; but the trouble is, he says one thing and does another. Last week there were vacancies on the Economic Stabilization Board. At that time, notwithstanding the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, four nominations were made, two from Minnesota, one from Montana, and one from South Dakota. Poor, poor North Dakota was left out. So I can only say that I hope the distinguished Senator will take a week off from his duties as Senator from Minnesota and will join me in being Senator from North Dakota, and during that time will help me get a member of the Cabinet, that we have never had; will help me get at least half a dozen consuls we have never had; will help me get some ambassadors, whom we have never had, and will help me get somebody into the policy-making divisions of the departments of the Government, whom we have never had. Minnesota has a proud record. The people of Minnesota have had men in the Cabinet, they have had consuls, they have had ambassadors. They have had everything that it is possible for them to have. Now I think they have two ambassadors, one of them to Cuba, Mr. Butler——

Mr. HUMPHREY. He resigned.

Mr. LANGER. And Mrs. Anderson, who is at present Ambassador to Denmark.

There has never been a man from the State of North Dakota on the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Judicial District. Minnesota has had as many as three at one time; South Dakota, two; Nebraska, two.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his offer of help. I accept it in the spirit in which it is offered. His office is next to mine, and I want to become better acquainted with him and find out how he does it for the State of Minnesota and whether he goes into the back door of the White House, as suggested the other day by the Senator from New Hampshire. I am going to ask the Senator from Minnesota to show me the back door. I do not know where it is. I always go to the front door.

In behalf of the people of North Dakota, I thank my distinguished colleague, and I assure him that I shall take advantage of his invitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs in customs collection district No. 27?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining nominations on the calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there be some further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1957. (Reappointment.)

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the term expiring June 30, 1953.

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the term expiring June 30, 1951.

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for terms of 2 years from July 1, 1950, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Walter E. Cosgriff, of Utah.
W. Elmer Harber, of Oklahoma.

C. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 1 year from July 1, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Seth W. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 3 years, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to be members of the Subversive Activities Control Board for terms of 2 years, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York.
Charles M. LaFollette, of Virginia.

The following-named persons to be members of the Subversive Activities Control Board for terms of 1 year, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts.
Kathryn McHale, of Indiana.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Chuck Mau, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert F. Jortberg
Anson C. Perkins

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William Jennings Bryan, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

CHIEF OF STAFF, SUPREME HEADQUARTERS, ALLIED POWERS, EUROPE, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Lt. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther, O12242.

CORPS COMMANDERS, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND AS LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. John William Leonard, O3840.
Maj. Gen. John Breitling Coulter, O3488.
Maj. Gen. Edward Mallory Almond, O4666.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PLANS, UNITED STATES ARMY, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND AS A LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, O6908.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Lawrence Carmel Jaynes, O10540.

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, O12269.
Brig. Gen. Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, O12353.
Brig. Gen. John Howell Collier, O12388.
Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, O15123.
Brig. Gen. William Brooks Bradford, O6661.
Brig. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479.
Brig. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845.
Brig. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004.
Brig. Gen. Wayne Clifton Zimmerman, O12436.
Brig. Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, O14905.
Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980.
Brig. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, O12376.
Brig. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746.
Brig. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Homer Case, O7090.
Col. John Charles Macdonald, O8402.
Col. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472.
Col. Onslow Sherburne Rolfe, O8637.
Col. Horace Harding, O9530.
Col. Frank Camm, O9902.
Col. Charles Wilbur Pence, O10283.
Col. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384.
Col. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663.
Col. Thomas Joseph Cross, O11431.
Col. William Thrower Fitts, Jr., O11917.
Col. Arthur William Pence, O12042.
Col. Joseph Jones Twitty, O12079.
Col. Claude Henry Chorpening, O12088.
Col. Orville Ernest Walsh, O12094.
Col. Eric Spencer Molitor, O12115.
Col. Hammond McDougal Monroe, O12132.
Col. Francis Andrew March, O12138.
Col. Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg, O12206.
Col. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247.
Col. Ernest Aaron Bixby, O12273.
Col. John Joseph Burns, O12299.
Col. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338.
Col. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832.
Col. Thomas Edward Lewis, O15020.
Col. John Joseph Binns, O15207.
Col. Kenneth Shearer Sweany, O15251.
Col. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777.
Col. Howard Everett Kessinger, O15692.
Col. Samuel Glenn Conley, O15707.
Col. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055.
Col. George Bateman Peploe, O16246.
Col. John Albert Dabney, O16602.
Col. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892.
Col. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947) and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, United States Air Force (Medical)

James G. Espey, Jr., AO322380.
Livingston P. Noell, Jr., AO381472.
John A. Norcross, O413505.

To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

Peter H. Dillard, AO364979.
Tom W. Duke, AO1735739.
Paul W. Myers, AO975797.

To be captain, United States Air Force (Dental)

Benjamin C. Gore, O397865.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (Medical)

Samuel E. Neely, 487967, United States Naval Reserve.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Dental)

Robert W. Bergmann, AO965220.
James H. Diriam, AO1906179.
Lee W. Helm, Jr., AO2059042.
Raymond C. Morris, AO1906201.
Charles T. Schwatka, Jr., AO1906266.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 2, Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress (act of June 25, 1948):

To be first lieutenants

Samuel E. Birdsong, Jr., AO861999.
David A. Botte, AO583665.
William A. Crawford, Jr., AO2060477.
James S. Dale, Jr., AO792807.
John V. Davies, AO671240.
Cornell DeGrothy, AO687999.
John J. Ensley, AO1796943.
Nicholas E. Gasaway, AO1643573.
Carl Goldschlager, AO730720.
Morris A. Hale, AO404620.
Fred Hamblen, 163837, United States Naval Reserve.
Billy S. Holland, AO377615.
LeRoy Kahn, AO1573315.
William J. Keeler, AO805844.
James J. Keough, AO1856948.
Francis G. McDonald O387161.
William H. Packer, AO666984.
Carl R. Pearson, AO800759.
Robert A. Prince, AO575953.
John M. Rankin, AO583483.
Albert M. Scruton, AO2046402.
William E. Shannon, AO737273.
Everett S. Van Matre, AO560436.
Robert L. Vickers, AO676180.
Charlie Y. Wier, AO725117.
John E. Wilcox, O1331899.
John C. Wiley, AO666109.
George M. Wilson, AO576730.

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Robert P. Adams
Conrad F. Ahrens
Dale R. Anderson
Richard M. Anderson
Gerard J. Andeskie
William O. Armstrong
Robert B. Artz
Earl L. Babcock
Billy N. Baker
John W. Baker
Robert E. Baker
Melville R. Barlow
Warren S. Barnes
Lee N. Barnett
Herbert E. Bell
Schuyler P. Berry, Jr.
Herman M. Blagg, Jr.
Charles H. Blanchard
Robert G. Blanchard
John M. Blount, Jr.
Waldemar E. Bode
Stanley Braun
Edmond J. Bronner
James H. Broussard
Edward A. Brown
Howard J. Browning
Gerald B. Bunker, AO1856376
George M. Burgess
Duane C. Burton
Robert P. Cady
Charles R. Campbell
Albert M. Card
William E. Carr
John L. Carson
Robert D. Carter
John E. Catlin, Jr.
Joe L. Church
Ralph A. Clack
Billy M. Collins
William J. Collins
Thomas P. Connelly
Vernon L. Connor
Fred D. Courtney
Francis G. Crawford, Jr.
Clifford D. Crompton
Walter R. Danielson, Jr.
Hubert P. Davis
Thomas B. Deen
Charles G. Deese
Randolph L. Dodd
Henry A. Domian
Cloyd J. Dowling, Jr.
Hans H. Driessnack
Charles H. Dudley
Richard E. Dussault
Richard A. Dutton
William C. Eagle
Gordon C. Edgar
William E. Elmore
Merle W. Emmert
Robert B. English, AO1856141
William C. Evans
Donald M. Fehlings
Bruce H. Ferguson
John A. Fiebelkorn
Bruce M. Fisher
Stephen M. Flanagan
Harold L. Fox
Frank D. Frazier
Francis W. Freeman, Jr., AO1863655
Donald F. Fryauf
David L. Gasser
Allison G. Glover
Paul F. Goodwin
Vernon D. Gores
Carl K. Greene, AO1854346
Kenneth W. Grubaugh
Leo W. Hall
Edward D. Hallett
Lawrence C. Harrington
William E. Harris, Jr.
James B. Harrison
John T. Hart
Joseph L. Hart
Edmund H. T. Hay, Jr.
Daymond E. Helton
John R. Higson
Lawrence W. Hitchins
Anthony E. Holland
Lemuel D. Horton
David R. Howard
William P. Hoyer
John D. Hunt
Evan E. Huston
Delmar G. Jacobs
John H. James, Jr.
Arthur L. Jarvela
Nathan L. Joel
Thomas H. Johns
Eugene A. Johnson
Harlan W. Johnson
William T. Johnson, Jr.
Richard A. Johnston
Frank G. Jones
Jacob N. Jones, Jr.
Nolan T. Jones
Richard M. Joppa
Leonard I. Kaplan
Evangelis H. Karalis
Arthur Karma
Edward W. Kassor, Jr.
Francis M. Kavanagh
Dare K. Keelan
Philip E. Kelgard
Robert J. Kiker
Paul E. Killion, AO1862339
William M. King
Dennett H. Kinnard
Philip E. Klein
John S. Knowles
Frederick G. Koehler
Edward F. Kramer, Jr.
Raymond A. Kucharchuk
Thomas J. Kuchera
Gladstone S. Lewis, Jr.
James P. Lindberg, Jr.
John T. Lindsay
Robert G. Little, Jr.
Curtis C. Love
Robert M. Lucas
John H. Ludwig
William G. MacLaren, Jr.
Solomon L. Madison
Hughie M. Maples, Jr.
Gerald E. Marsh
Don L. Marshall
James H. Marshall
Fernand F. Martin
Daniel P. Maxfield
Edward P. Mazak, Jr., AO1862545
John P. McConnell
David R. McDonald
Joseph H. Mendenhall
John Miller
Frank A. Modic
Marshall W. Moore

Guy L. Morrison, Jr.
Jimmy W. Mullins
Robert B. Murray, AO1853360
Roger R. Neel
Earle E. Nelson
Crawford Nevins
William L. Nichols
Joseph W. Noah
Paul L. Norris
Waymond C. Nutt
William C. O'Brien, AO1853471
Robert L. O'Connell
James J. Odom, Jr.
David J. Ottensmeyer
Henry W. Parlett
Frances W. Penney
George Penovich
Donald K. Percival
Donald C. Peterson
Harold E. Pfeifer
George K. Pickett
Joseph T. Pilcher, Jr.
Francis S. Pionowski
Jackson L. Raley
John W. Ray
Donald L. Reinertson
Charles R. Renfro, AO1864288
William H. Risteen, AO1863663
Samuel M. Robinson
Samuel Romano
John J. Ross III
B. W. Ryan
James H. Scharff
Alden A. Scott
William S. Seiers
James R. Selig
Robert B. Shaw
Hugh W. Shoults, AO1857757
Henry W. Simpson
Chadwick B. Smith
Lowell J. Smith, AO1863665
Roy W. Smith, Jr.
William E. Smurro
William G. Solomon
William R. Sommer
Orval C. Sorensen
John M. Staab
Richard R. Stanton, AO1853017
Gerald E. Starkey
James G. Steger
Spencer Struble
Emil Sturmthal, AO1853530
George E. Swick, Jr.
Shoji Takasugi
Henry L. Thomas
Ralph W. Thomas
James C. Thompson
Robert P. Tiel
John O. Tinius
George P. Tynan
John N. Van Dusen
William P. Venable, Jr.
William A. Volk
Charles W. Wallace
White M. Wallenborn
Frank A. Wallington
Marvin L. Walters
Eugene R. R. Warner
Robert W. Ward
Walter R. Weck
Burton L. Weller
Jerry D. Wethington
B. D. White, AO1904746
Clarence W. White, Jr.
John W. White
Simon S. White, Jr.
James L. Whitlaw
Edmund M. Whitmeyer
Richard B. Whittington
Richard J. Wieland
John C. Wilkerson
Bernard R. Williams, Jr., AO2061545
Henry N. Williams
James C. Williams III
Robert K. Wolf
Edward J. Woodhouse
Howard E. Wright
Benjamin F. Yancey, Jr.
Samuel D. Young, Jr.
Clarence E. Youngman

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Alfred S. Allen
Vernon H. Carter, Jr.
Lynwood E. Clark
Robert E. Darlington
William E. Dudley, Jr.
Leland R. Kirk
Allen D. LeBaron
Gilbert F. Libby
Vincent P. Luchsinger Jr.
William H. Martin
William J. Pollock
Eugene Raunikar
Eugene R. Starke
Virgil P. Swim
William W. Yary, O2000415

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Allen, Wallace Burns, 15390A.
Atchison, Frank Kester, 15400A.
Baggaley, Thaddeus Stevens, 15466A.
Baker, Ellis Crain, Jr., 15468A.
Barnhart, Harley E., 15488A.
Bates, Thomas Lawson, 15404A.
Bauman, Norman Joseph, 15481A.
Benkoski, Ernest Felix, 15443A.
Bernier, Norman William, 15480A.
Berry, Robert Earl, 15478A.
Berryman, Delbert Quinton, 15514A.
Bice, John Ward, 15498A.
Biles, Howard Kenneth, 15426A.
Bolen, George Oliver, Jr., 15453A.
Bond, Byron Franklin, 15434A.
Brady, Wendell Darrell, 15396A.
Buckwalter, Charles Quimby, 15515A.
×Buie, James Campbell, 15442A.
Cairns, Oliver William, 15411A.
Campbell, James Milton, 15519A.
Campbell, Warren Franklin, 15418A.
Canant, Orion Paul Davidson, 15464A.
Carrington, Richard Thompson, Jr., 15384A.
Childress, James Brack, 15527A.
Christian, Harold Winfield, Jr., 15462A.
Clark, Lester Earl, 15425A.
Cox, Frank Leroy, Jr., 15509A.
Cron, Rodney Leonard, 15483A.
Curfman, Arden Blain, 15427A.
Currie, Donald Archibald, Jr., 15491A.
Curtis, Jack Franklin, 15473A.
Davenport, Ernest Eldon, Jr., 15484A.
Davis, Burton Alfred, 15490A.
Davis, Harold Elmo, 15516A.
Deem, Ray Howard, Jr., 15416A.
DeSaussure, Hamilton, 15486A.
×de Wolski, Constantine Taddeus, 15448A.
Diehl, Alfred James, 15461A.
Dienst, William Lewis, 15415A.
Edwards, Dewey Fortner, 15497A.
Elliott, Merle Munson, 15525A.
Erbe, Robert Frank, 15394A.
Fleming, Lawrence John, 15459A.
Fritts, Robert Erwin, 15482A.
Frost, Murl, 15429A.
Gardner, Alfred James, 15465A.
Garner, Lynn Ellis, 15397A.
×George, Amin, Jr., 15454A.
Glover, Henry Atkins, 15508A.
Griffith, William Walters, 15492A.
Grissom, V. F., Jr., 15440A.
×Hallas, Gerald Edward, 15458A.
Hamilton, Jeff Lee, Jr., 15524A.
×Hanson, Junior Ole, 15409A.
Harnly, Merlin Wrightsman, 15446A.
Hart, Bernard David, 15511A.
Hatch, John T., 15517A.
Hatton, Sam James, 15513A.
Hennessy, Thomas Berchman, 15471A.
×Henshaw, Daniel Stewart, 15441A.
Hickcox, Harold Jennings, 15410A.
Hickman, Robert Gardner, 15403A.
Hicks, William, 15438A.
×Hinman, Richard Horace, 19541A.
Hoffman, Wesley Kammerer, 15502A.
Holdsambeck, Herbert Snead, 15476A.
Holley, Hazil Lee, 15398A.
Howard, Waldon A., 15507A.
Howell, Howard Dempsey, 15402A.
Hutchins, Raymond Henry, Jr., 15421A.
Jackson, Ralph Frederick, Jr., 15496A.
×Jacobsen, Raymond George, 15444A.
Johnson, Herbert Justus, 15457A.
Juhn, Kenneth Paul, 15452A.
Jureka, John Francis, 15432A.
×Keal, Thomas Lee, 15406A.
Keeffe, James Herbert, Jr., 15401A.
Keegan, Robert Emmett, 15505A.
Kerr, Frank Ross, 15423A.
Kimberlin, John Isham, 15463A.
Klinikowski, Walter Paul, 15512A.
Krieger, Andrew Warren, 15433A.
Lake, Gordon Wentworth, 15431A.
×Lansche, Robert Louis, 15500A.
Libell, Robert Warren, 15522A.
Marlow, Robert Dean, 15439A.
Marshall, William Edgar, 15424A.
Marxen, Edward Henry, Jr., 15393A.
McClelland, Robert Cornelius, 15435A.
McElroy, Sam Medford, 15437A.
McKay, Robert Barr, 15499A.
McKenna, William Wilfred, 15391A.
Meyler, Walter Patrick, 15494A.
Michels, William Nicholas, 15392A.
Miller, Edward Ashley, 15477A.
Miller, Frank Edward, Jr., 15479A.
Mimmaugh, Walter Edward, 3d, 15503A.
Mitchell, Vance Fitzgerald, 15528A.
Moullen, Roy Frederick, 15470A.
Nelon, Claude Rufus, 15417A.
Nicely, Gelvin Smith, 15414A.
Nixon, Floyd George, 15407A.
×Orrison, Charles Davidson, 15493A.
Partin, George Garrett, 15449A.
Pedracine, Patrick Charles, 15495A.
Peterson, Carl Herbert, 15456A.
Pickron, William Henry, Jr., 15395A.
Plame, Samuel, Jr., 15529A.
Porter, Philip Barton, 15520A.
Prow, Emmett McCormack, 15467A.
Quail, Donald Eugene, 15469A.
Richardson, Ned West, 15489A.
Robertson, Leslie Caroll, 15531A.
Rodgers, William Asklow, 15405A.
Ross, Marvin Turner, 15413A.
Roswurm, Richard Carl, 15530A.
×Ruggles, Bertram Leon, 15388A.
Salter, George Metz, Jr., 15451A.
Sampley, Troy Allen, 15455A.
Schaffner, Donald Raymond, 15526A.
Schroeder, Howard Richard, 15510A.
Scott, Gordon Holborn, 15445A.
Scott, Leon Luck, 15412A.
Seller, Wilbur Western, Jr., 15422A.
Sherrard, James Lamar, 15504A.
Smith, George Kitchen, 15506A.
Smith, John Carlyle, 15430A.
Smith, Robert Perry, 15386A.
Spears, Simms Memory, 15501A.
Spencer, Allan M., Jr., 15419A.
Spencer, Earl Wilber, 15436A.
Spencer, Glen Harding, 15408A.
Stevenson, Robin, 15485A.
×Swan, Algernon Gordon, 15472A.
Thompson, Raymond Farris, 15387A.
Trautwein, Donald Frederick, 15474A
Van Dyke, Wallace Ford, 15428A.
Venable, Calvin Houston, 15521A.
×White, Gerald Harn, Jr., 15447A.
White, Miller Grieve, Jr., 15385A.
Wilson, Clarence Edgar, 15518A.
Witham, Melvin Warren, 15475A.
×Wolfe, Donald Jack, 15450A.
Wright, Lawrence Chester, 15420A.
Yurcina, Thomas, 15399A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Darling, Kenneth Perry, 19523A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Blalock, Woodrow Wilson, 18297A.
Jenks, Harford Perry, 18299A.
Lockridge, Clarence Reynolds, 18298A.
May Edward Stanley, 18301A.
Palmer, William Joseph, 18304A.
Peters, Earl William, 20684A.
Plowden, Douglas Randolph, Jr., 20685A.
Reid, Addison Taylor, 18303A.
Sharp, David Martin, 18293A.
Shiver, Morris Eugene, 18294A.
Smith, Gayle LeRoy, 20683A.
Snyder, John Thomas, 18302A.
Tannenbaum, Leon Marvin, 20687A.
Thompson, Lawrence A., Jr., 18295A.
Toothman, Byron Rimbey, 20686A.
Trommershausser, John, 18300A.
Walter, Harvey Peter, 18296A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Lubrant, Anthony John, 21627A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress.

To be captain

AIR FORCE NURSE

Loyd, Eddie Ruth, 21131W.

To be first lieutenant

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

Deming, Elsie L., 20901W.

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to captain and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of March 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. John J. Ballentine, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Adm. Ingolf N. Kiland, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

The following-named enlisted men of the Navy for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy in the grades indicated:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Adair
Irving M. Applebaum
Carrol F. Bell
John E. Buchanan
Elmer "J" "B" Carr
John B. Copeland
Roy E. Curtis
Edward C. Czopek
George H. Doolittle
"R" "H" Dorman
John V. Draggie
Leon J. Drelicharz
Jack M. Farwell
Lyle F. Flick
Robert L. Gill
Walter J. Gregg
Reaves S. Heflin
Clarence H. Hutchison, Jr.
Harold Jennings
Ralph R. Johnson
Joseph F. Kakoi
Raymond G. Lair
Dean W. Larrick
Charles H. Long
Richard J. Long
Richard M. Manders
Cecil Manship
Joseph W. Mross
Clyde S. Newton
Gilbert H. Orr
Irving L. Patterson
John V. Patterson, Jr
David S. Rotchstein
William G. Schaufler
James N. Scofield, Jr.
Edward O. Sentar
Henry G. Smith
Hiram E. Smith, Jr.
Julian M. Steadman
Raymond O. Thuftedal
Cyril L. Touchette
Evan K. Williams
William L. Williams
George C. Willis
Charles H. Wittman, Jr.
Joseph J. Yakich
Frederick J. Young

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald L. Arvidson
David T. Avery
Bertram E. Barker
Robert O. Barnes
Emzer H. Bizzell, Jr.
Victor E. Blitz
Billie J. Bobek
Frank B. Bowen
Carl D. Brown
Donald B. F. Brown
James L. Chandler
Eugene C. Chase
Alvin L. Clark
Stuart W. Cochrane
Frank A. Dandrea
Earl S. Dickson
Jerome M. Dowling
William A. Doyle, Jr.
Edward A. Duff
Joseph Dugger
William W. Evans
Carl Everson
Floyd A. Faircloth
Howard D. Fields, Jr.
William M. Foster
Arnold J. Fransen
Bill B. Frink
James E. Goodman
Thomas J. Guilday, Jr.
Donald C. Hamilton
Robert C. Harris
"S" "J" Harris
Thomas G. Harty
Harlan J. Hays
Leo C. Hester
Delois V. Holloway
Wilton F. Johnson
Richard F. Johnston
Philip H. Jones
George E. Kenison
David V. Kyrklund
George L. Lamere
William H. Larson
Walter G. Leon, Jr.
Francis G. McEnaney
"G" "L" Marona
Paul A. Montgomery
Frank "E" Moy
Charles E. Nester
Walter E. Newell
Jay J. Niemann
Willard V. Noble
Lawrence E. O'Donnell
Harry E. Patterson
Seymour J. Premselaar
Thomas B. Pugh
John M. Richardson
Carl Sergun
Wilson W. Sheehan
Willard M. Shepard
Bert H. Smith
Boney T. Smith, Jr.
Robert W. Smith
Harvey G. Speed
Charles E. Spoerri
Gorman L. Strunk
Russell J. Timm
Harold R. Truesdale
William W. Vaughn, Jr.
Quinton O. Walters
George V. Warren
Donald F. Watson
Gerald M. Watson
William H. Watson, Jr.
David T. Williams
Walter T. Zebrowski

ENSIGN

Francis D. Furey

The following-named midshipmen (Aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Donald E. Adams
Corky J. W. Hedges
John T. Higgins
Arthur V. Kane
Robert P. LaMontagne
James M. Russ

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Charles E. Axtheim
Elmer A. Bloomquist, Jr.
Forrest A. Miller
William H. Payne
Clifford L. Peacock
Thomas J. Peterson, Jr.
Claude R. Stamey, Jr.
Donnell Van Noppen, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John R. Wassell

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Edwin M. Leach
Charles H. Ward

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Howard A. Baker
John R. Wassell

Harold A. Davis (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Betty L. Dunnam
Abbie C. Sheehan

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Anderson
Ralph G. Caldwell
Henry C. Duncan
Paul C. Hammerl
Martin J. Hoar
William M. Hunter
Joseph C. O'Brien
Edward O'N. Riley
George B. Riley
Alla W. Robertson

Harold F. Wimp (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

Will F. Graham (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Albert E. Brown
George P. Douglas
Seaborn C. Early
Martin Gellman
Neil E. Goodrich, Jr.
Paul "D" Grossnickle
David O. Hamrick
Roger L. Hiatt
James D. McIlraith
Henry B. Murphree, Jr.

Nancy M. Murtagh, woman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth D. Berzinger
Louise A. Buckingham
Patricia P. Crowe
Mary R. Easter
Ruth E. Eldridge
Joan M. Engle
Vera L. Foster
Regina A. Graney
Elizabeth L. Jaeger
Barbara E. Jago
Margaret Kantor
Mary A. Kelly
Mary E. Kirkland
Lillian D. Leutz
Catherine F. McCarville
Frances P. Maguire
Anna Sganga
Norma A. Sullivan
Marian J. Ulrich

The following-named warrant officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Willard C. Cannaday, Jr.
Broadus L. Gardner
Jack E. L. Carleton
Arnold M. Christiansen
William L. Gordon
Jasper S. Hardin
Ambrose H. Holdgrafer
John B. Jackson, Jr.
Clellan K. Keefe
Oscar W. Kihlstrom
Arthur E. Mayle
Mark E. McKin
Bernard F. Miller
Richard A. Seigler
Kenneth R. Wolf

CHIEF GUNNER

Fred Q. Gibson

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

William F. McNair

CHIEF ELECTRICIAN

Kenneth G. Armstrong, Jr.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Owen R. Brecker
Wiot L. Clarke
Edgar E. Fuller
Jack E. Hayes
Ovie D. Hixson
Wilfred R. Jackson
Kenneth C. Mathews
Claude W. Miller
Walter I. Mitchell
Reginald Peterson
David W. Snyder
Reid Wilson
James W. Woods
Norman G. Woods
James T. Wright
Guedon E. Zakotnik

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Jesse D. Cannon
Gayland M. Copeland
Wayne I. Egger
Jeptha B. Hicks
Roy C. Tamez
Stephen P. Yorden

CHIEF SHIPS CLERKS

Millard T. Baker
John Borgens
Vincent Y. Jones
Robert W. Palmer
Ronald J. Stafford

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICERS, HOSPITAL CORPS

Ocie T. Adams
Stewart K. Blanchard
Almon Carter
Robert H. Doud
Donald E. Feuquay
Ralph T. Goerner, Jr.
Robert F. Hoenscheidt
Frank L. Maxwell
Cecil J. Peart
Richard W. Ricker
Bernard T. Stradley
Francis E. Sullivan
Lowell W. Swartz
Johnny W. Young

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Odell M. Conoley
Louie C. Reinberg
William W. Buchanan
Jack Tabor
Joseph N. Renner
William R. Collins
Norman Van Dam
Herbert H. Williamson
John C. Miller, Jr.
Charles S. Todd
Thomas S. Ivey
Joseph L. Winecoff
James S. O'Halloran
William G. Robb
Ralph L. Houser
Robert C. Burns
Arthur A. Chidester
Reed M. Fawell, Jr.
Arthur J. Davis
Wendell H. Duplantis
Joseph R. Little, Jr.
Lawrence H. McCulley
Fenwick N. Reeve
Alexander A. Vandegrift, Jr.
George W. Hays
"A" "E" Dubber
Paul R. Tyler
Edmund M. Williams
Philip W. John
Harold B. Meek
Rathvon M. Tompkins
Charles M. Nees
Glenn D. Morgan
George B. Bell
Andrew B. Galatian, Jr.
Frederick R. Dowsett

Elby D. Martin, Jr.
Richard W. Wallace
John H. Masters
Harrison Brent, Jr.
William F. Kramer
Louis B. Robertshaw
William D. Roberson
Maynard M. Nohrden
Richard Rothwell
Herbert R. Nusbaum
DeWolf Schatzel
John H. Earle, Jr.
Bryghte D. Godbold
Glenn C. Funk
Robert C. McGlashan
Harold J. Mitchener
Leonard M. Mason
Joseph P. Sayers
Max C. Chapman
John D. Harshberger
John L. Smith
James S. Blais
Robert E. Galer
Cliff Atkinson, Jr.
Henry H. Crockett
David W. Stonecliffe
Milo G. Haines
Malcolm O. Donohoo
Stuart M. Charlesworth
Walter N. Flournoy
Robert F. Scott
Thomas C. Moore, Jr.
Kenneth A. King
Paul J. Fontana
Allen B. Geiger
George S. Bowman, Jr.
James G. Bishop, Jr.
Thornton M. Hinkle
Ronald K. Miller
Edward W. Johnston
Louis A. Ennis
Charles L. Banks
James L. Neefus
James C. Murray, Jr.
William H. Barba
George F. Britt
Robert W. Boyd
Spencer S. Berger
Marion M. Magruder
August F. Penzold, Jr.
George W. Killen
Noah P. Wood, Jr.
Jean H. Buckner
John S. Twitchell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harvey M. Miller
John R. Barreiro, Jr.
William McReynolds
John E. Sundholm
Robert W. Glickert
John L. Hopkins
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.
James G. Kelly
William C. Ward, Jr.
John T. Bradshaw
Robert E. Collier
Alexander A. Elder
Ward K. Schaub
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.
Alvis H. Allen
Robert K. McClelland
Clifford F. Quilici
Rufus D. Sams, Jr.
Thomas M. Burton
Victor R. Bisceglia
James H. Tatsch
Robert Y. Stratton
Amedeo Rea
Nathaniel Morgenthal
Louis G. Ditta
Gerald F. Russell
John T. O'Neill
Tom N. Hasperis
Ernest L. Medford, Jr.
Frederick J. Mix, Jr.
Ralph H. Currin
Arthur H. Haake
Oscar F. Peatross
Frank E. Garretson
Norman R. Nickerson
George A. Rickert
Norman Pozinsky
Fraser E. West
Quinton R. Johns
Donald G. H. Jaeckels
Stanley S. Nicolay
Darrel D. Irwin
James K. Dill
Stephen J. Zsiga
Vernice S. Calvert
Robert E. A. Lillie
Anthony J. Dowdle
Granville Mitchell
Paul B. McNicol
Charles C. Campbell
Marvin L. Ross
George C. Axtell, Jr.
Harold B. Penne
Walter J. Carr, Jr.
Charles Kimak
Wallace G. Fleissner
Robert H. Gray
Eugene V. Boro
Louie N. Casey
John J. Wade, Jr.
Karl N. Smith
Horace C. Parks
Bernard W. McLean
Olin W. Jones, Jr.
John L. Frothingham
Chester L. Christenson
Horace E. Knapp, Jr.
Stephen C. Munson, Jr.
Henry H. Reichner, Jr.
Edwin B. Wheeler
John B. Sweeney
Grant S. Baze
William T. Bray
Quintin A. Bradley
George D. Webster
Carl M. Johnson
George F. Vaughan
Henry S. Campbell
David M. Danser
James G. Brady
Robert N. Barrett, Jr.
Harry W. Edwards
James P. Rathbun
Arthur J. Rauchle
Edward J. Doyle
Wilbur R. Helmer
Paul H. Millichap
Bernard T. Kafka
Edward P. Dupras, Jr.
Louis C. Griffin
Houston Stiff
James E. Herbold, Jr.
John S. Hudson
James K. Eagan
Meryl F. Kurr
Webb D. Sawyer
Samuel L. Grigsby
Winston E. Jewson
Robert A. Campbell
George E. Moore
Donald E. Noll
Edward R. Gilbert
William P. Oliver, Jr.
Maxie R. Williams
Peter I. Olsen
Harry D. Pratt
Theodore A. Demosthenes
Sherman W. Parry
Frank A. Long
Robert T. Neal
Richard G. Warga
Kenneth N. Hilton
Joseph C. Missar
Charles E. Dobson, Jr.
Raymond C. Portillo
Edward G. Roff, Jr.
Walter M. Caulfield
Arnold W. Harris
Stanley M. Adams
John P. Wilbern
Raymond G. Coyne
Leonard D. Reid
Milton G. Cokin
Howard E. Wertman
Sidney J. Altman
Harry O. Buzhardt
James A. Feeley, Jr.
John R. Spooner
Joseph H. Elliott, Jr.
James T. McDaniel
Robert P. Keller
Donald H. Sapp
Richard M. Caldwell
Alan J. Armstrong
Robert E. Cameron
Donald S. Bush
Frank R. Porter, Jr.
Walter E. Gregory
Charles P. Weiland
John S. Payne
John P. Newlands
Albert W. Campbell
Fenton J. Mee
Spencer H. Pratt
Elwyn M. Stimson
Albert Arsenault
Frank A. Gunner, Jr.
David A. Van Evera
John V. Kelsey
John F. Corbett
Robert B. Farrelly
James H. Clark
Kenneth R. Chamberlain
Philip L. Crawford
Clifton N. Harvel
Leslie T. Bryan, Jr.
James W. Poindexter
Wilbur A. Free
Robley E. West
John H. King, Jr.
Robert J. Bear
Arthur K. Bourret
James R. Wallace
Hoyle R. Barr
Donald P. Frame
Douglas A. Bangert
Thomas G. Bronleewe, Jr.
Richard J. Ofstad
Julius W. Ireland
Harold E. Allen
Harold G. Schlendering
Charles E. Hinsdale
Clay A. Boyd
William J. Howatt
William G. Shoop
David S. Randall
James W. Sperry
James A. Michener
George G. Pafford
Edwin G. Winstead
William C. Esterline
William H. Marsh
James R. Blackwell
Leo J. Dulacki
George W. E. Daughtry
Raymond M. Hogue
Bruce B. Hammond
Stanley J. Nelson
John H. Brickley
David R. Griffin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Coady
John A. Hefti
Ernest E. Codere
William R. Watson, Jr.
Joseph H. Griffith
George L. Shead
William H. Kennedy, Jr.
Harold L. Oppenheimer
Foster C. LaHue
John J. Padley
James M. Joyner
Leo B. Case
William J. Dickinson
Irving Schechter
Leonard G. Hicks
Warren S. Siverstsen
John E. Gorman
George M. Chinn
Henry W. Bransom
Blaine H. Baesler
Edward J. McGee
Charles D. Gray
Paul E. Bardet
Fred W. Haxton
Clarence C. Gordon
James W. Dodson
John A. Reeder
Glen E. Martin

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Kennard F. Bubier

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Helen J. McGraw
Barbara J. Bishop
Emma H. Hendrickson

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James B. Seaton

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert J. Assad
James L. McGuire

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James H. Harrington
Daryl G. Sheehan
George C. Hunter
Ray W. Patterson
Ralph E. Johnson
Charles W. Keeton
Charles D. Pierce, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Joseph H. Turner, Billingsley.
Baugh E. Kilgore, Bynum.
James B. Martin, Jr., Springville.

ALASKA

Clarence T. Larsen, Seward.

CONNECTICUT

Raymond J. Wamester, Middletown.
Francis C. Brennan, Milford.

GEORGIA

Sybil M. Vickers, Ambrose.
James L. Cauthen, Milner.

IDAHO

Jalma A. Riley, Ashton.

INDIANA

Kenneth D. Brunson, Alexandria.
Norman A. Richwine, Clermont.
Perry W. Foster, Vallonia.

KENTUCKY

Foster Ratliff, Lookout.
Charles B. Westerman, Pleasure Ridge Park.
Elmer H. Morrison, Wayland.

LOUISIANA

Robert G. Fitzgerrald, Oakdale.

MAINE

Rosaire P. Plante, Jackman Station.
Harland E. Johnson, Monson.
Joseph L. Cook, Portland.
Villa M. Snow, Pownal.
Dominick S. DeFilipp, Ridlonville.
Leo N. Poirier, Van Buren.

MARYLAND

Manuel R. Diaz, Luke.

MICHIGAN

Leon D. Wallaker, Arcadia.
Hazel D. Harrison, Conklin.
William O. Kelly, Flint.
Stella A. Ritchie, New Troy.
Willet H. Schmidt, Port Austin.
Valentine R. Smith, Saugatuck.
William K. LaCombe, Trenary.
Russell K. Kilpatrick, Vermontville.

MONTANA

James Roy Cramer, Polson.
Ralph L. Benjamin, Shelby.

NORTH CAROLINA

Neva B. Wilkins, Butner.
Francis H. Powell, Ca-Vel.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elmer L. Schielke, McClusky.
Edward J. Sondag, Sykeston.

OHIO

Dory R. Swank, Butler.
Arnold T. Schoch, Coldwater.
Florence E. Gerty, Hamden.
Oliver C. Metzger, Strasburg.

OKLAHOMA

Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

Margaret E. Wirth, Adair Village.
Alice G. Kavanaugh, Manzanita.

RHODE ISLAND

Gianuario Spanedda, Georgiaville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Troy J. Lynch, Coward.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Edward C. Hausmann, Bonesteel.

TEXAS

Willard E. Howell, Alvord.
Jack G. Holson, Bacliff.
Harry O. Lindeman, Bartlett.
Harold B. Manry, Corrigan.
James H. Breeding, Encinal.
Robert F. Henderson, Frost.
Grace W. Blanchard, Fullerton.
Elbert H. Brown, Hubbard.
Ruth V. Hestand, Keene.

VERMONT

George E. McCanna, Hardwick.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Adams, Appalachia.

WYOMING

Oliver J. Colyer, Torrington.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 12 (legislalative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following personnel of the United States Coast Guard sent to the Senate on January 15, 1951:

Dwight H. Dexter	Martin Lentz, Jr.
Lewis H. Shackelford	Hamlett I. Allen
Edward W. Holtz	Michael J. Hoosick
Herbert F. Walsh	David H. Douglas
William W. Storey	Theron H. Gato
Edwin J. Roland	Edwin W. Coleman
Christian R. Couser	Robert S. Capp
Willard L. Jones	Leslie F. Cool
Robert N. Williams	John D. Roberts
Russell W. Thresher	Raymond J. Evans
William E. Schweizer	Scott P. Berryman
George F. Erwin	Willis G. Partridge
Wilfred Pantzer	Nelson W. Allen
Walter G. Davis	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou infinite and eternal God, we rejoice that in the annals of our national history we have the record of the life and character of many God-fearing souls who served their generation according to Thy holy will and of whose fame there will be no end.

We thank Thee for this day when we are privileged to call to mind and pay tribute to the memory of a great patriot in whose heart the fires of faith in God and man burned brightly and who placed his supreme confidence in the sanctity and abiding reality of the moral and spiritual order.

Grant that our beloved country may continue to have as its glorious aspiration and far-flung goal the coming of that blessed time when men everywhere shall walk together, unitedly and joyously, as brothers, on the highways of freedom and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the House was considering the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] offered an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the so-called escape-clause amendment. Mr. BAILEY's substitute appears in full on pages 1113 and 1114 of the daily RECORD of February 7, 1951. I made the point of order against that amendment on the ground that it was not germane and that point of order was sustained. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] then offered an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, containing the identical language of his first amendment with the exception of the heading which was altered to provide a specific amendment to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, instead of adding merely a new section to the bill under consideration. This amendment was germane. However, in the reading of it, page 2 of the amendment was misplaced. It was, I am informed, at the Clerk's desk. I am sure the Committee was aware that it was considering the language contained in the two pages of the Bailey amendment as originally offered. My friends on the other side of aisle accepted the amendment as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, and it was agreed to by the Committee of the Whole and subsequently by the House on a separate vote.

Permit me to read that part of the amendment which was read by the clerk, and then read the second page which was not read:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Amend section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended, by adding thereto the following subsections:

"SEC. 5. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement any product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I read the second page of the amendment which should follow at the end of section 7 of the bill:

Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that serious injury is being caused or threatened through the importation of the article in question, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury.

(c) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for such a recommendation to the President it shall, after due investigation and hearings, make a finding in support of its denial of the application, setting forth the facts which have led to such conclusion. This finding shall set forth the level of duty below which, in the Commission's judgment, serious injury would occur or threaten.

In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission shall deem a downward trend of production, employment, and wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales and a higher or growing inventory attributable in part to import competition, to be evidence of serious injury or a threat thereof.

Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] I feel that in all fairness to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] a correction should be made in the proceedings of the House, and I now ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 1612 was passed be vacated and that the language of the amendment I have just read be agreed to in toto as an amendment to the bill at the point it was intended, section 7 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been consulted on this matter; so has the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] stated.

I do want to say this, however, for a very efficient reading clerk, that I saw the confusion of the many papers that were on his desk at the time this amendment was read, and I can readily understand how this mistake could have been made. I have no intention whatever of holding the reading clerk to blame.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to lay any blame at all, not for 1 minute, and what I have said and am saying is in no way to be construed as criticism of the clerk. It was not the fault of the clerk; it was just one of those errors that may occur when an amendment is presented to the clerk's desk consisting of two pages and the two pages are not attached.

Mr. REED of New York. I realize the gentleman was not making any such implication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the proceedings whereby the House on February 7, 1951, ordered the bill H. R. 1612 engrossed, read a third time, and passed will be vacated. The amendment as read by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is agreed to and the bill will be considered as engrossed, read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 127, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers the following members of the House: Mr. GARMATZ, Maryland; Mr. BISHOP, Illinois.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER, Mississippi; Mr. D'EWART, Montana.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as Members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. BENTSEN, Texas; Mr. YATES, Illinois; Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 33, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, Texas, chairman; Mr. MANSFIELD, Montana; Mr. EVINS, Tennessee; Mr. BURTON, Virginia; Mr. MULTER, New York; Mr. MCKINNON, California; Mr. HALLECK, Indiana; Mr. HILL, Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, New York; Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Connecticut; Mr. CURTIS, Missouri.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 93, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Education and Training and Loan Guaranty Programs of World War II Veterans the following Members of the House: Mr. TEAGUE, Texas, chairman; Mr. ENGLE, California; Mr. EVINS, Tennessee; Mr. CHUDOFF, Pennsylvania; Mr. PATTEN, Arizona; Mr. WEICHEL, Ohio; Mr. BEALL, Maryland; Mr. SCUDDER, California; Mr. MORTON, Kentucky.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE USE OF CHEMICALS, PESTICIDES, AND INSECTICIDES IN AND WITH RESPECT TO FOOD PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 74, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Use of Chemicals, Pesticides, and Insecticides in and With Respect to Food Products, and for other purposes, the following Members of the House: Mr. DELANEY, New York, chairman; Mr. ABERNETHY, Mississippi; Mr. HEDRICK, West Virginia; Mr. JONES, Missouri; Mr. MILLER, Nebraska; Mr. MCDONOUGH, California; Mr. HORAN, Washington.

COMMUNIST PEACE COUNCIL

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to an attempt by the sneaking Communist traitors to use the proposal to draft 18-year-olds as a wedge to reach parents of young men with their propaganda designed to undermine the morale of our people for the benefit of the Kremlin-directed Communist conspiracy. I am in receipt of several petitions printed and circulated by the Southern California Peace Council. At the top in bold, black-faced type, they say, "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier." This is followed by the usual Communist propaganda, and at the bottom the petition is addressed to the Congress and has room for only four signatures above the printed words "Southern California Peace Council, 326 West Third Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif."

The Communists are, of course, fully cognizant of the fact that many good citizens are concerned, as we all are, over the necessity of requiring our young men to spend considerable time in the Armed Forces. They are seeking to capitalize upon this concern by using it as a pretense to contact as many citizens as possible in order to spread their propaganda calculated to destroy faith in our Government, weaken our Armed Forces, and our determination to resist the aggression plotted by the imperialists in the Kremlin. We can see the propaganda on the petitions, but we know not what lies the Communists used to obtain the signatures. We can well imagine that those who signed will be indexed and cataloged for future softening up by the Communists.

Before coming here from Los Angeles, I received first a telegram and then a mimeographed letter from this so-called Peace Council. The communications denounced the draft and universal military training. They claimed that these proposals emanated from a Nazi general, and were so obviously the product of the Communist Party that I immediately forwarded them to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the same time, I sent an investigator to the address of the so-called Peace Council. He found there only a locked door with a paper on the outside, and the name "Southern California Peace Council" written on the paper. Apparently, this Communist brainchild was hastily conceived, and the nefarious propaganda was considered so important to the Communists that they started spewing it out before they had time to give their infant "front" organization even the outward appearance of legitimacy.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House because similar fake peace councils may be operating in other areas, at least it is a fair guess that if they are not, they soon will be; and the great, free American press, which effectively exposed the Stockholm Peace Petition, will render another service to the people by warning them not to be induced by the Communists into signing petitions that are not directed to the Congress in good faith by the instigators of the scheme, but are rather another attempt by the Communist traitors to make dupes of well-intentioned persons who for their own reasons are opposed to universal military training or the drafting of 18-year-olds. The Communists are, of course, against any American preparedness of any kind. They would like to see us weak and Russia strong. They would like to see us completely disarmed and the Communists fully armed. They have no objection to universal military training or the drafting of 18-year-olds by the Russian Red Fascists. They will not hesitate to capitalize on the slightest doubts of any of our citizens, or our sincere desire for peace, to try to convince us that we need only to lie down meekly like a good, little lamb, and we will be safe. Safe, of course, in fact, for them to slaughter. These phony peace councils must be exposed, and I hope the Attorney General will place them on the subversive list, where I am sure they belong, so that our press can tell the truth about this latest tactic of the agents of the enemy operating within our Nation.

I DIDN'T RAISE MY BOY TO BE A SOLDIER

The plan to draft 18-year-olds for 27 months of universal military service would affect every family in America.

We who are mothers desire peace, security, happiness for our children. We did not raise them to go to war.

We who are fathers fought in two wars which were supposed to bring peace and security to our children. We don't want them to go to war.

We who are young demand the right to live in the world our mothers desire, for which our fathers fought—a world of peace, of jobs, careers, marriage.

We who are children want no more bomb drills, no more fear. We want a world of hope and peace.

A little war in Korea has solved no problem in the world. It has added to all problems. A bigger Army, a bigger war, is not a better answer. Peace can be won only through honest negotiations by heads of state.

We can stop plans for the 27-month draft, a bigger Army, a bigger war, we can speak and we can sign for peace.

Your voice, your signature, can stop the 27-month draft, can stop war, can bring peace. Sign this petition. Ask your neighbors to sign, and forward it to your Congressman.

To the Congress of the United States:

We petition you to act for peace—not war. Defeat all plans for the 27-month draft of our youth for universal military service.

Name_____ Address_____ City_____

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PEACE COUNCIL,
326 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ARMED FORCES TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the creation of a students' Armed Forces training program and for other purposes.

The primary purpose of this bill is to establish an Armed Forces training program which will utilize the existing plants and facilities of schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable in providing preliminary military training—as well as technical, specialized, and other scientific training—to persons serving in the armed forces. Many schools and colleges possess plants and facilities today which are well adapted and can be made readily available for such training. The establishment of this program will substantially benefit the Government by eliminating the necessity and expense of constructing and maintaining numerous training camps, and will in addition enable many schools and colleges to continue to function under conditions which, by reason of the service of students in the Armed Forces, might otherwise force their closing.

In order to carry out the stated purpose of the bill, the Secretary of Defense is directed in general terms to create a Students' Armed Forces Training Corps, to establish units of the corps at schools and colleges which meet the requirements laid down by him, and to provide by regulations for its organization, operation, and administration. The admission standards and courses of instruction are to be prescribed by the Secretary, with one exception: It is specifically provided that if 18-year-olds are inducted they must be given preliminary training in uits of the corps for at least a full academic year before being assigned to other duty.

The Students' Armed Forces Training Corps is to be patterned as closely as possible after the Students' Army Training Corps created during World War I by order of the War Department. The Students' Army Training Corps program of World War I was initiated by placing certain colleges under military control on a contract basis, enlisting the students, and continuing them in regular army status with full pay. Vacancies subsequently occurring were filled by the colleges themselves on the basis of examinations and aptitude tests devised by the Army, and a central clearance arrangement made the surplus of one institution available for units at other institutions. During the brief period of its existence, about 10,000 members of the Students' Army Training Corps were transferred to various branches of the Armed Forces for active duty, and the program was universally considered a valuable and promising one.

Since under this bill the inclusion in the corps of all 18-year-old inductees is mandatory, it is not contemplated that the Students' Armed Forces Training Corps can be an exact replica of its World War I model. However, the basic organizational structure of the Students' Army Training Corps and the experience gained in its establishment and operation should prove to be of great value in providing for its present-day successor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DENNY (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

TASK CONFRONTING OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Illinois Republican delegation in Congress and as a Representative from the great State of Abraham Lincoln, I feel it incumbent upon me to say that the great task that lies before the Nation today is the task of changing the present government in Washington from a government of the bureaucrats, by the bureaucrats, and for the bureaucrats, into the kind of government that Lincoln was talking about when he defined our Government as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is the great task that confronts this Congress today. May God give us the strength, the courage, and the fortitude to carry out that task.

READING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 22, 1951, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL GUARD MEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that members of the National Guard in many States are disturbed and irritated and this bitterness arises from the uncertainty of their position, but chiefly because private employers are denying increases in pay and promotion to National Guard men, using the excuse that these employees will soon be called into active service, and therefore will not be available for civilian work.

It is needless for me to point out that the morale of our National Guard troops is of vital importance to the welfare of our country. The National Guard constitutes the greatest organized force of trained troops we have in this country, many of them veterans of the last war, and they would constitute an important part of our first line of defense in the event of conflict.

To deny these men earned pay increases or promotions in their daily work because of selfish reasons, is in my opinion indefensible, in fact, despicable. In a sense, it is sabotage of our defense effort. It should bring down on the heads of such employers righteous anger and contempt.

Of what value are National Guard men or other men called into service whose enthusiastic belief in our American system of private enterprise has been destroyed or impaired even before they reach the fighting line. If they are not fighting for their employers as well as their country, themselves, and their families, who are they fighting for?

It does not seem possible to me that there can be many such American business or professional men, so irresponsible, so selfish, and so unpatriotic, as to penalize these volunteers for performing their patriotic duty.

Those who employ members of the National Guard or other young men about

to be called into service should recognize that these employees are the representatives of their employers and the companies for which they work on the fighting line, and they should help carry the rifles and equipment these men expect to carry into battle by honoring them, encouraging them, and holding out the promise of rewards when they return.

A man or woman who volunteers to protect his or her country under the threat of war has developed a sense of responsibility of the highest order and has attributes that are bound to be successful in the business or professional world.

Employers should be proud of the fact that those who are called into service should be recognized for what they are, the defenders of their employers, and have placed an obligation on their employers hard to repay.

Every association of business and professional men in this country should make every effort to arouse enthusiasm for our National Guard members and every employee called into service should urge their members to reward their patriotism in every possible way while they are awaiting the call, and agree to welcome them back into their old jobs or better ones when they are released from service.

On the uncertainty as to when our Organized Reserves are to be called out I suggest that the Army, Navy, and Air Force can give commanding officers some information as to when the National Guard or other units can expect to be called into active service, and thereby reduce the uncertainty even in these uncertain times.

While I realize it presents deep consideration and presents difficulties, it seems to me that the Department of Defense or the Army can at least make a broad general statement which will allay fears and clarify the situation without giving information or aid to the potential enemy.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of January 21, 1951]

BAY STATE GUARD ASKS PENTAGON END UNCERTAINTY

The Massachusetts National Guard yesterday appealed to Secretary of Defense Marshall to be informed as to the approximate date it may be called to active Federal service.

The request was contained in a resolution adopted by the National Guard Association of Massachusetts at its sixty-fourth annual convention at the Copley Plaza.

Some 1,100 officers of ground and air components voted unanimous approval after Brig. Gen. Edward D. Sirois, president, declared guardsmen are being discriminated against in civilian jobs.

The request to the Pentagon was based on the appeal that it would end unnecessary uncertainty and undue hardship.

"We should be able to plan our lives accordingly," said Sirois, the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division's artillery commander. "We have a right to know when our services are to be expected."

Asserting that guardsmen are confused, don't know what their role is to be, Sirois heatedly told the convention that some had lost jobs, been replaced, or passed over in promotion, "simply because we are subject to active duty call."

The Massachusetts National Guard, he said, was ready to perform in an emergency, "although few, if any, of us relish the prospect—but we are ready if needed."

TIMETABLE IS URGED

"We are not complaining, just begging that our lives are not further complicated," he said. "A timetable should be prepared. If mobilization is to be delayed, we should know about it. Our lives have been more complex and involved than the average citizen's."

Governor Dever, who left his hospital bed to address the convention, upheld General Sirois' opinion.

"You should be told what the future months hold in store for you," the Governor said. "I have little patience with those who would resist the call of need in this hour of peril. The fact of your membership in the guard is proof you are willing to serve if the need is present. But you should be informed of any prospect of the need."

Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., State adjutant general, described the future for the guard as "a foggy uncertainty."

Reminding commanders to be ready when the call comes, he urged "utmost zeal in pursuing your recruiting campaigns so when induction comes, the measure of our industry will be judged by the completeness of our formations."

General Harrison issued a warning to all unit commanders to hasten the completion of a screening process ordered last week by the National Guard Bureau.

STATE AIR GUARD PLAN HINTED

"It is important that all personnel who will not be available or physically unacceptable for induction into active Federal service be eliminated from the Massachusetts National Guard as soon as possible," General Harrison declared. He disclosed that he attended a Washington military conference on Thursday.

Possibility that the Massachusetts National Air Guard may soon be federalized was indicated by Maj. Gen. Willis H. Hale, commanding general of the First Air Force.

After informing the convention that all enlisted personnel of the Air Force Reserve in the United States will be subject to induction starting tomorrow, he remarked in an aside "that it wouldn't be a bad idea to shine up your buttons, too." This suggestion was directed to Brig. Gen. Lyle Halstead, commander of the 102d Fighter Wing, a State guard unit.

General Sirois and Col. Otis M. Whitney, commanding the 182d Regimental Combat Team, vice president, were reelected. The new second vice president is Col. Edward H. Bradford, Jr., commanding officer of the 102d Maintenance and Supply Group, M. A. N. G.

Speakers at the banquet were Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University who is frequently consulted by Washington as to affairs in Russia because of his first-hand knowledge of that country, and Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

Other convention speakers were Senator Richard L. Furbush, president of the Massachusetts Senate; Maj. Gen. William I. Rose, commander of the 26th Division; Maj. Gen. Charles G. Helmick, commanding general of the New England Subarea, United States Army, and Col. Edgar C. Erickson, chief, administrative office, National Guard Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COLLEGE TRAINING FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the draft of 18-year-olds is facing us squarely. We cannot dodge it, we must meet it without flinching. It is foreign to our way of thinking, this compulsory calling of young men to the armed service, but there is one thing that is worse, that is recalling the veteran who has served and suffered in the last war. He probably is married, may have several children, and has made a place for himself in our economic life. His return to the military life means a psychological and material loss of considerable consequence.

There is no way to compromise. The 18-year-old must be called or not called. The drastic step must be taken because of manpower shortages and for the safety of our country. The young unattached and unfettered man must go.

There is, however, a way in which the harsh step of snatching him away from his course of education and his family may be softened if not improved. During my service in the last war as an inspecting officer, I had occasion to visit some 50 college training detachments of the Air Force all over the eastern and southern parts of the country.

These training detachments operated at colleges between the basic training and the classification of pilot candidates. The boys underwent a college curriculum of 4 to 8 months and at the same time received military instruction and some pilot instruction from Air Corps officers. In my wide experience it was a successful experiment. It continued the education of the young men. It interested them to such an extent that it encouraged a large percentage of them to return to college after their military experience. It helped their morale and it made their families feel better about their future. Incidentally, it helped the colleges, particularly the smaller ones, in a time of critical need.

Basic military training is at best a drudge. It is not a full time job nor a full day's work. The old Army practice, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, is to get the boys up about 5 a. m., give them calisthenics now known as P. T., followed by close order drill for discipline and alertness. Then they indulge in obstacle races and an hour or so of class work. This program cannot go on for a full day. It is not physically possible. So the students are largely left to their own devices for perhaps half of the day. This is when their morale and their morals suffer, and they really take a beating after many weeks of the same.

My proposal, therefore, and I think it is a practical one, is that the basic training for 18-year-olds be combined with the same number of months of college training for those who are fitted for it and continued school training for those who have not reached that standard. There will be many who are not prepared for active college training. That this training be accomplished simultaneously at a number of colleges, preferably smaller ones, to be selected and designated by the Armed Forces. This plan will continue the education of the young man, give him a taste of college curriculum, help his morale, satisfy his parents, and materially help the colleges which are selected.

The cost will not be great. A full college tuition need not be paid. The groups of trainees will be small so that a minimum of military instructors will be on duty. The overhead of a large camp will be eliminated. The comfort, housing, feeding, and care of the boys will be immeasurably better. They will not be introduced to military life in large expanses of primitive, dusty, and uncongenial barracks. Life will be more pleasant and above all they will be constructively occupied. It is my firm belief that if this plan is followed we will turn out better soldiers and better men. The sheep will be separated from the goats and all of them will be developed, as our pilots were in the last war, into the finest young men in the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, every patriotic American not only wants to know, but is entitled to know, what is wrong with the so-called loyalty program of President Truman which keeps Communists in our Federal Government and at the same time coddles and protects them. The one who is more guilty than anyone else is the President himself, because he is the one who set up the present program and prescribed the standards under which the Loyalty Review Board has to operate under his Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I went to great lengths to point out the inconsistency of the President's loyalty program in my testimony as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 5, 1948. The Truman program reminds me of the thief who hollered "Thief, thief" and pointed to another man running down the street so the people would not detect his guilt. The President should know all about "red herrings" as he has been on friendly terms with them for years, and I now charge that his loyalty program is by far the biggest "herring" ever to be pulled before the eyes of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is but the first of a series of speeches I propose to make during the next few months that will draw the iron curtain of secrecy and expose those who are guilty of protecting Communists in our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the recent conviction of William Remington is cause enough to make the Congress of the United States give some sober thought and study to the cause and cure of Communists and their fellow travelers in Government service. In my speeches on this subject I will give the names and present the documented proof on those in high places in Government and out of Government who have been guilty of protecting Communists in Government. I will also recommend a remedy whereby no person of questionable loyalty will remain in Government. Then if the President is not willing to rectify his mistakes, I will lead a fight to have the Congress withhold every penny of appropriation from the United States Civil Service Commission and the Loyalty Review Board.

I also propose to show that these same people who have been protecting Communists in Government have been the arch conspirators in another program. They have attempted either to have dismissed from Government service people who are best qualified to deal with this loyalty program or to see that they are put away into what is generally referred to around Washington as "the deep freeze." I will show that there would never have been any necessity of spending millions upon millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in setting up a Loyalty Review Board if the Commissioners of the United States Civil Service Commission had fulfilled their obligations under the law and taken proper and adequate measures against those they knew to be disloyal to our country. Instead they yielded to outside pressure to have individuals rated eligible when they knew them to be ineligible.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the Loyalty Review Board, set up by President Truman under Executive Order No. 9835, of March 21, 1947. First, the President appointed a board of 12 people, under Mr. Seth Richardson, none of whom were qualified for the position because not a single one of them had worked in the field of subversive activities, particularly that of communism. Secondly, the President absolutely prevented the Board from effectively carrying out a real loyalty program because of the restrictions in the standards or yardstick under which they have to work. For instance, on page 4 of his Executive order in section 1 under Part V, Standards, is the following:

1. The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

I wish to call your attention to the last part of section 1, which reads as follows:

Reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

You will note that the word "is" denotes present tense and proves to be the joker in the prescribed standards.

Strictly speaking, an employee could be ever so disloyal, and so found by the Loyalty Poard within an agency where he is employed, but when he appeals to the Loyalty Review Board of the United States Civil Service Commission he could contend to the Board that at that very moment he is entirely devoted and loyal to the Government of the United States, and under the present standards the Loyalty Review Board would necessarily render a judgment finding the employee not presently disloyal. One can readily see that the Loyalty Review Board is handicapped under the President's standards as set forth in his Executive Order No. 9835.

For 4 years Mr. Seth Richardson was Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board and it was Mr. Richardson who passed judgment in the Remington case. Mr. Richardson, after 4 years as Chairman, cannot say he was unaware of the shortcomings of Truman's loyalty program, because with all the facts of the William Remington case before him he was the one who said that the record did not prove Remington "presently" disloyal. Not once is there any public record that Mr. Richardson went to the President and pointed out the deficiencies in the loyalty program and demanded they be remedied. Nor is there any public evidence that a single one of the Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission ever informed the President that the loyalty program was inadequate and unworkable.

For his faithful adherence to a program that was doomed to failure from the very start, Mr. Richardson was promoted to the chairmanship of the Subversive Control Board, set up under the McCarran Act. In his place the Civil Service Commission has appointed a former governor and Senator from the State of Connecticut, Hiram W. Bingham. The position in which Mr. Bingham finds himself is not an enviable one.

Unless he succeeds in having the loyalty standards or rules modified, at least to the extent of "reasonable doubt," he will find himself saddled with all the unfavorable publicity that is bound to follow the exposure of other "Remington" cases, because there surely are others that will come to light in the very near future.

It becomes more apparent each day that the President has no intention of amending his loyalty order. Confronted more and more with specific examples of the failure of the Civil Service Commission and its Loyalty Review Board, the President recently created the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights with Admiral Chester W. Nimitz as Chairman. In the text of the order creating this new Commission the President said:

The Commisson will be expected to report on the effectiveness and fairness of the Government's loyalty and security programs. In doing this, the Commission may wish to inspect individual case files, and it will be authorized to do so to whatever extent it may determine to be necessary.

The Congress of the United States may as well consider its face slapped. Time and time again committees of Congress have been refused access to loyalty files by an order of the President; yet the same President creates a commission comprised of people with absolutely no experience or background in combating subversive activities, and makes available to them the identical records denied the Congress.

The Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights has a year to report. Is this another device of the President to protect people in Government whose loyalty is questionable beyond a reasonable doubt? This is the sixth group set up, one on top of the other, that has worked in favor of the Communists in Government when the Civil Service Commission should have handled the job in the first place, to say nothing of the millions upon millions of

dollars these inadequate and ridiculous programs have cost the taxpayers. Thes groups are:

First. Civil Service Commission.

Second. Special Loyalty Board inside Civil Service Commission.

Third. Loyalty Rating Board inside Civil Service Commission.

Fourth. President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty—Executive Order No. 9806.

Fifth. Loyalty Review Board—Executive Order No. 9835.

Sixth. Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

Government employment is a privilege, not a right. The method by which the President can eliminate all this needless red tape and really rid the Government of all undesirables, if he is sincere in this direction, is to change his directive and use the exact words of former Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming in his testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on December 12, 1940, that "all doubts are resolved in favor of the Government."

As I stated earlier, I intend this to be the first of a series of talks on the operation of the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board and the President's loyalty program. Later, I intend to show case after case of persons of questionable loyalty receiving the blessing of the Civil Service Commission for Government positions. I intend to show case by case where the Loyalty Review Board reversed the loyalty boards of various Government agencies and compelled those agencies to retain employees the agencies believed to be disloyal. I intend to show that, while Congress was doing everything within its power to stop the operation of communism, the Civil Service Commission was constantly easing Communists and fellow travelers into Government jobs.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It is a fact that Congress has met with strong resistance in its endeavor to drive the disloyal out of the Government service. The Seth Richardson Loyalty Review Board played this sorry role. The conviction of Remington is simply further testimony as to the worthlessness of this Board, which at all times manifested a quick and a warm regard for the Reds.

In my opinion, the gentleman is performing a very fine service. The "whitewashing" of Remington by the Seth Richardson board meant that he was restored to his $10,000-a-year job in the Commerce Department, he was paid $10,000 back salary, and he was able to collect $10,000 from a broadcaster who broadcasted the testimony of Miss Bentley to the effect that Remington was a Communist. That is what the Seth Richardson board did.

If this Seth Richardson so-called Loyalty Board ever manifested the slightest interest in ridding the Government of Reds that were packed in all of the departments or ever reflected the slightest sympathy for the will of the Congress to get them out, the record does not show it.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask my very good and patriotic colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] what he thinks of the President's action in moving Mr. Seth Richardson, after being in charge of the Loyalty Review Board for 4 years, over to being Chairman of the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights?

Mr. COX. I have no comment to make on the action of the President, but I do say it was impossible for Seth Richardson, coming from the Davies' set-up, to perform a patriotic duty as head of the Loyalty Review Board.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comment.

As the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, former member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, once said:

> What does it profit us if we shout down Communists from our roof tops while we let our front doors open to all who would destroy that for which we stand?

In my speeches I intend to bring to the American public the true deceit and chicanery of administration stalwarts in high places who, while bleeding for the rights of the disloyal employees, arbitrarily remove, or discipline, those who believe it is a sacred privilege and not a right to work for the American Government.

To be denied the privilege of public employment, one has almost to prove high treason; thus countless decisions of the agencies are overruled by the Review Board by reason of lack of evidence. It smacks of a giant conspiracy to perpetuate the machinations of the architects of disaster who have reduced us to our present unhappy state, while at the same time it lends lip service to administration puppets who proudly point to this inept loyalty program as proof of their aversion to communism. Any board the President establishes by Executive order, in my opinion, is doomed to failure because if he were sincere in wanting to rid the Government of Communists and fellow travelers, he would have selected Board members who were qualified and experienced in the subversive field. The President's entire program is so much smoke screen, whitewash, and red herring, using as a front many well-meaning citizens who undoubtedly are well qualified in many fields, but are too naive to understand and comprehend the Communist conspiracy that has engulfed half a world through the very tactics we condone here.

The fight against communism, like charity, begins at home, and it will prove of little avail to shake our fist at Joe Stalin in Moscow while we shake the hand of his agents in Washington.

The case of William Remington, who was convicted in Federal court last week, after having been cleared by the Civil Service Commission on at least two occasions, is just the first of similar cases which will be brought to light in the near future. In my next speech I will start to name names, and show the American people for the first time who the individuals are who kept these undesirables in office when they knew they were not eligible for employment. It is high time the public is informed of those individuals who have betrayed their country and broken their oath of office.

I am making this first speech today because I have been informed that there will be a meeting of the entire membership of the Loyalty Review Board tomorrow, February 13, 1951, and this next remark is directed to them. The Loyalty Review Board should unanimously adopt a resolution tomorrow demanding that the President change the standards under which they now have to work, thereby preventing the handing down of another Remington decision, when the person involved is found ineligible for Government employment. It is hard for me to understand why, in 4 years of operation, not a single member of the Board, including Mr. Seth Richardson, the former Chairman, not once has demanded that the President change his standards. I would even volunteer to rewrite the one sentence for the President and guarantee, if the Loyalty Review Board would adhere to it as diligently as they do to the present one, not a single Communist or Communist sympathizer would remain on the Government payroll.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND INFLATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, one of the foremost Americans of all time.

During my seven terms as a Member of this House, I have thought at times the way for me to be difficult indeed.

In fighting enemies of the GI and the veteran both at home and in Washington, there have been moments of great frustration for me, especially when these enemies were so influential and powerful.

In striving for fair pensions for elderly people, I have suffered moments of anguish during temporary setbacks due to greed and selfishness of the obstructionists.

Now, I find the greatest opposition in my entire career arrayed against my crusade for lower food prices at the time the cost of all food items are the highest on record.

But I take heart as I thumb the pages of history and find that Abraham Lincoln had more trying days than most of us will ever witness.

I find that during the Civil War, prices of food and clothing also hit inflationary heights. Like today, the profiteers and the chiselers were active, realizing huge gains at the expense of the people.

Yes, Lincoln had his hands full with these characters, and with many right in his own Cabinet and his own party. They never lost an opportunity to stand in the way of his desire to see progress.

Lincoln was not only among the foremost Americans, he was the greatest Republican of all periods.

I am and always have been, always will be an Abraham Lincoln Republican. My faith in the Republican Party will

never be shaken as long as Lincoln is looked upon as its all-time leader, and as long as his principles are followed by rank and file Republicans. I hope we will never stray too far off his beaten path.

I have tried to pattern the Hall program of improving GI rights after the Lincoln policy of fair dealing to the soldiers and veterans of the Civil War period.

As an example, at the time Congress enacted the Servicemen's Adjustment Act of World War II, better known as the GI bill, I demanded that the homestead laws, enacted by the Lincoln administration, which made farm acres available to veterans of that day, be put back on the books.

I would like to have seen our GI's and veterans of World War II taken care of, as Lincoln's homestead laws provided farms and homes for Civil War soldiers.

If Lincoln were President today, he would insist that provisions of my program in the interest of our servicemen, and our veterans, be made the law of the land.

Lincoln would also back me up in my fight to get lower food prices for the folks back home.

FORRESTAL PROGRAM COMPARED WITH PRESENT DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the defense needs of our country, I think it is important to look back upon the so-called Forrestal report and see what was recommended then as a minimum for the condition of the country at that time and then compare it with the present program for our national defense.

The Forrestal program is so called because Secretary of Defense Forrestal indicated that these were the minimum requirements requested by the Chiefs of Staff—Generals Bradley and Spaatz and Admiral Denfeld—to meet the probable missions of their Departments at that time, which was in 1948. The details on this program are available for public inspection in the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings—supplemental appropriations—fiscal year of 1948, on H. R. 6226. It should be borne in mind that we were not then at war, as we are today. When the Forrestal program is compared with the 1951 program, we find that some very interesting facts are revealed.

As shown on pages 4 and 5 of the hearings on H. R. 6226, under the Forrestal program the Navy was to have a total of 12 carriers—3 of which were *Midway* class—and 10 light carriers, primarily for antisubmarine warfare and close support. Under the 1951 budget plus the first and second supplementals, a total of 10 large carriers, or 83⅓ percent of the Forrestal program, and 15 light carriers, or 150 percent of the Forrestal program were authorized. The present program, as indicated by public announcement, calls for 12 large carriers and 15 light carriers or 100 percent and 150 percent, respectively of the Forrestal recommendations. Secretary Forrestal further recommended a total of 24 carrier air groups and 12 antisubmarine warfare squadrons to man these carriers. Of this number 12, 50 percent, carrier groups, and 10, 87 percent, antisubmarine warfare squadrons were authorized in the 1951 program, while the present build-up calls for 15, 62.5 percent, groups and 15, 125 percent antisubmarine warfare squadrons. The Forrestal program further included a total of 34 patrol squadrons and 31 marine fighter squadrons of which 27, 79 percent, patrol squadrons, and 18, 58 percent, Marine squadrons were authorized for 1951. Present build-up calls for 34, 100 percent, patrol squadrons, and 21, 68 percent, Marine squadrons.

An inspection of the pertinent documents indicates that operating aircraft for the Navy are not being provided for in 1951 on the basis of the recommendations which were made even in peacetime. The Forrestal report recommended 10,687 operating aircraft for the Navy in accordance with the Finletter board report to the President, Survival in the Air Age, and the Brewster board report to the Congress, National Aviation Policy, Senate Report No. 949, Eightieth Congress, which recommended a total supporting inventory of 14,500 aircraft. The 1951 program, however, authorized 7,512—70 percent—aircraft, while the present program calls for 8,000—75 percent—operating aircraft.

Secretary Forrestal also recommended a total of 663,000 military personnel for the Navy including marines—see page 5 of H. R. 6226 hearings. The 1951 budget program authorized a total of 689,000 Navy personnel and 166,000 marines. The number of Marine divisions and supporting air wings recommended by Forrestal was four of each while both the 1951 budget and the present program authorized two of each, or 50 percent of the Forrestal program.

With regard to the Army, Secretary Forrestal recommended 12 regular divisions—see page 103 of H. R. 6226 hearings—while 1951 authorizations included 16—133 percent, divisions and present programs indicate 20 divisions, 167 percent. Army military personnel under the Forrestal program was originally set at 669,000 and included in its requirements support to an Air Force of 401,000 personnel. The Air Force raised the personnal figure from 401,000 to 502,000 based on, first, a change in strategic concept—emphasis on strategic air; second, requirements for a continental radar warning net; and third, assumption of functions previously handled by the Army. The Army requested that its 669,000 figure be increased to 837,000 to complement the 502,000 Air Force figure. Otherwise the Army would have had to reduce its combat forces in order to support the increased size of the Air Force; for increasing the number of Air Force bases, for instance, necessitates extra Army personnel as they furnish the military protection for the bases, extra quartermaster personnel, and so forth. The 1951 program authorized a total of 1,265,000 men or 151 percent while present programs build up to 1,600,000 or 191 percent of the original Forrestal recommendation.

For the Air Force, Secretary Forrestal recommended a total of 70 groups, based on the Finletter and BREWSTER reports of a 20,541-plane program. For 1951 a total of 68 groups, 97 percent, was authorized. These groups have been increased in size and are now called wings. Heavy bomber groups have been increased from 18-plane groups to 30-plane wings. Present programs call for a total of 90 wings, 130 percent, or considering the expansion just mentioned, a total of 150 old groups or 214 percent. As regards military personnel for the Air Force, Secretary Forrestal recommended 502,000. The 1951 program authorized 651,000 or 130 percent, while present build-up calls for 1,000,000 or 197 percent.

On December 6, 1950, I spoke in the House on a program for defense in the present emergency and said, among other things, that I believed that the over-all manpower requirements were closer to 10,000,000 men in the armed services than the 3,000,000 which were once mentioned. I, naturally, do not have all of the technical knowledge required for any authoritative answer to any of the defense needs of our country, but I feel it my duty to express my opinion on the basis of the available facts. These are serious times and I do not have the right to remain silent when I believe that our defenses are not adequate.

On the basis of the facts available to me, which are the same facts available to anyone who will study the public records and read the newspapers, it is my belief that, first, our mobilization is progressing slowly; second, our plans for future expansion are not nearly as large as they should be; and third, our plans for naval air power—including planes and modern carriers—are extremely inadequate. I hope that I am wrong on all of these points; but, on the basis of the data which I have cited, it appears that my position is well founded. It seems strange, indeed, that in important categories the Forrestal peacetime program is not being met or even planned to be met in the present emergency of actual war. What seems stranger still is that the marines and naval air power still lag far behind the Forrestal recommendations, while in other aspects of our defense those recommendations are greatly exceeded. All of this is in the face of the great record made by the marines and by naval air power in Korea. A public explanation of such planning would seem appropriate.

FALSE PROPAGANDA FOR AN IMPROPER PURPOSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when, on January 3, 1951, the House, by a vote of 245 to 178, adopted the rules of the Eighty-first Congress with the Cox amendment to subsection (2) (c) of rule XI, it determined the procedure under which proposed legislation is to be considered by the Eighty-second Congress.

Then why discuss that action at this time?

Because, and only because, for the past 15 years certain individuals and groups, sometimes in an effort to put over their own legislative measures, sometimes for financial gain, and sometimes apparently because of their own innate meanness, have time and again sought by various statements and unsound conclusions to discredit individual Members of Congress and the Congress itself, and there is no reason why we should cravenly submit.

These are two ways of meeting this propaganda. One is to remain silent, trusting to the good sense and sound judgment of the American people to correctly evaluate this class of propaganda. Unfortunately, mixed with these vilifications, are the statements and conclusions of honest individuals, uninformed or misinformed as to the facts.

It is also true that some hearing or reading these slanderous or libelous statements never hear them refuted, hence conclude they are true.

One way of combating this vicious propaganda which is designed to discredit the people's Congress is, with all the publicity that can be obtained, from the well of the House, to challenge false statements and unjustifiable conclusions. The latter method has been the one which I have followed.

Because, and only because, some columnists, some editors, and some radio commentators have knowingly and with malice aforethought made untrue statements as to what the Congress did on the 3d day of January, as to the purpose and effect of that action, permit me to set the record straight.

Let it again be said, as was above stated, some of those commenting upon the action of the House, and to whom reference is here made, are just misinformed, and no doubt gave voice to their honest opinions.

One such instance is that of the editor of the Grand Rapids Herald, published at Grand Rapids, Mich., who wrote the editorial captioned "A backward step," the evident purpose being to show that a small group in Congress adopted rules which prevent consideration of proposed legislation desired by a majority of that body.

Mr. Thomas L. Stokes is a dyed-in-the-wool, so-called liberal, propagandist. He seems to feel that if the New Deal-Fair Deal went on the rocks the country would be ruined. He can be counted on to consistently attack the judgment of any and every Republican, or, for that matter, southern Democrat, who ventures to oppose any part of the so-called social program of the spenders. He writes so convincingly that at least on one occasion during the last campaign he frightened himself.

Just preceding the November election he made a tour of the country and in one article wrote that a two-party system was essential if the interests of the people were to be served. He then went on to bemoan the fact that the Republicans were not stronger politically, were not offering an effective resistance to the administration's policies. Mr. Stokes with his merchandise, for he sells words and ideas, as well as criticism, has been consistently lambasting every Republican who did not without hesitation accept his views—who did not support his version of the New Deal.

He may have been disturbed by the failure of Republicans to reply to his criticism. He may have become apprehensive at the success of his propaganda. He may, in a thoughtful moment, have become fearful of the effect upon the country if the program which he had so strenuously advocated became a reality. In any event, for a reason which he never, so far as I have been able to learn, explained, besought Republicans to stand up and fight. That, for once, was much-needed advice. It was not followed, and Republicans failed to win control of the Eighty-second Congress.

To show the inaccuracy of certain statements which have been made, the unsoundness of conclusions which have been drawn from what the House did on January 3, permit me to make certain statements of fact.

During the Eighty-first Congress 14,988 legislative proposals—bills and joint resolution—were introduced in the Senate and House. Of these proposals, the Congress enacted into law 1,081 private bills, 905 public laws, and 4 or 5 additional public acts, were, as of the 6th of January, still in the hands of the President.

As of the 8th of January, 287 legislative proposals have been introduced in the Senate, 1,244 in the House.

It is obvious to the most superficial thinker that the individual Members of Congress cannot read, consider, and form sound judgment as to each of the proposals introduced, which when filed are referred to the proper legislative committee.

It is equally obvious that the Congress, in order that it may intelligently legislate, must set up some sort of screening organization. One might as well think of taking to the mill the unthreshed field of wheat.

One radio broadcaster argued that each of the 435 Members of the House should be given a chance to vote on legislative matters, that every Member should be willing to go on record for or against a bill.

The uninformed might understand that the gentleman meant that every Member of the House should have an opportunity, and should be required, to vote on every legislative proposal introduced. Of course that is not what he meant, for he knows very well that many bills are introduced in practically every session, with no expectation on the part of the author that they will ever be favorably considered or reported by the committee to which they are referred, much less be favorably considered by the House.

He also knows that such procedure, if bills were to be considered in the order in which they were introduced, would bar adequate consideration of bills reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, by the Committee on Appropriations. Without the enactment of tax and appropriation bills, the Government could not continue to function; hence, the necessity of the screening process.

Imagine the situation which would exist if there was no screening procedure, individual Members clamoring for recognition, for immediate consideration of a pet bill. Confusion and worse, the House a bedlam.

TO AID THE CONGRESS, LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN SCREENED

At one time the Speaker of the House made the determination as to whether and when a bill or resolution was to be considered by the House.

On January 18, 1924, the House adopted rule XI (c) which for 25 years, with but a minor amendment in 1931, gave the Rules Committee, until January 3, 1949, the authority and the duty of determining when and in what manner a bill should be considered by the House. This was the rule under which the Eightieth Congress functioned.

The authority granted was not absolute. There were several limitations upon the power granted.

The two most important were carried in rule XXIV, subsections 4 and 7, which provides for Calendar Wednesdays, and rule XXVII, which provides for bringing a bill before the House by discharge petition.

Briefly, rule XXIV, subsections 4 and 7, of the Eightieth Congress, provide that on Wednesday of each week "after the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consid-

---

[1] RULE XI (c)

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-second Congress, with the following amendment included therein as a part thereof, to wit:

Paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

eration: *Provided*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on 2 days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn." [1]

[1] RULE XXIV, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, MANUAL, PAGE 423; EIGHT-FIRST CONGRESS, MANUAL, PAGE 452

SEC. 4. After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consideration: *Provided*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on 2 days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn.

SEC. 5. After 1 hour shall have been devoted to the consideration of bills called up by committees, it shall be in order, pending consideration or discussion thereof, to entertain a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, or, when authorized by a committee, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider a particular bill, to which motion one amendment only, designating another bill, may be made; and if either motion be determined in the negative, it shall not be in order to make either motion again until the disposal of the matter under consideration or discussion.

SEC. 6. On the first Tuesday of each month after disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution so called, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker. Such bills and resolutions, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. No other business shall be in order on this day unless the House, by two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine. On such motion debate shall be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against said motion.

On the third Tuesday of each month after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar, preference to be given to omnibus bills containing bills or resolutions which have previously been objected to on a call of the Private Calendar. All bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar so called, if considered shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution other than an omnibus bill, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker.

Omnibus bills shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. Any item or matter stricken from an omnibus bill shall not thereafter during the same session of Congress be included in any omnibus bill.

Upon passage of any such omnibus bill, said bill shall be resolved into the several Committees are called not alphabetically but seriatim in the order in which they appear in the rules.

The rule further provides that—

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule—

Just quoted—

unless the House, by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine.

The above quotation from rule XXIV (4) (7)—Calendar Wednesday, Eighteth Congress—shows conclusively that the chairman of a committee which had acted favorably upon a bill had as much authority, when so authorized by his committee, to force consideration of a bill, favorably reported by that committee, as he had under rule XI (c)—House Rules and Manual, page 385—adopted by the Eighty-first Congress, with just two exceptions. He was limited under the rule of the Eightieth Congress in his right to demand consideration of a bill on which the Rules Committee had filed an adverse report and to Wednesday of each week, while the rule of the Eighty-first Congress provided that he could call up a bill adversely reported or not reported 21 calendar days after a bill had been referred to the Committee on Rules.

There was another way by which any Member of a majority of the House could force consideration of a bill by the House. That method was provided by rule XXVII (4), Eightieth Congress—motion to discharge a committee.

Under this rule "any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has been referred to it 30 days prior thereto." [2]

[2] RULE XXVII, EIGHTIETH CONGRESSIONAL MANUAL, PAGE 438; EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESSIONAL MANUAL, PAGE 452

(MOTION TO DISCHARGE A COMMITTEE)

SEC. 4. A Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has been referred to it 30 days prior thereto (but only one motion may be presented for each bill or resolution). Under this rule it shall also be in order for a Member to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of any resolution providing either a special order of business, or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action:

Provided, That said resolution from which it is moved to discharge the Committee on Rules has been referred to that committee at least 7 days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. The motion shall be placed in the custody of the Clerk, who shall arrange some convenient place for the signature of Members. A signature may be withdrawn by a Member in writing at any time before the motion is entered on the Journal. When a majority of the total membership of the House shall have signed the motion, it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the signatures thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referred to the Calendar of Motions To Discharge Committees.

On the second and fourth Mondays of each month except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling up the motion, and the House shall proceed to its consideration in the manner herein provided without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn. Recognition for the motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered on the Journal.

When any motion under this rule shall be called up, the bill or resolution shall be read by title only. After 20 minutes' debate, one-half in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto, the House shall proceed to vote on the motion to discharge. If the motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from any resolution pending before the committee, the House shall immediately vote on the adoption of said resolution, the Speaker not entertaining any dilatory or other intervening motion except one motion to adjourn, and, if said resolution is adopted, then the House shall immediately proceed to its execution. If the motion prevails to discharge one of the standing committees of the House from any public bill or resolution pending before the committee who signed the motion to move that the House proceed to the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution (such motion not being debatable), and such motion is hereby made of high privilege; and if

bills and resolutions of which it is composed, and such original bills and resolutions, with any amendments adopted by the House, shall be engrossed, where necessary, and proceedings thereon had as if said bills and resolutions had been passed in the House severally.

In the consideration of any omnibus bill the proceedings as set forth above shall have the same force and effect as if each Senate and House bill or resolution therein contained or referred to were considered by the House as a separate and distinct bill or resolution.

SEC. 7. On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed 5 minutes for and against. On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This rule shall not apply during the last 2 weeks of the session. It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion for a recess on any Wednesday except during the last 2 weeks of the session:

Provided, That not more than 2 hours of general debate shall be permitted on any measure called upon on Calendar Wednesday, and all debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill, the time to be equally divided between those for and against the bill:

Provided further, That whenever any committee shall have occupied one Wednesday it shall not be in order, unless the House by a two-thirds vote shall otherwise determine, to consider any unfinished business previously called up by such committee, unless the previous question has been ordered thereon, upon any succeeding Wednesday until the other committees have been called in their turn under this rule:

Provided, That when, during any one session of Congress, all of the committees of the House are not called under the Calendar Wednesday rule at the next session of Congress the call shall commence where it left off at the end of the preceding session.

Under this rule it was also in order "for a Member to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of any resolution providing either a special order of business, or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action."

The rule further provided: [4]

A comparison of the provisions of rule XXIV (4) (7) of the Eightieth and of the Eighty-first Congress providing for Calendar Wednesday shows they are identical in words and punctuation. Under either, the chairman of a committee, when so authorized, could call up a bill for consideration by the House.

A comparison of rule XXVII (4) adopted by the Eightieth Congress and rule XXVII (4) adopted by the Eighty-first Congress relating to the discharge motion shows they are identical in words and punctuation.

The whole argument that the rules of the Eightieth and preceding Congresses acted as a gag, were reactionary, and that rule XI (c) of the Eighty-first Congress made it easier to get legislation to the floor of the House, hence was more liberal, ignores the fact that the discharge petition was always available to force consideration of proposed legislation, and that in the Eighty-first Congress if the action of the Rules Committee was not favorable, the individual Member, in order to receive consideration for his pet measure, had also to run the gantlet of the chairman and the majority of the legislative committee to which his bill was referred.

Members with experience also know that if, for example, I should send a bill the terms of which would be acceptable to the members of the committee to which it was referred, that bill would finally make its appearance, if it appeared at all, under the name of some member of the committee who belonged to the majority party.[5]

The rules of the Eightieth, the Eighty-first, and of the Eighty-second Congress provide the same method whereby a majority of the House could and now can, when so desired, force consideration of a legislative proposal by the House.

So it is inaccurate to say, as some have said, that the action of the House in rejecting the rule which was used in the Eighty-first Congress, in adopting the rule of the Eightieth Congress, was, as contended by the editor of the Grand Rapids Herald, "a backward step," or, as argued by Thomas L. Stokes, that there was a "blockade again on in Congress," or to charge, as did the A. F. of L. News of January 9, the Machinist of January 11, and the CIO News of January 8, that the Eighty-second Congress, on January 3, took action which deprived Members of an opportunity to consider and vote on legislative proposals; that the Congress "gagged" 'tself.

Using rules XXIV (4) (7)—Calendar Wednesday—and XXVII (4)—discharge petition—which were identical in both the Eightieth, the Eighty-first, and the Eighty-second Congress, a majority of the House, whenever so disposed, can, and since 1924 always could, bring before it for consideration and action any legislative proposal which has been introduced through either bill or joint resolution.

Permit a few quotations which misstate the effect of what the House did. Referring to the action of the House on January 3, when it refused to adopt the rules of the Eighty-first Congress and went back to the rule which had been in force during the 24 years preceding January 3, 1949, Thomas L. Stokes wrote:

It is, therefore, somewhat embarrassing that a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats in our House of Representatives has just delivered a smacking blow to democracy. This was done on the opening day of the new Eighty-second Congress by restoring to the Rules Committee the arbitrary power to pigeonhole bills approved by the appropriate legislative committee and deny the House the right to vote on them.

That statement is not true, as Mr. Stokes well knew, and as anyone reading the provisions of the rules which have just been quoted can easily determine for himself.

Mr. Stokes further wrote:

Again a handful of men can thwart democracy in the House.

If, by democracy, the gentleman means the right of a majority to legislate, once again he is in error.

Permit me again to point out any time a majority of the House wants to consider and adopt legislation, it can do so and two roads are wide open. The legislation can be called up by a committee chairman on Calendar Wednesday—a majority of the House membership can force consideration by a discharge petition.

This article by Mr. Stokes received approval by the A. F. of L weekly news of January 9, in the following words:

YOU'RE SO RIGHT, MR. STOKES

WASHINGTON.—Tom Stokes, syndicated columnist, called the action of Republicans and Dixiecrats in restoring the House Rules Committee's power to pigeonhole legislation "a smacking blow to democracy."

He remarked that such reactionary conduct in the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had helped in the reelection of President Truman in 1948.

Labor unions told the story to their members through their union newspapers, as they are telling now of repeal of the 21-day rule and its meaning.

This is not very helpful to Republicans in their effort to win back labor votes.

The CIO News followed the same line in its article on pages 1 and 3 of January 8.

Referring to the same subject the Machinist of January 11, page 8, commented:

In their first major action the reactionary coalition killed the 21-day rule. In so doing

---

it shall be decided in the affirmative, the bill shall be immediately considered under the general rules of the House, and if unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up it shall remain the unfinished business until it is fully disposed of. Should the House by vote decide against the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution, it shall be referred to its proper calendar and be entitled to the same rights and privileges that it would have had had the committee to which it was referred duly reported same to the House for its consideration:

Provided, That when any perfected motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of any public bill or resolution has once been acted upon by the House it shall not be in order to entertain during the same session of Congress any other motion for the discharge from that committee of said measure, or from any other committee of any other bill or resolution substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, or from the Committee on Rules of a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of any other such bill or resolution, in order that such action by the House on a motion to discharge shall be res adjudicata for the remainder of that session:

Provided further, That if before any one motion to discharge a committee has been acted upon by the House there are on the Calendar of Motions To Discharge Committees other motions to discharge committees from the consideration of bills or resolutions substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, after the House shall have acted on one motion to discharge, the remaining said motions shall be stricken from the Calendar on Motions To Discharge Committee and not acted on during the remainder of that session of Congress.

[4] On the second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling up the motion, and the House shall proceed to its consideration in the manner herein provided without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn.

[5] RULE XI (c), EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report, or fail to report within 21 calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for the chairman of the committee which reported such bill or joint resolution to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of (p. 359, House Rules and Manual, 81st Cong.).

it restored the power of the Rules Committee to pigeonhole any legislation its reactionary majority doesn't like.

Another misleading editorial is that from the Farm Union, which reads as follows:

Congressmen are outdoing thmselves to approve reactionary legislation and undo what little good the Eighty-first Congress accomplished. During the first day's session on January 3, this Congress voted to restore the power of the Rules Committee so that 6 members of that 12-member committee can stymie any measure even if every other Member of both House and Senate favors it.

Farmers Union delegations which are pouring into Washington at the rate of about 75 a week, are embarrassing their Congressmen by asking why they voted to restore the power of this committee which, year after year, bottlenecked legislation in the House even when the majority favored it. Varying answers are given to these farmers from the grass roots who are getting a big dose of double talk from their elected representatives.

Mr. Stokes and those responsible for similar statements should know better.

In a different category is the Grand Rapids Herald editorial. The Herald editor is misinformed.

That editorial merely states that the present means "of forcing a bill to the floor cumbersome and difficult of execution." That is a matter of opinion. But they are no more cumbersome or difficult than was the so-called 21-day provision rule of the Eighty-first Congress.

As propaganda, it is well written. As information for the unadvised reader, it is misleading.

The editorial also states that—

The Rules Committee is intended to be a "traffic control" group whose function is to funnel legislation to the floor in an orderly manner. If it worked that way, it would be well.

Thus, the editorial acknowledges a traffic control is needed. As to whether it worked well, is a matter of opinion. The editorial is correct in stating that in previous years, time and again a majority of the Rules Committee's 12 members have kept the House from considering legislation recommended by a legislative committee. The Herald admits a "traffic cop" is necessary and there was always a way if a majority of the Members desired to bypass the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee never has had, it has not now, the power to keep a bill from coming on the floor of the House, either on a Calendar Wednesday or by discharge petition.

The gentleman who wrote that editorial just took a running hop, step, and jump to reach his conclusion.

Apparently all of the critics who contend that the Eighty-second Congress gagged itself by the adoption of this rule overlooked the cold, hard fact that a real gag can be, though it never has been, applied by the majority leadership. Recognition of a Member rests with the Speaker. If the majority leader and the Speaker decide upon a party policy or program of legislation and the Speaker should refuse to recognize any Member advocating any other program or legislation, the House has no remedy, so far as I know, other than the removal by party action of the majority leader—removal of the Speaker by House action.

Perhaps that might be done, but at the moment I know of no way of doing it, nor is there any likelihood that either the majority leader or the Speaker would attempt to apply such a gag.

Speaking, or thinking, of gags, the change in the rules made by the Eighty-first Congress would permit the chairmen of standing committees, when after 21 days and no action on the part of the Rules Committee, to call up a bill for consideration. Action by the House was, of course, subject to the limitation that the chairman of a committee must first obtain recognition from the Speaker. It was possible and sometimes it happened that more than one chairman was seeking recognition. It was then the prerogative of the Speaker to give preference in recognition. Thus the Speaker had the power to delay consideration of a bill; as for example, the FEPC, which the leadership did not want brought up.

Today, as always, the majority of the House membership can force consideration of action on any desired legislation.

On the third day of January, two methods of providing for consideration of proposed legislation were before the House. Presumably, each Member of the House voted for that method which he considered more desirable, more efficient. It was a matter of opinion and there is no reason to criticize the vote of any Member.

Neither is there reason for Members or non-Members to continue to insist that on that day the House took "a backward step," or that there was a "blockade again on in Congress," or that there was delivered a "smashing blow to democracy," or that the membership was gagged.

Inaccuracy and vituperation are but evidence, sometimes proof, of the inaccuracy of statements—the unsoundness of an argument.

Let us have less of propaganda designed unfairly, unjustly, to discredit the Congress, the Members of Congress.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman, the present-day Abraham Lincoln of Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, the gentleman realizes that any time this Congress wants to pass legislation that 218 Members signing a petition——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the discharge rule. That is rule XXVII.

Mr. VURSELL. Yes. There can be no gag rule as long as we have that provision. The facts are, and my observation in Congress has been, that you need a strong gate to hold back crackpot legislation. That gate has done a good job through the Committee on Rules. But, the point I wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman and ask him if he thinks I am right, is this——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is always right.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I thank him for the explanation, lucid and brief, of what I spent 10 minutes in trying to state.

Mr. VURSELL. But here is a better point that appeals to me. I am satisfied that when they changed the rules in the Eighty-first Congress, it cost the taxpayers of this country half a billion dollars during the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Half a billion?

Mr. VURSELL. Maybe a billion dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe. But, what is a billion or two to a spending, wasteful administration?

Mr. VURSELL. But, with the people crying for economy, with the lack of courage on the part of some of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, when the pressure groups come after us, it is absolutely necessary to get back to the old rule. I voted not to do away with it, and with pride I voted to go back to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress provide assistance to the Republic of India to meet the food crisis which now confronts the people of that country.

The people of India are in desperate need of emergency assistance from this country in meeting their food problems.

A series of natural disasters—earthquakes, floods, droughts, and plagues of locusts—greatly reduced the 1950 grain crop in India. The result has been to impair the ability of India to feed the population in its major cities and in many rural areas.

The average Indian food consumption is little more than half of our own. Grain constitutes more than three-quarters of the Indian diet. India has a large and effective rationing system, through which a large portion of the Indian population receives some or all of its necessary food grain supplies.

One hundred and twenty-five million people are covered by the rationing system. Some 45,000,000 depend almost entirely upon their Government ration for their food-grain supplies. Already the Government of India has found it necessary to cut the standard grain ration from 12 ounces to 9 ounces a day and take other drastic measures to meet the growing distress. Grain reserves have reached a dangerously low point.

Total grain requirements for ration distribution this year are estimated by the Government of India at about 9,000,000 long tons or 336,000,000 bushels. To maintain the rationing system, even at a level below last year's, the Government of India finds that it will have to import close to 6,000,000 tons in 1951. India is procuring almost 4,000,000 tons of this total through the use of its own foreign exchange resources. This grain is to be purchased in Australia, Argentina, Burma, and other countries. It includes

about 1,500,000 tons of grain which India is procuring for cash from this country and Canada in accordance with its quotas under the International Wheat Agreement.

Procurement of the remaining 2,000,000 tons—about 75,000,000 bushels—which India estimates it will need, presents a serious problem. This grain will have to come in large measure, if not entirely, from this country. The Government of India has requested the United States to make this amount available, with shipment to begin as soon as possible. India finds that it does not now have funds available to pay for this amount, and yet, if action is not taken, there may be a real danger of famine in India.

We cannot turn a deaf ear to India's appeal. Our friendship for the people of India and our traditional concern for human suffering impel us to take every reasonable step we can to alleviate mass hunger and distress. Furthermore, the needs of the people of India have a special claim upon our sympathies at this time.

India is the largest of the new nations of Asia which have attained independence since the end of World War II. Following the voluntary withdrawal of the British in 1947, the Indian people adopted a constitution and began their existence under it, as a sovereign democratic republic, on January 26, 1950, a little more than a year ago. India's constitution, which is similar to our own, provides for universal suffrage and for the protection of its citizens in a way akin to our own Bill of Rights. The people of India are striving earnestly to establish representative government and democratic institutions as a unified and independent nation.

Like any nation which has just achieved independence, India is confronted with great difficulties—difficulties which have been aggravated by the crisis in Asia caused by the aggressive forces of Communist imperialism. The present food crisis, if permitted to continue, would magnify these difficulties and threaten the stability of India.

It is important to the free world that the democratic institutions which are emerging in India be maintained and strengthened. With a population of almost 350,000,000 people, India has substantial mineral resources and important industries. Its continued stability is essential to the future of free institutions in Asia.

I recognize that there are important political differences between our Government and the Government of India with regard to the course of action which would most effectively curb aggression and establish peace in Asia. However, these differences should not blind us to the needs of the Indian people. These differences must not deflect us from our tradition of friendly aid to alleviate human suffering.

It is not our objective in foreign affairs to dominate other nations. Our objective is to strengthen the free nations through cooperation—free and voluntary cooperation based on a common devotion to freedom. Our actions have demonstrated our adherence to this objective throughout the world. It is natural that the Indian people should turn to us for aid in meeting the threat of famine that now confronts them. We should meet their appeal in the spirit which guides our relations with all free nations.

I am confident that the American people and their representatives in Congress will respond to this urgent call for help. Already, numerous voices from all over the country have urged the Government to send food; and a number of members of both parties in the Congress are strongly supporting this popular demand.

I have had the executive departments concerned make a careful study of our ability to meet the Indian request. We do not have an oversupply of food grains. Our current carry-over of grain stocks is not excessive for a critical period like the present. Nevertheless, from a supply standpoint it is possible for us to make available up to 2,000,000 tons of grain without reaching the danger point. Inland transportation and other facilities to bring the grain to shipside will present some difficulties in light of other heavy demands. To provide sufficient ocean transportation to get the grain to India in time, it will be necessary to take some ships from our reserve fleet and recondition them. These ships, on their return voyages, can also help to relieve the shortage of shipping which now impedes the flow of scarce materials to this country.

The Indian Government finds that it is not now able to pay cash for the additional 2,000,000 tons. It is, however, prepared to pay, and will pay, the very substantial ocean freight charges. India has limited foreign-exchange reserves and will have a somewhat unfavorable balance of payments this year. It is planning to use the major portion of its reserves, beyond the necessary cover for its currency, on a long-range economic development program. It is, of course, of major importance that India develop its resources and provide a better economic base for its citizens, many of whom live in dire poverty. Unless India can undertake such a program, its economic troubles will increase, the standard of living of its people will continue to decline, and there will be no end to its history of recurrent famine.

In view of these factors and the pressing need for immediate assistance, it seems desirable to make a substantial portion of the requested grain available promptly on a grant basis, with India paying for the cost of transportation. This initial grant will avert the imminent danger and provide time to explore in greater detail the need for the balance of the Indian request and to determine the best way of supplying the amounts needed.

I, therefore, recommend that the Congress at this time authorize the full amount requested by the Indian Government, but that it appropriate funds now only for the first million tons, deferring the appropriation of funds for the balance until the situation has been further clarified.

If the Congress adopts this program, I propose that a mission be sent to India under the Economic Cooperation Administration to observe the distribution of the grain and to assist in carrying out the program. This mission would make an on-the-spot appraisal of the full extent of the Indian needs. It would examine other supply possibilities and the terms upon which additional grain should be supplied from the United States.

As in the case of other foreign aid programs, we would expect our representatives in India to be given every opportunity to observe the distribution of the grain and to be sure that the aid we are supplying is distributed fairly. We would also expect that the Indian people be kept informed through full and continuous publicity as to the source of the grain. Similarly, we would expect the Government of India to deposit in a special account local currency equivalent to the proceeds from the sale in India of the grain we supply on a grant basis. This account would be used for the development and improvement of the Indian economy.

As the Congress is aware, this is the practice we have followed in those countries which have received aid under the programs of the Economic Cooperation Administration. In the case of India, such counterpart funds would offer a splendid opportunity for the improvement of Indian agriculture, the development of important natural resources and industries, and other projects of benefit to the people of India. We would also expect the Government of India to do all it can to expand supplies and otherwise to lessen the danger from crop shortages in the future.

The purpose of this program is to meet the current emergency in India and to stimulate measures to forestall such crises in the future. It does not constitute a precedent for continuing to provide food to India on a grant basis or for providing similar aid for other countries.

I strongly urge that the Congress take immediate steps to put this program into effect. It is within our means. Human lives depend upon our taking prompt action. Shipments must begin by April if this food is to reach India in time to meet the present emergency.

In this critical time in the affairs of the world it is vital that the democratic nations show their concern for the well-being of men everywhere and their desire for a better life for mankind. But words alone are not sufficient. We must implement our words by deeds. We must counter the false promises of Communist imperialism with constructive action for human betterment. In this way, and in this way only, can we make human liberty secure against the forces which threaten it throughout the world today.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1951.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States,

which was read by the Clerk, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to article 36, section 1, Public Law 506, Eighty-first Congress, I am transmittting herewith a copy of Part II of the Federal Register, February 10, 1951, in which there are set forth the rules and regulations which I have promulgated to implement the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1951.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. RABAUT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. WALTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Senator LEHMAN.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Trenton and also an article on the food situation in India.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article appearing in the Florence (Ala.) Times.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report by S. W. Jackson, Franklin, Pa., district engineer of the State highway department.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include letters.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks following any special orders today, and that the footnotes be printed as footnotes.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Enquirer.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two editorials from the Washington Post.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short newspaper excerpt.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a transcript of a telecast.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 13, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

187. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

188. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to fix the term of the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands at 8 years"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

190. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

191. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Saganing River and tributaries, Michigan, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

192. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 73 of the act or January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

193. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the second annual report by the Department of the Navy in accordance with the requirements of section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 on the disposal of excess property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

194. A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, for the year 1950, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 232, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1030. A bill to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2339. A bill to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 31. A bill for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; without amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2110. A bill for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2205. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 59. An act for the relief of Vernon Crudge; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt; with amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Luisa Monti; with amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Chu Bud Yick; with amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Taro Takara; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Elena Erbez; with amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1823. A bill for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of Sook Kat; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 2554. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2555. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of certain furniture for permanent exhibition at the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2556. A bill to provide hospitalization and medical treatment at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., to certain paraplegic veterans and other disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2557. A bill to establish a United States Peace Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2558. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 2559. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2560. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to prohibit the employment of certain personnel of the Corporation by organizations receiving loans or other financial assistance therefrom; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2561. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949 (Public Law 439), entitled the "Agricultural Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2562. A bill amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2563. A bill to provide for the creation of a Students' Armed Forces Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2564. A bill to provide for advancement to commissioned and warrant officer grades for enlisted musicians of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2565. A bill to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Army of the United States for service outside the continental United States in a Volunteer Freedom Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2566. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America by requiring the display of the flag of the United States of America whenever a flag or pennant of any other nation is displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2568. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2569. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 2570. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2571. A bill to create a commission to make a study of aid to medical education and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2573. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 2574. A bill to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2575. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 2576. A bill to make certain expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress subject to tax; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution for the promotion of the greatest possible efficiency and economy in executive branch of the Government and reduction of nondefense expenditures to absolute minimum; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people to all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 129. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the causes and reasons for the commuting of the sentences of the German criminals convicted of the Malmedy atrocities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. Res. 130. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of (1) the "fixing" of college basketball games and (2) illegal sales of narcotics; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 131. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1600, to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, requesting the President and the Congress to take no steps to establish or to join a world government at this time; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to the Armed Forces and the paying of Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to sending a duplicate certified copy of a compact in reference to civil defense, in accordance with a letter dated January 30, 1951, from Samuel H. Sabin, general counsel, Federal Civil De-

fense Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 2577. A bill for the relief of Earl T. Ellis, receiver of the Quantico Co., Inc., of Petersburg, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2579. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. LaDuska McFarland, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2580. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2581. A bill for the relief of Pedro Reljanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2582. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha Elizabeth Colley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2583. A bill for the relief of Osjasz Hersh Braksmajer (Sam Braksmayer), Rysa Margolit Braksmajer, and Moshe Braksmajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2584. A bill for the direct relief of individual stockholders and creditors of Laister-Kauffmann Aircraft Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 2585. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Cooperative Equity Exchange, Republican City, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2586. A bill for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 2588. A bill for the relief of Jorge Carrera Giral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2590. A bill for the relief of José M. Thomasa-Sánchez; his wife, Adela Durán Cuevas de Thomasa; and his child, José María Thomasa Durán; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Kirsch Fur Farm, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2592. A bill for the relief of Frederick Kjaer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of Alice Ibrahim, Hanna Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayouf Muhammad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Marcus Moscovic, Dora Moscovic, and Mary Moscovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Clarice D'Amico, Chiara Antonucci, Antonietta Angelicola, Carmela Antonucci, Anna Cagnazzo, Olimpia Cibelli, Maria Dachille, Giuliva D'Amico, Lucia Di Foggia, Maria Stella Fatibene, Anna Marino, and Lucia Spinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of Arpad and Szeren Suranyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Henry Hasenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela G. Webeler Stockwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Antonia Vybiral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Antonio Maria de Pinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Frank C. Torti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2604. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Jean Sutherland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Myron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of Billerica Grange, No. 223, Billerica, Mass., opposing the drafting of 18-year-old youths for military service in the Armed Forces of the United States at this time; to the Committee on Armed Services.

45. Also, memorial of the Boston City Council, to pass legislation the purpose of which shall be to roll back all prices to the level which existed on July 1, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, Beth Sholom Congregation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the Universe: In these challenging days our hearts are turned to Thee in prayer.

Be Thou with those who guide the destinies of our Republic.

Shepherd them with Thy wisdom that their judgments may be true and pure.

Grant them of Thy love that they may know the heart of all the people.

Send before them Thy pillar of light, to unite all Thy children in finding the road to enduring peace.

By Thy grace and manifold blessings Thou hast made this land the chosen of all nations.

Help us to remember that if we be chosen, it is not for privilege but for responsibility, not to be served but to serve, not alone to gain liberty but to grant it.

O Heavenly Father: Let be heard Thy word speaking to America through the Prophet even as Thou didst speak to ancient Israel.

I the Lord have called thee in righteousness and have taken hold of thy hand and kept thee and set thee for a covenant of the peoples, for a light of the nations; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon and those that sit in darkness out of the prison house. (Isaiah 42: 6.)

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting oriental ideas concerning the development of the soul of man was that which compared it to the lotus, a sort of a water lily of the east. With its roots embedded in the unlovely but gently nurturing mud at the bottom of a stagnant lake, the lotus pushes itself upward to the sunlight, to emerge gloriously above the surface of the lake—a pure white flower; the very antithesis of that from which it sprang.

The divine chemist who builds the souls of men sometimes takes the most unfortunate environments, the worst apparent marital unions, and the most sordid appointments of life to create for a waiting world, in the extremity of need, a man with all the mental and spiritual qualities to lead a people out of all the perils they have ignorantly and selfishly created for themselves, a spiritual Moses able to lead them to the promised land of freedom and greater achievements.

There is also another eastern legend which states that, due to the idea that man lives many lives, each life being just another day in the divine school of life, he eventually, at the close of his life experiences, graduates from that school with the spiritual degree of master.

With this dué preparation, he goes forth into the world as a master of life, to teach and lead his brethren in the world the more perfect way of a full mental, moral, physical, and spiritual liberty. As they are able to grasp and follow his teachings, they follow the stars of their destinies. If they do this, they become more like the master, as did the boy in Hawthorne's tale, the Great Stone Face. Should they not be able to understand his message, they

sometimes crucify the master or murder him.

If the mythologies of the east had no other message to give us, they might still be of worth in pointing a moral and adorning a tale. Possibly we lost something of great value when we forgot the beautiful tales they told of the struggles of man to attain divinity, in the similitude of the fully burgeoned lotus.

Perhaps, in the modern urge to condition men to an unlovely regimented existence, we have forgotten the fact that in the souls of all men there is a force which, when fully developed, gives such men a very special ability to lead mankind out of slavery to freedom, from darkness to light. When such stresses come, such men spring into evidence as suddenly and spectacularly as did Athena when she sprang fully armed from the head of Jove to do combat for the gods on high Olympus.

Such a great soul was Abraham Lincoln. He was born of mediocre parents, as we are apt to rate them. He lived in squalid surroundings. He was even denied the benefit of a public school. He had no cards to a public library; no entrance into school clubs or debating groups; no college nor fraternal organizations; no membership in any learned organizations, which a college or university degree might have enabled him to join.

Abraham Lincoln was self-taught. His compositions, for be it remembered he was a creator, were written with a piece of charcoal, while lying flat on his stomach before the simple fireplace of the family's log hut.

It is very easy for me to picture in my own mind the image of the great Creator of all that is, the great Thinker, brooding over this simple fallow soul, whispering into his waiting ear the great messages he was afterward to give to his countrymen, and pointing the way to lead a slave race to the freedom of the great day.

Evil must die. The sacred scriptures of all nations proclaim this. It is the basis of every lesson of life. It is the foundation of history, of logic, poetry, and all the arts. Only the good shall finally be perpetuated. From the beginnings of the fire mist through all the trials and tribulations of man; from that day when the blood of murdered Abel cried to the Lord God from the ground where Abel lay, down to the mass murders of Stalin, the modern Genghis Khan, with the mountains of the skulls of his murdered fellow countrymen remaining the chief mementos of his crime-scarred existence; all these must yet pass, with only the good, the beautiful, and the true remaining. The lines of battle are clearly drawn. Only sophistry may confuse the dividing line.

And there is that in the soul of man which immediately recognizes the lines of battle, if he has not conditioned himself to disregard truth for self-aggrandizement. Men instinctively know what is wrong, what lifts us upward to the stars, and what drags so many millions of us to despairful depths. Not more knowledge is what we need, but more action.

Abraham Lincoln lived and wrought at a time when he was needed most. Perhaps no other man could have accomplished his task; for, after all, God is the great conservationist. He rarely equips two men to do the same job. Back of the great debates between Douglas and Lincoln was the finger of God, pointing to the physically unprepossessing Lincoln, saying: "This is my beloved son, hear ye him."

Due to human selfishness, the greatest stumbling block between God and man, America had erred. They had dragged the black man from his home and people in the jungles of Africa, had imported him to America in hell ships, and had sold him on the block like cattle and sheep. They had enslaved him for pelf in the cotton fields of the South. His cries of anguish rose to Almighty God until He determined the time was ripe for the epiphany of the Great Emancipator, the friend of all mankind, the savior of the Union, Abraham Lincoln.

The battle was grim between the forces of evil and those of good. Lincoln was in peril every moment as he came to Washington for his inauguration. Public sentiment was dangerously divided as to the rights and wrongs of slavery. On the one hand was the rights of the property holder; on the other was the God-given spirit of freedom for all mankind. Which was to conquer? Lincoln chose the right; the eternally right. He espoused the right of all men to self-determination, their right to choose and work out their own destiny, without let or hindrance of creed, caste, or color.

The tides of battle swayed this way and that. There were many dark days. Tradition has it that Lincoln spent much time in prayer, seeking the same guidance in extremity Christ had sought in the garden of Gethsemane, asking for wisdom to guide his people to victory for the right.

Finally victory crowned the banners of the North. As the tides of battle finally turned, and being fully cognizant of what would be the aftermaths of war, Lincoln made his historic journey to the battle-scarred field of Gettysburg. On the way, free for a few moments from the burdensome cares of State, he jots down on a piece of scrap paper a few notes of that which was to be the greatest speech of all history, a masterpiece of English diction, and the finger pointing the way to the designs of the Almighty for the after-war period. How tragic those designs were not followed. What evils resulted from their being forgotten in an upsurge of worship of pelf and self-aggrandizement.

Peace at last. But a troubled and suspicious peace. Money-grubbers from the North seeking to perpetuate and magnify the feud between brethren. Pelf against magnanimity. Separation against brotherliness.

What might the great Lincoln not have achieved in healing the gaping wounds between the North and the South had he not been struck down with the bullet of a crazed murderer? One of the greatest faults of a modern society, even yet, is that we permit dangerous, unbalanced misfits to range about freely, until the fatal result of such a mistaken course of action becomes evident in the murder of innocents, the needless sacrifice of lives worth a thousand times more to society than the warped and crooked souls of the killers. Far transcending the rights of the individual is the right of society to protection against the unlimited freedom of the mentally unbalanced.

The immortal Lincoln was thus struck down, when America still needed him greatly, and the mediocrity thus projected into the seats of the mighty was not able to fully complete the regeneration of America from the wounds sustained in the Civil War. The South would have quickly recovered from the animosities engendered from an armed conflict, even though they were the losers. Their resentment against the rule of the carpet-baggers from the North still smolders. Can you not realize what stern action Lincoln would have taken against the crimes of these gentry?

Every visitor to Washington, seeing the Lincoln Memorial for the first time, is hushed in soul, and becomes immediately reverent. Even the taxi driver, whose constant familiarity with historic Washington tends to make him somewhat blasé, becomes as hushed and reverent as his passenger. What a most tremendous force has spiritual greatness. And on the other hand, what a promise and earnest of the future it is, when on occasions like this we are daily reminded by such a recognition of the kinship of the divine in mankind, that there truly is a force in the souls of men which shall still attain divinity.

Perhaps the beauty of this great memorial, showing Lincoln as if he were still brooding over his beloved America, is magnificently complete as it is. It ill becomes me to suggest any change. But if one wished to carve out the similitude of the growth of a soul in marble, the other side of the monument might show Lincoln as a boy, laid on his stomach before the fireplace of his boyhood log hut, tracing with charcoal on wrapping paper, the designs which were to later make him famous in perpetuity. The apotheosis of a great soul. Again the growth of the lotus.

It is a difficult thing to attempt to project the possible action of the great minds of the past into the present. It is not even easy for us to do it for our own futures. But a great speaker has said that we can only judge of the future by the past. Using that for a criterion, what might Lincoln have thought of some of the modern trends in America?

What do you think he would have thought about our membership in, and our acceptance of the domination of, the United Nations? No matter which way our sympathies lie in the noble, even if abortive, attempts of that body to attain international unity, what might he have thought of an America divided against itself, of a partial surrender of the indissolubility of the Union he loved, and for which he was willing to commit this country to an internecine war to preserve.

Knowing his passionate love of freedom and the rights of the minority, what do you think he would have thought of our partnership in the rape of Eastern Europe, of the enslavement of Poland and the Baltic countries, the double-crossing of China, as she tremblingly

looked to us for support, even as did we to France and Lafayette? Would that eloquent voice have remained still to the wrongs in which we have acquiesced?

If Lincoln dared to throw all the forces of the United States against a dissolution of the Union, solidly resting upon the thesis that a state divided against itself must fall, what do you think he would have said and done against the thought of permitting a supergovernment, whose vote would outbalance us 59 to 1, to direct the destinies of the Union he loved, even in the regulation of our internal affairs, insofar as they might affect the well-being of the peoples of the superstate. In other words, if the UN should vote that we in America should be taxed a hundred million dollars to feed the hungry in India, they would have the power to do it. It is true they have not yet thought it wise to use that power, but the authority so to use it is still implicit in the Charter.

Might he not have rather acquiesced in the division of the Union here at home? Might he not rather have seen the flag of the Confederacy flying over the South than the flag of the UN flying over the divided allegiance at Lake Success? For, after all, the Confederate flag was an American flag. These people were Americans, only separated from us by the question of slavery, and that troubled situation would have righted itself within 20 years with the advent of modern machinery.

None can deny that we are in partnership at Lake Success with nations who have no interest in us except to mulct us of billions, or to propagandize us with their hated and alien doctrine. They are energized traps for the ignorant and unwary of America. Would the powers that be ever have dared to place Lincoln there as one of our representatives? And if they had, what do you think he would have said and done there? How would he have answered Vishinsky or Malik? What would he have done about Korea? What would he do now about it? Would he acquiesce in the daily doings at Lake Success? Would he?

That eloquent and wise soul, still brooding over his beloved America, might be heard throughout this land of his, still thunderously declaiming that a nation divided against itself cannot stand, and a thousand times more so when we form unions with such malignant and bloodstained mongrels as Russia and its satellites. However, we are now told that we must not use the word "satellite" in relation to Yugoslavia. The antirealists, presently presiding over the destinies of America, have decided that due to our Yugoslavian loan, they are now our friends, and the enemies of Soviet Russia. Tito, the bloodthirsty murderer, whose hands are red with the blood of our innocent aviators, whom he ruthlessly shot down because they accidentally flew over a small corner of his territory, has never disclaimed one jot or tittle of his complete and present firm adherence to the Communist Party line, and he has repeatedly warned that in any international conflict he would side with his enemy Stalin; but we are told that gold may buy true friendship, that words do not mean anything, and that wishful thinking may take the place of stark reality, and that we may build a nation's security and future on the foundation of such weasel words. What a naive people we are.

Our enemies have one saving grace. So far they have always told us exactly and truthfully what they planned to do. Hitler told us that he would occupy the Ruhr. Mussolini made no secret of his plans to devastate Ethiopia. Japan told us she would regulate the internal affairs of China against banditry. We did not believe them. We felt that human beings could not be base enough to do such things. Perhaps Americans would not, but our copartners in the United Nations have taught us a good deal about crimes against mankind and modern duplicity. When Alger Hiss wrote the text of the United Nations, we accepted it. We thought that good could come out of evil; that we might accomplish some great world good by thus compounding with evil. Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot; and we did not.

Can you visualize where Lincoln would have stood against all this modern sham, sophistry, and claptrap? That great American would have uncoiled his ungainly length, and his great voice would have eloquently thundered against the soul-destroying, un-American sophistry of the United Nations.

We Americans need to stop dead in our tracks. We need to scan the broad panorama of trends in this great land of ours, and try to constructively plan for the future of America. Never in the history of men have the stakes been so great. Never has freedom's candle burned so low. The world is waiting for a great message of freedom. America must give it. That is the only divinely appointed destiny we have.

No man having lighted a candle puts it under a bushel, or dilutes its light by exposing it in the midst of a circle of faint and dimly shaded beams; he rather places it on a hill where its rays may cut the darkness asunder with its gleams of brightness.

Similarly, we have lost our identity in the welter of ignorance and hypocrisy which is dominant in the deliberations of the United Nations. We are no more the white knight among the nations, and we have lost the imposing position we formerly enjoyed, whereby the oppressed and suffering of the world stretched out their yearning arms to America, the heaven of opportunity for them. Step by step, to the extent that we identify ourselves with this organization, we stultify and degrade our previous glorious history and heritage.

America existed in the mind of Lincoln as the most sublime thing his brilliant mind was able to envision: "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." If he were present with us today, do you think he would countenance the sublime entity he loved being exchanged for a hodgepodge of chicanery and strife, wherein we are outvoted 59 to 1? Perish the thought.

Do we have the renewed vision of being true to the ideal of a strong and free America, released from the alien chains of internationalism? Are we great enough to once again stand for the kind of America Washington and Lincoln wished us to be? Strike off the chains of internationalism, and arise once again like a giant refreshed by sleep to point the way to true brotherhood because we have attained it within our own national economy. Dilution decreases strength. Mixing with incompatibles tends to explosions. Ruskin taught in his essay on the formation of a diamond the importance of unity. Mankind is still waiting for the vision of a free America, leading the world, as a bright and shining light, unmixed with the alien and nation-destroying idea of a world government.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROONEY, New York; Mr. LUCAS, Texas; Mr. SCRIVNER, Kansas; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, New York.

DRAFTING OF FARM YOUTHS FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram which I received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read at this time a wire which I have received describing very vividly the farm-labor problem in Minnesota. This telegram is as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 10, 1951.*

The Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota farmers are facing a serious manpower squeeze because of the present policies in drafting of farm youths for military service. Victor Christgau, State employment director, reports farm-labor shortage is serious. Only half as many farm workers were available in January 1951 as in January 1950, he says in statement issued Friday, February 9. Minnesota farmers highly resent present policy of nonselective drafting of farm youths, on ground that such policy deprives farmers of essential labor, thus creating unnecessary hardship and unequal sacrifice and resulting in loss of farms and interference with vital food production. Farm boys raised on farms provide skilled help that is not replaceable under present conditions. Unless action is taken immediately spring planting may be vastly hampered and vital food production cut. The Minnesota Farmers Union urges that immediate action be taken for issuance of instructions to all Minnesota draft boards to defer all farm youths on proof they are essential to maximum operation of family farm.

EDWIN CHRISTIANSON,
President, Minnesota Farmers Union.

CONTROL OF FOOD PRICES

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, I introduced H. R. 2333, which, if enacted, would amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to authorize the President to control food prices under that act to the same extent as other commodities. The measure was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and as of today no date has been set for a hearing on the bill, although I have asked that this be done. It seems to me the matter is growing in urgency.

During the months before the price freeze, prices were rapidly increasing and the administration obliged the opportunists by giving them plenty of time to get their prices up before freezing prices at the highest level. This fact, added to the food-price loophole, is making price controls a still-born product of political cowardice and economic special privilege. The exemption of food prices from control is a standing invitation for further food price increases, and the level to which they may be increased without becoming subject to control is rising as other prices affecting the parity formula continue to go up.

The American people are willing to make any required sacrifices provided all make equal sacrifices. They are not willing to see the political power of the farm groups used to place food in such a category that farmers will be the one group which can never suffer from price control. Since the start of the war in Korea, the great majority of consumers have had no increase in income, but skyrocketing prices have, in effect, reduced their incomes, and now we are proposing to reduce them still further by heavier taxes. To state the same thing differently, wages, social security, and fixed incomes have been sharply reduced by higher prices and higher taxes. We owe it to wage earners and the other hard-pressed consumer groups of this Nation to take politics out of price control and to make every group subject to the Defense Production Act of 1950. If our Office of Price Stabilization is capable of controlling prices for other groups on an equitable basis, it is capable of doing the same thing with food prices. From the performance of the price control office thus far, it would appear that it is of no value to consumers but of great value to the usual irresponsible profiteers who know how to use an emergency to make a quick dollar.

May I call your attention to two editorials taken from outstanding newspapers on both coasts and both requesting control of food prices. These editorials were printed in the Los Angeles Times and in the New York Times. For the benefit of Members who may not have seen them, I am asking that they be included in our RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1951]

INFLATION BY PROCRASTINATION

One of the most encouraging items of news to date from the price-control front has come from the office of Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Chief. A spokesman for Mr. Wilson is quoted as saying that the head of the ODM is deeply concerned over the rising trend of food prices, particularly bread grains and other farm products that have not yet reached parity.

The Defense Production Act, as most persons are probably now aware, exempts from price ceilings all farm commodities selling at less than 100 percent of parity, and the administration has chosen to blink at this farm-price gap in the price ceiling. The public should understand that in continuing to ignore this glaring weakness in the law the administration is deliberately playing into the hands of further price inflation. For, with rare exceptions, prices that are uncellinged today can move only in an upward direction, and this tendency is accelerated when the Government, in effect, virtually guarantees an artificial floor under them.

It was procrastination of just this kind that left farm prices uncellinged in the Second World War for about 8 months after all other categories of prices had been frozen. The Emergency Price Control Act became law on January 30, 1942, but it was not until the following October that the farm bloc capitulated to public opinion by revoking the provision calling for 110 percent of parity or better for farm prices. That capitulation, however, was a grim joke on the Nation's consumers. For by its tactics the farm bloc had succeeded in staving off the inevitable public reaction long enough to achieve its original objective. Indeed, farm prices had gained such momentum by that time that whereas they started the year 1942 at 101 percent of parity the final month of that year found them at 114 percent. If that experience should teach us anything it is that the time to clamp down on farm prices is not 6 months from now, or a month from now, but now.

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 8, 1951]

THE LAW REQUIRES HIGH FOOD PRICES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that retail food prices reached an all-time high in the first 2 weeks of January. Every housewife is aware that prices haven't gone down since then. The Bureau turned the knife in the wound in pointing out that the price of groceries now is 220.5 percent above the 1935–39 average.

CORRECTING TRUMAN

The administration's price doctors have given the injured consumers the impression that they can do something about this. They can roll back prices, they say, simply by commanding wholesalers and retailers to cut. President Truman has helped them to make this roll-back look not only easy but fair by stating that the middlemen and retailers were gouging the public. He said the farmers had not profited from the rise in prices since the outbreak of the Korean War.

But Mr. Truman was misinformed. The fact is that farmers have gotten 80 percent of the food price increases which have occurred since last June. The figure comes from a Bureau of Mr. Truman's own branch of the Government—the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture.

As long as the farmers get higher and higher prices for their products—and by law—it is foolish to talk of price reduction at the counter. A rollback of the sort the housewives dream of would drive the grocers out of business.

GALLOPING PARITY

If there is to be any substantial reduction in food prices Congress will have to change the Defense Production Act. This law, which is full of headaches for the layman, provides that no ceilings may be put on farm products which are selling below parity prices or below the highest prices received between May 24 and June 24, 1950—whichever is higher.

Parity prices are continuously revised—and nowadays always upward. The law states that they must be determined by the prices farmers pay for things they need. If the price of automobiles goes up, for example, that increase will be a factor in determining the higher level of parity prices.

The Department of Agriculture reported to the public on January 31 that some food prices can rise as much as 200 percent above present levels due to the operation of the parity arrangement; that is, before they are "fair" in comparison with the prices farmers must pay.

This parity arrangement at first glance may seem to be just. But it really is not because it gives the farmers an advantage in these rugged times over almost every other class of citizens. The price of the automobile might rise so much that the average wage or salary earner would decide he could not afford a new one unless his pay was raised. But he is told that the wage freeze forbids his employer to pay him more. The farmer, on the other hand, gets his permissible crop price raised by law so that he may be better able to buy the automobile at the higher price.

This same law, which requires higher and higher ceilings, at the farm, also requires that ceiling prices on processed foods must be high enough to reflect the farm price level.

A TENDER SUBJECT

It doesn't take much figuring to prove that food prices will not go down until this law is changed. Any attempt to hold wages in line will fail in the end if food prices—the most important item in the family budget—continue to rise or even stand for very long where they are right now.

Of course, farm legislation is a very tender political subject. Mr. Truman would be heroic if he faced it. His misstatement of the other day, blaming the middlemen and the grocers, does not give much hope that reform will be initiated by him.

But there is some hope to be had in the attitude of the farmers themselves. Every now and then their spokesmen say that the farmers cannot float through this emergency in their special heaven. Just the other day Wilson A. Heaps, head of the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, told his constituents that "the well considered opinion of good farmers from Maryland and every other State" is that "we have reached the time when all Government payments to farmers should be suspended." The consciences of these good farmers undoubtedly are troubled by the built-in jacks of the farm price ceilings.

GREATER EFFICIENCY IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great country are looking to this Congress and to the Federal Government for the leadership to which they are rightfully entitled, and among those people are numbered the men in Korea who have so gallantly stemmed the tide of communistic aggression. The American people have been told and we all know that we are headed into a period of sacrifices and hardships in order to meet the tests of free men. This period of sacrifice and hardship is not going to

be shortened by selfishness and greed on the part of individuals, but it can be shortened by unity of purpose and sincere industry by all. Lip service alone will not suffice; therefore it is my position now that the members of the executive and legislative branches of this Government should submit for taxation their annual expense account allowances; that all departments of the Government should be open and doing business 6 days a week without further costs to the taxpayers, and that Federal employees should lead the way toward more production and greater efficiency without additional cost.

ENLISTMENT OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a committee of another body recently reported legislation which recognizes the desirability of including in the Armed Forces of the United States the nationals of other nations. Unfortunately, that committee, in my opinion, did not go nearly far enough. They provide only for 25,000 enlistments per year for a period of 5 years, which is a mere drop in the bucket; but it is a step in the right direction.

That committee also proposes to make American citizens out of those who may thus enlist. In my opinion it is neither necessary nor desirable to bribe the people of foreign nations with a promise of American citizenship to get them to enlist in the United States Army in order to defend their own homes.

To me it seems ridiculous that our committees should take such a self-righteous attitude about what they call mercenary troops. To unctuously state that "America can never let paid hirelings assume the burden of defense," and then turn around and offer something more valuable than gold—our Nation's most priceless gift—American citizenship as payment to a small handful of foreigners.

I submit, if we can pay foreign soldiers with citizenship, we can surely pay them with money. If we can accept the principle of foreign enlistments in an army to the extent of 25,000 per year, we can surely accept enough such enlistments to promptly build up a really effective force before it is too late.

One of the most important features of the proposal that I have made to this Congress in regard to the enlistment of foreign nationals, is that we should give the people of Germany a chance to defend their own homes, that we should give the people of Japan a chance to defend their homes; not that we should make these people Americans and bring them to the United States to defend this country on our side of the oceans.

I want these people to join in defending the free world—and that defense must start by defending their own homes.

I am primarily interested in reducing the number of American boys that we must send to these distant lands. I know that if we will offer these people a job on definite, specific terms which they can accept or reject, many of them will accept. I propose to let them make the choice. If they do not want to eat American Army food and wear American Army clothes, I do not propose to force any of them into service. What is wrong with making the offer, and why do we have to offer American citizenship before we even give these people a chance to serve on a straight dollars-and-cents basis?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 1 hour, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

ADDITIONAL RESTAURANT FACILITIES

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 109, which would create an additional restaurant on Capitol Hill. It is needless to say that these restaurant facilities are badly needed to serve Members, their staffs, the press, committees and their employees, liaison office personnel, and visitors who come here from throughout America. Under the provisions of this resolution the restaurant would be located in the Old House Office Building. There are at the present time 193 Members who have offices in the Old House Office Building. At the time I came to Congress I only had two employees on my staff; today I have four. If you multiply 4 by 193 Members in the Old House Office Building—or 5, because a Member ought to be included—there are several hundred people who have to be fed. Precious time is lost by having to stand in line at the new House Office Building cafeteria. It makes for inefficiency until we do have another restaurant or cafeteria to serve the large personnel who work in the various offices on the House side of the Capitol. I commend to the membership of this House and the members of the Committee on House Administration this very fine piece of legislation. Early action should be taken on this resolution.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR TO REPORT IN PERSON TO CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON THE ASIATIC SITUATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the American people and Congress received a report of the findings of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower on his recent tour of Europe.

Since that date his report, as well as the policy of our Government toward Europe, have been the topic of much discussion by many prominent Americans with little being said about our problem in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Congress of the United States are entitled to an authoritative report on conditions in Asia and for that reason I renew the request I made on February 2, that President Truman order Gen. Douglas MacArthur to return immediately and give us his report on Asia.

As I said on February 2, in the opinion of millions of people General MacArthur knows Asia as General Eisenhower knows Europe and his views are vital at this moment so that Congress and the American people may have a complete picture of what we are faced with in Asia and Europe.

Now is the time to have General MacArthur report in person to Congress and the American people.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an address delivered last Friday night by former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY ACHESON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is often very easy to agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] tells us. Especially is it true when he talks about the security of our Republic, the welfare of our people. Had the Congress heeded his warning, followed his advice, we would have avoided World War II, not now be in world war III. Nor would the Communists ever have gained power in the executive departments.

It would be very, very helpful to those in command in Korea, it would be very encouraging to those who are on the battlefront, if "General" Acheson, who seems to be directing our military operations—whether he is doing it at the request or under the direction of the United Nations no one seems to know—but it would be very encouraging to those I have mentioned if while "Acting Secretary of State" Eisenhower is fronting for him on the diplomatic front, he, "General" Acheson, would make up his mind whether he owes allegiance to the British Empire or to the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the current debate on foreign policy has been labeled "the great debate." Leading Senators are participating. A former President of the United States, past and present Presidential aspirants, columnists, editors, commentators, all have spoken. Yet the debate itself, up to this point, is scarcely deserving of the label "great." The subject matter, Foreign Policy, is of great importance. But a debate to be great must be so both in subject matter and in argument. It is on the basis of argument that the current debate fails to achieve greatness.

Time does not permit me to distinguish the fine shades of difference among the various participants in this debate. It is my intention, today, to inquire into the validity of the general propositions.

Actually the isolationists have raised no new arguments, neither have they fortified their old ones. It is simply that circumstances have temporarily silenced other voices and have amplified the force of the scattered small voices of isolationism. Why is it that the isolationist position, which received scarcely any hearing a short time ago, is acclaimed today? Principally because at a time when foreign policy cannot be simply drawn, they proclaim that they have a simple answer. Because at a time when we are suffering military losses, they offer an immediate, although temporary, relief. Because at a time when we are beginning to see fully the mistake of our overly enthusiastic offers to Russia in order to secure her support in the war against Japan, and when we are forced to admit the error of hasty demobilization and withdrawal from Europe, they propose to ignore the consequences of these mistakes. Because when we as a Nation are experiencing the full psychological shock of the reality and enormity of the problem facing us, they tempt us to retreat from the reality, and invite us back to the childhood of our national life, when our responsibility was limited to our country alone.

Of course, if we do not challenge the premises of the isolationists, they can build a logical case. If, for example, we accept that the United States as a nation is in decline and that we are about to go down in defeat, as some of them apparently assume; if we are merely postponing that day, their proposal that we make our final stand, together, at home, offers a certain natural consolation. The weakness of the argument lies in the fact that the premise is unacceptable.

If we assume, as does Mr. Kennedy, the former Ambassador to England, that "the more people that are under its"—communism's—"yoke, the greater are the possibilities of revolt," it follows simply that in order to bring about the downfall of communism we should encourage the Russian absorption of all Europe and Asia. The Kennedy argument might stand if Russia were forced to swallow and attempt to digest all the peoples of Europe and Asia immediately. However, if we permit her to consume them according to her own schedule, the consequences projected by Mr. Kennedy are not likely to follow.

A third assumption upon which the isolationist case is built by some is this, namely, that the Communists will reach the point of satisfaction short of attack upon the United States. This position approximates that of Senator TAFT, who has said this of the Russians:

> Their purpose of military aggression may well wither and gradually peaceful relations in Europe may grow again. The desire of human beings for peace, comfort, and normal human relations is a powerful force which will constantly reassert itself.

This, it seems to me, is the most dangerous of all the false assumptions of the isolationists. It returns us to the old error of failure to recognize the basic evil of communism, of failure to realize that evil too can be a progressive force, and that its growth is limited only by the fertility of imagination, the viciousness of will, and the power of those who control the totalitarian state.

There is another ill-defined isolationist position based on a kind of lofty neutralism or detachment. This, I believe, is closest to the position taken by Mr. Hoover and the Gibraltar school. For the United States this school proposes "no peace, no war, unless you bring it to us." For Europe our policy is to be one of encouraging them "to arm and defend themselves." Our Asiatic policy, as Mr. Hoover defines it, is to "exert great pressure for rectitude."

In the face of this general assault by the isolationists it is important for us to return to a consideration of the objectives of American foreign policy. Only in the light of such consideration can we properly determine what our program of action should be.

American foreign policy in the twentieth century has pursued four main objectives:

First. It has sought to preserve western civilization, that of the United States and of Western Europe.

Second. It has sought to preserve the national honor of the United States.

Third. It has been directed to insure the territorial integrity of the United States and to secure and defend our life lines to vital materials.

Fourth. It has undertaken to raise the economic and cultural levels of peoples of other civilizations. And thus to promote the cause of justice and world peace.

Let us look at the record. We entered the European wars against Germany, first to save the peoples of Western Europe from militaristic domination, and then to preserve them from Nazi oppression. We took up the Japanese challenge in order to defend our national honor and to prevent the Japanese from cutting us off from vital supplies of tin, rubber, and other materials. We were concerned too with preventing Japanese oppression of the peoples of Asia and Oceania.

Since World War II we have continued to participate in world affairs by diplomatic action and by various aid programs, military and economic, seeking to establish more perfectly and more securely an order of justice and peace among the peoples of the earth.

The important questions of foreign policy facing us today are fundamentally the same as they were at the time of our entrance into World War I and again at the time of our entrance into World War II and in the postwar period.

If we are to have a foreign policy worthy of the United States, worthy of our great tradition; if we are not to repudiate our actions and sacrifices in two world wars and our great effort toward peace since the end of the last war, we must continue a positive and affirmative policy and program.

We must undertake to preserve western civilization and the peoples who value it. This responsibility is like that of a child to its parents. Our ties of blood and of belief bind us to Western Europe. In moments of extreme nationalism we are prone to forget or reject our inheritance. We cannot, however, escape the reality. Edmund Burke has stated it in this manner:

> Men are not tied to one another by paper and seals. They are led to associate by resemblances, by conformities, by sympathies. It is with nations as with individuals. Nothing is so strong a tie or amity between nation and nation as correspondence in laws, customs, manners, and habits of life. They are obligations written in the heart.

We must guard and protect our lifelines to vital materials to necessary supplies of oil, tin, manganese, uranium. We must keep these areas of supply open. Such protective action is the condition of survival.

We must preserve our national honor. This is simply to say that we must accept, as we have in the past, the responsibility that goes with national maturity and power. The more actual power and strength a nation possesses the greater is its moral responsibility for action against injustice. This moral responsibility grows in international affairs often without corresponding increase in legal authority or responsibility. The absence of legal machinery, however, does not void our responsibility.

Finally the United States must act, insofar as able, to raise the economic and cultural level of peoples of other civilizations and thus to promote the cause of justice and world peace. As a Christian people we cannot be indifferent to the poverty of other peoples, whether that poverty be material, intellectual, or spiritual. America must not turn its back upon the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Jet Fighters Put Umbrella Over Midwest France."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by a constituent.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address he made on Sunday last.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] given before the District of Columbia League of Republican Women.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BUTLER, for the required time, on account of a death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

195. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed increase of $3,850,000 in the limitation on the amount available for the administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1951 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

196. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, covering the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2608. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2609. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 2610. A bill to regulate the operation and conduct of commercial parking of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2611. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2612. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2613. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 966) so that certain Federal employees whose positions are subject to the Classification Act of 1949 may not be reduced in compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2614. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so that internees will not be denied detention and disability benefits thereunder because of being within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2615. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2616. A bill to ease the burden of income taxes on persons of limited means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2617. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2618. A bill making the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to certain hearings in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2619. A bill to provide that, for the purpose of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), certain travel time after separation shall be counted as active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution providing that a copy of the document entitled "Survival Under Atomic Attack" shall be furnished to every home in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that the United States should support action in the General Assembly of the United Nations looking toward the establishment of a temporary commission on human welfare, economic progress, and reconstruction in Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 132. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 129; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 133. Resolution providing $60,000 for expenses for carrying out the investigation and study of House Resolution 93; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to the enactment of effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion and to preserve natural resources, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to the Armed Forces and the paying of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, requesting the taking of all measures necessary to complete the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Constance Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Urbana Cihovics (also known as Sister M. Urbana Cihovics); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna M. Alzbeta Sijarto-Hajdukova (also known as Sister M. Elizabeth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2626. A bill for the relief of Christian & Co., Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of William E. Beauchamp, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2629. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonidas M. Peppas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Lynn D. and Gladys Chase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2631. A bill for the relief of the Av-Equip Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2632. A bill providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2633. A bill to provide for the relief of Leroy Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aiko Eijima Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2636. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hanaco Tatsumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Kwan Hon Cheun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2638. A bill for the relief of John David Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of Richard M. Taylor and Lydia Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the St. Catherine's Hospital Auxiliary, Kenosha, Wis., reaffirming faith in the American voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally opposing any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

47. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting Congress to oppose any proposed increase in Federal gasoline-tax levies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

48. Also, petition of John J. A. Ager, executive director, Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., endorsing the stand of Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR in opposing shipment of material of value to Communist China, and recommending complete embargo against Communist China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, may this Lenten season upon which we have entered daily become richer and more glorious in the culture and deepening of our spiritual life.

Cleanse our souls of all unrighteousness as we give ourselves to meditation and quiet waiting upon Thee in the spirit of contrition and confession, of penitence and humility.

Grant that by self-examination and self-discipline our wills may be strengthened to gain the mastery over every insurgent impulse, every inordinate desire, and every self-indulgent habit of life.

May each day of this blessed season be a veritable gateway through which we shall enter joyously into the spiritual realities of the more abundant life and receive the benediction of Thy grace and peace.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] may be granted a week's leave of absence on account of the death of his brother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RUSSIA'S DISPOSITION OF AMERICAN LEASE-LEND SHIPS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter dated February 7, 1951, written by Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan, addressed to John Foster Dulles, and dealing with the subject of fisheries in the eastern Pacific and in the Bering Sea. The Prime Minister informs Mr. Dulles that the Japanese Government will, pending the negotiations for a peace treaty with the United States, voluntarily prohibit their national residents and vessels from carrying on fishing operations in presently conserved fisheries in the above waters. Particularly involved are the salmon and halibut fisheries. The Japanese Government recognizes that this country, and possibly others, has adopted certain voluntary self-denying measures to prevent the exhaustion of high seas fisheries. It also recognizes in the letter that if these conserved fisheries were to be subjected to uncontrolled fishing from other countries the result would be international friction and the exhaustion of the fisheries themselves.

Japan is to be commended for its action in this matter. Much credit must also be given to Mr. Dulles who undoubtedly discussed the subject with representatives of the Japanese Government in his recent visit. However, most credit for obtaining this action by the Japanese Prime Minister must be given to Mr. Miller Freeman, of the Pacific Fisheries Conference, and Mr. Edward Allen, attorney, both of Seattle, Wash. Both Mr. Freeman and Mr. Allen have long been interested in Pacific fisheries matters. One of their primary objectives has been the protection and preservation of our own salmon and halibut fisheries. They have constantly urged that the proposed Japanese peace treaty contain provisions dealing with this subject. During the past year conferences were held with Japanese representatives in which the matter was discussed. The views of the Pacific Fisheries Conference were made known to Mr. Dulles prior to his trip to Japan. Mr. Dulles was urged to support the views of the conference and was requested to take with him a United States fisheries consultant. Both Mr. Freeman and Mr. Allen were aware, not only of the need for conserving fishery resources, but also of the possibility of international friction if the problem was not properly handled. Their extended efforts to settle the question are largely responsible for the voluntary action on the part of the Japanese Government. It is to be hoped that the peace treaty when finally drawn will permanently settle the matter.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I should like to discuss another matter with the membership of the House.

A recent news release has stated that Russia has handed Communist China several former Japanese warships as the nucleus of a South China fleet and has assigned 50 Soviet officers to train the Chinese.

Another recent news account informs us that our State Department has requested and is now negotiating for the return of 672 naval and merchant vessels which we loaned to Russia under lend-lease during World War II. These include 87 merchant vessels built by us during the war at a cost of some one million to one and a half million dollars each. No one seems to know how many millions of dollars the naval vessels cost us. So far as I have been able to ascertain, this is the second request made by us since the end of the war for the return of these vessels. The news account says that Russia has refused to discuss the return of the ships.

In view of Russia's attitude, and in view also of the fact that the House Committee on Maritime Affairs has been unable to find out where the vessels are or to what use they are put, the question is raised whether or not some of these vessels have not also, like the Japanese warships, been turned over to Communist China. I, for one, would like to know, and I intend to ask the State Department to make full inquiry into the matter.

The whole affair seems ridiculous, as does the action of our own Government in the matter. We have been informed that we were going to stop our policy of appeasement and speak to Russia in firmer tones. From what has happened and is happening it would seem that our determination to change our policy has not proceeded beyond the talking stage. Through our appeasement policy we have helped Russia and her satellites to build up their war machine. We are still continuing to do so. As an illustration, may I point to our continued trade with Russia at our expense. She has exported products to our country in order to obtain our dollars with which to purchase strategic materials. For instance, during the past 5 years we had imported almost $200,000,000 worth of Russian furs at the expense of our own domestic fur industry. Several thousand American fur farmers have been driven out of business because they cannot compete with Russian slave or forced labor. Our Department of State and Department of Commerce say they cannot do anything about this matter because furs are on the so-called free list. This despite the fact that by law the Secretary of Commerce can prohibit the importation of products manufactured by slave or forced labor. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Commerce recently prohibited the importation of crabmeat from Russia under his legal authority to do so. Why can he not also prohibit the importation of Russian furs? Why cannot our officials face the facts? Why do they have to continue this pretense and sham?

EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORK PERFORMED BY CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1009) to provide for the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1898) authorizing an annual appropriation to enable the Secretary of Commerce to compile and make available information and statistical data relating to travel within the United States and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in approving the Whitten amendment to the Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1951, the Congress exercised sound judgment. It is my view that the operation of the Whitten amendment has saved millions of dollars and will save more in the future. This amendment should be strengthened, not weakened, and should be included in the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1952.

I am certain that all Members of Congress desire to prevent personnel abuses and malpractices which occurred in the Federal civil service during World War II. The present national emergency must not be used as an excuse to build up a gigantic permanent Federal payroll. Veterans who return from the Armed Forces at the conclusion of the national emergency must be given an opportunity to compete for Federal positions and those veterans returning to Federal jobs should be given consideration for higher positions. Unwarranted upgrading of positions and excessive pyramiding of jobs at the higher levels must be prevented.

I do not believe anyone in the Government disputes the fact that most new appointments in the Federal service during the present emergency should be made on a temporary or indefinite basis. The Whitten amendment merely provides that the Civil Service Commission should exercise its power and authority to carry out this policy.

In addition, the Whitten amendment provides that transfers and promotions within the Federal service should be made on a temporary basis. After examining the views of the Civil Service Commission, I find it is in substantial accord with this policy. It is the desire of Congress to protect the rights of veterans who return to the Federal service at the conclusion of the emergency.

In strengthening the Whitten amendment, it is my belief that a provision should be included to prevent the too rapid promotion rate among certain Federal employees which occurred during World War II so that at the conclusion of the emergency there will not be an excessive and disproportionate number of persons occupying positions in the higher grades.

Specifically, the changes which I advocate to strengthen the Whitten amendment are: First, provide that employees may not be promoted to a higher grade without a waiting period of at least 12 months; second, require that the Civil Service Commission should provide reemployment rights for all permanent status employees who transfer to defense departments and agencies from nondefense Government activities; and third, allow promotions on a permanent basis only for permanent status employees who are promoted to positions which were in existence prior to September 2, 1950—the effective date of the Whitten amendment—contingent upon a reexamination of such promotions upon the return of veterans to the Federal service who were not considered for such higher positions during their service in the Armed Forces.

Under this policy and the Whitten amendment, the number of permanent status employees of the Government will not be increased. However, at the same time there would be maintained a civil-service system which recognizes the merit, ability, experience, and length of service of status civil-service employees. In addition, the national defense activities will have been aided with the full utilization of thousands of experienced Federal employees now engaged in nondefense work.

LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed delighted to pick up the Washington Post this morning and see on the front page a headline to the effect, "Reasonable doubt of loyalty should bring dismissal of United States worker, Review Board says."

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, day before yesterday, February 12, in a speech before this body I pointed out the weakness in President Truman's loyalty program, under which the Loyalty Review Board has had to work for the past few years.

The new Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, former United States Senator from Connecticut, and the majority of the members of the Board are to be congratulated on passing a resolution in accordance with my suggestions that the President change the standards under which the Board has to work at present.

It is regrettable that Mr. Seth Richardson, who was Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board for nearly 4 years, did not take similar action all during the time he was Chairman. The fact that Mr. Richardson did not take such action is one of many reasons why he is not qualified to be Chairman of the Board to administer the McCarran Act.

If Mr. Truman is sincere in wanting to really rid the Government of all employees who are disloyal, he will immediately adopt the recommendations of his Loyalty Review Board. It is his responsibility, and it is up to him to either back up the Board or publicly admit he does not intend to have a real loyalty program.

Quoting from the Washington Post, Senator Bingham said:

> Where there are reasonable doubts of his loyalty no person should be employed by the Federal Government.

I agree with that statement, and I think Senator Bingham and the Loyalty Review Board are to be congratulated on their stand.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week, at the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Thursday of next week is Washington's Birthday. Are we going to have them read Washington's Farewell Address again?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is already arranged for.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is going to read it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will have to ask the Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I see.

Mr. McCORMACK. You see, we alternate each year.

Mr. RANKIN. He ought to be blindfolded or have his eyes shaded so that he cannot see these communistic caricatures on the walls of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. All able and scholarly men.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ENLISTMENT OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the Department of National Defense presented a report on the bill which I have introduced to authorize the enlistment of nationals of other countries in the Army of the United States. The Department said that they preferred to reserve final decision on the matter pending further investigation and asked that no action on the bill be taken at this time. I am glad the Department is ready to make further investigation. I am disappointed that the Department has not already investigated this matter over the number of years that have passed and it has not already recognized the importance of using German and Japanese nationals to do some of the fighting to protect this world from communism. I hope that when they have completed their investigation that they may come in with a recommendation that will encourage some of the other people of the world to do some of the fighting along with the American boys.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, especially a resolution I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 90 minutes.

DECLARATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to submit for the RECORD a statement on foreign policy signed at this moment by 118 Republican Members of this body. It should be clear that we do not speak for the Republican leadership. Nor has the statement been submitted to the Republican policy committee although some members of the committee have signed it. This matter, therefore, should not be considered as being sponsored by the Republican leadership. We fully realize that a division exists in our party on this issue. It is entirely possible that those who have signed are not in complete agreement. Some wanted to make it stronger; some thought that it should contain a definite reference to the war in Korea; some are opposed to sending large contingents of troops to Western Europe; others agree that this is necessary. Those who have signed it are at liberty to elaborate on the particular point that interests them most.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives calling on the President to consult the Congress before sending additional United States troops overseas. Certainly the American people are entitled to have their chosen legislative representatives consulted before American boys are sent across the water to fight on foreign soil. A matter of such gravity and importance should not be determined in the Pentagon nor in the executive offices alone, but should be decided in the open debate of the Congress by the representatives of the people of the United States.

Far from being an impediment to any military effort that is necessary, such consultation will strengthen the hand of the United States internationally and domestically as well. If the Congress decides this matter, or is consulted about it, as provided by my resolution, then we will have closed our ranks and foreclosed any division, both for ourselves and before all the world. In a representative government such as ours, it is the legislators chosen by the electorate who are directly answerable to the American people.

The debate that is now going on in the Congress concerning this and related matters is not a new subject in American political history. It represents the latest of a long series of struggles between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Perhaps such a conflict is implicit in our Constitution which makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but reserves to the Congress the power to declare war.

Never before, however, so far as I know, has an administration undertaken to ignore the Congress and commit the manpower and vast resources of the country to foreign fields without the consent of or consultation with the legislative body. Indeed, few Presidents would wish to assume such an enormous responsibility, in view of the possible consequences of such an act.

If this is a government of checks and balances as most of us believe it to be, here is one of the places where the check should be placed upon the improvident exercise of power by the Executive.

I also was a signatory to the declaration of policy signed by well over 100 Members of the House of Representatives. That declaration of policy is directly in line with the resolution which I introduced. It suggests that the future military and political policy of this country must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress.

In this critical hour in American history, with the menace of communism threatening western civilization, the responsibility for safeguarding America rests, not only upon the Executive but on the elected representatives of the people, and ultimately, upon all American citizens. Only by free and full discussion and debate, can a righteous and workable conclusion be reached which will enlist support and unflinching defense for the survival of American constitutional government.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I, too, am a signatory to this statement which I think covers the situation, but the point I want to make is this: The question in the minds of the American people today is a question as to how successful our foreign policy has been during the last 5 years. That question can only be answered by a statement of fact. The fact is that during these 5 years we have spent $100,000,000,000 in this so-called cold war to contain communism or fence it in and keep it from spreading. During the same 5 years Stalin has reached out his long arms and claws and taken into his orbit, taken into his sphere of influence, 600,000,000 more people, until today he has over 900,000,000 people that he is dictator over. He has also surrounded himself during those 5 years with satellite nations all around, and today he sits in Moscow just like a big fat spider in the middle of his web, and he pulls a string in Korea and the flames of war break out. We have to send our fire brigade there to put out the flames. When and if we get them out, he can and he will pull a string in Indochina or in Siam or in Turkey or Greece or in Berlin or Yugoslavia, and after 3 or 4 years of that where will we be? We will be bled white; and, without losing a man of his own, he will then be ready to take over. I ask you, has our foreign policy during the past 5 years been successful in view of that, and if it has not been successful, is it not time we changed the men who have been drawing up this blueprint of our foreign policy?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. MASON. I would like to have that answered.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, it is a big order, of course, but it seems to me that we have always considered that our diplomacy has failed when we have to rely upon the military. That is exactly the position we are in today.

Now I would like to proceed for a few minutes, and then I will be glad to yield to anybody who wants to ask me questions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not unmindful, and I do not believe the rest of the membership of this House is unmindful of the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is, by far, the greatest authority on the real American approach to our foreign policy. I know all will agree when I say that his reasoning is always sound and logical and that he always bears in mind at all times what is best for America.

The question I wish to ask the gentleman is this: Many say that the slaughtering of tens of thousands of our boys in Korea is stopping the spread of communism; how is this slaughtering of our American boys 7,000 miles away stopping the spread of communism?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not think it is, if the gentleman please.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. As a good American I thought the gentleman would answer that way.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, perilous days are ahead for the people of this country. Government propaganda is beating the war drums again as it did in 1917 and in 1939. People are alarmed and confused. They have lost confidence in the President and, yes, in Congress, too, and they are demanding that something be done to save them from total disaster. This is so because our foreign policy has been a complete failure, notwithstanding great victories on the battlefield. It has been well said that the fist of military mobilization is pounding hard at the door of millions of homes today. By and large the civilians have surrendered almost entirely to the demands of the military. Hence the worried parent and the perplexed youth feel that they are just being herded along without much planning or direction. They know that an emergency has been declared, but many doubt its necessity.

The three or four million manpower is to be added to our Military Establishment, yet reports reach their ears which cause disturbing questions. Millions of youths are having their lives, their careers, and their homes disrupted and shattered. Oh, yes, it will be said that our country is in danger and they cannot expect to enjoy living an ordinary life as usual. This in spite of the fact that military training camps already have more men now than they can handle. They are usually overcrowded with shortages of facilities and equipment which makes adequate training almost impossible. It is a known fact that the Navy, Marine, and Air Corps has had, and still have, more men than they can use. It is true that enlistments are up, but that is so because the boys have a certain pride and want to choose their branch of service rather than submit to the draft. What excuse, then, is there for now insisting upon the drafting of 18-year-old boys? The American people are waiting for an answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body knows that the public is demanding action on our foreign policy. Mail is heavy with demands for removal and impeachment of Secretary of State Acheson. Since 1945 this Nation has been in the hands of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall, and now they are conjuring up another war.

One writer has said that these three form a triumvirate of mutual admiration. Truman calls Marshall the greatest living American. Marshall says that Truman is, and they both agree that Acheson is the third greatest living American. This writer goes on to say that—

General Marshall is a good man and a patriot, but he is usually wrong. He can't remember where he was the night before Pearl Harbor. He sat at Roosevelt's side at Tehran when Stalin swiped half of Europe. He insisted upon giving Russia control of Manchuria in order to induce Russia to fight Japan. He wanted Chiang Kai-shek to coalesce with the Chinese Communists. He advised Truman to send troops to Europe.

Is there any doubt about the concern of the people.

Let me give you one illustration and I am sure it could be duplicated many times over. In the city of Aberdeen, Wash., two newspapers were so concerned about our foreign policy that they took a people's poll on questions relating to foreign policy. The Aberdeen Daily World and the Grays Harbor Washingtonian submitted seven questions to the people. You will be surprised at the results and I give them to you at this time. The result is based on a total of 2,345 ballots and the newspapers report they are still coming in.

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the administration's foreign policy?	157	2,073
2. Do you favor Hoover's Western Hemisphere Gibraltar proposals?	776	539
3. Should this country order all-out mobilization (Dewey's plan)?	654	445
4. Do you think our foreign policy should be restudied and revised?	1,803	167
5. Do you favor holding Formosa and aiding Kai-shek?	754	385
6. Do you favor rearming Japan?	696	319
7. Do you favor rearming Germany?	620	484

A prominent citizen from my own district writes me as follows and I consider him a great American. I quote him in part:

The Truman administration is a serious menace to the American way of life. They have plunged us into the crisis and confusion of inflation. They have enslaved and burdened us with taxation. They have lowered the standard of living. In a few more years our bonds and savings will be worthless and we will be living in a state of peonage.

It is vain and futile for our children to consider the future for their careers have already been planned for them. They will police the world and fight wars wherever and whenever Stalin and Truman push a button.

Truman talks about freedom but we have no freedom. The Democrats yowl about the American way of life but it too has changed. Fourth of July orators speak about the American heritage for which our ancestors fought and bled but that priceless heritage today is merely a memory. Check through the statute books for abundant proof if you doubt me. The Fair Dealers have the gall and the guts to raise their voices in hypocritical protest against foreignisms, tyranny, and dictatorship in this so-called land of the free and the home of the brave. I say so-called land of the free and the home of the brave because it obviously no longer is free and brave. I don't think that our ancestors would have accepted the yoke so apathetically.

Our domestic policies rob, plunder, dispoil, and eventually enslave Americans. Our foreign policies are a dupe and a stooge for Stalin to pour American dollars down a rat hole in Europe and Asia which is senseless, illogical, and inane.

Poor old Al Capone. My heart bleeds for him. What a saint he was when compared to those who direct our foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policies have failed. Who, in 1943, ever thought that we would send many billions to support the British Empire and its socialistic government. In fact we are supporting socialism all over Europe. Whoever dreamed we would think of sending American boys to die in Korea or to support French colonial rule in Indochina. Whoever thought we would make a complete surrender to communism at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it is disunity to resist warmongers who would send our troops to defend Western Europe against communism when the nations directly threatened, so we are told, are apparently unwilling to do little to protect their own homes. The State Department would start us on a march to Moscow. They would continue to send replacements to Korea with full knowledge that eventually we must leave that graveyard which contains the bodies of many fine young Americans.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am one of the signatories to this declaration, and I want at this time particularly to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for what he has said and for his masterful approach to this problem.

It seems to me that what we are really up against in this country is the fact that we are all disturbed because we do not know what the foreign policy of the United States is. I suspect that there is no well-defined foreign policy. This was forcibly brought out when President Rocsevelt some years ago made the statement, in a spirit of jocularity, that people were running up and down the United States asking bellhops what the foreign policy of the United States was. This was supposed to be very funny. But, as one who has lived a great deal in Europe it did not strike me as being funny at all, because if you were to ask a bellhop in England or in France or in Germany what the foreign policy of that nation was, I can assure you that he could give you a very intelligent answer. In those countries the people know what the foreign policy is. The great trouble, the great danger in the United States today is that our people do not know; that they are confused; that they are worried; that they do not know what their boys are fighting for; that they are told one minute by the Secretary of State that we are going into a great era of peace and 5 days later their sons are called to fight in Korea. They are told that this is not a war; that it is a police action, and yet replacements are being sent out there at the rate of 15,000 a month and the casualties now are 50,000 and maybe more.

So, it seems that this may be a war. Then again, what of Europe? There again we do not know. We heard General Eisenhower the other day, and at the end of his report I think very few Members of Congress and very few Americans knew much more than they did before. They heard a fine speech, well delivered by a charming personality, by a great patriot, if you will. But, he was in a position where probably he could tell us nothing. He was in uniform and he was taking orders. So we heard what he believed to be the case, but we had no

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the Department of National Defense presented a report on the bill which I have introduced to authorize the enlistment of nationals of other countries in the Army of the United States. The Department said that they preferred to reserve final decision on the matter pending further investigation and asked that no action on the bill be taken at this time. I am glad the Department is ready to make further investigation. I am disappointed that the Department has not already investigated this matter over the number of years that have passed and it has not already recognized the importance of using German and Japanese nationals to do some of the fighting to protect this world from communism. I hope that when they have completed their investigation that they may come in with a recommendation that will encourage some of the other people of the world to do some of the fighting along with the American boys.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, especially a resolution I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 90 minutes.

DECLARATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to submit for the RECORD a statement on foreign policy signed at this moment by 118 Republican Members of this body. It should be clear that we do not speak for the Republican leadership. Nor has the statement been submitted to the Republican policy committee although some members of the committee have signed it. This matter, therefore, should not be considered as being sponsored by the Republican leadership. We fully realize that a division exists in our party on this issue. It is entirely possible that those who have signed are not in complete agreement. Some wanted to make it stronger; some thought that it should contain a definite reference to the war in Korea; some are opposed to sending large contingents of troops to Western Europe; others agree that this is necessary. Those who have signed it are at liberty to elaborate on the particular point that interests them most.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives calling on the President to consult the Congress before sending additional United States troops overseas. Certainly the American people are entitled to have their chosen legislative representatives consulted before American boys are sent across the water to fight on foreign soil. A matter of such gravity and importance should not be determined in the Pentagon nor in the executive offices alone, but should be decided in the open debate of the Congress by the representatives of the people of the United States.

Far from being an impediment to any military effort that is necessary, such consultation will strengthen the hand of the United States internationally and domestically as well. If the Congress decides this matter, or is consulted about it, as provided by my resolution, then we will have closed our ranks and foreclosed any division, both for ourselves and before all the world. In a representative government such as ours, it is the legislators chosen by the electorate who are directly answerable to the American people.

The debate that is now going on in the Congress concerning this and related matters is not a new subject in American political history. It represents the latest of a long series of struggles between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Perhaps such a conflict is implicit in our Constitution which makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but reserves to the Congress the power to declare war.

Never before, however, so far as I know, has an administration undertaken to ignore the Congress and commit the manpower and vast resources of the country to foreign fields without the consent of or consultation with the legislative body. Indeed, few Presidents would wish to assume such an enormous responsibility, in view of the possible consequences of such an act.

If this is a government of checks and balances as most of us believe it to be, here is one of the places where the check should be placed upon the improvident exercise of power by the Executive.

I also was a signatory to the declaration of policy signed by well over 100 Members of the House of Representatives. That declaration of policy is directly in line with the resolution which I introduced. It suggests that the future military and political policy of this country must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress.

In this critical hour in American history, with the menace of communism threatening western civilization, the responsibility for safeguarding America rests, not only upon the Executive but on the elected representatives of the people, and ultimately, upon all American citizens. Only by free and full discussion and debate, can a righteous and workable conclusion be reached which will enlist support and unflinching defense for the survival of American constitutional government.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I, too, am a signatory to this statement which I think covers the situation, but the point I want to make is this: The question in the minds of the American people today is a question as to how successful our foreign policy has been during the last 5 years. That question can only be answered by a statement of fact. The fact is that during these 5 years we have spent $100,000,000,000 in this so-called cold war to contain communism or fence it in and keep it from spreading. During the same 5 years Stalin has reached out his long arms and claws and taken into his orbit, taken into his sphere of influence, 600,000,000 more people, until today he has over 900,000,000 people that he is dictator over. He has also surrounded himself during those 5 years with satellite nations all around, and today he sits in Moscow just like a big fat spider in the middle of his web, and he pulls a string in Korea and the flames of war break out. We have to send our fire brigade there to put out the flames. When and if we get them out, he can and he will pull a string in Indochina or in Siam or in Turkey or Greece or in Berlin or Yugoslavia, and after 3 or 4 years of that where will we be? We will be bled white; and, without losing a man of his own, he will then be ready to take over. I ask you, has our foreign policy during the past 5 years been successful in view of that, and if it has not been successful, is it not time we changed the men who have been drawing up this blueprint of our foreign policy?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. MASON. I would like to have that answered.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, it is a big order, of course, but it seems to me that we have always considered that our diplomacy has failed when we have to rely upon the military. That is exactly the position we are in today.

Now I would like to proceed for a few minutes, and then I will be glad to yield to anybody who wants to ask me questions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not unmindful, and I do not believe the rest of the membership of this House is unmindful of the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is, by far, the greatest authority on the real American approach to our foreign policy. I know all will agree when I say that his reasoning is always sound and logical and that he always bears in mind at all times what is best for America.

The question I wish to ask the gentleman is this: Many say that the slaughtering of tens of thousands of our boys in Korea is stopping the spread of communism; how is this slaughtering of our American boys 7,000 miles away stopping the spread of communism?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not think it is, if the gentleman please.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. As a good American I thought the gentleman would answer that way.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, perilous days are ahead for the people of this country. Government propaganda is beating the war drums again as it did in 1917 and in 1939. People are alarmed and confused. They have lost confidence in the President and, yes, in Congress, too, and they are demanding that something be done to save them from total disaster. This is so because our foreign policy has been a complete failure, notwithstanding great victories on the battlefield. It has been well said that the fist of military mobilization is pounding hard at the door of millions of homes today. By and large the civilians have surrendered almost entirely to the demands of the military. Hence the worried parent and the perplexed youth feel that they are just being herded along without much planning or direction. They know that an emergency has been declared, but many doubt its necessity.

The three or four million manpower is to be added to our Military Establishment, yet reports reach their ears which cause disturbing questions. Millions of youths are having their lives, their careers, and their homes disrupted and shattered. Oh, yes, it will be said that our country is in danger and they cannot expect to enjoy living an ordinary life as usual. This in spite of the fact that military training camps already have more men now than they can handle. They are usually overcrowded with shortages of facilities and equipment which makes adequate training almost impossible. It is a known fact that the Navy, Marine, and Air Corps has had, and still have, more men than they can use. It is true that enlistments are up, but that is so because the boys have a certain pride and want to choose their branch of service rather than submit to the draft. What excuse, then, is there for now insisting upon the drafting of 18-year-old boys? The American people are waiting for an answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body knows that the public is demanding action on our foreign policy. Mail is heavy with demands for removal and impeachment of Secretary of State Acheson. Since 1945 this Nation has been in the hands of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall, and now they are conjuring up another war.

One writer has said that these three form a triumvirate of mutual admiration. Truman calls Marshall the greatest living American. Marshall says that Truman is, and they both agree that Acheson is the third greatest living American. This writer goes on to say that—

> General Marshall is a good man and a patriot, but he is usually wrong. He can't remember where he was the night before Pearl Harbor. He sat at Roosevelt's side at Tehran when Stalin swiped half of Europe. He insisted upon giving Russia control of Manchuria in order to induce Russia to fight Japan. He wanted Chiang Kai-shek to coalesce with the Chinese Communists. He advised Truman to send troops to Europe.

Is there any doubt about the concern of the people.

Let me give you one illustration and I am sure it could be duplicated many times over. In the city of Aberdeen, Wash., two newspapers were so concerned about our foreign policy that they took a people's poll on questions relating to foreign policy. The Aberdeen Daily World and the Grays Harbor Washingtonian submitted seven questions to the people. You will be surprised at the results and I give them to you at this time. The result is based on a total of 2,345 ballots and the newspapers report they are still coming in.

	Yes	*No*
1. Do you favor the administration's foreign policy?	157	2,073
2. Do you favor Hoover's Western Hemisphere Gibraltar proposals?	776	539
3. Should this country order all-out mobilization (Dewey's plan)?	654	445
4. Do you think our foreign policy should be restudied and revised?	1,803	167
5. Do you favor holding Formosa and aiding Kai-shek?	754	385
6. Do you favor rearming Japan?	696	319
7. Do you favor rearming Germany?	620	484

A prominent citizen from my own district writes me as follows and I consider him a great American. I quote him in part:

> The Truman administration is a serious menace to the American way of life. They have plunged us into the crisis and confusion of inflation. They have enslaved and burdened us with taxation. They have lowered the standard of living. In a few more years our bonds and savings will be worthless and we will be living in a state of peonage.
>
> It is vain and futile for our children to consider the future for their careers have already been planned for them. They will police the world and fight wars wherever and whenever Stalin and Truman push a button.
>
> Truman talks about freedom but we have no freedom. The Democrats yowl about the American way of life but it too has changed. Fourth of July orators speak about the American heritage for which our ancestors fought and bled but that priceless heritage today is merely a memory. Check through the statute books for abundant proof if you doubt me. The Fair Dealers have the gall and the guts to raise their voices in hypocritical protest against foreignisms, tyranny, and dictatorship in this so-called land of the free and the home of the brave. I say so-called land of the free and the home of the brave because it obviously no longer is free and brave. I don't think that our ancestors would have accepted the yoke so apathetically.
>
> Our domestic policies rob, plunder, dispoil, and eventually enslave Americans. Our foreign policies are a dupe and a stooge for Stalin to pour American dollars down a rat hole in Europe and Asia which is senseless, illogical, and inane.
>
> Poor old Al Capone. My heart bleeds for him. What a saint he was when compared to those who direct our foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policies have failed. Who, in 1943, ever thought that we would send many billions to support the British Empire and its socialistic government, In fact we are supporting socialism all over Europe. Whoever dreamed we would think of sending American boys to die in Korea or to support French colonial rule in Indochina. Whoever thought we would make a complete surrender to communism at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it is disunity to resist warmongers who would send our troops to defend Western Europe against communism when the nations directly threatened, so we are told, are apparently unwilling to do little to protect their own homes. The State Department would start us on a march to Moscow. They would continue to send replacements to Korea with full knowledge that eventually we must leave that graveyard which contains the bodies of many fine young Americans.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am one of the signatories to this declaration, and I want at this time particularly to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for what he has said and for his masterful approach to this problem.

It seems to me that what we are really up against in this country is the fact that we are all disturbed because we do not know what the foreign policy of the United States is. I suspect that there is no well-defined foreign policy. This was forcibly brought out when President Roosevelt some years ago made the statement, in a spirit of jocularity, that people were running up and down the United States asking bellhops what the foreign policy of the United States was. This was supposed to be very funny. But, as one who has lived a great deal in Europe it did not strike me as being funny at all, because if you were to ask a bellhop in England or in France or in Germany what the foreign policy of that nation was, I can assure you that he could give you a very intelligent answer. In those countries the people know what the foreign policy is. The great trouble, the great danger in the United States today is that our people do not know; that they are confused; that they are worried; that they do not know what their boys are fighting for; that they are told one minute by the Secretary of State that we are going into a great era of peace and 5 days later their sons are called to fight in Korea. They are told that this is not a war; that it is a police action, and yet replacements are being sent out there at the rate of 15,000 a month and the casualties now are 50,000 and maybe more.

So, it seems that this may be a war. Then again, what of Europe? There again we do not know. We heard General Eisenhower the other day, and at the end of his report I think very few Members of Congress and very few Americans knew much more than they did before. They heard a fine speech, well delivered by a charming personality, by a great patriot, if you will. But, he was in a position where probably he could tell us nothing. He was in uniform and he was taking orders. So we heard what he believed to be the case, but we had no

positive facts. Within 2 days of that speech he heard from our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. His report was entirely different from the report given by General Eisenhower. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] had just returned from Europe. He was not sanguine as to the will to fight or the possibilities of the Western Europeans' putting men into the front-line trenches.

It seems to me that this declaration is most important in its first sentence, and that is where we say that whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with full participation and approval of the Congress. If we are not to go back to that form of government, this Congress had better fold, because it is nothing better than the old German Reichstag. The Congress of the United States is the nearest thing we have in this country to the people themselves. We go back to the people every 2 years. We go back to them then for election, but we are in close touch with them all the time, every week and every day. We know about their daily lives, we know about their confusion, about their frustration, about their alarm. We know about their worries over this terrible inflation and this high cost of living. We know as we read these letters what may be in store for this country, because everytime I read one of them the words of Lenin come back to me, "The only way to destroy the United States is to make her bleed herself white." We are going along that path today.

Some will say that it is too strong to say that we will refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. I do not think that is too strong. Surely we all know that you cannot help anyone who does not want to help himself. We must be sure and we must be persuaded that these people want our help before we go out and force it upon them.

What are these stories, and they are well authenticated stories, too, that come from Western Europe. How about the French who say, "France never wants to be liberated again." You know, liberation today, under modern conditions and in a modern war, is not a very pleasant pastime. I do not think we here in Washington would be very pleased if our liberators came over in swarms and dropped bombs, atom bombs, possibly, all over this Nation's capital, and then turned to us and said, "But you are being liberated." No, it is a case of the medicine being worse than the disease.

So it seems to me the Western Europeans themselves have the right to decide whether they want our help. The only way they can show that they want it is by coming out and assuring us that they will go along shoulder to shoulder, taking up their full share of the burden.

Our last state will be worse than our first if we send American troops to Europe, merely a token, because that is all they will be against the 173 divisions that Russia has ready to spring there. If we send those boys over there and our allies are not willing at the last minute to shoulder their share of the burden, those boys will be liquidated and in a most horrible fashion, because we know that those that survive will be taken into Russia as hostages. All of you have read what happens in Russian prison camps.

No, that language is not too strong. Then again the important part in that fifth clause is that we invite Britain and the Commonwealth of Nations to participate fully. We cannot defend the world without friends. We need the British Commonwealth of Nations. We need Canada to the north of us. We need Australia, New Zealand, and the other bases which Great Britain has all over the world. We must count on Britain and the Commonwealth as our friends. If they are not our friends we had better retire to this hemisphere and give up the fight. Our friends are few and very far between. We have people who are envious of us. We have people who will take our money, but we have very few people who will fight with us today.

All this talk about Germany—who knows that Western Germany will fight? I think that is a very questionable thing. From what I hear, and from the German broadcasts I have listened to, I think Germany takes the attitude, "You wanted to make us into a goat pasture—now see how well goats will fight." I do not believe they are so anxious to come in on our side at all.

So here we have come to the point where we are trying to tell the people of the United States that we have got a declaration of foreign policy; that some of us would like to go on from here in our different ways, but bearing these few simple six points in our minds. The final one of those points is probably the most important because without it we can go nowhere. And that is that we should write peace treaties, and write them now, with Germany, Austria, and Japan; so that we can give those people an opportunity, as first-class powers, to come in again alongside of us for this fight, which we are prepared to wage; but only on one condition, that those who believe as we do, that those we believe in peace and honor and decency are willing to stand up now and be counted. We cannot do it alone. Yes, we can keep our own Nation all to ourselves—and probably the Western Hemisphere. But that is not what we want. We have come to the time now, Mr. Speaker, where we have to do what we can and not what we want.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, that the United States has supplied the decisive men, munitions, and wealth to win two world wars and our success has virtually inflated our ego and swollen our national pride. But against row upon row of countless white crosses in military cemeteries around the world as the wastage of the greater part of the natural resources of a continent loaded with a fantastic national debt of nearly $270,000,000,000.

Just this morning we were advised in the press that the Secretary of the Interior calls attention to the fact that we are very rapidly depleting those natural resources. And what have we gained? Nothing. Only more war and more war, more taxes, more regimentation, and the imposition of militarism, if you please, on this country, from which there will be no permanent escape.

The die has been cast. It is important that this Congress rise up and fight every measure which continues the present foreign policy of this country which is leading us to total destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks a copy of the declaration of policy which has been signed by 118 Members of the House, together with a list by States of those Members who are signatories to the declaration, and a portion of a short ad, entitled "Stop, Look, and Listen," by Mr. Frank H. Lamb, of Hoquiam, Wash., a great patriot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A DECLARATION OF POLICY

We, the undersigned, conceive that the present position of the United States is dangerous and its future tragic unless the Congress immediately undertakes a reexamination and revision of a foreign policy that in large part has been a costly failure. We submit the following as a suggested basis for our foreign policy:

1. Whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress.

2. Make this country impregnable to attack.

3. Reduce nonessential civilian expenditures.

4. Build a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere.

5. Establish a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. Refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. In any case invite Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations to participate fully in this program.

6. Conclude peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria.

Those who share our views are invited to join us in a fight for survival of American constitutional government and for America itself.

SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF POLICY, BY STATES

California: HUBERT F. SCUDDER, JACK Z. ANDERSON, ALLAN O. HUNTER, THOMAS H. WERDEL, NORRIS POULSON, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, DONALD L. JACKSON, JOHN PHILLIPS.

Colorado: WILLIAM S. HILL, J. EDGAR CHENOWETH.

Connecticut: ANTONI N. SADLAK, JAMES T. PATTERSON.

Idaho: JOHN T. WOOD, HAMER BUDGE.

Illinois: RICHARD B. VAIL, FRED E. BUSBEY, WILLIAM E. MCVEY, RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, NOAH M. MASON, LEO E. ALLEN, ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, SID SIMPSON, EDWARD H. JENISON, CHARLES W. VURSELL, C. W. BISHOP, CHAUNCEY REED.

Indiana: CECIL M. HARDEN, RALPH HARVEY.

Iowa: THOMAS E. MARTIN, H. R. GROSS, JAMES I. DOLLIVER, BEN F. JENSEN, CHARLES HOEVEN.

Delaware: J. CALEB BOGGS.

Kansas: ALBERT M. COLE, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, MYRON GEORGE, EDWARD H. REES, WINT SMITH.

Kentucky: JAMES S. GOLDEN.

Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, J. GLENN BEALL.
Maine: FRANK FELLOWS, CHARLES P. NELSON.
Massachusetts: EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, DONALD W. NICHOLSON.
Michigan: PAUL W. SHAFER, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, FRED L. CRAWFORD, RUTH THOMPSON, CHARLES E. POTTER, JOHN B. BENNETT, GEORGE A. DONDERO.
Minnesota: AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, H. CARL ANDERSEN.
Missouri: DEWEY SHORT, O. K. ARMSTRONG.
Montana: WESLEY A. D'EWART.
Nebraska: HOWARD H. LUFFETT, KARL STEFAN, A. L. MILLER.
New Hampshire: NORRIS COTTON.
New Jersey: T. MILLET HAND, JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, HARRY L. TOWE.
New York: HENRY J. LATHAM, RALPH W. GWINN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, J. ERNEST WHARTON, BERNARD W. KEARNEY, WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, JOHN TABER, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, WILLIAM E. MILLER, DANIEL REED.
North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK.
Ohio: WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, CLIFF CLEVENGER, CLARENCE J. BROWN, FRANK T. BOW, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, GEORGE H. BENDER, JACKSON E. BETTS, THOMAS JENKINS.
Oklahoma: PAGE BELCHER.
Oregon: HARRIS ELLSWORTH, HOMER ANGELL.
Pennsylvania: BENJAMIN F. JAMES, ALBERT C. VAUGHN, PAUL B. DAGUE, IVOR D. FENTON, ALVIN R. BUSH, WALTER M. MUMMA, LEON H. GAVIN, LOUIS E. GRAHAM, CARROLL D. KEARNS, HARMAR D. DENNY, JR.
South Dakota: HAROLD O. LOVRE, E. Y. BERRY.
Tennessee: B. CARROLL REECE, HOWARD H. BAKER.
Washington: RUSSELL V. MACK, WALT HORAN, THOR TOLLEFSON.
Wisconsin: LAWRENCE H. SMITH, GLENN R. DAVIS, GARDNER WITHROW, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, MERLIN HULL, ALVIN O'KONSKI, REID MURRAY.
Wyoming: WILLIAM H. HARRISON.

STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

(A New Year's contribution and appeal from Frank H. Lamb, Hoquiam, Wash.)

Parents of today and of generations yet unborn, are you raising your children for a normal life of work and service or to perish on some foreign battlefield?

Workers in field, factory, or office, are you laboring for a higher standard of living, the necessities of family and old age, or producing battle spoil to be spread around the world?

Businessmen, would you rather trade in or make articles for more human comfort and enjoyment for education, culture, and recreation or machinery, guns, bombs, poisons for the wholesale destruction of life?

Widows, orphans, aged, heads of endowed schools and foundations, all those depending on savings, annuities, bonds, fixed income, or insurance, will you be able to live on the provisions you or others have made for your future, or will all your bonds, endowments, reserves, and assets be wiped out by an inflation that has already reduced the value of the dollar to half what it was a decade ago?

These questions and others equally as critical are being decided today with little reference to you and on superficial congressional consideration by an administration dominated by military men (Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and MacArthur, for example) headed by a President prone to bombast and snap judgments ("We can lick old Joe," and some recent letters) and supported by a flock of columnists to whom war will offer opportunities for advancement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the statement you referred to the fact that Congressmen must be persuaded that there is aid coming from Europe. I think you should change that to "convince." That will be more effective. If you will agree to the suggestion, I think it would be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We are happy to have the gentleman's suggestion. I do not want to take the responsibility for making such a change, however.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not one of the signers of the instrument to which the gentleman refers. However, I would like him to know that that document is not without sympathy or support on this side of the aisle. I agree thoroughly with the contents of that instrument. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the mail that I receive in my office is an accurate barometer of public opinion, the American public has lost confidence in its top executive leadership, and is now looking to the Congress of the United States to bring it out of this haze of international confusion in which it has been groping for the last 5 or 6 years. I think the Congress has no honorable alternative but to accept that responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In Michigan we have a State-wide election on April 1. Will the gentleman express an opinion, as to how many of the Members of this House, and perhaps the President himself, would advocate a war either in Korea, Asia, or in Europe if he had to stand for reelection on April 1 next?

Mr. TOWE. I do not believe any of them would, except those who come from States where you can get both nominations. They might, if you could find anybody in those States of that persuasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not believe they would even in those States. Our people do not want war. They do not have confidence in Acheson or the State Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not mean to have the RECORD show that he would vote only for his next election rather than for the interest of the country.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman was not expressing his own opinion. He was answering the question which the gentleman from Michigan asked.

Mr. McCORMACK. Your answer was that you were thinking of the next election.

Mr. TOWE. I said nothing of the sort. The RECORD will not show that I said that.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that this country is alarmed today as never before in the history of the United States, and the people are alarmed because in this generation we have seen two world wars, and some of this antique leadership is leading us into a third world war. We have listened to the experts now for 30 or 40 years, and now we are willing, and we hope that the voice of the American people will be heard once on international policy.

I want to say this, that I have 30 minutes tomorrow, and I am not to speak from any notes, and I will welcome the gentlemen from that side of the aisle to hear what I have to say tomorrow. I was in Europe as an enlisted man. I did not go to the cocktail parties in London and Paris. I saw Europe from Normandy all the way to Stassfurt, Germany, on the under side, and I hope you gentlemen will come out tomorrow and hear my report to this august body and to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who signed this document and, of course, I speak only for myself as each will when he has the opportunity. Those of us who are interested in making the declaration do so out of an intense desire to be of some help to the leadership of this country and, if possible, to reflect as accurately as we can the feeling that we believe is in the minds and hearts of a great majority of the American people today.

As far as I am concerned, the declaration was not conceived or signed for the purpose of being destructively critical; my purpose was to do what little I could, as I know every other Member wants to do, to help his country, the country that we all love and the country that we want to preserve if possible. We are disturbed, as the American people are, at the course and trend of events today. We find that we are about, if the executive branch of the Government remains in absolute control of the situation, we are about to send huge numbers of men, ground troops especially, to Europe. That obviously is the plan, and that statement comes as a result of my conclusion after listening to testimony for about 1 month on the proposed draft law, if we are going to increase the size of our services to the extent desired or requested. They certainly are not being called into service for the purpose of maintaining strength in this country. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people, acting through their Representatives in Congress, at least have some responsibility to make their own decision rather than to be led into a situation from which it may be impossible to turn back when it is too late.

It is interesting to note, I think, that those who now advocate the policy under which we are operating are the same ones—most, if not all—who precipitated, or at least their philosophy directed, this country into going into the war back in 1941 on the side of Russia. It was predicted then by a gentleman who is now making known his position on the present situation that if we did that, we would not only make it possible for Russia to defeat Germany but we would also build up the strength of that country so that she would be able to impose her will on many other nations throughout the world; and, of course, that has come to pass. I speak, of course, of former President Hoover, who is now rendering, in my opinion, a great service to the American people by provoking discussion and debate. It is possible that his viewpoint will not be agreed upon by all; and I know very well as I stand here that I may be wrong about what I am advocating, but I have the intense desire to do what I can. As I said a few moments ago, I think we ought to review the record as we have seen it in the past.

The people of this country were told—and I was convinced somewhat by it, I must admit—that if we would establish the Marshall plan program, we would be able to get the economies of Europe back to normal. We were told further that if we did that, we would make them strong enough so that they could resist Communist aggression. We were also told that it would obviate the necessity of maintaining a huge military establishment in this country or sending one abroad. We adopted the Marshall plan. How many billions of dollars we have spent, I do not know. Then we went further and joined the United Nations and participated in its deliberations. I think that was a laudable effort on our part, because I thought at that time it might possibly produce an organization which would result in the countries of the world airing their differences and then coming to some agreement and preventing war; I thought it would further peace. We find that in the very first serious test of the strength of that Organization we are standing practically alone in Korea, and we are suffering great losses.

While I am on that point I would like to refer back for a moment to the observation which the gentlewoman from New York made about the price of being liberated. I read the other day in the newspaper about the terrific casualties to the Korean people, largely the South Koreans, those we went in there to help out of their difficulties. The casualties run into the hundreds of thousands. I agree completely with the statement which the gentlewoman from New York made that the price of being liberated might be worse than the disease which we are trying to free them from.

We are told in connection with the inability of France and England especially to help us in Korea that those nations are busy, one in India and one in Indochina. I do not contest that statement but I would like to know, if they are busy there, and it is a safe bet that Mr. Stalin will keep them occupied there as long as he can, how in the face of that difficulty which they have on their hands they are going to supply great numbers of troops for the army of Europe?

We are told by General Eisenhower, and I have great respect for him as a military man, that we are going to provide a minimum of men, but our effort, and I am sure this is a fair deduction from what he said, will largely be in matériel. I would like to repeat the question, and I want someone to answer it, How is Britain, how is France, going to supply a great army of men to participate with us in the event that we send our men over there? Everyone knows that they are the two large manpower pools in Europe. If they cannot do the job, then we are going to be standing alone, I fear, if we become involved.

It is significant to me, at least, from some of the discussions which have been had lately that General Eisenhower completely omitted any discussions with Spain. We are told by military leaders and by others that they have perhaps the finest army in Europe, 500,000 to 600,000 well-trained troops. It may be appropriate to comment at this time that that is one country in Europe that is anxious to fight against the Communists. That country is anxious to do that. We need not spend a lot of time and effort prodding them should the occasion arrive.

When General Eisenhower went to Europe, he did not go to Madrid. He went to Portugal. They said to him, "Well, you cannot talk to us unless Spain is in on this arrangement because our economy and all of our interests are so tightly interwoven with theirs that unless they are involved we cannot be."

It is difficult for me to understand how when a serious situation confronts us such as we are told is before us at this time we rush in pell-mell taking in 18-year-olds and everybody else who can render any kind of military service. We are putting our country under complete economic controls—we will shortly if not immediately. Here is a great country that is willing to fight. The general's answer was that that country was not on his itinerary. In other words, there are those in Europe, and I suspect some people in this country, who are in position of importance and power, who are not willing yet, for some reason or other to take that nation into the arrangement in order to prevent the spread of Communist aggression in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people are entitled to have some voice in the manner in which they are governed, of course, and in the manner in which the executive branch of our Government may use our Army and our Navy and our Air Force. I do not think it was ever intended that any President of the United States should have the power to send an army to foreign countries without a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. I hope that through this discussion and the one which is taking place in the other body that we can arrive at some solution which will be understood by the people. I think, in the first place, the people are entitled to have all the information that is available so that they may know what they are getting into, and I hope also that we can arrive at a conclusion not only in the interest of our country—of course, it should be that, but it should be largely, as far as possible, in the interest of those other countries of the world who want to remain free and are willing to do something about it.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in listening to the enlightened remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, particularly with respect to his reference to the position of Spain. As the gentleman may know, I have for some time sought to exert what efforts I could in normalizing the diplomatic and commercial relations between Spain and the United States. What the gentleman says with respect to the military position of Spain cannot, in my opinion, be gainsaid. In fact the advantage to our ultimate security to be derived from the inclusion of Spain is generally conceded by all experts. We have for a number of years, however, adopted what, in my opinion, is a singular attitude toward this country. We have applied against it in determining our diplomatic and commercial relations standards different from those which we have applied against other countries all of which is not in the best interests of the United States. The Spanish people are historically connected with us by ties of friendship and blood. Their views are, generally, the views of the average American and to them as to the people of this country and even of the people of India, hardships that flow from undernourishment knows no boundaries.

The current wheat position in Spain is most critical. The seriousness of the problem for the next 5 months cannot be overemphasized. The Spanish Government's efforts to bring more wheat into the free market has successfully reduced black-market transactions, and has established a fuller and more effective distribution to urban industrial workers at a satisfactory price. This is all to the good—but it has reduced the amount of wheat now available to meet the essential demands for the next 5- to 6-month period. This is so because by successfully inducing the wheat flow to the market for consumption during the past months, less wheat remains over which the Government has the powers of control which might be exercised.

It is essential, therefore, that Spain obtain, not later than the latter half of February, 50,000 to 70,000 metric tons of wheat for delivery in early March. It is essential that Spain obtain approximately 300,000 metric tons of wheat, including the 50,000 referred to above, for delivery during the months of March to May.

The Spanish Government is prepared to arrange for the financing directly of $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of wheat; it cannot do more than this. Yet the critical needs are clear—Spain requires more wheat than can be obtained with that sum of money.

This brings out clearly why Dr. Sunez, Spanish Under Secretary of Industry and Commerce, requested initially that $8,000,000 of the authorized $62,500,000

be utilized for wheat purchases in the United States markets of approximately 100,000 metric tons. Taking into consideration the position of the United States Government, as explained by officials of the Export-Import Bank, the request has now been reduced to $5,000,000 to be made available now. This is the very basic minimum of assistance required for wheat purchases.

The Export-Import Bank has under consideration a request by the Spanish Government to use $5,000,000 of the $62,500,000 for the purchase of wheat. Difficulties encountered in obtaining this approval spring from the fact that it is erroneously contended by the bank that the use of the money for the purchase of wheat would be inconsistent with the spirit of the loan. That, in my opinion, was not the intent of the Congress in enacting the loan. Even if Spain, with the essentially required assistance of the Export-Import Bank, is able to obtain 300,000 metric tons of wheat imports during this period, its total wheat supply will not be more than 3,331,673 metric tons, which at best will be over 100,000 metric tons less than was available for 1948–49.

It is hoped that when the Congress considers legislation for relieving famine-stricken people consideration will be given to the 28,266,518 people of Spain who represent a strong bulwark against any ideology foreign to our democratic institutions.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I preface it with a short statement. There is no doubt but what the treatise of the gentleman presented to the floor today is one that probably will be long remembered, and he is to be commended for the splendid way in which he has analyzed that very important subject, which is also very close to the hearts of the American people and which is invoking this great widespread interest throughout the whole country. What he said is exactly what the people in my district and my constituents are pleading for in the line of relief; there is no question about it. I think it is a very fine gesture for the gentleman from Wisconsin to appear here and take this time and make such a keen analysis of this very interesting and very, very pressing subject before us.

Now here is my question: Assuming that the problems that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has presented here so ably today all have merit—and I am sure they have merit, and I think even our adversaries will agree that they have a great deal of merit—from a standpoint of relief what can we do in Congress, or what can we do in the House, or what can any public official do, clothed with the authority that we are clothed with as Representatives here, to give the people the relief they are seeking at the present time. How can we do away with some of the conditions that prompt the heart-rending appeals that we receive from our constituents, in light of the fact that we are today being governed by the UN Charter which was adopted by the other body on July 28, 1945, by a vote of 89 to 2, which confirmed and approved everything that was in the Charter of the United Nations? That is No. 1.

No. 2: What relief presently can we hope to get or seek, and what deterrent can be put in the way of this present program that is being promulgated here and being put into effect as long as we have what is known as the Atlantic Peace Pact Treaty which has been adopted? Assuming all of these suggestions that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin makes, are all very pertinent and very much to the point, but in the light of these two great legislative barriers, what can we do to alleviate and give the people the help that they are beseeching us for, and what can we hope to accomplish until someone has the courage—and I have never yet seen anyone get up in the House to do that—to determine or analyze what in the United Nations Charter confers upon the President of the United States the power to declare war, and what is there in the Atlantic Treaty Pact that permits him to send armies to Europe? It would appear here that practically all of us, some by negation and others by public utterances, are giving countenance to the fact that under the United Nations he can do just that—declare secondary war, and not only that, but send troops to Europe, because we have entered into a combination, a confederation, under which the people of the United States are obligated, in writing, to send troops to Europe, and to other continents as well.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will get the answers if he will look at the debate on both those things over in the other body. We are not obligated by the Atlantic Pact to send troops anywhere.

Mr. JONAS. That is just debate. We are not getting anywhere debating. We have been debating this question for weeks and months not only in this session but in the prior sessions, and we are not giving the people any relief. We are just talking and talking and talking. But what is there that relieves these people of the responsibility of sending 18-year-old boys to war and of having their taxes jacked up in the light of these war measures, and what is it we are doing from a concrete standpoint that will give the people relief?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Neither of the documents to which the gentleman referred gives the authority to the President to send a single soldier across the seas. If the people back home will put the heat on the Congressmen and the Senators who advocate this policy of carrying on these two wars, you will see a change right on the floor of this and the other body.

Mr. JONAS. Let me ask the gentleman from Michigan a question relative to the statement he is making. Is it not true that the President of the United States is declaring secondary war, and that he is sending troops over to the European shores?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure; and we do not have the courage to do anything about it.

Mr. JONAS. That is exactly the point I am making.

Mr. McKINNON. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman from Illinois advocate that we withdraw our troops from Germany?

Mr. JONAS. I do not advocate anything that has to do with what we have done. I want at this time to analyze the situation in the light of what we are trying to do. In one breath we say the President does not have the power and in the other we say he does. I should like to see some expression in the House that would immediately and definitely settle the question of whether the President has the unlimited and unrestricted powers that he is and has exercised to date.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I say that the 118 people who signed this declaration are for doing something. We would be pleased to have the gentleman's signature on that list.

Mr. JONAS. I do not know about the effectiveness of signing something, but I will be glad to vote for what you are trying to do if you will do what you are talking about.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding me a few minutes to express my views in connection with the statement of principle to which I have subscribed. The statement, of course, is one which had to be in broad, general language. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated, many of us have disagreed, perhaps, on votes on previous issues affecting foreign policy. However, I think it is a great expression of the soul-searching desire of the Members of Congress in connection with this tremendously important problem to agree upon a statement of principles, principles to which I, at least, subscribe. The principal purpose is the welfare not only of the United States of America but of the civilized world.

Mr. Speaker, my mail of the last 2 months has been the heaviest and the most disturbing in my almost 11 years of continuous service in Congress. The people ask, "Where are we going? What are you doing to direct our destinies that involve the lives of our sons, or our brothers, or our husbands? What are you doing to get us out of the mess we are in?"

What have we had? Why, going back to lend-lease when I first came to the Congress, I remember how all of the arguments of propaganda were turned loose: That first we were to furnish the money; then the tools; then they said, "We have to have your youth and your men." I think it would have been far more honest had we gone into it openly and said to the people of this country, "This means a declaration of war." Tragically, the various programs we have had under the guise of this or that appealing program, such as the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, and so forth, added to Yalta and Tehran and Potsdam, is why, ladies' and

gentlemen of the House, we are in the condition which confronts us today.

Is what we do next a subterfuge for a declaration or a commitment which will lead us directly into world war III? How many more thousands are going to die in Korea? To what extent can we expend our blood and our resources, not only in arming ourselves, but those whom we choose to call our allies today?

Mr. Speaker, I think the hour is the most critical one in the entire history of America. The American people are so disturbed that when they have an opportunity to express their opinions, both in letters to their Congressmen, or when they have an opportunity to express their opinions through the medium of an honestly conducted public opinion poll, they overwhelmingly, at least in our part of the country, are in favor of getting out of Korea. In a poll which was conducted in my district 97 percent of the people said that Congress should have the authority to determine whether troops are to be sent overseas—and that does not mean merely the replacement of garrison forces in Germany. The Korean situation has left a terrific impression upon the people and they see great danger in that situation to the American people. Eighty-nine percent of the poll favored getting out of Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility, as Congress, no matter which side of the aisle we sit on, to see that we are not getting sucked into another maelstrom. I say to you, with all the power at my command and with the deepest conviction that if we get into world war III in the immediate future it can mean nothing but the economic destruction of this country which is exactly what Stalin and the Politburo want to see happen. I think the people of this country are crying aloud to the Congress to assert itself. If it does not, they have lost faith in us, their representatives. Our greatest responsibility is to represent them, not necessarily in a complete agreement, but to represent them in the expression of the disturbed conditions of their minds upon this problem. I say it is up to us, and we cannot dodge it, to assert ourselves, and to insist that in any determination that is to be made on foreign policy, any determination that involves the sending of American youth from this country, we shall have the last word. Otherwise, what are we to become? An idle appropriation committee that says, "Yes, we will give you what you want." I say, Mr. Speaker, in all the seriousness at my command, the time is now for us to act.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I have this question in mind, and I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota whether it is his contention that the Charter and the powers set forth therein is in the United Nations or does not confer upon that body the right to declare a blockade or to call out the Air Force or to declare what is akin to open hostilities anywhere, if they say there is a violation of the aggression rule. I presume the gentleman is familiar with that section.

Mr. O'HARA. I am familiar with it. But permit me to say I would prefer that the gentleman permit me to answer at some other time. There are others to whom time has been promised. I say it is obvious that the United Nations claims to have something to do with the control of military operations in Korea and in the determination of whether they shall go beyond or not go beyond the thirty-eighth parallel. With us fighting 98 percent of the war over there and doing the principal part of the fighting and dying and paying, it is a little ridiculous to me, but apparently the power is there for them to determine.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman that the way the situation is managed it is very unfortunate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I must yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think a constructive approach would be to see what the areas of agreement are rather than the areas of disagreement. Does the gentleman advocate our withdrawing completely from Europe?

Mr. O'HARA. No, I do not necessarily mean that; but, of course, to what extent?

Mr. McCORMACK. But that is the question. Who is going to determine that?

Mr. O'HARA. No. I do not say that we should completely withdraw from Europe. From past experience, the President will not consult me about it either.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's argument would leave that impression.

Mr. O'HARA. I did not mean to leave that impression.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that. That is one area of agreement. To what extent should we keep our troops in Germany that are there now?

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is a question of policy, as to whether it is necessary. I have not passed upon that question as yet. I am not passing on it now. Will I have, in the light of the past, an opportunity?

Mr. McCORMACK. Who would determine that?

Mr. O'HARA. The Congress should.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. O'HARA. Now, let me say to my friend I am not subscribing to the idea that the military is running this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Nobody does.

Mr. O'HARA. And I never shall. I leave it to the military to make decisions on matters pertaining to the military, but that, over-all, the Congress makes final decision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the President, under the Constitution, has certain prerogatives and duties.

Mr. O'HARA. Oh, I recognize that.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, is it fair to say that the gentleman feels there should be that cooperation of all, and understanding of all, and advice from military sources as to what should be done?

Mr. O'HARA. I think that instead of the Executive, military, and State Department making some of these decisions as they have time and again before they have advised with either the military or Foreign Affairs Committee or the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is being done all the time.

Mr. O'HARA. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not feel, then, that we should withdraw completely from Europe?

Mr. O'HARA. I answered that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there is at least one area of agreement. Does the gentleman believe that we should withdraw from Asia, from Korea?

Mr. O'HARA. In the light of the feeling of the people of my district I would have to say——

Mr. McCORMACK. No; how does the gentleman feel himself? The gentleman is presenting this argument. Does the gentleman vote on feeling or does he vote his own conviction and judgment?

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentlemen confine himself to a question and not an argument? I will say, yes; I would withdraw from Korea today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Based on your own judgment?

Mr. O'HARA. Based on my own judgment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see; that is an answer. Based on the gentleman's own judgment would he withdraw from the rest of the Far East?

Mr. O'HARA. I would not go that far; I would not go that far. I would like to have the opportunity of making the decision as a Member of the House, instead of it being made by some one or some few downtown. That should be the job for Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be in order here to call this to your mind, that by no stretch of anyone's imagination can this administration be relieved of the responsibility in regard to the situation we face in Asia, and that is why I wish to direct your attention for a few minutes to the reasons why we are in the situation in which we find ourselves in the world today.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield briefly.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that up to this time, regardless of what we Members of Congress think or have been thinking, the administration has paid no attention whatever to us, has paid no attention to the Congress? And that is why this group decided they would do something about it by signing this declaration.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is correct, but they will probably pay as little attention to us in the future as they have in the past.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In the last analysis, when we evaluate the situation and find the Congress subservient to the administrative branch of the Government, taking over and exercising powers that were allocated to the Congress in the

Constitution; do we not find that that situation came about because of legislation passed by the Congress giving blanket authority to the President to do the things that the Congress itself was supposed to do for the people who represent them? Is not the remedy to this situation a determination on the part of the Congress itself to take back the powers reposed in them by the Constitution, legislating as we are supposed to legislate, and exercising the powers the Congress alone is supposed to exercise? Is not that the real solution to this problem?

As long as we leave it where it is and let the administrative branch of the Government override the Congress, let the Congress be subservient to and take orders from the administration, there can be no relief for the American people. Is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And is not this statement signed by 118 Members of Congress a very laudable thing? Is that not what you are driving at?

Mr. HILL. Certainly; and I would like to add this further thought, that we cannot as a Congress act intelligently on these measures that are before us unless we know the history behind it. I want to give you just a little insight into what has brought this about, for I feel the lack of that knowledge is one of our great difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, in November 1943, at the Cairo Conference we said to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek "that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to the Republic of China. In due course, Korea shall become free and independent."

The year 1944 saw the great Allied offensive launched in Europe. In the Pacific, American forces inched toward the Philippines; while on the mainland, heroic China held the Jap invaders. At the year's end, British and American forces were at the Rhine, and Russia was knocking at Poland's door.

In February 1945, with Germany only needing the knockout blow, the Allies sat down at a conference table in the Crimean city of Yalta, on the Black Sea. For Russia there were Premier Stalin, Molotov, Gromyko, Vishinski, and Gusev. For Britain there were Churchill, Eden, Cadogan, Kerr, and Bridges. For the United States there were President Roosevelt, Byrnes, Hopkins, Stettinius, and Alger Hiss. China was left at home.

On February 11, the Yalta conferees announced they had reached an agreement. They revealed to the public that occupation plans for Germany had been decided upon, that the date for organizing the United Nations had been set, that an agreement had been reached calling for free elections for liberated peoples, that in response to Russian demands, Poland would be partitioned, with the Russians gaining a large slice of that beleaguered country, and finally, that Russia's demands had been met for the establishment of a Polish provisional government "to be organized on a broader democratic basis," meaning that Communists would be admitted. The world hailed these decisions as the blueprint for peace.

On the morning of February 23, 1945, President Roosevelt held a press conference. As reported in the New York Times the following day, the headline read, "Roosevelt back; speaks to Congress today." A smaller headline read, "Prophecy of peace; President hopeful for future; thinks arms cuts may come later; hails Yalta plans." Those were the headlines. But buried 13 pages away in the story in the New York Times was this little-noticed paragraph. Here is what that paragraph said:

> The President's report to Congress on his victory and peace mission to the Crimea tomorrow will not tell all. Some understandings reached at the Big Three meetings on the Black Sea were secret, he said. Whether these involved political or military arrangements, or both, was part of the secrecy.

The world was to learn that there were secret agreements, and that they were not military, but political.

The first glimpse came with the disclosure, bit by bit, that at Yalta the following agreements had been entered into but not immediately made public. First, the world learned that the veto power had been set up in the United Nations, a weapon, incidentally, which has been used by Russia time and time again to block action in that body. Next, it was disclosed that under a special arrangement, Russia had been granted three votes in the UN, a preferred treatment accorded no other nation. Later, it leaked out that at Yalta, German reparations had been agreed upon and fixed at $20,000,000,000, with the Soviet Union to get half, the other Allies being forced to share what was left. But Yalta's deepest secrets were yet to be uncovered.

Under the terms of this secret agreement, Russia was given control of Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, Manchuria, the Sakhalins, and the Kuriles. China, which had fought for eight long years to regain Manchuria, had not even been consulted or advised.

To carry out this secret Yalta deal, President Roosevelt had agreed to force China to accept the terms, notwithstanding the solemn Cairo pledge 14 months earlier restoring the boundaries of China and returning Manchuria to the Chinese people. The exact words of this enforcement section of the secret Yalta agreement are to be found in the text which was finally published by the State Department, March 24, 1947, 2 years after the deal had been consummated behind locked doors at Yalta:

> It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence, on advice from Marshal Stalin. The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

On December 15, 1945, came China's most crushing blow—President Truman's announcement cutting off United States aid unless Communists were admitted to the Government of China. Simultaneously, President Truman sent General Marshall to order a truce and to carry out his demand.

General Marshall, obeying the orders of his Commander in Chief, forced a truce at a time when Chiang Kai-shek's troops were winning. General Marshall did this by cutting off United States aid, placing an embargo on China's military purchases in the United States, scuttling a 1945 agreement between China and the United States whereby the United States would supply the Government of China with an air force of eight and one-third groups after the war was over, stalling discussion on a proposed half billion dollar loan which had been promised the Chinese, demanding that the Chinese Air Force, the most potent weapon against the Reds, be grounded.

The history of these disastrous steps has been set down in plain language by one of the great generals of World War II, General Chennault, who organized and commanded the famous Flying Tigers, who fought so brilliantly in China. In his book The Way of a Fighter, General Chennault has written:

> Some 50 truce teams each were dispatched to trouble spots all over China. Each was headed by an elderly American colonel specially picked for his white hair to impress the Chinese. Here are some specific examples of what they accomplished:
>
> North of Hankow, some 200,000 government troops had surrounded 70,000 Communist troops and were beginning a methodical job of extermination. Arrangements were made for fighting to cease, while the Communists marched out of the trap and on to the Shantung Province, where a large Communist offensive began about a year later. On the East River near Canton, some 100,000 Communist troops were trapped by government forces. Truce teams allowed the Communists to march unmolested to Bias Bay, where they sailed to Shantung.
>
> The worst fiasco was at Kalgan Pass, a historic gateway between China and Manchuria. At the end of the war there were no organized Communists in Manchuria. Early in 1946, a Government offensive captured Kalgan and sealed off the pass, trapping nearly a million Chinese Communists in northwest China who were moving toward Manchuria. Marshall made strenuous efforts to open the Kalgan Pass for these Communists. Eventually the Government withdrew, and the Communist horde poured into Manchuria. The Communists then broke the truce by fortifying Kalgan Pass. It was these troops who marched under a safe conduct of the American-sponsored truce through Kalgan Pass and returned with Japanese arms, supplied by Russia, that won the decisive battles in Manchuria in 1947.

Those are the words of General Chennault.

While the United States promoted a truce, the Russia Red Army was systematically looting the Jap arsenal in Manchuria. Guns, tanks, and planes were seized; entire war plants and whole industries were stripped and dismantled. The Red Army took 90 percent of the machinery of the coal industry, 80 percent of the metal-working industry, 75 percent of the textile industry, and 50 percent and up of the chemical, cement, power, railroad, and steel industries. Edwin W. Pauley, President Truman's reparations expert, put the over-all loot at $2,000,000,000.

For the Chinese Reds, the American-ordered truce was a godsend, because,

according to General Chennault, out of Russia's Manchurian booty, the Chinese Communist Army was given sufficient Jap arms to supply a million men for 10 years of fighting. It was these arms that sealed the fate of China.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to express to the Congress of the United States the concern of the people of this country, the concern that grips my district, over the foreign and war policies of the administration. Every day since January 3, for six long weeks, telephone calls, letters, and telegrams have come in a deluge, all saying the same thing: "We are worried; we are frightened; we are angry." And, this: "What are you going to do about it?" Now, I cannot believe that such letters come merely to our side of the aisle. I cannot believe that anywhere in the United States today there is a thoughtful person—and people are thinking—who does not recognize with just trepidation the national and the personal crisis that we are facing. So, when the opportunity came for me to read and sign this statement of policy, I looked at it very carefully. It seemed to me that the circulation of this statement constituted the first honest, constructive effort that had been made to ascertain the feeling of this Congress. I am simple enough to wish very much that we might have a symposium on foreign policy in this Congress without regard to party lines and in which every one of us would stand up and say honestly what our people are thinking and what we are thinking; and perhaps work out a plan that would be truly American. They tell me that is too utopian a dream to be accomplished in the United States Congress.

The people are frightened, and I share their fear. I happen to have lived here in Washington during a depression; a world war; what we thought was a victory; and this terrible present war. I can say to you what in my heart I know to be true. Never, never in any other crisis—and there have been many of them—has there been such reason for fear. Even during World War II, bitter as those days were, we knew two things. First we knew where we were going. We had a definite goal. And, second, it never occurred to our strong American hearts that we would not win that goal. Now, what my constituents and your constituents are telling us is this: We do not know where this country is going. We only know that present leadership seems to be taking us somewhere, too fast, and with a note of panic. Now, I very much agree with the wise gentleman from Illinois who earlier said, "What are you going to do about it?"

My first step is to sign this statement of policy because it is concrete and definite. I agree wholeheartedly, and I know the people of the Nation agree that the foreign policy and the responsibility therefor lies with the Members of this Congress. I concur with point 1 of the declaration. I certainly also agree that we must have an impregnable defense. That, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], is one of the grounds for common agreement for which he was seeking. We also agree very strongly that we must have a strong, economic basis for our prosperity. Without an expanding productivity and a sound fiscal policy no defense in the world could stand. We also agree that we must have peace treaties as soon as is compatible with the national interest. I certainly share the strong feeling that we must renew our Western Hemisphere homogeneity by returning to a good-neighbor policy with South and Central America—a policy which we seem to have been neglecting.

Now, on point 5 I faced a slight question: no question of principle, nor of fundamental policy; a difference of expression. Accordingly I signed this statement with two minor deviations. One of them was just minor. Instead of saying "prohibit aid" I would like to say "refuse to offer aid" except to those countries who show the desire to fight for freedom and demonstrate the will to defend themselves. Secondly, I personally would go beyond the inclusive, and, in one sense, exclusive, invitation to Great Britain to participate in the program; I would urge any country who shared our belief and would implement that belief with actual, substantial help to join in this fight against Soviet imperialistic aggression.

That brings me again to the point: What can we do? I think first that we can play fair with the American people and give them as many facts as possible. They want the truth.

We can do one thing more. I am a little frightened that every step taken since I have been here has dealt with militaristic policy or fiscal policy pertaining thereto, or anyway, with some measure that dealt with expanding militarism. I think in our foreign relations we have made one signal error. We have been too busy selling standards of living to the people whom we hope to influence and have not sufficiently expressed to them the underlying spirit and substance of what you and I would both call the American way of life.

I certainly hope that, as we stand, bound ourselves to defend our freedom and urging others to join us, we will remember to sell to everybody that we can, the common people of the world and not the governments, the expanding knowledge of what it actually means to live in full human dignity as free men. That is what I would like to contribute as a last point in this statement of policy. This may seem to be dealing with intangibles, but I would remind you that, after all, our happiness, our prosperity, our greatness, and I believe our safety, depend upon that great intangible of freedom, without which we would not want to live. We must demand and provide moral and spiritual, as well as military mobilization.

I am happy to support this statement of policy. I urge again that we bring as many facts as possible to the truth-hungry American people. Let us tell them over and over again that we, the Congress, whom they send here to represent them, will not abdicate our responsibility.

Further, this may prove to be the most expansive policy in the world, because the conviction grows that without American strength and American freedom—and would it not be terrible if we lost the habit of freedom—there is no hope for our civilization or for us; and neither, I am equally convinced, would there be any hope for a very weary world.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, the matter before the House has brought forth some wholesome discussion. There is little to be added. To this extent this declaration of principles has accomplished something worth while and justifies its presence here. This open debate helps at least to define an "area of agreement," to use an expression of the majority floor leader.

The preamble contains this statement: "We, the undersigned, conceive that the present position of the United States is dangerous and its future tragic," and something must be done about it.

Few thinking people will disagree with this statement.

We believe our foreign policy should be reexamined and revised. In view of the sorry fact that nobody knows what that policy is now or has been in the immediate past, this statement would seem to be reasonable and accurate.

Paragraph 1 asserts that Congress should participate in and approve our future military and political policy. President Woodrow Wilson authored the phrase "open covenants openly arrived at," and by that he meant that the secret diplomacy of the Old World brings war. We have since seen the tragic results of such diplomacy at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, and today our country is paying the price. We face the prospect of fighting undeclared wars in any place on the globe at the pleasure of the Kremlin, for we have forgotten or failed to heed the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> The provisions of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings have always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

Lincoln had not heard of "police actions."

We believe this country should be impregnable to attack. Who does not?

We favor economy in Government. This means reduction in nonessential civilian political expenditures. Who, save the administration, disagrees with that.

On this continent was enacted the great drama of all time—man's fight to work out his own salvation in freedom. The main difference between our forefathers and us is that they looked

to God for their help, and today the Fair Deal has persuaded so many to look to Government. Our forefathers had faith—faith in themselves, faith in America, faith in God.

We want a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere. Who finds any fault in that?

Again quoting Abraham Lincoln:

> If danger ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

Either a loose fiscal policy or a weird foreign policy can mean suicide at this stage of the game.

We want to establish a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. We would refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden.

In other words, we want to work with but not for freedom-loving nations. The effect of this declaration is this: Western Europe should contribute its part in preparing for its own defense. We have fought two wars in Europe on the theory that in so doing we were defending ourselves and furthering world peace. It is proposed now that we repeat the performance, and we are coy about accepting the invitation.

While this so-called declaration of policy does not cover the picture completely, we offer it as a starting point for producing coherence where now we have nothing but confusion. It gives impetus to discussion.

The reaction among Members of the House during debate was good, for from many quarters it was apparent that there is very little disagreement with the general principles stated by Mr. Hoover in his speeches to the Nation. Almost everyone with whom I have talked, regardless of whether he signed this declaration, indicated that Congress must not surrender further its legislative powers, and the opinion that already we have given to the Executive more power than he is able or should be willing to exercise. Such conduct on the part of the legislative branch has nearly if not quite destroyed its integrity as one of the three branches of this Government. This opinion is subscribed to by Members of Congress, regardless of party affiliations. It was the design of our basic law that treaties, which are nothing but agreements between nations, must be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Through the practice of entering into agreements with other nations the Executive has, for years, usurped the power of one branch of the Congress and assumes the power to bind us in the future without the advice or the consent of that body, as the Constitution provided.

February 22 will be set aside in the House of Representatives for the purpose of doing honor to the memory of George Washington, the first President of the United States. His Farewell Address will be read with force and quavering emotion. After the ceremonies, this great address, which would save us from catastrophe if it were followed, will be locked up and forgotten until February 22, 1952, when it will be consulted again.

Without standards of behavior we have no morality. Without landmarks, metes and bounds, courses and distances, we have chaos. We want a clear idea where we stand and in what general direction we are heading. If we do not heed history, and know where we have been, we probably will not understand where we are going. The Constitution of the United States was a thoughtful document which recognized the past, profited by its mistakes, and set a course for the future. It established metes and bounds. No straight and narrow path can be followed when fences and sign boards are removed or changed, and the paths are not kept shored.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], and ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the movement having its real beginning this afternoon is a healthy thing. I take pride in my association with it from its inception, some weeks ago. I am glad to have associated my efforts with those of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], as well as my colleagues, Congressmen TOWE, LAWRENCE SMITH, FELLOWS, and O'HARA, efforts which are joined by more than 100 Members of the House. That number will grow.

I think I should also say that we have enjoyed the benefit of the services, suggestions, and enthusiastic encouragement of a considerable number of distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle. It is, of course, entirely evident that a matter of such grave importance transcends any partisan considerations.

The American people and their elected representatives in the Congress are presently engaged in what is being called the great debate.

It is possible that this debate was touched off by the courageous speech made by Joseph P. Kennedy, our former Ambassador to Great Britain, on December 12, 1950. Quoting Lincoln, he said:

> If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better know what to do and how to do it.

Eight days later, Herbert Hoover opened his thoughtful address on foreign policy by saying:

> No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However, to find our national path, we must constantly reexamine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction.
>
> I do not propose to traverse the disastrous road by which we have reached this point.

I agree. I conceive that the present position of the United States is dangerous, and its future tragic unless the Congress immediately undertakes a reexamination and revision of a foreign policy that has been and will be a costly failure.

Many of us have been giving close and prayerful consideration to this problem. It is neither possible nor important that we agree on all details. But there are some fundamental issues which I respectfully suggest for your consideration.

First. Whatever our future policy is to be it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress. I fully agree with Senator TAFT, when on January 15 he said:

> The basic liberties of the people of this country are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies affecting the very life and being of the American people.

I confess profound shock at the opposing opinion of Senator CONNALLY, who would merely agree to a resolution that would not seek to direct the President in any way, but would give the Senate a sense of participation in the decision without giving it any real or assumed veto power. Presumably the House would not even enjoy this mild satisfaction.

Second. I definitely oppose the broad implications of the Truman doctrine, under the authority of which the United States has assumed the duty to support and defend any free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I deny that the United States has either the moral obligation or the practical capacity to carry on any such a global program.

Specifically, I believe we should—

First. Oppose the engagement of our land forces in any part of Asia;

Second. Decline further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden; and

Third. Concentrate future policy on the consolidation and defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Obviously this brief statement is subject to amplification and broadening in detail. But I feel the support of these minimum principles is essential to save the country from an attrition of strength which would lead to its ultimate ruin.

I recognize that many patriotic and intelligent people hold quite divergent views, and I fully recognize their right to do so. On the other hand, I demand equal respect for the motives of my position. At the very least these opposing views must be fully debated and resolved, by serious factual analysis, and not by name calling.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that I have specifically suggested my disagreement with the so-called Truman doctrine. This I believe to be the seed of our present difficulties.

There should be no misunderstanding of the Truman doctrine. The President was frank about it. Summed up, it is this—and I quote his words:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who

are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

In plain language by the pursuit of such a policy, we have bitten off more than we can chew. I warned of this in a speech I made on May 7, 1947, in connection with the debate on Greek-Turkey loan, I said:

> Four hundred million is appropriated to the President, to start America on a dark journey, a dangerous journey, an imperialistic adventure to every plague spot in the world.

I have no reason now to retract what I said then. In view of the limited time remaining, I shall content myself with a more complete discussion of this dangerous doctrine in the near future.

To conclude, either Congress actively participates in basic policy making decisions, or else we degenerate into a mere Reichstag, having only the very doubtful privilege of voting "Yes," and of providing the funds to implement policies not even submitted to us for our consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GOVERNMENT BIDDING

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1950, Mr. J. P. Lawlor, president of the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa, went to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, to find out if there was any contractual work available that could be performed by his company. While there he was given the forms and invited to submit a sealed bid covering 105 mobile demineralizers. On November 13, 1950 on behalf of his company, he did submit a sealed bid, accompanied by a sufficient performance bond, a financial statement, and a letter from a financial institution stating that funds were available to his company to adequately finance the project.

The bids were opened and read at 11 a. m., November 13, 1950. Five companies in all submitted sealed bids. The bid of the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa, was $348,591.75. The next lowest bid was by the Refinite Corp., of Omaha, Nebr., $409,842.50. The other three bids were higher than the Omaha corporation. The contract was awarded to the Refinite Corp., of Omaha, Nebr., whose bid was $61,250.75 higher than the bid of the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa.

No satisfactory explanation has been given to the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa, as to why its bid was rejected. A number of attempted explanations have been offered as a result of protests filed by the General Filter Co., of Ames, and each explanation is different than the previous one, and each one is just about as ridiculous and unfounded as the fact that $61,250.75 of the taxpayers' money was spent unnecessarily on a $350,000 to a $400,000 contract. I have computed the amount of money lost to the taxpayers by rejecting the bid of the General Filter Co., of Ames, and awarding the contract to the Refinite Corp., of Omaha, to be approximately 15 percent. Mr. Speaker, if all the contracts now being let, and to be let, by the Government are to be awarded on this kind of basis, it means that $150,000,000 out of every $1,000,000,000 will be an absolute loss to the taxpayers, or $1,500,000,000 out of every $10,000,000,000, $3,000,000,000 out of every $20,000,000,000, and $15,000,000,000 out of every $100,000,000,000.

Is it any wonder that the people are dissatisfied with the way the Government is handling its business affairs? Is it any wonder they are protesting additional taxes when they know things like this are going on? Just why, Mr. Speaker, when sealed bids are called for and a responsible company submits a bid, supported by a sufficient performance bond and proper financial statements, is such a bid rejected and it awarded another company whose bid is 15 percent higher? Is this favoritism, or is it just plain stupidity?

I do not expect anything I say here to change the present contract—nor do the officers of the General Filter Co. of Ames, Iowa, expect it to be changed now—but they, as well as every other taxpayer, would like to be assured that such unwarranted waste of the taxpayers' money will not be permitted in the future. Is this the reason why the President was reported recently in the press as having told a committee of Congress that there could be no reduction in the present budget and that he dared the Congress to cut it?

Mr. Speaker, I am fully conscious of the limitation of the powers of Congress; namely, that it is only a legislative body with power to investigate, but no power to enforce any of its own laws. However, Mr. Speaker, under the present emergency, would it not be possible to have a committee of Congress set up with power to compel governmental agencies to reduce waste and cut out foolish expenditures such as the one I have just cited? Surely, through its control of the purse it could force a great reduction of unwarranted waste.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions about this. Is the company in Ames, Iowa, a large company or is it a small company?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is a small company. It is a very good company. It was formed in 1935, and it has been doing a handsome business. It has made money. It has submitted its plans and specifications to the Air Force Department at Patterson Field and was told it was capable of doing the job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

THE INDIAN SERVICE HOSPITAL AT BETHEL, ALASKA

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, last November a disastrous fire swept through the United States Indian Service Hospital at Bethel, Alaska, destroying the main building and the Quonset-type annex. Fortunately all of the nearly 60 patients were removed to safety—and all within a very short period of time.

This hospital at Bethel served an area of between sixty to seventy thousand square miles and the town does not have highway or railroad facilities. Furthermore the river and bay into the Bering Sea are open only about 4 months of the year. Although the population of Bethel is only about 650, the Indian Service estimates that the area served by the hospital involves about 9,000 people.

I am reliably informed that the Federal Government is now paying about $140 minimum round-trip airplane fare to fly these emergency cases out of Bethel to other nearest Government hospitals. It is 770 airline miles to the Government hospital at Barrow and 1,140 airline miles to the hospital at Juneau. I am advised that in some of these instances the condition of the patient is such that it is necessary to send along a nurse or an attendant, thus doubling the fare.

When we figure that in the last fiscal year this hospital had 212 major surgical cases alone, we can realize the great expense involved in flying these cases to other hospitals and the urgent need to move at the earliest possible moment to begin rebuilding this institution which has served the Bethel area so well since it was built in 1939. In the hope that no time will be lost through unnecessary delays and to avoid waiting for the regular Interior Department appropriation bill, I have today introduced a bill designed to start this project on its way.

Personally I am a strong advocate of private enterprise and an opponent of Government carrying on a business at taxpayers' expense that could normally be carried on by private institutions.

In the case of the Bethel Hospital, private hospital facilities are just not available in the area. Our only alternative is to rebuild this structure destroyed by fire just as rapidly as possible.

We are today appropriating vast sums of money for do-good projects throughout the world—all to advertise democracy and in the hope we will stave off the advance of communism.

Here we have an opportunity to practice what we preach. Russians are attacking our policies with respect to our Territories and insular possessions. Here is an opportunity to show the world just how rapidly we can move in looking after the welfare of our own.

Since 1885 missionaries of the Moravian Church have been carrying on their work in this Kuskokwim River area served by the Bethel Hospital. Through their mission activities they have worked closely with the hospital authorities. These missionaries are now working among the church's 2,500 native members in 25 communities along Kuskokwim River and the Kuskokwim Bay.

Many of you will recall the work carried on among the American Indians in Ohio by the missionaries of the Moravian Church. One of these—David Zeis-

berger—is credited with saving the colonists from the attacks of the Iroquois Indians at a critical point during the Revolutionary War.

The missionaries of this church are well established in the Kuskokwim River area and are thoroughly familiar with the needs of the people there. Their board of elders has communicated with me, fearing that this hospital might not be rebuilt or that steps toward its rebuilding might be extended indefinitely.

The Indian Service informs me that it has filed with the Budget Bureau a request and accompanying papers justifying the rebuilding of this hospital. I am advised that it is the opinion of the Indian Service that the need for this hospital is great and that there are sufficient Alaska natives living in that area whose health problems are of such magnitude that they require a hospital in or near Bethel. I hope the Bureau of the Budget will realize the emergency in this situation and expedite this project.

During the fiscal year of 1950 this hospital had 450 admissions and in addition treated 3,792 persons who were not admitted to the institution as bed patients. This averages better than 1 new admission—1 new bed patient—every day and more than 10 persons given medical treatment and permitted to leave the institution every day.

In the months of June and July prior to the fire, the number of bed patients averaged 72 a day. The hospital was rated as a 60-bed hospital. Thus you observe the Bethel Hospital was already overtaxed. The Indian Service has asked the Bureau of the Budget for approval of a 70-bed hospital. It is felt this will handle the needs, since the tuberculosis patients treated at the Bethel Hospital at the time of the fire will soon receive treatment at a new tuberculosis hospital elsewhere in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, while we spend much time considering the needs of those associated with us in the struggle for a free world, I hope we will also move expeditiously in meeting this urgent need in one of our own Territories.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have listened for about 90 minutes to speeches in connection with the foreign affairs of our country. While they have all been very interesting, the sum total of the remarks impressed itself upon my mind as that my friends are possessed of a "defeatist" attitude. They are not possessed of that affirmative spirit which brings with it the confidence needed in the conflict or danger that may confront our country. The impression left in my mind was that they were advocating, without saying it in words, the spirit of retreat, criticizing, griping remarks containing nothing affirmative. Some even had differences of opinion with each other, no two agreeing.

I would like to search for the "area of agreement." To me this is very important, not the "area of disagreement." I think the "area of disagreement" has been stressed too much. What is the "area of agreement"? What are the things that the Members of Congress are agreed upon? When we find that we shall have found an area of basic agreement although we may differ as to methods, in which case there is an area of basic agreement. And then to find out in some sources what the "area of disagreement" is, the fatal tactics used to try and portray to the American public the feeling that there is confusion, confusion, confusion.

I can remember 10 years ago some of those who spoke today making the same type of speeches when we were trying to prepare ourselves against an attack by Hitler. I can remember the one-vote victory on extending the Selective Service Act. I have often wondered, Mr. Speaker, what a terrible price the conscience of every Member would have exacted who voted against the extension of selective service about 2 months before Pearl Harbor had the bill been defeated by one or two or more votes. The responsibility of one who loses is an easy thing to satisfy himself about; you can conjure up this and that and justify it; but I have often wondered, had the extension of selective service been defeated in September of 1941 instead of going through by one vote, what would have been the thoughts in the minds and consciences of those Members on that famous roll call who voted against it. I would not want to have it on my conscience if as a result of that vote my country lost its independence and our people their freedom, or if that vote contributed to the loss of independence and freedom, or if that vote contributed toward serious impairment of the best interests of the United States.

We had a civil war, and we had a great President, the first Republican President who was our leader in that tragic era. If he were alive today he would be a Democrat; he could not stand for what is going on and for the thoughts running through the minds of many I listen to on the left side of the aisle today, not only in reference to domestic affairs but in foreign affairs as well. He did not have the support of his own party in Congress when he was President; he was held in contempt; he was hated by Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate. Much of that was due to political reasons. The sad thing today is to see, not in this body I am glad to say, expressing my opinion, but elsewhere, some men with presidential ambitions who have jealousy toward such a great American as General Eisenhower because they fear he might be nominated by the Republican convention as a candidate for President in 1952.

We had men who hated Wilson only 30 years ago, and they stopped the League of Nations from becoming an effective instrument for peace. We have the same minds—different names—today. The feeling of jealousy and hatred is generating. I am glad to say that is not so in this body so far as I can observe, but it is generating just the same.

Reference has been made to certain polls. It is perfectly all right to consider polls as a piece of evidence, but when I see or hear Member after Member get up and talk about polls, conveying the information they should vote in accordance with those polls, I ask, "What is their responsibility under representative government?"

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. I do not know how many Members saw it, but back 3 or 4 weeks ago either Look or Life magazine had a picture story. Apparently some months ago at the time of Korea they sent their representatives into a town in Ohio and took a cross-section and printed the pictures and the stories of many people there. There was practically unanimity of opinion so far as those people were concerned in support of what was being done in Korea. About 3 weeks ago or around that time they went back to the very same people and asked them what they thought then. Those people for the most part had completely changed.

Now, that implies, to my mind at least, a responsibility not only upon the Representatives in this Congress to act upon their own initiative but also to have some information as to the basis upon which the people of this country are expressing opinions, because certainly we cannot have our policy shift back and forth as easily and as often as has been done by that illustration.

I may say to one of the Members who spoke recently, in which he mentioned a speech made by former Ambassador Kennedy, and I have no desire to comment upon that speech made by the father of one of our distinguished colleagues, I think if that Member is to use former Ambassador Kennedy's speech as an indication of what should or should not be done, perhaps he should also include in his remarks the stand former Ambassador Kennedy took in England when it was a question of whether England was going to try to resist Hitler.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman appropriately spoke about the hatred that people have for men who have reached the peak in political and other life. That was significant, as the gentleman stated, with reference to the great President Wilson, who was an American, a top American, a constitutional American, it also reached the peak with reference to President Roosevelt and President Truman; but it never in the history of this country reached as high a place as it did against President Hoover when he was President and ran the second time.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. FELLOWS. To the gentleman's speech about hatred and jealousy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman admit that when Lincoln was President he did not have a friend among his own party in the Congress?

Mr. FELLOWS. No. His Vice President came from my district. Certainly not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the Vice President a Member of Congress?

Mr. FELLOWS. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to Members of Congress. The Vice President presides over the Senate. He is not a Member of the Senate. Is my recollection of the Constitution correct that the Vice President is not a Member of the Senate?

Mr. FELLOWS. Well, of course, nobody ever received the abuse that Herbert Hoover received.

Mr. McCORMACK. From Republicans, too.

Mr. FELLOWS. From the gentleman's party.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me say to the gentleman that I can remember in 1933 or 1934 when a couple of Republican Members of the House bitterly and personally attacked former President Hoover. I was on the floor. The gentleman smiles because he probably has a recollection of that too. I waited to see if some Republican Member of the House would speak for the former President. Nobody did. And I rose and defended him as an American. He was my President when he was in office. I might disagree with him, but he was the President of the United States and while he was President he was my President and carried my respect as President and my respect for the office of President.

I can remember when Harold Stassen resigned as Governor of Minnesota to go into the Navy in World War II. When he made the statement about international affairs three or four Republicans got up, friends who did not agree with him—and they had a perfect right to disagree—but they bitterly attacked Harold Stassen. I only met the gentleman once. To my recollection I have not met him since. But I admired him as an American and as an individual. I waited to hear if any Republican was going to say a word for Harold Stassen. Nobody did, so I got up and defended him as an American. I simply refer to that to show that we Democrats do not hate. We may disagree but we do not hate. That is the prerogative of some other people; I am not saying it is the prerogative of the Republican Party, but it certainly is not within the realm of the Democratic Party or any Member to hate. We can disagree sharply and intensely, but we never hate.

Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to make an observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I would like to ask the gentleman how he characterizes the statement of the present President with reference to the marines.

Mr. McCORMACK. The present President is a man who, like the gentleman from Michigan, is a type. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], is a very rare type, and at least I interpret the gentleman's state of mind in accordance with the type he is. The type he is is due to heredity; he inherited certain characteristics.

He cannot get away any more than all of us can get away from certain characteristics. That was said in the same sense as the gentleman from Michigan says a lot of things. He does not intend them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am finding the gentleman not guilty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I insist upon it. He cannot plead guilty in my court. He can plead guilty to political differences but he cannot plead guilty to anything on the personal level. You can use it if you want to; I prefer you would.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the campaign?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a very high regard for the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not intend to go this far. I want to make a few observations now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman made reference to me. Will he yield for an answer?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot resist the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Please do not charge me with not at least thinking that I know what I am talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question of fact.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman's essay on types, but I want to register the fact that I am in complete agreement with his colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PURCOLO] in which he said he felt it was incumbent upon the Members of this body to make decisions for themselves upon information furnished, and I wish to say that I am very much in favor of that, and I hope it implies that we will in this House receive more information and more prompt information, especially upon international matters, than we have been receiving lately. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, will concur in that hope.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing about what the gentleman says but what anybody would concur in. I might say that President Truman has been consulting all the time with the appropriate committees in both branches of the Congress. Nobody expects the President to consult with each and every one of us, but there have been constant consultations. I have attended a number of meetings because of my being leader; others I have not, because they were confined to the Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Committee on Foreign Relations. But I can assure the gentleman and the people of America that there has been constant consultation. All Members may not agree but as far as consultation is concerned, that relationship has existed. I agree with the gentleman from California, it should continue to exist.

I think the debate today has done a lot of good. What I am searching for is the "area of agreement," not the "area of disagreement." I place a different interpretation upon Mr. Hoover's speech than some others do. I think there is an "area of agreement" there. There is also an "area of disagreement." Why do we not play up the "area of agreement" instead of playing up the "area of disagreement" and thus creating the impression that there is complete disagreement? I think if we went ahead constructively and talked about the "area of agreement" that exists, and played that up, and then through discussion saw whether we could extend that more and more, that would be more conducive to the best interests of our country than to play up the disagreements and create an impression that there is constant disagreement between Members of Congress and prominent Americans, Presidents, past Presidents, or otherwise, when as a matter of fact there is a wide "area of agreement."

The spirit of what has been agreed, the statement mentioned in today's debate, to and signed is the thing that disturbs me, the impression that goes out that we want to leave Europe to itself. I think it is for the national interest of my country to have friends in the world, to have other countries as friends. I think it is to the national interest of my country to try to help other peoples resist aggression. Aggression today is more than international communism when in control of a government, it carries with it all of the harmful results that flow therefrom—imprisonment, death, vicious persecution, the destruction of the dignity of the individual.

As far as we are concerned, we can have peace very easily if we want to get down on our knees and beg and crawl. Sure, you can have peace that way, but what red-blooded American wants to do that? No real red-blooded American will do it. So let us try to explore more and more the "area of agreement" rather than stress the "areas of disagreement."

Mr. TOWE. If the gentleman will yield, may I point out that the declaration does not say nor does it suggest that those who signed it want to leave Europe to their own resources? It does not say that, and that is an improper interpretation, if the gentleman will read it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the spirit of the resolution. Those who have spoken today do not all agree. I should like to do something where there is an "area of agreement," and then let us try to extend it as time goes on, not stressing the "area of disagreement."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman spoke about the "area of agreement," that we should stress that.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the "area of agreement" to which the gentleman would go?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was I asking the gentleman a question or was he asking me one? First, I was asking the gentleman a question, which was, having stressed the necessity of an "area of agreement," can the gentleman name one Democrat who has agreed in anything with the speech made by Mr. Hoover, and if so, what was it, and who said it?

Mr. McCORMACK. One Democrat who agrees with what?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With any one thing that Mr. Hoover proposed in this last speech, and if some Democrat did agree, when was it, and what did he say?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not agree with that statement. I made the statement just now that there is a wide "area of agreement" there, so the gentleman's hearing must be very bad, because only a few moments ago I made that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does the gentleman agree with that Hoover said? What did Hoover say in his last speech that the gentleman agrees with?

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with what is contained in this statement here that we should develop the strength of America, and I have always advocated that, but use it affirmatively and effectively for good, for a future decent world, and to stop international communism from taking over country after country. I agree on the development of the strength of America. Others disagree with me on how the strength of America should be exercised.

In any event, if we want peace, as I said, we can have it very easily by being kneeling cowards. On the other hand, if we are still Americans, as we are supposed to be, thinking rationally and soundly and with stout heart, there is no need for any one of us or any American to lack confidence as to the future in meeting the problems which may confront us. Let us have more affirmative speeches, rather than the nagging, distorted speeches which discolor the truth. As a matter of fact, the leadership of President Truman has been absolutely sound in opposition to international communism.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the expiration of the special orders already granted, and any which may hereafter be entered today, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be first in this session of Congress to direct the attention of this body to unfinished legislative business of the most vital importance to the national welfare. On January 3, I introduced H. R. 545, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation program of education in the public elementary and secondary schools.

This bill seeks no objective not recognized in several recent sessions of both the House and the Senate. A measure of this kind was adopted in the Senate of the Eightieth Congress by an overwhelming vote of 58 to 22. Practically the same legislation passed the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress by the still more decisive vote of 58 to 15.

In recognition of the urgent need which this legislation was drawn to meet, this House was not idle. Numerous Members of this body introduced in both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses bills providing for Federal aid to education. Almost certain passage was indicated by the strong support given to such legislation by Members who did not themselves join in introducing the measure. Unfortunately, the measure was never placed before this body for a vote. Its endorsement in the House Committee on Education and Labor was obstructed by continued controversy over matters that were little related to the welfare of children or to the national crisis toward the solution of which the measure was intended to serve. In the introduction of H. R. 545, I have attempted to avoid the controversies which previously blocked consideration of this measure, as I shall shortly make clear.

FEDERAL AID A BIPARTISAN ISSUE

I wish to call your attention to the fact that Federal aid to education is a bipartisan issue, as it should be. It would be a great tragedy in this Nation if one of the great political parties should aline itself against essential provisions for our schools, the institutions upon which popular government so largely depends.

Three times during the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress the President of the United States unequivocally endorsed Federal aid to education in official statements presented to the Congress, and upon more than one occasion he advocated the early adoption of Federal-aid legislation in his public addresses and interviews with the press.

Nevertheless, the Federal-aid measure so decisively approved by the Senate in the last Congress was introduced by a group of Senators representing equally both major parties; and support for the bill in debate on the floor of the Senate came from the leaders of both parties. The Federal-aid-to-education bills introduced in the House of Representatives during the Eighty-first Congress were offered by representatives of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties. Fortunately, therefore, concern for the welfare of our schools and the adequacy of their services to American children and youth cuts across political boundary lines.

THE PRESIDENT ENDORSES FEDERAL AID

I do not need to remind you that the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message on January 8, reiterated his request for Federal-aid legislation in the following words:

> From the standpoint of national security alone, as well as the enlargement of opportunities for the individual, the Nation needs to see that every youth acquires the fundamental education and training which are essential to effective service, whether in the Armed Forces, in industry, or on the farm. I, therefore, urge the Congress to authorize Federal financial assistance to help the States provide a level of elementary and secondary education that will meet the minimum needs of the Nation.

In his economic report to the Congress, the President said:

> As we move into a period when we will have an urgent need for all our trained men and women, we must face the fact that nothing can make up for faulty basic education in our primary and secondary schools. This is as true for the men in military service as for the factory worker or the farm hand.
>
> Our public-school system faces the greatest crisis in its history. More than ever before, we need positive action by the Federal Government to help the States meet their educational tasks. We simply cannot afford to let overcrowding or lack of equipment or staff impair the basic education of our young people.

In keeping with such recommendations often repeated by the President, I introduced H. R. 545. In behalf of the principle it advocates and the action for which it provides, I now address you.

A YEAR OF DECISIONS

This is a year of fateful decisions. Upon the nature of these decisions the very existence of the human freedoms, indeed, the continued existence of the United States as a free and independent nation may rest. I do not believe I have a single colleague in this body who does not recognize this fact.

I submit to you that there is no more important decision this body has to make than the one upon which I address you—a decision vitally affecting those human resources upon which both our military defense and our prosperity depend.

Those countries supporting ideologies threatening the existence of our own embrace in their populations nearly one-half the peoples of the earth. Already the majority of these peoples are heavily armed.

It should be clear to anyone who gives this matter a single thought that those who must protect themselves against such odds cannot afford to neglect the fullest development of the human resources which they have at hand. It would be suicidal to do so.

We are mobilizing our industrial resources. We are lengthening our assembly lines. We are stockpiling critical supplies. Our scientists and inventors are feverishly at work on more powerful and more deadly weapons of war. Sixty-nine percent of the budget recommended by the President is to defray the cost of national defense. Appropriations already made and which must yet be made for national defense total to a figure staggering the finite mind. Threatened by potential foes that can array against us six army divisions to our one, shall we not give thought to creating that superiority of personnel which is our only hope of victory?

We should need no proof of the advantage held by superior numbers in battle. But if we wish that proof we may have it by reading in any newspaper any day that overwhelming hordes

of the enemy are slowly but surely pressing the fighting men of the United Nations back to the beachheads of peril.

WAR AND EDUCATION

Experience should have taught us by now the cost of educational deficiencies in war. The lack of adequate education on the part of many thousands of men in World War I so hampered military effort that campaigns to reduce illiteracy in the United States were among the most marked domestic results of the war.

Data from the National Selective Service System in World War II show that 659,000 men were rejected for educational deficiencies alone. These men were physically fit. They qualified otherwise. Essentially they could not read and write well enough to participate effectively in a way that was so largely technical and scientific in character. These 659,000 men would have composed more than 40 divisions—counting 15,000 men to the division—more combat divisions than were committed to the South Pacific theater of the war. Forty divisions were lost because someone failed to see that the men who might have composed them acquired the simplest rudiments of education.

During World War II, and for the 5 years since hostility ceased, Congress has been urged time and time again to provide the necessary financial assistance for the equalization of educational opportunity. When hostilities in Korea began, youth again were submitted to the objective accounting imposed by war. The National Selective Service System found it necessary to turn down 6 men out of 10 for physical and educational reasons. How much longer are we going to take sides with our enemies? How much longer are we going to sabotage the national defense by failure to strengthen our human resources?

THE HUMAN STOCKPILE

The men who carry the guns, drive the tanks, fly the planes, man our ships, are our most important stockpile. It may be taken for granted by some people that this resource can be picked up at will without foresight, without effort, without expense whenever, wherever it is needed. This attitude is so unrealistic as to be untenable. Education is a long process, a process associated with mental, and physical growth. It can be hurried very little. By Herculean effort we may very quickly transform our peacetime factories into war plants. We may quickly restrict the use of raw materials to the urgent needs of defense. We cannot make such a transformation in the development of the young people upon whom we must depend for the services of defense. There is no whip with which learning can be speeded. It takes time. We must prepare now for the years ahead.

Recently Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

> To neglect our school system would be a crime against the future. Such neglect could well be more disastrous to all our freedoms than the most formidable armed assault on our physical defenses. * * * Where our schools are concerned, no external threat can excuse negligence; no menace can justify a bolt to progress.

TENSIONS WILL PERSIST

No one who predicts total war expects it to be brief in time nor confined in scope, although we all hope it can be avoided. In his state of the Union message the President advised the American people to get ready for the long pull. Secretary of Defense General Marshall in his testimony before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate predicted that—

> Tensions that unsettle the world may persist through the lifetime of many of us. We must husband our military and industrial manpower with utmost care; we must foster our scientific and technical resources; we must avoid waste in the productive energies that help make our Nation powerful.

Significantly the Secretary of Defense referred to "our scientific and technical resources"; the President of the United States, referring to the "long pull" called for effort "to increase our capacity to produce and to keep our economy strong." The extension of full educational opportunity to all young Americans, whatever its cost, will not be wasted if we are never called upon to fight a total war. Upon effective preparation of youth depends our scientific and technical progress and our future economy in peace. The stockpiles of bombs and guided missiles would become obsolete with peace, but the reserve of fully developed human resources is the best possible guarantee of prosperity for a peaceful future.

At present we are far short of preparing our human resources either for contributions to victory in war or for contributions to economic prosperity in peace. At the time of the most recent count there were in the United States 2,838,000 persons 14 years old and over who could neither read nor write. About three times as many had less than a fifth-grade education. Approximately 4,000,000 school-age children were not enrolled in any school.

SUBSTANDARD SCHOOLS FOR MORE CHILDREN

Substandard educational opportunity is certain to be provided for more children in this generation than in the last, unless some definite positive action is taken to prevent it. There has been a tremendous increase in the birthrate which is already felt in greatly expanded school enrollments. A stork that in 1933 brought less than 17 babies for every 1,000 of the population suddenly showed up in 1947 with 27 babies per 1,000. The rate of arrival of the new-born first jumped significantly in 1942. These youngsters are already in the elementary schools. Their brothers and sisters who have come on apace since 1942 will, in due time, be knocking at the schoolhouse door for admission. The increasing birthrate is more persistent than was anticipated by the Bureau of the Census, but a careful study by the Bureau indicates that a school enrollment which had reached less than 27,000,000 in the school years 1940–50 will jump past 34,000,000 at the end of this decade. There are not enough teachers now to take care of the increased school population. We are making anything but an auspicious beginning in turning out the 750,000 new teachers which, by the most conservative estimate, will be needed from 1950 to 1960. At the present rate of preparation in our teacher education institutions we can expect not much more than one-third of the needed number of qualified teachers.

There are in the American schools 90,000 teachers who hold substandard certificates—a number forty-five times that of prewar days. In 17 States more than one-half of the teachers have less than 4 years of college preparation.

SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS

The most important reason for the shortage of qualified teachers is economic. While the average salary of teachers in the United States is about $3,000 a year, in at least 10 States last year teachers received an approximate salary of less than $2,000; in two States an average salary of less than $1,600.

There is no reason to believe that parents in some States are less solicitous for the welfare of their children than in others.

UNEVEN DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN AND WEALTH

The inequality of educational opportunity in the United States is due to factors inherent in our national ideal of a free economy. It is a result of the uneven distribution of taxable wealth and of children among the States. A survey recently made shows that some communities of the Nation spent sixty times as much per year to maintain a school classroom as other communities expended. As a rule, States with more children and less wealth than other States make greater effort to provide good schools, and in spite of that effort meet with less success. There is no means of equalizing educational opportunity in this Nation except through the accepted principle of taxation. Taxes are raised where the wealth is located and expended for the needs of the Nation wherever they exist.

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 545

The legislative proposal which I have introduced for your consideration would help tremendously in eliminating the inequalities of educational opportunity in the United States. It would provide for a minimum foundation program for our public elementary and secondary schools. It calls for an annual appropriation of $300,000,000 distributed among the States on a purely objective formula. Ninety-seven percent of the funds would be allocated to the States directly in proportion to the number of children of school age and inversely proportional to the wealth of the States. The measure provides that Federal funds cannot be substituted for State and local funds. If States and communities decrease their support Federal funds are proportionately reduced. Provisions are made for aid to the Territories as well as the States. The rights of minority races are respected. The bill provides that a State educational authority dissatisfied with the administration of the act may appeal to an appropriate court. The measure offers no loophole of any kind through which State and local control of the educational program may be removed or abridged. In this respect it recognizes the tradition of the Nation from its founding and is consistent with nearly

one and three-quarters centuries of practice in granting Federal aid to education which has not resulted in Federal control of our educational institutions.

AVOIDING CONTROVERSY

Of special importance is the fact that this bill is drawn to avoid obstructing controversy. Previous considerations of the Federal-aid measures in the House Committee on Education and Labor have become entangled in disagreements over whether private schools should become beneficiaries of the act. There has been little insistence that Federal funds should be expended for the purposes of paying teachers' salaries in private schools or of maintaining and operating private school plants. Those who demanded that Federal funds be made available to private schools have asked that such funds be allocated solely for the purpose of paying for transportation of pupils, for health services, for textbooks, or for other auxiliary services. This bill provides that the moneys distributed shall be expended only for the payment of public school teachers' salaries and for the maintenance and operation of public-school plants. Any provisions for the allocation of funds to public and private schools for auxiliary services would be taken up in a separate measure and the issue decided there without imperiling our schools and our Nation in this crisis.

THE PEOPLE DEMAND FEDERAL AID

The proposal for Federal aid to education is made pursuant to wide demands on the part of those who are interested in the welfare of children and the future of our country. The American Legion at its annual convention last October again called upon Congress to enact at the earliest possible moment legislation which will provide Federal aid to education without Federal control and with full preservation of the accepted American principle of the local management of schools.

The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth recently held in Washington, attended by nearly 6,000 citizens charged with responsibilities for the education and care of youth advocated that "Federal aid be provided to the States for educational services in tax-supported public schools without Federal control to help equalize educational opportunity; the issue of auxiliary services to be considered on its merits in separate legislation."

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has adopted a resolution in favor of Federal aid to schools:

> We support legislation that would provide grants in aid for publicly controlled, tax-supported schools; allocations to States on the basis of relative per capita income and school-age population; and provisions for a minimum foundation program to serve as a guide for equalizing educational services within the State.

Among the many other organizations endorsing the principle of Federal aid to education are, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The most recent call for support to schools has come from the President of the United States in the annual report of the budget submitted Monday, January 15. The document includes the following statement:

> Promotion of education: Strong elementary and secondary educational systems throughout the country are vital to national strength and to the improvement of individual opportunity. Although educational opportunities are excellent in some parts of the country, children and youth in too many of our communities still do not receive adequate education. Inequalities exist primarily because of differences in the financial resources of the States and localities.
>
> The Nation as a whole suffers from these inequalities. The results are demonstrated most sharply in times like the present. The military services even find it necessary to teach some inductees reading and writing before they can begin combat training. From the standpoint of national security alone, as well as the enlargement of opportunities for the individual, the Nation needs to see that every youth acquires the fundamental education and training which are essential to effective service, whether in the Armed Forces, in industry, or on the farm. I therefore urge the Congress to authorize Federal financial assistance to help the States provide a level of elementary and secondary education that will meet the minimum needs of the Nation. The budget includes a tentative appropriation estimate of $300,000,000 for this purpose.

In the opinion of the lay citizen, in the opinion of the elected officials of this country there must be no moratorium on basic essentials. We cannot longer countenance a Federal policy of neglect of those institutions upon which the survival of our freedoms depends.

FEDERAL AID NOT NEW

The principle of Federal aid to education which I advocate is not an innovation. It is consistent with the American pattern of support for all Federal enterprises. Our revenues of all kinds and for all purposes are collected where wealth is and expended to meet the need wherever it may exist. Revenues collected in part from New England may help widen the channel of the Mississippi or build a postoffice in Alabama. Federal revenue collected in part from Florida may help eradicate the sheep tick in Montana or build a dam in Colorado. I ask only that the Federal Government be as concerned about the welfare of its children, the development of its human resources as it is concerned about the highways which bind our States together, the maintenance of our navigable waterways, the eradication of insect pests, protection from flood, and the irrigation of our deserts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at this time. I will yield later.

I know that we must practice economy, but this is a measure on which we cannot afford to practice false economy, in view of the record. We know from the other war—and the same thing is happening today—that the disparities in education are growing greater instead of less.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at this time. I will yield later.

This legislation is of great importance and I feel sure that the Committee on Education and Labor will give this subject the most careful consideration.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he thinks the Congress really grasps the serious situation confronting our public schools? Speaking, for instance, of the matter of school facilities, let me remind you that during the depression days there were periods in which we woefully neglected our school facilities, and before we were really out of the depression the Second World War came on; there was a freeze order on essential building materials; nothing was done during that period, and by the time we were beginning to get organized after the end of World War II we found ourselves in another period in which it is almost impossible. We are 20 to 25 years behind in our public school system today, particularly in the matter of school facilities. The situation is all too serious in regard to the teaching personnel, but I must say that this Congress in its effort to conserve and to throw everything possible into the education effort it must not forget the school system of our country. There is too much at stake. What good is it to talk about technical warfare if we neglect the education of the children to the extent that they could not even operate the technical implements themselves?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress realizes that there are over 1,000,000 boys and girls attending school in this country today on a half-day basis. I just wonder how much longer the American people can tolerate that situation affecting their public schools and expect to turn out the kind of citizens we need to carry on in a world as unsettled as it is at the present time. Do you really think the Congress has any grasp of the seriousness of the situation? Does the gentleman think they are informed of the needs of our schools?

Mr. PERKINS. First, I wish to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution.

I do not think that the Congress of the United States has given this important problem the consideration it merits; in fact, I believe we have been treating this question too lightly and that we must do something if we are to give the boys and girls in the public elementary and secondary schools the type of education they deserve. Why do I say this? Because the National Government owes something to the citizens of the United States. The record shows that the States with the least income, particularly the Southern States and some others, are spending a greater proportion of their income for education than are the richer States. Let us take for example the State of Alabama. Alabama spends 2.50 percent of her total income, the income of everybody added together, for her public schools, and stands eighth in the 48 States in her effort to educate her children. New York spends 1.56 percent of her total income for education, and rates forty-second in effort; yet Alabama's effort yields only $87 per child, whereas New York's effort of 1.56 percent yields approximately $225 per child.

Let us look at it in another way: For instance, South Carolina and Mississippi have some 280 children per thousand population; California, Connecticut, and New Jersey have only 170 children per thousand. This disparity exists to such a degree that in my judgment the Congress of the United States should pass legislation that would guarantee a minimum foundation program as provided in this bill, the expenditure of not less than $55 for every boy and girl in the elementary and secondary schools of this Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is regrettable to learn from the gentleman from West Virginia—and I assume he is speaking about the schools in his own community—that they are in such a deplorable condition. In our communities in the North we have schools, and I know of no one at least in southwestern Michigan who does not have an opportunity to obtain an education if he so desires.

I was somewhat amazed to hear the gentleman who now has the floor tell us that the Federal Government owes its citizens something. I had always supposed that the citizens owed the Federal Government something. I do not know how the Federal Government can pay anyone anything because it has no source of income, as we all know, except that which it takes from the people, and every time the Federal Government, or for that matter any other government, takes a dollar from the taxpayers it always does what we call shave that dollar before it lets it go back home. So it is a losing transaction for any community to accept anything from the Federal Government except, perhaps, protection, which every government ought to give to all its citizens.

Mr. PERKINS. In response to the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that I believe the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides equal protection under the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure, and with that I agree.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Michigan must bear in mind that much of the per capita wealth that he has in his State and the total income, that is income of everyone in the State of Michigan, added together was not all created in the State of Michigan. Some of that wealth was created in the State of Kentucky and in my State escaped taxation, or materially anyway, and appears in the income of people in the State of Michigan. Therefore it is reasonable and it is the thing for the Government to do to tax money where it is and distribute the revenues where they are needed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am constrained to make a preliminary statement for the gentleman's benefit. He referred to the birth rate of California as about 140 per thousand. I was going to suggest if the Eastern and Southern States would send out their younger citizens instead of their aged citizens to get on our old-age pension rolls, we would probably be able to raise that birth rate to something that would better please the gentleman from Kentucky.

But my question is this, and it is a very serious one because the gentleman has referred to the seriousness of the wider need for education. The Federal Government is $257,000,000,000 in debt. Will the gentleman tell me what the surplus is in the treasury of Kentucky and perhaps what the surplus in the treasury of West Virginia is? I may say that I send over to the Library of Congress about once a year and I get a list of the surpluses and credit balances in the States. They are all plus, but the Federal Government is $257,000,000,000 in debt. It seems to me if education is as important as the gentleman from Kentucky thinks, as I think, as the gentleman from Michigan thinks and as undoubtedly the gentleman from West Virginia believes, is it not the No. 1 item in the States to take care of their own children in the matter of education?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer the gentleman from California in this way: I stated that the school-age children per thousand of population in California was 170 as compared with 280 per thousand in some of the Southern States. If the gentleman from California wishes to disclaim the people that migrated to California over a period of years because of certain defense work and other reasons, I certainly think he has made a strong argument for Federal aid to education.

I believe the record will disclose that approximately 60 percent of the people that are born in one State sooner or later migrate to another State. But the point that we should consider is solely this: Whether or not a State that is making a greater effort by spending more of its total income than some other State for education should equalize that burden; and I contend that it is the duty and the responsibility of the Federal Government more nearly to equalize that burden.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to reply to the gentleman from California and advise him that he does not need to worry about the paucity of children in the State of California. I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee on education that conducted a survey of the schools in the interim between the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, and I would like to advise the gentleman that in his nearby city of Los Angeles testimony given to my committee showed that there were 50,400 boys and girls between the first grade and junior high school in Los Angeles County alone on a half-day session of school. I would also like to tell the gentleman that 63 percent of the buildings in Los Angeles are just mere shacks; only 37 percent are permanent buildings. He does not need to worry. I do not know of any other State in the Nation that needs some kind of aid from some source for their school system any more than the State of California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is a misunderstanding. We are not particularly worried. We appreciate the concern of the gentleman from West Virginia in this and many other matters, but he need not worry about assistance which is not solicited by California. It seems to me that it should be put on the record that California is building its own school buildings. In the last bill discussed in committee, California was not asking for aid, and I think the gentleman is giving a wrong impression. We do appreciate the gentleman's concern over California, and I trust he has the same concern over his own State.

Mr. BAILEY. I do have. I want to remind the gentleman that it is time someone in California, whether it be the delegation in Congress or the school authorities in California, correct some of the conditions prevailing there. I thought it was bad in the Southern States, but I did not know it was quite so bad as it was in some of the States that claimed to be at the top as far as education is concerned.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and many before it have often engaged in the consideration of financial aid by our Government to the underprivileged abroad. The point 4 program and many other such foreign aid endeavors, often referred to as bipartisan efforts, have been authorized with little opposition for the purpose of aiding undeveloped areas abroad, rehabilitating and educating the underprivileged on foreign soils, and encouraging the industrial and agricultural activities of those people. Such measures have no difficulty receiving the sanction of this Congress so long as they preclude assistance to the citizenship of the United States.

During my short tenure in Congress, no one has spoken any more frequently than I have for the preservation of the principles of democracy. You know that my theme song has been the continuation of individual initiative, free enterprise, open competition, and vested rights of the States.

Long ago the people of this country made a very definite and wise decision that providing for, maintaining, and operating our schools were public responsibilities.

One of the speakers preceding me today has mentioned the needs of the South for public-school assistance; and another has indicated that other sections of this great Nation are not responsible for the predicament of the South. However, it is my observation that the main and foremost reason why the underprivileged sections of the South have failed to receive Federal assistance in the education of their children is because that great area is within the borders of the United States. If the people in the underprivileged areas of the United States were foreigners, they would find

no difficulty in receiving assistance for rehabilitation and educational programs.

Please remember, gentlemen, that only 75 years ago the South was a defeated, torn, stripped, and desolate area, and was being governed by a ruthless mob. Its armies had been defeated in the war of secession, its homes had been destroyed, its barns burned, its farming implements and food provisions stolen, and its livestock driven away. To be sure of its complete destruction, even the open and cultivatable fields were ravished with fire. The manufacturing plants and transportation facilities were torn asunder. There was no Marshall plan and there has never been a point 4 program for the South; but to be certain that the South would starve, for 12 years the people were forced to live under the carpetbag rule of the hellacious reconstruction era, wherein what little was left after the war was gobbled up by these carpetbagging storm troopers.

The South is the only people ever defeated on the battlefields by the United States Army who were not later fed, clothed, and rehabilitated and its plants and facilities restored by our Government. The great southern area of this country by its own boot straps and with no outside assistance has been able during the short time of 75 years to make greater gains in every economic undertaking than any other section of the United States. I might add that during any period of time of these 75 years, the South has made greater advancements in every phase of our economy than any other section of this country; but, remember, gentlemen, that we started from nothing and cannot by any stretch of the imagination be expected to be on equal footing with more fortunate areas.

The raw product is taken from the South, manufactured in the North and East, and in turn sold back to us in the South plus the manufacturer's costs, which always amount to the greater portion of the over-all profit. I have always believed that a portion of such profit should be paid to us in the form of Federal aid to education for our children. So long as we have the unfair and discriminatory freight rates in the South—which is nothing less than paying reparations—we will never be able to compete with the manufacturing centers of the East and North; therefore, we are certainly entitled to some break for the welfare of our respective underprivileged communities.

Raising our living and educational standards go hand in hand. We don't expect to always live in a poor State, but will continuously fight for every opportunity to enhance the over-all economic conditions of our area. It has been suggested that the people in Detroit and New York, for instance, are not responsible for the education of the children residing in Arkansas. Children reared in Arkansas, or any other State, are not denied the right to at some time in life reside in the State of New York or the State of Michigan; in fact, a very small percentage of the people in New York or Michigan were born in those States. It is my understanding that approximately 60 percent of the people within the various States of this country were born and reared outside the State. Were it not for the trade relations existing throughout this great country of ours whereby New York and the other eastern and northern cities have been able to obtain so much trade profit from such States as Arkansas, then New York and other such wealthier States would be in no better position to educate her children than we are in the State of Arkansas.

Our unified system of governmental operations between the States and the interstate trade relations are such that some educational equalization system should be enacted which would afford the boy and girl in the forks of the creek within the poorer areas, an equal opportunity to prepare themselves for the battle of life in this great world of competition with the boy and girl in the metropolitan areas of the North and East.

Surely you will not contend that the school children residing within the wealthy industrial areas are entitled to better educational facilities and possibilities than those of the rural communities. Let us take the proposition down to your own local congressional district. There would be no thriving towns or cities within any of your districts were it not for the trade relations of the people of those areas with at least the local rural communities thereabout. The rural people in those surrounding trade areas of your big towns and cities leave with the people of those metropolitan areas the profits upon trade exchange. There are more people with more money within your metropolitan areas with which to pay taxes for school purposes than there are in the rural localities thereabout. Would you contend that those rural people who have by their trade made possible the towns and cities, are not entitled to equal educational opportunities?

Half of the city of Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., is within my congressional district of Arkansas. The other half of that city lies within the State of Texas. Let us suppose that the State of Texas were a hundred times as rich as it is, and that the State of Arkansas were a hundred times poorer than it is. Could it be argued that a child living on the Arkansas side of the city of Texarkana should be denied equal educational opportunities with his playmate who happened to live one block away on the Texas side of the city? Of course not.

Not many of you here today would quibble over educational assistance to foreign countries. Actually, I don't see but one present on the minority side of the aisle who would object to it, and that is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That does not apply to me.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is correct. I said that it did not; that you are the one exception.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are right. I have not voted for that money to be given away abroad.

I would like to ask you this question—you are talking about equality of education. Do you give it in your State? Do you give equal opportunity for an education to all your citizens?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, sir. We have the school equalization plan within my State of Arkansas, and it was my pleasure while serving as a member of the Arkansas State Legislature to assist in the adoption of an equalization program which gives to the poorer sections of Arkansas an equal opportunity for educational purposes with those in the wealthier sections.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you give it to the colored children? Do you give the colored children education in the white schools with white teachers?

Mr. TACKETT. I will tell you this, Mr. HOFFMAN, you and all the other gentlemen from the North, who are always worrying about how the South conducts its business, should know that the colored boys and girls in Arkansas receive equal educational facilities and possibilities with those of the white boys and girls; and that the colored teachers receive as much for their services—and in many instances more—than the white teachers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is fine. You make the statement, and I assume you included me, about the folks of the North sticking their noses into the business of the southerners. What you do not happen to know is that in the 16 years I have been here I have never once voted for a poll tax bill or for an anti-lynching bill or for the FEPC.

Mr. TACKETT. All that is beside the point and has absolutely nothing to do with Federal aid to underprivileged schools.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In your State, are colored children permitted to attend white schools? They are in Michigan.

Mr. TACKETT. No. The colored students do not attend public schools with white students, because equal facilities are afforded the colored students. I might add that where equal school facilities with that of the white's are not available to colored students, they are afforded the opportunity of attending schools with white students. For instance, there are colored students now attending the University of Arkansas medical and law schools with white students.

I favor Federal-aid-to-education legislation providing only financial aid, leaving the control and fixing of policies and procedures completely within the discretion of the respective States, to prohibit the possibility of federalization of our schools; and I doubt the wisdom of a general Federal aid bill covering sections of this country wherein the aid and assistance is not needed, but would be willing for the legislation to be limited only to areas in which everything possible has been done to provide adequate school facilities without Federal assistance.

Those suggesting Federal domination over State-controlled schools seem to forget that for many years a number of our school activities, such as the Smith-Hughes program, agricultural extension programs, and others have been subsidized by the Federal Government, and

yet the Government has in no wise attempted to infringe upon the local operation and direction of these programs in our educational institutions.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in my State of Kentucky the average teacher's salary is $1,935, and as a result of the defense work many teachers are leaving their profession and the boards of education are being called upon to staff those schools with substandard certificated teachers and people who are not trained to teach the youth. That is one of the reasons why I state that we need this legislation.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. It seems to me that most of the States being discussed here so far as education is concerned affect my home town of Akron, Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from West Virginia, and the gentleman from Arkansas for having come from States that have been so prolific because so many of their people have migrated to Akron, Ohio. In fact Akron is commonly known as the capital of West Virginia.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

We all know that both political parties pledged in their platforms Federal aid to education. This has always been a bipartisan issue.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I listened a moment ago to a discussion of the situation in California with respect to the schools and it occurred to me that with the increase in population of some 56 percent in the last 10 years, and due to the fact that there are debt limitations placed in the charters of our cities and school districts, it has been difficult to build schools to take care of all the children of the new families that have come to our State. As a matter of fact, during the war years when, as you know, the building business was held back very materially, it became necessary at times to run two shifts a day in the schools because we could not build the buildings fast enough. Then a third shift in the training of workers for the various skills was required, principally in the aircraft factories, and so forth; and it was a very difficult problem. We are getting out of it and in due course we will have all of our new buildings built. The buildings which were built prior to that time are of the highest quality and are earthquake-proof, as near as possible to make them. So, while we appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia, we also appreciate that he does not know what he is talking about as far as California is concerned.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to thank the gentleman. I know that the building problem is one of the great problems facing the school people of this Nation today. I believe that the gentleman from California will agree that part of the trouble in California has been caused by reason of Federal activities, as a result of World War II, and that we have already extended the principle of Federal aid to take care of situations of that kind by the enactment in the Eighty-first Congress of Public Law 815, for school construction, and Public Law 874, for the maintenance and operation of schools in war-impacted school districts. I know that the situation exists. It exists right here in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia where, because of Federal activities, many children can have school for only half a day. We do have this condition which is one of our main problems. But this Congress has not yet extended that same principle to take care of the rural areas and the States where we are spending a much greater percentage of our income than the national average for our public schools, and we are just letting that situation go by.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman has a very good point. I think that we in California perhaps appreciate his point more than some other States because we have received so many people from so many different parts of the United States, including that represented by the gentleman from Arkansas as well as the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman, and thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. And we recognize perhaps better than some others that the degree of education and the quality of education varies because we do get people from those other States when their families have moved to California.

I think the principal objection most of us have had to the matter of legislation which has been proposed so far is that the Federal aid to education should apply to the States that are well off as well as those that are not. We would be entirely satisfied in my State to receive nothing in the way of aid to education; we have enough. We want no Federal control whatsoever; we do not want a bureaucracy established which may ultimately achieve Federal control of education.

We appreciate what the gentleman has to say, and I for one would be glad to vote for a bill for aid to only those States which were unable to help themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there are other special orders; the gentleman from Michigan has a special order following him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. May I say in reply to the gentleman from California that in all these bills that I am familiar with, particularly the one I introduced, H. R. 545, the Senate bill, and bills introduced by some other Members on the left side of the aisle, I can subscribe in principle to these bills even though they differ from my own. Among other things, they are free of Federal control of our schools. The point I am interested in, just as is the gentleman from California, is that justice be done. The total income of California for the year 1949 was approximately $15,232,000,000. For the same year our total income in Kentucky was $2,186,000,000. It is my idea that to measure the need of the States on a total income basis in relation to the number of children to be educated is a just way to proceed in this matter.

Under my bill, under the Senate bill, and under many bills introduced by other Members of the House, an effort formula is provided; the State must make a certain effort and if they do not make that effort they get less Federal money. They decide for themselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understood the gentleman correctly he stated that the degree of aid from the Federal Government should be on the basis of the income of the respective States.

Mr. PERKINS. No; I am not measuring their need for aid on the basis of income; you must take into consideration two factors: The number of children to be educated, and the per capita income of the State.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under that theory if the people in one State worked harder and earned more then they would have to help educate the children of the people in another State who just sat around or went fishing.

Mr. PERKINS. Does not the gentleman come from a State which helps out the people in Colorado? Is it not true that the people of Michigan help pay the cost of irrigation in the Western States? All of this is in the national interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To educate the children of these fishermen?

Mr. PERKINS. No; I just made a comparison.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. The gentleman's argument was that if you made more money in Kentucky than we did in Michigan you should help us carry on our educational program even though we sat around or went hunting and fishing and wasted our time; the gentleman would still help educate us. That is his argument.

Mr. PERKINS. My idea is this: If the State of Michigan makes a greater effort and spends a greater percentage of its total income for educational purposes in the public elementary and secondary schools in the State, and that does not provide the children of Michigan with a fair chance to get a basic education, then we of Kentucky should help the people of the State of Michigan.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 134) electing WALTER S. BARING a member of the Com-

mittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WALTER S. BARING, of Nevada, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article in regard to air power.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Pasadena Star-News, a letter from the Korean War zone, and a speech by Mr. Homer Crotty, of the State bar of California.

Mr. RADWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter, a resolution, and an editorial.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the Governor of Illinois, notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $184.50.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief prayer.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article in reference to the evacuation of Boston by the British on March 17, 1776, including footnotes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a verbatim report of impromptu intervention of Philippine Foreign Secretary Carlos P. Romulo during debate on cease-fire in Korea before the United Nations Political and Security Committee, January 22, 1951. We all remember General Romulo served in this body with great distinction. All of us who served with him will always remember him and his outstanding ability as well as his fine personality and his great depth of knowledge. I ask unanimous consent also that this be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the fact it may run over the amount allowed by the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, at the annual Nation's Sales Conference in the Statler Hotel, New York City.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a sermon by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, minister of the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, and Chaplain of the United States Senate. This sermon entitled "The Righteous Sword," seems to me to answer many people who are groping for guidance in these serious days. I agree with it completely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. CELLER.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain material in tabular form also articles.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RANKIN (at the request of Mr. TACKETT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include additional material.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

198. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the thirty-eighth annual report of the Secretary of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

199. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

200. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument and to transfer the jurisdiction and control of the lands therein contained to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for Geological Survey' "; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

202. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

203. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of certain laws enacted by the Eleventh Guam Congress, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act for Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

204. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 22, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Steinhatchee and Fenholloway Rivers, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

206. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 18, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Ohio River, with a view to flood protection along Wheeling Creek and Little Wheeling Creek at and in the vicinity of Wheeling, W. Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on July 22, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 26, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Mississippi River between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, and other reports, with a view to improvements for flood control and drainage on the Fox River, Iowa and Mo., at this time, with particular reference to improvements in Van Buren County, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 23, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

208. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed list of the lands exchanged pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

209. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation to clarify the

provisions of section 6 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR (by request):

H. R. 2640. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize for persons who served in the Armed Forces additional compensation on account of disfigurement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2641. A bill to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 2642. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2643. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK (by request):

H. R. 2644. A bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2645. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2646. A bill to facilitate the development of small reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2647. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2648. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territories in the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 2649. A bill to include certain additional veterans' organizations among the organizations whose accredited representatives and claim agents may assist veterans and their dependents under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 and the World War Veterans' Act of 1924; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2650. A bill to amend section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to specify the veterans' organizations which may present claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2651. A bill to amend section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to specify the veterans' organizations which may act as counsel in the presentation of certain claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2652. A bill to include certain additional veterans' organizations among the veterans' organizations which may be recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2653. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1933, to except salvage vessels from certain provisions of the act of June 16, 1938; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2654. A bill to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 2655. A bill to authorize the erection of an Alaska Native Service hospital at Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2656. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2657. A bill relating to the operation by the United States of plants, mines, and facilities involved in labor disputes and to the terms and conditions of agreements terminating such disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2658. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2659. A bill to create the position of mail handler in charge in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for placing in the House Chamber, in lieu of certain plaques recently placed therein, plaques bearing portraits of individuals occupying places of honor and distinction in United States history; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, relative to the Taiya hydroelectric power project in southeast Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2660. A bill for the relief of William J. Popaca; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 2662. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2663. A bill for the relief of Danilo Kozarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Freda Seltzer Siegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Glen G. Wetsel and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Ruttner and Mrs. Edith Ruttner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2668. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Halbert and Kenneth H. McComb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Maria Sarandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 2670. A bill for the relief of Chakib Kassem Aboul-Hosn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 2671. A bill for the relief of Dr. Panagiotis Darviris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2672. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2673. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ferreira de Brito and Joao Pereira Leal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2675. A bill for the relief of Shigematsu Takeyasu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2677. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Racanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. Res. 135. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

49. By Mr. FUSH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Muncy, Pa., petitioning the State and Federal Governments for immediate action in the construction of flood-control devices in the valley of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

50. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of Massachusetts Veterans' Service Agents Association, urging the enactment of House bill 299; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, into the calm and confidence of Thy presence we would bring our drained and driven souls that the benediction of Thy peace may fall upon our restless lives. May this little shrine of daily devotion, built by our fathers on the high hill of the Nation, open for us vistas of green pastures and still waters where our jaded souls may be restored.

In a difficult and desperate era, be Thou our pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, as patiently and obediently we follow the kindly light. May we close our national ranks in a new unity, as deadly peril threatens the birthright of our liberties. Save us from living on a small scale in a great day. In this hour of destiny, O be swift our souls to answer Thee, be jubilant our feet. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE JAPANESE CONGRESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL MISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have present in this Chamber today a number of distinguished members of the Japanese Diet, who are visiting various places in our country in order to acquaint themselves with American institutions. We are very happy to have them with us in the Senate. The Chair has a list of their names and a statement which Mr. Kataro Mori, the chairman of the delegation, desires to have printed in the RECORD, rather than to be called upon to deliver it on the floor.

The Chair asks the members of the Japanese Diet to rise, so that Members of the Senate may see them.

[The members of the delegation from Japan rose from their seats in the rear of the Chamber and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. We all hope that the contacts which are being made between the representatives of the Japanese people and the American people since the end of the late unfortunate war, and their effort to create a new government, new institutions, and new relationships will result in the resumption of the long friendship which, until the late unpleasantness, existed between the people of Japan and the people of the United States, and between the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States. All who find it possible to come here from Japan, and all those in this country who find it possible to visit Japan, contribute to that happy result. Therefore, we welcome the distinguished group from the Japanese legislative body, and the Chair hopes they will profit by their visit to the United States, and will carry back to their people very happy memories of their contact with our people and our Government.

The Chair asks that the statement prepared by the chairman of the delegation and the list of the members of the delegation who are present may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement and list of members of the delegation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. KATARO MORI

Mr. President and Senators, it is indeed an honor and a privilege bestowed upon me and members of the Japanese Congressional Agricultural Mission to the United States of America to be so cordially received by this distinguished gathering of United States Senators.

Permit me in behalf of our Government to take this opportunity to convey through you to the American people the greetings of the Japanese people and an expression of their sincere appreciation for the generous food supplies given during the immediate postwar period and for the continued sympathy and understanding of your people. I cannot recall without feeling fresh pain in my heart that dreadful period of acute food shortage. The war's end brought in its wake social chaos and mental apathy. Worst of all, people were on the brink of starvation. This danger was averted mostly by the timely relief of foodstuffs shipped over from your country through the good offices of the occupation authorities. We were touched by the generosity shown by the American people to their former enemy. It is by no means an exaggeration that this relief gave hope and impetus to the man in the street to work for his own salvation and for Japan's rehabilitation. Given a right start, our people have been working hard for the last 5 years, and today I am glad to inform you that our livelihood is improved and our people restored to composure.

The American people are pleased, I am sure, to know that the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people stand today for the cause of democracy and its defense against the Communist menace, both from within and from without. We are fully prepared to offer our contribution to the defense of the peace in east Asia and in the world at large. We are all eager to see that the day will come soon for Japan to join the family of nations as a free and independent nation, and you may be assured that she will stand with the free nations of the world.

The object of our mission is primarily to see on the spot how your agricultural policy is formulated and executed in conformity with the will of the people. We are thankful to the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers and his staff in Tokyo for according us this opportunity of direct observation. We are determined to make the most of our visit for the benefit of Japan's agriculture, farmers, and people in general, and ultimately of the mutual interest of our two peoples. Underlying problems which we face today, apart from those which are in the limelight at the moment, are those of food and population. For the further improvement of our basic agricultural policy and the solution of these difficult problems, we shall need your continuous help, for which, I assure, the Japanese people will be forever grateful.

Since our arrival in the United States a few weeks ago we have experienced the warm friendship and hospitality of the American people in thier homeland. We now better understand the spiritual qualities which motivated the policies and conduct of the occupation in our country. During the years of that occupation a new and closer friendship has been developed between our two countries, based upon the best qualities and characteristics of our peoples. With this solid foundation, we are now able to give a happy end to the unhappy period of our history and to open the door to a bright and fertile future for our two nations.

JAPANESE CONGRESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL MISSION, JANUARY 1951

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (466 MEMBERS)

Liberal Party (285)

Kotaro Mori (chairman of mission): (61), Shiga Prefecture, fifth term, former Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, chairman of discipline committee.

Minoru Sakamoto: (46), Yamaguchi Prefecture, third term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of budget committee.

Tokuro Adachi: (40), Shizuoka Prefecture, first term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Raizo Matsuno: (33), Kumamoto Prefecture, second term, former member of agriculture and forestry committee, member of labor committee.

Democrat (67)

Kazumi Kobayashi: (45), Nagano Prefecture, second term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Social Democrat (46)

Ryoji Inoue: (52), Kochi Prefecture, fourth term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Secretariat

Kazuo Ichihashi: (38), Kanagawa Prefecture, chief translation officer.

HOUSE OF COUNCILORS (250 MEMBERS)

Liberal (76)

Kazuo Kitamura: (53), Niigata Prefecture, second term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, chairman of judicial affairs committee.

Social Democrat (62)

Soji Okada: (48), Tokyo, first term, chairman of agriculture and forestry committee.

Green Breeze Society (group of independents) (56)

Yoshio Kusumi: (45), Hyogo Prefecture, first term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of budget committee, member of cabinet committee.

Democrat (29)

Hajime Miyoshi: (35), Kagawa Prefecture, first term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Secretariat

Mikitaro Matsuno: (38), Gifu Prefecture, chief translation officer.

REPORTS OF FINANCE COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 12th instant,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the following bills, reported them on February 14, 1951, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91);

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92); and

H. R. 2141. A bill to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 93).

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and other routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT BY NAVY DEPARTMENT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess property disposal by the Navy Department, calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSOLIDATION OF PARKER AND DAVIS DAM PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ABOLITION OF CASTLE PINCKNEY NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument and to transfer the jurisdiction and control of the lands contained to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Legislature of Guam, making appropriation for the compensation of a member of the President's Commission on application of the Federal laws of Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending the deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report, dated December 29, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TERM OF JUDGE FOR DISTRICT COURT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the term of the judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands at 8 years (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Food and Drug Administration, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FINANCIAL AUDIT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the Director, National Organization of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent Resolution 32

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will exempt employees of the State and the political subdivisions thereof from the present wage stabilization order

"Whereas the Federal Wage Stabilization Board has announced a wage freeze in conjunction with a price freeze at the highest levels between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951; and

"Whereas the said wage freeze includes hundreds of thousands of employees of the State and its political subdivisions; and

"Whereas the salaries of government employees have fallen far below the level necessary to maintain a decent standard of living; and

"Whereas this order jeopardizes and forestalls the present wage adjustments which have been promised by State and municipal authorities for such employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the people of the State of New York through their representatives in the senate and assembly hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation, if necessary, and the Wage Stabilization Board to promulgate orders which will exempt employees of the State and its political subdivisions from the said wage stabilization order; and it is further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to Cyrus S. Ching, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"*Secretary.*

"In assembly, February 5, 1951, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"*Clerk.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress thereof to take no steps to establish or to join a world government at this time

"Whereas it is the desire of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of

Colorado to encourage and aid in the establishment of peace among the nations of the world, and it is the firm determination of this same general assembly to preserve the sacred rights of the people of Colorado and of the United States as have been determined by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas there are in the world today as well as in these United States people who are strenuously endeavoring to establish a world government and to cause the United States to become a member thereof; and

"Whereas it is the sentiment of this thirty-eighth general assembly that the peoples of the world are not yet sufficiently acquainted with or cognizant of the freedoms the American people enjoy to have attained that altruism which is essential to the harmonious and successful realization of peace among nations, the lack of this altruism having been made evident by the dissensions in the United Nations; and

"Whereas the organization of the world government as proposed is of a nature such that the people of the United States will be required to surrender part of their sovereignty to nations which have no concept of world peace and cooperation; and

"Whereas the sentiment of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado is not in accord with the whole intention expressed by the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-eighth general assembly (the senate concurring therein), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and are hereby petitioned to make no effort to create or join any world government whatsoever until there shall have been displayed by the peoples of the world sufficient altruism, and such desire to have and willingness to sacrifice to assure world peace and stability that it will unquestionably be established, but that their endeavors shall be such as will strengthen the cooperative efforts of the United Nations; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"K. EVELYN MILLER,
"Assistant Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to promptly take all measures necessary to complete the St. Lawrence waterway.

"Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of ocean-going ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

"Whereas the Presidents of the United States for the past 31 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence River and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

"Whereas world developments of the past few months and the existence of the present national emergency require in the national defense the development of this inland waterway as an additional means of transportation for the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the northwest States; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 31 years, has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the senate (the house of representatives concurring) commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to take all measures necessary to bring about the speedy completion of this great project as a vital defense and economic necessity; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Approved February 8, 1951.
"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact a law relieving all members of the Armed Forces now on active duty from paying any Federal income tax on any compensation received by such members for services performed as a member of the Armed Forces

"Whereas during the World War II members of the Armed Forces were not required to pay any Federal income tax on any compensation received for services performed in the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the present members of the Armed Forces are required to pay Federal income tax: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact a law to relieve all members of the Armed Forces now on active duty from paying any Federal income tax on any compensation received from the Government in payment of services performed by them as members of the Armed Forces.

"SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate and to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Memorial to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton, Senators from Montana; Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Senators from Wyoming; Carl Hayden, Senator from Arizona, and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Mike Mansfield and Wesley D'Ewart, Congressmen from Montana; William Harrison, Congressman from Wyoming; Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation; Dillon Meyer, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located in Big Horn County in southern Montana

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and the Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—about 35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont., and 44 miles southeast of Billings, Mont.; and

"Whereas, the Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys for the construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has completed preconstruction surveys, and work necessary for full construction work, and said surveys—including those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Power Commission, and other interested Federal agencies—are now in the hands, or are ready to be placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar Chapman, to be presented by him to the Congress and the President of the United States; and

"Whereas our Nation is now, of necessity, embarking upon a period of rearmament and defense planning, the ultimate end of which no man can foresee; and

"Whereas electrical energy is of the greatest importance in any defense industry. Already, and with industrial mobilization only just beginning, there is consideration being given to the necessity of enforcing electrical brown-outs in certain areas; and

"Whereas there is remaining no potential and undeveloped power site comparable to Yellowtail Dam. The Yellowtail power plant, as projected, will have an installed capacity of 200,000 kilowatts with an estimated annual firm energy capacity averaging 584,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In addition to this firm energy, this Yellowtail power plant is expected to have an average annual nonfirm energy output of 163,920,000 kilowatt-hours, bringing the average total estimated production to approximately 748,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and

"Whereas irrigation is one of the additional important contributions Yellowtail Dam will make to the economy of the area, and that of the Nation as a whole. Approximately 45,000 acres of irrigable land will be placed under the ditch by waters made available by Yellowtail Dam. In addition, there are a number of desirable pumping units along the Big Horn, Tongue, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers that will be made feasible by low-cost power derived from Yellowtail Dam, which will serve to irrigate some 180,000 additional acres, or an approximate total of 225,000 acres, of fertile land will be brought into production of food essential to our Nation's on-coming-wartime needs; and

"Whereas Montana has an immense, and mostly undeveloped, mineral wealth, that should be contributing to our Nation's defense program. (Herbert Hoover has stated that Montana possesses a greater mineral potential than the U. S. S. R.) The time may come, before this emergency shall pass, when Montana's minerals may be desperately needed. The low-cost power that Yellowtail Dam will provide will be a tremendous asset in bringing these minerals to a usable stage; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam, in addition to providing hydroelectric power and irrigation, will also bring a vast contribution to flood control, silt and soil control, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related and beneficial uses too numerous to mention for the benefit of all mankind; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam will be an arch-type, concrete structure, towering about 500 feet above the river bed, with a crest of 1,480 feet, and a storage capacity of some 1,366,000 acre-feet, and will flood about 27 square miles of almost totally unusable land. The lake so created by Yellowtail Dam will extend for 75 miles through tortuously winding, steeply walled canyons, flooding land that is of no economic value. Yellowtail Dam will be exceeded in size only by Boulder, Shasta, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse in the order named, and will cost approximately $100,000,000, which, by the sale of power, irrigation, and other benefits, will be repaid to the Federal Treasury through a 50-year period: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1951 now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make such funds immediately available that may be necessary to start construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana at once; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Crow Tribe, upon whose lands the site of Yellowtail Dam is situated, be adequately and fairly compensated for the site at a price agreed upon by the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Crow Tribe; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this Yellowtail Dam memorial be submitted by the secretary of state, Sam Mitchell of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate, Mr. Alben Barkley; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sam Rayburn; the Governor of the State of Wyoming, Paul Barrett; the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Wyoming; the regional director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Paul Fickinger; the regional director of Land Management, Albin Molohon; the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Kenneth Vernon; and the district director of the Bureau of Reclamation, D. C. Ketcham.

"CHARLES H. MAHONEY,
"President of the Senate Pro Tempore.

"CRY J. ARMSTRONG,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 2, 1951.

"JOHN W. BONNER,
"Governor."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"To Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION; Hon. W. STUART SYMINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITIES RESOURCES BOARD; Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES; and to Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alaska, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the opportunity exists for a major contribution to be made to the defense effort and the national economy by developing the tremendous potential hydroelectric power resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas a private company has signified its willingness to develop at its own expense the so-called Taiya hydroelectric power project in southeast Alaska and to install an aluminum reduction plant which would produce a large quantity of this metal so urgently required by the Nation; and

"Whereas statements have appeared in the press that this outstanding Alaska project is being deferred in favor of a similar project at Kitimat, British Columbia, whose construction would be made possible only by the United States defense officials negotiating a contract for purchase of a large quantity of aluminum from the Canadian producer; and

"Whereas the Taiya project in Alaska possesses many features of superiority over the Kitimat project in British Columbia, namely:

"1. Construction could start sooner and be completed at an earlier date because in contrast to the proposed Kitimat site, Taiya adjoins a well-developed harbor and town at Skagway, Alaska, which provides services and facilities allowing an immediate start to be made on the work, and which has good transportation connections including a new airport recently constructed by the Territory of Alaska, a railroad extending all through the area where the power development would occur and a new road direct to the proposed plant site at Dyea.

"2. The power at Taiya would be developed by the diversion of the headwaters of the Yukon River through large tunnels under the coast range which would be immune to enemy attack in contrast to the Kitimat project which entails the construction of a large dam.

"3. The Taiya project entails no transmission of power as the power plant would be right at the reduction plant site in contrast to the Kitimat project which would require transmission of power 55 miles over a high mountain range where lines would be subject to severe icing conditions and snow and rock slides.

"4. The ultimate power-producing capability at Taiya is greater than at Kitimat and the unit cost thereof cheaper. All of which considerations strongly recommend the Taiya project over that proposed for Kitimat; and

"Whereas construction of the power and electrometallurgical project at Taiya would contribute greatly, both during the present emergency and in the future, to the economic development of Alaska, which has been declared to be a national policy; and

"Whereas the private American company desiring to build this plant in Alaska has stated 'if we are granted governmental assistance comparable to that which is suggested would be given the Canadian company in connection with its proposed British Columbia development, we will undertake the Alaska project and carry it through to an early completion'; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has an official interest in this matter by reason of the fact that great effort has been expended by the Territorial agencies, including the Alaska Development Board, in bringing the Taiya project to its present state of readiness for early development;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States, in consultation with the national-defense authorities, reexamine immediately the situation with respect to the Taiya project and its proposed alternatives in Canada to the end that this large development shall take place on American soil; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by telegram immediately after adoption to Delegate BARTLETT in Washington for filing with the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which has announced it will investigate this matter.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 25, 1951.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor January 25, 1951.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Council of Women of the United States, New York, N. Y., signed by Mrs. Thomas G. Evans, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to send surplus grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition signed by Virginia A. Smith and sundry other citizens of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to send surplus grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against any increase in the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Tribal Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., relating to the payment for lands, interests in lands or improvements owned by nonmembers of the tribes, and so forth; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Central Labor Union, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 17-percent increase in pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Committee on Legislation and its administration, United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D. C., signed by Edward S. Matthias, chairman, favoring the enactment of legislation to create a Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96).

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 94)

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a report relating to the study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and States and municipalities, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate bill 337, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 95) thereon.

On behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] be added as cosponsors of the original bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the request to add the names of additional cosponsors is agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Frank N. W. Doodha, Kay Doodha, Eugenie Frances Maureen Doodha, and Frank Norman Winthrop Doodha, Jr.;

S. 868. A bill for the relief of Carlo Silvestrelli and his wife, Geneva; and

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 870. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert S. Amritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 871. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate bill 872, to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 873. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired by gift, trust, annuity, devise, bequest, inheritance, or as beneficiary of any insurance policy from an American citizen or national and to provide that in any present or future conflict similar property be held in trust for such enemy alien by courts of competent jurisdiction or by an agency of the Government appointed by the President, subject to the use of the United States Government for the successful conclusion of hostilities, to be returned to such alien after the end of hostilities under certain conditions as set out herein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the railway mail service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Col. Francis B. Upham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 876. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps," approved June 16, 1936, as amended, to certain former officers in the Army Air Forces who were erroneously commissioned in the Army of the United States rather than in the Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 877, to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India.

I am very much gratified, Mr. President, that such a large and distinguished bipartisan group of Senators has joined in sponsoring this bill, the purpose of which is to provide food grains available in the United States to help the people of India overcome a very serious famine situation which threatens them this year. As Senators know, the President sent a message to Congress on Monday last recommending legislation for this purpose.

The sponsors of this bill do not pretend that it is perfect, and I am sure that its various provisions will be thoroughly considered in the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate. But the bill as it now stands does represent an intensive study of the matter over a period of several weeks by a considerable number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, in consultation with the executive departments concerned and with interested citizen groups.

For my own part, I wish to say only that I have joined in this bill in a spirit which I believe is in the best American tradition—the spirit of neighborly assistance for human beings in distress. To

my mind the fact that we are in clear opposition to the Government of India in vital matters of far eastern policy should not enter at all into our consideration of how best we can come to the aid of the Indian people in their hour of need.

That need is urgent, Mr. President, and I know all the sponsors of this bill join in the hope that the Senate will give it speedy and favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with an explanatory statement on behalf of the sponsors, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President during the period ending December 31, 1951, sufficient funds to provide not in excess of 2,000,000 long tons of food grains and to provide for such administrative expenses as are not covered by local currency furnished by the Government of India in accordance with sections 4 and 5 of this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures authorized hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of meeting the emergency need in India arising during the period ending December 31, 1951.

SEC. 4. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between India and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of India:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of India, among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in India to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of supplies made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of India for the benefit of the people of India in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and India.

(e) To make available to the Government of the United States from the account established in subsection (d) local currency in the amounts required by it to meet its local currency administrative and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within India so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

SEC. 5. Local currency made available to the United States by India under the provisions of the agreement required by section 4 may be used for local currency administrative and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance provided by the United States without charge against appropriated funds.

SEC. 6. All or any portion of the funds made available under authority of this act may be transferred by the President to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government to be expended for the purpose of this act. Funds so transferred may be expended under the authority of any provisions of law not inconsistent with this act applicable to the departments or agencies concerned, except that funds so transferred shall not be commingled with other funds of such departments or agencies and shall be accounted for separately.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 3 of this act, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available to any department or agency for the purpose of this act: *Provided*, That to the extent that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for the transportation of supplies made available under this act, funds may be advanced hereunder to the Department of Commerce for activation and operation of additional vessels from the national defense reserve fleet for such transportation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, receipts from such operations may be used by the Department of Commerce to repay such advances.

SEC. 8. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to India under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

The statement presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

BACKGROUND STATEMENT ON BILL FOR EMERGENCY AID TO INDIA

The purpose of the bill introduced today for emergency food aid to India is stated at the beginning of the bill in these words: "to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country."

THE FOOD EMERGENCY IN INDIA

This bill is the result of careful study of the emergency food situation in India by interested Members of Congress. The emergency grew out of a series of natural disasters in the grain-producing areas of India, which seriously reduced the harvests of late 1950 and early 1951 and have brought about a net food grain deficit for the whole country estimated at between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 long tons. This deficit directly affects the food rationing system now in effect in certain regions of India, on which approximately one-third of the population depends. The seriousness of the situation is emphasized by the recent reduction of the per capita grain ration in some areas from 12 ounces to 9 ounces per day, which is well below the normal subsistence level.

To meet the threatened deficit for 1951, the Indian Government has purchased or is in the process of purchasing some 3,000,000 tons of grain on the world market, including the United States, and has stated her intention of purchasing an additional amount close to 1,000,000 tons.

In view of the threatened residual deficit, India on December 16, 1950, formally requested the United States to make available 2,000,000 tons in time to meet the emergency expected during the summer of 1951.

EMERGENCY AID IS IN UNITED STATES INTEREST

The sponsors of this bill are convinced that it is clearly in the interest of the United States, and within its capacity, to meet the request from India. A rejection of this appeal would mean widespread starvation during 1951 and a serious blow to the efforts of the new Indian republic to achieve economic and political stability and progress. Bearing in mind the position of India as the second most populous nation in the world and a natural leader in Asian affairs, such a development could have adverse effects throughout the area of non-Communist Asia, seriously hampering the growing efforts of countries in that area to solve their social and economic problems within a framework of political democracy.

United States aid in this emergency, on the other hand, would furnish a concrete demonstration of the friendly attitude of the American people for the people of India, and would be in harmony with our national tradition of relieving human distress.

As to the capacity of the United States, the current grain carry-over amounts to some 375,000,000 bushels. If the maximum of 2,000,000 tons should be shipped to India, this would amount to about 74,000,000 bushels, a quantity which could be spared without endangering the grain position in this country.

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Following are the salient provisions of the bill which deserve comment:

1. An appropriation is authorized sufficient to provide up to 2,000,000 long tons of food grains to India, plus necessary administrative expenses. It is expected that the major part of the grain will be wheat. The President, in his message to Congress of February 12, expressed his intention of requesting initially an appropriation to provide 1,000,000 tons. Facts already available make it clear that at least that amount will be needed, and an immediate appropriation for that amount will make it possible to get shipments under way in time to meet the emergency. The size of any further appropriation request will depend on on-the-spot studies to be made by officials of the Economic Cooperation Administration as to the remaining requirements of India and the degree to which those requirements can be met from other sources.

The appropriations authorized do not include the cost of ocean shipping, for which India is prepared to pay.

2. The bill requires that before any aid is provided an agreement must be entered into under the terms of which the Government of India will undertake to distribute food supplies, including those provided under this

act, without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; to give full publicity to American assistance; to permit United States representatives to observe the grain distribution; to set up a counterpart fund equivalent to the proceeds from sale by the Indian Government of United States relief grain, this fund to be used to increase India's food production and for other projects in the mutual interest of the United States and India; to make available local currency for on-the-spot administrative expenses of American personnel in connection with this program; and to take appropriate measures to lessen the danger of similar future emergencies.

3. The President is authorized to transfer funds made available under this act to any department or agency of the Government. A number of agencies may be involved in the program, although it is anticipated that the Economic Cooperation Administration will have the major administrative responsibility.

4. The bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances not exceeding $50,000,000, at the direction of the President, to carry out the purposes of the act, such advances to be repaid without interest out of appropriated funds. This provision will make possible immediate preparatory action, particularly with respect to shipping, pending appropriation by Congress.

It is particularly provided that advances may be made to the Department of Commerce for activation and operation of ships from the so-called "moth ball" fleet, to the extent that this is necessary to supplement private shipping. Since India will pay the cost of ocean transportation on "moth ball" ships as well as other vessels, it is expected that any advance to the Commerce Department for operation of reserve ships will be repaid out of receipts for the services of these vessels, and the bill provides that such receipts may be used for this purpose.

5. Finally, the bill provides that the President shall terminate assistance under the act whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that continued aid is unnecessary or undesirable.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Two aspects of this bill deserve special mention. First, the bill provides that the aid shall be furnished to India on an outright basis rather than as a loan or in exchange for money or other economic considerations. The initial Indian request expressed India's willingness to try to repay the aid requested, but from the facts now available it appears that India is not in a position to repay the United States for this consumption item in the foreseeable future without seriously jeopardizing her own domestic economy and thus making necessary further assistance. It is expected that the complex economic factors bearing on this question will be fully explored in committee.

The second important aspect of the bill is the omission of all political conditions. This is a deliberate decision of the sponsors, and is based on the belief that, as stated in a letter sent by certain of the present sponsors to the President on January 30, 1951, "the need to prevent starvation is entirely separate from all political considerations." It is recognized that differences exist between India and the United States on questions of international policy, particularly with respect to the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. But it is the spirit of this bill that the people of India who are threatened with famine and starvation deserve to be assisted entirely on the merits of their predicament—entirely aside from the wisdom or unwisdom of the policies of their government.

CONCLUSION

This bill is offered out of genuine concern for the serious food predicament facing the people of India, and after thorough consultation with appropriate agencies of the executive branch. In view of the urgent time factor involved, the sponsors hope that this bill will receive the earliest possible action consistent with thorough consideration of the issues involved.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the bill which has just been introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] providing for aid to India in the form of grain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the senior Senator from New Jersey and with many other distinguished Members of this body in sponsoring the bill introduced today to provide emergency assistance to the people of India, to help alleviate the terrible privations which are threatened in that country as a result of natural forces beyond their control.

The American people have always had the deepest affection for and interest in the people of India. We have long sympathized with their aspirations for independence. For many years popular sentiment in this country had urged upon the British Empire the great boon of granting independence to this country of 300,000,000 people.

Certainly it is in our interest to see that these people are not exposed to the extreme rigors of famine, insofar as it is within our power to prevent it.

This is not a question of sitting in judgment on the political policies of the Indian Government toward Pakistan or toward Kashmir or toward us. Those are questions which must be worked out in the political sphere, and on which judgment must be passed in the political sphere.

It is not particularly pertinent at this moment to conjecture what India might have done to prevent the threatened calamity. The calamity is now impending. When a neighbor's house is on fire, we do not stop to reproach him for having failed in the past to have it fireproofed.

We should urge the Government of India to devote any local currency obtained as a result of our aid to the improvement of the conditions which have contributed to the present danger. Provision for such an undertaking is included in the bill we have today introduced.

India is a land of almost 300,000,000 people—300,000,000 people whose institutions are devoted to the expansion of freedom. Our struggle today is for the protection and expansion of the areas of freedom in the world. Anything which threatens disaster in that area threatens us. Anything which we can practically do to shore up the free world should be done.

The proposal to provide aid to India is one which, if carried through in the spirit in which it was conceived, namely, of humanitarianism and of enlightened self-interest, will bring many benefits. It will raise our prestige throughout Asia. It will demonstrate to the people of all the free world, and perhaps even some of those behind the iron curtain, that we are willing to give some of our resources to help other peoples wherever and whenever we can, and that we do not insist on absolute conformity as a condition of our giving aid.

But most of all, the chief benefit should be, and will be, the knowledge in our own hearts and spirits that we have done the right thing, the generous thing, the human thing.

I may add, Mr. President, that this proposal has evoked a very favorable response in the national press. I call special attention to six editorials from leading newspapers throughout the Nation, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 5, 1951]

UNITED STATES GRAIN FOR INDIA

It is encouraging to find that 24 influential Senators and Representatives of both parties are sponsoring the proposal to contribute 2,000,000 tons of foodstuffs to India, to avert imminent famine there, in spite of India's failure to support the American position in the United Nations. This is wise. For if ever this country began to use its surpluses of basic foodstuffs as a weapon to coerce hungry peoples into acceptance of our political policy, we shall be asking for the enmity of the world.

India's need for food supplies is now quite clear. Her request was made about 6 weeks ago. The State Department has made its own investigation of the facts, and has found the danger of famine and widespread deaths to be a real danger. It is taken for granted that the administration will recommend aid to India, chiefly in bread grains, although it has not done so yet.

To be sure, the Government of India and the Indian delegation to the UN have been increasingly unsatisfactory. India was the leader of the bloc in the UN which opposed stamping Red China an aggressor. India has sometimes played Russia's game, in its effort to iron out the Russian-American cleavage—to reconcile the irreconcilable.

It would be easy to stall on India's request for food, and to let it be known unobtrusively that American foodstuffs are reserved for those who stand with us on the great issues of world politics. That might bring results. But that would be a dangerous game to play. It would invite the Indians and other peoples of Asia to believe that the ugly things said of America's motives and policy by Soviet propagandists were true. It would appear to Asians as proof that the great Western Powers are still determined to treat Asian peoples as pawns.

The wiser course is to treat India's hunger as a wholly separate problem, to be dealt with on the merits, and in the light of America's traditional humanitarian spirit. In the long run, this will do far more than coercive or punitive pressure to win the Indians to full support of the American viewpoint on world political issues.

There will be opposition in Congress to the allocation of food to India. And that opposition will be understandable. But such a question needs to be handled, not in terms of any tactical advantage we may get, but in terms of long-range strategy. And the wise strategy is to act decently and generously. For India is not an enemy. Its opposition to some measures we have sought is not inspired by any pro-Soviet alinement, but only by a difference of opinion with us as to the best way to assure peace in the Far East.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 5, 1951]

TO HELP INDIA

Americans have a great deal to say about the ways in which Soviet Russia dictates to its satellites or attempts to dictate to other nations. They will need to watch their own thinking that they do not fall into some of the same pitfalls of power with reference to the request of India for 2,000,000 tons of grain.

India needs the grain to meet famine conditions, while the United States could spare this 75,000,000 bushels of wheat and still have 300,000,000 bushels in storage. Though some wheat could earlier have been purchased from Pakistan, that grain is not now available. And though India has diverted some land to cotton and jute, its own wheat acreage has been increased 8 percent in the last year.

There will be a severe temptation in some quarters to try to penalize India for its reluctance to go along with American efforts in the United Nations to indict Communist China for aggression in Korea. Yet if America does stand for freedom of honest thought here is a place to prove it. Hungry people in India should not be obliged to forswear their leaders' convictions in order to obtain bread from a friendly power.

The Indian Government has not asked for a gift of grain but rather for opportunity to purchase it on long-term credit. It would be more humanitarian and probably more realistic simply to make a grant of the wheat.

If Congress is reluctant to release the wheat without at least partial payment, it would be a very good idea to set aside any payments received and use them for technical assistance (point 4 aid) to India in solving its agricultural problems or for American scholarships to Indian students.

In any event, two points are important about this request for aid: Congress should act promptly in order not to prolong distress; and Congress should act magnanimously in order to prove the nature of American motives in world affairs.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of February 7, 1951]

PLAYING POLITICS WITH HUNGER MIGHT HURT US WORSE THAN THE STIFF-NECKED NEHRU

The question of sending grain to save a million starving natives of India puts on trial the conscience and good intentions of the American people. It also poses a severe test of our hard practicality in world politics.

Some observers believe that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which turned a cold shoulder to the Indian request for aid, will moderate in time, especially since India failed in its vigorous efforts to block branding Communist China the aggressor in Korea.

That India has no intention of kowtowing to the United States Senate was demonstrated this week, however, when its UN delegate, Sir Benegal N. Rau, refused to continue serving on the United Nations good offices committee. The aim of this committee is to seek a settlement of the Korean conflict.

So what could develop into a serious cold war may be developing with the only important Asiatic nation which has made a strong pretense of being on the side of the free world.

It is natural that Senators should be irritated over the appeasement policies of Prime Minister Nehru. It is only natural that Americans should be more than a little bitter about philanthropy, especially in view of Russia's changed attitude since World War II and the growing hostility of the Chinese. Both received much assistance from us in the past. There are convincing arguments for being rigidly realistic in our foreign relations—based on the assumption that Uncle Sugar has been played for a sucker in the past. The question is, What is realistic? We cannot carry the whole world on our shoulders, to be sure. We cannot play the rich uncle to every poverty-stricken country. But what of our oft-repeated boast that humanitarian motives rather than politics prompt our aid programs?

How realistic would it be to exhibit before the world a kind of polite blackmail in which the Indian people are told to conform with our policies or starve? On the other hand, we must not be put into the position of bribing the Indians with food under threat they will turn against us if we don't. We can't buy friendship directly.

Communist propagandists already have made much of the theme that American philanthropy has strings tied to it, that it undermines the independence of nations accepting it. If we let a large number of Indians starve because their government refused to vote as we wished it in the United Nations, will not our vast humanitarian programs all over the world be grossly undermined?

What are the facts in the India controversy? Drought and locusts caused a severe food shortage and about 100,000,000 people, now depending on rationed food, are already down to nine ounces of rice or wheat a day. The Indian Government needs about 6,000,000 tons of grain from the outside. Two-thirds of this is being purchased. The United States is asked to furnish the remaining 2,000,000 tons. Nehru offered to pay for it on easy terms, but the State Department thinks that the Indian Government cannot afford to go into debt for the amount.

We have the grain. Our warehouses are bursting with surplus wheat which, if not moved to foreign markets, will grow stale. We have the necessary ships to move it, though some may have to be taken out of moth balls.

Questions arise as to why the State Department presented the Indian request to the Senate at a time when emotions were high over the Korean war and India's sensitiveness to the cause of Communist China. State Department officials are supposed to take the long view in such matters. Did they deliberately plan a slap at the Nehru government?

Another question: India's Moslem neighbor, Pakistan, reportedly has 600,000 tons of grain surplus which could be purchased. By refusing to use Pakistan grain, Mr. Nehru gives the impression he would rather let Hindus starve than to bolster Pakistan's economy by resuming normal trade relations. This should be looked into as well as reports of rice surpluses in Burma.

The strategic position of India with respect to the rest of Asia must not be overlooked in our realistic study. Nor should we fail to consider the Soviet policy of capitalizing on human misery and discontent. By refusing to assist the starving Indians, are we not putting ourselves in the category of the people we oppose?

By sending the needed wheat to India the United States could demonstrate to the world that we do not buy the consciences of other peoples. "If ever there was a chance to justify our friends and to confound our enemies," says Walter Lippmann, "it is here and now—by rising above all the petty feelings of the moment in order to play that part in the world which, when we are at our best, we find it a joy and a pride to be able to play."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 13, 1951]

A WORK OF MERCY FOR UNITED STATES: FEEDING INDIA'S HUNGRY

The sending of relief to the hungry people of India, which President Truman requested of Congress yesterday, is strictly in accord with this Nation's traditional readiness to help the needy and distressed, wherever they are.

Congress is asked to authorize the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of grain to India and to make an initial appropriation, estimated at $100,000,000, for half that amount. Prompt action must be taken if lives are to be saved. Food deliveries have to begin by April 1 if they are to reach India in time to meet the emergency.

There has been understandable opposition in Congress to this project because of the stand India has taken in the United Nations, in upholding Red China's cause, and because of Prime Minister Nehru's repeated attacks upon the United States.

For the head of a government that is looking to ours to keep its people from starving, Nehru has been acting in a strange fashion.

His meekness toward Communist China, and his refusal to label that regime as an aggressor in Korea, contrast sharply with his policies elsewhere: in Kashmir, for instance. He has been demanding that the United Nations brand Pakistan as the aggressor in Kashmir and has already imposed Indian sanctions against the Moslem state. His pacific tone in relation to Peiping is contrary to his belligerent attitude at home.

Some Congressmen naturally resent this behavior and wonder why the United States should take insults from Nehru and still spend millions to feed Nehru's countrymen.

But we cannot punish innocent persons because of their rulers' conduct. Most of India's teeming millions haven't the remotest idea of what Nehru has been talking about or what political issues are involved. All they know is their families are starving.

They ask us for help, and we are not the ones to turn aside from their pleas. Feeding India is another work of mercy in which Americans will be glad to join.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 9, 1951]

MR. HOOVER SPEAKS TO UPHOLD OUR ROLE

When ex-President Herbert Hoover spoke out for sending United States wheat to India to fight a famine, he cut the ground from under most of the congressional opposition. His agreement to act as an adviser to the administration on transportation and food resources in this emergency goes a long way toward restoring aid to India to its true perspective.

Mr. Hoover's work in European famine relief after World War I is a matter of history. So is his conservatism with regard to international involvement of the United States. It is impossible, then, for the most intense of his fellow Republicans to accuse him of advocating either waste or coddling a nation which is too soft toward the Soviet Union.

It was on the latter rather distorted argument, of course, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sidetracked India's request for help. India's Prime Minister Nehru and UN Delegate Sir Benegal Rau had opposed the United States resolution under which the United Nations formally affixed on Red China the charge of aggression in Korea. We disagreed at the time, believing China's aggression to be obvious. At the same time we felt that Mr. Nehru and Sir Benegal were earnest in their efforts to arrange a cease-fire, despite the fact that the proposals they were able to tender from China were specious.

The important point is that the United States has presented itself in the role of a protector of the oppressed and a champion of free opinion. If we had penalized India because we disliked what her representatives were proposing, why, then, we would have proved ourselves both an enemy of the oppressed and of free opinion as well—if it differed from our own.

As Mr. Hoover remarked, "The United States has never in its history failed to be helpful to a famine-stricken people." Of all times in history, this one is not the occasion to begin failing. Our granaries are bulging. Millions in India are hungry, and more face starvation because of crop failures. One may shrug and say India has always had famines and always will have; but he will be party to an exceedingly foolish attitude. As a free commonwealth, India faces a new day. Whether it will be a day of slavery or of emergence into the light of real advancement depends on the continued grimness of the free nations against Communist imperialism.

India is buying millions of tons of wheat from this country. Whether it is necessary for us to give 2,000,000 more tons or to advance them through long-term credit to avert real famine, the wise course is clear. Let us declare our intention and prove it with action without delay.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 9, 1951]

HOOVER AND INDIA

The prestige lent by Herbert Hoover to the project of providing food to the famine-stricken areas of India should weigh heavily with Congress.

As Mr. Hoover says, this kind of relief has always been humanitarian, not political, and should remain so.

Each Congressman has the right to agree or disagree with the international policies of Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government; but to try, as have some Congressmen, to use food shipments as a lever to move Indian policy into line with the views of Congress is worse than useless.

It would not, in the first place, have the desired effect. That kind of pressure notoriously arouses intense resentment. India's hungry millions would hardly establish a connection between the food we were denying them and the behavior of their government in matters of which they were only vaguely aware. And India's governmental functionaries are not the ones who are starving.

On the other hand, the indignation resulting from such an action would not be confined to Indians; people all over the world would resent this kind of callous squeeze play.

Whatever America provides should be provided without any political strings whatever—provided, as Mr. Hoover says, in consonance with our fundamental Christian faith and our traditions.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the purposes of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 877) to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I am today introducing a bill to place the three members of the Civil Service Commission on a term basis of 6 years each. My bill proposes that the terms of the members be rotated, to provide original appointments of 2, 4, and 6 years each, and to begin as of March 1, 1951.

The three members of the Civil Service Commission now serve at the pleasure of the President—one of the few agencies where this situation has continued to exist. Under such a system, where the members serve for extended periods, the Senate is provided with only infrequent opportunities to examine the records and qualifications of those who direct our civil-service system.

I need not remind my colleagues that my bill would follow the policy laid down by the Congress in recent years in adjusting the terms of other members of Federal commissions and boards. We have enacted laws that stagger the terms of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, the members of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as well as those of other agencies.

I am sure we all agree that a rotating system of commission and board members is both sound and in the interest of good government. Such a system would insure the continuity of experienced people to guide our Government agencies.

It is my opinion that my bill would strengthen the bipartisan nature of the Civil Service Commission as it would attract highly qualified persons in the field of personnel to the Commission. May I emphasize that my bill does not disturb the present bipartisan Commission. The Commission membership would continue on its present basis: Two members of the majority party, one member of the minority.

My bill provides that the present membership on the Civil Service Commission would serve until successors have been appointed and qualified, but not to exceed 60 days following enactment of my bill.

May I point out that my bill recognizes the basic policy expressed in the original Civil Service Act of 1883—to provide equal opportunity for consideration and appointment to civil-service positions for all citizens of our great Nation.

I shall refer this bill to the special subcommittee set up within the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to make a study of civil-service and Government manpower policies generally. A major objective of that subcommittee will be to draft legislation to strengthen the Civil Service Commission.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this worthy measure.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for the direct election of President and Vice President by the people and for primaries. It is the same as the joint resolution introduced by me in the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS UNDER CERTAIN MINERAL LEASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

WHERE AMERICA STANDS TODAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McFARLAND

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Where America Stands Today," delivered by Senator McFARLAND at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on February 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE MONTGOMERY COUNTY REPUBLICANS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Manor Club on Monday, February 12, 1951, before the Montgomery County Republicans, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO RESIST COMMUNISM—LETTER BY JOSIAH E. DUBOIS, JR.

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Josiah E. Dubois, Jr., to the editor of the New York Times and published in that newspaper on January 23 under the caption "To resist communism," which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWING OF GUAYULE IN THE UNITED STATES — STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the growing of guayule in the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORUM OF PUBLIC OPINION AT SUNRAY, TEX.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. E. Simpson, chairman of a public forum meeting held at Sunray, Tex., and an accompanying statement of the consensus of local opinion on a number of vital issues, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN ALASKA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD

a statement prepared by him relating to the defense construction program in Alaska, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MILITARY MANPOWER PROGRAM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials from leading newspapers regarding the manpower hearings and bills, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHY NOT A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR F. D. R.?—EDITORIAL FROM THE MACHINIST

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not A National Holiday To Honor F. D. R.?" published in the January 25, 1951, issue of the Machinist, organ of the International Association of Machinists, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRINCIPLES OF STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Richard A. Givens and published in the March 1951 issue of the Newsletter of the Students for Democratic Action of New York State, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENLISTMENT OF 18-YEAR-OLD BOYS—STATEMENT BY CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Shall We Enlist 18-Year-Old Boys," made by the editor of Progress, official publication of the International Reform Federation, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 31, 1951, and published in the February 1951 issue of Progress, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGED AND DISABLED RETIRED ENLISTED MEN—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT BY JOHN H. HOEPPEL

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 6, 1951, written to the President by John H. Hoeppel, founder, National Defense magazine, pleading for greater consideration for aged and disabled retired enlisted men, which appears in the Appendix.]

A DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY MICHAEL STRAIGHT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Democratic Foreign Policy," delivered by Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic, at Pittsburgh, Pa., January 25, 1951, at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Pittsburgh chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABELING OF FURS—LETTER FROM ASSOCIATED FUR INDUSTRIES OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the fur labeling bill now pending before the Senate, having been reported on February 5 by the Interstate Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter which I have received this morning from Robert Kottke, president of the Associated Fur Industries of Milwaukee. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Kottke's views.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED FUR INDUSTRIES OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 12, 1951.

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Associated Fur Industries of Milwaukee and Wisconsin, representing a large group of Wisconsin retailers, I must urge you to consider the evils of the labeling bill now before the Senate for consideration. Our industry has suffered acutely since 1943, first from the excise tax, next from the public bickerings, promises, and retraction regarding the lowering of such tax.

This labeling bill would deal our industry another hard blow. We have always suffered from the unfair practice of manufacturers and jobbers selling directly to the public. Not removing their labels would result in the public going directly to the manufacturers. It would also mean that we would hand over to our competitors knowledge that we have been a lifetime accumulating, knowledge that oftentimes spells the difference between success and failure.

Take away from a man his experience and sagacity in choosing the best sources for any given fur and what has he left to offer his customers? Take from him his own label in coats coming from his store and you have reduced him from an individual with a reputation to a nonentity. Shall we of Wisconsin just hand over the fur business to wholesalers and jobbers?

Check the steadily falling revenue from the fur excise tax as a true criterion of the state our industry is now in. I can assure you we cannot stand further hardships.

This labeling would not give a customer any idea of quality in any given fur. Therefore I am unable to see where any benefit would result.

We urge you to amend the bill so that the individual furrier could substitute his own label for that of the manufacturer or jobber and thus retain his identity.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. KOTTKE,
President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON DUTY ABROAD

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2141.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2141) to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is existing law. The bill merely extends the privilege to our soldiers abroad for a period of 2 years. It was unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee, and I believe there is no objection to it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is not this the same provision which we had all through World War II?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. This is a mere extension for 2 years.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2141) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXAMINATION OF RECORDS AND OBTAINING OF DOCUMENTS BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 87, which is a noncontroversial measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall make a brief statement in connection with the joint resolution. All the joint resolution does is to give to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the privilege of examining records and obtaining documents from the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the same privilege which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had prior to the Congressional Reorganization Act. That act casts some doubt upon the right of the joint committee to obtain necessary documents and information from the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This joint resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, and was unanimously recommended. I ask for its approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO SURVIVORS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE IN ACTIVE SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had intended to call up House bill 1, to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratu-

itous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in active service, and for other purposes, but certain amendments have been sent to the desk which are proposed to be offered, and I believe it will be necessary for the bill to go over. In no event, I think, could we dispose of it today.

If there are other amendments to be submitted to House bill 1, I hope Senators will avail themselves of the opportunity to have the amendments printed so that we have them before us on Monday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to House bill 1, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], I send to the desk two amendments to House bill 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. GEORGE. In view of the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] which I have not yet had an opportunity to examine, as well as the amendments offered just now by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which I presume inject certain controversial features into the bill, I think it would be wise not to call up the bill now, but rather to have it go over until Monday or such other time as we may be able to obtain consideration of it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be very glad to send copies of my amendments to the office of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his consideration in suggesting that the bill be put over until Monday or some other time when the matters in controversy can be carefully considered and acted upon.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I shall be pleased to have the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any other business to come before the Senate?

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the only other matter from the Finance Committee which, under a rather tentative understanding with the majority leader I might seek to call up today, is the Renegotiation Act of 1951, House bill 1724. I should like to have that bill made the unfinished business. I do not believe it can be disposed of today in view of the absence of a quorum from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) and thereby make it the unfinished business. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senate would be wise to permit this bill to go over until Monday. It is a very important bill. It ought to be acted upon, and no doubt we can act upon it Monday, unless the majority leader should have some other more pressing business that he desires the Senate to consider first. In that event, I would be glad to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend to follow action on H. R. 1724 with House bill 1?

Mr. GEORGE. I have already mentioned that bill. I have not asked that it be taken up, but I expect to bring it up on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. After action has been had on the bill to provide for renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I have asked Senators to offer any amendments to the bill they may have in mind to offer. Certain amendments have been offered by two Senators, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Those amendments result in certain controversial features in connection with H. R. 1, so I do not think we can dispose of the bill in the absence of a quorum of the Senate.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

C. Dickerman Williams, of New York, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Donald C. Miller, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 20, 1950.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Emil E. Palmquist

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Manly B. Root

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James W. Phipps
Leo R. Melcher
Robert J. Sillery

To be assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Harold M. Silver

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Irvin F. Buck

To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Arthur W. Dodds

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Frederick F. Aldridge

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Morton I. Goldman

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harry Rubin

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James R. Solomon, Abbeville, Ala., in place of Bryan Whitehurst, retired.

Clyde D. Watson, Clayton, Ala., in place of N. M. Wallace, retired.

Buford L. Hughes, Cottonwood, Ala., in place of G. D. Ward, removed.

Esther M. Sims, Delta, Ala., in place of O. P. Braswell, transferred.

James W. Cyphers, Foley, Ala., in place of C. A. Boller, retired.

Sister Mary Basil, Holy Trinity, Ala., in place of Sister Mary Teresa, retired.

Katherine T. Perry, Lockhart, Ala., in place of R. K. Bullard, deceased.

Roy M. Williams, Midland City, Ala., in place of A. O. York, retired.

Helen T. Humphreys, Montrose, Ala., in place of E. T. Fell, retired.

James E. Channell, Odenville, Ala., in place of B. M. Forman, retired.

John R. Hinton, Prattville, Ala., in place of L. D. McCrary, retired.

Lucy A. Robinson, Waverly, Ala., in place of J. B. Robinson, Jr., resigned.

ALASKA

Arlene A. Webster, Platinum, Alaska, in place of M. F. Harwood, resigned.

ARKANSAS

William S. Huggins, Bauxite, Ark., in place of N. L. Connevey, retired.

Earl H. Neely, Jr., Benton, Ark., in place of C. F. Elza, retired.

Elmer R. Gatten, Colt, Ark., in place of C. N. Wood, resigned.

Eunice M. Harvey, Huntington, Ark., in place of M. N. Old, retired.
Jack H. Griffin, Lake City, Ark., in place of H. T. Griffin, retired.
Pierce A. Reeder, Leola, Ark., in place of I. S. Matlock, resigned.
Sam C. Ingram, Luxora, Ark., in place of S. M. Brown, retired.
William H. Bridgeman, Mineral Springs, Ark., in place of E. K. Calhoun, retired.
James B. Hill, Nashville, Ark., in place of R. R. Millwee, retired.
Marvin H. Massey, Palestine, Ark., in place of D. A. Massey, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Meryl G. Adams, Acton, Calif., in place of P. K. Ihrig, removed.
Margaret I. Higgins, El Granada, Calif. Office established November 16, 1947.
Nelson F. Smith, Petaluma, Calif., in place of Frederick Martin, retired.
Kenneth R. Rudisill, Tulelake, Calif., in place of W. L. Stark, deceased.

COLORADO

Ralph J. McDonald, Berthoud, Colo., in place of W. E. Rogers, retired.
Matthew Martinez, Milliken, Colo., in place of E. P. Winkler, resigned.

FLORIDA

Frank L. Burgust, Apopka, Fla., in place of M. H. Vick, resigned.
O. B. Fowler, Citra, Fla., in place of L. K. Stewart, transferred.
William P. Baker, Hawthorne, Fla., in place of L. A. Sherouse, deceased.
Howard S. Warner, Orange City, Fla., in place of H. A. Richey, retired.
Mark H. Shaw, Palatka, Fla., in place of J. A. Shelley, retired.
Marian J. Davis, Wabasso, Fla., in place of K. P. Harris, resigned.
Edgar M. Henderson, Winter Garden, Fla., in place of W. H. Reams, retired.

GEORGIA

Julian R. Grimsley, Adel, Ga., in place of L. J. Flowers, transferred.
Frank T. Paulk, Alapaha, Ga., in place of Blanche Chambless, removed.
Charles W. Conley, Blairsville, Ga., in place of T. C. Conley, transferred.
Mary Sue Hampton, Clarkston, Ga., in place of E. R. Culpepper, retired.
Marion H. Reynolds, Clermont, Ga., in place of W. C. Haynes, removed.
Walter P. Hughes, Cumming, Ga., in place of K. A. Kemp, retired.
Charles H. Phillips, Dahlonega, Ga., in place of J. R. Jones, transferred.
Lanier R. Billups, Decatur, Ga., in place of Wylie West, retired.
Cephas S. Spruill, Dunwoody, Ga., in place of Ethel Nash, retired.
Robert C. Stembridge, Ellijay, Ga., in place of F. C. Wingate, resigned.
Huram R. Hancock, Gainesville, Ga., in place of J. F. Carter, retired.
Marion A. Burns, Hiawassee, Ga., in place of J. C. Puett, transferred.
James M. Stallings, Jr., Lithonia, Ga., in place of A. H. Flake, deceased.
Marjorie T. McCay, McCaysville, Ga., in place of C. J. Collis, resigned.
Guy H. Toles, Jr., Menlo, Ga., in place of J. W. Murphy, retired.
Ruth H. Grippo, Oglethorpe University, Ga., in place of M. A. Weltner, resigned.
Frank G. Owen, Stockbridge, Ga., in place of Fred Grant, transferred.
Robert A. Timmons, West Point, Ga., in place of F. K. Mize, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Gerald C. Hardiek, Dieterich, Ill., in place of Leland Adams, transferred.
Oliver W. Ator, Jr., Griggsville, Ill., in place of F. C. Hall, deceased.
Joy A. Mitchell, Noble, Ill., in place of Webster Hanna, retired.
Jerry H. Elliston, Waltonville, Ill., in place of M. E. Patterson, retired.

INDIANA

Olive C. Mohr, Flat Rock, Ind., in place of Woodbury Mohr, deceased.
Loren R. Buse, Poneto, Ind., in place of D. E. Ulmer, transferred.
Howard E. Dike, St. John, Ind., in place of S. M. Boecker, resigned.

IOWA

Wallace W. Koestner, Centerville, Iowa, in place of J. B. Taylor, retired.
Thomas G. Clifford, Charlotte, Iowa, in place of A. J. Hanrahan, deceased.
Vertie DeVerne Lugar, Derby, Iowa, in place of L. W. Lugar, deceased.
George L. Johnson, Emerson, Iowa, in place of I. B. Stokes, retired.
Roger E. Klay, Hull, Iowa, in place of Timon Roetman, transferred.
Richard D. Claus, Plymouth, Iowa, in place of Anna Bliem, retired.

KANSAS

Willard Eugene Foos, Healy, Kans., in place of Dale Graves, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Mamie W. Higginbotham, Delhi, La., in place of W. A. Dearman, designed.
Austin B. Smith, Rayville, La., in place of A. L. Page, transferred.
Nellie M. Whittington, St. Landry, La., in place of L. T. Tubre, retired.
Raymond J. Jolet, Weeks, La., in place of A. B. Darnall, resigned.
Simeon P. Cartier, Westwego, La., in place of E. J. Pierce, resigned.

MAINE

Orman M. Fortier, Guilford, Maine, in place of E. E. Ross, retired.

MARYLAND

Hubert Glen Caple, Cedarhurst, Md., in place of S. B. Caple, resigned.
James F. Burke, Taneytown, Md., in place of J. O. Crapster, deceased.
Francis M. Pickett, Woodbine, Md., in place of B. F. Dorsey, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Raphael F. McKeown, North Abington, Mass., in place of O. W. Gallagher, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Frank C. Middel, Detroit, Mich., in place of R. B. Huston, deceased.
Carl Knepp, Fairview, Mich., in place of E. L. Bailey, resigned.
John C. Lane, Galesburg, Mich., in place of R. G. Southworth, deceased.
William J. Johnson, Leland, Mich., in place of J. E. Lederle, retired.

MINNESOTA

Arthur J. Breen, Bemidji, Minn., in place of Thomas Hughes, retired.
John H. Sparrow, Ortonville, Minn., in place of J. C. Gowan, transferred.
Donald E. Cummings, Spring Valley, Minn., in place of Roy Viall, retired.
William H. Schaefer, Warren, Minn., in place of E. A. Swenson, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Nathan A. Riley, Dorsey, Miss., in place of F. G. Martin, retired.
Earl M. Whitehead, Roxie, Miss., in place of M. C. Flowers, retired.

MISSOURI

Clarence E. Whitton, Downing, Mo., in place of W. S. Smoot, deceased.
Edward D. Clay, South Kinloch Park, Mo., in place of B. E. Rainey, deceased.

NEW YORK

Emanuel W. Kuna, Hartsdale, N. Y., in place of R. M. Rooney, resigned.
Frederick B. Bertrand, Hempstead, N. Y., in place of T. J. Hartnett, deceased.
Francis J. Mahoney, Highland Falls, N. Y., in place of J. H. Wilson, retired.
Lawrence J. Ewart, Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of A. J. Belgard, retired.
James L. Dam, Vernon, N. Y., in place of Anna Marriott, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edward Russell Johnston, Belhaven, N. C., in place of J. A. Leigh, deceased.
Walter Wellington White, Hertford, N. C., in place of S. M. Whedbee, resigned.
James H. Mullinax, Pomona, N. C., in place of M. J. Bell, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ralph F. Covert, Calvin, N. Dak., in place of H. R. McKechnie, deceased.
Nettie E. Bruning, Solen, N. Dak., in place of B. G. J. Schimansky, Sr., retired.

OHIO

William T. Felske, Castalia, Ohio, in place of M. E. Perry, resigned.
Mary Jane Rebbin, Donnelsville, Ohio. Office established September 15, 1949.
Richard D. Ferguson, Risingsun, Ohio, in place of C. C. Myers, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Taylor E. Cavins, Ringling, Okla., in place of J. B. Steele, retired.

OREGON

Kenneth V. Parmley, Banks, Oreg., [illegible] e of H. J. Atlee, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack Kiser, Hungerford, Pa., in place of H. W. Albrecht, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carl C. Wilkes, Chester, S. C., in place of P. H. Wilkes, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Delbert W. Fitzler, Springfield, S. Dak., in place of M. L. Gaynor, retired.

TENNESSEE

James R. Wright, Trimble, Tenn., in place of R. M. Grills, deceased.

TEXAS

Kinchen V. Northington, Ballinger, Tex., in place of T. A. Caudle, transferred.
Victor J. Couture, Brackettville, Tex., in place of A. R. Davis, resigned.
Ernest I. Pratt, Copperas Cove, Tex., in place of A. L. Clements, transferred.
Alva C. Cotney, Jr., Follett, Tex., in place of A. C. Cotney, transferred.
Joyce W. Kemp, Fort Davis, Tex., in place of R. G. Ellis, retired.
Lem Ashinhurst, Henrietta, Tex., in place of D. A. Greer, transferred.
Carl M. Curry, Kennard, Tex., in place of Maud English, resigned.
John F. Bennett, Jr., McGregor, Tex., in place of S. H. Amsler, retired.
Morgan Haynes, Melvin, Tex., in place of H. O. Gainer, declined.
Leslie Alvin Smithwick, Miles, Tex., in place of H. W. Moynihan, transferred.
Archer T. Spear, Millsap, Tex., in place of A. S. Hightower, retired.
Ernest Lynn Fisher, Mullin, Tex., in place of S. S. Dorbandt, retired.
Henry G. Hankins, Newcastle, Tex., in place of B. B. Ward, retired.
Anna H. Dyer, North Cowden, Tex. Office established May 16, 1948.
Clarence B. Freiley, Poolville, Tex., in place of D. C. Waters, resigned.
Robert C. Phillips, Rotan, Tex., in place of J. V. Gray, deceased.
Claudine V. Kohutek, Rowena, Tex., in place of H. H. Wagner, deceased.
William E. Bryant, San Saba, Tex., in place of W. A. Smith, retired.
Henry D. Moreland, Snyder, Tex., in place of H. F. Shuler, resigned.
Willie O. Ham, Terminal, Tex. Office established October 1, 1948.
Kenneth B. Daws, Throckmorton, Tex., in place of J. T. Davis, Jr., resigned.
Irene New, Truscott, Tex., in place of A. S. Tarpley, resigned.
Julia J. Williams, Valentine, Tex., in place of E. S. Vick, retired.

Willie M. Johnston, Wolfforth, Tex., in place of J. A. McWhorter, retired.

VIRGINIA

Virginia H. Phillips, Booker Washington Birthplace, Va. Office established February 12, 1948.

Homer G. Murray, Boones Mill, Va., in place of L. C. Jamison, retired.

Robert G. Jones, Buckingham, Va., in place of L. W. Jones, retired.

Mamie H. Covington, Burgess, Va., in place of W. H. Covington, deceased.

Lloyd B. Taylor, Clifton, Va., in place of D. W. Buckley, Jr., transferred.

Alan G. Rosenkrans, Crozet, Va., in place of S. H. Dawson, retired.

Thurston K. Stoneburner, Edinburg, Va., in place of A. G. Carter, retired.

William P. Heath, Esmont, Va., in place of W. H. Dawson, declined.

Linnette B. Peak, Glasgow, Va., in place of E. L. MacMillan, resigned.

Howard O. Shields, Hurt, Va., in place of J. S. Yeatts, retired.

James E. Willey, Jr., Irvington, Va., in place of H. O. Rock, retired.

Lewis R. Rash, Jr., La Crosse, Va., in place of R. K. Northington, resigned.

John W. Bullock, Louisa, Va., in place of J. N. Porter, resigned.

Charles O. Faulconer, Monroe, Va., in place of T. M. Hesson, retired.

William J. Shull, Mount Solon, Va., in place of C. G. Arey, transferred.

Jesse M. Inge, Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon, retired.

Ward Blagden, Petersburg, Va., in place of G. L. Elmore, deceased.

Richard P. Davis, Phenix, Va., in place of H. F. Gilliam, resigned.

George E. Smith, Rawlings, Va., in place of G. H. Bilck, transferred.

Aubrey E. Johnson, Jr., Strasburg, Va., in place of R. S. Wright, retired.

Calvin C. Holt, Sutherlin, Va., in place of J. A. Vernon, retired.

Cecil M. Hunt, Sweet Briar, Va., in place of R. V. Martindale, retired.

Edward Ware, Tappahannock, Va., in place of F. B. B. Sale, retired.

Billy L. Hottle, Toms Brook, Va., in place of Lawrence Hottle, deceased.

Lewis M. Meador, Vinton, Va., in place of M. R. White, resigned.

Ernest M. East, Waynesboro, Va., in place of J. F. Harper, retired.

UTAH

William R. Green, Provo, Utah, in place of J. W. Dangerfield, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Joe Piccolo, Flemington, W. Va., in place of G. O. Sinsel, retired.

Virginia D. Sorensen, Fort Gay, W. Va., in place of Charles Pelfrey, transferred.

Nan G. McCormick, Helen, W. Va., in place of H. O. Lockman, retired.

Sybil G. Jimison, Kayford, W. Va., in place of T. O. Wash, resigned.

Lois Mae Powell, Mallory, W. Va., in place of W. H. Baker, resigned.

Donald L. Jamison, Morgantown, W. Va., in place of C. L. Hall, retired.

Rosalie K. Eanes, Nellis, W. Va., in place of E. B. Keenan, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, grant that in this moment of sacred communion with Thy spirit we may have an inspiring and uplifting sense of Thy greatness and goodness.

Help us to believe more sincerely and confidently in the efficacy of prayer, not as a power to take away our perplexing problems and difficulties, our trials and tribulations, but as a power girding our minds and hearts to meet them courageously and victoriously.

We humbly confess that when we forget Thee and lose sight of Thee, then we become anxious and are haunted with fears which rob us of all peace. We pray that Thou wilt enlarge and strengthen our faith in Thee and in the ultimate triumph of the true, the good, and the right.

May we continue to pray and labor for that blessed time when all the destructive and diabolical motives of hatred and selfishness which fill the hearts of men shall be supplanted by the nobler feelings of kindness and compassion and an eagerness to bear one another's burdens.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FIFTY-CENT DOLLARS STARVE AMERICA'S AGED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, 50-cent dollars are starving America's aged who should have first priority. Their meager incomes are static but food and the other necessities of life have skyrocketed in price until their real income is reduced one-half and many are now on a starvation basis in a land of plenty. To meet this problem I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 2678, embodying the Townsend social-security plan. My colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ELATNIK], is introducing an identical companion bill.

At a meeting with the Townsend executive committee, whose members are JOHN A. BLATNIK; RAY MADDEN, of Indiana; GARDNER D. WITHROW, of Wisconsin; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio; ROBERT C. SECREST, of Ohio; EDWIN A. HALL, of New York; and myself, it was expressed as the opinion of the committee that the same bill be introduced in the Eighty-second Congress as was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress inasmuch as it so clearly deals with the needs of our aged citizens.

The bills we have introduced today with one minor exception are the same as those introduced by us in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136. As set forth in the heading, the purpose of this legislation is to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there was never a more propitious time to enact this legislation. With the spiral of inflation confronting us and with the cost of food and other necessities of life at an all-time high, the elderly citizens of America are finding it impossible to meet the minimum costs to keep body and soul together. Not only food prices but shelter, medical attention, and every essential of living have skyrocketed beyond the ability of this low-income group to meet.

This legislation, if enacted, will solve this problem. It will be Nation-wide in its coverage, will afford modest but necessary income for the aged and at the same time will not unduly disturb our national economy. It will provide purchasing power for this large group of our citizens to secure the necessities of life and to that extent will tend to stabilize markets. When this problem is considered on an over-all basis and all forms of assistance and relief to the old people of the Nation are considered in toto it will be found that this method of meeting the problem, provided in the legislation we have introduced, will not be a greater drain on the resources of the Nation than the multitudinous overlapping programs already existing seeking to meet the problem.

I most respectfully urge all of my colleagues to give serious and immediate attention to this important legislation. It should have been enacted into law long before this in order to prevent unnecessary hardship to this great group of deserving citizens.

OLD-AGE-PENSION PROGRAM

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor and pleasure of joining with my very good friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] to introduce once again the Townsend pension bill (H. R. 2679) to provide real economic security for the old folks of America. The decision to reintroduce this pension bill was made last week at the meeting of the Townsend executive committee, the membership of which includes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SECREST], the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and myself.

This bill which I have the privilege of sponsoring once again is identical—with one minor exception—to the Townsend bills (H. R. 2135, 2136) which were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. Our reasons for reintroducing this bill are obvious to anyone who is familiar with the problems confronting the aged

of our country. The facts show that the present social-security program is wholly inadequate, both in coverage and monthly benefits, to give security to our senior citizens many of whom today are living in poverty and want.

The facts also show that the only solution to their problem is the enactment by Congress of a comprehensive and liberal old-age-pension program. The bill which I am offering to Congress today embraces such a program, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will meet its obligations to the fathers and mothers of America by enacting this bill into law without further delay.

MONETARY POLICIES

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is my responsibility to fight the battle against inflation on all fronts. This feeling that a better job must be done immediately is certainly shared by every housewife who finds her household costs still rising and by every worker who finds his wages frozen while his cost of living is being rapidly thawed out.

At the moment, the hue and cry of conflict centers around the familiar catch phrases of price control, wage stabilization, allocation, rationing. Even the mushrooming new agencies that sprout overnight out of the well-fertilized ground of bureaucracy come up with a new sequence of alphabet letters, but all doing the same job as before.

Whatever the combination of letters, unless they are backed by proper monetary policies, they all spell trouble for the housewife, the wage earner, the small-business man, the person living on a pension.

Still hidden behind the glare of exploding flash bulbs, and exploded economic theories, a battle goes on which has thus far escaped the general public eye and understanding. I refer to the battle between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department.

Upon the outcome of this battle hinges the success or failure of our entire effort to really do something about inflation. Here we come face to face with a problem which will require greater insight and more real courage than any yet displayed on the more popular and more easily understood other inflationary fronts.

The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve has for a long time been supporting the market for Government bonds to help maintain their low interest rates. This committee has bought billions of dollars of marketable bonds and has placed the cash into general circulation. This cash has become a part of our general demand deposits in the banks. The bonds are used by them as a basis for further credit.

Many people are quick to say that Government spending alone is responsible for the present inflationary crisis. I recognize that the total cost of Government must go up in any time of emergency. However, I believe that the cheap-money policy of the Treasury Department is a more important factor in causing our present inflation than is Government spending.

This cheap-money policy which in fact has allowed an expansion of bank loans to the extent of more than ten billions of dollars in recent months is the keystone holding up the inflation arch.

Since President Truman ordered our troops into Korea in June of 1950, the rise in price inflation—the cost of the things you and I must buy in order that we may live—has paralleled the inflation of our currency or the cheapening of our dollar.

How can anyone talk about too much money in circulation? Do you know anyone who ever has enough money to circulate? Every housewife in America finds her pocketbook empty by the time she has paid the week's bills. Many find theirs empty even before the bills needed to keep the family together are paid.

Possibly we can understand better what is happening if we recall our recent history.

Ten years ago—just before the start of World War II—all of us as loyal, patriotic Americans bought series E war bonds. Many of us bought these bonds to lay away money for the education of our children, to help provide care for ourselves should we be unable to work as we grew older.

Now, as we prepare for world war III, the first of these World War II bonds are about to mature. Those bond holders who so desperately need the money now to pay current expenses will find when they cash in these bonds that every dollar put away 10 years ago now can buy only 60 cents worth of things—if the things still are available.

This is what is meant by cheap money. Every bond holder or potential bond buyer wonders if the dollar has cheapened from 100 cents to 60 cents during the past 10 years what will happen to it at the end of the next 10 years.

Unless this policy stops, wages will never be high enough to cover the legitimate needs of a wage earner's family, a life-insurance policy will not give adequate protection; the much-needed and well-deserved pension just will not be enough.

The administration must decide whether it is proinflation or antiinflation. In my opinion, it is dishonest to suggest an antiinflationary tax policy on the one hand while at the same time insisting on a proinflationary interest policy on the other.

President Truman has sent a tax proposal to the Congress suggesting that our tax bill—your taxes and my taxes—be increased $10,000,000,000. This taking of an additional $10,000,000,000 of your money is urged on the basis that it is antiinflationary. If such is the case, then you have a right to insist that the same interest and bond-buying policy by which the Federal Reserve System has increased our money supply in recent months by nearly the same $10,000,000,000 be stopped immediately.

This is not a partisan political battle. The American people who today are being asked to do so much and to make so many real sacrifices have the right to demand from the present administration that it resolve immediately the very real crisis developing from the intramural battle being waged between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury. The time is now.

HELP FOR THOSE SUBJECT TO MILITARY CALL

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would help those subject to military call to secure employment or promotion in their present employment. This proposal, if enacted into law, would go a long way toward overcoming the handicap the armed services reservists, members of the National Guard, and those subject to selective service now face as they endeavor to secure employment or regular promotion in their present employment.

This measure amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals subject to military call. The bill provides an additional deduction by way of a business expense for part of the remuneration paid to such employee.

No doubt many Members have received letters, just as I have, calling attention to the fact that employers are naturally hesitant to consider employing anyone subject to and likely to be called into the armed services. It seems to me that there probably are not many employers who take this attitude. However, there are apparently enough to make a rather serious situation which is causing general alarm among members of the National Guard, reservists, and those subject to selective service. I am confident that there is not any employer who does not personally wish he could take on employees who might be called into the service. However, the employer is faced with a hard problem, and it is understandable that this situation annoys him as much as it does the employee who is likely to be called into the service.

It seems to me that the National Defense Establishment should make every effort, insofar as it is possible, to overcome the uncertainty which results in this situation.

I believe that the proposal I have introduced today will go a long way in helping to solve this problem. I believe further that it will help our over-all effort to secure the maximum utilization of our manpower and productive facilities.

This measure will in all probability be referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, but I want to call it to the specific attention of the House Armed Services Committee because I believe it is a problem to which both committees must direct careful consideration and some action to relieve the unfortunate

uncertainties, handicap, and discrimination which have naturally come about as a result of our national defense manpower mobilization policies.

I submit here along with my remarks a copy of the bill and request that it may be printed in the RECORD:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals liable for induction or call to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(cc) Special deduction in respect of employees entering Armed Forces:

"(1) In general: If during the taxable year any individual left a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of the taxpayer—

"(A) to be inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act of 1948, or

"(B) to enter upon active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or the Public Health Service, in response to an order or call to active duty,

an amount equal to 50 percent of the sum of the amounts allowable under subsection (a) (1) (A) as cash remuneration paid during the 2-year period ending on the date such individual left the position as salary or other compensation for personal services actually rendered by such individual.

"(2) Definition: As used in this subsection, the term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act.

LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Under the domination of Communist Russia, there still exists the yearning of centuries for freedom. To be a free people has been the age-old aspiration of the Lithuanians. For a few years, between the two World Wars, liberty was enjoyed and cherished. Then came the Soviet occupation and with it came the loss of freedom and misery to the people of Lithuania.

Several hundred thousands paid the price of loss of their lives. Victims were tortured; suffered from planned starvation, and finally were exiled to prison or slave labor camps. Husbands were separated from their wives and children; sent to different Siberian camps; and the children reared in complete contradiction to their cultural and religious backgrounds.

Behind the iron curtain, Lithuania cannot publicly proclaim its constant yearning for liberty. Soviet oppression has taken care of that. But the people in that unfortunate country keep on praying for the day of deliverance. They maintain an heroic underground capable of spreading intelligent American truth.

Here in America, the Lithuanians keep alive the spirit of their national aspirations.

May these aspirations some day become a reality.

That is the universal hope of Americans who believe in freedom and in the independence of nations to govern themselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania.

We find, however, that instead of enjoying that independence which was earned through great sacrifice, this brave, liberty-loving people are struggling in the throes of oppression and aggression.

It is high time that this Nation take a firm stand in defense of a people who have by force of arms lost that freedom for which we have pledged support. I urge the Congress and the Department of State to take appropriate action to bring to an end this reign of terror and oppression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans of Rockford, Ill., and my reply to these splendid people:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MASS MEETING OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS IN ROCKFORD, ILL., HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LOCAL BRANCH OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., ON THE 11TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1951, TO COMMEMORATE THE THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, has been and still is unlawfully occupied by the Soviet military and police forces; and

Whereas, after having usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people, the Soviet rulers are applying ever harsher methods of oppression and outright extermination of the indigenous population of that country by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to alien domination and are determined to regain their freedom and sovereignty; and

Whereas because of their manifest and unmistakable anti-Communist attitude, the Lithuanian people, backed by their kinsmen in this country, represent a reliable link in the defense chain which is presently being forged by the free nations against the Communist aggression: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, in joining our countrymen in the grief caused by the acts of aggression and injustice of the Soviet Union, voice an emphatic protest against the terroristic activities of the Soviets in Lithuania and especially against the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Soviet Government, and pledge all possible support to the efforts of the Lithuanian people to reestablish their independent and democratic republic; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States with the request to include the liberation of Lithuania and other countries enslaved by Soviet Russia into the program of the American foreign policy and to use a proper occasion for a public restatement of the views of the Government on the necessity to restore the independence of these countries; be it finally

Resolved, That we, Lithuanian-Americans, reaffirming our loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge our wholehearted support of the administration in its efforts to resist the Communist forces of aggression and achieve an international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice.

STEVE KELIOTIS,
Chairman.
PAUL A. DELTUVA,
Secretary.

ROCKFORD, ILL., *February 11, 1951.*

FEBRUARY 14, 1951.

PAUL A. DELTUVA,
Secretary, Rockford Branch,
Lithuanian-American Council, Inc.,
Rockford, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. DELTUVA: I acknowledge receipt of the resolution adopted at the mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans on February 11 with respect to the direful situation confronting the people of your homeland.

The contents of this resolution, setting forth in convincing detail the brutal aggression practiced upon your people, strike in me a responsive chord for I have long been interested in the devotion to freedom and abhorrence of injustice that through these many years has so outstandingly characterized the people of Lithuania.

I can understand how the injustices being presently imposed on your homeland by brute force bear more heavily on your hearts at this anniversary of national independence for, while you good people here enjoy as American citizens the freedoms denied to those yet in Lithuania, you would be less than human did you not do everything in your power to alleviate the deplorable conditions surrounding them and affecting their very existence.

Your resolution but intensifies my earnest desire to be helpful in every possible way. To this end I can assure you and those sponsoring this resolution that I shall press earnestly and persistently for a clear-cut statement of policy by our Department of State in harmony with the objectives so forcefully set out in your resolution and, further, shall urge affirmative action by the State Department to make such policy statement effective.

Sincerely yours,

LEO E. ALLEN,
Member of Congress.

IN HONOR OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was one of the first victims of the last World War. In June 1940 it was occupied by Soviet Union forces. In July 1941, Nazi troops expelled the Red army and ruled over the country until August 1944, when the Russians came back and incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union. And since Moscow did not succeed in changing the Lithuanians into Bolsheviks, thousands of them were

killed, expelled, deported. All the progress made in two decades of independence in every phase of life—economic, financial, commercial, educational—was destroyed by the teachers of a new way of felicity—communism.

American-Lithuanians, so much more fortunate than their brothers who live under Communist terror, are aware of Lithuania's tragedy. They know that today the members of the Lithuanian underground movement, risking their lives to fight the Russians in Lithuania, are in the same camp as American boys trying to hold back Communist aggression in Korea. Their fight is the fight of all free nations for freedom and democracy.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we think of all these thousands of people who died for their country, and we look forward to seeing again a free and prosperous Lithuania.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, today a group of us from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is introducing a bill to start action toward getting relief in the form of surplus wheat to more than 10,000,000 people in India who otherwise are likely to starve in the next few months due to famine resulting from earthquake, floods, and drought. No one has been more opposed than I to what I believe to be the unrealistic and unwise attitude of the Indian Government on the question of Communist aggression in Asia, which, unless checked in Korea and China, will, I fear, conquer India too. But our differences with the Indian Government on policy have no relation to American concern for the suffering of the starving Indian people. I believe we should make available within the reasonable limits of our capacities such wheat as full investigation makes clear India does not have the ability to purchase.

We should do it, first, because they are human beings in need; and secondly, because these particular human beings happen to live in a very vital spot in today's world. Communism makes headway by promising people whatever it is they need. Although it never yet has delivered on the big promises, you cannot blame needy people for following the false guides if they see nowhere else to turn. Our American way is not promises, but performance. This is a case where what our hearts prompt us to do coincides with what our heads tell us is in our own long-term interest and in the interest of peace and world security.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

THE COTTON SITUATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last war in conference with the Quartermaster General and other high officials, I was told that cotton ranked third in the importance of war materials. First comes explosives; then the various kinds of metals, and then cotton. In that connection I have just received a resolution passed yesterday by the general assembly of my State, which reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND UNITED STATES OFFICIALS TO REMOVE THE ORDER FROM THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION AFFECTING COTTON ISSUED JANUARY 25, 1951

Whereas cotton is one of the basic industries of this Nation; and

Whereas cotton has long been the basis of South Carolina's economic life and the growing and processing reaches into every phase of the life of the citizens of South Carolina and the Nation; and

Whereas the United States of America is in a critical period and cotton is essential to the national defense effort; and

Whereas at the present time cotton is in temporary short supply and the cotton farmers and producers of South Carolina and the Nation have been asked to produce more than 16,000,000 bales of cotton as part of the national defense effort which is a 60-percent increase in production; and

Whereas due to the recent Federal regulations, as contained in the order from the Office of Price Stabilization issued January 25, 1951, free trade and free flow of this commodity is at a compete standstill and conditions have become chaotic adversely affecting the farmers, cotton merchants, manufacturers, ginners, warehousemen, bankers, transportation systems and directly, or indirectly, all phases of normal business: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the President of the United States and the proper governmental agencies, including the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Stablization, are requested to immediately remove the present unworkable order pertaining to cotton in order to permit the resumption of normal distribution and processing of raw cotton; to assure the cotton farmer that the 16,000,000 bales he has been asked to produce by our Government will move readily as in the past; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate immediately transmit copies of the resolution to the President of the United States; the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Brannan; the Administrator of the Office of Price Stablization, Michael DiSalle; and to the South Carolina Members of Congress.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a new old-age pension bill, which is similar to the one I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. Substantially, the only change in the bill is that the amount has been increased from $60 per month to $100 per month.

This change in the amount was made after consultations with a number of Members of the House of Representatives and with many people interested in a good old-age pension program, including the American Pension Committee, Inc., and the General Welfare Federation, Inc. It seems to be the consensus of opinion of those who are most interested and most familiar with this proposed legislation that by reason of the present high cost of living and by reason of the fact that even under the present old-age assistance program some States are paying now amounts near this sum—the State of Colorado, as I understand it, is now paying, under the old-age assistance program, to those qualified for assistance on some occasions the sum of $90 per month and probably an average of $75 or $80 per month—that this raised amount is more nearly in keeping with what would be a just and fair pension allowance at the present time.

We who are interested in this program fully realize that this is a time of peril for our great country, and fully realize also that the welfare of our armed services, including, of course, our heroic troops in Korea and the protection of our beloved country from its enemies, should be our first and primary concern at this time. However, we also feel that one of the things for which our boys are fighting and dying is the welfare of their fathers and mothers and homes. We feel that we would be derelict in our duty if we should fail, on our part, to give all security possible to their loved ones for whom they are making such tremendous sacrifices.

It was my personal experience to fight in a number of the bloodiest battles in World War I, and I believe that I am in a position to know, first-hand, just what is in the mind of the combat soldier on the battlefield, and I believe that I know what he thinks primarily of the welfare of his country and of his father and mother, and his loved ones generally.

I am sure that a great many are familiar with the bill we introduced last Congress, but in order to inform those who might not be acquainted with it, and for the RECORD, I wish to state that in substance the bill provides for a direct, Federal old-age pension, at the rate of $100 per month to all qualified individuals. A person would be a qualified individual who is 60 years of age or over, and is a citizen of the United States, providing his gross income is less than the minimum amount with respect to which a Federal income-tax return is required to be filed.

We wish to do all that we can to further the progress of this bill and hope that the proper committee to which it will be referred will give us hearings on it, in the reasonably near future, and that same will be reported out for consideration of the House some time during this session of Congress.

We believe that this bill, or legislation similar thereto, is necessary if justice is to be accorded to our elder citizens who are most in need of a program of this kind. We do not find fault with those groups who now have adequate pension and retirement programs, but we are

most anxious that those who do not have such adequate pensions and retirement benefits, be accorded same.

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am interested in the resolution which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has introduced relative to giving wheat to India. I hope when the hearings are held before the Foreign Affairs Committee that that committee will make every effort to determine whether or not the Prime Minister of India has been playing power politics with Pakistan, and whether or not he has made every effort to treat Pakistan in the same way that he suggests we treat Communist China.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think I stated in my remarks that I favored giving only such aid as investigation demonstrates is beyond the capacity of the Indian Government to procure for its people.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate that, and I am sure the gentleman means that. I hope the investigation will be exhaustive enough to bring out some of these things that are in the minds of many of the Members. By this, Mr. Speaker, I mean I would like to know why Mr. Nehru bitterly attacks the United States for what he calls our intervention and imperialism in Korea and at the same time has had troops on the border of Pakistan for many months and has tried to strangle that country economically. In the meantime, he has brought his own people to the verge of starvation and now asks the United States to save them from that starvation while he continues his aggression against his neighbor. Certainly, this will bear a great deal of investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic.

On this date in 1918, this small Baltic nation proclaimed to the world her ability to engage in a program of self-democratic government and spiritual progress.

The modern history of Lithuania, however, as an independent nation was ruthlessly terminated by the forceful invasion and atrocious subjugation of the Republic by the overwhelming military forces of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were the first of the small nations democratically erected after the First World War to feel the brunt of Soviet aggression.

Since that time most of the Slavic nations, particularly Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Albania have been joined in the horrible fate visited upon the Baltic nations. About a year ago this time, reliable reports from underground sources indicated that all phases of life were growing steadily worse in Lithuania under the relentless fury of the Soviet program of enslavement.

Significantly, the program of Communist persecution has been aimed primarily at the extinction of religion in Lithuania.

Before the Soviet conquest, the population of Lithuania was predominantly Roman Catholic. Over 80 percent of the people professed this faith with the balance being distributed among the Protestant, Jewish, and Orthodox religions.

Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Army occupied Lithuania, the Catholic clergy has been killed or transported to Siberia, monastic orders have been exterminated, parishes have been abolished, Catholic universities and seminaries have been extinguished. The religious press has been silenced, and all endowed institutions of every description under religious auspices have been confiscated.

Under a vicious, cruel, and bloody program, the moral, social, political, economic, cultural, and military life of Lithuania has been absorbed by a collective Communist regime which has been dictated by the Soviet masters in the Kremlin.

Cries from the people of Lithuania in their crucifixion have reached us feebly from behind the iron curtain.

The terrible tragedy visited upon this small nation serves as a grim reminder that the great sacrifices of two World Wars will have been hopeless offerings if Lithuania and the other Slavic nations are not rescued from the grip of Soviet imperialism.

Everlastingly to our credit, this Nation has never recognized the absorption of Lithuania and her neighboring states into the land mass of the Soviet Union.

This refusal to recognize the conquest of Lithuania serves as a continual condemnation of, and protest against, the unlawful occupation of that noble little country by Russian military might. It serves also as a continual protest against the commitment of atrocities against the people and the democratic institutions of Lithuania.

Realizing for the moment that practical steps are perhaps impossible, nevertheless this continued protest is made and reiterated on anniversaries like today's so that the people of Lithuania and Americans of Lithuanian descent may know that our Nation shall never depart from the principle of self-determination for small nations.

On behalf of the suffering people in that tiny land on the Baltic Sea, I express the fervent hope that our foreign policy will continue to include a protest against the conquest of Lithuania and that, in the near future, it may become articulate enough to include a strong demand that the Soviet Union liberate Lithuania from the strangle hold of communism so that it may once again arise as a free and independent nation on the Baltic shores.

SAVE YOUR SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today which are intended to aid in the stabilization of our monetary system, by creating additional incentives to the holders of Government bonds to retain their investments therein. There are presently outstanding in E bonds approximately $35,000,000,000 which will mature over the next 10 years. The House adopted and passed a bill which facilitates the holders of those bonds retaining their investments and continuing to receive the same rate of interest thereon. That should be sufficient inducement to the average citizen, who not only believes in thrift but who also recognizes his obligation in these trying times to contribute what he can to prevent undue inflation. Many of these people, however, will cash their bonds because of fear instilled in them by irresponsible talk about runaway inflation which will depreciate the value of their bonds the longer they hold them.

The first of the bills referred to by me provides for a waiver of income tax on the earnings on E bonds, provided they are held for an additional 10-year period. The bill does not make it mandatory that any of the bonds be held for that length of time. The option will still be with the holder to cash them in any time he may desire to do so. If he cashes them in within the second 10-year period he will simply have to pay his income tax thereon. If he holds the bonds the full 10-year period he will save the tax. In view of the fact that we must increase the tax rate in the years ahead the bill also provides that the bond holder if he must cash them in and lose the tax waiver benefits will have the choice of paying at the rate then prevailing or at the rate prevailing on the date when he could originally have cashed his bonds, giving him the advantage of whichever is the lower rate.

This should provide a real inducement to the E bond holder to continue his savings in these bonds, giving him a return higher than he can otherwise get. Financiers and economists tell us

that for every dollar of currency released into the stream of trade, we actually increase the monetary supply six times. If the $35,000,000,000 of E bonds were all cashed in over the next 10 years at the rate of about three and one-half billion dollars a year, we would increase the monetary supply of the country by $21,000,000,000 a year. The taxable earnings represented by this $35,000,000,000 of E bonds will total $8,750,000,000 for the next 10 years. Assuming that none of the E bond holders had paid any income tax for any part of those earnings and estimating that the holders of those bonds will pay on income tax equal to 25 percent of those earnings during the next 10 years, the maximum tax the Government can receive out of those E bond earnings will average $218,750,000 per year. That sum is indeed small compared to the total tax receipts that we contemplate the Government must collect during each of the next 10 years. If it accomplishes the purpose of keeping out of circulation only $3,500,000,000 a year, it is money worth spending. Actually it will keep out of circulation over $21,000,000,000 during each of the next 10 years.

The second of the bills I have introduced today is intended to accomplish the same purpose with reference to government securities other than the E bonds, but in a different manner. There are some $23,000,000,000 of Government securities outstanding presently in addition to the E bonds. In order to induce the holders of those bonds to continue their investments therein for an additional 10 year period, my second bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a premium of an additional one-half of 1 percent of the face amount of the bond to the holders thereof who continue their investments therein for an additional 10-year period. In making that proposal I want it distinctly understood that I am in complete accord with the President and with the Secretary of the Treasury in their position that to increase the interest rate on Government securities at this time would be wrong and bad for all of the reasons set forth by them. I am in complete disagreement with those members of the Federal Reserve System and of its Open Market Committee who take a contrary view. To increase the interest rate on Government securities would unnecessarily increase the cost of Government and at the same time prove highly inflationary, adding that much more money periodically to the financial stream. If the bankers who are advocating a higher interest rate on Government securities were honest and frank with us they would tell us that the only reason for advocating higher interest rates on Government securities is to increase bank profits. Reardless of the motives, however, that prompt their recommendation the fact is that an unhealthy atmosphere has been created in the financial markets of the country and I believe some incentive must be created so that the holders of those $23,000,000,000 in Government securities will continue their investments therein. I believe my second bill accomplishes that by providing for the payment of a premium of one-half of 1 percent to those who continue to hold their securities for an additional 10-year period. My second bill also gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority which will strengthen the long term bond market. Long term securities other than the E bonds carry a higher rate of interest than short term securities. As presently issued, however, many Government bonds intended to be issued as long term securities with an interest rate of 2½ percent can be disposed of by the holder thereof at any time after acquisition thereof, the holder receiving interest at the fixed rate from date of purchase to date of transfer. The result is that long term securities can be traded in as short term securities at the long term rate. My bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to stop that practice by providing that bonds which are redeemed by the Government or acquired by the Federal Reserve Bank before maturity shall be so redeemed or acquired at a lesser rate of interest depending upon the length of time the security has actually been held by the original holder. The result I am sure will be that most of the owners of these long term securities will hold them until maturity.

REREFERENCE OF BILL AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

JOHN RANKIN, THE SCOTCHMAN, AND THE LADY'S HAT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some friends of mine have informed me that they heard over the radio that JOHN RANKIN, a Member of Congress from Mississippi, had been seen wearing a woman's hat over in the Capitol and had passed it to other Members of the House who also put it on.

He had evidently been listening to the Voice of America, because that is about as near as they come to telling the facts.

What happened was that, not a Member of this Congress, but a Scotchman by the name of John Rankin, a member of the British Parliament, the other day, rose to speak. The Chair refused to recognize him because he did not have on a hat. He reached over and took a hat off the head of one of the lady members and proceeded to make his speech. Other members then followed suit and put on the same hat in order to gain recognition.

I just did not want the public to get me mixed up with my Scotch namesake who resorted to that method of getting himself recognized in the British Parliament.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

MEDICAL CARE OF VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, letters are pouring in to Members from all over the country, I believe, regarding the kind of care the veterans are receiving as a result of the cuts in the field offices, cuts in the hospitals. I visited three hospitals, one Army hospital and two Veterans' Administration hospitals within the last week. They are very much overcrowded, not only with nervous and mental cases but also a serious situation is created when there is a shortage of beds, and a shortage of attendants. At Cushing General Hospital there were practically no attendants for the badly paralyzed men.

The Army has issued a call for some 400 doctors and they have asked for over 300 nurses. I think the time is past due when there should be a survey of the whole situation of Veterans' Administration facilities and the medical attention available to them. It is very much needed. On Monday I shall introduce the following resolution calling for such a survey. I hope it will be adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete survey of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliary centers and other like facilities, including the construction, operation, and personnel administration of such facilities.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the first session of the present Congress the results of its survey, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the first session of the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERAN VICTIMS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all in full accord with the statement of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that we must look after and care for our veterans. That is a debt we owe.

Once more it is my privilege to suggest that while we look after the veterans and do everything we can for them, we should do a little something about the foreign policy of this country which, war after war, gives us an ever larger crop of veterans. Unless we change our foreign policy soon there will be none but veterans in this country—called upon to support each other.

How would it be if for once we tried to do something about keeping some of our men from being killed, becoming veterans in wars which profit us nothing?

If we would vote as enthusiastically to keep out of war—for legislation to prevent war as we do for aid to veterans, some day there would be no veterans.

GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, has prepared a very important article which appears in this week's Saturday Evening Post. I want to commend the reading of that article to every Member of the House and the Senate as it contains information which I am sure will be valuable to all in whatever decisions have to be made.

There is one point in the article, however, which I desire to clarify a little bit for the newer Members because we here who were Members of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses are all aware of the situation. He speaks of the inability of the Air Force to develop a proper tactical air force because of lack of appropriations. Every Member of this body should know that the House of Representatives appropriated more money in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses for the construction of aircraft than was requested by the President and the Budget Bureau and that that money was impounded on orders of the President and, therefore, not spent. That should be pointed out in connection with this article because it certainly is not the fault of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force and the naval air arm are not further along today toward the capacity to fight which we thought back in 1948 and still think they ought to have.

INDIA EMERGENCY FOOD AID ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group in the House and in the Senate is today introducing the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, to authorize 2,000,000 long tons of food grains for India and seeking appropriations for a million tons in this fiscal year. Speaking personally, I consider this one of the most important foreign-affairs measures we are likely to have before us in this Congress. It is intended to relieve a critical food situation in India during this year threatening starvation directly to an estimated 13,000,000 people, and affecting the rations of the 125,000,000 people of India now down to 9 ounces of food grains per day per person. It follows the traditional pattern of our relations with friendly peoples in utilizing our surplus to relieve distress.

It is a measure likely to contribute very materially to the stability and peace of the whole Far East, a critical famine in India paralleling that of 1943 could rock the governmental structure of that new and free nation to its foundations. In that sense there is a real analogy between this aid program and our programs to prevent disease and unrest in overseas areas in which we have had direct governmental responsibility.

Finally, there is no better demonstration anywhere that we mean what we say when we speak of freedom than would be this aid to India, for the position of the Government of India on condemning the Communist Chinese as aggressors in Korea has been directly opposed to ours in the United Nations, and to my own and that of Members generally. Yet, despite our complete disagreement on that point, we would not be denying to India the food aid she so urgently needs. A more convincing demonstration that democracy does not imply retaliation for disagreement, so typical of communism, could hardly be found.

Appended hereto is the text of the House bill and the statement issued by the sponsors in connection with its introduction:

A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to promote the foreign policy and the national interest of the United States and the cause of world peace by providing during the calendar year 1951 emergency food relief assistance to the people of India out of surplus grains available in the United States, in order to prevent starvation brought about by famine conditions in India.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not in excess of $190,000,000 for the purpose of this act, including necessary administrative expenses, of which not in excess of one-half shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and the balance shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952: *Provided, however*, That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such agricultural commodity is available in excess of the domestic requirements, stockpiling, and existing commitments: *And provided further*, That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

SEC. 4. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available nor shall any funds appropriated hereunder be expended until an agreement is entered into between India and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of India:

(a) To distribute the relief supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in India to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of commodities and other assistance made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of India for the benefit of the people of India in programs to improve and increase food production and distribution.

(e) To take all appropriate measures to reduce its needs for assistance; to encourage increased production and distribution of foodstuffs within India; and to lessen the danger of similar future emergencies.

(f) To make available to the Government of the United States local currency in amounts required by it to meet its local currency, administrative, and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance supplied under this act.

SEC. 5. Local currency made available to the United States by the Government of India under the provisions of the agreement required by section 4 may be used for local currency, administrative, and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance provided by this act without charge against appropriated funds.

SEC. 6. Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. All or any portion of the funds made available under authority of this act may be transferred by the President to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government, to be expended for the purpose of this act. Funds so transferred may be expended under the authority of any provisions of law, not inconsistent with this act, applicable to the departments or agencies concerned, except that funds so transferred shall not be commingled with other funds of such departments or agencies and shall be accounted for separately.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 3 of this act, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on

advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purpose of this act.

SEC. 9. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be promptly terminated by the President (a) whenever he determines that (1) India is not complying with the undertakings in the agreement entered into under section 4 of this act, or is diverting from the purpose of this act assistance provided hereunder; or (2) because of changed conditions, continuance of assistance is unnecessary, or no longer consistent with the national interest or the foreign policy of the United States; or, (b) whenever the Congress by concurrent resolution finds termination is desirable. Termination of assistance to India under this section shall include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

A bipartisan group today introduced in the House of Representatives the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951. The group includes the following members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs: Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; THURMOND CHATHAM, Democrat, North Carolina; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, Massachusetts; J. K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota; EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, Connecticut; and the following other Members of the House: Representatives EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York; and ROY W. WIER, Democrat, Minnesota.

In connection with the introduction of the bill, the sponsors stated: "We have introduced this bill because of our firm belief that a favorable response by the United States to the request of the Government of India for help in an acute emergency food shortage with dire threat of famine is in the best interests of the traditional policy of friendship and good will between the people of the United States and the people of India. Unless we act promptly, there is grave danger that about 13,000,000 people of India will be directly affected by famine conditions. We shall do our utmost to see that the aid is granted and in time.

"We consider the need to avoid starvation in India entirely separate from all political considerations. There are no political strings and no reservations of a political character attached to the bill we are introducing. We do not want our desire to help the suffering people of India, within the reasonable limits of our capacity, to be regarded as in any sense lessening our opposition to the apparent views of the Government of India with respect to the Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, our firm opposition to this apparent position on the part of the Government of India does not lessen in the least our desire to help relieve the acute food shortage in India.

"Our bill calls for an authorization of $190,000,000, the estimated amount of the cost of the 2,000,000 long tons of grain needed without shipping costs (which we understand are to be provided by the Government of India), one-half to be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the balance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. We have provided for the authorization in this way in response to the Presidential message which recommends appropriation for 1,000,000 tons of grain at this time and then a survey of the situation to see what else is needed. Our bill also calls for administration of this aid program by the ECA.

"In summary, we urge this food aid on the basis of the relationship between people and people, those of the United States and those of India, in the hope that the deep sympathy which it expresses will further fortify the bonds of friendship between the two peoples and give further support and encouragement to the new free nation of India."

HOW LONG ARE WE GOING TO APPEASE THOSE WHO SEEK TO DESTROY US?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had to say I am wondering if the time will ever come when we shall cease to appease those who are seeking to destroy us.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks as this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The anniversary of this birth of freedom in the Baltic Republic is celebrated each year throughout the world on February 16. It is an anniversary the world must not forget—it is a warning to aggressors and a challenge to the free. Lithuania is waiting not only with patience but with confidence that the independence declared on February 16, 1918, and enjoyed until 1940, shall again be hers. As Shakespeare wrote: "For though usurpers sway the rule awhile, yet heavens are just, and time suppresseth wrongs."

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a sturdy, gallant, and resolute people who have made many significant contributions to the cause of human justice and freedom. I am keenly aware that many weighty matters of great national and international importance are awaiting your earnest attention, but it would be inexcusable if we did not pause, however, briefly to pay heartfelt tribute to a sister republic and to bestow on that republic the honor and acclaim which it so richly deserves.

Lithuania is a small country. It is essentially an agricultural country, the soil claiming more than 75 percent of a population of approximately 3,000,000. The independence of Lithuania was recognized by most of the great powers in 1918, and by Russia in the Treaty of Moscow. The Lithuanians have had first-hand experience with Bolshevik ruthlessness in that turbulent period. They survived it, they triumphed over it. They succeeded in forming their own representative government. They succeeded magnificently in carrying on their day-to-day affairs with courage and dignity despite their close and highly dangerous geographical proximity to the sinister Soviet tyranny.

During the chaotic period following World War I, the Lithuanians suffered the loss of Vilna, their historic capital. Two decades later the Nazis robbed them of Memel, their chief port. Shortly after World War II, the Soviet Government demanded the right to establish military, naval, and air bases in Lithuania. The country was quickly reduced to a state of vassalage and then occupied completely. Lithuania was among the first victims of insatiable Soviet aggression. The history of free Lithuania is unfortunately a short history and a sad one. It is the tragic yet inspiring history of a devout and freedom-loving people trying very hard to carry on their honorable and peaceful pursuits despite the constant threat and menace of unscrupulous and predatory neighbors.

We grieve for the resolute and heroic Catholic nation, because at this moment in history it is temporarily enslaved. Yet we glory in its past achievements and in the fierce and undying determination of its unconquerable people to regain at whatever cost and sacrifice their former liberty and independence.

The Lithuanians are one with us and with all the people of the free world in their wholehearted dedication to the great principles and ideals of democratic freedom. They are one with us in sharing that glorious Christian culture which nurtured Europe through many bleak and stormy centuries and which, please God, is surely to triumph over the menacing forces of oppression and tyranny.

We are therefore proud to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, and to express the sincere hope that Lithuania may soon resume its honored place and position among the free nations of the world. We hope that soon the white knight may ride again, freely as of yore, and the yellow, green, and red banner may again wave unhindered to symbolize Lithuania's ripened harvests of grain, her green forests, and the patriot blood which has not yet ceased to flow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, may I inquire what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called and on Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called. There is no other business for the rest of the week. I do not want, by this statement, to bind myself that there will not be any, but I have none to announce to the House. I want to frankly advise the House that I know of none now that is likely to come up next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will give us 24 hours' notice, I take it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. I will give all the advance notice possible. Insofar as I am able now, so that the Members may be guided to some extent in their actions, I will state I know of nothing that is likely to come up next

week. I know of no bill to be reported out of committee, but if there should be, we could wait until the week after next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat diffident, somewhat reluctant, to come before you this morning, but I feel that the international situation, the international crisis which we find ourselves in today, warrants some sound, honest thinking on this subject. I honestly believe that there is not a more patriotic group of Americans anywhere in this country than the 435 Members of this House. I am convinced that there is not a man or woman here who would not give his or her life to solve this great international crisis we are in today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and those who signed his declaration of policy on yesterday. I wish to compliment them for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people of this country. Also I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], my leader, for participating in that debate, because I believe that this great international crisis today can only be solved right here in this House through the duly elected Representatives of the people of this country. The people of America are the ones who will pay the bill. The people of America are the ones who will do the dying. So, I would like to see this House and the other body have more of a voice in shaping the foreign policy of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today representing a people who are international-minded and have been for many years, back to the days when Charles Pinckney and Thomas Pinckney were ambassadors abroad during the time of the Revolution, and after. Since that time South Carolina has also greatly assisted this country in formulating our foreign policy. It is my honor to represent the district once represented by that famous Secretary of State and Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun. I represent part of the district recently represented by James F. Byrnes, our great Secretary of State. Some of our contemporary leaders, in addition to Mr. Byrnes, from my great State well versed in foreign affairs are Mr. Bernard Baruch, and the Honorable John R. Peurifoy, presently Ambassador to Greece.

I speak to you today humbly, and with a sincere feeling of my own shortcomings and inabilities. I hope you will bear in mind that I do not claim to be an expert on foreign or military affairs. I only come to you as a representative of the grass roots of America. The only qualification I have for speaking on foreign and military policy is the fact that I served in Europe for 20 months as an enlisted man; all the way from the coast of Normandy to within 100 miles of Berlin. I studied the topography, the characteristics of the people, and the stamina of those people to resist aggression; therefore I feel qualified, at least to a certain extent, to come before you today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have you recall with me this morning the speech I made from this floor on May 7, 1947. It is practically the same speech in substance that I am going to make to you in a few minutes.

For that speech, as you will recall, I was listed as the No. 1 enemy of communism and a warmonger by Vishinsky on September 18 of that year at Lake Success, N. Y., heading a list of distinguished Americans.

Many Congressmen asked me the question then, right here, why they picked me, a freshman Member of this body, to label as a warmonger and attack constantly in the press of Russia. The answer to me was obvious. I advocated in that speech the one force that Russia feared more than any other force on earth, that is an invincible Air Force. I am still advocating that great offensive, defensive, and peace force today. I was again viciously attacked by the Russian press on several occasions that year when I suggested that some of the Marshall plan funds be used instead for the building of this Air Force.

It is my understanding that a great controversy is now raging within the Pentagon over the respective merits of sea power, land power, and the Air Force. Out of this controversy will come a policy that will lead us to peace, victory, or to extermination. It is our duty, as Representatives of the American people, to help unite all of these factions, as well as the American people, on a foreign and military strategy that will preserve this Nation for generations to come.

There is likewise a great debate raging over this Nation between the forces of semi-isolationism and of internationalism. This debate, in reality, has been going on since William Jennings Bryan resigned as Secretary of State in 1916 in protest over measures which he said would lead to American participation in a foreign war. This debate was carried on with great fervor by President Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Hiram Johnson. Again it flared in the late 1930's between Roosevelt, Wheeler, Lindbergh, and many others. And again today this controversy is becoming intensely heated between such leaders as Hoover, Taft, Dewey, and the present administration.

I want to say right here that I am taking advantage of our President's offer of constructive criticism, made during his great speech here on this floor. I think this question should be worked out now. I am accepting his kind offer. Also, I believe in unity, but I think we should unite on a policy that will save America, save its men, save its money, and not wind up in the destruction of American democracy, our economy, and our great country.

I am offering a plan to this Congress and to this country which is not isolationist, nor is it the policy of wasting our money and manpower in a thousand areas over the world. It is a compromise plan upon which all of us can unite and which, I believe, has the backing of the majority of the American people today. This plan is to build the greatest strategic and defensive air command in world history, an overwhelming striking force based on the continent of North America itself, ready at all times to lay waste the industrial potential of Soviet Russia. Once this air force is built, it will be an easy matter to serve notice on the masters in the Kremlin that we will not tolerate aggression anywhere in the world; that the moment their satellites and stooges invade a freedom-loving people our bombers will instantly wing their way to the heart of the Communist dynasty in Russia itself. We have tried extending the hand of comradeship and brotherly love. This policy has failed. Now is the time for cold realism. We cannot bribe with money the sagging morale of democratic peoples. We cannot bolster their spirit with a few divisions of ground troops.

However, I am not in favor of offering any protection to people who are not willing to fight for their own existence.

I think one policy today which might lead this Nation to disaster is the one of balanced armed forces. I believe that some of our strategists are living in the past. I believe they have forgotten that the records of military history show that Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at 27 years. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years of age.

Hannibal was commander in chief of an army in Spain at the age of 25. They were young men with imagination, looking to the future, and they are recognized today as the three greatest military geniuses in the history of the world. Under our present system you cannot be a lieutenant general in the American land Army at the age of 27. You cannot be an admiral in the Navy at that age. You might possibly be a brigadier general in the Air Force at the age of 30. So I am not going along with this antique semimilitary dictatorship. My fellow countrymen, let me say this: We need to analyze our situation today. We need to plan for a given, definite course. We need a foreign policy—frankly I do not know what our foreign policy is today, and I do not believe anyone else does either, because we have no clear-cut policy. But I would like to see a foreign policy adopted as to where we are going to go and what we are going to do, and then plan our three branches of the military services accordingly.

From all indications I believe that the present military policy of the United

States is too big a gamble. It can lead to disaster. That policy is akin to political expediency, one of carefully apportioning the funds for national defense equally between the Army, Navy, and the Air Force. This is a policy designed to get along with all the people at all times. It may lead to national disaster. We cannot simultaneously maintain the largest land army, the greatest air force, and the mightiest navy on earth. This policy can eventually bankrupt America and will not furnish the security freedom-loving peoples everywhere so earnestly desire. Already this policy of pouring money all over the world and, at the same time, building up balanced forces has carried America a long way toward a military dictatorship. We are losing our freedom under a false program of trying to preserve it. This policy cannot defend simultaneously Europe, all of Asia, Africa, South America, and the many islands against the overwhelming land superiority of the Eurasian Continent. America's military defense today, which also is the defense of democracy everywhere, should be composed of a land army with emphasis on airborne troops that can be sent to any area of the Western Hemisphere on a moment's notice; highly trained, mobile, super troops; young men with every training advantage that can be rushed overnight to Alaska, Greenland, or any other area directly affecting the security of the Western World. These troops should be based in North America proper and in our island possessions. This land force should consist of a powerful national guard, of a reserve composed of practically every able-bodied American citizen, ready to be called out to patrol the Nation in case of bombing and to do rescue work. Our Navy should be given sufficient strength to remain in surface command of the seven seas, with emphasis on destroyers, light carriers, submarines, and light, fast, and highly maneuverable vessels. Our Air Force should be built and maintained at a level far exceeding that of the combined air forces of the world. Once this Air Force reaches the point where it is sufficiently strong to seriously threaten Russian industry then we should immediately adopt a strong foreign policy. We could then tell Russia bluntly that we will not permit the invasion of any free nations anywhere in the world. We should then, at once, recognize the complete independence of Western Germany, accept her as our equal in the western bloc of nations, and give her the green light to build whatever army necessary to defend herself; immediately accept Spain as an equal partner. We should guarantee these nations and the rest of Europe that the minute they are attacked our Air Force will strike Russia. We should also recognize Japan as completely independent and call on her for a land army of several million men and make her the same promise of air support.

You know, I am shocked and surprised to see some Members of the House of Representatives who think we have to maintain bases in Europe in order to bomb Russia. We have planes today that can take off from the continental United States, bomb Moscow, and return without refueling, flying at a height of more than 8 miles and at speeds in excess of 400 miles per hour. The only reason Russia today has not already moved into Western Europe is because of their fear of retaliation over the North Pole, which retaliation would pierce the industrial heart of this giant octopus reaching its tentacles out over the Eurasian Continent.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we cannot build a larger land army than Russia in Europe. That is a very desperate gamble trying to match the great hordes of the Red army man for man on the continent of Europe. Suppose we lose that gamble. We have billions of dollars tied up in such a big land army. Suppose it is defeated. That will open the United States to attack.

I am convinced, along with a large part of the American people, that we cannot win a big land war in Europe or in China or in Siberia. In considering this proposal we should go back first to Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Napoleon for months accumulated vast stores of supplies, wagon trains, artillery, and equipment the like of which the world had never before seen, on the very borders of Russia. The attack began June 23, 1812, with over 600,000 crack soldiers. Napoleon reached Moscow in the fall of that year, but was swallowed up by the vastness of that country, by incessant attacks on his lines and supplies, and finally by the bitter Russian winter. He finally fled back into France with less than 100,000 of this magnificent attacking force. Hitler invaded Russia June 22, 1941, 129 years later, less one day. At the time of Hitler's attack the Soviet Union had a population of less than 200,000,000. Hitler and his direct allies held sway over 242,500,000 people. At this time Germany and her allies produced more than 50,000,000 tons of steel annually, compared to the Russian output of approximately 19,000,000 tons annually. The Nazi army was composed of veteran troops, numbered in the millions, with everything to be desired in the way of tanks, artillery, and equipment beyond imagination. She bordered on Russia itself and started the invasion on a 2,000-mile front. In December of that year Guderian of Von Bock's Nazi army was turned back 13 miles from downtown Moscow. The attack was started with nearly 200 divisions. Hitler's army eventually met the fate of Napoleon's.

It is interesting to note that in 1941, contrary to American public opinion whipped up by the American propagandist, that no American equipment of any consequence had reached the Russian front. The German invasion started in June. The American-Russian lend-lease bill passed Congress 2 months later, in August. Before any of this equipment could reach the Russian troops they had stopped the German Army cold on the 2,000-mile front.

Less than 4 years later the Russian Army had ground their way into Berlin and to all of south central Europe. The bulk of German manpower and equipment was left behind in the bitter defeat on the frozen Steppes of the Soviet Union. The Russian Army had steadily grown greater until at the close of the war it was at the zenith of its power. To give the world full warning that there would be no complacency and no let-up on the part of Russia to maintain and increase the efficiency of this army, Marshal George K. Zhukov, Russia's greatest general, declared on the 24th of June 1945, on Red Square in Moscow:

> After 4 years of savage battles, we have entered a period of peaceful growth. The Soviet state has emerged ever more mighty from the grim struggle which we waged, and the Red army has become the most modern and powerful army in the world. But for us Soviet peoples it is unseemly to become conceited—or complacent. In the future too we must strengthen the economic power of our country, unceasingly perfect our military skill, study the rich experiences of the fatherland war, and develop our military science.

With Zhukov's words in mind today, 6 years later, and with China, Manchuria, Tibet, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and parts of Austria added to Soviet might it is safe to assume that Russia today has a much more powerful land army than all of the rest of the land armies of the world combined. I am shocked, along with many other Americans, to see our military strategists apparently planning to challenge this might on the continent of Europe. It seems they are planning the next war on the military concepts of World Wars I and II. It seems that for sentimental reasons they want to go "back to Tipperary." Their ears seem to be tuned to that World War I song, Over There. They appear to be thinking in terms of another Maginot Line. They, above all people, should know that Western Europe cannot be held in terms of pure defense. Such a European army in order to escape being pushed into the channel must advance and seize all of Russia before an ultimate victory. This cannot be done, certainly not while, at the same time, we are trying to defend Korea, Japan, Indochina, Iran, India, and a hundred other places.

The question is immediately asked, Should we abandon Europe to her fate? In the first place, Russia would not advance into Western Europe in the face of overwhelming air power based in North America, ready to strike over the North Pole at the heart of her industrial potential. If Russia did advance and occupied Western Europe, extending her armies to the Atlantic, she would be more vulnerable than ever. It is extremely doubtful that the Russian armies would remain in Western Europe or India or any other far-flung battle lines while their loved ones were being destroyed in an atomic blitz at home. It is interesting at this juncture to recall Robert E. Lee's great army at Richmond. It was not defeated as much by Grant as by General Sherman, who, in the heart of the Confederacy, was destroying its railroads, food supplies, foundries, and munitions factories; threatening the women and children and causing Lee's veterans to desert by the thousands. Lee's army collapsed because Sherman pierced the Confederate heart. The Russian Government, with its armies in foreign countries hundreds of miles from home, would be

embarrassed by the destruction of its cities and industry and would be faced with revolution in the homeland. No government could maintain control over its people at home or its far-away armies under an overwhelming air attack, particularly when that government had sent its armies away for the purpose of aggression. While the Russian armies are away our Air Force will be our General Sherman to render those armies impotent.

How do we propose to stay in Western Europe with a big land army on defense—just purely Maginot-line thinking? Of all people, our military strategists should know that in order to win we must advance and hit the heart of the enemy and occupy the country. In this day it simply cannot be done. Therefore, it is too big a gamble to risk.

I do not want to abandon Europe. I do not think we should abandon any freedom-loving people anywhere in the world, particularly after spending so many billions of dollars and so much blood; but the question is, How are we going to save them? With a great Air Force based in North America, ready to strike over no man's land—the North Pole—where no gorgeous supercarriers can sail, where no battleships can prowl, where no foot soldiers can exist—the temperature 30,000 feet above the North Pole is the same as the temperature 30,000 feet over the Equator. That is the no man's land of world war III. Alaska is more important to security of the United States than Europe. Let us not be misled by this European land army talk.

Did you know that the United States today already borders Soviet Russia? A Russian foot soldier can walk in the wintertime from Russian soil across the Bering Sea into our Territory, Alaska. I was told by a high-ranking general that they could take Alaska in 48 hours. They could lay air landing strips in another 48 hours, and could bomb every city in the United States in a few days more. Oh, gentlemen, let us put first things first. Let us adopt a sensible policy.

Did you know that no great leader of past world history has ever based his military concepts entirely on the textbooks of the past? Alexander the Great and his father, Philip of Macedonia, developed the great Greek phalanx, and with only 35,000 men he was able to defeat the Persian host of a million men.

Go to the Bible. David did not go out there to fight man to man with the giant Goliath. He just could not do it. He used his ingenuity. He used his skill, and he won. Napoleon Bonaparte, when called upon by the government to defend the government buildings against a mob, did something new. He massed his artillery around the directory. Thirty thousand bodies of the mob lay dead in the streets the next morning without ever having made contact with the foot soldiers surrounding the government buildings.

Great nations of the past have concentrated on one single overwhelming instrumentality of war. The Roman legion was for 500 years the most feared power on the face of this earth. It was a peace force; no nation, no people dared challenge the might of Rome for nearly 500 years, the greatest era of peace the world has ever known. Turn with me back to the year 1500 when Great Britain, a dot on the map of the world, just a little nation, a little island, laid the basis for world power. They did not go out and try to match the land powers of the world. Great Britain was headed by smart men, who meeting in London, said: "We cannot match the continental powers of Europe, but we will build the greatest navy the world has ever known." In the next 400 years they spent more money on their navy than on their government and army combined; and Britannia ruled the waves for 400 years, the second greatest era of peace the world has ever known.

My fellow countrymen, listen. Lieutenant General Koller, of the German Air Force, after surveying the indescribable horror of what American air power had heaped in his country, with 80 percent of its industry incapacitated and the will power of his people destroyed by air raids, made this very significant statement after the war:

> We are decimated, defeated, and eliminated from world competition.

General Koller continued:

> The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world. It will be interesting to watch from the sidelines the game of power politics.
>
> The nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years.

He meant, of course, that the only nation that could do that was America. He also doubted, Mr. Speaker, that we would do it, because he was a student of our past international policy.

I hear over and over again some of the military strategists of the last two World Wars, who are still in power and who are now planning for a third war, say that the next war will be won or lost over the dead bodies of the American foot soldiers. Neither the dead bodies of the foot soldiers nor rifles in their hands can defend the helpless women and children of America from a hail of death falling from jet planes 40,000 or 50,000 feet above rain, snow, sleet, and fog. The people of Kansas City, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Denver, and Omaha cannot be protected by gorgeous super aircraft carriers in the far-away Atlantic or Pacific. The only force that can protect central United States from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is American air power. Out of the frozen North where no land armies can exist and where no aircraft carriers and no battleships can sail, will come death to American industry and her people if we neglect our Air Force. The North Pole is no man's land and the only power that can travel this no man's land is our fighters and bombers seeking the heart of an unscrupulous enemy.

Foot soldiers cannot deliver the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, or even TNT into the heart of Russia. Neither can carriers or battleships. The only force that can bring war to the heart of Russia is the American Air Force. Balanced forces are a terrible gamble, at the best. Big land armies in Europe are a great gamble. But in building a powerful Air Force and relying principally on it for defense and offense we make no gamble at all. With overwhelming air superiority we cannot be invaded across the Atlantic or the Pacific, whereas if the land gamble fails we might be open to immediate attack and possibly invasion. The greatest defense America has today against submarines is the American strategic air command. The battle against submarines is won most effectively by bombing the places where submarines are made, that is Port Arthur, Vladivostok, Murmansk, Leningrad, and the other Baltic seaports. Likewise, Russia's greatest defense against our land armies on a thousand fronts across the seven seas will be the bombing of our shipyards, harbors, embarkation centers, and factories supplying those distant armies.

In this great controversy now going on in the Pentagon, about land troops versus air power, the question of Korea is constantly injected. It is my observation that in this House and elsewhere the advocates of victory over the dead bodies of our foot soldiers are pointing to Korea with glee. Korea, more than any other place or any other experience, confirms my belief in the immediate need for overwhelming air power. In the first place, I do not believe any sane military man would entertain even the thought that North Korea would have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel had we possessed a thousand B–36's and B–50's, based in California, Hawaii, Alaska, and over the islands of the Pacific, loaded with the atomic bomb, or even with TNT. If we had possessed such an air force prior to the Korean invasion and had warned North Korea never to cross the thirty-eighth parallel, there would have been another consultation between the North Korean leaders and the Kremlin. They would never have crossed into South Korea under the threat of having every village in North Korea wiped off the face of the earth in one raid. No amount of persuasion could have ever encouraged them to move against such a threat. North Korea and the Kremlin knew only too well that our 70 group Air Force had been cut to a few groups of modern up-to-date planes. The Far Eastern Air Command had been decreased until it was almost nonexistent. Since the outbreak of the war it has been limited in that it has not been allowed to bomb the sources from which armies and materials have come. But for the little air power that was available, our forces in the early stages of the Korean war would have been pushed into the sea, and the present strange withdrawal of the Communist forces, with their overwhelming manpower, is due mainly to the incessant pounding they are taking from the air.

Air power is peace power. We are playing Russia's game in Korea today; we are playing it almost as perfectly, Mr. Speaker, as if Russia herself had directed it. She is lulling us to sleep; she is making us think that world war III can be won by balanced forces, just like we are trying to put into Korea, and we are falling for it. Russia is not going to let the cat out of the sack at this

stage of the game; they are going to wait until we have our forces stretched thin, until we are weakened economically, until we have our men on a thousand battlefields and battleships. Then she will strike out over the mist of the North Pole to Alaska and New York.

I have read in the newspapers recently about the great battleship *Missouri* bombarding the coast of North Korea. That battleship would last just a few minutes if Russia wanted to sink her. Do you remember the *Repulse*? Do you remember the *Prince of Wales*? Do you remember our battle fleet at Pearl Harbor?

This is indeed the time of decision. The only course open to the American people today is, in the words of Woodrow Wilson:

> Presently America will be surprised to find herself growing old, when she will adopt a new regimen of life. She will have to husband her industry, concentrate her resources; she will have to trust her best, not her average, men—that will be the time of change.

Mr. Speaker, the great Russian bear has perfected its land army. It is ready to move for instant action. She has today variously estimated in numbers from 1,000 to 3,500 heavy bombers. She is only waiting now until that force gets to be of sufficient size and strength that she can cripple and paralyze the United States. Then, Mr. Speaker, their land army will move and America will be at the mercy of the Russian hammer and sickle; unless we prepare now.

Let us adopt a wise policy. Let us build the greatest air force the world has ever seen. Do you know that one B–36 costs $3,500,000. Seventeen billion five hundred million dollars can build the adequate strategic air force we need. That is, 5,000 heavy bombers. That is only a small fraction of the money we propose to spend in Europe, that is only a small fraction of the relief money we have lost and given away since World War II. Air power is not only peace power, it is also economy power.

My plea today is to reassert your authority as Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Let us give this country the kind of a foreign policy it needs.

I remember going to the State capital of Georgia, the capitol building of the State of my good friend and distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [EUGENE COX]. There on the monument of Benjamin H. Hill were his immortal words:

> He who saves his country saves all things,
> All things saved will bless him.
> He who lets his country die lets all things die
> and
> All things dying curse him.

Let us not play the game of Russia. Let us not do exactly what she wants us to do.

How many casualties have we suffered in Korea? Fifty thousand. How many has Russia suffered? Zero. All right. Who is winning? Who is playing whose game?

Mr. Speaker, I am thinking about the democracy of this country. I want to preserve it because I am a young man. I want to enjoy it because I hope my life is not over yet. Yes, I would gladly give my life if I could solve the international situation and I know you would, too. Let me plead with you again, let us put first things first.

Right here let me say that I dislike exceedingly to disagree with the so-called experts of our time. I have, however, somewhat lost faith in our experts as such. I recall that many of our strategists before Pearl Harbor said our Pacific fleet was invincible; that Japan could be brought to her knees in a matter of weeks. I remember that many experts said Hitler would not last through the winter of 1939 after his invasion of Poland; that his regime would collapse of internal unrest; that the French Maginot line would hold, and the Nazi hordes would never reach Paris; also, that when attacked by Hitler, Russia would not last 6 weeks; that American boys would never be sent to Europe; and that England would do the job. Also, I remember how some of the experts castigated Gen. Billy Mitchell and forced his retirement for his views about air power. I remember, too, how the experts practically guaranteed the American people that there would be no more war in our lifetime; that the United Nations would solve all of our international problems; that Uncle Joe Stalin was a great world benefactor, a believer in democracy, and that we could get along with "Uncle Joe."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A year ago before Korea, they were saying that if the Communist army moved at 4 o'clock in the morning we would be ready at 5.

Mr. DORN. Exactly. Also, I remember many of the experts stating that the Communist rumblings in China were only an agrarian revolt. So, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I frankly no longer believe everything the experts tell the American people. It is interesting to note, however, at this juncture, that a few experts told the truth, but their warnings went unheeded. Outstanding among these were Gen. Billy Mitchell and Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

I think what we need in this country today is some common, old-fashioned horse sense. That is what we need. I only represent the grass roots of America, as many of you do, and it is for them that I am pleading today.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Indiana.)

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S FREEDOM

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's freedom which was inaugurated on February 16, 1918, by a declaration of independence creating the free Republic of Lithuania.

On that date the patriotic spirit of all Lithuanians, and of peoples of Lithuanian descent, was at its zenith. Every freedom-loving person throughout the world, regardless of nationality, was happy to learn that the Lithuanian nation was again embarking upon what they hoped would be a long period of independence and freedom.

Lithuania is one of the old nations of the European continent. In 1795, when Russia first occupied Lithuania, a period of enslavement continued for a century and a quarter. During this time the patriotism and loyalty which is always alive in the hearts of Lithuanians, enabled its people to constantly carry on an incessant fight against the conquering tyrant who temporarily controlled the government. The opportunity came on February 16, 1918, when Lithuania unshackled the tyrant's irons and declared its independence by establishing the Lithuanian Republic. Soviet Russia at that time renounced all rights to the territory of Lithuania and recognized the nation as a free and independent state.

Free Lithuania immediately proceeded to make progress as a nation and soon was acknowledged as one of the most progressive, cultured, and industrious nations in Europe. The year 1940 again brought disappointment, sorrow, and grief to this young nation when it was occupied by Russia for the second time. The territory of Lithuania was desecrated by the Nazis and the Soviets for the next few years, when in 1944, the Russians again occupied this country and this usurpation has continued to the present day. Over a million of its people have been murdered or taken prisoner and the Soviet Union is continuing its domination and liquidation of the leaders and people of Lithuania. Deportations, arrests, and humiliations have been inflicted by the Communists, and the Lithuanian people are constantly in fear of the dictator's slave-labor camps, within and beyond its borders.

The United States and other free nations continue to recognize the free and independent nation of Lithuania and disregard the usurpers and dictators now holding the country under temporary control. It is my earnest hope that the steps taken by the United Nations when Soviet aggression and infiltration broke out in South Korea, will prove to eventually bring about the halt of the expanding dictator, Stalin, and his desire to conquer the world. The free and democratic countries in the world must stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight. America has learned through experience that aggression and slavery anywhere on the globe is a constant threat to our own liberty and the liberty of all free nations If our free nations continue this fight, Stalin and his Soviet dictatorship will eventually be destroyed by insurrection from within or defeated by forces from without. That day will eventually come, and let us hope it will be soon.

When that day arrives, Lithuania will again take its place among the free and independent nations of the world, with the rededication of another declaration of independence, the same as they did 33 years ago tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuanian independence. In addition to the remarks which I delivered on the floor of the House commemorating this occasion, I wish to hereby submit a proclamation issued by Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, setting out a redeclaration of Indiana citizens, hoping that Lithuania will soon be unshackled from the conqueror and resume its rightful position as a free self-governing independent nation.

President Albert G. Vinick, of East Chicago, Ind., conveys on behalf of the American Lithuanian Council, identical sentiments as set out in the following proclamation:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis.

PROCLAMATION FOR REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1951

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1951 will mark the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on that day the citizens of the State of Indiana who are of Lithuanian origin or descent will convene in various communities throughout the State to commemorate that occasion and to join their countrymen in the grief of a liberty-loving nation caused by the aggression and acts of injustice of the Soviet Union which took over Lithuania by force of arms, usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people and proceeded with the extermination of them by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign occupation and oppression and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which has always been recognized by the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas because of their unmistakable attitude toward communism struggling for world domination, the Lithuanian people, together with a million Americans of Lithuanian descent, represent an important force in the present fight of free nations against the Communist aggression; and

Whereas the residents of the State of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism;

Now, therefore, I, Henry F. Schricker, the Governor of the State of Indiana, proclaim and designate February 16, 1951, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire and cherish, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 4th day of February 1951.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor of Indiana.
LELAND L. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a radio broadcast.)

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the day that the Americans entered World War II Winston Churchill, speaking of that day, said, "That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass." You will recall that before our men entered World War II Mr. Churchill said, and I quote: "Just give us the tools and we will finish the job." That is, Britain would carry on and win the war. Perhaps at the time he made the latter statement he actually believed it. Nevertheless, from the beginning—all the time—he was working, maneuvering, to get us into war. He succeeded. The war was won and from that day to this we have been aiding Britain. Apparently, that same thing is happening again. It is easy to agree, as do most of the American people, with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. He served here before. We all know that he is sincere, that he is patriotic, that his words come from his heart, and, moreover, are based upon the experience in the last war which entitles him to speak, not for the politicians or, if you prefer, the statesmen, not for the military experts, the generals, or the admirals, but for the men who in every war do the actual fighting.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the day which I have been looking forward to for a long, long time. A day when those in the House, who know very well, who for months have known what their people wanted, when those who are paid to come here and represent their people at long, long last spoke out, in opposition to the policy which we are following which will destroy us.

I notice the morning paper quoted Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court as saying that if we continued to follow our present foreign policy it would only lead to our destruction. That policy which was condemned by Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, our former Ambassador to England. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOHN F. KENNEDY, who after a 5-week trip in Europe made the statement which I will now read as a part of my remarks.

Said our colleague:

ISSUES IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

I have just returned from a 5-week trip through Europe. My purpose in making this trip grew out of my realization that the most important task that would face this country and its Government during the next few months would be the question of our relationship to Western Europe in the face of the growing threat of Soviet expansion. Upon the correct solution of that problem hangs the fate of millions of American lives—indeed, the very survival of the Nation may hinge upon it.

I spent my time in three countries—England, France, and Italy—who are the chief European members of the North Atlantic Pact, and in three countries—West Germany, Yugoslavia, and Spain—who are not members of that alliance but whose problems, whose loyalties, and whose capacities are tied into the question of the defense of Western Europe.

This issue of whether and how Western Europe can be defended, with or without American aid, depends, as everyone agrees—and as General Eisenhower only a few days ago told us—on the existence in these countries of a will to resist—a determination to build up within them singly and collectively forces that, together with such aid as we may supply them, have a reasonable chance of dealing with the threatened aggression from the east. In trying to analyze the quality of their determination, I talked with men of every level—with French and German generals, with prime ministers and cabinet members, with our ambassadors, our high commissioner in Germany, with political leaders, with Tito, and with the man in the street. The problem of European morale is, however, not merely what men say. It is also what men do. It is the capacity of their industry to devote significant portions to war purposes and still produce enough for basic and essential needs. It is their attitude toward manpower and its conscription, toward controls, toward taxes. It is their willingness to make sacrifices, to face deprivation, even to starve in defense of freedom. These are the thing without which armies destined for victory cannot be built, and we must find them without ourselves, as well as within others, if we would defend ourselves and our allies and those who might become our allies.

England is, perhaps, the easiest country to analyze. There is a will to resist in England but at the same time a deep spiritual and physical weariness over the thought of war. Victory did not bring an end to the privation that England's people had endured during the war. Instead, it deepened it. Only in the last year, has England with her efforts and our aid begun to see some solution to her overshadowing dollar problem and to hope again to regain some relief from her self-imposed austerity. Now the shadow of another war, further privation, queues and more queues, face her. It would be too much to expect her people to accept such a prospect with any degree of enthusiasm. There is definite resentment against our Korean policy, partly because she thinks it a waste and diversion of valuable resources which might be devoted to Europe, but more because in bringing us into armed conflict with Red China we have both endangered her precarious position in the Orient and enhanced the possibility of all-out war with Communist Russia. To me, the people were less eager than the Government to take those preliminary steps toward the mobilization of resources and manpower that the will to resist demands.

War weariness, of course, characterizes all Europe. But the problem of France has additional complications. France knows that she will have to bear the lion's share of the manpower necessary for the creation of a Western European force and that her soil together with Germany will probably again be the battleground of any such conflict. She looks longingly to German manpower for assistance and relief from her burden, but at the same time she is unwilling to pay the price that Germany demands for rearming. Jules Moch, France's Minister of War, assured me that time would prove France was right on the issue of not rearming Germany if she insisted upon a national army, and Bidault, the former Prime Minister, echoed this thought. In addition, he expressed the general European fear that rearmament of Germany might incite Russian aggression. General Billotte, De Gaulle's military aide, was in a more aggressive mood. He feared the 5,000,000 Communists in France, their opposition and their neutralism, their power of sabotage. He and De Gaulle, too, he said, would take stern measures to destroy the party were they to come into power, as he thought they would in 6 months. He criticized the present Government and its war effort as weak. As against the 20 divisions by the beginning of

1953 that the Minister of War spoke about, Billotte would have 40 divisions in the field in 1952 and a goal of 75. The Germans, too, he thought, should be brought in even on terms of independence from western control.

France gives me a sense of division and confusion, of hesitation and doubt. Her own economy gives little sense of being attuned toward a war effort. The control of materials and the diversion of production into military channels has not really begun nor is it even being adequately planned. The tax structure, where only 15 percent of the tax receipts come from direct taxation with the balance derived from hidden taxes, seems to slant away from bringing home to the public the burdens that a defense effort must entail. Wages are low and prices high, and no adequate price control exists. A prevalent criticism of France's Government is that it is unable to get through to working people, whereas the Communists succeed in doing so.

In Germany skepticism of the rearmament effort was rife. The German generals I talked with had a more realistic and less fearsome appreciation of Russian military power. They had met the Russian armies in the field and felt they knew them and their weaknesses. At the same time, they are distrustful of France's military strength. The picture of the French rout in 1940 was still vivid in their minds. Politically, everyone insisted that a necessary condition of German rearmament was that Germany must have something to fight for. A consciousness of what happens to a battleground in modern war, such as the devastation that today is Korea, was widespread and there was little desire on the part of the Germans to risk that tragedy unless, as Kurt Schumacher, the head of the Socialist Party and the strongest of Germany's political figures, said, they were assured a West Germany free of Allied control and, secondly, a substantial screen of American troops to shield Germany while she rearmed herself. Even given these two conditions, the army that Germany would be willing to build, must be her own army, officered by her own men, not brigades incorporated into some other force, and that would take months, if not years, to develop.

I could not convince myself that we and this newly formed cause of ours were particularly popular in Germany. They had no love for communism, but in their eyes our measures had been responsible for the disgrace of the German army. We had been preaching the evils of militarism, destroyed their war industries and were still doing so, when at the same time we seem to be urging their rearmament. As a popular joke in Germany these days goes, two Americans leave on a plane from New York, one has a mission to disarm Germany, the other's mission is to urge Germany to rearm; Germany cannot do both.

The recuperation that Germany has shown, however, is extraordinary. Steel, pig iron, coal production have climbed by leaps and bounds. Her national income has almost reached that of England. Her important industrial production and her strategic position in the middle of Europe makes her incorporation into a Western European defense system imperative.

Italy, though a member of the North Atlantic alliance, finds her position precarious. She has achieved some economic recovery despite the difficult burden on her of exporting sufficient to pay for the 60 percent of her food that she must import. Her slim recovery, however, is precious to her people and there is a fear of endangering it by assuming the heavy burdens of rearmament. The peace treaty still limits Italy to an armed force of 175,000 men as well as in the production of war materials and, as such, operates as a deterrent upon her desire to rearm herself. Nevertheless, she has far to go today to fill her allowable army quota.

The nine divisions that are her present goal are not expected to serve outside the country, and the probable area of invasion north of Trieste, the Italians are under obligation not to fortify. The widely expressed concern is that the burden of rearmament will so lower the scale of living that it will fan the Communist parties of the north, so strong in those industrial areas, to make difficult and even to stop her productive effort.

In Yugoslavia I had the opportunity of talking with Marshal Tito and his Minister of Foreign Affairs. The marshal answered the questions I put to him with directness. Czechoslovakia in 1938 made her mistake, he said, in not fighting instead of accepting the partial dismemberment forced on her at Munich. If she had resisted with arms, she would have forced England and France to come in on her side. If attacked, he said, we will fight long enough to bring the West in on our side, for a retreat by us in the north opens the road to Italy while our defeat imperils both Greece and Turkey. In case of attack, our need, he continued, will not be men but equipment—jet planes, tanks, bazookas, and heavy artillery. But America, and he paid respect to her military power, has not yet exhausted the possibilities of an amicable arrangement with Russia. Moreover, America is wasting her strength in Korea. The strategic area today as always, he concluded, is in Europe and not in Asia.

Marshal Tito seemed to have substantially weathered the Russian-Communist forces that initially opposed him in Yugoslavia. The vast majority of the Communists in Yugoslavia had been young and new members and had fought with him in the war, and he had thus succeeded in swinging their allegiance away from Moscow to him. But Yugoslavia is still a sparse and grim country, with recovery slowed by drought, the essential inefficiency of the Communist system, and the absence of Marshall funds. Its people, however, are determined to fight.

Spain again is a picture of poverty but of an army willing to fight. It lacks, however, almost everything needed for modern war. It has no real air force, few trucks, an inadequate rail system, and no antitank weapons. It needs officers conversant with our standards, our specifications, our training, and equipment to boot. The big question mark is whether Western Europe will permit it or invite it to join in the common effort of defense. In England I found distrust and distaste for Franco's help and doubt of its efficacy. In France, Bidault confided these doubts. Bringing Spain in, he said, might give the impression that our line of defense is in the Pyrenees and not on the Rhine and that would be fatal to France and her effort. But there is manpower in Spain, determined and aggressive, but a woeful lack of arms.

The firmness and quality of Europe's will to resist is not an easy subject of analysis. Besides the war-weariness of her peoples, there are the conflicting political ambitions of her nations. There is the precariousness of her hard-won economic recovery that could be overthrown by the heavy drain of rearmament, while waiting for just such an opportunity are the millions of disloyal Communists within her own borders. There is strength, great strength outside the nations of the North Atlantic Pact that still remains unharnessed and, as in the case of Yugoslavia, may be picked off singly before Western Europe can bring itself to a decision. There is Germany, about which there must be some meeting of minds. And although a line of defense for Western Europe must be far east of the Pyrenees, Spain as a base for operations, as a source of power, and because of its strategic position straddling the Mediterranean, can no longer be ignored.

The assessment of Western Europe's potentialities is a necessary condition for shaping the extent and nature of the aid we can and should supply. That program from this country's standpoint cannot be the product of one man's thought or that of a small group. It is this Nation acting through the Congress and the Executive that must fashion that program and coordinate in with our own defense. To do that we must not be afraid of facts or seek to gloss them over by a veneer of trustful but mistaken understanding. If we are to share, we should know the nature of the venture that we are being asked to undertake, what our partners say they will do, and what they actually do or have done. Mutual aid to be successful demands both aid and mutuality. Its conditions should be stipulated at least in broad outline and, if the spirit of mutuality is to endure, those conditions should be met. At the moment, no permanent assessment of the picture can be made and even a tentative one is full of doubt and darkness. In the countries of Western Europe dwell over 200,000,000 people. It has enormous productive powers that can be of immense value to us and can be tragically harmful in the hands of Red Russia. Productive power is the basis of military power, and because of that it is discouraging to an American observer to see the limitations on Europe's rearmament effort. Neither industrial power nor manpower are military assets unless they are efficiently mobilized.

If Europe is to be saved, Europe must commence to make sacrifices sufficient for that purpose and commensurate with the danger that threatens to engulf her peoples. The plain and brutal fact today is that Europe is not making these sacrifices. Except for Yugoslavia and Spain, her military budgets in terms of their proportion of the national income are far below those we propose for ourselves. Her draft of manpower is less severe than what we suggest should govern us here. The nations of the North Atlantic Pact still lack any systems for the control of strategic materials. This effort today is clearly not enough. It is important that Western Europe be saved, but we cannot do so ourselves or pay a price that will endanger our own survival. We cannot link our whole fate to what is presently a desperate gamble. We can and will survive despite Europe, but with her it will be that much easier. But Europe must know, as we are again learning to know, that freedom is born and held only by deep sacrifice.

Our colleague speaks from experience, not from theory. He lost a brother on the eastern front. Commanding a PT boat in the South Pacific, which was blown in two by enemy fire, he, with 12 of his comrades, swam to a small island, from which they were later rescued after a message cut on a coconut was delivered by a native to the Dutch commander at New Guinea.

We know our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. We know he believes in America. We know his first thought is of the future of this country; that he sees through the eyes of the average man—not through brass-bound glasses—as one who served in the front lines—in the first wave bound for the beach.

Again he is one of us; perhaps, more accurately, one of the younger Members of the House. He is looking forward. He is looking to the future of the country.

He has told us, as I have just read to you, that neither France nor Germany—and that is easily understood—wanted us again to make their countries—France or Germany—the ring where we settled our fights.

As to whether or not this war—world war III—is our war, we have been told by reliable, accurate reporters that the

men on the streets in London, as well as some of the members of Parliament and the men on the street in Canada, have time and time again repeated the statement that this is America's war, not their war. Not England's war, not Canada's war, but the war of the United States of America. So I can understand why our colleague who has just left the well, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], having, as he stated, followed our military leaders from Normandy on through into Stassfurt, Germany—I can understand why he, being a young man, wants no more of it for his country. I give full weight to the statement he made when he said that if he could give his life to save this Republic he would do it without hesitation. He offered his life for the safety of his country once before. There is no reason to doubt that he would do it again. Our colleague is looking to the future of his country. He is looking at it as a young man. I speak from the other extreme, as an old, old man who has nothing more to lose in this world. Do you get the point? Nothing more to lose, no more than many others who have been saying for the last few years, "Let us fight them, let us lick them," when all who heard them never would be called to fight, never intended to take any chance at all with their own hide.

Of course, that does not apply to all who talk big about going to war, because some served before, but I have observed in the last 6 or 8 years that those who are most anxious to get us into war are the ones who will not be called to take any part in war.

That gets me to this letter:

NILES, MICH., *February 11, 1951.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My husband is in Korea fighting for this country. He left behind two tiny babies and myself. He has been there 3 months and hasn't received even one letter, though I and the rest of the family write every single day and send one or two packages every week. Do you think it would be worth fighting for a country like this that doesn't seem to care what happens to our boys. Just because a bunch of big mouths up in Washington sit back on their thrones nice and safe where not a thing can harm them and say, "We the people want war." How do they know the people want war? Have they ever bothered to ask the people what they want? The people don't even seem to know what we're fighting for? Does anybody? The only sense we can make out of it is that Red China wants to join the UN but the UN doesn't want them because they are Communists. Isn't Russia a Communist? Yes, but she's in the UN. It just doesn't make sense. That's what we, the common people, make out of it. And our men are over there fighting for something like this. They should all tell Truman or whoever it is to go straight to hell and come home.

I suppose she means that that is what the men in Korea should do—but they would be shot if they did it. But I suppose she means that the men in Korea should come home.

Her letter reads further as follows:

All Mr. Truman, etc., can think of is raising taxes. If it was for the sake of our boys over there, we wouldn't mind being taxed to death but our boys don't even have warm enough clothes or any cigarettes. In fact they don't even get the things we send them. Some country over across the pond that probably hasn't any intentions of ever paying back gets all our tax money to buy supplies probably to fight us with. Well, thanks for listening while I blew off a little steam. I feel much better now and hope this crisis will soon come to an end. Sincerely hoping so.

Here are a few other excerpts from letters which could be multiplied many, many times:

It is too late for us as a Nation to make any mistakes. In fact, I believe we have exceeded our quota some time back.

We would like to see the ones who are guilty of creating Korea forced to accept that responsibility. Anyone can see, if they will, that it has been one dumb thing after another that has created the present situation.

How cheerfully a few men seem able to sacrifice the lives of thousands.

I am bitterly opposed to the placing of any boy of a day under 21 years of age in combat. I cannot understand in any degree how anyone could even think of any 18-year-old draft. Of course, actual emergency could alter the case. In a studied action, such as the Korean War, it is horrible to murder off our boys as we are doing.

I would rather go than see a lad under 21 years go. It might take more of us and perhaps cost more money, but it would be cheaper for America in the end.

I have written this for your encouragement, because if there is one single thing I can do to help in the desperate situation we are in, I am ready to do it. There seems to be so little one can do, for America seems determined to seek self-destruction, in any way that appears.

You may consider that my voice is also the voice of many solid-thinking citizens.

That first letter comes from a wife with two small babies. And how many others are there who write you that way? I agree with my colleagues and with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who told us that it is a hopeless task. It is a hopeless task—it is a task which if we keep at it as was stated yesterday by Mr. Justice Douglas, will not only destroy the freedom and liberty of our people, but will wreck our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, revise and extend my remarks, and include a statement by former Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Sumner Welles, regarding Lithuania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1951, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania which began its twentieth century existence as a sovereign political entity in 1918 after more than a century of foreign rule.

The resolute and persevering endeavors of the Republic of Lithuania to reestablish the country as a modern nation were cut short in 1940 when the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics forcefully imposed a Communist administration on its small neighbor and incorporated it against its will into the Soviet Union. On June 14 of that year, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delivered an ultimatum to Lithuania demanding the creation of a Lithuanian Government sympathetic to the Soviet Union. On the following day Soviet troops occupied Lithuania after which the country was subjected to the familiar Communist-type of election, with the result that the parliament thus formed petitioned on July 21 for incorporation into the U. S. S. R.

The attitude of the United States Government toward the incorporation of Lithuania, as well as of Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union was expressed by Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles on July 23, 1940, in a statement to the press, which read as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES

During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

The adherence of the United States Government to the fundamental principles expressed at that time is indicated by the fact that this Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of those countries in the United States.

The attitude of the United States Government toward Lithuania and the continuing active interest which this Government maintains in the welfare of the Lithuanian people are further indicated by the fact that Voice of America broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are being inaugurated on February 16, 1951. This broadcast, marking the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence in so significant a manner, will be the first of

a series of programs which will be beamed regularly to Lithuania in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the Lithuanians in this country and all over the world in trying to help Lithuania regain her freedom from communism and Russian domination. It is a hard time for the Lithuanians as they are battling against Communistic rule. We join with other freedom loving countries in extending good wishes to them in their fight for freedom and the protection of their people. The fact that the United States is greatly interested in them is shown by the Voice of America broadcasts beginning tomorrow to Lithuania in the Lithuanian language.

Good luck to the Lithuanians and may they very soon again be free.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and were given permission to extend their remarks on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "A Way Must Be Worked Out To Teach More Doctors."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution commending his former colleague, Will M. Whittington.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the Lincoln Day address of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Founding the Government" by Col. Robert R. McCormick.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Fathoms and Feet, Acres and Tons: An Appraisal," notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $287.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one, with reference to the commemoration of Lithuanian independence; and in the other, to include certain additional matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LIND (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

210. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Mobile Harbor, Ala.; harbor for light-draft vessels at Fort Morgan, Baldwin County, Ala., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on February 17, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

212. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

213. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation amending section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

214. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment, as part of the general criminal code, a fraud statute similar to the postal fraud statute (18 U. S. C. A., sec. 338), which would make a Federal offense the use of wire or radio communications to defraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting a copy of the financial audit for the year 1950, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the congressional act of June 28, 1935; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 119. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2678. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2679. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 2681. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2682. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2683. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to subsist-

ence allowance to be paid to veterans pursuing apprentice or other training on the job; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 2685. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2686. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Holly River State Park to the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals liable for induction or call to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2688. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for certain individuals who have completed 30 years of service and attained the age of 60, minimum annuities equal to one-half of the average compensation received by them during their five highest years of earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2689. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2690. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2691. A bill to provide for the grant of certain lands to the American Falls School District No. 381, American Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2692. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2693. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2694. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2695. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2696. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2697. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2698. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2699. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2700. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2701. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2702. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2703. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E United States savings bonds and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2704. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2705. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2706. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 2707. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2708. A bill to encourage the protection of soil and water resources of the Nation by providing for cooperation with the States in the restoration of the surface of the lands on which strip mining operations are conducted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2709. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2710. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the Governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2711. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2712. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861-65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 136. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the operation of accident, health, and hospitalization insurance companies, associations, societies, and funds; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 137. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 136; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Tullio Caporale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Joseph Criss Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Enrique M. Orpilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of Philip Fugh, Sarah Liu Fugh, and John Fugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Luigi Ginese Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Shandeor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian M. Lanphear Collier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Ralph M. Madden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edna M. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Daniel Lindsey Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Archie A. Plante and Earl T. Creech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Aya Iyoda Kono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Res. 138. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Annie L. Bourke; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

51. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of the Common Council, City of Detroit, Mich., favoring permanent rather than temporary defense housing during the present emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come asking that Thou wilt refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened

hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence. We would face the responsibilities committed to our hands in the daily sense of the eternal. Our insights are not deep enough for the solving of the tangled tragedy of our ailing world. In tense times that tempt to petulance, grant us the grace of patience, remembering always that courtesy is rarer than courage and that a soft answer turneth away wrath. Save us from being little men in a great day and from the futile endeavor to match the expanding pattern of a new world being born in travail with the outworn conceptions of a world that is dead.

Make this ancient Chamber of our national life a place of vision, a lighthouse of hope above the raging floods of human disaster and distress. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILLETTE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Friday of this week.

On request of Mr. BREWSTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the various committees, some of which have been mentioned, are to meet while the Senate is in session, I do not know how the Senate will be able to transact very much business. We shall have to find more time for committees to meet when the Senate is not in session.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. PAUL D. SHRIVER, TO BE UNITED STATES JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 27, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Paul D. Shriver, of Colorado, to be United States judge for the district court of Guam. He is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. DANIEL HOLCOMBE THOMAS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 27, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Daniel Holcombe Thomas to be United States district judge for the southern district of Alabama, vice John McDuffie, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. CHARLES J. McNAMEE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 27, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Charles J. McNamee, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Hon. Robert N. Wilkin, retired. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Malone
Anderson	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Maybank
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smathers
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO WOUNDED VETERANS VISITING THE SENATE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I understand that there is now in the gallery, and facing me as I stand here, a group of veterans from the Korean conflict, who have been casualties in that conflict. I know that in rising and making these very brief remarks I am expressing the feeling of every Member of the Senate. I say to these veterans: You have our deep gratitude. We are proud of what you have been doing. You have shown a loyalty and a patriotism which should be an example for everyone in this country. We wish you well. You are most welcome here.

COMMUNICATION FROM CERTAIN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT OF INDIA REGARDING EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF

The VICE PRESIDENT. In his capacity as President of the Senate, the Chair has received a communication from certain members of the Indian Parliament with reference to the arrangement to provide a certain amount of grain for the people of India. If there be no objection, the Chair would like to have the communication read at the desk, and the names of the members printed in the RECORD.

The communication was read, as follows:

NEW DELHI, *February 16, 1951.*

VICE PRESIDENT, SENATE, CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned members of Indian Parliament belonging to various Ipuchies groups and states request you place this message before honorable Members of Senate. Consideration by your House of proposal for gift to India of food grains to help this country tide over present shortage and mitigate distress to our people will be watched keenly by many here. We are among those in India who are opposed to totalitarianism in all its forms and recognize that liberty and integrity of free countries of Asia including our own are being menaced by Communist expansionism. We have, on the other hand, watched with appreciation the great effort for the welfare of the free world embodied in Marshall aid and the point 4 program. We would like to see United States and India cooperate with countries of commonwealth and other democracies in securing world peace through collective security, convinced as we are that the bulk of the Indian people believe in the democratic way of life and recognize in the democracies of the world their natural friends and allies. We should be happy to see our fellow legislators in United States Congress give their approval to proposal now before them moved by the needs of the people of India and uninfluenced by momentary differences of policy we are confident such a gesture of solidarity on the part of the representatives of the American people toward the people of India would strengthen friendship and understanding between our two countries and bring them closer together.

The names of the members of the Parliament of India were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Kalavati Dikshit and Messrs. Nasiruddin Ahmad, Frank Anthony, Lakshmanrao Bhatkar, Satish Chandra, Jagannath Das, T. Y. Desphande, G. A. Dholokia, G. S. Guha, A. B. Gurung, H. C. Heda, T. Husain, R. L. Jangde, P. S. Khaparde, S. N. Mahatta, R. L. Malviya, M. R. Masani, Bhopindersingh Man, M. A. Hasan, M. P. Misra, H. G. Mudgal, N. P. Nathwani, M. Y. Nurie, C. M. Poonacha, R. P. Potai, T. D. Pustake, Arigay Ramaswamy, N. G. Ranga, K. V. Reddi, M. C. Reddy, Syamanandan Shaya, Awdeshpratap Singh, Jaipal Singh, Jaswant Singh, Sardar Singh, J. I. Brajkshore, Peeasad Sinha, Shambhunath Shukla, Jawalaprasad Srivastava, Abulhasan Syedali, B. L. Tiwari, K. S. Vaidya, V. P. Vaidya, and B. H. Zaidi.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit reports, present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 319 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1, 1950, through December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVIDING WAR RISK, AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to providing war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Chairman of the War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims approved for payment by the Department for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the names of Shun Hsin Chan Chi, Chao Pieh Chi, Chao Chu Chi, and Chin Chi, and the name of Atta Kazerooni, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on June 1, 1950, and January 16, 1950, respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LAND WITH STATE GOVERNMENTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of land chiefly valuable for recreational purposes had been consummated during the calendar year 1950, between the Federal Government and State governments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office of Education, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF GENERAL CRIMINAL CODE

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a proposed amendment to the General Criminal Code, relating to fraud by radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to ward off foreign invasion of fundamental American rights

"Whereas by paragraph 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States it is provided that the President of the United States 'shall have power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur;' and by paragraph 2 of article VI of the same Constitution it is provided that 'this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, and that judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding;' and

"Whereas in the spring of 1950 in the case of *Fujii* v. *State*, in a unanimous decision of the Court of Appeals of California, it was decided that the United Nations Charter, which is a treaty approved by the President and Senate, not only repealed certain laws of the State of California, but extended that repeal to citizens of a country not a party to the treaty and to an individual not eligible for citizenship in the United States; and

"Whereas it thus appears that the constitution and laws of every State in the Union, and possibly the Constitution and laws of the United States, can be amended or repealed by the President and the Senate, thus disclosing a peril to the very fundamentals of American law and liberty, and the entire theory of popular government, a peril which certainly the founding fathers never contemplated and which must be obviated at the earliest possible moment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-eighth general assembly (the senate concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned and urged to immediately submit to

the several States an amendment to the United States Constitution providing that no treaty made under the authority of the United States may amend or supersede any portion of the United States Constitution unless submitted and ratified as at present required for amendments to that Constitution, nor repeal or amend any provision of the constitution of any State unless submitted and ratified as provided by the constitution and laws of such State; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado, and to each of the governors of the other 47 States comprising the United States.

"DAVID C. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"K. EVELYN MILLER,
"Assistant Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 1

"A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States

"Whereas both Houses of the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the number of terms which any one person may hold the office of the President of the United States of America, which proposal is in the following words, namely:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President.

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."'

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"SECTION 1. That the said above-proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D. C., to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"ROBERT C. RYMILL,
"President of the Senate.
"FRANK C. MOCKLER,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 12.
"FRANK A. BARRETT,
"Governor."

An act of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"An act concerning mutual military aid and assistance by and between the State of New Jersey and other States, in an emergency and approving and agreeing to an interstate compact therefor

"Whereas on the twelfth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fifty, the Governor of the State of New York, for and on behalf of the State of New York, and the Governor of the State of New Jersey, for and on behalf of the State of New Jersey, agreed to an interstate compact for mutual military aid and assistance between such respective States, in an emergency; and

"Whereas article II of said compact provides: 'This compact shall become effective as to the signatory States when the legislatures thereof have approved it and when the Congress has given its consent either before or after the date hereof. Any State not a party to this compact at the date hereof may become a party hereto'; and

"Whereas it is the purpose and object of said compact to promote the national security and the security of the States signatory thereto, and further protect the public health, safety and welfare; and

"Whereas it is the purpose and object of this act to approve said interstate compact; and

"Whereas, by the provisions of chapter 68 of the laws of 1950, the Governor of this State is authorized from time to time to enter into agreements with Governors of States bordering on New Jersey for the protection in the event of emergency of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries and other communications facilities between New Jersey and such other States: Therefore be it

"Enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The State of New Jersey does hereby agree to, approve, and enter into a solemn compact with the State of New York (upon that State concurring therein, or otherwise approving thereof by appropriate legislation) and with such other States as likewise concur therein or otherwise approve thereof, in form and terms as heretofore agreed to by the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the State of New York, as follows:

"' *An interstate compact for mutual military aid in an emergency*

"' ARTICLE I

"'1. The purposes of this compact are:

"'a. to provide for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency by the military forces of a signatory State to the military forces of the other signatory States or of the United States, including among other military missions, the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communications facilities and other vital installations, plants and facilities; and the military support of civil defense agencies;

"'b. to provide for the fresh pursuit in case of an emergency, by the military forces or any part or member thereof of a signatory State into another State, of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of a signatory State;

"'e. to make provision for the powers, duties, rights, privileges and immunities of the members of the military forces of a signatory State while so engaged outside of their own State.

"'(2) a. "Emergency" as used in this compact shall mean and include invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection or imminent danger thereof.

"'b. "State" as used in this compact shall include any signatory State.

"'c. "Military forces" as used in this compact shall include the organized militia, or any force thereof, of a signatory State.

"' ARTICLE II

"'This compact shall become effective as to the signatory States when the Legislatures thereof have approved it and when the Congress has given its consent either before or after the date hereof. Any State not a party to this compact at the date hereof may become a party hereto.

"' ARTICLE III

"'The Governor of each signatory State or his designated military representative shall constitute the committee for mutual military aid for the signatory States. It shall be the duty of the committee for mutual military aid to make joint plans for the employment of the military forces of the signatory States for mutual military aid and assistance in case of emergency.

"' ARTICLE IV

"'(1) It shall be the duty of each signatory State to integrate its plan for the employment of its military forces in case of emergency with the joint plans recommended by the committee for mutual military aid and with the emergency plans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"'(2) In case of emergency, upon the request of the Governor of a signatory State, the Governor of each signatory State, to the extent consistent with the needs of his own State, shall order its military forces or such part thereof as he, in his discretion, may find necessary, to assist the military forces of the requesting State in order to carry out the purposes set forth in this compact. In such case, it shall be the duty of the Governor of each signatory State receiving such a request to issue the necessary orders for such use of the military forces of his State without the borders of his State and to direct the commander of such forces to place them under the operational control of the commander of the forces of the requesting State or of the United States which may be engaged in meeting the emergency.

"'(3) The Governor of any signatory State, in his discretion, may recall the military forces of his State serving without its borders or any part or any member of such forces.

"' ARTICLE V

"'In case of an emergency, any unit or member of the military forces of a signatory State which has been ordered into active service by the Governor may upon order of the officer in immediate command thereof continue beyond the borders of its own State into another signatory State in fresh

pursuit of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of any one of the signatory States, until they are apprehended by such unit or member. Any such person who shall be apprehended or captured in a signatory State by a unit or member of the military forces of another signatory State shall without unnecessary delay be surrendered to the military or police forces of the State in which he is taken or to the forces of the United States. Such surrender shall not constitute a waiver by the State of the military forces making the capture, of its right to extradite or prosecute such persons for any crime committed in that State.

" 'ARTICLE VI

" '(1) Whenever the military forces or any part thereof of any signatory State are engaged outside of their own State in carrying out the purposes of this compact, the individual members of such military forces so engaged shall not be liable, civilly or criminally, for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty.

" '(2) The individual members of such forces shall have the same powers, duties, rights, privileges and immunities as the members of the military forces of the State in which they are engaged, but in any event,

" '(3) Each signatory State shall save harmless any member of its military forces wherever serving and any member of the military forces of any other signatory State serving within its borders for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty while engaged in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

" 'ARTICLE VII

" '(1) Each signatory State shall provide, in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State, for the pay and allowances of the personnel of its military forces, and for the medical and hospital expenses, disability and death benefits, pensions and funeral expenses of wounded, injured or sick personnel and of dependents or representatives of deceased personnel of its military forces, in case such personnel shall suffer wounds, injuries, disease, disability or death while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State. Each signatory State shall provide in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State for the logistical support and for other costs and expenses of its military forces while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State.

" '(2) Any signatory State rendering outside aid in case of insurrection or disaster not the result of invasion or hostile action, shall, if it so elects be reimbursed by the signatory State receiving such aid for the pay and allowances of its personnel, logistical support and all other costs and expenses referred to in section 1 of this article and incurred in connection with the request for aid. Such election shall be exercised by the Governor of the aiding State presenting a statement and request for reimbursement of such costs and expenses to the Governor of the requesting State.

" 'ARTICLE VIII

" 'Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the power of any signatory State in case of an emergency affecting that State only, to provide for the internal defense of any part of the territory of said State or for the protection and control of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, installation, plant or facility or any part thereof within the borders of such State or to prohibit the enforcement of any laws, rules and regulations or the execution of any plan with regard thereto.

" 'ARTICLE IX

" 'This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each signatory State until the legislature or the Governor of such State gives notice of withdrawal therefrom. Such notice of withdrawal shall not be effective until 6 months after said notice has been given to the Governor of each of the other signatory States.

" 'In witness whereof, the States whose Governors have signed below have become parties to this compact.

" 'DECEMBER 12, 1950.

" '[SEAL] THOMAS E. DEWEY,
" 'Governor of New York.

" 'Attest:
" 'THOMAS J. CURRAN,
" 'Secretary of State of the State of New York.

" '[SEAL] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
" 'Governor of New Jersey.

" 'By the Governor:
" 'LLOYD B. MARSH,
" 'Secretary of State of the State of New Jersey.'

"2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting, directly or indirectly, the power of the Governor to enter into interstate compacts or other agreements relating to mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency or impairing in any respect the force and effect thereof.

"3. This act shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the delegated conference of the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York State, New York, N. Y., relating to the national policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Mount Pleasant Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., relating to a study of the public transportation systems in the metropolitan area of Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of New York, N. Y., signed by Walter White, secretary, relating to the gift of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Sheboygan, Wis., favoring the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce, relating to Statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Two resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, relating to Communist China as an aggressor and that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States; the Secretary of State of the United States; the Secretary of Defense of the United States; and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Secretary for Air of the Department of Defense of the United States, not to commit the Armed Forces of the United States for duty or service except as is authorized by a fair interpretation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the defense of the United States, but not for the defense of other nations, and the powers to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to provide for calling forth the militia for specific purposes, and to make laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution said powers are all expressly vested by the Constitution of the United States in the Congress and not in some other branch or department of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas it is manifest that the executive branch of the Federal Government has been and is now assuming to exercise the powers of Congress respecting the land and naval forces of the Nation without regard to the exclusive authority in Congress in the premises: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That His Excellency the President of the United States and his Cabinet be memorialized not to execute or enter into any secret treaties or other agreements with any foreign power or powers which would commit the Armed Forces of the United States for duties or services in any country other than the United States and then only pursuant to the acts of Congress as authorized by the Constitution of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to the Honorable Secretary of State of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of Defense of the United States, the chairman of the committees of defense of both Houses of Congress, Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air of the Department of Defense, the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and United States officials to remove the order from the Office of Price Stabilization affecting cotton issued January 25, 1951

"Whereas cotton is one of the basic industries of this Nation; and

"Whereas cotton has long been the basis of South Carolina's economic life and the growing and processing reaches into every phase of the life of the citizens of South Carolina and the Nation; and

"Whereas the United States is in a critical period and cotton is essential to the national defense effort; and

"Whereas at the present time cotton is in temporary short supply and the cotton farmers and producers of South Carolina and the Nation have been asked to produce more than 16,000,000 bales of cotton a part of the national defense effort which is a 60-percent increase in production; and

"Whereas, due to the recent Federal regulations as contained in the order from the Office of Price Stabilization issued January 25, 1951, free trade and free flow of this commodity is at a complete standstill and conditions have become chaotic adversely affecting the farmers, cotton merchants, manufacturers, ginners, warehousemen, bankers,

transportation systems, and directly, or indirectly, all phases of normal business: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring). That the President of the United States and the proper governmental agencies, including the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Stabilization, are requested to immediately remove the present unworkable order pertaining to cotton in order to permit the resumption of normal distribution and processing of raw cotton; to assure the cotton farmer that the 16,000,000 bales he has been asked to produce by our Government will move readily as in the past; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate immediately transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Brannan; the Administrator of the Office of Price Stabilization, Michael DiSalle; and to the South Carolina Members of Congress."

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action toward the establishment of reciprocal agreements between the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the duty-free mutual transshipment of crude petroleum, natural gas, and petroleum byproducts between the respective countries

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada is and has been a large consumer of crude petroleum and petroleum byproducts, which products have been admitted duty free to the Dominion of Canada; and

"Whereas recent discoveries of extensive petroleum deposits and natural gas-producing areas in the Province of Alberta in the Dominion of Canada are being developed, and

"Whereas crude petroleum will be transported by pipeline through the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to Superior, Wis., and thence to Sarnia, Ont., for refining; and

"Whereas tentative plans call for the building of two oil refineries in the vicinity of Superior, Wis., for the refining of additional quantities of petroleum products from the Alberta fields; and

"Whereas these petroleum imports to be refined in the Superior area should be afforded means through elimination of discriminatory import duties by which they can be made available to American consumers; and

"Whereas the availability of large supplies of petroleum, natural gas, and petroleum byproducts is essential to the growth of industry, the assurance of fuel supply, and the general economic well-being of our people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to take the necessary steps through proper authorities toward the consummation of reciprocal agreements between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Government of the United States to the end that there will be equitable freedom of exchange of crude petroleum, natural gas, and petroleum byproducts uninhibited by the imposition of restrictive import duties."

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS BY STATE OF NEW YORK—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the text of a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the New York State Legislature, which respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will (1) prohibit the Federal Security Agency from imposing arbitrary administrative requirements such as State-wide standards of assistance save as specifically authorized by Congress, and (2) prohibit the Federal Security Administrator from disrupting long-established State civil service procedures by imposing special requirements for public employees engaged in administering the federally aided programs of public assistance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States respecting proposed administrative requirements sought to be imposed upon the State of New York regarding public assistance programs

Whereas the State of New York in its public-assistance programs has consistently endeavored to provide for the requirements of its needy persons on a humane and individualized basis and has maintained a system of public assistance which is among the best in the Nation; and

Whereas the Federal Security Agency has threatened to withhold from the State of New York Federal funds for aid to dependent children, old age assistance, aid to the blind, and for the new program of aid to the disabled unless the State of New York acquiesces to two arbitrary conditions sought to be imposed by the Federal Security Agency; and

Whereas one of these conditions would mandate an inflexible State-wide standard of assistance requiring all persons receiving assistance under a welfare program to receive mechanically the same benefits in total disregard of individualized needs; and

Whereas express authority for the imposition of such a requirement has not been granted by Congress to the Federal Security Agency and the making of such a demand represents an arbitrary exercise of administrative power and would result in the subordination of the needs of the people of this State to the convenience of Government administrators; and

Whereas a second condition imposed by the Federal Security Agency seeks to require the State of New York to depart from its long-established civil-service system and compel the adoption of special civil service standards and procedures for employees dealing with Federal welfare programs or a general revision of our civil service system; and

Whereas the result of acquiescence in any such demand would permit a single Federal administrator by administrative fiat to override the legislature of the State of New York and impress the views of a Federal agency in a matter of general State administration not directly involved in the Federal program; and

Whereas the State of New York has the oldest State civil service law in this country, having established a merit system in 1883, which has been administered under the supervision of a bipartisan commission with the general approval of civil service employees, civil service groups, and the people of the State; and

Whereas no objection has been raised relative to the sufficiency of public assistance programs or to the adequacy of aid furnished to the needy of the State of New York, and the conditions sought to be imposed by the Federal Security Agency are neither necessary nor desirable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the people of the State of New York, through their representatives in the senate and assembly, hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will—

1. Prohibit the Federal Security Agency from imposing arbitrary administrative requirements such as State-wide standards of assistance save as specifically authorized by Congress;

2. Prohibit the Federal Security Administrator from disrupting long-established State civil-service procedures by imposing special requirements for public employees engaged in administering the federally aided programs of public assistance; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Representative in Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

In assembly February 14, 1951, concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS—RESOLUTION OF BOSTON (MASS.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Boston, Mass., favoring the establishment of a volunteer freedom corps and increasing the number of voluntary alien enlistees from 2,500 to 25,000.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Boston City Council in meeting assembled commend United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE for his constant insistence that aliens be inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States and that this body go on record as favoring the enactment of the proposed legislation which will increase the number of voluntary alien enlistees from 2,500 to 25,000 as well as the establishment of the Volunteer Freedom Corps of 250,000 to serve abroad for a period of 2 years.

In city council February 5, 1951, adopted.

Attest:

W. J. MALLOY,
City Clerk.

GRANTING OF CITIZENSHIP TO CERTAIN PARENTS OF UNITED STATES SERVICEMEN—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN-PORTUGUESE LOYALTY ASSOCIATION, INC., FALL RIVER, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American-Portuguese Loyalty Association, Inc., of Fall River, Mass., relating to the granting of citizenship to the

parents of United States servicemen who have not been able to meet the English-language requirements.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN-PORTUGUESE LOYALTY ASSOCIATION, INC., OF FALL RIVER, MASS.,
Fall River, Mass., February 10, 1951.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: The following is the resolution unanimously adopted by the above-mentioned organization:

"*Resolved*, That the American-Portuguese Loyalty Association, Inc., of Fall River, Mass., send this resolution to the Honorable United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusets, approving and supporting a bill introduced by Senator LODGE in the United States Senate which will confer citizenship on the parents of United States servicemen who have not been able to meet the English-language requirements."

Unanimously adopted.

Sincerely yours,

JOSE SILVA,
President.

PROTESTS AGAINST COMPULSORY HEALTH-INSURANCE LEGISLATION—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference 43 resolutions from organizations in North Carolina, expressing opposition to the compulsory health-insurance measures which have been proposed for adoption in the Senate. These resolutions come from various organizations throughout the State. Several are from medical societies in various districts in North Carolina, others are from women's clubs throughout the State, others are from civic clubs like Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, and other similar organizations, others are from senior and junior chambers of commerce throughout the State. Altogether, this represents a cross section of the citizens in North Carolina and indicates that our people are definitely opposed to any compulsory health-insurance law and any other measure which leads in the direction of socialized medicine. In our State we do not believe in socialistic ventures of this character. I am definite in my view that the Federal Government should lend Federal aid and assistance to the local organizations so that they might carry on together a program which provides better health facilities, such as the building of hospitals, the conducting of clinics, and the establishment of other health programs under local direction. I ask that these resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee and that one of the resolutions and the accompanying letter listing the organizations be presented following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and, without objection, one of the resolutions and the letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The resolution and letter are as follows:

Whereas the United States has the highest standards of health, of medical care, and of scientific medical facilities of any country in the world, as a result of our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance wherever tried has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards and facilities; and

Whereas, wherever Government has assumed control of medical services, the result has been tremendous multiplication of costs over original estimates, extreme tax burdens and national deficits, and gradual extension of socialization into other activities of national life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Roanoke Rapids Merchants Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control;

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from the State of North Carolina and the Representative from our district, and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

W. GRAHAM LYNCH,
President.

Mrs. KATHLEEN C. DAVIS,
Secretary.

Dated this 12th day of October 1950.

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
February 12, 1951.

Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: Please find enclosed resolutions opposing compulsory health insurance from the following organizations in North Carolina:

1. First District Medical Society.
2. Roanoke Rapids Merchants Association.
3. Wilson County Medical Society.
4. Craven County Medical Society.
5. Third District Medical Society.
6. Wayne County Medical Auxiliary.
7. Carteret County Medical Society.
8. Literary and Art Club.
9. Morehead City Woman's Club.
10. Johnston County Medical Society.
11. Smithfield Kiwanis Club.
12. Wake County Medical Auxiliary.
13. Forsyth County Medical Society.
14. Surry-Yadkin Medical Auxiliary.
15. Business and Professional Women's Club.
16. Chapter 249, Order of the Eastern Star, Elkin.
17. Elkin Kiwanis Club.
18. American Legion Auxiliary, No. 1147, Elkin.
19. Elkin Woman's Club.
20. Wednesday Study Club, Elkin.
21. Elkin Merchants Association.
22. Surry-Yadkin Medical Society.
23. Thursday Book Club.
24. Yadkin Valley Garden Club.
25. Jonathan Hunt Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Elkin, N. C.
26. Elkin Junior Chamber of Commerce.
27. North Elkin Home Demonstration Club.
28. Red Springs Merchants Association and Chamber of Commerce.
29. Red Springs, N. C., Lions Club.
30. Cumberland County Medical Auxiliary.
31. Whiteville Business and Professional Women's Club.
32. Whiteville Garden Club.
33. Whiteville Junior Woman's Club.
34. Whiteville Merchants Association.
35. Whiteville Woman's Club.
36. Sorosis Club of Chadbourn.
37. Moore County Medical Auxiliary.
38. Hoke County Medical Society.
39. Ashe-Watauga Medical Society.
40. Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Charlotte.
41. Madison County Medical Society.
42. Jackson-Swain Medical Society.
43. Woman's Club of McCain.

I feel sure that you will find interesting these expressions of opinion from the people whom you represent.

Respectfully,

JAMES T. BARNES,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Madeleine Quarez (Rept. No. 97);

S. 529. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter, Lucy Dildilian (Rept. No. 98);

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Christos Roumanis (Rept. No. 99);

S. 695. A bill for the relief of William Greville Birkett (Rept. No. 100); and

S. 768. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn (Rept. No. 101).

My Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family (Rept. No. 102);

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla (Rept. No. 103);

S. 181. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert (Rept. No. 104);

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson (Rept. No. 105);

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Kohler (Rept. No. 106);

S. 548. A bill for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer (Rept. No. 107);

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask (Rept. No. 108); and

S. 666. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas (Rept. No. 109).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Baliquette Adele Rundle (Rept. No. 110); and

S. 728. A bill to amend section 174.1, chapter I, title 8, of the Code of Federal Regulations, relating to control pursuant to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, of persons entering the United States (Rept. No. 111).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 112) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6810161, Adamos, Nicola Dimitry or Damoff or Danoff.

A-6219112, Afshar, Nasser Gatli, or Nasser Afshar or Nasser Gatli Afshar or Nassere Cotli Afchar.

A-5325945. Alex, Joseph Benjamin.

A-7022692, Alpar, Julia Viola, or Julia Viola Froelich or Julia Viola Bagge.

A-5665037, Alves, Alipio.
A-4785339, Andal, Ester (nee Knaster, alias Esther Bjork alias Esther Johnson).
A-1939697, Aoki, Michio.
A-7188402, Ataide, Jose Fernandes.
A-3976165, Barbalic, Anton Danimir.
A-5518002, Barnett, Arthur Albert.
A-7070737, Barron, Raymundo, or Raymundo Barron-Aguirre or Raymundo Aguirre Barron or Reymundo Barron or Raymundo Agirre Barron.
A-2298439, Beuermann, Paul Richard, or Richard Beuermann.
A-4777113, Botosan, Traian or Thomas.
A-1989229, Broeders, Theodorus Aldegandos.
A-6961776, Bruorton, Maria Luisa Rivera De.
A-6287999, Buckmaster, Linda Louise.
A-6287998, Buckmaster, Orval Duane.
A-6750057, Buckmaster, Myles Carter.
A-6611834, Buonarota, Francisco.
A-6881760, Bustamante, Oracio Espinosa, or Oscar Oracio Bustamante.
A-7050092, Bustillos, Alfredo, or Alfredo Bustillos-Barrera.
A-7049126, Camillucci, Silva Sordoni, or nee Silvia Sordoni.
A-5663653, Caro, Maria Gracia De, or Mary Grace Di Caro.
A-3404707, Castaneda, Zenona Palomares de.
A-3435085, Castaneda, Valente.
A-5698077, Chautemps, Juliette Durand.
A-6779979, Chautemps, Antionette Charlotte.
A-5203205, Charlton, Iris Louise (nee Stephenson or Dwyer).
A-6712052, Chi, David (Chi Tai-Wei).
A-6829091, Christiansen, Elsa Maria Hansen (alias Elsa Marie Hansen Christiansen, formerly Elsa Marie Zinglerson, nee Elsa Marie Hansen or Elsa Marie Hildebrandt).
A-4380546, Cohen, Annie (nee Abrams).
A-6882891, Conits, Evangelia Costas Karagioges.
A-5981719, Corey, Hilton Oscar.
A-6702396, Corino, Michele.
A-7092105, Correa, Norberto, or Nolberto Correa or Norberto Correo.
A-7089753, Costa, Francesca Sacco.
A-6924566, Courvaris, Georgios, or George Couvaris.
A-983130, Dahle, John Ludwig, Johannessen, or John L. Dahle.
A-6828811, Dagios, Ioannis Panaiotou, or John Dagios.
A-5408860, D'Andrea, Matteo.
A-6172290, Darczy, Louis Alexander Anthony (Daroczy), or Louis Darousky.
A-6874136, Diaz-Lomeli, Reyes, or Reyes Dias.
A-6973707, Dodd, John Glyndwr, or Jack G. Dodd.
A-6943642, Drakulahos, Demetra Constantine, or Demetra Constantine Mavri.
A-5043401, Dykman, Theodorus Josephus Cyrillus, or Theodore Dykman-Dabster.
A-6209521, Escobar-Huet, Cesar.
A-6972476, Esparza-Hinojosa, Gilberto.
A-6628803, Fernandez, Maria Ydalia, or Maria Ydalia Madera.
A-4383592, Fiel, Manuel Lavado.
A-6004623, Fletcher, Marie Alice Welch (nee Welch).
A-7049256, Follain, Pierre Maurice Paul.
A-7049280, Galvan, Luis.
A-7117698, Gerasinos, Fotino (nee Valassopoulos alias Valli).
A-6498468, German, Rosa Moredo San.
A-5568143, Gentile, Giovanni, or Giovanni D. Ianni.
A-6868099, Gnusti, Rossana Silvia.
A-1418864, Goomas, Nicholas Vianailias, or Nick Goomas.
A-6524878, Gomez, Guadalupe Agvilar de Harrison.
A-7192722, Gomez-Ayala, Salud, or Salud Gomez Moreno.
A-6192703, Gonzalez, Erundino Lorenzo, or Erundino Lorenzo.
A-7189631, Gonzalez, Jose Antonio Perez, or Joseph Anthony Perez y Gonzalez or Joseph Anthony Perez.
A-6919676, Gordon, Ivy May, or Ivy May Shaw.
A-7112976, Halas, Dimitrios (alias James Hallas).
A-5441441, Halmos, Anna (nee Kertesz).
A-6472686, Halpern, Sara Sziomcze (nee Halpern or Sara Rubin).
A-6331906, Hamandijan, Yervant Edward.
A-6211068, Harris, Pati Behrs Eristoff, or Pati Dullivan Harris or Pati Behrs or Pati Behrs Eristoff, or Pati Derek Harris or Pati Behrs Eristoff Tohitchinadze.
A-7118467, Heinz, Dieter.
A-1090399, Helm, James Theodore.
A-2407788, Hendriksen, Peder Oskar (alias Peder Hendriksen).
A-6988873, Heuman, Ruth Wertheim.
A-6709319, Hing, Sheila Chien (nee Chien).
A-6330780, Holliday, Era, or Eva Grethe Ingeberg.
A-6975468, Hurtado-Padilla, Rosalio.
A-[illegible]50626, Isch, Julio Norberto.
A-6459716, Jenderzy, William (Wilhelm) Karl.
A-6016572, Johnson, Zaccheus Boyd, Sr.
A-3033801, Kaczmarkiewicz, Franciszek Vincent, or Frank Vincent Kaczmarkiewicz.
A-6475707, Khachadourian, Khachadour Hagop.
A-5069215, Kaiser, Anna (nee Beerner).
A-6971389, Kang, Kuojen John, or John Karo or Cogan J. K'ang.
A-3771855, Karas, Nicholas, or Nikolaus Karras.
A-7136989, Karam, George Joseph.
A-6972394, Knox, Derek Aries Tuyl.
A-6972393, Knox, Denis Anthony Tuyl.
A-6595963, Ladopoulos, Athanassios, or Athan Lades or Athanadsios Andreos Ladopoulos.
A-7036444, Levine, June Rhoda.
A-5167354, Levine, Bertha.
A-5411116, Levine, Reuben.
A-4065788, Lopez, Dionicia Silva de, or Dionisia Silva de Lopez.
A-3348068, Lotti, Angelina, or Angela Lotti.
A-7054539, Malcolm, Douglas Clarenton.
A-6855851, Maldonado-Esquibel, Nicolas, or Enrique Monroy-Martinez or Enrique Martines Monroy.
A-6249250, Mangos, Kleoniki, or Kleoniki Niketi.
A-4313375, Manoogian, Joseph Christopher, or Hovsep Christafolios Manoogian or Joseph Chris Manoogian.
A-7056581, Marin-Naranjo, Trinidad.
A-6236676, Mastrandrea, Mario Do Carmo Wagner Vieira Da Cunha, or Maria Da Cunha or Maria Mastrandrea.
A-7087620, Mazes, Malama (nee Kouzi).
A-5998358, McNary, Kathliin Betty (nee Nitkin).
A-6380054, Merriman, Margot G., or Margo Merriman.
A-7112714, Mertensova, Nadezda, or Dadia Klasinski.
A-6692542, Milan, Maria Rogue.
A-6358774, Mir, Antonio Matas y.
A-5559220, Miyahira, Taro, or Chumei Shiroma Gusukuma.
A-5969523, Monje, Amelia.
A-6671421, Moreno, Rosa Abigail Orta de Juarez.
A-5410972, Mori, Shizuo, or Shizoo George Mori.
A-6383774, Morrison, Arthur Ward.
A-1219198, Mulesa, George, or George Molessa.
A-7049123, Munro, Jessie Gallagher (alias Jessie Gallagher).
A-2104877, Namesnyik, Joseph.
A-1270992, Negi, Hassan.
A-3125283, Nixon, Margaret Elizabeth Annie (nee Childs by former marriage McWilliam).
A-6928029, Ortega, Lina Esther Tapanes y Leira de.
A-3706878, Ortiz, Margarita Fraide Vda De.
A-5197610, Ouellette, Claire Laura, or Claire Laura Godin.
A-5004366, Perez, Enrique, or Henry Perez.
A-4323478, Permanoff, Daniel or Perman.
A-5429116, Pettersen, Haakon, or Harry Pettersen.
A-5809517, Polsky, Peter.
A-4440238, Pories, Joanna, or Joanna Kropf or Tanit Ikao or Koreano.
A-7781923, Powell, Iry Elfreda (nee Babb).
A-6438746, Puppin, Giuseppe, or Joseph Puppin.
A-7189649, Raichi, Monique.
A-3720035, Raspavolo, Carmine.
A-5383010, Rees, Emil.
A-7761040, Resamny, Attia Ibrahim.
A-7761035, Resamny, Rafic Mohamed.
A-6603788, Rodarte, Ezequiel, or Jose Alvidrez.
A-6082512, Rodriguez, Jose, or Jose Rodriguez-Rojo.
A-5978909, Rogers, James Nathaniel or "Cantadora."
A-6476936, Rogers, Julita Centeno, or Judith Rogers.
A-7048622, Rogers, Dorothy.
A-6146858, Romo-Leroux, Esther Maria (nee Esther Garcia y Montejo).
A-6860704, Russino, Salvatore.
A-4870154, Sainz, Susanna Otero, or Sister Gonzaga Otero Sainz.
A-6622370, Sanchez-Banuelos, Salvador.
A-2159111, Schwartz, Izak, or Isak Schwartz or Jack Schwartz.
A-3569295, Schultz, August.
A-3778117, Schultz, Emilia (nee Eichorst).
A-4475428, Seceni, Aurelia Rebecca (nee Loebel).
A-5111674, Seceni, Alexander Julien.
A-6991828, Semaan, Joseph Sarakis.
A-3393075, Silva, Castulo (Amador), or Castulo Silvas Amador or Castro Silva Amador or Castulo S. Amador or Castulo Amador.
A-6524705, Silva, Adriano Sales Da, or Andriano Sales De Silva.
A-6988987, Silvestri, Ferdinando.
A-4383162, Smith, Zedekiah.
A-7095704, Spoon, Torsten Robert, or Torsten Robert Wangemann.
A-6923987, Stewart, Doet Leslie.
A-3289995, Syrigos, Georgios, or George Syrigos.
A-1378258, Taggo, August Erich.
A-2556293, Tamura, Tokio.
A-5680263, Taxides, Arthur D., or Athanasios D. Taxides.
A-5759957, Terronez-Morales, Asencion, or John M. Terronez or "Chon" Terronez.
A-6815380, Thomas, Rafael Ernesto.
A-2753409, Tome, Manuel Huerreiro, or Manuel Guerreiro Thome or Thomas.
A-1048543, Toriakides, Haralambos.
A-6917854, Tostado-Perez, Juan, or Juan Perez.
A-2336199, Tzannis, Georgios, or George Zanis.
A-1250895, Tsalikis, Andreas or Carambelas.
A-6336421, Valenzuela, Benjamin, or Benjamin Valenzuela-Vasquez.
A-6824851, Van-Lienden, Henrika Maria Petronella (nee Bitter).
A-5094424, Vandestel, Richard Anthony.
A-6166298, Vantent, Magdalera Maria Frederika Oosten.
A-7044360, Vargas, Lino.
A-7003827, Vega, Glodovaldo Augusto Peguero, or Glodobaldo or Cleodobaldo Augusto Peguero Vega.
A-6017478, Villarreal-Medina, Pedro, or Pedro Villarreal.
A-6620491, Villenave, Pierre.
A-4589132, Vitale, Antonio, or Tony Vitale.
A-5130754, Vitale, Angelina (nee Ingoglia or Angela Vitale Ingoglia).
A-7015037, Vitale, Francesco Paola, or Frank Vitale.
A-4738263, Vliembergen, Peter Agust Van.
A-4897200, Weiser, Mary (nee Bridget Glynn, alias Mary Ellen Glynn).

A-5641837, Yamanaka, Chiyokichi, or George Yamanaka.
A-5665283, Zakaib, Fred Louis.
A-5726791, Zander, George William.
A-5260149, Zoulinakis, Emmanouel Georgiou.
A-6861453, Zuniga-Hernandez, Isidoro, or Luciano Zuniga-Hernandez.
A-6994559, Bobone, Renato.
A-4934848, Hohenlohe, Stephanie Maria Veronika Juliana, or Princess Stephanie Juliane Hohenlohe Waldenbourge-Schillingfurst or Stephanie Maria Veronika Juliana Richter.
A-5824860, Foti, Joseph Arthur, or Giuseppi Arturo Foti or Giuseppi Correale or Arthur La Pierre.
A-7385536, Knowlton, Maureen Winifred (nee Maureen Winifred Sheila Gazalet).
A-7210047, Pappalardo, Salvatore.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 113) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:
A-7249095, Aaltonen, Aila Anneli, or Aila Anneli Johnson.
A-6477404, Acosta, Alicia Lugo.
A-6261666, Anagnostos, Avgi (nee Margaritou).
A-3256360, Anghelikusis, Mehalis K.
A-4202877, Archer, Thomas Alfred.
A-2021251, Basso, Francesco.
A-6312903, Beliel, Lilia Helen, or Mrs. Don Bell.
A-4154468, Berke, Bernhard, or Bernard Berke.
A-4932183, Betza, George, or Juraj Beca.
A-6936070, Bianco, Vincenzo, or Vincenzo Mario Biano or Vincent Bianco.
A-6722046, Birovcak, John.
A-2400781, Birovcak, Mary (nee Breza).
A-7189474, Boeke, Elisabeth (nee Mulier).
A-6958446, Bondar, Hilel.
A-6036648, Borbon, Amelia (nee Picardo or Amelia De Borbon).
A-7145111, Bougis, Susan, or Sideroula Antonios Hatjilias or Hadzelia.
A-7070301, Bouldoukian, Vahan.
A-9554614, Braun, Joshua or Joszua, or Szaja Braun.
A-3408474, Brown, Esther (nee Williams or Irene Palmer).
A-5862169, Brugman, Fritz Heinrich, or Fred Heinrich Brugman or Fred H. Brugman.
A-6187410, Bruguera, Agustin.
A-6192174, Bruguera, Celia Hortensia, or Gladys Gruguera (nee Marti).
A-5274353, Bruns, August Herman.
A-5653470, Bubendey, Herman August.
A-5949335, Burns, Edward.
A-2406365, Caamano, Andres or Andrew.
A-6080973, Casanave, Grete Kretzschmar, or Margarita Maria Kretzschmar.
A-4210637, Cecil, Annie, formerly Annie Rehfeldt (nee McCallum).
A-6921138, Cedeno, Humberto Aoun, or Humberto Aoun.
A-6921139, Cedeno, Miguel Aoun, or Miguel Aoun.
A-3744770, Cardosa, Manuel Ferreria.
A-5775687, Chou, Jang Lee, or Jan Wing Yee.
A-6878044, Chou, James Chia-San or Chia San Chou.
A-6790911, Chung, Fitzgerald Roberts, or Fitzgerald Dakers or Fitzgerald Roberts.
A-6212701, Clemencia, Jean Roger.
A-4633299, Cocchio, Giuseppe, or Joseph Cocchio.
A-5996900, Coronado, Antonio, or Antonio Coronado-Ramon or Macario Cerda.
A-6944875, Csorjan, John, or John Robert Chorgan.
A-3182072, Cutugno, Francesco, or Frank Cutugno.
A-1952253, Dapontes, Petros Nicholas (alias Peter or Petros Dapontes).
A-7270796, D'Araujo, Jose Emilio Seabra.
A-6943400, Davidson, Isabella Janet Fleming, or Isabella Janet Fleming Miller.
A-6045780, Davy, Kenneth Conrad, or Kenneth Davy.
A-3875033, Diaz, Julian, or Jose Diaz (alias Manuel Milero or Manuel Melero).
A-2210707, Dominguez, Manuel.
A-5036073, Dooner, Jacqueline Suzanne (nee De Gouy).
A-5920850, Douglas, Emmanuel, or Emanuel Douglas.
A-5126001, Dragovcich, Toma Mate, or Toma Mate Dragovic or Toma Mate Dragovich.
A-6552982, Ellett, Betty Lorraine.
A-4981495, Emerson, Gwendoline Ward, or Gwendolyn Ward Emerson or Gwendolyn Emerson or Gwendolyn Ward.
A-3410074, Epstein, Eva, or Eva Appel.
A-4173831, Eustathiou, Cariofilis Christos, or Costas Stathis or Costas C. Stathis.
A-5796700, Fallis, Dionisios George, or John D. Kostopoulos.
A-4846286, Ferreira, Antonio.
A-6262150, Floratos, Melpomeni.
A-5792026, Frey, Inez Evelyn, formerly Inez Evelyn Monroe formerly Bostrom (alias Wilton or Hagerty alias Clara Barton).
A-4814918, Fridberg, Adolf, or Adolf Freiberg.
A-2448994, Garcia, Pascual Reyes, or Pascual Garcia.
A-6509290, Geannesses, Bethlehem Eustathios (nee Theodoridou).
A-6169069, Geear, Lucy Sabillena.
A-9691044, Gianitsos, Ikovos, or Jack Gianitsos.
A-4991680, Gomez, Pedro Tavares.
A-5821620, Gronholm, Lauri Nikolai, or Lauri Nikolai Holm.
A-4770763, Gronholm, Hedwig Emilia, or Hedwig Emilia Holm.
A-6534349, Grongras, Mejer Jankiel.
A-5604077, Gussen, Elizabeth, or Elisabeth Gussen (nee Otto).
A-6088307, Guzman, Milagros Reyes De.
A-6088308, Guzman, Concepcion Reyes De.
A-6356205, Hodza, Aglaia, or Aglaia Stephanie Hodza or Anka Perishitch or Perichitch or Perischitch or Aglaia S. Hodza.
A-6664889, Hansen, Alida Josiena, or Alida Josiena Hansen (nee Van Der Hoeven or Alida Josina Van Der Hoeven or Mrs. Josie Hansen or Mrs. James K. Hansen).
A-6033751, Hassin, Agreen Bahal, or John Albert Hassen.
A-6078871, Hernandez, Manuel Mata.
A-6935696, Hios, Nicholas Leonida.
A-3607348, Huang, Paul Kuang-Pu, or Kuang-Pu Huang or Paul Huang.
A-6694302, Huang, Jane (nee Sun Chi-Ying or Chi-Ying Sun).
A-6844798, Inhaber, Abraham David.
A-4387911, Jeka, Joseph.
A-5844035, Kadir, Basir Bin.
A-3433599, Kalesky, Alexander George, or Alex George.
A-2851087, Kazanarakis, Nicholas.
A-5758569, Kesses, Stelios, or Stylianos Kesses or Steve Kesses or Alexander S. Tsangas.
A-4804309, Kim, Tey Chun.
A-127351, Kissanis, Nicholas, or Nicolaos Kissanis.
A-6936039, Kokinogenis, Dimitrios Michael.
A-3942064, Kommus, Anton, or Anton Kamus.
A-6067232, Konuk, Faruk.
A-3961638, Koren, Elinor, or Eta Koren.
A-6861979, Korinis, Anastasia Stawros (Stavros) or Tasia (nee Xanthakou or Xanthos).
A-5556158, Kosolapoff, Alexandra Vasali.
A-5674518, Kosticz, William.
A-6736260, Kurs, Taube.
A-5264789, Kvamso, Andrew Larsen, or Andreas Kvamso.
A-3557119, Lambrakis, Othesseas Demetrios, or Odyssea or Odysseas Dimitrios Lambrakis.
A-3556992, Lambrakis, Ekaterini, or Ekaterini Odyssea Lambrakis (nee Mihou).
A-7362107, Langford, James, formerly Jacques Roger Madeline.
A-6606615, Langsam, Arthur or Artur.
A-6510013, Langsam, Esther or Estera (nee Szusterman).
A-2102837, Laskarides, Sava Nicholas, or Sava F. Pashalides.
A-6357996, Lazaros, Archondia Apostel, or Archondia Apostel Combitchi or Archondia Apostel Tsamiadis.
A-1736425, Lederer, Stephania.
A-6671936, Licick, Elena, or Elena Boorkova or Elena Dormady or Elena Alexandrovna Dormady or Elena Alexandrouna Dormady or Elena Alexandria Dormady or Elena Aleksandrovna Burkova-Dormady.
A-4845878, Lima, Luiz Antonio Fernandes, or Louis F. Lima.
A-4071652, Lindsell, Adline Chrystal Lee.
A-4620132, Lopes, Manuel Maria Gomes, or Manuel Gomes Lopes.
A-6080998, Lopez, Joaquim Wakeley.
A-6080996, Lopez, Jose Wakeley.
A-6988012, Lubline, Annie (nee Annie (Chaja Henia) Lederman).
A-6538668, Luck, Eroeda Sinitskaya.
A-6237166, Lui, Bick Yoo Goo, formerly Bick Yoo Goo Wong or Goobick You or Rosa Goo Bick Yoo.
A-7083003, Luz, Visitacion Medina, or Visitacion Medina (maiden name).
A-6827610, Madouros, Panagiotis Demitrios.
A-2899025, Marginean, Gheorghe, or George Marginean.
A-6661990, Markus, Isidore, or Donald Markus.
A-3417994, Marshal, Leonard Ethelbert.
A-5625326, Mate, John, or Janos Mate.
A-5600956, Melendez, Viviana Diaz de.
A-6567206, Messier, Vassiliki (nee Economopoulos or Pertopoulou (former marriage)).
A-9825003, Mezzina, Francesco, or Francis or Franssesco.
A-3875186, Michitsch, John Frank, or John Michitsch or Joe Michitsch.
A-1324481, Mahalko, Mihal.
A-2578102, Miskic, Srecko Felix.
A-4340550, Miyagishima, Shizuko.
A-6916063, Muller, Artur.
A-6874300, Najat, Ali.
A-6874301, Najat, Mahin (nee Behbehani).
A-6471830, Nenopoulos, Constantine Demetrios.
A-6590295, Neuman, Benjamin.
A-6030497, Niamonitakis, Petros.
A-9066537, Nicas, Evangelos Panagiotis.
A-7049987, Nieto, Luis, or Luis Nieto Nieto.
A-5172081, Nino-Rivera, Abraham.
A-6911846, Olson, Johanna Sophie, or Johanna Faffie Johnson or Johanna Faffie Olson or Jeanette Johnson or Johanna Forseth or Forsyth.
A-6555158, Oxley, Barry Graham.
A-9776708, Pace, Mario.
A-1736783, Panorgios, Constantinos Nicholas, or Constandinos Nicholas Panorgios or Nicholaos Panorgios or Panorios.
A-4265030, Parna, George, or Georg Parna or Georg Bernstein.
A-6760696, Peckinpaugh, Julia Amparo (nee Ruiz; Julia Amparo Ruiz Urbina).
A-9605696, Penn, James Walter.
A-7578905, Perez, Isaac Cohen.
A-7138082, Perrini, Adriano.
A-2914650, Perry, Rocco Luigi, or Louis Perri or Lewis Perre.

A-6751522, Pekier, Abraham.
A-6609654, Photopoulos, Anastassios Sotirious.
A-5396114, Pila, Manuel, or Tony Morin.
A-5669746, Pistolis, Christos Serafim, or Christ Pistolis.
A-6249435, Protopapas, Assimina (nee Georgandas; Assimina Protos).
A-5035437, Ramon, Emilia Fayos, or Mother Virginia De San Jose.
A-9694038, Rasmussen, Finn.
A-4952610, Ribeiro, Armando.
A-6409507, Riccardi, Francesco or Frank.
A-4365329, Ricelli, William Frederick or Guglielmo Frederico Ricelli.
A-2173987, Roberts, Richard Ellis.
A-7080693, Rodrigues, Jose Lopes, or Jose Lopes.
A-2652959, Rodriguez, Antonio, or Antonio Jesus Rodriguez Bernardez.
A-3412462, Romeo, Francesco Antonio, or Tony Chiodo.
A-3222900, Rose, Karl.
A-3218438, Rose, Katrine, or Katherine Rose (Nee Kalns).
A-6829517, Rosenberg, Sandor, or Saul Rosenberg or Alexandre Rosenberg.
A-3490835, Rovis, Matteo, or Matthew Rovis.
A-7295921, Robert, Lucy Ann, or Sysiana Rubert or Luciana Rubert.
A-6243670, Ruhman, Smil.
A-3327484, Sabbaz, Guido Rota.
A-7622399, Sanchez y Gomez, Jose Carlos.
A-4184335, Sanchez, Rose (nee Alfaro).
A-9527243, Schmidt, Viggo John.
A-1488401, Scoufarides, Bertha (nee Schalme or Salme or Mary Scoufarides).
A-5927179, Sawich, Sam, or Simeon or Simon Sawich or Simeon or Simon or Sam Savich.
A-1032035, Seremelis, John, or John Seramis or Soramos.
A-3441764, Sherwin, Stanley, or Stanley Sherwinter.
A-6173664, Silva, Antonio Maria Armes.
A-5630437, Smalley, Stanley.
A-9736292, Snel, Lambertus Jan, or Lambert John Snell.
A-4691185, Solaas, Peter Olai, or Peder Olai Solaas.
A-7082893, Spazierer, Sigrid.
A-2401376, Spisak, Yuraj, or George Spisak.
A-6402173, Stauber, Elisabeth.
A-2093093, Stemmler, Frederick William.
A-6782507, Stone, Eliza (nee Eliza Sperling).
A-3525122, Sumi, Kazuye.
A-5488011, Sumi, Yone (nee Shimada, formerly Yone Yasumatsu).
A-4250745, Takahasi, Kengo, or Kengo Takahasi.
A-4492568, Takeda, Shiro.
A-2661142, Tembeckjian, Rosa.
A-1343090, Thalmessinger, Katharina Barbara (nee Schwartz).
A-5565387, Torre, Giacomo La, or Paul Solitro.
A-4686500, Trahos, Evangelos, or Evangelos Michael Trahos or Evangelos Trachos.
A-6904260, Trethewey, Samuel.
A-3899460, Vallo, Alberta (nee Alberta Gribaudo, alias Alberta Rossato).
A-5728947, Van Beek, John Leonard.
A-7038208, Varon, Lillie Fortuna, or Fortuna Varon.
A-7711756, Vasquez, Basilia (nee Hernandez y Robaina).
A-1638598, Veloudos, Vasilios Nicholas (alias Vasilios Veloudos).
A-7251953, Vidoz, Umberto Luciano.
A-5134828, Villar, Augustin Tolentino, or Augustin Vilar Tolentino.
A-6978197, Villarreal, Maria Luisa.
A-5626264, Watanabe, Sin, or Shinichiro Nomura.
A-6543899, Wilson, Cecely Hamilton, formerly France (nee Margaret Cecely Hamilton).
A-4687567, Woo, Ji Yah.
A-5973807, Yakabi, Shinei, or Arthur Shinei Yakabi or Arturo Shiney Yakabi Shiroma.
A-3472326, Yanagida, Tadashi.
A-3642010, Yuen, Chin, or Yuen Chin.
A-4219955, Zech, Edmund Albert.
A-7210155, Almeida, Maria Fernanda, or Maria Fernanda Carvalho.
A-5627992, Alonso, Victor Valentin, or Valentin Alonso.
A-4499803, Ameling, Karel Lodewyk, or Carl Ameling.
A-6983571, Austin, Arnold Leclerc, or Leslie Austin.
A-7071709, Bahre, Henry, or Enrico Granata.
A-6420107, Bertalan, Imre, or Imre George Bertalan.
A-5276461, Bertini, Guido.
A-5026304, Blasco, Lawrence, or Lawrence or Lorenzo Blasco Burgues.
A-5695775, Bonino, Maria Josefina, or Maria Villadonga or Maria Perez Pena or Maria Cuevas Zequeira.
A-2594546, Brown, Ruth (nee Zwick).
A-1121855, Caburrosso, John.
A-4658499, Cacciotti, Giuseppe, or Giuseppe Francesco Cacciotti or Joseph Cacciotti.
A-4965418, Caky, Michael or Chaiky (alias George Haki).
A-6758296, Capitani, Maria Di Sora (alias Maria Di Sora (maiden name)).
A-6391117, Cawley, Kenneth Earl.
A-5302785, Celis, Luis, or Luis Urbano Celis or Louis Urbano or Luis Urbano.
A-4584719, Chalhoub, Nagibe, or Josie Chalhoub or Nagibe Rahme (maiden name).
A-6732042, Changeat, Emile Louis, or Emile Changeat.
A-6498867, Chong, Wong Park.
A-6309757, Cohen, Dudley.
A-7371739, Corpuz, Isabel Acoba, or Isable Soriano Acoba (maiden name).
A-6305684, Cukrovany, Stefan, or Stefan Cukrovani.
A-6931255, Dawkins, Septimus Alexander, or Alexander Dawkins.
A-5699550, De Marco, Victor (or Vittorio).
A-7203347, Der Hagopian, Rosa (nee Tahmazian, formerly Baronian).
A-3301469, Ditt, Herbert Horst.
A-6440109, Dorfman, Roza Malcmann, or Malcmann Rosa.
A-779793, Downing, Sara Elonia Miranda, or Sara Eloina Downing.
A-6210806, Du Pre, Frits Karel.
A-2472907, Eldreos, John, or Joannis Stephanos Ydreos.
A-5830872, Ekonompoulos, Alexandros Constantine, or Alexander Constantine Economopoulos.
A-9777404, Emilio, Francesco.
A-9579078, Emmanuel, Demitrios, or Demitrios Emanuel.
A-1440812, Espich, Hugo Anton, or Hugo Espich or Espech.
A-6047724, Ferjado-Fernandez, Arturo Rafael.
A-5876133, Fernandez, Albert Eguerre.
A-6896406, Franchetti, Arnaldo Sergio, or Arnold S. Franchetti or Arnoldo Franchetti or Arnold Franchetti.
A-6534845, Frydman, Henryk, or Henry M. Friedman.
A-6817361, Frydman, Rozsa, or Rozsa Friedman.
A-4928591, Gabrys, Hermann, or Hermann Bujar.
A-5060074, Gantner, John, or John Gus Gantner or John Ganther (Gentner).
A-5125182, Gantner, Elizabeth.
A-5104593, Gantner, Mary.
A-6559003, Garcia, Annie Catherine, or Mrs. Justo Garcia.
A-7189124, Gath, Linda.
A-6246455, Geornaras, Malama (nee Hadjoglou or Hatzolu).
A-3552287, Geragosian, Nevart, formerly Garabedian (nee Boyajian).
A-3870697, Gomes, Anselmo Ferreira, or Gomez or Jose De Oliveira Jorge.
A-1644382, Gonos, Wasyl, or William Gonos.
A-6144167, Grammer, Patricia Ricken Yoder, or Patricia Turing Ricken.
A-7115309, Gravagna, Blanche Raymond Niel, or Blanche Raymonde Niel.
A-6702000, Gross, Gabriella Colanzi (alias Gabryella Colanzi).
A-6321100, Guardia, Eduardo Antonio.
A-7117921, Guinkh, Boris Nicolaevich.
A-6021692, Habon, Hans Heinrich Jacob, or Hans Jacob Harbon.
A-6225977, Hanson, Margaret Ruth (nee Lorbeer or Grete Lorbeer).
A-5934382, Harada, Mitaka Matsumoto.
A-1789220, Heckel, Martha Magdalena, or Martha Magdalena Rath.
A-2723970, Hofbauer, Jakob.
A-3451353, Hoffnung, Golda, or Olga Hoffnung.
A-1081271, Houmis, Michael George, or Michael G. Houmis or Makis or Mike Houmis.
A-2851702, Huseby, Trygve Teodor.
A-1418301, Itam, Abraham Bin, or Ibrahim Bin Itam or Itam Ibrahim Bin or Ebrahim Bin Etam or Abraham Itam.
A-6707951, Jacob, Joseph Shalom.
A-6653514, Jeffrey, Marie Olivia Winnifred (nee Teague alias Irene Happ).
A-6256125, Joannopoulos, Dimitris John.
A-7379728, Kam, Yip.
A-3241577, Kaponis, Dimitros, or James Kaponis.
A-3808434, Kappatos, Savas.
A-6459288, Karelis, Ioannis, or John Karelis.
A-3752876, Kenny, James Michael.
A-6319312, Kingham, Noreen Mavis.
A-7222123, Koers, Lillian Christine.
A-7137650, Kolkman, Angela Elisabeth (nee Van Megen).
A-7092900, Kornbluth, Abraham, or Abraham Kornbluth Herman.
A-6501324, Koukos, Helen, or Eleni Spirou or Helen Spirou.
A-5796785, Kracht, Otto Ernst.
A-4453274, Kramedas, George Theodore, or George Thero Kramedas.
A-6299978, Kuhne, Elva Dolores.
A-5343835, Kump, Andrej, or Frank Kurtz.
A-4777078, Ladas, Peter George, formerly Panagiotis George.
A-4777077, Ladas, Helen, formerly Helen Nicholarakos or Nicholas (alias Irene Solirakis).
A-4621787, Lazaroff, Nicholas, or Nick Lazaroff (alias Thomas Lewis).
A-5028604, Lefebre, Julia Maris (nee Julia Maria Desmedt).
A-52811149, Lehtinen, Oscar Teofil.
A-5228902, Leventis, Nicholas Denis.
A-7529337, Li, Yu Yuk.
A-6622846, Lindenfeld, Sandor, or Samuel Lindenfeld or Alex Lindenfeld.
A-7240709, Lionetti, Maria Carmela (nee Turi).
A-3066963, Liosatos, Gerasimos Aristides, or Jerry Liosatos.
A-6661701, Lombard, Theodora Dino.
A-6477399, Loria, Mauricette Louise Jeanne (nee Alliot).
A-1615319, Lueckert, Barbara (nee Glanzner).
A-6853289, Lynum, Lourdes J. Lynum, formerly Lourdes Jumalon-Simbajon.
A-1127465, Maher, Thomas.
A-2148511, Marinos, Harry Tony.
A-3688108, Martineau, Theodore Francis.
A-6774228, Mason, Isabel Stuart Robinson (nee McFayden).
A-1121312, Mastor, Louis Constanine, or Louis C. Mastor or Louis Mastor.
A-6870022, Mastracchio, Michele, or Michael Mastracchio.
A-5578929, Matacin, Anton, or Ante or Tony Matacin or T. Matsoni or Ante Sam Matacin.

A-5768024, Matsushita, Hiroshi, or Hiroshi Oshima or Harry Oshima.
A-3410834, Mavrophilippa, John Christos, or John G. Mavrophilippas.
A-7204907, McCrae, Hugh.
A-7204908, McCrae, Frances (nee Beckett).
A-3797247, Mee, Jung, or Charlie Jung Mee or Wing Lee.
A-7240364, Merlo, Remo.
A-6778414, Mezenen, Maud Evelyn.
A-5344056, Mitchell, John Edmund.
A-2787649, Mohammed, Alli Harris, or Hazir Ullah.
A-6861356, Morel, Nelly Christiane Renee.
A-6053634, Morris III, Garnet Green.
A-5362114, Mougingianis, George, or George Nicholas Mouginis.
A-5977624, Nakamatsu, Yako.
A-6153136, Nakamatsu, Natsue.
A-1302576, Nazarian, Virginia, or Verkine Nazarian or Verkine Tchiboutijian.
A-7081140, Newcomer, Jenifer Rosalind, or Jenifer Rosalind Dunn.
A-6806097, Nicolaidis, Kiriakos, or Jack Nicolson.
A-5359112, Nilsen, Alf Sigurd, or Alf Nelson or Nielson.
A-6615139, Oberlin, Betty, or Betti Obarzanek, originally Vita Kader.
A-1638250, O'Brien, Michael, or Michael Joseph O'Brien.
A-7367206, Oja, Gudbjorg Sigurdardottir (nee Gudbjorg Sigurdardottir).
A-5755068, Oostrom, Johannes or John.
A-7387848, Pellerin, Wilfrid Stanislaus.
A-7387849, Pellerin, Edward.
A-7387850, Pellerin, Maria Irene Gisele.
A-6343325, Perez-Flores, Gregoria, or Gregoria Perez De Untalan.
A-7243457, Peristera, Elena, or Helene Peristera.
A-3505307, Petro, Spiro Kiriaki, or Spiro Kiriaki Petrev alias S. Kereakoff.
A-5055158, Pinou, Sideris George.
A-4430165, Piscitello, Antonio.
A-1443075, Packaj, Guiseppe, or Joseph Pockaj.
A-5146482, Pokern, Otto Max, or Otto Cutes.
A-3854236, Polis, Jerry, or Gerasimos Polis.
A-3509040, Puttiah, Govind.
A-5999030, Rabineau, Boris Alexander.
A-1204743, Ragaisis, George Joseph, or George Rogers.
A-6989893, Reitter, Nicholas, or Miklos Reitter.
A-2958674, Repetto, Giovanni Francesco Luigi.
A-4889799, Richardson, John Thomas Romney, or Romney Richardson.
A-7593116, Rinde, Reile (nee Kanner).
A-7593117, Rinde, Esther.
A-3310362, Romanos, Dimitrios, or James Romanos.
A-1121849, Runga, Peter Kaska.
A-6680112, Saade, Doumet Milad.
A-6924329, Salovardos, George Konstantinos.
A-9550708, Salutregui, Francisco Opitz.
A-3947804, Schall, Josefine Marie.
A-9825060, Scharenguivel, Lorensz Neil.
A-7295470, Scherping, Renee Felicitas Victoria Dorthy, or Filicitas Wipfelder or Renee Filicitas or Victoria Dorothy Wipfelder.
A-4363752, Schmuckler, Herman, or Chanania Schumuckler or Herman Wagner.
A-3786143, Silvestre, Antonio Bernardo, or Antonio Bernardo Silvestra or Tony Silvestre or Antonio B. Silvestrel or Anthony Bernardo Silvestra.
A-4287330, Simon, Juliane (nee Juliane Baldasty or Julianna Simon).
A-6936604, Singer, Paul, or Pavel Singer or Pal Singer.
A-9549867, Sivertsen, Ivar Anker.
A-6839266, Skotis, Emmanuel or Emmanual, Emmanouel or Emmanouel Skottis.
A-6985723, Staleri, Caterina.
A-5439542, Stefania, Michele, or Mike or Michael Stefano or Michele Stefania Di Matteo or Michele Stephania.
A-7264358, Suchar, Wilfred, formerly Wilfried Skambraks.
A-3222143, Sugihara, Kyuichi.
A-4764913, Suhr, Hans, or Joseph Winkelmeier.
A-4289946, Svanholm, Herman.
A-2858962, Sydiaha, William, or Wasil Sydiaha.
A-3976730, Szedula, Barbara Anne.
A-5244385, Tarabocchia, Andrea Giovanni
A-6599691, Tornacioglu, Nubar Markar.
A-3844856, Tsoy, Victor Nichalos, or Victor Ghoi.
A-5880951, Urgent, Lillian Elisabeth.
A-6569447, Vallega, Attilio, or Attilio Pietro Angelo.
A-5755011, Van Bruinisse, Cornelis.
A-7034642, Van Bruinisse, Cornelis, Jr.
A-6927691, Vathis, Georgios, or Georgios Stelianos Vathis or Georges Stelianos Vathis.
A-6374182, Vega, Luz Mercedes, formerly Garcia (nee Ramirez).
A-7132186, Vourdahas, Kanella Elias, or Kanella Vourdachas (nee Kanella Constantinou Siminos).
A-7297145, Westergreen, Karin Karin Kownatzki.
A-4945683, Wiitainoja, Vaino Johan, or John Williams.
A-4581076, Wittleder, Magdalena (nee Gantner).
A-7780569, Wong, Frederick.
A-3608126, Xirichs, Panagiotis, or Pete Yirichs.
A-1425930, Yeramian, Ruth, or Hrut Yeremyan.
A-4007837, Yow, Lee Kim, or George K. Lee.
A-5709418, Zamboni, Guido, or Guy Zamboni.
A-2190686, Aguado, David.
A-4493884, Ahrens, Gerhard Wilhelm.
A-2721939, Anastasiou, George Evangelos, or Georgios Evangelos Anastasiou.
A-5912560, Anderson, Eric Gottfried.
A-1750257, Beglau, William, or William Martin Beglau.
A-3822893, Blank, Ethel, or Tania Blank.
A-3395469, Borges, Armando Da Silva, or Carlos Da Silva Chaves.
A-3295277, Capanna, Francesco or Frank, or Frank Campo.
A-1332341, Capurro, Antonio, or Anthony Capurro.
A-5420130, Caraman, Gavrila, or Gabriel Caraman.
A-1258576, Carnazza, Stefano.
A-3107035, Caroli, Gina.
A-6594631, Catania, Antonino.
A-2674808, Chao, William Tse Fong.
A-5621625, Claus, Friedrich Georg August, or Fritz or Fred Claus.
A-9782995, Colucci, Giovanni.
A-3248009, Cunha, Antonio Jose.
A-5555835, Dangerfield, Ethel Margaret.
A-6623572, D'Avanzo, America (nee Granados).
A-1954509, Daveggia, Francesco, or Frank Daveggia.
A-7061449, De Ascentis, Luigina, or Gina De Ascentis (nee Isicrate).
A-6924544, Dieminger, Elisabeth.
A-3454946, Di Gregorio, Margherita, or Margaret Di Gregorio.
A-2965674, Dobrich, Raimondo.
A-9506856, Dzintars, Janis Adolfs.
A-6882402, Ericksen, Elmar, or Elmar Eriksen.
A-7131173, Fillebrown, Gloria, or Gloria Valhuerdi Fillebrown or Gloria Margarita Valhuerdi Rodriguez.
A-9765008, Gavilis, Evstathios, or Steve Gabriel.
A-7203646, Gee, Betty Yiu Yue.
A-6075131, Genato, Manuel, or Manuel Genato-Muniz.
A-6525854, Gillette, Tatiana, or Tatiana Hakoljsky or Tatiana Addinsell.
A-1200451, Gomes, Agostinho Pereira.
A-7117697, Gordon, Ada Jane (nee Rothery).
A-6986657, Grosinger, Emeric.
A-2998484, Gruter, Gertrude, or Gertrud Grueter or Gertrud Fieles or Gertrud Kallen.
A-6382968, Ingber, Miklos.
A-3397664, Isakson, Hilda, or Hilda Bodbacks or Hilda Mangs or Anna Emilia Aman.
A-7182640, Kee, Eng Wah, or Paul Wah Eng.
A-7055543, Kickinger, Bernd Herman, or Bernd Teodorski.
A-5714331, Kiritsis, George Spiros, or George Kiritsis.
A-7070295, Kirsch, Alfred, or Alfredo Kirsch.
A-2883903, Kolydas, Ioannis Nickolas, or John Nickolas Kolydas.
A-6470795, Kornreich, Alfred, or Fred Virski.
A-6787923, Kwandel, Rozalia.
A-5523200, Laizner, Elizabeth Bertha Johanna Maximiliana (alias Lilli Laizner).
A-4912277, Lieberman, Eleanor, or Sara Brewda (nee Ana Meteliza or Meteliz).
A-4879322, Lopez, Bautista Vidal.
A-6986579, Mandelcorn, Helen Bertha (nee Neiman).
A-5877879, Meza, Jose.
A-3184809, Miranda, Tommaso.
A-3513743, Moenkemeyer, Heinz Hermann Karl.
A-3127484, Mora-Monterde, Alfonso, or Alfonso Mora.
A-5819169, Much, Helmut Paul.
A-7140771, Nen, Dei (alias Dai Nom or Tai Nom or Tai Nam or Tao Nan, alias Daniel Man).
A-7054920, Pappaiounou, Stavros George, or Steve G. Milford, Steve G. Rogers, or Steve George Rogers.
A-3115100, Pefanis, Gerasimos Makris, or Gerry Pefanis.
A-2469645, Pinto, Manuel Amorim.
A-1731911, Praet, Catherine.
A-1731912, Praet, Elias.
A-6706842, Pressley, Johanna Wilhelmina (nee Post).
A-6343692, Prodromou, Despina Vasilios.
A-4774635, Rahme, Tanios Elias, or Tom Elias Ramy.
A-1107914, Reha, John Evald, or Johannes Reha or Johannes Evald Reha.
A-6440484, Salabaing, Jacques Louis.
A-6965219, Salbaing, Madeleine Jeannine (nee Pallet).
A-4550233, Salem, Ahmed, or Ahemed Zabadany.
A-5089179, Sandler, Mollie, or Malka Sandler.
A-6954908, Servaas, Pieter Johannes, or Johannes Pieter Servaas.
A-4738546, Silva Carlos.
A-1994522, Siskopoulos, Athanasios George, or Tom Poulos.
A-6082637, Skiles, Lucy Mequila, or Lucy Skiles.
A-2354865, Soleh, Yousef Chen, or Lobia Soleh.
A-2070791, Sorce, Calogero or Charles.
A-7270946, Spinazzola, Antonio.
A-3901575, Sysok, William Stefan, or Stefan Tonasiczuk.
A-7131451, Szemerei, Bela Matkovics, or Bela Lajox Szemerei Matkovics or Bela Matkovics.
A-7398471, Tiberi, Angelo.
A-3160761, Toivonen, Albert, or Alexander Trivonen.
A-3285837, Tong, Hee.
A-3447163, Tuscher, Fritz-Friedrich, or Friedrich Tuscher or Fritz Fred Tuscher.
A-7375577, Whittemore, Brigitta, or Brigitta Deitelhoff.
A-1246506, Yobis, Christ Vasil, or Krste Vasili Yovis.
A-9769599, Zanni, Giovanni, or Giovanni Rossi.
A-6936292, Ziskind, Rubin.
A-6877593, Fokas, Panagis, or Panachia Phokas or Pete Fokas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 878. A bill for the relief of Umberto Randaccio;

S. 879. A bill for the relief of Luigi Podesta; and

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Ann Lamplugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 881. A bill for the relief of the Reverend John T. MacMullen; and

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Maswood Bakht Chowdhury, Miftahuj Jaman or Pirut Miah, Nosib Ali, Asoddar Ali, Abdul Karim, Konor Ali, Sogone Ali, Rofiquc Uddin Chowdhury, Abdul Rohim, Harun Chowdory, and Sunafor Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 883. A bill for the relief of Dr. F. Homburger;

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan;

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Wong Thew Hor;

S. 886. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll; and

S. 887. A bill for the relief of Eva Maria Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 888. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Forces.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Hara Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympeha Shpak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Kirill Mihailovich Alexeev, Antonia Ivanovano Alexeev and minor children, Victoria and Vladimir Alexeev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY), introduced Senate bill 891, to provide additional exemptions from the income tax for persons in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILLIAMS introduced Senate bill 892, to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide special income tax treatment for cooperative corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 893. A bill for the relief of Myron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 894. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 895. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yau Shum Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 896. A bill to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 897. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Melios, Michel Melios, and Hermine Fahnl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 898. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 899. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the United States of the Confederate Cemetery at Fayetteville, Ark., and providing for its care and maintenance; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 900. A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 901. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 902. A bill for the relief of Raymond H. Hempel;

S. 903. A bill making the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to certain hearings in the Post Office Department;

S. 904. A bill for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi;

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Marie Kristine Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 907. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Montana with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; and

S. 908. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Maud Door Whiteman; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Bernhard Buchal and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 910. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier; and

S. 912. A bill for the relief of Yoon Soon Kang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 913. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 34, relative to the number of United States troops to be sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to direct the United States Maritime Commission to sell a laid-up Liberty-type vessel from the United States reserve fleet to Panagos Diamanti Pateras, a citizen of Greece; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS FROM INCOME TAX OF PERSONS IN ACTIVE SERVICE OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a system of special income-tax exemptions for all men in the armed services, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared briefly explaining the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 891) to provide additional exemptions from the income tax for persons in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROVIDING INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

I am today introducing legislation providing special income-tax relief for all men in the armed services. This measure would eliminate the present system of allowing exemptions only for personnel in combat zones.

Under the formula that I am proposing all enlisted personnel and officers would be allowed a $300 additional personal income-tax exemption and an additional exemption of $100 for each dependent, exclusive of spouse.

While the exemptions provided are sufficiently large so that very few enlisted men will have to pay any income taxes, this bill reestablishes the principle that every American has a responsibility toward support of the Government. Instead of making a broad declaration that enlisted men as a group are wholly exempt from responsibility to support the Government, this bill reaffirms that individual responsibility. At the same time it recognizes that as a practical matter, enlisted men who are making a very special sacrifice for the country, frequently at great personal cost and hardship and for a relatively small amount of pay, are entitled to greater income-tax exemptions than are allowed civilians.

As far as officer personnel is concerned, this measure provides that exemptions for officers with fewer than three dependents would be somewhat lower than was provided in the last war.

The provisions of this legislation would be applicable in the cases of all personnel who serve at least 90 days on active duty or to individuals who are discharged less than 90 days after service because of service-connected disability.

I am aware that special income-tax relief has been granted to personnel in combat zones. However, with the rapid expansion of our Armed Forces and with the even greater expansion that is contemplated, it seems apparent to me that this Congress

must alleviate inevitable hardship by extending to all members of the armed services special income-tax relief.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN INEQUITIES IN INCOME-TAX LAWS RELATING TO COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to repeal certain inequities in the income-tax laws as related to cooperative organizations, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 892) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide special income-tax treatment for cooperative corporations, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That—

(a) Repeal of exemption of cooperatives from income tax on corporations: Section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code are repealed.

(b) Imposition of income tax and computation of income—

(1) Technical amendments: Section 4 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(m) Cooperative Corporations—Supplement V."

(2) Taxation of cooperatives: Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 a new supplement reading as follows:

"Supplement V—Cooperative Corporations

"Sec. 431. Tax of cooperative corporations.

"(a) In general.—

"(1) Cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter the term 'cooperative corporation' means a corporation (A) that calls itself a 'cooperative' or 'co-op', or (B) that represents to any persons or classes of persons which deal with it that their patronage will or may entitle them (i) to the payment, either actually or constructively, of patronage dividends, or (ii) to an equity interest in any of the corporation's assets, or (C) that is otherwise operated for the mutual benefit of persons or classes of persons that deal with it; but such term does not include a mutual insurance company or any corporation exempt under section 101.

"(2) Net income: In computing the net income of a cooperative corporation there shall be excluded patronage dividends paid or payable to patrons, but only if—

"(A) The activities of such corporation during the whole of the taxable year did not extend beyond (i) marketing commodities acquired solely from members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, or (ii) selling goods or commodities to, or performing services for, members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such sales or services;

"(B) The patronage dividends are paid in money exclusively not later than sixty days after the close of the taxable year, and there are no conditions either precedent or subsequent as to the application or use of such money by the members;

"(C) Such patronage dividends are derived exclusively from marketing commodities acquired from members, or the sale of goods or commodities to, or performance of services for, members, or from transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, sales, or services; and

"(D) Such patronage dividends are paid to each member solely on the basis of the amount of commodities acquired from such member or the amount of goods or commodities sold to, or services performed for, such member, as the case may be; and are not denied to any member because of the limited extent of his transactions, or conditioned upon his retaining or presenting evidence of his transactions.

"(3) Gross receipts: The gross receipts from the sales of goods or services used in computing the gross income of a cooperative corporation shall be determined without the exclusion or subtraction of any patronage dividends, paid or payable to patrons.

"(4) Cost of products bought from producers: In determining the cost to a cooperative corporation of products sold to it by a producer for resale (whether or not in their original form), only amounts, other than patronage dividends, paid or payable to such producer on account of such sales shall be used in computing such cost unless under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the corporation establishes that the application of this paragraph would more clearly reflect income, in which case the prevailing market price on sales of such products by producers, or the amounts, including patronage dividends, paid or payable in money on account of such sales, whichever is the lesser, shall be used in determining the cost to the corporation of such products so sold to it for resale.

"(5) PATRONAGE DIVIDEND.—For the purposes of this chapter the term 'patronage dividend' means an allocation or a distribution paid or payable (whether or not in money and whether described as a refund, rebate, price adjustment, or payment of a balance due under a marketing agreement) to member patrons or to member and nonmember patrons on some basis related to their sales to or purchases from the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditioned (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus.

"(6) Member of cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered a member of a cooperative corporation only if such person is entitled to exercise voting rights and meets such requirements for membership as are prescribed by the cooperative."

(c) Information returns required of cooperatives: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting between sections 148 and 149 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 148A. Information by cooperatives.

"(a) Payments of patronage dividends, refunds, or rebates: Every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall, when required by the Commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds, stating the name and address of each member in the association, and the amount of payments paid to each member and patron.

"(b) Accumulated earnings and profits: When requested by the Commissioner, every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall forward to him a correct statement of accumulated earnings and profits, including patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds allocated to, but not paid in cash to, members and patrons, and the names and addresses of members and patrons who would be entitled to the same if divided or distributed, and the amounts that would be payable to each."

(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

This is the same proposal as was presented to the Senate last year on August 25 and to which the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, on August 31, made the specific promise that this question would receive the consideration of his committee at this session of the Congress.

In introducing this bill I recognize that legislation of this type cannot originate in the Senate. It is my intention to reintroduce this measure as an amendment to the first revenue producing measure which comes to the Senate from the House. I am introducing this in the form of a bill at this time only in order that the Senate Finance Committee might give consideration to this subject in advance.

This is only one of the many loopholes in our existing tax structure and I trust the Senate Finance Committee will at the same time re-examine the tax exemption of the numerous charitable, educational, and religious organizations.

Needless to say, my previous proposal to repeal the present special tax exemptions enjoyed by the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress will also be offered to the first tax bill considered by the Senate.

NUMBER OF TROOPS TO BE SENT TO EUROPE UNDER NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution relating to the number of United States troops to be sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) relating to the number of United States troops to be sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution relative to the number of United States troops to be sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty

Resolved, etc., That the United States Senate and House of Representatives, reaffirming their belief that the central purpose of the Atlantic pact is the prevention of war, reposing special trust and confidence in the ability and integrity of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, and recognizing that the major American defense effort should be through the United States Air Force and the United States Navy, herewith approves the sending under present conditions of a limited number of United States troops (as well

as other United States Armed Forces) to serve in Europe as a minor fraction of the total armed forces created under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty: *Provided*, That—

(1) The Joint Chiefs of Staff certify their decision that each such assignment of United States troops is essential to the security of the United States.

(2) The Joint Chiefs of Staff further certify that the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have made a definite and dependable commitment that they are giving, and will continue to give full, realistic force and effect to the requirement of article 3 of said treaty that "by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid" they will "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack," specifically insofar as the creation of combat units is concerned.

(3) There be hereby established a Joint Congressional Committee on Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty to consist of nine Senators, five of whom shall be appointed from the majority party and four of whom shall be appointed from the minority party, and nine Representatives, five of whom shall be appointed from the majority party and four of whom shall be appointed from the minority party, said committee to be charged with continuous supervision of all steps taken by the United States in implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty and to receive the certifications by the Joint Chiefs of Staff set forth in subsection (1) and (2) of this resolution. The Senate membership of said joint committee shall be appointed from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services and the House membership shall be appointed from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL ITALIAN ALIENS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 663) to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality, introduced by me on January 25, 1951, be reprinted, and the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 511) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of officers discharged from the armed services, and that it be referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

It is the sense of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that this measure properly comes within the scope and jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS OF APPOINTED MEMBERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 682) to exempt the appointed members of the National Advisory Councils for the National Institutes of Health from certain provisions of the criminal laws and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the sense of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that this measure properly comes within the scope and jurisdiction of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF SHIPMENT OF WAR-USEFUL MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA AND KOREA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution urging our State Department to exert all efforts to persuade allied nations to discontinue shipment of war-useful materials to Communist China and Korea, and I ask that a statement bearing upon this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas United Nations Armed Forces, among them troops from Great Britain and other United Nations members, as well as land, air, and sea forces of the United States, are engaged in hostilities with, and have suffered great casualties at the hands of, Communist forces of North Korea and China, who are allied with and receiving both moral and material support from Russia; and

Whereas despite this fact many of the nations allied with the United States for the avowed purpose of stopping further Communist aggression are still supplying highly strategic and other much-needed products to these enemy countries, directly or with full knowledge that the shipments ultimately are for delivery to Communist governments, and may well be used to kill or maim members of their own or of their allies, fighting forces; and

Whereas Communist China has been branded by the United Nations as an aggressor in Korea, following urgent demand for such action by the Congress of the United States, with the Senate recorded unanimously on the matter by a 91-to-0 vote: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States declares that it is the sense of this body that such sales and deliveries of strategic or other products that contribute directly or indirectly to the fighting potential of these Communist nations are a threat to the continued security of the United States and other free nations, and should be discontinued as such.

SEC. 2. That the United States Department of State be directed to exhaust every effort to impress upon all such nations that continuance of such trade is contrary to the best interests of the people of this Nation, and is giving aid and comfort to our enemies to the point where its continuance is not only inconsistent with every concept of allied unity and mutual assistance but is indefensible on moral grounds as well.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

The tension created by present world conditions has led to heavy expenditures by our own Nation as well as by our allied nations in rearmament to prepare for war or to maintain such strength as would discourage other nations from seeking to war on the United States and the Western European countries. Toward this end, the United States has borne by far the heaviest financial burden and for the past few years has provided not only economic aid and military supplies in huge amounts to its allies in Western Europe, but has undertaken, and carried on almost single-handedly for an extended period, the containment of Communist aggression in Korea.

Such rearmament and such resistance to Red aggression is being undermined by the fact that our allies abroad are to some extent continuing to supply the Communist countries with materials which enable them to keep their war machines in operation. The Senate Committee on Export Controls has pointed out that large amounts of strategic supplies have been shipped to China from the United States until as late as December 1950 when, through the efforts of the committee, a stop was put on all shipments to Red China from the United States.

The subcommittee has not hesitated to criticize our own Government and businessmen for participating in and permitting such trade practices, so that if we criticize our western allies, it is not without the knowledge that our own Government and businessmen have likewise been responsible in the past of similar practices. In one respect, we feel that the United States has gone much further than our allies abroad. We have definitely taken a strong position on restrictions of known trade to the Soviet bloc. It is discouraging, however, that our Western European allies have not taken as strong a position, and we find that these Western European nations to whom we are supplying military supplies and economic aid paid by American taxpayers have profited at our expense by selling millions of dollars worth of strategic materials to Russia and her satellites. Included in these sales are such basic war necessities as iron, steel, copper, aluminum, lead, zinc, electrical machinery, rolling stock, rubber products, machinery, scientific and precision instruments. Examination of the trade figures show that in the 9-month period from January to September 1950, the following European countries now allied with the United States against communism, sold strategic goods to Russian satellite countries:

Austria	$27,833,600
Italy	30,990,000
France	14,793,000
Belgium, Luxemburg	16,870,000
Netherlands	11,040,000

These figures also show that during the 6-month period from January to June 1950 the following countries sold strategic goods to the Soviet bloc as follows:

Western Germany	$43,456,000
Sweden	40,155,000
Norway	2,710,000
Denmark	3,994,000

By far the largest European shipper to Russia and the satellite countries, however, has been Great Britain, whose sales of strategic goods for the 12-month period of January 1 to December 31, 1950, totaled $116,474,000. More importantly, the sale of such strategic items to Russia and her satellite countries still continues, and it should be stopped. An illustration of Great Britain's policy of doing business as usual is the fact that the British Government is permitting English businessmen to ship to Red China 10,000 tons of rubber valued at more than $9,800,000. This rubber is now on the high seas, reportedly on two British boats, consigned to Red China. An official of the British Government was quoted as declaring that his country has no intention of stopping this shipment, and it is further reported that the British Government's position was that it will not be stopped because there is no restriction by Great Britain on the export of rubber to any destination.

December export figures for the United Kingdom reveal also that the British are still shipping several strategic items to China in increasing quantities. For instance, in the month of December alone, Great Britain shipped almost as much steel and iron to China as during the entire year of 1949. Iron and steel shipments to China for December amounted to $452,000, as compared with $29,000 in December 1949; and $664,000 for the whole year of 1949, which was more than doubled in 1950 to $1,441,000. Other tabulations which I submit likewise give the total shipments from other allies. It is most difficult to understand how Britain, which has her own troops fighting in Korea alongside of other United Nations troops, is permitting such strategic items to be exported to China at this time.

So menacing to our Nation's security is this continued flow of war's necessities to our enemies that earnest efforts must be renewed to persuade Great Britain particularly, and all other friendly nations as well, that a successful defense to Communist aggression requires united action to deny to our common Communist foes whatever they need or can in any way use to strengthen their armies in the field, or to bolster their home economies.

To this end I am sending to the desk a resolution calling for the State Department to exhaust every effort in this direction.

United Kingdom exports to Soviet Bloc (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, U. S. S. R.), calendar year 1950—Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1950

Iron, steel, and manufactures	$949,000
Nonferrous metals and manufactures	2,118,000
Brass and copper alloys	869,000
Copper	208,000
Hardware, implements, and instruments	1,249,000
Electrical goods and apparatus	2,833,000
Cables, wires, etc	22,000
Transmitters, radio and radar	104,000
Telegraph and telephone equipment	511,000
Electric instruments	352,000
Machinery	93,125,000
Drugs	172,000
Vehicles, including locomotives, ships and aircraft	2,569,000
Commercial vehicles	153,000
Rubber tires for motor vehicles	514,000
Raw rubber	7,090,000
Raw wool	3,586,000
Total	116,474,000

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John C. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, vice Oscar Henry Doyle; and

Edgar W. Scarborough, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida, vice Jordan B. Royall, deceased.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and

Maj. Gen. Franklin A. Hart, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as commandant of the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.

FRANCES ELIZABETH WILLARD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by him in Statuary Hall on February 16, 1951, at the memorial services held for Frances E. Willard, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Lincoln Day dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on February 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR LEHMAN TO LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN INFORMATION CENTER ON THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed by him to the Lithuanian-American Information Center on Friday, February 16, 1951, on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which appears in the Appendix.]

MOBILIZING OUR FARM POWER—ADDRESS BY CHARLES F. BRANNAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Mobilizing Our Farm Power," delivered by Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, on Tuesday, January 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR ASSISTANCE TO FRANCE—STATEMENT BY CHARLES DELBRUCK

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Charles Delbruck, of France, made on February 14 at a luncheon given in Mr. Delbruck's honor, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERATION OF SLOVAKIA—LETTER TO SENATOR BREWSTER FROM DR. V. S. KRAJCOVIC

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 12, 1951, addressed to him by Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE FUTURE—SPEECH BY MALCOLM WILLIAMSON AT LINCOLN DAY BOX SUPPER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "The Republican Party and the Future," delivered by Malcolm Williamson at the Lincoln Day box supper at Washington, D. C., on February 5, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDISON'S VISION—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Edison's Vision," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., on February 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

BENJAMIN STOLBERG—ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY AND STATEMENT IN HUMAN EVENTS

[Mr TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the late Benjamin Stolberg, written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 29, 1951, and a statement relating to Mr. Stolberg, published in the January 31, 1951, issue of Human Events, which appear in the Appendix.]

THOMAS A. EDISON—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Edison's Shining Example," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the other entitled "Thomas A. Edison, Man of Vision," published in the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of February 9, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

REGIONAL SHIFTS WILL OFFER OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVERHILL—ARTICLE BY EUGENE L. BELISLE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Regional Shifts Will Offer Opportunities to Haverhill," written by Eugene L. Belisle, and published in the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY NOT TRY CHRISTIANITY NOW?—A WORKING PROGRAM FOR PEACE—ARTICLES BY CLARENCE POE

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Not Try Christianity Now?" written by Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, and an article entitled "A Working Program for Peace," both published in the Progressive Farmer, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE COAL INDUSTRY IN AMERICA AND IN BRITAIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) REPORTER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled What A Difference," having reference to the coal industry in America and in Britain, published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter, of February 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE CONTROLS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Selective Controls," published in

the Washington Post of February 19, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER TRUCE SPELLS NEW ERA FOR STATE—ARTICLE FROM TULSA TRIBUNE

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Public-Private Power Truce Spells New Era For State," written by Roger V. Devlin, and published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFORMS IN RFC END SOME ABUSES—ARTICLE BY JACK STEELE

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Reforms in RFC End Some Abuses," written by Jack Steele, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles and an editorial commending the work of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOHNSON, of Texas, from the Washington Daily News and the Washington Evening Star of January 19, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

FIGHT OR GET OUT—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA MORNING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fight or Get Out," published in the Omaha Morning World-Herald of February 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rushing for Seaway Band Wagon," published in the Detroit News of February 4, 1951; an editorial entitled "Senator DOUGLAS Scores Again," published in the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of February 6, 1951; an editorial entitled "Bringing the Ocean Closer to South Dakota," published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of February 6, 1951; and an editorial entitled "The Seaway Again," published in the Cincinnati Inquirer of February 6, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE LEGISLATOR'S DILEMMA—EDITORIALS BY JOHN WELLS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials entitled "A Legislator's Dilemma," written by John Wells, and published in the Arkansas Recorder on February 2, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

MISSISSIPPIAN FINDS HERBERT HOOVER A MAN OF FRUSTRATIONS—ARTICLE BY DAVID L. COHN

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the heading "Mississippian finds Herbert Hoover a man of frustrations," written by David L. Cohn and published in the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., of January 28, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MIGHTY MEN OF RUSHMORE

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem dedicated to the Mount Rushmore Memorial, and published in the American Legion magazine for February 1951 which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL FOR PEACE OR WAR—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address entitled "Soil for Peace or War," delivered on February 8, 1951, by Alfred D. Stedman, farm editor of the St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press, to the Minnesota Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors; which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL AGENCIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARLINGTON SUN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed dispersal of Federal agencies into Virginia and Maryland, published in the Arlington Sun on February 9, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER FOR THE MILITARY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials regarding the manpower question from the New York News, New York Post, the New York Times, the New York World Telegram-Sun, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Washington News, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT PRICE GOLD—ADDRESS BY FRANK LILLY

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Price Gold," delivered by Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., before the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on February 2, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLES ON ALASKA FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the subject of Alaska, from the Christian Science Monitor of January 9, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE INDUSTRIAL WEST—EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBIA BASIN (WASH.) NEWS

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Current Issue," published in the Columbia Basin (Wash.) News of January 31, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAGES OF AMERICAN SEAMEN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a compilation showing the basic monthly pay of American seamen, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDAMENTALS OF INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fundamentals of Inflation," published in the New York Times of February 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEN. CARLOS ROMULO—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials dealing with the activities of Gen. Carlos Romulo, Foreign Minister of the Philippines, one published in the New York Times February 2, 1951, the second published in the New York World Telegram February 3, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ACADEMY OF DIPLOMATIC SCIENCE

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 131, recommending the immediate formation and operation of an academy of diplomatic science, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUCTION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS INTO THE ARMED FORCES

[Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Irven J. Blum Post, No. 1609, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of York, Nebr., dealing with the induction into the Armed Forces of conscientious objectors, which appears in the Appendix.]

POEM BY ENLISTEE IN THE AIR FORCE AT LACKLAND, TEX.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by an enlistee in the Air Force at Lackland, Tex., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAST STAND OF THE GOP—SPEECH BY PALMER HOYT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "The Last Stand of the GOP," delivered by Palmer Hoyt, editor of the Denver Post, at a Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, Oreg., February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR INDIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Haggling Over Food for India!" published in the Christian Century for February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS AMERICAN WHEAT—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Don McKinnis, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, and recommendations adopted by the league December 7, 8, and 9, 1950, regarding the disposition of surplus American wheat, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXPLORATION FOR PETROLEUM IN THE GULF OF MEXICO—STATEMENT BY WALTER S. HALLANAN

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding exploration for petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico, made before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular affairs on February 19, 1951, by Walter S. Hallanan, president of the Plymouth Oil Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

TEMPORARY REORGANIZATION POWERS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Temporary Reorganization Powers," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, 3 years ago today I spoke on the floor of the Senate on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

On that occasion I noted with profound sadness the unhappy events which have led up to that nation's total disappearance behind the implacable shrouds of the iron curtain. I expressed my fervent hope that the day was not too distant when the sunlight of freedom and the blessings of liberty would again be enjoyed by the people of Lithuania. I voiced my concern that the United States seemed to be shutting its eyes to the conditions which persist in that unhappy small nation.

Three years have passed and last Friday marked the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at Vilna on February 16, 1918. Again there is little cause for rejoicing or celebration. Our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, so many of whom fought in World War II to preserve individual dignity and freedom, have every reason to look to the Government of the United States for support and encouragement. They know that in Lithuania men and women are deprived of every possibility to enjoy civil rights, freedom of press, speech, and assembly, the right to express their will in free elections, and their right to worship in accordance with their religious convictions. They can tell better than I can of the mass deportations, the arrests, the quick trials, the reign of terror.

We in this country have rightly joined with other moral peoples in condemning the recent tragic case of Cardinal Mindszenty. But do we realize that in Lithuania there has been a systematic persecution of leading prelates of the church together with their assistants and associates? As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the statement of the Supreme Lithuania Committee of Liberation dated October 15, 1947, contained in its appeal to the United Nations, describing the treatment to which members of the clergy have been subjected under Soviet enslavement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The wave of arrests has especially affected members of the clergy. On February 19, 1946, V. Borisevicius, bishop of Telsiai, was arrested and sentenced to death. In the middle of December 1946, his auxiliary, Bishop P. Ramanauskas, was arrested and deported. T. Matulionis, bishop of Kaisiadorys, was deported at the same time; he had previously endured Soviet imprisonment for 12 years (1920–32) and had been threatened by the Gestapo with confinement in a concentration camp. Recent persistent reports indicate the arrest and deportation of M. Reinys, archbishop of Vilnius. Thus, at the present time there remains only one bishop in the entire country. Also arrested were the closest assistants of the bishops: Prelates Labukas, Pukys, Olsaukas, and others. That one may appreciate the wide range of arrests in the church, it is enough to mention those in Kaunas alone. Here there are 12 churches. Up to the beginning of 1947, the following Catholic priests of Kaunas had been deported: Canon V. Kieleska, pastor of the Carmelite parish; Rev. J. Dagilis, pastor of Vilijampole parish, Reverend Fabijanskas; Reverend Bubnys, pastor of the Resurrection Church; the Salesian fathers, S. Gustas and B. Paukstys, of the Igulos Church; the prorectors of the priests' seminary, Canon Rauda and Reverend Kuzmickas; the Jesuit Father Biliunas, of the Jesuit Church; Rev. J. Zelvys, of St. Anthony's Church, managed to go into hiding. In the provincial churches, the following were arrested: Reverends Januiaitis, Adomaitis, Ylius, Jonas Grigaitis, Sauklys, Mieldazys, Sliumpa, Vaisnora, Nagulevicius, Giteravicius, Gaizutis, Cimiella; Franciscan fathers Cepulis, Puedziunas, Andraitis, and others—some 70 priests in all. Fearing persecution, about 150 priests have gone into hiding.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, these and other reported acts of incredible brutality are so shocking that it seems wholly inadequate merely to stand aside and refuse recognition to the unjustified annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries. It seems to me that we must do more. We should exhaust every possible means at our disposal to help this brave little nation resume her rightful place among the free and peace-loving countries of the world.

This will take courage, patience, and intelligence. To all Americans who have ties of friendship and family with the people of Lithuania, let me again express my profound hope that a way will be found to restore to that nation the liberty and freedom and prosperity which she deserves. May Lithuania's independence day be a day of true rejoicing.

BROTHERHOOD WEEK—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of New York State, Thomas E. Dewey, proclaiming the week of February 18–25 as Brotherhood Week in the Empire State.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

It is gratifying to be able to report growing success in one of the most vital endeavors that affect the common good of the people of New York and of the Nation. It is the systematic and well-organized program to bring about better understanding among the different groups, racial and religious, which constitute our population. In this State, government has done its part with the intelligently directed cooperation of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, as well as numerous other civic and benevolent organizations.

One outstanding proof of these efforts is the fact that since the end of hostilities in 1945 no major Nation-wide hate movement has made the slightest progress. This is a fact of which we may all be proud.

Another promising manifestation has been the enrollment of more than 4,000 school teachers who have been trained in the human-relations workshop of the NCCJ. These teachers are at work all over the country, spreading the humane doctrine of mutual understanding.

Intergroup relations manuals, based on 5 years' research, are now being extensively used by teachers all over the country as also are school textbooks which have been effective far and wide in the elimination of bias. There has been a notable decrease in discrimination in employment and in education. Hundreds of seminars have been conducted for leaders of management and labor and also community leaders which are spreading the knowledge of effective methods for overcoming prejudice.

Many businesses are adopting programs for eliminating prejudice among their personnel. This is a result of scientific studies which have proved definitely that prejudice costs money, not small money but big money. One of the Nation's outstanding analysts has collected figures to show that anti-Negro prejudice alone has been costing no less than $4,000,000,000 a year. The total cost of prejudice of all sorts is estimated as amounting to more than twenty billions a year. This is a staggering sum but the facts and figures adduced are convincing.

Obviously, it is now more necessary than ever that our program to eliminate intergroup bias be pursued with vigor and intensity. When the total resources of the Nation are being mobilized for the most important defense effort in our history, unity and mutual understanding are absolutely essential.

It is fitting to call attention to this problem in as public a manner as possible.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of February 18–25 as Brotherhood Week in New York State, and I urge men and women of all groups to cooperate heartily in the celebration of this week and, above all, in its spirit.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 5th day of February in the year of our Lord 1951.

[SEAL] THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY DAY—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of New York State, Thomas E. Dewey, proclaiming February 15, 1951, as Susan B. Anthony Day. Her name, linked with the emancipation of women and the success of the women's suffrage movement, deserves far more than ordinary recognition.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

Among the great emancipators of our country was a citizen of Rochester, N. Y., of whom the people of the entire State are justly proud. She devoted her life to perhaps the most difficult task ever undertaken by a woman. She had to fight against neglect, indifference, ridicule, and, finally, virulent hostility, but the world today honors the success and qualities of the late Susan B. Anthony.

Her great achievement was to advance liberty and equality one step further along the road to reality in our country. Her main argument was simple and true: That our claim as a nation that believed in equality for all was false so long as half of the people, the women, did not enjoy the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities as men. Her success was a lasting contribution to free government. If ever an American deserved a place in the Hall of Fame, it was Susan B. Anthony. Her name should be remembered for all time.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby

proclaim February 15, 1951, as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State and I call upon the people of the entire State to cooperate with the people of Rochester in celebrating this day.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 7th day of February in the year of our Lord 1951.

[SEAL] THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE RALLY SPONSORED BY AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC AND FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there was an important meeting held in New York on Saturday, February 17, to which I wish briefly to direct the attention of the Senate.

It was a national defense rally of outstanding American citizens, sponsored by the American Coalition of Patriotic and Fraternal Organizations. There were some 800 persons present, I am informed on a cold, rainy day. Present were representatives of 89 patriotic and civic organizations, including officers of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Patriotic Order, Sons of America, the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and others equally old and prominent in our American life.

The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland was one of the speakers on this occasion, along with a former member of this body, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes.

It has been stated that there is a great debate taking place in the Congress and over the country regarding the foreign policy of the United States. I have taken some part in this debate. But I should like to commend to your attention for its cogency, its thoughtfulness, and its incisiveness the resolution adopted at this meeting in New York. I hope it will be read and studied.

This very excellent resolution, adopted unanimously at this meeting, reads as follows:

As representatives of 89 patriotic organizations in convention assembled:

We pledge to the Congress of the United States our support in the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine when and where American troops shall be garrisoned in foreign lands.

We urge the President and the Congress to avoid commitments abroad of our military and economic resources which may weaken the defense of our own hemisphere, or jeopardize the independent action of our own Government.

We further urge that the President and the Congress, in the exercise of their separate constitutional functions, exact from our allies adequate military guaranties to avoid another Korea in which American troops are called upon to do most of the fighting and dying.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN FORESTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on February 16, before the Southern Forestry Conference, at Savannah, Ga., I delivered an address on the subject Private Enterprise in Forestry.

In the course of my remarks, I discussed several of the important issues which precipitated the so-called Great Debate. I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of my address printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to address the 1951 Southern Forestry Conference sponsored by the Forest Farmers Association. Your association has been of great assistance to the committees of the Congress in helping us to enact our most recent forestry legislation, with which many of you are familiar.

When your efficient executive secretary, Paul Schoen, advised me that the theme of this conference would be Private Enterprise in Forestry, I was well pleased. The continuance of our private enterprise in all of its phases should be one of keenest interest to all Americans. Through that system, our country has become the most powerful and the most productive nation on the face of the globe. We are by far, the best clothed, the best fed, the best housed, the best medicated, and in addition to all these blessings, the least governed people on earth. We have reached those heights because our people have been nurtured in an atmosphere of freedom, where their minds have remained unshackled and where our great system of private enterprise has been permitted to flourish unbounded.

Today we find ourselves the envy of a troubled world. Some countries are seeking our advice, our help, and our cooperation. But there are others—one in particular—which seek to destroy our way of life, and in fact, to put the whole world in darkness. America must meet that challenge. We care not what form of government a country lives under, provided it is chosen freely by its people, but we shall and must draw the line when a country seeks, by force, to impose its own form of government on all others. We have fought two world wars to preserve and protect our freedom, and by the eternals, we shall fight another rather than be reduced to slavery. This is not a challenge, but a solemn warning.

We are a peace loving people. I hope and pray that we may yet succeed in our quest for peace. We desire most fervently the good will and the friendship of all nations. We enthusiastically joined the United Nations organization, in the hope that it would provide an avenue for peace. I believe that our representatives in that organization have worked diligently in search of a formula that would bring about world peace, but at every turn, Russia and her satellites have interposed objections.

United Nations forces, composed chiefly of our own soldiers, are engaged in a conflict that will result in the making or the breaking of the United Nations organization as an instrumentality for peace. Some of our statesmen challenge the right of the Organization to assist and protect the South Koreans in their fight for independence. Rightly or wrongly, the promise was made in apparent good faith, and now that we are so engaged, we must make every effort to see it through.

The Korean struggle, in my opinion, is a blessing in disguise, so far as our country is concerned, for it has pointed out, very sharply, the inadequacy of our preparedness program. It has afforded our military leaders the opportunity to arrive at many new concepts of warfare that may be indispensable to our survival, should our real foe decide to wage all-out war. It has demonstrated that air power alone cannot win battles, but that the foot soldier must be ever present to seal a victory on the battlefield. Last, but not least, it has given hope to many of the countries of the world that they can expect help and protection, if and when attacked by Communist aggressors.

The entry of China into the Korea war has multiplied our problems in the Far East. The action of the United Nations in branding China as an aggressor, though belated, will strengthen our position. The UN should have acted long ago. Many of our allies stalled for time in the hope of reaching a peaceful settlement with the Chinese. But all that is now water under the bridge, and the next step is to tighten our blockade of China. Our allies must be made to realize that we cannot in any way appease China in order to preserve economic relationships between them and the Chinese Communist government. It is better to sacrifice trade now than to lose all of it, and perhaps our way of life as well, in the future. We must call a spade a spade, and not remain at war with China, and at the same time permit our allies to ship war supplies and goods to the Chinese Reds.

For the past month the Senate has been engaged in the so-called great debate. Many Republicans have been severely criticizing our foreign policy, even to the point of charging that we should have never engaged in the defense of South Korean independence. As I recall, when we first entered the conflict, there was little or no criticism, but, on the contrary, the choice to make a stand in Korea was praised far and wide as a most courageous act on the part of the President. But then when our forces met reverses, which were more or less to be expected, our armchair strategists began to pour it on, and they have been pouring it on ever since.

Some of the President's critics argue that he should not be permitted to send our troops abroad without the consent of Congress. Every schoolboy knows that our Presidents, from Jefferson on down to the present time, have exercised that right in the protection of our country's interests. As our Commander in Chief, why should the President not have that power? Surely no one will seriously contend that he would intervene solely through caprice or to further his own designs. In setting up the checks and balances that our forefathers so wisely incorporated into our system of government, the founders of our country provided that the executive and the legislative branches need not take orders one from the other.

If Congress is not in agreement with the President's policies as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, it may withhold its appropriations, and in so doing, effectively reduce the size of our forces, but I am of the firm belief that Congress should not be empowered to direct military strategy, particularly the deployment of troops. There is much to be said for the persuasive influence that Congress can exert when a majority of its Members feels that the situation calls for action or a change, but this must be kept as persuasive action and not as direct control.

Other critics contend that Congress should limit the number of soldiers that we send to Western Europe. I have faith in our military leadership. Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Sherman, Vandenberg, and a score of others, who led our forces to victory in World War II, are still at the helm. I am confident that the people of America have faith in them and I know that the President makes no momentous decisions affecting military strategy without consulting them, and doubtless follows their advice. To say that the President is reckless and should not be trusted in this crisis, stamps a black mark, and is a reflection on, our military leadership. But that is the way of politics. Issues must be created, no matter how underhanded, no matter how dastard, for the 1952 elections.

In giving aid to our friends across the seas, we must in turn receive assurances of a willingness on their part to fight for and to

protect their own freedom; there must be an all-out effort on their part to harness all their resources to the end that their armed forces are well and adequately supplied; and they must also provide for adequate taxation of all their citizens to help pay for the common defense. General Eisenhower has assured us that he will see to it that those conditions are met, and I trust in his judgment and leadership.

No, ladies and gentlemen; we cannot afford to retire into a shell, snaillike, and wait for lightning to strike, which in essence is the plan being advocated by some, including former President Hoover. We must be prepared to meet successfully the greatest menace that has ever threatened our way of life. Force is the only language that the men in the Kremlin can understand. In order to block Russia in whatever aggressive move she may make, we must be in a position to strike back. We must convince the Soviets that we mean business, that we will not take orders, and that we will fight for what we believe to be right and just. In my opinion, by following such a course we may prevent them from throwing the world into a most cruel and devastating conflict.

Russia must and should be warned now, in no uncertain language, to refrain from again inciting any of her satellites to engage in aggression. She should be told that an aggressive move on the part of any satellite will be considered an example of Russian aggression, that an attack by them will be construed as an attack by her, and that, in either event, she can expect all-out war to the finish.

And so, before discussing private enterprise in forestry, I thought it desirable to discuss with you some of the problems facing America in the choice of a course we should follow in order to preserve our over-all private-enterprise system.

As a preface to my remarks on private enterprise in forestry, I should like to remind you that the United States does not have a corner on the market in world problems, not even on problems involving agriculture and forestry. Recently I visited some of the ancient countries of the Middle East and saw the condition of their lands and their forests. We must never let our natural resources be dissipated as have some of these countries.

In Persia I saw the ruins of ancient civilizations—the ruins of nations whose rulers professed to have all the answers. There, where the twin rivers—the Tigris and Euphrates—once brought wealth and power to the people who farmed and built their cities, there now are only silt-choked canals and desolation. It is estimated that this valley known as Mesopotamia once supported a population of some twenty-five or thirty millions. Now a scant three million eke out a meager existence. The whole of ancient Persia at one time could support 105,000,000 according to some historians, today a bare 15,000,000 can exist.

This desolation has resulted from one thing—neglect. Neglect of the God-given natural resources of a country can lead only to ruin. The peoples of antiquity thought that they could bleed their soils and their forests without heed to replacement, to flood and erosion control, and to reforestation. Where now are the Cedars of Lebanon?

The advocates of economy in the Congress are determined to cut back governmental expenditures to the bone, except those funds earmarked for the mobilization program. With this I am in complete accord, for we cannot afford to prepare for war and at the same time support a full quota of peacetime activities. But I should like to make one thing clear—I shall insist in the Senate that when the ax of economy falls, that appropriations relating to the preservation of our natural resources be trimmed last, and I hope not at all. It has always been my contention that the money our Government spends in preserving, maintaining, and building up its natural resources is not only a wise investment, but an absolute necessity. In flood control, in irrigation, in power projects, in forestry, we have seen our Federal dollars not only returned in principal but returned with interest. I want to emphasize—our Government does not lose money on sound programs designed to conserve our natural resources. But, most important of all, if we are to advance and continue to make progress we must have ample natural resources to work with.

In any consideration of private enterprise, in forestry or elsewhere, we must first define the limitations of its antithesis, which in this case is our Federal Government. What should be the role of the Federal Government in American forestry?

Our Government needs the wholehearted cooperation of the American forestry industry, and, conversely, the forestry industry needs some assistance and help from the Government. Of that I am completely convinced. The question is "How much government do we want in private forestry?" or as I would rather put it "How much government can American private forestry get along without?" I do not think any of us here would welcome a return to the old days when our vast woodland resources were plundered and devastated by injudicious cutting, and no thought was given to planning for the future. And I am even more certain that no one here anticipated with pleasure a day when the Government will regulate your industry. It is between these two extremes that we must chart our course to obtain the greatest benefit from our natural forest resources and to best utilize our forest products.

In these perilous times, I need not mention to you the importance of forestry and the forest industries in our mobilizing economy. The United States has become the greatest consumer of wood in the world. Wood is a basic and an indispensable element in the daily lives of our people. While some uses for wood decline, new uses are continually being found for it.

The timber products industries are an important element in the support of many communities, both large and small. The Nation needs ample, dependable timber supplies to sustain and expand the supply of consumer goods and the industry and employment that are based on wood. Furthermore, as dramatically demonstrated by World War II, an ample timber supply is a vital aspect of national security. Beyond these considerations is the world shortage of softwood timber. If our large potential forest resources are developed properly, this country can, without depriving our own population, help to meet world timber needs in years to come, and so contribute to international well-being.

Of only slightly lesser importance is the increasing demand for pulpwood. Over the past 40 years, pulpwood consumption has been expanding rapidly. Consumption of paper and paperboard may well reach 30,000,000 tons in the next decade, without counting any increases that may result from the Korean campaign.

To supply its expanding needs for wood, our country must adopt scientific forest management to an extent as never before. Forestry is not a new science. Scientific forest management existed already in France and Germany at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and crude prescriptions as to the proper use of forests even date back to the fourteenth century. In Germany, the first courses for education in forestry were organized between 1770 and 1780 at the Universities of Liepzig, Jena, Giessen, and Berlin. In France, the first forest institute was opened in 1824 at Nancy.

In America, we have come a long way, in point of time, in forest conservation, but we have not progressed far enough. When the white man first began to settle this country, the timber stand amounted to at least 8,000,000,000,000 board feet. This enormous volume was very largely in virgin timber, centuries old. We now have about 1,600,000,000,000 board feet, only about half of which is virgin timber. In the course of 300 years, and chiefly during the last century, we have used or destroyed most of our original timber heritage plus much of what has grown in the meantime. The time is long past when timber could be regarded as an inexhaustible reserve, to be drawn on without regard for its replacement. It must now be regarded as a crop, much as the cotton and sugar cane and corn that we see about us in the South.

The South has been the victim of some of the worst ravagers of our forest-lands. I have seen the devastated areas with my own eyes. Thousands of acres of virgin timber have been completely denuded, leaving behind only black, charred stumps as a reminder of the wealth that used to be.

Forestry is a long time undertaking. While the country's annual cut may vary somewhat with the play of economic forces, the annual rate of growth is unchanging, relatively speaking, from one year to the next. Once the forest resources of America have deteriorated, as they have already done, it requires years of effort and additional investments to increase substantially the volume of cut that can be sustained. It is therefore important to set up long-range goals or objectives of forest growth as a basis for sound public policy and action. The Forest Service believes that we should aim at a growth of 18 to 20 billion cubic feet of lumber annually, which should produce 65 to 72 billion board feet of saw timber of good species and quality.

There is no question but that the Government can and in many cases does, perform valuable and necessary services to the forest landowners and forest products operators. Their sensible and restrained continuance can mean better forestry practices and more productive forests in the United States, more prosperous business for you, and an advancement of our Nation's general welfare.

Your Representatives who attended the many House and Senate hearings will tell you that we should be proud of the results we obtained in forestry legislation during the Eighty-first Congress. They will tell you that it was not at all easy, that there were many hearings and very many difficulties encountered before we could claim success. In fact, in 1949 we failed to obtain one of the four of our objectives for forestry legislation. Because of the confusion and difficulties encountered it was determined wise to accept only three of these objectives, namely, protection, planting, and education, and to wait until the following year, 1950, to obtain assistance in technical services. As a result of your efforts and those of some Senators and some members of the House, we now have what I believe is suitable legislation so that we can go ahead with vision to develop our private forest resources. I say we have at present satisfactory forestry laws but with full knowledge that more than legislation is needed. Congress must appropriate the money necessary for those cooperative endeavors. Also, the States and the private landowners must do their part. I believe you can count on all three—the Congress, the States, and the private landowners to prove that we were right in choosing the cooperative approach.

Now, what about the future of private enterprise in forestry? That is, indeed, a good question. Even in normal times, predicting future events is a little out of my line. And with the threat of war facing us, and an expanding economy geared for possible world conflict, the task of guessing the shifting winds of congressional intent becomes even more difficult. The international

situation will surely continue to affect your business. You will have less help, fewer machines, perhaps eventually less money for forestry and conservation activities. Wood will become less plentiful, and saw timber will become hard to harvest and expensive to process. But it will be easy to sell; make no mistake about that.

Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, who expressed his regret to me that he was not able to be with us here today, introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress that I believe of extreme importance to the forest industry and in particular to our conference today on private enterprise in forestry. It represents, I might say, a viewpoint far removed from what I assume to be that held by most of you.

The title of the Anderson bill is: "A bill to provide for the establishment of forest practices for the conservation of and proper use of privately owned forest lands, and for other purposes." Insofar as I am concerned, the title sets the stage for the details that follow. The bill declares it to be the policy of the Congress to establish forestry practices on privately owned lands. With one sweeping program, it removes from private owners the administration of their forest lands, interposing instead the Federal Government.

I believe this bill may represent the shape of things to come, unless we remain constantly on guard to combat it, and unless we seek to cure the evils that give rise to such a method of procedure for maintaining our forests. Over the past decade or more, our Nation has moved toward, not away from, increased Government control. Some of this regulation has been on the whole beneficial to our country. I cannot subscribe to the idea that any measure of benefit to the people as a whole is per se evil and socialistic, but I am convinced that the trend is present, and that we have been allowing more and more of our daily lives to be regulated by Government edict rather than by the ebb and flow of free enterprise. No better example to me can be found than the recent controversy over the tidelands, those littoral areas off our coasts containing oil and other minerals. If the tidelands discussion had come up 25 years ago, the States would have unquestionably prevailed and remained in possession of what I still rightfully believe to be theirs.

And if you remember, one of the arguments for Federal ownership and control of the tidelands was that because petroleum is usually in interstate commerce and is always essential for the national defense, therefore the Federal Government should have control over offshore petroleum resources. Likewise, the advocates of Federal control fought, and through a Presidential veto succeeded in killing, the Kerr natural-gas bill, which would have insured continued control of our natural-gas resources by the States.

It is high time, ladies and gentlemen, that something drastic is done to arrest the inroads of bureaucratic control. As I intimated a few moments ago, with a national emergency confronting our country, centralization of power in the National Government will continue to expand. We, every one of us, must fight against it. The tendency of an apprehensive people, fearful of war, is to rely upon a strong centralized Government, with the end result that our States' rights, and our people's rights, will wither away, or be chipped off, piece by piece, by the proponent of bureaucracy.

I feel that in time of national stress the Government must direct our Nation's efforts, but what I must caution you against is the insidious creeping of bureaucracy into our daily lives. And once it is in, under the guise of national emergency, or any other reason, it is here to stay, if I may judge by our past history.

The arguments of the advocates of regulation by government order, or whatever you want to call it, are cogent indeed. The planners have big dreams. The big dreams are beautiful on paper. It is usually only after they are here, and often here to stay, that we realize how insidious they are, how stifling for our system of free enterprise, our basic freedoms, even of our fundamental democratic form of government. These are reasons why I am opposed to it. The lure of big government has appeal for the people who think that they are going to get something for nothing. It is usually too late when they realize that instead of getting something for nothing, they have paid and paid with some of the dearest things America still possesses, paid with "liberty and freedom."

I do not believe that there is any immediate danger of socialization of forestry industries, even to the extent provided by the Anderson bill, for shortly before coming down here I spoke with Senator ANDERSON'S office and was told that he did not intend to reintroduce the bill—in the first session at least—of the Eighty-second Congress. I am not an alarmist, I hope, but if I serve no other purpose here than to awaken you to the dangers creeping up on private enterprise in forestry, then I shall feel that my time and yours was not wasted this evening.

The best way to combat the encroachment of government control into your business is for you, yourselves, to accomplish the objectives that the bureaucrats would achieve by public control of private forestry. Let me urge you, therefore, to set about putting your house in order. If you can do the job, you can present the best, the most solid, the most irrefutable argument to those who would sell free enterprise down the river. By doing the job, I mean putting into practice the measures that will conserve and expand our forest resources. If the Government can do it, then private enterprise can do it better. What is more, the Government, under present laws, will help you do it, and will help the States to help you do it.

And what should be done now? You must put into effect sound replanting practices, intelligent selective cutting programs, watershed management surveys and plans, fire control systems, flood-control facilities through reforestation, and in general halt the decline in our national timber stand. These and many more things are what you can do to forestall the encroachment of government control over your business. Those of you gathered here tonight cannot do it alone, but your organization and organizations similar to yours can be a prime factor in keeping the "free" in free enterprise forestry. Much improvement in forestry conservation is needed in the South, and from what I have learned, your group and other leaders in southern forestry have taken giant steps in the right direction. But, I repeat, much remains to be done. I promise that I shall work as hard as I am able, as a Senator and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to keep private enterprise the motivating power in American forestry. I feel, as I begin my fifteenth year in the Senate, that under our present forestry laws our Government can help you with the task of keeping forestry healthy and profitable, but I feel just as strongly that there should be no strings on the help and assistance, and that aid and technical know-how from our Federal Government should encourage rather than discourage private enterprise. A government, or an industry, or a people, that comes to depend upon the crutch of a paternalistic power, is sick. If we are to survive in a free world—if we are to preserve our cherished way of life—we, you and I, and all Americans, must unite in our efforts to keep American private enterprise healthy and strong both for now and for unborn generations.

NOMINATION OF JOHN C. WILLIAMS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think there is at the desk the favorable report of the Judiciary Committee on the nomination of John C. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina. I should like to have the Senate act on the nomination at this time because of the fact that court is held in that district beginning one day this week, and the present district attorney is disabled and has resigned and is out of office.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination by the Senate, as in executive session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the nomination received the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; it is unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee. I request action on the nomination at this time simply in order to expedite the handling of the business of the court in South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination, as in executive session?

There being no objection, as in executive session, the nomination was considered and confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator from Georgia wishes to address the Senate at this time, the first amendment of the committee will be read.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a preliminary statement which I think may shorten the consideration of the bill.

This bill is intended to prevent exorbitant and unconscionable costs from being charged to the Government in the case of materials, supplies, or equipment purchased for the national defense. Enactment of the bill at this time is deemed necessary because the country has again embarked upon a vast program of military expenditures. In many cases contractors will be asked to deliver materials, supplies, or equipment for the defense program without being given sufficient time to prepare adequate cost estimates. Some items called for will be different from those ordinarily produced in the manufacturing plant of the contractor or subcontractor. Other items may be entirely new, with no cost history. Because the Government will purchase materials, supplies, and equipment in large quantities, the prevailing market price of a great many of the items in

question, even if known, will still be an inadequate measure of a fair price.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President, that the power given to administrative officials under this bill to renegotiate realized profits on these contracts or related subcontracts amounts almost to a delegation to administrative officials of the power to tax, which, in my opinion, would have no justification except in time of war or of a national emergency. Perhaps it is well to bear in mind that Mr. Maurice Karker, first Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board during World War II, called the World War II statute imposing such a power "a dangerous and un-American statute."

While the World War II Renegotiation Act was upheld by the Supreme Court, the Court was careful to point out that—

the very finality of the administrative determinations here upheld emphasize the seriousness of the injustices which can result from the abuse of the large powers vested in the administrative officials.

In testimony before the Finance Committee it developed that renegotiation may have some defects which could become serious if the act is not clearly, impartially, intelligently, and equitably administered. It is, therefore, highly important that men with knowledge, vision, and practical business accounting and professional experience be selected to carry out the functions of this bill.

Because renegotiation will amount to the equivalent of a tax of 100 percent on profits determined by the administrator to be excessive, it may have a serious effect upon incentives to produce efficiently unless full and adequate allowance is made for efficient use of facilities, materials, and manpower. The renegotiation process must be simple and not cumbersome or time consuming, lest it interfere seriously with the work of producing the materials, equipment, and supplies necessary for the national defense. This last problem becomes much more serious if renegotiation is extended to too low a level. If the small contractor or subcontractor is required to spend a great deal of time in discussing renegotiation problems, instead of carrying on production, the Government's stockpile of materials, supplies, and equipment is bound to suffer. It is for this reason that I believe the renegotiation power should be surrounded by a great many safeguards. I hope that when sufficient procurement experience has been gained in the pricing of defense items, it will be possible to restrict to a minimum the renegotiation function.

The bill gives the Renegotiation Board discretionary authority to exempt from renegotiation any contract or subcontract where, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract or subcontract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits. I believe that the Board should not hesitate to use this power. In the final analysis, it is largely through careful and proper procurement that firm and reasonable prices can be established.

The House bill has surrounded the renegotiation procedure with certain safeguards and the Finance Committee bill has provided still further safeguards in an effort to prevent arbitrary and unreasonable determinations. In arriving at excessive profits under the bill, no recognition is given to the fact that a substantial part of the excessive profits will be captured through the Federal income tax, and the excess-profits tax which has been recently adopted. I, for one, would like to see excessive profits arrived at after taking into account the payment of Federal income and excess-profits taxes. However, it was not possible under this bill to prepare a satisfactory amendment to accomplish that purpose. And the services insist that renegotiation after Federal income and excess-profits taxes will materially increase Government costs in securing materials for defense purposes.

I shall now discuss briefly the important features of the committee bill, distinguishing the changes made by the Finance Committee from the provisions of the House bill.

This act will be administered by an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government composed of five members, appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which shall be known as the Renegotiation Board. The chairman of the Board is to be appointed by the President and receive compensation in the amount of $17,500 per annum. The other four members are to be appointed one each by the respective Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and one by the Administrator of General Services. These four members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

This differs from the House bill which provides for all five members to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and for compensation of $12,500 a year each.

Under the House bill, a contractor or subcontractor may be renegotiated where he has received or accrued, within the fiscal year, more than $100,000 in the aggregate from renegotiable contracts and subcontracts. The Senate Finance Committee raised this renegotiable minimum limitation from $100,000 to $500,000. During World War II, the minimum amount was also originally set at $100,000, but was later increased to $500,000. I recall that at that time both the Truman committee and the services recommended that the $100,000 limit be increased to $500,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was unable to hear the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia. If he will yield for a question, did he say a moment ago that the Truman committee set a limit of $500,000?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. That is not on one contract, though, let me say. It is for all contracts obtained by the contractor within a fiscal year. If they aggregate less than $500,000, they are not renegotiable.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. During consideration of the World War II legislation, it was shown that while the work load with a $100,000 limit would be approximately five times greater than the work load with a $500,000 limit, the additional recoveries from the lower $100,000 limit would still be small. This is also true today. Furthermore, a low limit of $100,000 will prevent the renegotiators from concentrating on the larger cases involving a greater amount of dollars. The higher limit of $500,000 will permit the small-business man with defense contracts or related subcontracts to spend his time more effectively in the production of defense materials. Of course, any excessive profits which may arise from the aggregate receipts and accruals of less than $500,000 received by the contractor or subcontractor during the fiscal year will not be large in any event and will also be substantially reduced through the excess-profits taxes and income taxes.

Another important change was made by the committee with respect to the agricultural exemption provided for in the House bill. Under the House bill, and the Senate Finance Committee amendment, an exemption is granted for an agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state. If the agricultural commodity is not customarily sold or does not have an established market in such state, then the exemption applies in the first form or state in which it is customarily sold or has an established market. The term "agricultural product" is broad enough to include not only products resulting from the cultivation of the soil but also natural resins, saps, gums of trees, animals, fish, and the produce of livestock, such as wool, eggs, milk, and cream. One difficulty with the House bill is that it confines the agricultural exemption to contracts or subcontracts with the producers of the agricultural commodity. The Finance Committee substitutes for the House exemption the exemption provided for in the World War II law. That law granted the exemption not only to contracts or subcontracts with the producer of the agricultural commodity but also to contracts or subcontracts with the person acquiring such product. Testimony before the Finance Committee indicated that the House bill would work considerable hardship. If a factor or merchant who handled and sold the agricultural products in their raw or natural state is subject to renegotiation he would pay the farmer less for his product. For example, a cotton merchant who buys raw cotton to sell to a cotton textile manufacturer would probably pay to the farmer a much lower price for his cotton if he were subject to renegotiation.

Any contract or subcontract for the product of a mine, oil, or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit or timber, which has not been processed, refined, or treated beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use is also exempt from renegotiation under the bill as amended by the Senate Finance Committee. An illustration of this exemption is that it would apply to contracts or subcontracts for the sale of pig iron, which is the first form or state of iron ore suitable for industrial use. Similarly, certain byproducts resulting from processing designed to produce an

exempted product are also exempt from renegotiation. For example, natural gasoline is a byproduct resulting from the processing of natural gas and would, therefore, not be subject to renegotiation since it falls within the purview of the raw materials exemption contained in section 106 (a) (3).

This exemption is broader than that provided in the House, which limited the exemption to the product of the producer and made the exempted state of the material the same as that at which percentage depletion is allowed.

The Board is required to prescribe regulations which will give an integrated producer a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount which would have been realized by such a contractor or subcontractor if he had sold his product at the last exempted form or state. This places the integrated producer who either acquires any of the agricultural commodities or raw materials or produces them initially and then processes them up to and beyond the last exempted form or state on a parity with a producer who sells at the last exempted form or state.

Another provision which was in effect during World War II exempted from renegotiation the profits realized by a contractor or subcontractor by reason of the increment in value of his excess inventory of the agricultural products described herein or the products of a mine, oil, or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit or timber.

The omission of this exemption by the House subjected to renegotiation an inventory profit which is not a manufacturing profit. Under the bill as passed by the House, a contractor or subcontractor who had on hand agricultural products or other raw material in excess of his contract needs which inventory had increased in value will be penalized if he processes such material beyond an exempt state and uses such products to fulfill Government contracts instead of going out in the market and purchasing new products at current prices to fulfill such contracts. The Finance Committee restored the World War II exemption. The following example will show how the Finance Committee amendment operates:

A has, through the purchase of long cotton, 600,000 pounds of cotton on hand on a particular date, which has a book cost of 30 cents a pound. On this date A has future orders which will consume only 100,000 pounds of such cotton. A thus has a long position of 500,000 pounds of cotton. The next contract that A takes is for Government goods and requires the use of 500,000 pounds of such cotton. On the day A takes the Government contract the current market price of such cotton is 35 cents a pound. In such a situation, A has placed himself in a position to realize an inventory profit of $25,000. This inventory profit, if realized, is not a manufacturing profit, but is in the nature of an investment or speculative profit which could be realized. It has no relationship to the profits to be derived from the Government contract, and therefore represents a profit from an excess inventory, which is excluded from renegotiation under the amendment.

The Finance Committee also added an amendment providing for a mandatory exemption in the case of contracts or subcontracts entered into with charitable, educational, scientific institutions, and so forth, exempt from taxation on their income from their related activities. The exemption applies only where the income from the contract or subcontract does not constitute unrelated business income for Federal income tax purposes. The bill as passed by the House did not provide for such an exemption. It is the opinion of the Finance Committee that such an exemption will be particularly beneficial in the case of contracts or subcontracts entered into with educational institutions to conduct research activities.

Another Finance Committee amendment provided for an expressed exemption from renegotiation in the case of contracts and subcontracts with common carriers or public utilities. This exemption was felt advisable because the vendor in such cases is subject to regulation by a public body. The exemption also applies to him if unregulated where he does not charge rates higher than these regulated rates. The bill as passed by the House did not contain any such exemption.

A new provision which your committee has added to the bill concerns long-lived industrial equipment, such as machinery, tools, and so forth. Some of my colleagues may recall that a provision dealing specially with this type of equipment was voted by this body in January of 1944 for incorporation in the renegotiation statute in effect during World War II. That provision was eliminated in conference, but the peculiarities of this type of equipment have now been reconsidered by the committee, and the conclusion has been reached that some limited protection is appropriate for manufacturers of such equipment.

When such equipment is sold directly to the Government, or to a contractor for the account of the Government, the sale is comparable to the sale of any other product entering into defense production. The Government pays the price and gets the equipment, and it is appropriate in such circumstances that the transaction should be subject in its entirety to renegotiation.

Where, however, the equipment is not sold to or for the account of the Government, but is sold to a contractor or subcontractor who uses it on Government work, a different situation prevails. Most productive equipment is used up only partly on Government work. The remainder of its useful life is devoted, in most cases both concurrently and subsequently, to private commercial production of its owner. The committee considers it only fair, then, that only that portion of the price paid for such equipment which corresponds to its defense use should be subject to renegotiation.

Of course, the extent of such use is never ascertainable in advance. The Finance Committee has determined, therefore, to solve this problem by making a flat and arbitrary assumption that productive equipment delivered to defense contractors or subcontractors will be used exclusively on defense work for the first 5 years and that the balance of its service life will be exhausted in commercial production. This allocation appears to be fair to the Government and the manufacturers alike, and also permits the application of a satisfactory working rule.

The rule we propose is that only that fraction of the amounts realized from the sale of durable productive equipment shall be subject to renegotiation which 5 years constitutes of the average useful life of such equipment. In other words, if the item has a 10-year life, one-half of the price paid therefor will be subject to renegotiation; if it has a 15-year life, one-third; and so forth. Bulletin F issued by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in 1932 prescribes the average useful life of most items of productive equipment. When it does not, the Board will apply its own estimate. The bill so provides.

The bill as passed by the House makes subject to renegotiation all of the moneys received or accrued by a contractor and related subcontractor on or after January 1, 1951, and attributable to performance on or after July 1, 1950, where the contracts are with the Departments of Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The Finance Committee added to the list specifically named the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was covered under the World War II law, and the Finance Committee is of the opinion that it should be covered under the pending bill, since the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's synthetic rubber, tin, and abaca operations are within the areas of contracts for defense materials which are proper subjects for renegotiation.

I may say, Mr. President, that the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has offered an amendment relating to this matter, which the committee will be glad to accept at the proper time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. My intention in offering the amendment was to include the public housing authorities also in the renegotiation provision. I believe that if we renegotiate contracts of everybody who has any business with the Government, those in the business of housing should also be included in the renegotiation provision, and I thank the Senator for what he has said about accepting the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. The Finance Committee thoroughly agrees with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice that by an amendment the committee proposes to include the Reconstruction Finance Cor-

poration. I was wondering whether it would also be necessary this time to mention the Panama Canal, in view of the language in section 102 which makes the title applicable to departments specifically named.

In explanation of my question, let me say that as the author of the amendment to the sixth supplemental defense bill of 1942 in the House of Representatives, which instituted the policy of renegotiation, I was recently called before a court here in the city of Washington to testify in a case in which the Government was seeking to recover from a contractor who had a contract for constructing the third set of locks on the Panama Canal.

The Senator from Georgia will recall that construction of the third set of locks on the Canal was started, but was later suspended during World War II. The contractor in the pending case has been contending that the Panama Canal was not covered by the language in the original act which named the Secretary of War and the War Department, and so argues that he was not subject to the renegotiation law. Within the past few weeks, as I have said, I was called in to testify on the intent of the coverage in the original renegotiation act, so far as the Panama Canal was concerned.

I might say, in this connection, that it was my thought that the Panama Canal was covered, since the Governor operated under the then Secretary of War. We did not name the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the original act, but did bring it in by an amendment which I offered to a subsequent appropriation bill. But I raise the question here so that a similar doubt might not arise in the future.

I am not certain whether any reorganization has been concluded which would bring the Canal Zone under any agency of the Government. If not, and if we are to specifically name the agencies which are to be covered by the pending bill, we ought to include the Canal Zone, so as to prevent any such contingency arising in the future.

Mr. GEORGE. I think there is much merit in the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. However, I think a provision in the bill does cover the specific question.

Mr. CASE. On page 2, lines 12 to 14, the bill states:

> The provisions of this title shall be applicable (1) to all contracts with the departments specifically named in section 103 (a).

The Canal Zone is not specifically named. Whether it comes under a department by virtue of a reorganization act, I do not know. It is not necessary to name the Maritime Commission, for example, because it was brought under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. It is in the Department of Commerce. I think the Canal Zone has been brought under a department, too, although I am not certain on that point. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the further provision that the President himself is given the authority to add to the list contained in the bill any department which exercises functions in connection with the national defense.

Mr. CASE. Apparently the President could make such designation.

Mr. GEORGE. The President could make the designation. I believe the Canal Zone has been brought under a department by a reorganization act. I believe it has been brought within the application of the proposed act. I am not certain of that fact, however. As I stated, I am not certain on that point.

Mr. CASE. I am under that impression also. I would suggest, therefore, that before consideration of the bill is completed, we should check into the subject. In the instance to which I referred the defense of the contractor was that the Canal Zone had not been named.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have already called attention to the fact that, in addition to the departments specifically named in the bill, the President is given the power to add other agencies and departments. He may add agencies or departments which exercise functions in connection with the national defense.

The Finance Committee is of the opinion that this power of the President should be confined to naming those additional departments exercising functions having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense. While a literal wording of the bill may require all contracts with the departments specifically named, or those designated by the President, to be renegotiated, the Finance Committee contemplates that the Renegotiation Board by a judicious use of its power to make permissive exemptions of contracts by classes or types will properly limit the area of renegotiation where contracts are not intimately related to the defense effort.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota is curious to know whether in renegotiating contracts the amount which is paid to a so-called 5-percenter can be deducted?

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand, the contract would be renegotiable if he were paid within the fiscal year more than $25,000 for his fees and commissions in connection with the renegotiable contracts. I believe such a provision is contained in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator point to the provision which deals with such 5-percent commissions?

Mr GEORGE I shall read from the report. In the meantime, I shall try to locate the provision in the bill I read from page 3 of the report:

> Your committee bill continues the $25,000 limit contained in the House bill in the case of subcontractors whose income is derived from commissions and fees based upon renegotiation contracts and subcontracts.

That is to say, if the fees received exceed $25,000 within a fiscal year, the fees are to be renegotiated by the board. The Senator will find the provision on page 26, at line 21, of the bill. It is contained in subsection 2.

Mr. LANGER. If a contract extends over a period of 5 years, a 5-percenter can be paid $25,000 each year. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill refers to the aggregate amount of the contract. That is what makes the contract renegotiable. It is the aggregate amount actually paid or approved. When the total fees runs above $25,000 for a fiscal year, the fee is subject to renegotiation.

Mr. LANGER. Why should any citizen of this country who wants a subcontract be allowed to pay 5 percent to another person, and deduct the 5 percent fee at the time his contract with the Government is renegotiated? Why cannot the Government advertise and get subcontracts without making it necessary for a contractor to pay someone else 5 percent?

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, there is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from North Dakota suggests. Under the income tax laws a contractor or subcontractor, or any taxpayer, may claim what he considers in good faith to be a reasonable expense in carrying on his business. If the taxing authorities agree with him, he can deduct the fee in computing his own taxable income.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Georgia believe that such a provision would be an open invitation to persons with influence to sell their influence in order to get a 5-percent fee?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I think not. I think it would be a discouragement, because all the facts revealed in the investigation showed, as the Senator will recall, that some of the 5 percenters got exorbitantly large sums of money. The provision in the pending bill would place a limitation on such practice. The fees would become renegotiable if in the aggregate for the fiscal year they ran above $25,000.

Mr. LANGER. Therefore a subcontractor could get as much as $25,000, if a contract ran as long as 5 years, without his subcontract being subject to renegotiation.

Mr. GEORGE. He could not get $25,000 on a particular contract. He could only be exempt if his total fees and commissions ran above $25,000 within a fiscal year. I believe it is a restrictive measure, which has worked very well. While there ought to be some way of advising a contractor or subcontractor about contracts to be let, as the Senator points out, so that businessmen would not have to pay any unnecessary sum of money, probably good businessmen find it convenient, advisable, and a reasonable business practice to engage engineers, and others with special knowledge, in order to negotiate certain contracts for them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that what he is saying may be perfectly sound. However, I do not believe the

subject should be dealt with in a renegotiation bill. If it is sought to prohibit such practice, it should be done in a measure dealing with the general subject of Government contracts. In this bill we are not trying to say what is legal and what is not legal. We say that when a man makes too much money we will renegotiate and see to it that he gets only the reasonable value of his work or contract. The subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is investigating the subject, and he may have something to report on the subject. I do not think a renegotiation bill is the place in which to try to legislate the legality of various kinds of contracts.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that I was very much impressed by the splendid work which was done by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I think he did a very fine job. However, I believe the language of the bill on page 27, lines 5 to 11, is very indefinite. It says:

> If the aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year under such subcontracts—

What is there to prevent a person from making a contract and getting $25,000 during the first year, $25,000 during the next year, and spreading out his fees over a period of years?

Mr. GEORGE. This is a limitation upon the fees and commissions of the person rendering services for the contractor or subcontractor. He cannot escape renegotiation if the sum total which he receives from such fees exceeds $25,000.

Mr. LANGER. I still do not see how that prevents a commission man from going to a man who wants a contract and saying to him, "You are going to get a 5-year contract. You are going to pay me $25,000 in 1951, $25,000 in 1952, $25,000 in 1953, and so forth." I think that is the kind of thing that ought to be stopped, and it seems to me this language will not stop it.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not undertake to stop or prevent or outlaw a particular contract. What it says to the contractor or subcontractor is, "When your expenditures for this item exceed $25,000, it is subject to renegotiation, and the reasonableness of the expenditures will be looked into by the board."

If a particular contractor were to have only one contract with the Government, and if he were to be paid over a period of time, he could make his contract; but if the amount paid out or the amount accrued under the contract reached $25,000 in the fiscal year, that would be all that he could deduct, unless the board itself found his expenditures to be reasonable.

Mr. LANGER. Under this wording, could he not get $25,000 the succeeding year, $25,000 the year after that, and so forth?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator mean the contractor?

Mr. LANGER. I mean the commission man, who gets the 5 percent.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; he could do it if he were not paid a total of $25,000 within the fiscal year. In any event the transactions would be subject to Federal income and excess-profits taxes.

Mr. LANGER. On page 37, line 7, I notice that appointments of officers and employees are to be made without regard to civil service laws and regulations. I wonder why they were taken out of civil service?

Mr. GEORGE. The purpose was to enable the Board to make its contracts rapidly, as it must do. While the civil service laws do not apply, the salaries fixed in the Classification Act do apply. It was thought that that would enable the Board to procure more rapidly suitably experienced persons to do the particular job. It must be done quickly, of course, because contracts are now being made, and some are being executed.

Mr. LANGER. That would be true in any war, would it not? In order to get employees rapidly, they must be taken outside the civil service.

Mr. GEORGE. That would not be true of the established agencies of Government; but with respect to a new agency which had to do directly with the defense program, it would be true in a measure. I think we have exempted other agencies from the civil service laws under similar circumstances, when it was desirable to obtain competent persons quickly—perhaps before they could be qualified under civil service.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. With further reference to the class of contracts described in section 103 (G) (3), pertaining to services performed in obtaining contracts, with the $25,000 limitation, how is it proposed to keep track of the $25,000 limitation when the agent receives his fees from more than one contractor? Clearly, if a single contractor pays more than $25,000 to a subcontractor or to a commission agent, that can be readily determined; but suppose the agent receives fees from more than one contractor, and seeks business from the whole field?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the subcontractor is required to file a statement with the Renegotiation Board, and itemize receipts from various sources.

Mr. CASE. That is, anyone in the business of selling his influence or selling his contacts dealing with the defense contracts will be required by the act to make a report to the Renegotiation Board?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, as I understand.

Mr. CASE. That certainly is an end greatly to be desired; and if the language in the bill is sufficient to accomplish that purpose, it will render a great public service.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe we had definite assurance that that policy would be followed in the regulations to be made effective, particularly in respect to the matter which the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder why natural gas was exempted?

Mr. GEORGE. I have already passed that point. It is exempted only when it is a byproduct.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the same question with respect to oil.

Mr. GEORGE. It was exempted under the World War II Act, and we simply followed the World War II Act. The exemption exists only when it is a byproduct of an exempted product.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to follow the Senator's pleasure. I have not been able to be present in the Chamber during all the time the Senator has been speaking. I have certain questions which I wish to ask in regard to the bill. Would the Senator prefer to complete his explanation of the bill and then have me discuss certain sections of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe I would prefer that course, unless in what I shall subsequently say I cover some of the points about which the Senator wishes to inquire.

The House bill does not provide for any carry-over of loss from 1 year to another in the case of renegotiable contracts. The Finance Committee has added to the bill an amendment permitting the excess of costs paid or incurred with respect to renegotiable contracts and subcontracts in any fiscal year over the amount received or accrued in such fiscal year, to be carried over and applied as an item of cost in the next succeeding fiscal year, subject to the regulations of the Board.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That happens to be the point about which I wished to query the Senator.

Under the old Renegotiation Act, as I understand, the Renegotiation Board could not take into consideration, no matter what the surrounding facts and circumstances might be, a loss which occurred 1 year in connection with a profit which occurred in another year. For example, take the case of a given contractor, Mr. X. Let us say that in 1942 he made $100,000. In 1943 he lost $200,000; and in 1944 he made $5,000. When we came to consider his renegotiation problem we could not take into account the year in which he suffered the heavy loss, with the result that I am satisfied, from my own investigation of certain cases, that some great injustices were done to certain contractors.

I have two questions to ask the Senator:

First, under the terms of the bill will the Renogtiation Board be allowed the wise discretion of taking into account both the losses and the profits which a contractor may make on Government contracts, in order to see to it that equity is done to him in the final renegotiation settlement?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct—for 1 year only, however. The bill does not authorize the carry-over for more than 1 year. But if in one year there is a loss, and in the subsequent year there is a profit, the loss, if it arose out of renegotiation of a contract, can be carried forward so that equity may be done to the contractor. Some cases have been brought to my attention, and no doubt have been brought to the attention of all other Senators, where the failure to give any carry-over, even for 1 year, has resulted in great hardship and in injury to the contractors.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia that that is true. I know of one case, with which the Senator from Georgia is familiar, because he has been very courteous and helpful in doing what he could as a committee member in having the case reviewed, and I refer to it here for the purpose of the RECORD because of a possible amendment I may want to discuss with the Senator from Georgia. I refer to a case with which the old Renegotiation Board did not take into account a loss suffered in one year when considering its renegotiation of a profit in another year.

Mr. GEORGE. That was done under the old law. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. So I invite the Senator's attention to page 45 of the bill, "Title II—Miscellaneous provisions," section 201, subsection (b) "Transfer of functions in general." I assume that this transfer of functions in general "conferred upon the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board by the Renegotiation Act" to the new Renegotiation Board would not permit the new board to apply the new provisions and regulations in taking into account losses suffered in 1 year as against renegotiations of profits made in another year in respect to pending cases going back to the work of the old Renegotiation Board of World War II?

Mr. GEORGE. As I am advised, the Senator's understanding is correct. The Board would only apply the old law in that case. It could not give to the contractor the benefits of any provision of this measure, which for the first time was inserted in the law.

Mr. MORSE. In reading the bill in toto, as I have, am I correct in my understanding that there is no language anywhere in the bill which possibly authorizes the new board under the new law to seek to do equity in any cases pending from the old board?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator's interpretation is correct. It does not apply. I personally have given some consideration to the problem. I had hoped that we might have some opportunity to apply an equitable provision in this measure in adjusting contracts which arose prior to the passage of this measure. But I have not been able to work out anything. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. This measure would not take care of the situation as he states it.

Mr. MORSE. Again I want to say for the record that I appreciate the outstanding fairness the Senator from Georgia has extended to the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to this problem, which I have mentioned to him in conversation and conference. I only want to say for the record that I do not think time ever rectifies or justifies an injustice. If we are, in this measure, seeking to prevent the kind of injustices which existed under the old act so far as the carry-over principle is concerned, it seems to me unfortunate that we do not take the steps necessary in this measure to clear the record of existing injustices. If we leave them to the Department of Justice under the wording of the old act, it apparently leaves the Department in no position but to follow a course of collecting from a given contractor on a renegotiation basis a return from the profits he made, irrespective of the fact that the very next year the Government itself might very well have been responsible for his suffering great loss, as I know is the case, having studied the complete record of the case I presently have in mind. Therefore, I ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks it would be unwise and unworkable to include in this measure a power in the new board to consider on appeal or review any specific cases which would justify a modification, in view of the surrounding facts and circumstances pertaining to those cases, so as to permit the Board to prevent injustices from being meted out to various contractors who will suffer an injustice if we simply apply the strict and literal meaning of the old act?

Mr. GEORGE. I will say to the Senator that I would be very happy if a proper provision along that line could be worked out. I have been unable to do it primarily for this reason: The distinguished Senator now has in mind a pending or open case. If all the cases were open, it could be done. But, of course, many hundreds and thousands of them have been closed without this right and without the benefit of this provision, and it would open up, or create, or rather bring to light inequities in those closed cases, and there would, of course, be some substantial basis for a consideration of those cases.

However, I may say to the Senator that if, before we finish action on the bill, any suitable amendment can be prepared to enable us to take this matter to conference so we can see if there is a possibility in conference of perfecting a provision which would meet the essential and substantial equity in cases which arose under the prior law, but which are as yet open and undisposed of, I shall be very glad to give it most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me to make an additional comment at this point in the RECORD, I certainly want to thank him for his offer of cooperation in this matter. In my opinion, he is correct, that the adoption of the principle for which I now argue will raise some question in regard to some settled cases. But I do not think we should overlook the fact that what we are dealing with here is not a matter involving business relations between two private contractors, but involving business relations between the United States Government and citizens of the country. Under the experience of those relationships, we have come to find, as I think the bill makes clear, that the United States Government insisted upon the application in its renegotiation of some very hard principles of renegotiation, in connection with which it failed to do equity to its citizens by not taking into account losses they suffered in one year when factually many times the responsibility for those losses was more the fault of the Government than of the citizen himself. Although doing equity now might open up some old cases, I hold tenaciously to the point that whenever my Government on the record has been found guilty of doing an inequity, I care not how old the inequity is, or how closed the case may be, if the equitable principle would be to make an adjustment beneficial to the citizen, I think it ought to be made.

If this principle—and I assert that the principle which the committee is inserting in this new bill is a sound one—is proper for the future contracts into which the Government enters in connection with the present defense program, then I say it ought to be applied to the contracts the Government negotiated during World War II, from the standpoint of reviewing cases only to determine whether an inequity or an injustice was done in specific cases by not carrying over into the following year the losses suffered in a previous year. I know we are going to find a considerable number of cases in which the Government struck a very hard bargain and worked great inequities.

Therefore, I am perfectly willing to take the position on the floor of the Senate today that we ought to reopen those cases and should give to the contractors involved the benefit of the equitable rule which we now say—having profited from the experience we had with the old act—should have applied during World War II. How many of those cases there will be, I do not know; but whether it is "Y" number or "X" number, if an inequity or an injustice were done, and if we now have a chance to rectify it, I think we should do so, and should give the review board or the appeals board an opportunity to take a look, frankly allowing it, in giving it that review power, to consider those cases and see whether an adjustment should be made.

So long as the Department of Justice takes the position that under the language of the present law it cannot take into account the fact that a loss was suffered by a contractor under conditions over which he had no control—and I challenge the correctness of that position, but this is not the place to debate that point—then I say to the Senator that the way to correct the injustices and inequities existing in the cases now pending is to give the board the power of review. Of course, I have no objection to having an adjustment made of those cases, if the Government finds that an inequity has been done.

As I indicated a moment ago, the Department of Justice takes the position that if a contractor suffers great losses during a given year as the result of unforeseen conditions which developed

after the contract was entered into, the contractor cannot offset those losses against profits made during the preceding year. This situation has worked great injustice and has threatened some contractors with bankruptcy.

In this new bill the committee apparently recognizes that the Renegotiation Board and the Court of Tax Appeals should be allowed the discretion of taking into account the equities involved in cases of losses, and should permit an offset of those losses suffered during a given year against profits made during another year. I think that is right, but I think that procedure should be applied to the old cases, as well.

I assure the Senator from Georgia that following this discussion I shall proceed immediately from this floor to consult legislative counsel. I shall present this matter to him, and shall ask him to cooperate with me during the next hour in the drafting of an amendment, which I should like to submit to the Senator from Georgia, for his consideration, to see whether it can be taken to conference, because I am satisfied that the Department of Justice at the present time is working such great injustices in some cases that something must be done to check that Department in what I think are very inequitable and unjust renegotiation settlements upon which it is insisting. It is the old case of the Federal Government again collecting a pound of flesh from a citizen, when in many cases the responsibility for the situation is more that of the Government than that of the citizen.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to express the hope that the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon will not propose that a new appeals board be set up to take over the functions which have been so well exercised by the Tax Court during the past few years. I hope that any suggestion of a further appeal will not result in the creation of a review board to be placed over the Tax Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, to permit me to reply?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from South Dakota that I am perfectly willing to have the Tax Court handle these matters; but what the Tax Court says now is that it is bound by the letter of the law, and cannot take into account a loss suffered one year, in renegotiating the profits made in another year, irrespective of the fact that the Government may have been responsible for the loss suffered.

Under the new bill the Tax Court will have the right, in connection with the litigation, to take into account the carryover for 1 year, as explained by the Senator from Georgia.

All I am asking for is that if that procedure is fair now, then it ought to be considered as fair under the problems which arose under the old Renegotiation Act during World War II, because I can show the Senator—as I shall be glad to do, knowing his keen sense of fairness and equity—cases in which the Government was primarily responsible for the loss which was suffered, but the contractor could not receive the benefit of those facts and surrounding circumstances in obtaining an equitable settlement of his claim. That is all I am asking for.

I care not who does it—whether the Tax Court does it or whether the Government gives the power, as is done by this bill, to the renegotiation board in the first instance.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, would the Senator have any objection to reopening cases?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to reopening a case if an inequity was done in the final settlement.

I am simply saying that I think the principle that losses incurred in one year can be carried over as against the profits made in a subsequent year—as is provided by this bill—is a sound principle. That is why it is provided for in this bill. I assume because of the experience under the old renegotiation law, for we found that without this safeguard in a new bill, we would continue some injustices and some inequities which the Government committed against its citizens during World War II.

I wish to see equity done not only as to future contracts, but also as to contracts with citizens whom the Government has wronged in the past.

I submit to the Senator from South Dakota that the Government has wronged a good many of its citizens in the past by not permitting that carryover to be made.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Let me say that the discretion afforded the old Price Adjustment Board was such that it was impossible for it to take into consideration the financial condition of a company. In the case of any company which had any continuing operations with the Government, it is my opinion that for the most part the record was fairly good. If anything, the Board was generous to the contractor, in case of doubt.

I think we might well consider the precise language now proposed before we give the Board, or any review or appellate body the right to reopen cases which have been closed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for 1 minute further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish most respectfully to submit notice of my disagreement with the observation just made by the Senator from South Dakota, namely, that the old Board exercised its discretion wisely or had such discretion to exercise. It had no discretion in regard to the problem covered by the language of the new bill now under discussion, namely, the taking into account of a loss suffered in 1943, as against a gain made in 1942.

I wish to cite to the Senator from South Dakota, for example, cases which fell into the following category: A contractor on a fixed-amount contract subsequently found himself confronted, for example, with the new cost of portal-to-portal pay, which caused him to take a considerable loss during the year when provision was made for portal-to-portal pay. He was not allowed by the old Renegotiation Board to take into account the new condition which caused him the loss.

I simply wish to say that the old Renegotiation Board took the position, and now the Department of Justice takes the position, as does the Tax Court, that under the language of that law they could not take into account the fact that the contractor's loss was suffered because of conditions over which he had no control. However, I think they should have the power to take those conditions into consideration or account. I think a great many injustices occurred as a result of that language which is now for the future specifically to be corrected by the new bill, and I am glad that is so. However, I repeat that the Government has been guilty of doing many injustices to contractors during World War II because this language of discretion was not contained in the old law.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say a word further on this point, because I want to complete the record. It is believed that this provision will be particularly beneficial to the small contractor and any contractor beginning production under defense contracts. Experience has shown that losses are frequently incurred at the beginning of production as a result of tooling up and other nonrecurring charges. This is particularly true with respect to new items not previously manufactured by the contractor or subcontractor.

Under the House bill certain factors are required to be taken into consideration in determining excessive profits. Among the factors is one relating to the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor. The Finance Committee is of the opinion that the statement of this factor in the House bill does not require favorable recognition of efficiency. Accordingly, the Finance Committee amended the House provision to require that favorable recognition must be given to the efficiency factor.

The House bill also contained a net worth factor but limited the consideration of this factor to the reasonableness of return on the net worth. The Finance Committee felt that the House provision was too restrictive and that it might preclude a consideration of replacement costs, total assets used in the business and other features. Accordingly, the House bill has been amended to require that all aspects of net worth must be considered and not merely the return thereon.

The House bill provided for the payment of interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon unpaid renegotiation indebtedness and in the case of amounts refunded to the contractor required the Government to pay interest also at the rate of 6 percent. The Finance Committee is of the opinion that the 6 percent rate is too high from both the contractor's and the Government's standpoint

and has added an amendment reducing this rate to 4 percent.

An amendment was also adopted to the House bill preventing interest from accruing after 3 years from the date of the filing of a petition by the contractor or subcontractor with the Tax Court where there is no final determination by the Tax Court with respect to such petition within such 3-year period. This amendment will protect the contractor or subcontractor from the running of interest where payment has been postponed because of long litigation or court delays. In addition, the Finance Committee added an amendment to provide that if the Tax Court determines a lesser amount than that determined by the Renegotiation Board, interest will not accrue on such lesser amount if the contractor or subcontractor prior to filing his petition with the Tax Court tendered in payment an amount equal to or greater than the amount determined by the Tax Court.

Another amendment affecting interest which was added by the Finance Committee provides that interest on unpaid renegotiation indebtedness should not commence to run until the thirtieth day after the date of the order of the Renegotiation Board or the date fixed for repayment by agreement of the parties. Under the House bill, interest would start to run from the date fixed for repayment by order of the Renegotiation Board or by agreement of the parties.

The Finance Committee also made a series of minor amendments to the House bill. One permits affiliated groups under certain conditions to conduct renegotiation on a consolidated basis if they so request. Another expressly excludes from the definition of subcontractor purchase orders or agreements to furnish office supplies. This is in accordance with the World War II statute. A third gives the contractor or subcontractor petitioning the Tax Court, 10 days to secure a bond to stay collection pending the Tax Court proceedings instead of 5 days as provided in the House bill. A fourth amendment provides that the Renegotiation Board may employ personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations. However, such personnel will be subject to the pay limitations of the Classification Act. A fifth amendment requires all moneys recaptured through renegotiation proceedings to be covered into the Treasury. The House bill provided that all moneys recovered in respect of amounts paid to the contractor or subcontractor from corporate or other revolving funds should be restored to such funds.

In order to facilitate the execution of the national defense program, the Finance Committee also adopted an amendment to enable banks, trust companies, and other financing institutions to advance funds needed by contractors and subcontractors without incurring the liability that money due or to become due under the assigned contract or subcontract may be withheld for the collection of the renegotiation liabilities of their assignors. Upon that point, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I shall offer a clarifying amendment to meet certain objections which have been raised by the lending institutions to that provision of the Senate bill.

To conform to more accurate accounting practice, the word "books" in several places in the bill has been changed to "records." The provision giving the Board in its determination of profits the power to eliminate items of cost which in its opinion are unreasonable, but which may be disallowed under other provisions of the bill as improper income-tax deductions, has been omitted as redundant and contradictory.

The House bill contains a provision suspending the profit limitation provisions of the Vinson-Trammel Act with respect to contracts or subcontracts, receipts or accruals of which are subject to renegotiation under this bill. At the request of the Maritime Commission, the profit-limitation provisions of section 505 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, are also suspended with respect to any contract or subcontract if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this bill.

Finally, the House adopted a provision suspending the prohibition of persons performing duties under the bill from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States after such person was no longer employed in any Department or the Board. The Finance Committee broadened the House provision to conform to the World War II statute so that any person employed in any named department or any department designated by the President, during the period, or a part thereof, beginning July 1, 1950, and ending December 31, 1953, will not be subject to such prohibition even though while with the Government he was engaged in performing duties not connected with the bill. This broadening of the provision is considered essential because of the desire to secure in the defense agencies men of professional experience who may desire to return to their former professions after their Government service has ended.

Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I desire to ask the Senator whether it is the purpose of this bill to make all Government contracts renegotiable.

Mr. GEORGE. No, I may say to the Senator, that is not the purpose. The committee was quite well satisfied of that from the general attitude and approach of Mr. Frank Roberts, who greatly assisted the committee in the preparation of its amendments to this bill, and who is at the present time the chairman of the Renegotiations Board, as I understand. We were given the positive assurance that it was not the purpose to renegotiate all contracts made, although the bill literally provides for the renegotiation of all contracts made with specific agencies; for example, with the Defense Department. At one time the committee was of opinion that it was necessary to write into the bill a limitation restricting the contracts to be renegotiated to those which were directly connected with the defense program. I have forgotten the exact language which was used. But upon fuller and more careful consideration——

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will pardon me—the committee used the language, I think, "having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense."

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct—a direct and immediate connection with the national defense. But upon more mature deliberation and upon fuller consideration, the committee was of opinion that it would be very difficult to determine or to define defense contracts.

So we decided that it would be very much better to incorporate in the report a positive and definite statement of the intent and purpose of the bill. If the House accepts this view, as I am satisfied it will, then we can request the House to put into the report of the managers themselves their interpretation of the contracts which are to be renegotiated. It is obvious that some contracts might be made by the Department of Commerce which would not relate to defense whatsoever.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the point I am raising. It occurred to me that as the bill is now written it leaves to the renegotiating authority absolute discretion so that they could take one class of contracts not related to defense in any way and could renegotiate those, and take another class, also not related, and say, "We do not want to renegotiate these." It seems to me we are giving them pretty broad powers and investing them with discretion which they could exercise.

Mr. GEORGE. That is undoubtedly true. The Senator is quite right in indicating that if the proposed law is literally interpreted, any contract made with one of the named agencies, or any other agency which the President may later designate, could be renegotiated. But that is not the understanding of what will be done and the committee was very well satisfied and assured that that would not be the practice, particularly if we included a strong statement in the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. By way of illustration, the Government makes contracts continually through a defense agency, the Corps of Engineers, for the construction of flood-control projects and works of that character, which are not necessarily related to the national defense at all.

Mr. GEORGE. They are not directly related, at least.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not directly, at least.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Senator agrees that under a literal construction of the bill as written, the authorities could select any one individual contract in that category and say, "We are going to renegotiate this, and not any others in this category." As I read the bill, they would have complete discretion to renegotiate any they desired to renegotiate, not as to particular classes of contracts, but as to individual contractors.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct in stating that, under a literal construction of the language, they would have that power. But let me call the attention of the Senator to this language in the report:

Under the House bill the President is given the authority to designate additional departments whose contracts shall be subject to renegotiation. Under the House bill, any department exercising functions in connection with the national defense might be designated. Your committee bill limits this power of the President to departments exercising functions having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense. While a literal wording of the bill would require all contracts with the departments specifically named or those designated by the President to be renegotiated, your committee contemplates that the Board by a judicious use of its power to make permissive exemptions of contracts by classes or types will properly limit the area of renegotiation where the contracts are not intimately related to the defense effort.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the able Senator from Georgia one further question. Would the renegotiation that is authorized apply to contracts which are entered into as a result of competitive bidding, as well as to negotiated contracts?

Mr. GEORGE. It would. The bill does not distinguish, as the old law did, between contracts obtained through competitive bidding and those obtained through negotiation. But the discretionary power is in the Board.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator feel it would do any violence to the bill to insert the words to which we have referred, which the committee originally considered, namely, "having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense"? Does the Senator think it would weaken the bill in any way merely to provide that the law shall say what is intended, rather than leave to the negotiating authorities the power to exercise the "judicious discretion," as the Senator has expressed it, which the committee has voiced the hope they will exercise, in view of the language incorporated in the report?

Mr. GEORGE. With respect to that amendment, I may say to the Senator that the committee did reach the conclusion that it would be unwise to write the language in the bill, for the reason which I have already indicated, namely, that it is not quite possible to define with accuracy all contracts which are immediately and directly related to national defense. There is a matter of degree, and the committee thought it would be better to leave the power within the discretion of the administrators, if the language found in the report, or the substance of it, is incorporated in the report of the managers to the House when the work of the conferees on the bill has been concluded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to incorporate the language to which I have referred, and I trust that in the conference report the conferees will further emphasize what the Senator has been saying, namely, that it is expected that the law will be interpreted as the Finance Committee has hoped it would be, and that it will be "judiciously" administered, along the lines suggested by the able Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Whether or not an amendment is offered and carried to conference, it will be the purpose of the Senate conferees to try to write an explicit, direct, definite statement in the conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It seems to me it would be well if the amendment could be carried to conference, and upon further discussion with the conferees representing the House in the conference, I feel it can be emphasized sufficiently to impress the will and intent of Congress upon the renegotiating authorities.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, so far as the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee to whom I have spoken are concerned, we would not have any objection to taking the amendment to conference, because we wish to emphasize the precise interpretation the Senator from Arkansas desires to put upon the law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator from Georgia, and at the proper time I shall offer the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will offer the amendment at the proper time, I shall be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 3, after line 3, to strike out:

(b) Renegotiation Act of 1948: The Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not apply with respect to any receipts or accruals subject to renegotiation under this title. If a contractor or subcontractor, during the same fiscal year in which he has receipts or accruals subject to renegotiation under this title, has other receipts or accruals from contracts or subcontracts subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act of 1948, the provisions of this title shall, notwithstanding subsection (a), apply to such other receipts or accruals if the Board and such contractor or subcontractor agree to such application of this title; and in the case of such an agreement the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not apply to such other receipts or accruals of the fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

(b) Performance prior to July 1, 1950: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the provisions of this title shall not apply to contracts with the Departments, or related subcontracts, to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after the first day of January 1951, which are attributable to performance, under such contracts or subcontracts, prior to July 1, 1950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 24, to insert:

(c) Renegotiation Act of 1948: The Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not be applicable to any contract or subcontract to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor on or after the 1st day of January 1951, and attributable to performance after June 30, 1950, whether such contract or subcontract was made on, before, or after such first day. In the case of a fiscal year beginning in 1950 and ending in 1951, if a contractor or subcontractor has receipts or accruals prior to January 1, 1951, from contracts or subcontracts subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948, and also has receipts or accruals after December 31, 1950, to which the provisions of this title are applicable, the provisions of this title shall, notwithstanding subsection (a), apply to such receipts and accruals prior to January 1, 1951, if the Board and such contractor or subcontractor agreed to such application of this title; and in the case of such an agreement the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 shall not apply to any of the receipts or accruals for such fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, to reletter the subsection from "(c)" to "(d)", and in line 22, after the word "supplemented," to insert "and of section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended and supplemented (46 U. S. C. 1155 (b))."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 9, after the word "Commission", to insert "the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, after the word "Corporation,", to insert "the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to construction undertaken by it,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "functions", to strike out "in" and insert "having a direct and immediate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 19, after the word "Corporation,", to insert "the Housing and Home Finance Administrator,".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have agreed that the Canal Zone, in its official designation, shall be inserted at the proper place in the bill, if it is found to be necessary to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 18, after the word "Commission", to insert "the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the word "profits", to insert "favorable recognition must be given to the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor, with particular regard to attainment of quantity and quality production, reduction of costs, and economy in the use of materials, facilities, and manpower; and in addition."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 13, to strike out:

(1) Efficiency of contractor, with particular regard to attainment of quantity and quality production, reduction of costs, and economy in the use of materials, facilities, and manpower;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, to change the subsection number from "(2)" to "(1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(2)", and in the same line; after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Reasonableness of return on" and insert "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 24, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 1, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(4)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 5, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(5)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 9, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(6)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, after the word "carry-back", to insert "but there shall be allowed as an item of cost in any fiscal year, subject to regulations of the Board, any excess in the preceding fiscal year of costs paid or incurred with respect to receipts or accruals subject to the provisions of this title over the amount of such receipts or accruals"; on page 8, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "cost"; in line 7, after the word "his", to strike out "books" and insert "records"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "cost," and in line 15, after the word "costs" and the period, to strike out: "Irrespective of the method employed or prescribed for determining such costs, no item of cost shall be charged to contracts with the Departments or subcontracts or used in any manner for the purpose of determining such costs, to the extent that, in the opinion of the Board, or, upon redetermination, in the opinion of The Tax Court of the United States, such item is unreasonable or not properly chargeable to such contracts or subcontracts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 9, after the word "subcontract", to insert "but such term does not include any purchase order or agreement to furnish office supplies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to strike out:

(h) Fiscal year: The term "fiscal year" means, except in the case of a partnership as defined in section 3797 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the taxable year of the contractor or subcontractor under chapter 1 of such code. In the case of a partnership as so defined the term "fiscal year" means such period as the Board by regulations may prescribe.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(h) Fiscal year: The term "fiscal year" means the taxable year of the contractor or subcontractor under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, except that where any readjustment of interests occurs in a partnership as defined in section 3797 (a) (2) of such code, the fiscal year of the partnership or partnerships involved in such readjustment shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 11, after the word "his", to strike out "books" and insert "records."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 11, after the word "subcontractors.", to insert "The Board shall conduct renegotiation on a consolidated basis with a parent and its subsidiary corporations which constitute an affiliated group under subsection (d) of section 141 of the Internal Revenue Code if all of the corporations included in such affiliated group request such consolidation and consent to such regulations as the Board shall prescribe with respect to the determination and elimination of excessive profits of such affiliated group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 16, after the word "the", to strike out "date fixed for repayment by" and insert "thirtieth day after the date of"; in line 18, after the word "or", to insert "from the date fixed for repayment", and on page 19, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "6" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 9, after the words "from the", to strike out "date originally fixed by the Board for its repayment" and insert "thirtieth day after the date of the order of the Board."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "date originally fixed by the Board for its repayment" and insert "thirtieth day after the date of the order of the Board."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "date originally fixed for repayment by the Board" and insert "thirtieth day after the date of the order of the Board", and in line 4, after the word "repayment", to insert "except that no interest shall accrue or be payable on such lesser amount if such lesser amount is not in excess of an amount which the contractor or subcontractor tendered in payment prior to the filing of the petition with the Tax Court."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 8, to insert "Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, no interest shall accrue after 3 years from the date of filing a petition with the Tax Court pursuant to section 108 of this title in any case in which there has not been a final determination by the Tax Court with respect to such petition within such 3-year period."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 3, to insert:

(5) Assignees: Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize any agency of the Government, except as provided in the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1029), as now or hereafter amended, to withhold from an assignee any moneys due or to become due under any contract with a Department where such moneys have been assigned pursuant to such act, or to authorize any agency of the Government to direct the withholding pursuant to subsection (b) (1) (C) of this section from an assignee bank (as defined in sec. 104 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code) or from an assignee Federal lending agency of any moneys due or to become due under any subcontract where such moneys have been assigned to such an assignee as collateral for a loan.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment in substitution of that particular committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 21, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 4 through 18 and insert the following:

(5) Assignees: Nothing herein contained shall be construed (A) to authorize any department or agency of the Government, except to the extent provided in the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, to withhold from any assignee referred to in said act, any moneys due or to become due, or to recover any moneys paid to such assignee under any contract with any department or agency, where such moneys have been assigned pursuant to such act, or (B) to authorize any department or agency of the Government to direct the withholding pursuant to this act, or to recover pursuant to this act, from any bank, trust company, or other financing institution (including any Federal lending agency) which is an assignee under any subcontract, any moneys due or to become due, or paid to any such assignee under such subcontract.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 19, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(6)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 24, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(7)", and on page 22, line 10, after the word "Treasury.", to strike out "All money recovered in respect of amounts paid to the contractor from corporate or other revolving funds (other than appropriations from the Treasury) by way of repayment, withholding, crediting, or suit under this section shall be restored to such funds. The Board is authorized to make regulations giving effect to the intent of this provision in respect of money recovered representing subcontract excessive profits not readily identifiable as to the public funds ultimately reflecting charges therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 20, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(8)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$500,000"; in line 15, after the word "than", to strike out "100,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 12, after the word "Computation.",

to strike out "In computing the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued during any fiscal year for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, such computation shall be made without elimination of intercompany sales."; in line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 20, after "(2).", to insert "In the case of a fiscal year beginning in 1950 and ending in 1951, the $500,000 amount and the $25,000 amount shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to $500,000 or $25,000, as the case may be, as the number of days in such fiscal year after December 31, 1950, bears to 365, but this sentence shall have no application if the contractor or subcontractor has made an agreement with the Board pursuant to section 102 (c) for the application of the provisions of this title to receipts or accruals prior to January 1, 1951, during such fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 20, after the word "market", to strike out the comma and "but only if such contract or subcontract is with the producer of such agricultural commodity."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 10, after the word "deposit", to insert "or timber", and in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by producers in order to obtain the first commercially marketable product, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner or operator of the mine, well, or deposit from which such product is produced. The term 'ordinary treatment process' means, in the case of the product of a mine, well, or deposit with respect to which an allowance for percentage depletion is provided by section 114 (b) (3) or (4) of the Internal Revenue Code, those processes which are taken into account under such section in computing gross income from the property, and in the case of any other product such term means such similar processes as may be prescribed under regulations promulgated by the Board; or", and insert "first form or state suitable for industrial use; or"; on page 30, after line 2, to strike out:

(4) Any contract or subcontract for timber which has not been processed beyond the form of logs, but only if such contract or subcontract is with the owner of the timber property or with the producer of the logs; or

And insert:

(4) any contract or subcontract with a common carrier for transportation, or with a public utility for gas, electric energy, water, communications, or transportation, when made in either case at rates not in excess of published rates or charges filed with, fixed, approved, or regulated by a public regulatory body, State, Federal, or local, or at rates not in excess of unregulated rates of such a public utility which are substantially as favorable to users and consumers as are regulated rates. In the case of the furnishing or sale of transportation by common carrier by water, this paragraph shall apply only to such furnishing or sale which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission under part III of the Interstate Commerce Act or subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board under the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; or

(5) any contract or subcontract with an organization exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, provided that the income from such contract or subcontract would not constitute "unrelated business income" within the meaning of section 422 of the Internal Revenue Code; or

And on page 31, line 3, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(6)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 5, to strike out:

(b) Cost allowance: In the case of a contractor or subcontractor who produces an agricultural product and processes, refines, or treats such a product beyond the first form or state provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (a), or who produces the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, and processes, refines, or treats such a product beyond the first commercially marketable state provided in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) or, in the case of timber, beyond the form of logs, the Board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to give the contractor or subcontractor a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount which would have been realized by such contractor or subcontractor if he had sold the product in the form or state provided in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), or, in the case of timber, in the form of logs.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

(b) Cost allowance: In the case of a contractor or subcontractor who produces or acquires the product of a mine, oil or gas well, or other mineral or natural deposit, or timber, and processes, refines, or treats such a product to and beyond the first form or state suitable for industrial use, or who produces or acquires an agricultural product and processes, refines, or treats such a product to and beyond the first form or state in which it is customarily sold or in which it has an established market, the Board shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to give such contractor or subcontractor a cost allowance substantially equivalent to the amount which would have been realized by such contractor or subcontractor if he had sold such product at such first form or state. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, there shall be excluded from consideration in determining whether or not a contractor or subcontractor has received or accrued excessive profits that portion of the profits, derived from receipts and accruals subject to the provisions of this title, attributable to the increment in value of the excess inventory. For the purposes of this subsection the term "excess inventory" means inventory of products, hereinbefore described in this subsection, acquired by the contractor or subcontractor in the form or at the state in which contracts for such products on hand or on contract would be exempted from this title by subsection (a) (2) or (3) of this section, which is in excess of the inventory reasonably necessary to fulfill existing contracts or orders. That portion of the profits, derived from receipts and accruals subject to the provisions of this title, attributable to the increment in value of the excess inventory, and the method of excluding such portion of profits from consideration in determining whether or not the contractor or subcontractor has received or accrued excessive profits, shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board.

(c) Partial mandatory exemption for durable productive equipment:

(1) In general: The provisions of this title shall not apply to receipts or accruals from subcontracts for durable productive equipment, except to that part of such receipts or accruals which bears the same ratio to the total of such receipts or accruals as 5 years bears to the average useful life of such equipment as set forth in Bulletin F of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (1942 edition) or, if an average useful life is not so set forth, then as estimated by the Board.

(2) Definitions: For the purpose of this subsection—

(A) the term "durable productive equipment" means machinery, tools, or other equipment which does not become a part of an end product, or of an article incorporated therein, and which has an average useful life of more than 5 years; and

(B) the term "subcontracts for durable productive equipment" does not include subcontracts where the purchaser of such durable productive equipment has acquired such equipment for the account of the Government, but includes pool orders and similar commitments placed in the first instance by a department or other agency of the Government when title to the equipment is transferred on delivery thereof or within 1 year thereafter to a contractor or subcontractor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, to change the letter of the subparagraph from "(c)" to "(d)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before we leave section 103 I should like to make a very brief statement.

It is my understanding that although section 106 of the bill exempts certain public utilities and common carriers, including those engaged in water transportation under specific statutes, from renegotiation, such exemption is not intended to limit the authority of the Board to exempt certain other carriers, particularly water carriers, under the permissive provisions of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that statement is correct, and I am very glad to concur in the statement. The matter was discussed in committee when the bill was under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 18, to strike out:

(a) Creation of board: There is hereby created, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, a Renegotiation Board to be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not less than three members of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Each member shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per annum. No member shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as a member of the Board. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(a) Creation of board: There is hereby created, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, a Renegotiation Board to be composed of five members to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; one by the President, to serve as Chairman; one each by the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, respectively, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense; and one by the Administrator of General Services. The Chairman shall receive compensation at

the rate of $17,500 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 19, after the word "be", to strike out "at such place as may be determined from time to time by the Board" and insert "in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "the civil service laws and", and in line 7, after the numerals "1949", to insert "(but without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 3, after the word "Board.", to insert "But no function, power, or duty shall be delegated or redelegated to any person pursuant to this subsection or subsection (f) unless the Board has determined that such person is responsible directly to the Board or to the person making such delegation or redelegation and is not engaged on behalf of any department in the making of contracts for the procurement of supplies or services, or in the supervision of such activity; and any delegation or redelegation of any function, power, or duty pursuant to this subsection or subsection (f) shall be revoked by the person making such delegation or redelegation (or by the Board if made by it) if the Board shall at any time thereafter determine that the person to whom has been delegated or redelegated such function, power, or duty is not responsible directly to the Board or to the person making such delegation or redelegation or is engaged on behalf of any Department in the making of contracts for the procurement of supplies or services, or in the supervision of such activity."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 6, after the word "person" it is proposed to insert "(other than the secretary of a department)"; and on page 38, line 15, after the word "person" it is proposed to insert "(other than the secretary of a department)."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 21, after the word "within", to strike out "five" and insert "ten", and on page 43, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "6" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 3, after the words "rate of" to strike out "6" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 10, to strike out:

Nothing in title 18, United States Code, sections 281 and 283, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to prevent any person by reason of service prior to January 1, 1954, in performance of duties or functions required by this act, from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States: *Provided*, That such person shall not prosecute any claim against the United States (1) involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed, or (2) during the period such person is engaged in employment in a department or the Board.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Nothing in title 18, United States Code, sections 281 and 283, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to prevent any person by reason of service in a department or the Board during the period (or a part thereof) beginning July 1, 1950, and ending December 31, 1953, from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States: *Provided*, That such person shall not prosecute any claim against the United States (1) involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed, or (2) during the period such person is engaged in employment in a department or the Board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when section 103 on page 5 of the bill was read for an amendment the question arose upon the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has been very interested in renegotiation contract legislation in the House through the years, whether or not the Panama Canal was included or covered by virtue of any of the renegotiation acts. The information I now have is that if we wish to cover the Panama Canal and the head of the Panama Canal in subsection (b), amendments should be made. I therefore offer the amendment that, after the comma in line 10 on page 5 the words "Panama Canal" be inserted in subsection (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. And to perfect it, I offer an amendment, after the comma in line 19 in subsection (b) to insert "the head of the Panama Canal."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his consideration in going into this matter. It came to my attention in a case involving several million dollars for the third set of locks in the Panama Canal subject, and I think it is wise now to take care of it. I thank the Senator for the consideration he has given the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, have all the committee amendments been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "contracts", it is proposed to insert ", having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment to the same effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 19, after the word "contracts", it is proposed to insert ", having a direct and immediate connection with the national defense,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, we agreed to take these amendments to conference because they are in accordance with our interpretation of the bill. We are sure that it will be administered as provided in these amendments, but in order to give double assurance, if the amendments themselves are in conference, we will have the opportunity of writing in the conference report a definite, explicit statement.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

(6) any contract that a department awarded as a result of competitive bidding for the construction of any building, structure, improvement, or facility; or.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I think perhaps the chairman of the committee will agree to take the amendment to conference. The amendment I have just offered would exempt from the renegotiation process any construction contract awarded on the basis of competitive bids.

This provision was contained in the Renegotiation Act of 1944 and also the Renegotiation Act of 1948. It is designed to preserve the competitive bidding method of construction contracts. Without this amendment, competitive bidding will not mean anything because no bidder will be assured of receiving the amount he bid even though he wins the award and properly completes the construction job. As a result, all bidders may have a tendency to bid too high on the theory that they must protect themselves against any possible risk of loss.

This section worked well during the previous renegotiation legislation and I

believe we should continue it in this measure.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is what is known as one of the mandatory exemptions under the World War II Renegotiation Act. I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference for consideration. The House left it out as a mandatory exemption. Perhaps it can be fully recognized under the permissive exemptions in the bill. I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If the amendment is to go to conference it occurs to me that it might be desirable to consider whether or not a distinction should be made between contracts which are operated by contractors with their own equipment and tools, and those in connection with which tools are supplied by the Government under some of the provisions for expediting production There is a vast difference when dealing with profits from contracts in connection with which the contractor uses his own capital and his own equipment, and those in connection with which he uses capital and equipment of the Government. In fact it was that difficulty which led to renegotiation in the first place, because a straight percentage tax law did not make it possible to draw a distinction between those two kinds of operators.

It is impossible for me to make any suggestion at this time as to what would be the effect of the language of this amendment, but I hope that if the amendment goes to conference, the conference will take into consideration the possibility of protecting the Government's right to renegotiate where the contractor is using Government-supplied capital or Government-supplied equipment.

Mr. GEORGE. That question would be open in conference, and I am very glad to have the Senator's suggestion. I can assure him that if the House will be disposed to accept the amendment, we will be glad to present that viewpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "BASIC DATA RELATING TO ENERGY RESOURCES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report unanimously four resolutions, and I ask for immediate consideration of the resolutions.

I send to the desk Senate Resolution 61, upon which I ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Basic Data Relating to Energy Resources," printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 61), submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on February 1, 1951, was considered and agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO AIRLINE INDUSTRY (REPT. NO. 115)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably with an amendment Senate Resolution 55, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, hereby is extended to January 31, 1952.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 6, to strike out "January 31, 1952,", proposed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and insert "June 30, 1951."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment shortens the date for the report to June 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be impossible to consider the amendment until permission is given for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution appropriates no money. It simply allows the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce until June 30, 1951, to submit the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does this matter relate to the committee that is investigating the postal rates for the air lines?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a part of it.

Mr. LANGER. Then I wish to object, because that job belongs to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In view of the La Follette-Monroney Act, for the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot understand why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce persists in studying the ocean rates and the airline rates in regard to postal matters. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has absolutely no jurisdiction over such matters.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me state that the investigation has been made. This resolution will extend until June 30 the time within which the committee may complete its work and may ascertain the facts on which it will report. Without such permission the committee will have no further time in which to ascertain the facts on which it is to report.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has spent more than $100,000 in making the investigation; and the committee did that in spite of the fact that members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service stood on the floor of the Senate and protested time and time again.

There would be just as much sense in having the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service investigate some interstate commerce problem as there would be in having the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce take from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service its jurisdiction over a matter dealing with postal rates.

If the measure now under discussion simply involves the making of a report, and if no more money will be spent——

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all it proposes.

Mr. LANGER. Then I shall not object.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I should like to point out to the Senator from North Dakota, with whose viewpoint I have great sympathy, that the origin of this matter lies in the fact that in the early days of the air mail, practically the entire amount paid to the airlines was a subsidy, but was very unjustly charged to the Post Office Department, because the receipts from the air mail at the time were negligible.

It is quite true that as time has passed the air mail has built up tremendously, so that what proportion of this expenditure involves a subsidy, a matter which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and what proportion of it relates to the carrying of the mails, is the $64 question which must be answered.

It might well be that both committees could join in this work; but the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce certainly has jurisdiction in this matter because of its interstate aspects. Certainly the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over postal matters. We are seeking to determine what that aspect of the matter is, in order that the Post Office Department shall not be charged any more than is appropriately due for the carrying of the mail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that 3 years ago, when this matter was up for consideration, it was entirely in the hands of the Com-

mittee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had nothing to do with it.

The La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act provides that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall have jurisdiction of the postal service generally, including the railway mail service. Under those circumstances, I cannot understand how another committee can claim to have jurisdiction over this matter and can spend $100,000 in investigating postal rates, when at this time, at least, a committee is organized and ready, and has been for the past few years, to investigate such questions, and has always investigated postal matters, without ever meeting with another committee or writing to another committee.

However, at the very time when the committee did this, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] had introduced a bill calling for an investigation of the ocean mail rates and the air mail rates, and the senior Senator from North Dakota had a resolution calling for an investigation of the railway mail rates. Representatives of the postal service came before our committee. At first they refused to bring in certain documents. Then the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] said to them, "Gentlemen, if you do not bring these documents and records, we will subpena them."

All of a sudden, the first thing we knew, after some months went by, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] rose in the Senate and began to talk about railway rates and postal rates and a proposed investigation to be made by his committee. We objected at that time, as my friend will remember, to jurisdiction by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee over postal rates, so far as they are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, as the Senator from North Dakota will realize, the entire matter is much larger than the question of postal rates. It is a very much larger question when we talk about the money we have been paying to the airlines, both the domestic airlines and the airlines engaged in international trade. That is much larger than the question of postal rates. If postal rates were the only issue involved, this matter would be a very simple one to settle. However, that is not the case at all.

When the Congress enacted the original law with respect to assisting the airlines to get started, Congress included in that law provisions for the making of payments to the airlines for rendering that service. Those payments amounted to far more than the postal rates involved. That is where the problem we now are facing arose.

For instance, at this very moment there are claims with the Civil Aeronautics Board for $225,000,000 for back pay. Senators may say that some of that is postal pay, and I suppose some of it is. However, postal payments and subsidy payments and all the other payments due the airlines are mixed together. Our committee has been trying to separate them and break them down, so as to separate the payments for postal rates from the other portions of the moneys which we pay to the airlines. We are trying to handle the matter of setting up those amounts in such a way that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress will completely understand the entire case.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Colorado is a very wise and very smart and very intelligent gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to read to him the portion of the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act which defines the duties of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and then I should like to have the Senator from Colorado tell me where in this entire portion of the La Follette-Monroney Act any jurisdiction whatever is given to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate postal rates.

I read now from the La Follette-Monroney Act:

(j) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.
2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipelines.
3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.
4. Civil aeronautics.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait a moment at that point. At that portion, the words "civil aeronautics" appear. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. LANGER. I shall take that matter up in a moment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. I read further from the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act, as it pertains to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

5. Merchant marine generally.
6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.
7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.
8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.
9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.
10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, life-saving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.
11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
12. The Coast Guard, including life-saving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.
13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.
14. Weather Bureau.
15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.
16. Inland waterways.
17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.
18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

The Senator from Maine claims, I believe, that this matter comes under civil aeronautics; does he?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly it comes under civil aeronautics.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator claim that anything having to do with postal matters or postal rates comes under civil aeronautics?

Mr. BREWSTER. Civil aeronautics in this country have been developed largely under payments made under what is known as the subsidy and under the acts developed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is chairman.

Mr. President, how did it happen that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did not consider the original legislation dealing with this matter? It was because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has always considered matters dealing with aeronautics.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, simply because an airplane may have carried some spoiled meat, that matter would be taken from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee handling agricultural matters, and would be given to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; but inasmuch as 90 percent of the payments we are discussing are for transportation by aircraft, it is not unusual that the matter would not be handled by the committee of which the able Senator from North Dakota is chairman.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Maine assert that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should consider all matters relating to pay for the carrying of mails, including railway mail service; and relating to ocean mail, pneumatic-tube service, and everything else in this category except post roads?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that if the Post Office Department had requested an investigation of why so much postal money was being diverted to the air lines, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would have had complete jurisdiction; but I do not think that excludes the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the exercise of a similar jurisdiction.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did. The junior Senator from Maryland at that time—the senior Senator now—offered a resolution dealing with exactly that proposition, and it was pending at the very time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce took jurisdiction of the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to point out that this

investigation has been practically completed. The resolution calls for the expenditure of no money. It merely provides that the committee shall have until June 30 to complete its report. There should be no objection to that.

Mr. LANGER. There is no use objecting to it now. The matter is settled. The horse is gone, the door is locked. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution reported by the Senator from Arizona amends the original resolution by restoring the original date, does it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all it does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is considered, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to, and the resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution as amended and agreed to, is as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, hereby is extended to June 30, 1951.

INVESTIGATING OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO DOMESTIC BANKING AND CREDIT, INTERNATIONAL BANKING, AND DEFENSE HOUSING (REPT. NO. 116)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 64, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 64), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert an amendment in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 16, 1951, to January 31, 1952, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) Federal Reserve matters, domestic banking policies, and credit generally, (2) international banking and policies of the Export-Import Bank, and (3) construction of housing in the present national emergency, including permanent and temporary defense housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, until January 31, 1952, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. The only explanation I have for the amendment is that the reference to small business has been eliminated from the resolution, because there is a Special Committee on Small Business. Of course, the Committee on Banking and Currency still retains its jurisdiction with respect to legislation affecting small business, but the investigative feature of it is transferred to the other committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to investigate problems relating to domestic banking and credit, international banking, and defense housing."

FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICY (REPT. NO. 114)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit the final resolution. It is from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 53, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 53), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government, with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel by such departments and agencies during the period of the national emergency. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I object. There is pending a bill on the same subject. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has no jurisdiction to investigate personnel. Under the resolution, that committee would have complete charge of the Federal civil service generally. What right has the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate Post Office personnel? I certainly object to the resolution. The people affected are under civil service, are they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a resolution from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. LANGER. Then, I am for it. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be considered. The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "Eighty-second Congress," and insert "period, ending January 31, 1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "date", to insert "but not later than January 31, 1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period ending January 31, 1952, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the personnel needs and practices of the various departments and agencies of the Government, with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel by such departments and agencies during the period of the national emergency. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1952, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Arizona have another resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no more.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951, RELATING TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, p. 1373.)

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 1724, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 109. Redeterminations under the Renegotiation Act: Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or any other provision of law, upon application made within 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Board shall make a redetermination de novo of any proceedings under the Renegotiation Act of any contract or subcontract in any case in which the amendment to section (a) (4) (B) of such act made by subsection (d) of section 201 of this act is applicable.

And on page 46, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

(d) Amendment of the Renegotiation Act: Section (a) (4) (B) of the Renegotiation Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and there shall be allowed as an item of cost in any fiscal year, subject to the regulations of the Board, any excess in the preceding fiscal year of costs paid or incurred with respect to receipts or accruals subject to the provisions of this section over the amount of such receipts or accruals." The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective as of the date of enactment of the Renegotiation Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of explanation of this amendment let me say that I have drafted it with the assistance of the legislative counsel within the last 30 minutes. I have no question about the fact that the language itself may need some revision and rewriting in conference, if the Senator from Georgia and the committee will permit the amendment to go to conference. My principal objective is to get this problem into conference, to see whether greater justice than the language of the present law permits, cannot be done in certain hardship cases.

I desire to make very clear, because my good friend from South Dakota (Mr. Case) raised this point earlier this afternoon, that I do not seek or propose by this amendment to create a new body or to create a new appellate court, but only to vest in the Renegotiation Board itself and the Tax Court the same authority, power, and discretion over hardship cases which accrued during World War II that they will have under the language of the new act as to new cases which may arise in the future.

It seems to me, to use an analogy, that we will be confronted in the future with some potentially sick cases for which we prescribe the serum of this new law, but at the same time we have before our very eyes some existing sick cases arising from World War II which deserve a little injection of the same serum of wise discretion, and that is what my amendment provides.

In my judgment, the problem is clear. I am perfectly willing to place the justice of my request in the hands of the Senate conferees, to see whether in conference, upon the basis of this language, there cannot be worked out an agreement which will permit the exercise of the kind of discretion in handling hardship cases growing out of World War II which I think equity entitles those cases to receive.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he will permit this language to go to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. As I have indicated to the Senator, I am willing to take the amendment to conference. The great difficulty, of course, is that, in giving this remedial right in a pending case, probably there will be insistent efforts made to reopen all other cases which have been concluded by agreements between the contracting parties and the Government, or which may have been settled by decisions or orders. That is the principal objection to the proposal as urged by the renegotiation board. But I am quite willing to take the amendment to conference, look into the general equity of the matter, and see whether it could be properly restricted to open or pending cases.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is proposed to be done by the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon is rather broad. The amendment starts out with the language:

Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or any other provision of law, upon application made within 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the board shall make a redetermination de novo of any proceedings under the Renegotiation Act of any contract or subcontract in any case in which the amendment * * * is applicable.

The Renegotiation Act originated as an amendment to the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, in April 1942. It was made retroactive to cover contracts entered into during that defense war effort. It was amended by the act of 1943 after very exhaustive hearings in both the House and Senate.

It continued in operation until after the shooting in World War II had stopped. Phases of it were reenacted in 1948. The broad field which was covered up to the end of 1946 resulted in the Government securing in excess of $10,000,000,000 in new recoveries, to say nothing of the changes which were made in respect to prices in new contracts. Now to make it possible to reopen all those cases and to bring about a redetermination de novo, or proceeding in cases where the recoveries alone exceeded $10,000,000,000, is to open a pretty wide gate.

I am aware of the argument which the Senator from Oregon presented with respect to the particular provision he would make for letting these cases go to review, but it occurs to me that since the amendment in 1943 provided the tax court as a board of appeals where the action of the Price Adjustment Board could be reviewed, and in view of the fact that the World War II Renegotiation Act was amended at various times, and the determinations under the law were made in such a large amount, the amendment would certainly open the door to a great deal of new work for somebody.

While the amendment may go to conference, I sincerely hope that the conferees will give careful study to the broad scope of the language, and resolve the doubts in favor of the original purposes of renegotiation, namely, to prevent contractors from making exorbitant profits because of defense contracts which were entered into in a hurry.

The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon, I am sure, know that at a time when the Government was proceeding with a defense effort in a hurry, renegotiation was conceived as a method whereby contracts could be let by letters of intent or on a short negotiation basis so that the work could go forward, but permitting the Government to recover in cases where an audit of the costs showed that the contemplated price was excessive, or where it was demonstrated that the contractor was making excessive profits by reason of the fact that he was using Government capital and Government equipment.

We conceived of renegotiation as a method of expediting the war and the defense effort, but with a protection for the Government and a protection for the people against excessive war profits.

I certainly hope the amendment will not be agreed to by the conferees in any form that will make it possible to reopen the door to the whole field of war contracts with which we were familiar in World War II.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say, in reply to the Senator from South Dakota, that I do not believe he and I are so far apart as he seems to think we are. I am not offering a wide gate, I am offering a very narrow turnstile, by which each person who is admitted to the turnstile is subjected to the very narrow application of an amendment which applies only to that language in the proposed new bill which takes the form of an amendment to section 84 (b) of the act.

I say to the Senator that the cases will be relatively few; they are not going to involve the billions of dollars of contracts which I think the Senator from South Dakota fears, and the provision will apply in only those few cases where it can be shown that injury would follow refusal on the part of the Government to take into account the losses suffered by an individual contractor because of the development of some unforeseen condition over which he had no control, and the responsibility for which in many instances rested with the Government itself.

In the negotiation procedure we do not have to worry about the big contractors, so far as the application of the law to what happened in World War II is concerned. In the renegotiation proceedings the big contractors were taken care of. The injustices fell upon the little fellows, many of them subcontractors, many of them independent contractors. The cases which I have investigated were those of very small contractors who could not afford losses which the Government forced upon them, without at least being given credit for those losses against the small profits they made in the preceding year.

What we are trying to do now is merely to say to the Department of Justice and the Tax Court that in settling these hardship cases they can exercise the discretion which the law specifically grants to them in regard to cases arising under the new defense effort.

To members of the Department of Justice who told me that some such discretion ought to be made available to

them in respect to these hardship cases, I have said at considerable length that the Government is doing the kind of an injustice which two businessmen would not be guilty of if they submitted their disputes to the kind of process of settlement contemplated in the renegotiation proceeding.

I have in mind a case which arose in my State, and, as I said to the Senator from South Dakota in a personal conversation some moments ago, my attention to the inequity and the injustice to which I am addressing myself today arose out a case in my State. But I have been advised by the Department of Justice officials, and by those of the renegotiation office, that there are a good many cases in the same category.

I have sat with representatives of the Department of Justice, an they have said that if they had the kind of discretion proposed these cases would be settled on a much more equitable basis than is now possible, because what they are now saying to the small contractors is, "We will compromise with you, but we will compromise on the basis of what you would get out of a bankruptcy proceeding, because that is all we can do under the act."

I have in mind a case in the Tax Court in which the court said to Government counsel, "We are not going to take this case, but will send it back to see if we cannot get a more equitable basis on which to settle it."

I merely say, Mr. President, that when any agency of Government is confronted with factual situations in which the Department of Justice officials and the Tax Court officials say that there ought to be some language which would permit the working of justice in a case, it is the duty of the Congress to see that an amendment is adopted which gives them the wise discretion which makes that possible.

I would certainly agree with the Senator from South Dakota that it is not wise to open up the World War II cases for renegotiation, save and except in the limited bracket of cases in which the committee itself recognizes a field for future action. If the law is made to apply to future cases, then I say it is a rule of equity which should be extended to present hardship cases. I do not believe there will be as many cases as the Senator fears, but the principle should be extended to whatever past cases would have been benefited by its application. If it is a sound principle of justice, it is the duty of the Government to correct the wrongs it has committed, because if the Government has not been applying equitable principles to past cases, it should get busy and do so. I am willing to leave the renegotiating power to the Tax Court, which had the power to apply the old Renegotiation Act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am somewhat bothered by the language which the Senator uses in his amendment. It seems to me it goes further than what the Senator has described in his discussion.

The amendment provides that the Board shall make a redetermination de novo of any proceedings, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or any other provision of law, upon application made within 1 year after the date of enactment. It seems to me that the amendment goes further than making it a matter which would come within the discretion of the Board or Tax Court.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator must read the language beyond the point at which he stops. The language continues:

> The Board shall make a redetermination de novo of any proceedings under the Renegotiation Act of any contract or subcontract in any case in which the amendment to section (a) (4) (B) of such act made by subsection (d) of section 201 of this act is applicable.

I have read the narrowing language which creates what I call the turnstile.

Mr. CASE. Yes; that is the turnstile. However, it seems to me that the language makes it incumbent upon the court to review any case which any contractor may wish to bring forward, in order to determine whether it may come through the turnstile or gate, but does not leave with the court discretion as to whether, from its own review of the case, further consideration would be warranted.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully to the Senator from South Dakota that the broad language in the first part of the paragraph is necessary to give the Renegotiation Board and the court jurisdiction in the first instance. It gives it de novo jurisdiction, which must be given in the first instance. It is necessary to put limitations on what the Board may review. Such limitation is provided in the last part of the amendment. It applies only in cases in which a party can show that the facts in the case can be fitted into the pattern of the language. Because of the informality of hearings, as the Senator knows, it could be done by administrative rules and regulations of the Board, which would permit a person to file a brief or memorandum, the Board saying to him, "We will judge in the first instance whether you come under the language of the amendment on the basis of your written application." If they decide it does not, the case is thrown out. If they decide that a prima facie case has been made which justifies further review, they can grant a hearing.

I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear that I do not intend to give a party the right to a formal hearing of record, but only that a party has a right to say, "I think, under the language of the provision, the facts in my case call for the Renegotiation Board to take a look at the written papers which I wish to file with the Board in order to see whether or not my case comes under the language." Such action could be almost ministerial.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not care to prolong the discussion. It seems to me that if the bill is to go to conference the subject should be carefully considered. I think it should be pointed out that in such cases as those to which the Senator from Oregon alludes in all probability the carry-forward provision of the tax laws have already been applied, and that in many of such cases the losses have been considered in the application of the excess-profits-tax law.

Renegotiation started before we had an excess-profits-tax law in World War II. After the excess-profits-tax law was passed the price-adjustment boards took into consideration the effect of the law and the taxes which were imposed thereunder. It should not be true that very many cases would benefit by the provision, even if it were applied. Because of the fact that the carry-forward provisions were contained in the tax laws subsequently enacted, because contractors presumably received the benefit of them, and also because the price-adjustment boards were given wide discretion, and took into consideration the financial status of the companies, it should not be true that very many cases would benefit by the provision.

I certainly hope that the language which may be finally adopted will not open the gate and throw upon the Tax Court or the Renegotiation Board the vast burden of work of going over all the cases which were renegotiated and in which settlements were finally attained and agreed to by the Government and the contractors.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from South Dakota and the junior Senator from Oregon are completely together as to the objectives sought to be attained. I agree with him that the cases are going to be very few.

So that there will be no misunderstanding in the RECORD as to my intent, let me assure the Senator from South Dakota that I do not intend that any benefits shall accrue to any contractor who has been accorded equity through the application of the tax laws, or through any other benefit made available to him by the Government. I am only insisting that we should be fair and see to it that equity is done to a citizen who has suffered as the result of a hardship case in renegotiation, in which the officials of the Government have not been able to exercise the wise discretion which they tell us ought to be exercised in all fairness to the citizen.

Such cases will be very few in number. I have no objection to making any change in the language of the amendment which would accomplish the end. All I am saying is I am satisfied that there are cases in which gross injustice is being done, and I think such injustice should be rectified. That is the purpose and intent of my amendment. I am confident that in conference the language can be perfected so that my intent can be carried out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 5, after the word "title", it is proposed to strike out:

If the aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year under such subcontracts is more than $25,000, no determination of excessive profits to be eliminated for such year with respect to such subcontracts shall be in an amount greater than the amount by which such aggregate exceeds $25,000.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

The aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year or any succeeding years under such subcontracts shall not be more than $25,000, and no determination of excessive profits to be eliminated for such year with respect to such subcontracts shall be in an amount greater than that amount.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning we discussed the subject of the so-called 5 percenters, the fellows who get an almost unlimited fee for obtaining a contract for another person. In the past years the practice has been a disgrace. Men who claim to have influence, particularly men who formerly worked in a department, approach a contractor and say to him, "If you hire me and I get a subcontract for you, it should be worth $50,000 to me."

I remember that in one committee hearing it was brought out that one such person was paid $100,000 in connection with the sale of some ships. The hearing was presided over by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I think there ought to be in our Government some kind of board which would get in contact with subcontractors by advertising contracts, and not make it necessary for a man who wants a contract with the Government to pay 5 percent of it to someone for getting it.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia said this morning that the $25,000 would not be limited to any one year. In other words, a man could procure a subcontract for another and get $25,000 for it in 1951, $25,000 in 1952, and so on. My amendment provides:

The aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year or any succeeding years under such subcontracts shall not exceed the sum of $25,000, and no determination of excess profits to be eliminated for such a year with respect to such subcontracts shall be in an amount greater than that amount.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that there should be paid even $25,000 to any individual for getting a subcontract for someone else. I believe that the Government ought to see to it that small concerns all over the country which want subcontracts have somewhere to go, within the Government, to obtain information with respect to contracts. A contractor in North Carolina, Kentucky, or Montana should be able to say to a Government agency, "I am equipped to do a certain kind of work." Why should a subcontractor be obliged to pay $25,000, or 5 percent, to anyone?

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I think it would be a mistake to adopt his amendment, because there are many instances of engineers residing in Washington following up contracts. For example, in connection with a shipbuilding contract or any other long-term contract, it actually pays the contractor to have a representative here from year to year rather than to send a capable man from his own factory or plant. He would lose the time necessary to come here and keep matters going smoothly.

As to whether or not there should be an absolute prohibition against paying anyone for procuring a contract from the Government for another, that is another question. Such individuals have been described as the "5 percenters." It seems to me that a limitation of $25,000 under the terms of the bill is reasonable. The House placed that provision in the bill and the Senate committee did not disturb it.

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not press his amendment, but will rather seek to amend the substantive law when some measure outlawing such agreements is presented.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from Georgia said that under such an arrangement as has been described, the agent could collect $25,000 in 1 year from the subcontractor, and then collect another $25,000 next year, and the following year, and so forth, ad infinitum, so long as the contract lasted. Why should a shipbuilder have a representative here drawing $25,000 a year for obtaining a subcontract?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood me or I misunderstood him. Such a payment as has been described could be made only once in a fiscal year. There is a limitation of $25,000 for the fiscal year. Of course, a contract might extend over a period of 2 or 3 years, and payment might be made for subsequent service—not for procuring the contract, but for servicing the contract, so to speak. It might be a very sensible arrangement for the principal contractor to pay the subcontractor, or a competent engineer or accountant in Washington, to keep his business straight for him.

I doubt if there could be any payment over a period of 3 or 4 or 5 years, because under the terms of the bill if the money paid or earned or accrued within a fiscal year is more than $25,000, the contract is subject to renegotiation. That ends the matter. It would be very difficult to conceive of a fee paid for procuring a contract which would not all come within the same fiscal year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps the Senator saw the same advertisement which I read about a month ago in the newspapers of Washington, in which a certain individual offered to pay 5 percent to any person who would get him a subcontract. That advertisement was issued by an American citizen in order to get business from the Government. Does not the Senator believe that the Federal Government ought to be able to furnish the necessary information to all the small subcontractors in the country, saying to them, "If you want a subcontract, come to this department and we will see if we cannot help you get it, without paying 5 percent to anyone"?

Mr. GEORGE. I fully agree with the Senator. If I had my way, I would require every principal contractor to specify what he himself expected to do under the contract, and what material and articles he expected to procure from standard manufacturers, as well as what work he expected to let to subcontractors. That information should be published in the Federal Register, or otherwise. A contractor ought to be required to open bids on every article he expects to get from subcontractors. The bids should be publicly advertised. The principal contractor himself ought to be held responsible for failure to give such notice and provide the opportunity for subcontractors to bid.

Nearly all these contracts go to contractors who do much of the work themselves and furnish many of the articles and materials. However, some of the work is usually sublet. It is in connection with the subcontracts that most of the difficulty occurs. The subcontractor does not know whom to approach. He does not know how to go about it. He does not know what office to visit. However, if the principal contractor were required to itemize the articles which he expected to obtain through subcontracts, and the service to be rendered by subcontractors, and that information were made available to subcontractors through public notice, with the requirement that they send their bids directly to the principal contractor, it seems to me that the problem could be handled without anyone having to pay unnecessary money.

When it comes to servicing a contract through a competent engineer, architect, or accountant, after the contract has been obtained, I can see that a limitation of $25,000 a year on all the contracts of a contractor—he might have a dozen or more—is not an unreasonable limitation. Such a payment under those circumstances is not exorbitant or unreasonable. I can also see how such an arrangement might be very helpful to the principal contractor, because of saving him the expense of sending someone to Washington who might not have as much knowledge as someone already on the ground.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. My distinguished friend and I agree entirely. I wonder if an amendment along that line could not be drafted and placed in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think it would have any part in this bill. This bill poses to do only one thing, and that is to look into the profits and earnings by

the contractor or subcontractor, and determine whether or not they are in excess of a fair charge for the work done and the services and materials furnished. If the expenditure seemed fair and equitable the Board could say so. If it were excessive, under the terms of the bill machinery would be established whereby a part of the profit might be taken away, and the profit reduced to the point where it seemed to the Board fair and equitable for the entire service performed by the contractor during the fiscal year.

Mr. LANGER. Am I correct in my understanding that there is nothing in the bill which would stop the so-called five percenters?

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing except the limitation in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The only provision in the bill is that if they make more than $25,000, the contract will be renegotiated.

Mr. GEORGE. The contracts will be renegotiated if they make over $25,000 in the aggregate on all their business for the year.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. They cannot stop with one contract.

Mr. LANGER. I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. But they are subject to renegotiation if they make more than $25,000.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. In view of the history of this legislation and the outrageous cases which were developed through investigation, I am quite sure that the Renegotiation Board would not allow contractors or subcontractors to keep excessive profits. It could hardly be said that a whole year's work, in which a contractor may have obtained four or five or six or seven different contracts, would be excessively compensated for if the total he could receive were only $25,000.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask a final question of the Senator? The Senator says the pending bill is not the proper place for the provision proposed by my amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who has conducted an investigation of this very subject, might recommend some legislation before his special committee is discharged, and I believe if he should do so, such legislation would be the proper vehicle to deal with the matter the Senator from North Dakota has in mind.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the very distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Will not the Senator take it to conference?

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot deceive the Senator. I do not think it would remain in conference, because I am sure the House Members are satisfied with what they have done. The Senate committee accepted the bill on that basis. I think it is better to deal with the subject matter of the Senator's amendment in separate legislation.

Mr. LANGER. I should like the amendment to go to conference or else secure a vote on it, because I feel so strongly about it, these persons who have looted the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not seen the Senator's amendment. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The aggregate of such amounts received or accrued during the fiscal year or any succeeding years under such subcontracts shall not be more than $25,000 and no determination of excessive profits to be eliminated for such year with respect to such subcontracts shall be in amount greater than that amount.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to accept the amendment but I do not think it would be wise to do so. I am perfectly willing for the Senate to vote upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been complaining to the Procurement Office of the Army engineers about this very question, and complaining very bitterly about it, because it is an outrage for anyone to go around selling political influence. That is exactly what some do. I have talked with the Army engineers about it, and they have told me that they do their best not to deal at all with any individuals of this kind and that when a man comes in and claims he is representing someone, they make the contract directly with the party who is going to fulfill the contract. But they say that oftentimes a lawyer comes in representing a client, and nothing can be done about that, because everyone has a right to employ a lawyer. So lawyers come here who may in reality be 5 percenters. Then I am advised another arrangement exists. Oftentimes a firm which has a contract makes some engineer a vice president of the company, and he comes here and, of course, has a perfect right to represent the company.

I am sure what the Senator from North Dakota is trying to deal with, and the thing I should like to see dealt with, is the 5 percenter who holds himself out to the contractors as being able to secure contracts for them, and when contractors talk to him he tells them he has political influence. I think it is a disgrace to the Nation and to the Government that men have been able to peddle influence. I think it is a disgrace that any contractor thinks he can buy influence. I think it is a disgrace that anyone should attempt to sell it. I hope the chairman of the special committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], will report to the Senate proposed legislation on this subject. It is a situation which needs to be corrected, and Congress should take action concerning it.

I must agree with the chairman of the committee that the pending bill is devised for another purpose entirely. I do not think it is possible to deal with this subject adequately in the bill which is now before the Senate; but it ought to be dealt with by the House and by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend that the bill deals with defense contracts. It is drawn up specifically for that purpose. Why can we not specify in the bill that we are not going to allow any 5 percent fees for procuring defense contracts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill deals with the renegotiation of defense contracts.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not with defense contracts primarily, but with their renegotiation. It is a far different matter from dealing with contracts.

Mr. LANGER. Whether it deals with renegotiation or deals with the contracts themselves, this is a proper place, I believe, to settle once and for all the matter of the 5 percent fees for procuring defense contracts. Therefore I do not want to withdraw my amendment. The Senate can vote it down, of course. But I think this is a very fine place to find out whether we are going to pay the 5 percent or whether we are not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division Mr. LANGER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to strike out the language beginning on line 9, page 34, continuing and including line 17 on page 35. The motion is to strike out the permissive exemptions under the renegotiation bill.

Mr. President, this is an extremely important matter. Literally billions of dollars are involved in the matter of renegotiation. We have already, under the somewhat complicated amendments proposed by the committee, tentatively adopted certain mandatory exemptions, and we now come to permissive exemptions, which are five in number. I specifically should like to invite the attention of the Senate to clause (3) at the top of page 35, namely, that the Board is authorized, in its discretion, to exempt from some or all of the provisions of this title, "Any contract or subcontract or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods if, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits."

In other words, complete power is given to the Renegotiation Board, three of whose members are to be drawn from the armed services, to exempt any contract from renegotiation if in its judgment the provisions are sufficient to prevent excessive profits. These are tremendous discretionary powers which are granted to this Board.

The matter was gone into quite thoroughly in the Eightieth Congress by a

committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I hold in my hand a copy of his report. That committee recommended that all mandatory and permissive exemptions in the future contracts should be abolished, and that there should be a renegotiation of all contracts where there was an annual volume of more than $100,000, or, perhaps, in modern equivalents, $200,000; and there were cited in support of that view the fact that in World War II, under the permissive exemptions which had been granted—in that case I believe by the procurement officers—excessively large profits were reported to have been enjoyed, although it was hard to find out about them, because the committee did not have access to the records of the companies, and there was some difficulty in getting the material from the procurement officers of the armed services.

Mr. President, if we allow this exemption, I can tell quite well what will happen: The Board will be in the position of using its own discretion in the granting of hundreds of millions of dollars in favors to war contractors; and the skies will be black with expediters, lawyers, and 5 percenters flying to Washington to join the hordes who already are here. They will exert pressure and influence upon the Renegotiation Board to make an exemption in an individual case.

Mr. President, I was very proud to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota, to try to abolish the evil of 5 percentism. I wish to say that clause 3, at the top of page 35, opens a floodgate for 5 percenters. The peddlers of influence and the fixers will swarm around Washington; and the Renegotiation Board will have great trouble in fighting them off.

When we come to the consideration of the provisions regarding the Renegotiation Board, I hope an amendment will be offered; for, Mr. President, we are putting the Renegotiation Board in an extremely difficult position. Unless its members have the character of saints and the courage of Daniel, the pressures upon them will be so great that excessive and enormous profits will be made. Even if the Board is honest, it will face pressures which will hinder honest work.

I see no reason why the floodgates should be opened in this way, with complete discretion given to the Board.

Similarly, Mr. President, I see no reason for clause 4, to authorize the Board "in its discretion to exempt from some or all of the provisions of this title (4) any contract or subcontract the renegotiation of which would jeopardize secrecy required in the public interest."

Mr. President, secrecy is not involved in the renegotiation. The secrecy referred to may be involved in the original contract. However, the profits should not be secret.

I would comment similarly in regard to the other permissive exemption provisions.

So, Mr. President, I believe we should eliminate all the permissive exemption provisions; and at the appropriate time we should limit or eliminate the mandatory exemptions, so that this renegotiation provision can be really effective.

The purposes of renegotiation, I take it, are to enable contracts to be made quickly, and yet for the Government not to be mulcted, because if the profits are large the Government can later recapture any excessive profits by means of renegotiation.

I am very glad to see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. The conclusions I am stating now are those to which he came in the Eightieth Congress. I think they are sound conclusions, and I am carrying out the recommendations of his committee when I move the elimination of these clauses.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Malone
Anderson	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Maybank
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Smathers
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe the question before the Senate is my amendment to strike out that section of the bill beginning on line 9, page 34, and continuing through and including line 17 on page 35. In other words, the purpose is to eliminate the permissive exemptions from the renegotiation powers.

Mr. President, since there are a number of Senators in the Chamber now who were not present when I raised this question originally, perhaps it is not inappropriate for me to summarize some of the things I previously said.

I should like to call the especial attention of the Senate to clause 3 at the top of page 35, which gives to the Board the power to exempt any contract which in its judgment contains provisions which are adequate to prevent excessive profits. In other words, almost complete discretion is given to the Renegotiation Board to exempt any contract from renegotiation.

The purpose of the renegotiation provisions, as I understand them, is to enable Government procurement agencies to negotiate contracts rather quickly, and then, even though the terms may be disadvantageous to the Government, to have a later renegotiation so that if excessive profits are made they can be recaptured for the Government. To the degree to which this practice operated in the past war, under the direction of General Hirsch and I believe Mr. Paull, considerable sums of money were recovered for the Government.

There was also a permissive exemption in the World War II Renegotiation Act which permitted procurement officers to grant exemptions from the renegotiation clauses. Various charges were made that these permissive powers had been used rather loosely, and as a result a committee was appointed in the Eightieth Congress, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], which went into this matter quite thoroughly, and submitted a report and recommendations. It found that the administrators of the renegotiations testified that they thought very large profits were made by some concerns whose business in whole or in part was exempted from renegotiation under some of the terms of the act.

The report goes on to say:

> No proof of this statement was offered.

I am informed that the armed services did not make available to the Renegotiation Board the details of costs, prices, and profits. In any event, as a result of the investigation, the committee headed by the senior Senator from Maine declared that any future renegotiation act should be improved in the following specific ways:

> (A) By bringing within its operation all contractors with an annual war business exceeding $100,000.

Such a provision is contained in the House bill.

> (B) Including war contracts of all Government agencies.
>
> (C) By eliminating all mandatory and permissive exemptions, so that all Government contractors with more than an annual business of $100,000 are renegotiated.

I call particular attention to that provision.

It seems to have been a thorough report and I think the conclusion is a very sensible one.

We can well imagine what would happen if the Board were given complete discretion to determine whether or not there shall be renegotiation. One concern after another would appear before the Board and say, "Our circumstances are different. The terms of our contract prevent excessive profits. Therefore we should be exempted from renegotiation."

That would be a natural result. It would be a way in which companies could

try to save money. Furthermore, there will be men who will put such ideas into their heads—lawyers and expediters, who are vulgarly known as fixers and peddlers of influence—and will suggest that that is the way to save money. The poor Board will be subjected to the most tremendous pressures conceivable. Human character would be put to a very severe test; and human character, when it deals with Government funds, tends at times to be fallible.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I gather that the distinction between mandatory and permissive exemptions to which the Senator now alludes is that in a mandatory case the Board is not subject to the influence which otherwise would be brought to bear in a case in which permissive authority existed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. I gather that the Senator in his recent study of executive agencies has found out the extent to which influences of that kind have unfortunately flourished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is always such a danger. Even if the Board should be completely honest, it would nevertheless be subject to constant pressures for exemption which would prevent it from doing its full work.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The administration of the old Renegotiation Act was for most of the time in charge of one of the most able and honest men that I think could be found for the job. I think he was in very cordial sympathy with our suggestion, in order to remove himself—I will not say from temptation—but from pressure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator refer to General Hirsch?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have excerpts from the testimony of General Hirsch before the committee. I quote from his testimony the following:

> The one real recommendation that I would like to make is the elimination of exemptions. That is the one recommendation I would make.

That is the recommendation of the man who dealt with renegotiations throughout World War II.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. He was a distinguished lawyer in Houston, Tex., who came to Washington at very great personal sacrifice to carry on the work. He is a man of the highest character and ability. His suggestions were given great weight by the committee which studied the subject at the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My untutored eye fails to see the reason for providing permissive exemptions. They open the door wide to possible fraud. They may lead to the Government's losing hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps even billions of dollars. Such permissive exemptions would expose the Government to corruption and would expose Government officials to temptation. If the provisions for renegotiation are good, I do not see why such power should be granted. Mr. President, unless reply is to be made by the sponsors of the bill, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in 1948 and prior thereto, the Senator from Michigan was a member of the War Investigating Committee. As has been stated on the floor, that committee made a report on its investigation of the national defense program. It is Report No. 443, part 6, Eightieth Congress, second session. It was the final report of the committee.

After extensive hearings the question which is now before the Senate—namely, the practice of the Board's granting exemptions to certain contractors—came under study. I do not believe all the conclusions and recommendations of the War Investigating Committee on this subject have been placed in the RECORD, and I desire to do so at this time. I read from pages 234 and 235 of the report:

> The committee recommends that there be no exemptions under any renegotiation. The committee believes that any further renegotiation act be improved in the following specific ways:
>
> A. By bringing within its operation all contractors with an annual war business exceeding $100,000.

I understand the present House bill contains the figure of $100,000. The bill now before the Senate provides for $500,000. Certainly $100,000 would appear to me to be a proper contract amount for renegotiation of contracts, because the very purpose of renegotiation is to take the enormous profits, the big and unreasonable profits, out of war contracts. Obviously, the possibility of inordinate profits rises in proportion to the amounts involved.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The point to which the Senator refers was discussed in the committee. It was recognized that $100,000 3 years ago or 4 years ago is the equivalent of $200,000 or $250,000 today. It was pointed out that under the operation of our conference system, in all probability the figure would be set somewhere between $100,000 and $500,000. Therefore, I did not press the point too strongly, recognizing the very great difference in the value of the dollar at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that the dollar has depreciated probably 50 percent as of this time. However, I still think that the principle of renegotiated contracts should apply even though the contracts are for $100,000. I say this because we have the case of large companies with their various subsidiaries, among which contracts are divided up. As a result some of the greatest margin of profits can come through the smaller contracts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been in attendance at committee hearings, and have not been in the Chamber. Can the Senator inform me whether or not the bill as reported was unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not a member of the committee. I cannot tell the Senator as to that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The committee voted unanimously to report the bill. There was some difference in the committee with respect to various provisions.

Mr. FERGUSON. The vote to report the bill did not carry with it unanimous approval of all the provisions.

Mr. BREWSTER. There were reservations. I had some.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The vote to report the bill was unanimous; and the vote was substantially unanimous on all amendments considered by the committee. I do not remember any serious difference.

Mr. BREWSTER. There was one amendment, which I think is the one here concerned, with respect to which there were some differences. There were only seven Members present and voting on my motion to reconsider. The vote was 4 to 3 in favor of the motion. However, I did not press it because there were six Members missing, so I would not really consider it a record vote. However, there was that division.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator refer to the amendment which is affected by the proposal of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that the final vote on the bill in the committee was unanimous.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Georgia did not understand. I stated that the bill was unanimously reported.

Mr. GEORGE. In the case of any bill of this kind, comprising fifty-odd pages, there is bound to be some division of opinion on certain provisions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after a study of this question of contract renegotiations the War Investigating Committee, having in mind World War II experience, made the first recomendation to which I have referred, in relation to the floor of $100,000.

The second recommendation was that a future renegotiation act might be improved by:

> including war contracts of all Government agencies.

No exceptions were stated. All war contracts were included. When we enter

into a state of mobilization and are compelled to spend billions of dollars, when contractors often do not know exactly what the cost of production will be because they have not been engaged in similar businesses, the law must be such that contracts may be renegotiated. The idea is to try to prevent excessive profits, not only through the operation of the excess-profits tax, but by means of renegotiation. Whether we are actually at war, or whether we are anticipating war, enormous profits to contractors during mobilization should not be permitted. So the recommendation was to include the war contracts of all the Government agencies. I believe that is a very valuable part of the recommendation, and should be carried out.

Continuing with recommendations, to improve the World War II practices:

(c) By eliminating all mandatory and permissive exemptions so that all Government contractors with more than an annual business of $100,000 are renegotiated.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators have mentioned on the floor the great responsibility of a renegotiating board in connection with exemptions. We can see what is likely to happen. The board cannot really tell whether or not an exemption should be made until after it has examined the contract and the profits. If a particular exemption is desired, the committee should examine the subject to determine whether or not the contract should be renegotiated. If it decides not, then it has granted an exemption, but it has done so in the particular and not in the general.

We find that on the Board there is to be a representative from each of the armed services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Under those circumstances, if they have general permissive powers they are likely to say, "Let the particular contract for this item go. I know those fellows in that department. They know this business. We have a great deal of work to do." That is what we run into when we have discretionary exemptions. No matter what we say about how honest these men are, they are going to have great difficulty in resisting pressure for exemptions. That is what General Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, referred to in his testimony before the War Investigating Committee on January 31, 1947. His testimony is set forth at page 23255 of part 29 of the hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense of the United States.

General Hirsch was emphatic in opposing the discretionary exemption. There was no doubt about it. I should like to read into the RECORD a portion of the testimony. The Senator from Michigan was questioning the witness:

Senator FERGUSON. Now, this may have been one of the cases, which I think we ought to cover here this morning if possible, of the exemptions, where the Government made a contract where they did not renegotiate. Was there any standard set up as to why they made contracts not requiring renegotiation?

General HIRSCH. The Senator has put his finger right upon one thing, which, based on the question of the chairman, I should like to make response to. Those of us in renegotiation do not believe that there should be in the law the privilege of granting any such exemptions.

Senator FERGUSON. But there was.

General HIRSCH. That was entirely apart from our operations.

Senator FERGUSON. But after the law provided for those exemptions, were there standards established so that they would only be granted in cases anticipated under the law?

General HIRSCH. I am sure, sir, that the procurement authorities in those cases felt that they were operating correctly, but I cannot answer for them because you see we did not grant those specific contract exemptions.

The chairman was the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I continue reading from the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as I understand, you are firmly of the opinion, and those associated with you in renegotiation, that any such discretionary powers——

General HIRSCH. In procurement, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That it is not wise.

General HIRSCH. That is our opinion, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is based on your observation and experience of the last 4 years?

General HIRSCH. It definitely is.

On page 23270, General Hirsch further testified:

The CHAIRMAN. We will appreciate whatever report you may want to furnish, and then we will want to ask you in later. I think the benefit of your recommendations on the over-all picture in the event of another emergency is what this committee wants to direct its attention primarily to, and you may want to take a month or two in order to think that over.

General HIRSCH. I have been thinking it over, and the one real recommendation that I would like to make is the elimination of exemptions. That is the one recommendation that I would make.

Senator FERGUSON. That is any exemptions?

General Hirsch. Yes; because there ought to be enough incentive with the kind of profit that the ones in renegotiation would accord, that ought to be enough incentive for a contractor to do his work well.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean over the $100,000?

General HIRSCH. Yes, because under that it is too small.

I should also like to call the attention of the Senate to hearings of the Senate War Investigating Committee, held in October 1947. Mr. John R. Paull, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, who was successor to General Hirsch, likewise opposed authority in the act to grant permissive exemption from renegotiation. I refer the Senate to part 42 of the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, page 25499.

Mr. President, some items in the current budget will be eliminated, but it will contain more than $60,000,000,000 for defense. It seems to me that all contracts entered into under that tremendous sum of money should be subject to renegotiation. So far as is humanly possible any enormous profits should be taken out of these contracts. There is no justification whatsoever for enormous profits taken out of this mobilization emergency.

As a matter of fact, I think we all agree that there should be renegotiation of defense contracts. The House passed this legislation unanimously. There are, however some who believe the Board should be allowed to make determination as to which contracts should be renegotiated, as well as what profits should be taken out of them, and what profits should be allowed while keeping contractors from making unreasonable profits.

If certain types of contracts are not to be renegotiated, it is equivalent to saying to the Board "The amount of profit a man makes is of no importance at all. The only thing of importance is the kind of contract that can be made. If you can get a certain type of contract the Board will give you an exemption. You can make any amount of profit. We are not concerned with it. We are not going to renegotiate that type of contract."

Obviously, this is not the purpose of a renegotiation act, and it appears to me that is not a good basis for writing a renegotiation act. Yet that is substantially what we are doing when we provide those mandatory and permissive exemptions. Mr. President, I favor the recommendations made by the War Investigating Committee that all war contracts—we now call them preparedness contracts—above $100,000 should be renegotiated, and that there should not be any exemptions granted by the Board, either mandatory or permissive.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan has evidently made a very thorough study of the bill. I wonder if he would express his opinion of subsection (d) on page 4, line 19, which provides:

Notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the profit-limitation provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 505), as amended and supplemented—

And then the language of the amendment of the committee—

and of section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended and supplemented—

And then follows the original language of the bill—

shall not apply to any contract or subcontract if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that to refer to the 10 percent profit provisions in other legislation, which would now be repealed.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that under the Vinson-Trammell Act and under the Merchant Marine Act the profits were limited by percentage.

Mr. AIKEN. To 10 percent.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Here there is no limit on what the Board may permit the contractor to keep or what the Board may take away from the contractor. It does not work on the percentage basis at all. It would be impossible to negotiate contracts which were begun under the Vinson-Trammel Act, but were not completed, and which might come under the provisions of this measure. From January 1 of this year the contracts would come under the provisions of this measure, and all accruals or payments made thereafter would be renegotiable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor so the Senator from Georgia may answer further.

Mr. GEORGE. They could not be renegotiated until the Vinson-Trammel Act was repealed.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from Georgia a question, since the Senator from Michigan has yielded the floor? This is a suspension, is it not, of the 10 percent profit limitation of the Merchant Marine Act?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If a shipbuilding company accepted a contract and should make 40-percent profit—it probably would not make so great a profit, but suppose it should—would the contract then be subject to renegotiation under the proposed law?

Mr. GEORGE. It would be if payments were made or accruals occurred after January 1, 1951.

Mr. AIKEN. It would really be subject to renegotiation?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it would. Therefore, there would be a conflict. Under the proposed law percentages do not control. There would be a question whether the profit was unfair or excessive.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not questioning the provision. I simply wanted to know its meaning.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. In response to a question the Senator from Vermont asked of the Senator from Georgia, the latter said that the shipbuilding contract the Senator from Vermont mentioned would be subject to renegotiation, but it is true, is it not, that the Board could exempt the shipbuilding contract unless the pending amendment should be adopted?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont was seeking information. I do not know that I am in a position to answer the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota. But on hurriedly reading the exemptions which would be permitted, and which were referred to by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], it would appear that a very wide variety of contracts would be exempted from renegotiation. Almost too wide an exemption is provided.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the pending bill and on the pending amendment to strike out all the exemptions to be found on pages 34 and 35 of the printed bill.

House bill 1724, a bill to provide for the renegotiation of war contracts, furnishes a much needed companion piece to the legislation which we have already enacted authorizing substantial expenditures of money for defense. I assume that all of us fully concur in the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON), that if we are entering upon a period when $50,000,000,000 will be expended—I believe he said the sum may reach $60,000,000,000—we, of course, must have renegotiation of the tremendous war contracts. There should be no argument at all about the fundamental necessity of legislation of this kind. But before I have finished my brief comment, I desire to call attention to the fact that one of the most unfortunate developments of the mid-period of the Twentieth century is the growing, almost to the point of universality, of distrust. Apparently we have lost faith in ourselves, faith in our fellow men, and many, no doubt, have lost faith in God.

If that be true, namely, that the moral standard of those in public life today is deteriorating, as someone remarked to me in the cloakroom this morning—it is a reflection upon all the people of the United States, not merely upon those in the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a profound Biblical student, is not the Senator from Virginia impressed with the part of the Lord's Prayer which says:

> Lead us not into temptation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am impressed with all parts of the Lord's Prayer, including the part—

> And deliver us from evil.

Mr. President, I desire to point out the evil of the Senator's amendment, if I may. [Laughter.]

I say that in the last war the Board, which was not nearly what this Board is expected to be, saved $10,000,000, in excess profits, by means of recapturing those profits; and no one knows how much prices were reduced as a result of the renegotiation of those contracts. If we can trust this Board to renegotiate the major portion of $50,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000 a year of defense contracts, and if we can trust it to do equal justice as between the contractor, the Government, and the taxpayers, certainly we can trust the Board to exercise less discretion than that which we provide for in this bill, and at least the discretion which we gave to the agency which renegotiated the contracts of the last war. If we do not have sufficient confidence in the Board, if we have so little confidence in it that we are inclined to say to it, "You cannot exempt perishable farm products, you cannot exempt prices fixed by regulatory bodies you cannot exempt 30-day contracts, and you cannot exempt some of the other things which may be found to be included in clause 3, on page 35," upon which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has specifically commented, then, Mr. President, the best thing the Senator can do is not to vote for the bill at all, because if he does not have confidence that the members of the Board will be high-type men, zealous and honest, he will be putting the necks of our businessmen in a noose, on the one hand, if he votes for this bill.

Oh, how well I remember the bitter criticism of the prototype of this bill when we first considered it during World War II. It was criticized as being un-American, as being tyrannical, as providing for star-chamber proceedings against American businessmen. Those were the charges which were made against the bill, and they were charges which a great many Republican Members of the Congress felt could be sustained. They did not want any part in putting business into a strait-jacket of that kind.

However, Mr. President, now it seems that we cannot get businessmen into any kind of a strait-jacket.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the first place, does the Senator understand that this measure does not affect farm products? From what the Senator has said, I think he is under a misapprehension in that respect. This measure does not affect farm products at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I understand, the Senator from Illinois has offered an amendment to strike out the exemptions on pages 34 and 35.

Mr. BREWSTER. Only the permissive exemptions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would strike out the permissive exemptions on pages 34 and 35.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and I am talking about the permissive exemptions. On page 34 we find that farm products constitute a permissive exemption which the Senator from Illinois proposes to strike out, as I have said.

Now I wish to proceed briefly with my other comments.

Mr. BREWSTER. No mention is made of farm products on pages 34 and 35, so far as I know. At the top of page 34 there is a continuation of the definitions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Maine. The Government is going to buy potatoes. Are potatoes a perishable product or not?

Mr. BREWSTER. Potatoes are a perishable product.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are potatoes a farm product?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This portion of the bill says the Board cannot exempt perishable products. In such case, the Board cannot exempt potatoes.

Similarly, is butter a farm product, and is it perishable?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Virginia evidently has not read the mandatory exemptions. I would be in favor of striking out many of the mandatory exemptions; and farm products are included under the mandatory exemptions, along with oil products, mineral products, and other commodities of that kind.

I suggest that the Senator from Virginia would pay the greatest possible tribute to the Board, which he has so greatly extolled, which operated during the last war if he would accept the advice of the Chairman of that Board, General Hirsch, who said we should eliminate the exemptions.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Board did a good job, but not so good a job as it could have done if it had had the kind of regulation which I recommended on this floor last August; and it was contemplated in connection with this very bill.

My distinguished friend, General Maurice Hirsch, of Houston, Tex., was referring to permissive exemptions by these agencies. The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] now are trying to tie up those exemptions with a new agency, one which General Hirsch did not have during the last war, but which I strongly recommended last August, and which I wish to commend the House and the Senate for providing in this very bill, if I can reach that part of my remarks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. First let me say that I am not opposing the Senator from Virginia; I wish to reenforce what he is saying. I begin with that introduction.

As a matter of fact, the objection which always has been made to any bill on this subject is that it leaves absolutely in the discretion of the Board the determination of what is an excessive profit. No standard is provided. There can be no standard for the determination of what are excessive profits. So this Board would have perfectly unlimited discretion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. TAFT. The Board would have unlimited discretion in deciding whether a businessman should pay back $1 or $100,000,000 under such a provision. Consequently, the permissive discretion is a very small part of the discretion given to the Board.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Ohio has very nearly covered the point I was trying to make, namely, that the discretion given in the permissive exemptions is not a circumstance as compared to the discretion the Board will have in determining that a businessman has made $100,000 of excessive profits, when the Board should have determined that he had made $1,000,000 of excessive profits, or vice versa. In this measure there is no guide or means of determination in that connection; and in that respect there will be nothing to aid the Board, except its ability and its patriotism, which will be the only things to guarantee how the members of the Board will perform in carrying out their duties under the provisions of this measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think there is a great deal of difference between giving the Board the discretion to determine the amount of profit to be allowed in cases in which the Board actually goes over such contracts and the work done under them, and so forth, and finally determines the proper amount of profit, as compared to giving the members of the Board the discretion to say—before they even look into the amount of the profit made, "We exempt this contract; we will not even look into it, regardless of whether a 1,000-percent profit or a 1-percent profit was made."

To my mind, those questions are entirely different. In the one case, the Board has to examine the operations under the contract and has to determine what is a fair profit in that connection. That is the essence and the whole meaning of renegotiation. It is an entirely different proposition than to say: "We exempt that contract without looking into it, regardless of how much profit has been made under it."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am sorry that I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. After all, discretion is discretion. We must not assume that the Board will shut its eyes and, without knowing anything about what is involved, will blindly say, "This contract is not to be renegotiated." If the Board would do that, we would be sunk before we started with this measure, as I understand it.

I shall state my understanding of what the committee intended to do, so far as I know. Unfortunately, I no longer have the privilege of sitting in on the writing of bills of this character, involving a subject in which I am very much interested, and I love it. I did not intend to speak for more than 5 or 6 minutes this evening; I simply wished to praise in a general way the work of the committee which considered the bill.

Mr. President, I say that all we seek to do by means of this bill will be a nullity if we do not have high-type men as members of the Board, and especially if we do not have a high-type man as chairman of the Board, for this Board is not to be merely another purchasing agent with friends. That was a weakness, and in that connection there was the type of exemption about which General Hirsch complained. I know about that, for I had many contacts with him. He is a wonderfully fine man, and one of the ablest on this subject that I know of in the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then the Senator from Virginia had better accept his advice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The agencies say, in this connection, "we will not exempt so and so and so and so." But this is an entirely different matter from the other, and we can trust the Board to pass on these permissive exemptions if, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio implied, we can trust them to do the big job of ascertaining how much in the way of excessive profits has been involved in a given contract.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that we must not overlook the fact that in normal times substantially every contract, whether awarded by the Federal Government or by a State government, is subject to competitive bidding, and that is a sound procedure. It should be that way. It has stood the test of time. But in a period of emergency such as the one through which we are now passing, it is, of course, impossible, without incurring great delay, to follow that long established policy. We therefore negotiate contracts in many cases rather than subject them to competitive bidding. But we do it with confidence, because we have had the assurance—and we today have the assurance—that every contract will be subject to renegotiation, and that if in the interests of speed we have entered into a contract on which abnormal profits are made, that will be disclosed in the appraisal of the contract when it comes up for renegotiation. But under this permissive exemption it is proposed that we do away with the scrutiny of many bills and that we do away with that scrutiny purely by the discretion and on the discretion of the Board. For example, on page 35, we read:

(3) Any contract or subcontract or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods if, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator from New York the Senator from Illinois has already read that provision. I yielded for a question, and if the Senator would not mind, will he save his speech until I have finished my brief remarks?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall conclude my speech by asking a question: How is it possible for the Board to determine whether an excessive profit is permitted to a manufacturer, unless it scrutinizes the contract with the degree of care which could come only through the process of renegotiation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. By carrying out the provisions contained in the last two lines relating to the permissive exemption, namely, "If, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate." It is necessary for the Board to find that the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profit, or else it cannot grant the permissive exemption under this provision.

The purpose of this permissive exemption is not to weight down a five-man board, which has to renegotiate something like $50,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000 worth of contracts a year, with every little minor detail which might be involved in all the ramifications of the Government's purchasing system.

Is it thought that anything is to be gained by striking out these provisions, and by tying the hands of the Board, requiring it to go laboriously through every contract and possibly finding $5 or $10, and saying, "Well, no particular excess profits are involved, but we have passed on it. We have spent 2 weeks on it, and now we get around to a $10,000,000,000 contract, or else we wind up the year with only about one-half of our work done; but we are going to carry out the mandate of Congress. Nothing shall escape the fine grist, the way our mill grinds"?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the Board, up to this time, 5 years after the end of the late war, has handled only half the applications under section 722, regarding war contracts? In other words, the volume of business was so great that the last war's business is not yet finished, although the Board did an efficient job in performing its work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely true, and, moreover, there remain from

the late war in excess of 20,000 cases, involving more than $5,000,000,000 of excess profits, which have not been passed on yet.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not have time, Mr. President, to become involved in an elaborate debate over this particular section. I merely want to call attention to the fact that it is a more strict provision than the one enacted in the late war, and that the point made by General Hirsch has been taken care of by providing an independent Board which is to be in charge of and under the direction of an outside man. So the agencies that have been doing the purchasing and building up, of course, close friendships, and all, will not have the privilege this time, which they had the last time, of saying, "Well, we know that fellow is not going to make too much; we know he is not making too much and so we will eliminate him from renegotiation."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand from the discussion between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Ohio, the Board has the widest latitude, with the exception of the mandatory exemptions, to determine whether a contract shall be renegotiated, and whether the Government is entitled to recover anything from such contract. That being the case——

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; I beg the Senator's pardon; I do not so understand.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the purpose of the exemption, then?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think there should be in the bill very specific directions to renegotiate; and what the Senator from Ohio and myself had in mind was that there is no standard fixed by the bill, no guide by which to determine whether the Board could find that a contract was 1 percent, 2 percent, 5 percent, or 20 percent too high. It is a matter of their discretion in arriving at what they will call excessive war profits.

Mr. AIKEN. That being the case, the Board having the widest latitude, anyway, what is the purpose of writing the specific exemptions into the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Because, if specific exemptions are not written into the bill, the Board may be tied up with minor details in which pennies are involved, and be unable to handle contracts in which millions of dollars are involved. It was to give them some little discretion to confine their activities—and they are human, and can do only so much—to the major undertaking which is involved. Perhaps the distinguished chairman of the committee will follow me, if I may finish, in about 5 or 6 minutes. The distinguished Senator from Georgia heard all the testimony, and this bill comes from the committee by unanimous report. It may be that certain members of the committee had mental reservations about some of the details, but it comes to us with the unanimous report of the committee. It represents their judgment regarding the amount of discretion which should be given to this Board.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator contend that $500,000 is a proper limit for one contract?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am not inclined to argue that. The Senator from Virginia has no deep convictions on the subject whether it should be $100,000, $200,000, or $500,000. He began primarily merely to commend the committee for getting this proposed legislation before the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the $500,000 limit does not apply to a single contract, but to the aggregate business of the contractor during the fiscal year.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Georgia. That explains the matter. What useful purpose does the permissive exemption serve, if, as has been explained on the floor of the Senate, the Board has the widest latitude in the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. It does not have the widest latitude to forgive. It has the widest possible latitude to tax, or to require a refund of money which it thinks is in excess of the fair value of the services rendered or the articles purchased.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill gives the Board the right to forgive if they feel that forgiveness is justified. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. No; they are never given the right to forgive. They are given the right to exempt certain contracts from renegotiation. That has been done for various reasons. I should like to read one to the Senate, if I may.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt this colloquy, but I want to say a very distinguished delegation from the Philippine Islands has been waiting very patiently since 4 o'clock to confer with me. I told them that I would meet them as soon as I could finish a 10-minute speech. That was 40 minutes ago. If my distinguished colleagues will now bear with me and will not deem that I am discourteous to them but wish not to be discourteous to guests from a foreign country, I shall proceed with the few memorandums I had prepared, and will then yield the floor to those who know more about this subject than I do.

Mr. President, as I was saying a few moments ago, we have made large defense appropriations, and we may have to increase them measurably. Therefore, it is very fitting and proper that we do as we did in World War II, namely, pass a law which, if properly administered, will be calculated to prevent excessive profits being made on defense procurement.

Last August I drew the attention of the Senate to the need for this legislation, and to the provisions of the bill which at that time had just been introduced in the House. I pointed out that the enormous increases in Government buying for defense purposes would result in high costs and excessive prices and profits unless we had the protection which the Renegotiation Act provides against these evils.

Close pricing in a defense emergency is an impossibility. Most munitions contracts are made in haste. In addition, contractors are called upon to manufacture items they have never made before, and under such circumstances costs and prices cannot be fixed properly until after some production experience has been gained. Even in the field of standard items which the contractor is already producing substantial volume increases may have a tremendous effect upon costs and profits.

During World War II the Renegotiation Act served extraordinarily well in the control of prices and profits on war procurement. It is recognized, not only throughout the Government but among businessmen as well, as the fairest and most equitable method yet devised for preventing war profiteering. More than $10,000,000,000 of excessive profits were recovered from war contractors under this act during World War II. The specific dollar results, however, are not the greatest benefit which the act afforded. Its principal virtue was in holding down costs and prices and preventing the realization of excessive profits. Just how much effect renegotiation had on reducing the cost of World War II will never be known, but it is reasonable to suppose that its over-all benefits in procurement savings were many times the amount of money actually recovered.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I helped draft the original Renegotiation Act and the amendments thereto. Most of us, I believe, hesitated to bestow such a broad grant of power on the executive departments as that which was contained in the renegotiation law, but under the exigencies of the war emergency we had no reasonable alternative. We were obliged either to take the renegotiation law with all its possible faults, and the danger of the abuse of discretionary power, or risk the virtual certainty that tremendous amounts of excessive profits would be realized on war procurement.

Those of us who worked closely on this legislation tried our best to construct a formula for universal application, but the subject matter was so diverse and the field so complicated that we were forced ultimately to write a statute which relied on the judgment of the administrative agencies. We could but hope that this judgment would be applied under the Renegotiation Act in a fair and equitable manner. Certainly under the law there was room for abuses, and I have no doubt that mistakes were made. All informed persons, however, seem agreed that the act was administered in such a restrained and conscientious manner as to earn for its administrators the commendation of businessmen throughout the country. Persons in every walk of life have come to look upon the Renegotiation Act as a necessary corollary to a large defense budget.

It seems to me that in the present emergency we have no alternative except again to resort to the renegotiation law as the best device available for the prevention of war profiteering. An excess-profits tax alone will not accomplish the

result. It is only through renegotiation that a powerful restraint can be laid upon excessive costs and prices in defense procurement. By rewarding efficiency and economy in manufacturing operations, by penalizing excessive charges and high costs, renegotiation serves as no other available instrument can serve to induce defense contractors to produce the best goods possible at reasonable costs and prices.

The pending bill follows very closely not only the framework, but the details of the World War II Act. In addition, it contains a series of changes from the World War II law which experience has indicated are desirable under the present circumstances. It is broad in its coverage, and it should be; it encompasses the entire field of defense procurement except for the specific exemptions of contracts for certain raw materials, agricultural commodities, and certain other specified contracts. I am informed that the bill represents the views and thinking of a wide number of persons both within and without the Government who had extensive experience with the renegotiation of war contracts during World War II.

In my remarks on the floor of the Senate in August in this connection, I pointed out two inherent dangers in drafting a comprehensive renegotiation law. One of these dangers involved the granting of broad areas of exemption from the coverage of the act. It seems to me unwise for the Congress to remove large segments of business from the field of renegotiation. It is wiser, I think, if exemptions are to be granted, that this be done by administrative action by the Renegotiation Board in the light of complete factual information rather than for the Congress to write such exemptions into the act.

Those exemptions which are contained in the pending bill are pretty much the same as those provided for in the World War II statute. In general, these exemptions have been found to be reasonable and workable from the administrative point of view.

Another danger which I pointed out in my remarks last August was in connection with the formation of the Renegotiation Board itself. The bill as reported by the Committee on Finance provides for the Renegotiation Board to be composed of five members subject to confirmation by the Senate. The Chairman of the Board would be appointed by the President, and the other four members by the secretaries of the procurement agencies charged with the primary responsibility for buying defense goods. The Board, as so constituted, conforms to the suggestions which I made last August, and would, in my opinion, best serve the purposes of the Renegotiation Act. One of the primary considerations is that the Board should be independent of departmental veto or restriction upon its judgment and actions.

I understand that the provisions of the pending bill which creates the Board, contemplates that the Board will be an independent agency and will be untrammeled by the governmental departments in formulating its rules, establishing its procedures, and in the actual handling of the individual cases which will come before it. Above all, it will be free, as it must be, to achieve a uniformity of result and application of the law as among the many cases which it will be called upon to examine.

While it is my firm conviction that the Renegotiation Board should be independent of the procurement agencies themselves, this is not to say that the Board should be completely divorced from procurement. Cooperation between procurement officials and the Board is indispensable to good administration. It seems to me that the provision of the pending legislation creating the Renegotiation Board and setting forth its duties and powers has carefully weighed these considerations, and should result in a workable and effective administrative organization.

We all realize, I am sure, that the pending bill, as did its World War II counterpart, bestows a tremendous breadth of discretionary power upon the Renegotiation Board. The dangers inherent in such broad grants of power is the price we must pay for the flexibility and scope of judgment which are necessary to achieve equity and justice in the wide variety of cases which will arise. In the last analysis, renegotiation is a matter of judgment and common sense. We can only hope that the administrators of the pending bill exercise that same wisdom and fairness and demonstrate that same devotion to duty that marked the administration of the Renegotiation Act during World War II.

With the enactment of the pending bill, there will still remain the most important element necessary to its successful administration, that is, the appointment of able, conscientious, and courageous men to interpret and apply the law. I am convinced that the American businessman will accept renegotiation in this emergency as he did in World War II as a necessary control so long as he is convinced that the act is being applied uniformly, with equality of treatment, and with fairness to the businessman and the Government alike.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to ask the Senator if he would yield to me to make a few remarks on the pending amendment before he places his request before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I deeply regret that my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has to leave the floor, but he will have the RECORD tomorrow, and what I shall say in reference to his remarks will be merely my interpretation of some statements he has made with respect to the creation of the Board for the administration of the Renegotiation Act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia expresses his great regret that he cannot remain to hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. As he explained, a delegation from the Philippines has been waiting for over an hour to see him, and he must leave at this time. However, the Senator from Virginia will be very happy to read in the RECORD what the Senator from Minnesota has to say on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Virginia. Thus far in the debate on the pending bill, H. R. 1724, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out what I regard and what he has well described as a very serious weakness in the pending legislation, namely, the permissive exemptions. I am in full agreement with the remarks made on the subject by the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I believe the recommendations made by the so-called Brewster committee in this field of legislation surely warrant the fullest and the most sincere consideration of the Senate.

Without directing my attention too much to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, I should like to skip along in the reading of the bill. At page 36 reference is made to the section which creates the Board. I mention the section because the Senator from Virginia was speaking under the impression that this was to be an independent board.

I am sorry to have to point out to my friend from Virginia, at least for the purposes of the RECORD, that it is not to be an independent Board. As a matter of fact, the language of the House bill, starting at page 35 and carrying over to page 36, provides for the establishment of an independent agency to administer the terms of the act. That provision was within the recommendations of the Brewster committee of the Eightieth Congress. It was within the recommendations of the renegotiation officials who carried on renegotiations during World War II. However, Members of the Senate will note that it is contemplated not to establish an independent agency, but rather a Board consisting of five members, one to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, who would be the chairman, and one member to be appointed by each of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Administrator of the General Services Agency. It should be remembered that we had a General Meyers. I submit, Mr. President, that the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and the Administrator of General Services are too close to procurement to be permitted to appoint or nominate the men for these very important positions on the Renegotiation Board.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will recall also that we had a General Hirsch.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Who has been very highly extolled. The Senator will also remember that General Meyers went to jail. He did not renegotiate any contracts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to have the Senator from Maine point out that fact. General Meyers was a procurement officer for the Air Force. All I wish to say is that it is entirely possible under the language of the pending bill for a procurement officer to be appointed as a renegotiation officer.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is altogether wrong in that respect. If he will read the entire bill he will see that the Secretaries are expressly prohibited from appointing anyone who is in procurement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy that the Senator has given me the information.

Mr. GEORGE. The purpose of having the Secretaries make the appointment is to get wholly independent persons, and there is another provision in the bill which prohibits them from going into procurement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the bill would not prohibit them from appointing persons who are in their departments. It would not prohibit their appointing men who are in the employ of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the House version, which was stricken, I read:

> No member shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as a member of the Board. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially recognized.

The language of the House bill follows more closely the recommendations which were made in the past. The committee amendment, which I understand has been agreed to, sets up a board of five members, four of whom are to be selected by the heads of the agencies which are primarily concerned with procurement. It so happens that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Administrator of General Services will be purchasing at least 95 percent of what is purchased. At least, their officers will be purchasing it. It appears to me that if we are to have a Renegotiation Board the directors of the Board should be as far removed from the agencies which do most of the procuring as it is humanly possible to remove them.

Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am proud to be a member, has had sufficient testimony presented to it already to indicate that there is all too often a tendency on the part of procurement officers to work with their old friends. I do not mean to indicate or intimate any suggestion of corruption. After all, it is only human nature, when one has known a person for a long period of time, has had close personal contacts with him, and has acquired intimate knowledge of the individual and his business, that relationships should become so personal as to make it difficult to render the judicious decisions that must be made by a renegotiation board. I wish to point that out as a weakness in the bill. I do not know why the language of the House should be changed. It followed the recommendation of the distinguished General Hirsch, which was brought to the attention of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to point out again that General Hirsch was a product of the very system which the Senator now condemns. He was selected by the former Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson. In his recommendations General Hirsch did not have the benefit of the investigation made by the distinguished committee which recently reviewed the activities of five presidential appointees, which have resulted so very disastrously. I assume that perhaps the committee which considered the subject felt it was rather conclusively shown that presidential selection of a board is no conclusive evidence or assurance that the board's powers will be administered with sole regard for the interests of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his observations, and for his little twist on Presidential nominations. However, I should like to call to the Senator's attention the recommendations of his own committee. I refer particularly to the fifth recommendation:

> The renegotiation agency should be a separate agency, independent from the procurement authority, and designed to handle renegotiation of all services and branches of Government.

It is the contention of the junior Senator from Minnesota that we cannot have an independent procurement authority when the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, and the Administrator of General Services, who are responsible for 95 percent of the procurement, are to select four members of the Board.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In my opinion, the point that there is a possibility that the Board would be the creation of the procurement agencies, which is the point the Senator from Minnesota is discussing, is the real weakness which we are trying to correct. The act of 1943 made it possible for the Secretary to exempt a contract from renegotiation. I refer to the following language:

> If in the opinion of the Secretary provisions of the contract or subcontract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits, he may provide that renegotiation shall apply only to a portion of the contract or subcontract or shall not apply to performance during a specified period or periods and may also provide that the contract price in effect during any such period or periods shall not be subject to renegotiation.

In other words, the 1943 act gave more power to the Secretary, who was the procurement agency in each case, than is proposed by the permissive section of the pending bill which would be stricken by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

However, the real weakness, it seems to me, is in the provision for creation of the Board, making it possibly the creature of the procurement agencies. That danger is coupled with section 107 (f), which provides for delegation of power. That creates a real danger, for in paragraph (f) of section 107 the Board is authorized "to redelegate any such power, duty, or function to any agency of the Government and to authorize successive redelegations thereof, within limits specified by the Board."

I am afraid that under the language of the bill, not merely could the Board itself create exemptions, but it could delegate to other personnel the power to create exemptions. It seems to me that it would strengthen the bill to restore the language of the House with regard to the appointment or selection of members of the Board, so as to separate them from the procurement agencies. If the Board were truly independent, there would not be so much risk involved in permitting the Board to say that certain contracts are sufficiently protected in the terms of the contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I agree with his position. I believe that his clear analysis of the difficulties involved in the bill is directly to the point. That was what I was striking at when I was discussing the question of the creation of the Board.

Mr. President, I intend to ask on Wednesday for a reconsideration of the vote on the committee amendments in section 107. Some Members of the Senate were not alerted as to the consideration of the amendments, and I feel that it is only fitting and proper that they should be opened up for further discussion.

I wish to take note of the fact that in the bill there is a complete mandatory exemption of any contract or subcontract with a common carrier for transportation, or with a public utility for gas, electrical energy, water, communications, or transportation, under the thesis that such activities are regulated either by local, State, or Federal Government.

I think the records of the Government of the United States will indicate that one of the most flagrant overpayments on the part of the Government in World War II was for railroad transportation. I find that the excess profits tax law excludes the same instrumentalities or enterprises. Now they are excluded from renegotiation. Yet I read recently, within the past week, that the profits of the railroads were the greatest they have been in 15 years. We are going to exclude them again.

If we are to exclude a major enterprise such as the railroads, which enjoy special privileges in handling postal matters, which are able to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and get rate increase after rate increase, which are able to have, without any investigation which amounts to anything, wreck after wreck, and which are able, more or less, to get their own way economically in this country, I say that that provision in the law is not equitable. It is not fair. It does not do service to

those who are compelled to renegotiate. It does not permit economic justice in the defense effort.

Mr. President, I also feel very strongly that if a limitation or basic minimum of $100,000 was adequate in World War II, when we needed full mobilization, then surely $200,000 or $250,000 ought to be adequate now in a preparedness and defense program.

I remind Members of the Senate that since July 1, 1950, the rate of profit in defense industries has been exorbitant. I also remind the Senate that it is entirely possible, under the $500,000 limitation incorporated in the bill, for a company to break up its contracts into $500,000 units, and therefore evade entirely the whole process of renegotiation.

There are several provisions of the bill which require our attention. First, there are the mandatory exemptions, which have been altered; the permissive exemptions, which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so properly pointed out; the increase of the figure as contained in the House bill from $100,000 to $500,000 as a minimum or floor for renegotiation; and the change in the provision for the creation of the Board. These provisions indicate to me that the bill needs very careful analysis and study on the part of every Member of the Senate.

There is a great deal of talk in the Senate and in the House about economy in government. There are two or three ways to achieve economy in government. One is by reducing expenditures. That is fine. I am in favor of reducing nondefense expenditures to a minimum. I commend my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois for the work which he has done in that field, and I intend to join with him in many of his efforts.

There is another way to get economy in government, and that is to see that waste in government is eliminated—the kind of waste which all too frequently creeps into a military preparedness program. We must watch that waste carefully and analyze every budget, every request for an appropriation.

There is still another way to economize in government, and that is to see to it that those who are the promoters of the economy cry on the outside of Congress—mainly those who are able to profit the most—do not profit excessively at the expense of the American taxpayers.

We have had many examples of such excessive profits during the period of inflation and speculation in the commodity markets. There has been a tremendous rise in the prices of chemicals and minerals. The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has pointed out that in all the defense efforts inflation has cost our Government $3,000,000,000 for defense materials. I submit that unless the Renegotiation Act is so written that the Board will be independent, above reproach, purer than Caesar's wife, unless the Board is able to delve into any contract of substantial size without fear or favor, unless it is removed from all kinds of political pressure, the American taxpayer will be forced to pay hundreds of millions of dollars of extra cost for the defense effort.

It is not adequate to say that $10,000,000,000 was saved in World War II. The question is, How much could have been saved had there not been permissive exemptions? I submit that in connection with this bill it is our job to see to it that every dollar possible is saved. The tax burden is terrific. It is being shared by every citizen of the United States. Some who are least able to pay are paying proportionately the most.

Not only should we see that there is equitable treatment in connection with taxes, but there should be equitable treatment in terms of the privileges of Government. This bill deals with privileges. It deals with that area of American industry and enterprise which is privileged to assume the great obligation of defense production for the United States. That great area of American industry did very well for itself in World War II. In this period of defense, which we hope will prevent world war III, it surely seems to me that we ought to minimize, to the best of our ability, any opportunity for excessive profits.

Many features of the bill are sound and constructive. I should say that that is true of 90 percent of the proposed legislation. However, I repeat that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is sound. I repeat that the creation of the Board must be carefully scrutinized. Some of the mandatory exemptions should be carefully scrutinized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we had thought it advisable not to have a meeting of the Senate tomorrow, in order to give committees an opportunity to catch up on their work. The hour is growing late, and there are several speeches yet to be made.

In order that we may know when we are to vote on the pending amendment, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote on the amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], or on any amendment or motion proposed thereto, the time between 12 noon and 2 o'clock to be divided equally between the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the Chair). Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. How can a Senator who wishes later to speak on the amendment assure himself of obtaining some time to do so?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Washington has merely to contact the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] or the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], depending on which side the Senator happens to be on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the very able majority leader whether it is his intention to proceed with possible amendments to later sections of the bill, and whether he would also include in his unanimous-consent request a motion to recommit.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that will be included in the latter part of the request I propose to make.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in order to conserve the time of the Senate I wish to say I do not believe that 2½ hours will be needed for debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The time would be less than 2 hours. I have requested that the vote be taken at 2 o'clock. Before that there must be a quorum call.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It seems to me the question could be decided in a briefer period of time than that. If the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] wishes the time before action on the amendment to be 2 hours, that is agreeable; but I thought if he is willing that we might save some time by perhaps limiting the total time for debate to an hour, with half an hour on each side.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I amend my unanimous-consent request by changing the time for the vote to 1:30 p. m. instead of 2 o'clock.

Mr. President, in order to try to move the voting along on Wednesday I further ask unanimous consent that on all other amendments the time for debate be limited to 30 minutes, divided 15 minutes to each side, all amendments to be germane.

I further ask unanimous consent that debate on the final passage of the bill be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 21, 1951, at the hour of 1:30 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the amendment proposed to the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, by Mr. DOUGLAS, on pages 34 and 35, striking out the provision relating to permissive exemptions, and upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) proposed to said amendment: *Provided*, (1) That after the disposition of the amendment proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS, debate upon any other amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. GEORGE; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter either of the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS or of the bill shall be received; and (3) that on the question of the final passage of the bill not to exceed 30 minutes debate shall be permitted, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. GEORGE and Mr. WHERRY (or some Senator designated by him).

Ordered further, That on said day of Wednesday, February 21, 1951, the time between 12 o'clock noon and said hour of 1:30 p. m. shall be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. GEORGE.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the amendments which I have offered on

behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY and Mr. KILGORE] are designed to eliminate a glaring injustice in H. R. 1. Not only is there an injustice to individuals in that bill, but one which is socially unwise and undesirable. I refer, of course, to the fact that the bill in its present form deprives the young men and women who will and are serving their country in the present emergency of the right to take out national service life insurance.

I wish to make clear at the outset that I am not opposed to the indemnity provisions of H. R. 1, nor to any other of the desirable provisions of that bill. I advocate and support the passage of H. R. 1 with the amendments I propose. I consider that measure a much better bill than it was when it came from the House. I think this is a tribute to the conscientious endeavors of the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the members of his able committee. I think it most desirable that all those who serve in the present military effort be protected by an automatic insurance provision which will make available to their dependents the uniform sum of $10,000. We owe that much, if not much more, to those who serve and to those they leave behind.

But the bill in its present form is not insurance; if it is insurance, it is death insurance, and not life insurance. It is good for one trip only, like the insurance you buy when you set foot on an airplane or a train. It is good for the duration of this emergency but it ceases to have any force or effect once the serviceman takes off his uniform and returns to civilian life, an eventuality we all hope and pray for at the earliest possible time.

At this point I should like to say that I was and I am in favor of the provisions contained in S. 84, a bill introduced by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. S. 84 provided that any serviceman who dies or has died in line of duty on or after June 27, 1950, shall be presumed to have been covered by a national service life insurance policy in the amount of $10,000. Obviously, the intent of this bill was to protect those Korean veterans who die in the service of our country who have not taken out a national service life insurance policy. S. 84 affected neither existing national service life insurance policies nor the rights of future veterans to those policies. However, the seeds of the idea contained in S. 84 have apparently germinated and grown in H. R. 1 into a plant which, while it contains worthwhile fruits, threatens certain rights which servicemen have enjoyed in the past. If the Senator from Georgia wishes to substitute the provisions of S. 84 for those of H. R. 1 at this point, I shall be very happy to support such a move.

I am convinced, however, that in the anxiety to provide an indemnity for all servicemen and to set up a new system of insurance to cover the servicemen who die while in the Armed Forces, an important and dangerous change has been made. The bill in its present form—without my amendment—would take from the "new" serviceman a real benefit which in the past all servicemen have had. I repeat, we are about to take from the new servicemen a benefit formerly available to all servicemen.

The benefit of which I speak is the opportunity to apply for, and obtain, NSLI. In my opinion, this is a valuable and a vital benefit. It is a socially desirable benefit. It is a benefit to the Nation as well as to the individuals concerned.

Let me try to describe some of the benefits of Government insurance. In the first place, except in unusual cases, the young man who is inducted into the Armed Forces at age 18, 19, or 20 will probably not have been carrying a commercial life insurance policy. If these men are in the Armed Forces for a period of 5 years, they will certainly not be in a position to obtain commercial policies during that period. Upon being released from the Armed Forces, they would find that the premiums on any insurance policy based on their then-attained age will be higher than the premiums at any earlier age. This will discourage many from having any life insurance at all. This will handicap those who have served their country in the Armed Forces as against those who have not. Obviously, by placing a man in a position where he cannot get life insurance, we are placing him in a position where he is forced to pay a higher premium when he finally does obtain a policy.

There is, of course, still another benefit of Government-sponsored life insurance. NSLI premiums are lower than those of commercial policies. For example, the premium on NSLI—participating—policies at age 25 is $16.22 per $1,000 on an ordinary life policy. On one of the cheaper commercial policies similar to the NSLI policy, the annual premium per $1,000 of insurance at age 25 is $23.10, a difference of $6.88 per thousand dollars per year, or for a $10,000 policy, $68.80 per year, or $688 in 10 years.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a chart to support my previous statements. This chart indicates that in other commercial policies and for different types of insurance, the difference is even greater.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gross annual premiums per $1,000 at age 25

[Including waiver of premium benefit]

	Ordinary life	20-payment life	20-year endowment
National service life insurance (participating)	$16.22	$25.10	$41.20
Travelers (nonparticipating)	17.15	28.59	47.75
Aetna (nonparticipating)	17.15	29.08	47.48
Connecticut General (nonparticipating)	17.15	28.86	47.43
Equitable of New York (participating)	23.10	34.36	52.16
Provident Mutual (participating)	22.23	34.36	51.80
Northwestern Mutual (participating)	21.05	34.11	50.41

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this again is a very real benefit which our servicemen should certainly have. If our country is to show any gratitude for the service rendered, for the sacrifices made, for the risks taken, our country should continue to make this benefit available to those who enter or are about to enter the armed services.

As an argument for discontinuance of NSLI, it is said that veterans in World War II were not generally insurance-minded and that many did not avail themselves of their opportunity to continue national service life insurance in civilian life. While that may be partially true, it is not fair on this account to deny such an opportunity to future veterans who may wish to avail themselves of such an opportunity.

It is maintained that because of the unwieldy nature and expense of the NSLI program, it should be discontinued. But House bill 1 would not actually discontinue this program. It provides that the program shall be continued for present policyholders and for those new veterans who cannot get commercial policies after their release from active duty. Depending upon the span of life of present policyholders and upon the length of the present emergency, the national service life insurance program may have to be continued for the next 50 or 60 years. I submit, Mr. President, that since such a program must be continued, it would not be disproportionately more expensive to extend NSLI policies to those new veterans who may wish to make an application upon their release from active duty. Since we must maintain the administrative machinery to take care of present policyholders and of the new disabled veterans, why not utilize this machinery for the others?

My amendment numbered 2–15–51–D provides that the veteran may obtain NSLI insurance at the premium rate for his attained age on June 27, 1950, or at the time of entry into active service, whichever is later. This will mean, of course, that the veteran will be required to pay premiums in an amount less than those required for his age at the time he actually made application. The premiums which he would pay under this amendment would be based on his age at the time he entered military service or as of June 27, 1950, whichever was later. This, in effect, sets up a procedure similar to that which affected veterans of World War II who were able to take out insurance upon their date of entry into active service. The veteran would not suffer because he had not had an opportunity to apply for a policy; and, in addition, he would pay lower premiums based on a lower age. Obviously, there would be a deficiency in the national service life insurance fund resulting from this provision. My amendment authorizes and directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund such amounts as are necessary to make up this deficiency.

Mr. President, I have prepared another amendment, numbered 2/15/51–E, which would grant the "new" veteran the same opportunity as that to be granted under my first amendment,

namely, the opportunity to apply for and receive a national service life insurance policy. This second amendment, however, would permit the veteran to backdate his policy to any date not prior to his entry into active service, or June 27, 1950, only upon the condition that he pay the required reserve to reimburse the fund. I think this amendment, which will cost the Government virtually nothing, is the minimum which should be accepted. If the veteran wishes, he may pay the premium required for his then attained age. If, however, he has the means, and desires to back-date his policy in order to take advantage of a lower premium rate and to invest any savings he might have, he has the opportunity of doing so. Under this amendment, it is not necessary for the Administrator to reimburse the fund.

The indemnity provisions are left untouched, and any savings which might accrue to the Government through these provisions during a period of extended mobilization are unaffected. This amendment simply extends to "new" veterans the same privilege which World War II veterans have enjoyed.

Mr. President, I could make many further arguments on this subject. I could discuss the basic philosophy of national service life insurance, and the social theory of insurance. I could describe how beneficial it is to the Nation to have these millions of young men and young women covered by national life insurance. To a large extent, they are individuals who would not otherwise have any kind of insurance. I could, indeed, if I had time, produce statistics which might show that many young people, introduced to life insurance through national service life insurance, have taken out commercial policies in addition. I could argue at length that national service life insurance is not an interference with the functions of commercial insurance companies, any more than the postal saving system is an interference with the functions of our great private banks.

But there is no need for me to go into these profound and controversial arguments. The fact is that we have national service life insurance. It is on the statute books. Some millions of young men and young women now are protected under it. They have contracts which cannot be revoked.

The only question is whether we are going to withdraw the right from our new service men and women—from the young men and young women who are leaving college, interrupting their young careers, who are going out of high school, who are volunteering, who are entering the service of their country as part of our country's struggle for peace and freedom, and for survival. The question is whether we are going to withdraw from these young people the right which was enjoyed by their older brothers and sisters in World War II, and by their fathers in World War I.

There is no reason for withdrawing that right from them. There is no justice in doing so. It would almost be an act of cynicism to use the grant of one benefit as a cloak behind which to snatch away another which is of equal, if not greater, importance.

I have heard, Mr. President, that the big insurance companies have worked to eliminate this right from our new servicemen. I do not know whether this is true. I deeply hope it is not true. I prefer to believe that in something as basic as this the sponsors of this proposed legislation have simply overlooked this phase of the subject. I prefer to believe that in their commendable desire to provide emergency coverage for all, in the dangerous days immediately ahead, they have inadvertently bypassed the problem of the future day when our young men and young women can come back to their places in a nation at peace with itself and with all other nations in the world.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BENTON obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BENTON. Is the Senator from Oregon requesting me to yield in order that he may make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I should like to make an insertion in the RECORD, with the understanding that in yielding to me for that purpose the Senator from Connecticut will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon with that understanding; and then I shall yield likewise to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with a half-minute explanation of the insertion, I wish to say that I had intended today to discuss for a few minutes foreign policy. It is said that there is a great debate going on in the Senate from time to time on foreign policy, but I think it is important that we bring to bear in that debate the points of view of some who are not Members of the Senate. I have in my hand a speech entitled "Forty-five Minutes Ago—and Tomorrow?" delivered on February 8 by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor. I had intended to read extensively from that speech and to comment on it today. But I shall not take the time to do that. I read but three sentences from it. Mr. Canham says:

> Some people are telling us we should hole-up in Fortress America and await the worst. That would be a fatal step. That would concede Europe and Asia to the Communists, with all their vital resources and skills—the Ruhr and probably Japan. We could not hope to resist successfully such a combination of power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks the complete speech of Erwin D. Canham, entitled "Forty-five Minutes Ago—and Tomorrow?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-FIVE MINUTES AGO—AND TOMORROW

(By Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

You and I and all the rest of us in the free and partly free world are living in one of the great opportunity moments of history. Just now our national thinking is in a maze of confusion. The problem is to snap out of it. Our task is to awaken each and all to the true nature of this crisis and to what we can do about it in terms of individual and group action.

First. What is the crisis? Putting it into broad and revealing terms, it is the age-old conflict between those who say the state is greater than man and those who say man is greater than the state—greater than anything else under God. Indeed, the conflict is to some extent between those who believe that individual man himself represents an infinite and imperishable value and those who deny all infinite and imperishable values, including God and truth itself. Least of all is the crisis of our time a power-political struggle between the United States and the U. S. S. R. And yet we have permitted much of the world to think of the conflict as between two imperialisms—or, worse, between capitalism and communism. Nothing could be further from the truth. The struggle is between the age-old idea of freedom and the age-old idea of slavery—between a belief in idealism and spiritual values and a doctrine that is profoundly materialistic.

Second. What can we do about it? Well, we can awaken to the true facts of the present situation and proceed to carry out in action a program that can prevent another world war and can insure the survival of individual freedom and opportunity.

Let us then take a hard look at the facts.

We see our own Nation in a period of doubt and uncertainty. We see Western Europe even more dubious and uncertain. We see confident communism spreading steadily into the soft spots of the globe. We see communism in possession of enough physical power to push us out of Asia and able to push free government out of Western Europe as well, although at the risk of considerable retaliation.

But we see several important deterrents to this use of communism's physical power. We still have some time. If we use it rightly, I believe we can still prevent a third world war and pave the way for a period of growing understanding and stability.

We ourselves have two great sources of power. One is fundamental and one is derivative. The fundamental power we have is the power of free men and free society. M. Tuve: "The greatest single discovery of World War II was the efficiency of the free system." The derivative power—and we have it because we are free—is still the physical striking power of the atomic bomb. But the bomb is not itself power. The power lies in the capacity of free inquiry and organization which produced the bomb, and which the totalitarians were later able to copy. (The natural scientists who were driven out of Europe by racial persecution and the denial of free inquiry might well have produced the bomb first for Hitler and Mussolini. We must be careful not to stifle free inquiry and free teaching here.)

And in addition we have all the other elements of physical action which men in a free society can produce. We have been rudely aroused by events in Korea, and we are proceeding to organize and apply this power so that we will have force enough with which to repel aggression. If we do this job effectively, there need be no war, if you accept the assumption that there is still

some margin of time. If there is no margin, we must do the best we can, and fight for freedom on whatever terms are available. In the end, even then, freedom will win, but it could be a hard fight.

There are several reasons, in addition to our atomic bomb stock pile, why we may have a margin of time. One is that the Russians, and in particular Marshal Stalin himself, have always had a great respect for industrial potential. Their own industrial potential is still believed by experts to be less than they would deem necessary before launching a major war. Another reason is that—regardless of our atomic bomb stockpile—the Russians themselves need a minimum number of bombs to do the job of aggression and surprise. It is reasonable to assume they do not have that number of bombs now. Another reason why the Russians may not strike soon toward a world war is that they are doing altogether too well without war. Satellite and subversive action are serving the Russians effectively. They might be expected to continue such successful tactics, without taking the grave risk of a major war.

Now, you will see that I am weaving together here two approaches: the moral approach and the physical approach. I believe they are completely interrelated. For Americans the immediate problem is a moral awakening; a clearing of the air. What does that mean? Well, I think we have to go back to the simple fundamentals. The Communists have cast over human thinking a blanket of confusion. They tell mankind that they are revolutionaries, and that we are reactionaries, defending the status quo. If that were true, we would be licked at the start. But that is the very opposite of the truth.

The fact is that our system is the true revolution, and that communism—like totalitarianism of any kind—is reaction, is part of the same tyranny by which kings and emperors and dictators have tried to tie man to the chariot wheel of the state down through the ages. Our system sets men free. Their system puts men into chains—physical chains, and, worst of all, mental chains. A century ago, Marx and Engels in the Communist manifesto said: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win." Where, in today's world, are the people in chains? Is it in the United States, where the proletariat (hateful word), where working people have more authority and more share in government and a better standard of living and more genuine freedom than ever before? Certainly we have unsolved and only partly solved problems, such as that of race relations. We will always have unsolved problems—always have a hill up which to climb. But we have made a lot of progress; we are on our way even in race relations. Are the people in chains in Great Britain, where labor's own government has held or shared power off and on for a quarter century? Is man in chains anywhere in the Western World half as much as he is in the world's most extensive Communist state, the Soviet Union, where tragic millions, suffering and dying, are wearing the literal chains of slave labor and prison camps? Where are the chains today? Where are the mental chains? Are they in the free universities or the free churches of the Western World? Or are they in the Communist states, where government is the source of every law, every truth, every norm of conduct, every social and economic relationship, and where no science, no music, no economic activity, no philosophy, no art, no theology, is to be permitted unless it is state licensed and state controlled?

That kind of police state is not revolution in the true and noble and traditional sense of that word. It is blackest reaction, as old as the hills. Now the great importance and value of our system is that its mind is free, it is capable of self-criticism, of self-improvement, of internal challenge, of perfectibility. We can do a far better job of setting men free than we have ever done, and this generation should dedicate itself to the task of doing it. I do not mean a crusade to the ends of the earth. I mean first and foremost awakening in our own thinking here in America, and proving by example that the free system holds the seeds of liberty for all mankind.

But because I emphasize the significance of free society in action here in America is not to ignore the challenge in far-away places. With other deeply involved nations doing their full share, we must carry out our treaty obligation to defend Western Europe. If we prepare with determination to do this job, I believe we will never actually be faced by war. In terms of human experience, as far as our understanding has yet elevated us, the best way to avoid a war is to be willing to fight it if we have to. This is as true of nations as it is of individuals, and that is part of the necessary awakening. Some people are telling us we should hole up in fortress America and await the worst. That would be a fatal step. That would concede Europe and Asia to the Communists, with all their vital resources and skills—the Ruhr and probably Japan. We could not hope to resist successfully such a combination of power. But we have no need to limit our own capacity of resistance in this way. We can continue in a grand alliance of free or would-be freemen—the states of Western Europe and part of Asia. Yet, of course, some of them are as confused now as some of us are.

Let us then awaken out of this confusion by reminding ourselves that we are the true revolutionaries of history, that we have the power of free society and freemen in our grasp, and that we must put these dynamic truths into action. I believe this is precisely what General Eisenhower is telling the Western Europeans today, and it is not just a pep talk. It is a sober calculation. I grant you that there are dangerous months ahead. But I have given you the estimates of the best authorities I could consult that the Russians are not likely to strike in a major way in the near future. We may be wrong. But we must go forward. If we show sufficient determination, I believe there is the chance to create a balance of forces temporarily in the world. In such a period of stalemate, I believe we should do our utmost to demonstrate the values of self-government and the free system to all wavering parts of the world. I believe, in the long run, this would lead to the modification of the Communist system itself, which has already changed greatly since 1917.

There are excellent peace terms we could offer the Soviet Union, and they include no need or vestige of appeasement. We offer them full right of development and progress within their own area. We only ask that they do not enslave other peoples now free. We ask for the right of self-choice for the nations around the Soviet borders who have been conquered and overthrown. This may seem a lot to ask, but it could be worked out on terms which would not endanger the security of the Soviet Union in the least. China could be permitted to evolve in its own way—to make the choice between communism and the free system which it has not yet by any means decided. Under these proposals, which could be greatly elaborated to give the Russians fullest assurances of development and progress within their own area, the world could stabilize. Nobody would benefit more than the Russians themselves. In the end—I must be frank—I believe freedom would win out there, too, but by an evolutionary process not necessarily involving the early overthrow of the 14 men in the Kremlin.

We all face a mighty challenge. It is not the challenge of making war but of being willing to make war in order to preserve peace. Maybe some day—surely some day—we will evolve into a better way of doing these things. In the words of a recent Archbishop of Canterbury, there is a case for pacifism, but there is no case for waging war ineffectively. At this stage of human thinking and experience I do not believe we really have the chance of choosing pacifism, but I respect deeply all who think so. I remain convinced that to choose pacifism today would be to doom the world to conquest by communism, and it would be a long time before we would be free from that yoke.

Similarly, if we withdraw and permit Western Europe to fall into Communist hands, it will be a long time before it is free again, and it will be immensely difficult if not impossible to preserve freedom here. That is why I think that the United States and Western Europe must recapture their joint morale and go ahead speedily to take the steps necessary to make Russian aggression suicidal. The Russians are shrewd and realistic, and I am sure they would choose our peace terms rather than a major world war.

Our generations face a mighty opportunity. It is in the final analysis the third chance of this century to make a lasting peace. Twice before we have tried. Once we failed totally. It is too soon to say whether we have failed to make peace this second time or not. A limited war is under way in Korea, a cold war is under way everywhere. Our job—through strength—is the task of preserving peace. It will interrupt our private lives. If we are quick enough and strong enough and determined enough we may well not have to fight. But if we have to fight, that will be an opportunity too, an opportunity brave men have taken down through all the years of history. We want to make that kind of sacrifice unnecessary and impossible. I think it is still possible that we can do so.

But first and foremost we must clear our own thinking, and that will help to clear that of our allies, too. Let us clear it by reminding ourselves that we have the doctrine and the system, proved in action, that really sets men free—that is the real revolution. We should be singing the songs and waving the banners and writing the poems. Our revolution goes back a long way: to the revelation of one God and one law, in the Ten Commandments, on the hills of Palestine, to the prophets of Israel. Our revolution continues, on those same hills, with the revelation of Jesus Christ and his doctrine of love and brotherhood of all mankind. It continues with the experience of orderly government we adopted from the Greeks and the Romans. It is enriched by the humane traditions of Western Europe. On our own continent it was carried forward through new frontiers of freedom, with the aid of waves of rich human resources and cultures coming to the New World from the Old. This tradition of ours is no mere doctrine, no unsupported ideal. We have proved it in practice. We prove it daily in our free—and perfectible and self-critical—institutions.

It is to this truth that we must awaken. Once we realize our own basic and truly spiritual power, we can apply it in action effectively and overwhelmingly. We can lift the spirits of men now in darkness. We can weld together the forces of freedom, for everywhere in their hearts men yearn to be free even if freedom is expressed—as it may well be—in the need for a bowl of rice and some rags to wrap around your feet. Our system shows men how to get the rice and the rags and spiritual freedom, too. Not our system narrowly viewed—not just an American system—but the common tradition of constitutional self-government which the free world and the partly free world are striving toward.

The next few years may be the most enriching years of our lives. We may be saving values that have been a long time building. We may be saving ourselves and all that we all hold precious. We may—and I think we can and will—prevent a third world war by being ready for it if it comes, but striving at all times, as citizens, to support the wisdom and statecraft which may be able to avert the war if we have strength enough not to invite aggression.

I know that armament races traditionally lead to wars. I know also that balances of power have preserved peace for long periods in human history. We can turn a balance of power into an overwhelming preponderance if we once teach the world the meaning of free society. We must understand and utilize in the world the flaming sword of an idea: The idea of freedom, put into daily practice. Your physical efforts, plus your comprehension and our mutual dissemination of that idea, can turn today's darkness into tomorrow's light.

I am reminded of these words written during the First World War:

Rejoice, whatever anguish fill your heart,
That God has given you, for a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part
In freedom's crowning hour.
That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heaven, their heritage to take:
"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight;
I saw the morning break."

AMERICAN WEAPONS SEEPING INTO RUSSIAN-CONTROLLED LANDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a short article published in today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "American Weapons Are Seeping Into Russia-Controlled Lands." In this article it is pointed out that United States war materials shipped to Europe under the arms-aid program are being sidetracked by international criminal groups operating in Vienna and Stockholm and are finding their way into Russian-controlled lands.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American weapons are seeping into Russian-controlled lands.

United States war materials shipped to Europe under the arms-aid program are being sidetracked by an international criminal ring, smuggled through Vienna and Stockholm into Communist countries, according to rumors in Germany which are confirmed by Scandinavian reports. United States Army officials in Germany refuse to discuss the size of the hijacking operation but hint it is causing concern.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say, in connection with the article, that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] today submitted a concurrent resolution condemning the shipment of war materials by European countries into Russian-dominated countries. I think the resolution perhaps should have gone further and condemned our own country for its shipments of raw cotton to Red China since the war began in Korea, because five different shipments of cotton, which had the complete approval of the United States Government as a deal negotiated by an agency of the United States Government, have been found to have gone to Red China since the Korean War broke out.

NONMILITARY INSTRUMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Congress and the people of the United States have been engaged for the past 2 months in what has been called the great debate. It has been an important debate, and a useful debate. It has helped show the American people that the overpowering issues of our time are in the field of foreign policy. But the time has come to point out that the debate has centered on a narrow facet of our policy, on a subject so limited in scope that it has tended to create a distorted picture of the world crisis.

Boiled down, the issue of the debate has come to be: How many divisions of troops should we send—when, and where? I think this preoccupation with the disposition of our Armed Forces has been unrealistic and spiritually deadening. It is as though a chess player attempted to attack or defend only with his knights and bishops, forgetting his queen and his rooks. The debaters have been neglecting the slowly learned lesson of recent years that there are important nonmilitary instruments of international policy which must be used in concert with the Armed Forces; that these nonmilitary instruments are at least as important as the Armed Forces in the influence they can exert. I have talked about this many times before.

Mr. President, Lenin once declared that the Soviet regime rested on a balance of coercion and persuasion. This has been true of all regimes, as it has of their foreign policies. Lenin saw this more clearly than most, and he studied more realistically the dividing line between coercion and persuasion. Paradoxically, the Soviet in the past 30 years has put far more proportionate emphasis on persuasion than we have; and it is we, with our faith in freedom, who have put and are putting more proportionate emphasis on force.

Yet for us military strength by itself can create nothing worth struggling for: nothing worthy of survival. A 20-year competitive race with the Soviet Union in developing weapons of destruction would leave our world in spiritual ashes, even if by some miracle open conflict did not break out. Necessary as is military strength it can never by itself promote or preserve freedom.

On several occasions I have pointed out that there are three major instruments of foreign policy in addition to military policy. In simple terms, the four instruments are: (1) military policy—or force or the fear of force; (2) diplomatic policy—or deals and bargains; (3) economic programs and policies—or goods; and (4) information and education—yes, propaganda—or words.

I shall not discuss force and diplomacy this afternoon. Force has been debated on this floor in extenso. As to our diplomacy, I shall content myself with the observation that, measured against the problems it has faced, and judged also by the relatively inadequate bargaining power our negotiators have had over the past 5 years in terms of force, goods, and words, our diplomacy has been more successful than most Americans seem to think. At a later date I propose to touch further on our diplomacy through a talk about its chief architect, Secretary Dean Acheson. I had planned the talk for today but finally decided to handle it separately rather than interrupt the trend of discussion here.

As to instrument number three—our international economic programs and policies—I want to comment briefly on their impact on instrument number four, our information and education program, or our words.

A year ago I described the Marshall plan as "by far the most imaginative step we have taken in our foreign relations since 1945." I added that it was no accident that the Marshall plan was also our most successful step—that it not only contained communism but rolled back communism. Today we are working on another great and imaginative idea in the economic field, which is symbolized by the phrase, point 4. Thus far, I feel the point 4 idea has been ineptly presented to the Congress and to the American people. When the Congress realizes the tremendous potentialities of this brilliant concept, in undeveloped areas where the Reds are manipulating adroitly the legitimate aspirations of the people, I predict that we shall see a great flowering of it.

Henceforward our economic instruments and our information instruments—what I have called our goods and our words—must move in ever closer alliance. For example, in our proposed shipment of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India, if the United States insists that the story of these shipments is told to the Indian people and to the people of Asia, we shall have a fine example of integrated economic and information policy.

In recent years there has been far too little relation between the two. On the economic front we Americans are now beginning to assist other peoples, within our capabilities, not with grand-scale industrialization projects, but with help to realize their specific, immediate local aspirations. On the information front, we ought to be putting far more emphasis, not on telling people what we think they ought to know about the United States, or even telling them about the blessings of personal liberty—important though these messages are—but upon helping give them the information they are seeking, specific information that will help them to realize their ambitions for self-development. Like good salesmen and good diplomats, we must talk to them in terms of their interests and not primarily of ours. We must do this first, foremost, and all the time.

Mr. President, I should like to quote three paragraphs by Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, of Harvard University, which appeared in yesterday's New York Times:

The Voice of America should speak of civil and cultural freedom to Western Europe, but of national and social freedom to Eastern Europe and Asia. This is not double talk, because all of these freedoms are parts of our democracy. I should not object to talking of any of them anywhere. But I should put

the emphasis on national autonomy and social betterment through modern methods of agriculture and industry in speaking to those parts of the world which are revolting against imperialism and exploitation.

Above all, I would have this Voice speak for, and not against. Nothing is to be gained by thinking and talking in negative terms. So far have our anti-Russianism and anti-communism gone that even freedom has come to mean only something which the Russians do not have and which communism cannot give. Unless it has a positive message for the world—a message that will seem positive because it promises to satisfy existing needs and fulfill existing hopes, and by action as well as by words—the Voice of America might as well remain silent.

The Presidential directive under which I operated as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Public Affairs in 1945, 1946, and 1947, was, in retrospect, an overly simple one. My directive was to present to the peoples of the world a full and fair picture of American life, and of the aims and policies of the United States Government. Events have broadened and intensified the tasks of the program. Now it must meet and defeat the challenge of Communist propaganda. It must do even more than that, much more. It must offer hope to the peoples of the world, in their own terms, the hope of progress and well-being as the hope of freedom. It is true that foreign people are curious about the United States; they welcome and profit by a fair and full picture of the United States. But they are far more curious about their own future than they are about ours.

Now we cannot outpromise the Russians. They do not have to live up to their promises as we do. So part of our program must be to expose the fraudulent nature of the Russian promises. But that is wholly negative. The greater part of our information and propaganda program must carry the message of hope which is implicit in our own honest efforts to help struggling peoples everywhere.

Thus it would seem to me that the substance of much of what we want to say is not merely to try to explain our Formosa policy, or describe our universities, or outline the progress of race relations in the United States. We want to tell foreign peoples in print, by radio, by movies, and by exchange of persons—tell them—what they eagerly want to know about production, about agricultural methods, health, and sanitation, and other down-to-earth problems. Our American program must now intermix as never before these two types of activities—our economic policies and our program of information and education.

Almost a year ago, in the Eighty-first Congress, I submitted, on behalf of myself and 12 other Members of the Senate, a resolution calling for what I termed a "Marshall plan in the field of ideas." Some of the most distinguished men in the country, including the President, General Eisenhower, General Marshall, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Mr. Bernard Baruch, Secretary Acheson, former Secretary Hull, Mr. John Foster Dulles, and Gen. David Sarnoff, have spoken up strongly and specifically in support of the basic idea. Many of these had spoken often before, but the hearings on the resolution (S. Res. 243) provided a further and renewed opportunity. During the past year many Members of the Congress have recognized the growing importance of this area, not the least being Senator TAFT in his major address on the floor of the Senate on January 5. Books have been published on this problem, one of the latest of them being "War and the Minds of Men," by Prof. Frederick Dunn, of Yale. Many magazine articles have appeared, one of the latest of which, in the current issue of Fortune magazine, outstrips anything I have suggested for the program by proposing that $500,000,000 a year be appropriated for it. Dr. George Gallup, the public opinion analyst, far outdistances Fortune with a proposal of 5 billions.

Judging from my own mail, almost everybody has become a pundit on the Voice of America. This is a healthy sign. Even though some of the criticisms of the present operation seem to me ill-informed nearly everybody says he wants to see an enlarged and more effective operation. Public reaction is based on the sound instinct that without a successful psychological operation all our armaments and bombs cannot win us the peace and security we Americans seek.

The Senate gave some indication of its attitude last summer when it approved supplementary appropriations which were more than double the regular appropriation, although in my judgment the appropriation approved, which was a pre-Korean request by the State Department and which was not revised after Korea, was far below the need.

The question then was, and is now, not whether we need an expanded and improved operation. The question then was, and still is, How do we get it?

To help provide the answer to this urgent and crucial question, I am herewith submitting, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Wisconsin, a new resolution which calls for a study and investigation by a committee of the Senate. I shall read the key portion of the resolution which I herewith send to the desk for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations and request that the resolution in full be then printed in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof duly designated by the chairman of such committee, in conjunction with two other Senators designated by the President of the Senate, shall conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to—

(A) The objectives, operations, and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Department of State and other civilian agencies of the United States.

(B) The prompt development of techniques, methods, and programs for greatly expanded and far more effective operations in this vital area of foreign policy.

(C) The extent and scope of organization and of reorganization of existing departmental and agency structures which may be necessary or desirable to accomplish the foregoing objectives in the present world crisis.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) submitted by Mr. BENTON (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed entire in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the first weapon of aggression by the Kremlin is propaganda designed to subvert, to confuse, and to divide the free world, and to inflame the Russian and satellite peoples with hatred for our free institutions, and

Whereas the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Europe has just reported to Congress that the security of the free world requires not only military and economic strength but a psychological offensive in behalf of our democratic principles and aspirations; and

Whereas General Eisenhower called for a great expansion in our campaign of truth which would give enormous moral strength to all other phases of our foreign policy—military, diplomatic, and economic; and

Whereas the international propagation of the democratic creed should be made an instrument of supreme national policy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof duly designated by the chairman of such committee, in conjunction with two other Senators designated by the President of the Senate, shall conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to—

(A) The objectives, operations, and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States.

(B) The prompt development of techniques, methods, and programs for greatly expanded and far more effective operations in this vital area of foreign policy, including the following, among others:

(1) Maximum utilization of radio broadcasting, by medium wave as well as shortwave, to overcome barriers of language, censorship, distance, and other obstacles to reaching the minds of the peoples of the world.

(2) Development of a comprehensive world-wide program to produce and exhibit documentary and educational motion pictures.

(3) Significant and immediate expansion of our program for people-to-people diplomacy, through exchange of students, industrial and technical experts, as well as representatives of cultural, labor, and religious groups.

(4) Use of all other practicable techniques and media to reach and inform people who are shut off from the free world by censorship and suppression.

(5) Promotion of democratic education abroad, including the occupied areas of Germany and Japan.

(6) Increased coordination with international information programs of other free nations.

(7) Maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steady and steadily increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information.

(8) Increased support and development of and coordination with the United Nations and its appropriate specialized agencies, facilities, and programs.

(9) Further encouragement of nongovernmental agencies to help inspire and guide the efforts of the millions of private American citizens who might use their talents and resources and contacts overseas in furtherance of the programs and objectives of this resolution.

(C) The extent and scope of organization and of reorganization of existing departmental and agency structures which may be necessary or desirable to accomplish the foregoing objectives in the present world crisis.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the

results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for necessary appropriations or legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, or other assistants as it deems desirable. The necessary expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, this proposed study by a Senate committee would focus mainly on three questions: the scale and scope of the operation which is needed, on its needed manpower and facilities and funds, and on its proper placement within the executive branch of the Government. The study would give the State Department full opportunity to report its progress, which in the past year under the leadership of Assistant Secretary Barrett has been most notable. The study would review where we have been, where we are, and where we think we are going. It could explore what other countries are doing on this psychological and propaganda front. It could examine our own deficiencies and develop bold and constructive plans to remedy them. And it could, for the first time by any committee of the Congress, do justice to the troublesome problem of organization of our executive departments for the best handling of this new and critical area so vital to the conduct of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I shall devote the remainder of my speech to the question of the proper placement within the Government of the administration of our international information and education programs. Should it remain within the State Department; and, if it should not, how might it better be set up? This subject has not hitherto been discussed on the floor of the Senate or, as far as I know, in any committee.

The Hoover Commission studied this problem and its findings reflected a fundamental uncertainty. The Commission agreed on the principle that the Department of State should not be burdened with major operating responsibilities and that its proper role was policy formulation and the coordination of the manifold foreign interests of many executive agencies. Applying this principle, the so-called task force which appraised the State Department recommended that the international information and educational exchange programs should be taken out of the Department. It suggested that the information program be transferred to a specially-created Government corporation. This proposal followed a pattern I had proposed while I was in the State Department as Assistant Secretary. In 1946 I sent a bill to the Hill calling for the establishment of what I called the International Broadcasting Foundation, with an independent board of trustees to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Coordination with the State Department was to be partially insured by the membership on this board of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

The Hoover Commission task force further suggested that the educational exchange program of the State Department be transferred to the Federal Security Agency, presumably in the Office of Education.

The Hoover Commission itself, reviewing the findings of its task force reversed these two particular recommendations, but it did so with words which were most hesitant. Let me quote the Commission's language:

In two instances—

The two being the information and the educational programs—

it appears that operational responsibility, for the present at least, must remain in the State Department in default of any other satisfactory location in the executive branch.

I may say in passing that I unequivocally agree that the Office of Education is not a satisfactory location.

Now, when the Commission used this phrase, "for the present, at least," it was referring to a present of 2 years ago, to a time when the international crisis was far less acute than it is today, and when the information and education operation was a relatively minor aspect of the State Department's work, with only about one-fourth the appropriations now available. And I think I have made it clear that I feel the present operating appropriations are only a fraction of what they should be.

Now, the Commission's phrase, "in default of any other satisfactory location" was made at a time when many felt that the umbrella of the State Department was necessary to keep the Voice of America not only dry behind the ears but actually with the breath of life in its body.

Today the importance of the program is almost universally conceded, and it seems inevitable that it is due for a great further expansion. Therefore, it is not only reasonable but imperative to ask whether a better job can now be done with independent status, let us say as the ECA has had independent status.

I do not want to be misunderstood on this point, and it is hard to make the point without being misunderstood. I admire the present Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Mr. Edward W. Barrett, and I was one of those who recommended him for the post. I am proud of the job he has done since his appointment last year. I know and admire many of Mr. Barrett's key subordinates, some of whom served under me in the Department. His two top men, Howland Sargeant and Charles Hulten, are two of the ablest executives I know. My argument is that we need many, many more like them, or as nearly like them as we can find: we need personnel in this area comparable to the best of the armed services, of the ECA, or of the Cabinet or subcabinet. Can the present subordinate role in the lower reaches of the State Department offer the right challenge and opportunity to the best communications people in the country? Or, if it does not, how can it be made to offer such a challenge? To this problem the State Department top officers have had little time to devote themselves.

Secretary Acheson wrote me the other day that before the end of the current fiscal year there will be 10,615 people working in the Department's information and education program. He added that the President's budget for fiscal 1952 calls for a 45-percent expansion over 1951 levels. Thus he seemingly aims to have more than 13,000 people—something approaching half the total personnel of the State Department and the Foreign Service—reporting to one Assistant Secretary of State. I remind you that there are eight Assistant Secretaries of State, and, in the organization chart of the Department, there are six or eight officers who outrank the Assistant Secretaries. Such a tail could well begin to try to wag even such a dog as the State Department. Or worse—and more likely—the tail will be lucky to get even one eighth of the dog's attention.

I repeat that I am not objecting to the size of this projected force. Far from it. It is about the size of one cut-down Army division. But many of these 13,000 people will be top creative people. Their work cannot readily be reduced to routine, as it is, for example, in the post office. The best of them will be people who respond to imaginative leadership. Can they get such inspiration under the present type of set-up?

We in the United States are the most communications-minded people in the world. We are proud of our achievements in this field. But as I have often said, we are amateurs in the field of international propaganda—amateurs in a world of professionals. We have never applied ourselves to this international field. We have potential talent but the will to utilize it has been lacking. In New York or Chicago or Los Angeles alone there are hundreds of outstanding men and women in education, in publishing, in journalism, broadcasting, motion pictures, public relations, and yes, in advertising, who can contribute to this enterprise, and who now only await the leadership. They would face unfamiliar kinds of problems; but under experienced direction they can learn what they need to know about foreign relations far faster than a foreign affairs expert can learn how to communicate to large groups of people.

Let me add that by communication leaders I do not mean only those from the mass media. The labor movement has produced many great communicators and there are none more effective abroad in combating totalitarian ideologies. We must learn to utilize the enormous contribution that the voice of religion can make to the Voice of America. We have a great ideological asset in our foreign language groups, and in their publications. And are we making use of the remarkable communication talents in our universities and our civic groups?

I suggest that there are three organizational patterns—and doubtless variations on these will be brought forward—which our proposed Senate survey will want to consider.

First, and most obvious, of course, is to keep the program where it is. I do

not discount this possibility. Let me discuss the arguments of its proponents under four headings.

First, there is a current argument that any change would cause confusion and delay at a critical time. This is an argument that could be leveled against any reorganization or proposed step forward. For example, the unification of the armed services, or currently, the establishment of the emergency production and control agencies.

Secondly, there is the argument that the State Department must directly control operations so that it can exercise close policy supervision over the output—shifting its propaganda emphasis, if necessary, from day to day in the light of fresh intelligence, of new appraisals, and changing tactics. This is a weightier argument than the first one, but not decisive. In the first place, it ignores the need for strong and forceful representation to the political officers of the viewpoint of top experts in the field of communications. In the second place, can it not be resolved by a system of close liaison, such as the State Department maintains with other operating agencies of the Government?

Thirdly, there is the argument that the presence of information specialists within the State Department exercises a healthy corrective influence on the policy-formulation activities of the career diplomats who are more accustomed to dealing with foreign diplomats than with the foreign policies behind them. Yes; there is good point in this—if enough of the right men are in the Department. A major test of any foreign policy is whether it can be explained persuasively to large numbers of people abroad. And that is often a question for the expert judgment of professionals in the field of communications.

This would, however, be a far more important point if anyone proposed to eliminate, or transfer, the office of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. I know of no such proposal. Under the Hoover reorganization plan, which created a general manager for Voice of America operations, the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs and his immediate staff were to be freed to concentrate on policy matters, and to advise the Secretary of State on public-opinion questions. This is as it should be, and need not be changed if actual operations are removed from the Department. Indeed, if operations are removed the Assistant Secretary's role as a policy officer will be even more sharply clarified. Further he would become the key liaison with any newly constituted outside agency.

Fourthly, there is the question of the relation of the information program's field operations abroad to our Embassies and legations. I believe it is a sound principle—which should be more rigorously applied—that our Ambassadors and Ministers, as representatives of the President, should coordinate all official interests of the United States in the countries to which they are assigned. The field operations of the information and education program should continue to be coordinated by the chiefs of mission in each country, even though the home organization were to be separated from the State Department.

There are other arguments against a separation, but the foregoing seem to be the principal four.

Now what of the arguments in favor of separation? They seem to me to be powerful.

My experience, including my experience with the State Department, makes me feel the evidence favors the separation, but I do not exclude the possibility that the proposed Senate study may bring out ways to achieve the seeming advantages, without the necessity for a separate operating unit.

But of this I am sure. If operations are to remain in the State Department, then a way must be found to bring into the Government, perhaps as a psychological strategy board reporting to the National Security Council, an independent group, including top leaders from the communications field, and from labor, education, and religion, to infuse fresh ideas and new vigor into the operations. A somewhat similar idea, to achieve correlation among Government agencies, has already been suggested to me by Assistant Secretary Barrett as a possible alternative to a separate operating agency.

Our Government, I am told, is the only one in the world today in which international propaganda operations, as distinct from policy, are concentrated in the foreign office. In the case of Britain, which has had far more experience in this field than we, the overseas broadcasting, the most important arm of Britain's international information program, is conducted by the BBC—that is, it is conducted, among other things, by trained broadcasters. The BBC's liaison with the Foreign Office is subtle. The Foreign Office of course not only has a veto power, which never needs to be overtly used, but also has a directive power—a power keyed to those British subtleties little known to the marbled halls of Washington. Britain's cultural relations with other nations are conducted by another operating organization separate from the Foreign Office but wholly responsive to it—the British Council, an agency financed chiefly by the Government.

Even the Russians, I understand, carry on their foreign broadcasts through a broadcasting agency separate from their foreign office. Propaganda is of course a principal preoccupation of the Politburo, and the propaganda line comes straight out of the Communist Party to all Government agencies. I call your attention to Marshal Stalin's own piece of pure unadulterated propaganda of last Friday. I suspect the broadcasters get the line first, and the Foreign Office follows the broadcasting rather than the other way around.

The first and most important argument for pulling out of our State Department the Voice of America and kindred activities is the one I have already intimated: the seemingly greater chance to bring into this operation the best brains and talent in the country. The presently contemplated 13,000-man operating force will be larger than the combined full-time staffs of the Associated Press, the National Broadcasting Co., and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. It is now inconceivable that a single Assistant Secretary—no matter how able he may be—could bring into the echelons ranged under him the top news and creative talent available in any one of those companies.

I know full well that the Government can never compete with private business, in salary terms, for the services of the outstanding men in the communication field. But I know also that it can attract them if their work is given the recognition and status it deserves.

While most of the political officers in the State Department have now accepted the so-called Voice of America program, and many would surely now resist having it reorganized out of the Department, I shall not forget the distress in 1945 of some of these men, who are top professionals in their own way, and who as craftsmen had been trained to labor for days to get the proper wording of a note to a foreign government, when they realized the Voice of America had been transferred to the State Department and was pumping out 250,000 or more words a day, for foreign consumption, in the name of the State Department.

The wholly natural—and traditional—attitude within the Department was not conductive to getting too creative men or holding them. Still today, you may look in vain for chiefs of mission—ministers or ambassadors—who have come from the information area of the Department or who are specialists in the field of communications. The OIAA and OWI contained many men of stature. Few have been called back into top roles in the Department. This is not deliberate prejudice, not at all. It is wholly unconscious. It could not be otherwise. But the natural concomitant is that top men from the communications industry do not seek to enter the Department.

Partly because of the entrenched tradition within the Department, as well as the grave risks involved in embracing new gods, I subscribe to the basic principle which the Department has self-consciously maintained, and the Hoover Commission supported—that the Department of State should not take on major operating responsibilities.

General Marshall and Mr. Bernard Baruch reenunciated this principle clearly and unequivocally in the hearings last July on my Senate Resolution 243. Although the Armed Forces are our most important operating instrument of foreign policy, we would never consider placing their operations directly under the Secretary of State.

Similarly, when the Congress decided to launch the European Recovery Program, as a major operating instrument of foreign policy, it gave scarcely any consideration to the possibility of asking the State Department to operate this program; it set up a separate agency. Now the information and education program is in some ways an even more complex operating problem. Thus I am not prepared to accept without study, arguments that this program is an exception to the principle. Many of my colleagues here in the Senate have pressed upon me again and again the idea that separa-

tion is essential and that a new status must be devised. I have received hundreds of letters from policy leaders all over the country advocating such a change. It is partly in response to these pressures that I am today asking for this study.

The most obvious and oft-repeated suggestion is the creation of an independent agency reporting directly to the President, or to the President through the National Security Council. Such an agency would provide the recognition, the freedom and the flexibility for full development. With proper leadership, it could become a magnet for the best talent in the country.

This special agency is the second of the three organizational patterns which the committee should study. Many of its eager enthusiasts will settle for no less than full Cabinet status for such an agency. It would then have its own eight top officers with its own eight assistant secretaries. Acting under an administrator, such an agency would take over all or most of the prospective 13,000 people contemplated under the State Department program. It would take over all five of the present types of operation—broadcasting; news and publications; motion pictures; exchange of persons; and the servicing of United States information libraries, institutes, and exhibits overseas. It would share responsibility for the staffs in the field with the chiefs of mission.

Parenthetically, I hope my colleagues will note that my remarks today are directed wholly toward the organization and amplification of America's overt, straightforward, open-and-above-board information and education operations. They do not bear upon the intricate problems involved in psychological warfare or so-called black propaganda. These are the functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the theater commanders, and the CIA. These operations do not mix well with overt propaganda. Nevertheless I am aware that there is a range of possible actions, which might be called unconventional propaganda, between these two main types. We have heard of some of these unconventional approaches described on the floor of the Senate, for example, Senator FLANDERS' balloons; and my office mail contains many unorthodox suggestions, some of them ingenious. Incidentally, there is a strong presumption that an independent agency would be more likely than the State Department to have the staff, the resources, the imagination and the freedom to receive, to evaluate and to act upon such proposals.

One possible way to organize such an independent agency would be the creation by Congress, under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, of a wholly owned Government corporation, let us say under some such name as the International Information and Education Foundation.

Such a Government corporation is the third and last of the organizational patterns I suggest for study. This is the formula to which I referred previously, and which I sponsored in 1946 for our broadcasting only. It can readily be extended to the entire range of activities associated with the broadcasting. The board of trustees, or directors, should be nonpartisan, composed of outstanding citizens, notably from such fields as publishing, labor, religion, education, and communications. The chairman of the board, the only paid member, should serve as chief administrative officer. In my original proposal of 1946, there were to be two consultative committees, one representing other interested Government agencies and the other representing the broadcasting industry. Such a foundation, although necessarily financed largely by congressional appropriations, would also be a logical recipient for private donations.

This formula of a Government corporation with a board of directors from private life would have most of the advantages of the independent Government agency which is so widely advocated. It would have some alleged disadvantages, which were suggested to me by the Bureau of the Budget in my State Department days, and these should be reexamined, but it would have many great potential advantages.

Such a Government corporation should bring into positions of responsibility men of ability and prestige whose services would not ordinarily be available to the Government. It should, at least in some degree, reduce the taint of official propaganda which sometimes develops in the minds of foreign people against the emanations of a purely governmental agency. It should provide greater flexibility for cooperative efforts with the many private organizations working in this field than is possible for a line agency of Government. Finally, and perhaps most important, it should greatly enhance the confidence of our own people in the whole operation.

Mr. President, I have presented these three alternative patterns of organization at some length, not to anticipate the proposed committee's agenda, but to show that there is great substance to many questions to which the committee should devote itself. I have not argued further today about the contribution to the successful conduct of our foreign policy which the right kind and the right scale of operations in this area can make. I have, however, suggested that, if the understanding and the leadership the times require are to develop in this area, the Congress will have to help provide them.

The resolution I am submitting today on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin and myself, is, I feel, a major step toward securing both the requisite understanding and leadership. Because both are so urgently required in this time of crisis, I hope hearings on this resolution can be held very shortly to be followed by any indicated recommendations for legislation and appropriations.

Mr. President, there are few questions both so urgent and so important to which the Congress can now address itself.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted at this point in my remarks the news story published in the New York Times a few days ago under the headline "Exiles from Soviet bloc proclaim principles for a liberated Europe." I read an extract from the declaration of principles:

The free world is the bearer of a political idea which it must share with all peo le eager to rally in a great and just cause; it is now for the United States of America, the Nation which marches at the head of the line, to speak the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXILES FROM SOVIET BLOC PROCLAIM PRINCIPLES FOR A LIBERATED EUROPE

PHILADELPHIA, February 11.—A declaration of independence by European exiles from communism was proclaimed today at the birthplace of the document that had inspired it.

More than 200 persons from 10 countries under Communist dictatorship met at Independence Hall and endorsed a Declaration of the Aims and Principles of Liberation of the Central and Eastern European Peoples.

At the same site nearly 175 years ago, the founders of the refugees' adopted "home of the free" signed the United States Declaration of Independence.

The gist of the declaration was set forth in 10 principles of liberation based on the concept that the suppression of freedom in one part of the world endangers the freedom of all nations and of all men.

Lasting world peace and democratic stability cannot be achieved, the document said, until the shackles of Russian mastery have been struck from the captive peoples behind the iron curtain.

On the premise that those peoples had been subjugated by the same Soviet Communist aggressor, the declaration said that they deserved to be defended with the same determination as that with which the United Nations is defending the freedom and independence of the Korean people.

Purporting to speak for an overwhelming majority of 120,000,000 people in Communist domains, the group of exiles advocated a European federation modeled after the United States in ideals and in structure.

The ceremony marking formal issuance of the document was held at noon on the paved plaza outside the main entrance of Independence Hall. It was arranged by the National Committee for a Free Europe, Inc., but the committee spokesmen said that the declaration originated with an informal group of expatriates, most of them former leaders in their homelands, who call themselves the Tuesday Panel.

The Panel has been meeting regularly in New York for 2 years at the home of Grigore Gafencu, former Rumanian minister for foreign affairs and envoy to Moscow.

Among other important figures in the exile "colony" whose names were announced as signers of the declarations were Mgr. Bela Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council and former speaker of the Hungarian Parliament; Dr. Peter Zenkl, former vice premier of Czechoslovakia; Dr. Georgi M. Dimitrov, chairman of the Bulgarian National Council, Washington, and Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman of the International Peasant Union and former Premier of Poland.

After the exiles who had come here for the occasion had been introduced to the principals in the old Continental Congress building on the west side of Independence Hall, the outdoor exercises began in sunny but freezing weather.

Men and women of diverse nationalities listened attentively as the aims of the Declaration were explained by Joseph C. Grew, former United States Ambassador to Japan, and C. D. Jackson, former publisher

of Fortune magazine. They are chairman and president, respectively, of the National Committee for a Free Europe.

"This demonstration is the first time since the evil day descended upon these countries that exiles have voluntarily banded together as a show of unity," Mr. Jackson said.

The declaration then was read in English by several exiles in rotation and was recorded for broadcast by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, a mobile station operated by the committee on Western Germany to send democracy's message behind the iron curtain.

During the reading, the exiles signed an illuminated scroll recording their endorsement of the declared. Monsignor Varga was the first signer, Alexander F. Kerensky, exiled head of Russia's first revolutionary regime, also signed.

The final event was the transfer of the declaration, with more than 200 signatures, to Dr. Edward M. Riley, historian of the Independence National Historical Park, for safekeeping in his office until eventual display of the document at the shrine.

The hour-long curbside ceremony was followed by a luncheon at the nearby Benjamin Franklin Hotel, where the principal speakers were Mr. Grew, Monsignor Varga, Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Malcolm W. Davis, executive associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. Grew praised the authors of the proclamation and predicted that the principles of the declaration will guide the remaking of their homelands once they are freed of Bolshevik domination.

SIGNERS NAMED

The announced list of signers of the proclamation adopted by the exiles included:

Albania: Nuci Kotta, member of the National Committee for Free Albania, and Xhevat Kalajxhi, journalist.

Bulgaria: Dimitar Matzankiev, member of the Bulgarian National Council, former member of Parliament; Gen. Alexander Todorov; Luben Vichegorov, Metropolitan Opera singer; and Kiril Z. Fournadjeiv, fellow of the Mid-European Studies Center.

Czechoslovakia: Dr. Stefan Osusky, former Cabinet member and former Minister to Paris; Vaclav Majer, Dr. Josef Cerny, Dr. Jozef Lettrich and Dr. Hubert Ripka, all former Cabinet members, and Dr. Jan Papanek, former Ambassador and chief delegate to the United Nations.

Estonia: Kaarel Robert Pusta, former Foreign Minister and Ilmar Raamot, former Minister of Agriculture.

Hungary: Ferenc Nagy, former Premier; Tibor Eckhardt, former chairman of the Smallholders Party; Zoltan Pfeiffer, chairman Hungarian Freedom Party; Charles Peyer, chairman, Social Democratic Party; Dr. Bela Fabian, former member of Parliament; Msgr. Joszef Kozi-Horvath, chairman Christian Democratic movement, and George Bessenyey, member, Hungarian National Council.

Latvia: Julius Feldmans, Minister to Washington; Alfred Berzins, former Cabinet member and Voldemars Lambergs, member of the Latvian Central Committee.

Lithuania: P. Zadeikis, Minister to Washington, and Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, former Minister to Germany.

Poland: Stanislaw Olszewski, chairman of the Polish Democratic Party, and Karol Popiel, former member of the Polish Government-in-Exile.

Rumania: Gen. Nicolae Radescu, former Premier; Constantin Visoianu, former Minister for Foreign Affairs; Charles A. Davila, former Rumanian Minister to Washington; Emil Ghilezan, former Under-Secretary of State; Brutus Coste, former Charge d'Affaires in Washington, and Dr. Augustin Popa, former Member of Parliament.

Yugoslavia: Dr. Vladko Macek, former Vice Premier and now chairman Croat Peasant Party; Dr. Milan Gavrilovic, former Ambassador to Moscow; Constantin Fotic, former Ambassador to Washington; Dr. Miha Krek, former Vice Premier; Ivan Mestrovic, sculptor; Dr. Slobowan Drashkovic, member of the Serbian Central National Committee, and Dr. Bogdan Radica, history professor and writer.

TEXT OF LIBERATION DECLARATION BY EXILES FROM COMMUNIST LANDS

PHILADELPHIA, February 11.—Following is the text of a Declaration of the Aims and Principles of Liberation of the Central and Eastern European Peoples, as adopted today by exiles from 10 countries, at ceremonies outside Independence Hall:

I

Whereas the peace ardently desired by the peoples of the whole world requires conditions of order and justice;

These times of great trouble will persist in the world so long as peoples aspiring to liberty are kept in isolation from the free world and in slavery;

This trouble prevails particularly in Europe, where the peoples, brutally separated from each other by an arbitrary will, see the ancient ties, both spiritual and material, ties formed by history and a common civilization, severed between them;

This division in Europe keeps the west in a continual state of insecurity and weakness depriving the countries that are still free of conditions indispensable to well-being and to the reestablishment of strength;

This division isolates the countries of Eastern Europe and, despite their aspirations and natural tendencies, confines them against their will in the sphere subjected to Soviet communism;

Whereas the isolation of an entire part of Europe can be maintained only by constraint and terror exercised equally against nations and individuals;

The nations held prisoners in an enemy camp are arrayed against the west as the advance guard of the new aggression which is being prepared;

Individuals, tortured in mind and in body, must suffer an unnatural warping of their spirit by a despotic rule, or perish.

In the domain of fact, the Communist experiment is doomed to failure; the economy of a country subjected to incessant levies, deprived of its markets and its natural outlets, moves toward catastrophe; the social order succumbs under a dictatorship which obolishes liberty of thought, creativeness, research, and enterprise, deprives the peasant of his land, the worker of the product of his labor, separates the child from the customs, faith, education, and patriotic inspiration of his parents, and denies to an entire category of citizens the right of life.

In the domain of the spirit, the pitiless struggle of communism against man leads to the debasement of the human being; in spite of the heroic resistance of our martyrs, to whom we render a tribute of deep emotion, our most precious heritage and our highest values, the very groundwork of our civilization, must suffer outrage and violence from a hostile mentality; in the systematic spreading of moral confusion, with no distinction between good and evil; the only law is an immense and brazen falsehood.

Under cover of a treacherous system of thought, designed to gain command of the mass mind but incapable of fulfilling its promises, obscure forces are at work, hostile to the entire world, whose only aim is to exercise absolute and limitless power; the exercise of this power becomes an end in itself, with the world as its victim; and the unlawful occupation of the Eastern European countries is the starting point for new conquests.

II

Whereas, moreover, the dangerous process of disintegration which threatens to extend over all Europe cannot be checked without restoring a rule of liberty to the countries in the east; and these countries are worthy of such a rule, having fought through centuries on the front lines of Europe to win freedom for themselves and for the Continent;

The word "liberty" has gained heightened meaning and new value through the sufferings endured by these countries, sustaining their peoples in hope of the deliverance for which they long with all their hearts;

And whereas such a deliverance calls for a great effort of constructive organization fired by a creative urge; this effort must aim at the liberation of man as well as nations; the liberation of man must restore his natural rights—fundamental, inalienable, not to be proscribed, but protected in their very finality against the abuses of power and the interference of public authority; this liberation, concentrated by legal guaranties of a national and international order, must deliver man from the fear that has permeated his being and give back his indispensable sense of physical and spiritual security; the freedom thus assured must be the essential element in the formation of states, and of those ties which are destined to draw more and more closely together the commonwealth of man;

The freeing of the nations must put an end to unlawful dominion by any alien power acting through the intermediary of servile government imposed and maintained by violence;

It must restore to the people their right of adopting freely the laws and institutions of their choice, so that the just power of governments shall derive from the consent of the governed;

Further, it must provide means for remedying as promptly as possible the social ills produced by Communist rule, which has created a much sharper social division than existed before between ruled and rulers; between the mass of half-starving and downtrodden people and a small upper ruling group, politically and economically privileged and self-perpetuating, which wields power of life and death unrestrained by any civil or moral law; this deadly distinction must be abolished;

And whereas the reconstruction of Eastern Europe involves problems of a political, economic, and social order beyond the capabilities and powers of nations to resolve separately; the dangers to which they remain exposed have prepared them to seek salvation through union; this tendency toward close international collaboration is in harmony with the present order of events; the federal principle, signifying union in liberty and implying the creation of organic ties, is the most appropriate and sure means of uniting the states; the peoples of the east are resolved to apply this principle to the regional organization which they envisage; these same peoples proclaim their right and their desire to take part in a United Europe on a federal basis, which they regard as the realization of all their prayers; and in spirit these continental and regional unions signify further steps along the road to the indispensable organization of the free world as a whole.

The desire for security

The great movement which carries the people of the east toward union springs likewise from a desire for security, from their need of opposing unitedly the menace of any totalitarian dictatorships whatsoever and of preventing any imperialist power from subordinating their countries to its will—as happened with Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

Consequently the peoples of the east feel themselves brothers not only to all the free nations of the west but also to the Russian

people and all the other peoples of the Soviet Union aspiring to a common deliverance.

III

And whereas, finally, continents, like men, are related to each other, and in the sense of the words spoken by the great American, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor at this time, the world cannot live half free and half slave;

The principles written into the Atlantic Charter could assure peace to the world under conditions of order and freedom; the present crisis results from the fact that certain of these principles have been abandoned; to cope with this crisis, and with the grave disorder provoked by the division of the world, there is no better way than to return to these principles and to restore to the Charter its original authority; in order to bring about this restoration it is necessary to possess a definite program and real strength;

The people of the United States of America, conscious of the mission before them, have resolutely given leadership to the free world in order to create, through new efforts and sacrifices, the preponderant strength able to assure a just and durable peace;

The free world is the bearer of a political idea which it must share with all people eager to rally in a great and just cause; it is now for the United States of America, the Nation which marches at the head of the line, to speak the word; here where the representative of the people, in a time of revolution against autocracy and in touch with the most enlightened minds of the Western World, once gathered to inspire the constitution of a free people, and where the wisdom of a free people with authority gained from glorious experience can restore to the world, in a time more infinitely troubled, the belief in liberty;

IV

Now, therefore, we exiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, loyally united and single in thought, dedicated by the profound sufferings and the high aspirations of our native lands;

Faithful to the example of predecessors who, in the course of centuries, have forged, in exile but in contact with the free world, the framework of the institutions, the laws, the liberties of their countries.

The principles of liberation

Wish to send from the great Republic of the United States of America, where we have the good fortune to see the forces of freedom assembling, a message of confidence to our far-away peoples; and

To proclaim solemnly together the principles and aims of liberation:

1. All men and all nations are endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty. The cause of freedom is, like the cause of peace, one and indivisible. The suppressor of freedom in one part of the world endangers the freedom of all nations and of all men.

2. The principles of law and liberty embodied in the Atlantic Charter offer solid foundation for just peace in our time. Therefore, as an earnest of the determination in the free world to replace lawlessness and tyranny now rampant, with liberty under law, there must be a return to the principles of the Charter.

3. The world can have no peace so long as no real peace reigns in Europe. This cannot be achieved so long as that continent is sundered in two. The iron curtain divides Europe into halves which are vitally necessary to each other. In the eastern half a ruling group irresponsible to the will of its own people is forging powerful arms for an aggressive war. Liberation of central and eastern Europe is therefore a condition essential to the establishment of international democratic order, justice and lasting peace.

Having been violated by the same Soviet Communist aggressor, the freedom and independence of our peoples deserve to be defended with the same determination as that with which the United Nations is defending the freedom of the Korean people.

4. The great powers cannot achieve their purpose of safeguarding Western Europe if they base their endeavors upon a recognition, even implied, of the present enslavement of Central and Eastern Europe. Let the free world give to the oppressed peoples of Eastern and Central Europe at every possible opportunity assurance that its purpose is to bring the principles of the Atlantic Charter into effect in their unhappy lands. It is for the free world to demand that all further deportations from our countries cease, that prisoners of war and persons deported from their homes be repatriated immediately, that all Soviet troops and foreign police units be withdrawn, and that all political prisoners wherever they are held be set free. The deliberate destruction of the best in our nations, steadily pursued, must be stopped. The first goal is the establishment of democratic governments and the holding of free elections under effective international supervision.

5. All our peoples, from the Baltic to the Black and Adriatic Seas, from the Iron Curtain into the heart of the Russian lands, anxiously await action that would herald their approaching liberation. They are confident that the spiritual and material forces gathering under the leadership of the United States of America are capable of establishing a peace based on freedom and justice. Despite its impressive military might, the ruthless power confronting the free world is undermined by hatred and latent revolt among the peoples it oppresses. Their contribution to the fight for freedom can lead to decisive results only if it is related to positive and determined action by the free world.

6. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are firmly resolved, upon their liberation, to join the community of free nations and to establish government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The right of habeas corpus, as well as freedom of religion, freedom of research, and artistic creation, freedom of opinion and of information, freedom of assembly, among other essential freedoms, and fundamental political and social rights, shall be assured. No one shall be barred from education because of national origin, religious or political belief, or social and economic circumstances. Parents shall have the right to send children to such schools as they may establish or choose. There shall be special care for the oncoming generation of the young, who have a right to the widest opportunities to use their enthusiasm and capacity in building a better new order of society. The machine of mutual extermination shall no longer roll through our countries. Crimes against humanity shall be dealt with through the regular process of justice and on grounds of personal responsibility for definite acts. Eastern European democracy cannot be revived through vengeance. "Thou shall not kill" is the basic commandment for us.

7. The movement of ideas and persons, goods and services shall be free. Individual initiative shall be stimulated. Choice between private and public enterprise should be determined on the basis of merit; those methods which can produce better results both for consumers and workers, should have preference.

There shall be no more iron curtains. Our countries shall again be integrated into the world economy and be able to raise their standard of living and add their contribution to general welfare.

8. The land shall be owned by the peasant as his private property in accordance with the desire of the whole peasantry, which forms a major part of our populations and the backbone of our nations. Cooperatives and other forms of association voluntarily entered into by the peasants for economic ends shall be free from government interference. Advanced scientific methods and modern implements will help to raise the standard of living of the rural and urban populations.

9. The workers, manual and intellectual, shall be protected against exploitation whether by private or by public enterprise and shall be free from the fetters of arbitrary and competitive forced standards in work as from repressive labor laws. They shall be free to choose their employment and the places where they wish to live and work. Free and independent trade unions and organizations shall be the guardians of workers' rights and interests. There shall be responsibility on the part of the public authorities and private administrators that technological and scientific resources be employed to increase output and improve levels of living. The workers shall be entitled to a just share in the profits earned by their industries. Before the interest of the machines comes the interest of man.

10. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are eager to take their natural place in the great movement of free peoples toward better relationship and closer union. They are desirous of establishing among themselves strong ties of a federal character and of joining in the formation of a United Europe. Such a fraternal federation must prize and respect the distinctive values of each nation, for the common good of our European civilization and for the cultural heritage of mankind throughout the world.

Our belief in the need of close and loyal cooperation has prompted us to come forward with this joint declaration. We pledge ourselves to remain faithful to this belief after liberation.

In this great country, where the idea of liberty is so closely bound to that of union, we pray God to give us the strength we need to bring to a successful outcome the fight for the freedom and the union of our nations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946 RELATING TO FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill which I introduced earlier today for appropriate reference is entitled "A bill to amend the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive branch of the Government of the United States."

This measure is a revised version of S. 2898, the budget bill I introduced in the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress.

The main purpose of this legislation is to provide much-needed improvement in congressional control over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government. It is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to appropriate funds needed for the support of all branches of the Federal Government. That responsibility, Mr. President, in this period of our national existence, and under the conditions of stress that now obtain, imposes a duty on the Congress to appropriate only as much, but no more, than is actually necessary.

Under our practice and procedure the President of the United States submits to the Congress an annual budget of all

proposed expenditures of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year. The items and the amounts in the President's budget constitute his recommendations and requests of the Congress for appropriations for the specific amounts and purposes indicated. The Congress is not duty-bound to follow the President's recommendations, nor to make all of the specific appropriations that he requests. However, budget requests and recommendations of the President carry great weight, and tremendously influence the Congress in its policies and in making appropriations for the operating cost of government and the servicing of governmental programs. Marked deference and respect are given the President's budget, and it is generally followed by the Congress in appropriating for the operating expenses of the Government. The Congress also accords to the President absolute good faith and sincerity with respect to the budget he submits and usually requires only a prima facie showing in support of items and amounts it contains.

Mr. President, under normal conditions the Congress might with reasonable safety continue its traditional policy of making appropriations for the expenses of the executive branch of the Government in line with the President's request. But conditions are not normal; they are extraordinarily abnormal. There are many warning signals of danger ahead, Mr. President. In the postwar peacetime period we have experienced almost astronomical increases in the operating cost of the Federal Government and in servicing new and expanded governmental programs. We have been either unable or unwilling, Mr. President, to keep a balanced budget and to hold expenditures within revenues.

Now, world dangers have compelled us to enter into a rearmament program in the interest of our own national defense and security. This program adds some thirty to forty billion dollars annually to our already burdensome costs of government, and may go as high as fifty to sixty billion dollars annually within the next 2 or 3 years. These extraordinary expenditures, Mr. President, make it necessary for us to greatly increase the existing heavy tax burden on our people. And however much we may increase the rate of taxes, Mr. President, and however much we may talk about pay as we go, it is highly improbable that this program can be supported on a pay-as-we-go basis. Thus, Mr. President, any deficits that are incurred will simply be added to and will pyramid the national debt, already around $260,000,000,000. The tremendous governmental expenditures that are envisioned and recommended in the President's pending annual budget of $72,000,000,000 add to the existing inflationary pressures on our economy. The more the Government spends and the larger its deficits become, the greater is the danger of inflation and economic disaster.

So, Mr. President, if there was ever a time in the history of our Republic when the Congress should exercise its full constitutional powers over the purse of this Nation, that time is now. If we are to avert economic disaster, the most rigid policies and practices of economy must be invoked. Each item in the President's budget should be examined and scrutinized with the view of eliminating it entirely or making a reduction in the amount thereof, if that can be done without serious injury to the necessary functions of Government and without impairing national defense.

The President's budget is made up from requests submitted to him by the various departments and agencies in the executive branch of Government. In the Office of the Bureau of the Budget there are more than 500 permanent employees who work all through the year with the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government in the development of budget items and in preparing the budget of the President for submission to the Congress.

When the appropriations bills come before the Appropriations Committees of Congress, hearings are held and the representatives of the respective agencies of the executive branch of the Government appear before the committees and invariably support the budget that the President has submitted. It amounts, Mr. President, practically to an ex parte proceeding. The department or agency of Government seeking the appropriation without exception supports it and usually advises the Appropriations Committees that the amount requested is not only needed but is hardly adequate to meet its operating expenses. Not a single witness from the executive branch of the Government appears before the committees and gives adverse testimony to or in any way challenges the budget items or amounts requested.

The committees and the Congress who have the final responsibility, are, therefore, at a tremendous disadvantage. The Congress has not heretofore provided itself with adequate staff or facilities to scrutinize the budget, investigate and examine into the necessity for the items requested or the amount the department or agency seeks to have appropriated to it.

Presently the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has a professional and clerical staff of only 15 members, and the Appropriations Committee of the House has a staff of 40 members, a total of 55 staff members, Mr. President, for the Congress, as against more than 500 that we have provided for the Bureau of the Budget. Staff members of the Appropriations Committees are engaged in general routine committee work. They are not now authorized or empowered, Mr. President, to make investigations of the various agencies and departments and to examine into the economy and efficiency of their operations. They are not presently empowered, Mr. President, to be present at agency hearings conducted by the Bureau of the Budget. They have no opportunity to study the budget during its formulation and thus when hearings are held before the Appropriations Committees they are not equipped to advise and counsel with the committee with reference to the need for items in the budget or whether the amounts requested can be substantially reduced. Neither the committees nor the staffs of the committees are prepared to challenge the evidence submitted by representatives of the various agencies and departments in support of budget requests. Because the Congress has not equipped itself with facilities to study the budget during its preparation and to make investigations of the various departments with respect to their staffing and expenditures, the Appropriations Committees have little or no evidence to controvert that which is given to it by the interested parties.

Mr. President, the bill that I have introduced would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget composed of 10 Members, 5 from each of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations to be chosen by those committees, 3 of whom would be Members of the majority party and 2 of the minority party. The joint committee would elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its Members and these two offices would alternate between the two Houses annually.

This joint committee would have several major duties. It would make studies and investigations on a year-round basis to equip itself with a full knowledge of the program and expenditures of the various agencies of Government. Second, it would furnish both the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations with adequate information to enable them to determine the fiscal requirements of each executive agency. Third, it would study governmental programs, changing economic conditions, and all available revenue estimates, including those of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Fourth, on the basis of such studies, it would report its findings to the two Committees on Appropriations with recommendations for proposed changes in the annual supply bills. Fifth, it would recommend to the appropriate standing committees of each House changes in existing laws needed to bring about greater efficiency and economy in the Government. Finally, it would, upon its own initiative or upon the request of any standing committee of either House, report any deviations in the supply bills from basic legislative authorizations.

This joint committee would be empowered to employ an adequate expert staff and fix the compensation of its members. Such employees would be appointed without regard to their political affiliations and solely on the ground of fitness to perform their duties.

The bill further provides that the staff of the joint committee shall have the right to examine freely the budget of any Government agency within or without the District of Columbia, with the exception that the staff would have to have specific authorization from the joint committee for access to information classified for security purposes.

The joint committee would have power to require Government agencies to submit for its examination copies of the spending requests which they have made to the Bureau of the Budget, together with their detailed justifications in support thereof. In my judgment, such in-

formation may well prove vital to a full and adequate consideration of the fiscal requirements of many of the executive departments and agencies.

In order to promote close collaboration of the staffs of the Bureau of the Budget and the Joint Budget Committee, the staff of the joint committee is authorized to attend the hearings held by the Budget Bureau on departmental estimates. It also provides that qualified members of the staff of the Budget Bureau may be required to attend executive sessions of the Appropriations Subcommittees to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations. This provision, I believe, represents an important improvement long needed to clear up many problems which cannot be, or at least will not be, fully covered in the huge budget document annually submitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. President, it is not the intent or purpose of this proposed legislation to usurp any of the authority or duties of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, but rather to implement, strengthen, and assist the Appropriations Committees in successfully meeting their full responsibility to the Congress and to the tax-burdened people of our Nation.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—section 202b—the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses already have the authority to expand their separate staffs in order to make a more systematic and intensive analysis of departmental spending requests. But the Appropriations Committees have not fully availed themselves of this authority. If they should do so, Mr. President, if both the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate should adequately expand their present staffs to perform the services contemplated under the bill which I have introduced, we would simply create a duplication of service at double expense.

Therefore, in effect what I am proposing, Mr. President, is to create a joint committee and joint committee staff to serve both the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees and the Congress and to prevent a duplication of effort, service, and expense.

As I see this problem, Mr. President, it is one of tremendous importance, and there are only two approaches to its solution. One is by having each of the Appropriations Committees adequately expand its staff and confer additional authority and powers on the staffs of the two committees to perform these services. The other, Mr. President, is the approach made in the bill which I have introduced.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of doing something about this, Mr. President. We are told that we must tax the people until it hurts. We are advised that the President wants this Congress to provide additional taxes to the amount of sixteen and a half billion dollars annually. That will bring the annual Federal tax take up to approximately seventy billions of dollars. Even that astronomical amount, Mr. President, will likely be inadequate to meet governmental expenditures.

In this crisis of economic stress and strain, Mr. President, every possible economy must be effected. It is the duty of the President of the United States to submit to the Congress a budget containing only requests for appropriations that are absolutely necessary to operate the indispensable services of the Government. All other expenditures should be eliminated. If they are not eliminated in the President's budget, it is the duty of the Congress to eliminate them and refuse to make appropriations therefor. Every economy possible must be effected. It is the Congress and not the President who has the final responsibility for doing this. We must do the economizing by reducing expenditures, by cutting the President's budget. That is the only hope the people have for sound fiscal policies and the Congress dare not fail in doing its duty in that regard.

The President of the United States is reported by the press to have said that the $72,000,000,000 budget he has submitted to the Congress is a tight budget, and that he challenges the Congress to cut it. Mr. President, I believe every Member of Congress should in good faith accept this challenge. It is our patriotic duty and our duty as representatives of the people to reduce the President's budget if it contains items and requests that are not necessary and which can be dispensed with in this emergency. I believe there are such items in the budget and I intend to vote against appropriating money for them.

I believe if this Congress meets its responsibilities, considerable savings will result to the American people, and our expenditures for the next fiscal year will be some five or six billion dollars below the President's budget recommendations.

This bill which I have introduced, Mr. President, is in the nature of an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In effect it would repeal section 138 of that act. I need not comment at length regarding the legislative budget that the section of the act attempted to establish. It has not worked. It is not effective and no effort now is being made by the Congress to comply with its provisions.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that this measure would at least offer a proper approach to the solution of this serious problem. It provides a basis for study and I shall undertake to have the committee to whom the bill may be referred hold public hearings on it at an early date, and I earnestly solicit suggestions and assistance from the membership of this body and from others interested in processing this legislation to final enactment.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, February 21, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 19 (legislative day, January 29), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Counselor of the Department of State, vice George F. Kennan.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William Boyd Sloan, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia, vice Robert L. Russell, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

J. Saxton Daniel, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 18, 1951.

J. Ellis Mundy, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 22, 1951.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Monday, February 19 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John C. Williams to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, grant that in this Brotherhood Week upon which we have entered we may resolve to covet and cultivate more earnestly the spirit of consideration and kindness toward all mankind.

May we be humbly grateful for the ability and the many opportunities, which are continually coming to us, to have a share in relieving the sufferings and hardships of the needy members of the human family.

Make us eager to extend the hand of helpfulness to the weary and heavy-laden and to speak the word of cheer to the sorrowing and lonely which will enable them to maintain their faith and their courage.

May we daily go forth on the journey of life with joy and hope, daring to believe in a future of great blessedness when men and nations everywhere shall live as brothers on the high levels of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–13.

INCREASED PAY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, recently our office has been flooded with mail requesting our support of certain proposed legislation which will raise the pay of people working for certain branches of the Federal Government. No doubt all of you are also receiving many such letters.

I want to say at the outset that I want working people to be well paid, and I realize with the high cost of living and the inevitable increase in the tax burden that adjustments must be made from time to time. Not with the view of telling you how to answer your mail, but in the interest of what I believe to be best for the whole country, I hope that you will take the time to look into this whole picture before you make an unqualified commitment on this legislation. I am advised that if this legislation is enacted, the first year's cost will be over $350,000,000. It seems to me that the first thing we should do is get some more income for the Post Office Department, which is presently operating at a deficit of a half billion dollars. We can get this increased revenue through increased postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class matter if the Congress will do it. We did that in the House last session on a limited scale, but, of course, no action was taken in the other body.

The easiest way to answer letters from a large group wanting something is to simply write back and agree that you will help them get what they want. A number of Members did that during the Eighty-first Congress in connection with the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal service. Then when legislation came up on the floor and we were faced with the actual fact of having to vote for or against the legislation and I entered into the fight to uphold the position of the Postmaster General, which I believed was correct, I had a number of Members tell me I was absolutely correct in my position; that they regretted they had previously committed themselves without realizing the full import of their commitment.

My purpose in taking this time today is simply to respectfully request of you that you give full consideration to the whole picture before committing yourself.

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we are working hard to build as fast as we can the strongest possible defense for this Nation and for the free world. I am persuaded that we must do all that is possible and necessary to that end.

In our efforts to guarantee national security and to prevent a third world war, we must exercise due care to protect the democratic institutions upon which the greatness of this Nation depends.

We should particularly do all that we can to strengthen the education of our youth. Our public schools are short of qualified teachers. Several million of our school-age population are not in school. The number in overcrowded classrooms and under unprepared teachers is yet larger.

Faced with increasing enrollments, the need for additional classrooms is critical. The United States Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, recently said that—

According to the best information now available, it is estimated that the country needs 250,000 public elementary and secondary classrooms and related facilities to relieve overcrowding, to eliminate half-day sessions, and to replace obsolete and unsafe school buildings.

At a time when the education of our youth looms with greater importance than ever before, we are faced with shortages of construction materials which, despite our best efforts, will inevitably handicap the proper education and training of our youth. I want to urge, therefore, that our national policy in allocating materials for school construction in these perilous times be as liberal as possible. The future security of the ways of freemen falls more heavily upon our youth than upon the youth of any other great world power. We must, therefore, do everything we can to prepare them for the successful discharge of this tremendous responsibility.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for tomorrow, the first one I have ever requested since I have been here, a little over 4 years. I do not contend or pretend at all that it will be a great speech or even that it will be a good speech, but it will be different.

I am going to speak on the subject of our foreign policy and war and peace. I am certainly no authority on this subject, but I have tried to put a little common sense and horse sense into the thoughts that I have been wrestling with and shall try to bring them to your attention tomorrow.

If you are not too busy and are not otherwise engaged I would sincerely appreciate your hearing what I have to say, because it will be different at least whether it is good or not.

REPUBLICAN OBJECTORS ON THE CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I desire to announce as Republican objectors for the Eighty-second Congress on the Consent Calendar: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD.

On the Private Calendar the Republican objectors will be Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Mr. DOLLIVER, and Mr. HUNTER.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, as you and every Member of the House knows, our people are gravely concerned, not only about the world crisis but the growing tense domestic situation. I think most of them feel as I do that our foreign policy, if there is any, is badly

muddled. It has brought only grief and higher taxes.

We have to provide an ironclad national defense for our own country. To a large extent this has been necessitated by our confused foreign policy. The Department of National Defense competing for goods has skyrocketed prices and greatly increased inflation in this country. Nothing real has been done about it by the administration. This affects all of our people, especially the low wage earner and the older people who are on fixed retirement income.

With our huge national debt we must tax to the limit for national defense and try to balance our budget. Our people are willing to pay taxes and make sacrifices if they know the money for national defense is not being wasted. The Government must practice austerity as well as the people. What makes us all mad is an expanding bureaucracy that squanders our money on socialistic schemes developed by the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

The country has lost confidence in the President and his Secretary of State. Under our system of Government a new administration cannot take over until January 1953. In the meantime, the people look to the Congress for leadership. Congress must cut the expense of Government to the bone. It will take courage. Politics must be forgotten. It is our responsibility and we must go ahead and assume it.

LET US GET GENERAL MacARTHUR'S VIEWS

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress an editorial written by Mr. John Knight in Saturday's Chicago Daily News.

In my opinion, the Democratic administration has been giving us biased views on our military problems. The Congress has heard Eisenhower's report on Europe, and Mr. Knight suggests a splendid idea: that we have a MacArthur report on Korea. Have MacArthur tell Congress the plain unvarnished facts about Korea.

With 50,000 casualties in Korea, our citizens do not know the true facts as to why we are fighting, except for the vague, nebulous idea of containing communism. General MacArthur has made remarks about diplomatic restrictions in his conduct of the war and, as Mr. Knight concludes:

After 8 months of diplomatic double talk about Korea, and for the sake of our sons in combat, it's time to find out or get out.

Mr. John Knight's editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, February 19, reads as follows:

BRING MacARTHUR HOME TO REPORT

Since we have had an Eisenhower report on Europe, how about a MacArthur report on Korea?

What greater service could General MacArthur perform for his country than to tell Congress and the people the plain, unvarnished facts about Korea?

His critics hint darkly that Mac wants to undertake an all-out war against the Chinese Reds. The accusation is false, but let MacArthur answer the question.

Let him outline his problems, amplify his remarks about diplomatic restrictions, and tell us what he would do, and when, if he were in a position of final authority.

It isn't only the kids in Korea who are confused. It's all of us.

The suspicion grows that the United States is being inextricably caught in the web of old-world diplomacy. This is a pattern of diplomacy which settles nothing permanently, nor makes more than a gesture toward reaching final and lasting agreements.

The American heritage is different. We knew what we were fighting for at Valley Forge, New Orleans, Missionary Ridge, and Manila Bay.

We thought we knew what we were fighting for at Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, Bastogne, and Okinawa.

Are we as sure today about Seoul, Inchon, and Wonju?

Or our 50,000 casualties in Korea?

Are we satisfied to accept the view that the United States of America must send the flower of its youth to fight communism on every front, or will we insist that our objectives must be clearly defined so we will know the reason for and the price of our sacrifice?

While the thought of war is repugnant to all of us, no good American shrinks from the conflict if he knows why we're fighting and what we are attempting to achieve.

The situation in Korea is beclouded by the inconclusive vaporings of timid men at Lake Success and the Foggy Bottom pontifications of those sitting in the seats of the departed mighty at Washington.

Walter Lippmann hints that we have long since put aside the political objectives declared in the UN resolution of October 7—to establish by arms a unified, independent, and democratic government in Korea.

What, then, are our objectives? A military partition of Korea which would again divide that country into two spheres of influence?

What is the truth?

A personal report by MacArthur would either confirm or dispel our doubts. It is a story that no other man could tell.

After 8 months of diplomatic double-talk about Korea, and for the sake of our sons in combat, it's time to find out, or get out.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

OUR SHIP OF STATE

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the West.

I would suggest that we install a weathercock on the Capitol Dome to advise the leadership on the shiftings of favorable breezes. The mothers and fathers are disturbed. They would probably be more content if they could see her full sail set and the ship of state in motion, even though it were just running ahead of the so-called bipartisan wind. They think this administration knows neither how to box a compass or chart a safe course.

NONFEDERAL PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND CONTROL OF WAGES

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the fact that the New York State Legislature has memorialized the Congress to enact legislation exempting the employees of States and their localities from the provisions of any wage-stabilization order.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of concern to every Member of Congress, their respective States, and all of their local governments. Public employees throughout the country are likewise anxious to know whether or not wage controls apply to their compensations.

I find, on investigation, the basic act provides that no action shall be taken under its authority with respect to wages, salaries, and compensations inconsistent with any law of any State. Moreover, general regulation No. 4 of the Wage Stabilization Board authorizes increases to State and local government employees without prior Board approval, except that such increases are expected to conform with the national wage stabilization policy. In the light of the provisions of the basic act and general regulation No. 4, it is evident that the States and local governments have a right to make any salary adjustments that they may deem necessary and desirable.

Section 402 (d) (2) of title IV, Public Law 774 of the Eighty-first Congress, reads as follows:

(2) No wage, salary, or other compensation shall be stabilized at less than that paid during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, inclusive. No action shall be taken under authority of this title with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, or any other law of the United States, or of any State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States.

Supplementing the provisions of this basic act, general regulation No. 4, adopted unanimously by the Wage Stabilization Board and issued on February 1, clarifies the exclusion of non-Federal public employees by authorizing such wage increases without prior Board approval, except that it calls for conformity with the national stabilization policy and possible review by the Board of any increases in compensation granted by the States and their political subdivisions. General regulation No. 4 reads, as follows:

NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Pursuant to the defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.), Executive Order 10161 (15 F. R. 6105), General Wage Stabilization Regulation 1 (16 F. R. 816) and Economic Stabilization Agency General Order

3 (16 F. R. 739), this general regulation 4 is hereby issued.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS

This general regulation is issued by the Wage Stabilization Board in discharge of its responsibilities under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Executive Order 10161, General Order 3 and General Wage Stabilization Regulation 1 of the Economic Stabilization Agency. It is designed to stabilize wages, salaries, and other compensation and to effectuate the purposes and intent of said statute, orders, and regulation.

For the purpose of preparing itself for the discharge of its responsibilities, the Wage Stabilization Board heretofore distributed to representative labor and industry groups a series of questions, the answers to which would provide the Board with essential information for the development of wage stabilization policies. Thereafter, the Board conducted conferences which were attended by representative groups of labor and industry, which presented their views respecting the development of wage stabilization policies. In the formulation of the provisions hereof there has thus been consultation with industry and labor representatives, including trade association and labor union representatives, and consideration has been given to their recommendations.

Sec.

1. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees authorized.
2. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees subject to stabilization policies.
3. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees subject to Board review.

Authority: Sections 1 to 3 issued under section 704, Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress. Interpret or apply title IV, Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress (E. O. 10161, Sept. 9, 1950, 15 F. R. 6105).

SECTION 1. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees authorized: Increases in the wages, salaries, and other compensation of State, county, municipal, and other non-Federal governmental employees whose wages, salaries, and other compensation are fixed by statute, ordinance, or regulation of duly constituted authorities of such governmental bodies may be made without the prior authorization of the Wage Stabilization Board, subject to the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this regulation.

SEC. 2. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees subject to stabilization policies: State, county, municipal, and other non-Federal governments and agencies thereof in making increases in wages, salaries, and other compensation of their employees are expected to conform to the national wage stabilization policy as expressed in the Defense Production Act of 1950, Executive Order 10161, General Wage Stabilization Regulation 1, issued by the Economic Stabilization Administrator on January 26, 1951, the general regulations and statements of policy issued by the Wage Stabilization Board pursuant thereto, and such orders or regulations as may from time to time be issued thereunder or in connection therewith.

SEC. 3. Increases in wages of non-Federal public employees subject to Board review. The Wage Stabilization Board reserves the right to review increases made under the terms of section 1 of this regulation and to revoke or modify such increases when required in order to effectuate the policies of the Defense Production Act and the applicable orders or regulations issued thereunder or in connection therewith.

Adopted unanimously by the Wage Stabilization Board.

Issued February 1, 1951.

CYRUS S. CHING,
Chairman.

The concurrent resolution—Resolution 32—of the New York State Legislature previously referred to reads as follows:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will exempt employees of the State and the political subdivisions thereof from the present wage stabilization order

Whereas the Federal Wage Stabilization Board has announced a wage freeze in conjunction with a price freeze at the highest levels between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951; and

Whereas the said wage freeze includes hundreds of thousands of employees of the State and its political subdivisions; and

Whereas the salaries of government employees have fallen far below the level necessary to maintain a decent standard of living; and

Whereas this order jeopardizes and forestalls the present wage adjustments which have been promised by State and municipal authorities for such employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the people of the State of New York through their representatives in the senate and assembly hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation, if necessary, and the Wage Stabilization Board to promulgate orders which will exempt employees of the State and its political subdivisions from the said wage stabilization order; and it is further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to Cyrus S. Ching, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

In assembly, February 5, 1951, concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

NEHRU IRKED BY PLEA FOR GRAIN SENT TO UNITED STATES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I made the remark on the floor of this House that I felt that when we were giving things away we ought to be very sure that the recipients wanted our help. This is not always the case. The words were hardly out of my mouth when I picked up the Washington Evening Star and read this headline: "Nehru irked by plea for grain sent to United States."

Now this is a rather interesting statement. Apparently the Prime Minister is very much upset and annoyed. This article states, and I quote:

The Prime Minister told the House the cable, sent to Vice President BARKLEY and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, was sent with no reference to members of the Government. Members of Parliament, Mr. Nehru continued, may send a message to anyone they wish, but confusion and embarrassment could result for members to address officials of foreign governments without consultation with (India's) Government and without consideration of the larger issues involved and of India's foreign policy.

BRANNAN PLAN NO. 2

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, the press, on Saturday last, carried an announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan to the effect that he planned on consolidating several of the bureaus and/or functions of his Department to the end that greater efficiency and economy in operation might be accomplished.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the sort of announcement that a vast number or percentage of our people have been asking, hoping, and praying for these many years.

First, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to congratulate the Secretary for bringing out this second, or Brannan plan No. 2. This is a plan that will receive the universal approval of our tax-burdened people. It is a plan that has much merit and possibilities and is long overdue.

With an estimated personnel of more than 90,000 Government employees, too many to have an exact count, we all know that there is much overlapping with a resulting great loss of manpower.

Now, if Secretary Brannan can call his Department heads together, consolidate their activities and then, with the reduced number of bureaus, issue definite orders to reduce the number of employees by at least 50 percent, I venture to say that efficiency will be increased. Such action on his part will set such an excellent example, and meet with such popular approval, that it may be promptly followed by a Chapman plan, a Sawyer plan, a White House plan, and yea, even an Oscar Ewing plan, from which this Congress may evolve a plan that will bring about a tremendous reduction in domestic expenditure, and this Eighty-second Congress can reestablish, in a substantial manner, a return of confidence in the Government and the individual Representatives.

I commend the Brannan plan No. 2, and again congratulate the Secretary.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania I wish again to restate my feelings of sympathy

that I have previously expressed on the floor of the House, not only for the courageous Lithuanians still under the thumb of Russian aggression, but for our own citizens of Lithuanian ancestry who feel so keenly the separation from their mother country. These thoughts are graphically expressed in the following excerpts from a letter which I received from Mary M. Kizis, the executive secretary of the Lithuanian American Information Center:

Lithuanian Americans, as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the iron curtain, will observe the day with fitting ceremonies, while Lithuanians in the homeland, completely shut off by the iron curtain, will silently and secretly join in observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the two World Wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations. The cause of freedom was precious to her and her progress was remarkable.

Today, Lithuania, as a nation, is being exterminated. She is the victim of a consistently carried out genocide. The Soviet occupation has cost over 500,000 lives, victims of torture, planned starvation, political executions, and exile to death camps. People are still being deported every month. Husbands are separated from their wives and children; wives are sent to different Siberian camps; the children to be reared in complete contradiction to their cultural and religious background.

Lithuania, together with other nations behind the iron curtain, is waging a great struggle against world-Communist expansion. Their freedom is not only for their own liberation, but it is a fight for freedom in the world.

Lithuania's underground is still fighting a heroic fight against a mighty, vastly superior, ruthless force.

Lithuanian Americans have a stake in the survival of this ancient race. Almost every Lithuanian American still has relatives in the old country, with whom all contact has been broken during the Soviet occupation.

The Lithuanian American Information Center, as spokesman for the Lithuanian American Council, which represents the overwhelming majority of nearly a million Lithuanian Americans, would like to call this anniversary to the attention of their good American friends who have helped them in the past in appealing to the conscience of the world.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit through which this small country had attained its independence, and it is the hope of all of us that Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free democracies of the world.

AID TO INDIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a cablegram received by the Speaker of the House from certain Representatives of the Indian Parliament.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The cablegram referred to follows:

NEW DELHI, *February 17, 1951.*

THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned members of Indian Parliament belonging to various parties, groups, and states request you place this message before honorable Members of House of Representatives of the United States consideration by your House of proposal for gift to India and for grains to help this country tide over present shortage and mitigate distress to our people will be watched keenly by many here. We are amongst those in India who are opposed to totalitarianism in all its forms and recognize that liberty and integrity of free countries of Asia including our own are today menaced by Communist expansionism. We have, on the other hand, watched with appreciation the great effort for the welfare of the free world embodied in Marshall aid and the point 4 program. We would like to see United States and India cooperate with countries of commonwealth and other democracies in securing world peace through collective security convinced as we are that the bulk of the Indian people believe in the democratic way of life and recognize in the democracies of the world their natural friends and allies. We should be happy to see our fellow legislators in United States Congress give their approval to proposal now before them. Moved by the needs of the people of India and uninfluenced by momentary differences of policy we are confident such a gesture of solidarity on the part of the representatives of the American people toward the people of India would strengthen friendship and understanding between our two countries and bring them closer together.

Mrs. Kalavati Dikshit, and Messrs. Naffruddin Ahmed, Frank Anthony Lakshmanrao, Bhatkar Satish, Chandra Jagannath Das, P. Y. Deshpande, G. A. Dholokia, G. S. Guha, A. B. Gurung, H. C. Heda, T. Husain, R. L. Jangde, P. S. Khaparde, S. N. Mahatta, R. L. Malviya, M. R. Masani, Bhopindersingh Man, M. A. Hasan, M. P. Misra, H. G. Mudgal, N. P. Nathwani, M. Y. Murie, C. M. Poonacha, R. P. Potai, T. D. Pustake, Arigay Ramaswamy, N. G. Ranga, K. V. Redii, M. C. Reddy, Syamanadan Sahaya, Awadeshprattap Singh, Jaipal Singh, Jaswant Singh, Sardar Singhji, Brajakishore Prasad Sinha, Shambhunath Shukla, Jwalaprasad Srivastava, Abulhasan Syedali, B. L. Tiwari, K. S. Vaidya, V. P. Vaidya, V. P. Vaidya, and B. H. Zaidi.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 12, 1951, the Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Thursday, February 22, 1951.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] read a letter from a sergeant in Korea which referred to the fact that he was fighting in a war which was undeclared. Not only that, that sergeant and his comrades are fighting in a war which is not the war of the United States, as everyone knows, but a war of the United Nations. I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the fact that the flag under which these men are fighting over there—these men from the National Guard units and others—is not the flag of the United States—it is not the Stars and Stripes, but it is the flag of the United Nations. If you noticed that editorial in Collier's last week, they have the flag of the United Nations above the Stars and Stripes, above the flags of all nations. For the first time in our history our flag has willingly been hauled down, replaced by another. It indicates the surrender of our independence. Sometimes the gentleman from Mississippi, who is a great student of history, a patriotic and loyal citizen who tells us about the things we should know, may someday tell us why we are fighting under that flag.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

CAN WE FIGHT TWO WARS 13,000 MILES APART AT THE SAME TIME?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, without getting into this controversy between the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Arkansas, I desire to point out the fact that our country is in the most deplorable condition it has ever been in in all its history. It is about time the Congress woke up and took over its prerogatives and stopped this so-called United Nations from sending our boys to destruction under one of their trumped-up UN flags.

Now it is proposed by some of these wild-eyed internationalists to send a million of our young men to Europe. What for? Are we going to try to go into Russia and bog down there and in Korea both? Are we going to try to fight two wars on two fronts, 13,000 miles apart?

Congress has not declared war in Korea. We had better get out of Korea and bring our boys home. That is what these letters suggest. Congress had better resume its prerogatives under the Constitution and say when and where our boys are to be sent to die, be killed or freeze to death, in foreign lands.

The Congress was elected for that purpose. You are merely getting a few messages from home now; and you are going to get more of them as time goes on. The American people are not willing for the Communist-controlled United Nations to send their boys to foreign lands to fight, freeze, and die under a foreign flag.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EXPENDITURES FOR LAND FOR RADIO MONITORING STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1730) to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman or some member of the committee can advise whether or not this is identical with the bill H. R. 4251 passed in the last session.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to inform the gentleman that this is an identical bill with the bill H. R. 4251.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This does not have any of the controversial features that were put in the bill by another body during the last session.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. None at all. This bill has already passed the Senate this year, although there were several amendments added to it. The Commission thought it best that we get this separate provision through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Commission may make such expenditures including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, lawbooks, periodicals, and books of reference, for printing and binding, for land for use as sites for radio monitoring stations and related facilities, including living quarters where necessary in remote areas, for the construction of such stations and facilities, and for the improvement, furnishing, equipping, and repairing of such stations and facilities and of laboratories and other related facilities (including construction of minor subsidiary buildings and structures not exceeding $25,000 in any one instance) used in connection with technical research activities, as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the Commission and as from time to time may be appropriated for by Congress."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS., BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 335) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., against the Government of the United States on account of delinquent real-estate taxes for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947 assessed and levied against three tracts of land in sections 11 and 14 of township 28 south, range 1 east of the sixth principal meridian, in Sedgwick County, Kans., constituting the aircraft factory and grounds owned in such years by the Defense Plant Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and leased to the Boeing Airplane Co. and transferred on or about February 25, 1948, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States subject to unpaid taxes for said 4 years. Such court shall determine the amount of said taxes, and render judgment in favor of said Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., and against the United States for the amount of any such taxes which such court may find and adjudge to have been lawfully assessed against such real estate and remaining due and unpaid: Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing suit or judgment for interest, penalties or charges on, or in connection with said taxes. The court shall have such jurisdiction if suit is instituted within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF FORMER CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 400) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of some member of the committee if this is an identical bill with the one that was passed in the Eighty-first Congress, known as H. R. 6616.

Mr. WALTER. It is the same bill, and the same bill as reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. It was on the Senate Calendar last year when the Senate adjourned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SADLAK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this measure, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I take this opportunity not to object, but to add my complete and wholehearted endorsement of the purposes and aims provided in H. R. 400. In the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced a like measure, H. R. 6781, which followed the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] then incorporated in H. R. 6616. Since the measure did not have the same success in the other body that had been accorded it here in the House, the measure failed to become a law. Therefore, on the opening day of this session of the Eighty-second Congress I again reintroduced my bill, and it was given the designation of H. R. 369. That bill is the same as H. R. 400, which today has my fullest support, should pass, and have the approval of the other body at the earliest possible date.

The necessity of the relief provided by this legislation was brought to me quite forcibly by relatives in my district of the State of Connecticut who were separated and could not be reunited due to the loss of United States citizenship caused by participation in these elections. Considerable personal hardship has been the direct result of voting in the Italian elections, and this measure will greatly alleviate the difficulties which definitely were not anticipated at the time of the overt act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a person who, while a citizen of the United States, has lost citizenship of the United States solely by reason of having voted in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy on June 2, 1946, or on April 18, 1948, and who has not subsequent to such voting committed any act which, had he remained a citizen, would have operated to expatriate him, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 2 years from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended. Certified copies of such oaths shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice. Such persons shall have, from and after naturalization under this section, the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss. The illegal or fraudulent procurement of naturalization under this amendment shall be subject to cancellation in the same manner as provided in section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

SEC. 2. The act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 614; 60 Stat. 866), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGE OF BECOMING A NATURALIZED CITIZEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 403) providing for the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] if this bill, as in the case of the other bills brought up today on the Consent Calendar, is identical with legislation passed by this body in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. WALTER. This is the same bill that was passed on four occasions by this House. It has never been acted upon by the Senate, largely because it had become incorporated in an omnibus bill which the Senate has not considered up

to this time. However, it is the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I am heartily in favor of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am strongly in favor of this bill, which removes the remaining racial restrictions in our naturalization laws. I introduced at the opening of this Congress a bill to remove racial restrictions from our immigration as well as our naturalization laws, and throughout my service in Congress have actively supported this policy. I regret only that this bill does not cover within its provisions the removal also of the restrictions in our immigration laws.

The restrictions involving Chinese, Indians, and Filipinos have already been removed. Each of these peoples were given at the same time nominal quotas.

The largest group of persons now in this country without the privileges of naturalization are the Japanese. Probably more of them live in Hawaii than in any other part of the country.

This fact should not obscure the application of this legislation to the Koreans and to a very large and varied group of people who reside in and about the Pacific. Among these people, for instance, are the Samoans. Close to a quarter of all of the people of the Samoan race live in east Samoa under the American flag. The balance of Samoans, those who are resident in western Samoa, live under the flag of New Zealand, but will also be given the privileges of naturalization under this law. This is as it should be.

Other members of the Polynesian race, such as the Tongans, Maoris, and Tahitians, people who live on the islands of the eastern Pacific, will also come within the provisions of this bill. They will no longer suffer the discrimination in our naturalization laws, as they do at the present time, after the enactment of this bill.

The law also covers the Micronesians. Virtually all of these people are now living under the American flag as residents of the trust territory. Although in the aggregate they are not a large group, numbering less than 60,000, they are spread over many islands in the central Pacific. The importance of these islands to this country from a strategic standpoint is so great that we have assumed the responsibility for their government and general welfare. Relatively few of these people are in this country, but our relations with them have assumed an importance they did not have before.

The law likewise will cover the people of southeastern Asia. Although the number of them in this country is almost insignificant, our relation with their countries at this time is a vitally important one.

The removal of the restrictions in our immigration laws is certain to foster friendship among them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (60 Stat. 416; 8 U. S. C., Supp. 703), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States, subject to the provisions of this act, shall not be denied or abridged because of race: *Provided*, That no alien who, under law existing immediately prior to the enactment of this section, as here amended, would have been ineligible to immigrate to the United States because of race shall become eligible for immigration to the United States by reason of the enactment of this section, as here amended."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMANTS DAMAGED BY BLASTING OPERATIONS ON THE MERRIMACK RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 512) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING THE IMMIGRATION STATUS OF ALIEN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1090) to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, because I feel this is a very meritorious piece of legislation, I wish to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration how the committee proposes to deal with civilians in the service of the Government in the Army and Navy in Japan and elsewhere who intend to marry or have married women of races ineligible to citizenship?

Mr. WALTER. In the first place, it is believed that within the next few months there will be general legislation enacted removing race as a bar to immigration and naturalization. I believe the subcommittee feels that instead of dealing with this particular problem piecemeal it is better to proceed with private bills in the few cases that come to our attention. The entire problem will be dealt with in an omnibus bill which I introduced several days ago, H. R. 2379.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Then it is the disposition of the subcommittee to deal favorably with private bills.

Mr. WALTER. Without committing the subcommittee in advance, I feel sure I may say to the gentleman that is the situation.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I may say that I have some 20 bills of this character and while I do not want to add to the responsibility and labors of the subcommittee, I will proceed on that basis and trust that they will receive the same generous consideration that similar legislation has heretofore received.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure I can assure the gentleman of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 717, Eighty-first Congress, is hereby amended to read: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), alien spouses or unmarried minor children of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II or the present national emergency shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be eligible to enter the United States with nonquota immigration visas issued under the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204 (a)): *Provided*, That in the cases of such alien spouses of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II or the present national emergency, the marriage shall have occurred before or during the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until such earlier time as Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

On page 1, on lines 9 and 10 strike out the words "or the present national emergency."

On page 2, on lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "or the present national emergency."

Beginning on line 8, after the word "before", strike out the balance of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof: "twelve months after the enactment of this act, as hereby amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING THE IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object because I believe this to be a meritorious bill and one that can properly be passed by unanimous consent, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, if in effect this bill does not direct

the Attorney General to carry out the spirit and intent of previously enacted legislation by the Congress?

Mr. WALTER. In a word that is exactly what the bill does because at the time the conferees labored with the problem we are now confronted with, we felt quite certain that existing law was in no wise amended—that is, existing law with respect to affiliation with or membership in certain Communist, Nazi, and Fascist organizations. The body of the law had been interpreted on numerous occasions. But the Attorney General felt that we had amended the law to such an extent that the body of it and its interpretations by the court had been changed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman feels that the passage of this bill will clarify the whole situation so that the intent of the Congress can be carried out as originally expressed?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill affects the loved ones of many of our war veterans and I think it should be passed without delay.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it so happens I, too, have cases like the gentleman from New Jersey who are affected by this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman, however, to explain the proviso which is contained in the bill and which is disturbing a good many people because it may deprive us of the services and usefulness of those who have fled from the Communists, who have abandoned them and who we may find very useful in our efforts to fight communism.

Mr. WALTER. I am well aware of the problem the gentleman from New York presents; however, in considering the question of whether or not membership in or affiliation with various organizations should act as a bar, the subcommittee concluded that if we were to err it should be on the side of the security of the United States. There is no way of telling whether or not a man or woman was an innocent or involuntary member of a Communist organization. I may say that the easiest thing a Communist does is to lie.

With respect to the Nazi and Fascist organizations, the situation is entirely different because in the Berlin Document Center there is a complete record of every member of the Nazi organization; and the record discloses the part that an individual played in these several organizations. The same thing is true with respect to Italy regarding fascism. So that we are not legislating in the dark insofar as the Nazi or Fascist organizations are concerned. However, with respect to Communists there are no records. There is no way of telling whether or not a person who comes forward today and says, "I was an innocent member of a Communist organization" is telling the truth.

Mr. JAVITS. How is the committee going to deal with these cases of persons who fled from behind the iron curtain and where we may have a real desire to take them in?

Mr. WALTER. There are organizations behind the iron curtain, there are labor unions and other groups that were by edict made component parts of the Communist system. In the general legislation that is being considered in the Senate now, and which will be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary very shortly, there will be provided an escape clause for truly innocent people. But it is a very difficult problem, one that cannot be dealt with quickly.

We are now concerned with a situation that should be clarified as soon as possible. However, on the broad over-all question of membership in proscribed organizations there must be considerable testimony taken, after which we can then write the kind of a formula that will make it possible, after the burden of proof has shifted for us, to feel very sure that a person who says he was an innocent, involuntary member of one of the proscribed organizations is, in fact, telling the truth.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it also might be pointed out that in a number of instances we have, in fact, enacted private bills to cover just such situations as the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes. The Committee on the Judiciary, at the time this particular bill was discussed, agreed unanimously that in these exceptional situations we would enact private legislation, but we do not think it is to the best interest of the United States to let down the bars to the possible infiltration of thousands of Communists in the disguise of involuntary membership.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, was there anything that the committee had in mind in using the term "communist" with a small "c" as opposed to Communists or members of the Communist Party? For instance, was it intended by the committee to exclude all the working people of Europe, for instance, who might be members of the Socialist Party? Probably every workingman in Europe is a member of a Socialist Party of one kind or another.

Mr. WALTER. This term is related to the language of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended, and it was meant to fit the definitions of such act.

Mr. YATES. Can the gentleman specify any examples of that, for example?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. That would mean, for example, a member of a cooperative, which became part of a Communist organization. All members would come within the category and would be excluded.

Mr. YATES. By Communist organization, the gentleman means the Communist Party?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; and its affiliates, as defined in the act of October 16, 1918, as amended.

Mr. YATES. And is it intended by the committee to exclude members of Socialist parties, for instance, who were never members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WALTER. The definitions are contained in the act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have received a number of communications from soldiers in Austria and Germany who are married to natives of those countries, who had been forced to belong to Nazi organizations when they were 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 years of age. Is it the purpose of this measure to clarify that particular category?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there are, very obviously, several questions on the important issue dealt with by this legislation. I have several constituents in my district with relatives who are DP's, who are affected by this clarification. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram I received from an organization of United States soldiers in Germany.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. The telegram reads as follows:

HEIDELBERG, *February 16, 1951.*

Recommend amending McCarran law permitting entry of fiancées who joined totalitarian groups under 14 years thus avoiding injustice thousands veterans.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, from my personal experience, I can vouch for the accuracy of the telegram which has just been read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may be prevailed upon to withdraw the objection which he has raised to the passage of this much-needed legislation. I appeal to the gentlemen to reconsider the matter in order that the plight of hundreds of brides of our own GI's and other loved ones of American citizens may be alleviated promptly.

The misinterpretation which the Attorney General has accorded the Internal Security Act of 1950 has brought untold anguish to the hearts of wives, husbands, parents, children, and other loved ones of deserving and worthy applicants for immigration to this country. Let us not longer delay in forcing him to rectify his mistake. It is his persistence in his peculiar interpretation of the wording of the statute which has occasioned the necessity for this legislation. This is an almost unprecedented step to direct him to amend his regulations to conform to court decisions and carry out the intent of Congress with regard to these aliens seeking admission to this country. So far as my research has been able to disclose, this is the first time Congress has been required to direct a change in the administrative regulations of the Immigration Service.

Of course, administrative misinterpretation can nullify the best of laws, if legal precedent is not followed when the

regulations to effect its purposes are formulated. A good law, badly administered, can easily be made to look like a bad law. The enactment of this measure today should end, once and for all, the studied campaign to discredit the Internal Security Act.

It is only fair to point out that in several instances the meaning ascribed by the State Department to words and clauses in section 22 of the Internal Security Act is not in accord with that set forth by the Attorney General. It is perhaps understandable that the Secretary of State, however, has not seen fit to go to the mat with the Attorney General on the subject. The result has been that American consuls overseas have virtually invoked a "freeze order" on the processing of nearly all immigration cases. Despite their disagreement with the Attorney General, their reasoning has been that they did not want the unfortunate victims of his actions to be brought to this country and then virtually incarcerated on Ellis Island because he saw fit to construe the law in a different manner from the construction placed on it by the State Department.

It should be pointed out that all of the Senators and Representatives who acted as conferees on the Internal Security Act signed a letter to the Attorney General concurring in the views of the Department of State and taking issue with him on his interpretation of this statute. These are the men who should know better than anyone else what was intended by the legislative enactment.

In their letter the conferees stated that it was their opinion that the interpretations set forth in a series of letters to the Attorney General by the Department of State are in accord with the established body of judicial and administrative interpretations upon which was premised the reenactment of such language in the Internal Security Act of 1950. In conclusion, the conferees urged that the Attorney General give renewed consideration to the matter. Thus far, however, he has not seen fit to change his rulings on the subject.

According to a letter addressed to the Secretary of State the Attorney General has based his exclusion of certain aliens under section 22 on the following words, and I quote:

> Those who "at any time, shall be or shall have been members * * * of the Communist or other totalitarian party * * * or organization."

Hence, he says:

> The test is not whether the alien is considered dangerous to the national security but simply whether or not he is or has been a member of a totalitarian party or organization, regardless of whether or not he may now be harmless, antitotalitarian, pro-American, or the circumstances under which he is or was a member of such totalitarian party or organization.

In a reply to the conclusions of the Attorney General, the Department of State over the signature of Carlisle H. Humelsine, Deputy Under Secretary, demonstrates that the construction placed by the Attorney General is dependent upon the deletion of certain phrases which are vital to a correct interpretation. As a result, he has ruled that members of the German and Italian Armies are excludable because they belonged to totalitarian organizations. But as the Department of State's letter points out very lucidly all armies are totalitarian organizations by their very nature in that a private is forced to take commands, regardless of his opinion of such commands. But, despite this, the American Army, for example, could by no stretch of the imagination be called a totalitarian party. By telescoping the phrases, the Attorney General has made the word organization seem equivalent to party, within the meaning of the act, while in fact the German and Italian Armies were neither totalitarian parties nor organizations, in the sense of being a subsidiary or branch of the party.

This instance, technical as it may be, seems to me a striking example of the perversion of the intent and purpose of Congress, since under this ruling members of the British and French Armies could be excluded as belonging to totalitarian organizations. While I hold no particular brief for the admission to the United States of German and Italian Army members, nevertheless I see no valid basis under the law for the blanket exclusion of all these army men.

Similarly the Congress did not intend to exclude persons who during childhood were forced to join Nazi or Fascist youth movements in order to live or get food or an education, nor did Congress intend that workers who joined in order to earn a living wage should be excluded. They are not a threat to the security of this country, and in my opinion, they do not come under the terms of the law "aliens who are members of or affiliated with" totalitarian parties or organizations.

The courts have held that decisions made under duress may be nullified and the subject not held accountable for the strict statutory results of his actions. For example, section 401 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 provides that a citizen of the United States shall lose his nationality by "entering or serving in the armed forces of a foreign state unless expressly authorized by the laws of the United States, if he has or acquires the nationality of such foreign state." However, it has been held administratively and by the courts that nationality is not lost under that statute when the military service was involuntary—*In re Asgal* (75 F. Supp. 268 (1947); *Dos Reis ex rel. Camara* v. *Nicolls* (161 F. 2d 560 (1947)).

These legal precedents were available both to the lawmakers when the bill was written and to the Attorney General when his administrative rulings on the situation were promulgated. There was clearly no intent on the part of Congress to interfere with the long line of decisions defining what constitutes "duress" and "involuntary." When the law was passed, the Congress had every right to believe that the Attorney General would follow these established legal precepts.

A similar situation has arisen from the Attorney General's interpretation of the verb "affiliate" as used in the act. There is a sound basis in the law for an exact legal definition of "affiliate" as it is used in this section.

The act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the act of June 28, 1940, reads in part as follows:

> That any alien who, at any time shall be or shall have been a member of any one of the following classes shall be excluded from admission into the United States:
>
> (c) Aliens who believe in, advise, advocate, or teach, or who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group, that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches—

And so forth. Section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, in amending the foregoing act of 1918, incorporates this very subsection and adds, among other provisions, the following: "Aliens who are members of or affiliated with"—list of prescribed organizations follow.

This pertinent language, identical in both statutes, reads: "Members of or affiliated with." The preservation of this language—tested as it is in the courtrooms and in administrative rulings—was intentional.

The unchallenged interpretations referred to above pertain both to the definition of "membership" and of "affiliation." To cite only a few of them:

> In *Colver* v. *Skeffington* (Fed. 17, 72 (D. C. Mass. 1920)) the court in considering petitions for writs of habeas corpus of aliens held under warrants of arrest for deportation made the following statement with respect to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence proscribed by the act of October 16, 1918:
>
> "* * * I accord with what I understand now to be the view of the Department of Labor, that such membership must be a real membership in or an actual affiliation with the proscribed organization. * * * Congress could not have intended to authorize the wholesale deportation of aliens who, accidentally, artificially, or unconsciously in appearance only, are found to be members of or affiliated with an organization of whose platform and purpose they have no real knowledge."

In *Bridges* v. *Wixon* (326 U. S. 135 (1945)) the Supreme Court of the United States said:

> The legislative history throws little light on the meaning of "affiliation" as used in the statute. It imports, however, less than membership but more than sympathy. * * * But he who cooperates with such an organization only in its wholly lawful activities cannot by that fact be said as a matter of law to be "affiliated" with it. Nor is it conclusive that the cooperation was more than intermittent or repeated, the act or acts tending to prove "affiliation" must be of that quality which indicates an adherence to or a furtherance of the purposes or objectives of the proscribed organization as distinguished from mere cooperation with it in lawful activities. The act or acts must evidence a working alliance to bring the program to fruition. * * * But close cooperation is not sufficient to establish an "affiliation" within the meaning of the statute. It must evidence a working alliance to bring the proscribed program to fruition.

U. S. v. *Reiner* (79 F. (2d) 315, 317 (CCA 2d, 1935)) is also illuminating on this subject.

Then the following appears in the Immigration Manual of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice:

> "Affiliation" is a working alliance to bring to fruition the proscribed program of an

organization, as distinguished from mere cooperation with the organization in its lawful activities or in the attainment of its wholly lawful objectives. The word imports less than membership but more than sympathy, and includes an element of dependability upon which the organization can rely that, though not equivalent to membership duty, rests upon a course of conduct that could not be abruptly ended without giving at least reasonable cause for the charge of a breach of good faith.

The act or acts tending to prove affiliation must be of that quality that indicates an adherence to or a furtherance of the purposes or objectives of the proscribed organization as distinguished from mere cooperation with it in wholly lawful activities.

It is evident both from judicial decisions and from departmental rulings that affiliation, while meaning less than membership, still implies ideological adherence to the purposes of the party or organization. Under this meaning a person affiliated with such a party or organization, if Communist or totalitarian, would properly be excluded as a threat to our national security under the internal-security law. However, under this definition, too, persons who, either as children or adults, joined youth or educational, professional, or labor groups sponsored by a totalitarian party, under threat of imprisonment or starvation, should not be considered as affiliated nor excluded under the law.

But the Attorney General has remained adamant in his peculiar interpretation of the wording of the statute. That is why we are asked today to pass the bill now before us.

REQUEST FOR ACTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON THE RFC SCANDAL

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wrote a letter to the Attorney General on February 14, 1951, calling to his attention specific Federal statutes, violations of which seem to be revealed in the report of the Senate Banking and Currency subcommittee on the investigation of the RFC.

I want to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that I wrote this letter to the Attorney General and set out those details. I would like to emphasize the basic point of the letter which is that a congressional committee's purpose of investigating is not to bring about the conviction of men for violations of the Federal statutes as they exist, but is really for the purpose of obtaining facts of violations so that the law may be changed, if it is deemed advisable, to prevent future violations. On the other hand, it is the duty of the executive branch of the Government and particularly the Attorney General's office to correct violations that have occurred and to make far-reaching investigations into situations where violations seem to have occurred so that punishment may be carried out in accordance with law. It is unfortunate that the Attorney General's office has been so remiss in this duty that the congressional committees, as an incident to their investigations, are bringing out multitudinous violations which the Attorney General's office should have been bringing out. Furthermore, the Attorney General's office is not acting upon the information dug up by these congressional committees which it should have been digging up itself.

Therefore, I am putting into the RECORD a copy of the letter that I wrote to the Attorney General:

FEBRUARY 14, 1951.

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has now been almost 2 weeks since the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency issued its report of its study of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, titled "Favoritism and Influence." To date there has been no indication that your office is taking any action to follow up on the numerous possible law violations which have been brought out in that report. It is apparent from a careful reading of the report that the following sections of the Federal statutes may have been violated:

Title 18, section 657: Any RFC employee who "embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, credits, securities, or other things of value" belonging to the RFC is subject to a maximum fine of $5,000 or maximum imprisonment of 5 years, or both."

Title 15, section 604b provides, in effect, all loans "shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment."

Title 15, section 604d provides: "No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful."

Title 15, section 604e: "No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interest, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested."

Title 18, section 1914: "Whoever, being a Government official or employee, receives any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States * * * or whoever * * * makes any contribution to or in any way supplements the salary of any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States" is subject to a maximum fine of $1,000 or maximum imprisonment of 6 months or both.

Title 18, section 1905: Any Federal employee who divulges "in any manner or to any extent not authorized by law any information coming to him in the course of his employment * * * which information concerns or relates to a trade secret * * * amount or source of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures of any person, firm, partnership, corporation, or association" is subject to a maximum fine of $1,000 or maximum imprisonment for 1 year or both, and "shall be removed from office."

A cursory examination of the Senate subcommittee report reveals at least 21 serious possible violations of these statutes and, in addition, there are several instances of apparent perjury provided, of course, the witnesses were testifying under oath at the time they gave their testimony. I cite for your consideration a few examples.

Quoting from page 5 of the Senate report:

"The subcommittee has been told repeatedly that certain Washington attorneys and certain other people were unduly influential with officials of the RFC. In some instances the reports have been received in sworn testimony which asserts that for a sufficient fee these people would give assurance, where no one else could, that matters pending before the RFC would have a successful outcome."

Quoting from page 10 of the Senate report:

"Strandlund [Carl Strandlund of Lustron Corp.] made allegations of other improprieties. His testimony describes instances in which Dunham or his friends attempted to influence the business decisions of Lustron Corp. for their own purposes. One such instance had to do with the resale of steel which was in short supply. Another instance had to do with the proposed substitution of a Jacobs product for other equipment used in the Lustron house. In the latter case there was to be $15 per unit for Meri Young."

Quoting from page 12 of the Senate report:

"The entries in [Walter L.] Dunham's office records indicate that it was his practice to discuss the affairs of RFC freely with representatives of the Democratic National Committee, and to give special attention to matters in which the committee was interested. Though he was a Republican board member [appointed through the influence of a former Democratic national committeeman], Dunham's most frequent visitors, judging from his office records, were attorneys and others who had been introduced by Chairman William M. Boyle or his assistants. Dunham cooperated freely with these people."

I would appreciate it if you would let me know what plans you are making to bring these matters before the grand jury and what plans your office is making, if any, toward a full investigation of these seemingly multitudinous criminal acts. Surely, the far-reaching effect of this scandal demands prompt action upon your part. A Federal grand jury should be specially convened for the purpose of getting to the bottom of this entire matter.

It is shocking to me that you, who are the head of the law-enforcing department of the Federal Government, have made no statement or made any indication of taking action on this matter to date.

Surely you are aware of the effect on public morale when your office, and the other concerned executive offices failed to react promptly to the exposés of communism in high places in our Government. Now we have bribery and corruption.

Although congressional investigations are primarily for the purpose of determining facts so that proper laws may be written and in this particular case to protect our people and our Government from attack from without and within, nonetheless it is the duty of the executive branch and in particular the Department of Justice to act immediately when the probable commission of crimes is brought to light. And this is true whether the facts came to light through congressional investigation or otherwise.

The people of this country want no more whitewashes and no more epithets of "asinine" or "red herring" when their country is being sabotaged from within by thieves and traitors. They expect and have a right to immediate and far-reaching investigation by your Department, however high in power those may be whom the investigation may reach.

In these times of peril to our Nation, your duty is doubly manifest. It should not take a Congressman or even a voting citizen for whom he speaks, to call your attention to this duty. It is that clear.

Yours very truly,

THOS. B. CURTIS,
Member of Congress, Missouri, Twelfth District.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951; RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The reorganization plan provides strengthened administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by placing in a single Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions of the present Board of Directors, except those that are specifically set forth and assigned to a new Loan Policy Board and to a board of review. The Administrator is thus made the executive head of the Corporation with major responsibility and authority over the administration of the Government programs carried out by the Corporation.

At the same time that this plan provides strengthened administration for the Corporation, it also provides certain additional safeguards with respect to loan policy and to specific loan applications. Under the reorganization plan, the Loan Policy Board promulgates general policies which shall govern the granting and denial of applications for financial assistance by the Corporation. The reorganization plan likewise includes new provisions for ensuring that all loan applications are handled in accordance with established policy.

In addition to providing strengthened administration of the Corporation and additional safeguards with respect to loan policy and the approval of specific loan applications, the reorganization plan provides the basis, by virtue of the composition of the Loan Policy Board, for better coordination of the Corporation's loan policies with other policies, programs, and activities of the Government. The reorganization plan provides that this Board shall have five members, all ex officio. These are the Administrator of the Corporation, the Deputy Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and one additional member to be designated from time to time by the President from among officials of the Government who are required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The participation of these officials will facilitate the development of loan policies consistent with the requirements of other broad programs of the Government.

Especially important is the participation of the Secretary of Commerce who, as head of the Department of Commerce, administers most of the Government programs for nonfinancial aids to business. Giving him a voice on the Loan Policy Board will aid in bringing under common policies the financial aids to business administered by the Corporation and the nonfinancial aids carried on in the Department of Commerce. Government aid to small and independent business should be particularly benefited by the participation of the Secretary of Commerce.

Specifically, the provision in the reorganization plan for a financial assistance procedure governing the processing of applications in excess of $100,000 to any borrower strengthens and gives statutory prescription to an administrative arrangement already existing in the Corporation. In handling such loans under the reorganization plan, applications will be referred for analysis and recommendation to a board of review composed of not less than five employees of the Corporation. Whenever the Administrator approves or denies an application for financial assistance on which a board of review has recommended otherwise, he must set forth, in a memorandum to be placed in the files of the Corporation, the reasons for his action. This procedure is provided in order to assure that all applications for loans involving large sums are fully analyzed by the technical staff of the Corporation and that the recommendations of the staff are fully available to the Administrator when acting finally upon such applications.

The reorganization plan continues the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a separate corporate entity in the executive branch of the Government. Those functions which are currently performed by the Corporation or any of its agencies or officers pursuant to a delegation or assignment of functions made by the President will be subject to termination or modification of any such delegation by the President.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I also have found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations, it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers of the executive branch of the Government.

The taking effect of the reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951 may not in itself result in substantial immediate savings. However, the important objective of achieving the maximum effectiveness in the administration of the Government's lending programs to aid business will be advanced. Increased effectiveness will in turn produce indirect savings. An itemization of these savings is not practicable.

The reorganization plan is especially important at this time of national emergency. It will strengthen the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and at the same time provide additional safeguards with respect to loan policy and the approval of individual loans. It will make possible the more effective coordination of the Government's general loan policies. I strongly urge the approval of the reorganization plan as a means of achieving these objectives.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1951.*

APPEAL FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to appeal to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] to withdraw the objection he has entered against the immigration bill recently brought before the House. I urge him to understand what delay will mean and I speak for a veteran hero who cannot be here today.

This veteran is Carl Giordano and he lives in my home city of Paterson, N. J. Carl fought in the European theater during World War II. When he was in Italy he met and fell in love with an Italian girl. They became betrothed. Later, however, something happened which made Carl certain there would never be a marriage. He was terribly wounded in action and had to lose both feet through amputation.

This young GI went home thinking, perhaps, his fiancée no longer cared. How delighted and thrilled he was soon to hear from her that she cared more than ever and insisted the marriage must take place.

The law permitting alien fiancées of GI's to come to the United States for marriage had expired and the State Department told Carl he would have to go to Italy and marry. Then his wife under our immigration laws would be entitled to a nonquota visa and she could return to Paterson, N. J., with him without any trouble. But trouble arose. The Internal Security Act of 1950 had been passed and when Carl was called in by the American consul he was told it had been discovered his wife had as a girl been automatically inscribed on the rolls of a youth organization under the Fascist rule. It was absolutely obligatory. Under the Government's interpretation of the act, the consul said, Carl would not return to the United States with his wife. Only by the passage of this bill can Mr. and Mrs. Carl Giordano take up their abode in our country.

Prayerfully, I appeal to my friend and colleague from Minnesota for reconsideration of his action blocking passage of this bill. I know he must feel with me that this veteran who gave so much for our country, and his bride, who did not forsake him, are entitled to the happiness they seek. It is so with many

others who cannot come into our country because of the strained construction which has been placed on the act.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have always had the highest respect for the most distinguished and sincere gentleman from New Jersey, and am completely in sympathy with the case which he has just told us about. I am absolutely in agreement with the intent of the measure which is before us today, but it has not been explained to my satisfaction, and I still do not know why some people, who were compelled through no fault of their own to join totalitarian organizations are covered and others are not covered. Why this discrimination? This is a problem I am quite familiar with. In my district there are many constituents whose relatives in Europe cannot come to America because they were compelled to join, by circumstances beyond their control, organizations controlled or directed by Communists. Others joined organizations collaborating with the Germans.

For example, in Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia they had the O. F., or the Liberation Front, composed of a united resistance front made up of various political and worker and economic organizations in those countries. It had in it members of the Catholic Party, the Social-Democrat Party, and the Peasants' Party, and many others. This liberation front was often organized and directed by Communists. The aim of this Liberation Front at that time was to fight the invading enemy, who were the Germans. They did fight the enemy. Now DP's and others who so fought our common enemy are listed as having belonged to a Communist totalitarian organization and therefore are denied the right to come to this country. Many of these are now in camps in Austria and Italy. I am merely asking that the same consideration be given in such cases as is extended to cases such as the one the gentleman has made reference to. I would like to have that consideration extended to other needy and deserving cases.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the case that the gentleman has just cited, was the organization a Communist organization at the time that this young man was a member of it?

Mr. BLATNIK. I do not know whether it was Communist. It was Communist-organized, and Communist-led, although some of the leaders were not Communists. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has spent a great deal of time on this problem of displaced persons, and has been most sympathetic and most helpful, to give us the assurance that his committee will seriously consider in the very near future the question of extending the same privileges to these other unfortunate people in the DP camps. In many cases they are there with their families. There are even American soldiers who have married girls who worked and fought in the liberation front, who are now displaced persons. I would like to have those wives of American veterans extended the same consideration as the wives of American soldiers who, through no fault of their own, were forced to join a Nazi organization. Can the gentleman give me that assurance?

Mr. WALTER. I will say that a bill, H. R. 4379, has already been introduced which provides an escape clause in some cases. However, even our forthcoming omnibus bill will not make it possible for active members of the Communist movement to come to the United States. There are active workers in the Communist Party who married American soldiers, whether deliberately or otherwise, who, in my opinion, should never be permitted to come into the United States.

With regard to displaced persons, I wish to assure the gentleman that I remain in close touch with our American voluntary agencies and I know very well how greatly preoccupied they are with the restrictive interpretation of the terms "members" and "membership" as expressed by regulations issued under the act of October 16, 1918, as amended. We are trying today to restate congressional intent as we know it to be and it appears logical that regulations governing the operation of our regular immigration laws and of the temporary Displaced Persons Act with its section 13, should provide for the same interpretation of identical terms used in both statutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. But as to those who are victims or who are compelled by circumstances to join such organizations when they were not themselves Communists, does not the gentleman feel they should be given the same consideration that is proposed to be given those who joined Nazi organizations?

Mr. WALTER. I do, and the legislation that has been introduced will adequately deal with those cases.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman has conveyed to the House a type of case that is worthy of deep consideration. We can see where persons, particularly during the war, who were bitterly anti-Communist but were bitterly anti-Hitler, might cooperate with Communists in their opposition to Hitler, as he was the first one to be defeated.

I can see where innocent persons who are bitterly anti-Communist might engage in a concerted activity with Communists, both of whom were fighting the same common enemy then, namely, Hitler. I think that is something that should be very carefully explored. However, this bill will do a great deal of good, and if my friend persists in his objection it will prevent even those cases that will be covered by the bill from being favorably acted upon as quickly as possible. Recognizing the logic and the weight of my friend's observation, might I ask that he withdraw his objection to this bill and let it be passed, and then the subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is chairman, will assure the gentleman—I think he has done so already—but he will assure the gentleman that his subcommittee will give early consideration to such legislation covering the type of cases to which the gentleman has referred, and will give the gentleman from Minnesota, and anyone else, an opportunity to appear.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has made a very emotional plea in behalf of his constituent soldier. I suppose all of us have cases similar to that. Why could not that case have been covered, as 10 or 15 or perhaps 20 cases have sometimes been covered, by private bills, introduced as they have been by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CANFIELD. Because there are so many cases in which time is of the essence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, you are talking today about one case. Why could you not have covered that case with a private bill?

Mr. CANFIELD. Well, I could, but this soldier from my district is over in Italy now with his bride. He went over there understanding there were no obstacles——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. In the first place, the gentleman from Michigan has the floor not in any parliamentary sense, because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] did not have to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his objection. Since he has made the statement, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill, and then you may proceed in order.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2339) to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what I was talking about was this question as to why this particular case could not have been covered in a private bill. The gentleman from New Jersey said it could have but that the soldier or his wife, whichever it is, is in Italy now. I have a soldier whose wife has been over in Japan, and I have had a private bill in for a long time but I never could get anywhere with it. Later on I intend to object to these private bills unless some consideration can be given to other bills where the circumstances are practically the same.

What I am talking about now is whether or not this bill will weaken the McCarran Act?

Mr. WALTER. It is not going to weaken the McCarran Act; we never intended to do that. The thing the committee has attempted to do was to state what we thought we were stating when the McCarran Act was written; and I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has introduced a similar bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that the gentleman is trying to give to the McCarran Act the interpretation the gentleman thought the House had in mind when it was passed?

Mr. WALTER. That we knew that they had in mind when they passed it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to provide by regulations that the terms "members of" and "affiliated with" where used in the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (except where, in context, such terms relate to communism), shall include only membership or affiliation which is or was voluntary, and shall not include membership or affiliation which is or was solely (a) when under 14 years of age, (b) by operation of law, or (c) for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living, and where necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized in his discretion to record the entry of any alien to have been for permanent residence in any case where the alien heretofore, when applying for admission for permanent residence, was temporarily admitted pursuant to the ninth proviso of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended, and whose inadmissibility for permanent residence was determined to be solely by reason of membership or affiliation (other than membership or affiliation related to communism) under subsection 2 of section 1 of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "fourteen" and insert "sixteen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a funeral sermon by Rev. James P. Johnson for the late Honorable John Sullivan.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Florence Times of Florence, Ala.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made on February 18.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Judge Clifford Stone of Denver.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a friend and his answer thereto.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Edna Lonigan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal and in the other a portion of the report of the State director of agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech recently made by George F. Hines.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include articles, letters, extracts, newspaper editorials, and reports.

Mr. HOPE and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in one include a speech of the Honorable John S. Battle, Governor of Virginia, and in the other a speech I made at Appomattox, Va., entitled "The Future Farmer of America," even though the latter may exceed the limit of two pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks and include additional material.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REMOVE TAX INEQUITIES BEFORE IMPOSING STILL HEAVIER TAXES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, my text today is a direct quotation from the remarks of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, on the day—February 6—when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was a witness before us. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina said:

If there are any inequities in our tax laws, we should remove those inequities before we impose still heavier taxes and heavier burdens on those who are honestly paying their taxes.

One month ago I told the House how $9,000,000,000 of additional revenue could be raised without placing hardships too great upon anyone and without creating too much disturbance in our economy. I suggested that $1,000,000,000 of that $9,000,000,000 could and should come from the imposition of the corporate tax on the business earnings of certain tax-exempts, as proposed by my bill, House bill 240.

Today I wish to elaborate upon this proposal to tax the cooperatives, the building and loan associations, the mutual savings banks and other tax-avoiders.

President Truman, in his recent special tax message to the Congress, urged that we "review the tax status of organizations now exempt under present law."

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, in his prepared statement to the Ways and Means Committee 2 days later, spelled out the administration's conviction that the tax laws should be revised as to the treatment of "business organizations

now exempt from tax, including cooperatives and other mutual enterprises." Recognizing the untenable competitive situation resulting from the present tax laws, he stated:

> Funds which are not returned to the members of these mutual enterprises are available tax-free for expansion in competition with other taxable businesses. We should seek to apply the corporation income tax to such retained funds.

I am glad to see President Truman and Secretary Snyder in agreement with the gentleman from North Carolina that there are inequities in the tax laws that must be removed as the first step in writing the Revenue Act of 1951. I find myself in complete disagreement with the Secretary, however, as to the amount of revenue that can be produced by the taxation of these tax exempts. According to my figures he is almost $1,000,000,000 too low in his estimate of the tax liability of all tax exempts. He tells us that taxation of the building and loan associations and the mutual savings banks would produce about $150,000,000,000, and that taxation of the cooperatives would bring in only $25,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, proof of the inadequacy of Mr. Snyder's estimate of the revenue possible from taxation of co-op corporations is easy to establish. One of the Secretary's assistants stated to our committee that there are 6,000 farmer cooperatives that are totally exempt from income tax under the terms of section 101 (12) and that there are about 4,000 farmer cooperatives that are so-called nonexempt, meaning that they pay tax only on so-called unallocated retained earnings and on earnings distributed as dividends on capital stock.

Among these 10,000 cooperatives, some have decided, as a matter of improving their public relations, to pay a part of the income tax they should pay. One of these is the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation Exchange of New York, probably the biggest co-op in the United States. Last year GLF announced that it would pay an income tax of some $928,000. That amount figures about 28 percent of its earnings at a time when competing companies were paying 38 percent of their earnings in income tax.

Another self-righteous taxpayer a couple of years ago was the Consumers Cooperative Association of Kansas City, which stated that it would pay about $400,000 tax to the Treasury. Any other corporation making the same amount of profit would have to pay a $2,000,000 tax—and CCA itself could well have afforded to pay the full amount.

Still another taxpaying cooperative was the Illinois Farm Supply Co., which also advertised the fact that it would pay about $400,000 in taxes, though its actual tax liability, were it on the same basis as its competitors, would have been at least twice that amount.

And then we have the Union Equity Cooperative Grain Exchange, of Enid, Okla., which stated last August that it proposed to pay to the Treasury a tax of nearly a million dollars on the profits it had made in transactions with the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have asked the Commissioner of Internal Revenue whether this so-called tax has been paid, and how a totally exempt co-op corporation can legally pay a tax of this kind. but, so far, I have no information from him that I can report to you.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that, inasmuch as 4 cooperatives out of 10,000 have, according to their own statements, paid to the Treasury some $3,000,000 in tax payments—actually only a fraction of what they would have paid at the full 38-percent rate—it is more than a little ridiculous to suppose that the other 9,996 farmer cooperatives, plus at least another 10,000 city consumer, hospital, and miscellaneous cooperatives, would only have to pay so puny a figure as $22,000,000, as the Secretary suggested.

Why, that is at the rate of about $700 apiece—and $700, today, is the income tax paid by an average family man with only $5,000-a-year income, or by a little corporation with only $2,800 of earnings. It is one-third of the income tax paid by a Member of Congress on his salary. Few, if any, cooperatives are so small as that.

Perhaps the answer to this discrepancy in estimates is that even in the face of a national emergency, when every one is to be taxed until it hurts, the Secretary is still seeking to give preferential treatment to this group of tax-exempt businesses.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that cooperatives, today, should also pay until its hurts, since it will hurt them no more than it hurts competing corporations. That is not my conclusion alone. It is the very recently published conclusion of one of the most distinguished and most respected tax experts in the country.

The Michigan Law Review of December 1950 published a thoughtful and fully documented article by Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury and now president of the Tax Foundation. Mr. Magill is a frequent expert witness before the Ways and Means Committee. His article, entitled "The Taxable Income of Cooperatives," is the result of an independent investigation of this controversial subject. The article is important because it categorically denies the oft-repeated claim of the cooperatives that they have no income and that their patronage dividends are not, therefore, taxable before distribution to members. Mr. Magill says:

> The so-called net margins of cooperative corporations constitute in reality the net income of such corporations. * * * The net margin is quite as much the net profit of the cooperative as the exactly similar net margin of operating income of the stock corporation buying or selling goods next door. * * * It should pay a Federal income tax on its gain, just as its competitor must do.

Mr. Magill concludes his article by saying:

> Tax gratuities, or subsidies, in favor of worth-while social experiments, such as cooperatives, may have been sound and desirable under the low tax rates prevailing during the first two decades of the income tax. They cannot be justified, however, in the political, economic and tax climate of the 1950's.

Mr. Speaker, we should remove the inequities in our tax laws before we impose still heavier taxes and heavier burdens on those who are honestly paying their taxes—just as the gentleman from North Carolina has said. And we must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there is about $1,000,000,000 of practically brand-new revenue involved in removing these inequities—$1,000,000,000 which, if collected, would serve to give some relief to those who are now honestly paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons offered from time to time for the failure of the Congress to act in this important matter is, as one of my colleagues has put it, that "we must not tinker with the farmer's income." I should like to discuss that point with you.

Competent evidence, presented to the Senate Finance Committee last summer by Attorney Karl T. Loos, general counsel for the National Association of Farmer Cooperatives, proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that full taxation of the entire earnings of these co-ops would have so minute an effect on the income of the great majority of farmer-members as to be unnoticeable.

Here, for instance, is a table showing patronage-refund payments made by the big Southern States Cooperative for the year ending June 30, 1949:

Senate hearings on H. R. 8920, July 1950 (p. 740)

Range	Fiscal year ended June 30, 1949					
	Patronage refunds to patrons			Dividends on outstanding capital stock		
	Number of payments	Total amount paid	Average payment	Number of payments	Total amount paid	Average payment
$0.01 to $0.99	126, 821	$54, 943. 41	$0. 43	176, 482	$47, 365. 64	$0. 27
$1 to $9.99	101, 974	567, 417. 38	5. 56	46, 238	98, 080. 60	2. 12
$10 to $49.99	10, 563	340, 068. 48	32. 19	5, 041	72, 303. 38	14. 34
$50 to $99.99	746	54, 751. 36	73. 39	303	16, 588. 86	54. 75
$100 and over	163	41, 785. 41	256. 35	513	143, 813. 88	280. 33
Total	240, 267	1, 058, 966. 04	4. 41	228, 577	378, 102. 36	1. 65

This table shows that of the 240,267 patronage dividends that were paid out in that year by Southern States Cooperative, 228,795 were for less than $10 and only 163 were for as much as $100. The average payment was $4.41. If taxes at the then current rate of 38 percent had been paid on the entire amount handed out in patronage refunds—as Mr. Magill says it should be—the aver-

age payment to each of the Southern States Co-op's patrons would have been reduced by only $1.68—though the Treasury of the United States would have received $402,420 on this patronage refund account alone. Mr. Speaker, would you call that tinkering with the farmer's income?

Let us take another case, from the testimony presented by this same exceedingly able cooperative attorney. This is a table showing the combined reports of 18 local cooperatives which are affiliated with the big Missouri Farmers' Association, of Columbia, Mo.:

Senate hearings on H. R. 8920, July 1950 (p. 742)

Cooperative No.	Number of refunds	1 cent to 99 cents	$1 to $9.99	$10 to $49.99	$50 to $99.99	Over $100	Total of refunds
1	831	449	345	36	1		$1,951.29
2	693	299	323	71			2,619.67
3	2,370	1,282	842	230	14	2	9,541.97
4	1,269	737	471	58	2	1	2,715.15
5	722	269	296	171	34	12	9,028.43
6	343	187	136	19			864.97
7	1,069	694	369	6			1,363.12
8	883	512	298	73			2,554.49
9	723	206	371	142	3	1	4,527.43
10	1,087	578	442	66	1		2,882.76
11	1,113	464	426	200	17	6	8,584.95
12	750	285	345	115	5		3,561.42
13	1,925	591	922	373	35	4	15,356.71
14	1,945	447	993	398	78	29	22,629.43
15	643	216	246	154	20	7	6,845.04
16	4,380	2,205	1,515	573	58	29	29,319.94
17	3,062	2,413	587	62			3,390.88
18	1,712	808	706	182	14		7,616.14
Total	25,519	12,642	9,575	2,929	282	91	135,353.79
Percent	100.00	49.54	37.52	11.48	1.11	0.35	

This table shows that out of a total of 25,519 patronage refunds that are tabulated, 12,642—or 49.54 percent—were for less than $1; 9,575—or 37.52 percent—were for from $1 to $10; and only 91 were for more than $100. The average refund was $5.30. The average refund would have been $3.36 if a tax at 38 percent had been levied before the payments were distributed, and the Federal Treasury would have received $50,434 in additional funds. I ask again, Mr. Speaker, can that be called "tinkering with the farmer's income?"

The summary finally presented by this cooperative representative is highly significant. It is to be found on page 752 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, second session, on H. R. 8920.

According to that summary, prepared and presented by Mr. Loos himself, out of a total of 929,000 individual payments of patronage dividends 563,000—60 percent of the total—were for less than $1, and 285,000—31.4 percent ranged from $1 to $10. In round numbers, therefore, 849,000 of the payments tabulated—91.4 percent—were for less than $10.

The significant fact in the summary, however, is that the total amount of money represented by these 849,000 payments was less than one-quarter of the earnings of the farmer cooperatives—23.8 percent—while three-quarters of the earnings—more than 76 percent—was distributed to the recipients of 8.6 percent of the payments.

In view of these figures, Mr. Speaker, compiled by the spokesman for the cooperatives themselves, that a few big patrons get the lion's share of co-op earnings, and that if the regular corporation tax of 38 percent had been applied to the earnings of these farmer co-ops, we should have been tinkering very slightly with the personal incomes of the great bulk of farmers concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my contention since the very beginning of this consideration of taxing the tax-exempts that no one would be seriously hurt by taxing these organizations and corporations under exactly the same formula that we apply to other companies. I am glad to have that opinion fully confirmed by the cooperatives themselves.

We are engaged in the task of finding $8,000,000,000, or $10,000,000,000, or $16,500,000,000, or $20,000,000,000 to build up the defenses of this Nation against aggressors. We must seek new sources of revenue, rather than continue to pile the entire burden upon those who are already overloaded—for we are already taking 25 percent of the national income in taxes, and 25 percent has always been considered the limit beyond which no nation could go and remain solvent.

The administration, unwilling to cut expenditures—though I believe they could be cut by seven or eight billion dollars—has urged that loopholes be closed, but its own suggestions for the closing of loopholes are totally inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, my own estimate of the revenue available from a really thorough job of closing loopholes is $1,000,000,000. Mr. Marriner Eccles, long-time member of the Federal Reserve Board, goes far beyond that. In testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report a couple of weeks ago, he estimated that $3,000,000,000 of brand new revenue would come from loophole closing. In any event, it would be a very substantial sum.

We have a job to do. It is not a pleasant job—but it is far easier than fighting in the ice and snow and mud of Korea as thousands of our American boys are now doing. It is far easier than the task will be of tens of thousands of American boys if they are sent into the maelstrom of Western Europe.

In my opinion it is unpatriotic for any individual or for any business to refuse to pay a fair and equitable share of the tax load at this time. It is unpatriotic even to suggest that special privilege or special exemption should be continued in this day of emergency.

If we adopt the inadequate method of taxing cooperatives and other tax-exempts that is proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury, we shall have gained practically nothing. Competition will still be unfair; the cooperatives and probably the other tax-exempts as well will still be able to dodge payment of most of the tax; and the Treasury will lose a substantial sum of money—whether one billion or three billion—that easily could and most certainly should become available at once.

The gentleman from North Carolina has very rightly said:

> If there are any inequities in our tax laws, we should remove those inequities before we impose still heavier taxes and heavier burdens on those who are honestly paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, to that I say "Amen"—and I offer as the way to accomplish the task the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H. R. 240, in the revenue bill of 1951. That will remove the inequities—and give us more than a billion dollars of new revenue.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I have listened to the gentleman's discourse on the subject of taxes with a great deal of interest and have followed his discussions in previous instances. I happen to hold a policy with a so-called mutual company—the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., which, as the gentleman knows, is an old and very well-established company. I would simply like to ask the gentleman whether a mutual company of this type falls in the same category, so far as their taxes are concerned, as a farmer cooperative, such as the gentleman has just discussed?

Mr. MASON. It does. It falls in the same category so far as their reserves are concerned.

Mr. HARVEY. Do the mutual companies like the Northwestern enjoy the privilege of tax exemption which the so-called stock-company life insurance company enjoys? Do they enjoy an advantage?

Mr. MASON. They do enjoy an advantage and it is that advantage which places them in what might be considered unfair competition with the stock companies.

Mr. HARVEY. Let us consider a so-called building and loan association, which are very common in my district. Do these so-called building and loan associations enjoy a tax advantage over a competing bank which is a corporation?

Mr. MASON. They do, and last year in the 1950 tax bill the committee included building and loan associations and mutual savings banks to be taxed. But when they refused to tax cooperatives on the same basis I offered a motion to rescind the action of the committee because I said they were not being consistent and if they were to tax one, they should tax all on the same basis.

Mr. HARVEY. Then it is the gentleman's contention that all of them fall in

the same general category so far as taxes are concerned?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. This question of taxing cooperatives is rather elusive and difficult to understand. I do not believe the public generally understands it. Do you recommend or do you draw a distinction between the so-called farmer cooperatives which are merely marketing associations and the cooperatives, for instance, which establish retail businesses on main street?

Mr. MASON. I do. I draw a distinction and it is because the original farmer cooperative, the pure and simple farmer cooperative which was organized in order to get a better price for their product has been so elaborated upon and so extended by rulings of the Treasury—not by law—that it has brought in all of these other unfair competitive cooperatives under that same program.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You will remember that in California the great citrus industry there was originally run by farmer cooperatives in the true sense of the word. In my own district I have the great cheese cooperatives where the farmer takes his milk to the small cheese factory and the cheese maker makes it into the form of cheese, and then it is sold and the amount of milk that the farmer sold is eventually deposited to his credit in a local bank. I consider that is a true cooperative.

Mr. MASON. And I consider it a legitimate and worth-while organization to help the farmers get the proper prices for their products. I for one would not want to do anything which would destroy that kind of co-op.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Your quarrel, then, is with the many variations that have grown up since the original concept of co-ops?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much, and I compliment the gentleman on his statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. For weeks we have heard witnesses testify on the question of drafting 18-year-olds. The military advocates it. They say it is necessary in order to fully mobilize manpower, yet we continue the 40-hour week for Government employees. Even though Saturday is practically the only full day a Member of Congress has free to devote to the problems of his constituents, he cannot find a bureau or an agency open for business on that day. Certainly this shows little effort to mobilize the home front and is little comfort to those who face the responsibility of preparing an adequate defense for this country. The 40-hour week prevails in industry. Unless the Government sets the example by extending the workweek for Federal employees, how can they have any basis for calling on industry for a longer workweek, and if neither Government nor industry extends its workweek, how can the military be heard to say we are fully mobilizing manpower?

Mr. Speaker, there is a grave waste of manpower within the Military Establishment itself. Square pegs in round holes, and round pegs in square holes. It happened in the last war and the military should have learned its lesson. The same thing happens today. Each day we hear of men who are placed in the Army without regard to any special training they may have. Only today my attention was called to a graduate in aeronautical engineering whom the Army has placed in a position where no special training is needed and which any soldier could fill. I know of cases where noncommissioned men with special training in war schools during the last war, with years of experience in such specialty, have been placed directly away from what they can do well, and at the same time the military wastes manpower teaching others to do what the specially trained is already equipped to do. Of course, the Military Establishment advises that individual cases should be taken up with them. The average man does not write his Congressman about such situations, and if he does, quite frequently the military can find a thousand reasons why they cannot or do not do anything about it.

I am today calling on the Military Establishment to urge the men with special experiences or qualifications to write a central office advising the military of such special training and qualifications, and that the military make every effort to place all such military personnel where such men can best be utilized. Such action must be taken. It will save both money and manpower. Of course, the military will say that they already have such information. They do have, but it is scattered in thousands of filing cabinets and unless something is done, it is forever lost.

Before all youths are called on for military service, we must not only fully utilize manpower on the civilian or home front, but within the military as well.

After the policies of the military in the use of its manpower in World War I were analyzed, it was decided by the military that there was a great waste of manpower, due to the fact that personnel was not placed in jobs in the military where their civilian experience and training could best be utilized. At the outset of World War II the military noted these mistakes in the failure to utilize the manpower in World War I and averred that it would not happen again. But as everyone knows, it did happen in the last war and the same thing is still happening. In placing a man in his military job, the military continues to place him in some assignment which involves his doing something which does not utilize his civilian training and experience. The military continues to assign persons who were truck drivers in civilian life to jobs as cooks in the armed services, and vice versa. Of course, this involves intensive training and schooling to qualify these men for their newly assigned jobs, and involves an unnecessary amount of teaching personnel, not to mention the waste of time and money, and, in the end, probably, a less efficient worker. The military insist on shaving a square peg to fit a round hole instead of using a round peg which is already available without the necessity of shaving. This shaving process involves an unnecessary waste of manpower, efficiency, time, and money.

This waste goes on and on. They have broken down segregation in the military service to further the social aims of the administration. Be it said to the credit of the military they are not for it, but the executive department has forced it on them. What do we find? In their efforts to get white men in their units, the Air Force, the Navy, and Marine Corps are getting enlistments from schoolboys just before they get out of school so they can fill their quotas. The Army, in order to keep from getting more than its share of Negroes, has raised mental qualifications to such an extent that they are rejecting nearly all Negroes and taking practically all the white boys in the South. Thus, it is easy to see that the breaking down of segregation in the Armed Forces has resulted in a tremendous waste of manpower. In other words, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps go out to our colleges, especially in the Southern States, and say to these boys: "Unless you volunteer now you will be drafted and put in the infantry." Many boys volunteer before having finished their college course, and the result is that the Air Force, the Navy, and Marine Corps have been able to eliminate a great percentage of the Negroes throughout the country—taking only a small percentage of them. You will recall that when we were asked to invoke universal military training and the peacetime draft, which I supported, in order to get necessary manpower, the Army, in my opinion, raised the mental standards to eliminate the great mass of Negroes. The records in General Hershey's office will show that from July through October 1950, in some of the Southern States, and one in particular, some 65 percent were rejected when sent to induction centers—4.2 percent were rejected because of physical disabilities and 60.7 percent were rejected because of mental or educational standards. The records will show that some of these Negro boys who had finished high school or junior college made points up to 3 or 4, where the standard was set at 13, the result being that 60 percent were rejected for mental reasons. In my opinion, this raising of the educational standards was only a scheme to eliminate the Negro from the service.

What is happening to this country today is that in the Southern States many Negroes are returning home from induction centers and the country is being stripped of white boys of draft age. The administration and political demagogs of this country, and probably some well-meaning people, have forced upon the military the breaking down of segregation, arguing that it would be a saving of manpower. Instead, however, it has resulted in a waste of manpower beyond anything this country has ever known. I introduced a bill last year and again

this year to permit men who register to certify whether or not they favor segregation and to give those who so desired an opportunity to serve in segregated units. I say to you that if the Negroes of the Southern States were given an opportunity to express preference in the matter, it would be found that practically all would be in favor of the segregated unit. I submit that the present policy on segregation is totally unfair to both white and Negro and that it is likewise a tremendous waste of manpower. Today, 48 cents out of every dollar in the present budget is for the military, only 17 cents is for the regular departmental activities. We find that practically all the young men in our Nation, except Negroes, will soon be in the military service, if present policies prevail. It follows that we must take every action to prevent the military from wasting money and manpower because that is where the manpower is and where the money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, we should have an immediate extension of the workweek; we should have an immediate investigation of the use of manpower by the military; we should immediately restore segregation in the armed services, certainly, for those who prefer it; and we should check on the spending policies of the Military Establishment. We are all for national defense but money wasted or manpower wasted helps nothing, but could lead to the destruction of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to those fine American citizens who have supported us through the years to do everything we can to prevent waste of money and manpower. They are doing their part—we must do ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REORGANIZE THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations was set up to bring about and sustain peace. The only positive action planned was to resist aggression by force. Nowhere in the debates creating the UN does there appear a single word about reestablishing the boundaries of nations, and reorganizing two or more countries into one.

Can this organization bring about peace? Anyone with half sense ought to know that with Russia holding veto power in the Security Council no peace can ever be established through the UN as it now exists. Russia has a mania for the destruction of religion and the capitalistic system, and since she holds a veto power no peace will be entered into by the action of the United Nations.

If the people of the rest of the world want the United Nations to exist, there must be a reorganization of the whole scheme. Those nations that have an uncompromising ideology which cannot exist with an absolutely opposite system will have to be left out in the reorganization. Those countries like India and Yugoslavia, who want our money but will not vote or act with us, should alter their course or be left out. The other free nations can then set up an organization to deal with those who will not consent to any peace unless it is what they dictate.

This organization could then proceed, and in reorganizing should make perfectly clear what its aims and purposes are. In the present set-up, aggression was to be restrained, but in doing that some UN members seem to feel now that boundaries of nations can be changed and two or more countries welded into one, like North and South Korea one nation when all the World War II Allies had, in effect, agreed on two separate governments. I do not say that dividing the country was right, but it was agreed to. If the new UN wants this power and exercises it, there will be no peace anywhere at any time. It will be the same old grab system that has for centuries impelled stronger nations to destroy smaller ones. We must start on the boundaries existing at the time the organization was created, and if any boundaries are to be moved it must be done with the consent of the people whose countries are to be divided, enlarged, or limited. Surely the UN cannot sit in judgment on local affairs and use its powers to interfere with the internal affairs of any nation.

With a new set-up, it may be possible to establish peace over a part of the world, but with Russia and other obstructionists remaining in the organization, peace will not be established in any country. We are playing directly into their hands in attempting any peace through the UN while Russia is a member. Through the UN, Russia's agents learn all our aims and purposes and soak up information for her own advantage, while we debate ourselves hoarse on propositions that Russia immediately vetoes.

The free nations of the world had better wake up and meet the issue. Russia will not turn aside from her long-nourished aim of putting over her doctrines of antireligion and anticapitalism. She is adamant on this, she is intolerant, she is inexorable and any consent on her part to a pretended peace is only her way of gathering more strength to carry out her will. Let the people of other nations, who refuse the Soviet doctrine, meet this challenge and combine for their own self-protection. Keep Russia out of our councils—make no effort to appease her—rely on no representations she makes—treat her as our deadly enemy, which she is.

Russia does not rely too much on aggression by force, except as she can get her satellites to carry out that action. Her strong aggressive weapon is propaganda. She is criminally intelligent and is one of the greatest opportunists the world has ever seen. In any country, including the United States, where people are in want and cannot be relieved, Russia finds a fertile spot to plant the seeds of communism. She promises reforms—those reforms are needed—distressed people flock to the one promising relief; they embrace her faith; and hence, Russia, without firing a shot, obtains a formidable army of support in any country.

China is a good example. Land reforms were needed in China. Millions were landless, and the feudal owners took most of the crops for the right of peasants to till the land. We recommended to Chiang Kai-shek land reforms, but he refused to comply. He could not, for he would lose the support of powerful landlords and their armies. Russia indoctrinated the Reds of China in land reforms, and the distressed people fell for it and either joined the Reds or refused to fight them. This was a promise, and only a promise, and now the Chinese find that they have surrendered to the Reds, and the promises are still to be fulfilled.

In our fight against the ideology of Russia we want to make sure of the economic conditions and where reforms are necessary put them in, rather than sit back and allow the Soviet to gain the aims by our own foolishness. Promise the poor people of any country that reforms will be introduced, and then actually install the reforms, and the aggression of Russia by propaganda will cease to attract people. If the nations who are banded together for peace do not soon recognize the power of this Soviet propaganda and how they gain followers, the battle against world communism will mount in fury, for the weapons of ideas are stronger than guns. We are abundantly capable of fighting with ideas, but so far we have used them ineffectively and are depending entirely on guns.

If we do not squander our resources and manpower, there is no force in the world today beyond the borders of this country that can offer the potential destruction of this Republic. If it is ever destroyed it will be from within and not from without. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and we should not forget to give our first attention to the United States. This does not mean that we shall not give other countries, striving for liberty, our aid and support to the extent of our ability, but we should not become so involved in other parts of the world that we shall finally be unable to defend ourselves. While the whole world was embroiled in political and religious wars our forefathers fled from that ceaseless turmoil and here in the New World established a people's government, which through its wise management has survived and has made us the most powerful nation in the world. The greater part of our history transpired with the admonitions of Washington and Jefferson constantly reminding us to avoid entanglements with foreign powers.

We left that safe course in 1917 after following their advice for 131 years, and since then we have had 33 years of constant agitation, wars, depressions, wars again, depressions, and now war again. We should take some heed of our error and get back on our historic course. In all those 131 years the name of the United States was held in high regard by most nations of the world, but today after 33 years of a different course we are perhaps the most hated nation among the majority of the inhabitants of the globe. Even those we have tried to help—those to whom we have given our last cent and even went further and plunged ourselves under a stupendous load of debt—even some of them now

call us "money-grabbers" who are trying to control the whole world.

Is not it about time to defend America? Those of us who believe in getting back on our historic track of safety are branded as isolationists—that name, some think, is sufficient to squelch the most loyal citizen. To me, I would much rather be called an isolationist than an internationalist who demands that this country, with all its men and money must protect the financial interest of free enterprise in foreign countries.

We do not have to play turtle and back into our shell. We can deal with foreign countries as we always have—we can trade with them—they can trade with us—an honorable trade promotes peace and understanding, but we do not have to enter into every controversy at the far ends of the earth in the name of international trade. It would be much better to have no trade at all than to trade in blood and debts. Our trade for 131 years did not demand this of us, but our new venture in 33 years has cost us the loss of untold thousands of our best men and has placed us under the most staggering debt any country in the history of the world has had to bear.

I repeat, we must not squander our resources and manpower. We should aid the free nations, yes, but we should not become so involved in other parts of the world that we shall finally be unable to defend ourselves.

Personally I do not care what I am called—I intend to fight this new program of all-out world interference and save this Republic. I have no ax to grind, I represent no interests, special or otherwise. I am not elected by any special interest, and hold myself accountable to the people only and to no one else. I am convinced in my own mind that the greatest enemies of this Republic will not be located in foreign countries, but right here at home, and only through such influence will this Republic ever fall.

I think it is impossible for the Communist dictator idea of state enterprise and the capitalistic free enterprise system to exist on this earth without a war in the future—probably for half a century, but eventually these two diametrically opposed ideologies must clash in war. In this country it appeared that after the beginning of this Government in 1787 free States and slave States could live together in peace, and they did so for 72 years, although there was much discontent on both sides right from the beginning and which increased in tempo until Fort Sumter was fired upon. Lincoln saw the picture plainly when he said:

> We cannot remain half free and half slave; we will finally become all one or the other.

That was an issue in the Nation itself and might not be easily applied to a community of nations. Yet, the same principle is there.

Suppose we settle down to the best peace we can get—naturally if there was peace we would be trading with Russia and there will be no time during this exchange of trade that the two opposed policies of operation will not clash. Events of small consequences at first—but gradually becoming more important as time passes and finally there will be a clash to the finish. I think it is possible for this Government to so conduct its business as not to give offense to Russia or any other country, but I am not so sure of the way the Russian Government will be conducted. If it is conducted in the future as it has been up to date, with intrigues and espionage, the two systems will not long remain in a world of peace.

The Russian people themselves may finally get possession of their own government, which they do not have today; then the program of the Russian dictators to propagandize the world may end. In that event, war may be averted.

Those countries who desire and want individual freedom may as well understand just what the Russians want and what they are determined to have and prepare their defenses accordingly. Any nation that will not do so will not have long the power to defend itself.

So far as the United States is concerned, our first duty is to so arm that it will be impossible for the Russians to force their system upon us by force of arms, for after all this United States may well be the last barrier between communism and free enterprise. If this statement is true or ever approaches the truth, we must be more vigilant than ever to see that we do not permit our economic conditions to become intolerable to the people of the United States and thus afford fertile soil where the seeds of communism can be sown.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am glad to see the gentleman has been stressing the idea of internal security. Does the gentleman feel there is a real danger that we may be dissipating both our manpower and our natural resources?

Mr. BURDICK. I certainly do, or I would not be up here today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has made a very instructive talk on this subject. I recall that on one occasion he was a member of a Minnesota football team and was at that time regarded as one of the most valuable players on that team, which, much to my regret, won several conference championships. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that he would not have wanted on that team any fellow that was not playing for Minnesota.

Mr. BURDICK. We did not have anybody on there except that kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was not just a happenstance, was it, that was a policy?

Mr. BURDICK. No; that was premeditated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The question I wanted to ask was this: We are told, at least I get that idea, that we must not let those 500,000 Chinese soldiers who want to slip across to the mainland and fight the Communists, because it might make the Russians mad. If that is true, does not the gentleman believe it might make Stalin and the Russians a little angry if we send 200,000 men over to confront them in Eastern Europe? How does the gentleman reconcile those two policies?

Mr. BURDICK. I reconcile them by telling the gentleman what Congress does. In order to keep Tito mad at Stalin, we put in $500,000,000. That is all we got out of it, that he is still mad.

We have given Tito $500,000,000 and all he had to give for that was to say he was mad at Stalin. When he got this money he was just as mad as he could be at Stalin. But in the United Nations he votes against us and in Korea he sends no help. Did that $500,000,000 gift help us in any particular, and now very soon Tito will not be as mad as he was unless we send him more money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can understand that. That is nothing new. They have been working us ever since 1917 on that theory have they not?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; if we are to buy everybody in the world so that they will be mad at somebody else, we have a big job ahead of us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When we buy them, it occurs to me that they ought to stay bought.

Mr. BURDICK. They do not stay bought unless we give them more money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you think of this policy which will not let the Chinese fight the Chinese Communists, and which insists that we send young Americans over to Europe to fight the Communists there?

Mr. BURDICK. If the gentleman remembers I inserted a speech in the RECORD where I advocated the use of these weapons. First, we never could have peace with Japan, with Russia's consent. But we could make peace with her and turn her 5,000,000 men loose to stem this tide of communism. That would be the best way. They want to do it. They are not Communists. They are anti-Communists, and they are champing at the bit, ready to go. But this country does not bring about an understanding with Japan so that they can be turned loose. I would do the same thing with Chiang Kai-shek's troops. I would turn them loose and let them go.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point was if we must fight the Communists and shoot a few of them, I am sort of in favor of letting the Chinese and Japanese and anybody else who wants to do it shoot them instead of sending our boys to do it.

Mr. BURDICK. Here is another situation even worse than that, I might state to the gentleman from Michigan. We are holding Japan now as a prisoner of war. She is our ward. Have we any right to hold her defenseless against the hordes of communism? Have we any moral right to do that? I think the thing for this country to do, the morally correct thing, would be to enter into a peace with Japan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman on that. I hope he will give us the benefit of his views on subsequent occasions and I hope those occasions will not be too far apart.

Mr. BURDICK. Are there any more questions? I might say I heard a speech

out in a mining camp one time. A fellow came along and he was not getting along with the miners anyhow. He started to make a speech and a fellow said, "Well, what about this?" And "What about that?" So the speaker said, "Come right down here to the platform and we will argue this thing out." So the other man went up to the platform and the speaker walloped him one on the jaw and stretched him out. And as he stood over him, straddled out, he said, "Ladies and gentlemen, are there any more questions?"

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2141. An act to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. HOLMES), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

216. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the proceedings of the Fifty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Chicago, Ill., August 27 to September 1, 1950, pursuant to Public Law 249, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

217. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $7,500,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

218. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

219. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

220. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

221. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend Title 18, United States Code, section 2311 to include the word 'tractor' in the definition of motor vehicle and sections 2312 and 2313 to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been embezzled, feloniously converted, or taken feloniously by fraud"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a report listing the tort claims approved for payment for the fiscal year 1950 and setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, and a brief description of each claim, pursuant to title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

224. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Shun Hsin Chan Chi, Chao Pieh Chi, Chao Chu Chi, and Chin Chi, file Nos. A-5507418, 7037141, 7037142, and A-7037168 CR 28307, and the case of Atta Kazerooni, file No. A-7779912 CR 27409, requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first Quarterly Report of Activities pursuant to provisions of Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, to provide war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

226. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1950, through December 31, 1950; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

227. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Cape Fear River, N. C., to St. Johns River, Fla., intracoastal waterway, with a view to relocating the alternate route through Plantation Creek near Brunswick, Ga., and also a preliminary examination of the intracoastal waterway with a view to relocating the route of the waterway in the vicinity of Brunswick, Ga. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 24, 1946, and was also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 11, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Johns, Blind, and Pass-a-Grille Passes, Pinellas County, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 29, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of West Gap, St. George Island, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2729. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the transfer of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2731. A bill to fix the term of the judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands at 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 2732. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased retirement benefits for annuitants and survivors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2733. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2734. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of an Assistant Solicitor General, and two assistants to the Solicitor General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2735. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2736. A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2737. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 2738. A bill to repeal provisions of the Social Security Act which require State plans for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, to restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2739. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States to include certain aircraft in flight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2740. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to make the injury or destruction of aircraft a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2741. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2742. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2743. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to permit employment of children 12 years of age

and older in the harvesting of agricultural products; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. R. 2744. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America by requiring the display of the flag of the United States of America whenever any other flag or pennant is displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2745. A bill to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2746. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2747. A bill to provide a fidelity trust fund in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2748. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2749. A bill to authorize the detail of officers of the Armed Forces to any duty or position with the Department of Commerce in connection with the work of promoting civil aviation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 23 (p) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2751. A bill allowing a credit against the additional estate tax for inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes paid to any State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2752. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2753. A bill to provide percentage depletion for crushed stone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2754. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to museums operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2755. A bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 2756. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the rebuilding of the bridge across the Cannonball River near Cannonball, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2757. A bill to amend the Social Security Act as amended, by increasing the amount of wages and net earnings from self-employment permitted without suspension of benefit payments under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2758. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired by gift, trust, annuity, devise, bequest, inheritance or as beneficiary of any insurance policy from an American citizen or national and to provide that in any present or future conflict similar property be held in trust for such enemy alien by courts of competent jurisdiction or by an agency of the Government appointed by the President, subject to the use of the United States Government for the successful conclusion of hostilities, to be returned to such alien after the end of hostilities under certain conditions as set out herein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1940, to provide an additional 1-year period in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army may make claims for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2760. A bill to amend section 2, Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946, providing for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, so as to include certain additional veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2761. A bill authorizing the loan or gift of condemned or obsolete combat material to veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2762. A bill to amend section 3268 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to tax on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables, by tax-exempting certain veterans' organizations and their local posts or chapters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2763. A bill to amend subchapter A, chapter 15, Internal Revenue Code, relating to tax on cigarettes, by tax-exempting cigarettes purchased by veterans' organizations for distribution to hospitalized veterans and servicemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2764. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2), Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 10), relating to income-tax exemption of certain employees, by including certain veterans' organization employees, and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2765. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2766. A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2767. A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2768. A bill to create a Federal corporation for the improvement of the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2769. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the selection of the successors of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress who become unable to perform their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, relating to the display and use of the flag, so as to establish a rule that no foreign national or supra-national flag shall be publicly displayed unless it is accompanied by the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 139. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct a survey of Veterans' Administration hospitals, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to their joint resolution No. 6, A, requesting enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to authorize development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway for navigation by seagoing vessels at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to ward off foreign invasion of fundamental American rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relating to their House joint resolution 2, branding Communist China an aggressor, and opposing the admission of Communist China into membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to legislation adopted by the New Jersey Legislature approving an interstate compact for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relating to Senate Joint Concurrent Resolution 3, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States and known as the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relating to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, requesting the President of the United States and his Cabinet not to execute or enter into any secret treaties or other agreements with any foreign power which would commit the Armed Forces of the United States for service in any country other than the United States and then only pursuant to the acts of Congress as authorized by the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to enrolled Joint Resolution 1, ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonarda Montalbano Cartafalsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Lon Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of C. E. Heaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:
H. R. 2773. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FELLOWS:
H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Lumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FLOOD:
H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2776. A bill for the relief of August Genetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2777. A bill for the relief of Frank Lobitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FORD:
H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Hermann Robert Heinrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GARMATZ:
H. R. 2779. A bill for the relief of Gay Street Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GREENWOOD:
H. R. 2780. A bill for the relief of Clara Gabriel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GWINN:
H. R. 2781. A bill for the relief of alien Sanders Knanishu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HART:
H. R. 2782. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:
H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of James Dore, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KEARNEY:
H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Higa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KENNEDY:
H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Kimi Hatano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McKINNON:
H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of Edgar A. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:
H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Charles D. Warburton; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WOLVERTON:
H. R. 2790. A bill for the relief of Mortimer L. Nottebrock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give concentrated attention and effort to the reactivating of the United States Naval Air Station Auxiliary of United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I., located in Charlestown, R. I., passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session and approved by the Governor on February 10; to the Committee on Armed Services.

53. Also resolution entitled resolution requesting the Members from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give immediate attention and use their best efforts to have reactivated the naval ordnance plant of the United States Naval Torpedo Station, at Newport, R. I., passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session and approved by the Governor on February 10; to the Committee on Armed Services.

54. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of the members of the St. John's Lutheran Ladies Aid and Missionary Society of Plainfield, Iowa, signed by 34 members of that society pleading that everything possible be done to restore peace to the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. By Mr. MASON: Petition of the grand regent and members of Court De La Salle No. 276, Catholic Daughters of America, La Salle, Ill., asking the Congress to enact legislation declaring Good Friday a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

56. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. Rowland F. Cowan, department of adjutant, the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., relative to resolution adopted calling on the United Nations to immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. Also, petition of Mr. W. K. Boardman, secretary, Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce, Ketchikan, Alaska, relative to statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Alvin E. Houser, D. D., First Christian Church, Elk City, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art almighty in heaven and in earth, demonstrate Thy almightiness in earthquake, storm, and rain; but, dear God, demonstrate Thy almightiness also in the lives of nations, and in the lives of the men who direct the destiny of our nations.

Our Father, Thou hast promised where two are in accord concerning anything that they ask of Thee that Thou shalt give it to them. Our Father, we pray that we may be in accord here this morning for peace, for brotherhood, for spiritual values that will renew America and cleanse it of everything that is destroying her.

Our Father, Thou hast said, and Thou hast demonstrated in times past, "If my people who are called by my name will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and forsake their wicked ways, I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sins and will heal their nations."

Our Father, we come to Thee this morning in penitent mood, with contrite hearts, acknowledging our own simpleness, acknowledging our own wickedness, and praying, dear God, that Thou shalt have mercy upon us and time shall be in the future for us to do Thy will, that the kingdom of this world may become the kingdom of our God.

Our Father, we ask divine inspiration upon the President of the United States that Thou shalt give him health, strength, courage, and heavenly vision to know that which is right and good, not only for us in this country but for the nations of the world.

Dear God, bless the leadership of this House and the Senate and every official who has been given authority by the ballot over us. Dear God, bless our homes. Especially do we ask that blessing upon our soldiers on battlefields, upon those who have been injured, and those with whom we have talked in the last few hours, whose hearts are torn and homes are wrenched from natural environments.

Dear God, we ask Thee to accept our penitent prayer this morning and to pour out Thy blessing and Thy holy spirit upon us, that we may have the wisdom and the ability to do Thy will. Watch over us and guide us in Thy love and in divine strength and ability to lead this Nation and the world to greater heights of spirituality and brotherly love.

We ask it in the name of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 85) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be made pursuant to House Resolution 80, by the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs), acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "Public Lands" and insert "Interior and Insular Affairs."
Line 11, strike out "or subcommittee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign

Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS BY SELECT COMMITTEE CREATED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 33

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 33, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

After line 8, insert "That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 3, 1951."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 124) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $210,000, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following: "The funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 3, 1951."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to inquire as to committee activities which require such a large sum of money. Is the chairman of the committee here or someone from the committee who can explain it?

Mr. BURLESON. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], is not on the floor. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], is, however, and I understand he will be glad to explain it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from California explain what the committee contemplates doing? I am not just aware what the committee has in contemplation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be glad to, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], is not here today and I have been asked to act in his place.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as set up under the Reorganization Act has the responsibility of investigating the expenditures of all the executive departments. We have broken down our main committee into five subcommittees. There are subcommittees chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], and myself. Mr. HARDY's subcommittee is concerned with the efficiency of Government operations, and in the last Congress they investigated among other matters the Maritime Commission, and made recommendations which we feel saved many millions of dollars.

My committee, the Committee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, was concerned mostly with the President's plans on reorganizations, including some basic legislation, such as Public Law 152 which set up the General Services Administration and coordinated all of the different housekeeping functions of Government. The Hoover Commission estimated that that act alone would save the Government $250,000,000 annually.

At the present time my subcommittee plans to go into the question of traffic management. As a result of the last war the Department of Justice now has filed suits for over $500,000,000 in refunds involving overcharges by transportation carriers during that war. We are going into the subject of traffic management to see if it is not possible for the Government to set up a traffic-management program similar to programs that are in effect in all the big corporations in America; this we believe will save several hundred million dollars in the emergency we are in now as well as in peacetime years.

We are also going into the subject of congressional reorganization; in other words, a review of the La Follette-Monroney Act, which was passed, as you know, several years ago and which at the present time is the subject of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures investigation. We are joining with them in this investigation, and the Members of the House will have an opportunity to come before this joint committee of the House and Senate and testify with reference to their ideas as to how the function of Congress can be improved in regard to staffing, committee structure, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman thinks we can make some real savings as the result of his committee's work?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I state unreservedly that the work of the Committee on Expenditures in investigating expenditures in executive departments will save many millions of dollars. We have proven that in the last 2 years, and we feel we can in the next 2 years do an equally good job.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman and his committee looking over the President's budget to any degree? You know we hope we can save some money. The President has dared us to make a savings.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We feel that is within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Appropriations rather than our committee. We are more interested in investigating waste and inefficiency in Government operations after the appropriations are made rather than in trying to limit appropriations which we feel lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman for his information that the committee was really set up to scrutinize the various departments of Government in the hope that we could make some saving. We did not expect it would depend entirely on the Appropriations Committee so far as economies in Government are concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I may say that we are doing that in this way: All of the reports of the General Accounting Office are referred to our committee and such criticisms as the General Accounting Office makes of the operation of any executive department is referred to our committee. The various subcommittees immediately take those reports, investigate them, and see if we can correct the situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not interested in criticism. What I am interested in is getting some real savings, and it is my hope the committee will do that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the primary purpose of our committee, and I assure the gentleman we will work very hard on that point.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not the matter of studying the reorganization of Congress within the province of the House Committee on Administration rather than the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has the jurisdiction of reorganization of both the legislative and the executive branches. The

La Follette-Monroney Act was passed through the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and all of the President's reorganization plans enacting laws under the authority of the basic Reorganization Act, were passed through the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Forty Republican heads of organizations and clubs in Massachusetts came on with their hatchets and thoroughly approved this legislation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is my understanding that the so-called Williams subcommittee has contended in various reports filed with the House that a great percentage of executive agencies at this time are overstaffed, and great savings can be made in the current budget and the budget for the new fiscal year.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I think that this discussion has pointed up the urgency for more funds for this committee and for a larger staff of this committee if it is going to be enabled to carry out its mandate under the Reorganization Act. The Government is so big there is no limit to what can be done, and because of matters such as this there is the necessity for getting funds in order to employ qualified personnel.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to ask what the source of the authority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to go into the matter of legislative reorganization is. That clearly comes within the province of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the provision of rule XI, which outlines the function of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the following subjects are considered as within their jurisdiction:

Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

Such committee shall have the duty of—

Receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view of determining its economy and efficiency; and

Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

That is the particular point the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned with and clearly defines the jurisdiction of our Committee on Legislative and Executive Reorganization.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 128) and ask for its immediate consideration:

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1951, the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 323 of the Eighty-first Congress and continued by House Resolution 74 of the Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of the sum made available for conducting such investigation and study during the Eighty-first Congress, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the chairman of such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "$75,000", strike out all down to and including the word "Congress" in line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS OF VETERANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 133) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 93 not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 3, 1951.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNIE L. BOURKE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 138) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Annie L. Bourke, widow of Robert J. Bourke, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Robert J. Bourke.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce the death of a former Member of this body, Charles R. Robertson, of North Dakota. Many Members on the floor today have served with him.

Mr. Robertson was born in Wisconsin in 1889. He was educated in the common schools of Wisconsin and was a graduate of Parker College in Minnesota.

He became identified with the mercantile business and held important positions of trust with business firms at Winnebago, Fergus Falls, St. Paul in Minnesota, and Aberdeen, S. Dak. His first lone venture was the establishing of a ready-to-wear store at Aberdeen and Redfield, S. Dak. Later, his success in business enabled him to operate department stores at Valley City, Wahpeton, Jamestown, and Bismarck.

He was married to Mary Armstrong, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. C. J. Armstrong, of Kansas City, Mo. He was a member of the Presbyterian Church, and a member of the following fraternal orders: Masons, Rotary, Elks, and Eagles. He was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1940. There being a vacancy on the Republican ticket in the fall of 1940, the Republican State executive committee selected Charles Robertson for the vacancy and he was elected to the Seventy-seventh Congress, filling the place occupied so long by William Lemke, who had withdrawn his name on the congressional ticket to run for Senator.

In 1942 Charles Robertson received the endorsement of the Nonpartisan Republicans but was defeated in the primary election by William Lemke.

In 1944, USHER L. BURDICK became a candidate for Senator and Charles Robertson again received the League endorsement, won, and was elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress and reelected to the Eightieth Congress.

Charles Robertson was a most affable and agreeable gentleman and made friends easily. He probably had more personal friends at home and in Washington than anyone who ever represented North Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

He was stricken with a heart attack just prior to his passing and expired in his sleep at Bismarck, N. Dak., Sunday, February 18, 1951.

The State and Nation have lost a valuable citizen and his many friends at home and here in this House will grieve his passing.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the opportunity to join with the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota in paying a tribute to the memory of Charles Robertson. He came to the Seventy-seventh Congress at the same time I came. There developed between us a personal friendship which meant a great deal to me. He was, as the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota has said, one of the kindest and most genuinely sincere men I ever knew.

He was conscientious in the time and effort he gave to the work of his committee, and in the discharge of his responsibilities as a Member of the House of Representatives. It was with a sense of deep grief that I learned of his death, and my most sincere sympathy is extended to his family.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I received word of the sudden and unexpected death of Charles R. Robertson, who was a Member of this body during the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses.

Charlie Robertson was a resident of North Dakota for a good many years. He was an able, ambitious, and prosperous businessman, who established some of the finest clothing stores that we have had in the State, and who at the time of his death, had the outstanding Robertson's store at Bismarck.

Charlie was an ardent and fervent supporter of the American system. He knew that if this country is going to continue its outstanding prosperity and its abundant opportunities for all people, the free-enterprise system would have to be preserved.

Particularly after his membership in Congress, which started in 1941, he was most active in community, State, and National affairs, giving support and encouragement to those ideals of economic order and the relationship and influence that Government should have upon them.

Charlie was able and energetic. He effectively fostered and promoted the objectives that he had in mind. He was a member of Freedom Train Committee of the State of North Dakota. He was North Dakota chairman of the Commission for Economic Development and Citizen's Committee of Hoover Commission. His death is a great loss, not only to his family and many personal friends, but also to the State of North Dakota, and this great Nation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the North Dakota delegation in these ceremonies occasioned by the death of a great American and a warm, personal friend. Charlie Robertson came to the House of Representatives with a fine business experience. He had but one ambition, and that was to serve his day and generation to the best of his ability. He made many warm friends in the House who came to know his great patriotism, his outstanding ability, and his eagerness to serve his country. His untimely death is a great loss to all of us. It is a loss to the State of North Dakota, and to our country. The world is richer for his having lived. To his wife and family we extend our deepest sympathy in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in everything that has been said by my colleagues about our friend, Charlie Robertson. I was very close to Charlie Robertson while he was a Member of Congress. We became well acquainted. I knew the heartbeats in his breast; he was a gentleman and a patriot of the highest order. Charlie Robertson was the kind of man who tried in every way he possibly could to be of benefit to his State and his Nation. I was shocked when I learned that my good friend Charlie Robertson had passed away. I grieve with his good wife and family and his multitude of friends in North Dakota and all over the Nation. Charlie had many friends, and his friends knew and loved him. They knew he lived and worked and carried on in a manner which was pleasing, not only to the people on this earth, but to God in heaven.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the Members of this body who was privileged to serve here with Charlie Robertson, of North Dakota. I can say honestly that this association and fine privilege has made of me a better man.

Charlie Robertson brought to the House of Representatives that degree of competence and understanding typical of the best among this membership. He had proved himself in the field of private endeavor. He was a successful man; he was a man of deep understanding, great wisdom, and capacity. He brought all three to his service here in the House of Representatives. Beyond that, he brought here a deep dedication to principle. Many times do I recall talking to him about troublesome matters that were coming before the House of Representatives. Many times have I heard him say that political consequences mean nothing to me. The guiding principle in all his deliberations was to come up with the right answer. Having once satisfied himself on the correctness of his position, he made that position known without fear or equivocation.

I know of nothing more complimentary that could be said of a Member who has passed from our ranks.

I join with those who have spoken before me in expressing profound sorrow at the passing of our one-time colleague, and in expressing my sympathy to his family and his host of friends.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. There was nothing of sham or pretense in the make-up of Charlie Robertson. He was genuine and sound. He was my friend and I loved him.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee and on one of the subcommittees with Charlie Robertson. I did not know of his death until I came to the floor this morning. I am truly shocked.

He was unquestionably one of the ablest men on our committee. He was a devoted public servant. In addition he was a very affable person. He was every inch a true gentleman.

I share the sorrow of his family and his many friends in this hour of his departure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, few men in this House knew Charlie Robertson better than I did. At the time he served, this country was going through a battle to turn back the tide of communistic fanaticism with which we were then threatened. The Committee on Un-American Activities was attacked by every enemy within our gates. Charlie Robertson was one of our greatest supporters.

He was a great American. He put the welfare of his country above all other considerations.

I wish we had more men like him today.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], one of Charlie Robertson's closest personal friends in and out of Congress.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, Charles Robertson's district adjoined mine. When I first came to Congress he took an interest in my welfare and in my service in this body. I came to know him and have a high regard for him because of the help he rendered me as a new Member of this Congress.

I am glad to have this opportunity today to join with my colleagues and pay my respects to him and the service he rendered this country, the service he rendered his State, and the fellowship and the friends he made in this House.

I also wish to extend my sympathy to his family in their loss at this time.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving with Charles Robertson. I regarded him as one of the soundest men with whom I ever became acquainted in legislative affairs; he was truly a great American.

As my beloved friends, such as he, pass away I think of our great Republic as something that is practically immortal if we perform our duty as he performed his, if we stand by the just principles which we find embodied in our charter of liberties. It is said that the men who worked upon the Parthenon, the most beautiful structure in the world, were so blinded by the dust and confusion of their chiseling of the marble that they never saw even in dimmest outline the beautiful structure they had created. That is so with regard to our great Republic; men come and go, they labor for a while; they adhere to principles; they add to its prestige, its honor, and glory as they should. They pass to the great beyond; other patriotic laborers take their place. None of us will ever see the beauty of the great structure upon which we labor, known as the American Republic.

I join with my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Robertson and the members of her bereaved family.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, remember our former colleague from North Dakota. I hold him in highest respect. He came out of the great West and was so typical of that region. I join with my colleagues from North Dakota in paying tribute to him today. He was a level-headed businessman, wise in counsel, and one of our best Members in any committee work in which he and I were associated.

I extend my sympathy to his family and his friends. I realize that North Dakota has lost a distinguished citizen and the Nation suffers greatly in the loss.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, knew Charles R. Robertson well. We entered the House together as Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress and I was immediately drawn to him because of his friendly smile, his gentlemanly attitude, and his intense desire to be right in the service of our common country.

When I was made chairman of the Treasury-Post Office subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in the Eightieth Congress, I urged the then chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to name Mr. Robertson as another majority member. He did so and I shall always remember Charlie Robertson's devotion to his assignment. "Call on me for any service; I'll work day and night," were his first words as we started hearings in 1947.

This patriotic son of North Dakota, both of whose parents were born in Ayrshire, Scotland, had worked his way up to a position of leadership in the business world. He knew that Lenin had expressed the thought that America would be ruined on the banks of insolvency. We had in the Congress no greater pleader for Federal economies. It was a theme that he continued to stress to the very end.

There was something Lincolnesque in Charlie Robertson's dealings with his fellow man. He could be calm and patient. He could be witty. More than anything else, he was anxious to inflict no wrong—no injury—upon anyone. He had an abiding faith in Almighty God.

I mourn the passing of this fine Christian gentleman and my heart goes out to Mrs. Robertson in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Charles Robertson was a fine, kind man. His service in Congress was of a high order. He was honest, intelligent, and a good legislator. To his family goes my deepest sympathy.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ESTATE OF JAMES PATRICK HACKETT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,285.70 to the estate of James Patrick Hackett and the sum of $4,500 to Charles L. Stover, East Keansburg, N. J. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States and Sgt. William A. McQueen on account of personal injuries, and medical and funeral expenses sustained when they were struck by a United States Army vehicle while they were walking on Route 35, Middletown, N. J., on January 21, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED E. WEBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Fred E. Weber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred E. Weber, Bradley Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., the sum of $4,226. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred E. Weber against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him when the automobile which he was driving on Central Avenue in the borough of Bradley Beach, was in collision with a United States Army truck on January 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alakska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., a corporation of Juneau, Alaska, the sum of $80,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for crushed rock, building materials, and services furnished the United States for use in urgently needed defense projects, including construction of the subport of embarkation, air-landing fields, and so forth, at Juneau, Alaska, and in the vicinity during the period from June 1, 1942, to February 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIM OF ALVIN SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 599) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the jurisdiction conferred upon the United States District Court of the District of Delaware by subsection (b) of section 1346, title 28, United States Code, is hereby extended to a civil action, which may be commenced not later than 1 year after the enactment of this act, asserting any claim or claims of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., against the United States for money damages arising out of property damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.: *Provided*, That the exception set forth in section 2680 (a), title 28, United States Code, shall not apply to the action authorized under this act. Except as otherwise provided in this act, all provisions of law applicable in and to such subsection and applicable to judgments therein and appeals therefrom, are hereby made equally applicable in respect of the civil action authorized by this act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 2, line 4, after the word "Delaware", strike out the colon, insert a period and strike out: "*Provided*, That the exception set forth in section 2680 (a), title 28, United States Code, shall not apply to the action authorized under this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 613) for the relief of John P. Hayes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $933.89. Such sum represents a shortage at the Albany post office due to the embezzlement of postal funds by a former clerk in the money-order section of that post office who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such embezzlement. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John P. Hayes in the sum of $933.89.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN THOMAS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 638) for the relief of Warren Thomas and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following claimants the sum specified with respect to such claimant in full settlement of all claims of such claimant against the United States for the damage indicated in his case resulting from a collision involving the automobile in which such claimants were riding and a United States Army truck (operated by a private who was using such truck without authority and not in line of duty) on or about February 1, 1946, on Anaheim Street near the intersection of such street and Santa Fe Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.:

(1) Warren Thomas, Long Beach, Calif., for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings, the sum of $5,582.67;

(2) Willie Thomas, Long Beach, Calif., for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings, the sum of $939.73;

(3) Jesse R. Reeves, Long Beach, Calif., for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings, and damage to his automobile, the sum of $971.50; and

(4) Fred S. Moseley, Long Beach, Calif., for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, loss of earnings, and damage to his automobile, the sum of $875.63.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "$5,582.67" and insert "$1,582.67."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "$939.73" and insert "$616.96."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "$971.50" and insert "$621.50."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "$875.63" and insert "$332.50."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF LOURDINE LIVERMORE AND THE ESTATE OF DOROTHY E. DOUGLAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 647) for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Lourdine Livermore, of Long Beach, Calif., and to pay the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas, of Long Beach, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Lourdine Livermore and Dorothy E. Douglas sustained as a result of being shot by Lt. Beauford G. Swancutt of the United States Army, on March 5, 1944, at Camp Anza, Riverside, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,701.62."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,499."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 680) for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California the sum of $478.13. Such sum represents the total amount paid by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as follows:

(1) To Allen D. Cameron, California, and Earle P. Schouten, California, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on February 3, 1939, when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with a truck operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. At the time of such accident, the said Allen D. Cameron and Earle P. Schouten were employees of the San Rafael Military Academy, San Rafael, Calif., and the sum of $382.10 was paid to them by the said State compensation insurance fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy with the said San Rafael Military Academy;

(2) To Officer Everett Ingram, of the California Highway Patrol, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on August 25, 1941, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, with a truck operated in the service of the United States Army, and the sum of $81.78 was paid to him by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy; and

(3) To the State department of motor vehicles for damage to the motorcycle on which Officer Ingram was riding, the sum of $14.25: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALICE N. KOZMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 706) for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma, of Millfield, Ohio, for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army truck near Gulfport, Miss., on July 12, 1944.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. WULF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 712) for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force, of 61 Maxwell Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., such sum as certified by the Department of the Army, which has been deducted from his salary, and it is hereby authorized and directed that the Secretary of the Army credit the account of the said Charles W. Wulf with such balance as is alleged to be due by him, in connection with certain shortages, due to the misappropriation of funds by subordinates, for which he is held accountable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEERLESS OIL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 721) for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Peerless Oil Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $2,320.03. Such sum is claimed by such corporation to be equitably due and payable to it by reason of an increase in the price of oil sold by it from April to June 1942, to the Department of War under authority of Office of Price Administration amendments 4 and 10 to Revised Price Schedule No. 88. Such increase was incorporated by subsequent amendment into contract Tps 45255 for the purchase of such oil as aforesaid. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims under such contract. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLO DE LUCA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 723) for the relief of Carlo de Luca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the bars or defenses of res judicata, lapse of time, laches, or any settlement or adjustment heretofore made, the claim of Carlo de Luca arising out of an error alleged to have been made by the Court of Claims in computing the amount of damages awarded him in a judgment rendered on December 7, 1936. The court shall have such jurisdiction if suit is instituted within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIA BUSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 727) for the relief of Julia Busch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Julia Busch, of Little Falls, N. Y., the proceeds of National Service Life Insurance Policy No. N-14184877, issued to Clifford J. MerCarter, late private, Company H, Two Hundred and Seventy-Third Infantry, United States Army, who was killed in action in Italy, on February 11, 1944. Although the said Julia Busch was designated by the insured as beneficiary of such policy, her claim for payment thereunder was disallowed by the Veterans' Administration on the ground that she did not stand in loco parentis to the insured within the meaning of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, because such relationship did not have its conception during the minority of the insured.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS A. TRULOVE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif., are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any funds over and above the amount of money collected from Andrew O. Benson, Jr., or his sureties because of his embezzlements of Government funds while a clerk in the Inglewood, Calif., post office. The sureties of the said postmaster and assistant postmaster are released from any liability to refund to the United States the whole or any part of the amount of the embezzlements not collected from Andrew O. Benson, Jr., or his sureties and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of the postmaster with this sum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIS A. BAKKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Harris A. Bakken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harris A. Bakken, of Wilmington, Calif., formerly sales officer at Vancouver Barracks, Wash., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $3,692.80. Such sum represents the amount for which he is accountable because of a shortage in his accounts. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of the said Harris A. Bakken in the sum of $3,692.80.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN BARREL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 774) for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $29,292.10 to the American Barrel Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the purchase of surplus steel drums from the Department of State, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, under contracts numbered W-ANL (ETO-II) 3831 and W-ANL (ETO-II) 4125, dated October 30, 1947, and February 12, 1948. Such reimbursement is due to erroneous representations made that the said steel drums were in usable condition and it was determined that they were worthless: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARTHA W. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 848) for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Martha W. Johnson, of Celeron, N. Y., the sum of $200. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Martha W. Johnson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her, on February 16, 1946, when she fell to the street while leaving the United States post office at Jamestown, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$200" and insert "$88."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROSE A. MONGRAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain, Lowell, Mass., the sum of $3,940.05. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on June 15, 1944, when she slipped and fell on the wet floor of the lobby of the main post office building in Lowell, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nowithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,940.05" and insert "$2,540.05."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS R. CHADBOURNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis R. Chadbourne, of Medford, Mass., the sum of $8,923.92. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Louis R. Chadbourne against the United States for additional pay and allowances for the period between November 19, 1945, the date of his release from active duty as lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, and March 1, 1949, the date as of which he was transferred to the retired list pursuant to the finding of a naval retiring board that his physical disability was service incurred: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "United States", strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "incurred" in line 3, page 2, and insert "as retroactive retirement pay from March 1, 1949, to the date of his release from active duty September 19, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESTON L. WATSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine on the merits, and to render in accordance therewith judgment upon the claim with such interest as the court may determine, of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods, chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, against the United States for alleged loss and damages suffered by Robert A. Watson arising out of certain transactions between said Robert A Watson and the Department of Justice of the United States, involving the purchase and importation of sugar from the Republic of Argentina in June 1920, and the alleged neglect, refusal, and failure of the Department of Justice to provide for the distribution thereof in accordance with the terms of a written agreement between claimant's decedent and said Department. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the defense of lack of authority of the Department of Justice or its officers in making said agreement and the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, right, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, and not otherwise to effect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. DRINKWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,325 to William J. Drinkwine, of 5029 Seventh Avenue, Kenosha, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of wages and expenses resulting from being unjustly suspended from the Kenosha, Wis., post office for violation of the Hatch Act in June 1939 and restored to duty July 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,325" and insert "$2,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHELBY SHOE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $84,498.98 to the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained as a result of contract numbered W 19-074qm-4627, dated May 21, 1946, with the Procurement Division of the Department of the Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUCE M. STERN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1239) for the relief of Bruce M. Stern.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $660.48 to Bruce M. Stern, of 391 North San Pedro Street, San Jose, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained in connection with the purchase of surplus steel lockers from the War Department (now Department of the Army) under sales contract No. W-04-393 (AAVI) S-211, dated December 23, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LA FAYETTE BREWERY, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1249) for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the La Fayette Brewery, Inc., of La Fayette, Ind., the sum of $5,460, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for a refund of the value of 63 canceled internal revenue malt liquor stamps valued at $4,155, and of 24 uncanceled internal revenue malt liquor stamps valued at $1,295 burglarized from the safe of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc., of La Fayette, Ind., January 28, 1944, which sum has heretofore been paid to the United States: *Provided*, That the La Fayette Brewery, Inc., shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount paid for such stamps, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the stamps hereinbefore described: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. FRED A. FLETCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1449) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher, of Forks, Wash., the sum of $2,650.15, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by them in connection with the eminent-domain proceedings instituted in 1940 by the United States for the purpose of acquiring their property, described in such proceeding as tract J-200, together with other parcels of land, for the Olympic public works project (P. W. A. 723 A and B); the United States having dismissed such tract from such proceedings after a verdict had been rendered in favor of the said Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher in the amount of $12,266.15.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE LISITANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of Josephine Lisitano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Josephine Lisitano, of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death and conscious suffering of her husband, Charles Lisitano, of Boston, Mass., resulting from wounds inflicted upon Charles Lisitano, deceased, by a bullet fired from a service pistol by an enlisted member of the naval forces of the United States at Braintree, Mass., on April 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1473) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their father, Commander Albert Moritz, United States Navy, retired, who died as the result of injuries sustained in a fall at the Brooklyn naval hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., on January 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SONOMA COUNTY FARMERS' MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1437) for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,534, to The Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Santa Rosa, Calif., in full settlement of claim against the United States, which sum represents the total amount paid by The Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co. to Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall on account of damage to their dwelling located at 1233 Sunset Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif., caused by United States Navy airplane, bureau number 06307, on October 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. J. CROZAT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1566) for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood-donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,026.38."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERSEAS NAVIGATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1580) for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Overseas Navigation Corp. of New York, N. Y., the sum of $12,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States based on the fact that a deposit of $12,500 made by such corporation, in connection with a bid which it submitted to the United States Maritime Commission in 1946 for the purchase of the coastal tanker *Blue Sonoco*, was declared forfeit on March 17, 1947, after such corporation, upon ascertaining certain facts as to the condition of the vessel not disclosed by the offer of the Commission, failed to take delivery: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "corporation", strike out "upon ascertaining certain facts as to the condition of the vessel not disclosed by the offer of the Commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS A. GUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Francis A. Gunn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Francis A. Gunn, of South Weymouth, Mass., the sum of $6,984.82. Such sum represents reimbursement for actual additional costs incurred by the said Francis A. Gunn in constructing a building to be used as quarters by the South Weymouth branch of the Boston post office, such additional costs being caused by delay in the granting of the Civilian Production Administration authorization necessary for such construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD WOOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Edward Woolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward Woolf, Boston, Mass., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward Woolf against the United States arising out of his being struck, on November 9, 1942, on Brattle Street in Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Woolf", insert "451 Shawmut Avenue."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EARL L. DOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Earl L. Doss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Earl L. Doss, postal money order clerk in the United States Post Office at Savannah, Ga., the sum of $145.56. The payment of such sum shall be in reimbursement for the payment of an equal amount by the said Earl L. Doss to the Post Office Department on account of the payment, without fault on his part, of two forged post-office money orders Nos. 194242 and 194243, issued at Estill, S. C., August 30, 1947, in the total amount of $145.56.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

N. H. KELLEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1596) for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1944 of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar, the elections of said N. H. Kelley and Clyde D. Farquhar, sole stockholders of Baker, Kelley & MacLaughlin, Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on December 29, 1944, to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, such benefits having been denied because the mailing of such election was delayed, without negligence or fault on the part of such stockholders, until the thirty-first day following the adoption of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. MARCIANO O. GARCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1682) for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Marciano O. Garces, of Cebu City, Republic of the Philippines, the sum of $810, in full settlement of all claims against the United States in reimbursement of a like sum of money advanced by him on May 21, 1942, to an officer of the United States Army for the purpose of hiring laborers to bring food to a Japanese prison camp for the use of American and Filipino prisoners of war held therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY C. GOAKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1822) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry C. Goakes, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $3,194.61. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry C. Goakes against the United States arising out of the loss of personal property owned by him when the vessel *Rio de la Plata* sank off the coast of Mexico in August 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount ap-

propriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM PATTERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1845) for the relief of Sam Patterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Patterson, Pidcoke Route, Gatesville, Tex., the sum of $300. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sam Patterson against the United States for the damage of real property and loss of personal property as a result of the negligence of two soldiers driving an Army vehicle which ran off the road and damaged a section of fence allowing a number of sheep to escape, of which 22 were never recovered, on or about July 4, 1946. This claim does not come within the purview of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 as the soldiers were not acting within the scope of their employment.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILCOX ELECTRIC CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wilcox Electric Co., Inc., of Kansas City, Mo., the sum of $104,121.52. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims under War Department Contract No. W-36-039-sc-3765, dated November 13, 1943, as amended, which claims are based upon additional costs incurred as the result of changes in packing requirements for military communication equipment furnished under terms of said contract. No part of the amount appropriated in this act, in excess of 10 percent thereof, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. OKSANA STEPANOVNA KASENKINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 622) for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina, who entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on June 15, 1946, for a temporary period, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of such date, upon the payment by her of the head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHISAKO SHIMIZU SHELDAHL ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 624) for the relief of Mrs. Chisako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and also the provisions of the National Security Act, which exclude from the United States persons ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Chisako Shimizu Sheldahl and Ryoichi Shimizu Sheldahl, Japanese wife and minor son, respectively, of Duane C. Sheldahl, a United States citizen and honorably discharged World War II veteran now reenlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Chisako Shimizu, the Japanese fiancée of Duane C. Sheldahl, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and her son, Ryoichi Shimizu, and that the said Chisako Shimizu and Ryoichi Shimizu shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chisako Shimizu is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Duane C. Sheldahl, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chisako Shimizu and Ryoichi Shimizu, they shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155, 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chisako Shimizu, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chisako Shimizu and her son, Ryoichi Shimizu, as of the date of the payment of them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chisako Shimizu and Ryoichi Shimizu."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILDEGARD DETTLING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hildegard Dettling may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hildegard Dettling is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Corp. Murphy Boggs, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Army, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Dettling she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Dettling the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hildegard Dettling as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall be held to be applicable to Judith Ingeborg Dettling, minor child of Corp. Murphy Boggs, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hildegard Dettling, the German fiancée of Corp. Murphy Boggs, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Army, and her daughter, Judith Ingeborg Dettling, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hildegard Dettling is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Corp. Murphy Boggs, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Dettling, and her daughter, they shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Dettling and her daughter, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hildegard Dettling and her daughter as of the date of the payment of them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PRIVATE LAW 814, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 676) to amend Private Law 814 of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 401 (C) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801 (C)) (relating to loss of nationality through voting in a political election in a foreign state), Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene, of Brunswick, Maine, shall not be deemed to have lost her American citizenship by virtue of having voted in elections held in Germany under the auspices of the United States military government in 1946 with respect to the adoption of the New Hessian Constitution.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 3, after the words "section 401", strike out "(C)" and substitute in lieu thereof "(e)."

On line 5, after the words "sec. 801", strike out "(C)" and substitute in lieu thereof "(e)."

On line 11, change the word "New" to read "new."

Add a new section 2, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Private Law 814 of the Eighty-first Congress, enacted August 14, 1950, is hereby repealed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES A. G. MARTINDALE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of James A. G. Martindale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), James A. G. Martindale, a native of Great Britain and a resident of Canada, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Great Britain.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 4, after the date "1917", insert ", as amended."

On line 7, after the word "found", insert "to be."

Strike out section 2 of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AENNY BLANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 715) for the relief of Aenny Blank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, a quota immigration visa shall be issued upon application heretofore filed by Aenny Blank, of Bavaria, Germany, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of such visa the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Germany for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Aenny Blank, who was born in Turkey of German parents, shall be held and considered to have been born in Germany and the visa application of the above-named Aenny Blank shall be deemed to have been filed under the German quota as of October 1, 1948."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 and section 18 of the Immigration Act of 1917, the aliens, Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli, upon payment by them of the required head taxes, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States at the port of New York as of the date of the enactment of this act, if they are not inadmissible on any grounds other than the fact that Nicoletta Pontrelli is feeble-minded and Guilia Pontrelli is an accompanying alien whose protection or guardianship is required by the feeble-minded alien.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head taxes, notwithstanding the provisions of the first category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended, insofar as it relates to the alien, Nicoletta Pontrelli."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLOS SANCHEZ PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 795) for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Carlos Sanchez Perez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry into the United States as a temporary visitor. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduce one number from the quota for Spain for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGOT KAZERSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 859) for the admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Margot Kazerski, 13 Karls Platz, Ludwigsburg, Germany, wife of serviceman Master Sgt. Frank Kazerski, 47 Sunnyside Avenue, Arlington, Mass., may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LENA VALSAMIS AND LUCY BALOSA VALSAMIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of

their last entry into the United States upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the quota for Egypt and one number from the quota for Greece for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the quota for Egypt and one number from the quota for Greece for the first year that such quotas are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATHINA MARY ONASSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Athina Mary Onassis, a native and citizen of England, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 27, 1942.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY VALSAMIS DENDRAMIS AND VASSILI G. DENDRAMIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 891) for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of May 25, 1946, the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the quota for Egypt and one number from the quota for Greece for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUNTER ARNO THELEMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Gunter Arno Thelemann shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Arno R. Thelemann, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, after the comma, strike out "the minor child."

Line 6, after "alien", insert the word "minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VERA RAUPE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vera Raupe (formerly Vera Kohoutek), of Dallas, Tex., who entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on February 6, 1948, as a temporary visitor, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Czechoslovakia for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vera Raupe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SOLVEIG NORMANSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 966) for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding her conviction for wartime activities, Mrs. Solveig Normanson, a citizen of Norway who is the spouse of Mr. Christian Normanson, of Goldfield, Iowa, shall be held and considered to be admissible to the United States as a nonquota immigrant if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "laws", insert: "and the provisions of section 1 (2) (c) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended, and section 305 (a) (3) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (64 Stat. 987; 8 U. S. C. 137, 705), shall not be held to be applicable to Mrs. Solveig Normanson."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY LEONARD HOFFMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1134) for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the admission for temporary residence of Henry Leonard Hoffmann, a native of Saar, Germany, who entered the United States at the port of New York, N. Y., on March 17, 1939, as a visitor under section 3, paragraph 2, of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, as amended), shall be taken, deemed, and regarded as an entry into the United States for permanent residence under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That upon approval of his admission into this country for permanent residence as herein proposed, the applicant named herein shall be permitted to file his petition for naturalization immediately to become an American citizen and shall in due course be admitted as a citizen of the United States by the court if otherwise found qualified: *Provided further*, That upon approval of this bill one number shall be deducted from the first available quota for Germany.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Henry Leonard Hoffman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 17, 1939."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO PUCCI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favette, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruni Sarzanini, and Allesandro Costa.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LUM YING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Lum Ying.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lum Ying, of Battle Creek, Mich., shall be held to have been lawfully admitted to the United States under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 204), on January 22, 1950, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lum Ying shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZYGMUNT PAKULA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1458) for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta), now residing in Cambridge, Mass. Hereafter, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 24, 1945, at the port of Boston.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Zygmunt Pakula (also known at Pakuta), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA GEERTRIUDE MULDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Maria Geertriude Mulders, of Crescent City, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of June 10, 1947.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Netherlands.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Geertriude Mulders shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD SPIELMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1840) for the relief of Bernard Spielmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Bernard Spielmann shall be deemed to have been born in Ecuador.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENA JANGE CHINN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Helena Jange Chinn (nee Helena Toy Jange), the wife of Harold Chinn, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Helena Jange Chinn under this act upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Helena Jange Chinn may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIROCOR HALADJIAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1971) for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State and the Attorney General be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to provide for the admission to the United States for permanent residence of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian, natives and citizens of Turkey, residing in France.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the quota for Turkey for the first year that such quota number is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of section 2 (a) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, and regulations made thereunder, Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, shall be issued visas on applications heretofore registered in 1923."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-6698176, Domanska, Sister Stanislawa Hieronima.

A-6698140, Dorda, Sister Sofia Dominika.

A-6868680, Achtman, Sala Szmulewicz.

A-6604456, Adam, Sister Columba Iren.

A-6379347, Berkowicz, Chaim.

A-6886832, Blumsztajn, Szymon, or Simon Blumstein.

A-6681810, Borger, Jakub.

A-6604457, Brosz, Sister Clare Violete Ibolya.
A-6703322, Byk, Abram Mojsze.
A-6703302, Klor, Elia-Ber.
A-6694202, Szczytnicki, Josef.
A-6555836, Perkowski, Srul.
A-6534355, Kagan, Mejer.
A-6545331, Krupnik, Abram Girsz.
A-6500157, Abramczyk, Jankiel.
A-6499311, Chejfec, Michel Aron.
A-6674496, Demenyi, Beno.
A-6674497, Demenyi, Margit Kelemen.
A-6886853, Fink, Chaim Burech.
A-6691567, Friedel, Estera Szmulewicz.
A-6503955, Friedel, Mordka.
A-6704688, Gasiorek, Helena (Sister Mary Corinne).
A-68113694, Gittelman, David.
A-6813697, Gittelman, Ida or Eichenblatt (nee Hinda Fliker).
A-6813695, Gittelman, Larry or Leiser.
A-6813696, Gittelman, Florence or Fania.
A-6704685, Gomulka, Aniela (Sister Marcita Clarine).
A-6527578, Grynberg, Jankiel Judko.
A-6683219, Grynszpan, Moszek Abram.
A-6984638, Grynszpan, E.ka.
A-6383342, Krupenia Lejwik.
A-6566306, Laub, Salomea.
A-6566307, Laub, Antonina Franciszka.
A-6684662, Lifszyc, Menahem or Martin Lifshitz.
A-6521647, Manson, Benjamin.
A-6687979, Maszyc, Dawid.
A-6676369, Maszyc, Rachela.
A-6752126, Merfeld, Necha Riwka.
A-6751218, Merfeld, Gershon.
A-6752123, Merfeld, Clara.
A-6704673, Nowicka, Jadwiga.
A-6704646, Ligaj, Maria.
A-6702170, Olbrycht, Stanislawa.
A-6704259, Szubert, Czeslawa.
A-6459147, Peker, Berko.
A-6459148, Peker, Sara (nee Mazurek).
A-6496258, Pekier, Mojaze Chaim.
A-6483085, Pekier, Rywa.
A-6683578, Rosen, Henryk.
A-6984449, Rosen, Josepha.
A-6612600, Rotkin, Lejb.
A-6616880, Rotkin, Sofia.
A-6718762, Rudnicki, David.
A-7046290, Rudnicki, Anna.
A-6344908, Rydz, Zygmunt Stanislaus.
A-6704263, Rygiel, Zofia (Sister Mercita Speciosa).
A-6538017, Schwanenfeld, Berl.
A-6538015, Orbach, Chaskel.
A-6538016, Orbach, Rosa.
A-6538018, Yoffee, Chana Schwanenfeld.
A-6658969, Orbach, Alexander.
A-6538014, Orbach, Chana.
A-6538013, Orbach, Efroim.
A-6090734, Sokalski, Wojciech.
A-6859161, Stopnicki, Abraham.
A-6704258, Syberyjska, Honorata (known as Sister Consolatia).
A-6638866, Szwarzberg, Samuel or Szmul.
A-6631510, Szwarzberg, Sara (nee Bernstein).
A-6985767, Turai, Sister Anna.
A-6601942, Wagner, Maria Beatrix.
A-6567557, Wajntraub, Moszek Hirsz.
A-6575209, Wenger, Morduch.
A-6504797, Wenger, Cyra.
A-6704221, Weselak, Janina.
A-6704229, Tumanow, Weronika.
A-6704255, Skarzenska, Maria Ludwika or Marie Ludwika.
A-6704226, Zaleska, Anna.
A-6704653, Novicka, Jozefa Theresa.
A-6704091, Uruska, Anna.
A-6704645, Lobuczek, Janina or Janina Mary Lobuczek.
A-6704691, Kreczmanska, Jadwiga.
A-6704235, Bilanska, Aniela.
A-6704267, Respondowska, Eulalia.
A-6856818, Zoliman, Leopold.
A-6991592, Zsiros, Jozsef or Joseph Zsiros.
A-6991593, Zsiros, Irene.
A-6991594, Zsiros, Sandor (Alexander).
A-6286548, Polodna, Joseph Vladimir.
A-6997881, Visoianu, Constantine Ion.
A-6751265, Grabinska, Wanda Wojtowicz or Wanda Wojtowicz.
A-6602994, Glogowska, Leokadia (nee Buttner).
A-6854461, Glokowska, Margaret Maria.
A-6856836, Glogowska, Maria Ludwika (nee Horodecka).
A-6905373, Glogowski, Tadeusz.
A-7125357, Markovits, Jeno.
A-7364828, Bilmanis, Halina.
A-6427863, Abu-Lughod, Ahmad Amin Ali.
A-6395529, Cretzianu, Alexandre.
A-6341475, Kowalski, Wincenty.
A-6742709, Krustev, Dimitr Iliev.
A-7243139, Siedlewski, Jan Karszo.
A-6652497, Tawil, Fuad, or Fouad Mousa Tawil.
A-6730648, Tse-Chiang, Mei.
A-6679689, Boks, Tamara.
A-6795026, Fattal, Akram Haron.
A-6991778, Korbonski, Stefan.
A-6991779, Korbonska, Zofia (nee Ristau).
A-7209591, Varga, Bela.
A-6903246, Godina, Josef (Joseph).
A-6864683, Cenkner, Stefan John.

REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTIES TO PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 31) for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization the sum of $120,000, paid by the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization to the United States as duties on property brought into the United States for sale to provide funds for the rehabilitation and resettlement of victims of German action pursuant to the agreement entered into on June 14, 1946, by the Government of the United States with the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS J. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 661) for the relief of Thomas J. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in th Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas J. Smith, of Beaver Dam, Va., the sum of $3,798.82, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of salary, loss of annual leave and attorneys' fees, all caused by his having been separated without pay from the employment of the Public Housing Administration for the period from July 25, 1947, to March 1, 1948, which separation was unjustified and unwarranted as evidenced by the findings of the Civil Service Commission in their opinion dated February 5, 1948, directing his reinstatement: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1 line 6, strike out "$3,798.82" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,041.95."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "and attorneys' fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY MANIOUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1966) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Dorothy Manious, Nebraska City, Nebr., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earnings sustained by her as the result of an accident involving an Army truck, which occurred in Munich, Germany, on January 31, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH DUNSMORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph Dunsmore, of Knoxville, Tenn., the sum of $1,387. Such sum represents currency belonging to the said Ralph Dunsmore which was entirely destroyed when the boat in which he was a passenger exploded and burned: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALDINE L. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor, of St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States (1) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Thomas Clayton Smith when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle at St. Paul, Minn., in 1943, and (2) for reimbursement of hospital and medical expenses incurred by reason of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINENTAL INSURANCE CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2110) for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,000 to the Continental Insurance Co., to pay the sum of $18,000 to Federal Insurance Co., and to pay the sum of $12,500 to National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained to the residence of Mrs. Ruth T. Weeks, of New Canaan, Conn., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army airplane of the Connecticut Interceptor Command which struck the dwelling on October 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ALICE FLOYD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2205) for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Alice Floyd, of Woodruff, S. C., former teacher in the Woodruff Public Schools, the sum of $10,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Alice Floyd against the United States for severe and permanent personal injuries and for continuing medical and hospital expenses arising out of an automobile accident in which she was involved on October 11, 1940, while she was traveling from Woodruff to Spartanburg, S. C., to receive instructions for conducting registrations under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The State of South Carolina paid the salary and medical and hospital expenses of the said Mary Alice Floyd from October 1940 until June 1945 but thereafter discontinued such payments on the ground that the said Mary Alice Floyd was acting for the Federal Government when injured: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY JANE SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2276) for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Jane Sherman, of Northbrook, Ill., the sum of $35,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Jane Sherman against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of a collision on May 18, 1943, involving the automobile she was driving, a tractor and trailer owned by the Kool-Rite Sales Co., Chicago, Ill., and a United States Army truck at the intersection of Waukegan Road and Shermer Avenue, Northbrook, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$3,041.31."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON CRUDGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 59) for the relief of Vernon Crudge.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vernon Crudge, who was born in China of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CORAL E. ALLDRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 664) for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt, Richmond, Va., who was admitted to the United States in September 1946 for a temporary period as a nonquota immigrant student, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her admission to the United States for such temporary period. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Australia for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISA MONTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 824) for the relief of Luisa Monti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luisa Monti, who entered the United States for a temporary stay and is now residing in Los Angeles, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such entry. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luisa Monti shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted

to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHU BUD YICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 963) for the relief of Chu Bud Yick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chu Bud Yick, as of December 7, 1949, the date on which he last entered the United States, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year that such quota numbers are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chu Bud Yick shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARO TAKARA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Taro Takara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion from the United States of persons of races ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to the alien Taro Takara, minor child of the Japanese race residing on Okinawa Island, and the said Taro Takara shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Ray L. Begeman, first lieutenant, United States Air Force, and his wife, Mrs. Bette L. Begeman, both United States citizens residing in San Antonio, Tex.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "and", insert "for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended."

Page 2, at the beginning of the line 1, insert the word "alien."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD GREGORY RUNDLE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1165) for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 316 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1146; 8 U. S. C. 716) shall not be held to apply to Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle, adopted children of Walter G. and Valiquette Rundle, United States citizens, and said children may be naturalized after completion of 5 months' continuous residence in the United States upon compliance with all of the other provisions of section 316 of said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELENA ERBEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Elena Erbez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elena Erbez shall be considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Priester, United States citizens.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Elena Erbez, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Priester, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND HER DAUGHTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Louise Leitzinger, the fiancée of James E. Shelly, a United States citizen and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and her daughter, Sandra Mary Lou Leitzinger, may be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Louise Leitzinger is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said James E. Shelly and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Louise Leitzinger and her daughter, Sandra Mary Lou Leitzinger, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 155, 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Louise Leitzinger, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Louise Leitzinger and her daughter, Sandra Mary Lou Leitzinger, as of the date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, now a patient at the Birmingham Veterans Facility, Van Nuys, Calif., shall be held to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry into the United States upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "his entry into the United States" and insert "the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOOK KAT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of Sook Kat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Sook Kat, minor Chinese orphan residing in Hong Kong, China, shall be held and considered to be the alien natural-born daughter of Huie Mon, of Minneapolis, Minn., a natural-born United States citizen, and the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall apply to the said Sook Kat.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, universal military training should be enacted into law at the earliest practicable moment in view of the critical situation which our country faces.

To require by law that the flower of our youth should devote from 22 to 24 months of their time to the service of their country is most distressing. It is not at all palatable to many of these young men, as well as to members of their families. Many fathers and mothers, who have worked tirelessly for several years to offer opportunities to their sons, dread the thought of these boys having to serve in the Armed Forces as a result of a peacetime draft. Plans have been made in many instances for the son to carry on the business of farming operations which his father has built through many years of toil and hard work.

The question comes down to this: Is it necessary for the protection of America to invoke such a far-reaching proposal as is involved in a universal military training program? When an adequate supply of manpower is made available through the medium of universal military training, there is a good chance of avoiding world war III. Our allies also should build what General Eisenhower called a wall of peace. The Soviet military power has been strengthened considerably in recent months. There is no United States monopoly on the atomic bomb. Satellites of the Soviet Union have shown a readiness to acquire new territory by aggressive action through invasion of a neighboring country. General Eisenhower states that it is necessary for America to stand by in a partially mobilized state for a number of years. If this be true, it is most essential that a long-time plan of universal military training be devised.

The universal military training program should not be confused with an extension of the Selective Service Act by mobilizing the manpower of the country on a total basis. Should we become engaged in a world war III, that is an entirely different matter. In discussing the passage of the universal military training legislation, it involves partial mobilization for a long-drawn-out time of international unrest, strain, and stress. The danger of America becoming involved in a global war is such a serious matter that our young men should have the proper military training for their own protection, as well as to provide adequate defense for the Nation. There will be a feeling of confusion and uncertainty in many families throughout America until such time as this problem is settled by both Houses of Congress. When the system begins fully to work, every young man on reaching his eighteenth birthday, or on finishing high school, whichever is later, should expect to enter the service of his country. Under the present system of selective service, a young man who has attained the draft-eligible age lives in uncertainty from mail to mail. This unrest exists in college, business, and industry. Universal military training would distribute the responsibility among all young men of America. The inductee realizes in the beginning his service is for a definite length of time. This universal military training service would come right after the completion of his high-school courses and prior to his entrance into college or business.

To look forward to a universal military training program may be a bitter pill to swallow. There is, however, an urgent need to build up over a long period of years a reservoir of trained manpower. It is the contention of those of us who support universal military training that for this country to provide such a force of trained personnel may be a decisive factor in avoiding an all-out war.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday, February 27, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many of the eastern peoples have always believed in the teaching of reincarnation, which affirms that men live more than one life here on earth, and that the events and destiny of the next life are conditioned by the behavior and events in former lives. In other words, one might think of an entire lifetime as a day in school, and that each life might inculcate some lesson, good or evil, in the age-old quest of the human pilgrim for his Holy Grail.

Implicit in this idea, of course, would be its natural corollary, that if one lived enough lives, he would eventually graduate with the rank of master. Having attained this high spiritual goal, he would then go forth into the world of men to teach and lead his brethren in the world, so that those who would be capable of accepting his teaching would in their turn in time attain a similar mastership.

Naturally men differ, as do stars in their magnitude and capabilities. One may become a great poet, a great writer, a Beethoven in the realm of music, a Copernicus in astronomy, an Einstein in physics, an Osler in medicine, an Edison in research. Or he might be a great leader of men, capable of leading a trusting people in a long struggle to win their liberty from their oppressors, and finally establish them under the aegis of a great constitution.

Grateful peoples have not always been so peculiarly blessed as we are by being able to preserve the mementos of the founder of their country as you have here in Washington. The destruction of wars, the ravages of time, and even the human element of neglect have frequently effaced the physical evidences of the greatness of the progenitors of a nation.

And let me say right here that to me the important thing in these physical reminder of the great is the place rather than the thing. Let me illustrate what I mean. Have you ever gone into some old church, within which the devotional thoughts of thousands of simple worshippers have risen to the heavenly throne for scores or perhaps hundreds of years? The very air is redolent with the sacred aura of prayer, even as the sacred incense clouds the altars of Buddha in some eastern temple.

Doubtless this was the true meaning of the holy of holies of the Temple of Solomon. The solemn and trembling thoughts of the blood-washed high priest as he walked into the most holy place with slow and stately tread, carrying with him the penitent prayers of the worshipping multitude without, perhaps constituted the real flame of the Shekina between the extended wings of the cherubim.

During my first visit to Alexandria in 1934, when I visited the sacred lodge room where George Washington had presided as master, the experience moved me more deeply than anything else before or since. I could envisage the presence of that great man and great Mason presiding in the east over his lodge, calling them from work to prayer. I could almost hear the sound of the gavel as he proclaimed order after order of business completed.

I am not finding fault with the removal of those sacred relics to the new Washington Memorial. But the thought has occurred to me what a grand thing it would have been if it had been possible to move the building, or at least the lodge room, bodily as well as the furniture of the lodge. When I saw those Masonically priceless mementos, I missed the remembrance of the very presence of George Washington within his own lodge room as I had experienced it in his old lodge.

Students of comparative religion find much to interest them in the great world religions of the past. Sometimes the ideas inculcated in these old philosophies strike out with peculiar force, and they seem to be very apt in explaining many modern things. I am mindful of the old Chinese religious system of Confucius, taught 500 years before the Christian era.

Implicit in that body of thought is the idea of "the perfect man," which means that to be a truly religious man one must also be a perfect gentleman, a perfect man of the world. He must not only be a gentleman; he must be a polished gentleman. In fact, the whole training received by a Chinese of the old school was to enable him to become such a polished man of the world, courteous, urbane, mindful of his elders, self-effacing, and thinking much of the well-being of those with whom he was brought into contact.

George Washington was a Christian gentleman; his name on the pew in Christ Church would indicate that. But his urbanity, his hospitality, and extreme sociability make me think he would have been a perfect disciple of Confucius. Washington, the perfect gentleman, without stain and without reproach.

There are two men of this time who impress me as standing head and shoulders above their fellows: Washington and Franklin. Washington was the peerless leader, the man of action, the great American Fabius. Franklin was the

thinker, the philosopher, with a most tremendous capacity in understanding men, and sometimes women. He was to provide the philosophic background for the Revolution: Washington was to execute the great undertaking. Such plays are rarely carried to completion through the efforts of one man alone.

Another thing also impresses me in a study of the life of Washington. By birth, and perhaps inclination he was an aristocrat. His fortunes lay more securely with those of the rest of the landed gentry in Virginia. He was flesh of their flesh. It is thinkable that if he had cast his lot with the Tories of those days, and there were many of them, we might still be an appendage of the British crown. One must think that his constant familiarity with the forest in his early surveying days, his contacts with the simple trappers and homesteaders of what was then the West, must have imbued him with the spirit of freedom, and that he was thus taught that this marvelous land had little in common with the stuffed shirts of the Georgian system in England.

Certain it is that Washington became closely acquainted with the forests. He lived in God's temple, and slept beneath its architraves. The trees whispered to him the future message of freedom, and the natural yearning of the human soul to be the master of its own fate.

My work has brought me much in contact with the Forest Service men of the West. I think they are the finest body of men to be found anywhere in the world. They have learned nobility of soul from the forest giants, they have grasped the lesson of cooperative democracy from the growing things in the woods. They have learned they must cooperate with their fellow men in the forests to preserve their existence. They must share the forest cabin. They must preserve the sanctity of the blazed trail, and they must respect each other's marks if they would live. I can understand well the greatness and sublimity of the early training of Washington, brethren. I have seen it exemplified a thousand times in the 41 years I have been the surgeon for the Forest Service in Idaho.

And these forest-trained individuals are natural handlers of men. Mediocrity begs for cooperation; greatness commands it; the great leader does not ask for discipline; his men instinctively yield it. I have known of many instances in the forests of the West where intelligent and intrepid rangers have led their crews out of fire traps when it seemed impossible to stave off disaster. I have also known of cases where partial crews without such leaders have lost control of themselves and have run straight into the fire. While not too much has been written of this phase of Washington's life, I am persuaded that his superb qualities of leadership were engendered and developed by his engineering experiences in the forests he knew so well.

And so when the Revolution came, and an experienced leader was needed, what more natural than that his people should turn to George Washington. Of excellent birth and breeding, trained in the social graces, well schooled in self-control, with great courage and discretion, with the military experiences already gained in the colonial wars, who could have been better than he for the job?

There is an old saying that "Man's extremity is God's opportunity." And so it seemed in this case. Here was this land of ours owing fealty to a foreign government "whose morning drumbeats, rising with the sun, and keeping company with the hours, encircled the earth with one continuous strain of the martial airs of England." Its armies had received experience on a hundred battlefields, and its coffers had been enriched by the loot of India and the east. Its generals were experienced leaders, and it seemed there could be but one outcome of the ill-starred Revolution. As is frequently the case, there were many living in America, even as today, who were receiving their life's blood through uncut umbilical cords binding them to a foreign power, so that a life apart from the mother country was unthinkable for them. Even as we do now, the soldiers of George Washington suffered more from the divided allegiance of these hybrids than from the red-coated armies of Britain.

The old Greek legend had it that the armies of Deucalion being hard pressed in their war against the aborigines seized stones and threw them backward over their shoulders. Each stone, on striking the earth, sprang into being as a warrior fully panoplied for combat, and the battle was won through the assistance of these rock men.

So it was with the army of George Washington. Small in numbers, poorly clad, without money, and insufficiently armed, everything seemed to be against them. But like the army of Deucalion, everywhere they campaigned, recruits seemed to spring from the earth. And while these newcomers were not trained soldiers, they were dead shots. They brought their squirrel guns with them and their hunting clothes. They had been inured to hardship and many of them had learned the Indian style of fighting with George Washington in the French and Indian War. Their colonial style of fighting went far to compensate for the superior regimented training in the British Army.

The tides of battle surged backward and forward. The Fabian tactics of Washington frequently wrested victory from defeat, and finally he received the surrender of the British Army at Yorktown. The shouting and tumult was over, the smoke of battle cleared away, Washington had created a new country, a new power on the earth, our beloved America. Even he probably could not have visualized that morning at Yorktown, as he proudly and magnanimously returned the sword of General Cornwallis, just what he had accomplished in the history of the world by his campaigns. He was never to see our marvelous flag with its 13 bars and 48 stars. But that was immanent in that historic surrender at Yorktown, and the Almighty under whose banner he had really fought knew what the long-term fruits of that victory were to be.

The Revolution was successful. A new country was born. A new phenomenon had occurred. Scattered over a wide extent of largely undeveloped country, without well-defined means of communication, were scattered islands of English, Irish, Scotch, German, Polish, French, and Dutch, each maintaining part of their birthright and social customs, but more or less united in a fierce love of liberty. They had left their mother countries to seek that boon, and while they were entirely unschooled in the art of organizing their freedom and liberties they were united in one aim—they knew what they wanted.

To unite these scattered and valiant settlers in the form under which these new-found liberties could be secured to them and their children's children was the new task of Washington. Fortunately, he was able to secure the intellectual training of Jefferson, the wisdom of Franklin, the natural genius of Hamilton, the suavity of Madison, and a host of others, each one of whom had something to add in the framing of that marvelous document, the Constitution of the United States.

During the Constitutional Convention, even as now, there were those who wished to make a power state out of this beloved land. They even went further than that and offered George Washington kingship. On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson wrought for the rights of the people and the States. Finally, there was evolved a magnificent compromise which gave power to a strong central government to do those things which would be implicit in any such conglomerated government as our own, but secured to the sovereign people of the States all other rights not specifically delegated to the central government. The immortal document ensouled a fine governmental system of checks and balances, so that liberty could thrive in the new government if its citizens adhered to the framework of the Constitution.

Lord Macaulay, the British historian of those times, prophesied that this Government could not long endure, because "it is all sail and no anchor." It was his thought that the electorate was not generally intelligent enough to govern itself, and that due to the unchecked will of the people to loot their Government, that either the plundered Government would become bankrupt, or some strong central figure would arise to seize power as the man on horseback. Because of the inertia of the people refusing to make freedom their daily job or, in other words, the working out of the principle of "let George do it" would wreck the newly formed Government which had cost the founding fathers so much in blood and suffering to carve out for their posterity. You may draw your own conclusions as to how closely this prophecy has been realized.

It has always been a remarkable thing to me how closely the newly formed Government followed the pattern laid down in our Masonic lodges. It is probable that Masonic procedure played a great part in the deliberations at the Constitutional Convention, and tended to shape the decisions there, for after all a majority of the Constitution-makers

were Masons. To a Mason the practice of leaving the entire body of rights not intelligently surrendered to the Federal Government for a very definite purpose in the hands of the sovereign people should be well understood. It was nothing new in a Masonic lodge. The ultimate power was, is, and let us hope ever shall be, on the floor of the lodge.

When George Washington was elected the first President, there must have been a great feeling of security and safety among those early greats in our country. Masonry had received his obligation at its altar. He had advanced enough to be chosen as the master of his lodge. The enormous body of the Masonic builders of the new Government knew full well his actions as a President would still be bounded within the points of the extended compass.

Nor did the great Washington disappoint them. He followed a course of rectitude of conduct and governmental sagacity which his brethren had every reason to expect he would manifest. His entire life history could hardly result in our regarding him in any other way than as the Father of his Country. We have had Masonic Presidents since, but their course of action has not always manifested to the people they remembered the obligation they took at the altar, or else they probably never properly understood what they were saying. For let it never be forgotten in our country as well as in our lodges, the ultimate power resides in the combined wills of the people. Masonry could never condone dictatorship.

How well Washington illustrates the fact that the setting sun of a well-spent life gilds its parting moments with the glory of a beautiful sunset. Monuments have been erected to his memory, whose towering spires cleave the heavens. Weak men such as I may honor and revere his name. States and towns may be named in his honor, but after all this Government stands as the chief reminder that this great man of Masonry lived and wrought in the times when this great country of ours had its beginnings, and that, as a man, a Mason, a lawgiver, and finally as a very great Christian gentleman, we have very reason to name him in a very real sense: The Father of his Country.

OUTLAWING THE GERRYMANDER

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a time-worn but not time-honored custom indulged in by frustrated political bosses which ought to be legislated against for the good of our country.

I speak of the notorious practice of gerrymandering, the foul method of eliminating incumbent officeholders who become too solid in the people's regard to be defeated by the politicians.

This is their only recourse, after giant public smear campaigns, carried on for years without avail, and expenditures of more than a million dollars, as in my own case, have all failed.

In desperation they resort to the gerrymander and throw loyal constituents out of a Congressman's district simply by a change of geography.

Every honest public officer who has been able to survive their barbs and innuendoes, and has remained strong enough with his voters to win in spite of their attempts to turn people against him, is vitally affected by a gerrymander. Actually, no Member of Congress is entirely safe, because he can be victimized overnight by the same bloodthirsty gang he thought were his friends.

In the midst of national calamity, when the Nation's eyes are focused upon our very survival against outside, evil forces, the time is ripe for political opportunists, like small boys playing with dynamite, to take care of Congressmen they hate through the dastardly use of gerrymander.

It behooves each Member of this House, therefore, regardless of how safe he may consider himself or how fairhaired he may pose at the moment, to be on guard. He may wake up some fine morning to find that his State legislature has thrown him into a new constituency, much of which is new and strange territory to him.

Such policies are detrimental to the very purposes for which this Congress was founded.

The gerrymander places the average officeholder in a district in which time prohibits his campaigning for reelection. He is therefore dependent upon those who control the political machinery to such an extent that a handful of men can prevent him from running for office in the traditional American way.

The people are thereby deprived of a champion, knocked out of the lists by cowardly duplicity, before he is given the chance of a fair fight.

The people never have the opportunity to know the men who aspire to represent them because things are all decided for them before the new constituency is made public.

For these reasons, and to insure our country of a direct election system which makes American Government worth fighting for, I am introducing the Hall antigerrymander bill and hope for its early consideration.

This is the year the entire country must be reapportioned. It is only sensible to accompany the measures already presented which will change the number of Representatives from the several States, to the advantage of some and detriment of others, with a bill such as mine, laying down a fair policy of defining congressional districts.

Let us destroy, once and for all, the disgraceful practice of gerrymandering, so that free Americans will be certain of the chance to select the men they wish in a free manner, unhampered by dirty politics or by vengeful political bosses.

The Hall antigerrymander bill reads as follows:

A bill to strengthen national defense by outlawing the gerrymander and saving representative government

Whereas through our history ruthless political rings have succeeded in eliminating representatives of the people whom they could not defeat at the polls by gerrymandering them out of office; and

Whereas it is to the advantage of political cliques and detrimental to the people to radically change or modify political subdivisions of any State, county, or town; and

Whereas the practice of gerrymandering which violates the geography of a political subdivision and deliberately seeks to place incumbent officeholders in constituencies strange and hostile to them for the sole purpose of defeating them for reelection; and

Whereas no political subdivision should be composed of anything but the nearest possible compactness in geographical shape for efficiency and ease in bringing about direct representation; and

Whereas political opportunism which thrives on the gerrymander system must be submerged in the interests of national defense: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc.—

1. It shall be unlawful to design any congressional district in any State in any other geographical form than a rectangle or as nearly thereto as possible.

2. Elongated geographical shapes composing counties and other subdivisions formed to create congressional districts shall be prohibited.

3. Upon the passage of this bill the notorious practice of gerrymandering shall be forever null and void and those responsible for its continuance shall be liable to individual fines up to $100,000.

EASING THE TAX BURDEN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of a bill—H. R. 2618—to ease the burden of income taxes on persons of limited means. Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful and fine objective. The bill proposes to arrive at that objective by raising the exemptions on personal income taxes from $600 to $1,000 for a single person, to $2,500 for married persons, with an added exemption of $1,000 for each child.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should read, "A bill to remove from the tax rolls 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 present taxpayers, and to reduce the tax take of the Treasury some $7,000,000,000 at least." Our budget is now unbalanced to the tune of $16,000,000,000, and if this bill were passed it would unbalance it still more to $23,000,000,000.

GREATER RECOGNITION OF AGRICULTURE IN DEFENSE SET-UP

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, just when does the administration intend to give

agriculture its rightful place in the national defense set-up?

Agriculture is the Nation's basic industry. Our farmers are being called upon to produce food not only for our own Nation but for other large segments of the world's population. If they are to produce the food that is needed during this emergency, they will have to have the needed manpower, farm machinery and repairs, fertilizer, and other essential items.

To date the needs of the American farmer in the food production program have largely been relegated to the background. Agriculture is not yet recognized as being a vital part of the defense program.

Agriculture, as well as labor and business, is demanding its rightful place in the defense effort. I call upon the administration to immediately give a farm representative a top place in the Economic Defense Agency. Such representation would make the farmers of the country really feel they were a vital part of the Nation's defense effort. Given the tools, the supplies, and the manpower, you can depend on the American farmer to do the job.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EVIDENCE THAT INDIA CAN PAY FOR NEEDED GRAIN

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of helping the people of India to get the grain they need to avert starvation. The President urges that no political strings be attached to it. With this I agree. Under the circumstances it is our duty to make this food available.

The question arises, however, should it be a virtual gift or should we ascertain whether India is in a position to pay for this grain? If she is not, then considerations of humanity should prevail.

But I find substantial evidence that India is in a position to pay without impairing its dollar reserve or disrupting its economy.

Three ways that India can pay for this grain are:

First. By sale to us of thorium and uranium, or agreements with regard thereto.

Second. Payment in blocked British sterling in India's account in London.

Third. Payment from the vast wealth hoarded by India's princes.

This would mean a saving of one hundred and ninety millions to the American people with no injury to the people of India.

There is also danger that we may antagonize friendly Pakistan if we pass this bill as it stands.

Now as to the thorium and uranium, the raw materials for atomic energy. It is true that part of India's people must have grain to live. But I submit that the United States has to maintain its lead in stockpiling atomic materials in order for our entire country and the free world, including India, to survive. I understand the Atomic Energy Commission has ascertained that India is the world's greatest source of the fissionable metal thorium. The beach sands of Travancore used to be exported to this country for the extraction of thorium and other minerals called rare earths.

But since 1946 India has had an embargo on the exportation of thorium. They have been extracting the rare earths, but stockpiling the thorium ore, although the Atomic Energy Commission says that the United States is very anxious to increase its stockpile of thorium. A small percentage of uranium is also in this ore.

Since India is not deriving any revenue from this thorium, but is merely sitting on it, is there any good reason why they should not trade us thorium for grain? Since thorium is one of the two elements from which atomic weapons can be made, it is obvious that the strategic importance of such an arrangement would even outweigh the economic side of it.

During the last war this country engaged in what was called preclusive buying in neutral countries in order to deny strategic materials to the enemy. Would it not be very reassuring if in return for the 2,000,000 tons of grain that we are going to furnish at India's behest, this vital stockpile of thorium were made available to the United States, and thus unavailable for purchase or seizure by Soviet Russia or Soviet China?

In addition to this great thorium supply, India is reported to have found uranium ore in two different localities during the past 6 months. The Indian geologists have been reported in the press as saying that these two uranium discoveries are of large extent and of workable quality. The Atomic Energy Commission does not know how important these uranium strikes may be. I suggest that it would be a very handsome thing on the part of India if she would offer this country a long-term agreement to explore, develop, and buy this uranium, if it turns out to be a significant source of supply.

In favoring the supplying of grain to India, I am thinking of the best interests of the Indian people. And in suggesting that there should be a simultaneous offer by India to supply us with atomic materials, I am thinking of the best interests of the American people, which, after all, is the main thing that our constituents elected us to do.

My inquiries also indicate that India could pay, if we asked her to, in blocked British pounds. The so-called blocked sterling balance that India has in London is the result of the very large profits that India earned during the war by furnishing Great Britain materials and services. At the end of the war India had a balance of £1,200,000,000 in blocked sterling. At the present time she still holds £619,000,000 or some $1,700,000,000, according to the British Information Service. About a third of this is obligated to the Colombo plan under which it will be used during the next 6 years for building up India's production.

This leaves more than a billion dollars' worth of blocked sterling, at current exchange rates, part of which could be used to pay the United States for this grain. The State Department, I understand, feels that there is no question but that we could make good use of blocked sterling in the future. It might be that we could not use it immediately for fear of upsetting the British economy, but it could be used eventually, by agreement with Britain, for the construction of air bases in sterling-area nations, and in many other ways. Please note that this would save the United States $190,000,000 in future expenditures which otherwise would have to be appropriated by the Congress, and eventually paid by every American taxpayer. At the same time it would not cost India any of its dollar exchange, and it would not cost India any sterling that under present arrangements can be used in the next 6 years.

The third way in which India could pay for this 2,000,000 tons of grain is by borrowing or taxing the amount of money required away from its fabulously wealthy citizens, the Indian princes. There are many of these princes, a number of them of great wealth. I have had time to check on only one of them, the Nizam of Hyberabad, reputed to be the richest man in the world. According to the 1948 edition of Current Biography, this miser has a personal fortune of $2,000,000,000 made up of a half billion dollars' worth of gold and silver bullion, and one and a half billion dollars' worth of jewels.

Please understand that this hoard is not in any way productive. This greatest miser of all time keeps it in his palace where he can gloat over it daily. Inasmuch as this fortune was wrung from the hides of the coolies of Hyderabad over a long period of years, would it not be fitting that a small portion of it be returned to these poor people now in their time of need? If any of my constituents in Wisconsin feel that they are better able to afford having their taxes raised than the Nizam of Hyderabad I shall be surprised to hear it. Again let me point out that payment for the grain by this means would not cost India any dollar exchange that she currently is earning.

Naturally men of such wealth as these Indian princes have many friends at court both inside and outside of India, and it might take some effort on the part of the Indian Government to follow the suggestion made here. I should not be surprised if the thought of shaking down these miserly royalties might go against the grain of the protocol-conscious diplomats in our State Department who recommended to the President that our only course was to present this $190,000,000 worth of grain to India free and clear. They have no stomach for any kind of rude bargaining in the interests of the United States.

There has been considerable comment in recent days both in the press and radio and in a speech in the House by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman HAYS, indicating that India has refused to buy the surplus grain available in next-door Pakistan because India has been waging an economic war against Pakistan. I do not pretend to know the full story on this, but I have taken the trouble to ascertain from the Pakistan Minister that Pakistan does expect to have available for export this year a half million tons of rice and wheat above its own requirements. He also said that India has made no effort to buy this grain, though it has used up much of its dollar exchange buying grain in Canada and this country, which grain then must be shipped half way around the world with the shipping charges adding 25 percent to the original cost. It seems to me this phase of the matter should be very thoroughly examined because it would be certain to antagonize friendly Pakistan if we should enter into an arrangement that would mean we were, however unknowingly, supporting an economic blockade of Pakistan by India.

Offending Pakistan might also offend the other Moslem nations of the Middle East. Whoever pays for the Pakistan grain, the importation of this half million tons surplus by India would save one-quarter of the amount of grain being asked of this country, not to mention the saving to India in shipping charges.

To sum up, I want the people of India to receive the grain they need. I also want the people of the United States to know that their Government has finally reached the point where it will abandon the Hopkins-Wallace-Acheson principle of free milk and honey for every foreign country, preferably socialistic ones. The people want ther representatives to spend less money on nondefense items and hand-outs. I submit this matter of asking India to pay for our grain in a way that she can afford to is an excellent place to start doing what the people are demanding.

I also submit that the State Department in its recommendation to President Truman and the President in his recommendation to Congress have deliberately omitted any mention of India's ability to pay for this grain. We, the representatives of the American people, are supposed to take the word of this spendthrift executive branch that this colossal sum of $190,000,000 must be handed to India as a present. One hundred and ninety million dollars may not sound like so much these days; but just as an example to the American people of how much of their substance they are being asked to give away without any real investigation, I find that the combined cost of the great battleship *Wisconsin* and the Grand Coulee Dam, the world's largest—both of these great American assets—were bought for this amount of money we are asked to hand blithely over to India—no strings attached.

No information has been presented to Congress by the administration as to whether or not India is in a position to pay without damage to its economy. Our bounty is not so great that we can part with our substance to those who are in a position to pay, particularly when there well may be others with real, stark need.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not claim to be, and definitely am not, an expert on military matters, nor on foreign policy. I merely hope, however, that I have just a little bit of horse sense. I heard a fellow say recently that horse sense is that sense that a horse has that keeps him from betting on man. Well, maybe he had something there. I am sure that none of us would feel justified in bragging on mankind, just now, but I am sure that all of you join me in hoping and praying that the whole world may become a better and a safer place in which to live. As for me, I generally keep the optimistic attitude and somehow I believe the world will get better instead of worse. Of course I do not know and neither does anyone else. I do know this one thing, however, that like you, I love this, my country, with all my heart. I stand ready at all times to give my political or my physical life for it. I offered my physical life for my country on several battle fields in World War I and if it will ever be worth anything at all in any future war, regardless of who brings it about, I offer it gladly again for my country.

> Breathes there a man with
> Soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land.

Yes, I shall try to use just a little bit of horse sense in discussing this most important matter of war and peace. I may fail entirely to use any horse sense, or any kind of sense whatsoever, but I will at least try. Some of the ideas I shall suggest will be my own and some will be those of others that I have picked up here and there largely through reading and studying for the past 30 years. I shall present these ideas to you for your consideration. You, of course, will do what you please with them—I just want you to think with me about them and I am sure your thinking will be as good as mine and very probably much better.

My general thought is that by following the policy of sending a large land army to Europe and Asia, we will be spreading ourselves out all over the world and by this process, which will also entail almost unbearable financial obligations, we will so weaken ourselves as to endanger our very existence.

AGREES GENERALLY WITH HOOVER AND TAFT

In the beginning, I might say that I agree in substance with former President Hoover and Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, in their recent statements relative to foreign policy. Mr. Hoover has said, in substance, that he thinks we should build up an impregnable defense here in the Western Hemisphere; that we should strengthen our naval and air forces as our primary defense. I agree fully in this philosophy. He thinks we should not commit large land armies to Europe and so does Senator TAFT, and I certainly agree with them. On January 5, 1951, in a major address on foreign policy, according to the press, Senator TAFT, among other things, said:

> We have no business going over there—
>
> Meaning Europe—
>
> and trying to prod them into a great military program which, in my opinion, is almost certain to produce war. I doubt very much that the Russians contemplate any military conquest of the world. I do not myself see any conclusive evidence that they expect to start a war with the United States, yet it seems to me most unwise to admit that war is inevitable until it has occurred and it seems to me today that our policy is based too much on that premise.

I might add that, in my judgment, the Russian leadership has never contemplated a military conquest of the world, nor do they now do so. It is as plain as the nose on your face to me that their program is to take over the world by infiltration and fanatical propaganda and teachings. In other words, it is evident from all signs I have been able to read that it is their fanatical belief that capitalism will some day die of its own weight because of the alleged weakness existing in such a form of government. In other words, they believe that as soon as we have another big depression, our people will accept communism as a matter of natural consequence. They, in their fanatical way, believe that communism will finally be accepted, not by force of armies, but by force of necessity.

We, therefore, in my judgment, are missing the boat entirely and are building up a great military machine and spreading it out all over the world and doing violence to our domestic economy on the theory that Russia intends to march with its armies, when as a matter of fact, Russia has no such intention. If I am right in this, they, the Russians, are outsmarting us in that particular respect and are weakening us. I believe that we should reexamine our foreign policy in line with this thought.

We judge everything by comparison. We say that a chair is small in comparison with a large room it is in. But we say that the same chair is large in comparison to the small child who is seated in it. We say a man is good when we do not mean that he is a perfect man but we only mean that he is good in comparison to a man who is bad, and vice versa. We in the democratic countries know that communism is bad in comparison, of course, to democracy; in other words, to our way of life. The Russians, however, have no way to compare it with democracy. They have never experienced democracy and the only thing they can compare it with is czarism, and as bad as communism is, it probably is not as bad for the Russian people as czarism was. My understanding, from reading history is that the Czarist government was just about the most tyrannical, corrupt, and oppressive the world has ever known. That is why communism was accepted in Russia. Under czarism, the Russians had had neither personal liberties nor economic welfare, among the masses of their people. In other words, the average person was continually hungry and craving even the barest necessities of

life. Under communism, the Russian people still do not have personal liberties, as we have, but they do have apparently more food to eat and more clothes to wear. Communism will never be accepted, I mean generally, of course, in this country or any other country that has really experienced democracy.

PRESENT POLICY IS TOWARD WAR

With our present policy we are fast drifting toward world war III, in my judgment. Such a war is not inevitable and if we profit by past experience, I think it may be avoided. But we are following generally the same pattern that we followed before both World War I and World War II. We could have stayed out of World War I and World War II had we really tried. The thing that got us into those wars was not appeasement—we have never been appeasers, nor will we ever be—nor was it isolationism—we have never been isolationists—those are merely scare words, expressions of derision built up by the propagandists; but the thing that got us into those wars was our own intervention, in other words, taking sides in wars that were going on.

We violated the admonition given to us by George Washington to beware of foreign entangling alliances and became all tangled up in the intrigues, secret dealings, selfishnesses, jealousies, and hatreds of the European and Asiatic countries and, of course, when we took sides and began actively and materially to assist one side and violently oppose the other, we, of course, became involved in war; and as long as we do that, we shall continue to become involved in war. Of course, our motive and intention was good, there can be no question about that, but the question is: Did we profit and did the world profit by our getting into those two wars? Are we not, and is the world not, worse off than if we had not become so involved? If we had stayed out of those wars, they would have been only European and/or Asiatic wars, at the most, and would not have become world wars. Of course, we had to fight, and we properly did so, after Pearl Harbor, but would there have been a Pearl Harbor if we had followed a different course? I do not think so. Switzerland stayed out of both wars and she was right next door to them. Sweden stayed out of both wars and she was right next door. Ireland stayed out of World War II although great pressure was brought to bring the Emerald Isle into the great conflict. Argentina in the Western Hemisphere stayed out of World War I. I know that a great many people will say, "Yes, it is true that these nations did stay out but they are small nations." Instead of this being an argument to disprove my point, it is an argument in favor of it. A small nation has much less chance to stay out of a world conflict than a large nation does. Neither side will hesitate very much in trying to force a small nation into its orbit for its own selfish interests, but will hesitate long before committing any action of violence or aggression against a large nation which, if aroused in opposition, might turn the balance of the scales against that side.

No, the real truth of the matter is we got into both wars because of the fact that we definitely involved ourselves by our words and by our actions. The reason we became involved, and I shall elaborate on it later, is that our people hated and feared one side of the antagonists so violently that soon neutrality was thrown to the wind and a desire to become engaged was engendered. This hatred and fear was planted in the hearts and minds of the people by continuous, from day to day, propaganda. The propagandists, no doubt, meant well, at least some of them did, but their views were distorted by unreasonable fear and hate, and truth was either crushed to earth or at least seriously wounded and reason fled and hysteria reigned supreme.

PROPAGANDA CAUSES FEAR AND HATE

The reason we become so violent in our dislikes toward certain countries during war, or during a period of confusion and near-war stage, is not because our people are inherently warlike, but because we become unduly alarmed and irrationally afraid. We become, in fact, hysterical. I think this is true of any and all people who are subjected to continuous scare stories. We have heard them now for years—not one but many, practically every day. You can scarcely read any newspaper or tune in on any radio any time without hearing them. No wonder the people are engulfed with fear until the Nation is no longer completely normal. The people hate and fear so much that one whose head is cool and whose heart is true is either afraid to speak out in words of sanity, or if he does, is not heeded and is often stoned or scorned. We hate and fear just whatever the newspapers and the radio want us to hate and fear. They turn public opinion on and off just like you would turn water on and off at a hydrant with a water faucet. May I give you a concrete example in my own life. When I was a kid 18 years old, a senior in high school, I enlisted in World War I. I thought the Germans were cutting arms off Belgium children and pitching them up in the air and catching them on their bayonets; that they were crucifying Canadian soldiers and taking dead English soldiers and boiling their bodies and making soap. I believed this because the newspapers, the leading ones in our country, almost daily told of such atrocities, on the part of the Germans, or similar ones. Of course, after I got over there I found those stories were utterly untrue. A great many of the people actually thought that the Kaiser was probably the anti-Christ here on earth, that he was the devil incarnate. Of course, years later, after the passions of war had cooled down and had practically died, he was referred to as a great Christian gentleman. Right now we are talking about rearming the Germans and Japanese, as allies and friends, who only a short while ago were so barbarious and beastly as to be unspeakably bad.

I suppose that a great many of you who are hearing me today will recall that during World War II there was a strong movement here in our Capital City on the part of many very fine people to cut down the cherry trees in the city because originally they had come from Japan. Now, anyone who would advocate the cutting down of those trees would be laughed at or, if he attempted to do so, would be put in jail. The real change is in our own minds. We are not now listening every day to horror stories hurled against the Germans and the Japs. We even call them Japanese now and we never refer to the Germans as Huns as we once did. I want it distinctly understood that I am certain that the Kaiser and Hitler and the Japanese leaders committed many diabolical acts of violence by their policies and I certainly hold no brief for any of them but the point I am making is that in their day and time they were so violently hated and feared that our people were convinced that unless we should go to war against them, they would overrun the world. No doubt they would have liked to have taken over the world, each of them, but looking at the matter in retrospect, we now know that it would have been utterly impossible for them to have done so. It is exactly the same today. It is utterly impossible for Russia, or for any nation for that matter, to take over the world by military might, ourselves included. If they should undertake such a thing, they will meet with disastrous results. If we should attempt such a thing, although with a good purpose in mind, we shall meet with the same disastrous results. The newspapers and radio unwittingly, of course, have by continuous scare stories built Russia up as a sort of super state as far as strength is concerned. Russia does not in reality have such strength. In one breath they say that Russia is governed by a bad and weak political philosophy and in the next breath, they say that unless we send armies out all over the world Russia will take over the world; it just does not make sense to me.

THE ANSWER

The only answer that I can see to bring about a real change in our policy is, first, a return to the teachings of Christ, which, if we actually follow, will rid us of so much hate and fear that is now in our minds and hearts and which weakens us by keeping us in a state of hysteria; and, second, establishing a practical status of building an absolutely impregnable line of military defense for ourselves, including our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. In other words, if we maintain a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, and especially a strong Air and Navy Force, and get rid of some of our fear and hatred, and thus rid of some of our false thinking, in my judgment, neither Russia nor any nation, nor group of nations, will dare start a war with us, but if they should we will surely win. Thus, I think we might by such policy definitely guarantee the peace of the world. If the world remains at peace for a reasonable period of time democracy will whip the socks off of communism in a nonwar fight, because of the inherent spiritual strength that there is in democracy, as opposed to communism. Communism is inherently a weak philosophy of government for two reasons:

First, no political philosophy can be permanently strong in this world that does not form a partnership with Almighty God. In other words, communism has a partnership with materialism and leaves God out of the picture; whereas democracy realizes that God must be taken into account at all times; and, second, communism is inherently weak for the reason that the mind of man cries out for, and will eventually demand, recognition of individual liberties and justice, and, therefore, will demand that the Government guarantee these inalienable rights; whereas communism teaches and practices totalitarianism, which is, in fact, a worship of the strength of the state, and which results in the loss of human freedoms. Therefore, a world at peace, since every normal individual in the world will continue to strive for democracy will gradually dispose of, and relegate to oblivion, communism. However, if we should become involved in a world war, even our own Nation would at least temporarily have to largely abandon its democratic processes in order to carry on an effective military program, and if we should abandon them, that fact, together with the destructive forces that would be unloosed on the world, could very easily result in a destruction of all democratic processes for at least years to come.

DO EUROPEAN NATIONS WANT OUR MILITARY HELP?

Can any of us truthfully say that we are convinced that the European nations have been demanding or even urging us to furnish them with arms or send large armies over there now or in the near future? Is it not true that we are the prime movers in insisting that they be rearmed? May it not be true that the nations that are much closer to Russia than we are and, therefore, are in a better position to know what the true state of affairs are, are less fearful of Russia, especially from a military standpoint, than we are? In other words, if there are signs that Russia intends to move militarily against Europe, why is it that the European nations do not know it or cannot sense it? No; the European nations either do not fear Russia from a military standpoint or else they do not have the will to resist. In either case, it will be most unwise, very dangerous, and can well be disastrous for us to try to carry out such a policy of forcing upon the European people what they apparently do not want. By urging the European nations to arm, we are without a doubt scaring the Russians. Even though we are violently opposed to their communistic philosophy of life—and no one could possibly be more opposed to it than I—we must recognize the fact that they are human beings and, being such, they are subject to being scared the same as we are, and if we start arming their neighbors to the teeth for the very purpose of encompassing them round about, even though our moves are actually intended to be defense moves, will they not be interpreted by the Russians as offensive moves on our part?

In other words, suppose Russia were obtaining bases and sending large armies of their own to Mexico and other countries on the Western Hemisphere. Would we believe them if they should say that they were doing that merely as a matter of defense against us? We all know that we would not believe any such strategy on their part; then why should we expect them to believe us? The Russians, who experienced loss of lives running into the millions in the recent war with Germany, evidently fear for their lives the same as we do. Practically every human being, whether good or bad, wants to live. Ordinarily, the Russian leaders, in my judgment, could not force the Russian people to engage in military aggression unless they could convince the people that some particular enemy was getting ready to attack them. In other words, by our very own actions of arming Russia's neighbors, if the Russian leaders actually do want to start a military war, we are playing right into their hands in solidifying the Russian people, in their favor.

If, as I have suggested, Russia should be moving armies to the Western Hemisphere, we know that it would not make any difference to us what party might be in power, whether our Government at that particular time was popular or unpopular with the people, but every true American, and that would include most all of our people, would forget all differences and grievances; all criticism would cease, and practically every man, woman, and child would turn his or her attention to one thing alone, and that would be loyalty to his country and a concerted effort to prepare for resistance. Yes; and even for attack. We would not want to see so powerful a military force of a potential enemy move in so close to us, and we no doubt would attack, and if we did, our whole Nation would be united as never before.

Then why will we expect them not to do so? If they, the Russians, really intend to try to overrun the world by military force, why have they not started their armies moving by now? There is not the slightest question but what the Russian leaders would like to communize, sovietize the world, but there is no evidence, in my judgment, that even they are crazy enough to believe that they can do so by military force.

IS OUR POLICY FOR PEACE?

It is my sincere opinion that at least most all of those who subscribe to the present program truly believe that it is in the interest of the people, but the important question for us to ask is not what they actually believe but what the actual realities are. If the program of our arming and sending large land armies to Europe is actually for peace, of course, it should be supported by everyone, and I most certainly would support it, if I so believed, but since I do not believe it is for peace, nor for the good of our own country, I cannot conscientiously subscribe to it.

At this time we are engaged in an actual war in Korea, and as a citizen and as a Member of Congress, I shall do everything within my power to provide for and support our heroic servicemen who are there, and will continue to hope and pray that the best results possible may be obtained. I hope the war may not spread in Asia and feel that we should do all within our power to prevent its doing so. I fear that a general conflagration there might prove disastrous to us. In this connection I call your attention to an article appearing on the front page of the Washington Post just a few days ago, February 15. The article is as follows:

TUCSON, ARIZ., February 14.—(AP)—William O. Douglas, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, said today, "If we continue our present foreign policy, especially in Asia, if we continue in our present direction, we are doomed to disaster."

Justice Douglas was speaking to a local civic club gathering. He said the Asiatic world is in revolution similar to that which came to France and America. The Justice added, "I gathered my information, not in the capitals of the Asiatic countries, but in talking to farmers and goat herders in the back areas.

"The world is different than we in America have thought. The plain fact is that the world is in a revolution that cannot be bought off with dollars. There are rumblings in every village from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

"We think of that force as communism but it is not. The Communists only exploit the situation."

Why do we think we can solve the problems of foreign nations by sending our armies out over the face of the world? How many of us here in Congress know anything to speak of, about how to solve the problems of these foreign governments? Do you not believe that we pretty well have our hands full in trying to solve the many problems of our own Government, our own people, without taking over the problems of the whole world?

CONCLUSION

May I say in conclusion that I do not contend that the newspapers, radio, and other instrumentalities for informing the public, that ordinarily give us so much good and accurate information, are inherently to blame for the fear that grips our Nation, for all down through the ages, long before newspapers and radio came into being, nations have hated and feared other nations and those hatreds and fears have driven them to unnecessary wars. In the olden days those hatreds and fears were passed from mouth to ear. The reason I have said what I did about these absolutely necessary institutions of public information is that they are to adults, in a sense, what school books are to children. They keep the adult population educated on current news and events. Their power is very great, indeed, in these modern times. It seems to me to be a definite human trait for one to believe the things he sees in print, especially, or hears over the radio, far more readily than what he hears in ordinary conversation. They are run by human beings who are just like the rest of us. They have their hates and human weaknesses; become scared and act unwisely, yet, ordinarily, with the best of intentions. They are subject to error, also, and when you add it all up you will find, I believe, on every occasion when serious conflict occurs in our international relationships and especially when we are dealing with countries whose ideologies we abhor, and still more especially as tension of near-

war status approaches, more and more irrational information is furnished until there is an avalanche of it and it engulfs us and we become panicky and, of course, act irrationally.

Then why should I, believing as I do that we have gone so far with an unwise and dangerous foreign policy and been subjected to so much propaganda, still have some degree of optimism? I will tell you why. Deep down in my heart I believe that a true Christian conviction is growing in the hearts and minds of our people. That they are beginning to rely more and more on spiritual values; that they are praying more than they ever have, and that if this tendency continues we will begin to think more clearly and be less affected by erroneous information and thus will lose some of our hate and much of our fear, and then we will begin to act more normally. We will realize that we do not have reason to fear Russia, so much as we have in the past. We will, of course, recognize the fact that we must be practical and prepare ourselves militarily, for no one absolutely knows what the Russians are going to do and we must take no chance, but be fully prepared so that neither Russia nor any other nation will dare attack us or, if they do, that they will meet an inglorious defeat. We will understand that all-out war is to be avoided, if at all possible, and do sensible things to avoid it, as it does not cure the evils in the world, and thus we will avoid it. My hope is that the people generally will begin to urge such a policy as I have suggested upon our leadership, and if they do, in my judgment such policy will be adopted and our grand and glorious Nation will become the undisputed leader for peace upon this earth.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McMULLEN. If in your opinion you do not believe Russia will resort to the military force of war, why do you feel it is necessary that our Government form an impregnable defense through air and sea power?

Mr. MORRIS. Because we must not take any chances. No one knows what they are going to do, and we must not take any chances. We are living in a dangerous world, and we cannot afford to take any chances. No one knows what they are going to do, of course.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did we not have air and sea power in Korea?

Mr. MORRIS. Of course we had that power there; yes, sir.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman indicated he was very strongly opposed to sending large land forces to Europe. Does he not believe that the statement which General Marshall made before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to the effect that only four new divisions would be needed in addition to the two that are there pretty well removes from the so-called great debate the question of large ground forces in Europe?

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir; it does not remove that question at all from the problem. In my judgment, if they get four, they will begin to ask for eight, and so on, and the number will just be increased and increased, and, like a snowball rolling along, it will gather weight and size and strength, and there we will go into another war. That is my judgment. I am subject to error, of course. I may be entirely wrong, but that is my judgment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee asked about four divisions in addition to the two divisions, making six. Do you think for a moment that if we send six divisions over there and get into any trouble that we would not have to send all that may be needed?

Mr. PRIEST. Of course, I think if it came to a question of an invasion of Western Europe by Soviet Russia, certainly we will send as many divisions as needed, but I think that would involve a declaration of war, all-out war, and the Congress would authorize whatever is necessary to win such a war. I simply asked that question in order to get that into the RECORD. I do believe, in view of the statement made by General Marshall that we need only four new divisions, making six with the two already there, which would be 10 percent of the army contemplated to implement the North Atlantic Treaty organization under General Eisenhower, that that will be a great deterrent to a Russian invasion of Western Europe. Certainly it would not be a force of sufficient strength to indicate that we—I mean by that the western nations——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has a special order following.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. No doubt General Marshall, for whom I have the greatest respect, spoke in good faith. There is no question about that. But we recall that before World War II they said, "You just send us the supplies. We do not want men. You just send supplies and material and we will take care of them." But we know where our men went, and many of them were killed on foreign battlefields. They said that, of course, but it does not work out that way.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma for his very fine contribution to this debate that is going on all over the country. Our people are alarmed as a result of certain war hysteria, perhaps. I agree with what the gentleman has said about the possibility of war. I would like to refer to a statement made by Mr. Eugene Lyons, who is perhaps one of the outstanding authorities on communism in this country, having lived over there for a number of years. He said:

> Soviet Russia since war's end has had the physical capacity to overrun all of Europe but has not done so. She might have swallowed up Finland, smashed the Berlin air lift, reinforced Greek Communist guerrillas to the point of victory, taken Iran in a week; but most significantly, she could have overwhelmed Tito's Yugoslavia, the most serious threat to her totalitarian hegemony. She did none of these things for the plain reason that they packed the possibility of a real war to a finish.

In addition to that, the gentleman is supported by a statement made by General Bradley a short time ago, in which he expressed his opinion that there was no immediate danger of war.

Last week I had occasion to write to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, Mr. Harold Stassen. He had just completed a trip abroad. I asked him specifically as to the possibility, in view of his trip, of whether another war would come this spring or summer. He said:

> As to your question about the possibility of Russia's army moving this spring or summer, one can never tell, but I do not believe they will.

It seems to me that is powerful evidence contrary to the present tendency to whip up war hysteria.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course the gentleman knows what he is letting himself in for.

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, yes. I am not unmindful of that, of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You were talking something about these other nations going into a third world war. Let me read you what Churchill said right after World War I. This is what he said:

> America's entrance into the war was disastrous, not only for your country but for the Allies as well, because if you had stayed home and minded your own business we would have made peace with the central powers in the spring of 1917.
>
> Then there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by communism, no breakdown in Italy, followed by fascism; and nazism would not at the present time be any threat in Germany.

He also said this; he repeated the other statement:

> If America had stayed out of the war and minded her own business all these "isms"

would not today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down all parliamentary government.

That is what we got out of World War I and World War II. What will we get out of this one?

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman said he was in the First World War. This is a thing that we have got to watch both as civilians and as Congressmen, that is that war is a game on the part of military men. During the First World War—and this is documented evidence—when the French were short of war materials they would call over across the line and it would be shipped over by the trainload. When the Germans were short of certain materials they would in turn call upon the French for material and get it. That kept the war going. That is documented. I say that is a side of this issue that we want to watch; there are people who want to get us into war just to play the war game.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CHARLES WILSON AND MOBILIZATION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our Government should have learned a valuable lesson from its experience in mobilizing manpower and industry during World War I and World War II. After the Korean trouble started last June, the Eighty-first Congress, after much delay, passed the Defense Production Act. A minority in Congress protested at that time that this legislation was a skimmed-milk effort to control either food prices or rents, the two necessities which have contributed more than anything else to skyrocket the cost of living.

President Truman signed the Defense Production Act reluctantly because it was the only legislation he could get from the Congress before adjournment. The Congress is not without responsibility for the present unfortunate upheaval in our economy because it listened to the pressure lobbies when the Defense Production Act was passed last fall. Under the Defense Production Act, it is impossible to adequately control food prices and rents.

The other reason for the unfortunate turmoil developing in our mobilization program is the short-sighted attitude of Mobilization Chief Charles E. Wilson in excluding representatives of labor from the inner sanctums which have set up the present ineffective price-control program.

LABOR IGNORED

In World War II, America performed a production miracle because labor's representatives sat side by side with industry and business in an effort to solve equitable price-control and wage problems. Up to this time, under Mr. Charles Wilson, our mobilization program has been formulated on a policy of by and for big business. Labor has not only been denied a seat in mobilization councils, but its recommendations have been wholly disregarded. The present wage-stabilization policy hampers collective bargaining and totally disregards adequate wage adjustments to offset in any degree whatsoever the unreasonably high cost of living. In World War II labor's representatives not only participated in our war-economy program but their recommendations for an equitable bearing of the war burden was adopted. This policy brought about remarkable harmony between management and labor and resulted in the miraculous American production which Mr. Stalin himself said was the No. 1 contribution to our victory.

Since last June industrial and big-business management has been engaged in an unfortunate race for big profits and have totally ignored the millions of wage earners who are trying to survive on a June 1950 pay check. The most unfortunate victims in this profiteering scramble are the millions of office workers, unorganized wage earners, school teachers, old folks on pensions, persons on retirement, and so forth.

On the shoulders of Charles E. Wilson, who has been delegated the master minding of our war economy, rests a responsibility which is greater than the task confronting our military leaders. If our production becomes hampered and delayed by industrial unrest, strikes, and work stoppages, it will indirectly cost untold lives and hardships at the front and complicate our war problems immeasurably.

STRIKES, RAILROAD, ETC.

The recent railway tie-up, the textile strike, and other work stoppages over the country are but a beginning of what is sure to follow unless the cost of living is rolled back and profiteering curtailed so that millions in America can live within their monthly income. During the recent unfortunate railway tie-up, I received numerous letters and also long-distance telephone calls from wives of railway workers in my district, protesting against the unreasonable attitude of railway management in refusing to grant a reasonable increase so that their families could adequately live under the present inflationary prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that certain newspapers and radio commentators and some Members of Congress impugned a lack of patriotism and disloyalty on the part of railway workers during that crisis. Most of these workers had sons in our Armed Forces and some fighting in Korea. Most of the men themselves served in either World War I or World War II. Most of the propaganda regarding the railway wage controversy would infer that railway management was an innocent victim. This propaganda failed to mention that during the last year, the Pennsylvania Railroad, after all taxes were paid, had a 1950 profit of $38,000,000 compared with $12,000,000 the year before; the Santa Fe Railroad's profit increased from $55,000,000 to $81,000,000; Union Pacific Railroad, from $21,000,000 to $44,000,000; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, from $27,000,000 to $34,000,000; New York Central, from $9,700,000 to $18,300,000, and so forth. These unreasonable profits are not necessarily confined to railroad corporations, but apply to most other industries in relative proportions. For instance, after taxes, United States Steel jumped from $165,000,000 in 1949 to $215,000,000 in 1950; Bethlehem Steel, from $99,000,000 in 1949 to $126,000,000 in 1950; Socony Vacuum from $98,000,000 in 1949 to $125,000,000 in 1950, and so forth.

These quotations are merely to reveal a small picture of the unfortunate scramble for profits during this war mobilization crisis. When the propagandists proceed to condemn labor and the wage earner every time tie-ups, work stoppages, or strikes take place, they should also let the American public know that patriotic sacrifice in America is not a one-way street. Charles Wilson is a man of great ability in executive capacity as he has demonstrated during his long success as a business executive. Up until now, Mr. Wilson has not convinced the American public that he is willing to grasp both sides of our economic picture and recognize the importance of our No. 1 force in American production; to wit, manpower and labor.

Yesterday I read in the newspapers and heard over the radio where railway management is asking for a 6-percent increase on freight rates and an additional increase on mail transportation. During the last 6 months, the trend on the part of management, not only in the railroad field, but in other fields, has been to take advantage of this crisis to further build their profit margin and this policy has sapped the worker's pay check to such an extent that millions of our wage earners today have cashed in their Government bonds and most of their available assets in order to survive inflation.

From the very beginning of our national emergency, American labor has led the fight for effective control of the cost of living and other measures necessary to insure economic stabilization.

INDUSTRIAL CHAOS COULD RUIN US

Mr. Speaker, up to now, I have not heard the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, or these other powerful business organizations, come to Washington or offer any program for price roll-backs, control of food costs, or rents; on the other hand, I have heard numerous demands on the part of labor organizations that action be taken and they have submitted constructive suggestions. These appeals have gone unheeded by Mobilization Czar Wilson. Unless a policy of cooperation is inaugurated immediately, on the part of Mr. Wilson as Economic Stabilizer and the business and industrial interests of this country to cooperate with the manpower segment of our economy, we will enter a period of industrial chaos and turmoil. This would be the condition which Mr. Stalin and the Communists are striving to bring about. If this situation occurs, the majority of commentators in the newspapers and on the radio will again send out their blasts that labor and the wage earners are failing the Government in this crisis.

The profiteer has sabotaged the Government so far in our war-mobilization program. The profiteer brings about inflation and siphons from the American home the wages that are so necessary to provide happiness and contentment and allow millions to enjoy the American way of life. The United Press made a spot check of grocers in 26 cities across our country and found that food to the American family has gone up approximately 15 percent since last June. If the same rate of increase continues for a year, it would mean an increase of about 30 percent. Rentals in our cities throughout the country have been and are further skyrocketing by reason of the unfortunate decontrol action of our Congress last session. The rise in price of clothing, furniture, and other necessities is adding flames to the conflagration.

This Congress has also the responsibility to enact a tax bill. This tax legislation must not further deplete the pay check of the lower- and middle-income groups. If Congress closes the tax loopholes wherein tax dodgers are cheating the Government out of billions of dollars, it will aid greatly to relieve the burden on the small-tax payer. This will also avert the possibility of the enacting of a Federal sales tax which some Members advocate to further reduce the pay check of the lower-income groups. The three No. 1 problems which Price Stabilizer Wilson and this Congress must solve to prevent the wrecking of our mobilization program and industrial chaos are: Prices, rent control, and taxes. If these three problems are not solved, higher wages must follow the cost of living, and we will embark on the pathway of ruinous inflation. The time is short and the threat is critical. We must have action now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to ask the gentleman who is responsible for the appointment of the Wilsons and the Harrimans and the rest of the representatives of big business?

Mr. MADDEN. He was appointed by the President.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to proceed for 10 additional minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand the attitude of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. Labor thought that it had a hard-and-fast agreement with the administration for anything and everything, for everything for which it might ask in return for its political support given in 1948 and 1950. Now it finds that, under the stress of war, other people's interests have to be taken into consideration and Mr. Truman just cannot deliver without endangering the defense program.

If I might be permitted, I would like to follow the gentleman's line of argument—the argument which he made in behalf of his people, mainly industrialists, mainly union men. Following his plea for organized labor I would be justified by saying that, in my judgment, the prices ought to be rolled back for the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. They should be exempt from taxes of all kinds, and each and every one of them ought to have a subsidy so that he or she would be satisfied. Farmers should be paid whatever their organizations demand for their members and there should be no ceilings on the price of the merchandise manufactured in the Fourth District or on the wages paid there. That is about the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument as he speaks for organized labor. It is about the sum and substance of the argument made by 16 distinguished Members of the other body from cotton-growing States who went down to the White House a while ago and asked the President to avoid the imposition of any price fixing that would interfere with the sale of cotton. It is the usual plea. Everybody is in favor of taxing someone else, but does not want any part of that burden imposed on him. We seem to be much alike.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said that the President was interfering with collective bargaining because he was following a course which would not permit the labor unions, which have enormous political power, to bargain with management for wages fixed at a stabilization figure. Management has not been disposed to deny an increase in wages that organized labor has asked recently. Why? Because, after granting the increase, as did steel, management just tacked the increase in wages, plus a little something for itself on the price of the product they sold. So soaking the consumer—once for labor and once for itself. Motors tried it, but got caught when they tried to increase the price of the cars they sold.

But the gentleman did not say anything about collective bargaining generally. He is talking about collective bargaining for the unions.

I wonder if the unions are to have collective bargaining, and if they are to be permitted to refuse to work when they do not get what they ask, is there any reason why the postal employees who write they receive much less than industrial workers, should not bargain collectively—walk out if they do not get what they ask? Why should not those wives that keep writing to Congressmen when their husbands are drafted, leaving them with a dependent child or children, have the right to bargain collectively with General Hershey as to whether their husbands shall go to war? Why should not the men who are conscripted or who enlist have collective bargaining rights with the draft organization to determine whether they should be taken and, if taken, where they should go and what they should do, how much they should be paid, how long they should serve?

This collective bargaining business, if I understand it, while necessary and advisable in mass production industries in peacetime just goes out the window when the country is in war.

The gentleman said in substance that unless organized labor got what it wanted there would be chaos, there would be strikes. I wonder about that, too. Can one man strike for higher wages in wartime and yet another be forced to throw up his hands and his job, leave his wife and his family, as they are being forced to do? Do what, where Uncle Sam directs? In wartime have I the right to refuse to work when my neighbor is taken, forced to work, and fight? What kind of equality is that? This collective bargaining business ought to work for all of us, with everyone, or for none of us.

I wonder how long the gentleman thinks the people of America, when their sons, their fathers, and their husbands are being conscripted to fight abroad, will submit to strikes by organized labor, or anyone else, for that matter, when those strikes interfere with supplying the men who are doing the fighting with the things they need in order that they may fight successfully? As I listened to the gentleman it almost seemed he was telling us that unless the President gave the unions what they wanted the unions would walk out on their leaders with all-out strikes.

The gentleman said that the railroads arbitrarily refused—and I hold no brief for the railroads; I have no stock in the railroads—to make any concession in the recent disputes. Let us see about that. The President, under the authority given him by Congress and under the law which the Congress enacted, and which has been in force for many years, appointed mediation boards. They heard the witnesses offered by the companies and by the unions. They made findings of fact on both occasions, which the unions refused to accept after the union's bargaining representatives had signed on the dotted line.

David Lawrence commented on that in today's Star, as follows:

TWO VERY BAD PRECEDENTS SET—LABOR'S WAGE BOARD WALKOUT, RAIL UNION'S REPUDIATION OF PACT HURT DEFENSE EFFORT

Two very bad precedents have been recorded in the last few days which can rise to plague the whole defense effort.

One is a walkout on the Wage Stabilization Board aimed really at the absence of a labor man at the top level in the Defense Mobilization Office. Even though the Government has gone to the only place where it could possibly go to find management ability to supervise the production program for defense, labor thinks this management function must somehow be divided and an equal voice given to labor.

The other precedent is a repudiation of signatures affixed by the presidents of four railroad unions at a White House conference with mediator Steelman and the claim that no union agreement is valid unless ratified by another group of representatives with presumably higher authority.

This opens the way for management representatives to do the same thing. They, too, apparently now can sign agreements and, if their higher officials don't like them, cry out that the agreements were only tentative and subject to ratification.

Thus a board of directors of a big corporation can upset the applecart by claiming that the president of a company either exceeded his authority or that he was acting only on the assumption that his board of directors would later have a chance to approve or disapprove. Conceivably the way is open to stockholders to go still further and by their vote reject an agreement approved by a board of directors.

The truth of the matter is that collective bargaining is doomed if it runs up against such a blind alley. Labor-union chiefs might well ponder what they are doing to the cause of collective bargaining by reversing their historic attitude in support of the viewpoint which it has taken so long for the National Labor Relations Board and the courts to establish—namely, that the employer is responsible for the acts of his agents even down to the foreman. Certainly no NLRB or court decision would ever hold that the agreement made by a bona fide negotiating committee for the employer was without binding effect.

The railroad brotherhoods are among the oldest and hitherto have been considered among the best of America's trade-unions. Their record for honorable dealing has been without blemish. But now the brotherhoods are in the public position of claiming that a signature by a union president who has been negotiating for his union isn't worth its weight in fountain-pen ink.

Much more realistic is the view that any negotiating representative who isn't fully acquainted in advance with the limits that will be acceptable to his union should not have been entrusted with the task of negotiation in the first place. There is need for a further examination of the powers of negotiating representatives before they enter mediation conferences on disputes which, if unsettled, can bring hundreds of millions of dollars of losses to innocent bystanders.

The revolt against the Wage Stabilization Board appointed by Defense Mobilizer Wilson is a step calculated by the labor-union leaders to force a division in the management of the defense program. They openly concede they are not objecting so much to the 10 percent formula for wage controls as they are to the process by which it was made. They are attacking Mr. Wilson for venturing even to suggest the program for consideration by the Wage Board. The two-headed Hillman-Knudsen arrangement in the last war didn't work, and such a set-up will not work this time.

Equal representation with management on boards that decide labor questions is the unequivocal right of labor unions, but this is as far as labor representation should go unless labor can come forward with some one of the managerial genius of Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric.

In such a contingency the genius, no matter where he came from, should have complete control at the top, just as Mr. Wilson has today. The latter was appointed because he knows how to exercise management functions and how to deal with managements which are entrusted with billions of defense orders. He wasn't chosen for ideological reasons, and any effort to make it appear that way merely breeds dissension and makes impossible an efficient set-up at the top level.

If political pressure is to decide who shall really manage the defense program, then defeat on the production front is a distinct possibility. The mere fact that the labor unions are running to Mr. Truman in the hope of exerting political pressure is a sign that they think that's the way to get one of their partisans appointed to coequal authority with Mr. Wilson. It remains to be seen how Mr. Truman will react to this pressure.

I ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]: Do the unions believe in arbitration, in mediation, or are they to follow a rule which says, "We will tell you what we will take, and we won't work for any less"?

If we are to have collective bargaining, why should not the farmer bargain? I do not know who he would bargain with. He might bargain with the fellow he sold his produce to. But in the end, if he followed some unions, he would say, "You will pay so much or you don't get the beef, you don't get the eggs, you don't get the milk." That is the attitude the gentleman has. That is the attitude, apparently, of the unions. But the farmer and the man who sells merchandise sell at the price the demand fixes.

I repeat again, I believe in unions. I think they must have the power to bargain collectively. But there is also a limit to what they may do when they strike and endanger the public safety, health, or welfare. Then old Uncle Sam will have to take over.

Another point the gentleman made—and I am critical only of his argument, not of him—was this: He said these companies are making excessive profits. That is always the story. I have heard that argument about excessive profits many, many times over the years. That is always the story, the other fellow is making too much.

All my life I have lived in Michigan, and I never at any time had as much money as Henry Ford—never. So what? It never bothered me, never worried me. I never expected to have as much. And I never cussed out Henry because he charged so much—made so much. I had a car when I would not have had one had it not been made and sold by Henry. And Henry Ford was one man who never wasted his money on chorus girls, horse races, or in any foolish or sinful ways.

Yes, Henry Ford made a whale of a profit. Hundreds of thousands of people are glad he did, have enjoyed many things because he made millions, and he created, gave, and paid for jobs of millions of workers who are now paying good salaries to union officers.

So I have been content in my ignorant way to go along with taking what I could earn, be thankful for what I did have—not envious of someone who earned and had more.

The answer to the argument that someone in industry is making too much money seems to be this: Some of these unions have millions upon millions of dollars in cash and bonds. I recall very well a meeting that one union had, I think it was the teamsters' union in New Jersey. They had something like $4,000,000 in cash and some $4,000,000 in bonds. They authorized the executive committee to spend as much of those as might be necessary to defeat certain named Congressmen at the next election. If that was the teamsters' union and we have the trainmen and the CIO, and we have the A. F. of L., and we have the mechanics and all the rest of them, each with money in the treasury—those unions admittedly have more than $20,000,000—if some greedy crooked industrialist is making too much money, would it not seem to be fair for those unions and their officers to just establish some factory somewhere and operate business the way it ought to be run and make that excessive profit for the union? But I have never known of a union going into business, getting on the other side of the fence. So much for that.

Did anyone here ever hear of John L. Lewis, who is always cussing out the mine owners, locating or buying a mine, hiring and paying a wage, even a starvation wage, to a miner? With his $25,000 and plus a year, John ought to be able to buy a mine, even if it was just a little one. No, John would rather squeeze the small home owner out of a quarter or two on each ton of coal he must have to keep his family warm.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] a question. I know the gentleman has limitless courage. Does he realize that after making the speech that he did today that tomorrow or in the near future he will be accused of giving aid and comfort to Stalin?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know what I may be accused of. I only know that in my judgment I told the truth. I did it for the purpose of trying to be of help and of benefit to our Nation, which we all love. I probably will be very severely criticized by some and maybe by most—I do not know. But as I said in the beginning I am willing to give my political life and my physical life for my country. I know not what effect the speech will have. I only know what was intended, and it was intended as a service to the people I represent and to the greatest Nation upon the earth, this our beloved land, for which I am willing to give anything, even my life.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman offered his life when he enlisted in a prior war. We who know him know that he spoke his mind today—that he rendered a great service to his country—that he spoke notwithstanding the fact he knew he will be criticized. I listened to his statement here not only with interest, but with profit. I am convinced that he expressed the sentiments of his people as he expressed the sentiments of the people in many other districts. Our people do not want this war. They do not know why we are in it. They do not know the purpose of this war. They do not trust Acheson nor the State Department. They know the administration is not consistent. They are fearful of the cost, not so much in dollars as in lives. They are fearful of its effect upon the security of our Republic even though the war be won. They have won two wars. They have seen those victories thrown away by double talking incompetent or unpatriotic diplomats, intent upon forgetting the security, the interests of the Republic—intent upon serving Britain or the Communists.

Going back to the question that I asked the gentleman. My experience here tells me that these columnists, a certain group of them, and some radio commentators, too, if you please, shortly will renew and intensify their attempts to silence or brand everyone who speaks out in behalf of his constituents and who opposes this movement into war—this attempt to put millions of our men in Europe. They will brand as unpatriotic everyone who opposes a full all-out war.

Charge him with following the Communist line. When I say I do not want another war in Europe because the other two wars got us nothing, the obvious answer is, "Sure, Stalin wants Americans to stay home." Hence I am a supporter of Stalin. That is the lying method they always use. But because our people wish to stay at home is no reason why I, when I express the wishes of my people, who are demanding that I do everything within my power to keep us out of this war, should be charged with speaking for Stalin. But that is just what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] may expect from the pink, the Red, the international, commentators and radio announcers.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Does not the gentleman agree with me that our primary duty here is to speak our conscience within the rules of parliamentary debate and to do that which we believe is to the interest of our country and forget as much as we possibly can our own selfish interests?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course. Every honest, patriotic American should endeavor to follow that course; and he needs a thick hide—a conviction that cannot be shaken—an indifference to his political future—a stubbornness that borders on obstinacy.

Another we owe to our people and our country is not to swallow every improbable story designed to frighten us, even though it comes from the administration, from the brass hats, from the State Department, or from our political leaders here in the House. We ought to do our own thinking, and after we listen to what our constituents have to say, after we weigh their statements in the light of our own experience, use the best judgment and the common sense that God gave us.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] said something about sending an army to Europe. It has been said we are fighting this war to contain communism. How can anyone contend that statement to be true when we know that under Acheson, who followed the Hiss line, the State Department today refuses to let those 450,000 trained fighting men, the Chinamen in Formosa, willing to fight the enemy who drove them out of China, go across that narrow arm of the sea and fight side by side with our men? I cannot understand why it is that the State Department wants our men to march on, be wounded or killed, but they do not want to let the Chinamen, who want to do the job, do at least part of it. Acheson and the State Department, which seems to be running this war, by their acts indicate that American lives are of less value than are the lives of the Chinese. Oh, the British do not want the Chinese Nationalists in this war because they say it might offend Stalin and it might offend the Chinese Communist Government and they might take over Hong Kong. Well, then, let the British fight the war in Korea. But if the reason given be the real one, then why do the British, if they do, want us to send a million or more men into Europe. Will not that offend Stalin, make him mad, provoke him to war?

I know that the gentleman's sole purpose in making his talk today was to relieve his mind, satisfy his conscience, advise his colleagues of the course his people and he want to follow, because he and they believe it to be the only one which will preserve this a free nation. He expressed better than could many the thoughts of my people.

You know the British long boast that the sun never sets on the British flag. Now, if we keep on in this business of one war after another Americans can say, but in sorrow, that the setting sun never fails to cast its fading light on a cross which marks the grave of an American who gave his life in a futile attempt to make good the visionary scheme of the one-worlders. Mighty as is our Nation, continuous warfare may make it a fading nation—eventually an extinct nation.

A few moments ago I read to the gentleman what Churchill said after World War I. He told us in effect that war—World War I—was none of our business. He said we made the whole situation worse because we went into World War I.

Mr. MORRIS. In that connection I would like to say that, in my judgment, our Nation was not built for empire. Our Constitution is such and our traditions are such that we cannot effectively become an empire. Rome built for an empire status.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But it is no longer here.

Mr. MORRIS. And so did England, and so have others, but they have gone the way of all flesh, as far as great empires are concerned. However, they, to some extent, built for empire, but we were never even built for it. It was never intended by our founders, and when we get into that status we are getting into a status that is very probably going to mean disaster for us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is one thought I have been trying to express. Now coming back to the thought as to the criticism the gentleman will receive; the gentleman referred to a statement by Justice Douglas, which was to the effect that if we continued on our present course and followed the present foreign policy we would be wiped out as a nation. Did you notice an editorial in the Washington Star of the seventeenth following that talk, which took him to task and said that he was speaking out of turn and, in effect, said he did not know what he was talking about?

That editorial reads as follows:

JUSTICE DOUGLAS ON FOREIGN POLICY

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, has sounded off again in a field where he has shown, at least once before, an extraordinary lack of good judgment. Last summer, while touring the Middle East, he stirred up a lot of ill will both for himself and his country by presuming to tell the Iranians, in a sort of know-it-all manner, that they ought to wake up, make every peasant a landlord, and work out Iran's "destiny according to its own genius, perhaps 10 percent communism, 15 percent capitalism and 75 percent something else." And now, out in Tucson, Ariz., he has taken it upon himself to cut loose against American foreign policy.

Thus, as reported by the Associated Press, Justice Douglas has told his Tucson listeners that "if we continue our present foreign policy, especially in Asia, if we continue in our present direction, we are doomed to disaster." He has told them that the Far East is in a revolution similar to our own American Revolution—"a revolution that cannot be bought off with dollars." He has told them, too, that the people out there have "a catalog of specific complaints" (such as the absence of schools and medical care) and that the United States never has addressed itself to those complaints. Finally, as a free gift to the Kremlin propagandists, he has had this to say: "We talk about democracy and justice and at the same time we support regimes in those countries whose object is to keep both democracy and justice out of the reach of the peasants for all time."

Justice Douglas' remarks are so sweeping and nonspecific that one must ask him some questions. Precisely what kind of foreign policy would he substitute for the one we are now following in Asia? When he refers to buying off revolutions with dollars, what is he talking about? How does he square that seemingly snide remark with the fact that the United States played a leading role, but not necessarily a wise one, in hastening the independence of lands like India, Indonesia, and the Philippines, and then lending or giving them money and other types of aid? As for the "specific catalog of complaints," does he hold us responsible for the conditions that have led to those complaints, and has he looked twice at the point 4 program? And just what does he mean when he says we support antidemocratic and unjust regimes?

Does he mean that we should wash our hands of the Bao Dai government in Indochina and let Ho Chi-minh's Communists take over? Does he mean that we ought to give up Korea so the Reds can drag it behind the iron curtain for the Kremlin? Does he mean, as far as China is concerned, that we should forthwith dump Chiang Kai-shek and cuddle up to Mao Tse-tung, that great and nonaggressive "agrarian reformer"? Does he mean, in short, that our foreign policy dooms us to disaster because we have made up our minds not to permit the Soviet Union to dominate and tyrannize the whole of Asia? What is he talking about? If he were running things, exactly how would he run them? Would he run them with his formula of 10 percent communism, 15 percent capitalism, and 75 percent something else? And what is the something else? Sheer muddleheadedness?

A member of the Supreme Court is entitled to respect. But Mr. Douglas, by injecting himself into a field that is really none of his business as a Justice, and by doing it in a way that does not appeal to the intelligence, has invited something less than an admiring reaction. The propriety of his off-the-bench remarks would be seriously open to question even if they were sound. They certainly have added neither to his own stature nor to the stature of the Nation's highest tribunal, which is supposed to hold itself aloof from the hurly-burly of domestic and world politics. In some ways, his conduct in this instance is faintly reminiscent of the time when Henry Wallace, while Secretary of Commerce, tried to uppercut and rabbit-punch the State Department.

That is an example of what the gentleman from Oklahoma may expect from some of those who do not fight wars, who were not in the war as the gentleman was, but who want someone else to do the fighting and pay the costs, from some who just cannot tolerate any opposition to their own views.

Mr. MORRIS. I may say to the gentleman that I expect it, of course. I do not claim to be any great student of history, but I have read history for some 30 years and I know something of what I am talking about. I know my statement will not meet with the approval of many and I realize that no doubt it will be distorted by some; yes, I know that that is the natural consequence to one who speaks out, however true his head and heart may be, if he truly speaks out in a time of hysteria, and we are in such a time at the present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and I know something else the gentleman will get when he seeks advice. Sometimes we go here to those who are among our leaders on one or the other side of the aisle and not sure in our own minds ask: "What is the vote on this bill?"

The answer, "Well, the right thing to do is to vote 'no'; the sensible thing is to vote 'no,' but then, on the other hand, the expedient thing may be to vote 'yes'."

And so on this issue of world war III we will be told that we are in it; we must go along without protest; that we are disloyal if we refuse to follow a course which we believe will destroy the Republic.

The gentleman spoke about the need for Christianity. We are all agreed on that but too many think about it just in terms of its being a good objective. They do not consider whether the objective can be won. The internationalists are sincere and patriotic. They think that we are going to have universal, eternal peace by getting into some one world thing. This, they insist, is a great crusade. They ought to think about what happened when there were some other crusades a long, long time ago, in 1307. Those crusades lasted for years. Hundreds of thousands of people, men, women, and children—for children marched on some—died in those crusades to the Holy Land. Their purpose was fine, but they did not get peace.

And along with that I notice, talking about this thing of establishing peace and ending war, that in the Balkan States during the hundred years before 1948, 72 years and 6 months were years of war and conflict. So what will we get by wasting American manhood in a vain attempt to by war end war—establish permanent universal peace throughout the world? My fear is we will destroy ourselves.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, have I any time remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield it to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Talking about the Crusades, I may say that Peter the Hermit and Richard the Lionhearted beat up the war drums of the day back in the time of the Crusades, and the people actually believed that unless they did go to the Holy Land and wrest it away from the hated Mohammedans they might be struck down by a blow from Heaven. They went, of course, for I believe about a hundred years. But today no one would be so insane as to advocate a war against Mohammedanism by Christianity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ALBERT and Mr. STEED asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include newspaper articles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. McMILLAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Ricardo Romulo.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include House Concurrent Resolution 27 of the Texas Legislature.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address by Miss Marcia Anne Harmon, of St. Bernardine High School, Del Rosa, Calif., which won her one of the $500 college scholarship awards and a trip to Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. POTTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper story.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include an article.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

230. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces to public airports, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

231. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 85. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 80; with an amendment (Rept. No. 120). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 118. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 28; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 113. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 33; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 124. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 123). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 128. Resolution to provide funds for the investigation and study continued by House Resolution 74; with an amendment (Rept. No. 124). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 133. Resolution providing $60,000 for expenses for carrying out the investigation and study of

House Resolution 93; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Background information on the use of United States Armed Forces in foreign countries pursuant to House Resolution 26; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 138. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Annie L. Bourke; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2792. A bill to provide for the creation of a Students' Armed Forces Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2793. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2794. A bill to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to make inapplicable, in the case of certain radio stations, the requirement that a construction permit be obtained prior to issuance of an operating license; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces a statutory award for the total loss of hearing in one ear; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2796. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of Public Law 393 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2797. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend Public Law No. 172, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 12, 1949, chapter 340, 64 Statutes 440 (title 28, sec. 2680, U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2799. A bill to strengthen national defense by outlawing the gerrymander and saving representative government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2800. A bill to provide an allowance for uniforms for certain officers recalled to active service with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBESON:

H. R. 2801. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to apportionment of members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the compilation of Federal laws pertaining to veterans, 1914–50; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the suggested plan for national defense prepared by the Committee on National Defense of the American Association of Junior Colleges; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relating to Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, requesting that Congress continue and enhance its program of rehabilitation of the landless Indian in Montana, known as nonwards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 2802. A bill for the relief of Ming Foon Tow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of the Sun Laundry Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2804. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien Sophie Szenczi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of Gustaf Henrik Walfrid Walden, and his wife, Anja Leila Sylvia Seijes Walden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Malak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Di Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Franciska Gruber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2810. A bill for the relief of James Nels Ekberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. By Mr. GROSS: Petition presented by Virginia Kimm, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, bearing her name and that of 97 other residents of the Cedar Falls-Waterloo, Iowa, area, and calling for the equal levying of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

59. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of Pillager, Minn., urging that the serving and selling of alcoholic liquors and alcoholic beverages to service men and women be discontinued; to the Committee on Armed Services.

60. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Doris Hollingsworth, Washington, D. C., relative to requesting the impeachment and removal from office of Edward M. Curran, judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

61. Also, petition of John DeLaMater, secretary, Mount Pleasant Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., relative to appointing a committee to study the public transportation systems in the metropolitan area of Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John C. Millian, D. D., district superintendent, Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Holy and eternal God, ruler of men and nations, bestower of grace, mercy, and peace, we bow humbly and prayerfully in Thy presence.

Keenly aware of our failures, we come in deep contrition praying that in Thy redeeming grace we may find strength for the facing of this hour.

As responsibility rests heavily upon us, wilt Thou endow us with that true wisdom which comes only from Thee, with that spiritual insight without which we are sightless, with that understanding heart whereby we can pray even for our enemies. May Thy divine spirit turn their hate into love and their deception into honest cooperation.

May our strength be renewed that we may rise above our faltering selves and with Thy help courageously bring peace to nations and freedom to the imprisoned souls of men.

We pray this in faith, believing for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 19, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 59) for the relief of Vernon Crudge.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 31. An act for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization;

H. R. 335. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 400. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy;

H. R. 403. An act providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence;

H. R. 574. An act for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 596. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 613. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 624. An act for the relief of Chisako Shimizu and Ryoichi Shimizu;

H. R. 638. An act for the relief of Warren Thomas and others;

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 661. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 676. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 680. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 706. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma;

H. R. 712. An act for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 715. An act for the relief of Aenny Blank;

H. R. 721. An act for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of Carlo de Luca;

H. R. 727. An act for the relief of Julia Busch;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Fakken;

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicolette and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 774. An act for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 795. An act for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Louisa Monti;

H. R. 848. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson;

H. R. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain;

H. R. 859. An act for the admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Baiosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 1090. An act to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1134. An act for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Lum Ying;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle;

H.R. 1239. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Stern;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1449. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta);

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Josephine Lisitano;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 1566. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 1580. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

H. R. 1584. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Earl L. Doss;

H. R. 1596. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter;

H. R. 1730. An act to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1822. An act for the relief of Harry C. Goakes;

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz;

H. R. 1840. An act for the relief of Bernard Spielmann;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of Sam Patterson;

H. R. 1908. An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian;

H. R. 2066. An act for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor;

H. R. 2110. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; and

H. R. 2339. An act to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services sitting jointly were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 1724 is before the Senate, and under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on February 19 the time between now and 1:30 is equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the calling of the roll be charged equally to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Cordon
Anderson	Cain	Douglas
Bennett	Capehart	Duff
Brewster	Carlson	Dworshak
Bricker	Case	Eastland
Bridges	Chapman	Ecton
Butler, Md.	Clements	Ellender
Butler, Nebr.	Connally	Ferguson

Flanders	Kilgore	O'Conor
Frear	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Langer	Pastore
George	Lehman	Robertson
Green	Lodge	Russell
Hayden	Long	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	McCarran	Schoeppel
Hennings	McCarthy	Smathers
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hill	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Hoey	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Holland	Malone	Stennis
Humphrey	Martin	Taft
Hunt	Maybank	Thye
Ives	Millikin	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Wiley
Kefauver	Murray	Williams
Kem	Neely	
Kerr	Nixon	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and offer matters for insertion in the RECORD, without debate, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the Douglas amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before presentation of matters for the RECORD, the Chair wishes to say that the Japanese Diet has chosen four of its members representing different political groups to come to the United States to study our institutions, and stay among us for the purpose of carrying home with them such lessons as they may, in connection with our Government and its institutions, in order that they may create among the Japanese people and in the governmental circles of Japan a wider understanding of our institutions, our purposes, and our character.

I ask that the clerk read a brief statement ending with the names of the distinguished members of the Japanese Diet.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Under the sponsorship of the Department of the Army, and supervision of the United States Federal Security Agency, the following members of the Japanese Diet from both Houses have been selected by the Japanese Government to visit the United States in order to familiarize themselves with American methods in the field of public health and welfare.

It is my privilege and pleasure to welcome the following members of the Japanese Diet: Ryutaro Terashima, Buichi Oishi, M. D., Gishin Yamashita, and Miss Natsue Inoue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate the Chair desires to welcome these distinguished guests to our Chamber and to our country, and to express the hope that their visit among us will be pleasant and mutually profitable between the two peoples.

The Chair asks that the four members of the Japanese Diet, who are sitting in the rear of the Chamber, rise so the Members of the Senate may recognize them.

The four members of the Japanese Diet rose and were greeted with applause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the delegation from the Japanese Diet and now asks unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES THIS 21ST DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE YEAR 1951 BY FOUR MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

(Statement presented by Mr. Ryutaro Terashima, leader of the group)

We members of the Japanese Diet arrived here on the 28th day of January to participate in the Japanese cultural exchange program under the auspices of the Department of the Army. The purpose of our mission has been to observe the administration of social welfare and public health in the United States of America and our more specific goal is to acquire information which will be helpful in revising the social-security system of our country.

Since our arrival under the kind and helpful supervision of the Federal Security Agency and through the cooperation of both the legislative bodies of the Congress of the United States and through our association with many groups of citizens outside of Government, we have been able to follow closely the legislative process as it pertains to social welfare and public health.

We eagerly look forward in the time still remaining with the sincere desire that we will be able to make further observations which will enable us to formulate more positive ideas in these fields.

You well knew that immediately after the war the state of our nation was one of extreme impoverishment, yet so fortunate for our people, through the humanitarian assistance of the people of the United States, we were able to rapidly reestablish ourselves upon a minimum level of subsistence. Once again we now are able to look to the future with the hope of making the lives of our people happy and to the rebuilding of a more peaceful and more democratic Japan. We feel that one of the most important problems facing us is the early establishment of an over-all social-security system in our country.

Our stay in the United States up to today has been about 3 weeks. It is, therefore, difficult for us to express a concise statement as to our impressions of America other than that we have already recognized the unique broad-mindedness of your people and have marveled at how they have adapted scientific developments to the utmost benefit to themselves and to mankind as a whole.

We desire the friendship of the United States; we dedicate ourselves to maintenance of closer relations between our respective nations; and we shall do our utmost in contributing to the peacefulness of the world and the happiness of mankind.

Today you, the Senate of the United States of America of the Eighty-second Congress, have extended to us the rare privilege of visiting your session, for which we express our deepest gratitude.

MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE SOCIAL WELFARE MISSION VISITING THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY–APRIL 1951

Under the sponsorship of the Department of the Army and supervision of the United States Federal Security Agency, four Japanese Diet members from both houses have been selected by the Japanese Government to visit the United States in order to familiarize themselves with American methods in the field of public health and welfare. They arrived in Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1951, where they will remain for 3 weeks, visiting various public and private welfare organizations. Then they plan to tour the United States to study State, municipal, and local public health and social-security systems. The group wil be in the United States approximately 80 days. The mission is composed of the following persons: Ryutaro Terashima; Buichi Oishi, M. D.; Gishin Yamashita; Miss Natsue Inoue.

RYUTARO TERASHIMA

Liberal Party member of the House of Representatives from Chiba Prefecture; chairman of the welfare committee.

Mr. Terashima was born in Mangai Village, Chiba Prefecture, on March 31, 1911. He graduated from Chiba Prefectural Agricultural School in 1930 and the Daito Bunka Gaknin (Cultural College) in 1933. He has been an active journalist and also worked in various governmental positions, including the nonofficial staff Repatriating Farmers' Section, Planning Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 1945–48. He was elected a member of the House of Representatives in April 1947 and reelected in January 1949.

BUICHI OISHI, M. D.

Liberal Party member of the House of Representatives from Miyagi Prefecture; member of the welfare committee.

Mr. Oishi was born on June 19, 1909, in Sendai City, Miyagi Prefecture. He studied at Sendai Second Middle School and Second Higher School and was graduated from Tohuku Imperial University's School of Medicine in 1935. He remained at his alma mater as an assistant and lecturer until October 1947, when he was appointed chief of the Internal Medicine Section, National Sendai Hospital. Oishi was elected to the House of Representatives at a by-election in May 1948 and was reelected in January 1949.

Oishi has been outstanding in the field of medicine and as a member of the Japan Medical Association, Japan Academic Society of Internal Medicine, and a committeeman, Advisory Council on Social Security.

GISHIN YAMASHITA

Social Democratic Party member of the House of Councilors from Hiroshima Prefecture and chairman of the health and welfare committee; priest of Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist sect; educator and social worker.

Yamashita was born on March 21, 1894, in Kure City, Hiroshima Prefecture, and was graduated from the Buddhist College in 1927. Prior to his study at the Buddhist College he served in the Japanese Army as second

lieutenant for several years. Yamashita served as lecturer at the Hiroshima Police School, 1940; nonofficial staff, Hiroshima Prefectural Office, 1942; director of War Orphans' Care Center in Hiroshima Prefecture, 1945; and was elected to the House of Councilors in 1947. He has been serving as chairman of the welfare committee since May 1948, to which post he was reelected in July 1950. He is also a member of the Social Security Advisory Council and the Community Chest Central Committee.

MISS NATSUE INOUE

Independent member of the House of Councilors; member of the welfare committee; president of the Japan Nursing Association.

Miss Inoue was born on July 25, 1898, in Hyogo Prefecture, and was graduated from the Nurses' Training School, Osaka Red Cross Hospital, in March 1917 and from Bedford College, London University in 1929, where she majored in public health nursing sponsored by the League of Red Cross Societies. Through self-study she passed the Japanese Government's high-school qualification examination in 1931 to become eligible for college entrance. She served as public health nursing instructor at the Public Health Institute, Tokyo, from 1940 to 1946; superintendent of nurses, Tokyo Central Red Cross Hospital, 1946-47; and was elected to the House of Councilors in April 1947. As president of the Japan Nursing Association since November 1946, she has been giving advice and guidance in nursing throughout Japan.

Miss Inoue published a brief history of nursing in Japan and a book entitled "Ethics in Nursing." She is here to study public health and welfare work in the field of nursing.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the year ended April 1, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize immediate development of the St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas development of the St. Lawrence waterway is vital to full development of the country's resources and inland transportation facilities; and

"Whereas for years the governors and legislatures of the State of Wisconsin, regardless of political affiliation, have gone on record as favoring this great project; and

"Whereas the demand for this seaway is greater than ever today to open the Great Lakes to navigation by seagoing vessels and furnish Midwest farm, factory, mine, and shipyard products access to the markets of the world; and

"Whereas this seaway will increase our national security, stimulate development of the resources of the Midwest, lower transportation costs, and conserve our natural resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway for navigation by seagoing vessels at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the clerk of each House of the Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"GEORGE M. SMITH,
"President of the Senate.
"THOMAS M. DONAHUE,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"ORA R. RICE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of New York, relating to public assistance programs by the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. IVES on February 19, 1951, p. 1310, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The petition of Mrs. J. M. Leader, of Aurora, Ill., relating to the drafting of 18-year-old boys, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by Chapter No. 1, Disabled American Veterans, Oahu, T. H., favoring the continuation of Drew Pearson on the air as a newscaster; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Republic of Lithuania Day, February 16, was an occasion of outstanding importance to the Lithuanian-American colony of Maryland. In happier days, prior to the initiation of Communist aggression in Europe, it was a day of rejoicing and celebration, for Lithuania was free after years of enslavement and its progress in cultural and economic fields was of an extraordinary nature.

In the dark days which have descended upon the Baltic countries, Republic of Lithuania Day, while no longer an occasion for rejoicing, is replete with significance to those among us of Lithuanian birth and descent in that it serves to keep alive and strengthen the ideals of liberty and the determination that has never been extinguished in the hearts of free people anywhere to strive unceasingly until freedom again is achieved.

It was in accordance with this spirit that the Baltimore Council of Lithuanian Societies adopted a resolution in commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at its 1951 Republic of Lithuania celebration.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, citizens of Baltimore, Md., gathered under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, in commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1951 at Lithuanian Hall, after due deliberations regarding the present international situation, take note of the following:

The United States of America, together with other United Nations members, is engaged in a bloody struggle in Korea defending the freedom of peace-loving people against Communist aggressors.

We believe the bold and determined steps taken by the United States of America to protect a defenseless people emerging into a status of independent statehood rallied the forces of freedom everywhere and revived suffering mankind's faith in American policy objectives.

Let it not be forgotten, however, that the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia constitute the original "Korea," since they were the first to be overrun by the Communist forces more than 10 years ago. These same nations are still under Communist domination and they are being inhumanly subjected to extermination by the genocidal policy of the Soviet rulers.

Furthermore, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were members in good standing of the League of Nations. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, which had been expelled from the League because of the aggressive war it waged against Finland, is a member of the United Nations with a veto power to block the complaints of the victimized Baltic States.

We agree with the statement of the President of the United States in his last state of the Union message to Congress, that free and independent nations can band together in a world order based on law, and that the cornerstone of such a peaceful world has been laid in the United Nations. But the President's further statement: "The imperialism of the czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty and menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union," indicates to us that the Soviet Union does not intend to abide by the Charter of the United Nations.

Wherefore it is respectfully requested that the United States of America continue to maintain its world leadership in its efforts to achieve international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice, and we urge the President and the Secretary of State to adopt appropriate measures in order to accomplish the following:

1. To bring up the matter of the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the open international forum of the UN;

2. To invoke the aid of the UN in condemning and stopping the crime of genocide which is being perpetrated in Lithuania and other Baltic countries by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its ruling Communist Party;

3. The release of all of the political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union;

4. To allow freedom of religion to all people;

5. To assist the Lithuanian Nation and the other Baltic States when the forces of Com-

munist imperialism are crushed, in the re-establishment of a separate national sovereignty and true freedom and independence; and

6. To demand the ouster of the Soviet Union from membership in the UN if it continues with its flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
By ANTHONY J. MICEIKA, *President.*
By MARTIN RAILA, *Secretary.*

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS AND AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT IN CUMBERLAND, MD.—RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, attention has been called previously by me to the depressed economic condition now prevalent in the Cumberland area of western Maryland. Pertinent to this matter are two resolutions which I am sending to the desk which were adopted by the House of Delegates of Maryland, one requesting that the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory be located in the city of Cumberland, the other asking that the city of Cumberland be considered as a site for any Government offices moved from Washington.

In line with President Truman's expressed interest in moves to rehabilitate such depressed economic areas it is sincerely hoped that some assistance may be afforded by the Federal Government toward this very desirable end.

I present the resolutions for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 21

"House resolution requesting that the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory be located in the city of Cumberland

"Whereas the Department of National Defense has under consideration the possible construction of a Quartermaster Research Laboratory; and

"Whereas the city of Cumberland would offer many advantages as a site for this research laboratory among which are easy accessibility to the District of Columbia, favorable railroad transportation, and a large pool of intelligent workmen; and

"Whereas locating the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory in the city of Cumberland also would help to alleviate the serious conditions of unemployment now existing in that area: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, be requested to give serious consideration to the possibility of constructing the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory in the city of Cumberland and to the numerous advantages offered by that site for the new laboratory; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to Gen. George C. Marshall, and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 13, 1951.

"Resolution adopted.

"By order Raymond H. Miller, chief clerk.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"RAYMOND H. MILLER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 15

"House resolution requesting that the city of Cumberland be considered as a site for any Government offices moved from Washington

"Whereas the Federal Government is seriously considering the removal of some of its many offices concentrated in and around the District of Columbia in order to provide a dispersal of governmental functions as a means of guarding against the excessive damage of a possible bomb attack; and

"Whereas the city of Cumberland is located about 140 miles away from the District of Columbia and is easily accessible to the District of Columbia by all modern means of transportation; and

"Whereas the inland location of the city of Cumberland places it sufficiently far from the District of Columbia as to give a measure of tactical safety for air raids; and

"Whereas there is an abundant labor supply and a variety of possible sites for the establishment of any such Federal departments or agencies in Cumberland: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Federal Government be urged to give full consideration to the possibilities of establishing units and agencies of the Federal Government in the city of Cumberland as part of its program for the dispersal of the many offices and agencies now located in and around the District of Columbia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 13, 1951.

"Resolution adopted.

"By order Raymond H. Miller, chief clerk.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"RAYMOND H. MILLER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

MINIMUM PRICE CEILINGS ON MILK—RESOLUTION OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from William O. Perdue, general manager of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, of 18 West First Street, Fond du Lac, Wis., an important resolution regarding the maintenance of minimum price ceilings on milk in non-Federal milk order areas. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Perdue's resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and be thereafter referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the State board of directors of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, in official session at Fond du Lac, February 8, 1951, does hereby urge the retention of title 4 of the Defense Production Act which contains the Cole-Ives amendment providing for minimum price ceilings on milk in non-Federal order areas. It is pointed out that there is no conflict as between this amendment and the Federal Marketing Agreement Act. On the contrary, the effect of the Cole-Ives amendment will be to aid in preserving price balances as between the Federal and the non-Federal order markets; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Wisconsin's Senators and Congressmen, urging them to support and defend the Cole-Ives amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 as presently written, together with other safeguards contained in the act relating to minimum price ceilings for milk in Federal order markets and for milk and dairy products in other markets.

PROTEST AGAINST TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST—RESOLUTION OF WAUSAU (WIS.) COMMON COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have this morning received from J. L. Brown, city clerk, of Wausau, Wis., a resolution adopted by the common council of that community on February 13. The resolution opposes the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury to tax the interest on municipal bonds. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, heretofore, interest on municipal bonds has not been subject to Federal income taxation; and

Whereas such freedom from income tax has made it possible for municipalities to borrow money for improvements at a low rate of interest; and

Whereas the city of Wausau has heretofore been able to finance public improvements at an extremely low rate of interest because of such income-tax exemption; and

Whereas it has now been proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury that interest on municipal bonds be subjected to income tax; and

Whereas there have been similar proposals in the past all of which have been decisively defeated in the interest of the welfare of municipalities; and

Whereas if the interest on municipal bonds is subjected to income tax as proposed, the result would be merely to raise the interest rates which municipalities would be obligated to pay on their obligations, and thereby the burden of such income taxes would be transferred to the general property taxpayer; and

Whereas such a step would make it difficult and far more costly to municipalities to finance public improvements; and

Whereas such a step would place an undue, unwarranted, and unnecessary burden upon municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Wausau, That any attempt to subject interest on municipal bonds to Federal income taxation be and is opposed; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable REID F. MURRAY, Congressman from the Seventh Congressional District, and to Senator WILEY and Senator MCCARTHY.

HOMER L. DUNCAN.
GEORGE W. RAKOW.
HENRY J. LUSSIER.
HELEN OHM.

AID TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from John G. Ausman, president of the Wisconsin Association of Directors of Vocational and Adult Education, an important resolution on the subject of continued fulfilling of this vital program. We of Wisconsin have pioneered in the field of vocational training and for that reason I

am particularly interested in the comments made by that able group of American leaders. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted at the meeting in Madison by the association be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the George-Barden Act, Public Law 586, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 725, second session, authorized an appropriation of $28,850,000 as aid to the States for the further development of vocational education; and

Whereas an appropriation of $19,842,759.97 has been made available by Congress under the provisions of Public Law 586, Seventy-ninth Congress, and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has received an annual allotment of $465,450.77 for instruction in agriculture, distributive occupations, home economics, and trades and industries which has been expended for purposes authorized in the act, and contributes materially to the successful program of vocational education in the State; and

Whereas the budget submitted by President Truman to the present session of Congress recommends an appropriation of only $9,842,760 under the provisions of this act to be distributed under the formula set up in the act and Wisconsin's allotment of aid will, therefore, be reduced to $181,934.03, and the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that $10,000,000 available in the past as aid to the States for vocational education be appropriated to be used for defense training and training for essential civilian employment only, and not subject to apportionment under the provisions of the act; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Association of Local Directors of Vocational and Adult Education meeting in Madison on Wednesday, February 7, respectfully wishes to point out to each Member of Congress from Wisconsin that—

1. This reduced appropriation will seriously hamper the present program of vocational education operating in the State in the fields of vocational agriculture, trade, and industrial education, home economics, and distributive education and may result in the discontinuance of programs in communities in the State.

2. That the existing programs of vocational education contribute materially to our economy from the standpoint of defense training: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Association of Local Directors of Vocational and Adult Education urge Members of Congress from Wisconsin that funds appropriated under the provisions of Public Law 586 as aid to the States for vocational education should not at this time be reduced but should be increased to the full $28,850,000 authorized in the act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin by the president of the Wisconsin Association of Local Directors of Vocational and Adult Education.

FOOD FOR THE PEOPLE OF INDIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE HINDUSTAN TIMES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 15, I was proud to be a cosponsor of proposed legislation designed to provide 2,000,000 tons of food grains for the people of India. It is my sincere hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will soon act favorably to report this measure to the floor of the Senate for action.

This proposed legislation is an indication of the growing spirit of friendship by the people of the United States for the people of India. As evidence of that friendship, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Hindustan Times of February 14, 1951, published in New Delhi, India. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

[From the Hindustan Times, New Delhi, India, of February 14, 1951]

A GENEROUS GESTURE

President Truman's message to Congress to authorize the supply of 2,000,000 tons of food grains for India will be widely welcomed in this country, especially, coming as it does after the recent divergence in the United States and Indian foreign policies over Korea. Referring to these differences, President Truman stated that they "should not blind us to the needs of the Indian people." He added: "These differences must not deflect us from our tradition of friendly aid to alleviate human suffering." The Indian Prime Minister has also stated in Parliament that India was not going to allow these differences to stand in the way of continued friendship with the United States. What will make the American gift more worth while, when it comes, is that it is being offered unconditionally, without any attempt to exact a price from India. The spirit of this gesture is bound to be deeply appreciated in this country. Indians have always responded warmly to acts of kindness and we have no doubt that as a result of American assistance received at a time when the rationing system in the country is on the point of breakdown, there will be increasing cordiality and friendship in the relationship between the two countries. India will remember with gratitude the help rendered in this regard by the timely declaration of sympathy by Mr. Hoover, whose word must have fortified President Truman, and the undoubted influence exerted on her behalf by the United States Ambassador, Mr. Loy Henderson.

Under the scheme of relief placed by President Truman before the United States Congress, India will receive 1,000,000 tons of food grains as an outright gift, India paying the transport charges. The other million tons, for which also the President has asked for authorization, will be sent after an American mission has made on-the-spot appraisal of conditions in this country. Proceeds from the sale of these food grains in Indian currency will be placed in a special account which will be utilized for the improvement of Indian agriculture and development of natural resources, in order to deal with the root causes of recurring food crises. To get over the shipping difficulty, ships are to be taken from the American moth-ball fleet and on their return voyages these ships will help to relieve the shortage of shipping impeding the flow of scarce materials to the United States of America. Thus not only will the grant of food grains relieve the immediate food shortage but the use of counterpart funds, as in the case of other ECA countries, will help in the rehabilitation of Indian agriculture. India's food shortage is chronic in the sense that, with the separation of Burma and the creation of Pakistan, large food-growing areas have ceased to be part of the country and, consequently, food sufficiency can come only by way of increased production and the bringing of fresh land under cultivation. American generosity will thus be of assistance to us in forging ahead with our program of food self-sufficiency as well. It is to be hoped that the legislation will be passed by the United States Congress without unnecessary delay, as the time factor is of vital importance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1601. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 118).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 683. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 119).

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING ACT OF 1951—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report unanimously, with amendments, the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 117) thereon. The amendments are in the nature of a substitute to the original text of the bill and to the title.

I should like to call the attention of the Senators to the fact that the printed bill and the committee report should be available for distribution tomorrow. The committee hearings have been available for several days and a great number of copies have been sent to the various Senators.

This bill addresses itself to a very fundamental proposition.

The greater the degree of familiarity with the text of the legislation which each Member of the Senate has, the more effective will our consideration of the legislation be.

For that reason I am hopeful that the Senators will find it possible to give to this bill and the committee report such advance study as the very crowded schedule of a Senator will permit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Masako Miyazaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; and

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Sheldon J. Coffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 917. A bill for the relief of Arnold Csapo and his wife, Gizella Csapo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 918. A bill to provide for an increase in grade on the Regular Air Force retired list of certain officers who are called to active duty subsequent to their retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 919. A bill to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the recovery of triple damages under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 920. A bill for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 922. A bill to repeal the proviso against the filling of the vacancy in the office of district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 923. A bill to extend the basis for appellate reviews in Veterans' Administration; and

S. 924. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 925. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 923. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 927. A bill to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 928. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; and

S. 929. A bill to authorize the detail of officers of the Armed Forces to any duty or position with the Department of Commerce in connection with the work of promoting civil aviation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 930. A bill for the relief of Ivan Herben, his wife, son, and daughter-in-law; and

S. 931. A bill for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 932. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng Yeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 933. A bill for the relief of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 934. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 935. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 936. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. BRICKER introduced Senate bill 937, to extend to nations with which the United States engages in armed conflict the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 938. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 939. A bill to provide for the designation of the lignite research laboratory at Grand Forks, N. Dak., as the Charles R. Robertson Laboratory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THYE) introduced Senate bill 940, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 941. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for the retirement of individuals without regard to age after 40 years' service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 942. A bill to provide for the abatement of tax of certain trusts, the income and corpus of which are equitably owned by members of the Armed Forces who died on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to January 1, 1948; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to nations with which the United States engages in armed conflict the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining its provisions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 937) to extend to nations with which the United States engages in armed conflict the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

During the latter days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, I introduced S. 4244, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act. The purpose of the bill was to broaden the provisions to include situations such as that we now face in the Far East.

We live in a day of undeclared war, of police action, of Communist-directed revolt. Whatever term we use, we must face the fact that American boys are being sent into battle against troops either of nations or directed and supported by nations with whom this country maintains commercial or even ostensibly amicable relations. I cannot condone sending supplies of any sort, particularly military matériel, to any nation supporting an armed force in conflict with our own. For that reason, I am reintroducing in the Eighty-second Congress my amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act, to make it clear that no one may sell or ship articles of trade to nations who are, in fact, allied against the United States.

MASWOOD BAKHT CHOWDHURY ET AL.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 882) for the relief of Maswood Bakht Chowdhury, Miftahuj Jaman or Pirut Miah, Nosib Ali, Asoddar Ali, Abdul Karim, Konor Ali, Sogone Ali, Rofiquc Uddin Chowdhury, Abdul Rohim, Harun Chowdory, and Sunafor Ullah, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Thursday, February 15, on behalf of myself and a bipartisan group of 29 other Members of the Senate, I introduced Senate bill 872, to furnish emergency food aid to India. Since that time the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has requested that his name be added to the group of sponsors. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania be added to the sponsors of the bill (S. 872).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is no doubt that in the years since the end of hostilities in World War II the United States destroyed, abandoned, gave away, or lost billions of dollars' worth of military equipment in various parts of the world. In our present danger we wish that we had kept some of this equipment. It is conceivable that we could save literally billions of dollars if we knew where it is today. So far as I know, no complete inventory of it is available. I, therefore, submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for an investigation of the disposition of all the materials which were declared surplus after the end of hostilities in World War II. If we can find out what we had, we will know what we can expect to salvage in our present crisis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all phases of the disposition by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government of materials declared surplus to the needs of the Government after World War II.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than 3 months after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951, RELATING TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 76), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951 transmitted to Congress by the President on February 19, 1951.

STUDY OF PROPOSED SALE OF GERMAN EMBASSY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is directed to make a full and complete study concerning the proposed sale of the property in the District of Columbia known as the German Embassy, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study together with its recommendations as to the advisability of such sale.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is hereby requested to postpone the proposed sale of the German Embassy until the completion of the study referred to in the first section of this resolution.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar:

H. R. 31. An act for refund of customs duties to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization;

H. R. 400. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy;

H. R. 403. An act providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence;

H. R. 574. An act for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover;

H. R. 576. An act fo the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 596. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 613. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 624. An act for the relief of Chisako Shimizu and Ryoichi Shimizu;

H. R. 638. An act for the relief of Warren Thomas and others;

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 661. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 676. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 680. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 706. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma;

H. R. 712. An act for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 715. An act for the relief of Aenny Blank;

H. R. 721. An act for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of Carlo de Luca;

H. R. 727. An act for the relief of Julia Busch;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 774. An act for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 795. An act for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Luisa Monti;

H. R. 848. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson;

H. R. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1134. An act for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Lum Ying;

H. R. 1239. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Stern;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1449. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta);

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Josephine Lisitano;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of the Sonoma County Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 1566. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.;

H. R. 1580. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

H. R. 1584. An act for the relief of Edward Woolf;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Earl L. Doss;

H. R. 1596. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter;

H. R. 1822. An act for the relief of Harry C. Goakes;

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz;

H. R. 1840. An act for the relief of Bernard Spielmann;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of Sam Patterson;

H. R. 1908. An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Kirocor Haladjian, Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, and Virginie Haladjian;

H. R. 2066. An act for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Geraldine L. Smith, mother and natural guardian of Thomas Clayton Smith, a minor;

H. R. 2110. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd; and

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1730. An act to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 335. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe;

H. R. 1090. An act to extend the period for the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Richard Gregory Rundle and Valiquette Adele Rundle;

H. R. 1966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; and

H. R. 2339. An act to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CANADIAN DEFENSE EFFORT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, having received a number of requests for information concerning the Canadian defense effort, I have looked into this matter which interests so many Americans and find that a greatly enlarged defense program was announced on February 5 in the Canadian House of Commons by Hon. Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defense of Canada. The new program covers the next three fiscal years, that is, from April 1, 1951, to March 31, 1954.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement of the chief features of the Canadian defense effort printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

1. Cost: The total cost of the program is estimated at over $5,000,000,000. The cost in the next fiscal year is put at about $1,600,000,000. Defense expenditures 4 years ago were $194,000,000. The original vote for the current fiscal year before the Korean War began was $425,000,000. (This estimate was enlarged last autumn by a further vote of $142,000,000 and by a special vote of $300,000,000 to cover the cost of equipment to be supplied to North Atlantic Treaty countries under mutual aid.) There has been almost a fourfold increase in defense estimates in the last year (from $425,000,000 to $1,600,000,000).

2. Air Force: A striking feature of the new program is the expansion of the Canadian Air Force to a total of 40 squadrons and the provision of training facilities for air crews for a greatly increased number of Canadians and others. Of the 40 squadrons, 11 comprising an air division will be made available to General Eisenhower's command, including 1 already in the United Kingdom and 2 to be sent overseas before long. These will all be fighter squadrons equipped with Sabre and Canuck jet aircraft. (The Canuck is an all-weather, two-engine fighter of Canadian design and very high performance.)

Arrangements are already in effect for the training of aircrews in Canada from five Western European countries and the United Kingdom. The facilities are to be expanded to permit an out-turn of over 3,000 aircrew per annum, of whom about 1,100 will be trained for other NAT countries under mutual aid.

The strength of the Canadian air force will be expanded by the addition of 3,000 planes. This will involve a considerable expansion of the Canadian aircraft industry for production of the latest types for the Canadian air force and for other countries.

For continental defense a screen of radar stations is being developed in cooperation with the United States. These are being equipped with the latest apparatus and supported by fighter squadrons. The American and Canadian radar chains will be linked to form a single system, of which about one-quarter will be in Canada.

3. Army: A brigade group (or regimental combat team) is to be made available for service in Western Europe under General Eisenhower's command. It is hoped that it may arrive in Europe at about the same time as additional United States forces.

A specially trained airborne striking force will continue to be maintained in Canada to deal with any possible attempts at landings in Canadian territory. The army will also provide strong formations of antiaircraft artillery for local defense.

Under mutual aid the armament and ammunition for one infantry division, which was offered to NATO last August, was shipped to the Netherlands late in 1950. Allocation of similar equipment for a second division has just been made by NATO and it will be shipped shortly. The allocation to Luxemburg of armament for an artillery regiment has also just been announced. As arrangements are completed for the replacement of Canadian stocks by United States types, transfers of the balance of Canadian stocks of United Kingdom types will be continued. (The Canadian Army is adopting United States type equipment and its needs are being met by purchase in the United States and manufacture in Canada.) Stocks of United Kingdom types in Canada will provide nearly all the armament for four infantry divisions. General Eisenhower has reported that "the most immediate need of Europe is munitions and equipment."

Equipment will be secured to permit the rapid expansion, in the event of war, of the Canadian forces. The aim is to have available as soon as possible whatever is required for all the expanded services during the first year of a war.

4. Navy: The active strength of the Navy will be doubled and nearly 100 ships together with many small craft will be manned to carry out the Canadian share under NATO planning of North Atlantic defense. For this duty ships of the latest types are now under construction and others in commission or in reserve are to be rearmed and refitted.

The defenses of vital harbors are to be completed with modern equipment, and the shipbuilding industry is to be made ready for rapid expansion.

5. Manpower and production: Under the program the strength of the active forces will be increased by nearly 70 percent to 115,000 active service personnel and 33,000 civilians. The active forces in being and planned are sufficient to carry out the agreed role of Canada under the North Atlantic Treaty.

Canada is already producing some new equipment for allied countries, and as standard designs are approved and shortages determined by NATO the production of equipment beyond Canadian needs will be greatly expanded.

6. Comparative figures on population and income: According to the latest available figures, the population of Canada is about one-eleventh that of the United States and the Canadian national income is about one-eighteenth or one-nineteenth that of this country. It is plain, therefore, that Canada is not dragging its feet.

7. Canadian contributions in Korea: To assist the United Nations forces in Korea Canada sent three destroyers and they have given a good account of themselves. They are being successively replaced by other destroyers.

The Four Hundred and Twenty-sixth Heavy Transport Squadron gave great assistance in the arduous airlift to the Far East.

The Canadian Army enlisted 10,000 men for an 18 months' term for the special purpose of carrying out any undertaking by Canada under the Charter of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty. With 900 men posted from the regular active force they form the Canadian Army special force. Appropriate arrangements will be made for officers and men who wish to do so to become part of the regular force.

One unit of the special force, the Second Battalion of the Princess Patricias, is in Korea. The remainder of the special force is continuing its training at Fort Lewis and will be available for service where required.

RECENT CHANGES IN FOOD PRICES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to submit in behalf of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a preliminary statement on the subject of recent rises in food prices relating to beef and a few canned commodities. I ask unanimous consent to be granted 2 minutes in which to read a few extracts from the statement and to comment thereon for the benefit of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. With reference to beef prices:

Current retail prices of the important cuts of beef are higher in relation to either wholesale beef sides or to live-cattle prices than a year earlier. Between the latter part of January 1950 and the latter part of January 1951 the price of Good grade (now called Choice) beef steers at Chicago increased from $30 to $35 per 100 pounds, or 17 percent. During the same period the wholesale price of comparable carcass beef increased 20 percent and the average price of several retail cuts increased 31 percent in the Washington area and 26 percent in eight representative cities.

The spread between the wholesale price of carcass beef and the average of these retail cuts increased 46 percent in the Washington area and 38 percent in the eight representative cities. Preliminary data based on eight cities indicate that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar spent for beef dropped to 71 cents in January 1951 as compared with 75 cents in January 1950.

I would like to call your particular attention to the table attached to the statement entitled "Prices of Live Steers, Carcass Beef, and Selected Cuts January 1950 and January 1951." It will be noted that the spread between the prices of carcass and various cuts ranges from 21 percent to as high as 140 percent in the city of Washington, and in the eight selected cities, from 16 percent to 89 percent.

With respect to a few processed commodities, such as canned peaches:

Processors reporting to the committee paid farmers 40 cents more in 1950 for the peaches in a case of 24 No. 2½ cans than in 1949. In contrast to this increase of 40 cents per case going to growers, processors in January 1951 were selling their peaches at $1.20 to $1.50 more per case than in May 1950.

Growers of canning tomatoes received approximately the same prices in 1950 as in 1949 from the processors reporting to the committee. The processors are now selling their popular-priced brands of tomatoes around 80 cents a case, or 25 percent higher than in May 1950. Prices of their higher-priced lines of canned tomatoes also have been raised around 25 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire statement printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON RECENT CHANGES IN FOOD PRICES

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerned about recent advances in food prices and statements which have appeared in the press blaming farmers for these increases.

Many of the farm products were already sold by farmers before the price increases

occurred. In fact, in a number of cases farmers received lower prices for their products in 1950 than in 1949 even though these products are now selling at sharply higher retail prices.

With this in mind, Chairman ELLENDER, of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, by and with the consent of the committee, about 3 weeks ago requested several large representative processors of canned fruits and vegetables to report prices paid to growers in 1949 and 1950 for their products. Information on inventories, sales, and selling prices covering the period May 1950 through January 1951 was also requested.

Comparable information was obtained from several retail food chains. Similar information was also obtained on beef prices in the Washington area.

The processors and retailers have complied fully with the requests of the committee and made available a large amount of unusually timely and valuable information on food price changes.

BEEF PRICE CHANGES

Current retail prices of the important cuts of beef are higher in relation to either wholesale beef sides or to live cattle prices than a year earlier. Between the latter part of January 1950 and the latter part of January 1951 the price of Good grade (now called Choice) beef steers at Chicago increased from $30 to $35 per 100 pounds, or 17 percent. During the same period the wholesale price of comparable carcass beef increased 20 percent and the average price of several retail cuts increased 31 percent in the Washington area and 26 percent in eight representative cities.

The spread between the wholesale price of carcass beef and the average of these retail cuts increased 46 percent in the Washington area and 38 percent in the eight representative cities. Preliminary data based on eight cities indicate that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar spent for beef dropped to 71 cents in January 1951 as compared with 75 cents in January 1950. The detailed price data are shown below.

Prices of live steers, carcass beef, and selected cuts, January 1950 and 1951

	Washington, D. C.[1]			8 cities[2]		
	Jan. 16-31, 1950	Jan. 16-31, 1951	Percent increase	Jan. 15, 1950	Jan. 20, 1951	Percent increase
Steers on hoof, Chicago (900 to 1,100 pounds Good grade, now Choice)	$0.30	$0.35	17	$0.30	$0.35	17
Carcass (side of beef)	.44	.53	20			
Wholesale, Chicago (600 to 700-pound carcass, Good grade, now Choice)				.45	.54	20
Sirloin steak	.84	1.15	37			
Round steak	.92	1.11	21	.88	1.10	25
Rib roast	.64	.83	30	.70	.83	19
Chuck roast				.54	.71	31
Hamburger	.49	.65	33	.52	.66	27
Average of above cuts	.72	.94	31	.66	.83	26
Spread between prices of—						
Carcass and sirloin steak	.40	.62	55			
Carcass and round steak	.48	.58	21	.43	.56	30
Carcass and rib roast	.20	.30	50	.25	.29	16
Carcass and chuck roast				.09	.17	89
Carcass and hamburger	.05	.12	140	.07	.12	71
Average	.28	.41	46	.23	.29	38

[1] Data supplied to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by retailers in the Washington area.
[2] Data from BAE and BLS.

PROCESSORS' PRICES FOR CANNED PEACHES

Processors reporting to the committee paid farmers 40 cents more in 1950 for the peaches in a case of 24 No. 2½ cans than in 1949. In contrast to this increase of 40 cents per case going to growers, processors in January 1951 were selling their peaches at $1.20 to $1.50 more per case than in May 1950.

PROCESSORS' PRICES FOR CANNED VEGETABLES

Growers of canning tomatoes received approximately the same prices in 1950 as in 1949 from the processors reporting to the committee. The processors are now selling their popular-priced brands of tomatoes around 80 cents a case, or 25 percent higher than in May 1950. Prices of their higher-priced lines of canned tomatoes also have been raised around 25 percent.

Pea growers received slightly lower returns per case for their products in 1950 than a year earlier, although there were substantial differences among the reports. Processors' selling prices of canned peas varied from no change between May of 1950 and January of 1951 to increases of 10 percent.

Corn producers in 1950 received from 4 to 19 cents less per case for their product than they received a year earlier from the reporting processors. The prices on canned corn in January 1951, nevertheless, were 35 to 80 cents per case higher than in May 1950.

Producers of green snap beans for canning received 10 to 15 percent lower returns per case in 1950 than a year earlier with most processors reporting no change in prices between May 1950 and January 1951.

These data show that all of the recent retail price increases are not the result of higher farm prices. The committee is not taking any position at this time regarding the reasonableness of the price changes reported. It is continuing its investigation, especially of the retail price changes in recent weeks.

It will be the purpose of the committee to continue this investigation without fanfare and in the hope that all of the facts can be submitted without bias or prejudice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite Senators to make such suggestions as in their opinion will assist the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in bringing to light the true facts in regard to who is getting what, as between the farmers on the one hand, and those who handle farm products on the other hand. It is our purpose to present all the facts and let the chips fall where they may.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA—LETTER FROM HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, last November the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] directed the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself to visit Alaska and to report to the full Armed Services Committee in regard to various phases of the national defense. Upon our return, and in making our report, we realized that there was one phase of our report not then complete, namely, that dealing with labor-management relations. So, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior and officials of other Government agencies, a further hearing was held in Alaska. That hearing was moderated by our former colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable Frank P. Graham. He has made to me, as chairman of the subcommittee, a report, in the nature of a personal letter, on the work of the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPEL HILL, N. C., *February 19, 1951.*
Senator LESTER C. HUNT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LESTER HUNT: I thank you for your letter. I will share its deeply appreciated and generous sentiments with our team. We were glad to try to do our little bit for our country, for Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON and your alert subcommittee, for the departments and agencies involved, and for the unions and contractors in their collective bargaining, which was our main job.

We deeply appreciate the fact that, after clearing some hurdles and straightening out some misunderstandings, we had the cooperation of the unions and the contractors and the good will of the government and the people of Alaska. Without the alertness of Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON and the Hunt-Morse-Saltonstall task force, which went to Alaska last summer, there wouldn't have been any such conference at all. For your Senate committee, Colonel Chambers kept his militant marine breath blowing hot down the backs of the Federal agencies and the Interdepartmental Committee in Washington, which consequently prepared the way and did a good job.

The Interdepartmental Committee in Washington was composed as follows: Departments of the Interior, Labor, Defense, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Resources Board, the Federal Security Agency, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In Alaska we had to disabuse the minds of the parties of an almost subconscious fear that Uncle Sam was coming up to Alaska to push 'em around and to tell 'em in a dictatorial way what was what or else. Along with this, there was anticipation on the part of some that with flag waving we might try to pressure them into hurried, unwise, and unfair settlements; also, there was some concern on the part of some union leaders that the Alaska conference would unwisely try to anticipate the Miami conference in the policy making of the building trades for the Nation. You will recall that the national building-trades unions were in conference at Miami at the same time. Some outside observers thought that our mission was premature and, therefore, doomed to failure because it seemed to be a case of the tail trying to wag the dog; also, there was the danger, in view of the probable coming wage-price freeze, that management might simply sit down, do nothing, and wait for the national freeze and the Federal policy to take over. The shortage of skilled labor for the large construction program constituted a problem. The higher cost of living in Alaska, the woeful lack of housing for families, the difficulties of moving workers to a frontier area for the construction season, and the rigors of camp life in isolated sections added to the problems of both management and labor regarding recruitment and wages. These are the things we sized up early as part of the problems that had to be surmounted psychologically and otherwise before we would be able to get fairly inside the minds and hearts of the parties most directly involved.

It was, therefore, important that the opening meeting have the right keynote, dispel fears and misunderstandings, and win confidence. Also it was important that, without unintelligent pressures, we develop con-

sciousness of our common cause in Alaska, in America, and in the free world and reenforce a patriotic determination to reach agreements through voluntary collective bargaining and enhance pride in a great construction program in one of the most strategic areas for the defense of freedom in the world.

In the preliminary meetings of the members of our delegation we hoped that there would develop a team consciousness and a high morale for the job to be done. The morning and evening sessions of the team were held daily as clearinghouses of criticisms, suggestions, anticipation of pitfalls, loose ends, misinformation, misunderstandings, next moves, right approaches to leaders on both sides, and personal follow-ups. We couldn't have asked for a better team, including representatives of your committee, the armed services, the Washington departments, and the Seattle and Alaskan agencies. Without their cooperative teamwork (for which I wish to express deep gratitude) our mission would not have received the welcome and help in Alaska which it did. I wish at this point to say that you, Morse, Saltonstall, and Colonel Chambers had prepared the way with your understanding and your backing of our team at all times.

The Department of the Interior as the responsible Federal Department in the Alaskan situation, the Department of Labor with its special interest, the Conciliation Service with its continuing responsibility, and the Department of Defense, the armed services, and the Corps of Engineers, with their most strategic relation to the whole enterprise, cooperated at every point with their inside information and patriotic devotion. Governor Gruening and his representatives were hospitable, understanding, and helpful at all times. Mr. Edwin Fitch, personal representative of the Secretary of the Interior, was our most capable secretary.

It was important that we have the conference opened with the right Alaskan background and good will. Through the good offices of Henry Benson, Territorial Labor Commissioner, I called on Federal Judge A. J. Diamond, one of the most respected citizens of all Alaska, and asked him to give the Alaskan address of welcome. Mr. Joe Flakne, director of the Alaska division of the Office of Territories of the United States Department of the Interior, fittingly opened the meeting and gladly introduced Judge Diamond. Excepting his two generous references to the conference chairman, Judge Diamond did his part with just the right ideas, tone, words, and hopes. Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, sent, through the chairman, a most timely message of encouragement.

Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, commander in chief of all the armed services in Alaska; his associates, Maj. Gen. J. W. Cunningham, Maj. Gen. W. D. Old, Admiral C. F. Sprague, Brig. Gen. Richard Prather, who, as personal representative of Lieutenant General Kepner, was available at all times with his good offices as liaison between the Armed Forces and our delegation, and Col. Lyle E. Seeman, of the Corps of Engineers, all entered into the spirit of the meeting in a highly intelligent way. They made good talks, to the point and in the right spirit. Col. Justice Chambers, who had told me he was under advice not to take a definite part in the proceedings, yielded to our insistence and made one of the best keynote talks. My introduction of him gave me a chance to tell of his heroism as a regimental leader of the marines in the Pacific from Gudalcanal to valiant landings on successive Pacific island groups, including his extraordinary heroism on Iwo Jima, Saipan, and Tinian. The members of the conference had a chance to see in the flesh a Congressional Medal of Honor man. Fitting talks were made by Col. John R. Noyes, Alaskan road commissioner; Col. J. P. Johnson, manager for the Department of the Interior of the Alaska Railroad; John D. Argetsinger, district engineer, Alaska Public Work; A. W. Blackerly, representing the United States Department of Agriculture; Mr. Charles Straub, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor; and Mr. Henry Gomperts, associate director, OILA, who announced an immediate BLS comparative study of living costs in Seattle, Anchorage, and Fairbanks.

We tried to impress upon the unions and contractors that it was their conference rather than ours, that the responsibility was upon them to reach agreements and that the agreements should carry forward or include provisions and procedures against strikes, slow-downs, lock-outs, and stoppages. We took the time during the first afternoon and the second morning to have each side, in open meeting and then in private sessions, to get off their chests all their sense of grievances, wrongs, and misunderstandings, and also to make constructive suggestions for meeting the problems and the situation in Alaska for an uninterrupted season of defense construction at a critical time in a strategic area.

Realizing that part of the heavy losses (from a third to a half of the season) in defense construction last year were due to failure to come to early agreements, we asked for agreements early in the week's sessions. We made clear that there was no intention of trying to set the national policy or of anticipating the building trades conference in Miami, or of misusing the impending national policy regarding prices and wages. We kept emphasizing that the critical times and the strategic place made imperative the prompt negotiations of agreements with provisions and procedures against strikes and stoppages during the ensuing year. During the second morning's session the parties did what we hoped they would do and what the two representatives of the Labor Department suggested. Spokesmen for labor and management eagerly expressed the desire to go into immediate collective bargaining with the clearly stated patriotic determination to reach prompt agreements and to provide provisions and procedures against strikes, lock-outs, stoppages, and slow-downs.

In order to make it clear that we wanted to be absolutely fair, when we learned that one side, through some channels or another, had advance information of a particular development, we immediately, through members of our team, made that information available to the other side. We had the leading spokesmen for the two sides, for example, talk directly on long distance telephone to the Secretary of Labor so each could hear, not simply through me, but at first hand the developments then underway in Washington. In order to be abreast as far as possible of developments in Miami we reached Dan Tracy over the long distance telephone and had him talk directly to leaders. The parties came to know that we wanted both sides to have equal access to any information we had, both sides to receive equal treatment, and both sides to have complete freedom, within the limits of national security and the urgencies of national defense, in working out their own agreements through voluntary collective bargaining. One of the hazards of the conference was the fact that the plumbers union had last year won a wage scale that was considered by many Alaskans to be out of line and which, if adopted as the Alaskan pattern, would, it was feared, unstabilize the whole Alaskan economy. Another danger was in the relations of the electrical unions and the electrical contractors, which, though on a personal basis most friendly, yet in collective bargaining had reached an impasse with both sides holding adamant positions.

I met with the able spokesman for the electrical union, Mr. H. W. Newcombe, and for the electrical contractors, Mr. J. B. Majerus, in my room on Wednesday, January 24. All matters had been or were agreed upon except wages. The different positions with regard to wages were referred, under the contract, to their National Industrial Council permanently set up by the two parties. An agreement was that day, Wednesday, January 24, reached on this point as follows: that both sides would accept as final and binding the decision of the national council as of January 1, 1951. This was, therefore, a complete agreement which did not require further meetings or bargaining of the parties. The able spokesman for the general contractors, Mr. Everett Dunn, and the able spokesman for the basic building trades union, Mr. Louis C. Berman, Jr., reported to me that on January 25 they had all reached agreements on all points and had included provisions and procedures against strikes, lock-outs, slow-downs, and stoppages of work for the year 1951. The wage increases averaged approximately 10 percent. Our concern that there be procedures against work stoppages in case agreements were not reached, was met by the fact that agreements were promptly reached.

This Alaskan conference, we hope, has set a pattern for future labor-management relations in Alaska:

(1) The collective bargaining was completed for the first time in Alaska instead of in Seattle. Too much had Alaska become an economic appendage in finance, wholesaling, and industrial relations.

(2) Practically all the building trades and unions participated in the conference and reached binding agreements at the same time.

(3) The agreements are continuing agreements and can be reopened or amended at the end of the year 1951 on the basis of their being continuing in nature.

(4) Negotiations did not drag on beyond the time of the expiration of current agreements in March but were consummated almost 2 months in advance of their expiration, with provisions against strikes and stoppages. They thus contributed to mutual understanding, to a spirit of cooperation, and to a patriotic determination to make the next season the greatest season of defense construction in the history of Alaska.

I wish to acknowledge our appreciation of the fine cooperation of public officials in Alaska, of the newspapers, the Daily News, edited by Mr. Norman P. Brown, and the Anchorage Daily Times, edited by Mr. Robert Atwood, the radio station KENI for the generous use of its auditorium, the Westward and Anchorage Hotels, and the people of Anchorage in particular, and of Alaska in general.

I think it would be fitting for Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON and you for the Hunt-Morse-Saltonstall subcommittee to express your appreciation to Oscar Chapman, who took the responsibility of calling the conference as Secretary of the Department of the Interior (Secretary Chapman's department bore the financial burden of the conference and supplied our most efficient executive secretary, Edwin Fitch and Director Flakne and Administrative Officer D. H. Nucker of the Office of Territories), to Secretary Morris Tobin of the Department of Labor for his understanding and cooperation at all times and for his wise and able special representatives, Judge Charles Straub and Henry Gomperts; to Cyrus Ching, United States Director of Conciliation Service and his alert and veteran representatives, Alvin Peterson and Louis Ziman out of the Seattle office; to Leonard Evans, Territorial representative of the Department of Labor, and Henry Benson, Labor Commissioner of

Alaska, both of whom gave us much local background and information; and to Secretary Marshall, and through him to the commanding generals of the Armed Forces in Alaska, and to Col. Carl E. Welshner from the Pentagon, who had efficient charge of our Army plane; to Paul Sutton, FHA; to Al White, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the officers of the Army who met us at St. Louis, Cheyenne, Great Falls, and Anchorage, and especially to the colonel at Great Falls, who outfitted us for the rigors of Alaska; and to Governor Gruening, the wise and able Governor of Alaska and his associates, the gracious Mrs. Gruening, and Governor Gruening's energetic aide, Commander Edward Chester. All of these agencies and persons generously contributed with their knowledge, wisdom, experience, and teamwork to the purpose of this mission.

In letters of appreciation to these departments and agencies it would be well to also thank members of the Interdepartmental Committee and your own Colonel Chambers for arranging the prompt preliminary steps for setting up the conference. With the alertness and foresight of your committee, with the preparation of the Interdepartmental Committee and with the cooperation of all the appropriate agencies in Washington, Seattle, and Alaska, and especially with the cooperation, good will, and patriotic determination of the contractors and the unions, our mission, we trust, has achieved some of the purposes which Chairman JOHNSON and your committees and the departments involved had in mind in urging that the mission be sent to Alaska. The undertaking had the nature of an adventure for which all participating had real zest and joy in a rich experience in trying to serve our country. Please express my best wishes to LYNDON JOHNSON, WAYNE MORSE, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and, of course, accept them for yourself, as my friendly one-time, next-seat neighbor in the United States Senate.

When WAYNE MORSE for the committee called me to go, I knew there was no saying "No" to such a determined man. With a half day of briefing by the interdepartmental committee we were in the air on the way to Alaska 12 hours ahead of schedule.

Always sincerely,

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman of the Conference.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 1, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for himself and 25 other Senators, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 27 to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project. It is my pleasure to be associated with that enterprise as a cosponsor.

The House Public Works Committee is holding hearings at present. This morning the Secretary of Defense, George Marshall, testified that it is of the utmost importance to the mobilization program to undertake this project immediately. General Marshall spoke both for the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is important that Members of Congress promptly have available the Secretary's views on this subject, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the brief text of Secretary Marshall's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GENERAL MARSHALL BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1951

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, the Department of Defense, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supports the House joint resolution now before your committee which would permit implementation of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and recommends its adoption by the Congress.

Our support is based on the advantages to national defense that this project offers.

First, the seaway, when completed, will increase the flow of high grade iron ore for the production of steel for munitions and other purposes from the Labrador-Quebec area which is now being developed. Unless the seaway is built, obtaining ore from this new source will present serious problems of transportation including the hazards of wartime sea transportation. On the other hand, the accessibility of the Labrador-Quebec area made possible by the seaway would supplement our present supply and would furnish a substantial additional source if our present primary source should be seriously reduced. Freedom from submarine attack does not, of course, mean full security. The risk of interruption of the new seaway by enemy sabotage must be faced. The danger of sabotage, however, is already of critical importance at the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, through which our Lake Superior ores are brought in such vast quantity. Until the seaway is built, almost the whole of our iron ore supply is subject to interruptions by a single act of sabotage there.

Second, the power project in connection with the seaway will provide additional sources of cheap and independent power so necessary, especially in the case of an all-out mobilization.

Third, the seaway will facilitate the transportation of munitions to overseas bases. Moreover, in case of atomic attack, transportation could be diverted from one city to another. It is realized that the seaway will be closed for months every year because of ice conditions but that is equally true of the present Great Lakes transportation route from the Mesabi Range to which all interested parties have successfully adjusted their operations.

Fourth, the seaway will afford access to additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities always very necessary in time of war to the maintenance of our supremacy on the high seas.

Finally, it should increase the capabilities of mutual defense between Canada and the United States.

I have brought with me Mr. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who can explain in some detail the industrial mobilization aspects of the project.

For the record, I want to add that the project has had the approval of the Department of Defense in the past and that I supported it before a committee of Congress as Secretary of State.

We are still in the fortunate position of being able to buy time insofar as this project is concerned. We have not yet run short of iron ore in continental United States. Our annual supply from the Lake Superior region is declining, however, in a period when our requirements are mounting rapidly. We must have other sources readily available. It is urgent that this project be begun promptly, so that by the time we must depend heavily on foreign sources of ore supply it will be ready.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY MISS NORITA NEWBROUGH

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Voice of Democracy, which is sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio Television Manufacturers Association, and is endorsed by the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, this year conducted a college scholarship contest among high school students throughout the Nation. I have before me the essays of four of the winners in that contest. One of the winners is a very charming young lady from my own State, Miss Norita Newbrough, age 16, of Baton Rouge, La., who is attending the Baton Rouge High School. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there may be embodied in the body of the RECORD her essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Norita Newbrough, age 16, Baton Rouge High School, Baton Rouge, La.)

I speak for democracy. I have no franchise yet, no voice in who shall make the laws, or what those laws shall be, still, democracy and I have been acquainted for some time now. Very early, since before we learned to walk, all of us were learning those fundamental things which democracy is based on. We stumbled upward from our first ideas to others, always adding to our knowledge about the democratic way of life. Sometimes, acquiring that knowledge was painful.

In the home, we saw how decisions are arrived at by a majority vote, and that even if sometimes we do get stuck because we are in the minority, we have to swallow our protests and abide by the wish of the largest number of people, if we want others to respect our voice. You see, we first learn tolerance of views opposite ours when we come to recognize the fact that the man who stands against us is every inch as tall, and counts as much, as the man who stands with us. The key phrase in understanding democracy then, is understanding and respecting the individual.

Few of us have ever lived in a totalitarian state. But we have all seen the Nazi, and the Fascist, and the Bolshevist, manifested in the emotional attitudes of individuals we have known in our home, school, and civic circles. Those are the people who haven't learned their social lessons well. They are immature in essentially the same way that Communist states and Fascist states are immature. The Fascist you and I know is the boy who overvalues himself and undervalues his companions, who hasn't yet learned the awful consequences involved when he trifles with the rights of others. The ability to live democratically is the big test of an individual's maturity.

Ever since time immemorial, wise men have stressed the word individual. God Himself has made it pretty clear what He thinks of the individual. Men have talked about His importance, and now we are talking about it again very loudly today till sometimes some of us think that perhaps we have overdone our eloquence. Yet look what has happened in countries where the individual has been

underplayed. Look at the men who are willing to sell individual rights for a song about a party. Look behind into the history of the countries, and find out why those men think the way they do—study the social and economic conditions which fostered their criminal unconcern.

There are some people who say we are headed toward a totalitarian state. They say that democracy, as we know it, will give way to socialism, as it exists in England, then to communism, as we see it today in Soviet Russia. They say that government, all government, must move in that cycle. Now maybe I'm wrong, but it seems to me we learn from history that only slavery makes anarchists of men, and that anarchists eventually enslave themselves. There we see a cycle of political mistakes, one following, of necessity, on the wake of the other. But is democracy a political mistake? Really free people, free in the truest sense of the word, freely adhering to principle, and therefore free from the consequences of license, people like that can never be slaves, and can never be anarchists. So there goes your cycle.

The leaders of today have said over and over again, that we, the youth of America, are the architects who will inherit the job of building a better America. Lately we have been told that the responsibility of building a better world is ours also to shoulder. So now that we know what we're out to build, let's consider the different ground plans—communism and slavery on the one hand, democracy, and freedom on the other. Then, with the tools God has given us, let's make our world a democracy.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF NORTH CAROLINA AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NORTH CAROLINA FARM BUREAU

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator SMITH of North Carolina at the annual convention of the North Carolina Farm Bureau in Asheville, N. C., on February 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DUFF

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Senator DUFF at Boston, Mass., on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MARTIN at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Lincoln Club at Portland, Maine, on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT ANNUAL DINNER OF THE TRAFFIC CLUB OF NEW ENGLAND

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator MARTIN before the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New England at Boston, Mass., February 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject America's Opportunity for Leadership, delivered by him before the American Business Association at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on February 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN, THE MAN OF THE PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Lincoln, the Man of the People," delivered by former Representative Charles A. Plumley at Montpelier, Vt., at a dinner given by the Women's Republican Club of Washington County, Vt., which appears in the Appendix.]

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—ADDRESS BY RABBI NORMAN GERSTENFELD

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Abraham Lincoln delivered on February 11, 1951, by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR LODGE AND LABOR—LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald from James F. Hughes, past president of the Central Labor Union, A. F. of L., published in the Boston Herald of February 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WHERRY'S COURAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Wherry's Courage," published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIVIDENDS FROM THE UN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dividends From UN," published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

REV. MARTIN NIEMOELLER'S OPPOSITION TO REARMAMENT OF GERMANY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Niemoeller's Visit," published in the Washington Post of February 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CURE FOR INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE HAVILAND (KANS.) JOURNAL

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Production Is the Only Cure," published in the Haviland (Kans.) Journal of February 2, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM THE TOPEKA STATE JOURNAL

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Do We Want Universal Service?" published in the Topeka State Journal of February 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGION'S PART—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOMERSET (PA.) DAILY AMERICAN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Religion's Part," published in the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American of February 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S EARLIER APPEARANCE BEFORE CONGRESS—ARTICLE FROM THE ARMY-NAVY-AIR FORCE JOURNAL

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "General Eisenhower's Earlier Appearance Before Congress," published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of February 3, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

VANISHING SURPLUSES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Vanishing Surpluses," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the Washington News, the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Birmingham Post-Herald, regarding proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act, which appear in the Appendix.]

WAGE-PRICE FIASCO ANOTHER SYMPTOM OF ANARCHY—ARTICLE BY RALPH A. LEE

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wage-Price Fiasco Another Symptom of Anarchy," written by Ralph A. Lee, managing editor of the Southwest Times-Record, of Fort Smith, Ark., and published in the February 18, 1951, edition of that newspaper, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE BROOKLYN EAGLE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the Atlantic Union resolution published in the January 18, 1951, issue of the Brooklyn Eagle, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between now and 1:30 p. m. is to be equally divided, to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in the portion of the time which I shall use, which will be not more than 1 minute at this time, I am sending to the desk an amendment which does not directly affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois; but I send the amendment to the desk at this time, and now state that I shall offer it as soon as it is in order to do so.

This amendment prohibits the Board from delegating its authority to grant permissive exemptions. The prohibition is outright. The Senate Finance Committee amendment prevents this power from being delegated to procurement officers, but the power could be delegated

to an agency of the Government, as defined in the bill, which agency could, in turn, delegate such power to a person other than a procurement officer. While I believe the bill will establish adequate protection against abuse of delegation by taking this power out of the hands of procurement officers, since some question has arisen on this point, and in order to make the bill more agreeable to the committee itself, I shall offer the amendment, which will permit this power to be exercised only by the Board.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield only for a question, because I am sure all Senators realize that the time now is limited.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for a question on the subject of exemptions, a matter which is very important to those who reside in my State?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question based on a telegram which was received this morning from the Boston Wool Trade Association.

On page 28 of the bill, under mandatory exemptions, subparagraph (2), which is the agricultural paragraph, I should like to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee if an exemption for "an agricultural commodity in its raw or natural state" includes ginned cotton and scoured wool?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the Senator is referring to the mandatory exemptions. The amendment before the Senate relates to permissive exemptions. So, we can discuss that subject at a later time. However, I do not think scoured wool will be exempt under the mandatory exemption. It was not exempted under the World War II statute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As nearly as I can understand from the explanation which has been made—and I wish to be sure about this matter—I believe that the amendment now referred to will completely reserve to the Board itself the authority to grant permissive exemptions. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly correct; it prohibits the Board from delegating that power. The power must be exercised only by the Board itself.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to hear that, because, as the Senator may recall, that was one question which I raised the other day in regard to the powers of the Board.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite correct, and I have attempted to meet the very pertinent point the Senator raised in that connection, in order to improve the bill.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor, unless there are further questions.

Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan in the time of the Senator from Georgia? The time between now and 1:30, the Chair will say to the Senator from Michigan, is under the control of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that the Senator from Illinois has requested the Senator from Michigan to proceed in his stead.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Therefore, I wish to proceed now, in the time of the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois is busily engaged in a committee which he cannot leave at the moment; and he has yielded 10 minutes, at the present time, to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the Finance Committee has today sent to the desk an amendment which would preclude the board from delegating its powers of permissive exemption. In my opinion that would help the bill somewhat. As the bill now stands the authority for permissive exemptions can be delegated and redelegated until some minor employee emerges with the power. It might not be so bad if a contracting officer could have that delegated authority, because it may be said that he could use it to drive a better bargain in the original negotiations. But under the terms of the bill a contracting officer cannot receive the delegated power, although almost anyone else can. And when we get to such a broad use of the power of permissive exemptions we open the door to the temptation, the pressure, and the favoritism that are the evils behind discretionary authority.

But, Mr. President, that improvement will not cure the defect in the bill which we are attacking in the motion to eliminate entirely the powers of permissive exemption.

As I view this problem and the theory of renegotiation, it is inaccurate to speak of contract renegotiations. That is not entirely correct. What we are talking about here is a renegotiation of profits and losses under a contract. Ordinarily, in America, we are all opposed to the fixing of profits. I certainly am. It is a step toward statism, when we move toward the fixing of profits. We understand that there are certain ideologies which do not favor profits, and under normal conditions profit fixing is no more than a furtherance of those ideologies.

But these are not normal conditions. We are in a state of emergency. We are letting Government contracts of many, many billions of dollars. In this state of emergency we have embarked upon a program of fixing prices, and fixing quotas; as a result we find ourselves in the position, in a way, of having outlawed the individual-enterprise system in America. We declare an emergency, and we in effect outlaw the individual enterprise system. At least we hog-tie it. because real competition is stifled. Once we start on the road of controls, we find ourselves in the position we occupy today.

The question then is, How are exemptions to be provided? I think we need certain controls, for if we say to a man who is in business, "We will provide you with the machinery, we will allow you to have the necessary tools, and therefore you will be able to make this product," and say to another man, "You cannot have the tools, you cannot make this article, because it is necessary for us to have controls," controls breed controls, and renegotiation is a necessary consequence of the circumstances.

The situation, in brief, is that under emergency conditions we have abandoned the automatic disciplines of our pricing system under free enterprise. Competitive bidding is impossible. The Government cannot say to a concern: "I don't like your price. I'll take my business across the street." It cannot say this because there is no place of business across the street free to make an offer. It is subjected to controls. Whatever tools of production it has are needed for another job.

So it is that the Government has to make its contracts on a negotiated basis. The urgency of the Government's requirements prevents it from shopping around. The same urgency does not permit satisfactory price arrangements. Possibilities of excessive profits in a noncompetitive situation of that sort are obvious. Thus we go to a policy of renegotiation. The theory of renegotiation is that no one shall make an exorbitant profit out of Government contracts awarded in these circumstances of urgency and emergency.

Having adopted the theory of renegotiation—and I am one who has done so, however reluctantly and however regretfully, the question is whether there shall be exemptions.

In a renegotiation of profits it seems to me that when the first step is taken and the theory of profit limitations through renegotiation is adopted, exemptions should not be allowed. Once exemptions are allowed, there is a breaking down of the rule originally conceived of as necessary in order to control profits. If there is to be renegotiation, then the only thing to do is renegotiate, straight across the board.

If the new amendment offered by the chairman of the committee should be agreed by the Senate, only the board could allow an exemption from renegotiation, except as to exemptions which have already been provided and fixed in the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator will recall that on Monday the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. McCLELLAN] providing that no contracts shall be renegotiated unless they have a direct and immediate effect upon the defense effort.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to have the Senator explain to the Senate how the Board could operate under this bill in view of the provision that a contract must have an immediate and direct effect upon the defense effort. That includes housing, which is named in the bill. It includes a synthetic-rubber plant, all of whose products may go into civilian use, and it includes all hydroelectric plants and things of that kind which are now in process of building. All those come under this bill. It must be determined that a contract has an immediate effect on the defense effort, and at the same time it is necessary for the Board to go into all the minor details. When it is thought unnecessary or not feasible to renegotiate, without the Douglas amendment that determination could be made. But I should like to have the Senator tell us how in the world a board is going to renegotiate more than $50,000,000,000 worth of Government contracts a year, with this limitation, on the one hand, and with its hands tied by the Douglas amendment, on the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think we come down to this proposition: the objection of the junior Senator from Virginia is that the total amount of contracts is beyond the capacity of man to renegotiate. The Senator says that $50,000,000,000 is so large a sum that it is impossible to renegotiate the contracts. I start with the premise that the sum of $50,000,000,000, which is involved in the letting of the contracts, is so vast as to be almost beyond the power of the human mind to contemplate. I, therefore, think and I stress that it should not be within the power of a group of men to let such enormous contracts unless there is to be a renegotiation. By renegotiation it is contemplated that there will be a checking up after the fact upon what a contract officer has done, when he had neither the time nor the capacity to obtain competing bids, as a result of certain controls. I conclude that all contracts should be renegotiated in the future if the public interests are to be best served.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The position of the junior Senator from Virginia, as he stated on this floor last August, and as he again stated last Monday, is that the key to this situation is an independent board composed of the finest, ablest men who can be found, men who have a sense of patriotism and of public duty, and who would be willing to serve at a personal sacrifice in the emergency. The junior Senator from Virginia thinks the Senate made a mistake in agreeing to a modification of the House language regarding the independent board, assuming that we would get the kind of men I have referred to. Certainly we ought to have men of that type.

If we got that kind of board, we certainly would not want them to be placed in the impossible position of determining what is an immediate and direct defense activity and what is not; neither would we want to tie their hands regarding numerous unnecessary details, where sound judgment can eliminate them and give them an opportunity to concentrate on the big work. The Senator will recall that in the last war a board—not the kind of board I am proposing now—saved us $10,000,000 by contract renegotiation, and possibly much more than that, in an indirect way, from the repricing work it did.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator meant $10,000,000,000, I believe.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I meant to say $10,000,000,000. I notice that in the RECORD for Monday I was quoted as saying "million," though I thought I had said "billion" then. But perhaps the Official Reporter was correct. If I have made the same mistake twice, please let me emphasize that it is billions. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I sympathize with the view that, after all, it is going to be a practical impossibility for the Board to determine what is a defense contract and what is not a defense contract. However, I do not see how it makes any difference at all, in the case of a contract for a dam or an airport, whether it is directly connected with the defense or is not. The basic fact is that the Federal Government is spending a vast amount of money under abnormal conditions. We have so many controls that competitive free enterprise to a large extent has been eliminated. As a result the Government cannot negotiate its contracts on a competitive basis to eliminate excessive profits. Therefore we must have renegotiation of profits. That is the theory of renegotiation, and that is what this bill is intended to provide.

Once we adopt that theory of renegotiation, then we should renegotiate across the board. That is what I have tried to say heretofore on the floor in contending that there should be neither mandatory nor permissive exemptions. I think all contracts ought to be renegotiated in such a period as this. I contend further the limit should not be fixed at $500,000. It is too high.

I am particularly opposed to permissive exemptions, because we shall find that there will be, and there cannot help but be, claims of favoritism, a thing which breaks down the public morale when the Government comes to contract for goods and services. We have had an example in the case of the RFC Board, composed of five men; and the men who are to be appointed to the renegotiation board are to be appointed by the same Chief Executive who named the Board of the RFC. The mere fact that a man may be named by the President and approved by the Senate does not indicate that he has the necessary will power to resist temptation.

It should be our endeavor, when we adopt a policy of the renegotiation of profits, to proceed in a way which will not permit favoritism or claims of favoritism. We should, in fact, be seeking to remove all the pressures which may possibly lead to favoritism. Permissive exemptions are an open invitation to pressures.

Short of eliminating permissive exemptions entirely, there is another midway step toward eliminating pressures upon the board. That is, that exemptions are to be granted only by virtue of the class in which the contractors fall, so that those who deal in a certain class of goods would have an exemption, rather than that individuals in particular classes would have exemptions. That would help relieve pressure upon the board for favorable treatment in individual cases.

As a Member of the Senate I assisted in conducting hearings of the War Investigating Committee on World War II experience with renegotiation. We concluded any exemptions were undesirable. We found that profits up to 85 percent occurred in connection with some of the contracts where an exemption was allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Ohio as he wishes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would yield to the Senator from Florida to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TAFT. On the subject under discussion; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the senior Senator from Georgia would permit, I should like to address a question to him for the RECORD.

In the event the Board, under the permissive exemption now provided in the bill, had the power to exempt, in its discretion, an individual contract or a class of contracts, in the event it were later discovered that fraud had been perpetrated on the Government, would the Board have authority to reassume jurisdiction in such a case?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly, fraud would always permit the reopening of the agreement. And the bill so provides.

Mr. HOLLAND. But if an actual order is entered by the Board, in its discretion, to exempt a single contract or a class of contracts, and it is later shown, at any stage, that the Board was imposed upon and that fraud was perpetrated, is the Senator clear that the Board would have authority in such a case to recapture complete jurisdiction to handle the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only a word to say in opposition to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The matter of renegotiation is an extraordinary remedy. Frankly, I opposed the provision for renegotiation altogether at the beginning of the last war, because it offended every sense of justice, particularly where there was no clause in the contract under consideration providing for it. But the Congress provided that in spite of a written contract, and in spite of provision for compensation expressly written into the contract, after the contract was performed the Government could say to the contractor, "You made too much money. We are going to take part of it away from you, and we will not pay the amount we contracted to pay."

The whole basis of renegotiation was, and is, entirely in the discretion of the Board. There were no principles upon which renegotiation could be based, and so the matter could not have been handled in connection with a tax law of some kind. The whole power of renegotiation is an extraordinary remedy, and the law puts the business people of this country and others completely at the mercy of the Board set-up. There is no question about that. The Board would have practically complete power to say that a company has made excessive profits, and fix the amount of reimbursement.

The only question now is whether the Board can go further, and instead of finding that there are excessive profits, can say, "Here are contracts in connection with which we do not believe there is any serious danger of excessive profits being made, so we will exempt them and save ourselves going into an examination and investigation."

We are confiding no more to the discretion of the Board in giving the power of exemption than we are in the bill giving them power to fix limits of profits the Board desires to fix. Therefore, so far as the danger of dishonesty is concerned, the danger is just as great whether the Board can exempt the companies entirely, or can fix the amount of the excess profits according to its arbitrary discretion.

When we give them power, we must admit there is a possibility of corruption, but we must also assume that those who are appointed and confirmed are honest. We do not afford any remedy against corruption by taking away from the Board the power to provide that certain kinds of contracts need not be renegotiated. Unless we give this power, the enforcement of this law is almost impossible administratively. There are hundreds of thousands of individual contracts of every kind. We have probably exempted the greater number in fixing a limit of $500,000 a year, which may be exempted. But there are still a great many and we would practically be forcing the Board to cover the whole field covered by the purchasing departments in dozens of departments of the Government and go over their contracts again.

I believe that unless the Board did have the power to make exemptions of the kind provided, they would be simply swamped by the tremendous amount of work, and the expenses of the Board would begin to equal the expenses of other departments. It seems to me the right of exemption is necessary unless the Board is to be swamped.

We still have several hundred cases in the Tax Court, which acts as an administrative appeals body. Even with the limitation which existed in the World War Act it is 6 years after the Second World War and hundreds of cases are still unsettled.

Furthermore, this right was given in time of war. We do not at the present moment face war. We face something less than war. We face a period of great governmental contract operation. But I cannot see, in the consideration of the pending amendment, or any other amendment, perhaps, the necessity of making the law stronger than it was made during the Second World War. The provision was made on the theory that contractors should not make profits out of war. That was the basis of it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I recognize, of course, that no war has been declared, but does not the Senator feel that war is actually under way in Korea?

Mr. TAFT. I do feel that, but it is not a war which entails any change in the economy of this country. As a matter of fact, if the Senator will look into the expenses of the Federal Government, he will find that for the 7 months running from July 1 to February 1, the expenses of the Federal Government amounted to $1,400,000,000 less than for the same 7 months beginning July 1, 1949, and that the only increase is an increase of about a billion dollars in the expenses of the Armed Forces. So that it is obvious that the Korean war has not created an economic situation which particularly affects the Government's economic policy.

There are other provisions in which the House proposed somewhat stricter language than that found in the original law. The Senate committee, in most cases, went back to the provision of the World War Renegotiation Act. That act was well administered; it was possible to administer it, except for the long hangover of cases still pending. But in general it was well administered. It resulted in the recovery of $10,000,000,000 of excess profits, and I see no reason why at the present time we should impose a stricter rule than the rule imposed during World War II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure occasionally to disagree with my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. With all due regard to the respect which we entertain for him and for his conclusions, as we do for all other Members of the Senate, I am moved in this matter not merely by the studies of our committees, which have been necessarily brief, but by the very extensive investigations of the operation of the renegotiation law during the last war.

The committee of which I was chairman went into the subject extensively. It thoroughly investigated the actual operation of the law. It had the benefit of the views of the gentleman who had been chiefly responsible for its administration, Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, of Houston, Tex. He had the opportunity—I do not know that I should say the distinction—of being educated, with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself in the same class at Harvard Law School, where we were also associated with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. President, in this particular matter it seems to me that very great respect may well be accorded to the views of General Hirsch, who came to the subject fresh from a very distinguished legal career. He administered the law, as has been said, to the very great satisfaction of all concerned in what was the Truman War Investigating Committee and the committee which followed its activities later on. The staff was continuously impressed with the very broad understanding which General Hirsch demonstrated of the purpose of the act and of the practicability of its administration. It was the well considered conclusion of General Hirsch, who had administered his powers with practically no criticism, that the one great recommendation which he would make was the elimination of the so-called permissive exemptions. It seems to me that he must have been led to make the recommendation as the result of his intimate experience with the administration of the law, and that it was such experience which persuaded him to recommend that the Board or Administrator be relieved of the pressures which would almost inevitably result.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator from Maine feel that General Hirsch was dealing with the condition which prevailed under the previous law, when exemptions could be granted by the very officers who were letting the contracts? That was the condition under the previous law.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. We have eliminated that condition. Under the pending bill only the Board could grant the exemption. The Board would not be able to do it except by classes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, my time is limited. General Hirsch certainly did not stress any such distinction insofar as my recollection goes, or the reports indicate. He merely felt that it was unwise and undesirable. It seems

to me since that time even more persuasive arguments have been made. In spite of the suggestion that the very broad discretion of the Board affords opportunity for it to do almost anything it desires in connection with profits, it seems to me that there is an extraordinary difference between saying to a firm, "We will not even look into your affairs," and looking into them and saying to the concern, "We find and determine that 10, 15, or 20 percent is a proper profit." If we have the benefit of the considered conclusions of the Board as to what is a fair profit, there is very much less danger of excessive abuses arising in the administration of the act.

Former Senator Walsh once said, "If a power is to be denied because it may be abused, government must cease." It is perfectly true that we must guard great powers. However, after the recent revelations of abuses of administrative authority, and when we realize both the power and the influence of the interests which are seeking to pervert great defense activities purely to selfish ends, it seems to me we must preserve all the safeguards we can preserve in the administration of an act such as the one now proposed. I have far less concern with a possible abuse of power to determine profits than I have with the power to exempt from profit. In our investigations we found it was the practice of the Board, while not being limited as to the amount of profits, to apply renegotiation to categories of cases, and with regard to circumstances, on the basis of 10 percent, 12 percent, or 15 percent.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems desirable that the exemptions should be wiped out.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, far be it from me to presume to say anything which would minimize the necessity for and the importance of renegotiation when we are dealing with large defense contracts entered into in a hurry.

What I am about to say I shall say only because of the position which I take on the amendment. Renegotiation was introduced into Federal legislation under an amendment which I offered in the House of Representatives to the sixth supplemental appropriation bill in 1942. It was first applied to the Department of the Secretary of War, the Department of the Secretary of the Navy, and their establishments. Subsequently, I offered an amendment on another bill which extended the provisions to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. When the act was amended in 1943 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to make some suggestions for the improvement of the act, based upon experience which we had had with the act up to that time. The existing renegotiation statute of 1948 stems from the amendment which I offered to the supplemental appropriation bill in the spring of 1948.

I mention this only to illustrate the fact that I want renegotiation to succeed. I do not want it to bog down. I fear that if we eliminate the authority of the Board to exempt a limited area of contracts under the permissive exemption section, we will risk the danger of renegotiation bogging down by causing the Board to examine contracts which it knows, by reason of their terms, present no field in which to operate.

The provision for exemption is limited in this bill. I have no doubt that Senators have quoted Mr. Hirsch correctly but I think he must have had in mind the broad authority of the Secretaries under the old act. I also recall what Mr. Karker and Mr. Dodge, the earlier Administrators of the Price Adjustment Board, said. They all recognized the fact that we were dealing with an extraordinary power, which should be exercised in such a way as to preserve as much as possible free enterprise, and at the same time expedite procurement for the Government in a national emergency.

I do not know whether Mr. Hirsch had the suggestion made to him that the proposed permissive exemptions were a limitation of the broad exemption power which the Secretary had in the prior act. In spite of that fact, there were more than $10,000,000,000 worth of recoveries, as has been pointed out, certainly a worth-while result.

The presently proposed permissive exemption section does not give unlimited authority to the Board to exempt. Only in five areas may it be exercised. The first is contracts or subcontracts to be performed outside the territorial limits of continental United States or Alaska. Senators who are familiar with the problems which arise in connection with construction work in Alaska and in some other places of the world will realize that on certain occasions it is necessary to employ a foreign contractor. I would favor renegotiation of contracts with foreign contractors whenever it seems worth while or can be productive. But it seems to me not unwise to grant to the Board authority to permit exemptions in such cases where it finds that renegotiations would be fruitless or would defeat the possibility of getting the needed job.

The second permissive exemption relates to contracts or subcontract under which, in the opinion of the Board, the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty when the contract price is established.

The third class consists of contracts or subcontracts or performance thereunder during a specified period or periods when, in the opinion of the Board, the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits. Why should we require the Board to use its personnel to go into that class of contracts, when it has an ample field in which to apply its facilities—namely, to contracts which really need renegotiation?

The fourth class of permissive exemptions consist of those where renegotiation would jeopardize secrecy required in the public interest. Opinion may vary as to whether essential secrecy is involved in a particular case. But the amendment which the Senator from Georgia has said would be offered, to prevent the Board from delegating the power to pass on exemptions should meet the situation. A board whose members would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate should be competent and trustworthy enough to determine when legitimate security is involved.

The fifth class involves subcontracts in which it is not administratively feasible, in the opinion of the Board, to determine and segregate the profits attributable to such subcontract or group of subcontracts from the profits attributable to activities not subject to renegotiation. In other words, this last provision lets the Board save its energies when examination shows that the Board could not distinguish between profits made from ordinary business and war business. There is real work to do where results can be obtained; the energies of the Board should be free to concentrate in fruitful fields.

Mr. President, under all the circumstances I hope we will permit the Board to operate, and not let it bog down.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Illinois wishes to speak at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask how much time has been taken by the respective sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 10 minutes left.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has about 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to defer to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not mind proceeding at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, obviously 10 minutes does not suffice for a full discussion; but this is, in a sense, a narrow amendment. The motion is to strike the so-called permissive exemption section from the bill. That is the section which merely permits the Board, in its sound discretion, to exempt from renegotiation individual contracts or contracts by classes.

The House wrote these provisions into the bill. It wished to restrict the permissive power of the Board to make exemptions, except for five classes as stated in the bill. The House eliminated certain permission exemptions which were carried in the old law, the wartime act, under which contracts for standard commercial articles could be expressly exempted. The House did not include that provision in its bill. Neither has the Senate included it. The five particular classes of contracts which may be exempted by the Board entirely in its discretion are set forth in subsection (d) of section 106, on pages 34 and 35 of the bill.

Attention has already been called to the fact that the Renegotiation Act itself is an extraordinary act in that it gives to a board the power to undo a solemn contract made by the Government of the United States with one of its citizens. That power is practically absolute. The Board may look at a contractor's profit in his fiscal year and conclude that some are excessive. It makes no difference under what circumstances the contract was made. The Senate should bear in mind that during the execution of the contract the procurement officers of the Government have the right to reprice the very articles which go into the contract. They have the right to redetermine the value of the articles or services. It is only after the contract has been negotiated that the Board which we are now considering in this bill has any jurisdiction. The Board then determines whether the profits under the total contracts of the contractor for the entire fiscal year are in excess of a fair and reasonable profit, or are exorbitant. The Board does not look to a single contract. There is a limitation in the bill on the gross amount which will make renegotiable the profits of any contractor.

As a fundamental principle underlying this matter, it seems to me that we must bear in the very forefront of our minds that we are undertaking by this bill to create a strong and independent Renegotiation Board, vested with broad administrative powers. The appointment of the Board, whether accomplished in the manner provided by the House or in the manner provided by the Finance Committee, is surrounded by such safeguards that we may feel reasonably assured, I believe, that only men of the highest caliber will be appointed to the Board. It would be anomalous to attempt to create a strong Board and at the same time to pin its arms by its sides. We cannot create strength and weakness at the same time. We cannot demand judgment from the Board and deny it discretion. In the opinion of the Finance Committee, it is imperative that the Board be given authority and opportunity to determine within specified areas that renegotiation should not be applied to certain contracts or subcontracts, or to certain classes of contracts or subcontracts, either because renegotiation is not necessary in those cases, or is not administratively feasible, or should not be undertaken because it would not be practical or make good business sense to do so.

I think we may best understand the need for retaining permissive exemption authority in the Board by considering several illustrative cases. Take, for example, a contract entered into by the Air Force for an item to be manufactured by a Swiss contractor. The difficulties of conducting renegotiation in such a situation are fairly evident. It would be difficult and burdensome for the Board to obtain from the Swiss contractor all of the voluminous financial and operating data required for renegotiation and to conduct conferences with executives of the Swiss firm, and, in the event the proceedings resulted in an impasse requiring the issuance of a unilateral determination of excessive profits by the Board, it would be difficult to enforce that order against the Swiss firm by any of the various means provided in the bill. The expense incident to proceedings of this sort would also be a consideration. It would be preferable, it seems to me, if the Board, by the use of its exemption power, could contribute its good offices to bringing about a proper price for such a contract in lieu of undertaking the burdensome and expensive proceedings I have just described.

As another example, consider the case of a consultant employed by one of the departments to render expert personal services, let us say, of a scientific nature, in connection with the defense effort. Such a contract, under the terms of the bill, would be subject to renegotiation, although under the pay scale now permitted by law such a contractor could never aggregate a sufficient amount of money to make him subject to renegotiation for a fiscal year. Unless the Board had the authority to exempt such contracts from renegotiation, the staff of the Board would be put to the trouble and expense of sending the necessary forms to each such individual, and each such individual would be put to the trouble, expense, and irritation of having to fill out the necessary form to indicate that he was not subject to being renegotiated for the year. The power to exempt such contracts is obviously necessary, and if we are to deal fairly with our citizens we certainly ought to entrust his power to the Board.

A further illustration might involve a company which furnishes, as a subcontractor, items of a character which flow freely in trade, for example, nuts, bolts, and other common items. Even at the height of a war such products, when purchased by a contractor from his supplier, are used both in the production of war or defense goods and also in the manufacture of his regular commercial products. It is not always possible, and certainly it is never easy, for a contractor in such circumstances purchasing these items from various suppliers to identify the source of any particular quantity used on a given job. It follows, then, that the suppliers of these items would have difficulty in determining and segregating the profits attributable to his sales for defense purposes from his profits attributable to his sales for nondefense purposes. This problem became very acute during the early administration of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and imposed great hardship both upon suppliers of such items and upon the renegotiation agencies. The situation was relieved only by the use of the permissive exemption authority contained in that act. Unless similar authority is vested in the Renegotiation Board contemplated by the present bill, there will be no way of alleviating this difficulty in the future.

These few illustrations will serve to indicate generally the type of exemptions which the Board would issue pursuant to the authority contained in the bill. It is not intended or anticipated that the Board will indiscriminately exempt contracts, either with individuals or generally, which would result in an escape of large amounts of excessive profits from renegotiation or in favoritism as between contractors and subcontractors.

So, Mr. President, the committee is strongly against the elimination of this permissive portion of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, no one can overestimate the importance of the issue which we have before us. The purchases of the Federal Government during the ensuing fiscal year will probably amount to between forty billion and fifty billion dollars, and it is likely that the same annual volume of purchases will continue for years to come. Involved in this issue therefore is the question of whether we will provide proper safeguards to see that excessive profits are not made, and that the American taxpayer is protected.

Mr. President, nothing can do more to destroy morale in a period either of defense mobilization or of war itself, than a contrast between great profits made by the few on the one hand and the hardships suffered by many upon the other. If we are to go into this period of defense preparations and possible eventual war, it is necessary to provide every safeguard to assure that there shall be a substantial equality of sacrifice, and that no particular group in the community shall make excessively large profits—especially at the expense of the Government.

The difficulty which procurement agencies frequently face when they place huge defense and war contracts is that they do not know in advance what the costs will be. In many cases the items which are ordered have not previously been produced, or upon which past experience has been slight. Yet if these agencies wait and draw a contract so carefully as to protect the Government in every conceivable contingency, valuable time will be consumed, production will be delayed, and the preparedness of the country will be diminished.

So the device of renegotiation has been hit upon in order to permit procurement agencies to make contracts which are initially favorable to the suppliers, favorable to the firms which are selling to the Government—liberal contracts as to price, and so forth. Then, if later it develops that the prices are excessive, and the costs have gone down much below what was expected originally, and if the profits prove to be excessive, the contracts can later be renegotiated to permit only a fair and reasonable profit to be made.

The procedure for this, on the basis of the experience in the last war, is that the Renegotiation Board conducts a preliminary audit to see whether or not the gross profits seem to be excessively large. If they do not seem to be too large, then renegotiation is not carried out. But if they do seem to be excessively large, then the Renegotiation Board goes into the

circumstances of the particular contract. I think this is probably about as wise a device as we could develop in the very difficult situation in which we are placed.

But the Renegotiation Act can be made worthless by opening up so many exemptions that it will not apply to a sufficient proportion of war contracts. I am very frank to say that I think altogether too many exemptions are made in this measure. There is a wide range of mandatory exemptions which we are not discussing at this time, but, in addition, there is a wide range of permissive exemptions. I should like to call the Senate's attention once again to clause (3), which gives to the Board, prior to production and prior to cost experience, the right to exempt any contract from renegotiation at the time the contract was made or shortly thereafter if in the opinion of the Board ample provision was made to protect the Government.

The Board cannot tell in all circumstances then whether or not ample provision has been developed to protect the Government because it will not know in advance what the cost will be. But business firms will come forward—we can be quite certain of that—and will ask for the exemptions, and will have their influence peddlers working on the Board, saying, "Our case is different. Do not subject us to renegotiation." The political, financial, and economic pressure on the Board will be great. Its members will have to be men of steel to resist these pressures. There will be a great temptation to use fraud. Even if the members be men of steel, they will spend a large part of their time fending off those who ask for exemptions rather than getting on with the work promptly.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. KILGORE rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have only a brief amount of time left. I should like to finish my statement if I can. Then I shall be glad to yield.

The able Senator from Georgia and the able Senator from Ohio say that if we renegotiate all contracts, or if the right be given to renegotiate all of them, there will be so much work that the Board will be swamped. I should like to point out that there is a dollar exemption. In the House bill it is $100,000 and in the Senate bill it is $500,000. I think the first is too low and the second too high. But the small firms will be exempted. Their cases, which are large in number, will not come up.

Then, I should like to point out that the Renegotiation Board can conduct a preliminary audit and after production and after costs have been ascertained, can determine whether or not renegotiations should be carried out. This preliminary audit does not take much time. It can be done rather briefly from sworn profit and loss statements of the company as a whole. Then if the profits seem too large, and only in that case, will they proceed to detailed renegotiation.

Mr. President, I think it is vitally important that we leave open to carelessness and fraud as few loopholes as possible. Clause (3) and certain other clauses open the gate wide for wholesale exemptions involving billions of the taxpayers' dollars.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was wondering if, in the Senator's opinion, the Board could properly allow an exemption unless it had in effect renegotiated the profits to ascertain whether or not they were exorbitant. That is the only reason for providing renegotiation, and the absence of exorbitant profit is the only justification for granting exemptions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is the precise point. This clause would permit the Board to grant exemptions in advance before any production was brought about and before any preliminary examination of profit was carried through.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was out of the room for a short time and did not hear the Senator's entire statement. I wondered whether the Senator discussed permissive exemption No. 1—"any contract or subcontract to be performed outside the territorial limits of continental United States or in Alaska"? Does the Senator realize that under contracts performed by local corporations in the United States, if 80 percent of their business is done outside continental United States they do not even pay income taxes? Now it is proposed that merely because a contract is outside the United States that is a reason why it should not be renegotiated. In other words, if a contract is obtained outside the United States, the sky is the limit. If 80 percent of the total business is outside continental United States, it is not even necessary to pay income tax. Does the Senator know of any reason why there should be any such exemption?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not. I am grateful to the Senator from Michigan for bringing forward this additional argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. On this question the yeas and nays have already been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chapman	Green
Anderson	Clements	Hayden
Bennett	Connally	Hendrickson
Brewster	Cordon	Hennings
Bricker	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Duff	Hill
Butler, Md.	Dworshak	Hoey
Butler, Nebr.	Eastland	Holland
Byrd	Ecton	Humphrey
Cain	Ferguson	Hunt
Capehart	Flanders	Ives
Carlson	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Case	George	Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.	Malone	Saltonstall
Kem	Martin	Schoeppel
Kerr	Maybank	Smathers
Kilgore	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Knowland	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Langer	Morse	Smith, N. C.
Lehman	Mundt	Stennis
Lodge	Murray	Taft
Long	Neely	Thye
McCarran	O'Conor	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Mahoney	Watkins
McClellan	Pastore	Wherry
McFarland	Robertson	Wiley
Magnuson	Russell	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on pubic business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kem	Pastore
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Langer	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Hendrickson	Monroney	Wiley

NAYS—39

Bricker	George	Malone
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Maybank
Byrd	Holland	Millikin
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	McCarran	Stennis
Eastland	McCarthy	Taft
Ecton	McClellan	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Williams

NOT VOTING—15

Benton	Gillette	Nixon
Chavez	Jenner	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Welker
Fulbright	McMahon	Young

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, earlier I sent an amendment to the desk, but, in view of the vote on the Douglas amendment, it is entirely unnecessary to offer it, because the amendment would simply have prevented the Board from delegating its power to grant permissive exemptions. It is therefore unnecessary to offer the amendment, and I do not offer it.

I desire to take this occasion to say, however, that in view of the amendment which has now been agreed to, my candid judgment is that the act becomes incapable of administration. Time will demonstrate the truthfulness of this statement as shown by the experience under the World War II Act when it was found that discretionary exemptions were necessary to administer the act in a way to properly carry out its functions. I have no further amendment to offer.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield the floor. But there is no pending amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In the event the bill goes to conference, and the provision which has just been stricken should be proposed to be restored by the conferees from the other body, would the Senator then be in a position to propose at that time the amendment which he now is not presenting, but which would prevent the Board from delegating its power?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not sure, but I think it could not be done. I may say, however, that I always abide by the votes taken by the Senate. If the Senate does not want renegotiation of contracts, I would be bound to uphold its wishes. But if the Senator from South Dakota, who has shown unusual alertness in comprehending and understanding the entire process of renegotiation, desires that the amendment be offered, so that if, in conference, there should be a restoration of the provision just stricken out, I will raise no objection. I am sure that there is no objection on the part of any Senator to saying that the permissive authority, which has now been stricken out of the act, should not be delegated if it should be restored.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to offer the amendment which the Senator from Georgia refererd to just recently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on pages 34 and 35 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has offered an amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, line 22, after the word "rules", it is proposed to insert "and other than its power to grant permissive exemptions under section 106 (d)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as some of the Senators now present were not in the Chamber when the amendment was discussed, if I may, I should like to speak very briefly on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this is an amendment which was drawn by the Senator from Georgia to make it clear that the Board might not delegate or redelegate any power to make permissive exemptions. At present the section covering permissive exemptions has been stricken from the bill, but if it should be restored either on reconsideration or as a result of conference with the House, it seems to me the Senate and the country would want the assurance that if the power to grant any kind of permissive exemption were granted to the Board, it should not be delegated by the Board to some clerk.

This point arose in the discussion on Monday, and it was pointed out that the Board had certain powers of delegation and redelegation of its duties, and of powers and duties which might be assigned to it under the powers of other acts. Certainly if it is to delegate any power, it should not delegate to any other board or to any subagency or to any clerk in a department the right to grant permissive exemptions. That is why I feel the amendment should be incorporated in the bill, so that we will be sure that there can be no delegation of power to grant permissive exemptions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment on pages 34 and 35 was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask the Senate not to reconsider the vote, because I am willing to be bound by it. I merely want the country to know that there are some Members of this body who apparently do not want renegotiation of contracts. I know this amendment will bog down the enforcement of the law as it did in prior years. I hope very much that the Senate will have a vote on the Senator's motion and not on a motion to table.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 41, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hennings	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kem	Pastore
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Langer	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Monroney	Wiley
Hendrickson	Morse	

NAYS—41

Bennett	Byrd	Chapman
Bricker	Capehart	Connally
Butler, Md.	Carlson	Duff
Butler, Nebr.	Case	Eastland

Eston	Kerr	Robertson
Frear	Knowland	Russell
George	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Hayden	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	McFarland	Stennis
Holland	Malone	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Martin	Wherry
Johnson, Tex.	Maybank	Williams
Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—14

Benton	Jenner	Sparkman
Chavez	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Dirksen	McKellar	Welker
Ellender	McMahon	Young
Gillette	Nixon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 41, and the nays are 41—a tie vote. The motion is rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, how much time is available on the motion which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes is allowed to each side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object to the withdrawal of the motion at this stage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the motion can be withdrawn only by a majority vote.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true. It cannot be withdrawn by the proponent of the motion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, inasmuch as there seems to be some doubt on the subject, I suggest that we proceed on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GEORGE. I have risen to speak on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the pending motion.

Mr. President, the Senate has voted to strike from the bill the discretionary exemption power. Having stricken from the bill this power, the Senate should vote to strike also the mandatory exemptions in order to be at all consistent.

Mr. President, the moment that is done, farm products, lumber, and cattle are subject to renegotiation on contracts and subcontracts relating to these commodities. The moment that is done, iron ore will be subject to renegotiation from the moment it comes out of the ground. If Senators wish to destroy the Renegotiation Act, that is the choice they have.

Let me say to Senators from the South and from cotton-growing States that under the House bill as it stands today, a cotton gin with only 450 or 500 bales of cotton, or a warehouseman who stores only 500 bales of cotton, will become subject to renegotiation the moment the cotton goes into a mill and the Government made a contract with the mill. That is so because today cotton is worth, with the seed, more than $200 a bale, and 500 bales would bring a contract up to more than $100,000, the amount provided in the House bill.

Under the World War II act, under which our country lived when we were fighting for our very existence, and when we were the arsenal for all mankind, the permissive and mandatory provisions were contained in the law. They had to be left in the law in order to make it administratively feasible. Under the previous act the Board did not have power to renegotiate in the case of any metal or ore until it had reached such a stage that it could be utilized in an industrial process. We must be consistent. We do not want the Board, which has arbitrary power, to say that a contract which is made by the Government with a citizen has yielded excessive profits, with practically nothing but the conscience of the Board to guide it. We do not want to say that the contract of expert engineer or scientist, who is brought to Washington as a consultant, will be subject to the act, though the Board knows that such a consultant could never earn $100,000 during the course of the year. Nevertheless he would have to be queried. He would have to fill out reports. He would have to go to all sorts of trouble, and the Board would have to go to him. The whole process would bog down. I simply say that if Senators do not want any mandatory exemptions in the bill, such exemptions should not be written into it. I say: Do not do it for agricultural products; do not do it for wool; do not do it for cattle; do not do it for beef; do not do it for cotton; do not do it for wheat; do not do it for any other agricultural product; do not do it for a single ounce of ore or a single mineral which comes out of the ground, because there can be no consistency in saying to the Board, "We will prevent you from looking at certain contracts for renegotiation purposes, but we will not give you the power to exempt from renegotiation a contract which the Board knows can never result in excessive or unreasonable profits."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator cited the example of a man who comes here as a consultant. The Senator stated that his compensation could never exceed $100,000 a year. He would be exempt under the provision still remaining, the $500,000 exemption sponsored by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly; but the Board would have to query him about his contract. The Board would have to ask him to show what renegotiable business he had done under contracts with A, B, C, and D, although the Board might know that he would not be subject to being renegotiated.

Mr. BREWSTER. He would not be subject to renegotiation unless this total were more than $500,000.

Mr. GEORGE. How would the Board know it until he had been queried and until he had answered all the inquiries?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Board is forbidden to go into the question of profits on any contracts totaling less than $500,000.

Mr. GEORGE. How would the Board know that the total was less than $500,000?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would know that on the basis of a simple return. The Board would not have to spend time examining contracts.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Government knows how much it is paying the man.

Mr. GEORGE. He may be working for various individuals.

The distinguished Senator from Maine and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were wholly misled, and misinterpreted General Hirsch's testimony. General Hirsch objected to the delegation of authority by a board back to a procurement officer, and allowing the procurement officer himself to exempt the contract from renegotiation. That is what General Hirsch was talking about. That is all he was talking about.

We wrote into the bill a provision that there should be no delegation of power to a procurement officer, and there will be no delegation by the Board at all, under the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

It is not a question of whether or not a person is liable to renegotiation. It is a question of going through all the details of accounting work to show that no contract or subcontract which he had with the Government brought him within the limitation fixed under the terms of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am in thorough accord with the viewpoint so forcefully expressed by the Senator from Georgia, that the adoption of the amendment would make the proposed act unworkable.

Some of my colleagues seem to be fearful that the Board will not porperly discharge its duties from the standpoint of protection of the Government and the taxpayers. When we dispose of this issue, which I hope will be disposed of by reconsidering the vote by which the amendment was adopted, and then eliminating the amendment, an amendment will be offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to provide for the kind of independent board which the House contemplated, a Board composed of the best type of men, not less than three of whom shall be from civilian life. That is the key to the situation.

No Army officer could draw the $12,500 or $15,000, whichever it may be, while he was drawing his military pay. The advice I get is that he would probably be required to resign from the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. Then where would the choice lie? It would lie with those willing to resign from the service. The best type of officer, who wished to remain in the military service, could not accept the appointment.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct. If this amendment prevails, the Board will not have the power to exempt from renegotiation any contract affecting the production or distribution of the hydrogen bomb.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the distinguished Senator's position that if the permissive exemption provision is stricken out, then all mandatory exemptions should also be eliminated, because there are so many types of contracts that should properly be exempt that they cannot be set forth in the act; and therefore, if they cannot be set forth in the act and cannot be eliminated from the recapture clause, then nothing should be exempted? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. GEORGE. I simply say that there is absolutely no consistency in not allowing the Board to exempt a contract with respect to which, in its judgment and opinion, there could not possibly be excessive profits, and then writing into the bill a group of mandatory exemptions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are a large number of such types of contracts.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly there are. In order to protect the agricultural and stock-raising interests, as well as the mining interests, we had to amend the House bill and go back to the World War II Act. Who could say that the conferees on the part of the Senate could contend for that amendment for one moment, in the face of the vote taken by the Senate to strike the provision giving the Board itself power to make an exemption in the case of a contract which clearly ought to be exempted?

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has three minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. I will reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has control over 15 minutes of time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is quite clear why the Senator from Georgia should desire that the mandatory exemptions should be the issue at this time; but a mandatory exemption is an absolute prohibition on abuse. There might be arguments as to whether some items should be exempted, but that question is not here raised. The whole question is about the permissive exemptions. Mandatory exemptions are clearly laid down in the bill, covering agriculture, mining, and certain products of the soil. That provision remains firm. The very action of the Senate in striking out permissive exemptions is clearly designed to prevent very grave and gross abuses of administrative discretion such as those which have been revealed in such telling, repeated, and increasing force in recent weeks and months.

If the question of the mandatory exemptions is presented, if the Senator from Georgia feels that that question should be presented, the Senate can vote upon it. Personally, the Senator from Maine has no doubt as to the result, whatever might be the arguments on one side or the other.

However, on the question of permissive exemptions, the issue is clear. If there is not $500,000 in total Government payments to any individual or concern, the contract does not come within the purview of the act in any way. It is not a question of what a man made or did not make. It is only a question of what the Government finds is due the corporation or individual; and if the totals for the individual or corporation are less than $500,000, under the terms of the bill that is the end of the matter. There is no investigation, no discussion, no renegotiation, no action of any character, and no burden on the Board. So the illustration of the petty amounts—they are not really petty—up to $500,000 is entirely outside the scope of the issue.

With respect to permissive exemptions, the dangers of abuse have been repeatedly pointed out. There is no question in the mind of the Senator from Maine as to the caliber of General Hirsch, who had more experience in this field than any other man, and whose administration was characterized by everyone concerned as beyond reproach. Based on his judgment, his wisdom, his experience, he urged that the permissive exemption should no longer remain within the act. It was on that basis that so many Members concerned with the discussion before, and with the recent study, were persuaded this possibility of abuse should be wiped out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has indicated that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are mistaken as to what General Hirsch said in regard to the elimination of the exemption. The Senator from Michigan knows that he was not misled, because the words of General Hirsch were:

> I have been thinking it over, and the one real recommendation that I would like to make is the elimination of exemptions. That is the one recommendation that I would make.

I asked him this question:

> That is any exemption?

General Hirsch said:

> Yes.

In other words, he was for the elimination of exemptions.

Now it has been indicated here on the floor that the proposed legislation will not work if exemptions are taken out of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was it not General Hirsch's idea that the mandatory exemptions should be eliminated?

Mr. FERGUSON. He wanted them all eliminated.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If he wanted them all eliminated, that would mean deleting the mandatory exemptions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite correct, but that is not the proposal before the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is the proposal before the Senate if we are accepting General Hirsch as an authority.

Mr. BREWSTER. The impracticability of eliminating the mandatory exemptions is due to the eloquence of the Senator from Colorado and his associates. So everybody knows it is useless to propose the elimination of the mandatory exemptions.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator quotes an authority for guidance in a limited field, which would eliminate all mandatory exemptions, which certainly limits the general's authority under the predominant view of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan was not mistaken as to what General Hirsch meant. The Senator from Michigan is not of the opinion that this bill will be in any way weakened by such a proposal. It will in fact be strengthened. Let there be no doubt that I favor renegotiation, and that the principle of renegotiation is strengthened by deleting exemptions.

Questions may be raised on the floor with respect to those who make the A-bomb. It has been said on the floor that those who have A-bomb and nitrogen bomb contracts have them on the basis of cost plus a dollar. Those contracts would not be renegotiated under any circumstances.

The bill contains an exemption with respect to security. How can the examination of a board into the profits under a contract affect security? I suppose all members of the Board and employees are going to be cleared for security. If we permit the use of that kind of a security shield as a basis for exemption we would not have any contracts renegotiated, because the services would say that all the contracts involved security and were not open to scrutiny.

I wish to present to the Senate the fact that there is a great distinction between saying to the Board "You cannot grant exemptions" and giving the Board discretion in determining the amount of profit. When the Board is given the power to grant exemption it can grant an exemption without going into the matter of profit. The Board can grant exemption without even looking into the facts. But when we say to the Board that they can determine the amount of profit we assume that they are going to look into all the facts. After they secure the facts it is quite true they can play favoritism by allowing one contractor 1 percent more than another contractor. That is true. But there is a great difference between saying that they can do it after the record has been made, which record would be capable of being scrutinized by the Congress, and to say that they can arbitrarily, without any

cause whatever, make the contract exempt from renegotiation, and that there will be no determination on the basis of the profits.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator feel that if the Board knew that in a certain case it would come up with the answer of zero in the matter of profits it should proceed with renegotiation?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Board knew that the determination would be zero, it should give the contractor a clear bill of health and consider that the contract had been renegotiated. Bear in mind that what we are renegotiating on is profits. I do not find anything in the bill which provides that the Board should go into all the figures. On a general review they can tell from the income tax and the balancing of the books how much each company is making on its contracts, and can tell whether or not an excessive profit has been made.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate how this matter was handled in the past. The War Investigating Committee spent many hours, after the war was over, in trying to provide a guide should there be a need for any future renegotiation legislation. What did the committee do after weeks of examination of contracts? They made the following recommendation:

> The committee believes that any future Renegotiation Act be improved in the following specific ways:
>
> (a) By bringing within its operation all contractors with an annual war business exceeding $100,000.
>
> (b) Including war contracts of all Government agencies.
>
> (c) By eliminating all mandatory and permissive exemptions so that all Government contractors with more than an annual business of $100,000 are renegotiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think it is well that we clarify the issues somewhat. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated that it was obvious that some Members of the Senate did not desire a renegotiation act. While the Senator from Georgia did not specify who the individuals were, it is quite apparent he thought this group consisted of those of us who want to eliminate the permissive exemptions from the act.

I am sure that upon reflection the Senator from Georgia will come to exactly the opposite conclusion. It is because we believe in a renegotiation act that we do not believe an administrative body should be given the power when a contract is made, to exempt that contract and the contractor from renegotiation. That is the issue.

It is because we believe in the principle of renegotiation that we say that individual contractors should not, by decision of an administrative body, be free from renegotiation—for these are administrative bodies which can proceed in secret, be exposed to hidden influences, hand down decisions which they do not have to justify, and take away from the Treasury and the people of the United States billions of dollars. It is precisely that potential form of vice we want to stop.

So those of us who propose the amendment, far from being the foes of renegotiation, as has been implied, are the friends and advocates of renegotiation.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has pointed out, the question of the mandatory exemptions is not involved in this amendment. The mandatory exemptions are covered from page 28 to the top of page 34. We are not now proposing an amendment to strike out the mandatory exemptions. But we do say that the permissive exemptions on pages 34–35 are extremely dangerous, because we know that in the past they have been abused, and because the man who was in charge of this matter in the Second World War opposed them. An eminent committee of the Eightieth Congress, consisting of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] all joined in opposing them. We should not expose the Board to such temptations. I think they made a good report.

Mr. President, this is a matter of extreme importance, and I hope very much that we shall not reconsider the vote by which my amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to belabor the issue. The very report which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] recommended the elimination of all exemptions, both mandatory and permissive.

Mr. President, we now find ourselves in this peculiar situation, and I am going to deal fairly with the Senate, as I have always tried to do: The House of Representatives did not provide sufficient relief for agricultural products; for cattle; for wool; it did not provide sufficient relief for minerals, and so on. The Senate had to do it. Can the conferees on the part of the Senate go to the conferees on the part of the House and say to them, "Gentlemen, you were wrong in not allowing the mandatory exemptions which we have written in the bill to fully protect American agriculture, American livestock growers, American mining interests"? Can we do that, Mr. President, in the face of a vote by the Senate against even permissive exemptions?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, someone may do that, but it would take a person with an elastic conscience.

I can assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that the conferees on the Finance Committee would not expose themselves to that sort of situation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I do not yield. I have but 3 minutes.

As I have said, it is not a question of what is involved in this amendment, but it is a question of what is involved in a conference report.

Now I wish to make this statement to the Senate, and I do so in all kindness: It is passing strange to me that we are called upon to rewrite a bill of this character on the floor of the Senate, when our committee has given honest and conscientious and hard work to the responsibilities placed upon it by the Senate; and I mean precisely what I am saying. If Senators do not wish to support the committee, but wish to rewrite the bill in order to satisfy the wishes of particular groups, all good and well. Then I shall be under no obligation to support the committee's findings and deliberations. However, what Senators are doing by their vote is to place such a tremendous burden upon the Board as to bog down renegotiation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I have any time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I listened with some amazement to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the greatest regard, when he was critical of the fact that Members of the Senate had the effrontery to propose amendments which would change the bill prepared by the committee. It seems to me that if his thesis is correct, it would mean that no amendments should ever be offered from the floor or otherwise to a bill prepared by a committee. It would mean a complete surrender of the authority and duties and responsibilities of Members of the Senate, other than those who sit on a specific committee. So far as I am concerned, I would feel that under those circumstances, service in the Senate was well nigh useless. I would not want to acknowledge or agree to any thesis of that sort.

Let me say that when I speak on this subject, I do not speak in complete ignorance or from inexperience, for, by appointment of the President and the Secretary of War, in 1919, I served on the very first Board of Contract Adjustment after the First World War. We had the same problems. I saw the tremendous pressure which was brought on the Board by various interests, not in bad faith, but simply because they felt they

should not be subject to the provisions of the act as it was then written. We shall have exactly the same situation if we allow permissive exemptions to be made by this Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ecton	McCarran	Tobey
Ellender	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	McClellan	Wherry
Flanders	McFarland	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	
George	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether the Presiding Officer would be so kind as to state the issue before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The issue now to be passed upon by the Senate is whether it shall reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois was agreed to. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bennett	Frear	McFarland
Bricker	George	Malone
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Byrd	Hoey	Millikin
Capehart	Holland	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ellender	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hill	Neely
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Kem	Pastore
Clements	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Langer	Schoeppel
Douglas	Lehman	Smathers
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Ferguson	Long	Tobey
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Monroney	Wiley
Green	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—14

Benton	Jenner	Sparkman
Chavez	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Dirksen	McKellar	Welker
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Hunt	Nixon	

So the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the time for debate on which has been exhausted.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hennings	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kem	Pastore
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Langer	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Monroney	Wiley
Hendrickson	Morse	

NAYS—42

Bennett	Frear	McFarland
Bricker	George	Malone
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Byrd	Hoey	Millikin
Capehart	Holland	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	McCarran	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ellender	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—13

Benton	Jenner	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Welker
Dirksen	McMahon	Young
Gillette	Nixon	
Hunt	Sparkman	

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on page 35, line 16, I offer an amendment to strike out the words "both individually and" and to substitute in lieu thereof the word "only."

The effect of the proposed amendment would be to eliminate the power of the Board to grant exemptions from renegotiation to individual firms, and permit it to grant exemptions only to a general class or type of firms. The Board would be given the power to exempt individual industries or particular types of companies, but not to exempt individual firms within an industry.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate made a very bad decision a moment ago. The adoption of the amendment I now propose would help make it not quite so bad as it otherwise would be.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether

or not the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois L subject to a point of order. My understanding is that the Senator's original amendment was to strike out language in the bill which included the language which the Senator from Illinois now identifies as a single phrase or group of words.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that the language which the Senate refused to strike out is subject to amendment. Therefore the amendment which is now being offered by the Senator from Illinois is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will not agree to the amendment which is now being proposed by the Senator from Illinois, although I do not know the precise reasons for the amendment. I do not know whether it could possibly possess any real merit. I am not sufficiently familiar with what the Senator has in mind. Would the Senator mind stating his amendment again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment is to strike out the words "both individually and" and to substitute therefor the word "only", so as to make lines 16 and 17 read:

> The Board may so exempt contracts and subcontracts only by general classes or types.

Under the amendment the Board could grant an exemption to an industry, but could not grant it to individual firms, or favor them in advance. It would do away with individual favoritism within an industry, although the Board would still be subjected to pressure by an industry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it appears to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois has a meritorious purpose. Its purpose is to prevent discrimination and favoritism. On the other hand, I wonder if it would not also prevent the Board from asserting its power of renegotiation if it found a flagrant case in a general class. For example, with respect to class 4, if it came to the attention of the Board that certain contractors had some secret projects, in which the Board felt there were some flagrant examples of excessive profits, how could the Board recapture the renegotiation right, if the proposed amendment were agreed to?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was not the purpose of the Senator from Illinois to permit any permissive exemptions. It was the purpose of the Senator from Illinois to eliminate all permissive exemptions, in order to remove from the administrative Board the temptation to make rulings which would favor particular individuals or classes. However, after some debate and a number of roll calls, such a general amendment was defeated. As the situation now stands, the Board has the power not only to exempt general classes, but individual firms as well. What I am trying to do is to cut down the range of abuse. I would not give the Board any more powers than it now possesses under the bill. I would give it fewer powers, so that it could classify industries or firms according to particular circumstances which may arise, and make a general rule for such firms, but the Board would not be permitted to pick out company A and favor it over company B, or give one company a favor which it did not give to another company in the same category.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator's amendment were agreed to, would it not restore competition? I ask that because at the present time if one man can get an exemption, and another man who is selling the same product cannot get an exemption, there is not fair trade or fair practice. In other words, the amendment would require the Board to treat all firms alike. In the case of the Government's purchase of wheat, one man could submit a bid to the Government and know that while his contract could be renegotiated, the contract of someone else dealing in wheat would be exempted from renegotiation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment would restore at least the individual enterprise system in such contracts as nearly as it is possible to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And reduce as much as possible the danger of governmental fix.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. In the mind of the Senator from Illinois, would his amendment eliminate any possibility of political favoritism?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would reduce the possibility of political favoritism.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not eliminate it, but it would reduce it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would reduce it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if a distinction between classes based upon whether a contract is executed or not executed is not significant. It seems to me that if the Board were given the right to exempt contracts after they have been executed, and a person executing them did not know whether they would be exempt, there would be much less chance of abuse than if an exemption were given in advance. I wonder if we could not achieve the purpose by saying that the Board would have discretion if a contract had been executed under the belief that it would be renegotiated, but that if it found nothing substantial was involved, it could refuse to go forward with renegotiation. Is that not a valid distinction?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is. The very process of renegotiation itself gives the Board the power to make a preliminary audit. If the figures do not seem to justify renegotiation, the Board is not compelled to renegotiate. What has been done now is to give the Board the power in advance, before production, before any costs have been determined, to exempt any or all contractors. Now that we have permitted that abuse, I think we should limit it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. There is no question that the Senator from Illinois has a laudable purpose in presenting his amendment. It is to prevent favoritism. However, anyone who has studied the problem of renegotiation will find that what it would do would be to defeat what renegotiation permits.

I have before me a copy of the hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means at the time the Renegotiation Act was amended in 1943. In illustration of what was brought out before the committee, and which I believe to be apt now, Colonel Browning, who did a great deal of the renegotiation in its early stages, brought to our attention the fact that in many instances people who were engaged in making the same product operated with different facilities, different capital structures, and different tooling and equipment. The result in many cases was that although two companies were producing the same product, one company would make more money than the other company. Renegotiation made it possible for the Government to get the production it needed, without the necessity of going to some companies which did not have as efficient tools as others.

For example, Colonel Browning showed us that a contract had been made with a certain company for the manufacture of machine guns at a price of $500 per gun. Another firm was receiving only $400. Yet the company with the $400 price on machine guns made a profit of $24,000,000 on a $51,000,000 contract. Renegotiation made it possible to give the company which was making machine guns at $400 a larger percentage of profit in recognition of its enterprise, and yet to recapture some of that profit for the Government. As a matter of fact, when we asked the result, we were informed that the price was renegotiated down to $280 per gun for one firm, and yet it made a profit of 20 percent. Another firm was reduced to $330 per gun, and yet it made a profit of 13½ percent.

If it were required that machine guns as a class be altogether exempted, we could not reach a situation such as I have described. We would freeze, for the company with the tools which permitted it to make an exorbitant profit of $24,000,000 from a $51,000,000 contract, the right to obtain such a profit, without making it possible for the Board to establish a differential by taking into consideration the experience or the plant and equipment of the various companies. It may be a discretionary feature, but it is something that has to do with the process of renegotiation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield so that I may ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator demonstrate the proposition that exemption should be by classes rather than by individuals?

Mr. CASE. The Senator——

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment, if I may finish the question. Does the Senator demonstrate that it is necessary that there be renegotiation to determine whether or not there are excessive profits in a given case? Both contracts would have to be renegotiated to get the relative facts. Why should the Board, at the time the contract was entered into or prior thereto, have the right to exempt one manufacturer, and not another, without knowing all of the facts? Is not that the situation at which we are aiming?

Mr. CASE. The broad power of granting exemptions which the Secretary or the head of a procurement agency had under the old act is circumscribed by the five specific areas provided in the permissive exemption provision. While I do not like the idea of treating one firm differently from another, we are dealing with the very difficult problem of trying to encourage private enterprise as much as possible, and yet not make it possible for some firms to make excessive profits in connection with the defense effort. There must be some discretion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the comment of the Senator from South Dakota show very clearly that not only should we not exempt machine-gun manufacturers from negotiation, but that we could not know until after the fact whether or not either of the concerns was going to make excessive profits, since one firm might improve its efficiency?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement. There is some misapprehension on the part of Senators. A number of Senators seem to have the impression that a person may go to the Board and get an exemption for himself, or for a contract which he has not made. That is not true at all. He cannot do so until after his contract is negotiated. It must be in existence. Under the permissive exemption provision of the bill the Board may say, "We know that there are no excess profits involved in this contract, and we will exempt it." It may do so by classes or types or by individual contracts. I rather think that striking out the words "both individually and", as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, would be harmful and would work very great hardship upon many individuals. But if it is understood that I may take this amendment to conference for the purpose of giving study to it and understanding its real effect, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as an untutored Member of this body, I have often wondered what practical significance to attach to the phrase, "I will take it to conference." I have sometimes thought that this phrase means, "I will take the baby, but I will lay it on someone else's doorstep, and I will not take care of the baby after I have laid it there."

If this type of foundling is to be turned loose and subjected to the devices of the conference committee, I should much prefer to have the amendment voted up or down than to give it such ambiguous treatment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, very frankly, I do not quite see the effect of the Senator's amendment. In fact, I doubt that it is a wise amendment. However, I am willing to give study to it and determine, in conference, whether or not the amendment is meritorious and not harmful to the general purposes of the proposed act. If I were to be called upon to vote upon it at this time I should vote against it and ask the Senate to reject it. I think I am fair in saying to the Senator from Illinois that I will take his amendment to conference and give it careful consideration. If I can see any merit in it, I shall be very glad to support it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the assurance from the Senator from Georgia that he will not prematurely abandon the child, I am very glad to accept his offer.

Mr. GEORGE. I will not prematurely abandon the amendment without careful consideration, but I disclaim any responsibility for the parentage of the child. [Laughter.] I want the Senator from Illinois to have that signal honor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy to claim it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield. I said I would take the amendment to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to clear up this question. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say it was his opinion that the Board could not have inserted in a contract one of these exemptions, at the time of making the contract?

Mr. GEORGE. No. I said that the contract must be executed before there is any final determination that the contract is not renegotiable.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the contract must be a contract that can be renegotiated, and then the Board rules as to whether or not it will be exempt from renegotiation.

Mr. GEORGE. That is my understanding.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator could point out for the RECORD the paragraph or the section which so provides. I inquired from the Board this morning, and did not receive an answer on this question.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand how there could be renegotiation unless there had first been negotiation. Renegotiate means simply to negotiate again. That is the literal meaning of the word "renegotiate." Therefore, there must be a contract, and that contract must be negotiated, although the Board might permit a provision to go into a given contract that it would not be subject to renegotiation, if it were clear that there could be no excessive profits. However, I do not think that is the practice.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the Senator is of the opinion that if this provision is carried out, as indicated by the language, it means that the contracting officer makes a contract, and then the Board, after the contract is made, determines whether or not the particular contract is subject to renegotiation.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct as to individual contracts. That is my candid statement as to how it should be and is interpreted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. One of the arguments used for the exemption is that the contracting officer is able to get better prices by virtue of being able to say, "This contract is not going to be renegotiated."

Mr. GEORGE. I did not use that language.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know where that story came from.

Mr. FERGUSON. That came in the testimony before the War Investigating Committee; that was one of the justifications for permissive exemptions.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have completely stripped the procurement officer of any authority to exempt any party to any contract. He does not have that authority under the bill. He cannot renegotiate. The procurement officer is out of the picture. Under the World War II act it developed that by delegating the authority the procurement officer could give an exemption. Of course, that power might be subject to abuse; there is no doubt about it. But under the bill neither a procurement officer nor any agency which has supervision over procurement can have anything to do with the exemption of contracts from renegotiation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am inclined to the opinion that the Senator has a point which is valuable. If these contracts cannot be exempted at the time they are made, but must be exempted later, that would mean that the Board would have to get some facts at least to determine whether or not a contract should be exempted, and there may not be a full renegotiation.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. But even though only a partial renegotiation it could still be of great value.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct. Since we were at great pains to exclude from the renegotiation process the officer who does the procuring for the Government, and took him out of the picture, since we said that there can be no delegation of this authority, it makes quite a difference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Whatever may have been the construction given in the past to a prior act, now it would seem to me to be undoubtedly true that before the Board could say to an individual "Your contract need not be renegotiated" it must have looked at some of the facts, it must have something before it to justify it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that in presenting the matter to the conference, as he expects to do, that there is very great advantage, both from the standpoint of the administrative burden and of the danger of abuse, if they are able to proceed by classes instead of by individual cases?

Mr. GEORGE. I would be very glad to present the matter fairly. I would be very glad to give it careful consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. There may be other things to outweigh it, but I thought perhaps the Senator would agree that if it could be handled in this way both the administrative burden would be lightened and the danger of abuse lessened.

Mr. GEORGE. We will certainly give it full consideration and undertake to present it fairly. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was apparently under a misapprehension, but I should like the Senator to make it clear as to why exemption cannot be made prior to the execution of the contract, without any knowledge of the contract itself. The Senator said that is not the case.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not the case, because under the bill only the Board has the power to exempt. It cannot delegate that power to anyone. It does not make the contract. It is not a party to any contract. It is not a procurement agency. So, if it has any knowledge of the situation at all, it must have after the contract is executed and it has some facts upon which it can act intelligently.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not realize that. I thought that under the general provision at the top of page 35, lines 16 and 17, the Board could make a general exemption for classes which would apply in the future. It looks that way to me.

Mr. GEORGE. That might be true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the only matter that bothered me.

Mr. GEORGE. That may have been true as the House wrote the bill, but the Senator must recollect that we have amended the House bill in certain important particulars. We have said that the Board itself cannot delegate the power to exempt a contract with anybody; that the Board must retain that power. That, of course, makes this measure different from any act we have heretofore passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. I have said, Mr. President, that I would carry the amendment to conference for the purpose of carefully studying it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on page 35, to strike out in lines 16 and 17 the words "both individually and" and to insert the word "only."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the same paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph in lines 16 and 17 on page 35?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. The amendment I offer is as follows:

On page 35, at the end of line 17, to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the Board may in exceptional or aggravated cases require renegotiation of particular contracts after execution even though contracts of that class may have been previously exempted.

This language follows the thought expressed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and I think by some other Members of the Senate, that if a particularly aggravated or exceptional case involving inordinate profits appears to have arisen after the execution of the contract within the limitation that it is an exceptional or aggravated case, the Board should nevertheless have the power to renegotiate that contract even though the particular class of contracts may have been exempted in the beginning.

I offer the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by an aggravated case or an exceptional case?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will state for legislative history that I mean a case where a very excessive profit has been made or where it developed later that the material which went into the performance of the contract cost a great deal less than was anticipated, or some other situation arose because of which the contractor should not in good conscience accept or want the Government to pay such a tremendous profit on the particular contract. When I use the words "exceptional" or "aggravated," that is what I have in mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator think others will understand what he means by the words "aggravated" and "exceptional"?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assume that in conference the conferees can work out proper language if my language is not clear.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that his is exactly the negative of the amendment already offered by the Senator from Illinois, which provided that there must be no consideration of the individual contract. That provision of the bill has been stricken out. The Board can only act with respect to classes. Now this proposed amendment completely contradicts the amendment just agreed to.

It also seems to me, Mr. President, that this amendment should be subject to a point of order because it is part of the same line that has already been amended.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment negatives the class amendment which has just been agreed to and is to go to conference, except in cases which are exceptional or aggravated. In such cases my amendment, if adopted, would, of course, negative the class-exemption amendment.

However, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] said, in certain types of cases the board might wish to exempt all contracts of a certain type; and yet certainly it would not be in the public interest or in the interest of the Government, nor would it be proper, to have the Government be unable to renegotiate a particular contract, after having exempted all contracts of the particular class, when it was found that for some particular reason the contractor in the particular case would make an inordinate profit.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether this matter should be handled in conference. I understand the Senator's point, and it is worth considering, of course.

The Senator from South Dakota referred to secrecy cases. The Senator wishes to exempt, he says, all contracts which would involve war secrets. Yet, as the Senator pointed out, there might be a case in which it would be desirable to renegotiate a particular contract.

I wonder whether we should not leave the working out of this particular problem to the conferees. In other words, if the House of Representatives wished to accept the amendment, it would then be able to work out the matter in conference.

In regard to this particular provision, I simply ask the Senator whether he might better leave the matter to the conferees. The exemption might apply to a particular class; and yet, as has been stated, as to certain cases, we might not want to have the exemption.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What the Senator from Ohio suggests might be a good procedure to follow. However, if this amendment is not adopted, this matter will not be in conference.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I can say to the Senator that it will be in conference, I think.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator please read his amendment again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to do so. On page 35, in line 17, at the end of the line, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following:

Provided, however, That the Board in exceptional or aggravated cases may require renegotiation of particular contracts after execution, even though contracts of that general class may previously have been exempted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that, as the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee said a moment ago, this amendment would substantially negative the amendment which has just been adopted by the Senate, namely, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would not negative that amendment, except for the words "exceptional or aggravated." In other words, the general rule then would be that, as the Senator from Ohio has said, secret contracts or contracts of a particular class could be exempted. However, after exempting such secret contracts generally, if after the execution of a particular secret contract it was found that in some way it worked an inordinate or excessively heavy hardship upon the Government, the Board still would have the right to ask for the renegotiation of the contract.

So, Mr. President, I think my amendment, if adopted, might help in such cases. No doubt certain general classes of contracts, such as those pertaining to secret work, should be exempted; but after exempting them, it might be found that a particular contract which worked a great hardship on the Government should be renegotiated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Who would determine whether the case was exceptional or aggravated? The Board would determine that, would it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the bill provides that the Board may exempt contracts and subcontracts, both individually and by classes and types. The bill uses, in that connection, the words "both individually and." That language provides authority for the Board to take into consideration whether the case is exceptional or aggravated. In other words, these are permissive exemptions; they are not mandatory.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In response to the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, I would say that if the Board in the beginning decided to exempt all secret contracts, the words "exceptional or aggravated," in view of the legislative history which would indicate that they related to profits which were inordinate or shocking or in very large amount in proportion to the size of the contract, would establish standards by which the Board could proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The words "both individually and" are written into the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. Under that language that very thing could be done. I suppose that is why the House used the words "both individually and."

Mr. KEFAUVER. But my amendment includes the words "exceptional or aggravated."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then I go back to my original question, namely, who would decide what would be an exceptional or an aggravated case Certainly the Board would decide that, would it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the Board would decide that. However, the words "exceptional or aggravated" would give the Board a standard by which to proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not true that to all intents and purposes the Senator's amendment would destroy the purpose and effect of the language on page 35, in lines 16 and 17, of the bill as it was passed by the House?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I disagree with the Senator. I may say that I spoke to the Senator from Illinois, and I believe he said he would prefer to have this part of the bill remain as it would read as modified by his amendment, but that he would prefer to have my amendment added rather than to have the bill enacted in the form in which it was before his amendment was adopted.

Let me inquire whether I correctly state the position of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is substantially correct. To my surprise, my amendment was adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. However, I think my amendment improves the amendment of the Senator from Illinois because his amendment now requires the Board, when it wishes to make certain exemptions, to exempt all in that class. It is quite conceivable—and I think would ordinarily happen in connection with the execution of a great number of contracts of a particular class—that there might be one of that type of contract—let us say a secret contract—which it would be outrageous not to have renegotiated, and in that connection not to have some funds returned to the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "if any of", and insert in lieu thereof the words "except to the extent that."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this amendment is a slight one to paragraph (d) on page 4, under the heading "Suspension of certain profit limitations."

At that point the bill now reads as follows:

(d) Suspension of certain profit limitations: Notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the profit-limitation provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 505), as amended and supplemented, and of section 505 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended and supplemented (46 U. S. C. 1155 (b)), shall not apply to any contract or subcontract if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title.

Mr. President, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there are contracts for seven vessels which were in the course of construction on January 1, 1951. An estimated $125,000,000 had accrued to contractors at that time. This part of the bill, as it now reads, would free such contracts or subcontracts from the profit limitation provisions of the Merchant Marine Act. The language to which I refer is as follows: "shall not apply to any contract or subcontract if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title."

The $125,000,000 I understand would also be freed from renegotiation, as the new renegotiation bill would free merchant marine accruals antedating January 1, 1951. In other words, the $125,000,000, which I understand has already accrued to contractors, would be exempt, both from the 10 percent limitation of profits, under the Merchant Marine Act, and, because of the dating of the pending renegotiation bill, would also be exempt from renegotiation.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt the Senator is correct in his statement, and that this matter can be dealt with in conference. However, on the point the Senator raises I have an amendment which I think is somewhat clearer, for this reason: The Renegotiation Act of 1948 suspends the profit limitation provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act, with respect to any contract subject to the 1948 act, but that is not true with respect to the Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Therefore, as the Senator properly points out, we would have two conflicting acts, under the amendment, starting on page 4, line 24, after the word "apply", we insert a comma and the following: "in the case of such act of March 27, 1934"—referring to the Vinson-Trammell Act—and then, on page 5, line 2, before the period, we insert a comma and the following: "and, in the case of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to any contract or subcontract entered into after December 31, 1950, if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title." I think that will accomplish, in a little clearer way, precisely what the Senator intends by his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand that the entire matter will be considered in conference?

Mr. GEORGE. The entire matter can be considered in conference.

Mr. AIKEN. If that be true, and if it is simply a case of proper wording so as not to exempt either under the Merchant Marine Act or this renegotiation bill the $125,000,000 which already has accrued to contractors in connection with the construction of these ships, I am not anxious to press the amendment, if the Senator from Georgia can take care of the matter in conference.

Mr. GEORGE. I intended to raise that very question in conference, and, in fact, I had this amendment prepared. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes to offer another amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. No. I did not know that the Senator from Georgia had an amendment in mind.

Mr. GEORGE. The matter could go to conference, and we certainly shall have to notice it then, because there is a necessity of correcting what the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, has prepared an amendment, I shall be very happy to withdraw the one which I have offered, and let him submit his.

Mr. GEORGE. I have prepared it. It requires two changes, instead of the one which the Senator has offered. We want to make it clear that the suspension which is intended to apply to contracts under the Merchant Marine Act does not interfere with the Merchant Marine Act, insofar as the percentage limitations which have already been applied to that contract are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. That is, until January 1?

Mr. GEORGE. Until January 1; that is correct. I would offer my amendment, or let the Senator offer his, and take it to conference.

Mr. AIKEN. It does not matter to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Vermont has the floor, though I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan to enable him to address a question to the Senator from Georgia without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the purpose of this amendment to make subject to renegotiation money which may already be due and payable under the Merchant Marine Act?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator mean prior to January 1?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; prior to January 1.

Mr. GEORGE. No; that is not the purpose. The purpose of this amendment is to leave the contractors under the Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that they might get up to 10 percent under that act?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And then, after that date, it would affect all money due or to become due under this law?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the purpose?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; and since there are two different standards, it is necessary to make this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether, if the amendment which I have offered is adopted, that will then put before the conference committee everything which should be before the committee?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so. I think it is necessary to begin the amendment on page 4, line 24; and if the Senator will accept my amendment, I can assure him the amendment I have has been worked out with some care.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be very glad to withdraw my amendment so that the Senator from Georgia may offer the one to which he refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont withdraws his amendment. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 24, after the word "apply", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words, "in the case of such act of March 27, 1934,"; and on page 5, line 2, before the period, to insert a comma and the words, "and, in the case of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to any contract or subcontract entered into after December 31, 1950, if any of the receipts or accruals therefrom are subject to this title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 6, after the word "wool", it is proposed to insert "in the grease or scoured."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. I am informed that during World War II the words "ginned cotton and scoured wool" were never thoroughly interpreted, as to whether wool and cotton in those forms were agricultural commodities in the raw or natural state. The purpose of the amendment is to determine whether "wool in the grease or scoured" is an agricultural commodity in its natural state. As I understand, scoured wool is simply cleaned wool, which is still in its raw state. There are in Massachusetts many woolen mills and wool dealers. As I understand, many of the mills do not have the facilities to scour or clean wool. Therefore, if the dealers had to clean wool, the cost would be passed back to the producers and would cut down the price of wool in the natural condition.

I hope the distinguished chairman may be willing to take this amendment to conference, in order that it may be worked out. The Senator stated to me this morning, in answer to an inquiry, that he did not think the bill in its present form included scoured wool. I therefore believe that in the interest of the producer of wool, and in the interest of having wool considered as an agricultural commodity, this is a fair interpretive amendment. I ask that it be taken to conference, there to be perfected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, although I have had no request or notice from anyone representing the wool trade, I am very glad to accept my colleague's statement of the purpose of this amendment. This very vital industry is a tremendous factor in the livelihood of people in Massachusetts and, of course, the woolen industry as a whole is of national significance. I wish to take this opportunity to record myself in favor of the amendment, and to express the hope that it may be agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two on the particular subject now being discussed. When we were considering the bill in committee, one of my main objectives was to see that agricultural products were exempted and to include cleaning or processing in order to put them into a marketable condition. My own personal understanding is that ginned cotton and scoured wool come under the same category.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I regret that I am not able to take this amendment to conference, for the reason that the Senate committee bill does restore the World War II exemptions. The exemption under the World War II act has been construed, and as construed by regulations of the Department wool was exempted only if in the grease. Scoured wool is not exempted under the construction of the World War II act. Therefore, the amendment would broaden the exemption to much wider limits than at the present, because the scouring of wool is a step beyond the first form in which it has an established market.

Some of my colleagues have called my attention to the fact that cotton is construed to mean cotton in bale; but cotton in bale is the form in which cotton is ordinarily and generally sold. Of course, it can, as a remnant, be sold in the seed, which sometimes occurs; but that is not the usual and general form. So there is no analogy.

Much as I should like to take the amendment to conference, I am satisfied that to include wool after it had been subjected to the process of scouring would be broadening the exemption quite too far.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the words which have been inserted by the committee are the same words which were used in the World War II act?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; we have gone back to that act, and the words in that act were given a construction which would exclude scoured wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, does the Senator believe that the information I have received from the wool group in my home State of Massachusetts to the effect that the term "wool" was never clearly interpreted; is incorrect?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it is; but if it were so, perhaps the Senator would not need any legislation on the subject. I believe, however, that the term was construed by regulations to mean wool in the grease.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that if the wool is going to be exempted, it has to be wool in the grease, and it has to be sold as wool in the grease, rather than as scoured wool?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a dealer sells scoured wool, having scoured it himself before he sells it, he has to take that into consideration in the price he quotes the producer; does he not?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; it might have that effect, and undoubtedly would have that effect. But scouring is a step in the processing of wool, it is one degree beyond the form in which wool is generally and customarily sold.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But, as I understand, scoured wool is merely cleaned wool. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. GEORGE. That is my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the Senator's opinion, that is one step in a process, and therefore it is no longer a commodity in the raw?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator that it is so interpreted. Perhaps the interpretation is not correct, but it was so interpreted under the World War II act provision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assume the bill is left in its present form, without any change, without the amendment which I have offered, the word "wool" would still be open to an interpretation which might include scouring. It might be reinterpreted so as to include scoured wool, as well as wool in the grease; might it not?

Mr. GEORGE. It might be, if the conclusion might now be reached that it is erroneous to confine the interpretation to wool in the grease only, if I understood the Senator's question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was my question.

Mr. GEORGE. It might be so construed, but having been construed as wool which had not passed out of the grease form, I could only remind the Senator of the construction which was given to the term as it was used in the old act, namely, that it did not include scoured wool, but only wool in the grease.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, a wool trader or a wool broker would have to sell the wool in the grease, or, if he had to scour it, he would have to consider the scouring as a separate process, and charge someone for it?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. That is the theory on which the interpretation I have cited was placed upon the act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If, under the interpretation of the act, scoured wool were now included by the amendment I have offered, with the support of my colleague, it would differentiate wool from every other agricultural commodity, would it?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe it would, because it would carry the commodity to a process beyond what is now ordinarily the process through which the commodity must pass in order to get into the merchantable or marketable shape in which it is generally and customarily sold.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the only purpose I have in suggesting support for the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Massachusetts is that it is in the interest of the producer. The whole purpose of exempting agricultural commodities in their raw stage, and every stage in which they become marketable, is to protect the producer. That was the reason why cotton was exempted until it had been ginned, and that is exactly the reason why wool should be exempted until it has been cleaned. I believe the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts should be accepted.

Mr. GEORGE. There might be some reason for so construing the word "wool," but I must remind the Senator that cotton is not usually and customarily sold in the seed. In fact, it would be purely accidental, or done to meet the exigencies of a particular case. It must ordinarily, generally, and customarily be ginned before it is placed in a condition to be sold.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the answer of the Senator predicated on the fact that the seed is the heaviest part of the cotton, and is usually consumed in the area where it is produced, and the lint is the lesser weight of the cotton, and is generally processed at a place distant from where it is produced?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. Personally I should like to take the amendment to conference, but I realize that it would open the bill to very severe attack, and I am anxious to see the World War II act restored, because it has been construed, it has been applied, and it did function fairly well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am somewhat confused by the answer of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Wool in the grease certainly is a raw product. While the scouring may be one step in processing, what is the difference between wool that is scoured and wool in the grease, so far as industrial use is concerned? It is not fabricated until it is scoured.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is true ordinarily. I believe if the Senator will study the question very carefully he will find that even in the tariff acts Congress has always differentiated between wool in the grease and scoured wool, and the yarn, and wool in the different processes. I think a distinction between wool in the grease and scoured wool was made in the Tariff Act of 1930, known as the Smoot-Hawley Act. I am pretty sure that my recollection is correct in that respect. I know there was a great deal of discussion, and that we spent the whole summer on that bill before there was any air-cooling system in the Capitol.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it not be unfortunate to classify wool which had not been used for fabricating purposes, or which was not intended to be used for fabricating purposes, in any other way except as wool in the grease? In other words, someone may be required to pay for something which does not exist. I can see how a distinction could be made for tariff purposes. The point made by the Senator from Massachusetts and my colleague from Nebraska has raised some doubt in my mind. Why should scoured wool be placed in a different class than wool in the grease, for the purposes of this proposed act, on the theory that scoured wool represents the result of one step in the process, when that is not the fact, because scoured wool is just as much a raw material as wool in the grease? The wool has not been fabricated up to that stage. Perhaps there is nothing to argue about on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator may be right. However, the same language in the World War II Act was made the subject of regulation and construction by the Board. The Board may have committed an error, but they construed wool to mean only wool in the grease.

Mr. WHERRY. That would establish a precedent, which might be followed at this time, or might not be followed. I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator would not agree to do in the case of wool what is done in the case of other products. It may be that the same construction would be placed upon the word "wool" which was applied in the last act. Why could not the Senator take the question to conference and discuss it with the conferees, on the theory that there is no intention to grant anything to wool which is not being granted to any other product, but that, until wool is in a stage or process for industrial use, wool in the grease and scoured wool come under the same classification?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I am about to say comes to me second-hand. However, I understand that in some in-

stances farmers who think they will get a better price, or hope to get a better price, scour their own wool and then try to sell it directly to the mill. I do not think they would do it if scoured wool were not interpreted as wool in the raw or in the grease. Therefore, it does affect the price received by the producer of a raw agricultural product.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I had in mind. I do not know to what extent that has been done. It may represent only a small percentage. My feeling is that if a construction could be placed on what is meant by raw wool as wool which had not been previously processed, regardless of the form in which it came from the producer, whether scoured or in the grease, it could be placed in the same class.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further so that I may ask another question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. If I have the time to yield, I do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia is very courteous and helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired. The Senator from Massachusetts has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia would be willing to take the matter to conference in an attempt to work out an interpretation, and clear up the subject. It might be helpful to him and his conferees. If, on the other hand, there is no further information available, and scouring is one step in the process, that would be another matter. At least we would be able to look into the subject a little more fully.

Mr. GEORGE. I am almost persuaded by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, but I am not quite persuaded. I will do this: I will ask the House managers if they would be willing to indicate in their report that the word "wool" had been a bit too narrowly interpreted under the World War II act. That might be of help to the Senator. That is as far as I could go without opening the bill to very serious changes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Knowing him as well as I do, I am sure the Senator from Georgia will handle it to the best of his ability.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will not need more than 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true, however, that the only agricultural form in which wool is produced is in the grease, and that scouring is an additional process over and above the raising and production of the wool?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is correct. In my opinion, that is what persuaded the Board, under the World War II act, to say that the term referred only to wool in the grease.

Mr. CONNALLY. Otherwise, wool yarn could be included.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; or any successive step. As I understand, scouring is a necessary step in the process. However, there is a ready market for wool in the grease.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I recall, scoured wool weighs only about a third of what raw wool weighs. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas addressed his inquiry to me, as I judge he did, I would say that scouring takes nothing from the wool. It merely removes——

Mr. CONNALLY. The grease and dirt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It removes the sand, dirt, and grease which may have gathered upon the back of the sheep on the range. The wool, as a product, is not at all changed by the process of scouring. From my point of view, scouring does not constitute a step in the processing of wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the Senator from Nebraska desires to take.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I shall not need very much time. Having been in the business of handling agricultural products, I can say very definitely that there are few, if any, agricultural products which are handled in their absolute raw stages as they come from an individual farmer. Wheat, for example, when it is finally sold, has been cleaned. Some of it is clipped. It has been separated into different varieties as to protein, and other classifications. However, it is still in its raw state, and is so considered by the Renegotiation Board. Wool, on the other hand, must be handled in the condition in which it comes from the back of the sheep. It may have cockleburs in it. If cotton has cockleburs in it, the burs are picked off. Cotton is taken out of the boll and is cleaned. It is put in a merchantable condition. That is not permitted in the case of wool. I believe there is great similarity between cotton and wool. In fact, I believe they are identical. As I said before, no other agricultural crop is handled in its absolutely raw form. Every one of them has been processed to some extent before it goes to market.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that in all the Western States—I believe without exception—the farmers have what is known as a wool pool?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. They send their wool to a central place. Usually there is one such place in each State. Some States have two such places. The wool pool scours the wool before it is offered for sale, and it really is in the raw state.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Georgia the fact that the line which is proposed to be amended by the Senator from Massachusetts lists several commodities. It refers to the produce of live animals, such as wool, eggs, milk, and cream. Beginning with the last, it is obvious that cream must be separated from the milk. Is that processing? Of course not. It is not so regarded. Take the case of eggs. Is it not a fact that every farmer expects eggs to be washed before they are sent to market? Is anyone to interpret this language as meaning that, for the purposes of this legislation, "eggs" means unwashed eggs? Likewise, how can it be argued that "wool" means unwashed wool?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that corn in the crib must be shelled before being loaded into a boxcar?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that; but this provision deals with animal products.

Mr. WHERRY. My colleague mentioned wheat. Wheat must be cleaned. It must be harvested. The same argument applies to a great many other agricultural products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not true that when a producer sells wool in the grease, the weight of the dirt, cockleburrs, sand, and everything else that is in the wool is calculated, and the actual price of the wool in grease is on the basis of scoured wool. Wool in grease varies in price perhaps as much as 5 cents, depending upon whether or not there is excess grease.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is an estimate as to the shrinkage which would result from the process of scouring.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But that is not a manufacturing process. It is merely a cleansing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has this amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been disposed of. The Chair is advised that 3 minutes remain of the time of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In the time of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia just what he agreed to do with respect to this amendment. What

was the comforting assurance which he gave to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GEORGE. I stated that I would ask the House conferees if they would include in their statement on the conference report a sentence to justify including scoured wool.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, that such a recommendation be contained in the report of the House conferees?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. That would go into the report of the House conferees. They must make a report to the House, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows. Such a statement would interpret the term.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator does not feel that he could take the amendment to conference with the understanding that the conferees would do the best they could to accomplish the purpose desired.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to insist.

Mr. GEORGE. I know that this is a close question. If the Senator can assure me that no effort will be made to strike from the bill the mandatory exemptions of farm and animal products, I will do as he suggests. If the Senator would wait until we are ready to pass the bill, I might be able to get the amendment into conference so that it could be considered.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot guarantee anything except what the junior Senator from Nebraska will do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on the statement which the Senator from Georgia has just made, I temporarily withdraw my amendment and trust that I may be able to obtain recognition prior to the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator for withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, beginning in line 6 on page 36 and extending through line 17 on the same page, was adopted. I wish to make a few remarks with reference to the amendment which I intend to offer.

It is my intention, should the motion to reconsider be agreed to, to move that the House language beginning with line 19 on page 35 and extending through line 5 on page 36, be restored to the bill, with one exception, namely, that the salary of members of the Renegotiation Board and of the chairman of the Board shall be made as approved by the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no right to speak for the committee as a whole. However, I am prepared to offer, on my own behalf, an amendment if it would be agreeable to the Senator, as follows:

(a) Creation of Board: There is hereby created as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government a Renegotiation Board, to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, respectively, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services, shall each recommend to the President for his consideration one person to serve as a member of the Board. The chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this amendment would take the appointment out of the hands of the Secretaries. Under the terms of this amendment they would be given authority only to recommend to the President for his consideration. Of course, I am obliged to say that their recommendations would not be binding upon the Chief Executive. Nor do I think we could make them binding upon the Chief Executive, because I think that would be an invasion of the appointive power residing strictly and solely in the Executive.

Mr. President, I am willing to ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, and to offer this amendment, if it meets with the approval of the Senator from Minnesota. Of course, it would throw the entire subject into conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make one observation with respect to the suggested amendment of the distinguished chairman. It meets pretty much what I have in mind. First of all, I had doubt as to whether or not the language of the committee amendment, as printed, would even meet the test of constitutionality so far as the nominating powers of the President are concerned. That question may be debatable.

I invite attention, in the House language, to the following provision:

No member shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as a member of the Board.

In view of the salaries which have been suggested by the committee, and which I think are certainly desirable, I believe that we should retain that language. With that language, I would be more than willing to place my support behind the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, and urge its acceptance by the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there might be some objections to putting it so broadly. If the Senator means he shall not be actively engaged, very well. He may be a professional man and be engaged in his profession, although he may temporarily——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would consent to the use of the word "actively."

Mr. GEORGE. Although he may temporarily be in retirement from active duty. But he still is a lawyer, if he happens to be a lawyer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I would say that that qualification is very desirable. That is, that no member shall be actively engaged in any business, vocation, or employment other than that as a member of the Board. If the Senator will accept that addition to his amendment, I think I can withdraw my motion.

Mr. GEORGE. I should be pleased to add that language to the amendment, or we can insert it at the proper place in the amendment. If the Senator will read the sentence to see where it should be inserted, we will carry the matter to conference. Of course, it will be in conference anyway, because the House and Senate are in disagreement on this very important matter. I have an idea that the House Members probably will be pretty stout in insisting on their provision creating the Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that as I now understand the situation it would be necessary for the junior Senator from Minnesota to withdraw his motion to reconsider, and at that time the Senator from Georgia would offer his amendment to include words "No member shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than as a member of the Board." That language could be incorporated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the proper method of handling the situation would be for the motion to reconsider to be withdrawn, and that the new proposed amendment by the Senator from Georgia, as amended by the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota, be adopted by unanimous consent, if such consent be given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. If the Senator from Minnesota withdraws his motion to reconsider, will it be agreeable that the words I have suggested be included?

Mr. GEORGE. That would be agreeable. I shall be very glad to take it to conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, we might add an additional phrase "actively engaged while serving as such member." But I presume that is the meaning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the intent.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the intent. That would be the proper construction probably.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say further that I have read the portions of the committee amendment on page 38 which deny any procurement officer the right to serve in any capacity for the Board, either in the delegation of powers or in the redelegation, and I wish to commend the committee, particularly the chairman, for that foresight, in view of the testimony which has been given in previous years with respect to renegotiation. So with that, Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senate re-

consider the vote by which the amendment on page 36 was agreed to in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on reconsidering the vote by which the amendment on page 36 was agreed to. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed substitute amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, it is proposed to strike out lines 6 through 17, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) Creation of Board: There is hereby created, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, a Renegotiation Board to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, respectively, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services, shall each recommend to the President, for his consideration, one person to serve as a member of the board. The chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. No member shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than as a member of the Board. The Board shall have a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment on page 36.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment relating to minimum amounts subject to renegotiation was adopted. The purpose of my motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment relating to minimum amounts subject to renegotiation was adopted is to secure the attention and cooperation of the chairman of the Finance Committee to see what the spirit of the committee will be in terms of the conference committee and its report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am fully in a position to give the Senator a direct and definite statement on that point. On my motion, as a member of the Finance Committee, $300,000 was written in as the ceiling, and I was quite content with that. There was, of course, much argument on preceding days, and finally some suggestion was made that the amount be raised to $500,000, because the matter had, of course, to go to conference. By virtue of the depreciated value of the dollar, we agreed that the amount should be $250,000 or $300,000, which would be almost equivalent to $100,000 at the time we passed the World War II Act. I would not hesitate to say to the Senator that as one member of the conference I would think the amount ought to be $300,000 or $250,000, somewhere in that neighborhood. If the House conferees would agree to that I am sure the Senate conferees would be glad to acquiesce in their agreement. I have no doubt that we can agree on that question when it is fully considered by the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Georgia that, if the motion to reconsider was favorably acted upon, it was my intention to offer an amendment to insert $250,000. As the chairman of the Finance Committee has pointed out, the $100,000 figure in the World War II Renegotiation Act would be equivalent today to about $240,000 or $250,000 in terms of the depreciated value of the dollar. I know the chairman of the Finance Committee is most persuasive—as he has demonstrated this afternoon without a shadow of a doubt—and since I have received his own expression as to what he feels to be an appropriate and adequate figure for the minimum amount subject to renegotiation, I feel that possibly the best way to handle this is to have my comments as a point of record in the Senate debate urging that the figure of $250,000 be the figure finally decided upon by the conference committee.

I desire to point out the importance of this matter. The testimony which was taken during the Eightieth Congress in particular, as set forth in Senate Report No. 440, part 2, Eightieth Congress, second session, indicated quite clearly that substantial sums of money could be reclaimed under negotiation without injury to the business concerns themselves, if a minimum figure, which at that time was $100,000, was incorporated in the legislation. I feel now, in view of the inflation and the rise in the cost of commodities, of labor, and of what we may call other costs of production, that the $250,000 figure would be adequate.

The War Department Price Adjustment Board furnished the committee of the Eightieth Congress a study of the renegotiation of companies in the $100,000 to $500,000 bracket under the 1942 act. Of 3,728 cases in this bracket, 1,631, or 44 percent, were found to have made excessive profits totaling $57,371,000. Even more interesting is a tabulation of a group of 13 companies selected at random, all in the $100,000 to $500,000 bracket during 1943 and therefore not subject to renegotiation. These companies had average profits of 38.1 percent of gross sales. One company's profit was 91 percent of its $152,880 in gross sales.

I should also like to point out that the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, in the Eightieth Congress, second session, include the following very straightforward recommendation:

The committee believes that any future Renegotiation Act shall be improved in the following specific ways:

(a) By bringing within its operation all contractors with an annual war business exceeding $100,000.

Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether he feels it would fortify his case if we should vote on reconsideration at this time, in order to write into the bill a figure which could be used for his purposes in conference; or would it be advisable for the junior Senator from Minnesota to withdraw his motion to reconsider and place his reliance in what he knows to be the honor and integrity of the chairman of the Finance Committee?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would unhesitatingly say to the Senator that I think we would come nearer to accomplishing our purpose if the Senator would withdraw his motion to reconsider, and would permit the amendment to remain as it is. I am not at all sure that the House would agree to have this figure raised above $100,000, but I am hopeful that the House would agree to raise it to at least $250,000 or $300,000. Inasmuch as skilled men to handle these matters will be scarce, and, furthermore, in view of the fact that at the prevailing high, inflationary prices of today, only one or two contracts could easily amount to $100,000 or $200,000, I think a limitation of $250,000 or $300,000 would be low enough to protect both the Government and the contractors.

Moreover, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the 1942 act a contract for $100,000 or less was thrown out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not true under the bill now before the Senate.

In short, because of the possibility of the existence of a multiplicity of even small contracts, at the present high prices a contractor may during one fiscal year soon run his account with the Government up to $200,000 or $300,000, if he is doing a large amount of business with the Government.

I think what the Senator from Minnesota has in mind would be better accomplished if he would be disposed to withdraw his motion at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am surely disposed to withdraw my motion to reconsider, in view of the comments which have been made by the chairman of the Finance Committee and in view of what all of us know will be his position and his intention in the confines of the committee of conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota desires to withdraw his motion to reconsider. Unanimous consent is required for that purpose. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from Report No. 440, part 2, Eightieth Congress, second session, on page 234.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The administrators of the act also urge that the base for renegotiation be reduced from $500,000 to $100,000. The original act in 1942 applied to all annual business in excess of $100,000 but this was raised in the 1943 act to $500,000 at the request of the Price Adjustment Boards. At that time very slow progress had been made in renegotiation and a vast volume of work was facing the Boards. It was felt that the possible recovery from concerns in the $100,000 to $500,000 bracket would not justify the time and expense of renegotiating them. At that time this committee also recommended the elimination of concerns with less than $500,000 in war business. The committee now feels in view of our wartime experience in the administration of the renegotiation laws that this recommendation was a mistake. It should be noted, however, prior to the passage of the 1943 act, Senator Carl Hatch, then chairman of the Subcommittee on Renegotiation, of this committee, testified before the Senate Committee on Finance that further studies by this subcommittee indicated that the backlog of cases before the Boards was rapidly dwindling and that it might not be desirable to make the change. He pointed out that excessive profits on $100,000 of business were very possible.

The administrators of the act testified that recoveries of excessive profits from contractors in this bracket probably would not be large. The principal reason for this recommendation, they stated, was that in their experience most of the complaints they received about excessive profiteering during the war were directed at contractors with less than $500,000 annual war business. It was damaging to war morale, they thought, to let contractors in this bracket retain excessive profits while neighboring contractors with over $500,000 war business annually were renegotiated. It also frequently happened that contractors about whom complaints were received were located in small communities where it soon became common knowledge that the contractor was profiting excessively.

The War Department Price Adjustment Board furnished the committee a study of the renegotiation of companies in the $100,000 to $500,000 bracket under the 1942 act. Of 3,728 cases in this bracket, 1,631, or 44 percent, were found to have made excessive profits totaling $57,371,000. Even more interesting is a tabulation of a group of 13 companies selected at random, and all in the $100,000 to $500,000 bracket during 1943 and therefore not subject to renegotiation. These companies had average profits of 38.1 percent of gross sales. One company's profits were 91 percent of its $152,880 in gross sales.

Administrators of the act testified that companies in this bracket could be renegotiated with very few more renegotiators and that the cost of renegotiating them would be very small.

There was some indication that the $500,000 limitation also served to discourage some subcontractors from accepting additional war work that would have put their gross business over this amount and subject them to renegotiation. There was also evidence that an attempt to avoid the base limitation was made by some individuals who set up new businesses to take war work that would subject the individual to renegotiation. This was discouraged to a certain extent by the statutory provision and regulations bringing within renegotiation concerns under common control if the gross aggregate business was in excess of $500,000. However, proof of common control was at times hard to establish and no doubt where such common control was not obvious the companies avoided renegotiation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The committee believes that the renegotiation law, coupled with the excess-profits tax, is more likely to be successful and equitable than any other less flexible method. No more desirable method of reducing war profiteering was suggested to the committee.

2. The renegotiation system should be incorporated in a general industrial mobilization plan ready to be put into operation at once in the event of an emergency.

3. The factors to be considered in determining what is a fair profit in time of war should be set forth more specifically and with greater particularity.

4. In deciding what is a fair profit, the committee feels that any future renegotiation law should emphasize the importance of net worth as a factor in deciding a fair profit for a company during a war. In this way the growth of war millionaires could be prevented or greatly curtailed.

5. The renegotiation agency should be a separate agency, independent from any procurement authority, designed to handle the renegotiation of all services and branches of the Government.

6. The committee believes that any future Renegotiation Act be improved in the following specific ways:

(a) By bringing within its operation all contractors with an annual war business exceeding $100,000.

(b) Including war contracts of all Government agencies.

(c) By eliminating all mandatory and permissive exemptions so that all Government contractors with more than an annual business of $100,000 are renegotiated.

7. The committee recommends the establishment of regional price adjustment boards in each area, in order to eliminate duplication of facilities and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now call up and offer again my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would agree to waive the reading of the amendment by the clerk; and in line with my statement to the Senator from Massachusetts, I shall be very glad to have the amendment go to conference. That certainly will give the conferees on the part of the House an opportunity to place their interpretation on the bill as it now stands.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the committee.

Will the Chair put the question on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, for himself and Mr. LODGE, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 29, line 6, after "wool", insert "in the grease or scoured."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment on page 37, in line 7, was agreed to, be reconsidered. The wording of the amendment is as follows: "(but without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations)."

Mr. President, this Board may appoint thousands upon thousands of employees. We are spending millions of dollars for the Civil Service Commission, and we have working for the Commission many men and women in almost every region of the United States. I do not see any sense in having all these appointments made without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations. Therefore, I move to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement already entered, the Senator who has made the motion has 15 minutes in which to speak, if he desires to use that much time; and the chairman of the Finance Committee has 15 minutes to discuss the motion, if he desires to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will not reconsider its vote on this amendment. While the bill does provide that such employees shall not be subject to the civil-service laws, yet it expressly requires them to be under the salary Classification Act.

Of course, it is obvious the Board must obtain competent employees quickly and without delay.

At this time, when manpower may become scarcer and scarcer, it is believed necessary to take this action. I hope the Senate will not agree to the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Was it brought out in the hearings with reference to this particular item, by the representatives of the present Renegotiation Board, that in their search for competent help in reference to the technical and very highly classified tasks of renegotiation, they had to go beyond the registers of the Civil Service Commission, and had been compelled to do so even in order to operate the limited Renegotiation Act now on the statute books?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct. As I recall, such evidence was produced before the committee. I know the committee felt it was well advised to give the Board the opportunity to make up its personnel subject to the provisions of the Classification Act, but not subject to the requirements of the civil-service laws and regulations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this matter is so important that, in connection with it, I suggest the absence of a quorum, before I speak further in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Cordon
Anderson	Cain	Douglas
Bennett	Capehart	Duff
Brewster	Carlson	Dworshak
Bricker	Case	Eastland
Bridges	Chapman	Ecton
Butler, Md.	Clements	Ellender
Butler, Nebr.	Connally	Ferguson

Flanders	Kerr	Neely
Frear	Kilgore	O'Conor
Fulbright	Knowland	O'Mahoney
George	Langer	Pastore
Green	Lehman	Robertson
Hayden	Lodge	Russell
Hendrickson	Long	Saltonstall
Hennings	McCarran	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smathers
Hill	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hoey	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Holland	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Humphrey	Malone	Stennis
Hunt	Martin	Taft
Ives	Maybank	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Tobey
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Wherry
Kefauver	Mundt	Wiley
Kem	Murray	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no time to yield. My time has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is whether, in the appointment of employees, we are to disregard the civil-service laws and regulations. The paragraph I have in mind reads:

> The Board is authorized, subject to the Classification Act of 1949 (but without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations), to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees—

In other words, the salary is fixed. If the committee amendment were not adopted, the employees would be taken from the civil-service rolls.

Mr. President, we are spending millions of dollars for civil service. Why should an important Board like this not take its employees from the civil-service list or register? All I am asking is that line 7 be eliminated, which says: "(but without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations)."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate. Testimony before the committee was to the effect that the Board, in order to get the experienced people who were required to do the job imposed on it by the Reorganization Act of 1948, had to go outside the register to get them. It also appeared that in many instances they could get retired businessmen, retired professional men, retired teachers, and others who could not qualify under civil service. At the present time when we need manpower, we thought it would be wise to say, "You need not go to civil service, but you will be limited by the Classification Act as to the salaries to be paid." That is why the committee came to its conclusion. This is a temporary job. It is not a lifetime job. I hope the Senate will not reconsider its vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining of my minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send forward a unanimous-consent request which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> I ask unanimous consent that—
>
> (1) The bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.
>
> (2) That in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make such changes in section, subsection, paragraph, etc., numbers and letters and cross-references thereto as may be necessary to the proper numbering and lettering of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALLEGED BARTER AND SALE OF FEDERAL OFFICES IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an Associated Press dispatch from McComb, Miss. It has to do with the barter and sale of Federal jobs in the State of Mississippi. The dispatch reads:

> McCOMB, MISS., February 20.—A Mississippi publisher charged today that several Mississippians offered jobs as county economic stabilization directors were first asked to contribute $300 to $400 to the Truman faction of the State's Democratic Party.
>
> The charge was made by Publisher J. Oliver Emmerich, a leader in the States' rights movement, in his McComb Enterprise-Journal.
>
> Emmerich said that a businessman had been asked for a $300 contribution when offered the job as Pike County (McComb) economic stabilization director.
>
> At Washington, it was reported that all district and regional offices now being set up will be under the Office of Price Stabilization instead of the Economic Stabilization Agency.
>
> OPS Director Michael DiSalle said:
>
> "We are turning this matter over to our enforcement division for investigation. If it is found there is any truth to it we will ask the Justice Department to prepare indictments for submission to a grand jury. Furthermore, if we find any of our own people involved in it, they will be dismissed and prosecuted, if subject to prosecution."

My colleague [Mr. STENNIS] and I desire to explain the matter and its background to the Senate. For a great many months we have been getting reports of the widespread sale of Federal jobs in Mississippi by people in the State who have organized a committee which calls itself the Mississippi Democratic Committee, and which is recognized and affiliated officially with the Democratic National Committee, indeed, it was set up by the Democratic National Committee. It was created by it. It is its agent. It is its instrumentality. It is its official representative in Mississippi. In fact, this committee in Mississippi dispenses all Federal jobs and Federal Government favors in the State.

Judging from repeated reports, this situation has become so bad and so corrupt that my colleague and I have had an investigator at work in the State to secure information on which to base an investigation by the Senate of the deplorable condition which exists there. Several weeks ago we jointly called upon Mr. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General of the United States, and requested an investigation by the FBI of the sale of places under the jurisdiction of the FBI. Mr. McGrath promised his full cooperation and our information is that he has started such an investigation.

Mr. President, we have confidence in Howard McGrath, and we know that he will do his utmost. The FBI has no jurisdiction over the postal service, and we have also gone to the Postmaster General with reports of the sale of postmasterships and places as rural letter carrier in the State. Mr. Donaldson has assured us that he would investigate these matters.

The personnel of the Office of Price Stabilization is currently being set up in the State. Our information is that places as county director for this agency are being sold for a fixed fee of from three to four hundred dollars in each county.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to read an affidavit which I received from Pearl River County, Miss., a county not involved in the newspaper article which

I have read to the Senate. The affidavit reads:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Pearl River:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority in and for the above-mentioned county and State, W. Denny Russ, who stated on oath that he was approached on February 13, 1951, by R. F. Brashier, who gave his address as Brookhaven, Miss., phone 1698, who stated they were looking for a man to set up a ration board in Pearl River County and that he had been directed to see me for the position of supervisor, that I would be directly in charge of all personnel, which would consist of 10 to 12 people, and that my salary would be, as supervisor, the sum of $4,500 per year, but in order to get this appointment, I would have to give him a check in the amount of $400 to be made out to the National Democratic Committee. This was stated by both Brashier and his wife, who was with him, and to convince me that this was on the level and that he had the authority to set up this Board, he produced some four or five checks from different counties, which were made out for the sum of $400 and signed by different people.

I asked Mr. Brashier if this appointment would come from the endorsement of Members of Congress or Senate from Mississippi, and his wife, Mrs. Brashier, informed me that as far as any appointments in the State of Mississippi were concerned that both the Senators, EASTLAND and STENNIS, were through with appointments.

Due to the fact that I did not think his offer was legitimate, I would not accept, and they hurriedly departed.

W. DENNY RUSS.

The affidavit was acknowledged before a notary public.

Mr. President, Mr. Russ is a competent and high class gentleman. I think he made a mistake in the affidavit when he said that the check was to be made out in the name of the National Democratic Committee. I think they said the check was to be made out to the Mississippi Democratic Committee.

But the fact is that the Mississippi Committee was set up by the Democratic National Committee. The Mississippi Committee is the agent in Mississippi of the Democratic National Committee. It is the representative, the instrumentality in the State, of the Democratic National Committee. The group which compose this committee state publicly that they send a part of this money to the Democratic National Committee.

Furthermore, we have received reports from other counties where this has happened. Automobile dealers are being approached and told, "You pay this money and you can control the ration board. You will get benefits over your competitors in the automobile business if you put up $400 for this job. If you do not want it, name the man and we will appoint whomever you name."

Mr. President, here is another affidavit which substantiates what my colleague and I have to say about conditions in the State:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
County of Jones, First District:

Personally appeared before me, Lonie E. Meador, circuit clerk of the above-named county and State, J. Allen Pickering, of Collins, Miss., who being by me first duly sworn, states on oath that on or about the 25th day of July A. D. 1949 he paid the sum of $150 in cash to H. R. Abercrombie, a merchant of Collins, Miss., who in exchange for the said sum of $150 guaranteed a continuance of the job of said J. Allen Pickering (said job being rural letter carrier from the post office at Collins, Miss.) for a period extending until after the congressional election of 1950.

The said H. R. Abercrombie, at the above-stated time, says Mr. Pickering, stated that he was acting for or was the agent of Curtis Rogers, of Sylverina, Miss., who is one of the Trumanite State committee and who claimed to have Federal patronage in this section.

Mr. Rogers is personnel man for the group which call themselves the Mississippi Democratic Committee.

Continuing the quotation:

Regardless of the above-described agreement or contract between said parties, J. Allen Pickering further states on oath that, after receiving due notice, he was relieved of the said job on March 1, 1950.

J. ALLEN PICKERING.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this the 25th day of March A. D. 1950.

LONIE E. MEADOR,
Circuit Clerk.
By NELL GRAVES,
District Clerk.

Mr. President, these affidavits were secured as the result of the work done by an investigator whom my colleague and I have had in the State. There has also come to us information as to the sale of places in the Office of Price Stabilization in a number of other counties in addition to the instance in Pike County mentioned in the Associated Press dispatch. We believe that this information is accurate, and we desire to make it available to an investigating committee, which we shall ask be established to investigate thoroughly the situation within the State of Mississippi. It is my judgment that the sale of places in the Office of Price Stabilization is widespread over the State. In recent weeks rumors have reached both Senators from Mississippi that war contractors have been approached by this group attempting to solicit certain sums from them for their influence in the procurement of war contracts.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will not the Senator broaden his request for the investigation so as to include not only the State of Mississippi, but all other States and possessions of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. The only State with respect to which we have any proof is the State of Mississippi. We think we have first-hand knowledge of conditions there. We shall request an investigation in that State by a Senate committee. If the Senator from Michigan desires to ask for an investigation to cover the entire country, that is something for the Senate to determine; but we shall ask it for Mississippi.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will not the Senator accept an amendment to include the rest of the country?

Mr. EASTLAND. I would not agree to that. My colleague and I intend to submit a resolution. We shall be very glad to consider the Senator's suggestion. However, it is our intention to submit the resolution with respect to Mississippi, where we have the proof to which I have referred.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will offer an amendment later.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the Senator's privilege.

As I have stated, in recent weeks rumors have reached both my colleague and me that war contractors have been approached by this group attempting to solicit certain sums from them for their influence in the procurement of war contracts. However, since this matter is of recent origin we have not been able to tie it down, though we verily believe the reports to be correct.

Another report is that persons indicted for income-tax fraud have been contacted by this group, have received suspended sentences over the protest of the United States attorney, and thereafter emerged as Federal patronage dispensers in their respective areas.

Mr. President, the administration was warned on several occasions of what would happen, what was happening, and what subsequently did happen in Mississippi. They were warned by prominent people both in private life and in the Government. Those warnings were ignored. Why they were ignored in the face of what was happening in the State is beyond my comprehension. The administration has a number of influential and prominent people in the State who are its friends. These people are highly respected and are people of the very highest integrity. My colleague and I have requested that the Federal patronage in the State be handled by these friends of the administration so that there would be no scandal attached to the Democratic administration and in order that no tribute be levied upon veterans and others who desired Federal employment and that there would be no shake down of businessmen and others who desire to cooperate with the Defense Establishment and who would have to do business with these agencies.

The present newspaper publicity has come before the two Senators from Mississippi could finish their investigation of the conditions in the State. We believe that this condition is widespread and that it must be investigated by the Senate. It is our purpose in the near future to submit a resolution to set up a special Senate committee to investigate the sordid aspects of the entire set-up in Mississippi. We desire a special committee, Mr. President, because this is a subject matter with respect to which the Judiciary Committee would have jurisdiction of one aspect, the Finance Committee over another aspect, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee over another, the Armed Services Committee over another and probably the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments over another aspect.

This whole matter is interlocked, and separate investigations by a half dozen Senate committees would be wasteful and inefficient. The people of our State are disgusted and dismayed. They had no idea that they would be turned over as the prey for political free-booters.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to assure the Members of the Senate that I am asking for decent consideration of the people of my State, to protect them from the practices which have been related on the floor of the Senate and which are proceeding now.

When the Economic Controls Act was before the Senate in 1950, I realized it meant that the people of America would be put in an economic strait-jacket, their freedom taken away, and their daily lives controlled. I saw in that bill many opportunities for fraud and corruption. I felt that the main administrators, certainly those at the State level, ought to be confirmed by the Senate so we would have some direct responsibility in connection therewith and some control over the matter. I knew that that control was needed in Mississisippi, because I was already receiving reports about the activities of those who supported and were representing the administration in my State, some of whom had highly questionable reputations. My colleague [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and I offered an amendment in the Senate requiring confirmation of administrators serving at the State level and above. That amendment was adopted by the Senate. It was lost in conference and did not become a part of the law.

When the Congress returned in November 1950, I spoke to several of those who were high and influential advisers of the administration, and asked them to look into the situation in Mississippi, because I was certain in my mind that when the Economic Stabilization Act was put into effect there would be an attempt to sell jobs and sell alleged war contracts, and other activities in my State. I emphasized to those persons repeatedly that I did not want to have anything to do with naming the administrators, that is, to select them myself.

Soon after Congress convened in January of this year I renewed the same warning to several individuals in the administration, and emphasized again that I did not want to name any of the individuals who were to be appointed. My colleague and I then went together to other members of the group in the administration and explained that we did not want to make the appointments. We warned them of what would happen and suggested the names of two very able and highly respectable Mississipians who had the complete confidence of the administration, and suggested that they at least be consulted in an advisory capacity with reference to the administration of the Economic Controls Act. This suggestion by my colleague and me was ignored.

We have now received reports that numbers of persons in Mississippi are being approached by individuals who claim to have the authority to act under the Economic Controls Act, and are being offered good paying positions for $400 cash on the barrel head. The affidavits mentioned by my colleague and placed in the RECORD speak for themselves.

Mr. President, I anticipated such practices as this by some of those who were advisers to the administration in Mississippi, because for some time I have been receiving reports from various parts of the State that appointments to rural mail routes and to postmasterships were being sold for cash. Members of the House of Representatives from Mississippi have not been consulted by the administration in the selection of such mail carriers and postmasters.

I have no direct proof to substantiate any particular case, but I have information from reliable sources which causes me to believe that veterans who are still carrying wounds from German and Japanese bayonets and who are entitled to these positions under the Veterans' Preference Act, are being hijacked and held up for money in order to secure these positions. Some weeks ago I gave information along this line to Postmaster General Donaldson, a man for whom I have a high regard and who, I am sure, will proceed to investigate such matters. Other violations of law with regard to appointments outside the Post Office Department have also come to my attention.

I have representations from men of the highest integrity that small contractors are being approached by persons in Mississippi who claim to represent the administration and are charging them $200 to get their names on a so-called "eligible list" for Government contracts. I mentioned this matter to some Members of the Senate but have not actually reported it, as I am developing further proof along this line.

Mr. President, these are grave charges, and I can assure the Senate that they are serious to the people of Mississippi. It is not characteristic nor typical of the people of my State to indulge in or to be subjected to such practices in connection with governmental affairs. I assure the people of Mississippi that I have done everything I can to avoid such incidents happening to them, and assure the Members of the Senate that the people of Mississippi highly resent such tactics being employed in connection with their public affairs. Given the proper opportunity, I believe that most of them who have knowledge of these matters will disclose them in the interest of justice and decency, and I encourage them to do so.

Under these circumstances, I make a special request of the Senate for a full-scale investigation of all these matters to be conducted directly by the Senate through a special committee, because the subject matter will be found to be so varied that it will far exceed the jurisdiction of any committee or subcommittee now in existence in the Senate. On my responsibility as a Member of the Senate I give my assurance to each Member that I am satisfied that a full-scale investigation will disclose that rural mail routes and postmasterships in Mississippi are actually being sold for hard money, that small contractors are being made to believe that they have to pay money or they will be on the Government blacklist and not get any Government contracts, and that, because of the unsavory situation, some persons are paying money in expectation of Federal jobs. I believe that a full-scale investigation will show that positions in the economic controls organization are being offered right and left for money consideration. I am not fully informed as to tax matters, but I have sufficient information to cause me to feel that certain income-tax cases in Mississippi should be thoroughly investigated. It is because of these conditions that I shall ask the Senate for full-scale investigations by a special committee.

Mr. President, let me point out that there is now enough uncertainty among the American people without adding scandal to the administration of the war effort or other public affairs. This is not a question of politics. It is a question of decency and honesty in government. I trust that the Senate will see fit to authorize the investigation which will be asked for in the resolution to be submitted soon to the Senate by my colleague and myself.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. In the Senator's opinion, would it not be advisable, in view of the fact that Federal law is being violated, for the President, who has jurisdiction of the activities of the FBI, issue orders to the FBI to make the investigation? It is not only in Mississippi that such conditions as the Senator describes exist. I know of several instances which have occurred in my State which simply made my blood boil.

Mr. STENNIS. My remarks are confined to facts concerning which I have personal knowledge and direct information. I have confined myself to a statement respecting the State of Mississippi.

DISCREPANCIES IN ACCOUNTS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on March 25, 1949, I first called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation were in a deplorable condition and that the staggering amount of $366,000,000 had not been accounted for. I requested at that time that the Senate Agriculture Committee give this subject its immediate consideration. Following my disclosure, a renewed effort was made to adjust these records, and by June 1950 this item of $366,000,000 had been reduced to $96,440,497. At that time we were advised that this amount was being written off in order to bring the books of the CCC into balance.

I protested that procedure, and on June 6, 1950, when the Commodity Credit Corporation was asking for an additional

$2,000,000,000 of borrowing authority, I took the position that the Senate should not authorize any additional funds for this Corporation until such time as it had accounted for all the money it had received. However, the Senate saw fit to override my objections, and took the position that since the $96,000,000 referred to as written off represented transactions which occurred during the war years, it would not be profitable to the Government to persist in reestablishing the old records.

I refused to accept this explanation as final. I am sure the Senate will be interested in knowing that further renewed efforts by the Comptroller General have accounted for an additional $15,266,000, which now reduces the amount unaccounted for from the $96,440,497 referred to in the audit report for the year ended June 30, 1947, as reported to the Senate on June 6, 1950, to $81,174,497. A breakdown of this $15,266,000 is as follows:

Government agencies:	
War Department	$10,964,000
Navy Department	2,043,000
Department of Agriculture	736,000
U. S. Commercial Company	426,000
Lend-lease	382,000
Veterans' Administration	221,000
Panama Railroad Company	132,000
War Shipping Administration	80,000
Treasury Department	53,000
War Assets Administration	23,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,000
Total	15,061,000
Less net amount refunded to UNRRA for corrections of billings	1,171,000
Total Government agencies	13,890,000
Other than Government agencies:	
Foreign governments	136,000
Commercial (consists of approximately 1,000 items representing claims filed after June 30, 1947, and adjustments of claims, mainly against carriers, warehouses, vendors, and other private corporations and individuals)	1,240,000
Total	15,266,000

The fact that a substantial part of this recovery represents collections from other Government departments means that these departments were also, during the years in question, not keeping accurate records of their own expenditures; otherwise, these discrepancies would have been picked up in their reports.

I reiterate my previous position that Congress is negligent when it allows any Government corporation to continue its operations when it knows that the books of that corporation are in such a deplorable condition. As one Member of the Senate, I shall continue my interest in this Corporation until the remainder of this amount has been fully accounted for or until I can determine who is responsible.

BASIC DATA ON UNITED STATES ENERGY RESOURCES (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, so many requests have been received by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for copies of a monograph which was prepared by its staff entitled "Basic Data Relating to Energy Resources" that I wish to make the announcement that the monograph has now been authorized to be printed by the Senate of the United States as Senate Document No. 8, and will be available presently to all who may care to purchase it from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., for 75 cents a copy. It will be a valuable addition to the library of any person who is interested in promoting the development of this country. The document is the first compilation in a single volume of fundamental, comprehensive, factual information on each of the four major energy sources—coal, oil, gas, and hydroelectric power—upon which the industrial and military might of the people of the United States rests.

A vast amount of information on these great natural resources has been available in many publications, but the material is in such scattered form that practical use of it can be made only by the fuels expert who has the time to make detailed examination of a large number of volumes. The painstaking job of reviewing the mass of material, selecting the important and significant facts, and presenting them in a concise manner in compact form, has been done for the layman in Senate Document No. 8. The more than 200 charts, tables, and maps represent the best judgment of experts in the various energy fields as to what information on each fuel should be brought together as the basis for the energy-resource study being conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The material was compiled by specialists from the Department of the Interior and the Library of Congress, working with the committee staff.

Senate Document No. 8 offers the most comprehensive picture possible, in a volume of this size, of where the Nation stands in terms of energy resources. What they are, who uses them, how fast we are using them, and how much of them we have left, are matters covered in this document. The illustrations and explanatory material deal with all phases of energy consumption by type of fuel and by type of user, the changing patterns of fuel consumption, the rates and trends of production of the various fuels, and the amounts and kinds of fuel imports and exports. Statistics are given showing the nature and extent of the industry facilities, such as coal mines, oil wells, pipelines, and refineries. Other data show the major concerns in the several fuel industries and the division of the markets among them.

Perhaps the most provocative section of the document is the chapter on fuel reserves—those reserves which are the keystone of our entire economy in time of peace, and of our national security in time of war. Estimates by competent authorities are cited for liquid fuels, natural gas, coal and hydroelectric power. Synthetic liquid fuel from coal and oil shale is also discussed.

Other sections of the document deal with financial aspects of the fuel industries, with employment and productivity, and with the technological changes in the discovery, production, and use of each of the fuels.

When the document was issued recently as a committee print, the demand within 24 hours was greater than the supply available to the committee. Again let me say, Mr. President, that this document is now on sale at the Government Printing Office for 75 cents a copy.

The volume is the most complete compendium of basic, fundamental, and comprehensive information with respect to our principal sources of energy, including coal, oil, natural gas, and hydroelectric or water power. I feel that it is important that this notice of the availability of the document in the Government Printing Office should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that those who read the RECORD and who are interested in obtaining the information may know how the document may be acquired.

SALE OF CHEDDAR CHEESE TO BRITISH GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, recently there was released to the press by the Department of Agriculture a notice to the effect that 50,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese had been sold to the British Government.

Upon inquiry relative to the price the British paid, I was advised that it was the policy of the Department not to disclose prices of negotiated sales with foreign governments. However, further correspondence has developed the information which I now pass on to the taxpayers, who, after all, are going to pay the bill.

This 50,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese cost the Federal Government an average of about 31 cents per pound, or approximately $15,500,000. On October 20, 1950, the 50,000,000 pounds referred to above was sold to the United Kingdom Ministry of Food for 15 cents a pound, or about one-half of its cost, representing a loss of about $7,500,000.

It is of interest to note that during the same period in which this cheese was purchased by the Federal Government, and subsequently was exported out of this country to Great Britain, at a substantial loss—apparently for the purpose of making the price of Cheddar cheese higher to the American housewife—we imported Cheddar cheese from the British Empire in quantities amounting to over 13,000,000 pounds, with 2,470,000 pounds coming from Canada and 10,370,000 pounds coming from New Zealand, at prices ranging from 21 to 37 cents a pound.

To further complicate the case, the importation of this cheese was encouraged under the reciprocal-trade agreements by a 50-percent reduction in tariff rates.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] recently called a similar transaction to the attention of the Senate in relation to our exportation of substantial quantities of butter at 15 cents a pound, while the American housewives are being forced to pay 75 cents.

Unless we discontinue this absurd contradictory policy, by which we find that one Government agency is spending millions of dollars for the sole purpose of deliberately forcing food prices higher, by creating artificial shortages, and, at the same time, another Government agency is set up and staffed with thousands of employees for the sole purpose of holding down these same prices, Washington, instead of being classified as the Capital of the State of Confusion, will find itself as the Capital of Bankruptcy.

As evidence of what this type of program is costing the American taxpayers, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. F. J. Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, dated October 11, 1950, in which he points out that the Commodity Credit Corporation, the agency which handles these transactions, has since its inception cost the American taxpayers $3,251,843,466.22. This amount does not include $1,952,544,994 which has been expended by the Department of Agriculture under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; although that amount has been spent as a subsidy to agriculture, those operations are conducted under separate legislative authority.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In answer to a telephone request from your office concerning the operating results of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception and through June 30, 1950, the following information is submitted:

OPERATING RESULTS TO JUNE 30, 1950, AND DEFICIT

Net operating loss, exclusive of cost of wartime consumer subsidy program	$1,149,773,595.73
Adjustments for recovery of price support losses:	
Charges to the reserve for postwar price support	500,000,000.00
Recovery from Secretary of the Treasury—Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong.	56,239,432.11
Net operating loss after adjustments	593,534,163.62
Cost of wartime consumer subsidy program	2,102,069,870.49
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury	1,897,367,543.78
Net deficit as of June 30, 1950	798,236,490.33

The net operating loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including the $2,102,069,870.49 cost of the wartime consumer subsidy program, was $3,251,843,466.22. Of the net operating loss of $1,149,773,595.73, excluding the wartime consumer subsidy program shown above, $705,790,030.36 represents the establishment of reserves for estimated losses on loans, receivables, and inventories as of June 30, 1950. In other words, this amount represents possible future losses rather than realized losses as of that date. Actual realized net losses, exclusive of the wartime consumer subsidy costs, amounted to $443,983,565.37, this amount including both net program losses as well as overhead expenses and interest costs.

In regard to section 32 operations, the funds made available for "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities" since enactment of section 32 legislation on August 24, 1935, through the fiscal year 1950 have amounted to $2,241,557,961. Of this total, $1,961,716,479 had been obligated as of June 30, 1950, and $1,952,544,994 had been expended. Of the total obligations, $1,400,631,148 was used for the purposes within section 32, and $561,035,331 represents funds used in accordance with legislative directives other than section 32. The latter include National School Lunch Act (1947, 1948, and 1949), cotton price adjustment program, agricultural conservation program, wartime incentive payments, and pay act purposes in 1947. Of the total funds available to June 30, 1950, the sum of $115,223,849 was returned to the Treasury in the form of unobligated balances. The remainder of the unused balances was either reappropriated or was continued available for obligation after June 30, 1950.

It should be pointed out, we believe, that the Commodity Credit Corporation does not spend section 32 funds, and in tabulations of CCC costs section 32 expenditures should not be included. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), is a separate legislative authority under which a number of different programs are carried out by the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Director.

TITLE TO LANDS BENEATH NAVIGALLE WATERS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 34 of my colleagues from States spanning the Nation, both inland and coastal, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to establish, confirm and vest in the States title to lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. The following Senators are joint sponsors of this measure: Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN; California, Messrs. KNOWLAND and NIXON; Delaware, Mr. FREAR; Florida, Messrs. HOLLAND and SMATHERS; Indiana, Messrs. CAPEHART and JENNER; Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; Kansas, Messrs. SCHOEPPEL and CARLSON; Louisiana, Messrs. ELLENDER and LONG; Maryland, Messrs. O'CONOR and BUTLER; Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL; Minnesota, Mr. THYE; Mississippi, Messrs. EASTLAND and STENNIS; Nebraska, Mr. BUTLER; Nevada, Messrs. MCCARRAN and MALONE; New Jersey, Mr. HENDRICKSON; Ohio, Messrs. TAFT and BRICKER; Oregon, Mr. CORDON; Pennsylvania, Messrs. MARTIN and DUFF; South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSTON; South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT; Texas, Messrs. CONNALLY and JOHNSON; Virginia, Messrs. BYRD and ROBERTSON; Washington, Mr. CAIN.

The primary objective of this measure is to preserve and restore unimpaired the fundamental property rights of the several sovereign States, and to prevent further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights of the States in this respect.

May I express the view of myself and my colleagues that the time is long overdue that definite and permanent action be taken by the Congress to accomplish this end. There are important reasons, emphasized by current events which are well known to all, why this is imperative. Had such action been taken when such a measure was first presented to the Congress some 5 years ago we would not find ourselves confronted with the problem which now faces us.

Experience has demonstrated and present conditions confirm the fact that the States have shown superior ability in the development and production of petroleum resources. This statement is substantiated by the report of the National Petroleum Council on this question. This national body, composed of outstanding experts in the oil industry, was appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an investigation, to make research, and to formulate "A national oil policy for the United States." In its report, after a thorough review of the entire situation, the Council expressed its studied conclusion and made the following recommendation:

> The petroleum resources of the lands beneath the marginal seas extending to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf can best be explored and developed under State, rather than Federal, control.

In that connection, it went on to say:

> Substantial quantities of oil lie under the seas bordering the shores of several States. They constitute one of the most important sources of additional domestic oil supply remaining to be discovered and developed. A prudent oil policy would require that these resources be discovered and developed as soon as possible.
>
> Years of experience have demonstrated that State laws and regulations, designed to provide the necessary incentives and proper conservation practices, and on-the-ground State administration encourage the risk-taking vital to the discovery and development of petroleum resources. Federal laws and regulations, with final authority far removed from the scene of operations, have tended to discourage exploration for oil underlying Federal lands and to retard its discovery.
>
> Furthermore, on historic and constitutional grounds and under judicial precedents, the abutting States should own the lands and the resources beneath the marginal sea to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, inasmuch as any area within or appurtenant to the continental United States is required under our Federal system to be included in one or more States of the Union. A sound national policy should prompt Congress to confirm in such abutting States the ownership of the lands and subsoil beneath such marginal seas.

Despite this definite recommendation, action by Congress resolving this problem has been delayed, with resulting confusion on the part of the oil industry, the

States, and the Federal agencies. This confusion was further enhanced by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court on June 5 of last year in the cases brought by the United States against the States of Louisiana and Texas. These decisions had been looked forward to with a considerable degree of expectancy for guidance in the solution of the existing problem. It had been hoped that the Court might correct what many consider an erroneous pronouncement of the law in the California case, which failed to recognize the rights of the States which had prevailed in this Nation for over a century. These rights embraced the ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. No order and decree effectuating these decisions was entered into until December 11, 1950, so that no legislation was passed during the Eighty-first Congress.

At the opening of the Eighty-second Congress a so-called interim resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 20—was introduced by the senior Senator from Wyoming and the junior Senator from New Mexico. The hearings are now being conducted thereon before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. These hearings demonstrate the serious confusion and uncertainty that exists, and that, in my opinion at least, the so-called interim measure is entirely inadequate and will not provide the remedy to clear up the situation. It is recognized by all that to effect a permanent solution of the problem Congress can take one of two steps. It must restore to the States their long-asserted rights or must implement the claims of the Federal Government. In the judgment of the introducers of this bill, the one tenable course to be followed is the first named—that is to protect, defend, and restore to the States their long-asserted property rights.

It is the considered opinion of a substantial number of the Members of this body that definite and permanent legislation should be considered and passed without delay. While this bill now presented may not treat every angle of the problems presented, its concept is deemed sound and the basic principles upon which it rests are considered worthy of approval of this body. Whatever additional provisions may be deemed desirable can be readily provided upon a hearing of this measure. It is hoped that such hearing will take place immediately, and we believe it will result in a righteous solution, one of benefit to the entire Nation.

The policy which Congress should follow has been clearly set forth in a report (No. 2078) by the Judiciary Committee of the House dated May 17, 1950, where it was thus expressed.

> We consider it against the public interest for the Federal Government to commence a series of vexatious lawsuits against the sovereign States to recover submerged lands within the boundaries of the States, traditionally looked upon as the property of the States under a century of pronouncements by the Supreme Court reflecting its beliefs that the States owned these lands.

The report also said:

> The committee is of the opinion that not only will the public interest be best served by confirming the rights of the States but that common justice and equity require such action.

As yet, many States, including my own, have not been subjected to any legal action instituted by the Federal Government, challenging the ownership and use of the submerged lands and resources within their boundaries. Who is there to say that many States, interior or coastal, are not subject to being placed in jeopardy by court action brought by Federal agencies in an effort to invoke the same doctrine of so-called paramount rights?

In presenting this bill, my cosponsors and I find ourselves in highly respectable company. This company includes the following Nation-wide organizations whose dignity and patriotism are unchallenged: The Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, National Reclamation Association, National Water Conservation Association, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (representing 503 cities), and the National Association of Secretaries of State.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, the bill which is described in my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 940) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1, the veterans' bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside, until after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address, tomorrow, at which time, if it is agreeable to the majority leader, I shall ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I remember, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee expressed the opinion that it would take not more than an hour to dispose of House bill 1, and, inasmuch as it will take but a very short time to dispose of it tomorrow after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address, I think we should do so; after which we can recess until Monday, February 26, thus giving the committees an opportunity to catch up on their important work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF JOSEPH AIUPPA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on the calendar are a number of resolutions the purpose of which is to cite witnesses for contempt of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. The first is Senate Resolution 66, which I desire to call up at this time. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee make a motion or request unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is a privileged matter, Mr. President. However, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) citing Joseph Aiuppa, alias Anton Palunas, alias Joey O'Brien, for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Aiuppa (alias Anton Palunas alias Joey O'Brien) to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said Joseph Aiuppa (alias Anton Palunas alias Joey O'Brien) may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF JOSEPH DE CARLO, JAMES LICAVOLI, PETER TREMONT, AND DAVID N. KESSEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider en bloc Senate Resolution 67, citing Joseph De Carlo, alias "The Wolf," alias Di Carlo; Senate Resolution 68, citing James Licavoli, alias Jack White; Senate Resolution 69, citing Peter Tremont; and Senate Resolution 70, citing David N. Kessel—all for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolutions were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

Senate Resolution 67

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph De Carlo (alias "The Wolf," alias Di Carlo) to answer certain questions in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said Joseph De Carlo (alias "The Wolf," alias Di Carlo) may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 68

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of James Licavoli (alias Jack White) to answer certain questions in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, to the end that the said James Licavoli (alias Jack White) may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 69

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Peter Tremont to answer certain questions in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Peter Tremont may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Senate Resolution 70

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of David N. Kessel to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the northern district of California, to the end that the said David N. Kessel may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF CARLOS MARCELLO (REPT. NO. 120)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 78), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Carlos Marcello to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, to the end that the said Carlos Marcello may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF PETE LICAVOLI (REPT. NO. 121)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 79), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Pete Licavoli to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, to the end that the said Pete Licavoli may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF RUSSELL TRILCK (REPT. NO. 122)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 80), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Russell Trilck to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the eastern district of Michigan to the end that the said Russell Trilck may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF JOHN J. FOGARTY (REPT NO. 123)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Inestigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 81), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of John J. Fogarty to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana to the end that the said John J. Fogarty may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF PHIL KASTEL (REPT. NO. 124)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 82), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Phil Kastel to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana to the end that the said Phil Kastel may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF ANTHONY MARCELLO (REPT. NO. 125)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 83), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Anthony Marcello to answer certain questions and his failure to produce certain records in response to subpena duly issued, before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana to the end that the said Anthony Marcello may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF MIKE RUBINO (REPT. NO. 126)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 84), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mike Rubino to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, to the end that the said Mike Rubino may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF JOSEPH A. PORRETTO (REPT. NO. 127)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized

Crime in Interstate Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 85), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph A. Porretto to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, to the end that the said Joseph A. Porretto may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

APPREHENSION OF WITNESSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 65, for the apprehension of certain persons desired as witnesses before the Special Committee To Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McFARLAND. What resolution is it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Senate Resolution 65, and I might make an explanation in connection with it. In December a resolution was submitted averring that certain witnesses had absented themselves, and that they could not be found for the service of subpenas.

The matter was brought up on the floor of the Senate, and on a voice vote the resolution was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary reported that while, of course, the Senate had the right to issue warrants for the arrest of witnesses who were in hiding, the matter should have been referred to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, in addition to the efforts of the committee's staff to serve subpenas, in order that the committee might have the help of the Sergeant at Arms. Subsequently that was done, and the witnesses for whom warrants of arrest are called for in Senate Resolution 65 were listed, and, in addition to efforts to serve subpenas on them by the staff of the committee, by the police officers, both State and local, where they are located, and by letters posted in registered mail, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate has been called upon to locate them, and he has reported that he has been unable to do so.

Our committee voted unanimously that we had the duty to use every effort to see that these persons did not thwart the will of the Senate. Senate Resolution 65 complies with the suggestions of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 65?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate issue warrants commanding the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, or such persons as may be deputized by him, to take into custody the bodies of Rocco Fischetti, Charles Fischetti, Murray L. Humphreys, Jacob Guzik, William G. O'Brien, John Angersola (alias King), Moe Dalitz (alias Davis), Samuel T. Haas, Morris Kleinman, Louis Rothkapf (alias Rhody), Samuel "Gameboy" Miller, Morris "Mushy" Wexler, Samuel Tucker, George Angersola (alias King), John Croft, James Brink, Louis Levinson, and to bring the said persons before the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce at Washington, D. C., or if the said committee be no longer in existence when the arrest is made, before the bar of the Senate or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, then and there to answer such questions pertinent to the matter under inquiry as the said special committee, the Senate itself, or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate;

That, for the purpose of executing warrants issued in accordance with this resolution, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate may by all-inclusive order or orders deputize all law-enforcement officers of the Federal Government; and

That the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, the Senate itself, or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may discharge any of the persons taken into custody under the authorization of this resolution upon proper assurance by recognizance, or otherwise, that he will appear to give testimony when required to do so. The committee, the Senate, or such appropriate standing committee as the Senate may designate, may require such assurances as it deems necessary, not to exceed $25,000 for any one witness.

For the purpose of discharging any person from custody and ordering assurances, one member of the said committee, or of an appropriately designated standing committee of the Senate, shall be a quorum.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar W. Scarborough to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Ernest F. Klinge, of Maryland, to the position of Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John P. Cowart, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Edward B. Doyle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

Joseph Henry Young, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia. Mr. Young is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, USAF (medical)

William R. Armstrong, O357049.
Laurence S. Ayars, AO427941.
Richard S. Fixott, O315322.
Claud M. Mears, AO490247.
Henry G. Wallace, O347249.

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Jack M. Cilliland, AO1765591.
Richard T. Shugart, O1735983.
Frederick S. Spiegel, AO518309.

To be captains, USAF (dental)

Norman G. Hoot.
William A. C. Miller, Jr., O487550.
Joseph R. Prowler, AO2213551.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Timothy N. Caris.
Richard M. Fenno, AO1014321.
Richard H. Ferguson, 495181, USNR.
Sam M. King, AO1906867.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Arthur L. Milbourn, AO659575.
Charles R. Morris, AC1906203.
George W. Schrader, AO1640926.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (veterinary)

Russell F. Greer, AO1705369.
William P. Hayman, Jr., AO937260.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (chaplain)

Patrick J. Ahern, AO966658.
John S. Bennett, AO403239.
Harold W. Bonner, AO977026.
Connor G. Cole, O550570.
George E. Hoop, AO966138.
Timothy J. Larkin, AO927183.
William J McPeak, AO958793.
Oden M. Pullen, AO933140.
Edmund A. Puseman, AO970849.
Laurence E. Saul, AO967163.
David K. Shelton, AO973145.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical service)

Owen F. Connolly, AO745626.
Frank R. Foley, AO1541859.
Lorenzo K. Kimball, AO1534060.
Lee I. Saul, AO154548b.
Charles J. Werderman, AO2014109.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (medical service)

Albert V. Alder, AO1906167.
William C. Bodner, AO976663.
Sidney D. Cox, Jr., AO534604.
Earl H. Eggett, AO1040702.
Benson Y. Olenick, AO955944.
Kenneth G. Sparling, AO1683388.
Richard A. Turner, AO1534405.
John Venaglia, AO937973.
Glen F. Wood, AO971553.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants, USAF (nurses)

Glenna L. Chandler, AN792075.
Patricia A. Cooney, AN792212.
Dorothy D. Danowski, AN804278.
Florence F. Elser, AN792719.
Lillian T. Hatfield, AN804194.
Shirley A. Mansfield, AN792802.
Patricia J. Orme, AN785207.
Madelyn A. Sullivan, AN792188.
Mildred A. Zila, AN804300.
Alma E. P. Zollner, AN779683.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 102, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants, USAF (women's medical specialists)

Filomena R. Fusco, AR1906231.
Barbara M. Hodgkins, AR1906465.
Barbara L. F. Lacy, AR2531.
Mary N. Will, AM2863.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadet for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

Glenn E. Wasson.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Richard L. Gehle, AO591342.
Harry A. Gordon, Jr., AO591345.
Lawrence E. Green, AO591346.
Varney R. Nell, AO591396.
Jack B. Shaw, AO591420.
Harold L. Stancil, AO591424.
Lee R. Wasmund, AO591444.

The following-named distinguished officer candidate for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenant

Betty L. Parsons, AL591464.

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Richard W. Couvillion.
Bryan E. Zimmerman.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Sterling S. Cook — Clyde W. Brunson
Warwick T. Brown — Charles F. Behrens

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William O. Hiltabidle, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Amelia B. Peirsol, to be postmaster at Camino, Calif., in place of F. E. Savage, resigned.

Jeremy A. Gregory, to be postmaster at Muroc, Calif., in place of F. J. Schultz, resigned.

COLORADO

Julius B. Pritchard, to be postmaster at Fort Lyon, Colo., in place of W. B. Sweezy, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Merwyn H. Squires, to be postmaster at Chestnut Hill, Conn., in place of F. M. Caples, retired.

ILLINOIS

Carroll K. Heitzman, to be postmaster at Litchfield, Ill., in place of P. W. Blackwelder, resigned.

KANSAS

Max E. McRae, to be postmaster at Altamont, Kans., in place of E. F. Hill, resigned.

John W. Robinson, to be postmaster at Coffeyville, Kans., in place of J. E. Brogan, resigned.

Lloyd E. Ashton, to be postmaster at Fairview, Kans., in place of C. F. Mellenbruch, retired.

Charles E. Schneider, to be postmaster at Glasco, Kans., in place of G. F. Colwell, transferred.

Claude O. Leonard, to be postmaster at Richland, Kans., in place of C. J. Montfoort, transferred.

Marvin I. Lawrence, to be postmaster at Scott City, Kans., in place of H. R. Winter, transferred.

Daniel H. Pollet, to be postmaster at Sedan, Kans., in place of B. J. Funk, transferred.

John R. Fogleman, to be postmaster at Ulysses, Kans., in place of C. W. Hickok, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Leon J. Guidry, to be postmaster at Lafayette, La., in place of S. L. Voorhies, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harper T. Gerry, to be postmaster at Shelburne Falls, Mass., in place of R. H. Amstein, resigned.

MICHIGAN

John H. McFarland, Jr., to be postmaster at Alma, Mich., in place of J. L. Winslow, resigned.

Melvin E. Lietzke, to be postmaster at La Salle, Mich., in place of E. R. Hanna, declined.

Clayton R. Ramsay, to be postmaster at Mulliken, Mich., in place of A. R. Merritt, retired.

Earl Willey Kenrick, to be postmaster at Onaway, Mich., in place of W. J. Faircloth, deceased.

Stephen J. Doster, to be postmaster at Plainwell, Mich., in place of G. A. Ruddy, retired.

MINNESOTA

James E. Ruddy, to be postmaster at Moorhead, Minn., in place of F. A. Lamb, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Rusie M. King, to be postmaster at Heidelberg, Miss., in place of J. T. Carr, transferred.

Stanton W. Johnson, to be postmaster at Richton, Miss., in place of A. A. Edwards, transferred.

MISSOURI

Emil E. Bock, to be postmaster at Pilot Grove, Mo., in place of M. T. Barnes, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Norbert F. Kalkowski, to be postmaster at Ashton, Nebr., in place of L. L. Lewandowski, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

George T. Knapp, to be postmaster at Mullica Hill, N. J., in place of H. D. Glutting, resigned.

NEW YORK

Theodore J. Marden, to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of W. H. O'Brien, Jr., removed.

John Eugene Robson, to be postmaster at Bovina Center, N .Y., in place of F. W. Thomson, retired.

Paul A. Hughes, to be postmaster at Granville, N. Y., in place of D. J. McHenry, retired.

Arnold D. Case, to be postmaster at Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

William A. Murphy, to be postmaster at Irvington, N. Y., in place of J. J. Reilly, deceased.

Henry E. Holley, to be postmaster at Otisville, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Zimmerman, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

David F. Cordner, to be postmaster at Bismarck, N. Dak., in place of Christian Bertsch, retired.

Donald C. Fraser, to be postmaster at Fargo, N. Dak., in place of W. S. Hooper, retired.

Alf N. Ellingson, to be postmaster at Valley City, N. Dak., in place of C. K. Otto, retired.

OHIO

Gerald V. Danison, to be postmaster at Glenford, Ohio, in place of Annabelle Mechling, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clair E. Johnson, to be postmaster at Beech Creek, Pa., in place of I. J. Rohrbaugh, deceased.

Edgar S. Husband, Jr., to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Pa., in place of Cornelius McCullough, deceased.

Paul M. Kuhns, to be postmaster at Leacock, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paul C. Althouse, to be postmaster at Parkesburg, Pa., in place of J. R. Owens, retired.

Frank P. Hill, to be postmaster at Sharon Hill, Pa., in place of R. B. Althouse, removed.

John A. Linder, to be postmaster at West Fairview, Pa., in place of R. S. Poffenbarger, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

James G. McAvoy, to be postmaster at Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. J. Duncan, retired.

WISCONSIN

Bruce W. Freck, to be postmaster at Fall River, Wis., in place of M. I. Dunn, resigned.

Arthur E. Carstens, to be postmaster at Hilbert, Wis., in place of C. H. Eldridge, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Edgar W. Scarborough to be United States marshal for the northern district of Florida.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. Franklin A. Hart to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as commandant of the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.